86 U.S. Congress. Congressional Record.
11

Appendix

Address by Former Senator Hendrickson of New Jersey on the Constitution of the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLIFFORD P. CASE
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, June 18, 1956

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. Mr. President, I know that my colleagues are always interested in what my predecessor, Senator Robert C. Hendrickson, has to say. In his capacity as our Ambassador to New Zealand, he has recently had occasion to tour some areas of New Zealand, and to bring an American message to the people of that land. The Senate will be very much interested in reading an address made by Bob Hendrickson to the Overseas League on April 23, 1956. I ask unanimous consent that the speech be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OVERSEAS LEAGUE, CHRISTCHURCH, APRIL 23, 1956

Tonight it will be my purpose to bring to my good neighbors of the Overseas League some enlightenment in respect to the provisions of the Constitution of the United States of America and since we in America are on the eve of an election very important to free peoples the world over, I will endeavor in the short time at my disposal to treat briefly with those features of American constitutional government which give rise to an election procedure which seems filled with complications to our good neighbors abroad.

In any discussion of the Constitution of the United States it should be said at the very beginning that we in America all agree, save those who subscribe to Communist ideologies, that as a legal document, it establishes a highly successful system of Government. A great British statesman, William E. Gladstone, speaking of the American Constitution put it this way: "As the British constitution is the most subtle organism which has proceeded from progressive history, so the American Constitution is the most wonderful work ever struck off at a given time by the brain and purpose of man." The precision and brevity of our Federal Constitution are admirable. It is true, of course, that millions of words have been devoted to its constitutional principles. Great jurists have interpreted the meaning of the Constitution in all its parts. Obviously as a framework of Government it has stood the test of time, wars, and depressions. It is a document based upon truth and, like truth, it laughs at all the assaults of time.

Before I treat with any of its basic principles or with laws and usages which have grown up thereunder, I would like to make just a few observations in respect to the heart and soul of the Constitution, and the qualities within its framework which spring from the human heart and not merely from the human intellect. Unless a Constitution satisfies the aspirations of the heart and feeds the human soul, unless it stirs our emotions deeply, it could not be regarded as an appropriate expression of any free people and this is particularly true, I think, of a written Constitution such as ours in the States—so we might ask these four questions: Why was the Constitution formed? Who were the framers? What emergency fronted them? And what did they aim to accomplish?

Stated briefly, the answers are that the American Constitution was formed for the purpose of perpetuating American liberty by uniting 13 separate and distinct Colonies in 1 indissoluble Government. When one recalls that few, if any, of those Colonies had little in common with their neighboring Colonies as of that time, it becomes immediately evident that all other aims of that new partnership were secondary to the basic objective which was to safeguard the liberty so recently won by giving those new and unprotected States a medium of common defense.

The history of the Articles of the Confederation by which the interests of the new States were loosely bound—very loosely bound, indeed—for approximately 11 years preceding the adoption of the Constitution makes it self-evident that at the close of the Revolutionary War the American liberty which has come to mean so much to the world of today would have been completely lost for all time unless the States had banded together under a solemn agreement possessing the strength and character to preserve their liberties. Now, then, if you believe as I do that our lines stem from God and that our Creator endows man with the right of liberty the moment he breathes life into him, it becomes difficult to take issue with the framers of the Constitution of the United States in their search to perpetuate their newly won liberty for their sons and daughters—and their children's children.

In any event, the framers of the Federal Constitution set their hearts and minds to the task ahead with all the earnestness and vigor they possessed as they undertook to write a legal document which would enable a new nation, "the American people," to exercise their power within their own hands to maintain their liberty against either foreign attack or internal dissension.

At the very outset these men who were soldiers, planters, lawyers, physicians, merchants, and judges—some very rich, others quite poor—wrote into the preamble of their new charter of human rights five basic purposes of their inspired mission. The first was to form a more perfect union; the second to establish justice; the third to insure domestic tranquility; the fourth to provide for the common defense; the fifth to promote the general welfare; and finally, they declared that the Constitution is to secure "the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity." Having completed a statement of the mission, they then proceeded to write the pattern under which a new government might proceed. First, they gave us a legislative branch of Government by which they vested in a Congress all legislative powers. For this purpose they created a House of Representatives and a Senate: The House of Representatives to be composed of Members chosen every second year by the people of the several States according to population. The Senate to be composed of 2 Senators from each State to be chosen by the legislature thereof for 6 years. I hasten to say here that this provision was changed by the 17th amendment so that today, Senators are elected by popular election in each of the States. In addition to its legislative powers, the Senate of the United States has the power of impeachment of all officials of the United States, including the President. The Senate possesses another power which is not possessed by the House, namely, that of approving treaties and confirming the appointments of Ambassadors, public ministers, and consuls, judges of the Supreme Court, and of other officers of the United States whose appointments are not expressly provided for in the Constitution.

Having written a very competent program for the legislative branch of Government, the Convention proceeded to the task of establishing the executive branch of Government. This falls under article 2, which provides the methods by which the President and Vice President shall be selected, and defines their duties and powers. It will interest you to know that our Cabinet system has no constitutional status. It was created by enabling acts within the constitutional framework.

The next step in order was the establishment of the judicial power of the United States which is found in article 3—whereunder there is established one Supreme Court and such inferior courts as the Congress from time to time may ordain and establish. The 2d and 3d sections of article 3 spell out rather carefully the areas of the law or jurisdictions in which the courts may function.

To any of you who have listened to any extended discussions of the American Constitution—you will recall the frequent references to the phrase: "checks and balances." It may sound confusing to some, but the explanation is rather simple.

The framers of the Constitution had lived through rich and varied experiences in Colonial Government for over 169 years and under their own poorly conceived Articles of Confederation for 11 years. So that in all they had more than 180 years of "trial and error" to guide them. They had been taught by hard and sometimes costly experience that their great safety lay in preventing any concentration of power in one authority. Thus, by a complete separation of the legislative, executive and judicial powers and making them each a check upon the others, it was felt that all powers necessary could be entrusted to the Government without any danger of usurpation of power or resulting tyranny in any form by any branch of their new Government

But those wise and sagacious men went one step further. They provided one additional check which has been a great salvation on at least one occasion in my own lifetime. In article IV they retained large powers in the States and by so doing erected a further barrier or check against encroachment upon their liberties by the great central Government which they were creating.

In order to fully comprehend the unique system provided in the United States Constitution it must be borne in mind always that the States existed and each had its own individual sovereignty before the United

AUTHENTICATED
U.S. GOVERNMENT
INFORMATION
GPO

States was created. It was to bind them together and swing them into their coordinated orbits that the Union was perfected.

Perhaps the next vital feature of the Federal Constitution—next to the Bills of Rights, which was not adopted until 1792—is the Amendment Clause (art. V). Here again, the Founding Fathers exhibited farseeing wisdom. They provide a medium by which changes could be made from time to time to meet the most pressing needs of the people, but at the same time established safeguards against hasty and ill-considered proposals stemming from ill-tempered reactions in periods of great strain and strong emotions.

Now there are other provisions of importance but the articles I have mentioned coupled with the Bill of Rights (the first 10 amendments) vitually furnish the blueprint upon which our legal system is based and under which the Government of the United States has been administered now for 169 years. And it should always be remembered that the laws which are passed pursuant to the Constitution must conform to that blueprint—even a State law which violates the design of the pattern will upon proper legal review be declared unconstitutional and held to be without force and effect. Aside from the laws which are expressly prohibited to the Congress and the States the legislative authority is very broad indeed—and covers many fields and facets of life for the language of section 8 of article I very carefully spells out the express grants of power to the Congress for the enactment of every law a nation might need to adequately maintain itself within the terms of the preamble of the Constitution.

The laws specifically prohibited include such matters as the suspension of the writ of habeas corpus, bills of attainder or ex post facto laws, certain tax laws, laws giving preferences to the ports of one State over another or imposing duties between States; laws granting titles of nobility, etc. Then, there also are certain limitations in respect to the laws which the several States may enact which were very wisely included.

Since I might go on now for hours treating with hypothetical cases of the categories of laws that might be the subject of judicial review to test whether a constitutional right had been violated, I think the time has arrived now to make good my earlier promise to treat with some of the proceedings under which our elections are conducted for most of the present enabling legislation in this field has been tested by time, precedent, and careful constitutional review through both the State and Federal courts.

Here, I hasten to say that most of the election laws are State laws enacted by the State legislatures. This is so because aside from the President, the Vice President, the Members of the United States Senate and House of Representatives, all other elected officials are State, county, or municipal officers.

So the Constitution after providing a very unique, but I think archaic fashion, for the selection of presidential electors—for the election of the President and Vice President—leaves the election of the Members of the Senate and House upon the electors of each State who are qualified to vote for Members of the most numerous house of the State legislature.

Thus, our elections in the United States do become complicated to one who has never had residence there—for each State has its own laws to treat with its voting procedures—as well as the qualification of candidates and voters. By and large the State laws have over the years become fairly uniform but there still remain differences in registration procedures, dates of elections, filing procedures for candidates, limitations on campaign expenditures which under the wise guidance of organizations like the Council of State Governments will one day become uniform throughout the 48 States. At least this is my fond hope.

I am quite sure that the American election system which has developed under our Constitution becomes more difficult to understand abroad because of the two elections each election year—a primary election between the candidates of the same parties and then later, after an extensive campaign, the final or general election. In our primaries, as we call them, any qualified voter is eligible to become a candidate in the party of his choice for any office in the land—from the lowest to the highest. He qualifies himself by the filing of a petition signed by a number of qualified voters fixed by the statute according to the importance of the office. In some primaries there have been upwards of 30 candidates in a given party. The candidate who receives the greatest number of votes of course becomes the candidate for his party in the general election. Since both parties operate on the same basis in this respect, the winners in the primary election are the contestants in the general election. Here, I hasten to add that although we have only two major parties, there are always spaces on the ballots in which to write in candidates of one's choice and in addition to this fact, a candidate may always file as an independent or as a member of a minor party, as for example the Socialist Party. I wish that time permitted to relate some of the interesting experiences I have had in primary contests in my own State.

Now, when a President is running, the delegates for the party convention are selected from each State to represent their parties at the Presidential conventions. In my own State of New Jersey these delegates were selected last Tuesday in the primary election held three. These delegates may or may not, according to their designations on the ballot, be pledged to certain candidates for President or Vice President. In the year in which a President is to be elected it is usually customary for all other candidates in both parties to lean heavily upon the presidential candidates' popularity and by the same token, county and municipal aspirants for office generally lean heavily upon Statewide candidates—as, for example, the candidate for Governor or for the United States Senate. Our campaigns in the United States are properly the subject of much criticism both at home and abroad, and this is so primarily because candidates for various offices will start to announce their intentions very early in the year and the first announcement immediately brings on the beginning of a primary campaign.

Both in 1940, when I ran for governor, and in 1948, when I ran for the United States Senate, I was campaigning constantly from the middle of February until the day before the general election, which in every State, except Maine, falls on the first Tuesday after the first Monday of November of the election year.

We have pictures here which tell vividly the story of our party conventions for the Presidency, so for the sake of brevity I will not dwell on that subject.

It should be mentioned that we have adequate proceedings in the law of each State for contesting elections on the grounds of fraud or corruption, or even for an alleged faulty count. In the case of the election of United States Senators and Congressmen there are not only safeguards in the law against fraud and corruption but the Constitution provides specifically that each House may be the judge of the qualifications and fitness of their Members so that there are occasions where Members of the House of Representatives and the Senate are investigated for integrity both at the State level and again by the respective Houses to which they might seek membership.

I had the unpleasant task for a number of years of serving on the Senate Committee on Privileges in Elections and had to pass judgment on the qualifications of men who were duly elected by a majority of voters of their own State. I can assume you it is not an easy task to look beyond what seems to be the will of the people of one of our great States.

All this election machinery falls within the blueprint of the Constitution of the United States and is established, as I have indicated, by laws enacted pursuant to that great charter of the Government. Under its benign influence America has enjoyed on the whole that quality of service from its elected officials and its representatives in its 49 legislative bodies which has given the people of the country both the inspiration and incentive to expand their national resources in a period of 169 years to a position which has no parallel in the world. I know that I speak for my President, for the Congress, for the people of America when I express the hope that, as we try to share with others who seek liberty akin to our own, our unselfish purposes will be fully understood everywhere.

May it be the will of the Almighty to give to all people throughout the world the bountiful blessings which have been ours in the fields of justice, liberty and a well-balanced free way of life—through the medium of free elections and sound constitutional procedures.

Partisanship Set Aside

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK E. SMITH
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 16, 1956

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include the following editorial from the St. Louis Post-Dispatch:

PARTISANSHIP SET ASIDE

Walter S. Robertson is one of the most responsible officials in the Eisenhower administration. As Assistant Secretary of State for Far Eastern Affairs he shoulders the responsibility for United States policy with respect to the perplexing problems of the Orient. His specific assignments have taken him to the Geneva Conference of 1954 and to the Manila Pact Conference at Bangkok last year.

Because Assistant Secretary Robertson is this trusted official of the Eisenhower administration special importance attaches to an address he delivered at Staunton, Va., the birthplace of Woodrow Wilson. The occasion was a notable gathering, including ambassadors or their representatives from 35 countries, in connection with the centennial year of the birth of the World War I President.

Mr. Robertson's review of the Wilson career was in striking contrast to the slurs frequently thrown at that great President by Republican partisan speakers. There was no low blow at Woodrow Wilson as the first of "three Democratic Presidents to get the country into war." There was no attempt to dismiss him as a visionary, an impractical idealist, an egghead.

On the contrary, Mr. Robertson made a point of saying that when war came in Europe in 1914, "Wilson was primarily concerned to keep our Nation out of it." He told how Wilson as a boy of 8 "had seen at firsthand in Georgia the horror that follows in the wake of war."

Because Wilson's "devotion to peace was genuine and compelling," the Democratic President struggled through 3 years of the war in Europe to find a common ground on which the belligerents could meet. Of this Mr. Robertson said:

"Wilson's statesmanship stands out as matured and inspired. He could not have tried harder than he did to bring about peace without victory, but no man could have held back the tide of events that was to follow—the sacrifice of more hundreds and thousands of lives, the achievement of power by the Communists in Russia, the internal collapse of Germany, and the eventual rise of nazism, bringing on Europe another and near fatal war."

The Assistant Secretary of State not only commended Wilson's 14 points as a historic peace program with overpowering psychological effect that shortened the war. He commended also Wilson's vision in proposing the League of Nations and in insisting that it be part of the World War I peace treaty. Then Mr. Robertson made this remarkable statement:

"President Wilson's defeat came not in Paris but at home. It is not my purpose to explore the causes of that rejection. No one can question the earnest patriotism of the opposition. No one can question that the blame must be shared.

"It is enough for us to recall that on August 8, 1945, the United States Senate voted in favor of American membership in the League's successor, the United Nations, vindicating Woodrow Wilson's ideals by the startling vote of 89 to 2.

"We had by then paid in copious measure for our failure to join the League of Nations that Woodrow Wilson had founded."

What relevance does the Wilson example have for us today? Mr. Robertson made it very clear when he recalled how Wilson's idealism was derided in the 1920's and then said: "We have had to learn once more that when Wilson said 'the world must be made safe for democracy' he was expressing the necessary and transcendent objective of our Nation's foreign policy, the end we still must achieve if we mean to survive."

At the start of 1956 the hope was expressed on this page that the centennials of those two great men of ideas, Woodrow Wilson and his Supreme Court appointee, Louis Dembitz Brandeis, would somehow raise the level of campaigning in the presidential election year.

Certainly Assistant Secretary of State Walter S. Robertson has done his part to set partisanship aside and to give credit where due. His address at the historic and lovely town of Staunton, Va., ought to be required reading for Republican and Democratic speakers in the months ahead. It has the stamp of statesmanship.

United States Potters Association Consolidated Report on Sales, Earnings, Wages, and Man-Hours, 1947–55

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. HARRY McGREGOR
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 18, 1956

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, I am today in receipt of a chart showing what our so-called reciprocal trade and low tariff program is doing to one of our great industries, who for years has given employment to many, many people. The chart that I am inserting shows a steady decrease in earnings, in total wages, and total man-hours worked.

Mr. Speaker, for many years I have been calling to the attention of Congress this situation and others of similar nature as it affects industries in my district. It is disgraceful that we are asking our American labor and manufacturers to compete with products produced in other countries by low wage rate labor. I say it is time to stop such a procedure.

EXHIBIT A.—*United States Potters Association consolidated report on sales, earnings, wages, and man-hours, 1947–55*

Year	Sales, less allowances and returns, prepaid freight, packages, and discount	Earnings before taxes	Earnings after taxes	Total dozens shipped	Total wages, production employees, including all premium and vacation pay	Total man-hours worked, production employees
1947	$56, 620, 850	$6, 688, 246	$4, 150, 350	27, 293, 281	$32, 806, 817	25, 681, 758
1948	59, 409, 591	5, 552, 471	3, 428, 569	27, 466, 052	35, 796, 623	24, 895, 846
1949	52, 765, 241	1, 998, 548	1. 158, 747	21, 862, 812	31, 504, 426	21, 472, 919
1950	54, 881, 791	3, 467, 055	1, 951, 892	23, 365, 968	31, 505, 141	20, 596, 834
1951	59, 670, 911	3, 790, 339	1, 811, 416	22, 987, 942	34, 124, 409	20, 958, 997
1952	58, 789, 381	2, 275, 621	942, 504	22, 701, 589	34, 617, 634	20, 385, 137
1953	53, 508, 651	1, 026, 227	255, 815	19, 337, 151	31, 744, 522	16, 703, 501
1954	48, 315, 607	[1] 683, 786	[1] 1, 107, 882	18, 932, 883	26, 976, 496	15, 858, 009
1955	45, 529, 915	510, 025	48, 938	19, 065, 937	24, 867, 746	14, 377, 871

[1] Loss.

Cotton Research Needed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK E. SMITH
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 16, 1956

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include the following newspaper article describing a recent proposal for major acceleration of cotton research made by W. T. Wynn, of Greenville, Miss., chairman of the board of directors of the National Cotton Council:

WYNN URGES FIGHT FOR RESEARCH AT TEXAS MEETING

DALLAS, TEX.—If cotton is to insure its long-range future, cotton farmers should begin thinking about paying from $1 to $1.50 per bale into an industry fund for research and promotion.

This proposal was advanced here today by W. T. Wynn, Greenville, Miss., in an address to the Texas Cottonseed Crushers Association. Emphasizing that cotton must choose between research or recession, he said that with an average 12-million-bale crop the collection of from $1 to $1.50 per bale would yield $12 million to $18 million annually for work on cotton and cottonseed problems.

Chairman of the board of directors of the National Cotton Council and long prominent in the industry, Wynn said, "In no other way can I envision that over the long pull we will be able to give cotton a truly adequate research program.

"In no other way can I see how we are to hold and expand our markets, to utilize effectively our land and capital investments, and to be assured of a prosperous cotton economy.

"I make this proposal," he said, "knowing we have made great progress and that fine work is being done in Government and private research laboratories, and in our textile schools and textile mills. I make it, however, knowing, too, that we must continually plan for the future."

Wynn said he was addressing the group as an individual, "a farmer and a businessman whose experience and observation have been impressed with the vital role that research plays in the changing patterns of economic growth, business survival, or business catastrophe."

The $12 million fund he proposes admittedly is but a start, he said, toward matching the money that is being spent by producers of man-made fibers; but $12 million is enough to get into a really effective program of research and promotion.

COLLECTION PLANS

How could such a fund be collected? There are several possibilities, he said, all of which must be considered carefully. He quoted a resolution passed by cotton council delegates at the organization's annual meeting, putting the organization on record to "seek to develop a long-range program to finance, from private sources, research and promotion in amounts adequate to make cotton fully competitive with synthetic fibers and other competing materials."

The purpose of this resolution, he explained, is to make sure that the right answer is found to the problem of financing such a program as he envisions.

Mr. Wynn also called attention to a bill introduced recently in Congress, incorporating the idea of a greatly expanded fund for research and promotion.

"This bill, as I understand it, would have the farmers vote a levy on themselves when they vote on production controls each year. This is one method at which the industry will be looking. But whether we come out with this method of financing or some other, we can all agree that the time for half measures is past."

IDEA NOT NEW

The idea of farmers assessing themselves for their own protection is not a new one, the cotton industry leader declared, noting that in the Mississippi Delta cotton producers for a period of 50 years paid a dollar per bale each year for levees to protect their lands from floods. In many of these years the price of cotton was less than a dime a pound.

"The threat to the cotton industry by the Mississippi River was no more real," the industry leader warned, and not nearly so permanent in nature as the threat now facing the cotton farmer—the threat that his means of livelihood will be swept away by the onrushing flood of synthetic fiber production."

Foreign Aid and the Taxpayer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALVIN M. BENTLEY
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 18, 1956

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I wish to insert the following statement which gives the results of some calculations I have made in an effort to relate the foreign-aid bill to my own district.

In reaching a decision as to whether or not to go along with the administration on their request for $4.9 billion in funds for foreign aid, I found it of considerable interest to apply this figure to my district. I felt it important to bring my constituents' attention to the amounts which are actually coming from their pocketbooks without their being given an actual opportunity to vote on the measure. As their Representative in Congress, I am very much aware of the fact that they are heavily burdened with tax and that I should extend my efforts wherever possible to ease that load.

Since coming to Congress I have fought consistently for cuts in foreign aid and this year for the first time voted for the bill after the cuts I worked for in committee were made. While I certainly do not base my decision to fight for cuts entirely on the basis of per capita cost to the taxpayer, I do feel it is of great importance.

In applying the 1956 foreign-aid figure to my State, I find that Michigan's share amounts to $277,340,000. My Eighth District, with a population of 333,277, would carry a portion of this request amounting to $14,504,882.

In my district, there were 104,995 voters who cast a ballot in the congressional election in 1954. It is surprising to realize that their share of the proposed $4.9 billion would amount to $138.14 each.

I believe the following figures on the 6 counties and 6 largest cities in the Eighth District are worthy of our study:

	Population	Share of 1956 foreign aid
Clinton County	31,195	$1,358,966.00
Gratiot County	33,429	1,453,261.60
Ionia County	38,158	1,658,493.20
Montcalm County	31,013	1,350,645.80
Saginaw County	153,515	6,683,894.00
Shiawassee County	45,967	1,999,621.40
8th district	333,277	14,504,882.00

Applying the same figures to our six largest cities:

City	Population	Share of 1956 foreign aid
Ionia	6,412	$278,626.85
Alma	8,341	361,861.74
Greenville	6,608	290,388.85
Owosso	15,948	696,968.74
St. Johns	4,954	215,803.80
Saginaw	92,918	4,043,755.87

Technical and Scientific Education and Proposed Federal Scholarships

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, June 18, 1956

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter written to the editor of the New York Times by William Benton, former United States Senator from Connecticut.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MAY 31, 1956.

The EDITOR,
THE NEW YORK TIMES,
New York, N. Y.

DEAR SIR: In his important address at Baylor University last Friday President Eisenhower called upon American universities and foundations to help provide "adequate institutions of modern techniques and sciences" in underdeveloped areas.

The President thus makes a tentative approach to a problem of the highest importance and urgency. He eloquently sketches the breadth of the opportunity. At Baylor he said:

"Do we not find here a worthy challenge to America's universities and to their graduates? I firmly believe that if some or all of our great universities, strongly supported by private foundations that exist in number throughout our land, sparked by the zeal and fire of educated Americans, would devote themselves to this task, the prospects for a peaceful and prosperous world would be mightily enhanced.

"I honestly believe that the opportunity here for each educated American is invaluable beyond the comprehension almost of any one of us."

I read the Baylor address in Paris. Perhaps this explains why I reacted with distress over the considerable misunderstanding it will cause abroad. Foreigners don't realize that our Federal Government has no authority over the programs of our universities or our foundations. Further, abroad as well as at home, some people think of foundations as bottmless cornucopias, and of universities perhaps as turbines of energy and intelligence that can be redirected at will.

Naturally, the ideal in any such situation is to hope that private money can carry the load. But all of our universities today commit all of their annual income to maintaining their own existing programs. Many are incurring deficits to keep them going. I do not know one institution that could undertake important new obligations overseas in the underdeveloped nations without slashing drastically the services it now renders to its own students or to its own State and community; or to the cause of science and scholarship. Indeed, our universities must develop far bigger budgets to do justice to their present obligation. Some estimates predict a doubling of college and university enrollment, on present trends, by 1970.

The foundations, for their part, don't often have deficits. But they do have existing programs and commitments, worked out painstakingly between their officers and their trustees, which consume most of their income. If all of the uncommitted 1957 income of all the major American foundations were to be devoted to President Eisenhower's suggestion, the total would not remotely meet or match the need or the challenge implicit in it.

In the Times and elsewhere I have pointed out that the classroom is a critical front in the cold war. Last fall I personally saw the evidence of this in Moscow, Kiev, and Leningrad. One small example is that Soviet engineering institutes last year graduated 63,000 new engineers—competent and indoctrinated engineers. We graduated only 23,000 in the face of a domestic need for 45,000 to 50,000. The surplus export crop of Soviet engineers is now beginning to infiltrate the underdeveloped areas. Soviet technicians and educators are arriving in Rangoon to build and staff the technological institute Khrushchev promised the Burmese people as a gift of the Russian people. They are the advance point of the new offensive.

The conference called for June 12 will clearly see that President Eisenhower has opened up a new and little recognized problem in national defense. Viewed as such, it is manifestly a Federal problem. I therefore emphasize three proposals for immediate consideration and action:

1. Because we ourselves are wasting our own manpower potential so grievously—with only one-quarter of the top 20 percent of our high-school youngsters graduating from college—I have suggested the establishment of competitive Federal 4-year scholarships, beginning with 20,000 a year and increasing to 100,000 annually as rapidly as the colleges can handle them. Why should not service overseas be expected from some or all of the scholarship winners? Just as graduates from the service academies are expected to serve their country for 3 years, so our young engineers and scientists, educated at the expense of the American people, could be expected to serve an interneship in their specialty overseas. Further, I suggest that a proportion of any Federal scholarship program be set aside for students from the underdeveloped lands, with special consideration given for students and for curricula which would contribute most to economic, political and scientific development.

2. I have proposed the creation by the Federal Government of a series of technical assistance academies, here in this country, in conjunction with existing centers of higher training—"West Points of Point Four." Foreign students should be welcomed and supported in these academies, just as students from friendly powers are welcomed in our service academies.

3. Since both the United States and the U. S. S. R. are already embarked on limited educational technical assistance efforts abroad, I suggest that the United States take the leadership in proposing to the Soviet Union and to the free world that the United Nations, with the full support of the United States and the U. S. S. R. greatly step up its budget for technical and scientific education in underdeveloped areas.

Very sincerely yours,

WILLIAM BENTON.

SOUTHPORT, CONN.

Commendation of the Hicks Corp.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEVERETT SALTONSTALL
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, June 18, 1956

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter from Adm. F. S. Withington, Chief,

Bureau of Ordnance, USN., congratulating the Hicks Corp. for the fine work it has done in the development and production of certain guided missile rocket motors.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY,
BUREAU OF ORDNANCE,
Washington, D. C., June 14, 1956.

THE HICKS CORP.,
Boston, Mass.

GENTLEMEN: I desire to acknowledge personally the outstanding performance of the Hicks Corp. in the development and production of Terrier guided missile rocket motors. You have been the leader among the producers in quality and price reduction. The Hicks Corp. is the only supplier classed as small business.

I wish to congratulate you particularly on two major contributions made recently. The response on your part in introducing the flame deflector as a safety feature for shipboard use into the later units of the booster Mk 3 is greatly appreciated. The U. S. S. *Boston*, the Navy's first guided missile cruiser, was outfitted with these safer Terrier-missile boosters off your production line.

Your cooperation in introducing the current motor design into production at an accelerated rate has permitted steady and rapid progress in the improvement programs of missiles. The work of your production engineering staff in close cooperation with the Bureau's design personnel plus the ordering of long lead time critical materials at your financial risk in advance of contract has reduced the normal lead time by two-thirds. This is particularly noteworthy when considering you are a small business concern.

I am anticipating equally successful performance on your part through adaption of hydraulic spinning techniques and the research type contracts with the S. D. Hicks & Son Co.

Sincerely yours,

F. S. WITHINGTON,
Rear Admiral, U. S. N.,
Chief, Bureau of Ordnance.

Dangerous Decision

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STYLES BRIDGES
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, June 18, 1956

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Dangerous Decision," which appeared in the Manchester Union Leader, Manchester, N. H., on June 16, 1956, which I feel will be of interest to everyone.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DANGEROUS DECISION

There will be general agreement among the American people with the dissent against the majority decision in the United States Supreme Court that the Government must not only find an employee is a subversive in order to fire him, but also that he occupies a sensitive job.

This kind of ruling can, as the dissenters said, have the Government honeycombed with subversives. It is a flagrant violation of the power given to the President by Congress to pass judgment on whether a Government employee is a risk to national security or not.

The significance of the majority decision is revealed by the hearty approval that it has received from an organization such as the American Civil Liberties Union. Approval by a group like this simply means that the decision is a victory for pro-Communists and Communists, who as a result, are better able to carry on their program of subversion and undermine our national security.

It is therefore important that Congress enact legislation on this matter to see that the Government is not a harbor for subversives. It is disturbing to see the United States Supreme Court basing decisions on technicalities, while the broader application of principle is ignored.

Martha Shull, Oregon's Choice

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, June 18, 1956

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a most capable article entitled "Martha Shull, Oregon's Choice," by Richard Barss, editor of periodicals for the Oregon Education Association. The article, from the June 1956 issue of the Portland OEA Bulletin, describes the Portland school teacher and education leader, who this month very probably will be elected as president of America's largest organization of educators, the National Education Association.

Although Martha Shull has not been on the same side of political questions as Mrs. Neuberger and myself, we are pleased and privileged to cast partisanship aside to join in congratulating Miss Shull on the eve of her great honor. May her administration as head of the National Education Association be crowned with achievement and success.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MARTHA SHULL, OREGON'S CHOICE

(By Richard Barss)

Truly a remarkable classroom teacher. That's Miss Martha A. Shull, Oregon's candidate for the presidency of our great National Education Association.

She is a thoroughly charming personality—warm and friendly, gracious and gay. But she's much more than that. She's a woman of great educational experience and a long-time leader in organizational affairs. Consider these few recent examples of her busy professional career:

Only 2 summers ago, she was one of 2 United States delegates to the 17th International Conference on Education in Geneva, Switzerland, appointed by the Department of State.

She has just completed serving as one of 33 national leaders on President Eisenhower's Committee for the White House Conference on Education.

And now, of course, she's first vice president of the NEA and doing other professional work as well.

Yes, she's a remarkable teacher, one I would like to have known far longer than I have.

I first began working with Martha in 1943–44, shortly after I started editing publications for the Oregon Education Association. She was then chairman of our Economic Welfare Committee—and how that committee functioned. It really knew where it wanted to go. It brought group insurance to OEA members for the first time. And it got the ball rolling on sick leave, improved salaries, health certification procedures, and credit unions—a vigorous action program soon realized.

True, Martha had a good committee. But it was she who kept it moving and helped pull misty visions into manageable practicalities. Her quiet sallies relaxed tension in committee debate. And her poise and charm brought about significant educational gains in work with laymen, legislators, or reluctant educators.

Martha Shull was discovered by her fellow educators long before I came to know her. She had already served as president of the Inland Empire Education Association which meets every year in Spokane, Wash., and draws the attendance of leading educators from Oregon, Washington, Idaho, and Montana. She was one of the first women presidents of that large organization. She had also held various offices in the Portland High School Teachers Association and was secretary and a charter member of the Portland Teachers' Credit Union.

After 1943–44, the list of her professional services became even more impressive. That was only natural, because she believed thoroughly in the significant work to be done through effective educational organization.

Successively she became Northwest regional director of the NEA Department of Classroom Teachers, member and vice chairman of the National Commission on Teacher Education and Professional Standards, chairman of the Oregon TEPS Commission.

She was president of the Oregon Education Association, on the executive committee of the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, and a member of the executive committee of the National Education Association from 1950 to 1954. An OEA delegate to the World Organization of the Teaching Profession at Ottawa, Canada, Martha was later an NEA delegate to its successor organization at Oslo, Norway.

Phi Beta Kappa she is, and a member of such groups as the National Council of Teachers of English, AAUW, League of Women Voters, National Conference of Christians and Jews. Portland's Quota Club recently honored her as its annual "Woman of Achievement" and Theta Sigma Phi cited her as 1 of 5 leading women in Oregon public affairs.

Despite all her organizational interests, Martha does a teaching job that draws the plaudits of pupils in Portland's Jefferson High School. Wrote one, in a recent pregraduation note: "I feel so fortunate to have had you our last year at Jefferson. You have been my absolute favorite teacher of all times. English literature and reading would never have been interesting to me if it had not been for you, your knowledge, experience, and patience."

My own favorite tribute to Martha was given in the seconding speech for her as NEA first vice president last summer. Said former NEA President "Andy" Holt:

"I wish I had the vocabulary so I could do justice to a description of Martha Shull's innumerable virtues. Lacking such, I can only describe her in my native Tennessee dialect.

"As you can see, she is as pretty as a speckled pup. When she smiles, you feel warm inside, just like somebody has said something nice about your grandchild.

"She is as shrewd as a farmer's wife at a Sears, Roebuck sale.

"She knows the NEA like a moonshiner knows his corn.

"She is as eloquent as a Baptist preacher at camp meeting, and when she talks she sounds like a spring branch running down a mountainside.

"She is as sweet as sorghum molasses fresh off the mill, and she is as pleasant as a hog at sloppin' time.

"She will be invited everywhere, and wherever she goes, we'll be glad she has been."

North American Regional Broadcasting Agreement

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. BRICKER
OF OHIO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, June 18, 1956

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "A Long Overdue Treaty," published in the New York Times of June 7, 1956. The editorial deals with the North American Regional Broadcasting Agreement.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A LONG OVERDUE TREATY

For more than 5 years the Senate Foreign Relations Committee has failed to act upon a treaty that has an important bearing upon our relations with Canada and ouf Latin-American neighbors. It is the North American Regional Broadcasting Agreement, generally referred to as NARBA.

Just as broadcasting stations in the United States must operate on assigned frequencies in order to avoid radio anarchy, similar regulation should exist bilaterally between our country and each of those near our borders. That is the purpose of NARBA.

Interference from Cuban radio stations is effectively destroying the service rendered by some United States broadcasters, particularly in the South and along the eastern seaboard. Even a weak station in Cuba can cause interference hundreds of miles away. Radio waves do not respect national boundaries and an international agreement is the only practical method of obtaining mutual protection.

Although the proposed NARBA does not satisfy everyone, in many respects it is more favorable to the United States than any earlier agreement. Opposition to it comes from only 15 of the more than 2,500 AM stations in this country. Some critics of NARBA say that ratification still will leave us without a radio treaty with Mexico. Efforts are being made to work out an agreement with that country, but in order to strengthen our position in Mexican negotiations we should have a deal with the other North American stations. NARBA would give us a much-needed bargaining tool.

The Chairman of the Federal Communications Commission, George C. McConnaughey, has urged the Senate to take immediate action on NARBA and consent to ratification. The work of the FCC constantly is hampered by trying to adhere to the provisions of a treaty which in fact does not exist. The Senate should make a decision before adjournment this summer and, in the public interest, we think that decision should be to ratify NARBA.

Importance of Coal to the National Economy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD MARTIN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, June 18, 1956

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, there has been much discussion of the economic situation of coal in the United States. The increased uses of power, because of the expanding economic situation of our country, have created new uses for coal. In addition, the depletion of the mines of Europe has also created an additional market for this important product.

Mr. President, a few days ago the President of the Chesapeake & Ohio Railway Co. delivered in Washington, D. C., a very important address on this subject. The title of the address is "Coal's Vital Place in World Prosperity and Peace."

Capt. John M. Cummings, a special writer for the Philadelphia Inquirer, has also made comments along this line.

Railroad officials, heads of the coal-producing companies, and also the United Mine Workers have organized a new corporation for the purpose of promoting the increased use of coal.

Mr. President, inasmuch as I feel that all my colleagues will be interested in reading these two important documents, I ask unanimous consent that the address by Mr. Tuohy and the article by Captain Cummings be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address and article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COAL'S VITAL PLACE IN WORLD PROSPERITY AND PEACE

(By Walter J. Tuohy)

If coal could be rediscovered today in the research laboratory the world would hear with wonder of this amazing energy source. Coal, nature's concentrated power package in the handy black container, is perhaps taken a bit for granted these days.

Coal powered the industrial revolution which began a century and a half ago. Today a second industrial revolution is sweeping the world, bringing with it as radical a change in the way of living as did the first. Nations all over the world are rebuilding after the war years, and are driving hard for higher living standards for their people. One may be the impression that new sources of energy are to power this second revolution. We hear of atomic energy, petro energy, and hydro energy. The fact, however, is that coal energy, which powered the first industrial revolution, will carry the heaviest part of this second one, too.

Coal actually furnishes today the greatest share of the world's energy. As energy needs double in the next generation, more and more coal will be required. The energy demand will be so great that all coal, as well as all other energy sources, will be needed.

How will this extraordinary demand for coal be met?

We know the United States has the world's largest recoverable coal reserves, and the capacity efficiently to produce it. Behind the Iron Curtain, in Russia and Red China, are also vast reserves of coal. We may assume their ability to mine it and their own growing need for it. In South America and Japan, the coal resources cannot keep up with the growing needs and they are importing United States coal.

There is one vital area in the free world, however, where a serious shortage of coal threatens both prosperity and peace. It is about the coal hunger of the nations of Western Europe that I should like to speak. This year over 40 million tons are going abroad to help meet this deficiency. In the years ahead Europe's import needs will be much greater. It is vital that American coal in the necessary amounts be made available to Western Europe, for it has a direct bearing upon the economic strength that underlies the ability to resist aggression.

If I may I will use slides to help make understandable the statistical material. How big is Western Europe's new demand for energy? The slide shows that Western Europs used 805 millions of short tons of coal equivalent in energy in 1955. This is made up of coal and lignite 597, oil products 139, hydroelectric 63, and natural gas 6. Of the coal, 27 million tons were imported from the United States. This was 71 percent of all United States coal exports in 1955.

The next slide gives the biggest customers in Western Europe. Last year Germany took 6,672,000 short tons; Italy, 6,056,000; the United Kingdom, 4,858,000; the Netherlands, 4,623,000; Austria, 1,219,000; Belgium and Luxembourg, 1,142,000; and France, 1,017,000.

What is the probable future coal demand in Western Europe? The slide shows that Western Europe's energy demands expressed in the equivalent of millions of short tons of coal will go to 926 in 1960, and to 1,323 in 1975. It shows also the proportion of that demand that must be filled with imported sources of energy. These projections are made in the report just published by the Organization for European Economic Cooperation.

The worldwide expansion of steelmaking capacity is a reliable guide to the magnitude of future increased coal use, keeping in mind that it takes a ton of coal to make a ton of steel. The slide portrays steel production in several countries in Western Europe in 1955 and estimated capacity by 1960, with the increase in tonnage that this represents. The hard core of European demand for United States coal is for metallurgical purposes. Europe consumed 17.5 million tons of United States metallurgical coal in 1955, and is reported to be seeking 22.5 million tons for 1956.

The next slide charts the OEEC's estimate of European coal imports from the United States—27 million tons in 1955, 44 million in 1960, and 55 million tons in 1975. The report says it has taken 55 million tons as the maximum because larger amounts would probably need considerably increased port and transport facilities. "Larger imports in the future," says OEEC, "would almost certainly have to come from the United States and their cost would be largely dependent on the level of transatlantic freights at the time." It is my belief that both port and transport facilities can and will be improved, and that United States export can go to the level of 100 million tons a year.

The exportation of American coal overseas began as far back as the 1890's. The first really substantial movement of export coal occurred in 1920 when 22 million tons went to overseas destinations. Another peak movement of 22 million tons occurred in 1926, acused by the British coal strike. But in other years the export volume varied widely, and it was not until after World War II that export became a major factor in the coal industry.

The slide shows coal exports from the United States since 1920—first, the average

annual tonnage from 1920 to 1945, which was 4 million tons—second the average of 22 million tons in the 10-year period 1946 to 1955—and finally, the estimate of 42 million tons this year, based on the first quarter.

The next slide shows production and overseas exports of coal for the last 10 years. There were two high points, 1947 and 1951, but beginning with 1954 we see the development of a year-to-year upward trend in exports. The forecast for this year is a continuation of this rise.

The real significance of the trend is the change in the character of the export coal movement. It is becoming more evident day by day that the foreign demand for American coal is no longer on a spot basis, but is permanent and expanding. Export coal is now being purchased in sizable quantities on contracts of 3 to 5 years duration.

Can Europe increase its coal production materially and lessen dependence on United States imports? It cannot.

Chief among the problems of the European coal industry are a declining labor force in spite of recruiting efforts, and the low output of manpower.

The next slide gives the coal output per man per day the United States is 10 tons, compared with 1.21 in Great Britain, 1.12 in Germany, 0.98 in France, 0.78 in Belgium, and 0.63 in Italy.

In addition to low productivity and manpower decline, other reasons are given for the inability of some countries abroad to increase production in the face of rapidly expanding energy requirements. These include faulty and wasteful mining practices of the past, inability to adopt older mines to mechanization, and difficulties involved in deeper mining. The shafts of British coal mines grow deeper and deeper. In 1924, the average depth was 1,000 feet, today it is 1,300 feet. New mines opened in recent years range from depths of 1,800 to 3,000 feet.

The authoritative London publication, the Economist, regards the British coal production outlook as dismal. After 6 years of diligent long-term planning by the British National Coal Board, and the investment of large amounts of Government money in capital improvements and new mines, output targets have been revised downward and capital costs have been revised upward.

The National Coal Board forecasts that declining coal production in present collieries would necessitate in the next 10 years for new equipment and the opening of new mines, capital expenditures of 1 billion pounds (close to $3 billion). Even with this huge new exepnditure, British coal production in 1965 will be only 20 million tons more than it was last year. Under these circumstances it is quite apparent that Great Britain, once the coal supplier to Europe, can never again fill that role.

A friend of mine who holds an important place in the British coal and shipping trade recently told me that in 1913 Great Britain exported 75 million tons of coal, 18 million tons moving through his home port of Cardiff, Wales. Last year no coal was exported from Cardiff, and coal-loading terminals in that port are being converted into unloading facilities for the permanent importation of coal.

Other sources of energy can be expected to expand in response to the heavy demand for more energy. But petroleum, natural gas, and falling water are not available in quantities sufficient to meet the current energy deficit. Atomic energy, on a commercial basis, is too far in the future to bear any sizable portion of the load.

The OEEC report says that the popular enthusiasm aroused by nuclear energy, and the headline publicity given to developments of relatively small importance have been unfortunate. This is a false impression of the contribution that nuclear energy is likely to make to Western Europe's energy needs during the next 20 years. The report forecasts that nuclear energy will not provide more than 8 percent of the total energy demand in Western Europe in 1975. It is a mistake, the report indicates, to assume that atomic energy on a large scale is just around the corner. The conclusion is:

"For many years to come conventional forms of energy will be needed and coal must remain the mainstay of the Western European energy economy."

Thus, we find that international trade has become an established part of the coal industry in the United States. We now face the responsibility of seeing to it that the exportation of coal continues to be the billion-dollar business the United States Department of Commerce has called it.

Now is the critical time to examine this channel of international trade that has been set up, connecting the American coal mine with the foreign consumer. What needs to be done to strengthen the channel, and keep the coal moving?

There are four major parts in this channel: (1) Production of the coal at the mines; (2) rail transportation from mine to tidewater; (3) ocean transport to foreign shores; (4) unloading and distribution of the coal overseas.

As to the first our highly mechanized and efficient coal mining industry has well established its ability to produce the coal at low cost. The coal producers are making heavy capital expenditures to enlarge operations, increase capacity, and reduce costs. It is estimated that they will increase their capital spending this year to $300 million. This faith and confidence being exhibited by the American coal industry have spread to our most conservative financial institutions, such as banks, investment houses, and trust funds.

Look at this slide of a recent advertisement by a leading bank, the First National City Bank of New York. It is headlined "Bright Future for Black Diamonds," and it continues "Coal production can more than double by 1975 * * * with bank help." Please notice particularly those last three words. When a bank wants to put its money behind coal's future, it is saying it with more than words.

A heavy responsibility rests upon the coal industry to produce good low-ash coal, well prepared, and reasonably priced. Farsighted producers recognize that a quality product alone is the firm foundation of the export coal trade.

We can count on the solid backing of the miners in maintaining high productivity and efficiency. The United Mine Workers of America, to its credit, has historically supported mechanization in the industry. Six years of peace in the coal industry have proved what progressive men can do working together.

2. Next is rail transportation from mine to tidewater. Speaking for the two largest railroads that originate coal for export, who together move 80 percent of all the coal exported through the port of Hampton Roads, we recognize fully our obligation to provide an ample supply of coal cars for loading, to maintain adequate facilities for dumping, and to give good service at reasonable rates.

These railroads are now making heavy capital expenditures to increase the capacity to handle export coal at Hampton Roads. At Lambert's Point in Norfolk, the Norfolk & Western is building additional tracks, piers, and terminal facilities.

The Chesapeake & Ohio has under construction at Newport News a new coal pier that will go into operation this fall, with supporting yards, tracks and other terminal facilities.

The 2 roads together now have nearly 14,000 new hopper cars on order, and bad orders are at an all-time low—around 1 percent.

The railroads are handling this export traffic at less than a cent per ton mile, in trains which represent the world's lowest cost land transportation.

Because of these efforts of the coal producers and the coal-carrying railroads to do their cooperative job more efficiently and more economically this remarkable fact can be stated:

The superior coals of the United States can be mined and delivered to tidewater piers, ready for shipment overseas, at much less than the cost of coal at the mines in Great Britain, Germany, France, and other coal producing countries.

3. Third is ocean shipping. Much credit is due to the shipping companies for their part in preserving the export market. When we consider that there has been no merchant marine as such for the handling of export coal, a miracle of transportation has taken place. A fleet of ships has been put together that last year transported 38 million tons of coal abroad, truly a great achievement.

But the quality and quantity of ocean shipping are limited. Herein lies one of our greatest problems. We need larger, better and more modern ships that can get the coal across the ocean at a cost low enough to hold the markets.

4. No less important is the fourth factor, the unloading of the coal at the foreign port and its delivery to consumers. Large bulk terminals, as modern and efficient as the United States coal loading piers, should be constructed at the other end of the ocean routes for low-cost redistribution of the coal cargo.

Forward looking decisions taken now can provide immediate relief for these four problem areas, and will lay the foundation for an international coal trade that could go a long way in stabilizing the economy and peace of the world. There is too much at stake to stand by and do nothing when we see that there are inadequacies in our international coal trade channel.

The American coal industry, the miners' union, and the railroads have joined in an unprecedented partnership. It is my privilege here today to announce the formation of an organization which will have a far-reaching effect on the future of our foreign trade in coal.

Late last fall the top executives of the industries and organizations most vitally concerned with the overseas export of coal held joint discussions in Washington. Called by Joe Moody, president of the Southern Coal Producers Association, the group included the chief executives of the larger exporting and coal-producing companies, the president of the miners' union, and the presidents of the coal-originating railroads. A survey of all phases of the coal business was made, and on May 28 the group voted to organize a new corporation, to be known as American Coal Shipping, Inc. Papers of incorporation were filed earlier this week, capitalizing the company at $50 million.

This new corporation will promote the export coal trade on the broadest possible basis. Its first proposal is to enter immediately into the ocean shipping business, by acquiring ships of its own and placing them in the export coal trade. Other plans will follow, directed toward additional problems in the international movement of American coal. It will be remembered that it was 4 years ago that Mr. John L. Lewis proposed a cooperative venture to provide more ships for export coal.

This is an historic moment in the coal industry. We stand as a cohesive group—the coal producers, the miners' union, the exporters, and the railroads. Our unity is the assurance to the free nations that coal, America's greatest and most abundant natural resource, will find its vital role in world prosperity and peace.

[From the Philadelphia Inquirer]

Pennsylvania, as the Nation's leading coal-producing State, has much more than an academic interest in the formation of a $50 million corporation to engage in the business

of exporting the fuel. And Philadelphia, as the State's leading port, could very well become the central point of the export trade.

Bulk cargo is a specialty of the port of Philadelphia. Coal, particularly anthracite, has for many years been shipped from this city and at Port Richmond the Reading Co. has the finest plant in the country for transferring the fuel from rail- to water-borne commerce.

The new corporation, from all accounts, will deal especially in bituminous shipments. Expanding European industry has created an ever-increasing demand for coal of this type and to meet it we find capital and labor cooperating.

American Coal Shipping Corp. was born the other day in Washington. Coal producing companies, railroads, and the United Mine Workers of America are financing the new venture in international trade.

Here you find Walter J. Tuohy, president of the Chesapeake and Ohio Railroad, a large coal carrier; Ralph Knode, chairman of Philadelphia's General Coal Co., among others, joining with John L. Lewis, president of the United Mine Workers, and Tom Kennedy, its vice president, to take advantage of the new opportunity to increase the output of American mines.

Each of these groups, the carriers, the mine owners and the union will toss some $16,700,000 into the kitty. The company will acquire ships of its own which will ply between American and European continental ports.

Until the last big war much of the continental supply came from England. But this source is unable to produce in quantity sufficient to meet the demands of an expanding economy. American coal in large quantities is constantly going abroad. But with their own bottoms the new company hopes to be able to increase deliveries substantially.

Here is where Philadelphia comes into the picture in a big way. Here, too, is where Mayor Dilworth and his port officials should bestir themselves to action. The Pennsylvania Railroad has frequently boasted of being the largest coal carrier in the world. Its lines tap the richest coal lands in the country. Philadelphia is the natural coal port of the Pennsylvania system. Here is has built an enormous plant to handle the bulk of ore coming in from South America. It could just as readily transfer from car to ship as well as from ship to car.

Most of the anthracite coming to Philadelphia is handled by the Reading Co. But the bituminous coal in large quantities is carried east by the Pennsylvania and the B. & O.

With the St. Lawrence seaway being pushed to completion, port cities on the Great Lakes are alert to the opportunities this new artery will afford. Cleveland is preparing for a big business in overseas trade. Coal, being a nonperishable commodity, is the type of cargo with a strong appeal to shippers via the seaway. Cleveland is expanding as a steel city and this, naturally, calls for more coal to feed its mills. And if they go into the coal shipping business, too, well, it's time for Philadelphia and Pittsburgh to square away for action.

A Telegram to Drew Pearson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARENCE J. BROWN
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 18, 1956

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I insert therein copy of a telegram which I sent to Drew Pearson, columnist, last Saturday morning, June 16. The telegram is self-explanatory:

JUNE 16, 1956.

DREW PEARSON,
Washington, D. C.:

Was amazed to read in your column in this (Saturday June 16) morning's Washington Post your statement I had said President Eisenhower's operation was "the last straw," and that he should not be a candidate for reelection. Story completely incorrect and untrue, as I have never made any such statement, either publicly or privately. Instead, during the past week, I have expressed in public addresses, press releases, and radio reports, my confidence President Eisenhower will soon fully recover from his operation and will be a candidate for reelection. Furthermore, as a duly elected Delegate at Large from Ohio to the coming Republican Convention I shall cast my vote for Mr. Eisenhower's renomination. As a fellow newspaperman I regret your failure to check story with me before publication. Will appreciate correction of report as promptly as possible.

CLARENCE J. BROWN,
Member of Congress.

Problems and Need of Armed Forces Reserve—Address by Brig. Gen. Richard L. McNelly, USAR

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE H. BENDER
OF OHIO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, June 18, 1956

Mr. BENDER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a speech delivered by Brig. Gen. Richard L. McNelly, USAR, at the Akron, Ohio, military dinner, on April 4, 1956. This speech sets forth the problems and needs in the Reserve, and, I believe, discusses our Armed Forces Reserve program with keen insight.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY BRIG. GEN. RICHARD L. MCNELLY, UNITED STATES ARMY RESERVE, AT AKRON, OHIO, MILITARY DINNER, APRIL 4, 1956

The suggestion was offered that my talk tonight should partake somewhat of the self-appraisal climate, upon the premise that one of the best ways to improve self or cause is to submit first to self-examination. I'll buy that with one proviso; let's look mainly at our problems and needs in the Reserve—not waste any time preening our feathers and gushing over what's good about us; and there are many good things, believe me.

For me to bore you with a long resume of oft repeated facts and figures and categorical statements concerning the Reserve program, many of which would be already familiar to you, would doubtless carry out my mission tonight. But I fear those who hadn't slipped out during the speech would be practicing that difficult of social graces—yawning with their lips closed, by the time I had finished.

In contrast to a repetitious treatment of the mechanics of the Reserve program, I would like to treat of a few problems which seem to be vital to the Reserve's future operations, no matter the details of daily routine. I suppose we will always be haunted by that typically American weakness where military matters are concerned, namely, a smug contentment and lackadaisical attitude amongst the general public where military peacetime effort is indicated. We are often faced at the individual level in the Reserve recruiting phase with cynicism, skepticism and what sometimes borders on an organized sales resistance to the objectives of the military Reserve.

Since we are indulging in self-appraisal tonight we may as well admit that we have to date approximately only one-third of the 1,600,000 trained and organized reservists needed. Why should it be such a task to interest men in a proposition which, if offered by an experienced pitchman on a circus midway or by a promoter in a plush office, would be a self-evident bonanza? Suppose I were to hold under your nose a beautifully embossed certificate similar to the pieces of paper you get from corporations as stock certificates, instead of an enlistment blank, and I said to you, "No money required. All I want of you is your signature and your promise to give me 2 hours of your time 1 evening a week and 2 weeks out of the summer—that's all. For your promise you will receive (if you keep your part of the bargain), with no strings attached, the following:

"1. A minimum of 63 days pay—63, all earned in off business hours, mind you.

"2. This pay can be anywhere from $2.77 to $6.88, to start, per day; with increases that can go as high as $12. per day, according to how you apply yourself; and higher when and if you can qualify for a commission.

"3. Free schooling at no extra charge in everything from photography, electronics, radar, automotive mechanical training, communications, weapons, police science—nearly any subject you can think of and all of which fit into civilian life.

"4. Free clothing—no need to wear out your own clothes.

"5. Opportunity to draw a pension under our pension plan which requires absolutely no payments down on your part—only your sticking to your bargain."

Wouldn't you sign it—almost automatically? Did you ever hear anything like it in this day and age? An age when you ordinarily can't turn around without it costing you money. And I have not even touched on the intangibles of friendships formed, valuable personal connections, pride of a job well done, standing in your community, to say nothing of the heart warmth and satisfaction of patriotic participation in preserving the greatest way of life man has ever known since the dawn of civilization.

Now, after that sales outburst, what is wrong that so many folks turn it down? Why is it that this bonanza I've described is ducked by otherwise acceptable and prudent individuals; is evaded by subterfuge at times degenerating into utter defiance? Is it the fear of losing one's daily livelihood—losing a job? That is a very powerful human force—the struggle to gain and hold onto security.

Which brings me to the first problem of importance in our self-scrutiny. This is a dire need for a Federal Law to implement employer cooperation in the matter of active duty, summer field training and so on, with stringent enough penalties upon the uncooperative to make it effective. Such regulation has been flirted with, but a workable, fair and enforcible law with real teeth in it is yet to emerge from the hopper, as far as Reserve forces are concerned. So the nightmare of maintaining even minimum strength and going to field training with a respectable showing of troops gives responsible commanders bad dreams. The complication of the demands of the uncooperative

employer but adds to the confusion and frustration.

I pay high tribute to the many employing firms who have been most cooperative in releasing men for tours of Reserve duty in the Armed Forces.

Many chambers of commerce have diligently studied the problem and contributed many a plan to establish definite employer policies where reservists require time off for drill and field training. However, there are many employers who aren't as wholehearted and patriotic. The reservist and the future of the defense policy need protection and guaranties against this type of resistance; a man has to eat—his family has to be supported—and patriotic duty and fervor run a poor second to junior's and mommy's breakfast and Fido's kennel ration. Many are the number of employers whose cooperation will be enlisted only under the boom of the law.

Some of this resistance probably is hatched among subversive channels, and amongst enemies of the state. However, it appears to me that much of the apathy and resistance, as it applies to public and private nonsupport of Reserves participation, is engendered from statements of otherwise well-meaning folks who pose as experts; prate blithely about a pushbutton war, and actually hypnotize themselves and their audiences into the conviction that armies as we've known them are no longer necessary. "Save your breath and time," "It'll all be in the sky next time," "All we need are a few highly trained specialists to man the machines," are among the careless statements heard every day. Now this all combines to build up disdain toward the standard troop establishment; to build up public apathy and skepticism toward the fundamental concept of "the man with the gun in his hand." It makes it tough to get men who will conscientiously support the Reserve. While the units famish and struggle for effective strength thousands of available youngsters, even in the face of what force there is in the Reserve program bill, hide behind the false hope that deferment "until they can't get at me"; "if I could only grab onto that indispensable job"; "I'll get married quick and raise a family"; "maybe the draft won't catch up with me"—some one of these gimmicks will save his hide until the pushbotton war is a reality. What wonder that such a climate begets a dismal personnel picture?

We use the term "man with the gun in his hand" in the broad sense, of course. All the usual ground, amphibious, and airborne troops are included, from the special weapons team to the signalman. The ground combat unit will ever be needed as long as man argues and exchanges blow for blow. The individual whose very presence in the deployed ground position serves to preserve that status quo, which in turn creates the climate for diplomatic negotiation, is probably one of the oft-overlooked, effective means of terminating strife and warfare, once begun; to say nothing of prevention through the same means. The difficulty with this atomic and nuclear war business is that there is no alternative—no twilight between the black clouds of war and the first glimmer of the dawn of reason, wherein the man deployed on the ground can hold the diplomatic atmosphere charged with ions of force long enough to compel men to make peace. In atomic warfare you do as the little Italian crapshooters said, "Go for broke." Hanson W. Baldwin, in his recent article in Combat Forces Journal entitled "Land Power as an Element of National Power" writes: "Control of the land or—more properly speaking—control of the land animal, man, must be, therefore the ultimate objective of all military force, no matter how applied. This has been true throughout history and will be true as long as man walks upon two feet * * * and this will certainly be the objective of any future war earth men may fight, even if it be an all-out nuclear war. For the goal of any such war would be to compel the enemy to submit; to control the land animal man; the military animal, man; the political animal, man, who in turn controls various areas of the earth. * * * The ultimate objective of war between men is men. The penultimate objective is land—the other fellow's land—and what is on it and beneath it."

Hans J. Morgenthau, writing in the Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists, says: "Atomic war is no longer, as was traditional war, an instrument of national policy; rather it is a means of universal destruction and, as such, a last resort of desperation. Thus it has become incumbent upon all nations to pursue their objectives with the traditional weapons of warfare rather than through resort to atomic war. However, to do this successfully requires preparedness with traditional weapons."

A further problem which is timely at this point and which involves again public apathy, nay actual public resistance, is the matter of military installations. It has become a legend in these parts as you all well know, concerning resistance to the Nike sites in Cleveland. I speak particularly of experience in my own community as regards the gaining of an armory site. You of Akron can deem yourselves fortunate that you have in view a well situated plant which will aid in all aspects of the Reserve program—your training, recruiting, security, and best of all, the great element of pride of unit and esprit. There is no substitute.

Housing and slum clearance have become national bywords. One of the greatest aspects of personal and public self-respect and dignity can be said to be adequate and dignified housing. Yet it is tragic to observe the viciousness and utter selfishness with which public officials and their screaming mobs of misled constituents in some localities attack the military when it asks for the basic privilege of housing itself adequately and dignifiedly. Legislators may often be observed turning about-face as to the location of an armory site merely because some bleeding heart or colloquial public official burns up the wires to the lawmaker's sanctorium with the plea that certain so-and-so's do not want "one of those armories" in their neighborhood. So, rights of the military, rights of eminent domain, rights of adequate compensation to the contrary notwithstanding, the appropriation is permitted to lapse, oil is poured on the local waters and the loyal group of reservists are permitted to continue to meet in the basement of Joe Bloe's store or over the town pool parlor. If I speak with feeling, I do so advisedly, having donated many days of my personal time over a period of some years on such futile projects.

The most vital aspect of this housing problem for Reserve units is the dire necessity for storage and security for arms, equipment and rolling stock. We of the 83d Division, after intense recruiting efforts, all sorts of inducements and attractions to build up our Reserve strength, with, say, a modicum of success, are convinced that the egg must by all means precede the chicken. Small arms, crew served weapons, tanks, trucks—all the usual implements of the traditional army are a must before you can expect a full complement of men to be interested in joining up. Pictures out of books, lectures, and blackboard talks ultimately fail. The man loses interest and drops away.

The equipment is available. But, you've got to have a place to put it. That place must be secure, adequate in facilities, and fit for human habitation and must lend itself to training facilities for the type unit housed therein. That is how important this housing problem is. You will readily observe that it is vitally and integrally tied in with the recruiting problem and the relative strength problem.

Now these armory installations have still a further angle which is often overlooked. In most of the discussions of assistance and resistance from communities, in establishing armories, the purely mercenary angle is often ignored. Some of the highest powered promotion work is at times put on by communities to bring manufacturing plants, business, or other payrolls into that community. The yearly payroll of a Reserve unit, with its combination of full-time personnel, with its part-time bulk of spendable dollars, is not without economic impact. From a business viewpoint it is what you might call extra money, that is, it spends easily. Communities should be made aware of the immediate dollar value of a Reserve unit. It will in the long run far offset any loss in property tax for the municipality.

Gen. Maxwell Taylor, present Chief of Staff, United States Army, in a recent interview commented: "We still have no pushbutton method of waging war, and the man who closes with the enemy and lives under the gun for a long period of time is still the man who wins the battle in the end." He goes on to say, "I often reflected in Korea that we had behind us thousands of people running a vast supply system; we had the greatest Navy in the world in the waters around Korea; we had the greatest Air Force in the sky overhead—the purpose of all of which was to help a few men seize an objective on the ground. The cutting edge of the military machine is formed by those men up forward, those whom James Michener called the few who actually storm the blockhouses."

History, if we will but read, provides adequate justification for the thesis that we cannot approach our Reserve program with too much fervor and enthusiasm. One of the most pathetic, as well as prophetic, pronouncements on the importance of a live, red-blooded, working Reserve program is found in a very extraordinary publication of the year 1950, the Memoirs of Marshal Mannerheim. Among his reflections upon that rough winter war, as it was known, carried on against the Soviet state in the winter of 1939–40, he remarks:

"In earlier chapters I have described how our defense had been neglected. * * * The winter war clearly illustrated the unfortunate result of our policy of passing over part of the annual contingent of recruits to the second category of the territorial army, which would only be trained at the outbreak of war. The mobilized army thus smaller than it should have been, and our possibility of raising new detachments and making good losses, reduced. The lack of manpower became more and more desperate during the war, and the almost untrained troops who were brought up to fill the gaps in the ranks suffered disproportionately heavy losses. The economies achieved in time of peace had now to be paid for in blood. The officer cadres of peacetime were insufficient and largely used up after years of exhausting work; both officers and noncommissioned officers of the reserve carried out their duties with the greatest devotion, but they could naturally not take the place of regular cadres. The war trained them, but the price was too high."

Our Reserve program is designed to avoid this tragic result. It seeks to prepare in peacetime the cadres, indeed the going units, adequately efficient initially to take the field in emergency and form the great bulwark with which to exploit success in the field.

It seems self-evident for success that the civilian and quasi-military bodies must more earnestly shoulder responsibility along with us who are intimately active. The watchword is get out and get men. Personal contact and persuasion are necessary. Sales-

manship. As there is no pushbutton war, so is there no pushbutton recruitment formula. You can't do it by remote control. It's a gridiron game; you've got to contact the body. If properly approached, no red-blooded man, otherwise qualified, could refuse to become an American fighting man, the finest soldier the world has ever known. Never has the American soldier left an area that he hasn't left it a better, finer, cleaner, more self-respecting place for man to inhabit. History is replete with example.

Which brings me to the third and last point which seems appropriate. This is the fact that we may have become overly materialistic in this military business and may have lost the concept of unit esprit de corps. We hear a lot about the term "automation." Have we carelessly begun to apply that to the making of soldiers too? Perhaps. Have we gone overboard on the concept that you can make troops by the automation process, on the production line scheme? Turn him out like a lead soldier—no guidon, no standard under which to rally, no unit to tie to?

There is little glory and satisfaction stirred in a man's soul to be returned as a lonely castoff from the travail of military field duty; just another GI coming back. Is it any wonder that so few veterans of the Korean conflict and World War II would have anything to do with us? They drifted back like lost sheep, for the most part unsung and unhonored save for the town pool parlor.

The concept of return of men by unit must be enlarged and retained. Operation Gyroscope was a beginning, but regimental, battalion, and separate company identity must be stressed. You can't hold victory reviews, homecoming parades, and unit recognitions with a heterogenous mass of indivdiuals. Personal honor, personal dignity, the desire to continue to belong—these are the stuffs that tradition, unit honor, and esprit de corps are made of. Such are not maintained by the periodic decimation of proud units to return lonely individuals home, merely because the howl for immediate rotation goes up from every fireside. I can't help but feel that our Army system lost much of its attraction and historical lore when we adopted the production line method of fillers by the conveyor system. It was a sad day when they aboloished the regimental band. It is human nature to follow the hoorah—join up with an honorable going outfit. The fellow who came home alone, and there were thousands, came home with a bad taste in many cases.

Witness the return about 2 years ago of the Third Battalion, Hamilton Light Infantry, Canadian Territorial Forces, from Korean duty. A more stirring spectacle seldom seen. Matter not that many of that group had not seen the entire tour of service, 800 men marching as a returning battalion, with all the honors thereunto appertaining, made headlines. Eight hundred individuals dribbling back may have made page 5. Needless to say, that outfit has few recruiting problems.

Armies may travel on their stomachs. Soldiers fight with their hearts. Maybe the prideful heart and proud chest somehow got lost in our too practical thinking.

And now in closing I would like to leave the words of a poem I once heard, the author of which I cannot at the moment give you, and which in its original form did not refer explicitly to the soldier. However, its implication so well fits the spirit of the American trooper as many of us have seen him, in action and in repose, that I cannot resist the temptation to change a word or two and adopt this theme to our discussion tonight. It might be dedicated to the men who really win wars—those who aren't here any more to talk about it.

"Let me live, O Mighty Master, such a life as men should know,
Tasting triumph and disaster, joy, but not too much of woe.
Let me run the gamut over, let me fight and love and laugh;
And when I'm beneath the clover, let this be my epitaph:
Here lies one who took his chances in a world of fighting men;
Battled luck and circumstances; fought and fell, but fought again;
Won sometimes, but did no crowing; lost sometimes, but did not wail;
Took his beatings, kept on going, never let his courage fail.
He was fallible and human, and therefore loved and understood
Both his fellow men and women, whether good or not so good;
Kept his spirits undiminished and was never false to any friend.
He played the game until it finished—that's your American fighting man."

Ladies and gentlemen, it has been a pleasure and an honor to have been here this evening, and I thank you deeply for listening to our cause.

Why I Am a Republican—Prize-Winning Essay by Dan Harmon

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KARL E. MUNDT
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, June 18, 1956

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, out in South Dakota the Young Republican organization has sponsored a contest on the subject "Why I Am a Republican." The winning essay in this Statewide contest was written by Dan Harmon, a student at General Beadle State Teachers College, in my hometown, Madison, S. Dak.

I am sure that it is a wise and worthwhile idea for political parties to sponsor contests of this type which stimulate the thinking of our young citizens on the matter of getting better government. It is an idea that should be repeated every year in every State.

I ask permission to have this essay, which was recently printed in the Madison Daily Leader, Madison, S. Dak., inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the essay was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHY I AM A REPUBLICAN
(By Dan Harmon)

My first reason for being a Republican is the way our own State has been developed and enriched by Republican administrations. South Dakota is a Republican State and has no reason to be ashamed of that fact. The record of South Dakota's Republican government is an apt refutation of the antiprogressive charge against Republicans. The development of South Dakota, economically, in the past 20 years, and the present statewide plan is an indication of the farsightedness of our State administration.

The second reason for my stand as a Republican is the Republican program on a national level. A good majority of the young people with whom I have been associated have been quick to see that policies of appeasement in foreign fronts and "creeping socialism" on the domestic scene were designed by those who desired war as a crutch for their high economy. President Eisenhower and his advisers have now pointed the way for our generation to an era of prosperity with peace. We realize that our President has the influence and friendship with our allies to insure a permanent peaceful cooperation. Republican policies have restored the faith of my generation in its future and have shown us anew that readiness is better than war.

Perhaps the major reason for my belief in the Republican Party is my recent study of the men in our history who have been great Republicans and Americans. The lives of men like former President Hoover, Senator Robert Taft, and President Eisenhower, as well, are an inspiration to me as a young person. They have seen that the Republican Party has held to a paramount belief in individual freedom. Every young American can be proud to follow their examples.

Eventful Record of Shipyard Employee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEVERETT SALTONSTALL
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, June 18, 1956

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an item from the Boston Naval Shipyard News commenting on the record of William A. "Billie" Dowd, in his more than 50 years of continuous service for the Navy.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Boston Naval Shipyard News of June 8, 1956]

WILLIAM A. "BILLIE" DOWD BIDS ADIEU TO SHIPYARD—EVENTFUL RECORD—YARD EMPLOYEE CLOSES CAREER OF 50 YEARS, 9 MONTHS, AND 23 DAYS

A well-known shipyard employee, William A. "Billie" Dowd, the second BNS worker to compile over 50 years of continuous service in Navy Department history, retired last week and closed a Federal Government career of 50 years, 9 months, and 23 days.

Dowd, a resident of Somerville, was appointed honorary shipyard commander on August 9, 1955.

His first visit to the shipyard came on August 17, 1904, when he was among those who witnessed the launching of the U. S. S. *Cumberland*. One year later, on August 8, 1905, he began his shipyard career as a messenger boy at $1.04 a day. Promotions followed, and Dowd, a former supervisory clerk in shop 31, can look back on an eventful career of almost 51 years of service to the shipyard.

Dowd's half-century of employment covered many changes in the Navy. He saw ships converted from coal burners to oil burners, and the beginnings of the use of nuclear power. The shipyard has progressed too; while Dowd was an employee, he witnessed the addition of the South Boston annex, the Lynn gear plant, and fuel farm in east Boston to the shipyard family.

Dowd recalls the days when the commandant's office, now in South Boston, was in the shipyard, and remembers when a ball park existed on the site now occupied by the pipe shop and the electric shop. In those days, there were sometimes as many as six battleships at a time berthed in the yard.

The climax to Dowd's career in the shipyard came on August 9, 1955 when, in recognition of his having completed 50 years of service, he was appointed honorary shipyard commander for the day. Honors that came to him that day included a Marine Corps formal guard mount, which he reviewed on the marine barracks parade ground, a luncheon tendered to him by the shipyard Masters' and Foremen's Association, and a personal letter from the Secretary of the Navy, Charles S. Thomas.

Chief Joseph

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, June 18, 1956

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, frequently we tend to forget the motivation behind the name which we give to a mighty edifice, such as the Chief Joseph Dam, on the Columbia River, which was dedicated June 12 near Bridgeport, Wash.

So that Members of the Senate will know something of the illustrious and noble Indian leader for whom the colosal dam is named, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article by Jim Running, from the Oregon Daily Journal of June 12, 1956, describing an eloquent address at the dedication of the dam by Erskine Wood, noted attorney of Portland, Oreg., whose father, Col. Charles Erskine Scott Wood, figured prominently in the historical events of the Indian wars in which Chief Joseph fought.

Let me add that Erskine Wood himself lived for a time with the great Indian leader, before the death of Chief Joseph in 1904.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CHIEF GETS HIGH PRAISE—PORTLANDER SPEAKS AT DAM DEDICATION

(By Jim Running)

BRIDGEPORT, WASH., June 12.—A Portland lawyer who, as a boy, lived in Chief Joseph's tepee, gave one of the most touching talks at the dedication today of the mighty Columbia River Dam that bears the Nez Perce warrior's name.

Erskine Wood, 77, admiralty law specialist who has practiced in Portland 44 years, shared the platform with Harold Stassen, Gov. Arthur Langlie, and other bigwigs in the sun-drenched dedication ceremony in this many hued, semidesert country.

Wood paid tribute to Chief Joseph as "great and noble" soldier and leader who "ruled his people by sheer force of character."

Chief Joseph was reluctant to enter the 5 months' series of battles in Wyoming, Montana, and Idaho that culminated in his surrender to United States Army Gen. Oliver Howard and his Federal troops at Bear Paw, Mont., in 1877.

The general's aide-de-camp was a young lieutenant who was to become Erskin Wood's father. Lieutenant Wood fortunately wrote down the Indian warrior's surrender speech—described today by the son as paragon of magnanimity—thus preserving it for history.

Fifteen years later Lieutenant Wood, now the defeated enemy's fast friend, asked the Indian chief if his 13-year-old son, Erskine, could live with him.

And the boy did, for 6 months in 1893, and 3 months in 1894, on the Colville Indian Reservation at Nespelem, 30 miles from here, where Chief Joseph died and was buried in 1904.

Wood recalled today that the chief had a fine physique, bearing, and carriage, "a great gift of eloquence with a melodious, somewhat deep voice."

The 55-year-old Indian and the 15-year-old boy slept side by side on the floor of the chief's tepee, sharing the same fire and food of meat, bread, berries, and roots.

They herded ponies together, hunted together, and crossed the Columbia River in dugout canoes, their horses swimming at their side.

Death, Danger, and Tired Feet

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ESTES KEFAUVER
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, June 18, 1956

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article about the American policemen, by Chester Morrison, of the staff of Look magazine. It is a well-deserved tribute to the men appointed to enforce the laws we make. The article is entitled to wide circulation, in the hope that all who read it may have added respect for the men and women who have the arduous duty of enforcing the law.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEATH, DANGER, AND TIRED FEET—HE MIGHT NOT COME HOME TOMORROW

(By Chester Morrison)

Nineteen and a half million people are going to see this issue of Look, and every single one of them, with the possible exception of a few saints, is, has been, or will be a lawbreaker. There are only about 280,000 policemen of all kinds in the entire country, but, sooner or later, they collar most of the country's many lawbreakers. That's why a lot of people don't like them.

To be sure, there are corruption and skulduggery in some police departments. There always were and there always will be wherever there is moral weakness, and wherever the police are subject to the pressures of politicians who ally themselves with criminals. But it does not mean that a policeman is or should be automatically suspect. He just has more chances than ordinary people have to turn a buck.

When tempted, however, most policemen, like most laymen, turn their backs. This is a predominantly honest world, and cops are predominantly honest—only don't call them cops; call them police officers or policemen. You owe them at least that small courtesy. (Incidentally, in London, they're called Bobbies; in France, they're Flics; in New York, they're Bulls, and in San Francisco, where the dramatic photographs on these pages were taken, they's The Fuzz.)

He does more for you, this policeman, than you probably know, or let yourself know. If he is in a mood to define his social position, he can think of himself as the public guardian. He does guard the entire population against those among us who become killers, thieves, or violators of other categories. And he guards all us nice people (we who are resentful of punishment if guilty) with his life.

And what does the policeman get out of it, besides, among other frightening things, a chance of getting shot down in a dark alley? This man who lives in a world of death, constant danger, and tired feet gets, on the average, $3,600 a year to start with on a police force in a big city and as little as $1,770 in a small town. If he is energetic, and lucky, he can work his way all the way up to a glorious $5,000 as a big-city patrolman. Only 1 policeman in 5 ever gets above the grade of patrolman. And not because he is a dumb cop either. It is simply that he has little time in which to better himself, and besides, there is little room left at the top.

He is always on duty with his gun in its holster, even on his day off. If he makes an arrest while he is working the night shift that ends at 8 a. m., he has to go to court that day, on his own time, and tell the judge just what happened. Of course, he is supposed to get a compensating day off.

On his average top pay of $3,900, he is expected to get married and have a family. In most cities, a policeman is not permitted to take a part-time job, even if he has time for one. So his wife works. She works days while he often works nights. He has to sleep sometime, but who takes care of the kids while he sleeps and she works?

At this point in many a policeman's career comes temptation. It is easy money. It makes the difference between comfort and nagging financial discomfort. He has reached the ceiling pay fixed by us taxpayers, who think policemen cost too much anyhow. Will he fall? Answer this one yourself. Of all the policemen in the country, how many crooked ones do you know about?

The day of the grafting bully in police work is on the wane. Law enforcement has become a respected profession, rather than something to be socially ashamed of. The police officer patrolling his beat on foot or on wheels is the personification of the public conscience. He is the man on the spot, who must decide, on the basis of his knowledge, intelligence and experience, how to handle a breach of the peace—exactly how much of the letter of the law to enforce, what aspects of ornery human nature to consider.

He is the man with the club, the gun, the handcuffs, the badge of authority. All our laws would be ineffective if it weren't for the man appointed to enforce them—the policeman. Subject to the safeguards of due process, he is the law.

No Choice But To Run

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 18, 1956

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I include an interesting and penetrating editorial, "No Choice But To Run" which appeared in the Boston Post, Boston, Mass., of June 13, 1956:

Deliberate misinterpretation of straightforward medical reports on the physcial condition of President Eisenhower, and distortion of the degree of management he exercises over the Nation's affairs, seem to have become the principal political objectives of those who by almost any means are determined that the President will run for a second term, whatever the state of his health.

Fortunately there are some voices raised to keep the medical reports in context and to apply sound, common sense to the excep-

tionally partisan nature of reports of the President's sickroom activities.

Dr. David D. Rudstein, of Harvard Medical Shool, debunked the notion that the President can be expected to arise from a sickbed and caper around like a youth with his unvarnished declaration that when the President's physicians said that he will be better than ever they meant that he would be better than he was before the intestinal blockage developed. He emphasized the fact, too, that no one is better off for having had coronary thrmobsis and ileitis, and that there is still a 50–50 chance for relapse.

No one can take great joy in learning that an overoptimistic interpretation has been placed upon the medical reports. But, the President and the Nation are ill-served by deliberate distortion.

Some of the commentators on various news media say flatly that the President will be a candidate, that he's better than ever and that he is carrying out the duties of the Presidency even while he is convalescent.

The facts are entirely different. If he were able to carry out the duties of the Presidency he would be in the thick of a personal effort to have his foreign aid bill enacted, he would be dealing with Chancellor Adenauer, he would be carrying out his manifold duties from the White House. The fact is that he put in 10 mintues with his chief assistant, Sherman Adams, who, since last September, has shouldered a great deal of the load of the Presidency, which necessarily takes place away from the inquisitive view of press and public.

The medical profession shows no apparent alarm over the capricious manner in which straightforward medical bulletins have been twisted around to show only the poltically optimistic aspects, ignoring the fact that ileitis is a chronic disase, that the President's convalescence may take longer than presently supposed, and that as a man of 65 the President cannot be expected to run a 4-minute mile. Yet, there is justification for considerable misgivings on the part of medical men over the grave damage which could result to their professional integrity should this practice of putting words into their mouths for poltical purposes continue.

The American people share a heartfelt wish that the President recover speedily and completely. There are many who will vote for him if he seeks election from convictions they hold quite apart from considerations of health. But, there are many other Americans who feel that the acute crisis of our times is at hand and that the President's health is of paramount importance.

Resolution Adopted by Democratic Farmer Labor Club of Minneapolis Regarding Income Taxes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROY W. WIER
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 18, 1956

Mr. WIER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I include a resolution unanimously adopted by the Democratic Farmer Labor Club of Minneapolis, Minn., regarding income taxes:

Whereas about 75 percent of the Federal Internal Revenue collections are derived from income taxes; and

Whereas prior to 1934, corporate income-tax dollars usually totaled greater than the dollars received from individual income taxpayers; and

Whereas beginning in 1934, 1937, and every single year from 1944 through 1953, the individual income-tax dollars exceeded the corporate income-tax dollars; and

Whereas from 1925 through 1953, figures do indicate that the tax burden in those 28 years has been shifted to the individual income taxpayers; and

Whereas in 1947 and 1948, the individual income-tax dollars collected by the Federal Internal Revenue Department not only exceeded, but were actually double the corporate income-tax dollars collected (in explanation, verification of above statements is found on p. 304 of Historical Statistics of the United States, 1789–1945, issued in 1949, and on p. 38 of the Continuation to 1952 of the Historical Statistics of the United States 1789–1945, issued in March, 1954, by the United States Department of Commerce and the Bureau of the Census); and;

Whereas newer data now available indicates an accelerated shift of the tax burden, and specifically shows that this tax burden is falling more greatly on the individuals who pay through withheld taxes; and

Whereas corporate income-tax dollars reached their high point in 1953, the total dollars being just over $21½ billion; and

Whereas nonwithheld income-tax dollars also reached their high point in 1953, the total dollars being just over $11½ billion; and

Whereas corporate and nonwithheld dollars collected fell from 1953 through 1955, the dollars collected through withholding taxes have not yet reached a high point in 1955, and indications are such that the 1955 total of $26.8 billion withheld will increase for the year 1956 (in explanation, p. 763 of the World Almanac for 1956 contains the figures for 1951–55): Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Congress of the United States do immediately eliminate all income taxes for those persons below a certain gross income (in granting full exemption for those grossing below $1,000 per year, 1952 revenue losses would have been only $51 million, about $330 million if full exemption for those below $1,500 gross income); raise all exemptions to $1,000; repeal present tax loophole and special privileges laws such as, 27 percent oil allowances, depletion allowances on natural gas, capital gains preferential treatment, exempt-securities income, corporate stock option plans for executives, minors-in-partnership income for tax purposes, corporate deductions abuses now allowed from operating expenses, source of income preferential treatment, deviations from basic rate tables which favor some businesses or persons against the rest of the taxpayer.

United States Foreign Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. SPARKMAN
OF ALABAMA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, June 18, 1956

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, in yesterday's Washington Post there appeared a very interesting, informative, and thought-provoking article on our foreign policy. The article was written by Chalmers M. Roberts. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article war ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post and Times Herald of June 17, 1956]

IKE'S ILLNESS FURTHER BECLOUDS FOREIGN POLICY

(By Chalmers M. Roberts)

Eighty-year-old Konrad Adenauer stood ramrod straight at a press conference here last week and declared with force and feeling:

"You must lead us because you are the strongest."

Back home in the Federal Republic of Germany, newspapers were bewailing the illness of President Eisenhower, 15 years Adenauer's junior. Instead of an anticipated long talk with the President at the White House, Adenauer was able to see him for a bare 10 minutes at Walter Reed Hospital.

The President's illness has not stopped the wheels of the Federal bureaucracy. But coming at a time of great Western uncertainty over military, political, and economic policies to be pursued in the new phase of relations with the Communist world, it has compounded the uncertainty over American policy—and over the American leadership which Adenauer called for.

A SEPTEMBER MEMORY

Government is not a single act or set of acts. It is a continuing flow of actions and decisions. Last September, when the President suffered a heart attack, the world was basking in the post-summit Conference warmth. But while the President lay in a Denver hospital bed, the Russians at the Geneva Foreign Ministers Conference torpedoed the hopes of those who had thought that Moscow was prepared to do business on such hard issues as German reunification.

The President was back at decision-making in 4 months. But then the beginning of an attack on the massive problem of how to face the new Soviet look was sidetracked by the Middle East crisis. By the time this problem had dropped from boil to simmer and the administration had begun once again to attack the main issue, the President was taken sick.

Even at best, according to the doctors, he can hardly tackle the main issue again until next month, just a year after the summit Conference. And then come the national conventions and a presidential campaign.

MEMORANDUM STAGE

The net result is that the United States, in the year since the historic tacit agreement at Geneva that nuclear war was out for both sides, has been able only to consider the new problems and to build a mound of paper work on what to do about them. The administration has made only the merest beginning in resolving these questions. And, in the end even more important, it has not told Congress or the American public what new policies should be followed.

One has to look no further than the conflicting events at the Capitol on the foreign aid bill to realize that confusion over what should be done—and what the administration believes should be done—is general today.

Sometimes, of course, foreign policy changes are announced in dramatic fashion, as when President Truman went to Congress to announce his Greek-Turkish policy. But more often they come about through a series of seemingly disjointed actions so that one only slowly begins to see that a major shift of attitude has taken place.

That a shift has taken place in Washington is undeniable. The Summit Conference last July is, in retrospect, the major foreign policy benchmark of the Eisenhower administration. At Geneva Mr. Eisenhower exercised his unquestioned talents to impress a wary world that our brink of war phase was ending; that America realized that nuclear war must be avoided; that somehow the Soviet Union and the Western democracies had to find a way to live together on the same planet.

But a benchmark is only a point of reference. Since Geneva the question for the West West has been, how does the United States propose to go about it? The Russia of Khrushchev, Bulganin and company quickly demonstrated that it had a plan and a procedure and was swiftly putting them into practice. Adenauer was still asking that question about the United States last week.

Military power is the core of a nation's strength, and strength brings the opportunity for leadership, as Adenauer indicated. The Eisenhower administration, in adjusting to the nuclear weapons age, has altered or begun to alter military concepts. The uncertainty today over the future of NATO springs in part from the uncertain effectiveness of nuclearizing the NATO forces. American power elsewhere in the world is founded on what Secretary John Foster Dulles keeps referring to as our "mobile striking power," though congressional hearings have cast doubt on the extent, and future, of our military power in general.

A TACTICAL SETBACK

On top of this, a report by the National Academy of Sciences last week on the biological effects of atomic radiation casts a new shadow over the employment of nuclear weapons. It reenforces at least the moral position of those who cry out for an end to the big bombs.

But it may turn out also to make more difficult any Presidential decision to use the smaller nuclear weapons. Yet the world knows how dependent on such weapons the United States would be in a conflict with Communist China, for example, where the President has said they would have to be used just like bullets.

More than incidental, too, is the scientists' quiet alarm over the problems of atomic waste connected with nuclear power—a further complication to what has seemed to be one of the President's most successful proposals, the peaceful atomic pool plan.

The biological effects of radiation is a subject the Kremlin already has used to whip up world opinion against the United States. It seems reasonable that the scientists' report will further complicate the already intricate disarmament problem.

Beyond these unsettled aspects of American military power and its future lie a host of political problems.

Discussions are now underway on how to harmonize the political policies of the 15 NATO nations. Publicly to the press and twice privately last week (to Adenauer and to Canadian External Affairs Minister Lester B. Pearson), Dulles expounded the American dilemma: Yes; the United States favors more harmonizing, but it will not accept any procedure which would enmesh us or deprive this country of the power of quick and decisive action. We will not be subject to the veto of any NATO member (he named one that had better be left unnamed) because America is a world power, not just a European power.

In short, we want Western European nations to give up a measure of their sovereignty in the common interest, as we see it. But we will not give up any measure of our own. In effect, the United States seems to be approaching the longtime British position that Britain is for European integration but cannot take part itself because of its worldwide commonwealth obligations. Each thesis is at least subject to question in today's shrinking world.

One point of alarm to Adenauer before he came here last week was the shift in American thinking about neutralism indicated by Mr. Eisenhower's recent press conference remarks, despite the subsequent clarification.

It was Dulles, on his recent trip to Asia, who began to shift toward at least a benign acceptance of neutralism in such nations as India and Indonesia. Yet it was the same Dulles who called neutralism an immoral concept only a few days after the President had said that such a choice was not a choice between right and wrong or decency and indecency."

Adenauer, too, was alarmed about talk of an East-West arms agreement before an agreement on German reunification.

Adenauer was additionally unhappy last week over the increasing Soviet-American exchange of persons as dramatized by the visit to Russia this week of Air Force Chief of Staff Nathan Twining and the possible later visits of the other chiefs. Yet the President has conceded that here is no general American policy on exchanges.

Washington, despite the harmonizing in the Dulles-Adenauer communique, is unwilling to take the rigid stand the Chancellor seeks for the West. Washington knows that it is not a sustainable policy after Geneva. But the President has yet to provide the answers, or to offer the lines of reference for an American debate.

If Europe offers so many problems, what of Asia? Here the beginning of a Sino-American thaw has been halted. But once the presidential election is past, the Chinese Communist issue will arise again in the United Nations General Assembly.

On this issue, the President has always been careful publicly to leave a loophole. Yet there have been varying reports of a hard presidential stand in the talks here last winter with British Prime Minister Anthony Eden. One unconfirmed report, by a Member of Congress in the vocal anti-admission group, is that the President went so far as to say that he would sign a congressional resolution taking the United States out of the U. N. if Red China were admitted.

The free world's statesmen are now in general agreement that if war is out, they must pursue a stepped up economic aid policy, especially in the underdeveloped areas of the world. But they go off in all directions as to how to do it. Congress thus far has only served to demonstrate the American uncertainty.

In the Middle East, there is only a precarious sort of peace. And as for sub-Sahara Africa, there is no American policy but only a growing recognition that that continent will shortly become the focus of a new struggle between freedom and communism. Here the United States will again be plagued by the ambivalence of its historic anticolonialism and the widely varying colonial policies of its four NATO allies with great African holdings—Britain, France, Belgium and Portugal.

No administration, of course, can have a policy to meet all problems everywhere at all times. Too often the curse of American policy has been an attempt to enunciate a coverall doctrine such as massive retaliation or a plague on neutralism. But policies go out of date, and post-Stalin Russia has made a lot of American policies out of date.

As yet there has been only a groping toward new policies and new methods, and some of that has been with reluctance on the part of an administration which calls for deeds, not words, but too often, its critics say, indulges in words, not deeds.

Spanish War Widows

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BARRATT O'HARA
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 14, 1956

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, by invitation of the national legislative committee of the United Spanish War Veterans I introduced H. R. 2867, a bill to increase the pensions of Spanish War widows from $54.18 to $75 a month. I deeply appreciate the honor and the privilege given me of presenting to the consideration of my colleagues this most meritorious measure. I deeply appreciate, too, the fine cooperation of the distinguished gentleman from California, [Mr. McDONOUGH], who has introduced a companion bill and has been most active in support of our efforts to get relief for the widows of Spanish War veterans in their pitiable fight to make both ends meet on a monthly pittance of $54.18.

The widows of Spanish War veterans are not young in years or many in number. They have passed the age when they can find employment. Most of them have no other means of subsistence than the meager pensions they receive. If the Congress takes no action this session, for many of these aged widows what the next Congress might do would be of no concern. Let me be realistic in speaking of the immediate need for this legislation. The widows of the men who fought a war now almost six decades ago are falling as leaves of a tree in approaching winter. Steel indeed would be the structure of the congressional heart if for the few days or months or years remaining we should deny these aged women this pittance of $75 a month.

The Spanish War veterans have set for us the pattern. They ask nothing for themselves. Their claims as a veteran group upon the consideration of the Congress they lump in this one request—a little aid, a bit of a pension boost, to the aged widows of comrades gone to the beyond.

In the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of May 31 on pages A4352–A4355 I extended my remarks to include the statement of the Honorable Lloyd Thurston before the House Committee on Veterans Affairs. Mr. Thurston was accompanied on that occasion by Past Commander in Chief William S. Otjen, chairman of the national legislative committee of the United United Spanish War Veterans; Hattie B. Trazenfeld, national secretary of the Auxiliary United Spanish War Veterans and cochairman of the auxiliary legislative committee; and James Craig, adjutant general, United Spanish War Veterans.

WILLIAM OTJEN'S STATEMENT

At the conclusion of Mr. Thurston's statement Chairman TEAGUE inquired as to the rules in the Spanish-American War as to service conection and line of duty. The testimony of Past Commander in Chief Otjen follows:

Mr. OTJEN. It is my view, Mr. Chairman, that during the Spanish War and the Philippine Insurrection you had to be able to trace the injury to the actual service.

For instance, I had a man in my company who came off of guard one night and put his arm over his rifle and pulled the trigger. He was denied any pension on the ground that the injury was self inflicted; and in every case that I knew about, I did not know of any of the Spanish War veterans who received pensions when we got out other than when, at time of discharge, they were given simply a cursory examination.

My personal experience was that clothes were removed and a doctor walked down the line in front of them and walked down the line in the rear and looked them over.

In my personal acquaintance with Spanish War veterans I did not know of any that drew a pension until they could show injuries which were attributable to the service and, because of the lack of records, it was very difficult for them to do so.

I would also like to call the attention of Mr. Thomson, who asked about the average length of service, to the fact that this states 7½ months, but you will note that the note below says:

"Information and length of service during the Boxer Rebellion-Philippine Insurrection not available."

Now, my own service in the Philippines was that there were 24 United States regiments called United States Volunteers, who went to the Philippines for 2 years' service. Some of us were held overtime. About all the soldiers who went to the Philippines and the Boxer Rebellion served, at the least that I know, about 2 years except the State regiments which went, like the 10th Pennsylvania, and the Iowa Regiment.

* * * * *

The CHAIRMAN. The point I was making was the point of need. I believe that the people of this country will support any kind of veterans' program to take care of widows, orphans, and disabled, and people in need; but I do not think you will get them to give a man with 91 or 92 days service a pension for the rest of his life if he does not need it. I do not think that the people of this country will accept that.

If we had just the Spanish-American War Veterans and widows, it would be different.

Mr. OTJEN. I would be against such a thing myself. I attended the briefing that General Bradley gave to the veterans representatives. As I understand his statements, and I think he discussed them before you, the theory on which that Commission made the report was that for the period following the earlier wars, commencing with World War I, that many of the men were actually benefited by their period of service. He advanced that argument and said that they found much to support it by reason of the fact that they did not suffer any injury when they were in the service; they were also given liberal pay, and educational opportunities were afforded to the younger men when they came out; various loans were made available to them; so that they were actually benefited by the service they incurred. I don't think it would probably be proper to quote him personally. I talked to him afterward and so did Mrs. Trazenfeld.

As he discussed it, he said that the theory they were following was that need was necessary but, referring to the Spanish War veterans, he said that he considered the advantages which were given and the pay which was given to the later veterans as so much more of an assistance toward making progress in either profession or business or getting started.

* * * * * * *

Now, my understanding is that, as to the law at this time, there is no financial limit to the service-connected veteran. On that theory, as I say, the Spanish War veterans feel that the Congress has treated them liberally, and I don't know of any man in the Spanish War category who was asking that more be paid to the men, but on the widows it is a different story.

The pay when a private was $13. When I went abroad, my pay was $15 and when I got to be a noncommissioned officer, it jumped $4 or $5. However, for the 2 years I was over there, I thought I did awfully well when I saved on discharge about $156.

When I came home I studied law and, goodness, if I could have had that educational course, I don't think I would have ever felt I ought to have a pension even though I was in very severe fighting.

WIDOWS HAVE NO INSURANCE

As to the widows of the Spanish War veterans, I know that you have been receiving letters from widows of other wars and they would say, "Why should the widow of a Spanish War veteran receive more?"

Well, we fellows, when we went out and got a job and got to working and got married, could not very well pay for insurance and, if any of us did do well, it took a long time. There are so few of these Spanish War widows that have any insurance available. I think it was a splendid feature that you gentlemen of the Congress put on when you provided the Government insurance available for the men in the service. I would certainly have liked to have been eligible for it. It is a thing to be considered with the widows of the Spanish War for whom we are asking this raise.

I can appreciate the situation you men are in when you are asked those questions of why should the Spanish War widows' pension be raised.

In reading the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD here with Senator LANGER's discussion of this very Bradley Commission report, he narrates how he obtained a pension for a World War veteran who had most of his stomach removed. His wife was driving a taxicab and, when he got that pension of $66.15 per month, he states that the wife wept with joy but he just felt sad at heart that it wasn't more. I would heartily agree with that.

Now, few of our widows had the benefit of any insurance, or any insurance amounting to anything. They might have a thousand dollars.

I think that should the needs provision be applied right down the line, it ought to also have an age provision attached to it, or, when a man comes up into the 75's and 80's, it costs him far more to live because of medical treatment, hospitalization, and things of that kind; and not all of them by any means can get in the veterans' hospitals.

On the married ones, if they have that, I think that there should be a higher limit on income than $2,700 for the married couple because, when they become aged, it is so much more expensive for them to live.

I appreciate, gentlemen, the situation that you are in with the increase in pension demands, and the graphs that were pictured there of the enormity of the expenses that went along with it.

However, I think it would be well said that, even as the pension load of this country has increased, the national income has also increased proportionately, and the heavier taxation is not simply represented by that. There has been a heavier national income almost commensurate with the increase in the pension rolls. That argument has been advanced by some of those who have appeared before you, but I can appreciate the difficulty you have in reconciling all of the situations that arise.

I do feel that it is a very meritorious bill that the Spanish War veterans have here, and that it is seriously needed by those widows.

Now, so few of either the veterans or the women are eligible for social security. Their husbands, if they worked, were not under positions where they would get social security because nearly all of them were so old that they couldn't work in such an occupation after the social security became available.

However, as I say, the Spanish War veterans have not asked an increase of pension for years, and I do feel that it is a meritorious thing for these widows to have this even though it is more than the widows of the World War I and World War II veterans for the reason that the age makes for more expense and more infirmity.

I think that, if you would put an age provision on there for the older widows of World War I and World War II, it would be a just measure.

Could Mrs. Trazenfeld say a word?

The CHAIRMAN. Certainly.

STATEMENT BY MRS. TRAZENFELD

Mrs. TRAZENFELD. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I think that our own Mr. Thurston and our chairman have covered pretty well our opinion of the report of the Bradley Commission. They have covered our thinking in regard to not downgrading the veteran in any instance.

I would like to speak for the opinion of the widows. Now, in listening to the briefing and in studying the report, and also from the hearings before this committee, it would seem that the Commission took the stand that our veterans when they returned from the wars were compensated in many ways. They received—I think it enumerated—rehabilitation, hospitalization, mustering-out pay, vocational training, home loans, and what have you, and many of them took advantage of that and it made it possible for them to assume a higher scale of living than they would have otherwise had.

Now, our war, the Spanish-American War, terminated on July 4, 1902. The records will show that nothing was requested from the Congress until 1918. In 1918 the widow of a Spanish War veteran was awarded $12 a month and $2 a month for each minor child.

They did not receive mustering-out pay, hospitalization, rehabilitation of any kind, vocational training, home loans, or anything.

The Spanish War veteran in the majority came from the mines, the fields, the stores, the jobs of any kind that were just salaried jobs. Very few came from the big industrial firms, from the stock market, or from the banks or from that category of men. We have a few, but very few.

The records will also reveal that.

When they were discharged from the service, many of them didn't care whether they were examined. There were no records of disabilities. They wanted to get home. You can talk to any of them, and those were the facts. They went back to those same jobs if they could get them, and they asked for nothing.

They increased the widows' pension in 1922 to $20 a month and $4 for the child.

In 1922 the veteran received nothing. He received none of the other things that would enable him to make a better living.

Certainly you cannot apply the findings or the treatment of the Bradley Commission to the Spanish War veteran or his dependents.

There is another thing that is pretty important. In the latter years since World War I, the wife has been able to go out and supplement the husband's income, and in many, many instances they do. Many make as much as their husbands, and some make more. Back in the Spanish-American War period and following up until World War I, it was almost a disgrace for the wife to work, and the average husband would almost rather have seen his family go hungry than for her to be employed. They did not have a chance to add to their income.

May lose their homes

Many bought homes and had small mortgages on them. They could not amortize them every month. They had to be renewed every 3 or 5 years. The only worry they had was that they were going to be unable to renew that because they knew that they couldn't pay it off. They bought a home with a mortgage and usually died with that home and a mortgage. Many widows still have that home.

Many widows have written to me in the last spot poll we took, saying that they had a home but are having difficulty in keeping up the water rent and the necessary repairs

on that home on the pension they receive. Therefore, I do not believe that the report of the Bradley Commission can conscientiously be made applicable to the Spanish War veterans or their widows or those of prior wars, and I speak certainly for those of prior wars—the Civil War veterans' widows. It cannot be made applicable to them if we are going to consider all the angles.

I am just stacked up in the office with letters of fear. It would wring your hearts to read them: "What is going to happen to us because of the Bradley Commission report?"

Certainly this Veterans' Committee has it within its power to grant the greatest happiness in the world if you could give a word of comfort to them that this Bradley Commission, in your opinion, should not apply to them.

The CHAIRMAN. You have been present here most of the time. This committee has tried to point out that this commission report is just a recommendation to the President, not a law. We are getting letters saying that pensions and compensations are going to be cut off. The Bradley Commission report is by no means a law. It is merely a recommendation to the President of the United States. Many people read the headlines and assume that it is a law. We are getting a lot of those letters, and we have done everything we could to try to get the information out that it is a recommendation and not a law; that no one is fixing to be cut off of the pension rolls because of it.

Mutual Security Act of 1956

SPEECH
OF

HON. WALTER H. JUDD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 8, 1956

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H. R. 11356) to amend further the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended, and for other purposes.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I shall support the Kelly amendment with the Williams amendment, to cut off all aid to Yugoslavia unless the President himself determines otherwise.

But I rise primarily to point out that this is a situation from which it seems to me we can learn a great deal as we wrestle with difficult problems around the world. It is important periodically to take inventory on a given operation and draw lessons from our experience.

Our aid to Yugoslavia is an illustration of the truth of Abraham Lincoln's statement that nothing that is morally wrong can ever be politically right. The immoral things that have been done in the Yugoslavia case, beginning with actions by some of our allies during the war, had led us to the difficult position we are in today, where there is no good way out. About our only choice now is to decide which course will do least harm to our country.

It is also a case study in the larger question of whether we can better serve the interests of the United States in the long run by helping Communist dictators retain tyrannical control over their people, or by encouraging and helping the people to resist the dictators.

Tito has opposed and is opposing every one of our policies in Europe, in the Middle East, in Asia, and all around the world that this whole $4 billion program of aid is supposed to promote. He opposes every one of the foreign policies we are trying to carry out today. But still we have continued to help him all these years, until it now may be more dangerous to stop than to go on.

How did we get into such a predicament?

To begin with, some of our European allies sold out another ally, Mihailovitch, a genuine friend, a man of the people, and committed to real democracy, in order to bring to power in Yugoslavia, this Communist dictator Tito, thinking it might shorten the war and save lives. There was little, if any, real gain then; and look at what that betrayal has cost us since and is threatening to do to us today, with Tito rearmed by ourselves and proclaiming publicly his undying union with our mortal enemy, the Communist world conspiracy.

Anything that is morally wrong will not turn out to be politically right. I hope we will learn something from this painful experience.

Then, during the postwar period, we gave vast UNRRA aid to Yugoslavia, whose people were desperately hungry. But we gave it through Tito. Some of us fought then against that system of giving aid to Communist rulers, because food in such circumstances is the strongest and most powerful political weapon in the world. A man will himself stand up against the machine guns of a tyrant; but if the tyrant controls all food and the only way the man can keep his children alive is by signing the tyrant's card, he is likely to sign up. With our food, we enabled Tito to entrench himself and fasten his oppressive rule on the Yugoslav people. Once more a thing that was morally wrong turned out to be politically wrong.

Then in 1949 there was a hard famine in Yugoslavia. It was partly due to peasant resistance to Tito, but there was also a severe drought. For 2 years it did not rain; the ground was baked and barren. Our instinct, of course, was to help hungry people there, as everywhere. But we had to decide whether our sending of food to Tito would bring more good to the people than it would bring them harm in the long run by strengthening his hold on the country. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS] led the fight against the aid. I spoke for it, arguing that we ought to try to get some help to the people even if it did also help their oppressor. I suspect the gentleman from Ohio was right. We should have required Tito to give freedom to his people in return for our aid. But we are softhearted. Food seemed more important to us than freedom.

Just about that time Tito and Stalin had their differences. Stalin kicked Tito out.

Let us have this point clear. It is frequently said, as if to Tito's credit, that he broke with the Kremlin and the Communist world conspiracy, that he put his nation's independence ahead of communism. That is not the case. Tito had a personal quarrel with Stalin. He is not a nationalist; he was not trying to save Yugoslavia's independence or working for the well-being of the Yugoslav people. He is an egotist; he was trying to save his own neck.

At that point I thought we should stop aid. Year after year I supported in committee this same effort to cut off aid to Tito which the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. KELLY] is making today. The argument that can be made today with validity, namely, that to stop aid just now would leave Tito no choice but to go back to the Kremlin, become wholly dependent upon it and, therefore, under its complete control, did not apply then. In 1950, 1951, 1952, and until Stalin died in 1953, Tito could not go back. He would have lost his head. Stalin never forgave anybody. Tito knew it better than anyone—except perhaps the admitted coward, Khrushchev.

That was the time to shut off our aid and cause Tito's power at home to be weakened so that the freedom-loving people of Yugoslavia could rise up and overthrow the dictator. We could have had now in Yugoslavia a genuinely free government, a democratic government, friendly to the West, under leaders chosen by the Yugoslav people themselves.

But instead, for 4 years, we not only sent Tito food and supplies, but needlessly armed his divisions and sent him scores of jet planes. I say needlessly, because we did not have to bribe him to stay away from the Kremlin. He could not go back as long as Stalin lived.

Within a month after Stalin died, in Marhc 1953, I said in a Town Hall speech, in New York, "I think we can anticipate that Tito will now gradually slip back into bed with the Kremlin and its Communist conspirators everywhere." The reason for the break was gone.

Sure enough, Tito now reveals his true colors and proudly reavows his allegiance to communism. Why should anyone ever have doubted it?

But some protest that he has not gone back to the Kremlin completely. Of course not. Why should he? He would be of far less use to the world revolution if he were openly and completely in the Kremlin's arms. He would be like East Germany and Czechoslovakia and Poland, something of a drain on the Soviet Union. How much more valuable he is to Russia if he can keep us supporting him and building up his armed forces. What sense would there be in the Kremlin making him break with us yet? He would not be any more use to them than are Hungary and Bulgaria and Rumania.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. JUDD was granted 3 additional minutes.)

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, Tito's greatest value to the Kremlin is not as a satellite. His greatest value is as a supposed neutral or independent. That gives him all the advantage of being on both sides. We continue to support him, we enable him to maintain large armies in the field, and we help him keep the Yugoslav people under his thumb. Doubtless he can also learn a good deal

about our plans and our strength and that of NATO, and of Greece and Turkey. What better arrangement could there be? The free world sustains him and the Communists world reaps the benefit.

Mr. Chairman, there was no justification for our helping Tito as we did while Stalin lived. Tito was dependent on us for his life and his power, not we on him.

But now Stalin is gone. As predicted, Tito has moved back openly into the Kremlin's orbit. But perhaps not completely. That is what makes our predicament and our decision today so difficult. Having given him such vital aid all these years, is this the moment to stop? Should we adopt here today so drastic an amendment as the Kelly amendment which would rule out any possibility of perhaps keeping up some division between Tito and the Kremlin, to the extent that there may still remain some of the division that existed as long as Stalin was alive and kept it going?

Mr. Chairman, I sympathize entirely with what the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. KELLY] is trying to do as I have all these years. But I think the direction of foreign policy must come from the President, and so I shall support the Williams amendment to allow the President to continue the aid if he determines it to be in our national interest. That unquestionably puts the President on the spot. But that is the proper thing to do; it should be his responsibility to make the decision, just as it is ours to express our views in favor of stopping the aid.

Mr. Chairman, having fooled along with the immoral policy of aiding a Communist tyrant all these years when we did not need to, we have now got ourselves into a position where I believe we ought to accept the Williams amendment and then pass the Kelly amendment as so amended.

But at the same time we should take to heart some of the lessons of this whole unworthy episode—and please God, never get into such a sorry mess again. At this stage of affairs we, and the President, must weigh the possible benefits that may develop with the other satellites, to the extent that our aid to Tito might conceivably encourage other Communists to try to be independent in their communism—if that is not a contradiction in terms, as I suspect it is—against the certain benefits that would occur all around the world should the people of the United States, the Congress, and the Executive, in their proper relationships, decide the time has come to cut off all aid and comfort to any and all Communist regimes. I am sure the latter would electrify hundrers of millions of people, especially those enslaved behind the curtain and those threatened around its borders. It would give them hope and courage to hang on. It would demonstrate that it pays to be an ally of the United States and that it does not pay to pull Uncle Sam's whiskers or to bite his hand while it feeds them.

I do not blame Tito for trying to get us to feed him; I do not blame Tito for biting our hands; I just blame us for being so dumb as to keep on feeding him while he kept on avowing his devotion to communism and opposing all our efforts against communism everywhere in the world.

I have said all these years, and I say it again today, that in the long run only those things counts and will endure that promote the well-being not of tyrants but of people. What we have faced all along is a moral decision. Does the United States stand with the oppressors or with the oppressed?

Do we put our faith for the future in deals with tyrants or in standing everlastingly on the side of their victims and against the tyrants?

We have never yet quite made that decision as a government.

For myself I have never believed the deals would work out, and I do not believe it now. But at the same time, inconsistent as it may seem, I fear it would be unwise for the Congress to cut off all aid to Tito at this particular moment. It is wrong for a person to be given narcotics year after year. But once that has happened, it generally is unwise to stop them suddenly and entirely before one is completely sure of the condition of the addict.

Mr. Chairman, I think the President soon will have to end this aid to Tito, because that is the right thing to do, it is the moral thing to do, and it will prove to be in the end the expedient thing to do. But I think it probably should be done under the procedures set forth in the Williams amendment. That is the proper way for us to carry on the conduct of our foreign affairs.

The Moral Basis of Our Foreign Policy in the Americas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE H. FALLON
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 18, 1956

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Speaker, it is highly commendable when a leader of our Nation's commerce and industry analyzes present day trends and purposes a course of positive action to advance America's interests without the sacrifice of the principles and ideals which have enabled the United States to remain pre-eminent in the family of nations.

Such an instance has occurred in the public address delivered by Mr. J. Peter Grace, president of W. R. Grace & Co., at the commencement exercises of Loyola College, Baltimore, a leading liberal arts institution, of which the Reverend Vincent F. Beatty, S. J., is president. Mr. Grace made an eloquent and impressive presentation of United States policy and demonstrated that its preservation has been the result of constant adherence to fundamental principles throughout the execution of a forward-looking international policy.

The sound advice given to the graduates by President Grace was so timely and based on such rich experience that it would be fortunate if our citizenry throughout this Nation would be conversant with the views and recommendations outlined in Mr. Grace's persuasive presentation. For that purpose, I insert the salient portion of the address in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

THE MORAL BASIS OF OUR FOREIGN POLICY IN THE AMERICAS

In recent years, I have been invited to speak in Baltimore on two occasions, much to my gratification. Each time, however, those groups with whom it has been my good fortune to meet, have gathered in places where men talk of trade and of commerce, as has been their wont from the days of clipper ships to these of industry and science and finance.

It was on such a springtime afternoon, 3 centuries ago, that 16 men—not far from this place where the daily recollection of the Calverts is so strong—proclaiamed the first colony dedicated to freedom of thought and of conscience, and blessed it with the name of our lady. It was 3¼ centuries ago that the *Ark* and the *Dove* brought 200 pioneers to the shores of the bay so near us. And Loyola graduates will know that among those who came to, found that colony were Andrew White and John Altham of the Society of Jesus, priests bringing with them the tradition and the training of Ignatius Loyola which you today and henceforth proudly share.

In an age when teachers, jurists and even some spiritual leaders are talking the language of shifting moral concepts, it is inspiring to realize that the sound principles which have guided your education are based on immutable truths and on pedagogical methods which, under the test of centuries, stand today as the finest in the world. Here on this uniquely American campus, one may reflect on the richness of the blood stream of our Nation with the very best of the Old World's qualities molded into the uniqueness of the American character.

As I speak to you today, I am reminded too that gratuating classes of previous years—far too many in fact—have gone forth with high hopes and enthusiasm as you are doing, only to find that instead of the bright, New World they dreamed of, they faced apprehension and concern. But why should there be this doubt and uncertainty? Why should our young men be constantly confronted with an apprehensive world? Why should these conditions exist in our country which most certainly has been blessed by God, "conceived in liberty," endowed with tremendous natural resources and enriched with an intelligent, hard-working, God-fearing people? These questions are all the more pertinent when we realize that our democracy is a model to the world and that our country has never been more prosperous or productive. Never have our people enjoyed material goods as much as they do today. Our schools are filled to overflowing. Our churches are well attended. The State of the Union is good. In the words of the preamble to our Constitution, we have established justice, we enjoy domestic tranquility, we are providing for the common defense, and promoting the general welfare. But what of the blessings of liberty, have we fully secured them?

This great American heritage means many things other than the simple exercise of free will. It means that parents can plan the education of their children; that our young people can plan for marriage and raising of a family. It means that this Nation must have that indispensable sense of security with which it can enjoy the blessings of liberty. But I must say in all frankness that that sense of security is lacking of the overbearing fear that this age of thermonuclear weapons has produced in us along with its threat of annihilation of our way of life. It is this insecurity which is breeding apprehension,

doubt and uncertainty in our generation. This situation relates not so much to our domestic affairs as to the state of our international relations.

"It is in the area of foreign affairs that we and our sacred institutions are threatened by the great menace of communism. It is this menace that is causing us to conscript our youth in peacetime and spend 61 cents of every Federal dollar for major national security programs. And it is precisely that menace which has brought worry to the face of America.

Latin America is not only significant to us, it is actually essential. It is strategically essential as a key area of the world and economically essential to us as a customer for our exports and principal source for vitally needed raw materials. Culturally and politically Latin America is tied to us as the common inheritor of the western Christian tradition. With its population growing at the fastest rate in the world, Latin America will have twice as many people as the United States at the end of this century.

It is particularly timely for us to review our policy in this area because this year the 21 American Republics are celebrating the 130th anniversary of the call by Simon Bolivar, the great South American liberator, for an Inter-American conference at Panama to lay the ground work for cooperation among the nations of this hemisphere. The realization of Bolivar's dream came about in later years when the 21 American Republics fashioned a cooperative international system that has proved an example of a peaceful international coexistence. In fact, it has been so successful that Secretary of State Dulles in his memorable speech of April 23 held up the Organization of American States as an example of the kind of system he would like to see developed in the North Atlantic Treaty Organization.

A substantial part of our achievements in the Western Hemisphere, I believe, is derived from the very foundation stones of American diplomacy and political thinking set down by our forefathers. In his classic account of American diplomatic history, John W. Foster, Secretary of State under President Harrison and grandfather of Secretary Dulles (and, by the way, great-grandfather of Avery Dulles of the Society of Jesus who will be ordained on the 16th of this month), pointed out that the Declaration of Independence, the Farewell Address of President Washington, and the Monroe Doctrine, constitute the basis of American foreign policy. He maintained in his book, "A Century of American Diplomacy" that these three documents have had the most profound influence on the destiny of America and have significantly affected the conduct of many nations of the world. This is a very striking but simple fact about American foreign policy which we should always bear in mind.

The point that Secretary Foster made was that each of these three documents served as a foundation stone during the development of American foreign policy down through the years and even to this day. The Declaration of Independence, for instance, announced to the world that the United States of America would be guided by the natural law and that the American people, created equal, receive their inalienable rights from God and not from any sovereign, parliament or charter. I would like to recall at this point the view of scholars of which my Jesuit friends are aware, that Jefferson, author of the Declaration of Independence, was undoubtedly influenced by Robert Cardinal Bellarmine, the great Jesuit saint and advocate of human rights.

Washington's Farewell Address was not just a warning against foreign entanglements, as it is too frequently described, but it was in fact a set of great moral precepts designed to serve the Nation in its later years. Washington's words are as full of meaning today as they were over 150 years ago and they reflect a wisdom which has made the Father of his Country one of the truly great men of world history.

The third foundation stone of American foreign policy is the Monroe Doctrine, one of our greatest heritages. Although President James Monroe announced his ringing doctrine to the world in 1823, the origin of this proclamation appears to go back as far as 1808—to Jefferson's idea of the independent common destiny of the Americas. John Quincy Adams, Secretary of State under President Monroe developed it as a master stroke of American diplomacy and secured for us an everlasting interest in the freedom and independence of the nations of Latin America.

The important aspect of what I have just related to you is that from the very beginning of American foreign policy our conduct abroad was set forth on a high moral plane. This was particularly true of our initial relationship with the newborn republics of Latin America. It was John Quincy Adams who established that the basis of our relationship with the new nations of Latin America should be "disinterestedness, cordial good will, fair and equal reciprocity." As Adams succeeded Monroe to the Presidency, his Secretary of State, Henry Clay, proposed to put the Monroe Doctrine into effect through a series of what he called good-neighborhood treaties with the new American republics. I would like you to note at this point that it was over a century ago that the neighborly tone of our relationship with Latin America was introduced into our foreign policy.

Our policy in Latin America later progressed through the proposal of Adams and Clay for the United States to participate in in a Panama conference of the Western Hemisphere nations as a realization of the great dream of Bolivar. This brought about our leadership in the Pan American Union which was established in 1890 under the guiding hand of Secretary of State James G. Blaine. It was advanced by Herbert Hoover and brought to magnificent heights by Roosevelt, Cordell Hull, and Sumner Welles. Today President Eisenhower and Vice President Nixon and Dr. Milton Eisenhower, the President's special Ambassador to the Latin American nations, are sparing no effort to maintain and further these friendly relations.

In test after crucial test, through feast and famine, then nations of the Western Hemisphere have been bound together in peace and friendship, with mutual respect, prosperous and growing trade, and a rising standard of living. Undoubtedly we made a number of unfortunate decisions in Europe and Asia through force of circumstances, unbearable pressures, and conditions over which we had no control. Nevertheless, this does not explain everything. It is plain to see from our present situation in Europe and Asia that somehow during the past two decades our faith and the faith of others in us has suffered. Great and good men are working hard to restore it, but damage has been done, and our situation with regard to Europe and Asia is not a very happy one today.

It was the spirit of the American Revolution and the sharp cry of independence in this country that influenced the Latin American nations to revolt and win their own independence.

It was the idealism of America that captured the hearts and minds of Europeans who had long since had their fill of power politics. It is the vision of America as a land of the free and the land of opportunity that gives the captive peoples of Europe their only source of hope and strength.

It was the torch of freedom, equality, and justice which influenced the hearts of Asiatics and set up in their minds a glowing picture of the United States as a brilliant sun illuminating a dark horizon. To give you an example of what I mean, let me make only a brief reference to the recent visit of President Sukarno, of Indonesia, to this country. As you may recall, he made a special pilgrimage to the home of Thomas Jefferson out of appreciation for the inspiration which Jefferson's life and ideas had given him during the many years of his struggle for the independence of Indonesia.

We can seek to win the faith of the peoples of Europe and Asia by the justice of our policy, and we can realize that only Divine power can prevent a catastrophe. We can attain our true greatness by insisting upon principles and we can avoid expediency.

My esteemed graduates of Loyola College, you are the custodians of our great American heritage. In your hands this Nation places the most powerful tools for justice, equality, and the common good. Whether you go forth in the religious field, in the professions, the military, or some other activity, I urge you to remember that as an American your rights and privileges are found in this great American heritage, but your duty is to exert leadership and wisdom. Out of a combination of the two the world may find the remedy for its fears and anxieties.

I feel that God has richly endowed this great Nation in order that it may lead the way to world peace. Perhaps He is testing this generation with the worldwide challenge of communism to ascertain its strength of character. I urge you to meet it inspired with the history of your Nation, armed with the faith of your fathers, and guided by the purity of purpose which is the essence of American Catholic manhood.

Value of Research and Extension Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CHARLES W. VURSELL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 18, 1956

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, Secretary of Agriculture Benson, and all of his department heads each year come before our Appropriations Subcommittee of seven members with their request for funds for the Department of Agriculture for the coming year. This year, after lengthy hearings and careful evaluation of their requests, we appropriated about $800 million for the regular activities of the Department.

Today, I want to discuss the importance of the Research and Extension Service, and the great benefits it brings to agriculture.

As an illustration, our scientists are doing a tremendous job in protecting farm crops from the ravishes of insects by developing chemicals, and by many other means that help to protect the farmers' crops from insects and plant pests.

Not withstanding the constant fight made against insects, and plant pests, the annual loss runs about $3½ billion.

Were it not for the constant fight we make the destroy or hold back these insects, the damage would run many times the above amount, and they would multiply to the point where they would almost destroy the agricultural production of this country. So you see, the $12

million annually we spend on this phase of research is paying the farmer, and the economy of our Nation tremendous dividends.

The purpose of one type of research in cooperation with the State departments of agriculture, the extension service, and the State experiment stations is to increase farm production.

One illustration, of the many that could be made, of the benefits of this research can be illustrated by referring to the development of hybrid corn, which development at the cost of only a few million dollars has increased the farmers' production of corn by 25 percent, and has increased their income on corn alone by over $750 million a year.

BRUCELLOSIS

The work of our scientists in the United States Department here cooperating with the State departments of agriculture and the extension service toward the eradication of brucellosis, is another outstanding example of the benefit of research with which every county agent and most farmers are familiar. It is estimated that the total loss to livestock farmers since 1930 to the present time has been over $2 billion. Our committee and the Congress in 1954 increased appropriations to $15 million a year up to 1956, and in this session of the Congress increased it to $20 million a year for another 2-year period.

This stepped-up program is bringing results. In 1930, 11 percent of the cattle was infected. Through the work of the United States Department of Agriculture, State experiment stations, county agents, and progressive farmers, infection has been reduced to 2½ percent, and with the additional funds to employ additional veterinarians, our purpose is to reduce it to the lowest possible minimum.

NEW USES FOR FARM PRODUCTS

Tremendous benefits have been brought to the farmers, through the work of the research scientists in finding new markets, and new uses for farm products.

A good illustration of the benefits of this work can be found in soybean production, and markets.

Since 1935, our total production of soybeans has increased from 49,000,000 bushels to 372,000,000 bushels this year, and has become one of the most profitable farm crops—yielding the farmers about $000,000,000 annually.

Since 1935, research scientists, by cross-breeding of soybean plants, developed new varieties with greater resistance to plant disease—all producing higher yields. On an average, these varieties now yield 20 percent more oil, and 10 percent more beans than the varieties they have replaced. There is a great demand for soybean oil at home and abroad, and for soybean meal, which demand has caused the price to raise from $2 a bushel at harvest time to over $3. At this time, when we have so much surplus wheat, corn, and other products, I would like to point out that this huge crop of soybeans is selling far above any support prices, and we are not plagued with any surpluses.

NEW USES FOR SOYBEANS

In addition to its great use for livestock feed, soybeans today provide 70 percent of all vegetable oils used in margarine and 54 percent of all vegetable shortenings.

Research has also opened an outlet for 221,000,000 pounds of soybean oil annually for use as drying oil products. Many new industrial products have been developed including: acids, special resins, and plasticizers made from soybeans. In plastics alone, the potential market for soybean oil is estimated at 200,000,000 pounds annually.

Industrial uses of both soybean oil and soybeans cover a long list from linoleums and tile, to glues and plastics.

In the field of printing inks and paper, ever-increasing amounts of soybean oil are being used, as well as in the making of such things as shotgun shells. A great field is open for the use of soybean products in the manufacturing of textile sizing, and automobile tire-cored sizing. These are only a few new uses of soybeans.

As a result of the continued work of research scientists, markets in industry are steadily being extended, which help to keep the demand for the farmers' soybeans strong in our domesic and export markets.

From July last year to February this year, 55 million bushels of soybeans were exported—40 percent more than a year before.

Out of the total production of soybeans last year, Illinois led all of the 48 States, with 77 million bushels.

POULTRY RESEARCH

Let me discuss briefly the value of research as applied to the poultry business.

You will recall not many years past, poultry, both chicken and turkey, was a luxury generally reserved for the Sunday dinner. Today, chicken and turkey are served daily in hundreds of thousands of restaurants and have become one of the leading meat menus throughout the country. Research scientists, by cross-breeding, have developed the broad-breasted turkey, a better meat-type chicken, and greater production in the number of eggs per hen. Through research has come better feed nutrition, producing heavier broilers in less time, on less feed—both a saving to the farmers. We have seen the broiler business expand from 43 million broilers in 1935 to over 1 billion broilers today. Better type birds are produced in shorter time with less feed, which has brought a great saving and more profit to the farmers.

Egg production per hen has been increased from 122 in 1935 to an average of 184 eggs per hen this year. The 200-eggs-a-year hen is becoming more common on the farms, and the research scientists have set their goal for a 240-eggs-a year hen in the near future.

The poultry business, which was a fringe sideline for the farmers 20 years ago, has grown into a $3,450,000,000-a-year business—over 10 percent of the total gross national farm income today.

Mr. Speaker, may I close by saying that for the past 2 years we have substantially increased appropriations for Research and Extension Service. We feel that these appropriations in the hands of the research scientists in the Department of Agriculture, cooperating with the States' departments of agriculture, and the States' experiment stations are bringing vastly greater benefits to the farmers, generally, than any other like amounts we have appropriated for agriculture.

Federal Support for the Public Schools

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, June 18, 1956

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, on the occasion of the 50th anniversary of the College of Education of the University of Minnesota, a distinguished American, Mr. Beardsley Ruml, delivered a remarkable address entitled "Federal Support for the Public Schools." As is customary with Mr. Ruml, he not only expresses his thoughts in a clear and persuasive manner, but documents his observations with facts and statistical evidence.

Mr. Ruml's address should be read by every Member of Congress. It will remind us of our responsibilities in the field of education. It will also call to our attention what I believe to be a dereliction of duty by our failure to this date to take any positive action in behalf of our public-school system. The American people are looking to Congress for action—not delay. The parents and the schoolchildren of this Nation are at a loss to understand why we procrastinate when our school plant is becoming evermore inadequate and the school population ever larger. The failure to properly care for our educational structure could be every bit as serious—in fact, more serious—than an inadequate military defense.

I, for one, am deeply indebted to Mr. Beardsley Ruml for again reminding each and every Member of the Congress that the cause of education requires immediate assistance, and I ask unanimous consent that the address delivered by him be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FEDERAL SUPPORT FOR THE PUBLIC SCHOOLS

(By Beardsley Ruml)

Point of view shapes the way and the will to action, and point of view is revealed by language, in the words by which purpose and action are described. Thus, point of view is revealed in the phrase, "Federal aid for education." The point of view that is implied is that of giving help where help is needed, of sharing with the poor or the less fortunate. It implies the means test, the hand-out.

Federal aid for education takes us back to the early thirties when the means test and the hand-out characterized public and private programs for aiding the unemployed and people of advanced years. I well remember an incident told to me in those unhappy years of an elderly man applying at the proper bureau for assistance for himself and his ailing wife. He was asked a question proper to the times, "Do you have any money of your own?" "Yes," he replied, "I still have $83 left in my savings bank." The answer was routine. "Come back when that is gone and we will see what we can do."

The means test and the hand-out have substantially disappeared from unemployment and old-age security. They will not and should not completely disappear, since human life enfolds both deep tragedy and instant generosity. However our society today is not the society of 25 years ago with respect to provision for the aged and the unemployed. And since the phrase "Federal aid for education" implies a point of view now obsolete in these other areas, the phrase should be dropped from the language of current discussion. A new phrase should be substituted, a phrase that reveals a modern point of view. I suggest as a substitute, "Federal support for the public schools."

Support implies interest and duty. Certainly we have a Federal interest in making certain that our future citizens can communicate and can compute. These are the basics on which our society rests; and having a Federal society as we do, a Federal interest in the basics of education follows inescapably.

A Federal duty to support the public schools flows both from the national interest, and from the fact that access to the growing income of the country is most direct and most equitably imposed through the Federal income tax. State and local bodies will add to the foundation of support built federally as their vision, conscience, and means provide. There is neither prudence nor equity in making plans such that the requirements of the public schools would have to be met from the resources to which State and local bodies have access.

The phrase, "Federal support for the public schools," deliberately uses the term "public schools" rather than the broader term "education." The public schools are an essential but not exclusive instrument in the Nation's educational policy. State and local bodies, churches, families, formal and informal voluntary agencies, will have plenty to do in expressing their own variety of insights in the general educational fabric of which the public schools are part. Federal support for the public schools should therefore provide important substance to the communities' educational programs without the rigidity and interference usually associated with responsible Federal use of Federal funds.

The question still remains, Can Federal support for the public schools be provided in a form that carries no danger of objectionable interference? I believe that Federal support can be so provided once the point of view of aid and the means test is set aside.

In its report, Financing Public Education in the Decade Ahead, the National Citizens Commission for the Public Schools had this to say: "Equalization of one kind or another has been used in the past, but the amounts involved were small. By 1965, on the other hand, the amounts would be large. Equalization, involving as it does, some measures of need and ability to meet need, always threatens to bring about Federal dominance or control of education. The possibility of the Federal Government coercing the States in education matters would exist—at least potentially. This should be avoided and could be by distributing Federal aid for education on a per capita, school-age-child basis. Each State government would receive this money each year upon certification that the funds would be spent that year for public education as defined by the State."

Later, speaking to the American Association of School Administrators in Cleveland on April 4, 1955, I said that such Federal funds "should be on a per capita child in public school basis, the definition of public school to be made by each particular State. One objection might be that the wealthier States that now pay the larger share of the Federal income tax are already able to take care of public education on any level they feel suitable. This I doubt, but even if it were so, it still remains true that a child in a wealthier State is also at the same time a child of the United States and deserves equal Federal support for the basic costs of his school system."

On what scale of expenditure should we think about Federal support for the public schools? This question will be deeply studied and long debated. My suggestion is that a start be made for fiscal 1958 with a per capita child in public school payment by the Federal Government of $20 and that this amount be continued in fiscal 1959. In subsequent years the amount should be raised to $80 per capita in 2 or 3 steps, reaching this figure in fiscal 1961 or 1962. The aggregate amount need only be estimated roughly at this time; the payments at the $20 per capita rate would be about $750 million and at the $80 per capita rate in fiscal 1962 would be about $3½ billion. These figures though important are not unmanageable, particularly when account is taken of projected increases in national income. It should also be observed that no new or increased Federal taxes would be required, since these amounts can be obtained by reducing present taxes somewhat more slowly than might otherwise have been the case. Some perspective is given as to relative magnitudes when it is realized that an increase of $100 in the present exemption in the individual income tax would result in loss of revenue at present national income figures of about $2¾ billion. A reduction of 7 percentage points in the corporation profits tax, that is from 52 percent to 45 percent would reduce tax revenue from this source at present profit levels by about the same amount, $2¾ billion. These examples showing the relation between tax rates and revenue show clearly that the suggested scale of Federal support for the public schools would constitute no significant burden to the taxpayer.

Some explanation of the suggested per capita rates and timing is in order. The $20 figure is intended to give a period of time to allow for the development of administrative, accounting, and auditing procedures. I have mentioned fiscal 1958 as the starting date in order to give time for the passage of legislation and for determination by State and local authorities as to how the funds will be distributed and used.

As to the $80 figure, some gradualism in arriving at this point is clearly desirable. If it can be reached efficiently in 2 steps, that is certainly better than 3. Time may show that the $80 figure is somewhat too low in view of rapidly mounting population at the high-school age level. Eighty dollars per capita is about one-third of the amount now being spent by the States, exclusive of interest and amortization of school building costs. If local expenditure is substantially higher by 1962, a somewhat higher Federal support figure would seem appropriate. It would seem undesirable for the Federal support figure to exceed the per capita expenditure of the lowest State.

How do these Federal support figures compare with projected public-school needs? The Citizens Commission's report previously mentioned estimates a range of from $13.5 to $19.2 billion for 1965 requirements for public, private, and parochial schools. The Federal support at the $80 level, amounting to $3½ billion, would thus be between 25 and 18 percent of the projected estimates. Such percentages, particularly at the higher expenditure levels, still leave a very heavy financial burden for education on non-Federal sources of revenue.

The suggested level of support should be related also to projections of increased gross national product. The current figure of $400 billion is up $35 billion since 1593. Estimates of $425 billion for 1960 and $525 billion for 1965 are likely to be exceeded in the light of current trends. Federal support for the public schools of $3½ billion 5 years from now is clearly no substantial withdrawal from increased productivity.

Another quotation from the report of the citizens commission is relevant here. "The financing problem is a problem of policy, not of resources; the problem is to select the best basis on which to make a small portion of the increased national production and income available for education."

Although at the level of broad purpose and policy, Federal support for the public schools on a per capital basis offers no difficulty except the effort to get it going, there are nevertheless several sensitive points that must be anticipated and dealt with. Of these I shall mention five.

First, the definition of what is a "public school" must be left to the individual State. The definitions will vary and will seem to some fanciful and even inconsistent wtih prevailing notions of what a public school really is. Some will define a public school in terms of its top controlling board, some in terms of its availability to students, some in terms of the character of its support. Some States will define parochial schools as public schools, others will not. Latitude must be given to the State to define "public school" as it sees fit. This is a prime consideration for State freedom from Federal control.

Second, there must be a definition of what is a "child in school." This is the unit in terms of which support will be given. Here are some of the questions: What is a child, that is, from what age to what age is the child to be counted as such? When is he in school, that is how many days a year, how many hours a day? Must he be on the school premises, or only under school supervision? These points as a statement of minimum standards should be a matter of Federal determination.

Third, what about present funds now going to the schools from State and local bodies? Must they be maintained? My answer here is that the maintenance of existing funds should not be required, otherwise the Federal support is not really the discharge of a Federal responsibility, and the State would be coerced as a result of a history that may or may not be currently in tune with overall needs as the State itself presently appraises them.

Fourth, what about desegration? I feel that aid should be given to all States on a per capita basis without regard to how the administration of the public schools is currently handled. Law enforcement of national policy is in the hands of the courts. Improved educational opportunity will be a powerful force in aiding in the establishment of a rational and humane democracy.

A special problem arises however if a State defines what is ordinarily considered to be a public school as a private school for purposes of evading the intent of national desegregation policy. Should a State be permitted to define public school in one way for the Supreme Court and in another way for the Comptroller General. Personally, I feel that one definition is enough, and public school once being defined, that concept should prevail uniformly in all juridical and administrative matters where the public school as such is involved.

Finally, the dreary question of accounting and auditing. Here I feel that the accounting should be done by the State, certified to by some high agency other than the school authority. The auditing should be done by an agency of the Federal Government, and the rules of the audit should provide whatever uniformity and flexibility in accounting the State machinery will use as its guide to procedure and to form. Such Federal supervision is not an interference with the educational program of the State, it is only the assurance that the declared policy of the State has been performed in terms that reflect Federal responsibility and accountability.

Opposition to Federal support for the public schools is rarely heard on economic

grounds, that the burden on the Federal budget would be too great. It is frequently contended that the States could do more if they only wanted to, by means of reassessments, higher rates of real estate taxes, higher general and specific sales taxes, new taxes on business turnover and the like. There is no doubt some truth in these contentions; but what is not always recognized is that States and local communities have many public responsibilities other than the schools, and that growth and shifts of population have created many a new problem for local government. In any case catching up with school necessities and keeping up with school demands will require more State and local funds than have ever been planned for, even with moderate assistance in Federal support.

The most vocal opposition to Federal support for the public schools comes as exressed apprehension that Federal money means Federal interference and ultimate Federal control of education. The right of each State to determine what kind of education it wants is constantly asserted, a somewhat legalistic position considering the interference of the State in the educational affairs of local communities and of both in the decisions of the individual family, which after all should have some final rights as to how the children should be brought up.

It is true that the protestations of fear of Federal interference are mostly based on the assumption of an equalization formula, of the means test, handout policy which always presented a potential danger. If, however, the measure of Federal support is on a per capita child in public school basis, the only Federal concern would be to prevent false reporting or fraud of other kinds. The opposition will now come from those who favor Federal aid because they expect at the same time to get Federal influence on local educational policies and standards. This opposition feels that working through local citizens groups is too slow and too uncertain, and that unless there is conformance to Federal standards there should be no Federal aid. Whether or not this group is large, it is extremely vocal; and recent disclosures as to what the Soviet Union has been able to accomplish educationally by means of central expenditure and central control makes this group understandably impatient with the slower policies of popular consent and popular will.

There is, however, another angle to this controversy—one that is very old and very deep. Briefly it is the question of whether the burden of social programs, such as education, should be borne by a tax on real property or by a tax on income.

This issue was brought home to me very vividly in 1931 when I was a dean at the University of Chicago. Prof. Charles H. Judd had just returned from New York where he had attended a small private meeting of businessmen and educators. The subject under discussion was increasing the required age of school attendance. I asked him how the meeting went. He said, "Fine. There was unanimous agreement that the compulsory school attendance age should be raised." I was surprised and asked him to explain. "Well," said Judd, "the educators and the businessmen have a common interest. The educators want more children to teach and the businessmen want to put the burden of unemployment on real estate."

This conflict between the income-tax payer and the real estate taxpayer or renter is not a conflict between the rich and the poor. We now have over 44 million income-tax payers, and the median taxable income on which income tax is paid is only $3,800. To make it concrete, here is a man making $100 a week who has a wife and 3 children. He now has $3,000 in exemptions. If the exemption allowance should be raised $100 per person, since his highest bracket is 20 percent, he will increase his income after taxes by $100. If, instead of raising the exemption, $80 is put into the public schools (on the per capita child in public school basis), his children if they are in public school will get $240 more spent for their education. Which do you think this head of a family would prefer—$240 more spent a year on the education of his children or $100 a year of his own to do with as he pleases? Well, your guess is as good as mine.

From the point of view of the national welfare the choice is clear. The $240 more a year for the better education of the 3 children is more desirable than $100 a year spent or saved beyond the family's present consumer status.

Obviously this is an illustrative generalization, and exceptional cases can be imagined. But the exceptions will fall on both sides around this average, and the balance is clearly in favor of Federal support of the public schools.

We are now in a time of historic change in education. The old traditions are falling apart under the pressure of the new necessities. And in a curious way the new necessities derive from a will to provide for all children the educational opportunities which the old traditions were designed to give the few.

The period from 1929 to 1939 was a period of economic disorder. The institutional pattern was no longer able to support the basic demands of production and distribution. We were confronted for a decade with the paradox of need for goods and need for work in a setting of abundance of raw materials and the highest technical competence the world had at that time known. Later the folly of war revealed the folly of the old economic and financial traditions. The reluctantly adopted palliatives of the early thirties became established as the guides to institutional economic reform.

In 1946, after 15 years that were marked by both depression and war, a national policy was formulated in the simple preamble to the Employment Act of 1946. This policy has become more creative as the years have passed. It declared that the Federal Government has responsibility, consistent with a fundamental belief in free, competitive enterprise to "utilize all its plans, functions and resources for the purpose of creating and maintaining conditions under which there will be afforded useful employment opportunities, including self-employment, for those able, willing, and seeking to work."

At the time the Employment Act was passed, there were misgivings, even fears. The New York Herald Tribune on June 14, 1946, spoke of the act as "perhaps the most serious threat to free enterprise and democracy with which the country has been confronted in the 170 years of its existence." But today the act has bipartisan support at the highest levels, and all sectors of the economy recognize its policy as a necessary element in protecting the national welfare.

The period from 1949 to 1959 is a period of educational disorder. The old institutional structure can no longer contain the urgent demand for general and selective educational opportunity. The public schools in 1956 are in the same position that the banks were in 1931. In a year or two or three, more and more public schools will become educationally insolvent. Unfortunately, or perhaps fortunately, there can be no run on the schools that will force them to close. But the present inadequacies will become more apparent as the needs become more acute, and we can look forward to an Education Act of 195x whose preamble may well be a paraphrase of that of the Employment Act of 1946.

Such a preamble to the Education Act of 195x might read in part as follows: "There is a Federal responsibility, consistent with the constitutional rights, the privileges, and the duties of the States, to utilize all its plans, functions, and resources for the purpose of creating and maintaining conditions under which there will be afforded useful educational opportunities, including self-education, for those able, willing, and seeking to learn."

Statement of Commissioner Thomas E. Murray, United States Atomic Energy Commission, to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLINTON P. ANDERSON

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, June 18, 1956

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a summary of a statement, as well as the statement itself, of Commissioner Thomas E. Murray, United States Atomic Energy Commission, submitted to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy on June 18, 1956, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the summary and statement were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SUMMARY OF STATEMENT OF COMMISSIONER THOMAS E. MURRAY, UNITED STATES ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION, SUBMITTED TO THE JOINT COMMITTEE ON ATOMIC ENERGY, JUNE 18, 1956

1. The increasing threat of world destruction compels me to urge again the acceleration of effort on peacetime power reactors.

2. The prospect of getting industrial atomic power in the near future is very gloomy. The Government has prematurely abdicated to private industry the primary responsibility for building large power reactors.

3. Important reactor types have been staked out by individual companies or groups. Yet there is no firm assurance that these and other power reactors will be built in the near future.

4. Repeating a recommendation made last February, I again urge the Government to assume the primary responsibility for large reactor construction.

5. While continuing to support the power demonstration program, I recommend that the Government construct several large power reactors. These reactors should be located at AEC production facilities thus eliminating the issue of public versus private power.

6. A program of large reactor construction would help private industry. It would also enable us to keep our repeated and widely publicized promises to make available the benefit of atomic energy to mankind at an early date.

7. I strongly recommend that Congress enact legislation similar to that proposed by Senator ALBERT GORE and Congressman CHET HOLIFIELD. This legislation should provide for a program of large power reactor construction generally along the lines I have proposed and at the locations I have suggested.

STATEMENT OF COMMISSIONER THOMAS E. MURRAY, UNITED STATES ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION, SUBMITTED TO THE JOINT COMMITTEE ON ATOMIC ENERGY, JUNE 18, 1956

My views on a national policy for the development of industrial atomic power are importantly influenced by the ever increas-

ing threat of nuclear weapons to the continued existence of mankind. Echoing a warning which I previously voiced, a recent report by a group of outstanding scientists notes the possibility that the detonation of enough of these weapons could render the entire earth, or a large portion of it, uninhabitable.

I have on prior occasions before your committee endeavored to demonstrate the relationship between this threat and our atomic-power program. Once again, however, the dimensions of this danger were impressed on my conscience as I recently witnessed a nuclear explosion in the far Pacific. The possible implications for man's future, so vividly illustrated, compel me again to urge the acceleration of this Nation's progress in the field of peacetime power reactors.

The present prospect of getting any substantial quantity of industrial atomic power in this country by 1960 is very gloomy—and getting more gloomy every day. At the root of the matter is the fact that the Government has prematurely abdicated to private industry the primary responsibility for building large power reactors. Under our present policies, with one notable exception, the Commission's activities in the field of large power reactors are confined to research and development, small-scale pilot-plant construction, and limited assistance to participants under the power demonstration program.

Our immediate national effort in the field of large scale power reactor construction is limited to this demonstration program as supplemented by other activities under the licensing provisions of the Atomic Energy Act. Thus our progress is in the greater part based upon decisions by either participants or licensees as to what type of reactors to construct and at what time to begin constructing them.

Under these procedures four basically different large-scale reactor types are being explored. Some of these reactor types have now come to be accepted as the domain of an individual company or group of companies. For example, the Detroit Edison group is identified with the fast breeder reactor; North American with the sodium graphite reactor; and Commonwealth Edison and its associates with the boiling reactor. Yet the public is given the impression of a massive attack toward industrial nuclear power carried forward by private industry on each sector of the front. Let us examine the situation more closely to determine how rapidly this massive attack is advancing.

The fast breeder reactor area has been staked out by Detroit Edison and its associates. In addition to the many technical obstacles involved in this project there are other difficulties cited as barriers to progress. Unless the problems relating to third-party liability insurance and exemptions from the Public Utility Holding Company Act are solved in a manner satisfactory to the Detroit Edison group the project is not likely to get beyond the initial stages.

Another technical area that has been staked out is that of the sodium graphite reactor. North American Aviation plans to construct a full-scale reactor of this type rated at 75,000 kilowatts for the Consumers Public Power District of Nebraska. However, this project is contingent upon obtaining satisfactory results from the operation of a small experimental reactor now under construction. In my opinion these results will not be known until 1958. Thus we are faced with a possible delay of 2 years before a decision is made as to whether or not to construct this important type of power reactor. Moreover, there is a serious question whether a public power group can afford to take the financial risks inherent in this project.

Yankee Atomic Electric Co. presently plans to construct a large reactor of the pressurized water type. Under a contract with Yankee the Commission has agreed to provide certain financial and other support for this project. However, the contract does not establish any date for completion; neither does it provide any penalty for withdrawal. It does have a provision that the contract may be modified by the parties to provide for a different reactor or design in the event that estimated power costs substantially exceed the original estimates on which the proposal is based.

In addition to the ractor types represented by these projects there is another class of considerable importance, namely, aqueous homogeneous reactors. Pennsylvania Power & Light has announced its intention to build a reactor of this class for operation in 1962. However, actual construction is contingent on prior proof that construction would be economically justified. This contingency casts grave doubt on the projected completion date of 1962. This project, of such a tentative nature, is the only plan which contemplates constructing a large size homogeneous reactor.

There are those who believe that our present program is an adequate one. In support of this view the argument is advanced that our efforts are sufficient to enable us to remain ahead of the Soviets. To my mind, however, our program should not be paced solely on estimates of what the Soviets and other nations are doing or intend to do in the power reactor field. Nor should we allow ourselves to become embroiled in arguments over estimates that are made of Soviet capabilities, and so permit such arguments to become the basis for delay. What is required is that we recognize the need for action and that we take this action unilaterally and independently of the actions of other nations.

Right action should follow if we recognize the central fact that the development of industrial atomic power is not a matter of choice, but of necessity. Electric power is the very life blood of nations and the hope of the have-not countries. The upward trend in world population, the accelerated industrializatin of underdeveloped areas, and the progressively growing per capita utilization of energy all imply increasing requirements for electric power. On the other hand, there is a limit on the amount of conventional fuels which will be available. Nuclear fuels will be required to meet the increasing demand.

Already in certain areas abroad fuel shortages are beginning to appear, notably among the highly industrialized nations of Western Europe and in Japan. In such countries imported fuels are being used to supplement dwindling fuel reserves. For example, in the case of Western Europe the total net expenditures for fuel imports have been estimated as between 1.5 and 2 billion dollars for 1955, and these are expected to increase to $5 billion by 1975. The problem of fuel shortages in Japan was one of the considerations that led me in 1954 to propose the construction of a large power reactor in Japan.

The United Kingdom has abandoned the idea that coal and oil can meet her expanding requirements for electric energy and has undertaken the active development of atomic-electric power as a matter of national policy. The goal of its program is to develop this new source of power so as to provide a major portion of Britain's electric-energy requirements as soon as possible. Concretely it envisages building a large number of power stations with an installed capacity of 1½ million or more kilowatts by 1965.

We should recognize, of course, that such a program will place the United Kingdom in an excellent position to export large power reactors. Mr. R. N. Millar, manager, atomic-energy department of the General Electric Co., Ltd., puts the case quite forthrightly in these words: "In Britain the emphasis is on large central station. * * * When the export drive gets under way it will be backed by sound practical experience in a large home market, an advantage which will not be shared by America."

What the atomic-power pattern will be in underdeveloped countries is difficult to discern in detail. It will depend in part on our willingness to aid these countries in answer to their pleas for improved standards of living. Yet the needs of these countries for electric power is beyond question. One has only to realize that the present per capita consumption of electricity in the United States is 600 times that in Haiti and 200 times that in Ceylon to understand the differences in the respective standards of living which these figures imply and the serious problems involved.

It is appropriate to ask how the electric energy needs of these countries will be met. Where conventional fuels are inaccessible or otherwise unavailable the clear answer will be through nuclear power. In other cases conventional fuels will present a solution under present economic conditions. But looking beyond the present it will be evident in many cases that conventional fuels alone cannot form a stable basis to meet long-term needs. Nuclear power, however, can furnish long-term solutions. Sound planning indicates that such nations must begin now to integrate nuclear power into their economy. We should be prepared to assist them.

If action is not forthcoming to break the monopoly now enjoyed by private industry in the large industrial reactor program, we will not be prepared. It is evident to me that without such action the only significant amount of electric power that will be available in this country in 1960 will be the kilowatts coming from the Shippingport plant, the construction of which is largely being financed by the Government.

On February 23, 1956, I proposed that we adopt a national policy which treats the development of industrial atomic power as a matter of urgency. I made certain recommendations as to how this policy should be implemented. One of these recommendations was that we establish a goal of 2 million kilowatts for the construction of power reactors, here and abroad, between now and 1960.

It is important to emphasize the significance and importance of goals. Adoption of a goal, simply and forthrightly stated, has, in my experience, been the sure way and the practical way to give direction to a complex program. It has the merit of bringing order into all the diverse efforts involved. It becomes the practical gage against which progress is measured. Intelligently used, it becomes the spur to achievement.

This has been already significantly demonstrated in our own atomic energy program, where I insisted on raising our goals to bring about a revolutionary improvement in ore procurement. This experience encouraged me to attack the industrial nuclear power problem in the same way; that is, by recommending the establishing of goals in terms of kilowatts.

I also recommended last February that the Government assume the primary responsibility for meeting the objectives I suggested for the period between now and 1960. Consistent with this proposal I now urge that the Government undertake to construct several large power reactors.

One of these reactors should be an enlarged and improved version of the pressurized water reactor now being constructed at Shippingport. All the valuable lessons learned and extensive experience acquired in the course of developing and constructing this plant would be incorporated. An expansion of effort of this kind is required if the United States is to take the greatest advantage of its progress in this field. There is, for example, the need to enlarge our capabilities for testing the new and improved core designs for this type of reactor. Since the first core of the Shippingport plant will

last approximately 2 years, the loading of an improved core at Shippingport will not take place until 1959. Another facility would advance the testing of new core concepts.

The Government should build one large size aqueous homogeneous reactor. As I have previously indicated there are at the present no firm plans for constructing a large reactor of this variety. I recommend that the Government step into this gap. Unless such a project is instituted the homogeneous reactor is destined to remain in the research and development stage for many years to come.

There are other areas of reactor technology which have received relatively little attention in our programs. One is the gas cooled reactor; another is the natural uranium reactor. There are several variants of both types. I would propose to build a large scale plant of each of these kinds of reactors along whatever lines hold promise of the greatest contribution to nuclear power.

An important consideration in constructing these reactors is the manner of disposing of the power they produce. My recommendation is that they be placed at the sites of our production facilities, which today require a capacity of about 7 million kilowatts. Such tremendous electric power requirements could well absorb the output of these reactors with only barely discernible effect on the cost of weapons. Moreover, the small contribution of atomic power to the total demand would make it possible to carry out experimental operation of these reactors without affecting production of weapons materials.

Construction of a large-scale sodium-graphite reactor in the near future presents a different problem. To solve it I propose an approach that differs in detail, but not in principle. Concretely I would have the Government assume the responsibility for building a large-scale reactor of this type. It could be located in Nebraska and the power made available to the Consumers Public Power District. North American Aviation would continue to develop and construct the plant. Such a plan would permit research and development to be stepped up from its present inadequate level. This is the only way that I can see to bring this reactor into operation at an early date.

Taken together these proposals for constructing large reactors constitute a well-integrated program with two exceptions. They do not guarantee sufficient progress on the boiling-water reactor and the fast-breeder reactor. Both require more extensive investigation. Without specifying the precise method it suffices to say that the Government must insure that construction of such reactors goes ahead.

It is, of course, easy to conjure up reasons for not undertaking such a program as I propose. There is always the appealing alternate of convening committees and task forces to formulate arguments for inaction. One such argument is that it would result in an unjustifiable drain on the Nation's limited supply of scientific and engineering manpower. I do not subscribe to this argument. Far from decreasing the numbers of those trained in reactor technology a program of building reactors should act to increase them. There is no way of training competent reactor engineers that is comparable to designing and building reactors. A predominant effect of a large and assured program of reactor construction would be an increase in the numbers of those attracted to the reactor engineering field.

There are many reasons why private industry should favor the Government's undertaking the program that I have outlined. A first consequence of such an effort would be that the Government would bring its immense resources to bear in eliminating the technical obstacles that are now impeding private industry's program. This would react to decrease the cost and increase the likelihood of success of private industry's plans to construct large reactors. The resulting progress would assure for American manufacturers a place in the world market for industrial power reactors.

In addition, a Government program of the scope proposed would not only provide an assured base for the construction of large power reactors but would also serve to increase overall industry participation in the atomic energy field. It would, for example, encourage private industry to undertake to provide services such as fabrication and chemical processing of reactor fuels.

Private industry needs the assistance which a Government program of large reactor construction would give. Yet the view prevails that private industry is prepared to undertake the crucial and costly phase of reactor development which large scale construction represents. The prevalence of this view derives from the fact that atomic power has been oversold. Millions of people have been given the impression that electricity from the atom is just around the corner. However, our present knowledge is so meager that, in the absence of an accelerated program, the corner is 10, 15 or more years away. Such an accelerated program will not be forthcoming as long as we rely on our present policies which make the economics of nuclear power in the United States the consideration governing progress.

It is a tragic mistake for this Nation to base its atomic power program primarily on our own economic interests. To do this is to fail to recognize the vast political and humanitarian implications of atomic energy throughout the world. It is to follow a course which is at variance with our own larger interests, and more importantly, with all that this Nation stands for.

The fact that we are taking this course is the result of fear; fear by private industry that Government will enter the power business as a consequence of its accelerating development through power reactor construction. Such fears are unwarranted; they cannot rightly be countenanced as cause for delay.

Acceleration of reactor development by the Government will not jeopardize the role of private industry in power production. Irrespective of who develops it, when industrial atomic power becomes available, the Government can use it to produce electricity, should it so desire. In this respect nuclear power does not differ from power which is produced from conventional fuels.

The traditional role of private industry in the production of electric power must be preserved. But private industry is not helped by an artificial argument which seeks to preserve industrial atomic power as private industry's domain at the expense of the national interest as well as its own particular interests.

It requires no great powers of discernment to understand what the national interest requires in the development of atomic power. One has only to view the problem in the light of already massive and constantly growing proportions of the threat from developments in nuclear weapons. Had representatives of private industry stood with me and watched a recent nuclear explosion, I am confident that they would recognize the nuclear threat to civilization. I am further confident that they would endorse the most urgent measures to accelerate the development of industrial atomic power.

It is the urgent need for action of this type which causes me to submit this statement to your committee. I have read many statements assuring you that our industrial atomic power program is adequate. My responsibility compels me to alert you, as I have on other occasions, to the fact that I can give you no such assurance.

I believe that our present program will not enable us to fulfill our responsibilities with respect to the early development of industrial atomic power. The Commission must continue its basic research and development activities as well as continue its support to private industry under the power demonstration program. However, if we are to keep our repeated and widely publicized promises to make available the benefits of atomic power to mankind at an early date we must do more. The only way I know to discharge our responsibilities and redeem our pledges is for the Government to assume the primary responsibility for large reactor construction. In order to do this I strongly recommend that Congress enact legislation similar to that proposed by Senator ALBERT GORE and Congressman CHET HOLIFIELD. This legislation should provide for a program of large power reactor construction generally along the lines I have proposed and at the location I have suggested.

The Issue of Neutrality

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 18, 1956

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, the inconsistent statements recently made by President Eisenhower on the subject of neutrality—his clarification which aggravated the situation, and those made by Vice President NIXON, and later by Secretary Dulles, are very disturbing. They have created suspicion and distrust among our friends.

In connection with these differing statements, particularly those made by President Eisenhower and Secretary Dulles, I enclose an editorial, The Issue of Neutrality, appearing in the New York Times of June 14, 1956:

THE ISSUE OF NEUTRALITY

The fundamental principles of American foreign policy have been stated so often in word and deed as to make it clear that the only one aim we pursue is a just and lasting peace in an atmosphere of expanding freedom. But the application of these principles is a complex and constantly changing world is a task requiring the highest type of statesmanship, especially from a power whose slightest gesture has immediate repercussions around the globe. Taken as a whole, this type of statemanship has been provided by the United States, as demonstrated by its achievements and its sacrifices. Unfortunately, every so often our statesmanship is marred and its task made more difficult by unclear and sometimes unwise statements which convey impressions different from those intended and thereby create confusion with potentially serious consequences.

Such unfortunate statements have been made under both Democratic and Republican administrations. The latest examples are the seemingly conflicting and certainly confusing administration statements on neutrality by President Eisenhower and Secretary Dulles. In their foreshortened form they convey more than mere language differences, and in their general rather than specific application they both go too far in opposite directions.

President Eisenhower rightly rejects a flabby spiritual neutrality between right and wrong, between freedom and slavery. But in view of our own earlier history he expresses sympathetic understanding for the military neutrality of nations which, for

ideological geographical or other reasons, avoid military alliances. Then, however, in his off-the-cuff statement, he emphasizes the risks of military alliances, especially to border nations, and thereby appears to discourage such alliances and to encourage neutralism. In his later clarifying statement he seeks to correct such a possible misconception by emphasizing that our alliances with 42 nations are the bulwarks of world peace and provide not added danger but added security. But the damage has been done and the result is perplexity everywhere and alarm in such border nations as Germany and Pakistan.

Secretary Dulles, on the other hand, seeking to repair the damage, goes overboard on the other side. He makes no distinction between spiritual and military neutrality and, barring "very exceptional circumstances," declares the very principle of neutrality to be "obsolete," "shortsighted" and "immoral." He thereby seems to cast reflections on the policies of such nations as Sweden and Switzerland, not to speak of Indonesia and India, and in so doing he will scarcely earn their approbation.

Yet the basic ideas behind these statements are evident. In principle, the concept of neutrality is, indeed, outlawed for United Nations members by their charter, which calls on all members to assist the organization in any enforcement action against an aggressor, even a nonmember. That is one reason why Switzerland remains out of the U. N. But since the United Nations has been unable to organize forces of its own, free nations valuing their freedom have been compelled to organize thair defenses in their own specific alliances permitted by the charter, and membership in these alliances is a matter for the consideration of each separate nation.

We welcome allies, and the more the better; for by entering into an alliance with us they not only safeguard themselves against being forced into the Communist orbit but also add to free world strength to deter Communist aggression. But their adhesion to such an alliance must be voluntary and in their own best interest. We could and should consider preferential political and economic cooperation with our allies for our mutual benefit, but it would be futile to attempt to buy or to scare other nations into an alliance with us which would fall apart at the first test.

Short of such alliances, the next best thing for the free world is to have truly independent nations determined to safeguard their independence even though neutral militarily. Such nations we should likewise welcome as members of a free world and extend to them whatever aid we can. That is in fact the policy which Secretary Dulles himself proclaimed to the newly independent nations of Asia during his recent Asian tour. As he has said, "our interests will be fully served if other nations maintain their independence and strengthen their free institutions." On that note the debate about our stand on neutrality might well be closed.

Egypt Is Smothered With Political Sympathy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES W. VURSELL
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 18, 1956

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, with leave to extend my remarks, I am including an article which appeared last week in a leading daily newspaper of southern Illinois, the Centralia Sentinel, in which the editor gives some advice to the Democrat candidate for United States Senate, Mr. Stengel:

EGYPT IS SMOTHERED WITH POLITICAL SYMPATHY

Now comes Democratic senatorial candidate Richard Stengel to southern Illinois to shed tears about some "distressed area" that is supposed to lie within the southern region of the State he seeks to represent in Congress.

The advance copy of a speech he plans to deliver at Gillespie Friday paints a horrible picture of life in southern Illinois and he says he would like to be the man to "meet the problems of distressed areas of wide underemployment, unused factories, and stagnant productive resources," at least until he is safely elected.

We didn't know Egypt was so badly off. As a matter of fact we do not think this political candidate knows so either.

We thought people laughed, and cried, and ate, and slept in southern Illinois just as they do elsewhere. We know that a person never has much money, as big a car, as big a house, or as much time to go fishing as he would like to have, but we thought these wants were universal.

Now comes Mr. Stengel to tell us in exchange for misguided votes, that we are a miserable bunch of sharecroppers, without any shares, here in southern Illinois.

"The Republican Senator's heart has never bobbled for southern Illinois and its distresses," says Mr. Stengel.

We weren't aware anyone wanted his, or any other man's heart, to "bobble at our distress," if such there actually is. There certainly isn't any around here. We're pretty well contented with ourselves and our lot around here.

Perhaps someone should tell Mr. Stengel that the days of the WPA are over also in southern Illinois just as they are in Chicago.

Southern Illinois doesn't want WPA projects today. It doesn't want or need his or anyone else's sympathy. It just wants to live down the unjust 'bad labor conditions' tag hung on it years ago by some pundit or other hard up for copy. It wants to go along with the nationwide prosperity that has come into existence under the Republican administration.

Take your tears and your WPA projects to Chicago, Mr. Stengel. Haven't you heard?

People are moving out of Chicago every day. The suburbs are getting crowded. People are moving to the country. Think of the poor distressed folks who still have to live in Chicago because they can't afford to breathe good country air.

Outside of a few political jobholders who never had it so good as when they were supervising a WPA project back in the F. D. R. 1930's, we don't know of anyone in Egypt who is crying for such Federal or State handouts. Egypt has real opportunities to sell. Just help us sell it to those industries who need it, and peddle your political buncombe upstate.

Just give us a chance to continue living in a Nation that is prosperous and southern Illinois will look out for itself.

Her Daddy's Prayer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN E. FOGARTY
OF RHODE ISLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 18, 1956

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, on May 19, 1956, I had the privilege of joining with the Association for the Help of Retarded Children, Inc., at their seventh annual dinner in New York City. On that occasion the association distributed a dinner journal—the last page of which was devoted to a poem by David Gimbel, of Brooklyn, N. Y.

This poem was entitled "Her Daddy's Prayer" and it was one of the most beautiful and touching things I have ever read. Mr. Gimbel most certainly must have written it with his heart for no pen alone could ever portray such deep feeling.

In fact, Mr. Speaker, I was so much impressed that I thought it should be brought to the attention of all the Members of this House. Under leave to extend my remarks, therefore, I hereby include Mr. Gimbel's poem in the RECORD:

HER DADDY'S PRAYER

(By David Gimbel)

The ticking clock upon the wall
And the approaching night as shadows fall;
Oh heavenly God with Thy worldly powers
I ask Thy help in my lonely hours.

Creator of humanity of nature and words
The moon and sun and flying birds;
Mountains, streams, and a sky so blue
The breaking of dawn and the morning dew.

And yet dear Lord I only have tears
As I think of my child in the coming years;
Her little brain, so injured and weak
When folks pass her by, in whispers they speak.

Endow people with knowledge, so they understand
That they may come forward and these children befriend;
And so, dear God, how I hope and pray
When Thou will grant us that glory day.
So that whispers can cease and action will start
And deeds will start pouring right from the heart;
Then my nightly shadows shall all disappear
I beg Thee oh Lord, that this day may be near.

Textile Mills Curtail Due to Japanese Imports

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT T. ASHMORE
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 18, 1956

Mr. ASHMORE. Mr. Speaker, the textile industry of this country continues to plea for relief from the unfair competition of Japanese fabrics made at an average wage rate of 13½ cents per hour.

When Congress passed H. R. 1, in July 1955, and the GATT agreements were announced in August, American textile executives declared it would soon be impossible for them to operate at a profit if this country was to be flooded with cheaply made foreign textiles. These complaints did not seem to impress the present administration, since both President Eisenhower and Secretary of State Dulles consistently refused to approve quota limitations on low priced Japanese textiles. Consequently, the importation of these goods is increasing by leaps and bounds, and thus, seriously damaging our

entire textile industry. Undisputed evidence of this unfair competition is contained in a recent statement of William F. Sullivan, secretary of the Northern Textile Association. Mr. Sullivan says that imports of cotton clothes from Japan during the first quarter of 1956 "have increased 183 percent over the corresponding quarter a year ago." There are many similar instances of like injury. As a result of this unjust discrimination our domestic textile manufacturers and laborers are suffering badly and soon will suffer much more unless the Government changes its policy and gives a reasonable amount of protection to this vital industry. The President has authority to stop this influx of foreign textiles, made by cheap labor, simply by setting up quota limitations under the provisions of section 22 of the Agriculture Adjustment Act.

Cotton mills throughout the country are curtailing because of cutthroat Japanese goods. J. P. Stevens & Co., one of the largest manufacturers in the business, last month cut its gingham and broadcloth production from a 6-day to a 5-day week; Reigen Textile Mills, Ware Shoals, S. C., recently laid off 82 workers because it was forced to cut back its production of pillow cases; Kendall Mills, in May, cut its broadcloth and poplin production from a 6-day to a 5-day week; Consolidated Textile Co. announced on June 7 from New York that it was shutting down 2 plants—1 in New England and 1 in the South—because of Japanese competition. On June 5, Senator FREDERICK G. PAYNE, Republican, of Maine, whote President Eisenhower that the administration's refusal to protect the American textile industry from foreign textile imports may defeat the administration's national trade policy. Senator PAYNE urged the President to take prompt action due to the distress in our domestic textilé industry.

Not only has production been cut back but huge expansion programs have also been postponed or abandoned. Approximately 1 year ago Col. Elliot W. Springs, president of the Springs Cotton Mills in South Carolina, announced a $10 million expansion program. But under prevailing conditions in the textile industry there will be no expansion by this company, and on the contrary 12,000 persons presently employed by the Springs Mills are now working only 5 days a week, whereas they formerly worked 6 days.

The following news report of an interview with Colonel Springs gives a vivid picture of present conditions in the American textile industry:

JAPANESE THROAT CUTTING BLAMED: SPRINGS CURTAILS WORK, POSTPONES HUGE EXPANSION

COLUMBIA, June 6.—Postponement of a $10 million expansion program at Springs Mills, Chester, and curtailment from a 6-day to a 5-day week in all Springs Mills because of Japanese throat cutting, was announced today by Col. Elliot W. Springs, president of the mills.

The Springs Mills, heretofore, have opened steadily on a 6-day basis and the reduction to a 5-day week, already in effect, amounts actually to a 12-hour per week pay loss to employees because the sixth day carried time and a half wages. More than 12,000 persons are employed by Springs Mills.

The Spring mills are the largest makers of sheeting in the world. The Springs chain is composed of seven mills with 740,000 spindles. There are only about 19 million spindles in the country. The company is now busy covering up 55,000 spindles in the retrenchment program.

The expansion program which has postponed was for $10 million.

Colonel Springs' reasons are outlined in the text of the following letter to W. E. Wrenn, president of the Chester Chamber of Commerce.

"I wrote you on February 24th that, due to Japanese competition, we had to change our balance and this gave us a surplus of yarn. Therefore, we either had to curtaill our production or install additional looms. We don't like to curtail."

WOULD ENLARGE

"After your chamber offered us every cooperation to put the looms in Chester, I wrote you that I would consider enlarging the Eureka plant if I could get permission from the Seaboard to encroach on their property; that I would consider enlarging Springsteen if something could be done about city taxes, and Gayle if something were done about Japanese throat cutting.

"Since that time, the Japanese situation, instead of improving, has deteriorated considerably. They are gaining on us every day. We gave them new machinery as reparations for Pearl Harbor, and the CCC sells them the same cotton I buy at 10 cents a pound less. We have always been able to meet competition without tears, but, we can't lick the State Department, the Secretary of Agriculture, GATT, OTC and the 64 billion dollar give-away-program while Congress twists our arm.

"Therefore, we have been forced to revise our plans and, instead of expanding, we are going to have to curtail. It is with regret that I tell you reluctantly the Springs Cotton Mills' operations will be reduced indefinitely, and that we will have to postpone our plans for installing additional looms. By 'indefinitely,' I mean until my customers find out that all that is yellow is not gold, or the public decides our textile industry is not part of foreign aid. If this meets with the approval of the people of Chester, I suggest they write President Eisenhower and tell him how much they love Secretary Dulles."

A Blow to Security

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS E. WALTER
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 18, 1956

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Evening Star of June 13, 1956:

A BLOW TO SECURITY

Whatever its finer shades of meaning may be, the Supreme Court, in deciding the Kendrick M. Cole case, has dealt a severe blow to the Government's Federal employee security program. It may be that the program was in need of revision anyway, and the Court's opinion will hasten it. At any rate, Congress or the administration itself must now consider the need, and the extent, of revisions to meet the Court's objections.

The opinion of the six majority judges hangs on what they call a "chain of inferences." Its principal effect is substantially to nullify the President's executive order of 1953, which was designed to rid the Government of security risks, including employees of doubtful loyalty.

In simplified form, this is the story: Congress in 1950 enacted the Summary Suspension Act. This law listed as "sensitive" 11 Federal agencies. It provided that the head of any such agency, if he deemed it necessary in the interest of national security, could suspend "any civilian officer or employee" of his agency. And after preferring charges and giving the employee an opportunity to answer, the agency head was authorized to discharge the employee if this was deemed necessary or advisable in the interests of national security. The law also authorized the President to add other agencies to the "sensitive" list if he felt it necessary to do so. Mr. Eisenhower added the agency in which Cole was employed, and based his Executive order of 1953 on the statute.

According to the Court majority, however, the President misinterpreted the intent of Congress. His Executive order was framed to require all Federal employees to meet minimum standards of loyalty. But the Court said that Congress, in using the words "any civilian officer or employee" did not mean to include all employees. The real intent of Congress, according to the Court, was to make the law apply only to employees who actually hold sensitive jobs.

This means that Cole, who refused to answer the charges against him and who refused to seek any agency hearing, must be reinstated because there was no specific finding that his job was a sensitive one.

It probably also means a great deal more than this, although it is difficult to estimate the full consequences of this decision. It certainly means that a great many employees, including employees in the agencies designated as sensitive by Congress, cannot be dismissed under the security risk program. They can be dismissed only if they are in "sensitive" jobs. Who is to determine the definition of a sensitive job? How is the determination to be made? On these points the Court is silent—perhaps because it does not know the answers. The opinion does suggest that it may be possible, under other procedures, to get rid of employees of doubtful loyalty who are in "nonsensitive" jobs. But officials close to the administration of the program are doubtful that this can be done effectively.

In short, the Court has crippled the security risk program through what seems to us to be a strained interpretation of the intent of Congress, which has given no visible evidence that its intent was misinterpreted by the President, and by relying on a "chain of inferences" to strike down the Executive order.

In the belief of the dissenting justices, the Court, in this ruling, has interpreted the intent of Congress in such a way as to "intrude itself into Presidential policymaking. "Further, they said, it has created a situation which "might leave the Government honeycombed with subversive employees." That is an unlikely prospect, in our opinion, for neither Congress nor the administration will permit it to happen. But the next move is now up to them.

Foreign-Aid Cut Was Needed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES B. HOEVEN
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 18, 1956

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the REC-

ORD, I submit the following editorial from the Sioux City, Iowa, Journal of June 13, 1956:

FOREIGN-AID CUT WAS NEEDED

It is not surprising that the United States House of Representatives slashed about a billion dollars from the multi-billion-dollar foreign-aid bill. What is surprising is the fact the House didn't reduce the huge appropriation bill even more.

Our Government has not been niggardly when it comes to helping our allies abroad. Indeed some $50 billion have been poured into countries abroad since World War II ended. As a matter of cold fact, we have been appropriating money so fast for foreign aid that the Government hasn't been able to give it all away.

If Senator RICHARD RUSSELL's figuring is correct, there are $7 billion in previously appropriated foreign-aid funds that have not been spent. Now seven billions represent a fabulous amount of money. And when the $3,800,000,000 contained in the House-passed bill is added to it, the total of unspent foreign-aid funds will be nearly $11 billion.

Nobody figures in the millions in Washington any more. It's always billions, and they're tossed around with gay abandon. Our major objective is to fight the spread of aggressive communism by helping finance the economies and the armies of our friends overseas. We are handing out largesse on a grand scale. And we are told by the great givers that this is absolutely necessary if our national security is to be maintained.

In the meantime, Gen. Curtis LeMay, Chief of the United States Strategic Air Command, testified before a Senate Appropriations Subcommittee that the SAC needs approximately $3,800 million (the amount of the foreign-aid bill) to step up production of B–52 bombers and provide for additional bases and personnel.

Senator RUSSELL said, in that regard, he is toying with the idea of proposing that the foreign-aid money contained in the huge bill be transferred to the Air Force. "I don't think it would wreck the foreign-aid program if Congress didn't authorize any new expenditures or appropriate any new money," the Senator said. "That might necessitate the transfer of some funds, but I believe it could be done." His idea is that the foreign-aid program could be carried out with the $7 billion previously appropriated but still unspent. Not a bad idea, at that.

An ironic angle to the House action cutting more than a billion dollars from the foreign-aid bill was a plea by John B. Hollister, Director of the International Cooperation Administration—which is the successor to the old Marshall plan setup. Mr. Hollister viewed with alarm, warning that unless the billion dollars is restored, the Government will have to reevaluate its plans, especially with respect to NATO.

Actually Mr. Hollister put up a very good argument for the cut, although he meant to argue against it. NATO is eminently unsuccessful. It was created as a military organization among Western European nations to fortify the west against possible Russian aggression. Only trouble is, our allies don't want to ante up, either with their share of the money or the men to man the defenses.

It is time Uncle Sam stopped being softheaded about foreign aid. It is time he became realistic. Rather than dump nearly $4 billion into the already swollen foreign-aid fund, he might be wise to take a look at his own defense picture. It is quite possible we could do the cause of freedom more good by putting that money into our own defense arm.

If we can't buy friendship abroad, we can at least stay strong enough on our own hook to discourage Soviet aggression.

Foreign Aid Unjustified Unless It Helps To Block Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. H. R. GROSS
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 18, 1956

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, an excellent editorial in the June 8, 1956, issue of the Waterloo (Iowa) Daily Courier deals forcefully with one of the most vital issues in connection with foreign-aid legislation—the unreasonableness of taxing the American people to aid foreign governments which has taken a neutral position with respect to the Communist world conspiracy.

It is utterly ridiculous for the United States to attempt to do for foreign governments and their peoples those fundamental and basic things which they themselves must do if freedom and justice are to be preserved.

The editorial from the Daily Courier follows:

Billions of dollars spent for foreign aid can be justified on only one basis: To strengthen resistance to communism among the free nations of the world.

But President Eisenhower proposes a new approach to foreign aid. He suggests that neutralism is an acceptable position for any nation and that neutral nations should receive American aid.

Basically, this issue resolves itself into a question of how to define neutralism. No American would insist that a nation receiving American aid should surrender its independence and become an American satellite. The purpose of the aid is to build independent governments so responsive to the will of their people that Communist infiltration will not succeed. And such independence can mean disagreement with American policy and even neutralism in the face of some points of conflict between the United States and Russia.

But it would surely be wrong and impractical to tax the American people to aid countries which use neutralism as an excuse for permitting infiltration. The present Government of Egypt, for example, is accepting military aid from the Communist bloc, is allowing Communist agents to enter the country, and is being maneuvered into a position where it cannot act decisively to block Communist subversion. Can the Egyptian policy be called neutralism?

The present Government of India, motivated by passions aroused in colonial days, has also made neutralism an excuse for a soft policy toward Communist infiltration. The recent visit of Khrushchev and Bulganin in India, under Nehru's sponsorship, greatly strengthened the pôsition of Indian Communists. If Russian Reds are friends, Indian Communists are obviously acceptable people.

This neutralism has also resulted in considerable Communist infiltration of countries like Indonesia where memories of European imperialism are so strong that dangers of Russian imperialism are minimized.

Thus the new policy proposed by the President could be disastrous unless neutralism is very carefully defined. The new masters of the Kremlin have stripped the cruel mask of Stalin from the face of communism and are busily strapping on a new mask, bland and smiling. They know that further Communist infiltration in east and west cannot succeed unless communism gains the appearance of a respectable political movement. But the purpose of conquest by subversion and revolution has not changed to the slightest degree.

That being true, an American policy of aiding neutrals which cooperate in their own self-destruction could actually promote the Soviet plan. Congress ought not to accept such a policy merely because the President proposes it. This is one field where the broadest collective judgment is needed.

Un-American Activities Committee Hearings

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS E. WALTER
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 18, 1956

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the St. Louis Globe-Democrat of June 6, 1956:

UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES COMMITTEE HEARINGS

Twelve St. Louisans thus far have invoked the fifth amendment by refusing to tell the House Subcommittee on Un-American Activities if they have been Communists.

These people are within their rights under the Constitution in refusing to testify. Each person can make up his own mind, however, whether or not these 12 are or have been Communists. There can be very little doubt how most people will interpret their refusal to testify.

For many years, the American people were almost totally misinformed on the true nature of the Communist conspiracy. In the years between the Bolshevik revolution and the recognition of Russia by the Roosevelt administration in 1933, very little was known about the Communists. Only the students who had read Karl Marx were aware of the enormous revolution in the vast Soviet empire.

The political cartoonists of those days contributed to the general lack of clear thinking on the subject. They pictured Communists as little men, with beards, carrying bombs in their hands. It came as a complete surprise to find that clean-cut looking American-born citizens like Alger Hiss could be just as much under Communist domination as the unwashed proletarian.

With the recognition of the Soviet Union and the influx of vast numbers of spies under diplomatic and consular registration, the large body of Americans first began to learn of infiltration tactics. The Communist cells of the earlier days of the New Deal went to the very vitals of the government, and only recently have come to be recognized.

It was somewhat of a shock to many to realize that Communists and fellow travelers are right here in St. Louis, and in many of our own unions and industries. Too many naive people have been inclined to believe that communism was confined to Union Square in New York and a very few other places on the east and west coast.

It just isn't so. There are Communists in St. Louis and in many of the cities and towns in this area, whose mission is to subvert, to cause disunity and division, and to be the hard core of treason and the eyes and cars of the worldwide conspiracy of subversion originating in the Kremlin.

Congressman MOULDER and his associates have been performing a very great public service in their well-conducted inquiry. We hope that they continue with increasing success to the very end.

The Fine Record of REA

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES W. VURSELL
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 18, 1956

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, today I want to talk briefly about REA legislation in which the farmers in my district, and the Nation, have a special interest.

First, may I say at the opening of this session, many farmers being served with REA light and power were fearful that the REA recommendations of the Hoover Report to the Congress might have the support of this body, and the present administration.

Happily, and for the good of REA and the Nation, Ancher Nelsen, then Administrator of REA, after making a close study of the recommendations strongly opposed the proposal and pointed out why it was ill-advised, unworkable, and would, in fact, destroy REA in its future service to the Nation.

Secretary of Agriculture Benson and President Eisenhower agreed with Administrator Nelsen in his opposition. The Congress also is so strongly opposed to the Hoover report on REA, that, in my judgment, if called upon to vote, would defeat it by an overwhelming majority.

REA OFFICIALS MEET IN WASHINGTON

Officials of all the 27 REA cooperatives of Illinois came to Washington and held a dinner meeting here last March 26, which was attended by most Members of Congress from Ilinois, for the purpose of expressing their opposition to the adoption of the Hoover Report.

Attending that meeting from my district were: Mr. Joseph H. Heimann, manager of Clinton County Electric Co-op, of Breese, Ill.; Mr. H. G. Downey, manager, Tri-County Electric, Mount Vernon, Ill.; Mr. Elmo A. Cates, manager, Clay Electric Co-op, Flora, Ill.; Mr. O. J. Chaney, manager, Wayne-White Electric Co-op, Fairfield, Ill.; Mr. V. C. Kallal, manager, Southwestern Electric Co-op, Greenville, Ill.; Mr. Damon Williams, manager, Newton, Ill., and with these managers were one or more directors of each of these cooperatives.

Mr. Speaker, at that meeting the Members of Congress present from Illinois expressed their opposition, and, at that time, both Senator DIRKSEN and I expressed our opposition to the recommendations of the report, and told the officers of REA, in our judgment, "they need not worry because the Congress, which brought REA into being, and had nurtured its growth through the years, was so proud of the great work it had accomplished that they need not have any fear that we will permit its present organization to be handicapped, or changed in any way that would mar its fine record."

Mr. Speaker, may I say now, in my judgment, in view of the fine record of service this organization has made that no administration or Congress in the future will ever change, to any appreciable extent, the present organization setup of REA, which has proven its worth—not only to the farmers but to the entire economy of the Nation.

APPROPRIATIONS FOR THIS YEAR

Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Subcommittee on Appropriations, the officials of REA and all departments of Agriculture came before our committee in request for funds some weeks ago. We approved loan funds in the amount of $214 million for next year for REA, and $100 million for REA telephone loans. I have supported all the loan funds for the continued expansion and extension of REA in every session of the Congress for the past 14 years, which totals about $3 billion, including the amounts we appropriated in this session of the Congress.

All of these loan funds are being paid back by the members of the REA cooperatives, with interest, and I know of no big business in the Nation that has a finer record of business management than does the REA, which has been managed in the field, at the grassroots of every community, by progressive farmers who have given freely of their time in the interest of their communities and the Nation.

When I came to Congress, the REA organization was about 8 years old, and about 47 percent of the farmers had been reached with its service. Today, about 95 percent of the farmers of Illinois and the entire Nation are receiving light and power. Of all the billions of dollars I have helped to appropriate for various departments of Government for the past 14 years, none of it, in my judgment, has done so much to aid the farmers, to lift the drudgery from farm work, and from farm women, and build up the economic welfare of the country as has the money we have loaned to REA cooperatives.

Let me tell you how promptly they have met and paid their obligations, using Illinois as an illustration:

Up to January 1, 1956, the 27 cooperatives in Illinois have borrowed from the Government $84,510,000 upon which they have met the due date on every payment, and have paid back, to date $18,167,359. In addition to paying interest on the amount loaned, of $8,950,834. In fact, they are now $5,147,854 ahead of schedule on their loan payments.

In my congressional district, the five REA cooperatives at the close of 1955 had met every due date interest payment and have paid $6,600,000 on the principal, and have made advance payments on principal, before due date, in the amount of $2,400,000. I submit this is a fine record.

The record of REA throughout the United States is almost on a par with Illinois. At the present time, nationwide, the REA cooperatives, after paying back to the Government all of the payments as they came due with interest, have to their credit advance payments, before due, of over $80 million. About 700 of the 900 cooperatives have made such advance payments to the Government.

NELSEN MAKES FINE RECORD

Early in 1953, Ancher Nelsen, who helped to start REA in Minnesota, was appointed national Administrator of REA. During his tenure of office, he has brought to REA's management his practical experience plus executive ability in adopting sound business policies which accelerated its expansion. The results are that today the REA, through its cooperatives, has reached its greatest output of electric energy to the people served, and, most important, it should not be overlooked that the farmers are buying this power on a national average today of 2.8 cents per kilowatt-hour—which is the cheapest rate they have ever had.

The day that Administrator Ancher Nelsen came into office in 1953, there were backlog applications that had not been approved, or processed, totaling $220 million. By expediting the processing of these applications, and getting the power to the farmers the backlog has been reduced to about $90 million—which is the lowest backlog since 1947.

REA TELEPHONES

While the REA telephone organization is in its infancy, compared with REA light and power, rapid progress is being made in the development of REA telephone cooperatives.

The following figures will indicate the progress being made:

Fiscal year ended—	Number of loans to telephone co-op's	Amount of loans for the period
June 30, 1951	96	$38,000,000
June 30, 1952	53	42,000,000
June 30, 1953	103	43,000,000
First full fiscal year of Nelsen administration ended:		
June 30, 1954	150	74,000,000
June 30, 1955	147	53,000,000
June 30, 1956	[1] 200	[1] 80,000,000

[1] Estimated.

Mr. Speaker, these facts not only pay a tribute to the great benefits the REA has brought to the farmers and the economy of our Nation, but also pay a high tribute to the thousands of progressive farmers who have given freely of their time and ability as directors and officials of the 900 cooperatives in our country. They can depend upon us Members of Congress to continue to safeguard the interest of REA.

Mr. Dulles and the New York Democratic Delegation—The $64,000 Challenge

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. IRWIN D. DAVIDSON
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 18, 1956

Mr. DAVIDSON. Mr. Speaker, under date of March 15, 1956, a letter was sent in the name of the members of the New York State Democratic delegation to Secretary of State John Foster Dulles re-

questing that he meet with the signatories to that letter to discuss the then critical situation in the Middle East. This request was made because each of us felt that the interests of our combined constituencies, numbering over eight million people, demanded that we speak directly to the Secretary on this subject of vital world concern.

Replies to our letter were sent out first on March 19 and then again on March 26, not from the Secretary, but, rather, from the Honorable Robert C. Hill, Assistant Secretary. The latter of those two letters informed us that the Secretary of State regrets that he will be unable to meet with the Democratic members of the New York delegation in the immediate future." The reasons assigned for his inability to meet with us was that the Secretary was leaving for the White Sulphur Springs meeting of the Canadian-Mexican-United States heads of government, a meeting, which, if memory serves me correctly, lasted all of 3 days. The letter of March 26, 1956, ended with the suggestion that we meet with lower echelon officials of the State Department. Mr. Hill was immediately informed both by telephone, and by a letter of confirmation, that the members of the delegation desired to see the Secretary personally.

It is now the 18th day of June, Mr. Speaker, and we have not yet seen the Secretary of State. In our humble opinion, the situation in the Middle East has not as yet been solved, and there are many questions to be answered. We protest the patent discourtesy that has been shown us by the Secretary of State. He has agreed to see but three of our group and is adamant in his refusal to see the entire delegation. For some reason, certainly unknown to us, the Secretary feels that he can more easily ward off the opinions and interrogatories of 3 of our number rather than those of the delegation.

Mr. Dulles has taken a position with regard to the Middle East, one with which, to say the very least, we are not in complete agreement. If he is so sure of the course that he has charted, he should have no fear of discussing his views with the elected representatives of over 8 million people, for these representatives feel that their ideas and opinions are worthy of consideration. As the Secretary well knows, we of the New York Democratic delegation have taken an active interest in the Middle East situation and we are fairly conversant with the problems that exist. We seek merely the opportunity for a face-to-face discussion of this matter with Mr. Dulles. The result of such a meeting can be but twofold: one, the Secretary will be able to persuade us that his program and decisions on policy are in the best interests of our Nation and of the causes of world peace; and, two, that we will be able to bring to light information which will persuade the Secretary that there is merit to our position and that reconsideration of our present policies is called for.

Mr. Speaker, the members of the New York Democratic delegation have repeatedly issued joint statements on this proposed meeting. We have indicated that we would like an explanation, in detail, why arms are shipped to Saudi Arabia and Iraq by the United States, and why Israel is not accorded equal treatment. This is of great concern to us, especially with regard to Saudi Arabia, a country which Mr. Dulles, in testimony before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee earlier this year, included among those in the Middle East having a background of "centuries of antimosities" toward the Jews. We would also like to know why our allies have been given an "all clear" by the State Department on their shipment of arms to Israel while at the same time Mr. Dulles forbids Americans arms shipments to that country. Finally, Mr. Speaker, we would like to know why our representatives in the United Nations acceded to the demands of the Arab states and of the Soviet Union on the resolution offered in that body by Great Britain.

These are some of the questions that require answers. Mr. Dulles is duty bound to inform us and the entire world of his intentions and his position. At the very least, whether we agree or disagree with his views, whether national policy toward the Middle East remains as it is or is reconsidered and reevaluated, the facts will be out in the open for all to see and for everyone to discuss, so that through the process of assimilated, collective wisdom, the proper, the moral, the decent, and the just solution may be chosen and followed. Only then can a decision be reached which will aid the cause of world peace and which will sell the story of the greatness of the democratic way of life. It is shameful for Mr. Dulles to be silent, for his silence, when added to his refusal to see the members of the New York Democratic delegation, can only lead to a concern for his motives and his courage.

Mr. Speaker, I am but 1 of the 16 Congressmen who has expressed this desire to meet with Mr. Dulles. I have set forth the story of what we seek and the shabby treatment that we have received at the Secretary's hands, because over 350,000 people who reside in the 20th Congressional District of New York, which I have the honor to represent, are vitally interested in the situation in the Middle East; they are entitled to know the position that I, as their representative, have taken.

Somerset (Wis.) Centennial To Recall Lumber Days

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LESTER R. JOHNSON
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 18, 1956

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, this weekend—from June 22 through 24—the good citizens of Somerset, Wis., will celebrate a triple centennial.

The June 17 issue of the St. Paul Pioneer Press carried an interesting story on the coming centennial celebration of this picturesque community in St. Croix County. Here is the account of the coming celebration as carried in the St. Paul Pioneer Press:

SOMERSET, WIS.—When Gen. Samuel Harriman named a village on the Apple River, Somerset, in 1856, local French lumberjacks didn't object because to them it sounded like St. Morrisette.

Next Friday through Sunday the roaring lumberjack and pioneer days will be relived when Somerset celebrates a triple centennial.

Many activities are planned for the 100th anniversaries of the founding of the Catholic parish of St. Anne, the township of Somerset, and the village of Somerset.

The community that nestles on the banks of the Apple River at Highways 35 and 64 is familiar to St. Paulites, who frequently stop there for dinner during the warm months and in winter enjoy skiing in the area.

French historical background will come to life during the centennial, for it was a Frenchman, David Germain, who on July 18, 1851, bought the first parcel of land from the United States land office in Hudson at 25 cents an acre.

VIRGIN FOREST

Pioneers pushed back the virgin forest and cleared land, built log cabins, farmed, and slowly the area became prosperous as lumber and grist mills mushroomed on the river.

The township of Somerset petition was given the county board at Hudson on September 19, 1856. Chairman of the first township meeting was Thomas J. Chappell and supervisors were Thomas Parnell and Desire Rivard.

St. Anne's parish was the focal point of activities. French missionaries and the populace helped build the first log church. On June 24, groundbreaking ceremonies will be held for St. Anne's Catholic school and gymnasium. Cost is estimated at $300,000.

Festivities will begin at noon Friday when carnival and museums open. A kangaroo court session will follow when men failing to grow beards or mustaches will be "tried" by visiting court dignitaries. An outdoor square dance will cap the day's activities.

PEA SOUP DAY

Saturday will be "pea soup day," the special French dish, and free soup will be offered visitors from 10 a. m. to 6 p. m.

Other events will include a village versus township ball game, a pioneer dinner in St. Anne's Church with French-Canadian food; trick log-rolling acts, girl's water ballet, canoe exhibition, kiddie centennial parade, street dance, and the Saga of Somerset, a historical pageant.

Sunday will be Jean Baptiste day, the patron saint of the French. In addition to the groundbreaking ceremonies at St. Anne's, an old settler's buffet lunch and centennial grand parade will be held.

Pioneer descendants will discuss the powerful figure of General Harriman in Somerset history.

Harriman built a lumber mill on the Apple River and more than 800,000 feet of lumber was sawed each year. He also owned the Apple River Boom Co. Logs were bought from cutters along the St. Croix and Apple Rivers. In 1874, the Stillwater Gazette reported that the Stillwater boom handled 189 million feet of logs. Of these, 4 million came from the Apple River and sold for $13.75 per thousand feet.

Slowly the village and township of Somerset grew. Bridges were built, roads cut through the forests, and farmers hauled their grain to Harriman's grist mills to be ground into flour and feed.

POWER TO ST. PAUL

Dams were built on the Apple and St. Croix and soon power companies supplied power as far away as St. Paul.

A copy of store record books in 1884 show that prices included: barrel of salt, $1.75; cotton flannel, 15 cents a yard; eggs, 20 cents a dozen; beefsteak, 11 cents a pound; butter, 20 cents a pound; corsets, $1; shoes, $1.50 a pair, and overalls, 90 cents.

Beginning in 1887, dairy farming replaced the ebbing lumber business and Grant & Sons founded the first cheese factory in St. Croix County.

Since then, it has been a leading center of the western Wisconsin dairy industry. It is also famed for its frog-raising industries. Many of its leading restaurants feature the delicacy of the "Frog-leg capital of the world."

Many persons across the country became conscious of Somerset when, in 1941, a national picture magazine featured a spread of riding down the Apple River on inner tubes.

Communism's Greatest Victory

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STYLES BRIDGES
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, June 18, 1956

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an article by David Lawrence, entitled "Communism's Greatest Victory," which appeared in the Manchester Union Leader, Manchester, N. H., on June 8, 1956, which I feel will be of interest to everyone.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COMMUNISM'S GREATEST VICTORY

(By David Lawrence)

WASHINGTON.—The confusion inside the Supreme Court of the United States seems to grow with each week's decisions. This time the Communist Party can boast of its greatest victory. Three out of the nine Justices have accepted the persistently expressed alibi of the Communists in this country that they are "just another political party."

Congress has repeatedly proclaimed by law that the Communist Party is not a political party but a conspiracy which waits for the opportune moment to overthrow the Government of the United States.

The three Justices of the Supreme Court who have accepted the argument of the Communists that they are just a political party are Chief Justice Warren, Justice Douglas, and Justice Black.

The opinion of the Court in the case held that an employer in California was justified in discharging an employee because of membership in the Communist Party and that it was covered by the contract between the union and the employer, Justices Harlan, Reed, Burton, Clark, Minton, and Frankfurter concurred in the ruling of the Court.

But Justice Douglas, writing a dissenting opinion in behalf of Chief Justice Warren, Justice Black, and himself, said it wasn't a matter of a local contract and that the doctrine expounded by the majority "violates first amendment guaranties of citizens who are workers in our industrial plants." Then Justice Douglas writes:

"I can better illustrate my difficulty by a hypothetical case. A union enters into a collective-bargaining agreement with an employer that allows any employee who is a Republican to be discharged for 'just cause.' Employers can, of course, hire whom they choose, arranging for an all-Democratic labor force if they desire.

"A union has no such liberty if it operates with the sanction of the State or the Federal Government behind it. It is then the agency by which governmental policy is expressed and may not make discriminations that the Government may not make.

"But the courts may not be implicated in such a discriminatory scheme. Once the courts put their imprimatur on such a contract, Government, speaking through the judicial branch, acts. And it is governmental action that the Constitution controls.

"Certainly, neither a State nor the Federal Government could adopt a political test for workers in defense plants or other factories. It is elementary that freedom of political thought is protected by the 14th amendment against interference by the States, and against Federal regimentation by the first amendment.

"Government may not favor one political group over another. Government may not disqualify one political group from employment. And if the courts lend their support to any such discriminatory program, Shelley V. Kraemer teaches that the Government has thrown its weight behind an unconstitutional scheme to discriminate against citizens by reason of their political ideology. * * * The Court today allows belief, not conduct, to be regulated."

This means that Robert Hutchins of the Fund for the Republic, who thinks the Communist Party is just another political party and who is spending Ford's millions to advocate that doctrine in America, has found stanch support in the views of three members of the Supreme Court.

It means also that these same Justices reveal an inconsistency with their refusal last week to review a case in which two workers had appealed against a court decision compelling them to join a union though it was against their religious beliefs as protected under the first amendment of the Constitution.

Justice Douglas offered in support of his view in the California case just decided, that Chief Justice Hughes, in 1937, had ruled that a State couldn't punish Communists for holding a public meeting. But that was long before the true meaning of the Communist conspiracy was exposed, as it has been in the last 10 years, and safeguards written into law by Congress.

Justice Douglas says a defense plan may need to protect itself against sabotage but that the worker wasn't guilty of any acts of sabotage. This means that the doctrine of prevention is being discarded, and, if the argument is fully accepted, Congress and the States must wait till bombs are thrown and complicity of an individual is actually proved before precautions can be taken against the hiring of agents of the Communist espionage and sabotage apparatus. It's all just a "political ideology" to Justices Warren, Douglas, and Black.

From Bucktown to the Blackstone

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN C. KLUCZYNSKI
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 18, 1956

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following reprint from Editor & Publisher, April 21, 1956:

COWBOY COLUMNIST—NATE GROSS TATTLES AND CHICAGO LISTENS

(By George A. Brandenburg)

CHICAGO.—It has taken Nate Gross, Chicago American's Town Tattler columnist and former reporter and assistant city editor, 25 years to get from Bucktown to the Blackstone.

Bucktown is the name given a Chicago Northwest Side neighborhood in which Gross grew up as a kid. Today, the beefy newsman with a flair for the unusual is proprietor of High Dresser Ranch, his fabulous suite in the Sheraton-Blackstone Hotel, complete with corral, pistol collection, and his own branding iron, plus a worldwide collection of music boxes and whistlers that reflect Nate's global jaunts in recent years.

UNIQUE SPOT

High Dresser Ranch has become a gathering place for movie and stage celebrities, including well-known cowboys of motion picture fame, together with hundreds of Chicagoans from all walks of life. Nate's suite is not the biggest in Chicago, but it certainly ranks among the most unusual. Nate Gross is a bachelor. "High Dresser Ranch" is his home and the place where he taps out his daily column late at night.

William R. Hearst Jr., a longtime friend of the Chicago columnist and a visitor to Nate's hotel/hacienda, wrote his approval of "High Dresser Ranch" in Mr. Gross' "Boots and Saddle" scrapbook as follows: "San Simeon is very lovely, but for real comfort and good company, give me High Dresser every time."

But Nate Gross doesn't hibernate in Suite 419 of the Blackstone. He's a busy newshawk, dating back to his early days as a hard-hitting reporter and continuing up to the present as "Town Tattler." His column is in its 17th year. He describes it as "a little paper within a newspaper," admitting that he snipes on other departments, such as society, sports, politics and occasionally the front page. In the latter instance, however, Nate's page one news usually is lifted out of his column and given front page display, with or without his byline.

HAS TRIED ALL STYLES

Columning doesn't come easy for Nate Gross. He's written all kinds of columns, from the standpoint of style—depending on editors' whims—including the punch line kind, name dropping, and gossip. In recent years, since his doctor has warned him to get away from Chicago during the winter months, Nate has become a worldwide traveler and after starting on his "vacation" he begins his travelogues which have proven to be exceedingly popular with his readers.

A recent letter from a reader, however, probably describes Nate's tattling better than he can himself. "It's a homespun version of a big city column," wrote the reader. "I can always tell who's cutting wood here, or if there's a quilting bee, by reading your column."

Nate says he tries to capture the glamour of Chicago as "seen through the little people." He points out that everything changes. When he began writing his column some 16 years ago, there were a dozen big name night clubs in Chicago. "Today we have one well known night club and a few hotel dining rooms that offer attractions worthy of the attentions of a columnist," he added. "So now you meet the people at their own parties, either at the better restaurants or at their own clubs."

PLAY GAMES WITH READERS

Over the years, he has "played games with his readers," telling about Bucktown, which was Nate's boyhood "hometown" within the big city; Burke's Park (really Grant Park on Chicago's lakefront, but dubbed Burke's Park by Nate Gross in honor of John Burke, former manager of the Congress and Blackstone hotels); and the Randolph Street Post and Paddock Club, namely Henrici's restaurant and gathering spot for Chicago's politicians, race track biggies and stage celebs. In recent years, he has become identified

with "Back of the Yards," having a keen interest in helping the Catholic Back of the Yards Council in its welfare program for people living in the stockyards district.

At the time of the 1952 Democratic national convention in Chicago, Mr. Gross revived an old song, composed by oldtimer Walter Goodwin, entitled, "Back of the Yards." Nate arranged to have the convention orchestra, augmented on that occasion with 50 fiddle players, play Goodwin's tune. It has since become Mayor Daley's "Campaign song" and is played whenever His Honor arrives at public functions. Goodwin, in appreciation for what Nate did in helping to popularize his oldtime song, composed a special tune in honor of the columnist, "Bucktown, U. S. A."

But, as we said earlier, it has taken Nate Gross 25 years to get from Bucktown to the Blackstone. Although he doesn't like to admit it, Nate Gross is today a Chicago celebrity. But it wasn't always that way. He started out to be a lawyer and received his bachelor of laws degree in 1929 from the Chicago Law School.

BECOMES A REPORTER

Before passing the bar examinations, Nate switched to journalism, having been initiated into newspaper work, via the City News Bureau of Chicago, while he was still going to law school. He joined the American as a reporter and made a name for himself as one of the best in Chicago. For 15 years he was content to be a reporter, and later assistant city editor of the American. During this period he got to know as many policemen as he did bankers. He covered every news beat in town, and became acquainted with judges, politicians, socialites, theatrical people, gamblers, gangsters, lawyers, and "lots of little people" who make up a big city.

Dillinger was making arrangements to surrender to the proper authorities through Nate Gross, but was killed first. Testimony on file in the Federal Court bears this out.

When Samuel Insull, the elder, returned to business and started a radio chain, the former utilities magnate, unapproachable to most newspapermen, gave his story to Gross.

When Cyrus Eaton, Cleveland financier and Insull's former enemy, appeared in Federal court as a defense witness for Insull, the American had not only the fact that he was to take the stand, but also what he would say, thanks to Nate Gross.

ARIEL AND CALIBAN

When Elaine Barrier chased John Barrymore across the country in the now famous love marathon, it was Nate Gross who scored a scoop. Caliban and Ariel would have been just characters in Shakespeare's Tempest, if it hadn't been for this. Elaine became Ariel and John, Caliban in a taxicab on Chicago's Outer Drive, as Gross and Elaine Barrie followed another cab, in which the great lover's bags were headed for a California train.

Mr. Gross became a columnist during World War II, at the suggestion of the late Jack Malloy, Herald-American editor. Nate aided in collecting over a quarter of a million dollars for Chicago's servicemen's center. In those years, he worked closely with Mrs. Ed Kelly, wife of Chicago's wartime mayor. Nate not only was active in fund raising, but also prevailed on Chicago food brokers to provide hundreds of Thanksgiving and Christmas turkeys for homesick GI's stranded in Chicago during the holidays.

Today, Nate Gross is not a nighthawk columnist. He stays away from saloons and "joints," preferring to travel in the better circles of Chicago's cafe society.

He's usually back at High Dresser Ranch by midnight, when he sits down to write his column which will appear in the American 2 days hence. He's up about 8:30 a. m., and at the office by 10 o'clock. He revises his column, killing out any duplicates of items appearing in competing Chicago columns, and he answers correspondence until noon. He's a "hound" for the luncheon circuits and manages to keep on the go throughout the afternoon and evening before tackling his next column.

One final word about Chicago's cowboy columnist who gets to Palm Springs, Calif., and Las Vegas each winter season to mingle with the Chicago colony and loop cowboys. His High Dresser branding iron bears the numerals "144." His shirts have the same numbers woven into the pocket. One hundred and forty-four is 12 dozen, or one Gross. It's that simple.

Sixteen Democratic Congressmen Refused Appointment by Dulles—Members Take Vigorous Exception

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMANUEL CELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 12, 1956

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, Secretary of State John Foster Dulles has refused to see 16 members of the New York State Democratic congressional delegation: Hon. VICTOR L. ANFUSO, Hon. CHARLES A. BUCKLEY, Hon. EMANUEL CELLER, Hon. IRWIN D. DAVIDSON, Hon. JAMES J. DELANEY, Hon. ISIDORE DOLLINGER, Hon. JAMES C. HEALEY, Hon. LESTER HOLTZMAN, Hon. EDNA F. KELLY, Hon EUGENE J. KEOGH, Hon. ARTHUR G. KLEIN, Hon. ABRAHAM J. MULTER, Hon. LEO O'BRIEN, Hon. ADAM C. POWELL, JR., Hon. JOHN J. ROONEY, and Hon. HERBERT ZELENKO. They represent a sizable proportion of the population of the largest State of our Union.

Mr. Dulles is adamant in his refusal to see the delegation and insists that he will only see three of the group. The delegation, speaking as a unit, has requested this interview to discuss with the Secretary of State the grave problems of the Middle East. Mr. Dulles, however, continues in his refusal to grant this request. Obviously, he cannot face the challenge of meeting 16 Members face to face, most particularly when he is well aware that this delegation is thoroughly cognizant of the issues at stake and their relation to the maintenance of peace between Israel and the Arab States.

The 16 members of this congressional unit have together explored this problem and have unanimously arrived at the central conclusion that the most concrete step that can be taken for the maintenance of peace is an equilibrium of arms between the opposing factions. It is, of course, this unanimity of approach that has frightened Mr. Dulles in view of the inconclusive, wavering, timid public appraisal the Department of State has made relative to this crucial situation.

It may well be that Mr. Dulles prides himself upon his diplomatic suavity faced with 1, 2 or 3 Members of Congress but refuses to subject himself to the interrogations and opinions of 16 Representatives. He has given no reason for such refusal but has arbitrarily refused to grant the appointment. If Mr. Dulles is so secure in his position on the Middle East and so certain of what serves the United States interests best, it would appear to us that he would more than welcome this opportunity of addressing himself to this problem before the New York State Democratic congressional Representatives.

If the logic and the facts are on the side of the administration, would he not, therefore, welcome this opportunity to persuade the 16 of the rightness of his course? Would he not welcome this opportunity to explain why United States arms are shipped to Iraq and Saudi Arabia and arms are denied to Israel, and why our allies are given the green light to ship arms to Israel while the United States denies Israel's request? Or is Mr. Dulles so shaky in his own opinion that he dares not expose it to the scrutiny and question of the 16 Members of Congress? Can he face 16 challengers and reply to their request for an explanation why the United States yielded to the Arab States and the Soviet Union in emasculating the resolution in the United Nations offered by Great Britain?

Surely Mr. Dulles must know the answers to these questions, but are the answers of such dubious worth that he does not dare expose them to the critical attention of 16 of New York State's Representatives?

The 16 members of the New York State Democratic congressional delegation, having a unanimity of viewpoint, have agreed to act as a unit in this matter and we resent the discourtesy shown to 16 Members of Congress in Mr. Dulles' refusal to see us. We question his motives.

Deputy Attorney General Rogers Addresses Federal Bar Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PATRICK J. HILLINGS
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 24, 1956

Mr. HILLINGS. Mr. Speaker, I wish to place in the RECORD an address by Deputy Attorney General William P. Rogers which appeared in the May 1956 issue of the Federal Bar News. The speech follows:

DEPUTY ATTORNEY GENERAL ADDRESSES DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CHAPTER—ROGERS URGES CHIEF JUSTICE REPORT TO CONGRESS

Four hundred members of the District of Columbia Chapter gathered for luncheon April 25 to hear an address by Deputy Attorney General William P. Rogers. The title of Mr. Roger's speech was: "A report to Congress by the Chief Justice of the United States—an important forward step."

Bart Smyth, Chapter President, presided at the luncheon which was held at the Dolly Madison Room of the Madison Arms Building in downtown Washington.

The news of this luncheon is Mr. Roger's address which, in part, is reprinted here:

Most of us here today are lawyers. We have professionally and personally dedicated

our lives to the prompt and effective administration of justice. Here are a few basic facts concerning our Federal judicial system.

Do you know how much of the budget is allocated to the administration of the court system? About one-twentieth of 1 percent—little more than the cost of one destroyer or one light cruiser.

How many persons would you estimate are employed in our judicial system? There are about 300 judges and 4,000 employees. This constitutes the entire manpower of 1 of the 3 branches of Government. Over 40 times this many people are employed in the administration of veteran affairs. The entire Federal judiciary, including the Administrative Office, is operated on a budget half as large as that used in the administration of the Bureau of Indian Affairs.

I use these illustrations, not to suggest that some special significance should be attached to them, but rather to show that speaking relatively the size and cost of the courts are insignificant in terms of service rendered.

In nearly every year since 1942 the civil cases commenced have exceeded those terminated. The continuous yearly increase in the pending caseload is illustrated by the fact that the 1955 caseload is nearly 150 percent greater than the 1941 figure. This, like many other problems of the courts is a continuing one. With the growth and progress of our society, and changes in legislation and economic conditions, the courts are constantly presented with new problems and requirements.

We Americans pride ourselves in our independent and impartial judiciary. We believe in the rule of law and look to the courts to safeguard our rights and to preserve our institutions of freedom. Yet how long does a person have to wait to have his case tried? In many districts litigants must wait from 1 to 4 years to have a case tried. By means of extraordinary effort, the district courts in the southern district of New York, in Washington, and elsewhere, have made valiant strides in decreasing the backlog during the past year. However, in most jurisdictions the problem continues to be most serious. The unfortunate fact is that very few persons know this except the judges, lawyers, and the litigants involved.

The solution of this problem will not be found in one panacea of magical formula. I am convinced, however, that solutions would soon be forthcoming if the spotlight of public opinion, so much a part of our democratic system, were focused on the judicial branch so that both its accomplishments and its operational difficulties, and its weaknesses would be matters of public knowledge. Once the facts and the problems are generally known, I believe corrective action would follow.

As one of the three coequal branches of Government, the judiciary needs a strong and effective spokesman. It must be provided with a voice to make known to the Congress and to the people of the United States its needs and requirements—its accomplishments and its failures. It is my sincere conviction that great value would attend a report by the Chief Justice to each Congress on the condition of the courts.

I publicly recommended such a proposal in 1954 and the rseponse was almost unanimously favorable. Judges, leading members of the bar, Members of Congress, and others, agreed that it was essential that the courts be provided with an effective spokesman to make known objectively and persuasively, their problems, needs, and plans for more effective performance of their vital functions in our society.

Judge Parker of the fourth circuit, in an address to the American Bar Association meeting in Philadelphia last year, said:

"Last year, at the judicial conference of the fourth circuit, Deputy Attorney General W. P. Rogers made a proposal that the Chief Justice be invited * * * to address the two Houses of Congress in joint session as to the needs of the judiciary. His proposal has received the unanimous indorsement of that conference; and, in my opinion, it is one of the most important proposals affecting the judiciary to be made since the foundation of our Government."

Legislation was introduced in Congress and hearings were held in February 1955. I think you would be interested in some of the testimony.

Loyd Wright, then president of the American Bar Association, testified in complete support of the proposal, stating in part:

"The American Bar Association has long felt that there has been a shocking lack of understanding as to the Federal judiciary of the United States. * * * The judiciary was removed, as it should have been, from political influence, and hence it has had no one to constantly champion in the legislative halls its needs and requirements in order to fully meet the obligations of service imposed upon it by our form of government."

The late Judge Stephens, for many years the chief judge of our circuit court here and of whom it has been said that he gave his life by his continuous actvities in promoting the cause of justice, also testified in favor of the proposal. He stated:

"I do not have in mind some dramatic actor-like pressure or presentation by the Chief Justice of the United States. What I have in mind in supporting this resolution is that the Chief Justice could in a dignified manner, once each session or once each Congress, in the first place, tell the whole Congress and, therefore tell the whole people of the importance of the Federal judiciary and what it means to freedom, what it means to our liberties, and what it means to the peaceable settlement of our controversies between man and man and between man and his government in the Federal courts."

Judge Biggs, chief judge of the third circuit, observed that in 33 years that circuit had never been up to date in its work. The late John W. Davis telegraphed his approval of the proposal "provided that it would not prove an undue tax upon his [the Chief Justice's] time and energy." The Chief Justice, in response to an inquiry from the subcommittee, wrote: "If the Congress should be of the opinion that it, and through it, the public might become better informed on the subject through a statement of current conditions and recommendations of the Chief Justice, I would be happy to cooperate."

Despite overwhelming support, a few objections were made to the proposal. First, it was suggested that the plan might be embarrassing to the judiciary by tending to impair its independence and impartiality. Second, it was questioned whether the Chief Justice could have anything of sufficient importance to say to justify an address before a joint session of Congress. Finally, it was said that it had never been done and therefore should not be done. I would like to address myself to these contentions.

The suggestion that a factual report on the conditions of the courts by the Chief Justice might somehow be inappropriate or impair the independence of the judiciary seems to me without foundation.

No one has ever suggested that the doctrine of separation of powers requires that there be watertight compartments with no right of interchange of information. Progress can hardly be accomplished in a vacuum.

In his capacity as head of the Judicial Conference of the United States, the Chief Justice is already required by statute to submit an annual report to Congress. This report by the Chief Justice has nothing to do with the merits of cases or to the judicial as distinguished from the administrative aspects of the courts. The proposal that the Chief Justice personally present factual data to a joint session of Congress does not contemplate any change in this respect. To permit him to present orally to Congress every other year information of immense importance to the conduct of judicial affairs so that proper emphasis could be placed upon those aspects deserving particular attention is only commonsense. It would substitute an effective way to present these views for the present ineffective way.

The contention that the Chief Justice would have nothing of sufficient importance to say to warrant an address before a Joint Sesison of Congress strikes me as being equally without merit. One of the statutory functions of the Judicial Conference of the United States is to make recommendations to the Congress. Undoubtedly this program directly affecting the administration of justice would receive favorable and widespread consideration if it were personally presented by the Chief Justice of the United States who is chairman of the conference. Certainly Congress should be apprised, for example, of the backlog situation, its causes, its effects and possible remedies for it. In the interest of economy and efficiency, Congress should also be fully informed at regular intervals of all fiscal and administrative problems of the courts.

Does information relating to the judicial branch effectively reach Congress? Compared to the executive branch which, as you know, has the benefit of the President's state of the Union message, special messages, testimony of Cabinet and other top level officials, and which is otherwise constantly in touch with Congressmen, it does not.

Prior to 1939, the Attorney General spoke for the courts. While this procedure provided the courts with a spokesman, it had one substantial drawback. It tended to make the judicial branch appear subservient to the executive branch; it was also dependent upon its chief litigant to presents its case for appropriations to Congress, to fix the salaries of its employees and to approve its expenditures for books and travel. This was hardly consonant with our traditional view, as well as constitutional provision, for the complete equality of position between the three branches of government.

Since 1939, the responsibility for the management of the fiscal and administrative affairs of the courts has been lodged in the courts themselves, the Judicial Conferences and the Administrative Office of the Courts. This system has not been too effective because their recommendations do not receive adequate attention.

Each year, as you may know, there is a judicial conference in each circuit where local problems are discussed and assessed and recommendations are made. The chief judge of the circuit presents the recommendations of his circuit to the Judicial Conference of the United States. At the conference material compiled by the administrative office on the status of the courts is presented and discussed.

The result of this process is a printed report which is probably read by very few Members of Congress. No Member of Congress, however diligent, can possibly read all material presented to Congress. After hearings of the Judiciary Committees of the House and Senate, at which court administrative officials and district and circuit judges testify, the subcommittee reports to the committee, the committee reports to the Congress, and Congress considers the recommendations. Because of lack of attention worthwhile recommendations are often pigeonholed.

Over the years failure of Congress to respond to the pressing needs of the courts is a recurring problem. Of the 57 judgeships created between 1945 and 1954 only 6 were created during the year in which the recommendations were first made. Twelve were not created until 3 years later and 3 were not created until 5 years later.

There are presently pending in both Houses of Congress omnibus judgeship bills which propose to carry out the current recommen-

dations of the Judiciary Conference. If enacted, it would create 1 additional circuit judgeship and 20 additional district judgeships. The Department of Justice has strongly urged the enactment of this legislation and it is hoped that favorable congressional action will be forthcoming shortly.

The final objection which has been made to the proposal is that it would result in a break in tradition—that because no Chief Justice of the United States has ever appeared before Congress in person, such an innovation should not be instituted now. Customs and traditions should be continued only so long as they serve a useful purpose. When it can be demonstrated that adherence to obsolete procedures is not productive, it is time to search for new and more effective measures which will bring about sound and desired results. In a matter so important and vital as the preservation of the strength and vitality of our judicial system, the choice is an obvious one. We cannot permit the legitimate needs of the judiciary to go unattented because they are presented in such form and matter that they miss the mark.

Regrettably, Congress, or to emphasize a point, a subcommittee of a committee, despite the support of the chairman and the ranking minority leader, took no action on the proposal in 1955. I am firmly convinced that eventually Congress will approve this proposal which has such general and widespread support. An invitation to the Chief Justice of the United States to address Congress on the conditions of the courts would provide an important steppingstone in the drive to bring justice up to date. I believe that the idea is one which deserves the wholehearted support of the Federal Bar Association.

Foreign Student Inspired by Washington Trip

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH B. KEATING
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 14, 1956

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, in recent years Americans have become increasingly aware of the value of exchange programs for old and young people with our neighbors across the seas. Recently, an example of the value and results of such an exchange came to my attention.

A few years ago a constitutent of mine, Miss Sheila Sparnon, of Wolcott, N. Y., carried on a correspondence for some time with Vid Chang in Thailand. Through the interest generated by this pen pal correspondence, he decided to come to the United States for schooling. This June he graduates from Wolcott High School.

When Vid Chang arrived in this country he knew very little English. Now, 2 years later, we have ample testimony to the great strides he has made in mastering the language. It comes in the form of an eloquent poem inspired by a senior class trip to Washington.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I am including this poem, as it appeared in the Lake Shore News, Wolcott, N. Y., on May 24. I hope that the example of Vid Chang's successes in this country will serve as an inspiration for many others who will follow and thus aid in building up mutual understanding between this Nation and our friends around the world.

The poem, The Glorious One, follows:

THE GLORIOUS ONE
(By Vid Chang)

What a beautiful city it is! Washington.
The gigantic Government buildings and the gracious monuments
Among the fine scenery it stands.
A pale blue river, the light green trees and the various colors of the blossoms
It is beautiful and dignified as its Nation.

Across the Potomac River, opposite the city,
Under the quiet-cool shadows of the green tall trees.
Rest hundreds of men, the heroes, known and unknown.
For the country they served,
For freedom and justice, they found their destiny.
Near the top of the hill, lies an unknown soldier
Who represents the hundreds unknown.
Their fellow countrymen pay respect to them nights and days,
Regardless of rain or snow.

To you, the men who deserve
The gift even richer,
The gentle wind blows from the river.
It carries the fragance of the blossoms from the bank,
Refreshes the one who rests, and cheers the ones who serve.
"Here rests in glory honored an American soldier known only to God."
The gentle wind likely to whisper.

Foreign Aid Reaches a Dead End

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 13, 1956

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am including an article by Mr. William Henry Chamberlin which appeared in the Wall Street Journal on Tuesday, May 15. Mr. Chamberlain indicates that the American foreign aid request for winning friends among neutral nations has proved a blind alley.

The article follows:

DEAD END: THE AMERICAN FOREIGN AID ROUTE FOR WINNING FRIENDS AMONG NEUTRAL NATIONS HAS PROVED A BLIND ALLEY
(By William Henry Chamberlin)

So-called lend-lease aid to nations fighting against Germany, Italy, and Japan was advocated as an essential means of winning a war that would usher in an era of peaceful cooperation among peoples. The war was technically won; but the era failed to materialize. Since the end of hostilities against the Axis the United States has disbursed close to $55 billion in relief, economic aid, and military assistance to foreign powers.

The sum is considerable, even in this age of easy spending and currency inflation. Had it not been spent at all, American individual citizens would have had much more money to spend or save. Had it been spent directly on such defense objectives as intercontinental bombers, guided missiles, and scientific teaching and research, there would probably be fewer pessimistic comparisons between American and Soviet accomplishments in these fields.

It would be unfair and unrealistic to write off this whole expenditure as a total loss, although some items, like the subsidization of the French colonial war in Indochina, seem to fall in this category. Had it not been for United States aid, the recovery of Western Europe would not have been so rapid, Japan, Korea, and Formosa would be in much worse shape than they are, and one or more of these Pacific bastions might have fallen.

However, at a time when there is a good deal of agitation for continuing and expanding some of the most debatable aspects of America's giveaway program, it seems worth remembering that in two respects this program has not lived up to the claims and expectations of its advocates. It has not made America or Americans particularly liked. And, what is more important, it has not transformed the beneficiaries into reliable allies or, in some cases, even into friends.

DOLLARS VERSUS EMOTIONS

It should be clear by this time that dollars, even a great many dollars, will often not outweigh stronger political and emotional factors. Take the case of India, for instance.

American aid to that country has been far in excess of Soviet aid. But a red carpet of organized cheering hosts was prepared for Khrushchev and Bulganin, while Secretary of State Dulles, on his visit to New Delhi, was given the chilliest reception compatible with formal correctness. Prime Minister Nehru of India is frequently and sharply critical of American policly, seldom if every critical of Soviet and Red Chinese actions.

There is no reason to believe that this situation, an outgrowth of Indian antagonism to what its leaders like to call Western imperialism and materialism plus Indian resentment toward America's anti-Communist policy, would change if the United States doubled or trebled its giveaway program to that country.

Greece offers another illustration of the same point. The United States poured into Greece for economic reconstruction and military aid over $2 billion, a considerable sum for a small country. But at the present time the Greeks show far more inclination to be resentful over Cyprus and over American failure to induce Great Britain to consent to the union of that island with Greece than to remember the American aid. There are many similar examples.

It should be clear to us by this time, after the expensive education we have received, that favors between nations, like favors between individuals, do not always make for friendship, and sometimes make for the reverse. Such favors, if they are too one-sided, can easily arouse a defensive psychology of envy and a suspicious tendency to seek ulterior motives for the behavior of the bountiful giver.

TARGET OF THE MOBS

The United States Information Agency is sometimes made the scapegoat for these attitudes. And it is an ironical fact that when foreign mobs go on the rampage the first building they seem to attack instinctively, perhaps because it is apt to be large and prominent, is the office of the USIA.

But even if all our Information Agency representatives spoke with the tongues of angels, it is doubtful whether they could succeed in overcoming the psychological reaction of envy and suspicion generated by the spectacle of a country so rich that it is able to give away so much, and perhaps sometimes in rather too lavish and ostentatious fashion. The number of American automobiles with diplomatic immunity in the heyday of the Marshall plan was a subject of some acid comment.

In any case, there is something repelling about government-to-government aid, with its inevitable overlay of bureaucratic procedure. Private undertaking is an entirely different matter, when it is accompanied by

friendly interest and a complete absence of anything savoring of a superiority complex. The American Friends Service Committee has earned widespread international goodwill by sponsoring humanitarian and reconstruction projects in which young men and women work with their hands on local jobs.

INCIDENTAL UNDERSTANDING

American educational enterprises like the American University in Beirut, Robert College in Istanbul and similar institutions in Japan, China (until the bamboo curtain fell) and other Asian countries won much incidental friendship and understanding for America among the native students whom they attracted.

While there are cogent practical reasons for continuing to subsidize reliable allies, in the interest of our own security, no particular benefit is likely to accrue from increasing handouts to uncommitted and sometimes unfriendly neutrals or from channeling American aid through that Tower of Babel, the United Nations. As a means of winning friends and influencing people lavish Government aid has proved a dead-end street, which only the blind would continue to try to travel.

New Look at Neutralism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOE L. EVINS
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 18, 1956

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, there continues a daily concern that our country is continuing to lose the cold war—if we have not already lost it completely. Evidence of this fact appears on every hand. Certainly it is devotedly hoped that our State Department and policymakers in the field of foreign affairs may awaken to the realities of conditions with which this Nation is confronted, reverse the present trend, and, recapture the initiative in the matters of first importance for our country. There never has been a better time for this Nation to take the offensive on the idealogical front for democracy than at present.

The State Department should not scatter its shots but center its efforts and target aims in limited areas needing first consideration. A new look at neutralism for this Nation is certainly indicated.

In this connection, Mr. Speaker, I insert in the Appendix of the RECORD a timely editorial entitled "New Look at Neutralism," which appeared in the Nashville Tennessean, June 12, 1956. This editorial which is deserving of attention and thoughtful consideration, follows:

That there has been a basic change in the United States attitude toward neutralism is evident, and in the light of what is going on around the world, it would be surprising if this were not so.

In Moscow there is the interesting report of Marshal Tito serenely finishing his nap while Kremlin officials wait to confer with him.

In Italy, Italian Communists, shocked by Khrushchev's indictment of the dead Stalin, have worked out an independent strategy of adopting the methods of western democracy to attain their ends. They are cutting loose from Moscow domination. This is more Titoism.

Among the Soviet satellite states in Europe there is the prospect of being forced to apologize and pay indemnities to Tito for past acts which were dictated by the deflated Stalin, whose vileness is now known to all the world.

Before his illness, President Eisenhower made two statements on neutrality which added up to an opinion that though military alliances against communism offered the best security, it is obvious that certain ideological, geographical, or other reasons make military alliance impractical. This being true, neutralism can be tolerable and acceptable.

This is only commonsense, but it is important that such views should not be used to weaken courage and resolve in anti-Communist nations. For it is the democratic opposition which gives uncommitted nations any choice at all.

After his press conference views on neutrality, Mr. Eisenhower issued a clarifying statement, and since that time there has been a further explanation by Mr. Dulles. But the American people, we think, already have a fairly realistic grasp of the situation.

Some neutral nations, such as Indonesia, whose President is Mr. Sukarno, deserve sympathy. On his recent visit to Washington, Mr. Sukarno spoke with exceeding frankness to a joint session of Congress, and was given an enthusiastic reception. He did not profess indifference to the rest of the world, but made it clear that his first consideration was the salvation of his own land.

Less of a welcome will be given Prime Minister Jawaharlal Nehru of India whose visit impends—a leader who does not treat communism with consideration at home but chooses to be a middleman in international affairs. Yet even his type of neutralism offers hope, since the people of India now know the worst horrors of Stalinism. Indian Communists who bowed down before the meglomaniac Russian ruler, like all others have been made to look like dumb dupes, and their cause is bound to suffer thereby.

The policies of free nations cannot be controlled by foreign aid or anything else, and in many cases there is much to be obtained by abandoning the dollar diplomacy which causes natural resentment.

The most important task for Messrs. Bulganin and Khrushchev is to convince thinking people that there has been a clean break with Stalinism and that Russian communism can achieve the decency it professes to desire. Millions of awakened Russians also need such proof.

Not only have free peoples been shocked, but Communists everywhere have been put upon the defensive. There never was a better time for democracy to press its offensive on the ideological front, with especial attention to those who have adopted the course of neutrality. And signs that the administration appreciates its opportunity are distinctly heartening.

Better Watch Our Step

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
CLARE E. HOFFMAN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 18, 1956

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, for years, the government of Russia brutally oppressed its people. Its government was a blot upon civilization.

After a group of its leaders revolted, which we falsely assumed gave the people at least a degree of freedom, we in 1933 again recognized Russia as a nation, our own Senator Vandenberg casting the only dissenting vote. How right he was in his distrust of those who controlled that country has been proven by time and subsequent experience.

While we sent the "Polar bears" to Siberia in World War I and were allied with Russia against the Kaiser, and subsequently, in World War II, were allied with Russia against Hitler, we now know that Russia was fighting for her own advancement rather than for a common purpose.

Whatever may be the belief and the purpose of Russia's people, those who control her have accepted and relied upon the belief that "there is no God, that religion is a fraud, that ministers and priests are hypocrites."

Since the end of World War II, Russia may accurately be characterized as the enemy of the rest of the world. She seeks world domination.

Through aid given during World War II and subsequently, Russia and communism have spread over much of the world's area—this in spite of the fact that we have spent billions to prevent it.

Are we now about to fall into another trap, just because Stalin—now dead and incapable of retaliation—and his atheistic, immoral, oppressive practices have been denounced by his former asssociates?

Holding out to us what some think is the olive branch of peace, the new regime has invited our Air Force Chief, General Twining, to Moscow.

The President has given his consent, but yesterday from his sick-bed in Walter Reed Hospital, said that other members of the Joint Chiefs of Staff would not now accept a similar invitation.

Common courtesy would require us after Twining's visit—certainly after a visit by other top military men—to issue a return invitation for the Communists to visit us.

We are still spending billions to hold our so-called allies in line against the spread of communism. They are watching us.

Just what will happen to their already extremely weak support of our world position if they see our top military men breaking bread, drinking toasts with the Communist leaders?

It is all very well to hold out the hand of friendship to an enemy, but I never would permit one to get behind me.

If forced to meet one, I would like to first search him for his shoulder-holster gun, the knife in his bootleg, first sip the drink he proffered so I might be sure it was not poisoned.

Most assuredly I would expect a friend who lived in fear of communism to look upon my social visit to those who are oppressing him with not a little misgiving.

Sometimes we are judged by our associates. The nations we hope will resist communism may be confused when they see us acting buddy-like with Russian rulers, their enemies.

Address of Hon. Ralph Harvey, of Indiana, at Muncie, Ind., Saturday, June 16, 1956, at the State Convention of AMVETS

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HAROLD O. LOVRE

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 18, 1956

Mr. LOVRE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following address delivered on June 16, 1956, at the State Convention of AMVETS, in Muncie, Ind., by my colleague and good friend, the able Representative from the 10th District of Indiana, the Honorable RALPH HARVEY:

It is a real pleasure to be here today. Organizations such as yours, I believe, are more widely admired than some realize.

As war veterans in civilian life, you are properly concerned with the welfare of veterans and their kin; but AMVETS, to their credit, have demonstrated an alert interest in all they share with others—the progress of the home community, the prosperity of State and Nation, and profoundly, the peace of the world.

I am sure I speak for more than one in congratulating you upon the scope of your sympathies, the division of your interests. By word and deed you have made evident the resolve that while veterans are not to be forgotten, a just regard of their fellow Americans shall be maintained. The goals you seek are intelligently conceived to be helpful to some without being hurtful to others.

In considering current veterans' legislation, I should like to read a letter that came to my desk a few days ago. It omits mention of veterans and their programs, but it pointedly touches upon some of the many public problems confronting us all, veterans included.

This letter, whose author might have been your wife or mine, came in response to a public opinion questionnaire. It says:

"DEAR MR. HARVEY: At risk of seeming completely negative, I must vote 'No' to proposals which will spend more money. We must stop somewhere, and I fail to see any benefits received from all the wild spending we have done. Foreign aid? The time should be run out now. Roads and highways? Go a little safer and more slowly on the ones we have. Arms? Yes; but use some sensible spending.

"As for NATO, I believe Congress should assume the duties that NATO wants. I guess I am a contrary female (gentlemen, at this point it is obvious the writer couldn't be your wife or mine) but I am tired of working and taking home less than three-fourths of my pay. Can't we increase the personal exemptions of taxpayers? Thank you. I respect your efforts and service very much. Under Eisenhower, at least we have peace."

The lady, bless her, feels as many do. But I repeat that word "feels" with emphasis, because she is dealing with large orders—foreign aid, highways, NATO, and guided missiles. The real point at issue, as I see it, is not how we feel; it's the more soul-searching challenge of what we know, and if knowing, what we can do about it.

Let's start in again at the beginning and try to think the letter through aloud.

The writer would have us vote "no" on proposals which involve the spending of more money. Assuredly it wil be a happy day when we privately or publicly can have what we want, and all we want, for nothing. More realistically it can be said that the cost of Government to our people is pretty faithfully reflected by the demands of the people.

I am reasonably certain the writer would not choose to deny herself or her neighbors the protection of a policeman, a fireman, or a building inspector. They are but a few of the necessary public servants whose tools and wages must be provided through the collection of local taxes.

Our writer, it may be assumed, would not ask Indiana school teachers to go payless, nor would she leave streets and roads to become impassable, our penal and benevolent institutions to rot away. Their maintenance and improvement represent but a part of the day-to-day functions of state government.

Finally, I am prone to believe that the writer, despite an understandable desire to retain more of her pay, would not subscribe to the proposition that we substantially cut down our Army, Navy, and Air Force. Yet the implementing of these and all they entail by way of national security accounts for the spending of 70 cents of every dollar collected in Federal taxes.

Our correspondent, to be fair, has in mind proposals of new spending, including those she enumerated, so let us strive to take an unbiased view of them.

There shall be no foreign aid, none at all. A few days ago I voted against foreign aid, as did many of my House colleagues, both Democrat and Republican. But I voted, as did most others, in protest to the amount and direction of foreign aid, not to its existence. I could never vote against every dollar of United States foreign aid so long as there remains loose in this world a conspiracy to destroy the very freedoms for which you men fought. And whatever the Russian threat to the future of this country and its principles, I could not in good conscience join those who contend that the way for us to deal with the rest of the world is to withdraw from it. Our withdrawal—unless I misread the doctrines of international communism—would set free in many parts of the earth such a frankenstein of terror, treason, and murder as to wipe out the last trace of mankind's yearning for liberty, decency, and justice.

The letter suggests a passive solution of our highway problems. Just let them multiply. Make all land-bound vehicles travel more slowly; take it easy and our existing roads will suffice. Speed, we must admit, is often a killer, but speed in the movement of food to hungry cities, steel to waiting factories, and to most of us a thousand and one necessities of present-day living—for them, speed can be essential. Our error, it seems more likely, has been that of producing and affording more cars than can be safely accommodated on public thoroughfares, and the remedy for more cars and more trucks is surely more roads. We can debate the number of roads, the type of roads, and the cost of the use of them, but we can scarcely hope to outlaw the manufacture of motor-driven vehicles and put our people back into the safer transportation age of the horse and buggy.

The letter, you will recall, urged sensible spending on arms, commonsense investment in our military might. I certainly am for that, and so are you. There is one hitch. Who, even among the expert, can tell us what constitutes sensible spending for guns, ships, bombers, and rockets? I know of no single authority, and because he, too, cannot be sure of the answer, the President of the United States is a modest and sometimes worried Commander in Chief. Sensible spending by all means, but I can tell the lady in behalf of all officials in Washington: If ahead of us are unbroken years of peace, then we are wasting tax moneys; if war in all its atomic fury should come tomorrow, then the few who survive in this vast land can vouch that we spent too little.

The writer would have Congress assume the duties of NATO. I believe Congress has only the constitutional authority to help govern the American people. It can't legislate for the British, the French, the Scandinavians, or the West Germans. NATO, of course, as some judge the United Nations, may be futile, a waste of our time and substance. Here again, however, I am sure that all in Congress, commended by the President, would vote yet tonight to withdraw from the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, if only we could be assured on two counts:

One, that Russia has no ambitions to rule any but the Russian people, and two, that a Russian pledge can be honored under any circumstances. You may be sure I am not here to preach on communism, but I pray we may all be spared from the day on which those responsible for America's survival are charmed into inertia by the sweetness of the Soviet smile.

The letter's last question deserves an answer: Can't we increase the personal exemptions of taxpayers? Why not? If Congress so votes, it is done. The President might veto such a measure, but even then if taxpayers insist, Congress will oblige. But into the bargain must go some other considerations: An unbalanced budget, deficit spending, the hiking of other taxes, or further increases in the public debt. A personal tax exemption increase of $100 means a Treasury loss of some $2 billion. Vote-seeking candidates may make it sound simple and justified, but those who take their responsibilities more seriously know that tax cutting now is the sure path to more headaches tomorrow, headaches that would multiply for all taxpayers if the present high level of prosperity should slip.

Let us, to conclude with the letter, be honest in advising the writer that she is not a contrary female. It is more pleasant to regard her for what she surely is, a good and worthwhile citizen. She has expressed her opinions and if they should crystalize into the conviction of many citizens, then our Government is such that her wishes will prevail. Whatever faults beset Washington, indifference to the will of the American voter is not one of them.

One week ago yesterday, as many of you know, veterans' legislation began to loom large in the closing days of the 84th Congress. While a few veterans' benefit bills had been passed into law earlier, and attention was divided among many others, the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs took unprecedented action. It voted out H. R. 7886, and the significance of the omnibus bill is becoming apparent. Its fate in Washington is left to your conjecture.

In its main provisions, H. R. 7886, now awaiting the disposition of the House Committee on Rules, calls for the following:

1. The American Legion's plan for $105 in monthly pension to all needy veterans at the age of 65.

2. The disabled American veterans' plan to increase payments for service-connected disabilities by 10 to 15 percent.

3. An increase in Spanish War widows' pensions to $75 a month.

4. An increase in the basic pension rate for widows of both World Wars and of Korea to $75 a month.

5. A Veterans of Foreign Wars proposal for a 20-percent pension premium for those who served overseas.

6. An amendment to give World War II and Korea widows the more liberal compensation now provided widows of World War I veterans.

7. An increase in veterans' burial allowance from $150 to $200.

The estimated first-year cost of the legislation would be $1,400,000,000. In succeeding years, it would rise rapidly.

The proposal, as pending, is subject now to public debate. I trust that you, both as veterans and taxpayers, will make your voice heard in the controversy at hand.

Before concluding, I wish to offer this assurance to veterans and their loved ones: During my time in Congress, it has become unmistakably clear to me that the American people mean to stand by those who have defended them in time of war. They are as one in their belief that the survivors of those lost in battle, as well as those who are themselves disabled in service, should be generously provided for; that those who leave the security of home and livelihood to answer the call of duty shall be afforded every opportunity to readjust to civilian life, retain their job rights and seniority, and receive material assistance in obtaining for themselves and their dependents an education, a business, or a home. They want no man or woman who marched under the colors to be left in his or her declining years destitute, demoralized, discarded. They are not merely prepared to pay their part of the terrible cost of war when it is upon us, but through the years that follow, they want the Nation's defenders to share and share fully in the Nation's progress and prosperity. Their lasting gratitude to those who sacrifice most is the finest guaranty of our future—a guaranty that to Americans young and old, their country, and its flag are worth fighting for.

Thank you.

Theodore Roosevelt Centennial

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. OTTO KRUEGER

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 18, 1956

Mr. KRUEGER. Mr. Speaker, as plans develop for the observance for the centennial of the birth of Theodore Roosevelt, we are naturally interested in our participation contemplated over the Nation. In this connection I would like to call to the attention of the Members the speech given by the Honorable Norman Brunsdale, Governor of North Dakota:

SPEECH GIVEN ON THE THEODORE ROOSEVELT CENTENNIAL, APRIL 8, 1956, BISMARCK, N. DAK., BY HON. NORMAN BRUNSDALE

It has been my privilege on several occasions in the last few years to attend celebrations commemorating community anniversaries in North Dakota. Some of these go back 75 years; some of them, particularly in the western part of the State, 50 years. I have recently been invited to attend the 75th anniversary of the town in which I live, Mayville, N. Dak.

In all these anniversaries I have rejoiced that someone has made it his business to write a history of that community going back to the very beginning. Very often the community has been fortunate that someone of the earliest settlers is still living in the community and has assumed the responsibility to see that a history is written, setting forth the events of the past, many of which would be foregotten except for the labors of such people. Then again, I have been most happy to learn that the files of the local newspaper going back to the first edition in my community are available in our State historical library in microfilm. These files are of great importance to the man in the future who wants to know what conditions were like back perhaps over a century from the time that he seeks that information. I hope many communities in the State have fared as well as mine.

There are, however, other reasons why we observe anniversaries, and particularly is that true when we commemorate the anniversaries of individual people. I think most fittingly the centennial celebration commemorating the birth of Theodore Roosevelt as embodied in the statement of purpose as submitted to Congress in March "recognizes that this is the time less to indulge happy recollections of an earlier age than to summon the resources of the past to help men face the challenge of the present."

I know it will interest you what has been done in the matter of preparation for the hundredth anniversary of the birth of Theodore Roosevelt. Congress passed legislation that was approved by the President on July 28, 1955, which became Public Law 183, chapter 418, establishing a commission for the observance of the hundredth anniversary of the birth of Theodore Roosevelt.

Pursuant to the law, the Commission consists of 15 members. These include the President of the United States of America, the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives, all ex officio; 2 Senators; the Honorable Karl E. Mundt and the Honorable Joseph C. O'Mahoney, appointed by the President of the Senate; 2 Representatives: the Honorable Steven B. Derounian, of New York, and the Honorable Leo W. O'Brien, of New York, appointed by the Speaker of the House; and 8 persons appointed by the President of the United States during November 1955, Mrs. Hazel H. Abel from Nebraska, Gov. C. Norman Brunsdale from North Dakota, Mr. Hal Davies from North Dakota, Mr. Hermann Hagedorn from New York, Mrs. Sherman Post Haight from Connecticut, Judge Herbert Millen from Pennsylvania, Mr. Lowell Stockman from Oregon, and Mr. Oscar S. Strau II from New York.

Theodore Roosevelt had the faculty of calling attention to the dangers confronting our system of government from within—very often in prophetic words, as, for example, in the following: "The fate of the 20th century will in no small degree depend upon the type of citizenship developed on this continent."

The Commission went further on to state: "Mr. Roosevelt's achievements as political leader, statesman, and Chief Executive were epicmaking. The personality which charmed his contemporaries with its gaiety, warmth, and vigor, and dazzled them by the diversity of his interests and his instinct for action, was the very stuff of which legends are made. But richer in meaning to us and to all men struggling to achieve or maintain free institutions is the man who demonstrated in his own life that this basic truth of free government that surpassing public service requires no surpassing gifts of intellect, only ordinary abilities raised to extraordinary power by those personal qualities that constitute character, and by the fire in the heart to give and to serve."

So you see that the observance of the hundredth anniversary of Theodore Roosevelt in the eyes of the Commission and of those who have been concerned with preparations for that anniversary in 1958 is not going to rely so much upon the political events of a great man, upon his accomplishments of his administration as for example in the building of the Panama Canal or in ordering the American Fleet on a voyage around the world or his exploits as a hunter and explorer. Yes, perhaps in the background we may refer to his activity in a great movement today, and one which he started, the conservation of our natural resources. The Commission, however, has felt that, as important as these events were and as these qualities of a great man were, the Commission is convinced, "that Theodore Roosevelt may be fully commemorated only as that commemoration is related to the basic summons of our time which even today asks the question: whether man has the capacity under God to govern himself and to use the liberty that is his to build a civilization that shall endure."

Following the statement of purpose to the Congress the Commission requested in its report that it be permitted to carry out three expressly stated tasks indicated in the resolution establishing the Commission: (1) to prepare a program for symbolizing the hundredth anniversary of the birth of Theodore Roosevelt and to take such steps as may be necessary to coordinate and correlate its plans with those prepared by state or civic bodies; (2) to provide for the completion of the development of Theodore Roosevelt Island in the Potomac River; (3) providing for the completion of the development of the Theodore Roosevelt National Memorial Park in North Dakota. I believe that you are perhaps more interested at this time in what is tentatively contemplated for improvements in the Theodore Roosevelt National Memorial Park in North Dakota.

Two million dollars has been asked for the improvements in this park in both of its sections. The National Park Service is asking for something in the neighborhood of $600,000 for the work in the area for fiscal 1957. Currently, that is over five times as much as the park had appropriated to it for various purposes in the current fiscal year.

Mr. Hal Davies, who attended the last meeting of the Commission and who has been most active in connection with representation on the Commission for North Dakota, the superintendent for the park, Mr. John W. Jay and Mr. Howard W. Baker, regional director of the Park Service from Omaha, Nebr., have conferred with representatives of our State highway department, representatives of the Greater North Dakota Association and the Governor's office in connection with the plans for rebuilding of the National Park headquarters in the city of Medora. This necessitates, in addition to headquarters and park entrance facilities in both park section, also the building of approaches to the highway and roads leading into the park. Eventually, and before 1958, road construction in the park will be a material improvement that has been looked forward to for a long time ever since the park was opened to the public. This includes also highway improvement in the south and north sections.

As Mr. Davies reported, the Commission members took it for granted that the development of the park in North Dakota was a must for the centennial observance. This is because, after all, Theodore Roosevelt did spend 2 of the most worthwhile years of his life in North Dakota. They were the years in which he regained his health, thus giving him a robust physique that stood him in good stead in the years to come because in all his endeavors he expended above average energy in every undertaking that he was concerned with.

Commissioner Davies, when he was in the East attending the meeting in Washington, also stopped off in New York and had an opportunity thus to see the Theodore Roosevelt House and become better acquainted with the activities and plans of the Commission, to meet Mr. Roosevelt's daughter, Mrs. Richard Derby, her husband, and trustees of the Theodore Roosevelt Association.

Then of course to the people in the East and to the Nation as a whole there is going to be another park development on Theodore Roosevelt Island, which was purchased by the Theodore Roosevelt Association in 1931 and presented to the Nation at that time. It is located near Washington in the Potomac River and will be connected to the mainland by a bridge at one end of the island. The plans for the improvement and development of this park has been made by distinguished architects and have the approval of qualified people. I have here in my hand a picture of

an artist's conception of what this memorial shrine will be like when completed. I shall be happy to have you pass it around.

May I also state that Congress has approved the report filed by the Commission. Next we need the appropriations. When the year for the centennial approaches I hope we will be fortunate enough in North Dakota as well as in America to have not only the support of patriotic civic organizations assisting in the commemoration of the hundredth anniversay of Theodore Roosevelt's birth but also that every community will take note of the event and actively take part in commemorating the anniversary programs and functions in connection therewith.

I just want to close with words from his voice uttered some years ago. They are in a sense prophetic, and I hope that they will be proven true in spite of dire predictions: "We know there are dangers ahead, as we know there are evils to fight and overcome, but stout of heart we see across the dangers the great future that lies beyond and we rejoice as a giant refreshed, as a strong man girt for the race. The greatest victories are yet to be won, the greatest deeds yet to be done. There are in store for our people and for the causes we uphold grander triumphs than have ever yet been scored."

Thank you.

Tito Should Never Have Been Trusted

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 7, 1956

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, Tito of Yugoslavia, a life-long Communist, has now pledged Yugoslavia's support to Red Russia, and has turned his back upon the United States which, during the last 8 years, supported the Yugoslav nation with United States loans, credits, and outright grants.

Yugoslavia, a Communist nation built and maintained with United States aid in the hope that such aid might set an example and encourage other nations under Soviet domination to break away and turn to the Western democracies, has proved once again that the Communist doctrine of deceit and conspiracy is supreme law to the Communist, and that the nation naive enough to place trust in the pledge of a Communist leader can only expect disillusionment and betrayal as a result of its trust.

I have consistently opposed aid to Tito by the United States, recognizing the fact that a Communist leader could not and should not be trusted. I have warned of the danger in sending military supplies to this Communist nation when such materials might be used at some future time against American boys. But the State Department, then under Dean Acheson, insisted that Tito's friendship was essential to the United States, and the program of aid to Yugoslavia was underway.

In August of 1949 the State Department granted a permit to send an American steel mill to Tito, and at that time I addressed the Members of the House as follows:

An event has occurred within the past 24 hours that we should think seriously about. The State Department has granted a permit to Tito, the communistic dictator of Yugoslavia, to obtain a steel mill from the United States.

I think that Tito, the Communist dictator, is the most dangerous man in the world next to Stalin. Here we are taking a communistic sinner, Tito, and trying to make him into a democratic saint. It was Tito that only 3 short years ago shot down our planes and killed our American flyers, and we are saying to him through our State Department, we think you have reformed, we think you have broken with Stalin.

You can have a permit to obtain an American-made steel mill because we think you are breaking the Iron Curtain for us.

Are we so naive as that? I think we ought to give a lot of thought to what that means in connection with the granting of funds to arm Western Europe, because we will have to use the funds if Tito uses this steel mill to make munitions. And we have no control nor assurance that he will not. We do not know if they are going to use it to make munitions or not.

Tito is playing Stalin's tune and we are dancing to it.

Tito is the most dangerous man in the world and we are baing made to look like puppets by playing along with him.

The State Department now appears sold on what it calls the "reformation of Tito." Only time will tell how honest a reformation this is. If the State Department is wrong we may regret this action which now allows Yugoslavia an American-made steel plant which can be used to produce arms and munitions which may be fired against our own men in the event of world war III, which God forbid.

Today Tito's duplicity stands revealed. As a Communist dictator, he has again joined forces in the plot of Soviet Russia for world domination through Communist conspiracy and aggression.

The whole story of Tito's brief alliance with Western democracy, his return to the Russian orbit, and what it cost the United States in our attempt to hold Yugoslavia as an ally is contained in the following article which appeared in a recent issue of the U. S. News & World Report. It is a story which confirms the opinion that "you cannot do business with Communist nations." Their creed is to confuse, their keynote is expediency, and their method is betrayal of a trust:

BILLION-DOLLAR GAMBLE THAT FAILED?—TITO, WITH UNITED STATES ARMS AND AID, LIKES MOSCOW AGAIN

Tito's mission to Moscow is the latest jolt for the United States.

Communist Yugoslavia has been kept going with United States aid. Now there's a move in Congress to cut off all aid, to consider Tito just another Moscow man.

Tito's game of "neutrality" may be over. If it is, United States has lost a billion-dollar bet.

Marshal Tito is running Yugoslavia as a Communist country built with United States aid. It's the only Communist nation in the world still getting United States help.

You can see modern United States jet fighter planes on any military airport in Yugoslavia. When Tito puts any of the 30 divisions of the Yugoslav Army on parade they march with United States equipment—United States tanks, guns, jeeps, and trucks.

Throughout Yugoslavia you find factories in operation with machinery made in the United States of America. On the plains of Croatia, in the valleys of Slovenia and Serbia, Yugoslav farmers are working their fields with United States farm machinery. For 8 years the Yugoslav economy has depended heavily on United States loans, credits and outright grants to keep going.

All of this represents a billion-dollar gamble for the United States. Since 1948, when he broke with Joseph Stalin's Russia, Tito has received a half-billion dollars' worth of United States military aid. Economic aid, over and above the 300 million dollars' worth of United States relief funds pumped into Yugoslavia at the end of World War II, totals about $400 million in the same period.

United States plans for the year ahead still call for aid to Yugoslavia—$30 million for economic aid, an undisclosed amount for military aid. But Russia now is to be Yugoslavia's biggest partner in trade. And President Eisenhower has said the United States is reassessing its policies toward Tito.

A HERO IN MOSCOW

Question now is what the United States has in return for all this aid to a Communist country and its leader. Tito, the man who broke with the Kremlin in 1948, has gone back to Moscow to be hailed as a Communist hero by Stalin's heirs, the new rulers of Russia.

In Moscow, Tito has told the men in the Kremlin that the break between his country and Soviet Russia is healed. "Nothing of the kind," he told his Russian hosts, "will ever again happen between the two countries. * * *"

Patching up their differences with this one man, as the Moscow Communists see it, can bring Yugoslavia, the only country ever to bolt Moscow's empire, back again, the richer for a billion dollars' worth of United States aid in arms and goods.

Key figure in all this is Josip Broz Tito, a life-long Communist. In 1944, Prime Minister Sir Winston Churchill of Britain and United States leaders picked Tito and his Guerrilla "Partisans" as the force to support against the Germans. Allied aid, much of it from the United States, helped Tito win. Yet, a few months after war ended, Tito's troops shot at United States troops on the Italian frontier.

In the early postwar period Yugoslavia looked like just another Soviet satellite. Tito, to all appearances, took his orders from Stalin in Moscow.

AMERICANS KILLED

One incident particularly aroused the United States. In the summer of 1946 the Yugoisavs shot down an unarmed United States transport plane, killing five United States fliers, and forced down another, jailing its occupants. A storm of protest in the United States and a blunt United States ultimatum to Tito forced him to release the Americans and pay indemnity. But Tito then was considered a cold war enemy of the United States.

Suddenly a blast from Moscow changed all this. On June 28, 1948, the Communist International denounced Tito, in effect, for defying Stalin. Communists the world over soon were calling Tito a "traitor." Out of Moscow came orders to all Communists everywhere, Yugoslavia included, to overthrow Tito.

Inside Yugoslavia, however, Tito remained secure. The Yugoslav army, the Yugoslav Communist Party supported him. A wave of Yugoslav nationalism made him a hero at home. But the country, threatened by famine, desperate for machinery and raw materials, faced economic collapse. And the Yugoslav army, promised arms by Russia, got none, feared a Soviet attack.

The United States gamble on Tito dates from this period. The Yugoslav dictator appealed for western help, though still insisting that he was a Communist.

Calculated risk by the United States was designed to make Yugoslavia an example to the countries still under Soviet rule. Idea was—and still is—to show that the satellites could break with Stalin and survive.

LOOSE TIES WITH WEST

Thanks largely to United States aid over the last 8 years, Yugoslavia has prospered. As the United States sent hundreds of millions of dollars in aid to the country. Tito gradually made his peace with the West through a number of loose alliances.

Through these years, however, Yugoslavia remained a Communist dictotorship. Tito's rule, while more liberal than Moscow's rule, was that of a police state. Yugoslavia never joined the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, often turned up on the Communist side of votes within the United Nations. There was much criticism of United States aid to Communist Yugoslavia within the United States Congress, but the aid continued to flow.

Stalin's death in Moscow brought a sharp change in Russia's policy toward Yugoslavia. A year ago, Nikita Khrushchev and other Soviet leaders went to Belgrade to confess Stalin's errors in breaking with Tito.

ESTEEM FOR RUSSIA

For a year Tito played hard to get. Just last October he received United States Secretary of State John Foster Dulles at Brijoni, his magnificent island estate in the Adriatic, for friendly talks. Now Tito has gone to Moscow to be received as a Communist hero, a friend of the Soviet Union's new leaders. Here is what he has to say about the future of Yugoslav relations with Russia:

"The common struggle of our peoples from 1941 to the end of the war against the common foe testifies to the great truth that our fates are inseparable and that there is much for which we can value and esteem each other. However, dear friends, something unheard of and tragic nevertheless took place, and neither the people of Yugoslavia nor the people of the Soviet Union were responsible for this.

"We were greatly pained, but we believed that the time would come when everything separating us would be overcome and when our friendship would receive a new and still more firm foundation. This time has come, thanks to the Leninist policy of the government and the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union.

"The arrival of Comrades Khrushchev, [Premier Nikolai A.] Bulganin and [Soviet trade boss Anastas I.] Mikoyan and others in Belgrade, the talks with them, the declaration which was drawn up on that occasion, and afterward the courageous and farsighted foreign policy of the collective leadership of the Soviet Union are, in my profound conviction, a guaranty that nothing of the kind will ever happen again between the two countries marching along the path of Marx, Engels, and Lenin."

ALERT IN THE PENTAGON

Tito's game, whatever it is, has shaken the United States. Senators heard Yugoslav exiles testify that Tito has helped Moscow all along. The House banned all aid to Tito unless the President orders that it be continued.

The Pentagon's experts, when United States military aid first went to Yugoslavia, had trouble finding out just how the aid was used. Now, however, several hundred United States military men are moving about in Yugoslavia checking up on United States equipment and providing the United States with valuable intelligence on the whole area.

Yugoslavia's army, these observers report, now has so much United States equipment that it is dependent on a 50-million-dollar flow of parts and supplies from the United States to keep going. Tito, once again, would become completely dependent on Russia if United States aid ended.

Tito himself, in Moscow, coolly said: "Our relations with the United States will not suffer." And Tito's friends say he knows he will be in trouble with his own Yugoslavs if he breaks his United States ties.

In the weeks just ahead, however, American policy makers will be taking another look at Tito. They must decide whether Tito has enough independence left to warrant any United States aid, or whether he is back on Moscow's side after a billion-dollar build-up from the United States.

Supreme Court Bypasses the States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 13, 1956

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, my mail indicates that the people at the grassroots evidence great concern over recent decisions by the United States Supreme Court which appear to be in violation of so-called States rights. I am including a timely article on this subject.

People are becoming wary of more and more concentration of Federal power in Washington at the expense of the individual States. In the coming campaign I intend to discuss this as one of the issues confronting the electorate.

The article follows:

SHRINKING STATES: THEIR SIGNIFICANCE DWINDLES AS WASHINGTON BYPASSES THE LANGUAGE AND INTENT OF THE 10TH AMENDMENT

(By William Henry Chamberlin)

Amid the furor of discussion about the use and abuse of the 5th amendment a growing threat to the 10th amendment has been somewhat obscured.

The 10th amendment, commendably brief and clear like many other clauses of the American Constitution, reads as follows: "The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people."

In other words, the weight is against the assumption by the Federal Government to powers which are not specifically assigned to it. This was entirely in harmony with the spirit of American revolutionary times.

Now it is the fashion to say that one must always be for something, never merely against something. But the Founding Fathers believed that, if the creative energies of individual liberty under law were to be released, a good many don'ts on the exercise of arbitrary authority had to be spelled out.

Take the wording of the first amendment, perhaps the most important of the 10 articles of the Bill of Rights: "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; or abridging the freedom of speech, or of the press; or the right of the people peaceably to assemble and to petition the Government for a redress of grievances."

HANDS OFF

Here Congress is told to keep its legislative hands off such natural rights of free Americans as the profession of religious faith, without favoritism or discrimination, freedom of speech and press, and the right of peaceful assembly and petition for redress of grievances. It is interesting to compare the short, sharp, blunt constitutional assurances of these and other natural rights with the more long-winded wording of the United Nations Covenant on Human Rights, phrased affirmatively, but full of loopholes and evasions.

The 10th amendment is equally clearcut in phrasing and purpose. The United States had won its independence in a war against the abuses of a distant government over which the American colonists exercised no control. There was a strong impulse to erect all possible safeguards against the emergence of a too powerful centralized authority at home. Hence the decision to give the States and the people the benefit of the doubt in regard to powers not specifically assigned to the Federal Government.

However, since the advent of the New Deal the political significance of the State governments and their value as a check on excessive concentration of authority in Washington has been diminishing. A shrewd French political observer, a man old enough to remember the United States as it was at the beginning of the century, reported as one of his impressions on a recent trip that the buildings housing Federal agencies in State capitals often overshadowed the State government offices in size and in the number of persons employed.

One factor in the relative decline of the States has been the growing practice of Federal grants-in-aid to State governments. This is possible, of course, only because the tax intake of the Federal Government has increased in astronomical proportions during the last quarter of a century.

SPEEDING THE DEADLINE

More recently a new factor has contributed further to the decline of the authority, prestige and significance of the States. This is the present trend toward centralism in Supreme Court rulings. The momentous ruling of 1954, forbidding segregation in public schools, overrode a previous assumption that States possess the right to set up such educational systems as are best suited to local conditions.

A recent 6–3 decision of the Supreme Court, upholding the appeal of a Communist organizer named Steve Nelson against conviction under a Pennsylvania State law against sedition, possesses implications that go far beyond the immediate case. Nelson's appeal was based on the contention that the Federal Government, by passing the Smith Act, had preempted the field of antisubservsive legislation, thereby invalidating laws which many States have enacted against sedition.

What the Supreme Court seems to have done by this decision is to stand the 10th amendment on its head. The plain purport of this constitutional provision is that the States and the people possess those powers not specifically vested in the Federal Government. But the Supreme Court, in upholding the Nelson contention, asserts that when "Congress has occupied a field to the exclusion of parallel State legislation • • • the dominant interest of the Federal Government precludes State intervention."

Under this reasoning it would seem that Congress might nullify any State legislation by enacting some Federal law. It might be argued that a Federal subsidy to education would carry with its Federal control of education, which has hitherto always been considered as reserved to the States.

MISUNDERSTOOD INTENTION

It is clear from the wording of the Smith Act that there was no intention on the part of the author to interfere with the execution of State antisedition laws. And Representative SMITH has now introduced a bill designed to reassert the autonomous legislative rights of the States. This bill provides that "no act of Congress shall be construed as indicating an intent on the part of Congress to occupy the field in which such act operates, to the exclusion of all States laws on the subject matter, unless such act contains express provision to that effect."

It would be interesting and valuable to have the scope and meaning of the 10th amendment given a thorough legal test. For it embodies a principle of opposition to undue concentration of power in the central government which is worth remembering—and preserving.

Clinch Has Grounds for Protest

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. IRIS FAIRCLOTH BLITCH
OF GEORGIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 18, 1956

Mrs. BLITCH. Mr. Speaker, the people of Georgia are greatly disturbed over the Navy's proposal to convert 32,000 acres of our best pine forest land into a practice bombing range. We realize that the Navy must have a place to test their skill at bombing and to experiment with new bombing methods, but we also think it would be utter folly for them to convert some of the best income property in Georgia for that purpose. Mr. Turner Rockwell, of the Valdosta Times, has expressed the feelings of our people in an editorial which appeared in his paper under the date of June 14, 1956. Under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herein this very fine editorial entitled "Clinch Has Grounds for Protest":

CLINCH HAS GROUNDS FOR PROTEST

It is understandable that the people of Clinch County are up in arms over the proposal by the Navy to acquire 32,000 acres of land in that county for use as a land bombing range. Many residents of the county have protested vigorously over the proposal and Congresswoman IRIS BLITCH, Representative from this district and a resident of Clinch County, has held conferences with Chairman VINSON, of the House Armed Forces Committee, and Senator RUSSELL, chairman of the Senate Armed Forces Committee.

The tract under consideration is on the rim of the Okefenokee Swamp in an area leased from the Superior Pine Products Co. by the St. Regis Paper Co.

State Representative Downing Musgrove made the following comment: "It looks like a shame to take an area that produces a pine tree faster than any other area in the world and convert it into a bombing range when we've got oceans and all throughout the United States deserts, swamps, and other waste land that could be used."

Aside from the loss of production of valuable pine timber that would be involved, there is grave danger that removing this valuable tract from the tax books would seriously lessen the county's income, thereby endangering the schools and other necessary county services.

Of the 510,000 acres in Clinch County, 496,812 are in forest and the great part of the county's tax income must come from timberlands. Undoubtedly the removing of this large acreage would reduce the tax income of the county.

Another protest is based on the ground that the bombing could drive all wild game from the area and would probably drive game from the surrounding land.

Game and conservation officials have already registered a protest in Washington.

A sum of $2,267,000 has been authorized for land purchase for a bombing range. The committees headed by Representative VINSON and Senator RUSSELL must give approval to any site that is purchased for a range.

The committee chairmen have said that there will be public hearings on the proposal before there is any definite action.

The people of Clinch County do not want to interfere with any legitimate plans for making the country's defense adequate. However, they feel that since the Government already owns large acreage in north Florida and elsewhere that could be utilized for a bombing range it would be unfair for their county to take over this acreage.

This seems to be a case of where the Government has not given sufficient study to proposed action. Surely there is other land available which would not seriously cripple the finances of the county where it may be located.

The Clinch County protest is based on pretty solid ground.

Mr. Speaker, at this point I would also like to include two articles which appeared on the front page of the Clinch County News under date of June 15, 1956. The first is entitled "Protests Made Against 32,000-Acre Bomb Range" and the second is an editorial entitled "It's Time To Protest":

PROTEST MADE AGAINST 32,000-ACRE BOMB RANGE

Clinch County officials Tuesday expressed alarm and indignation at a Navy proposal to acquire 32,000 acres of the county's choice pine land for a bombing range.

The tract is on the rim of the great Okefenokee Swamp in an area now leased by the St. Regis Paper Co. from Superior Pine Products Co. It is described as the finest pine land in the world.

"It looks like a shame," said State Representative Downing Musgrove, "to take an area that reproduces a pine tree faster than any other area in the world and convert it into a bombing range when we've got oceans and all throughout the United States deserts, swamps, and other waste land that could be used."

Musgrove and Iverson Huxford, county school superintendent, said they are alarmed that the taking over of the taxable land by a nontaxpaying Government agency might seriously cripple county revenues. Huxford said he particularly feared that the schools might suffer from dwindling funds.

Clinch is second only to neighboring Ware County in timber area. Of its 510,080 acres, 496,812 are in forest.

The Government owns all of the some 700 square miles of the adjacent Okefenokee Swamp as a wildlife refuge.

The Clinch officials declared that the game resources would suffer seriously from the bombing range. They said game would be driven completely from not only the 32,000 acres but from surrounding land.

Plans for an official protest were held in abeyance until more complete details of the Navy proposals are received.

Game and conservation officials already have registered a protest in Washington, where the Navy proposal was first disclosed.

Congresswoman IRIS BLITCH said Tuesday she will oppose the Navy plan.

Mrs. BLITCH said she has conferred with Chairman VINSON, Democrat, of Georgia, of the House Armed Services Committee, and Chairman RUSSELL, Democrat, of Georgia, of the Senate Armed Services Committee, in regard to the proposal.

Both committees will have to approve the site. They have authorized $2,267,000 for land purchase for a range. VINSON said his committee will schedule a public hearing shortly on a site.

IT'S TIME TO PROTEST

There comes a time when everybody should rise up to protest something that is detrimental to the whole community. Such a time is at hand. The United States Navy wants to take over some 52,000 acres of choice Clinch County pine-growing forest land for use—of all things—as a live bombing area.

Mostly involved in this are 32,000 acres of Superior Pine Products Co., W. M. Oettmeier, president; this tract under lease to St. Regis Paper Co. Other lands, probably 20,000 acres to the north, nearer Homerville, are reportedly proposed for navigation purposes.

Mr. Oettmeier says that his company and St. Regis are opposed to the plan. He and Albert Ernest, of St. Regis, have been to Washington. Senator RICHARD RUSSELL and Congressman CARL VINSON, chairmen of Senate and House Armed Services Committees, respectively, along with Congresswoman IRIS BLITCH, are fighting the plan. The county seems 100 percent opposed.

Clinch County cannot afford to lose 52,000 acres of land. Employment, families, timber production, tax support of schools, roads, hospital, etc., will be lost, not to mention the loss of our beloved wildlife.

As Bill Oettmeier says, the Government already owns nearly 1 million acres in this immediate area. As State Representative Downing Musgrove says, there are swamps, deserts, oceans, suitable for live bombing. As the Atlanta Journal says, the Government owns in Nevada alone 46 million acres of the sun-baked desert. It seems fantastic to use Clinch County, the pine center of the South, for such a purpose. We do not know what live bombing holds for us, either now or in the atomic future.

Needed now is the active opposition of Clinch County people and their friends. A few people and officials by themselves cannot stop the United States Navy. Ware and Lowndes citizens, newspapers, wildlife officials oppose it. The Atlanta newspapers oppose it. But most effective could be the letters and telegrams of Clinch County people, sent to Senator RICHARD RUSSELL, Congressman CARL VINSON, Congresswoman IRIS BLITCH, Washington, D. C. Let us express our support of them in their efforts to represent us in this important matter.

Mr. Speaker, also included is an editorial which appeared in the Atlanta Journal under date of June 14, 1956, entitled "Navy Idea Bad for Georgia":

A United States Navy proposal to convert 32,000 acres of choice Clinch County forest land into a bombing range is fantastic. Not another spot in the country can grow a pine tree finer or faster than the verdant area which the Navy seeks to destroy.

Congresswoman IRIS BLITCH, in opposing the Navy's plans, should point out the vast and almost worthless tracts of land which stand vacant and available in the far west.

In Nevada alone, the Government owns more than 46 million acres of desert which do nothing except bake under the sun. New Mexico has more than 13 million public-owned acres which stand empty; Arizona has almost as many.

A bomb is not a discriminating object. It finds a desert as congenial as a forest, and would certainly make no distinction between the far west and Georgia.

The Government reports with alarm every year that forests are rapidly disappearing. The Navy can expect little thanks from anybody for helping to speed the process.

Petition of Residents of Sylacauga, Ala.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH A. ROBERTS
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 18, 1956

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have the attached statement inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. All signers of this petition are bona fide residents of the Fourth District of Alabama, living at Sylacauga, Talladega County, Ala.:

To Our Senators and Representatives in Congress:

We, the undersigned, respectfully petition you to exercise the proper discretion vested in you by passing legislation to prohibit the transportation of alcoholic beverage advertising in interstate commerce and its broadcasting over the air, a practice which nullifies the rights of States under the 21st amendment to control the sale of such beverages.

At a time when 1 out of 10 drinkers is becoming an alcoholic, there should be no encouragement to increase the use of such beverages. Children and youth are being misled to consider them harmless, especially by the powerful audio and visual suggestions of radio and television.

Hugh Bazemore, Jr., Mrs. J. O. Davis, Mrs. Lola Griggle, Mr. and Mrs. J. B. Bentley, Louise Walton, Mrs. Pearl Walton, Agnes Bazemore, French Thompson, Dr. and Mrs. Nancy Slay, Mrs. Audrie Fowler, Mrs. G. W. Carden, Mrs. Arlene Sauls, Mrs. James B. Allen, Rev. Homer M. Sauls, Mrs. Pernie Pearce, Mrs. Madge M. Brewer, J. R. Brewer, Mrs. Jack Livingston, Mrs. Annie Mal Jarrett, Mr. and Mrs. P. H. Bazemore, Mr. Clyde Perkins, Mrs. Betty Perkins, Mr. Willis Moore, Jr., Mr. and Mrs. D. H. Best, Sylacauga, Ala.

Status of Forces Agreements

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK T. BOW
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 14, 1956

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, one of our servicemen has written me a letter which I am proud to read to the House. I think it is an effective reply to those who in their zeal to support the status of forces agreements throw a cloud of suspicion over he morals and activities of our servicemen abroad. It also answers the claim that asserting our rights would mean losing our bases or installations in the country concerned. The letter follows:

DEAR MR. BOW: As a serviceman stationed in an overseas theater, I read with interest an article in the June 1 issue of Stars and Stripes newspaper, dealing with your efforts to end the provision which allows certain foreign governments to prosecute off-base, off-duty servicemen.

I have been at Wheelus Air Force Base for about 6 months and I have talked with many persons, civilian and military, both United States and foreign nationals. Most of these people agree that American servicemen are, on the whole, fine ambassadors of good will. Libyan-American relations are cordial, with few differences. That is the way it should be.

These same people also agree that American servicemen should not be liable to arrest or prosecution by governments in whose countries they serve. After all, we are here not only for our own benefit, but also for the defense of the particular country in which we serve. Furthermore, any idea that, should the United States deny right of arrest to the various countries, we would lose a particular base in said country, is completely wrong.

American servicemen need no iron hand, wielded by a foreign government, to act like respectable citizens from a great nation completing tours of duty abroad.

Here at Wheelus we have strong, frequent character guidance lectures given by chaplains, which lectures are doing a fine job in helping Americans realize their responsibilities on foreign soil. With such lectures and guidance we cannot go wrong.

I hope this will encourage and help you and other broad-minded Congressmen to enact proper legislation regarding American servicemen's rights overseas.

P. S.—I might add that erring United States personnel should be tried, judged, and punished by United States military court system for alleged crimes committed off base during off-duty hours.

The Mystery of a War Hero

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 21, 1956

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend the following item to the attention of our colleagues. It appeared in the May 1956 issue of the ADL Bulletin:

THE MYSTERY OF A WAR HERO

(By Joseph L. Lichten)

Twelve years ago, a 32-year-old businessman departed his native Sweden on a wartime mission. On July 9, 1944, he arrived in Nazi-controlled Budapest. He bore credentials as an attaché of the Swedish embassy. But diplomacy was not his business.

His name was Raoul Wallenberg.

His task was incredible and gigantic; as brazen as it was courageous. He had been selected to rescue as many of Hungary's hapless Jews (there were 300,000 in Budapest alone) as his ingenuity and his immunity as the citizen of a neutral nation could manage.

Raoul Wallenburg had come in haste. The free world was aware that for several months the Nazi movement in Hungary had been planning systematic genocide, the same inhuman plan of forced deportations and mass liquidations that had destroyed the Jewish community of Poland. The horrors and tortures that had befallen Jews in the ghettos of Warsaw, Lodz, and Cracow were now to descend on Hungary.

Each week the list of deportees ran into the hundreds. Many of the victims never reached the concentration camps they were marked for; they died of hunger or dysentery, or frantically killed themselves, on the way. Appeals to Admiral Horthy, the Hungarian regent, that he force a halt to the butchery had little effect. The pleas of the Pope, of Sweden's King Gustav and other neutral leaders, were spurned. A warning from President Franklin D. Roosevelt was ignored. Mass roundups were routine incidents in Hungary on the day Raoul Wallenberg arrived there.

Wallenberg was a Christian gentleman, scion of a distinguished Swedish family. His father was a well-known banker; his grandfather had been an ambassador to Turkey and Japan. Raoul had studied architecture in the United States. But he returned to Sweden after his schooling to establish himself successfully in the export-import field.

He knew little about Jews, less about Jewish affairs. Before the war he had visited Palestine, more as a tourist, however, than as an observer of political or social developments. The rescue of Hungary's Jews had been planned by Swedish and American authorities in Stockholm. Wallenberg had been asked to lead the undertaking; he accepted promptly. He was a bachelor and—to repeat— a Christian in the finest tradition.

Raoul Wallenberg proved his mettle at once. To combat the mass deportation he began rescue operations on an equally wholesale, and completely unheard of, scale. He started by recruiting an embassy staff. But what a staff! It swelled to 660 persons and their families—most of whom were Jews who, for various reasons, had been accorded priority status in his rescue plan. The priority non-Jews whom Wallenberg similarly gathered into his fold were leaders of Hungary's anti-Nazi underground.

As members of a legation, the new "Swedish officials" found immediate safety in their diplomatic status. The success of this happy fraud prompted Wallenberg to play it to the hilt. Within weeks he was issuing Swedish passports to anybody and everybody who could, in the remotest way, show some prior contact with Sweden. These passports saved hundreds more.

But thousands were being deported. So Wallenberg next challenged the Nazi tormentors by designing a "protective passport" which he had printed in Sweden's colors and which bore the embassy's seal and signature. This document bluntly affirmed that its holder was under the protection of the King of Sweden—a broad hint to Hungarian officials that a passport owner was not to be molested in any way!

Hungarian Nazis, frustrated and angry, nonetheless respected the hint. They were fearful to do otherwise. By that time, the war was going badly for Hitler and Wallenberg had a disturbing habit of reminding them of a day of reckoning.

The protective passport trick was used widely. Soon the Swedish Red Cross in Budapest began distributing them, as did the embassies of several neutral nations and the Papal Nuncio. Finally, several underground groups went to work circulating forged copies. Within weeks the number of protective passports mounted of tens of thousands.

The Nazis tried hard to invalidate the forgeries. The Gestapo visited Wallenberg regularly, bringing him obvious forgeries to examine. Wallenberg studied them carefully. But his answer was always the same. "They're authentic," he insisted.

Wallenberg carried his rescue operations inside the councils of the enemy. He planted agents, with both the Hungarian police and the Gestapo. In that way he sometimes got his hands on a copy of the daily list of Jews placed under arrest. Promptly, Wallenberg prepared protective passports for them, personally bringing the documents to deportation headquarters. There he forced the authorities to give up a large part, if not all, of the imprisoned group.

Wallenberg acted with utter fearlessness in his confrontations with the Nazis. His personal heroism was reflected in the peristent ways in which he harassed their rule. But always he maintained the correct, dignified demeanor of the diplomat. Nazi transport commanders, assigned to deliver truckloads of Jews to nearby concentration camps, often were dismayed to find that Wallenberg had attached himself to their motor caravans. He rode in a Red Cross truck which bore food, medicine and clothing for the Jewish victims. With Swiss legation workers and Roman Catholic nuns to assist him on these mercy errands, Wallenberg became a common sight on the dusty roads, leading out of Budapest.

The Nazis were afraid to harm him in public. But they marked him for murder and Wallenberg found himself in all sorts of freak accidents. He was threatened, shot at, run down by army tanks and trucks. He always escaped—to persist with his urgent mission.

When Hungary's pro-Naxi Szalasi government, eager to facilitate the mass deportations, tried thwarting Wallenberg and the underground by ordering a 10-day blockade of Jews, Wallenberg quietly fought back by organizing a Jewish commando group. The commandos successfully infiltrated the blockade to bring food and supplies to the embattled Jewish families. Later, with the assistance of the Swedish Red Cross and underground Zionist groups, Wallenberg established several children's centers which he insisted were Red Cross operations protected by Sweden's international immunity. In that way he saved at least 8,000 children from certain death.

Again, when Budapest Jews were ordered to enter a newly created ghetto, Wallenberg popped up with 32 large houses which he rented and placed under Swedish immunity. He filled the houses with thousands of Jews. Other neutral embassies followed his example, creating among themselves an international ghetto, probably the only one in history.

By December, 6 months after Wallenberg's arrival in the city, Russian troops had begun their siege of Budapest. In frenzied retaliation, the Arrow Cross movement, Hungary's Nazi gang, planned a mass murder of the remaining Jews. Wallenberg learned of it and quickly intervened by reminding the Wehrmacht chief, General Schmidthueber, of the death penalty that would befall a German commander who allowed a pogrom of this sort. The general understood perfectly; he ordered his troops to prevent any possible massacre.

On January 13, 1945, 4 days before Soviet troops were to seize full control of Budapest, Wallenberg, decided to seek out their military chiefs for assistance in rescuing Jews still trapped in the ghetto. He was referred to a Major Demchenko and, to his surprise, was placed under guard. Wallenberg reappeared at his office 4 days later, in the wake of the liberating troops. Three Russian soldiers accompanied him. "I am going to see Marshal Malinovsky (the Soviet commander)," Wallenberg informed his coworkers. He added, somewhat ruefully, "I don't know whether I am going as a prisoner or as a guest."

Raoul Wallenberg left the office, the three armed soldiers with him. He has not been heard of since.

If Wallenberg is still alive he is probably unaware that the thousands of families he rescued and protected, in their gratitude, built a monument in his honor; that a pavilion of Budapest's Jewish Central Hospital is now called Wallenberg Building; that a busy avenue similarly bears his name. Nor is it likely that Wallenberg knows of the petition signed by 1,600,000 Swedish citizens demanding an explanation of his fate, or that Sweden's Prime Minister, on a recent visit to the Kremlin, kept posing an embarrassing question to his Soviet hosts: "What hapenned to Raoul Wallenberg?"

The Communists are uncommunicative about it. Shortly after Wallenberg's sudden disappearance, Russian officials reported that he was "under the protection of the Russian army." Since then, however, they refuse to acknowledge that they ever heard of him.

In 1916, a report filtered through the Iron Curtain that Wallenberg was in a Ukrainian prison camp. Later, he was reported a prisoner in the most dreaded MVD camp in Moscow. And last year, several German prisoners of war, returning from Russia, recalled a "Raoul Wilborg, a Swedish Red Cross officer," as an intern at a camp in Tayshed in central Asia. "This Wilborg," they said, "was a tuberculosis case."

None of these rumors has been corroborated. To all inquiries, the Soviet shrug and say nothing. Thus, the fate of Raoul Wallenberg, one of war's noblest heroes, is yet to be answered for.

The Communist Inquiry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS E. WALTER
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 18, 1956

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of June 6, 1956:

THE COMMUNIST INQUIRY

A subcommittee of the House Un-American Activities Committee has been conducting hearings in St. Louis since the first of the week. It is now possible to summarize and appraise its work thus far.

The first thing to recognize is that the investigative powers of Congress are very broad and justifiedly so. Time and again Congress has used its authority to inquire into situations and conditions which urgently needed ventilation in the public interest. There can be no question about the power of a congressional committee to dig into areas of subversive activity. Communist infiltration into defense industry in St. Louis is a proper subject of governmental investigation. Indeed the Government would be grossly derelict if it did not ferret out efforts to undermine the national security.

A second fact to note is that this subcommittee has conducted itself for the most part in a generally quiet and dignified manner. The Tuesday afternoon session did produce a sharp rebuke from the chairman, Representative MOULDER, of Missouri, when Douglas MacLeod, lawyer for one of the summoned witnesses, called for an apology from the subcommittee.

But there has been little to suggest the shouting and recrimination that characterized the McCarthy subcommittee of the Senate. Most of the sessions, held in the courtroom of United States Judge Harper, have been as orderly as a Federal trial. Credit for this goes not only to the chairman, but also to his colleagues, Representatives SCHERER, of Ohio, and FRAZIER, of Tennessee, and the subcommittee counsel, Frank S. Tavenner, Jr.

It might have been expected that a subcommittee so exemplary in its own conduct would enjoy the cooperation of the witnesses subpenaed and questioned. This has not been so. Very few questions have been answered. Witness after witness has refused to reply on the grounds that his answer might incriminate him. Up to now this has handicapped the subcommittee in its effort to elicit information from those summoned to testify.

A witness is within his rights in refusing to answer if he thinks that what he would say would incriminate him. The Bill of Rights protects a person from being forced to present testimony against himself. The reason is the sound one that in trials it is up to the prosecuting officials to gather evidence on which to base their case. Were it otherwise the State would have an enormous power of coercion over the individual; and law in a free society should protect the individual from such excessive power.

Why so many St. Louisans invoked the fifth amendment has not been explained. Pamphlets distributed in advance of the hearings by a group of those subpenaed appealed to all witnesses to defy the subcommittee. This suggests a pattern of organized noncooperation. Yet even if this is the fact, there may be some instances in which the fifth amendment's protection was invoked fairly and not with intent to abuse a historic right of citizens.

It is for this reason that the Bar Association of St. Louis, greatly to its credit, took steps in advance to help any summoned person obtain legal assistance. Chairman MOULDER showed his appreciation of the need for professional legal advice for each witness when he complimented the St. Louis bar for acting voluntarily to arrange for counsel for those summoned but unable to hire counsel. As Mr. MOULDER said, the appearance of any lawyer with a witness who himself could not obtain counsel "should not in itself be taken as any disparagement against the lawyer for doing so."

But even if a pattern of refusing to answer questions impedes the work of the subcommittee, the sessions ought not to be without their gains. From the questioning it is clear that some with Communist sympathies worked their way into labor unions and that others got into defense industries while some obtained employment as teachers.

As so often stated in these columns, the Post-Dispatch sees in communism a worldwide conspiracy in which no loyal American would now have a part, and in which none should have had a part in the postwar era—certainly not since the outbreak of the Korean war. Many persons who entered the Communist Party by honest mistake withdrew long before communism's armed aggression across the 38th parallel.

Among the men who erred in judgment, particular credit goes to those who have openly confessed their mistake and have since led exemplary and patriotic lives. Society has an obligation to be fair with them and not to punish them for their honesty. Mr. MOULDER stated a fact when he said that in the depression years there were "innocent and loyal" Americans who became "frustrated with economic conditions" and "in seeking a solution to national unemployment and economic problems, were misguided into the Communist Party."

The problem of tracking down subversive activities would be greatly simplified if all those who made honest mistakes were to remove the cloud of suspicion and doubt by full and free testimony. It is to be hoped the Moulder subcommittee can still contribute to that desirable end.

Straight Talk About Foreign Aid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 13, 1956

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, Farm and Ranch magazine for June contains an editorial by Tom Anderson entitled "Straight Talk." He discusses the foreign aid program. I commend this editorial to the attention of the House membership:

"We've got billions to give away all over the world—so they can afford to give some to me—charity begins at home."

We've gotten many letters like that—from farmers who think 100 percent parity should come before foreign aid; from veterans who think there should be a lifetime monetary reward for service to country; and from others who claim that, when the Government gravy bowl is running over, why should they have a fork when foreigners are using a spoon?

What is foreign aid? What part charity, what part security, what part defense? It

has been called everything from Marshall plan to putting spats on cannibals.

Cannibals like those in the cartoon in the New Yorker: They were sitting in a circle in a thatched hut. The leader said, "Now, here's the plan. We let word out that we're in a state of political ferment. Russia smells an opportunity and makes overtures. The West gets worried. They make overtures. Russia asks to send cultural ambassadors, and we let them. The West asks for equal representation, and we invite them. Then, when we've got them all here, we eat them."

In 1945 we were stronger than the world combined. Russia was licking her wounds and was no match for us. Since then the Soviet Union and Communist China have gobbled up the largest area of land and the largest number of people ever controlled by one power. And we handed it to 'em.

Since 1945 we have spent, invested, or poured down the international rathole over $55 billion and authorized over $20 billion more which we haven't yet found a way to spend. Thirty-four agencies of the Government have been ladling it out to 55 countries, through 2,000 different projects. And yet we've lost ground. The Communist conspiracy has captured a third of the world and now threatens to break us, enslave us, and exterminate us.

TITO TEETERED BACK, NATURALLY

Tito teetered back. Your leaders gave the Yugoslav Communist butcher over a billion dollars of your money trying to buy him. And new he's back in the Russian camp and some day the weapons we gave him may be killing American boys.

We gave $11 billion to Russia—since the Revolution our greatest enemy. We made her, not a friend, but the second greatest world power. We made her the monster which can possibly destroy us.

Our great and good friend and ally, jolly old England, has—as Senator BYRD pointed out—used our aid to reduce her taxes. But our taxes go up constantly. In Denmark our economic aid was used to pay off the public debt. Our debt, over $275 billion, is at an all-time high.

Are we making friends—or competitors? We've already practically Point-Foured ourselves out of the world cotton market. Now that the backward nations have the know-how, the land and millions of serfs, why should they buy cotton from us? They can produce it cheaper.

It's not that collective defense is wrong. Nor that economic cooperation with other counries is wrong. But it's wrong to pick up nearly all the checks and pay all the tips. It's wrong to be a sucker.

Can we buy security? Are other peoples going to join us if we're attacked because they had a friendly feeling toward us? No. They won't risk atomic annihilation for friendship. If they join America, it'll be because we're strong. Because we're the potential winner. If we waste our substance and go broke through interminable international boondoggling, we'll lose allies, not gain them. If we go broke, Russia will take the world, including the United States.

If we stop this foreign spending we can balance the budget and reduce taxes across the board by 5½ percent. A strong and rich United States of America is a better guaranty of peace. Where, and when, and how do we stop?

Go it alone? No, let's go it together. Dutch treat! Not with any cut-throat we can find, as we did in World War II, and since—but with peoples who understand freedom and democracy, and are willing to spend, work and fight for them, with us.

We should put the lid back on the gravy bowl.

Foreign aid should not be allocated as the President wants, on a 10-year or any other long-range plan. Congress should determine it from year to year, with the knowledge, understanding and approval of the people.

It should not be unconditional aid. We should get value received in return: economic, political, or strategic products or advantages—or harbor rights, air bases.

We should aid friends only. Some Congressmen tried to bar American assistance to any country which ships strategic materials to the Reds. The administration blocked that.

International friendship, like any other friendship, can neither be forced nor bought. It has to be earned. We can't stop communism with dollars. We can stop it with trade, travel and education; with ideals and ideas, written, spoken, and broadcast to the people (not the rulers) of the world.

AUCTIONEER'S CHANT: SOLD TO AMERICAN

What more aid now? Because there's a new deal in Russia.

Russia used to give only to her satellites. Now she's trying to buy friends and allies away from us. It's an auction sale. The "neutrals" are on the block.

Maybe we ought to call the bluff of the neutrals and let 'em go Communist.

The most we've gotten for our billions is not friendship, but neutralism. We're at an all-time low in global goodwill. This is a struggle for the world. A struggle between nations who believe and practice freedom of the individual against those who believe the state is God and the individual is nothing.

Dante said, "The hottest fires of hell are reserved for those who, in a period of moral crisis, remain neutral."

Maybe we ought to let the neutrals go to hell.

Mr. Nehru, Have You Heard This One?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. IRWIN D. DAVIDSON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 18, 1956

Mr. DAVIDSON. Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct the attention of this House to an incident that, I believe, sheds considerable light on the problem of our relationships with some nations that claim a neutral status in the present world situation.

This incident involves a movie, With These Hands, produced by the International Ladies' Garment Workers' Union, depicting in semidocumentary form the history and purposes of that union. This movie, translated into 11 languages, has been shown to millions of working people around the world, introducing them to the functioning of an American trade union.

Among the other nations in which this movie was shown was the vast and great country of India, whose Prime Minister, Jawaharlal Nehru, will shortly be visiting our country. Recently, this movie came up for regular review by the censors in India. When it did, the Indian censors insisted that the United States agency showing the film remove a sequence describing the fight of the ILGWU against Communist attempts to dominate that union in the 1920's. The United States Government refused to conform with this request for censorship.

The executive council of the American Federation of Labor–Congress of Industrial Organizations has called upon the Indian Government to act like a free democracy instead of a satellite nation and has called upon the United States State Department to intervene actively to lift the censorship on the ILGWU film.

I wish to go on record as praising our Government for its forthright resistance to censorship in this matter. I also wish to insert in the RECORD the comments of Mr. David Dubinsky, president of the ILGWU, and several newspaper editorials on this matter, with the express hope that the sentiments of our people may be brought to the attention of Mr. Nehru, so he may understand our shock and protest against these attempts to suppress the truth about the history of an American union simply because it may injure the sensitivities of the rulers of the Soviet Union.

The people of India are entitled to know the truth about the way American trade unions view Communists. The Government of India should not conceal this truth because the Communist leaders do not like it.

[From the New York Times of June 3, 1956]

INDIA CENSOR HALTS A UNITED STATES LABOR FILM

NEW DELHI, INDIA, May 30.—The United States has withdrawn a popular labor film from India because of the censor's orders to cut out the story of a union's fight against communism.

The film, With These Hands, was produced by the International Ladies Garment Workers Union. Through the life of one dressmaker it traces the fight against sweatshops and records the growth of the union.

About 5 years ago the United States Information Service (now Information Agency) decided to show the film in India. It was approved by Indian censors and since then has been shown to schools and unions, at conventions and exhibitions and in towns and villages throughout the country.

The censorship board's license for the film expired a couple of months ago and the picture was entered for a new permit. This time the Government-appointed censorship board demanded the deletion of 28 lines, all of them having to do with the union's fight against Communists who tried to take over the ILGWU in the late twenties.

The cuts apparently were ordered because the censors thought the anti-Communist dialogue might be offensive to the Russians. Rather than show a censored version, the United States agency has withdrawn the film from circulation.

STATEMENT BY DAVID DUBINSKY, PRESIDENT, INTERNATIONAL LADIES GARMENT WORKERS UNION, AFL–CIO, JUNE 4, 1956

After 5 years of enthusiastic acclaim by Hindu labor, the ILGWU film With These Hands, has been ordered banned throughout India by the New Delhi government.

With These Hands has been translated into 11 languages. Though some of the scenes depicted in the film have not met with the approval of the American Government, though some of our reactionary legislators have objected to its being shown overseas because it is prolabor, the USIA has never attempted to censor it. Millions of people in the free world have hailed this film.

Hitherto, this film has been outlawed only behind the Iron Curtain. It is unbelievable that the democratic Government of India should now also outlaw a film showing the achievements of the workers in the American

ladies garment industry through their free trade unions and through the democratic process.

We cannot see why the Government of India should now rule that the showing of such a film is "likely to be looked upon as derogatory to itself." We are amazed that any sovereign democratic government can find that such a tribute to democracy will serve to arouse disrespect of another foreign country. We are told that one of the reasons for the ban is that the film depicts Communist efforts to capture our union. This is an unchallengeable fact of history.

We cannot see why the Government of India should after 5 years of approval now decide to ban a film on this score. It is incredible to us that the authorities of India should join the Kremlin in objecting to the facts of history and in rewriting history. No free country can institute censorship at home for fear that it is liable to embarrass relations with any foreign government.

The issues involved in this unfortunate action by the Indian Government are of the highest concern to the American labor movement and to the International Free Trade Union movement.

While I applaud the refusal of the USIA to permit censorship of our film, I strongly urge the State Department to instruct the American Embassy in India to take steps to secure a correction of this unwarranted censorship which is detrimental to the cause of democracy and derogatory to the good name of the freedom-loving people of India.

[From the New York Times of June 6, 1956]

With These Hands, a popular film produced by the International Ladies Garment Workers Union, has been shown through the United States Information Agency in schools, union meetings, conventions, and other gatherings in towns and villages throughout India for the past 5 years. The film pictures the true, and very American, history of the union's successful fight against the sweatshops of earlier days and of its many other activities to improve conditions for its members—a saga told through the life of a typical New York dressmaker. Among its most telling sequences are those which show the struggle of Communists to control the union and how they have been effectively thrown out.

The Government-appointed Indian Censorship Board's license of the film recently expired. It is reported this board will not renew it unless these sequences are cut out. This action is said to be based on a rule against foreign films "likely to arouse disrespect of * * * or liable to embarrass" the Government's "relations with, any foreign government." In one of the sequences communism is called "a Moscow creation."

This action raises several leading questions. What has happened after 5 years of the film's licensed showing, to make this rule suddenly apply? Does this mean that efforts of Indian unions to resist Communist control will now embarrass their own government? This is hard to believe in view of Nehru's tough stand in the past against Communist subversion.

The episode is most unfortunate. It is embarrassing to the United States Government. The USIA has, of course, refused to submit to any such censorship and has withdrawn the film from further circulation. It should also embarrass the Government of India. Only in Iron Curtain countries has this film been outlawed. Finally, it is too bad that the workers of India are to be deprived of so good an example of how free unions function in a free economy. But censors have been known before to make rulings that reffect neither national policy nor enlightened public opinion. We hope this is merely another such—one subject to prompt reversal.

[From the New York Post of June 6, 1956]

KNOW-NOTHINGISM IN INDIA

For 5 years the United States Information Agency has been presenting a film in India (and other places) called With These Hands. It is a dramatic chronicle of the rise and growth of the International Ladies Garment Workers Union, and has won wide popularity among Indian audiences.

Recently the film came up for renewal of its censorship certificate; India's censors thereupon abruptly demanded elimination of a sequence describing the ILG's successful battle against Communist infiltration of the union.

Dispatches from Indian say this action was based on the ground that the sequence might "embarrass relations" between India and Moscow. The excuse is as indefensible as it is foolish. We doubt that Mr. Khrushchev's primary concern at the moment is the treatment accorded American Communists on India's screens.

In any case, such censorship is intolerable. India's leaders have often decried the hysteria and suppression that accompanied the age of McCarythyism here. America has had its bad hours; but surely this performance of India's censors is as grotesque as any manifestation of the American jitters. It is, one might say, McCarythyism in reverse.

When India's censors try to edit American labor history to placate the Kremlin, they discredit themselves, give new ammunition to India's critics in the free world and undermine her status in the world community. This isn't honest "neutralism;" this is spineless submission to Moscow.

The USIA is plainly justified in refusing to accept the censor's decree, and Prime Minister Nehru ought to be heard from on the subject. He would not be reluctant to condemn American censors if they displayed a comparable brand of know-nothingism.

Senior Class at Newark Central School Favors 18-Year-Old Vote

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH B. KEATING

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 14, 1956

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, in the 83d Congress and again in this Congress, I have sponsored the administration's bill which would lower the voting age to 18. I have asked the chairman of the Judiciary Committee for hearings on this vital matter so that we may have some action in this session of Congress. Our 18-year-olds are capable and ready to vote, and I hope this Congress will grant them that precious right and privilege.

Recently I received in the mail a series of letters from members of the senior class of Newark Central School, in Newark, N. Y. As part of their study of American history, they have discussed the possibility of the 18-year-old vote and have written me their opinions.

The letters from these young people, including those who oppose lowering the voting age, are the best argument yet I have seen in favor of that proposition. The maturity, clarity, and cogency of their arguments on both sides indicate they are prepared to assume that crucial weapon of democracy.

The teachers at Newark Central School who encouraged this project are to be commended for their initiative and wise judgment in undertaking this very worthwhile study, and the students are to be congratulated for presenting their opinions in such fine fashion.

I think it would benefit all Members of this body to study what they have written me. Under leave to extend my remarks, I am inserting portions of the letters I have received from members of the senior class of Newark Central School:

I know that my classmates and other 18-year-olds, are capable of voting. The student's education today encompasses more fields and gives him a broader outlook on such subjects as politics. He reads the newspaper, looks at television, and listens to the radio. Each of these vehicles of thought conveys different opinions concerning politics to the observant and ever-questioning 18-year-old.—Yolanda Andrew.

High school seniors and juniors at 18 years of age are generally better equipped to vote intelligently than most people at 21 who have not pursued their education. The people in this latter group have usually been decidedly removed from national issues ever since they were graduated from high school. Eighteen-year-olds are often required to pay taxes to both the State and Federal governments. It seems only natural that they should be represented in the Government by which they are being taxed. I feel certain that were 18-year-olds allowed to vote, they would take a new interest in their government and would accept their new privilege and responsibility with intelligence.—Robert Beales.

The high school graduates today are better informed on current affairs than many older persons. I also believe that the 18-year-old person has become mature enough to accept the responsibilities of the 21-year-old. When we wait until we are 21 to vote we will have forgotten some of the essentials we need to know to become a good voter.—Marie Benne.

Most of those in favor of 18-year-olds voting use the reasoning that if they are old enough to fight for their country they should have the right to vote. This may be true, but just because a boy is physically old enough to fight, it does not mean that he mentally old enough to vote.—Sandra Blair.

I definitely feel that the average 18-year-old is mature and quite capable of taking over the responsibility of voting. It is true that today's voter needs much preparation to vote wisely. I think we are getting this background preparation in our classes at school.—Shirley J. Blankenberg.

The time has now come when teenagers are maturing much faster. I believe this is due to education and world in which we live today. The 18-year-old of today is older than the 18-year-old of yesterday. Therefore, people of this age feel they are mature enough and capable enough to vote. Teenagers of today are taking more responsibility than they have in the past, their education is better, and they start to support themselves at a much earlier age. Through education the teenager learns of his government and its functions and learns what voting really is and what it means to himself and his country.—Patricia A. Boynton.

Eighteen-year-olds should be allowed to vote because by working in class we have kept in close touch with problems of the Nation and the world. Young people would be more interested in government affairs if they knew they could vote at the age of 18. I'm sure 18-year-olds all over would take full responsibility of making wise decisions.—Bernice Bruinix.

I truthfully do not believe that the teenagers want the vote badly enough to work for it. Of course they would accept it as anyone would accept another right. I don't think it would be a drastic disappointment to the average 18-year-old to have wait until 21.—Robert Chamberlin.

The 18-year-old today is mentally fit for voting. He is well informed about world conditions, perhaps even more so than his elders. I also think that any person who is physically fit to fight for his country has also to be mentally fit. If he is mentally fit to safeguard the welfare of his country, why is he not mentally fit to vote?—Diane De Blaese.

It is my personal opinion that we teenagers are capable of voting wisely and enthusiastically and without prejudice. I feel we should be given the power to vote.—Barbara Downey.

I favor having the 18-year-old vote. With the knowledge that we have from study about how our Government runs and how to elect the Government officials, we would be able to vote intelligently. The teenager of today is just as mature as the 21-year-old was when the first voting age law was passed—Diane Franklin.

Eighteen-year-olds should be allowed to vote. We feel certain that because of the great advancement in education we are justly qualified to vote. Since we are well informed and aware of current affairs, political or otherwise, we sense that we are as capable as any person 21 years old or over—Patricia Hines.

I feel that * * * you should vote in favor of the lower age requirement * * * the 18-year-old upon graduating has many responsibilities and duties thrust upon him, but without certain privileges to accompany these, there is a lack of incentive. For instance, he must pay taxes, but he cannot cast a vote concerning the officials regulating the taxes. I have come to the conclusion, through discussion with older friends, that most people are no better qualified to vote at 21 than at 18. I am certain that young people, on the whole, would be so grateful for this privilege that they would not abuse it. In fact, the knowledge that they can vote at 18 would be a great stimulant toward interest in Government and politics in younger high school children—Lorie Houghton.

Just recently in my American History II class the issue of voting for the 18-year-old came up. Personally, I believe that an 18-year-old person cannot accept the responsibility of voting—Ann Humphrey.

I sincerely feel that a great majority of the 18-year-olds of New York State would be intelligent voters. We who are without the right to vote realize what a privilege it is to be able to vote. If this right were given to us, we would use it conscientiously.—Carole Janto.

I am very much interested in having the minimum voting age lowered to include 18-year-olds.—Ronald Keukelaar.

Many of the older people do not pay too much attention to politics and voting. Many of them have other things to think and be concerned about. If the 18-year-olds could vote they would bring about more interest from the older adults. There would be more discussion and debate in many homes. The younger people would urge more of the adults to get out and vote. We would also show them exactly how important it is to vote. Consequently, there would be more voting all over the country.—Beverly A. Lewis.

I do not feel that the voting age should be lowered. Those who oppose me, and there are many, seem to feel that since we draft 18-year-olds, we ought to allow them to vote. However, it is my belief that the draft and enlistment ages are based largely on physical maturity, while the voting age is based on mental maturity. Most young people reach physical maturity quite some time before they reach full mental maturity.—Mary Livingston.

I believe that the 18-year-olds should have the right to vote because the young people of today have as much knowledge or more knowledge of political affairs than they did when the former 21-year-old law was passed.—David C. Lyon.

I firmly believe that the young person of today is more mature due to more education, more responsibility, and having to have jobs. If a young person accepts all this, he is certainly capable of voting at 18.—Marjorie MacLaren.

I believe the 18-year-old deserves the right to vote. Many of them pay taxes, pay dues to labor unions, and fight for the United States. Why shouldn't they have a voice in choosing its leaders and officials?—Mary Mangan.

I am in favor of 18-year-olds voting as I feel that they are just as capable of voting as adults. I base my opinions on the facts that teen-age boys are called upon to protect their country, and that a large percentage of the 18-year-olds have or are receiving training in the working machinery of politics.—Donald Martens.

I hope that, in the near future, the 18-year-old citizens of this Nation will have the right to vote. I appeal to you to vigorously support the growing campaign for this extension of suffrage.—James R. Renick.

I have decided that 18-year-olds are not qualified to vote. They do not have the experience nor the seriousness required to choose good candidates for government offices. Eighteen-year-olds are too easily swayed to be able to make individual decisions.—Jane Reuter.

Nowadays, many 18-year-olds have responsible jobs and many others attend institutions of higher learning. Some of my classmates will be farmers after graduation. I believe that they should be able to vote since they are affected by the giant farm problem and any legislation concerning that matter. Similarly, those in business are and will be affected by legislation. Should they not have a right to elect the men and women who are to make the laws that they must abide by? Those who go to college will certainly be well-informed and conscientious in performing the great task and privilege of voting.—Nancy Robb.

I am a 17-year-old senior in Newark Central School. Many of my friends have an ardent desire to be able to vote. Some of them work part-time as I do myself and a few of the boys are taking part in the Reserves. These things I have just mentioned plus a great many other activities have helped the teenagers in this community to become good citizens. In our school, fine teachers have prepared us to become worthwhile citizens of our community, our State, and our Nation. Times have changed! Just 20 or 30 years ago, a large majority of the denizens of a town never traveled more than a hundred miles away from home. They certainly never got to the Nation's capital as the senior class of Newark Central School did recently. After we had been taught about the problems of urbanization and segregation, we saw first-hand what these problems were like.—Richard Stevenson.

I believe teen-agers are just as capable of voting wisely in elections as people 21 or even 35.—John Stone.

I believe the voting age should be lowered to 18, because at this day and age the teenager is more capable to handle wisely the responsibility of voting. Today high school graduates are better informed about the affairs of the Nation and world; they are earning their own living or entering the military service at that age.—Elaine Taylor.

If 18-year-olds can fight for their country, I think they should be able to vote for the officials of our Government. Also, most 18-year-olds are in school and are studying about political figures and politics, which makes them better qualified to vote at 18.—Willis Tellier.

In my opinion, I think the 18-year-olds should have the right to participate in voting. They are just as capable and intelligent as the 21-year-olds.—Rosanne Trozzo.

We 18-year-olds are allowed the privilege of dying for our country. Why, then, are we not allowed a better privilege of living for our country? * * * We young people * * * need to get into this (voting) fight, along with our best people, to keep our Nation ever strong.—David Van Boxlaere.

The 18-year-olds, right out of high school, have been informed of the problems of our Nation and of the world. Therefore, our future citizens would not lose their interest if they could vote right away after leaving high school.—Shirley Wright.

The Importance of the Civil Air Patrol

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. VICTOR WICKERSHAM

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 18, 1956

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following speech delivered by me at the Civil Air Patrol congressional dinner recently:

This week the big news splashed in headlines across the country has been the squabble between the Air Force and the Army. Each service has clashed with the other over budgets and appropriations. Army has charged Air Force with demanding more and more from our defense appropriations, and Air Force counters that Army is attacking the established national policy of air-atomic power as our prime deterrent to aggression. Navy, too, has entered the picture through its demands for a larger role in our strategic air power.

This inner-service bickering is a sorry situation and will benefit no one, unless perhaps, the Kremlin. No one blames our Nation's people for their keen interest in such a vital affair, for on the shoulders of our fine services rests the responsibility for safeguarding America's freedom. We in Oklahoma like our rivalry to be friendly, like the rivalry between Oklahoma University and Maryland, Texas, or Notre Dame. I think that the basic concept of air warfare and that of ground warfare clearly indicates the utilization of each force and the scope of their activities. We must recognize that in this air age, our Nation's prime salvation lies in air power. I would call for an end to this arguing, this assassination of morale by charge and countercharge, because all branches are essential. Each branch feels it is the most important. The CAP is important, the Air Force is important. However we must not underestimate the value of the Army, Navy, Marines, and Coast Guard. They are most essential. The national situation is such that it requires the maximum coordinated efforts of the Army, Navy, Air Force, Marines, Coast Guard, and CAP working as a team. I wish to pay tribute to Secretaries Brucker, Thomas, Quarles, Generals Pate, Spaatz, Agee, and Vice Admiral Richmond for the good work they have done. I feel they can work together.

While the conflict between these services has drawn the focus of the news mediums, there is another, a continuing tragic event

taking place within the United States. It is something every bit as dramatic as the daily headlines and if allowed to continue, its ultimate effects will be devastating. You in Civil Air Patrol know all about it. As a matter of fact, everyone does. I am referring to a creeping paralysis which is slowly but surely crippling our military and commercial air potential. This paralysis is the lack of interest shown in aviation and other technical fields by our young people today.

Why then aren't the citizens of this great Nation alarmed at the situation? Are they developing an apathy toward the air age and its problems? Nothing would please the Soviet more than an indifferent attitude on our part toward airpower. Of course, the people I should be talking to about this situation are not here. You are gathered here tonight because you are sincere devotees of airpower and recognize what must be done if we are to survive. And, you are doing it. Of course, I mean educating the young people of our great Nation to this, the air age.

The fact that you undertake this great crusade as volunteers is the marvelous part of your program. Your time and your efforts given so freely to the young members of CAP is truly patriotic—a splendid display of devotion to freedom.

In Russia today, there exists a youth aviation education program quite similar to that of the Civil Air Patrol except for two important facts. Theirs is mandatory. We have freedom. Practically every school in the major cities of Russia includes this program as a part of their curriculum. No volunteers there. In addition, the Soviet makes flight training available to its youth at little or no cost. The result is very clear and alarming to thinking Americans. The U. S. S. R. is far outdistancing us in the number of graduate engineers, technicians, and student pilots. I've been there.

We are told that by 1958 Russia will meet and surpass our Air Force in terms of numbers of aircraft. The race is on for an intercontinental ballistic missile. At this time, there is no indication as to exactly which side will win that race, but in both the aircraft and missile fields we are taking strides to insure an outcome favorable to the United States.

While all of this is taking place, Russia is winning the personnel war, having a lopsided advantage over this country. And let me assure you that the final winner of this race will have all the odds in his favor in any future war. Where, then, does the United States stand in this silent race for survival? All we know is, that in a general sort of a way, we are far behind. Almost all that is being done to maintain any interest in aviation among young people today is being done by CAP and the Active Reserve. While there may be arguments churning up over various phases of Armed Forces activities, there may be no cause for argument over the fact that we must do more to interest the teen-ager in the advantages of a career in aviation.

There was, and not too long ago, a time when a youngster could go to the local airport, walk up to an airplane—touch it and see what it was like, and if he had a dollar saved up he could get the pilot to take him for a ride over his town. Saturdays and Sundays used to find local airports well populated with greasy-faced kids—working on aircraft engines, re-covering wings, and doing the other things necessary to the maintenance of small airplanes. This was their hobby and while they worked at it, they also learned. Most of those lads answered the call when World War II came and served admirably in the war theaters of Europe and the South Pacific. In other words, when the emergency struck, we had a pool of qualified young people who were ready, with a minimum of training, to maintain and fly our planes. We had the advantage of time, too. We were able to train hundreds of thousands of other young men in this relatively new business of flying.

In any future war, we will not be so fortunate. Time will be our enemy rather than our ally. Those who will fly our fighters and bombers will have had previous training, so any victory will be contingent upon having a ready reservoir of trained personnel.

But suppose we do not have a next war to worry about? Why, then, should we bother to develop aviation among our young people? One reason is because the aviation industry is a growing thing. The operation of airlines demands control-tower operators, ramp attendants, stewardesses, weather technicians, mechanics, and hundreds of types of highly specialized personnel. Industry, too, is learning to depend heavily upon the private airplane. Thousands of companies, both large and small, now have their own planes which play a large part in the daily transaction of their business. This trend, too, is demanding an ever-increasing supply of aviation-minded people to fill its needs. It is not enough for us to sit here tonight nodding our heads in agreement that something must be done about the problem. I am very much aware that on the shoulders of CAP rests this staggering burden—this task of motivating our youth, and I say that if any volunteer organization ever earned a "well done," it is the Civil Air Patrol. Your mission is never completed. Your mission grows because the air age plays an increasingly important part in our daily lives through both the commercial and the military airplane.

Even more perplexing is the siphoning off by industry of highly trained technicians from the Armed Forces. Quite literally, the aircraft industry today competes directly with the Air Force, offering attractive salaries and benefits to qualified personnel which no branch of the military can match. This competition will continue until we are able to increase the number of scientists, engineers, and designers available each year at the close of the college term to take responsible positions in industry. When this goal is met, then and only then will our Armed Forces be free from the unhappy position of being in competition with industry. For, as the situation now exists, it is nothing but a vicious circle. Industry draws personnel from the military to produce equipment for the military which is then shorthanded due to a loss of personnel. Besides the work which you members of CAP do in your various assignments let me urge you also to be missionaries. Certainly you contact many young people whose minds are not yet made up about careers which they wish to follow. Here then is an opportunity for you to help in this vital effort. Talk to them—try to make them see the need for more specialized personnel. And, if you are unable to reach them with this appeal, point out the lucrative advantage of such careers, for today specially trained individuals can practically "write their own ticket" as the old cliche goes.

Teen-agers are responsive to leadership. As a result of your efforts to train and orient them in aviation, these young people will grow to understand the importance of both technology and airpower. Never for one moment doubt the value of the work you are doing for these young Americans. The spirit with which you tackle this tremendous task is the same spirit which inspired George Washington at Valley Forge and Gen. Anthony McAuliffe at Bastogne when he responded to the German's surrender demands with the now-famous word "Nuts." This is Americanism at its best.

In this dedicated organization you are dealing with a power more tremendous, more potent than the greatest nuclear device which has been or ever will be perfected—you are directing and developing youth power which today stands as the monumental hope for a bright tomorrow.

Ladies and gentlemen, I am proud of the Civil Air Patrol. I am proud of each and every one of you for your unselfish devotion in helping this great country. You are serving America nobly in your continuing efforts to keep our Nation first in aviation.

The spirit of Civil Air Patrol also represents the finest quality of Americanism.

Flag Day Address Delivered by Mr. August W. Kopke at the Elks Lodge in Oklahoma City, Okla., on June 14, 1956

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN JARMAN

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 18, 1956

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include a Flag Day address which was delivered by Mr. August W. Kopke at the Elks lodge in Oklahoma City, Okla., on June 14, 1956:

Exalted Ruler, member Elks, and fellow Americans, I need not tell you that I'm happy to be with you once again and to have a part in this Flag Day service—a service that is being observed and celebrated in every Elks club in the United States of America and its possessions, and rightly so, for as Elks, we are first of all Americans, with no "ism's" attached.

One hundred and seventy-nine years ago today, nearly two centuries ago, a new flag appeared in the blue of the heavens, and Old Glory became the century plant of human hope in full bloom. It became the full-grown flower of ages fighting for liberty. The gentle breeze with lingering caress kiss the folds of no flag in all the world, that compares with it in beauty or in character. That piece of red, white, and blue bunting represents 5,000 years of struggle upward. Emblazoned on its folds in letters of living light, are the names of our heroic dead, whose wisdom and courage and sacrifices give birth and life to these United States of America, where every citizen is a sovereign, but where no one cares to wear a crown. Its spirit is the spirit of America itself. And so, whatever may be my shortcomings in the direction I'm headed at this moment, there is one thing about which I'm absolutely certain. I may yet become a man without a party or creed, but so long as Old Glory blazes in God's blue firmament, I'll never be a man without a country! I would not exchange my title as a private in the unbroken ranks of America's millions of common men, for all the remaining crowns in Christendom!

And I believe there is room in every patriotic heart that is here tonight, not alone for Old Glory, but for every acre of America's sunny soil, for its every hill on which the morning breaks, for its every vale that cradles the evening shadows, for its every stream whose rippling waters laugh back the enchanting image of a midnight moon!

As an American I am proud of every man of whatever calling or vocation, who by the nobility of his nature or the majesty of his intellect, or who by faithful endeavors and honest toil, has added a single jot or tittle to the fame of this fair land, or who has in any way contributed a single spark that has added new power to the great oar of human progress.

Ever since I first came to the age of understanding at my mother's knee, there has always been something about Old Glory that somehow prompts me to throw aside all reserve, and in the enthusiasm of these patriotic occasions to exclaim with poetic fervor—

"Oh blessed land of America
I pray, God guard thee until time shall cease.
His blessings scatter o'er Thy ways,
And crown thee with His perfect peace."

And well may we call upon God, for my friends, God and this great Nation are and must remain inseparable.

And so tonight, as we celebrate once again the birth of our country's flag, I shall assume that it is not unfitting this presence or this occasion, if we recall briefly the story of our country's life. Let us recount for a moment the lofty deeds of vanished years, the toil and the suffering, the defeats and the victories of heroic men—men who made America great and grand.

First, the story of the great struggle between king and colonists should again be told. A struggle that was waged first for justice, then for freedom. England was then the most powerful of nations—mistress of every sea, and yet our forefathers poor and few, defied that mighty power. Today let us recall the weary marches, the suffering, the defeats, and the victories, but above all, the glories of the Revolution.

We remember all from Concord and Bunker Hill to the frightful winter at Valley Forge, where the infantry of snow and the cavalry of the wild blasts, scattered our meager legions like winter's withered leaves. Then on to the surrender of Cornwallis and Yorktown, cloudless and victorious day. Of the thousands who marched with Washington and Old Glory through those 7 sacred years, not one remains.

Long ago the last have mingled with the earth and nearly all are sleeping now in unmarked graves. Some along New England's rugged hillsides—some beneath the towering pines and weeping willows of the Southland. Some beneath the crumbling marble from which their names have been effaced by the relentless hand of time. But the Nation they builded remains a temple of liberty that no storms may shake—a monument to freedom that passion must never destroy.

Let us remember too, the gallant men who carried Old Glory in the War of 1812, in which we fought for the freedom of the seas—a struggle that was crowned with the victory of New Orleans.

We remember too the heroic men who carried the Flag across the Rio Grande in our war with Mexico—when our great Southwest became united with us, under the protecting folds of the Stars and Stripes.

Peace came again, and the Nation hoped and thought that strife at last was at an end. Our resources were becoming boundless, the future seemed secure. Hardy pioneers had moved to the great West, beneath their ringing strokes the forest disappeared, while on the prairies waved the billowed seas of wheat and corn. Rivers were crossed, the mountains conquered, until the foot of victorious adventure pressed at last the golden sands of the majestic Pacific.

Then came the bitter Civil War. Whatever may be your opinion or mine as to the justice or injustice of either the Union or the southern cause, this fact remains unchallenged.

For centuries Puritan had hated Cavalier. This rank infectious weed took root, not on American soil, but across the sea and develped into the Revolution that sent King Charles to the block and invested Cromwell with more than regal power. Together Puritan and Cavalier had crossed the billowy deep to seek fame and fortune in the New World. Together they had suffered untold hardships that they might have freedom to worship God. Together they fought with Washington through the long years of blood and tears, out of which human liberty was born. Together they laid broad and deep the foundations of this Republic and reared thereon this wondrous super structure we call America. Together they shed their blood in one instinted tide upon its sacred shrine.

But the Puritan was still a Puritan, the Cavalier was still a lord. One had his hard-headed convictions, the other his aristocratic institutions, and neither would yield the right-of-way. This friction was evident even in the early days of the Republic and grew and gathered fire, until it burst at last into a mighty conflagration whose pathetic ashes repose in a million sepulchers.

Let us thank God that fierce baptism of fire is in the past and not yet to come; that the bitter cup can never be pressed to our children's lips; that never again will American meet American in battle shock, for the Civil War removed the last stumbling block from our path of progress, and since that time we have been moving forward with a giant's stride to that high destiny for which the hand fo God has fitted us—the beacon light in a troubled world casting its gleaming rays of hope to all mankind, everywhere.

Let us remember too the brave men who carried the flag in the Spanish-American War. For the first time we seen an army fighting, not to destroy, but to save, not for ourselves but for the others, followed by independence and freedom for both Cuba and the Philippine Islands.

Then came World War I, the memory of which still haunts humanity everywhere. When stricken Liberty called from afar America answered the call and fought as we thought to make the world safe for democracy. When the struggle ended, the now immortal Woodrow Wilson at the almost frantic solicitation of our allies, went to the Paris Peace Conference with a program, worldwide, humanity deep, and heaven high, calling for a thousand years of peace. But these same allies, flushed with a victory that we alone had made possible, seeking only the spoils of conquest, they rejected his major proposals, just as a selfish and materialistic world rejected the plea for a universal brotherthood made by the Prince of Peace, 2,000 years ago. Their answer was Calvary's cross. Woodrow Wilson, too, reached both his Gethsemane and his Calvary. Had we gone into the original League of Nations wholeheartedly, with the position we occupied in the estimation of the world at that time, insisted on, and enforced the provisions it contained, World War II would, in my humble judgment, never have taken place.

As a result of our folly and indifference we have fought two other and far costlier wars, and after more than 10 years of bickering with a ruthless traitor, we are still awaiting the outcome of negotiations, on which will depend the future security, and the very destiny of the entire human race. So we must remain firm—we must remain strong, ready for any emergency, for whether we like it or not, the cold, hard fact remains that world leadership has been conferred on us by the ceaseless march of destiny. The door of lesser responsibility has been closed to us. We cannot sail by old and easier charts. We have to play this part in sheer defense of our own self interest, until the curse of every revolutionary "ism" has been forever lifted from the brow of mankind.

After all, my fellow countrymen, the difference between our America and the rest of the world is really this: America is seeing visions not alone of material wealth but of spiritual instinct—visions of men who know that higher than wealth, higher than the profits of private opportunity is the distinction that comes from serving mankind; and as loyal Americans, as loyal Elks, we will fight for our country and die for this flag so long as reason primes the rifle—while honor draws the sword—and justice breathes its blessings on the standards they uphold.

A husband and wife, long estranged, met one day at the grave of their first born—the child of their youthful strength. Their strife had been biter—love had turned to hate and they had elected to tread life's path apart. They stood, one on either side and looked coldly at each other. And they they looked down upon the little mound that held the broken link with which God had joined their hearts. They knelt down on the cold sod that covered the sacred dust of their dead. They stretched forth their hands across the little grave, each to the other, and the Angel of God washed away all the bitterness of the years with a rain of penitential tears and sent them down life's pathway hand in hand, as in the olden days, when love was Lord of their two lives and their sweet babe was cradled on its mother's breast.

And so on this Flag Day, whatever may have been, or may be our differences, social, political, religious, economic or what not, let us as loyal Americans, kneel beneath the protecting folds of Old Glory, let us stretch forth our hands across the now invisible barriers of a forgotten past, and let the benediction of Almighty God fall upon a people forever reunited, over which the Stars and Stripes shall wave, until time shall be no more. Rise up then glorious freedom's banner and send out these messages of thing: Tell the air not a spot ever sullied thy whiteness. Thy red is not the blush of shame, but the flush of joy. That they blue stands for loyalty and constancy. Tell the dews that wash thee that thou art as pure as they. Say to the night thy stars lead to the morning, and say to the morning, a brighter dawn will arise with healing on its wings. And then, O Glorious Flag, bid the sun pour light on all they folds with double brightness, while thou art bearing round and round a weary and war-torn world, the eternal message of peace—of brotherhood and democracy—with the Fatherhaad of God and the brotherhood of man enthroned and triumphant. And finally, my friends, we have too many empty flag poles in Oklahoma City and in all America as well. I would urge all of you, who can, to display Old Glory not only on Flag Day, but every day and if you cannot display the physical emblem, then wear its image in your hearts, and if you do, the great heart of America, will one day, interpret the heart of the world.

AUGUST W. KOPKE.

Vote, It Is Your Patriotic Duty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VICTOR WICKERSHAM
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 6, 1956

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, we should make a start in taking an earnest interest in self-rule, and thereby insure for the future generations the implanting of a mighty good habit—that of being a real good citizen. It is a serious responsibility to be a citizen. Your first ethical duty in the field of public service is your duty as a voter. Use, protect, and cherish this right.

If we are to maintain a government of the people, by the people, and for the

people, we must vote. Democracy depends upon it. A democracy is a group of people who get together in a common enterprise for the purpose of governing themselves.

Registered adult citizens, regardless of property or poverty, may vote. Our wishes can be best expressed through the ballot. You do not have to be a king or of nobility to have a part in our Government.

We, as American voters, should not be derelict in our duty, and we must not be negligent about taking part in our elections. Under a democratic system of government like ours, the character of the Government is largely what the voters make it. Every voter is a part of the Government. As such, he has a distinct moral duty to exercise his franchise in such a manner as to bring about the best welfare of the Nation as a whole.

As a result of 50 years of agitation by those who felt that the discrimination against women was unjust and unreasonable the 19th amendment to the Constitution was adopted, giving women equal suffrage with men. Since then women have taken a deep interest in elections.

You mothers, fathers, wives, sweethearts, and relatives of veterans, should remember that the ballot is just as essential to the maintenance of good government in time of war and peace as arms and a willing soldier in time of war, especially when our servicemen have been sacrificing their lives for the freedoms we enjoy.

There should be no difference on our part. If popular government is to be a success, we must have an electorate, not only intelligent and honest but also wide awake and vigilant at all times.

Among the greatest dangers of popular government are indifference and neglect on the part of voters. We should be greatly concerned about the failure of our friends to vote. You should contribute your share by going to the polls and voting and urging your neighbors to do likewise.

We have no right to criticize unless we do take part in elections. To fully participate in the official activities of our Government is a patriotic duty, privilege, and opportunity no citizen can afford to shirk because the majority rule is determined by the will of the people.

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is located in Statuary Hall, House wing, where Mr. Frank Brodie is in attendance during the sessions of Congress to receive orders for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month, and where single copies may also be purchased. Orders are also accepted for the printing of speeches in pamphlet form.

LAWS AND RULES FOR PUBLICATION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

CODE OF LAWS OF THE UNITED STATES

TITLE 44, SECTION 181. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; ARRANGEMENT, STYLE, CONTENTS, AND INDEXES.—The Joint Committee on Printing shall have control of the arrangement and style of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and while providing that it shall be substantially a verbatim report of proceedings shall take all needed action for the reduction of unnecessary bulk, and shall provide for the publication of an index of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD semimonthly during the sessions of Congress and at the close thereof. (Jan. 12, 1895, c. 23, § 13, 28 Stat. 603.)

TITLE 44, SECTION 182b. SAME; ILLUSTRATIONS, MAPS, DIAGRAMS.—No maps, diagrams, or illustrations may be inserted in the RECORD without the approval of the Joint Committee on Printing. (June 20, 1936, c. 630, § 2, 49 Stat. 1546.)

Pursuant to the foregoing statute and in order to provide for the prompt publication and delivery of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the Joint Committee on Printing has adopted the following rules, to which the attention of Senators, Representatives, and Delegates is respectfully invited:

1. *Arrangement of the daily Record.*—The Public Printer will arrange the contents of the daily RECORD as follows: First, the Senate proceedings; second, the House proceedings; third, the Appendix: *Provided*, That when the proceedings of the Senate are not received in time to follow this arrangement, the Public Printer may begin the RECORD with the House proceedings. The proceedings of each House and the Appendix shall each begin a new page, with appropriate headings centered thereon.

2. *Type and style.*—The Public Printer shall print the report of the proceedings and debates of the Senate and House of Representatives, as furnished by the Official Reporters of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, in 7½-point type; and all matter included in the remarks or speeches of Members of Congress, other than their own words, and all reports, documents, and other matter authorized to be inserted in the RECORD shall be printed in 6½-point type; and all rollcalls shall be printed in 6-point type. No italic or black type nor words in capitals or small capitals shall be used for emphasis or prominence; nor will unusual indentions be permitted. These restrictions do not apply to the printing of or quotations from historical, official, or legal documents or papers of which a literal reproduction is necessary.

3. *Return of manuscript.*—When manuscript is submitted to Members for revision it should be returned to the Government Printing Office not later than 9 o'clock p. m. in order to insure publication in the RECORD issued on the following morning; and if all of said manuscript is not furnished at the time specified, the Public Printer is authorized to withhold it from the RECORD for 1 day. In no case will a speech be printed in the RECORD of the day of its delivery if the manuscript is furnished later than 12 o'clock midnight.

4. *Tabular matter.*—The manuscript of speeches containing tabular statements to be published in the RECORD shall be in the hands of the Public Printer not later than 7 o'clock p. m., to insure publication the following morning.

5. *Proof furnished.*—Proofs of "leave to print" and advance speeches will not be furnished the day the manuscript is received but will be submitted the following day, whenever possible to do so without causing delay in the publication of the regular proceedings of Congress. Advance speeches shall be set in the RECORD style of type, and not more than six sets of proofs may be furnished to Members without charge.

6. *Notation of withheld remarks.*—If manuscript or proofs have not been returned in time for publication in the proceedings, the Public Printer will insert the words "Mr. ——— addressed the Senate (House or Committee). His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix," and proceed with the printing of the RECORD.

7. *Thirty-day limit.*—The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD any speech or extension of remarks which has been withheld for a period exceeding 30 calendar days from the date when its printing was authorized: *Provided*, That at the expiration of each session of Congress the time limit herein fixed shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee.

8. *Corrections.*—The permanent RECORD is made up for printing and binding 30 days after each daily publication is issued; therefore all corrections must be sent to the Public Printer within that time: *Provided*, That upon the final adjournment of each session of Congress the time limit shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee: *Provided further*, That no Member of Congress shall be entitled to make more than one revision. Any revision shall consist only of corrections of the original copy and shall not include deletions of correct material, substitutions for correct material, or additions of new subject matter.

9. The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the full report or print of any committee or subcommittee when said report or print has been previously printed. This rule shall not be construed to apply to conference reports.

10. *Appendix to daily Record.*—When either House has granted leave to print (1) a speech not delivered in either House, (2) a newspaper or magazine article, or (3) any other matter not germane to the proceedings, the same shall be published in the Appendix except in cases of duplication. In such cases only the first item received in the Government Printing Office will be printed. This rule shall not apply to quotations which form part of a speech of a Member, or to an authorized extension of his own remarks: *Provided*, That no address, speech, or article delivered or released subsequently to the final adjournment of a session of Congress may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

11. *Estimate of cost.*—No extraneous matter in excess of two pages in any one instance may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by a Member under leave to print or to extend his remarks unless the manuscript is accompanied by an estimate in writing from the Public Printer of the probable cost of publishing the same, which estimate of cost must be announced by the Member when such leave is requested; but this rule shall not apply to excerpts from letters, telegrams, or articles presented in connection with a speech delivered in the course of debate or to communications from State legislatures, addresses or articles by the President and the members of his Cabinet, the Vice President, or a Member of Congress. For the purposes of this regulation, any one article printed in two or more parts, with or without individual headings, shall be considered as a single extension and the two-page rule shall apply. The Public Printer or the Official Reporters of the House or Senate shall return to the Member of the respective House any matter submitted for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which is in contravention of this paragraph.

12. *Official Reporters.*—The Official Reporters of each House shall indicate on the manuscript and prepare headings for all matter to be printed in the Appendix, and shall make suitable reference thereto at the proper place in the proceedings.

Appendix

Observations on Russia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE H. BENDER
OF OHIO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, June 18, 1956

Mr. BENDER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, the first of two articles appearing currently in the Cleveland News, and written by one of its feature staff writers, Miss Doris O'Donnell.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DORIS O'DONNELL IN RUSSIA—FINDS "NEW LOOK" GIVES FREEDOM TO TRAVEL, BUT CLOUD OF FEAR REMAINS

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—News Reporter Doris O'Donnell, first Cleveland journalist to visit Russia since World War II, is back in Cleveland. The News today begins the exciting story of her adventures and observations, written without restriction from the exhaustive personal diary kept by Miss O'Donnell during her tour of cities and rural areas of the Soviet Union.)

(By Doris O'Donnell)

Moscow, U. S. S. R.—From Cleveland's Public Square to Moscow's Red Square is about 5,600 air miles. But in a way of life there is no greater distance on the face of the earth.

I have been in the Soviet Union a month. It is a land which to me has always been shrouded in mystery. But like most terrifying closets when you look inside, the awful fears give way to nervous and monumental curiosity.

Russia frightened me.

Outwardly here in Russia, I have not been restricted. But I must point out this is a peculiar new world, even to the Russians. This is post-Stalin Russia.

It did not have this freedom 6 months ago. It may not have it 6 months from now.

I have gone where I pleased within reason, traveled to Stalingrad, Rostov, Kiev. I have flown in Russian and Czech airplanes, and drifted down the Volga and Don Rivers in a steamer loaded with potatoes and peasants.

I took copious notes wherever I went. I have taken snapshots openly and without hindrance except in Kiev, where I was stopped from photographing the bustling industrial harbor on the Dnieper River.

The mere thought of purges, liquidations, MVD police, Siberian prisons—petrified me.

Yet I was driven on by insatiable curiosity and the challenge of the assignment to see as much as I possibly could of this strange country.

Imagine! Moscow! And an American woman alone behind the Iron Curtain.

I longed many times for the precious land of the free world, as corny as that sounds. I don't think I'll soon recover from the tensions and from the fear that unseen eyes watch every movement.

For the first time in the violent history of this vast and impenetrable country, the Iron Curtain was lifted for a girl reporter from Cleveland, Ohio, to see what she wanted to see, talk with the little people, eat their food, and share unfamiliar heartbeats.

I met some big people, too, Bulganin, a wolf by American standards, but a man of compelling charm and gripping fascination.

I was frustrated by Russian Communist bureaucracy, by the difficulties of language, by the problems of coping with a philosophy completely alien to me.

Yet I sincerely like the Russian people. I found them warm, affectionate, and incredibly curious, though in so short a time and with an impossible language barrier, I could not hope to understand them or hope they could understand me.

The journey from Cleveland into the Soviet Union and my midnight arrival in Moscow is an experience indelibly printed in my memory.

As my Swissair ship skimmed over the neat Swiss countryside toward Prague, Czechoslovakia, on the first lap of the adventure into the Communist world, I felt lonely and shriveled inside.

I had read so much about the Soviet Union that I did not know what was reality and what was fiction. I decided to erase the preconceptions in my mind. It was a good thing I did. Because I found a completely new face on Russia, a new face, which today baffles the old Russian experts and sends them off with puzzled, skeptical brows.

My flight companions, all sturdy, overfed-looking Czechs, chatted away in a holiday mood, no doubt recounting successes of their business trip to Zurich. All were laden with bulging briefcases and sacks and bags full of packages of all sizes, including toys and dolls.

Their Slavic faces were in sharp contrast to the Swiss faces, but the Czech faces have a reassuring familiarity. They looked like the Czech faces back in Cleveland—rosy, round cheeks and sky-blue eyes.

On this flight I got my first taste of the big, open stare. I could feel pairs of eyes looking me over, from my hat down to my shoes. It finally got so that I simply stared back, giving them the big wondering gaze and looking over their clothes which were not stylish by American terms, but solid and adequate-looking.

The Iron Curtain began at Prague airport where I had a 4-hour wait before taking off to Moscow.

The airport is located in the countryside, and there is nothing to see for miles around. It was modern, sizable, and clean, with a comfortable lounge, continuous movies, a bare restaurant, and showcases filled with such Czech-made products as glassware and vacuum cleaners.

I hauled out my typewriter and started pecking away at my diary, and almost fell off my chair when the background music came on. Billy Eckstine sang "Bitter with the Sweet," and the announcement was in English, too. Will wonders ever cease?

Without Czech money, I was unable to buy lunch, but I had brought along Swiss candy bars.

My real lunch was a cheese sandwich donated by an Italian woman, who with her husband and two teen-age daughters were en route to Warsaw, Poland. The man was with the Italian Embassy there. The woman had had the foresight to pack a lunch, and had saved cheese and meat from the meal served aboard the Swiss airship.

We picnicked on a bench within a fenced-off area outside the airport where we watched several airplanes land and take off.

Traffic was light there, and the only other Western airship was from Belgium.

A Hungarian airship landed with a handful of people, including two tall, bearded Orthodox priests in their long flowing black robes, high headgear and huge breast medallions.

As flight time grew near, my passport was returned to me, and then I discovered the two priests and their civilian companions were getting the VIP treatment. They were speeded off in the Russian Aeroflot plane on which I had been scheduled. The priests were being whisked in for the Orthodox Easter celebration.

A group of Hungarians—a labor delegation—protested mildly, but were quickly placated. All of us would take the second section, a Czech airliner, of the exact construction of the Russian one.

From what I could see, all the satellite countries use Russian-made twin-engined ships, old and weatherworn, but sturdy and plodding. The airplanes have the same kind of personality as the people at the airport handling passports, luggage, fuel, etc.

A French girl, young, breezy, and attractive with yellow shoes and matching handbag, and I were the only two women on the Moscow-bound flight, with the exception of the stewardess. She reminded us to buckle the seat belts, and at 2025 or 8:15 p. m. we would land at Vilnius, on the Lithuanian-Russo border.

My first taste of the Soviet world was at the customs office at the Vilnius airport. The airport was a monstrous white stucco building, surrounded by farmyards, and small unpainted farmhouses.

The customs official handled the passports of all the men before he came to me. He was dressed in a shiny blue serge suit with red piping around the neckband. His peaked cap was also trimmed in red.

"Who asked you to Moscow?"

His English wasn't bad, but self-conscious.

"No one," I said.

Then again in slow, halting, measured English, he asked:

"Who asked you to Moscow?"

Bulganin's name came mischeviously to mind, but a chill was already moving around my heart.

"No one."

Lack of vocabulary or sheer bewilderment ended the conversation. He, as most Russians are, familiar with large delegations of Czechs, Poles, Hungarians, Chinese, and others from Soviet satellite countries. A single American—and a lone American woman—was too much for him. His brow never unwrinkled and he avoided looking me directly in the face.

While my fellow-passengers disappeared in the vast building, I was detained to fill out a form about furs, jewelry, pieces of luggage, and the amount of my foreign currency. Rubles cannot be purchased in the United States, and I had left home with travelers' checks and a book of coupons purchased

from the official Soviet Government agency, Intourist.

A silver chain bracelet was the only item which interested the customs official other than my money.

"Gold?" he asked several times.

"Nyet," I said. Here was the first opportunity to test-run my limited Russian vocabulary.

He did not go through my luggage which included one suitcase, a small flight bag with tissues, etc., a typewriter, and a German-made camera.

Business concluded, the official waved me off to a restaurant on the second floor. Here the huge hallways and staircases were covered with yards of red carpeting, and the walls were hung with portraits of Lenin and Stalin. A huge white bust of Stalin was planted on the balcony near the entrance to the paneled eating room.

After cold cuts aboard the plane, my appetite had disappeared. I was pretty nervous, anyway. I sat down at a table set for 4 with 2 Hungarians, 1 a huge red-haired man; the other a thin dark-haired man, both of whom wore sweaters under their suitcoats. They had finished the soup course, and were on the veal plate.

Neither spoke English, and here began the adventure with the Russian-English dictionary.

By shaking my head "no," the waitress was convinced I did not want the meat after the big bowl of chicken noodle soup.

The red-headed man offered me some lemon carbonated water which tasted terrible—watery but sweet.

Both tried to converse, using a few French words. However, we managed better before boarding time when the French girl who spoke English, understood and translated their French. The girl, I learned, was going to Bandung as an interpreter at a youth conference.

During the flight from Vilnius to Moscow, a holiday air pervaded the plane. Before Vilnius, everyone had slept or read. Now the conversation was livelier, men strode up and down the aisle, and there was an intense interest over when the first lights of Moscow would dot the inky-black landscape.

A young Russian man pulled a pack of American cigarettes from his small suitcase and offered me one. I was amazed. He explained he was returning from an international meteorological conference in Geneva. The No. 1 American weather expert had given him the cigarettes.

The Russian weatherman spoke good English. Although the cut of his suit was foreign, he wore a white shirt. This was in contrast to the other men aboard, who wore dark blues, browns, blacks. To the French girl, he raved about Paris; to me, he said he hoped to come to America. He had been in Canada.

Soon the lights appeared, first a dot here, and there, then a whole blanket of twinkling lights.

One huge building was covered with red lights. It looked like a giant Christmas tree. I thought it was the Kremlin, but it was Moscow University. We circled the field several times, and within minutes landed smoothly at Vnukova Airport.

This is Moscow's big landing field, a 30–35 minute drive from the city. Here is the airport where a few days after my arrival the Soviet chiefs of state gave a military salute to French Premier Guy Mollet.

But on this late, windy and rain-swept night, there was no one—no band or honor guard—to meet me.

A Russian woman doctor looked us over as we deplaned. The few Russian men aboard were swallowed in the darkness outside the airport, although later I saw two of them giving their wives and children bear hugs.

It was now 12:15 a. m.

I followed the Hungarians into a brightly lighted waiting room. A huge library table was covered with big picture magazines in Russian, Chinese, and other languages.

On the wall was a king-size portrait of Stalin in a white tunic uniform. His figure was disproportionately large against a wheatfield, a farmer, and tractor.

Several Chinese men sat opposite me on straight-backed chairs. I was so nervous I didn't know what to think. Finally, a uniformed guard showed us into a smaller room, the luggage-weighing-in place.

A tall blond young man who looked exactly like Edgar Bergen's Mortimer Snerd seemed to be in control.

"Do you speak English?" I asked.

"Yes; and who are you?"

Now began the bureaucracy.

"Your name is not on my list," he said, looking over a paper notebook similar to the kind American children use in the second grade.

I explained a delay caused me to arrive a night late.

"We have no hotel for you, and no taxi to take you into Moscow," he said.

I looked helpless.

I had no idea what to do. The American Embassy, the newspaper friends I was to contact in Moscow—everything seemed remote. I hadn't the faintest idea how to telephone them, and this seemed impossible at that time of night.

Old Mortimer, as I started thinking of him, already had told the French girl she could not telephone her Moscow friends. Her plane for China would not leave for nearly 12 hours, and he suggested she sleep in a hostel on the second floor of the airport.

I peeked into the high-ceiling waiting room. The benches were nearly filled with shawled and babushkaed women, bundled in padded coats and wearing knee-high boots. Besides, each wore string bags bulging with packages. I could see myself cuddling up on one of the wooden benches.

Finally old Mortimer said I could drive into Moscow with a Czech.

"You don't mind?" Mort asked.

"Mind? Goodness, no." I was elated.

While waiting for the taxi which the Czech had ordered, Old Mortimer took me to the telegraph office, where I cabled home.

I had to exchange dollars for roubles—$10 for which I got 40 pink-papered roubles. The cable costs took half. For Mortimer's kindness I gave him an American penny. You would have thought it was a million dollars. He was delighted and slowly read the words on the coin—"In God we trust." He made no comment.

It was 3 a. m. before I saw the first red illuminated stars on the spires over the Kremlin. I couldn't believe my eyes. It was like a fairy tale—this huge old fortress looming before us as we drove over one of the Moscow River bridges.

My companion and I had tried to communicate, even using my small pocketbook flashlight to pick out phrases in my Russian-English book. I learned he was an engineer, and he learned I was a journalist. We said goodby in our respective tongues in front of the National Hotel, guarded by a husky militiaman.

Within minutes I was ushered up to room 227, with a large sitting room, alcove bedroom, and bath. Dawn—pink, blue, and silvery—was coming up over the Kremlin towers as I pulled the red plush curtains across my alcove doorway and tumbled into a small clean-smelling bed.

So this is Moscow. I was too tired to think, to worry, to wonder. I was safely in Moscow. Part of my mission was over.

Address by Hon. Robert C. Hendrickson, Ambassador to New Zealand, Before the Tin Hat Club

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CLIFFORD P. CASE

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, June 19, 1956

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. Mr. President, in yesterday's RECORD I inserted in the Appendix a speech by my esteemed predecessor, Senator Robert C. Hendrickson. I would like the Senate to have an opportunity to read some additional remarks by our Ambassador to New Zealand, delivered during a tour of the Islands where he represents the Government of the United States. Since we are all so interested in his efforts to bring about greater understanding between the people of our two countries, I ask unanimous consent that an address by Bob Hendrickson delivered on April 24, 1956, before the Tin Hat Club, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

In the first quarter of the 19th century the new Government in America produced some very unique and brilliant characters. Among these we find one Daniel Webster. His brilliant oratory still echoes through those time-honored walls of my Nation's Capitol Building. About the time that Senator Webster had reached his dramatic heights there came to the House of Representatives from Tennessee another character—his name was David Crockett. He was unschooled in any of the formalities of education, but he was a frontiersman, a hunter, a trapper and a guide who led our people of that time through Indian entrappments which would have cost them their lives. The story goes that shortly after he entered upon his congressional duties he wandered over to the Senate to hear the great Daniel Webster in one of his challenging debates. When the then famous Senator from Massachusetts had concluded his remarks, Davey Crockett was heard to say: "Well, now I have been told that Webster is a brilliant man, but it ain't so—I could understand everything he said."

My comrades, I try to pioneer—I stand with Crockett. I hope you will understand everything I say. To be with you, my comrades of the Tin Hat Club, on this the eve of Anzac Day is like being with my comrades of the 40 and 8 back home just before an American Legion convention.

As prospective ambassadors, we are pretty thoroughly briefed at home on the background of the country where we will serve. Despite the briefing, however, until an ambassador is on his own steam he doesn't get the true course he should follow. In my case it has not been too difficult because I was with New Zealand troops in Italy and so I came to feel there—more than a decade past—our mutual dedication to the purposes of free men.

Your Anzacs began their great exploits on April 25, 1915, when they landed at a point in the Near East called Gallipoli Peninsula. The name was "Greek" to many in America, but though only in my early teens it was not "Greek" to me.

I suppose that the nearest word to Gallipoli in the jargon of my country would be

our now famous Gallop Poll which has to do with sounding out public sentiment, chiefly about our politicians. This poll might be best remembered for its inaccurate selection of Mr. Dewey over Mr. Truman in 1948.

I must confess that upon my arrival here one of the things which impressed me most were your campaign hats. They are so much like those we wore in 1918—floppy but serviceable.

Though my new neighbors in New Zealand may have had some trouble with the language which I speak, I could understand them quite well—particularly when they spoke up with enthusiasm. May I say at this point that if you have a fault in the expression of the finest language yet unveiled by man, it is that you do not turn your throats loose. You must speak up and with vigor.

I remember so well those wonderful 6 years I spent in the United States Senate—and though I confess to being a Southerner at heart there were times when I wondered whether some of my beloved colleagues had not been dropped from the outer spaces of the world, linguistically.

Well, the language barrier has presented no difficulties in the New England * * * we curse in precisely the same tongues.

This reminds me of the story of the Spanish gentleman visiting Great Britain who was terribly upset by the English pronounciation. As you well know, the Spanish people pronounce virtually all the letters in any word. This is not so in England nor in America. Thus, our Spanish friend could not for example, see why the British pronounce t-h-r-o-u-g-h- as "through." He studied very hard, however, and slowly mastered the new pronunciation. Then one day he met a sudden and unhappy end. He was walking along and spotted a movie billboard depicting an advertisement of that splendid film, Cavalcade. The billboard said: "Cavalcade pronounced success"—so our Spanish friend proceeded to a mission of self-destruction.

Such are the tribulations of visitors to strange shores.

Happily for us tonight it is always true that whenever the chips are down, the English-speaking peoples rally together and come to the aid of their neighbors whenever any of us are threatened with the overthrow of our free way of life. This was the basis of our union in two World Wars.

The examples of bravery, heroism, and valor by our Allies in the first great World War are legion and it is truly difficult to single out particular acts of bravery above others.

I have already referred to the courageous exploits of the Anzacs which had their start on April 25, 1915, when they landed on the beach at Gaba Tepe (which later became known as Anzac Cove) on Gallipoli Peninsula. The purpose of this operation was to clear the Dardanelles, control Constantinople, cut the Turkish communications from her German partners, and open up the Black Sea, which would allow Russia to send needed stores of wheat to the Allies, and, in turn, allow the Allies to send war materials back to Russia.

It has been stated that if the Dardanelles could have been forced by the unaided fleet and Constantinople taken, the war would have been shortened by years. I have no doubt at all that Russia might have been saved from communism.

Although the Anzac landing was accomplished with heavy losses in dead and wounded, the major objective, the conquest of the Gallipoli Peninsula, was not attained.

After months of fighting, in which your Anzacs proved their valor by a performance above and beyond the call of duty in the face of a well-entrenched enemy, the decision was finally made to evacuate the forces.

In December (1915) 80,000 men with their equipment, were transferred from the peninsula. Those evacuated left behind 35,000 of their brave comrades—dead and buried on the war-torn battlefield.

From Gallipoli, the Anzacs moved on to other theaters of operations, leaving a glorious record of achievements behind them.

I am sure that it will be carrying coals to Newcastle, but it is always of interest to me to hear again the origin of the word "Anzac."

Before the Gallipoli campaign was initiated, the forces of Australia and New Zealand were training in Egypt with headquarters in Cairo. The clerical work was done by some of the men detailed from the divisions. It was here in the headquarters that the history of the term "Anzac" began.

Can't you visualize the corridors outside the clerks' offices with the many cases of stationery lined against the wall with the large black letters in stencil "A and NZ Army Corps," which in abbreviated form represented the Australians and New Zealand Army Corps. Well, the name was too cumbersome and above all, a code was needed for telegraphic communications.

Most of the stories on the subject report that when the question was put, Lt. A. T. White, of the English Army Service Corps, replied: "How about 'Anzac'?" The name was proposed to the commanding officer, General Birdwood, who immediately approved the use of the term. So, it was not long after the adoption of the code name, that the term was carved into its place—high and for all free men to see in their record of history for all time to come. The word "Anzac" today is a symbol of the greatest sacrifice brave men can make for their God and country.

The commemoration of Anzac Day in both New Zealand and Australia will be perpetuated as long as these two great peoples survive—that should always be among the prayers of all free nations of the world.

As we in obedience to a wisely written law of the land today make our contribution to a never-ending recognition of those heroic deeds of an age now past, it is only right and proper that we should remember these words: "These are our martyrs, and their blood the seed of noble futures. 'Twas for us they died. Keep their memory green."

It is not difficult to understand why these words were in the minds and hearts of those men who stood on the beach an Anzac Cove in Gallipoli on the 25th day of April 1922 in a just and fitting tribute to the comrades who came to their final resting place there 7 years earlier.

I am quite sure that it was from the unselfish sacrifice of those men who gave their all in the first great world cataclysm of war that we of the English-speaking peoples took courage, united, and in a full spirit of cooperation joined forces to once more preserve our precious freedoms in the onslaught which confronted us in those dark days which followed on the heels of Munich and all the nightmares which were ever there within the mind of the madman of the ages.

In this needless and frightful calamity the Anzacs again wrote a brilliant record of heroic effort. Many of them were sons and nephews of the fabulous fighters of 1915.

I am sure that the statement made by your Prime Minister Peter Fraser in 1941 sums up the courageous spirit of "do or die" which fired every son and daughter of New Zealand in those dark and tragic days. Said this distinguished statesman: "There is nothing too much for us to day, and if there is anything more we can do within our resources, then it will be done." The new Anzacs (with some help of the old) made good the assurances of their able Prime Minister.

These young men—a few I met in Italy, as we traveled up the boot together—wrote a chapter of their own in the annals of that conflict—and today as we salute them, we know that their worth to the free world was quite equal to the exploits of their fathers, their uncles, and other heroic relatives.

The new crop of Anzacs fought on three continents and everywhere achieved recognition for their military prowess. Should I mention the theaters of war? Yes, of course, I shall. They were in all the theaters where the lives and fortunes of free men were at stake—among them, Dunkirk, the Battle of Britain, the African desert, Italy, the Pacific, and most recently in Korea. I remember them most particularly in Italy.

But an editorial which appeared at the time of the Battle for Britain had this to say:

"The year 1940 and the Battle of Britain are as sure of a place in history as 1066 and the Norman Conquest, 1588 and the Spanish Armada, 1815 and the Battle of Waterloo. Your children and your children's children will read of those incredible days when only a strip of blue water and a few hundred pilots stood between a slightly mad 'living room' decorator and the Empire of the World. They will read with pride that in a place of honor, ready to meet the Nazi hordes, were the soldiers of New Zealand."

In the traditions of their fathers, the Anzacs of the Second World War "carried on" to win the highest honors for all who participated with them.

No one knew the temper of their steel more than did the enemy.

"A ball of fire" was Sir Winston Churchill's description of the New Zealand Division. He was discussing the Alamein victory on the floor of the House of Commons at the time.

Now I have talked of war at some length but only because of the impacts which our wars together of the past can have upon the peaceful existence of the world for the future.

In the suggesting of an appropriate subject to your able secretary last December for this occasion, I offered the title "American and British Commonwealth Relations in War and Peace."

So, in the interest of that just and last peace for the world for which all free peoples are searching daily, I conclude with these positive and specific observations.

Anzac Day calls us to our better selves. It is a day and time for consecration. Actually it belongs to those who died that we might inherit the greatest blessings that may flow from human endeavors.

If this devotion should ever call us to the uniform again in unavoidable war, I am convinced that our patriotism will vindicate their sacrifice. But in this modern age, when war will be allout with the possible destruction of all the precious institutions this civilization has established—war, ugly, bloody, and futile war, with all the maiming, crippling, and devastating wake it leaves behind—it really has no proper place in our pattern of peace under well-ordered law. The challenge then to us today, to the American and British Commonwealth relationship in war and peace, is to pursue the ways and means to preserve an honorable peace by peaceful means—yet, never to surrender at any price the ideals and institutions that have made us what we are as free nations working in a common and noble cause.

When the Parliament of a country gives due recogniation to its soldiers, sailors, and airmen, you can be sure that it speaks for the people. So when in 1949 the Parliament of this land of wonderful people and delightful countryside dedicated Anzac Day to those who gave their last full measure of devotion to the end that your cause shall not perish from the earth, they sealed a firm commitment under God: That your

government of your people by your people, and for your people shall endure as long as men speak the tongue of that old Mother Country—God bless and keep her always—and her gracious Queen.

Citation to George Meany for Combating World Communism and Assisting the American Legion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD MARTIN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, June 19, 1956

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, as a part of the Flag Day program of the American Legion of Allegheny County, Pa., there was dedicated on June 14, in the city of Pittsburgh, a bronze plaque containing the pledge of allegiance to the flag.

As a feature of the impressive ceremonies, a citation was awarded to George Meany, the distinguished president of the AFL–CIO, for his outstanding work in combatting world communism and his assistance to the American Legion in patriotic support of Americanism and an adequate national defense.

The citation was accepted by Peter M. McGavin, assistant to Mr. Meany, in a speech which is worthy of national attention as a vigorous and forthright attack on the menace of communism.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the text of the citation awarded to Mr. Meany and also the remarks of Mr. McGavin in accepting the citation on behalf of Mr. Meany.

There being no objection, the citation and address were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE AMERICAN LEGION CITATION TO GEORGE MEANY

President of the American Federation of Labor-Congress of Industrial Organizations, for his extraordinary thoughtfulness, profound understanding, and unusual ability to analyze the danger of communism to free labor and to the principles of American democracy, as promulgated by the American Legion, for all free men, coupled with his fighting spirit and clear exposition of the myth and fraud of communism, requiring definite concentration and the awareness of communism which is a challenge to free men everywhere. He has vividly pointed out to all true liberals the false doctrine with which the Russian imperialists would dupe them.

He earnestly and zealously portrayed the tasks that must be met by all of us. First: Military forces must be strong enough to deter and defeat aggression wherever it arises. Second: Social, economic, and political superiority of the democratic order must be developed throughout the world, and, finally, our own freedom must be vigorously defended against the fifth column here at home.

Because of his keen intellect, industry, and personal integrity, and with the help of God combined with personal courage of the highest order, he has won the admiration and respect of the American Legion, and we take great pride in recognizing the vitally important task of giving us a firm foundation on which to uphold the integrity of man as an individual creature of God, without regard to race, color, or creed.

Awarded by the American Legion, Department of Pennsylvania, Allegheny County committee, June 14, 1956.

JOHN C. GONGAS,
Commander.

Attest:

SIDNEY J. SABLE,
Adjutant.

ADDRESS BY PETER M. MCGAVIN

It is a sincere pleasure to accept this award from the American Legion of Allegheny County on behalf of President Meany. Mr. Meany asked me to extend his deep regrets that circumstances did not permit him to accept in person this great honor.

In a real sense, it is an honor to the American labor movement which, like the American Legion, is dedicated to keeping alive the great traditions of personal liberty upon which our beloved Nation has been built.

Men and wmen, many of them members of the Legion, gave their lives to protect these cherished freedoms and to establish our government of laws, not of men. But these freedoms are not automatically inviolate. They must be protected and cherished. We must be eternally vigilant to detect and to halt all—at home and abroad—who would undermine the foundations upon which our way of life is built.

The American labor movement is clearly a child of democracy. It could not exist in a land where men were not free. It abhors and rejects every antidemocratic regime; it is the unrelenting foe of totalitarianism of every stripe. That is the key to our continuing fight against communism and all its evils.

The Communist brand of dictatorship is—in many respects the most subtle, sinister and dangerous enemy of freedom. It demagogically poses as a higher form of democracy. It poses as a political movement, though it is anything but a political party in the normal democratic sense as we know it and live it. Furthermore, it operates as a worldwide conspiracy, as a fifth column, in every free country—with its head and heart in Moscow.

The only patriotism communism knows is loyalty to the clique or despot who happens to be at the helm of the Russian dictatorship at any particular moment.

That is why we of American Labor have always said; There are no American Communists—there are only Communists in America. These subversives are fanatical believers in the doctrine that their end—Soviet world domination—justifies any and every means.

In view of the illusions some people who specialize in wishful thinking now have about the Soviet orbit moving toward democracy; it is most urgent that we take a sober and realistic look at the Communist New Look and Big Smile tactics. You need no agitation or explanation from me on this score. The Communist criminals, like other dangerous criminals, are no less dangerous when they are well masked. In fact, when they are well masked they are even more dangerous. Political subversives who seek to rob the American people of their liberties, are not good citizens or gentlemen merely because they say they are for freedom, or merely because they wear kid gloves in the process of their criminal operations. Well masked, fully camouflaged Communists, do not make the face of communism less ugly or its aim less sinister.

Any system of government in which a party is the government—particularly when there is only one party with absolute power over every walk of life—cannot be government by law. And without government by law, there can be no freedom.

We have refused and will continue to refuse to lend respectability or provide democratic friendship and approval to any regime which has destroyed democracy at home and is dedicated to the destruction of democracy abroad. We did not send delegations to Fascist Italy, Nazi Germany or Falangist Spain, and we won't send any to Russia, Mao-Tung China, or to any other paradise behind the Iron Curtain. We were militantly anti-Nazi and not just non-Nazi. We are militantly anti-Communist and not merely non-Communist.

We of American labor approach this Communist problem and fact in the Communist menace as citizens and as trade unionists. We fight this enemy unrelentingly, without a letup. We don't fall for any of the Communist maneuvers, because we do not believe in doing business with them—on a partnership or any other basis. We fight this enemy with the philosophy of democracy. We fight communism with practical deeds as well as hard-hitting publications in many tongues. We expose their fallacies and frauds and put communism in its proper and ugly light by comparing its Soviet paradise with our human American institutions and achievements. These are not always perfect—but they are always getting better.

If you will take a look at the Communist press in our country or in any other country, on either side of the Iron Curtain, you will see that we are under constant bitter attack. This obviously because our policies and activities really hurt the enemies of freedom everywhere.

Our philosophy as American citizens is that democracy and dictatorship cannot mix. The one is the very opposite of the other. They have nothing in common. They negate each other.

Our philosophy as trade unionists is that without democracy there can be no free trade unions and without free trade unions there can be no democracy.

And we do not intend to change our mind because of any Kremlin face-lifting or teeth-flashing smiles.

Thank you again for this honor. On behalf of President Meany and on behalf of the American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations, let me express our deep appreciation for this tribute you have paid to the free, democratic American labor movement.

Public Opinion Survey—11th Illinois Congressional District

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. TIMOTHY P. SHEEHAN
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 19, 1956

Mr. SHEEHAN. Mr. Speaker, each of the 6 years that I have been in Congress I have conducted a public-opinion survey among my constituents. This year I mailed out 46,500 questionnaires, making an equal distribution into every single precinct in the 11th Congressional District in an effort to obtain the views of a representative cross section of the people whom I represent. To date, 6,976 questionnaires have been tabulated, which is a return of 15 percent.

Five of the questions on this year's questionnaire have been repeated in a similarly worded fashion in each year's survey since 1953. A comparison of these results over the 4 years is interesting in establishing either a constancy or a changing trend in the thinking of the people of the 11th Illinois District.

The results of the 1956 survey are as follows:

	Yes	Percent	No	Percent	No answer	Percent
1. Are you in favor of the United States continuing as a member of the United Nations?	5,107	73.2	1,671	24.0	198	2.8
2. Do you favor the proposed $4.9 billion foreign-aid bill?	1,556	22.3	5,053	72.4	367	5.3
3. Do you approve of the Republican foreign policy in general?	4,344	62.3	2,064	29.6	568	8.1
4. Do you approve of the Eisenhower administration to date?	5,328	76.4	1,122	16.1	526	7.5
5. Are you in favor of a basic pension plan for veterans of World War I?	4,096	58.7	2,312	33.1	568	8.2
6. Do you favor Federal aid to education?	4,359	62.5	2,378	34.1	239	3.4
7. Do you favor H. R. 627, which proposes the establishment of a bipartisan civil rights commission and the creation of a civil rights division in the Department of Justice?	3,542	50.8	2,068	29.6	1,366	19.6
8. Do you favor continuation of the Federal Government's low-rent public housing program, which in H. R. 10157 provides for 50,000 public housing units in each of the next 3 years?	3,383	48.5	3,286	47.1	307	4.4
9. Do you favor postal rate increases to help cut down the present postal deficit?	4,570	65.5	2,172	31.1	234	3.4
10. Do you favor the discharge of Government employees who invoke the 5th amendment in order not to disclose Communist connections?	6,301	90.3	521	7.5	154	2.2
11. Are you in favor of a constitutional amendment which would set a percentage limit on the amount of income tax the Federal Government could levy against individuals in peacetime?	5,003	71.7	1,631	23.4	342	4.9
12. Do you approve of permitting labor unions to use membership dues for political purposes?	681	9.8	6,134	87.9	161	2.3
13. Do you favor retention of the principles of the national origins quota system which has been in effect since 1929, and which regulates immigration so as to maintain the historic population pattern of the United States?	5,274	75.6	1,188	17.0	514	7.4
14. Do you approve of President Eisenhower's and Secretary Benson's farm program for flexible price supports and a soil-bank program?	4,872	69.9	1,537	22.0	567	8.1
15. If there is a surplus due to greater Federal income than Federal expenses this year, should it be used to: (A) reduce taxes, or (B) reduce the national debt?	(A) 3,094	44.4	(B) 3,636	52.1	246	3.5

The comparison for repeated questions in 1953, 1954, 1955, and 1956 is shown below:

	Percentages										
	1956			1955			1954			1953 [1]	
	Yes	No	No answer	Yes	No	No answer	Yes	No	No answer	Yes	No
Are you in favor of the United States continuing as a member of the United Nations?	73.2	24.0	2.8	69.5	28.3	2.2	67.0	29.9	3.1	64.1	35.9
Do you favor further arms and military aid for foreign nations? [2]				44.9	49.8	5.3	45.7	46.4	7.9	44.7	55.3
Do you favor continued economic aid (Point 4 program) to foreign nations for development of backward areas? [2]				50.0	46.0	4.0	54.4	38.8	6.8	43.3	56.7
Do you favor the proposed $4.9 billion foreign aid bill? [3]	22.3	72.4	5.3								
Do you approve of the Republican foreign policy in general?	62.3	29.6	8.1	56.9	30.3	12.8	52.9	36.6	10.5	78.5	21.5
Do you approve of the Eisenhower administration to date?	76.4	16.1	7.5	65.3	23.9	10.8	58.0	25.9	16.1	84.2	15.8

[1] It is to be noted that in the 1953 questionnaire, the "no answers" were not included in the percentage breakdown.

[2] In the 1953, 1954, and 1955 questionnaires, the foreign aid subject was broken down into separate questions, that is, arms and military aid, and economic aid.

[3] In 1956, all foreign aid was treated as 1 question.

The Atomic Race for Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT GORE
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, June 19, 1956

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "The Atomic Race for Peace," published in the Knoxville News-Sentinel.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE ATOMIC RACE FOR PEACE

We are a country rich in conventional fuels—oils, gas, and coal—with which to generate electricity. We have power available, too, from falling water.

So generally speaking, there would seem to be no pressing economic reason to rush headlong at this time into big-scale production of electricity from the energy of the split atom.

Yet there are other factors when we consider our atomic-power program.

Primarily this: As the Nation which first used the atom for wartime destruction, we must be the leading nation in using the atom for peaceful constructive purposes.

The United States Atomic Energy Commission, or at least its Chairman, Lewis Strauss, believes we are achieving this leadership. The Commission is satisfied with its partnership, chiefly with private utilities, which is expected to create in 5 to 10 years a series of atomic powerplants. The Government will contribute, directly and indirectly, to these plants.

AEC's Chairman also is satisfied we are ahead of the Russians in this field. We wish the AEC didn't sound so complacent.

There are well-informed Congressmen who differ with AEC.

Some think the Government immediately should start a "crash" program, building atomic furnaces of the best possible design (some not now a part of AEC's program) to produce power, especially in remote areas not fed with adequate supplies of conventional fuels.

Another group thinks we should make big propaganda abroad by building atomic power reactors in underdeveloped, power—starved, friendly countries. They would be ready for our use, after adequate testing, when our conventional fuels begin to dwindle, as one day they will.

We don't want to see Congress set up an atomic TVA. We don't think the atom should be dedicated now to a wide-scale Government-financed public power program.

But we are convinced the United States must do all within its power to stay ahead of the world in the peaceful atomic power race.

If this requires some selective building by the Government of atomic power reactors here at home; if it requires Government building of atomic reactors abroad, we would favor this means of really implementing President Eisenhower's atoms-for-peace plan.

We believe that with the world in its present shape, confronted by the Russians' smiling duplicity—and remembering that they produced atomic and hydrogen weapons before our "experts" thought they would—we cannot take a chance with complacency.

This is a world-wide race we dare not lose.

National Library of Medicine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN F. KENNEDY
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, June 19, 1956

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Inheritance in Danger," published in the Boston (Mass.) Globe, of June 10, 1956.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INHERITANCE IN DANGER

Ever since man began to communicate with his fellows he has had a legacy to hand down to those who came after him more vital than the changing physical and mental characteristics of the body in which he dwelt.

This legacy was the library, the repository of human thought and recorded deeds of every generation. Whether it was left in grave or cave, in temple or monastery cell or university hall, on tablets of stone or scrolls of papyrus or on the vegetable pages that

take movable type, the library has been man's shortcut to achievement by inheritance.

For no idea ever sprang full blown from any brow, even that of genius. Nor does any man pass on what he has learned, no matter how painfully, in genes or chromosomes. It is the papers and books and pamphlets in which he records his trials and errors, his successes and failures and discoveries, his thoughts and opinions and guesses, that save each new generation the need to start all over at the beginning and retrace the steps their fathers have taken.

No one recognized earlier than New Englanders that this legacy must be kept safe and accessible, lest as on the neglected farm there be nothing left to share but a few crumbling bricks and the fragrance in spring of forgotten lilacs. Though many cities would wait until the 20th century for a coal baron to build them libraries, Boston was having its first public library almost as early as its first public school.

People from this part of the country, therefore, should have special interest in legislation which will be considered shortly by the Congress—Senate bill 3430. Introduced in March by Senators LISTER HILL, of Alabama, and JOHN F. KENNEDY, of Massachusetts, it is a bill to "promote the progress of medicine and to advance the national health and welfare by creating a National Library of Medicine."

It calls for the establishment of a library "decently housed, efficiently staffed, properly located, and adequately financed," to take over the functions and collections the Armed Forces Medical Library ineptly left for a century as the responsibility of a branch of government whose proper function is the defense of the Nation.

The bill was referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, after an eloquent speech by Senator HILL, himself son of a physician, with the able support of Senator KENNEDY. It is regarded practically as emergency legislation, and its support was urged on physicians who gathered here from all over the country for Harvard's Medical School alumni meeting the other day by eminent graduates.

For as the Hoover Commission's task force on Federal medical services stated, this is "the most important medical library in the world. * * * No other medical agency of the Federal Government serves the future of medical research so intimately and so widely as does this unequaled collection of books, journals and bibliographic services."

The Boston Medical Library already was 31 years old when the Armed Forces Medical Library was organized in 1836 for the Surgeon General. Boston's is one of the great medical libraries of the world, with 225,000 books and journals, 160,000 pamphlets, and yearly accessions of more than 2,000 books, 3,000 journals and 1,500 pamphlets. Its incunabula are zealously guarded but available to every physician in the area.

But greater than the sum of this and many other medical libraries over the country is that of the Armed Forces, the library which Senators HILL and KENNEDY so properly feel should be a first charge on the Nation, rather than a poor relation that happened to come and just has stayed for 120 years with one branch of Government. For it contains today more than 650,000 bound volumes with well over 1,000,000 titles. It is adding 25,000 volumes a year, and currently receives 5,000 medical periodicals. It should be protected but accessible to everyone in the Nation concerned with health.

Yet this "priceless treasure of medical literature" which, if it were once destroyed, not all the gold in Fort Knox could recreate," as Senator HILL told the Senators, has been so neglected that it is in constant danger. Books and charts and magazines of incalculable value are housed in a warehouse in Cleveland and in a structure in Washington built in 1887, condemned 30 years ago, as inadequate, and now in such condition that its iron columns have buckled.

This current Congress, like others in 1919, 1938, and 1941, authorized the expenditure of money for plans for a proper building, and committed itself to appropriation of necessary funds for construction of the medical library building. Nothing came of it. Nor is it especially surprising that the Secretary of Defense should decide not to ask for the apportionment of the money authorized by Congress in the face of the pressing demands of military budgets, though like other branches of government, the military have been reluctant to let anything go.

The solution, obviously, is to give the Medical Library separate status. The terms of the bill suggest a board of regents made up of the Surgeons General of the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Public Health Service, the Librarian of Congress, and 12 individuals appointed by the President wtih the advice and consent of the Senate. This board would name the director of the library without regard to civil service.

Medicine is moving far and fast. But the speed with which better health can be achieved depends on what men of medicine can learn from each other and from the experience of the past.

Surely no medical man can find fault with this legislation—in itself a refreshing experience for those charged with making the laws. But there should be more than tacit support for it, not only from doctors, but from a public forewarned of the dangers in the present situation.

Future generations could, with reason, class an indifference which permitted destruction of such an inheritance with the vandalism which sacked Rome and lost many of its treasures for all time.

UNCLE DUDLEY.

Convention of American Library Association and Citation of Merit to Judge Eugene A. Burdick

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM LANGER
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, June 19, 1956

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a press release just issued by the North Dakota State Library Commission, relative to the convention of the American Library Association at Miami Beach on June 16 to 23. Mrs. Hazel Webster Byrnes, the director of the North Dakota State Library Commission, will represent my State at the convention; and I am very sure she will make as capable a delegate there as she has been an outstanding and devoted worker for the improvement and expansion of library facilities throughout North Dakota.

Let me also call attention to the fact that this convention at Miami will confer one of two 1956 trustee citations of merit upon Judge Eugene A. Burdick, of Williston, N. Dak. Judge Burdick is the son of the Honorable USHER L. BURDICK, long a Member of the House of Representatives from my State.

There being no objection, the release was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

North Dakota will be greatly honored at the convention of the American Library Association, Miami Beach, June 16–23. One of the two 1956 trustee citations of merit in the United States will come to North Dakota. Judge Eugene A. Burdick, of Williston, N. Dak., will be the recipient.

Recent word coming to Mrs. Hazel Webster Byrnes, director of the State library commission from Eleanor Plain, the chairman of the ALA jury on citation of trustees read: "It is my privilege to notify you that the ALA jury on citation of trustees has unanimously voted to award one of the 1956 citations of merit to Judge Eugene A. Burdick."

This citation will be given Tuesday, June 19, at 2 p. m. at the general session of the American Library Association held in the Municipal Auditorium at Miami Beach.

Mr. Burdick is president of the board of directors of the James Memorial Library, Williston, N. Dak., and his active participation has seen that library reopened and developed into a thriving institution. He is also a member of the State library planning board and his efforts are a continuous help in library promotion in the State.

Judge Burdick is a native of North Dakota, the son of the Honorable USHER L. BURDICK, a Member of Congress from North Dakota. In connection with his active interest in his profession which he has served as president of the State bar association, he has also taken a leading part in fraternal, service clubs and community affairs, and a special interest in library activities, local and State.

Letters of commendation for Mr. Burdick and his work represented many fields, law, research, journalism, civic affairs, banking, industry, as well as the library field. The State library commission has been very pleased and proud to submit his name for this award, and is also honored to have this recognition for North Dakota.

Judge Burdick has been invited by the American Library Association to attend and personally receive this citation. However, due to the press of trial work, it is impossible for him to be present.

Mrs. Byrnes will represent North Dakota at this meeting which is the 75th annual conference of the American Library Association and one of the Nation's largest professional gatherings. More than 4,000 librarians from all parts of the country will participate. The conference will have more than 250 business and program meetings covering all phases of librarianship.

Mrs. Byrnes is council member for North Dakota and coordinator of Federal Legislation. She will also take part in a workshop in adult education. Previous to the Conference of the American Library Association, Mrs. Byrnes will attend the convention of the National Association of State Libraries, which will be held June 16–17, also at Miami Beach.

Political Charges Regarding Voting on the Harris-Fulbright Natural Gas Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MILTON R. YOUNG
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, June 19, 1956

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial appearing in the Grand Forks Herald,

published at Grand Forks, N. Dak., under date of May 31, 1956; another, appearing in the Minot Daily News, published at Minot, N. Dak., under date of May 26, 1956; and still another, appearing in the Bismarck Tribune, published at Bismarck, N. Dak., under date of May 26, 1956. The editors of these newspapers state in an effective way what they think of recent charges leveled at me by a political publication in North Dakota known as the Leader, published at Bismarck, N. Dak.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Grand Forks (N. Dak.) Herald of May 31, 1956]

LEADER LEADS WITH ITS NOSE

Blatant and unsupported charges of sell-out made against Senator MILTON R. YOUNG by the Leader, weekly publication of the Nonpartisan League, have boomeranged in the face of its irresponsible editor and his advisory board.

Called before a special committee of the United States Senate to support its inferential charges of bribetaking by the Senator, the publication's author-editor of the charges made an abject disclaimer of any intention to suggest the Senator had taken bribe money.

One K. W. Simons, weekday schoolteacher and weekend volunteer editor of the Leader, told the Senate committee he did not intend to imply in any way that Senator YOUNG had taken a bribe at any time.

The Leader's wild, though characteristic, charge against Senator YOUNG grew out of Mr. YOUNG's vote in favor of the Harris-Fulbright natural-gas regulatory bill, which later was vetoed by President Eisenhower.

"YOUNG Sells Out Again," read a front-page top headline, with a one-column subhead saying "CASE Bribe Recalls $5,000 MILT YOUNG Got From Dutchman."

Senator YOUNG asked the Senate's Special Committee To Investigate Political Activities, Lobbying, and Campaign Contributions to look into the publication's charges, and the Washington hearing was the result.

The Senate committee consisted of Senators MCCLELLAN, Democrat, of Arkansas, chairman; ANDERSON, Democrat, of New Mexico; KENNEDY, Democrat, of Massachusetts; BRIDGES, Republican, of New Hampshire; THYE, Republican, of Minnesota; PURTELL, Republican, of Connecticut; and GOLDWATER, Republican, of Arizona.

The committee, meeting May 24, heard Senator Young, Simons, and R. C. Nathan, of Jamestown, N. Dak., a member of the board of the Leader Publishing Co.

Excerpts from the Leader's article charging YOUNG with selling out again were read by members of the committee, including the following sentence:

"But facts like this never bother MILT, who is certain that the public memory is so short and the integrity of the North Dakota press so rotten that he is not likely to be tripped up on his contradictions, misrepresentations, and outright lies."

Here is an unreliable embryo journalist, drooling over his own words, calling the legitimate press of North Dakota rotten while his own nose was stuffed with the stench of the filth of yellow journalism that he himself was so ineptly trying to practice.

The daily press of North Dakota has always given small heed to the puppy-dog yelping of most of the so-called editors of the league's organ of personal abuse and misrepresentation.

Its meager circulation and known partisanship has marked it always for what this episode has again proven: That it is merely an organ of political venom, without responsibility and judgment, and steeped in the conviction that a sought-for end warrants any means, however disreputable.

Chairman MCCLELLAN, a Democrat, and, therefore no political partisan of Senator YOUNG, directed this blast at the Leader and its cringing editor:

"The article in the Leader charging Senator YOUNG with selling out again is that sordid and irresponsible type of journalism that resorts to a poisoned pen to contaminate the news and pollute the stream of public information through the medium of a free press.

"Now that it has been exposed for what it really is, it deserves no further attention by the committee."

The incident may be closed for the United States Senate with this vindication of Senator YOUNG, but it can hardly be closed for the many honorable and honest members of the Nonpartisan League, whose political partisanship does not make them forget honor and integrity.

This newspaper and every honorable citizen admires a good, clean political fight, in which principles are weighed honestly, and the outcome is not determined by lying, unsupported charges and the filth of gutter politics. We are sure the real league membership does not support such tactics.

[From the Minot (N. Dak.) Daily News of May 26, 1956]

THEY EAT CROW

If a couple of North Dakotans have stomach pains, it is due to eating crow—lots of it.

The dish was served up to them—Kenneth Simons and Robert Nathan—of the Nonpartisan League newspaper, the Leader, at a congressional hearing in Washington this week to air some irresponsible charges they had made through the paper against United States Senator MILTON R. YOUNG.

It was in the Leader issue of February 9 that a headline was carried: "YOUNG Sells Out Again." And underneath was a subhead: "Case Bribe Recalls $5,000 MILT YOUNG Got From Dutchman."

The accompanying story didn't say so, but it was obvious to many readers that the Leader was trying to get across the idea that Senator YOUNG had taken money for his vote on the natural gas bill.

Understandably, Senator YOUNG was incensed, and demanded the facts be aired, and as was expected when the lippy Mr. Simons and Mr. Nathan got to Washington they were revealed, by their testimony, as being eligible for the nonelective office of flannelmouth.

The charges were exposed, as was expected, to be lacking in all substance and leaking like a soup fork.

"Completely unsupported by any evidence whatsoever" was the label the Senate Lobby Investigating Committee put on the accusations made in the newspaper, and it added that both Simons and Nathan had testified that they "knew no facts or of any evidence that would show that Senator YOUNG was influenced improperly on any vote during his tenure in the Senate."

Thus, Mr. Simons and Mr. Nathan and the Leader are flattened like a bottom wheat cake on a 6-cake stack.

Senator YOUNG should be happy—he is completely vindicated, and while he talked for a time about collecting reparations through a lawsuit, it would be surprising if he doesn't forget about it because Mr. Simons and Mr. Nathan, under oath, seem to have made a round turn like a country haircut. Their testimony sounded like the last wheeze coming out of an accordion.

It would be surprising, however, inasmuch as history has no record of a satisfied loser, that the Washington hearing revelations will put a damper on the silly capers of the threesome.

[From the Bismarck (N. Dak.) Tribune of May 26, 1956]

ACCUSERS BACK DOWN ON CHARGES

A committee of the United States Senate has cleared Senator MILTON R. YOUNG of any implication of improper influence in his vote on the Harris-Fulbright gas price decontrol bill.

Witnesses associated with the Leader, political publication of the Nonpartisan League, admitted to the committee that they have no evidence to support insinuations there was anything shady about Senator YOUNG's support of the bill.

Confronted with a Senate committee's demand that they give, under oath, any reasons which might support such an insinuation, those who raised the cry of bribe backed water ignominiously and hastily.

Really, they hadn't meant any such thing at all, they said. All they had meant was that, in their opinion, some of YOUNG's votes in the Senate weren't in the public interest. They hadn't intended to imply anything immoral or illegal.

Oh, no. Not at all.

The close association of YOUNG's name with the word "bribe" was strictly accidental.

Actually, in their eyes, not only YOUNG but a clear majority of United States Senators are stooges who vote against the public interest. As a matter of fact, anybody who doesn't see eye to eye with these self-appointed protectors of the public interest is a stooge.

And, of course, if what you say for 50 or 100 people to hear embarrasses you afterwards, you deny your ever said it. That, friends, is guts; in reverse.

One of the most revealing exchanges at the Senate hearing went as follows:

Question: "Were you trying to destroy Senator YOUNG's character and reputation by this article?"

Answer: "Well, the newspaper is not favorably disposed toward Senator YOUNG."

In other words, however, base and unjustified, all is fair in war and politics, and if to score a political point on a political enemy character assassination by smear and association is expedient, go right ahead.

It brings back to mind the antics of two characters name Cohn and Schine who used the same technique when they were in the news a couple of years ago.

This should be the end of this matter insofar as the 1956 political campaigns in North Dakota are concerned.

Atomic Power and the Coal Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 19, 1956

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, in the June 21, 1956, issue of the Public Utilities Fortnightly magazine, published by the Public Utility Reports, Inc., Baltimore, Md., there appears the following article in which I discuss atomic power and its effect on the coal industry:

ATOMIC POWER AND THE COAL INDUSTRY

(By the Honorable JAMES E. VAN ZANDT)

A new era of robust prosperity lies ahead for the United States coal industry. Our rapidly developing atoms-for-peace program is today one of America's largest coal-consuming industries, using approximately 20,200,000 tons a year for its own heat and

power requirements. And this vast atomic program already is expanding faster than United States coal production.

At present our atomic experimental plants are using 1 car of coal every 80 seconds, night and day, the year around. Experts in the Atomic Energy Commission estimate this demand likely will double over the next 5 years. Instead of replacing coal as a basic energy source, atomic power promises to test the entire coal industry, over the next decade, in its ability to keep abreast of the still unmeasured demands of atomic experiment and development.

From studies presented before the Congressional Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, of which I have the honor to be a member, I am convinced that we face, not the displacement of coal by the new A-power program, but rather the question, "Can coal keep up with the call to be made upon it over the next 50 years?"

Electric-generating capacity installed in the United States today measures 116 million kilowatts. By 1970 our demand will be 320 million kilowatts; and by 1980, 600 million. Only 18 percent—less than one-fifth—of our power today is supplied by hydro energy. With America's need for electric power expanding so fast, the ultimate problem is not which fuel may be crowded out of the market, but rather, what new energy sources may be developed to help carry the load?

Nothing could be farther from the fact than the suggestion that atomic energy eventually might close down our mines. The truth is that by 1980 (only 25 years forward) our atomic power production will be, at best, about 175 million kilowatts, against about 425 million kilowatts from fossil fuels. With our power requirements multiplied by 5 by 1980, today's conventional fuels in various forms still will supply approximately 71 percent, and atomic plants only about 29 percent of our total energy. Even after allowance for increased efficiency in coal consumption at steam plants, our coal requirements for power alone by 1980 would call for 5 tons for every 1 consumed today for electric power.

Neither shall we fear exhaustion of our fossil fuels. The Interior Department assures us that our potential supply of these fuels * * * is literally beyond the realm of accurate estimate * * * our resources are so vast as to apparently insure an adequate supply for any reasonable foreseeable period of time. Some official estimates say we have plenty of these fuels in reserve for at least a thousand years.

Recent history attests the ever-increasing efficiency of coal as our basic energy source. The Federal Power Commission tells us that in 1926 we required 3 pounds of coal to produce 1 kilowatt-hour of electricity. Today, less than 1 pound of coal produces the same energy for the transmission system—and engineers already are designing new boilers to give us 1 kilowatt-hour of electricity for only six-tenths of a pound of coal. When the productive energy obtained from a pound of coal thus can be multiplied by 5 over a period of only 30 years it is utterly unrealistic to harbor fears that the industry may be pushed out of the fuel market.

It is likely, too, that we cannot long continue to consume natural gas at our present prodigious rate. As these naturally limited supplies tend toward exhaustion, the replacement demand will fall first on coal. The Atomic Energy Commission calculates that by 2000 A. D. only about 1 percent of our electricity will come from oil and natural gas fuels—as against approximately 50 percent from those fuels today.

Production of gas and liquid fuels from coal also is progressing in giant strides. This new form of coal fuel is not yet competitive with direct-consumption coal, but easily could become so over the next 2 decades. The Atomic Energy Commission estimates that by 2000 A. D. as much as 76 percent of our electricity might come from such converted coal fuels. This is a fourth compelling reason why coal faces a future of sustained prosperity.

A second argument heard occasionally against atomic electric power programs is that, with Government investing heavily in every A-power project, the way is being paved for the eventual nationalization of the entire electric industry.

This argument neglects utterly the fact that private investments in A-power projects in the United States at the end of 1956 will total more than $175 million. Are these people investing in eventually state socialism.

We must not forget that until 1954, when the new Atomic Energy Act became effective, A-power remained a complete, airtight Government monopoly. Not only was it illegal for private enterprise to experiment in atomic research save under rigid Government tutelage; all atom research and development were under almost crippling security protection, which forbade even the theoretical discussion of scientific probabilities in normal public speaking and writing. During those 14 years (1941–54) atomic energy was a total state secret. It was as if the first automobile had been impounded by the Government, and no private experiment or development permitted until about 1905.

The problem of protecting our A-power defense systems still remains. That area of nuclear development necessarily must continue a stoutly protected Government monopoly, at least until international control treaties may be perfected. Meanwhile, the AEC has made great progress since 1954 in releasing research data not related basically to defense programs. This has been accomplished through the Eisenhower concept of active partnership between Government and industry, as outlined in the 1954 act.

Today there are 15 electric power plans under construction, in design, or proposed in pending AEC contracts, all for completion during the next 5 years. These plants will cost in excess of $1.5 billion, of which private enterprise will pay approximately half. Surely it is untenable to suggest that such companies as Commonwealth Edison, Pacific Gas & Electric, Duquesne Light & Power, Yankee Atomic Electric Co., Detroit Edison, General Electric, and North American Aviation are parties to a gigantic conspiracy to socialize the electric power industry.

To my mind, this type of planning on the part of our large cooperating companies refutes conclusively all arguments that Government participation in the nuclear energy program imperils private development of A-power electricity. To provide effective legal safeguards against such a takeover by Government, Congress in the 1954 act specifically and categorically forbade the AEC to engage in "the sale or distribution of energy for commercial use" save where such energy became available as a byproduct of Government research and development programs.

Through all human history timorous philosophical fears have argued against progress. The railroad was resisted in the first half of the 19th century because it might run over the farmers' cattle, sheep, and horses. In every generation there has emerged a small fringe of sabotage against mechanical and scientific equipment—even to the resistance offered by our own horse breeders early in the present century against development of the automobile; or the more recent campaign against the dial telephone, on the ground that it surely would displace and impoverish all manual operators.

Yet, in every case, the new industry came on, only to broaden the productive base of the entire economy, provide more jobs, bigger payrolls, more leisure for all. We know today, for example, that without the automatic dial phone there would not be available in the entire country enough capable telephone centrals to handle our present volume of local traffic.

Similarly, nuclear power is here to stay. It will not make us poorer, but richer. So long as the Government must continue to spend large sums every year in development of the atomic defense program, it is logical and sound to carry on the collateral studies for peacetime applications of the same power. The cost of these peace studies is relatively small, yet they promise to contribute magnificently to national development clear across the economic horizon. Indeed, they already have yielded vast benefits in medicine, agriculture, food preservation, electronics, and heat machines. Should all these fabulous byproducts of the defense program be neglected merely because they entail a degree of partnership and cooperation between Government and private enterprise?

Secondly, there are large areas of the earth which have no conventional fuels. Atomic power is the only hope of those regions for industrial progress. We have much to gain from industrial progress among the sandal-and-loincloth peoples of Asia, Africa, and Oceania.

England already is pressing her nuclear-power program under forced draft, chiefly because her coal resources are vanishing rapidly.

Russia is fully abreast of America and England in A-power technology. Shall we stand by to see communism take the lead in peacetime application of the atom?

Third, many areas of the United States are far removed from today's conventional fuels. Smaller unit package reactors, now well along in development, promise adequate power for those areas long before A-power electricity becomes truly competitive in our great industrial areas closer to fuel deposits.

True, A-power electricity today is perhaps 10 times more costly than power from conventional fuels, but this cost is coming down every month. At some point in the future A-power electricity must become competitive in our great metropolitan markets. Meanwhile, however, our power demands are increasing much faster than our generating capacity.

Government has a definite place in the development of new industries and new energy resources through all the experimental phases, for the entire national economy benefits from such progress. But our Government's support of scientific research and development in aviation during World War I did not entail nationalization or socialization of the aviation industry after 1918. Nor did Federal aid to wireless research in the early years of this century entail socialization of the radio and electronics industries.

Free enterprise has its own great strengths and values. Government research in new fields of technology, as a function of national defense, does not weaken or destroy the ultimate values of freedom.

Perhaps the most convincing answer to the charge that the atom may bankrupt our coal industry has been given by the National Coal Association. This organization, which represents most of the bituminous-coal tonnage produced in 26 States, certainly has as great a stake in the Nation's energy program as any individual company or other association.

The following two paragraphs are from a resolution adopted by the National Coal Association and submitted formally to the Congressional Joint Committee on Atomic Energy:

"I. In the progression of humanity, in furthering world trade, in advancing the cause of peace, and in maintaining the world leadership of the United States, there is a need to continue Government sponsorship of the development of nuclear energy. To this end,

the National Coal Association recognizes the need for the Government to support the national laboratories and to carry out the basic as well as applied research in the field of atomic energy.

"II. Future development of economically feasible nuclear power is necessary to provide power for underdeveloped areas of the world, to assist nations which have power shortages, and to protect the future of the United States in the power field. The National Coal Association therefore recognizes the need for the Government to continue the power demonstration program to optimize the conditions under which atomic power is generated."

Tom Pickett, executive vice president of the National Coal Association, came before the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy and stated unequivocally that the coal industry has no fear about the development of the atom for peacetime uses. He submitted his own studies showing that the Nation will need at least twice as much coal by 1980 as was produced in 1955. Mr. Pickett, like other coal industry spokesmen from whom we have heard, asks only that cost figures and other unclassified information pertaining to the reactor program be made public.

Speaking for myself, I can assure the American people that we of the Congressional Joint Committee will not permit the peacetime application of atomic power to undermine in any way our private enterprise system. I intend to make certain that—as implicit in the new atomic energy law—there shall be no permanent subsidies once the research and development stage is past.

We will do whatever is possible to bring about competitive nuclear power to the benefit of all the people of the world, but there will be no subsidization beyond the research area.

My one intent is to support the program to the extent necessary for the betterment of mankind. If in the process of carrying out this program any Federal official or other participant attempts to advance the cause of state socialism in the electric power industry, I shall vigorously oppose such action, and shall, without hesitation, make my suspicions known to the American people.

National Library of Medicine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN F. KENNEDY
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, June 19, 1956

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "National Medical Library," written by Dr. Sara Jordan, of the Lahey Clinic, Boston, Mass., for Gastroenterology, a national and international journal.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NATIONAL MEDICAL LIBRARY

The medical profession has an opportunity at the present time to indicate to Senator LISTER HILL, of Alabama, and Senator JOHN F. KENNEDY, of Massachusetts, their enthusiastic approval of a bill (S. 3430) sponsored by these gentlemen, to create a National Library of Medicine to "promote the progress of medicine and to advance the national health and welfare." The Medical Task Force of the Hoover Commission recommended the establishment of such an institution, and this bill was devised and is now under consideration to bring it into existence. By the terms of this bill, this library is to replace the present Armed Forces Medical Library (formerly the Surgeon General's Library), part of which is now precariously housed in a condemned building in Washington, the rest being stored in Cleveland. The National Library of Medicine is intended by this bill to be an entirely new institution, separated from the Department of Defense. It is to have autonomy under the direction of a Board of Regents to be composed of the Surgeons General of the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Public Health Service, the Librarian of Congress, who shall be ex officio members, and 12 individuals appointed by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate and without regard to political affiliation. These 12 members are to be chosen from all fields of medicine and its allied branches. This Board is to be authorized to construct a suitable building and to organize and administer the new library to house and safely preserve the volumes (almost a million), collections, records, and equipment presently constituting the Armed Services Library, and to organize, catalog, and make available to the profession this material, as well as to acquire new material and provide reference and research assistance. As an autonomous institution, it will be authorized to hold and administer gifts and bequests which might very well become a lucrative source for medical research. The necessary funds for the construction and development of this library are to be appropriated by Congress under the provisions of this bill, and with the addition of independent gifts and bequests this medical library, now one of the largest in the world, might become, like the National Art Gallery, one of the Nation's great institutions. The American Gastroenterological Association has already indicated its approval of this bill by a communication to Senator KENNEDY, but the individual support of all physicians should be given to these Senators who have so effectively planned this great opportunity to serve medicine and mankind.

House Revolt on Foreign Aid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM LANGER
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, June 19, 1956

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "House Revolt on Foreign Aid," written by Constantine Brown and published in the Washington Evening Star of June 11, 1956.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HOUSE REVOLT ON FOREIGN AID—SENATOR ALSO EXPECTED TO BACK SLASH DESPITE EISENHOWER'S AND DULLES' PLEAS

(By Constantine Brown)

Neither the colored charts and graphs presented to Members of Congress to prove how essential economic help is and how carefully it is being dispensed nor the personal intervention of President Eisenhower could forestall the House cuts of more than a billion in foreign aid.

The reason for the ineffectiveness of the intervention of the highly popular Chief Executive was the sentiment of the country's grassroots which the legislators could not ignore, particularly in this election year.

Many of the congressional leaders have taken swings, especially through the Middle West. They found an overwhelming opposition to indiscriminate support to foreign nations—some of whom are only fair-weather friends of ours.

The large volume of mail reaching Senators and Representatives from their States and districts also has put them on guard. These letters, except those obviously inspired by the usual pressure groups, are strongly against full acceptance of the administration's figure for foreign economic and military assistance.

To these considerations must be added the fact that the representatives of the executive branch have not made a very convincing case. Moreover, many Congress Members have now a firsthand knowledge of conditions abroad and do not believe that the approval of aid amounting to nearly $5 billion is justified.

They also know from their own personal investigations that while the governments in Western Europe, for instance, have not fallen completely into the Red propaganda trap that war is now unthinkable, the people themselves have become convinced that the war clouds have completely dispersed. And in the constitutional countries the people hold the fate of the governments in their hands.

The people abroad see no reason for any kind of military preparedness even if this means only a relatively small outlay of the European taxpayers' money. They would rather have their young men work in remunerative jobs in industry, commerce, and on farms than serve in the military services for 18 or 24 months.

They see in our mild flirtation with the U. S. S. R. a confirmation of their optimistic beliefs that there will be no wars during this or the next generation.

These facts were laid frankly before President Eisenhower last week when congressional leaders representing both parties and Houses spent hours with him explaining why his plea to restore at least $600 million to the military-assistance program will not be heeded.

The expectation of some of Mr. Eisenhower's lieutenants that the Senate may be less obdurate than the House is likely to be wrong. Normally this is the case. There are only 96 Senators and it is rare when more than 84 are present for the vote on a major bill.

The White House and the State Department have done a good lobbying job.

A number of the opponents of giveaway programs from the Middle West have softened up already. Some are running for reelection. They either want full White House support or do not want to bear the stigma of having voted against the wishes of the Commander in Chief.

Others have waited for a long time to obtain patronage in the form of judgeships for important constituents. Their requests have been kept on ice and they have been given to understand that if they vote on a somewhat watered-down measure dear to the hearts of the administration, their candidates' names will be sent to the Judiciary Committee for confirmation.

Despite these maneuvers an informal poll taken by the majority and minority leaders has shown that under the best circumstances only a pittance may be added to the revised foreign aid bill as passed by the House. It was explained to the President last Tuesday that the token sum would save the administration's face and would be accepted by the Senate and House conferees.

The approval of the $600 million increase asked by the White House would only produce a deadlock which might kill the whole bill.

Secretary Dulles, whose prestige stands much higher than that of some presidential advisers such as Mr. Eisenhower's secretary for disarmament, Harold Stassen, has worked hard to convince Senators in both camps of

the necessity to bolster the administration's foreign policy.

But he has no satisfactory reply when he is asked by legislators in private conversations how he could explain, if he were a candidate for elected office, our response to the smiling policies of the Kremlin team and still expect our allies in Europe to continue to arm.

And if the armament question is pushed in the background by our allies, how could the American taxpayers be persuaded to continue to give until it hurts?

American Foreign Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM E. JENNER
OF INDIANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, June 19, 1956

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "We Must Make a Choice," from the Indianapolis Star of June 14, 1956.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WE MUST MAKE A CHOICE

Why does American foreign policy often seem so indecisive—to move in two directions at once?

Why has our foreign-aid program failed in its avowed objective of making our Allies stronger and weakening the Communist bloc?

Why do so many formerly friendly nations, nations that looked to us for inspiration and leadership in their search for national independence and individual liberty now regard us with suspicion and distrust?

The answer seems to be that the United States is now trying to follow two contradictory foreign policies at once. One is a wholly new approach for Americans. The other is our traditional national foreign policy.

Our new policy is to try to build, with economic and military aid programs "positions of strength" among our allies to make a bulwark against Communist advances. This is no new tactic. Great nations from Rome to Britain have successfully followed this course for long periods. Why were they successful and why are we not? They were successful because when they gave "foreign aid" they expected and got a specific return for it. They bought Allies. They financed entrenched regimes and kept them in power. They imposed conditions on every farthing of aid and every piece of military equipment they sent out.

We have not done this. We have given aid without strings attached. We have not used our aid as bribes, as lures to cooperate. We have not forced upon our Allies policies and actions subordinate to our own. Why not?

Here we come to the other fundamental American policy or principle, which is in conflict with the above imperialistic design. Americans have never—except in part in recent years—tried to be an imperialistic nation. We have always supported the rights of all peoples and all nations to self-determination and self-government. When we have aided others, it was always from generous, humanitarian impulses, and never with the hope of a quid pro quo. We have not sought to buy allies or buy off enemies. We have consistently encouraged the nationalistic aspirations of colonial peoples because of our own anticolonial history.

So, when we try to give foreign aid in the hope that other countries will join us in common cause against the Communist enemy, it runs counter to our national character to demand a quid pro quo to impose conditions. So we don't do it. But you cannot make an imperialistic policy work unless you are willing to go all out and be an imperialist.

A good case can, of course, be made for such a policy for Americans. We no doubt could impose by our material and military strength a Pax Americana. We could tell the British to quit trudging off to Moscow for trade and cultural deals or we give no more help and demand our loans be repaid. We could tell India to cooperate or else lose any hope of economic aid from us. We could impose conditions on every cent we spend in allied countries and force them to toe the line or be left without a protector. We might very well be able to impose that Pax Americana which could last for generations.

But, as Jesus Christ once put it, "What shall it profit a man, if he shall gain the whole world, and lose his own soul?" What shall it profit Americans if we gain a Pax Americana in the world by force and bribery and lose the precious heritage of liberty, humanity, and respect for others that compose our own national soul? If we adopt the methods of imperialism in order to combat imperialism, will we not be surrendering to the very principles of tyranny and force which our fathers and brothers fought to eliminate in our own land and in other parts of the world?

It is senseless to continue our present foreign-aid program on such a scale unless we adopt imperialistic methods. It will not work, as it has not worked after 10 years and $65 billion. We must choose another course. We must choose a course that embodies our own American traditions and the principles that led up to greatness as a country and as a people.

Unfortunately Americans will, this year, have a difficult time making such a choice. The national leaderships of both major political parties are still committed to the dual policy—half imperialism, half self-determination. At the top our people cannot, it seems, force this choice upon our leaders. But they can do so in local elections and with local candidates. They can demand that they be given a choice to vote for either a policy of frank imperialism or a policy based on respect for the rights of other nations, support for the liberation of all people wherever they are dominated by foreign countries, and the maintenance of enough military power here in America to protect ourselves and our allies.

It is our belief that if that choice is offered to Americans today, they will reject imperialism and choose the traditional American way. This does not mean a return to isolationism. Americans have always been willing to give aid and support—without strings—to people suffering from catastrophe or threatened by conquest. They will continue to be willing to do so on a selective basis. Americans have always believed that this country leads best of example, by inspiration to others, by generous understanding of the aspirations of all for national independence and personal freedom. They wil continue to believe that and act upon it. Americans have always believed in "talking softly and carrying a big stick." And it is part of our heritage to cry out "Millions for defense but not one cent for tribute."

By keeping strong, by sticking firmly to our American principles, by supporting the hope of freedom for all peoples behind and in front of the Iron Curtain, Americans can do more to preserve freedom and peace than we can by bribes, threats, or cajolery.

If this is not true, then all is lost. If we must adopt the methods of imperialists to defeat imperialists, then there is no hope for free men. If the ideals and dreams of Americans—and of all people yearning to be free—are now dust and ashes, we can only look forward to the eventual replacement of one tyranny by another and it matters little which wins.

This defeatism about liberty Americans must reject if they are to save their own souls. In making their choice they will certainly nobly save or meanly lose the last, best hope on earth.

The Philippine Scouts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OVERTON BROOKS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 4, 1956

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to present a letter I have received from the American Legion commending the members of Subcommittee No. 1 of the House Armed Service Committee for action in approving H. R. 11787, the Philippine Scout bill. I am sure the members of the subcommittee will appreciate this commendation as I do, and I feel it will be of interest to all the Members of Congress:

THE AMERICAN LEGION,
NATIONAL LEGISLATIVE COMMISSION,
Washington, D. C., June 19, 1956.

Re H. R. 11787, Philippine Scouts.

Hon. OVERTON BROOKS,
Chairman, Subcommittee No. 1, House Armed Services Committee, House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: The contractual obligation of the United States Government to pay its soldiers cannot be lightly brushed aside and forgotten, as it was in the case of the Army's refusal to pay a small part of the Regular Army known as the Philippine Scouts, because one day the truth will be known and justice will prevail.

It is, therefore, with a deep sense of gratitude that I address you and the members of your subcommittee today, following your stamp of disapproval upon the arbitrary action referred to above. It is even more significant that you have, after considered judgment, initiated H. R. 11787 to mandate payment of "soldier's pay" to the approximately 5,000 surviving Philippine Scouts or their widows that was denied them more than 10 years ago.

The gross injustice has been keenly felt by the Scouts who had been a part of our Army for 40 years, and who had served with loyalty and heroism worthy of emulation. Further aggravating the deplorable situation was the fact that the Navy, using the same law as the Army used to deny pay to Philippine Scouts, paid their Filipino naval personnel who had been in identical status with the Scouts and, in addition thereto, the Navy also paid its civilian employees in the Philippines. Moreover, the Congress of the United States authorized compensatory pay to American civilians caught behind the Japanese curtain and who remained in the Philippines during the occupation. Presumably this was done because the United States Goevrnment was powerless to do anything to bring aid or relief to these persons.

Our Government also saw fit to reimburse certain welfare agencies and religious groups

for the losses sustained or for services rendered. Can we do less for our soldiers who fought for us, and suffered for us, so long as they remained loyal to the United States? We believe the answer is obvious, and that your subcommittee's bill, H. R. 11787, will be approved by the Congress.

In behalf of the American Legion I hereby express to you and each member of the subcommittee our sincere appreciation for your recognition of our Nation's contractual obligation to our soldiers, and for your action to the end that simple justice may prevail.

Sincerely yours,

MILES D. KENNEDY,
Director.

Health Service Is a Basic Right of All the People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. Y. BERRY
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 19, 1956

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, one of the major responsibilities of Congress today is to take an increasing interest in the human factors as well as the economic aspects of American life.

For this reason, I want to call the attention of my colleagues to a new study which has just been published, dealing with the general health situation of the American people. And surely national health is a foremost human factor which deserves the consideration of Congress today.

Only recently off the presses, the study entitled "Health Service Is a Basic Right of All the People" is one of the most competent which I have noted in this field in recent years. It brings together the latest facts on the state of the people's health and the facilities available to keep us well. This study was done under sponsorship of the Public Affairs Institute, Washington, D. C. The institute is a nonpartisan, nonprofit research organization.

It is especially significant, I think, that the words in the title of this new study are the same words used as the guiding premise for the President's Commission on the Health Needs of the Nation.

It is equally significant that this institute, which seeks to promote wide public knowledge and appreciation of currently important problems, chose to deal with the topic of America's health needs at this time.

Dewey Anderson, doctor of philosophy, director of the institute, drew on the findings of a large number of research specialists in compiling the data used in this publication.

My colleagues will be especially interested, I know, in the general approach to one aspect of the national health situation. In the foreword to his publication, Dr. Anderson wrote:

The author holds the view that all the professional health services should be licensed strictly by the State and each should be policed by its own professional organization to insure the satisfactory and ethical performance of its tasks. That this is the surest way to protect the public from unprofessional conduct. The author is not frightened by charges and countercharges leveled by one group of practitioners at another. For he has given considerable time to the objective study of the merits of such attacks, and seeks in his summaries, handicapped as they are by necessary limitation of wordage, to present reasoned conclusions. The final judgment naturally rests with the reader.

I would certainly say to my colleagues here today that this is a most concise and fair-minded way to begin such an exhaustive summary study by a man who has been trained in the social sciences and has had long experience in examining data and writing his findings in this and related fields.

The purpose of this new booklet, I should point out, is "to present in condensed form for ready reading and reference the main points made by the President's commission" in its recent 5-volume survey of the health needs of the Nation, according to Dr. Anderson.

In a review of this new survey, Glenn E. Long writes in Healthways magazine that—

From all that is presented in the booklet, it is obvious that the national health level is not as high as it should be. It is equally obvious that there are not enough doctors in the recognized branches of healing, and not enough hospitals and other facilities to provide the required care to maintain national health at a maximum level.

That is one reviewer's summary, but I encourage my colleagues to read for themselves the facts as summarized in this new Public Affairs Institute booklet so that they may draw their own conclusions.

Considering it true that a shortage of doctors exists to provide maximum national health, I think it is especially noteworthy that Dr. Anderson included in his study a review of the Doctor of Chiropractic as an integral part of America's health personnel.

It is the intention of the author to treat the various professions separately in order to more fully cover the contribution of each to the Nation's health. One of these has now appeared as The Present Day Doctor of Chiropractic. Here we have a penetrating unbiased study of a comparatively new arrival on the American health scene.

Dr. L. M. Rogers, executive secretary of the National Chiropractic Association, says "there is no doubt that this current study is providing a fine, factual basis for constructive nationwide discussion of our profession and its progress."

Science Sidelights comments that "since every profession is built upon a body of knowledge which has developed over a period of years, Dr. Anderson correctly appraises chiropractic in the light of certain concepts which are regarded as well accepted by the public at large."

And, in one phase of the study on chiropractic, Dr. Anderson says:

From a handful of patients somewhat more than half a century ago who came to D. D. Palmer (chiropractic's discoverer), and got relief, those being cared for by today's chiropractors number many millions. And every year the number swells as chiropractors become more proficient and as their satisfied and healthy patients spread the word. Here is the best and final test of an emerging profession seriously serving the public.

Here, I believe, lies an important fact. In an era when there is a shortage of doctors and of health facilities, we find the fastest growing branch of the healing profession. In its 60-year history, chiropractic has grown to become the second largest branch of the healing arts with over 25,000 doctors now licensed to practice this important healing profession, dedicated to public health and welfare.

The importance of Dr. Anderson's study is seen in this opinion from Science Sidelights that—

Since this is the first time that an independent and unbiased study of the chiropractic profession has been published, the author's findings are of great interest not only to chiropractors but to the public at large.

The author himself writes:

In these modern days of our high-speed, nerve exhausting living, chiropractic is fast becoming an indispensable element in helping people maintain good health.

And he says:

Add to the foregoing the fact that the doctor of chiropractic is striving to build his profession, to meet his social responsibilities, to take his place as a leader in the community.

Insofar as America's national health is concerned, it is vitally important that more and more people turn to the art and science of healing so that we may, as a Nation, cope with the increasing problems and responsibilities, in this area of human living.

Therefore it is of interest that Dr. Anderson concludes his special study on chiropractic by saying that "the profession itself is so ardent about its future that nothing can stop doctors of chiropractic from being devoted public servants and becoming better ones with the passage of time."

Mr. Speaker, I call attention to these studies of Dr. Anderson because I believe they both contribute much to the knowledge that is needed in America today so that we may better meet and solve our problems of human living for the benefit and betterment of all our citizens.

The Foreign Aid Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM E. JENNER
OF INDIANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, June 19, 1956

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from the Indianapolis Star of June 10, 1956.

It is time, as this splendid editorial says, to recognize that our foreign aid program cannot be patched up. It has never worked, and it never will.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IT CAN NEVER WORK

The foreign aid program should not be cut by $1 billion, as proposed by the House Foreign Affairs Committee. It should be completely abolished.

The big push is on to restore cuts in the foreign aid program and all the influence of the Eisenhower administration is being brought to bear to keep the program going as before. But more and more opposition to foreign aid is appearing in Congress. There is a reason. Congressmen up for election have been hearing from home.

Look what happened to Senator GEORGE, of Georgia, a supporter in the past of foreign aid. He was ousted without even a fight by Herman Talmadge, who opposes continuance of the foreign aid program.

Look what happened to Senator WILEY, of Wisconsin. He failed to receive the backing of the Republican organization and was replaced on their ticket by a vigorous opponent of foreign aid.

The American people have got more common sense than their leaders in Washington. They have watched the Government spend $65 billion in economic and military aid abroad, and what did they get for it? The NATO alliance is virtually defunct. Countries like Yugoslavia, India, and Egypt, which have received our aid, have turned their backs on us. Britain and France, while taking our help, have begun wooing Moscow for trade and cultural relations. The Soviet Union could take all of Europe within a matter of days because our allies have refused to build their own defenses and depend instead on us to defend them.

Suppose you had a neighbor who for 10 straight years spent thousands and thousands giving away money to people who promised to help protect him from bandits. And suppose these people kept on taking his money and spending it for high living instead of guns and barricades. Suppose they began to visit the bandits and make deals with them for an exchange of food and materials. Suppose that at the end of 10 years the bandits were more dangerous and stronger than ever, the people your neighbor paid were weaker and less united, and it looked as though they were going to treat the bandits even better than they treat your neighbor. Yet he still keeps on paying them at the same rate in the hope that maybe next year they will change.

Wouldn't you call your neighbor a plain damn fool?

Well, that is just what our Government has been doing with foreign aid.

We are told, "The world is a sick patient kept alive by foreign aid." Nuts. The world is a sick patient because we give him sedatives and keep him in bed. If we made him get up and walk, he would. If we made our allies face their own problems, economic and military instead of shielding them from having to do so, they would get well mighty quickly.

We are told that we have had 10 years of foreign aid and that has produced 10 years of peace. Again, nuts. We have had two wars—in Korea and Indochina—in those 10 years. And even if we had had peace, the fact that we have been giving away American taxpayers' money during that period isn't necessarily responsible.

It makes just as much sense to say that we have had 10 years of record automobile production in the United States. And we have had 10 years of peace. So that means that if we keep on having record automobile production we will continue to have peace? What kind of ridiculous logic is this?

The truth is that none of our aid programs has been responsible for peace. Does NATO keep peace in Europe? The Soviets have a 10-to-1 advantage over NATO forces and could take Europe in a few weeks. Why don't they? Only because they fear the retaliatory military power of the United States. It is our power, and our power alone, that has kept the peace—such as it is. Foreign aid has brought us nothing but bigger deficits, lost friends, and the disrespect of our allies. In the 10 years we gave away $65 billion the Soviets have grown stronger, our allies have grown less united and militarily weaker, and several of our beneficiaries have virtually abandoned us.

Why keep on spending money which does us no good when we could be spending it on planes and ships and bombs that would assure our own safety—and at the same time assure the safety of our allies?

Foreign aid cannot work as present and past administrations have hoped it would work because the whole program is based on foreign policy that is schizophrenic, as Dorothy Thompson calls it. It can only work if the United States becomes frankly imperialist and demands, as a return for our aid, actions by those receiving it that support our policies. We must use foreign aid to impose a Pax Americana, or else abandon the whole idea that peace can be won by this method. It is against America's traditional principles to impose conditions for aid, to force allies to follow our direction. Our belife in self-determination conflicts directly with our attempts to buy allies. If we are true to these traditional American principles, we can never make a foreign-aid program work for America.

We will have more to say on this subject in the next few days.

Jim Hagerty's Job

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUGH SCOTT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 19, 1956

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, all of us have followed with close attention the reports on the President's condition during his stay at Walter Reed Hospital. I am sure that we will all agree that the public and the press have been kept fully informed of all developments. This is as it should be, and I feel that the man chiefly responsible for keeping the public informed has done a magnificent job. James C. Hagerty, the President's press secretary has received numerous commendations in the press for his forthright handling of the situation. In this connection I would like to insert in the RECORD an editorial from the Washington Evening Star, June 11, 1956, and the John M. Cummings column in the Philadelphia Inquirer, June 14, 1956:

[From the Washington Evening Star of June 11, 1956]

JIM HAGERTY'S JOB

This morning's bulletin from Walter Reed Hospital reflects the President's steady progress toward recovery from his operation Saturday morning. And now that the crisis atmosphere has passed, the bulletin also serves to remind one of the splendid job which has been done by Jim Hagerty, the President's press secretary.

Mr. Hagerty is getting to be an old hand at this sort of thing. During the long weeks after the September heart attack he manned the information post in Denver and kept the Nation posted on Mr. Eisenhower's condition. That ordeal is not likely to be repeated this time, for the President seems to be out of the woods and well on his way to a resumption of the quieter White House routine. Nevertheless, it was a rugged weekend for Jim Hagerty—14 press conferences on Friday and Saturday, 37 hours without sleep, etc.

This, of course, is his job. It is what he is supposed to do when the need arises. Still, this country has never seen anything quite like the handling of the news of Mr. Eisenhower's two illnesses. Never before have the people been kept so fully informed on a matter of such vital importance to them. To be sure, this was both the right thing and the smart thing to do. But it also was a job that could have been badly botched had it been entrusted to less competent hands.

[From the Philadelphia Inquirer of June 14, 1956]

"CANDOR" A GOOD NAME FOR JAMES "C." HAGERTY

(By John M. Cummings)

There are times when we feel the initial "C" in the name James C. Hagerty stands for candor. Jim is the White House Press officer. He is the public-relations man who sees to it that the reporters, the television and radio blokes on the White House beat are kept well and truthfully informed on the activities of President Eisenhower.

In the present emergency springing from the operation on the President to remove an intestinal obstruction Jim Hagerty has been every bit as frank as he was last year in handling the news of Mr. Eisenhower's heart attack in Denver. And in this policy of laying everything on the line he has the full approval of Mr. Eisenhower.

Candor pays off in confidence. Now, if Jim Hagerty had resorted to the technique of beating around the bush, of trying to conceal what should be fully exposed, suspicion would have crept into the public mind. Lincoln it was who said something about the futility of trying to fool the American people. You may get away with it for a time but eventually the truth will out, generally to the embarrassment of the fakers.

The whole world knows exactly the nature of the operation performed on the President at Walter Reed Hospital. It was explained in detail by the operating surgeon. For the benefit of the press he drew on a blackboard a diagram showing exactly what was done to relieve his distress.

It was conceded the President's condition called for an emergency operation. It was major surgery. There was no pretending that what was to be done was something on the order of removing a wart from the little finger of the left hand. It was not an unusual type of surgery. As Governor Harriman of New York remarked, it was the sort of emergency that might come into the life of any person.

Jim Hagerty deserves a lion's share of the credit for frankness and candor in White House press relations. It was not always so. Jim is a chip of the old block. His father, James A. Hagerty, was for many years the top political writer of the New York Times. Young Jim himself started out as a political reporter, but gave it up to become the press relations officer of Gov. Thomas E. Dewey when he first went to Albany.

Americans of every political complexion are concerned for the health of the President. But they are no longer worried. They have learned they can accept as gospel the bulletins on his recovery issued through Jim Hagerty. They received their first lesson in this refreshing candor following the Denver heart attack. Now their faith is reaffirmed in the handling of the present illness.

The attending physicians tell you that Ike's recovery will be more rapid than in the Denver case. This was emphasized by the fact that within 48 hours after the operation he was permitted to walk.

While it may be distasteful to make comparisons, it is difficult to avoid recalling the far different attitude of the men close to President Roosevelt in the final months of his life. He was renominated in Chicago in

the face of the knowledge on the part of Democratic leaders that he could not reasonably be expected to last another year. He died a few months after taking the oath for the fourth time. There was no candor in his case; no effort truthfully to advise the people on his condition.

Politicians, labor leaders, yes, so-called public-relations experts, would be well advised to observe carefully the work of Jim Hagerty in Washington.

Coming to the Aid of Cotton

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARLAN HAGEN
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 19, 1956

Mr. HAGEN. Mr. Speaker, for some time it has been apparent to me that the attempt to bring prosperity to cotton growers by establishing a guaranteed profitable price is comparable to attempting to cure cancer by the administration of opium. The patient receives some temporary relief from pain but the favorable prognosis of this disease is hindered. Moreover, the acceptance of pain relief as a cure is a deterrent to the development of a kind of program which will effect cures. It was for this reason that I voted against a return to rigid 90 percent of parity for cotton and other basic crops, and it is for this reason that I have introduced legislation which I feel is a better solution to the cotton problem. The legislation I refer to is my bill, H. R. 11478, which would provide for a referendum among cotton growers and if two-thirds of their number or producers of two-thirds of the volume of cotton approved such a program, $1 per bale assessment would be levied to provide a fund for the establishment of expanded research and promotion programs in connection with cotton fiber production, usage, and sale. This legislation has been very favorably received in various parts of the Cotton Belt. Among other comments to date, I include herewith an editorial from the Hanford Sentinel, dated June 6, an article from the June 12 Fresno Bee, an editorial from the Memphis Cotton Trade Journal, dated June 1, and an editorial from the June 16, Fresno Bee:

[From the Hanford Sentinel of June 6, 1956]

COMING TO THE AID OF COTTON

Congressman HARLAN HAGEN's proposal to finance cotton research on a massive scale through collecting a fee on each bale of cotton sold rings true with reason.

HAGEN has introduced legislation to put this proposal to the farmers in a referendum. It deserves industrywide support.

The main problem with cotton today is overproduction. The demand cannot keep up with the supply. Consequently the Government must buy the surplus in order to keep the farmers from going broke. This oversimplication of the cotton difficulties does not present all the aspects, but that's the general idea.

To complicate the demand-supply squeeze is the constant improvement of the synthetic fiber industry. Textile material is being built up from wood pulp, petroleum, coal and other common substances to offer real competition to cotton. This reduces demand, and increases the surplus.

What is obviously needed are ways to use cotton more. Create more uses, broaden the market, sell the surplus for manufacturing in the wider field, and the cotton problem dissolves.

The ideal situation, from the farmer's standpoint, is grow crops that enjoy such a high market demand that the need is never quite met. Then prices are stable at a high level.

HAGEN'S proposal was suggested to him by cotton growers of the San Joaquin Valley. It makes good sense.

The idea is to have the Secretary of Agriculture collect a sum of money on each bale of cotton marketed, possibly $1 per bale. The money would then be paid to the National Cotton Council to supervise and conduct research on a nonprofit basis.

To be most effective the research should not be restricted. Perhaps physicists would be able to find ways to improve cotton strains, making it more adaptive to manufacturing needs. Perhaps important gains could be made in methods of harvesting and ginning.

Perhaps the research would find new uses for cotton fibers, in chemical treating, blending with other fibers, improved ways of weaving and spinning.

Perhaps some completely new use could be found. The printing industry, for example, is sore-pressed with shortages of newsprint, the paper on which newspapers are printed. A ready market would be clamoring for a cheap, strong, cotton paper.

There is no way to tell where such research might stop, when one thinks of all the products that have been developed from common coal, for example.

There are several precedents for this cotton-research idea. One is the wool program. Another is the California beef promotion levy. Citrus growers of this State have long realized the values of pooling efforts to improve the product and its distribution.

Cotton is still king. But the kingdom is under threat from many powerful quarters. It needs this basic, strengthening research program.

[From the Fresno Bee of June 12, 1956]

TEXAS COTTON LEADER PROPOSES FARMERS START RESEARCH FUND

DALLAS, TEX.—If cotton is to insure its long-range future, cotton farmers should begin thinking about paying from $1 to $1.50 a bale into an industry fund for research and promotion.

This proposal was advanced here today by W. T. Wynn, a Greenville, Miss., cotton leader, in an address to the Texas Cottonseed Crushers Association. Emphasizing cotton must choose between research or recession, he pointed out that with an average 12-million-bale crop the collection of from $1 to $1.50 a bale would yield $12 million to $18 million annually for work on cotton and cottonseed probems.

Wynn, the chairman of the board of directors of the National Cotton Council, said, "In no other way can I envision that over the long pull we will be able to give cotton a truly adequate research program."

MUST ALWAYS PLAN

"I make this proposal knowing we have made great progress and that fine work is being done in Government and private research laboratories, and in our textile schools and textile mills. I make it, too, knowing we must continually plan for the future."

The $12 million fund admittedly is but a start, he said, toward matching the money which is being spent by producers of man-made fibers, but is enough to get into a really effective program of research and promotion.

The idea of farmers assessing themselves for their own protection is not a new one, Wynn declared, noting that in the Mississippi Delta cotton producers for 50 years paid $1 a bale each year for levees to protect their lands from floods. In many of these years the price of cotton was less than 10 cents a pound.

"The threat to the cotton industry by the Mississippi River was no more real," he warned, "and not nearly so permanent in nature as the threat now facing the cotton farmer—the threat his livelihood will be swept away by the flood of synthetic fiber production."

COMPARES FUND

Wynn pointed out about $14 million annually is being spent by all agencies on cotton research as compared with $60 million for synthetic-fiber research and development.

The speaker said cottonseeed has lost to soybeans in the vegetable-oil market much as cotton fiber has lost to synthetics. Research has improved the quality of soybean oil as well as lard, another cottonseed oil competitor. Major work is needed, he said, on such problems as improving the color of cottonseed oil.

Among many research needs for cotton fiber he listed, increased efficiency toward lower prices, staple length uniformity, greater strength, better insect and disease control, and improvements in marketing, ginning, and manufacturing. There is need, he said, for research to give cotton greater resilience, and resistance to heat, acids, and weathering.

If the research gap is not closed, he warned, the industry can expect too an annual decline in cotton production.

[From the Memphis Cotton Trade Journal of June 1, 1956]

LET'S GO TO WORK

Too many people in the cotton industry—from farmers to spinners—have allowed themselves to be depressed by the problems created by surplus stocks, relatively high support prices, unsatisfactory disposal program, the competition of synthetics—and related irritants, major and minor. Actually, there is no cause for despair. More than that—there is every reason for hope, for faith in the future—and even for confidence, if that confidence is based on hard work.

True, we are going through a crisis in our cotton economy. We are not alone in this. All those interested in producing, processing and merchandizing other farm commodities are sharing our tough experiences. They are unavoidable as part of the agricultural revolution now going on in the United States. Economic revolutions—like their political counterparts—are painful. But it will be a successful revolution in cotton—provided we roll up our sleeves and go to work.

Blaming our mess on politics won't get the job done—although undoubtedly politics played a major role in bringing about the present situation. Cussing the Government won't do it, either—although Government agencies at times have adopted policies which have seemed to us unreasonable and unwarranted. What will get the job done is an energetic effort to make cotton competitive in quality, end uses and in price with synthetics. That's our major chore.

An example of an effective approach is the bill introduced this week by Congressman HAGEN, Democrat, California, providing for a $1 a bale tax in order to finance a cotton research campaign, based upon acceptance by cotton farmers in a referendum. This is sound thinking. One fact is apparent. The members of the cotton industry will

have to work to save themselves—no one else is going to do the job for them—certainly not a welfare state government.

Free enterprise is still the best social system devised by man. We still retain a measure of freedom. Let's be more enterprising so that we may regain what we have lost.

[From the Fresno Bee of June 16, 1956]

COTTON INDUSTRY CHOICE

W. T. Wynn, of Greenville, Miss., chairman of the National Cotton Council board of directors, pointedly says the cotton industry must choose between research or recession.

This is challenging advice and there should be no question about which of the alternatives will be chosen. An increasingly competitive market demands intensified research to create expanded outlets for cotton products.

In an address before the Texas Cottonseed Crushers Association, Wynn suggested the payment by growers of a $1 to $1.50 a bale assessment into a fund for research and sale promotion. On the basis of a 12-million-bale crop year, say, this would provide $12 to $18 million.

Such an amount, along with the approximately $14 million already being spent yearly by all agencies in cotton research, would go a long way toward an effective remedy and maybe a solution for the industry's marketing problem.

Moreover, the outlay still would be far less than the $60 million annual expenditure for competitive synthetic-fiber research and development.

To enjoy its rightful role in the economic picture the cotton industry will have to face the fact that what once was good enough to hold its own no longer fills the bill.

It has an essential product to offer. But more acceptance thereof will depend upon the measure in which the cotton industry itself encourages demand.

Abandonment of the Income Tax

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM E. JENNER
OF INDIANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, June 19, 1956

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from the Shelbyville (Ind.) News.

I fully agree with the editorial's indictment of the income tax, and its recommendation for a Hoover-type commission to give Congress the means to make a full study of the subject and arrive at a remedy.

Our ancestors fought against taxation, because they knew taxation is the enemy of liberty. We shall be able to destroy the monstrous taxation of the present day, when we realize that in our time, as in 1776, the struggle is really a fight for liberty.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ABANDONMENT OF THE INCOME TAX

"Let's get rid of the income tax."

That has been said by many a beleaguered citizen, after sweating his way through the tax forms and dredging deep to find the money to pay the bill. Usually it is amplified with unprintable adjectives.

But now that very thing has been said, in all seriousness, by a top authority—T. Coleman Andrews, the former Commissioner of Internal Revenue. It is the title to a strong article which Mr. Andrews recently contributed to the American Weekly.

Mr. Andrews denounces the income tax, as it is now constituted, on just about every conceivable ground. Here, in summary, are some of the things he has to say.

The tax amounts to legalized confiscation. It begins at 20 percent and goes up to 91 percent. A man with a $40,000 income pays far out of proportion in the amount of his tax compared with the man with a $10,000 income, and people receiving income from dividends get even a worse deal—the corporation tax takes about half of corporation profits before they are divided among the shareholders, where they are taxed again.

Mr. Andrews said: "We have failed to realize, it seems to me, that through out tax system we have been playing right into the hands of the Marxists, who gleefully hail the income tax as the one sure instrument that will bring capitalism to its knees."

The tax is too complicated. Comparatively few people can accurately figure their tax without help. In this connection, it is significant that Members of Congress commonly call on Revenue Service experts to prepare their returns.

Few people, if any, really understand the tax. As an example, 20 months after the Income Tax Code of 1954 became law, the official Treasury Department interpretations had not been issued. The difficulty lies in trying to figure out what Congress meant in wording the law, and then trying to plainly express Congress' intentions.

It costs the Government too much to collect. Mr. Andrews has high praise for Internal Revenue Service personnel. But even the more than 50,000 people in the Service cannot assure adequate enforcement. It also costs the taxpayers too much. Huge sums of money go to lawyers and accountants to fill out and to defend tax returns.

It is unstable. As Mr. Andrews puts it: "Being based upon income, it's a low producer in slack times and a high producer in good times. Thus, theoretically, rates must be raised when people are least able to pay, and they may be lowered when everybody is most able to pay."

It is destroying the middle class. This is among Mr. Andrews' most serious indictments: "The middle class is being taxed out of existence and the Nation, thereby, is being robbed of its surest guarantee of continued sound economic development and growth and its staunchest bulwark against the ascendancy of socialism."

Mr. Andrews proposes the appointment of a Hoover Commission type of group to completely study the income tax and the whole tax system. Then a program can be adopted, he believes, for starting afresh. We're sure that a great many American taxpayers would agree that it's about time.

Panama Canal Company

SPEECH
OF
HON. PAUL CUNNINGHAM
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 18, 1956

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, may I inquire of the author of this bill or some member of the committee as to who owns the Panama Canal Company?

Mr. BONNER. The United States Government.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Is the United States Government the sole stockholder?

Mr. BONNER. I know of no one else.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I have been advised it is a private corporation authorized by the Congress, but the Government is not necessarily the stockholder.

Mr. BONNER. The Government owns the entire investment in the Panama Canal Company.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Is it an arm of the Government?

Mr. BONNER. It is.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Then any expenditure by the Panama Canal Company would be equivalent to an expenditure by the United States Government?

Mr. BONNER. Of course it would.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I withdraw my reservation of objection, Mr. Speaker.

Presentation of Congressional Franklin Medal to the Pennsylvania State University, June 16, 1956

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 19, 1956

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege to present the Congressional Franklin Medal to the Pennsylvania State University, University Park, Pa., during the alumni institute June 16, 1956, in commemoration of the 250th anniversary of the birth of Benjamin Franklin.

The address I delivered in connection with the presentation of the Congressional Franklin Medal follows:

ADDRESS BY REPRESENTATIVE JAMES E. VAN ZANDT, MEMBER OF CONGRESS, 20TH DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA, ON THE OCCASION OF THE PRESENTATION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL FRANKLIN MEDAL TO PENNSYLVANIA STATE UNIVERSITY, UNIVERSITY PARK, PA., DURING THE ALUMNI INSTITUTE JUNE 16, 1956, IN COMMEMORATION OF THE 250TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE BIRTH OF BENJAMIN FRANKLIN

It is a special privilege to speak to you today about Benjamin Franklin and to bring you a message of deep appreciation from the Congress of the United States.

When the plan was made originally to honor the 250th anniversary of the birth of Benjamin Franklin the committee thought of only a small celebration.

They expected to limit it to an exchange of ideas among the societies and institutions of which Franklin was once a member or which he founded or helped.

But such is the stature of the man that the original and limited plan soon developed into a great outpouring of voluntary cooperation in 51 countries of the world.

Franklin's spirit and philosophy were never more alive and vital than it proved to be in this year—2½ centuries after he was born.

Nearly a thousand organizations, with hundreds of thousands of members, seized upon this opportunity to do one of the things Benjamin Franklin believed was necessary to help bring enduring peace to the world.

They will cooperate, all during the year 1956, in a free and voluntary communication of ideas to help improve international understanding.

Each group plans its own program in its own country, in its own way.

Ideas are exchanged through addresses, papers, books, and broadcasts through the generous cooperation of many thousand publishers and broadcasters.

Already the Franklin Institute, which organized this plan, estimates that upward of 500 million people have been reached in the 51 cooperating countries.

This is the kind of plan that Franklin himself once developed for the young United States.

He was elected to membership in 28 of the most famous learned societies of his day—in England, France, Scotland, Holland, Russia, Germany, Italy, Spain, and America.

Through the transactions of these societies and the free press he helped so much to develop, he took part in the exchange of ideas which helped our young country to grow in the technological world we know today.

Twenty-one of these famous old societies that helped Benjamin Franklin are still in existence and cooperating in the current program.

They have been joined by many others in South America, Asia, and Europe in this modern exchange of ideas.

Franklin believed that it was necessary for the peoples of all countries to communicate with each other—in addition to their governments.

He thought that in this way, mankind could hasten the day when peace and understanding would replace wars and threats of war.

The Congress of the United States thought of this objective when they met to consider the most fitting tribute they could pay to Benjamin Franklin on the 250th anniversary of his birth.

They felt, as they believe Franklin would have felt, that honor should be paid to those groups which did so much to help make his success in this field possible.

The Franklin commemorative medal for distinguished service was designed for this purpose.

On it appears these words of Franklin's: "Wise and good men are the strength of a nation." The complete quotation adds the words: "Far more than riches or arms."

Someday, the world will come to recognize the truth of that statement.

The position of a country in the council of nations will be determined not by its material wealth or power of its armaments alone, but even more by the contributions of its great men and women to the welfare and progress of all mankind.

Benjamin Franklin believed this more than 200 years ago.

He knew and said that the road would be long and difficult.

But he never lost faith in the belief that "wise and good men" would be recognized as the "strength of a nation far more than riches or arms."

And that this day would be speeded by the free and open communications between the peoples of all countries.

The United States honors that philosophy in the creation of the Franklin medal.

Dean Stevenson Fletcher, of your university, in a delightful paper read at the Franklin Institute, listed Benjamin Franklin as one of the great leaders of Pennsylvania agriculture.

Dean Fletcher did not accord him this honor because of any great success he had made on his Chester County farm, where he was mostly an absentee owner.

But he did include Franklin because of his great services in helping to found and promote the idea of agricultural education for the young farmers of America.

Benjamin Franklin was one of the early members in founding the Philadelphia society for promoting agriculture.

He was a tireless advocate, as you know, of practical education as opposed to the more limited and ornamental education of his time.

In pursuit of this objective, he helped to found the University of Pennsylvania and brought into it, for the first time in America, the teaching of scientific and technical subjects.

He wrote the Rules Respecting a Medical Education and Degree, which were adopted by the college of physicians for the training of young doctors.

He assisted in developing Franklin and Marshall College at Lancaster as a school especially for young Germans.

So it was only to be expected that he would lend his influence and ability to the development of a school for students of agriculture.

Actually, the first farmers' high school was not opened until after Franklin's death, but the idea of its beginning may be traced directly back to Poor Richard.

This Farmers' High School filled such an obvious and important need that it grew into your great university of today.

The Congress of the United States is especially proud that the institutions which Benjamin Franklin helped to start have been developed in succeeding years far beyond his fondest expectations.

That is why this Franklin medal is presented not only to honor Benjamin Franklin but also to honor the many wise and good men of your institution who have made the reality greater than the founder's dream.

Perhaps a true measure of greatness is to build so well that the foundations will carry forward into the future without danger of weakness.

Benjamin Franklin built that way.

It is part of the measure of the man that he helped to found our first scientific and technical education, our first medical college, our first school for young people speaking another language, and our first agricultural school—all of which have come to greater service than even he could have dreamed.

It is a very special privilege for me today, Dr. Eisenhower, to present you this medal in the name of the Congress of the United States, in memory of Benjamin Franklin, and to honor also the many wise and good men of Pennsylvania State University who have built and are building so well upon the foundations he laid.

Strengthening the Family Farm, and Opposition to Foreign Aid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM E. JENNER
OF INDIANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, June 19, 1956

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD two editorials from the Bedford (Ind.) Daily Times-Mail for June 6 and 7, 1956.

These editorials vigorously support our historic national policy of strengthening the family farm, as the basis of our political, economic, and social system. They also point out how our so-called foreign aid actually involves the subsidizing of foreign agriculture with American taxes, in the case of the very products which we are trying to dispose of, because of the vast surpluses.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Bedford (Ind.) Daily Times-Mail of June 6, 1956]

JENNER WOULD HELP FAMILY FARMERS

Separation of the Nation's emergency farm measures from the long-term proposals with a goal of strengthening the family farms is proposed by United States Senator WILLIAM JENNER, of Bedford, who recently sought unsuccessfully to put a limit on the amount of Government aid any one farm could receive.

In a speech before the United States Senate a short time ago, JENNER called for reexamination of our farm policies and declared that socialistic trends of the 1930's were responsible for the farm programs of the past 24 years which he said have not solved the problem.

In his demand for a limit on the amount of Federal tax money that would be paid to any one landowner or farm corporation, JENNER obviously saw the need for help for the small farmer, the farmers who actually face hardship and a lower standard of living unless given some assistance and reassurance that he would be paid a living wage for his efforts.

The Senator cannot see the necessity of paying thousands of dollars to the big farm corporations simply to increase their profits at the expense of taxpayers.

In his recent Senate speech, JENNER said that he understands that under present farm legislation great landowners in the West can obtain more than a million dollars from the Nation's taxpayers without lifting a hand.

"Our policies," JENNER declared, "exert constant pressure toward corporation farming and the hated 'latifundia,' the huge estates owned by absentee capital and operated by farmers turned into hired hands.

"Government payments have greatly increased the tendency toward the purchase of farmland by financial, nonfarm interests. During the potato scandal, we heard how farms in Maine were being sold by farmers to interests in Boston which had never seen a plow."

The Senator said that he had lost hope that manipulation of the so-called parity prices will be of any permanent benefit to the American farmers because parity price is price control and price control means price-controllers. Beyond that, price control machinery must, in the nature of the case, fall into the hands of the planners, the collectivists, the supernationalist, he said.

"The first step on that slippery road brings us inevitably to the last step," he said, "where we are enmeshed in a web of controls, visible and invisible, which is designed to destroy the superiority of the United States in agriculture, in industry and in war."

JENNER said that the purpose of a farm program should be to save the American family farm which he said is the social basis for our free enterprise system, our political liberty, our biological heritage and our military strength. He recalled that the real military strength of the Romans lay in their independent farmers more than in their legions. But when the farms decayed, Rome was dependent on mercenary armies recruited from barbarian tribes.

"It should not be the purpose of Congress to help corporation farming," JENNER asserted, "or the spread of factory methods to farming. It should not be our purpose to help the city owner who buys farmland to help him avoid taxes. It should not be our

purpose to do one single thing to increase the price of farmland."

JENNER described the price of farmland as a cost to the farmer-operator which reduces the net income he receives for his work. He declared that maturing societies must distinguish between the share of farm income which goes for enterprise and the share which is paid for land because land ownership and land use inevitably grow more and more apart.

The Senator called for the establishment of a congressional advisory commission which would gather the best ideas in the Nation on how to restore the family farms as the foundation of our society, on helping them maintain themselves without Government aid and by their productive arts, by constant cost cutting, by skill in marketing, and by raising the real income of those domestic producers in nonfarm industries who should buy most of their products.

Tomorrow this column will discuss Senator JENNER'S views on the relationship of the farm problem with the State Department.

[From the Bedford (Ind.) Daily Times-Mail of June 7, 1956]

FOREIGN AID CONTRIBUTES TO FARMERS' PLIGHT

Our Government is doing everything possible to increase agricultural production across the face of the globe while groping with the problem of how to reduce it at home.

That statement was made by Senator WILLIAM E. JENNER, of Bedford, recently in a speech on reexamination of our farm policies on the floor of the Senate.

We are, JENNER said in effect, promoting competition for our farmers by strengthening foreign agriculture to the point that it is competing with this country in the world markets.

Our Government is spending a substantial portion of its foreign-aid appropriations for agricultural promotion abroad, and through these programs we taxpayers, including the farmers, are paying to supply competitor nations with seed, farm machinery of every description, and hundreds of agricultural experts to increase their farm output.

While our own farmers have to pay dearly for such equipment and other factors, foreign farmers are getting it all free from the United States.

In addition, this country is also spending vast sums of money to provide irrigation and other soil improvements abroad—again free of charge—which will continue to skyrocket competitive farm production.

"We hear the Secretary of Agriculture complain about the surplus of cotton in the United States," JENNER declared. "What has the administration done about it? It has made it possible through United States money for Mexico to double its cotton production. It has made it possible for India to increase its cotton production by 50 percent. It has made it possible for cotton-growing Egypt to add 2 million irrigated farm acres when the Aswan Dam is finished.

"All this cotton growing is being encouraged by the State Department at a time when world production in the past 4-year period for which figures are available has already increased by more than 5 million bales, all of which competes with American cotton."

JENNER said that as result, this country's cotton exports dropped nearly 40 percent in 3 years, while exports by other cotton-growing countries rose 46 percent.

United States exports of wheat were cut approximately in half since 1948–49, while production and exports of countries receiving United States aid went up.

We had an opportunity to sell wheat in South America, JENNER said, and our Department of Agriculture wanted to sell it, but the State Department said "No, we must take it up with our friendly allies."

Canada was tipped off and the Canadian Minister of Agriculture went to South America and made the wheat deal. "Yet we talk about farm legislation for an emergency," JENNER declared.

"We hear the Secretary of Agriculture complain even more bitterly that there is a surplus of dairy products," he continued, "yet the action of the administration in helping foreign dairy production to increase rapidly has forced a drop of nearly 90 percent in United States exports.

"This is only the beginning. Money to build up foreign farm competition is flowing as freely as the Mississippi River."

The legislator said that there are nearly 750 United States farm experts abroad, helping spend the money, helping foreign nations build up their farm production. This must stop, he said, if we are going to help American farmers realize an American standard of living.

"If we want to beggar them to the level of the Asiatic peasant, then the program so diligently pursued by our State Department is well on its way to doing the job," JENNER asserted.

Regarding foreign-aid expenditures, JENNER said:

"I have already mentioned the extent to which our Government is helping to increase farm production abroad." The actual figures are even more striking. In the 7 years beginning April 1948, the United States foreign-aid program provided, for the promotion of foreign agricultural production, a total of $984,159,436—nearly a billion dollars.

A half billion dollars went for the purchase of agricultural machinery and equipment—all as a gift to foreign farmers who are now able to compete with American farmers, who find no overgenerous Uncle Sam to give them tractors, or reapers, or trucks, or seed, or fertilizer, but who, on the contrary, in addition to the cost of operation of their farm machinery, have to pay the tax bill.

One reason why the cost of farm machinery and other things that the farmer buys is so high is the unbearable tax burden to pay for foreign gifts.

In addition to this billion dollars, the United States has set up over $700 million in counterpart funds, also to help agricultural production.

This direct aid is only a part of the total picture. The Government has given tax privileges and other forms of incentives to encourage private investments abroad. Also, the policy of keeping American goods off world markets has, in effect, encouraged private investors to expand production abroad without fear of having any real competition from American farm products.

The 1 million acres of farmlands added to Mexican farm production were financed largely by American money. The story is the same all the way across Latin America.

Strong Words, Good Advice

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WINT SMITH

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 19, 1956

Mr. SMITH of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, as the final chapter of the foreign aid program will soon be written, it might be well for some, who so often and so loudly proclaim what Teddy Roosevelt would have said and how he would have acted in these troublesome times, to read again what Teddy said about the professional internationalist.

Recently Mr. Warren Zimmerman, of Lawrence, Kans., in a letter to the editor, quoted Teddy Roosevelt and made some very pointed, well chosen remarks about the futility of foreign aid.

Mr. Zimmerman simply points out what some of us here in Congress felt for a long time. The greatest asset there is for world peace is for a strong America in her own internal affairs, and about the surest road to defeat for the free world would be to have a bankrupt America. Is there anyone who does not believe that there can be no security or freedom for anyone in a bankrupt America? Is it not asking quite a lot of the Congress, in view of our present debt of $278 billion, to give away another $4,900,000,000 to peoples of foreign nations for the fiscal year of 1957?

Here is Mr. Zimmerman's letter to the editor:

STRONG WORDS, GOOD ADVICE

EDITOR, JOURNAL-WORLD: "The professed internationalist usually sneers at nationalism, at patriotism, and at what we call Americanism. He bids us forswear our love of country in the name of love of the world at large. We nationalists answer that he has begun at the wrong end; we say that as the world is now, it is only the man who ardently loves his country first who in actual practice can help any other country at all." (Theodore Roosevelt.)

Those prophetic words by the above illustrious 26th President, a real and patriotic American if there ever was one, are more significant today than at any time since he uttered them.

The salvation of the world depends upon a strong America; strong from a religious, moral, patriotic, and never-to-be-forgotten financial standpoint, for a worthless government financially can accomplish no more in its sphere than the commonest lout of the racetrack or gambling den.

And if we continue financing the foreigners via the income-tax route; try to educate the underprivileged of the world while we wonder how to handle our own educational problems (and that's just one of the new and bold concepts of a vital social conscience); try to buy the gangster Tito or the Moscow sympathizer Nehru's friendship; try to support the poor people of the world whom "ye have with you always" (one able authority once put it) that they may realize their aspirations in life while your own can go to Sheol, for the one-worlders, you understand, must be kept happy; if we continue to support the mendicant nations of the world who have warred since creation's dawn and always will, for they have never learned the meaning of the word "honor"; then we will wind up finally just where every nation in Europe and Asia has ultimately landed, with poverty and wretchedness abounding with us on every hand. We've blithely traveled that route $280 billion to date.

We will give our all and take off our shirt finally for our country, but supporting foreigners financially forever is something else, a task we've long been fed up on. We trust that God in His infinite wisdom, loving kindness, and tender mercy, points out a route to the electorate this fall for defeating the organized financial brigands of both parties, commonly called bipartisan foreign-policy makers, that there may remain in this weary old world one nation still strong in all the essentials which make a country and keep it great. In other words, we are sick and tired to death of voting "ja."

Visits to Red Russia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 19, 1956

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I include a very interesting editorial entitled "Visits to Red Russia," which appeared in the Catholic Standard, Washington's archdiocesan newspaper, on June 15, 1956. The editorial contains some very pointed and pertinent observations that are worthy of deep consideration. There are millions of Americans who are greatly concerned with the increasing fraternization that is going on now between our Government and the Soviet Union.

VISITS TO RED RUSSIA

The decision of the President not to permit all the military chiefs to visit Russia at one time is good news. It is not only a sound decision in itself but it is particularly opportune for snuffing out the conflagration of speculation about visits to and from Red Russia.

In fact, the presence of Adenauer in this country should provide a good incentive for caution. His trip to Moscow gained little or nothing while the extent of his substantial loss is not yet precisely assessed.

There is no reason for inordinate haste in this delicate and potentially explosive matter. Haste can only aid the Reds. It was fortunate that the President, according to reports, stated that any further visits would depend on the "circumstances at the time and the report of General Twinning at the time." Certainly, it would be fantastically foolhardy to risk the prestige of the United States in one impulsive gamble.

It seems to us that there is very grave reason to consider the following points in accepting invitations to visit the Reds:

1. Every acceptance implies at least an invitation to the Americans' counterpart in the Soviet Union. We shall put ourselves in a grossly unfavorable light if we do not extend at least reciprocal invitations.

2. Every acceptance increases their hopes for expecting an eventual invitation to their highest authorities. This would be only a natural expectation and it could be incessantly and cleverly exploited by their propaganda instruments. We shall not be able to drop the invitations at our choice without paying a heavy price in vilification and possible loss of prestige. We are not engaged in an exchange with a nation which acts according to a code of civility—this is a propaganda battle with an avowedly ruthless enemy.

3. No step should be made without considering its implications and repercusions on the millions of oppressed but potentially helpful allies behind the Iron Curtain. As the President and our Secretary of State (even recently) have stated, we have a moral obligation to these people, as well as an obligation toward our own defense to foster all possible allies. We are the only hope of millions of enslaved peoples. The only fuel for their hope is the conviction that the United States does not approve the policy of the Soviet Union and that some day our opposition will effect somehow their liberation, as promised by our President. It would possibly crush their hope and their present moral resistance to the Communist propaganda if we are pictured as becoming friendly with the Reds and therefore approving the Reds' policy.

This is an established fact, not supposition. We know this on the most trustworthy evidence of very reliable persons who are in contact with these people. In fact, the hesitation and vacillation by our Government in this matter has already caused considerable disappointment and has shaken the morale of these people. Probably this fact can be adequately appreciated only by those Americans who have actually lived in contact with these peoples.

The reaction of the ensalved peoples is roughly equivalent to that of the peoples enslaved by the Nazis during the past World War. The spirit of resistance was maintained, as everyone knows who was in contact with these people, by the constant promises of help by the Allies. Any dashing of those hopes would have been a huge blow to our effort in liberating Europe.

The resistance of these ensalved peoples is not a minor matter either to the United States or to the Reds. The Reds in Poland revealed their concern and the extent of this threat to their security by stating that 30,000 lives were lost in combating the guerrilla fighters since the war. This is a far higher number than was ever expected and certainly represents a minimum since it is to the advantage of the Reds to minimize the efforts of the guerrillas.

4. The accounts of these visits will be published in the Communist and satellite world only by the Reds, not by the United States. It should be remembered that even the British account of the arrival of Bulganin and Khrushchev in England was jammed and thus eliminated by the Reds. They would permit only their account of the whole visit.

Obviously, the account of their visits to this country as well as the visit of Americans to Russia will be slanted, altered or omitted in accordance with their designs. We have made no provisions for impartial reporting and could not enforce them even if they were made. If the visits are favorable to our cause, we can only expect that the reports will be silenced or distorted. It is not a contest in which we can win—only one in which we can lose in varying degrees.

Let us have a long, careful appraisal of the results of General Twinning's visit (the wisdom of which is not yet demonstrated) before we make another move.

A Vote on School Aid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES G. POLK
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 19, 1956

Mr. POLK. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the lead editorial in today's New York Times on the subject of A Vote on School Aid:

A VOTE ON SCHOOL AID

The welfare of many hundreds of thousands of school children in cities, towns, and villages throughout the United States may be directly affected during the next few years by what the Rules Committee of the House of Representatives does today. All year long this powerful committee of 12 Congressmen has had before it a bill to grant Federal aid for school construction, and at last there is a good chance that it may vote on whether or not to allow the measure to come to the floor. If the vote is taken and, as seems likely, the decision is favorable, the House itself may be passing upon this important measure next week, not quite too late for the Senate to act before adjournment.

The delay has been unconscionably long already, due to political maneuvering rather than any lack of merit in the legislation. One of the major stumbling blocks in recent months has been the threat of the Powell amendment, which would deny Federal school aid to districts failing to comply with the Supreme Court's antisegregation decision. Integrated education is a necessary and desirable goal for our democracy; but the Supreme Court itself has laid down the general lines along which it will be accomplished. Irrelevant and punitive measures such as the Powell plan have no place in such a program. It now appears as though the Powell amendment can be beaten on the floor, and this prospect gives some hope for ultimate success for the bill.

The matter is one of genuine urgency. The enormous population growth of this country since the war has created an undeniable crisis in local school systems throughout the country. This crisis takes many forms; but the one that the Federal Government can do most about, and in complete conformity with the American tradition, is the desperate shortage of schoolrooms and school buildings. At the present rate of construction it is estimated that our country may be 150,000 (or more) classrooms short when schools open 3 years from this September, meaning that in round figures some 4,500,000 children would not have adequate facilities.

Congress recently found it possible and politically expedient to pass a bill to help the States with highway construction. Has our civilization become so grossly material that Congress thinks this is more important than passing a bill to help the States with school construction? We refuse to accept such a conclusion. Without such aid we will be depriving our children of even the basic physical plant in which to acquire the education and culture that ought to be the birthright of every American.

Investigating a Union Treasury

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PETER FRELINGHUYSEN, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 19, 1956

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I include the following editorial, from the New York Herald Tribune of June 16, 1956:

INVESTIGATING A UNION TREASURY

In the vast and still largely unexplored terrain of funds that unions collect for the supposed benefit of their members, consider the case of the Distillery, Rectifying Wine and Allied Workers International Union of America.

This is the union which District Attorney Hogan has been investigating since 1953. He finally obtained an indictment against three union officials charging bribery in the sum of $299,000 for welfare-fund kickbacks. The indictment, however, was dismissed on the ground that those accused had been acting as trustees of the fund and could not properly be tried for shortcomings as union officials. Mr. Hogan is contesting this on appeal.

Now the district attorney has gone a little further. Another indictment against one of these former self-same officials charges $16,125 grand larceny from the union treasury, the money being paid to a woman friend who posed as a clerk but appeared at the office only on the occasion of Christmas

parties. Furthermore, the prosecutor has reason to think that a lot more money was being shifted around, for which reason he would like to have a good look at the union books. But these records are in Chicago, where Mr. Hogan cannot get at them, and the union president declines to cooperate. The district attorney's only recourse, at least so far, is to appeal to the AFL-CIO ethical practices committee.

What the 30,000 distillery workers think does not appear on the record. Neither has anything been heard from the AFL-CIO. But the money involved belongs to the rank and file, and certainly there ought to be a sense of responsibility. It shouldn't be wholly up to the district attorney to enforce that trust.

NATO and What's Ahead

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 13, 1956

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Hanson W. Baldwin is a well-known military expert. In the New York Times of last Sunday he analyzes the issues that face the NATO organization in a changing world situation. The article follows:

NATO AND WHAT'S AHEAD—AN ANALYSIS OF ISSUES THE ALLIANCE FACES IN RELATION TO CHANGING WORLD SITUATION

(By Hanson W. Baldwin)

The era of agonizing reappraisal is starting for the North Atlantic Alliances.

Last week's events, superimposed on the cumulative evidence of months indicated strongly that the alliance's present level of forces and probably its strategic concepts, as well as its basic political policies, would have to be changed.

The clearest indication of the shape of things to come was the forecast from London that in a few years Britain's new military look would mean the end of conscription and a sharp reduction in the strength of British forces in West Germany.

These plans follow a whole sequence of events that make the handwriting on the wall apparent. In itself the announced retirement of Gen. Alfred M. Gruenther as Supreme Allied Commander, Europe, in the fall implies the end of an era. The French military preoccupation with Algeria, which has resulted in stripping the Atlantic pact defense system of nearly all French regular land forces; the troubles in Cyprus, a divisive factor between Greece and Turkey; and Iceland's request that United States troops leave are other weakening factors.

An even more important factor is that the West German contribution to the Atlantic Pact forces still is largely on paper. The recent action of the North Atlantic Council in appointing three wise men to study ways and means of strengthening the alliance by emphasizing political and economic measures indicates the underlying worry in the West about the future NATO.

Fundamentally, the problem of the alliance is the problem of military contradictions, psychological frustration, and economic stresses.

ECONOMICS HELD VITAL

The economic factors have been important since the beginning of the Atlantic alliance. However, the sense of urgency stemming from the Korean and Indochina wars reduced the impact of the economic factors for the first few years of the life of the alliance. But in recent years, particularly since the new peaceful policy of Moscow, the sense of urgency has been reduced.

There is sharp competition for foreign markets, with both West Germany and the Soviet Union adding to Britain's export-or-die difficulties. Above all, there is an unresolved psychological conflict in the Atlantic alliance induced by the military policies the organization has followed.

The strategy of the Atlantic alliance has been based on a nuclear concept. So-called tactical atomic weapons will be used to defend West Europe against any Soviet attack. According to this strategy implied in this concept, but not explicitly stated, is the corollary that so-called strategic targets in the Soviet Union would be attacked with thermonuclear weapons.

According to this theory, the superiority in numbers and conventional arms of the Soviet bloc would be neutralized and defeated by the West's present superiority in nuclear arms, and the means of delivering them.

This nuclear strategy is primarily responsible for the military contradictions that now exist in the Atlantic alliance and for some of the psychological frustration. Very few experts believe that it would be possible to fight a tactical or limited nuclear war in West Europe without extensive devastation and hundreds of thousands of civilian deaths. Very few experts believe that such a war could be kept limited.

EFFECT ON WEST EUROPE

This prospect of becoming a radioactive desert, quite understandably does not fill West Europe with enthusiasm. It has had a two-pronged effect: reduced European support for the Atlantic alliance and developed greater military dependence on the United States, which is the principal Western atomic power. It has led to a rather widely prevalent belief that if West Europe's shield is to be a United States atomic one, there is not much use for conventional forces.

According to this belief, small ground forces would serve merely as a plate-glass window. Under the same line of reasoning, if the ground forces were attacked, the breaking of the window automatically would trigger the nuclear defense of the West.

These fears and these beliefs have influenced greatly the future of the Atlantic Alliance. Britain's decision to end conscription at some future date and to reduce her ground forces in West Germany by at least one-half is in part the product of the West's increasing reliance on the nuclear deterrent. Inevitably this policy undermines West German conventional armament, and must lead, in time, to a reduction of United States ground forces on the continent of Europe.

This nuclear strategy sells the Atlantic alliance down the river. It offers no alternative to nuclear devastation or Communist conquest.

A new strategy, as well as a new political policy, for the Atlantic alliance is the need of tomorrow.

We Must Not Forget the Enslaved Peoples of the Baltic States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCES P. BOLTON
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 19, 1956

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks, I insert in the RECORD the text of my broadcast over station WHK, Cleveland, on June 16, 1956, on the subject of the Soviet enslavement of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia:

BROADCAST BY HON. FRANCES P. BOLTON, REPRESENTATIVE (REPUBLICAN) 22D DISTRICT, OHIO, ON STATION WHK, CLEVELAND, JUNE 16, 1956

We Americans are deeply grateful for the freedoms that are ours. They have cost us blood and sorrow, which give us a certain understanding of the anguish of those who have lost their freedom. We remember the sadness in the hearts of all who have so suffered. We know that in the past decade alone more than 700 million people have fallen under the despotism of the Soviet Union. We have not forgotten that even more than 10 years ago Soviet armies enslaved the people of the Baltic States of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia.

All this week Americans of Baltic descent and their friends have been holding memorial services that mark the Soviet occupation of June 1940, and the mass deportations that started the following year. Tonight in Cleveland many of our fellow citizens are gathered in St. George's Hall to observe those sad chapters in the history of civilization.

Since there is much talk these days of changed attitudes in the Soviet Union, we Americans must take note of those who remain in the enslaved lands. Let me say to all who think Moscow has changed its strategy, read the speech by First Party Secretary Khrushchev before the 20th Party Congress of the Soviet Union. Our Department of State released copies of the speech last week.

Read how cruel Stalin was in deporting Russian people from their home areas. But does Khrushchev have a single word of regret for the mass deportations of men, women and children from Latvia, Lithuania, and Estonia? No; not once in his 6-hour address.

The new collective leaders of Soviet Russia say that Stalin was bad, but Lenin was good. But the people in St. George's Hall tonight know that in 1920 and 1921 it was Lenin himself who renounced the Soviet rights to the Baltic States. But in spite of that they were taken over. Do the collective leaders plan to return those lands to the people who have lived there for centuries?

The Soviets say they have stopped the reign of terror in the enslaved lands. But still the people of Baltic descent cannot get their parents, brothers, or sisters out of enslavement, for the Communists will permit no one to leave.

What can we in America do—so many miles away from the Baltic—to be of help to those brave people? Let me read a portion from one of their underground appeals to the free world:

"We wonder whether the world knows about our sufferings, and our difficult and heroic struggle for the right and freedom of mankind to democratic ideals which the leaders of Western democracies have proclaimed."

We must tell them that we do know and we hear their appeals—just as they tell us that they hear our voices speaking out in anger. We must give them the encouragement to continue their battle against seemingly impossible odds. For they have to know that we are still determined that the Baltic States will some day return to their rightful owners. If we ever forsake these fighters for freedom, we will destroy their last thread of hope.

Tomorrow our fellow Clevelanders will attend mass in St. George's Church in memory of those who are still enslaved. We all join in their pleas for the deliverance of their loved ones. Let us also urge them to include in their service a prayer for the continued strength of America and for the never wavering determination to spread the principles of freedom throughout the world.

Salute to Frank Gannett

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD C. OSTERTAG
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 19, 1956

Mr. OSTERTAG. Mr. Speaker, the newspaper trade journal, Editor and Publisher, this weeks pays a well-deserved tribute to Frank E. Gannett, of Rochester, who began his career as a newspaper publisher just 50 years ago this month. Under leave to extend my remarks, I include in the RECORD a column by Robert U. Brown describing Mr. Gannett's initial venture as publisher of the Elmira (N. Y.) Gazette, and his long and fruitful association in the years that followed, with Frank E. Tripp, now chairman of the board of Gannett newspapers.

SHOP TALK AT 30

(By Robert U. Brown)

"Fifty years ago this Wednesday, a date easy to remember, 6-6-'06, Frank Gannett, 6 years an editor, took over the 6-man staff of the Elmira Gazette, at 106 Lake Street, as half owner of his first newspaper. Six was to prove his magic number."

So reports Frank Tripp who sort of went with the deal at that time and is now chairman of the board of the Gannett Newspapers after many years as general manager.

Mr. Gannett is president of the organization which started 50 years ago with that 1 paper and a claimed 12,000 circulation. Today there are 23 newspapers in the group with total weekday circulation of 784,000 and 385,000 on Sunday.

Mr. Gannett, born September 15, 1876, had 6 years of newspaper experience under his belt when he moved into Elmira—as editor of the Cornell Alumni News, managing editor of the Ithaca (N. Y.) Daily News, and editor of the Pittsburgh (Pa.) Index.

Mr. Tripp, only 5 years his junior, born February 21, 1882, had almost as many years experience as a reporter in Elmira, having started there in 1901. It wasn't long before he switched to the advertising and management side of the newspaper business although F. E. T. never lost his first love for the news side. In fact, he has returned to it lately by writing a reminiscence column syndicated by General Features Corp.

It is from one of these columns that we quote now.

Mr. Tripp recalls that in 1905 Edwin R. Davenport from the Omaha Bee had bought the other half of the Elmira Gazette. When Mr. Gannett (F. E. G.) entered the field, Mr. Tripp says he expected it to be his last day on the already 78-year-old Democratic mouthpiece. Instead it was the beginning of a half-century association.

Quoting Mr. Tripp:

"To look at Frank Gannett that first day no one would have guessed his destiny. He was 29, frail, narrow faced and pale, eager but scared.

"Perhaps he was regretting that he had just risked the $3,000 savings and $17,000 of borrowed money for half of a decrepit political newspaper kept for years by David B. Hill, its undercover lawyer, and by the Democratic Party.

"Political sheets were gasping everywhere, or reforming. The Evening Star had been beating the daylights out of the Gazette for 10 years. Gannett and Davenport had bought into a tough job.

"But they knew how. It took only a year for the old-timers on the Star to conclude it smart to join up with the two youngsters on the Gazette, rather than buck them. Elmira couldn't support two evening papers. The Star and the Gazette became the Star-Gazette."

The march of progress in the last 50 years has not been all milk and honey, F. E. T. reports. "The first expansion was no aim toward a group of newspapers. It was necessity. Consolidation of the Star and the Gazette put five families of owners among the paper's dependents. The Star-Gazette was going good, but not that good. Come wartime 1917, something had to be done about it.

"This predicament was to change American newspaper history. By 1917 the owner of the Akron Beacon-Journal had two sons, one in Cornell, one age 8. This year he made a decision that brought about two important newspaper groups.

"The harassed Elmira owners heard that the Ohio paper might be bought. There were negotiations, but finally Charles L. Knight decided to keep the Beacon-Journal for his boys. Those boys are John S. and James L. Knight. (Now of the Knight Newspapers in Akron, Chicago, Detroit, Miami, and Charlotte.)

"Disappointed, the Elmira shoppers were led to Rochester by their national representative, J. P. McKinney. He knew Rochester, came from there; was born in a hotel along the old Erie Canal, on the very spot where now stands Gannett newspapers headquarters in Times Square.

"Frank and Davvy moved to Rochester. The other three original owners, who had owned the Elmira Star, died early, I. S. Copeland, Woodford J. Copeland, and James F. Woodford. I bought Mr. Woodford's share. All interests and acquisitions by 1925 had merged into Gannett Co., Inc., Frank Gannett the mortgaged owner."

Mr. Tripp wishes that "Frank Gannett had strength to reenact with Davvy and me the scenes of his Elmira beginning." We wish so too.

Unfortunately, F. E. G., approaching his 80th birthday, has not been in good health in recent years. We join others in saluting him on this 50th birthday of the founding of the Gannett newspapers.

Petition Opposing Alcoholic Beverage Advertising in Interstate Commerce

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE HUDDLESTON, JR.
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 19, 1956

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, it is my pleasure to submit herewith, for the RECORD, a petition which I have received from a group of my constituents:

PETITION

To our Senators and Representatives in Congress:

We, the undersigned, respectfully petition you to exercise the proper discretion vested in you by passing legislation to prohibit the transportation of alcoholic beverage advertising in interstate commerce and its broadcasting over the air, a practice which nullifies the rights of States under the 21st amendment to control the sale of such beverages.

At a time when 1 out of 10 drinkers is becoming an alcoholic, there should be no encouragement to increase the use of such beverages. Children and youth are being misled to consider them harmless, especially by the powerful audio and visual suggestions of radio and television.

Mrs. H. E. White, Mrs. W. E. Stewart, Mrs. A. M. Clark, Mrs. Roy Smith, Mrs. Owen Raines, Mrs. Cora New, Mrs. E. M. Sutter, Mrs. A. J. Robins, Mrs. H. C. Weldon, Mr. H. C. Weldon, Mrs. Emma Sanderson, Mrs. J. P. Lawson, Mrs. C. L. Autry, Mr. and Mrs. J. H. Reames, Miss Donnie Gay Vance, Mr. S. E. Crawford, Mrs. Katie McWilliams, Mr. Roger G. Mitchell, Mrs. Horace Wilson, Mrs. Louis A. Wilmat, Mr. John Chadbourne, Birmingham, Ala.; Miss Marjorie Crockett, Miss Shirley Crockett, Miss Ruth Crockett, Miss Jerrelyn Crockett, Sayreton, Ala.; Mr. J. L. Davis, Mrs. John Chadbourne, Birmingham, Ala.

How Long Will Americans Stand for the Tax Grab?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK T. BOW
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 14, 1956

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, the Town Journal for June contains an excellent editorial on the Hoover Commission reports and the opportunity for reducing Government expenditures. Under leave to extend my remarks, I offer the editorial:

HOW LONG WILL AMERICANS STAND FOR THE TAX GRAB?

This month the second installment of the 1956 Federal income tax is due, and millions of Americans will have to dig deep to pay their share of the Government's spending spree. Other millions, who are subject only to the withholding tax, may not be so conscious of the relentless drain on their earnings because their share is "withheld" before they get it. But they're paying for wasteful Government spending just the same.

How do you feel about today's excessive income taxes? Do you pass them off with a shrug and a complacent "It can't be helped"? Or do you burn with anger that such a large part of your earnings is taken from you to pay for unnecessary Government functions, unneeded Federal employees, unsound Government projects that compete unfairly with private business, unintelligent purchasing methods?

For it can be helped. Federal income taxes could be lowered without sacrificing a single essential function or necessary defense appropriation. Had you realized that the recommendations of the first Hoover Commission have already saved the taxpayers about $7 billion since 1949? But there is still staggering waste. If the recommendations of the second Hoover Commission were followed, an additional $7.5 billions yearly could be saved.

Such a saving could mean a reduction of 25 percent in every taxpayer's personal income tax. Isn't that worth trying to get?

Such a saving could be made merely by getting rid of the incredible waste and inefficiency that are costing all of us so dearly. Our tax rates are so high they have been aptly called "outrageous confiscation in action."

For example, among the fantastic revelations of the Hoover Commission were these: new Federal hospitals being built while existing hospitals have a billion dollars worth of unused beds; the Army with enough women's wool serge taupe uniforms to last

more than 10 years; the Navy with enough canned hamburger to last almost 60 years; 1 Government agency selling—at a few cents on the dollar—something another Government agency is buying at full price.

Americans have always been known for their refusal to submit meekly to injustice. Yet, strangely enough, they do little or nothing about the exorbitant and increasing income tax rates that rob a man of his ambition and initiative as well as a big part of his earnings, and put a brake on industry's effort to expand.

The common assumption is that nothing can be done about it. But something can be done about it. If Congressmen and Senators get enough letters of protest from their constituents, they'll realize the people's patience is wearing thin and something had better be done. For Congress is still subject to the will of the voters.

If you want to help put an end to unnecessary Government spending and waste, so that you may keep more of your hard-earned tax dollars for yourself and your family, write to your Senators and Congressmen and tell them so. Have your friends, neighbors and civic organizations do likewise. The more the better—and the sooner you'll get long-needed action.

GRAHAM PATTERSON,
Publisher.

Armed Forces Day Means What?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDGAR W. HIESTAND
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 5, 1956

Mr. HIESTAND. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a column by George Todt which appeared May 19, 1956, in the Valley Times, of North Hollywood, Calif.

In the column Mr. Todt predicts that when a showdown finally occurs between nationalism and internationalism, that our Armed Forces will be found to be a tower of patriotic strength for the Republic against her world-government enemies.

ARMED FORCES DAY MEANS WHAT?

"The essence of war is violence. Moderation in war is imbecility." (Lord Fisher.)

Armed Forces Day is a day to celebrate. Our young men and women in uniform have it coming to them. They are the sinew and muscle upon which the Nation must depend if attacked by an aggressor. Better to honor them now before they may be sent away to fight someone else's war. The service people are often the forgotten ones in peacetime—but oh, how they are lionized when war has been declared. So give them a break before it happens. But Armed Forces Day is really more than just a day to celebrate. It is also a day on which to think about the preparedness of our country to defend this citadel of modern freedom against the fanatical Marxist gangsters—domestic and international—who would sell the birthright of the Republic and chain the United States to the hideous bondage of a future socialist world government. This would destroy our inspired Constitution and its Bill of Rights overnight. Every officer of the Armed Forces, as well as every officer of the United States Government, has taken a mighty oath to defend our Constitution against all her enemies—foreign and domestic—and from whatever quarter or direction such a threat might arise. It would be nothing less than treason to do otherwise.

Today there are a great many persons who flirt with treason and subversion without, perhaps, being entirely aware of what they are doing. Ignorance is no legitimate excuse in such a case, however. Since the balmiest days of the slaphappy New Deal, loyalty to the United States has steadily given ground to the bitter rantings of false prophets who have counseled rank, undisguised disloyalty among our people. This has been done skillfully under the vague guise of brotherhood, universal peace, and world government. They are the inevitable carrots which must accompany the Marxist stick. In the self-interest of those political-action hatchmen who exploit such cure-alls, we are told to discard our old-fashioned Constitution and American traditions for a confused, unworkable mess of socialist pottage.

This is outright subversion, pure and simple, and we should do well to mark such people who counsel thus for future reference. The day of reckoning will not be too far hence. For a great reaction against the Marxist conspiracy to sell American Joe Doakes to a self-appointed world government oligarchy has already commenced. Those who cannot even now perceive its tremendous and growing power in the grassroots of the Nation are either blind—or fools.

I predict that when the nationalism, versus internationalism chips are really down in this case, our Armed Forces will be found to be a tower of partiotic strength for the Republic against her world government enemies. For Marxism of all shades is hated by the officers and men of our combat services—and this includes radical, anti-American internationalism. Just ask the boy who formerly fought in Korea. Or perhaps the one who may be later shipped to the Midde East. Ask one of them the name of the only flag they might ever wish to fight for—and you will quickly learn it is old glory, and none other. There motto is just this one: "America first, last, and always."

Finally, on Armed Forces Day, we should all dedicate ourselves to the proposition that the American fighting man must have the most advanced weapons and tactics that this richest of all nations can provide for him. Our theory of warfare must be the most advanced in all the world—because we have the most to defend. We can take no chances on defeat. We must forget the adolescent strategy of the previous world wars, and of history before our time. We must concentrate on perfecting our research and development along military lines for futuristic war as long as we are threatened by aggressors. We must achieve qualitative superiority over any combination of enemies which might be brought to bear against us.

Public Sour on Foreign Aid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 8, 1956

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the whole country is ahead of the Congress in this matter of foreign aid. I am inserting at this point an editorial that appeared recently in the Janesville (Wis.) Gazette. It expresses the general view of my constituents, I am sure.

PUBLIC SOUR ON FOREIGN AID

Senator ALLEN ELLENDER, of Louisiana, put it straight in a radio forum Monday when he opposed the $5 billion foreign aid bill because, he said, "the American people are sour on foreign aid."

Representative WALTER JUDD, of Minnesota, was arguing for restoration of the billion-dollar cut made by the House in the President's gigantic proposal. He added, however, that there is a billion dollars of appropriated foreign aid still unspent and still uncommitted.

This fact is seen, also, in the new lower pressures in the Senate. The foreign aid proponents now want at least $600 million restored. Thus they infer that the tremendous giveaway is actually not needed and that half the cut might do.

At last the men in Congress are aware of the growing and active opposition of the people to digging up billions which cannot be controlled in foreign spending. Neither are the people convinced that this huge spending is producing the desired results.

Senator ELLENDER commented that the United States Government has already spent millions in establishing manufacturing plants, such as one for making starch in South Korea. These are wholly owned by the Government. In this country we call Government operation of business pure socialism.

On the other hand, Representative JUDD urged that some millions are needed to operate these plants, or they would be closed, and the Koreans would suffer.

The supposition seems to be that the United States must save the world by building Government-owned factories everywhere, and then we are obligated to pour more billions into those countries to keep the plants operating.

If this is not an endless circle of big spending, we have never seen it.

The only answer to this tremendous waste is the pressure of public opinion. If enough citizens tell their Congressmen and Senators that they object to this run-around, the gentlemen in Washington will begin to clamp down. Then we can start to pay off our unconscionable public debt and cut taxes.

Shipwreck and Rescue on the North Carolina Outer Banks

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERBERT C. BONNER
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 19, 1956

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, at Rodanthe, N. C., on June 16 I had the privilege to speak at an exercise honoring the remaining few members of the former Lifesaving Service which service was taken over by the Coast Guard many years ago.

In addition to my address, Mr. Speaker, Mr. David Stick, of Kill Devil Hills, N. C., delivered an interesting and historical talk on the feats of heroism performed by members of the Lifesaving Service on the North Carolina coast. I include a copy of Mr. Stick's address in my remarks:

SHIPWRECK AND RESCUE ON THE NORTH CAROLINA OUTER BANKS

(A talk, delivered at Chicamacomico celebration, Rodanthe, N. C., June 16, 1956, by David Stick, author of Graveyard of the Atlantic)

I am a writer, and not a public speaker. Therefore, I have written my talk today, and with your permission I shall read it.

For a number of years I have attempted to find and preserve factual information about shipwrecks on the North Carolina coast. In the process of this search it was not long before I realized that there was one period when the activities of those whose job it was to save the lives of shipwrecked mariners overshadowed in drama and human interest the very shipwrecks themselves. This was the period from the late 1870's until 1914—the period when the United States Lifesaving Service was active on our coast.

The Lifesaving Service was, of course, succeeded by the United States Coast Guard, and most people today consider them as one and the same. Certainly, there were a large number of individuals—including many of you here today—who were active in the Lifesaving Service, and continued that activity in the early days of the Coast Guard.

But I would not be honest if I did not point out that the great and glorious period of continual human sacrifice which characterized the Lifesaving Service began to wane soon after the amalgamation with the Cutter Service to form the Coast Guard. It was due partly to the changeover from sail to steam—and partly to the introduction of more modern lifesaving devices following World War I. As a result, there is no more resemblance between the old Lifesaving Service and the present-day Coast Guard, than there is between the three-masted schooner, and an atomic submarine.

For a few minutes I'd like you to go back with me to those days of the three-masted schooners—to the days of the original Lifesaving Service—and relive some of the shipwrecks and rescues on this coast.

Do you remember the August hurricane of 1899? When it struck the outer banks in the middle of the month it was already a full-scale hurricane, for in Puerto Rico alone, some three thousand people were left dead in its wake. It caught up with more than a dozen vessels off the banks, and six of them disappeared without a trace. Seven others were sunk, or piled up on the beach, total wrecks. It broke loose the moorings of Diamond Shoals Lightship No. 69, and drove her ashore at Creeda Hill. It flooded most of the homes on the banks, and at Diamond City near Cape Lookout it caused such concern that the entire population picked up what was left of their houses and moved away—to Harkers Island, and The Promised Land—and some of them live there still, and may even be here today.

On this section of the banks that the August huricane of 1899 kept the crews of Chicamacomico, and Gull Shoal, and Little Kinnakeet, and Big Kinnakeet stations busy for 3 days and 3 nights, and left the beach littered with wreckage—and bodies.

It began shortly after noon, Wednesday, August 16, when Surfman W. G. Midgett, of Gull Shoal station, on south patrol, saw a three-mast schooner dangerously near the beach. Midgett was on horseback, and hurried back to the station to report to Keeper D. M. Pugh, who immediately assembled his own crew and called Keeper E. O. Hooper, of Little Kinnakeet, and Keeper Bannister Midgett, of Chicamacomico, asking both to meet him at the scene, 2½ miles south of Gull Shoal.

Horses belonging to G. L. Midgett and D. L. Gray were hitched to the beach apparatus cart at Gull Shoal station, and the crew reached the scene less than an hour after the vessel—the *Aaron Reppard*—had been sighted. By then she was on the edge of the outer reef, five to six hundred yards from shore. The surfmen from Chicamacomico and Little Kinnakeet arrived in short order, and helped set up the Lyle gun.

Keeper Pugh's first attempted shot, using a 6-ounce cartridge of powder and a No. 7 Whitten line, and with an elevation of 23 degrees, burned off the line and the shot was lost. The second fell short. The third, elevation increased to 25 degrees, and using a No. 4 shot line, put the shot over the head stays. But by then, as Keeper Hooper of Little Kinnakeet reported later, "it was impossible for the men on the wreck to do anything, only to hold on for life to the rigging to keep from being swept overboard." One man was swept overboard; then, as the lifesavers watched helplessly the vessel went to pieces.

There were eight men on board the *Aaron Reppard*. Four more downed as she broke up. The remaining three, clinging to wreckage, drifted closer to shore—close enough for the lifesavers to go into the surf after them. Despite the danger from floating spars and planks thrown against them by the high breakers, they managed to save the three sailors. One of the lifesavers, Keeper Hooper, needed to be saved himself, for he was knocked down by a wave and pummelled by wreckage, and in the process his leg was broken.

Surfman W. G. Midgett had first sighted the *Aaron Reppard* at approximately 12:40 that afternoon; by a little after 5 p. m. the crews had returned to their stations, with the three survivors and the injured keeper, Hooper. At almost that exact same time the day watch at Big Kinnakeet station sighted another three-masted schooner close in to shore, abreast of the station. Keeper A. L. Gray, of Big Kinnakeet, aware of what had been going on immediately to the north of him, called Cape Hatteras station for assistance, and mustered his own crew, and started down the beach after the vessel which was drifting toward the south.

This was the three-master *Florence Randell*, with 10 people on board, and within half an hour she had struck the beach, approximately 2 miles south of Big Kinnakeet station. This time the luck turned, a line was fired across the vessel, the breeches buoy was set up, and with the assistance of residents of Big Kinnakeet, and lifesavers from Cape Hatteras and Creeds Hill stations, keeper Gray and his men succeeded in landing all nine of the crewmen, including the captain, as well as the captain's wife, before dark that evening.

By then, however, the hurricane was reaching full intensity, the horses could not pull the beach cart back to the station against the wind, and for more than 24 hours afterwards it was impossible for regular patrols to be maintained by any of the stations.

That was Wednesday, August 16. Not until the early morning of the 18th were patrols resumed, and at 4:45 that morning, surfman C. O. Miller, of Litlte Kinnakeet station, discovered a vessel ashore, about three-quarters of a mile south of the station. He immediately reported back to Acting Keeper N. W. Dailey, who had taken over when Keeper Hooper's leg was broken. All telephone lines were down, and Dailey and his crew hitched O. J. Gray's horse and another to the apparatus cart and tried to go down the beach to the wreck. But the sand was so soft, almost like quicksand, that the horses soon mired to their bellies, and fell time after time, and the cartwheels buried up to the hubs. Somehow they got through to the wreck, found it to be the three-masted schooner *Robert W. Dasey*, her bow so close to the beach that her jibstays were hanging down, within reach from the shore. Again the rescue was accomplished without loss, this time 7 men, including the captain; and despite the soft beach the job was done a little over 2 hours after she had first been sighted. At a vendue, or auction, 12 days later, the vessel was sold for $30; what remained of her cargo of coal, for 50 cents.

Meanwhile, up here at Chicamacomico, Keeper L. Bannister Midgett had sighted still another three-masted schooner in distress at break of day. This was the schooner *Minnie Bergen*, loaded with railroad iron, coal oil, and coal, with a crew of seven. When Keeper Midgett first sighted her she was anchored about 3 miles offshore with a distress signal in her forerigging; at about 7 o'clock the captain slipped his chains, and at 8:30 the *Minnie Bergen* struck the beach a mile and a half north of Chicamacomico station. The Chicamacomico crew was on the beach, opposite, waiting and ready, when she struck. One shot was fired to the vessel, 300 yards offshore, the breeches buoy was rigged up, and by 10:30 the Chicamacomico crew and the 7 rescued marines were safely back at the station.

Once again, as in the three previous wrecks, the survivors were supplied with clothing which had been collected and sent to the station by the Woman's National Relief Association.

This had been a busy morning for the crew of Little Kinnakeet, at the wreck of the *Robert W. Dasey*; and for the crew of Chicamacomico at the wreck of the *Minnie Bergen*. It was busier still for one man in between these two—Rasmus S. Midgett, of Gull Shoal. For shortly before dawn that morning Rasmus Midgett, on south patrol from Gull Shoal, had found the barkentine *Priscilla* on the beach, 3 miles from the station. There had not been time to return for assistance, so Rasmus Midgett had done what he could by himself. It was enough to earn him the gold lifesaving medal of honor, highest award for lifesaving; for Rasmus Midgett had rescued 10 men from the wreck of the *Priscilla* singlehanded, running into that terrible pounding, churning surf time after time after time. Seven of the men slid off the deck and into his arms, and were carried through the surf to safety; the remaining three, too weak to help themselves, remained on deck. But Rasmus Midgett scrambled up the side of that wrecked vessel three times and rescued each of them, without assistance.

Certainly that August hurricane of 1899—when the three-masted schooners *Aaron Reppard, Florence Randell, Robert W. Dasey*, and *Minnie Bergen*, and the barkentine *Priscilla* were piled up on the beach between New Inlet and Cape Hatteras—could not be called a typical 3-day period in the activities of the men of the Lifesaving Service. But the response of the lifesavers, at each of the five wrecks, was typical of the way the men reacted to the call of duty at the risk of their own lives.

The breeches-buoy operation—attempted three times, and successful twice on this beach in that August hurricane of 1899—has continued to be one of the basic methods for rescuing shipwrecked mariners. Since the breeches buoy is effective only when a vessel is close up on the beach, an entirely different type of rescue operation is called for when a vessel founders at sea, or is stranded on an offshore shoal—this is the rescue by surfboat.

The records of the Lifesaving Service contain a great number of surfboat rescues by North Carolina men operating from North Carolina lifeboat stations. One of the earliest and most famous occurred on December 22, 1884, when the crew of Cape Hatteras station, under command of Keeper Benjamin B. Dailey, and with Keeper Patrick H. Etheridge, of Creeds Hill filling in for an absent surfman, rowed through what was described by the investigating officer as "the most tumultuous sea that any boat within the memory of living men had ever attempted" on this coast, to save the crew of the barkentine *Ephraim Williams*. For that feat the two keepers, and Isaac L. Jennett, Thomas Gray, John H. Midgett, J. N. Jennett, and Charles Fulcher, received gold life saving medals of honor.

Another of special note was the rescue of six men from the schooner *Sarah D. J. Rawson* by the crew of Cape Lookout station, February 9 and 10, 1905. The vessel was sighted aground on the shoals around noon on the ninth during a break in the fog which had shrouded the area all morning. An epidemic of influenza had swept through the station crew that week, and every man

in the outfit was sick. But they launched their surfboat, rowed out to sea on that cold and bleak February afternoon, and after 4 hours reached the vessel, aground off there on the shoals. She was surrounded by breakers, her boat had been smashed to pieces, her bowsprit, foremast, maintopmast, deckhouses, and rigging were gone, and the lumber from her deck load literally filled the surf around her.

Already one of her crew had been washed overboard; the six remaining were huddled together on the canted deck of the wreck. Keeper William H. Gaskill attempted to guide his boat through the mass of wreckage, came within 200 yards, but was beaten back. Again he tried, and again and again and again, but when darkness came he was forced to pull away, and the surfboat was anchored there on the shoal, downwind from the *Sarah D. J. Rawson*, in the very path of the spars and lumber floating away from the wreck—for the lifesavers wanted to be near at hand if sailors were washed overboard.

The 15 of them survived the night somehow—9 lifesavers in their little boat, 6 shipwrecked sailors on the remnants of their schooner. And when the wind shifted shortly after dawn the surfboat moved in closer than before—close enough to get a line on board the wreck. One of the sailors tied it around his waist, jumped into the cold and angry sea, was pulled safely on board the rescue craft. Back went the line, 6 times in all, 6 men rescued; and as each sailor was pulled out of the water a lifesaver would remove his precious oilskin, wrap it around the man whose life he had helped save. And then the return trip, 9 miles of rowing through a sea too rough for the safe passage of larger boats. They made it, finally, back to Cape Lookout station, 24 hours after they had gotten out of sick beds to launch their boat. For this feat gold lifesaving medals were awarded to keeper Gaskill, and to surfmen Kilby Guthrie, Walter M. Yeomans, Tyre Moore, John A. Guthrie, James M. Fulcher, John E. Kirkman, Calupt T. Jarvis, and Joseph L. Lewis.

There is time for only one more recollection, and it seems appropriate that it should be of a memorable rescue by the crew of Chicamacomico station.

The United States was at war in August of 1918, and German submarines had laid minefields in the sealanes off our coast. In the early afternoon of August 16, the 6,679-ton British tanker *Mirlo*, manned by a crew of 52, and carrying a full load of gasoline from New Orleans to Norfolk, struck one of those German mines opposite Wimble Shoals light buoy. A terrific explosion rocked the ship, wrecking the engineroom and putting the lights and wireless out of commission. This was followed shortly after by a second explosion, which set fire to the gasoline, the British captain ordered his lifeboats lowered away.

The port lifeboat, first to be lowered, fouled the stays and capsized, but the 16 men on board, thrown into the sea, all managed to reach the overturned boat. The other two boats got away safely, just as a third explosion took place, cutting the ship in half and spewing its cargo of highly inflamable gasoline over the water in all directions.

One boat, the captain's, with 17 men on board, was soon clear of the sea of fire; the second, without oars, drifted before the wind, which was steadily increasing in velocity. The third—the one that had capsized—remained near the sinking vessel, bottom side up, in the very path of the burning fuel still gushing from the sinking ship. The men clinging to this lifeboat were themselves covered with gasoline, their clothes and their hair and even their bodies on fire. Only by remaining under water for as long as breath would hold out, then coming up again for a hurried breath of air and submerging once more, were they able to remain alive; even so, in short order 10 of them disappeared from view, leaving only 6 still clinging to the overturned boat.

Here at Chicamacomico, meanwhile, the lifesavers, under Keeper John Allen Midgett, had heard the first explosion and immediately prepared to launch their motor surfboat. Keeper Midgett and his six-man crew came through the breakers without accident and headed for the towering cloud of smoke and flames rising from the sea of Wimble Shoals. En route they met the lifeboat carrying the captain of the *Mirlo*, and gave instruction for him to proceed in close to shore and wait until the lifesavers could return.

The Chicamacomico boat then moved to within a few hundred yards of the *Mirlo*, which by now was on the verge of disappearing beneath the surface. There they were confronted by a veritable sea of fire. The entire surface of the ocean seemed to be covered with burning gasoline. Flames shot up in patches, and above them the great cloud of black smoke rose skyward. The lifesavers circled the cloud, finding at last an opening in the blazing surface of the sea. And down this opening they saw the overturned lifeboat, with figures still clinging to it.

Keeper Midgett turned the wooden boat toward that blazing sea, the men manned their oars, and they skillfully maneuvered her down that narrow open passage, moving directly through great sheets of fire at times, constantly enveloped in black smoke, hardly able to see for the darkness around them. The overturned lifeboat was reached at last; the six men, exhausted, burned and blackened, hysterical and unbelieving, were pulled into the surfboat.

The Chicamacomico boat headed, then, for the open sea, searched for the third lifeboat, found her finally, drifting aimlessly, so crowded her gunwales were almost level with the water, the men inside, singed and blackened. A line was passed aboard, and the Chicamacomico surfboat headed back toward the beach to pick up the captain's lifeboat, towing the second one behind, carrying the six survivors of the third. They landed through the surf, delivered the six survivors of the capsized boat into ready hands, then pushed out through the surf again, and brought in the other boats.

They, too, were awarded gold lifesaving medals of honor—Keeper John Allen Midgett, Surfmen Zion S. Midgett, A. V. Midgett, P. L. O'Neal, L. S. Midgett, and C. E. Midgett.

Already the Coast Guard has suceeded the Lifesaving Service, but their feat was in the glorious tradition of their predecessors.

It is a tradition we should never let the world forget.

Transpolar Route Via Seattle

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. THOMAS M. PELLY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 31, 1956

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, recently I had occasion to obtain information concerning the Military Air Transport Service operation in the Pacific area. In this connection, I was given a comparison of air transport operations over the Central Pacific as against North Pacific. For example, the difference in mileages showed a round trip via the Central Pacific is 13,450 miles, while the short circle route with an origin at McChord Field in the Pacific Northwest is only 9,748 miles. This means an average saving in operating a cargo, passenger or convertible airplane, based upon current rates for equipment, of $10,000 per round trip flight.

That is why the postal service is making tremendous savings by sending A. P. O. mail to the Orient and Far East via Seattle. Where the cost to the Post Office Department is on a per ton per mile basis the economy of the short circle route is obvious.

So, on western area air mail to Western Europe, will there be a huge saving by use of the polar route via Seattle.

To emphasize the taxpayers' interest in the Civil Aeronautics Board's hearing for transpolar air service, I include an editorial from the Seattle Times favoring more frequent service over the Arctic, and especially regular service from the west coast with Seattle as a coterminal:

SEATTLE DESERVES MORE FREQUENT SERVICE OVER THE ARCTIC ROUTE

Seattle and this area today are represented at a Civil Aeronautics Board examiner's hearing in San Francisco on applications of two American airlines for transpolar air service between the Pacific coast and European destinations. The applicants are Pan American World Airways and Trans World Airlines.

Seattle—meaning the area served by the Seattle-Tacoma International Airport—has two principal petitions to make in connection with the proposed transpolar service. One is that the CAB authorize at least one or both of the domestic airlines to operate over the transarctic route from the west coast, with Seattle as a coterminal.

The other is that the Seattle gateway be given more frequent service than is contemplated by either of the applicant domestic airlines. If the applications are granted as now stated, both Los Angeles and San Francisco would have the benefit of 4 or 5 flights a week on the transarctic route. The most Seattle or Portland could expect would be a single flight a week in this European service.

There are ample reasons why Seattle should be given greater consideration in these plans. This is the closest west coast city for European businessmen and tourists traveling by air to the United States. In the large Scandinavian population resident in this immediate vicinity there is an impressive potential business for travel to the Scandinavian countries.

This area already transacts a big volume of business with north European centers, which are markets for products of Pacific Northwest agriculture, notably fruits from this State's orchards, and for timber from the region's forests. The Boeing Airplane Co. has substantial orders to supply jet transport planes for a number of German, Belgian, and French airlines.

All this commercial interchange requires travel back and forth, providing business for airlines operating between Seattle and the European countries. There also is a considerable volume of military travel—servicemen and their dependents—from military installations in this immediate area to European stations.

Moreover, the Seattle-Tacoma International Airport has been selected by the Government for the second largest airmail facility in the country, destined eventually to handle the bulk of the foreign airmail of the entire Western United States.

This area's interests in this matter are being presented at the San Francisco hearing by J. D. Paul, as spokesman for the Seattle

Traffic Association of which he is secretary-manager, the Seattle Chamber of Commerce, the Port of Seattle, and the Tacoma Chamber of Commerce. These agencies have the full support of the community in their efforts in this behalf.

Medical Literature on Ileitis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN D. DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 19, 1956

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I found an article in last night's Washington (D. C.) Star by Doris Fleeson to be most interesting. I hope the Members of this Congress and the public at large will carefully consider the sobering facts contained therein.

MEDICAL LITERATURE ON ILEITIS—PESSIMISTIC OPINIONS ARE MARSHALED TO COUNTER ATTITUDE OF WHITE HOUSE

(By Doris Fleeson)

As every doctor knows, the authority in medicine is the literature.

It takes precedence over any one man's opinion, be he doctor, reporter, politician or White House press secretary.

One of the great medical libraries of the world is the Armed Forces Medical Library in Washington. Its collection of texts, surgical manuals and medical reports on ileitis is distinctly bearish in tone.

At practically every point it contradicts the "think-nothing-of-it" mood which the White House seeks to induce regarding President Eisenhower's operation for ileitis 10 days ago.

Instead, it depicts a chronic, debilitating, often progressive, disease for which the cause is unknown. Therapy for ileitis is repeatedly described as "supportive, not curative."

Dr. Burrill B. Crohn, who gave ileitis his name, is quoted optimistically by White House Press Secretary Hagerty. Hagerty argues that since ileitis is usually a disease of young adults, the grim figures about its recurrence do not apply to persons in the President's age group. The President is 65.

Dr. Crohn is certainly somewhat sunnier in his view of ileitis than most. But in the Journal of the American Medical Association for November 27, 1954, Dr. Crohn and Henry D. Janowitz, under the title, Reflections on Regional Ileitis, 20 Years Later, wrote:

"The cause of this disease remains unknown. * * *

"Clinical aspects. The disease occurs in persons of all ages and both sexes and it appears to have worldwide incidence. * * *

"There is no specific therapy for regional enteritis and all available measures are strictly supportive. With the increasing length of follow-up studies, it has become evident from all carefully studied series of patients treated surgically that the rate of recurrence of ileitis is increasing. * * *

"The high rate of recurrence of ileitis following the short circuiting or the resection type of operation is leading to reevaluation as a criteria for operation. * * *

"The reoperating of all the cases of terminal ileitis as they recur led to more recurrence and more operations. I prefer nowadays to handle my patients as a medical problem rather than a surgical one.

"My attitude is much more conservative today than it was."

The newest text on regional enteritis seems to be by Frederick F. Boyce, professor of clinical surgery, Tulane University of Louisiana School of Medicine, New Orleans, La., January 1955. Dr. Boyce states:

"Personal and collected therapeutic experiences (in regional enteritis) are sufficiently discouraging to produce the conviction that, as Kiefer has well expressed it, there are few diseases which should leave the physician with a greater sense of humility. * * *

"Unfortunately, any method of treatment used in regional enteritis is empiric and will remain so until the etiologic factor is discovered and the pathogenesis of the disease clarified.

"The beginning of therapy, therefore, is to make the patient understand the tentative nature of his treatment and to emphasize to him that he is suffering from a condition which will require observation, if not active treatment, the rest of his life. * * *

"This is a disease in which psychologic factors are important, even if they are not responsible for it. * * *

"I * * * regard sidetracking procedures simply as preliminary to subsequent resection. * * *

"The most discouraging feature of regional enteritis is the realization that no matter how expert the therapy and how gratifying the immediate results, there is no assurance whatever that the patient has been cured. * * *

"There seems no justification for the statement that one sometimes hears that recurrent disease is less serious than the primary disease. If anything, the contrary is true. Moreover, recurrent disease frequently presents major therapeutic problems. Recurrence of recurrent disease is not infrequent. * * *

"In the face of figures * * * from two of the most expert groups of surgeons in the country, it is clear why, before any treatment is undertaken, the patient or some responsible member of the family must clearly understand the nature of the disease, the limitations of treatment, and the chances of recurrence after any regimen that is employed."

The famous Dr. Charles W. (Chuck) Mayo, in his book, Surgery of the Small and Large Intestine, 1955, says:

"With regard to surgical treatment, the situation is rendered difficult because of the high rate of recurrence. * * * This rate is high regardless of the surgical technic used."

Anent Special Session

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WATKINS M. ABBITT
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 19, 1956

Mr. ABBITT. Mr. Speaker, time is fast approaching in Virginia when the people of that great Commonwealth must take a stand. They must choose up sides; they must decide once and for all, whether or not they shall give up the fight to retain constitutional government in this great country of ours or whether they will sit idly by and watch the so-called Supreme Court of the United States, which has arrogated unto itself the task of regulating the thoughts, the minds, and sociological developments of the people of this country.

I thank God that three are people in Virginia who are willing to stand on principle in this great fight. They are not willing to see the octopus-like court take over by judicial fiat the amending of the Constitution of America. There is no middle ground in this fight; we are either for retaining our constitutional government or we are for giving in and taking the easy course out.

There are those in Virginia today who are advocates of a so-called assignment plan in answer to the Supreme Court's opinion of May 1954, declaring segregation in the public schools unconstitutional. The assignment plan standing alone and by itself simply legalizes integration, as well as implementing the Supreme Court's decision. I am not willing for this plan to be fostered upon the people of Virginia unless and until the people know and understand what is happening to them under such a plan. I am convinced that there are many others in Virginia who feel exactly as I do.

We are fortunate to have in southside Virginia a man of outstanding leadership, intellectual ability, and the intestinal fortitude to bring forcefully unto the people of Virginia the true facts and consequences that they are now facing. He is the Honorable J. Barrye Wall, editor of the Farmville Herald. He reveals the assignment plan for what it really is, legalized integration. Mr. Wall has writpeared in the Farmville Herald on Friday, June 15, and under leave to extend my remarks, I include the editorial herewith:

ANENT SPECIAL SESSION

Governor Stanley will call a special session of the Virginia Legislature before the middle of September to consider the school problem in Virginia. The action was taken after a recommendation by the school study commission in a 1-day session Monday, June 4. The governor asked and, we presume, expected the commission to restudy its former report in the light of developments. Since it took the commission only 1 day to formulate its report it may be presumed that it did not do much studying, nor did it make public any new proposals. It is logical to presume that the commission has completed its work. If so it might be dissolved with thanks and let a full discussion of its November report be had.

The rank and file citizen has more or less depended upon the school study commission for leadership. The average citizen has given little thought toward a solution so implicitly did he depend upon the members of the commission. It is high time that each citizen, not in favor of integrated schools, do some thinking for himself, and if we dare to be so bold, educators, newspaper editors, and others begin a study of this report in the light of developments.

The most important question is: Do you believe the United States Supreme Court had the right under the Constitution to decree the end of segregated public schools in Virginia?

If your answer is "Yes," then you will favor the school study commission's report which provides for legalized racial integration in Virginia's public school system. The Court's decision would nullify section 140 of the Virginia Constitution requiring separation of the races in public schools. The assignment of pupils to schools on bases other than race definitely accepts the principle of racial integration of the schools. You may expect as a result racial bickering, indetermin-

able law suits, deterioration of public edution, and tense racial tension.

Having established the principle of racial integration in schools the NAACP will take one of the subsequent steps in its "Target for 1963": (1) Integration in employment by law through FEPC, decreed by the United States Supreme Court; (2) integration in housing, "abolition of ghettos which now deface the American cities"; (3) registration and voting; (4) integration in education; (5) integration in transportation; (6) integration in public accommodations, hotels, restaurants, theaters, parks, and playgrounds; (7) integration in hospitals and health services; (8) repeal Senate rule 22, to prevent filibuster (which is a must in the NAACP program; (9) integration of voluntary associations, churches, clubs, etc. It is indicated in the "Target for 1963" published by NAACP that these objectives except No. 9 would be attempted by law. If not curbed the Supreme Court could well effect them by decree.

If your answer is "No," you will join hands with millions of Americans, the majority of the lawyers, and legislators in six States, who believe in government by the Constitution, the rights and powers of States, and the individual liberties of the individual. The overwhelming majority of the southern people have been jolted out their lethargy by the integration decision of the Supreme Court and for the first time realize the constant and consistent trends away from the principles of constitutional government. The Court has made bold to usurp the powers of the States in other decisions of not so widespread effect in recent months which begin to awaken the people in other areas of the Nation.

The Virginia Legislature took a stand through the interposition resolution. Six other States followed suit. By this procedure, constitutionally compatible, the issue of contested power can be forced. Until it is decided by a clear-cut amendment to the Constitution, there is nothing to be done. Governor Stanley and the board of education have the power and, as we see it, the obligation to proclaim the fact that Virginia schools will be operated according to the Virginia Constitution (racially separated).

For this good reason the Herald has not seen the need for a special session. Of course if those in authority fail to enforce the letter and spirit of interposition, it is conceivable that a special session of the legislature may be needed to do it.

However, this action is not indicated by the May report of the Governor's school study commission. It could have shared the responsibility with the Governor by recommending a firm policy, but instead it recommended a special session. The attorney general and lawyers representing the Prince Edward School Board want a special session and new legislation. So far as we can determine the only proposals now made public are contained in the Gray report, the assignment portion of which legalizes integration.

Therefore, unless the legislature and the people repudiate the interposition stand made February 1, thereby breaking faith with sister States who have followed our lead, it would be inconsistent to enact the assignment program.

May we ask what proposals the Gray Commission has for the special session? What legislation the attorney general and counsel for the school boards desire?

Senator Edward O. McCue, of Charlottesville, has made a proposal that the State assume responsibility for the public school system and finance the operation through a sales tax, thereby transferring the responsibility solely to the State.

Are there any other proposals?

Summary of the Major Provisions of the Rees Bill To Prevent Employment of Disloyal Persons by the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD H. REES
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 19, 1956

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, the bill I have introduced today establishes a top-level, independent, three-member Loyalty Review Board responsible for determining the loyalty of Government employees and applicants for Government service. Members will be appointed by the President, with the advice and consent of the Senate. Not more than two members can be of one political party. The President will designate the Chairman. Terms of members will be 6 years, on a staggered basis to assure continuity of policy and administration. Members may be removed by the President for inefficiency, neglect of duty, or malfeasance. The salary of each member will be equal to that of assistant secretaries of executive departments, except the Chairman will receive $1,000 more. Membership on the Board will be a full-time job, with no outside employment permitted. Board headquarters will be in Washington, but the Board will have subordinate boards as needed for its work.

The Rees bill provides a comprehensive and effective procedure for investigation and development of information with respect to loyalty of present or prospective Government employees. Maximum use will be made of existing investigative facilities.

After the bill becomes effective, no person can be appointed in a Government Department until his absolute loyalty has been determined under these procedures—except in case of urgent necessity for a new appointment, certified by the agency head concerned and approved by the Board, where prompt investigation will be made after appointment. Any agency head may initiate the loyalty procedure on evidence of disloyalty of an employee of his agency.

The Civil Service Commission will conduct a preliminary investigation of every applicant being considered for appointment, using all pertinent sources of information, including files of the FBI, military intelligence units, the House Committee on Un-American Activities, local law enforcement agencies, other Government investigative and intelligence agencies, and employment and school records.

If the Commission finds no derogatory information relating to loyalty, it will so advise the department. That closes the loyalty procedure. Of course, if there is any other question of suitability for employment the Commission will take proper action.

If the Civil Service Commission finds indication that any employee or applicant for employment is of questionable loyalty, it will immediately terminate its investigation, refer the matter to the FBI for a full field loyalty investigation, and notify the department concerned. The FBI will report the results of its investigation to the Loyalty Review Board. The President may, in the national interest, require an FBI investigation without a preliminary investigation by the Commission and, in his discretion, notify the department concerned.

On receipt of notice from the Commission or the President of a full field loyalty investigation of any employee, the head of the department concerned may, in his discretion and if national security requires, suspend the employee pending final determination of his loyalty. Any suspended employee restored to duty because of a final determination that he is not disloyal will receive compensation for the period of suspension at the rate provided for the position from which suspended, less any earnings in other employment during such period.

The Loyalty Review Board will refer each FBI report to a subordinate board for review and preliminary findings on the evidence. A unanimous finding that there is no question of loyalty will become the decision of the full Board, which will notify the agency concerned that in its judgment there is no reasonable doubt of loyalty. If the favorable finding is not unanimous, the full Board will review it and, if in agreement, will take the same action.

If the finding of the subordinate board is adverse, or if the full Board agrees with a minority adverse opinion of the subordinate board, the person concerned will be notified in writing and may appeal to the Board within 15 days.

The Board may, if in its judgment justice requires, disclose its sources of information, but any finding and statement to the person involved will be held confidential by the Board.

Upon appeal the Board will consider any additional evidence submitted in writing or at a hearing and make a final decision, with immediate notice to the appellant and the agency head concerned.

If there is no appeal from an adverse decision, or if the decision on appeal is adverse to the appellant, the Board will certify to the agency that the loyalty of the individual is doubtful after allowing him 30 days to file a complaint with the appropriate United States court, with copies to the Board and the agency head. The court then will have exclusive jurisdiction to dismiss the complaint or to set aside the Board's decision if satisfied that it is arbitrary, capricious, or otherwise contrary to law. The court may order suspension of any employee during the consideration of his complaint if the Board shows that continuance on duty might be dangerous to the United States. No employee or applicant who files a timely complaint with the court will be discharged or rejected for disloyalty until his complaint is decided by the court.

If there is no complaint to the courts and the Board certifies that there is reasonable doubt of the loyalty of any em-

ployee or applicant, or if the court dismisses the complaint, the employee will be discharged or the applicant will be rejected, as the case may be.

The Loyalty Review Board will make rules and regulations to carry out its functions and publish them in the Federal Register. All statements before the Board by an appellant must be under oath. The appellant will have the right to be represented by legal counsel, to produce evidence and witnesses, and to furnish competent affidavits or other written statements. No decision of the Board will be made except with the concurrence of at least three members, and the Board must maintain a permanent record of each member's vote.

The Loyalty Review Board and its subordinate boards may subpena witnesses and books, records, and documents as deemed necessary, and may administer oaths or affirmations to witnesses. Witnesses will be paid fees and mileage as paid to witnesses in United States district courts.

In case of contumancy or refusal to obey a subpena the Board may invoke the aid of the appropriate United States court. Failure to obey a court order may be punished as contempt, under penalty of a $1,000 fine or 1 year imprisonment, or both.

The Rees bill sets forth basic standards for use by the Board in determining the need for removal of an employee or refusal of employment. These include evidence of sabotage, espionage, association with spies or saboteurs, treason or sedition—or advocacy thereof—advocacy or revolution or altering the form of Government by force or violence, disclosure of government by force or violence, disclosure of confidential or nonpublic documents or information under circumstances which may indicate disloyalty, performing or acting to serve foreign interests in preference to those of the United States, membership or association with any person, group, or party known to the Loyalty Review Board or designated by the Attorney General as Communist, totalitarian, or subversive, or as advocating force or violence to deny rights under our Constitution or to alter our form of government by unconstitutional means. The Attorney General is required to publish a list of any such group, party, organization, or combination of persons and upon request will furnish the Board his reasons.

The Board will report to the President and to the Congress each year on the performance of its responsibilities under this legislation.

Every agency will submit to the Board the name and fingerprints of any employee not already submitted.

The functions, records, and personnel information of the present Loyalty Review Board in the Civil Service Commission—called the Old Board—are transferred to the Loyalty Review Board created by the bill. This legislation in general will replace Public Law 298, 82d Congress, authorizing certain preliminary investigations by the Civil Service Commission, except for pending cases. All inconsistent laws or regulations are repealed or rescinded to the extent of any inconsistency with this legislation.

The Rees bill also closes a gap in existing laws by spelling out in affirmative language a prohibition against any person holding or accepting, Government employment or payment for any Government service if he, first, knows, or has been notified in writing of a determination by an appropriate authority, that he is of doubtful loyalty; second, engages in any activity which, under any law or Executive order, reflects adversely on his loyalty; or, third, belongs to or is sympathetically associated with any group, party, organization, or movement in which membership reflects adversely on the loyalty of members to the United States.

Violation of this prohibition will be a criminal offense, under penalty of $10,000 fine or 5 years imprisonment, or both.

Any Government officer or employee who knowingly appoints or pays, or refuses to discharge, any person found disloyal by the Loyalty Review Board or otherwise prohibited by this bill from Government employment or pay will be subject to dismissal from his office or position and a $2,000 fine or 2 years imprisonment, or both.

The bill does not apply to the President or Vice President of the United States or to Presidential appointees by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. The President may exempt certain specified persons as he deems necessary in the national interest.

The provisions of the bill relating to the Loyalty Review Board will become effective 60 days after not less than 3 members of the Board are in office. The other provisions will be effective upon enactment.

Question of President's Health

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN D. DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 19, 1956

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, there are a number of things about the recent attack of ileitis suffered by the President which have been obscured by the great burst of press agentry which followed it by members of the President's staff and even apparently reputable members of the medical profession. While members of the President's staff are politicians and can be to some extent excused their misstatements both from basic ignorance of medical subjects and from their desperate dependence on one man to hold their jobs for them, I think that there are certain facts which have been beclouded and which should be clarified.

I intend to treat this matter further, but I think that an excellent study of the true state of the President's health has been critically reviewed by Doris Fleeson, a newspaper woman of more than ordinary ability.

I here insert into the RECORD an excellent article from the Washington (D. C.) Star of June 14, 1956, by that splendid journalist, and hope that all will read it who have not already done so. It goes far to dispel much of the foggy thinking, some of which has been deliberately fostered by desperate men, with regard to Ike's health.

QUESTION OF PRESIDENT'S HEALTH—INSURANCE AND MEDICAL STATISTICS ON ILEITIS PATIENTS ARE QUOTED

(By Doris Fleeson)

An excess of propaganda is beginning to get in the way of the public dialog about President Eisenhower's health. That dialog is necessary and proper because the health of the President is an affair of state with grave consequences to this country and the world.

The psychological warfare over the President's new illness was begun by his Army doctors almost before he was out of the ether. His aides are continuing it.

The Democrats are starting to fight back. These attempted manipulations of public opinion can be expected to continue until they cease to have a point.

Even the medical profession outside the Government is joining in. Dr. David Allman, a candidate for president of the American Medical Association, for example, told reporters in Chicago that "when President Eisenhower recovers he will be in better physical condition than any of his opponents, Republican or Democrat, have been at any time in their lives." Dr. Allman never attended any of these men. As the Milwaukee Journal points out, such silly stuff tends to degrade the medical profession.

History shows that this is the way people are. Such is the stuff of the power and advantage to be derived from the office of the Presidency.

Yet whatever is or is not true in the propaganda war, the disease which required surgery for the President is a fact for which ample literature exists. That literature is available. In at least two cases of unquestioned respectability and authority it cuts across the optimism dispensed at Walter Reed last Saturday afternoon by Maj. Gen. Leonard D. Heaton, the Army surgeon who operated on the President.

Dr. Heaton said he thought the President's life expectancy might have been improved because he would almost certainly not again suffer with the disease. He thought there was nothing in the picture to prevent the President's running again.

Both the insurance underwriters' bible, Risk Appraisal, by Dr. Harry W. Dingman, and the current issue of the New England Journal of Medicine, May 31, 1956, suggest that Dr. Heaton drew a long bow.

The Risk Appraisal comments (p. 248, 1954 ed.) begin:

"Ileitis, regional—Crohn's disease. Serious. Always serious."

Details of the disorder follow and then this comment:

"Slowly, progressively, the ailment becomes chronic, about 10 percent. Resulting in obstruction of various degree. Short-circuiting operations offer hope, but not much. Prognosis always dubious.

"Recurrence is distressingly high, 1 in 3 within 2 years. In Mayo Clinic record of 42 recurrent cases, 5 were dead, 10 invalided, 27 arrested but 1 had continued diarrhea of severe nature, 5 had nutritional disturbances, 19 had continued diarrhea of mild degree. Fact is, recurrence must be expected within 2 years. (Lahey Clinic Bulletin 8:149, 1953.)"

A second grim study was cited and the point then made that "bowel resection often

necessary because of abscess, fissure, or obstructions, in which event 50 percent may appear to be well, 50 percent will probably have recurrence in some degree or other. Trouble is, affected persons are subpar in general health.

"Life insurance possibly acceptable on 10-year endowment plan rated for 300 percent mortality.

"Disability coverage no, positively no."

Walter Reed doctors, after extensive tests, recently certified the President as in excellent health. Their glowing diagnostic findings did not mention the President's intestinal pathology for which surgery was performed last weekend.

The New England Journal of Medicine, page 1031, describes surgery as "palliative rather than curative" in a complete review of regional enteritis which is Crohn's disease. The review discusses all of the treatment included in ileocolostomy. Its conclusion:

"It is this high recurrence rate, even in the hands of the most enthusiastic sponsor of any one form of operation that has relegated surgery to the role of a palliative rather than curative measure. This disappointing aspect is usually found within a year of operation, at the proximal point of the new anastomosis—the 'new terminal ileum.'

"There is pessimism and disillusionment about the effectiveness of any regimen of providing more than palliation and control of symptoms.

"They all suffer from the disappointing sequel of recurrence and persistence of the disease."

That doctors disagree is a truism, but the foregoing accounts hardly fall within its scope.

They are not the whole story. Patients often surprise their doctors and confound the body of research. And it also has been a very long time since the great Winston Churchill could pass a medical examination. But the above is part of the story, too.

Resistance All the Way

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WATKINS M. ABBITT
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 19, 1956

Mr. ABBITT. Mr. Speaker, as I have stated on the floor of this House a number of times, we in Virginia are fortunate indeed to have people who are willing to put principle above personal fortune; to have people who believe in the constitutional precepts of their Founding Fathers; to have people who regardless of the consequences are willing to point out to the people of Virginia the pitfalls that are surrounding them, and to tear away the camouflage that has been thrown up by certain people in an endeavor to get the people in Virginia to swallow the Supreme Court's decision of May 17, 1954.

I have in mind one of the outstanding Virginians of today, an editor who has done much to enlighten the people of Virginia, a man who stands upon the constitutional principles of our Founding Fathers; I refer to the editor of the Richmond News Leader, James J. Kilpatrick. On Tuesday, June 5, 1956, there appeared an editorial in the Richmond News Leader entitled "Resistance All the Way."

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I desire to include herewith that editorial and I commend it to the people of this great country, and in particular to the citizens of the Commonwealth of Virginia:

RESISTANCE ALL THE WAY

There is mighty little to be gained, for for the people of Virginia or for the Byrd political organization, by the unwarranted exchange of acerbities between Attorney General Almond and Speaker E. Blackburn Moore on the matter of school legislation. These gentlemen are too valuable to this State for their energies to be wasted in public feuding with each other.

The dispute between them, if we read it correctly, stems largely from the different backgrounds that each brings to this problem: Mr. Almond is a lawyer, a former judge, an experienced student of the law. Mr. Moore is a farmer and businessman, whose distinguished public service has been concerned with making laws, not defending clients. That each is equally dedicated to preserving segregated schools scarcely need be argued. Their end is the same; and if reasonably minded men may differ on the best course toward attaining that end, at least it may be suggested that, within the family, these differences be kept at the level of rational debate.

This newspaper would like to join the Gray commission in recommending that a special session of the assembly be called. Perhaps a session in Virginia advantageously could be timed to coincide with the July meeting of the North Carolina Assembly in Raleigh, the better to preserve a common front in this part of the old South. But in any event, at some time during the summer, Judge Almond and other defense counsel must be equipped with new legal weapons, designed not for compliance with the Supreme Court's mandate, but for more effective resistance.

For the past 2 years, Virginia has been pursuing what John Randolph, of Roanoke, once described as a course of "wise and masterly inactivity." Virginia has not panicked or rushed off halfcocked. We have made one desirable change in the State constitution; we have, on February 1, forcefully expressed those principles of fundamental law which Virginia conceives to lie against the Supreme Court's decision, and we have asked other States to resolve a stated question of contested powers. Beyond that Virginia has not stepped.

Now it is time, in our view, to consider further measures consistent with Virginia's expressed determination to resist the Court's illegal encroachment by every legal, honorable, and constitutional means.

Toward that end, two steps might usefully be taken.

The first would be a declaration of State policy, whether by the assembly or by the Governor in conjunction with the State board of education, that no school, anywhere in Virginia, shall be integrated without specific court order, and then only after the people immediately affected shall have had an opportunity to vote upon integrating the particular school, or abandoning it.

The second would be for the assembly, after mature debate, to enact whatever new laws may be found desirable, consistent with the stated intentions of February 1—that is to say, consistent not with compliance, but with resistance.

On the first point, it may be suggested that such a declaration of State policy would settle many uncertainties at the local level. Virginia's position, as a State, is that section 140 of our State constitution, which requires separate schools, ought as a matter of right to be treated as still binding upon the localities. Virginia has recognized, as a matter of superior force in the Court's hands, that the Court has undertaken to render section 140 void. But Virginia has denied the Court's authority thus to trespass upon the reserved powers of this State, and we have called upon all other States in the Union to decide the issue.

Until the issue is so decided, Virginia may have a duty to abide by specific court orders directed to specific local cases, but we need recognize no duty voluntarily to comply anywhere else. And let it be suggested that such a declaration of policy be directed to individual schools, and not to whole counties or cities. There is some doubt even in the Prince Edward case, as we read the pleadings, whether the suit goes to secondary schols only, or to all Prince Edward schools. In this connection, it may be noted that the NAACP now has suits pending in 2 counties and 3 cities; but the other side of that coin is that no suits are pending in 96 counties and 29 cities.

On the second point, it may be suggested that a number of new laws may be considered, entirely within the State's authority to enact, which would not acknowledge the concept of voluntary integration. A bill already has been drafted to provide for tuition grants. Another bill is ready for introduction by which compulsory school laws would be amended. A third measure would protect retirement benefits of public school teachers who may be employed by private educational corporations.

More basically, bills could be drawn with the aim of shifting the battle from local school-board members to the Governor and the assembly. Or in another direction, bills could be devised with the object of so multiplying litigation as to frustrate the NAACP for years to come; for example, once a county had been ordered to integrate a particular school, and its people had approved, that county could be authorized to assign each particular prospective student upon qualifications having nothing to do with race. Thereafter, separate suits might be required challenging a locality's decision as to each individual student.

The important thing is not to despair, and not to retreat. Let us recall that Northern States, over a period of 30 years, deliberately and willfully—and successfully—defied both the Constitution and the Supreme Court in the matter of "personal liberty laws." Between 1830 and 1860, more than a dozen States above the Potomac, in the very teeth of a clear and unambigious requirement of the Constitution, enacted laws by which the return of fugitive slaves was prevented. Surely Virginia and the South, in seeking not to defy the Constitution but to preserve it, can exercise an equal ingenuity now. Surely we can defend our institutions with a vigor at least equal to the enthusiasm of those antagonists who would destroy them.

Not long back, the Roanoke World News summed up the basic choice of policy that must soon be expressed by the assembly: It is whether to proceed in a spirit of compliance, and attempt to minimize the impact of integration; or whether to proceed in a spirit of resistance, and attempt to prevent any integration, anywhere, for as long as possible.

Our own choice, and to judge from the January referendum, it is the overwhelming choice of the people, would be the latter: Resistance now, resistance later, steadfast, unrelenting, massive resistance, stopping short only of local violence or civil war. The South can win this fight for State sovereignty and the constitutional structure of the Union, provided the South establishes one consistent course and holds unswervingly to it.

Statement Regarding the St. Vladimir Russian-Orthodox Youth Organization

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT H. BOSCH
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 29, 1956

Mr. BOSCH. Mr. Speaker, much is being said and written about the visiting Russian delegation of churchmen in the United States—is this just another facet in the propaganda program of the Soviet Union aimed at making us believe that there has really been a change in Soviet policy?

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include a statement regarding the St. Vladimir Russian-Orthodox Youth Organization and a press release from this organization regarding the above-mentioned delegation. I commend this release to the careful study of my colleagues.

The St. Vladimir Russian-Orthodox Youth Organization is an organization composed of young people of the Russian Orthodox Church outside of Russia. There are chapters in every Russian orthodox parish in the United States.

Most of our members are recently naturalized citizens who came to this country after World War II. Quite a number of them came from behind the Iron Curtain and therefore know what communism is.

We have chosen to become citizens of this country and would like to be useful as such. Our organization has set as one of its purposes a constant fight against communism wherever and whenever it is possible. Many of our members have proved their patriotism when they fought against Communists in Korea.

Since the Geneva Conference the free world has been facing a new Soviet psychological offensive more dangerous than any so far experienced. The goal of the offensive is to undermine the morale of the citizens of the free world and confuse their minds as to the true aims of Soviet policy.

Christian churches of the Western World have long been a great deterrent to the spread of communism; therefore, if the Soviet Government can succeed in softening the attitude of these church groups and win their confidence and friendship, it will win the psychological war. With this in view Soviet leaders have given their blessings to the current visit of their churchmen to the United States.

For subtle reasons of strategy the arrival of these Soviet churchmen to the United States has been planned in two sections. The first section, comprised of Protestant churchmen, headed by Mr. Jacob Zhidkov, of the All Union Council of Evangelical Christian Baptists, was welcomed in this country on May 18. Mr. Zhidkov's role could be likened to that of Mr. Malenkov's when he preceded Mr. Bulganin and Mr. Khrushchev on their visit to England. Mr. Zhidkov is paving the way in much the same manner, for the arrival on June 2, of the head of the delegation, Metropolitan Nicholas Krutitzky. The nature of the visit is in no sense less political in spite of its being made by churchmen instead of Government officials. Mr. Zhidkov's mission is to ingratiate himself to the large groups of Baptists in the United States and by this association to win the good will of these groups toward the Soviet Union.

The Baptists are a very small minority in Russia. Mr. Zhidkov is not likely to encounter many refugees from Communist Russia among the Baptists in America—consequently he can sow his seeds of friendship without much fear of being challenged by Christians who know the true face of the powers he is representing. If Mr. Zhidkov and his companions can charm the native American Baptists and recruit supporters among these unsuspecting groups, in advance of any controversy which the more conspicuous figure of Metropolitan Nicholas may arouse upon his arrival in this country, the success of this campaign is assured.

Mr. Zhidkov has cheered the Baptist World Alliance by announcing that Russian Baptists are converting 12,000 new members every year and that the Russian Baptist Church has grown from "100,000 since prerevolutionary times to 500,000 in the Soviet era." These figures are fantasy and Mr. Zhidkov conveniently forgot about the more than 600,000 German Baptists of the Volga German Republic, who disappeared together with their Lutheran brothers, somewhere in Siberia in the late 1930's and early 1940's.

Not much is known about the career of Mr. Zhidkov excepting that he was always a trusted friend of the Soviet Government. In his speech at the Conference in Defense of Peace of All Churches and Religious Associations in the U. S. S. R., held in Troitse-Sergiyeva Monastery, Zagorsk, May 9–12, 1952, Mr. Zhidkov made the following statement: "Our country and her people, led by I. V. Stalin, the standard bearer of peace, unswervingly march at the head of all peace supporters." (Published patriarchate documents and materials, p. 150.) This meeting at Zagorsk was taking place at the very time when the United States Army together with armies of several members of the United Nations were fighting in Korea against Chinese and Korean Communists, armed and sustained by this same "peace-loving" leader.

On many occasions Metropolitan Nicholas too has paid high tribute to Stalin, praising his love for mankind and peace, at the same time denouncing by inference, Americans, as warmongers, alleging and protesting the use of "germ warfare" by Americans in Korea and attributing all the unrest in the world to capitalist greed.

Some examples of the type of speech made by Metropolitan Nicholas are as follows (March 13, 1952, to the workers of Moscow, Journal of Moscow Patriarchate, No. 4, 1952): "The American aggressors in Korea have covered themselves with dishonor in bombing the defenseless, peace-loving Koreans."

In his speech at the second world congress of Friends of Peace published in the Journal of the Moscow Patriarchate, No. 12, 1950, Metropolitan Nicholas spoke not only as a citizen of the Soviets but also as a bishop of the Russian Orthodox Church, in the name of the church, recognizing his responsibility in the face of God, the Orthodox Church, and history. After that introduction, Metropolitan Nicholas spoke of Americans in Korea as using, "Gallows, firing squads, atrocious tortures—not only of prisoners of war but of children, old people, women, and sick people."

In December 1951, as recorded in the Journal of the Moscow Patriarchate, Nicolai declared: "American aggressors continue to wage a war of extermination in Korea. * * * The ideas of hatred of humanity are inoculated in children and young people on a broad scale in the U. S. A. * * * It is thus that the American kindlers of war try to raise murderers from their tender years."

He called us American criminals and also civilized savages. In a speech delivered in Berlin, February 23, 1951, before the first session of the World Council of Peace, also reported in the Journal of the Moscow Patriarchate, Nicolai said:

"For the purpose of annihilating the population, the American criminals first of all fanatically killed political prisoners (from 200,000 to 400,000 persons) forcing them first to dig their own graves; they threw the bodies of patriots who had been hung, shot, or who died from typhus into a precipice and, to conceal the traces, blew up a cliff above it. * * *

"These civilized savages arranged shooting matches with living targets, binding peasants to posts with barbed wire and shooting each of them over the heart of the target. Reviving the customs of the young Fascists, young Yankees photographed these scenes for their family albums and sent them home to their fiances and wives."

These and other statements were brought to the attention of Metropolitan Nicholas at the last meeting with American clergymen, in Moscow, but in the reports they have published no mention is made of any words of repentance on his part. If Metropolitan Nicholas believes he spoke the truth, how then can he visit a country guilty of such crimes? If Metropolitan Nicholas does not believe his own statements express the truth why does he not make a public statement to that end and apologize?

In 1945, Metropolitan Nicholas was an "impartial" member of a commission which investigated the massacre of some thousands of Polish officers at Katyn, in Poland. Metropolitan Nicholas signed a statement exonerating the Soviet Government and attributing this massacre to the Germans. A congressional committee has recently come to the conclusion that the Katyn executions were carried out by order of the Soviet Government.

Metropolitan Nicholas began his association with the Russian Orthodox Church as a youth, before the Communist revolution. He distinguished himself as a brilliant student in a theological seminary. His rise to an influential position in the church in Soviet Russia, however, took place at a time when thousands of monks, priests, and bishops, were being martyred, executed, or deported, by the Soviet Government. During those years of persecution the hierarchy of the Russian Church opposed all the attempts of the Soviets to gain its obedience. After the death of Patriarch Tikhon no successor to his see could be elected and a number of Locum-Tenere's were subsequently arrested until in 1927 Metropolitan (later patriarch) Sergey agreed to pledge loyalty of the hierarchy to the Soviets. The majority of bishops did not agree with him and were arrested. By 1939 the only prerevolutionary bishops still active were Patriarch Sergey and the present Patriarch Alexy. His right hand is Metropolitan Nicholas.

Metropolitan Nicholas made a compromise with Communist rulers, set aside considerations of principle and conscience, and placed his ability at the service of the Soviet Government. He became the political force within a church subjugated by Communist rulers—an arm of the Soviet Government. Church and religion were used to extol godless Soviet Communist rulers and their aims, sanctioning the atrocities committed by them while denouncing and vilifying their opponents and victims in the free world.

Unable to destroy religion in Soviet Russia through persecution and the demolition of churches the Soviet rulers have taken up a new weapon and tactic; to gather the church into their fold, to give it their official recognition, to use it for propaganda purposes in the free world and ultimately for its own self-destruction through complete submission.

On the death of Stalin, Metropolitan Nicholas stood guard at his bier. On the day of Stalin's burial, Patriarch Alexis, the primate of the Russian Orthodox Church recognized in Soviet Russia, celebrated a requiem service. Speaking on that occasion he praised Stalin as a great moral and social force. He called him a genius and said, "And we, having come to pray for him, cannot omit proclaiming his ever-benevolent and sympathetic stand toward the needs of the church.

No appeal addressed to him was ever turned down; he fulfilled all our requests." (Sermon, March 9, 1953.)

If Stalin was so sympathetic toward the needs of the Orthodox Church, why were so many churches closed? In Leningrad alone 145 churches have been closed since 1929, and only 10 are reported open now. In Moscow there are only from 50 to 55 churches compared with 657 which were functioning in 1917, at the same time the population of Moscow has quadrupled.

Psychological warfare is a term used to designate various stratagems and activities of propaganda such as the dissemination of false information and rumors within the ranks of the enemy and on his home front designed to dissuade the enemy from continuing his resistance.

It can concentrate on various means for achieving this end. For instance, by creating panic it can spread defeatism and a sense of the futility of continued resistance in the face of a stronger adversary. Or, the enemy can be persuaded that he would be better off if he joined his lot with his adversary instead of fighting him. Psychological warfare can sow dissension within the ranks of the enemy and turn the people against their rulers, or their military against their civilian authorities, etc. The main task of psychological warfare is to conquer the enemy from within; make him fold his arms; make him change the concept he has of his adversary. In short, the most successful psychological warfare is that which so changes the convictions of the enemy's population that in the end a good portion of this population will fight the battles of the adversary.

Such results are in the process of achievement by the Soviet political machine under our very eyes and in our own front yard. Through a sort of agile somersault the Communist leaders pretend to have turned from ruthless persecutors of religion into benevolent protectors of churches, churchmen, churchgoers, and clergymen of all faiths—from prophets of hatred into angels of peace. Whereas a few years ago a lone Red Dean of Canterbury fought the battle for the Communist conquerors in the free world, many innocent and sincere American churchmen today have taken up the arms of the enemy and are opening the way for Communist aggressors and enemies of religion, in the blind belief that they are fighting for righteousness, Christianity, and peace.

Status of Forces Agreement

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK T. BOW
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 14, 1956

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, my esteemed colleague from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK], in his remarks in debate on the amendment which I offered to the Mutual Security Act on June 8 said this:

> While it is only the sense of Congress, knowing the President as I do, if this were to become law he would feel himself compelled to take the steps here advocated.

I heartily concur in this expression of confidence. In my appearances before the Foreign Affairs Committee I said I firmly believed that if my resolution was adopted that the President would recognize the will of the people and would fulfill his constitutional duty to take care that the laws be faithfully executed.

My colleague expressed his conviction that if the operation of any of these agreements should be demonstrated to be harmful to our men in the service, the first man to move as the Chief Executive, the Commander in Chief, would be the President. I like to believe that too.

Unfortunately I do not believe the President has been fully informed of the cases in which there has been a miscarriage of justice in foreign courts. Does he know there is a marine now serving a sentence of imprisonment in Japan whose conviction was described by official observers as manifestly unfair and unwarranted? Has he heard the reports of observers of the trials of any other of the more than 80 servicemen still in prison?

Does the President know that the Army commander in France said that the French procedure of combining trial of criminal and civil actions is a persistent source of irritation and dissatisfaction? That the French have tried servicemen for alleged offenses and found them guilty so that civil damages could be assessed, when our own court-martial board did not consider the evidence warranted prosecution?

Does the President know the Judge Advocate General has said there are certain basic constitutional rights which an accused may be denied in French courts? And, the same is true of all NATO countries?

Last July I requested the Secretary of the Army to furnish copies of the observers' reports in all cases of criminal prosecution of our servicemen by foreign authorities resulting in sentences of imprisonment. It was told the Defense Department had not required these reports to be forwarded to Washington, except in cases which had attracted particular notice in the press, or which had been the subject of congressional inquiry, or in which the Senate resolution procedure was involved. I understand this has now been remedied. But has it been remedied to the extent that the President is informed of the real situation?

With the same conviction expressed by my colleague from Indiana I am obliged to conclude that the full facts have not been presented to the President.

Representative Hosmer's Feather River Solution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PATRICK J. HILLINGS
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 8, 1956

Mr. HILLINGS. Mr. Speaker, our colleague, the gentleman from California [Mr. HOSMER], is recognized as an authority on water problems. He has performed outstanding service for our State as a member on the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

I wish to place in the RECORD an editorial which appeared in the Los Angeles Times of Tuesday, June 5, 1956, which describes our colleague's proposal for settlement of the Feather River controversy. The editorial follows:

REPRESENTATIVE HOSMER'S FEATHER RIVER SOLUTION

Representative CRAIG HOSMER, of Long Beach, has submitted a bill to the House which contains a solid basis for settlement of the long drawn out San Luis Dam-Feather River controversy.

HOSMER's suggested solution comes just after the announcement in Washington that the prospective new Secretary of the Interior, Fred Seaton, of Nebraska, is strong for State rights in water matters. Inasmuch as the San Luis struggle has been a Federal versus State issue, and the Secretary of Interior carries a great deal of weight in such matters, the position of Seaton is of vital importance.

HOSMER's bill would provide for State ownership, construction and operation of the San Luis Dam and Reservoir. The financing would be with money borrowed from the Federal Government and guaranteed by the credit of the State.

It is to be hoped that at last Governor Knight will cease his baffling and inexplicable opposition to the State San Luis project and accept the solution embodied in Representative HOSMER's bill. The governor has stubbornly supported Federal domination of the San Luis unit—which is the controlling project of the whole Feather River system.

The Hosmer bill requires that the State build the San Luis Dam expeditiously; there is a proviso that if it does not do so the Federal Government may step in. This stifles the oft-used argument that "the Federal Government could do it quicker."

Only Governor Knight's opposition prevents the State from getting started.

The legislature has appropriated the money for buying both the Oroville and San Luis Dam sites. It has passed a resolution urging immediate acquisition so the work can get under way.

State Engineer Harvey Banks has been named head of the new, unified, streamlined California Water Department created by the legislature to carry out the Feather River program and the State water plan.

So far, Governor Knight has blocked the necessary forward steps on San Luis.

The Administration's Foreign Policy Wins Tremendous Victory in Egypt (Serendip-style)

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 6, 1956

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, on June 12, 1956, James Reston's article in the New York Times on "Serendipity in Capital" advised us of the cure-all the administration has discovered. A remarkable elixir originally found by the English writer, Horace Walpole, it gets its name from his fairy tale, The Three Princes of Serendip. The three princes were never dismayed by misfortune, but always managed to discover the most wonderful things.

In the prevailing fashion in Washington these days of always creating the impression that all is well in the world I have come to the startling conclusion

that our foreign policy has just won for us a tremendous victory in Egypt.

Mr. Speaker, for reasons of state it is not likely that the future American historian will take special note of the 5-day celebration that began in Cairo last Wednesday, June 13. This is a period of rejoicing in Egypt where they are celebrating the most glorious event in their modern history. That event is the departure of the last British soldier from the Suez Canal base and the transfer of the canal to Egyptian hands. To mark the end of 74 years of British guardianship, the Egyptians climaxed their celebration on Monday by naming it Evacuation Day.

This day should be marked in our own diplomatic history as a milestone in American Middle East policy, for we were primarily responsible for persuading our British allies to give up this life line of empire. Apparently we also insisted that no conditions were to be attached to this generous gift of a powerfully equipped military base and a critically important international waterway.

At the same time the American people were assured that a new day was dawning in the Middle East. Egypt was going to be made safe for democracy and freedom, and we could believe her claim of being an enemy of Communism. Egypt could not be any other than our everlasting, grateful friend. With our help, living standards would go up and American technical know-how would speed the modernization of Egypt. We were told that under Naguib and Nasser a grateful Egypt would surely be a cooperative Egypt and that as a result tensions in the Middle East would disappear.

The author of this profound policy was our former Assistant Secretary of State for the Near East and present Ambassador to Egypt, Mr. Henry Byroade. To him must go the applause for inspiring this spectacular change, and its execution should have earned him at least the eternal gratitude of Egypt. Mr. Byroade is now in Cairo. And no doubt the Egyptians planned to honor somebody on Evacuation Day. But these Egyptians are a strange people. They did not respond the way Mr. Byroade said they would. The guns they fired during the celebration were Communist guns, and the jet planes that flew overhead were Soviet MIG fighters. Furthermore, the man they invited to help them celebrate Evacuation Day was not Mr. Byroade, but Mr. Dmitri Shepilov, the new Foreign Minister of Soviet Russia. Perhaps Mr. Shepilov will suggest to his new Egyptian friends that they rename Monday, June 18, Byroade Day.

No doubt there is some logical explanation for Egypt's choice of Mr. Shepilov in place of Mr. Byroade. It may have something to do with the mercurial nature of the Egyptian rulers who find such extraordinary ways to show their devotion to freedom and democracy. No doubt Mr. Byroade has an explanation.

But if he has, he should come home to enlighten us. And if he has not, he should come home to tell us why he has not. Either way, it is high time that Mr. Byroade, who started the administration's last agonizing appraisal of our Near East policy, step aside to let someone devise a program, more appreciative of the danger and more faithful to America's own best interests.

Speech Delivered by Hon. Estes Kefauver, of Tennessee, Before the 1956 Wisconsin Democratic Party Convention at Superior, Wis., Saturday Evening, June 16, 1956

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LESTER R. JOHNSON
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 2, 1956

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to have included in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the speech given by Senator ESTES KEFAUVER, of Tennessee, at the 1956 Wisconsin Democratic Party Convention at Superior, on June 16.

I am in full accord with the views expressed by the distinguished Senator and the delegates at the convention enthusiastically received the speech. On the basis of the vote in the Wisconsin Democratic primary this April, Wisconsin's 26 votes at the National Democratic Convention are pledged to Senator KEFAUVER for the Presidency. I found the Wisconsin delegates unified in their support of Senator KEFAUVER and determined to fight for him at the coming convention.

The Senator's speech follows:

Wisconsin is at the heart of what may well be the principal battleground between the Democratic and Republican parties in 1956. If anything is true in our politics it is that the Republican Party must win the support of the great agricultural heartland of America in order to win national elections.

The Democratic prescription for victory, on the other hand, calls for us to win here in these important farming states. We will win if we have a platform which deals forthrightly with the issues. We will win if we have the will to win and truly represent the spirit of progress which has characterized the Democratic Party in the past, and will in the future.

There may be some who believe that we can win on a negative basis. They count on President Eisenhower not running again. They count on the support of farmers because of the failures of Secretary Benson either to understand the gravity of the farm problem or to do anything substantial to help the farmers retrieve a fair share of the Nation's income. In my judgment this is not enough. We must take a positive and affirmative position and we must win on our own merits and not on Republican failures.

I do not know whether President Eisenhower will consider himself able to run for another term of office or not. I hope that for his sake and the Nation's sake that he soon will be well enough to exert the actual leadership that the Nation and the world so greatly need. Whether or not he is again a candidate will depend on questions beyond any man's control, and whatever his final decision is I do not intend to question it. This I know, however, that we Democrats are inviting defeat if in our thinking, our planning, and our strategy, we are not ready to run—and run to win—against the strongest ticket the Republicans can put up.

As individuals and as a party we must rise to meet the great challenges of our time.

Of overriding importance, of course, is the absolute necessity of reaching peaceful solutions to the questions and anxieties which plague the world. Here is where failure of Republican leadership has counted most against us. We must be ready to substitute diplomacy for threats. Without the loss of a single value, or a single iota of power, we can make much greater use of simple and firm courtesy in our international relations. We lose prestige and respect when we brush off too quickly proposals from other nations, including the Soviet. In dealing with the neutral nations, we can rewin much of the friendship and respect which we have so painfully lost by using the methods of peace and diplomacy.

We must return to our traditional position of sympathy and aid to all people who desire freedom and self-government and are capable of exercising it. In giving aid we can offer it not as bait or bribe, but as a means of strengthening free nations so as to keep them free. As Dr. Sukarno, of Indonesia, pointed out in Washington the other day, gifts alone will not win us the friendship of the world—we must also have respect.

Most of all, we must once again learn to assess our strengths and our weaknesses with honest realism. We can once again use truth and nothing but the truth as a means and a method of discussing foreign problems with both our own people and the world.

Finally, we share with most of the peoples of the world a belief in a Supreme Being. This is a point of similarity between us and one that we even share with many of the peoples of the Soviet—who long for the days when they, too, may worship their God. We must not forget this.

We must push forward to that day which will come, since it must come, when no super bombs will be dropped in either anger or anguish.

This is the greatest challenge of our time and we must meet it with resolution and courage, with imagination and with daring. We must place its solution above party and partisanship. We must move toward this solution as an undivided people whose only cause and only purpose is rightness and justice.

Our next great challenge is to prepare our economy for the era of peace. Even with our economy booming in many areas because of the tremendous outpouring of billions of dollars in the defense effort, there are many inequalities. Any recession resulting from a slowing down of this effort would immediately show the distress in many of our farm areas in its stark reality. Industries dependent on the farmer, small-town businesses, churches, and institutions of many kinds in the rural areas are suffering.

We can have a farm program which will reverse the downward trend of farm prices. We can have a farm program which will seek to give the farmer a fair income without building up surpluses. We can have a farm program which will effectively liquidate the farm surpluses we already have to the national advantage. And we can have a farm program which will give a fair break to the small farmer with limited land and limited capital. I have outlined such a program, and you have shown, by the votes which I appreciate so much that you approve of it.

Congress tried to improve the farm program, but our effort was vetoed. Under threat of a veto we tried again but the result bears no resemblance to a real farm program.

Today, despite near record employment for the Nation as a whole, there is serious unemployment in many so-called soft areas. Many of these areas fall in this category precisely because the farmers have lost so much of their purchasing power, and more than that, have lost confidence that they ever will have much more purchasing power under a Republican administration. If we can reverse this fact and this state of mind, it will do as much as anything to relieve the unemployment which exists here and in many other States of this region.

But what has the Republican administration done about it? A generation ago when anybody in a family got sick, mother was likely to turn up with the bottle of castor oil. Today when anything about our economy seems to need fixing, the Republicans have one remedy. They turn on the hard-money policy. At the very outset of the administration the new hard-money policy pushed us into a recession. I hope that some of the businessmen and industrialists who are now so loud in their praises of this administration will remember that. A few months ago they turned the hard-money policy on again. They raised the rate at which banks themselves borrow money. Then all the rates went up all along the line. The administration has seen to it from the start that farmers would have to pay more for the money they need. Now it costs more to finance a house. It costs more to own an automobile or a television set—or anything bought on time.

According to the Federal Reserve Board this was deflationary. Yet inflation occurs when there is more money than there are products to buy with it, and eager purchasers bid prices upward. No such situation exists with us. Prices of many things, as every housewife knows, are high—often too high—but this has not come from a lack of production. Currently we can make more automobiles and radios and automatic washers and shoes than the market can absorb. Yet the hard-money policy being pursued by the administration makes it more costly to buy them. Demand slows down and workers are laid off. And eventual cost to the consumer goes even higher because of higher financing charges. I doubt if even the bankers benefit from a hard-money policy under such conditions as those which exist at present. Perhaps there is a contest between Secretary Benson and the Federal Reserve Board as to which can be more stubborn. How else can it be explained?

These are not the most difficult problems we have to solve at home. With sound thinking, with good will, with the determination to give the farmer, the worker, the consumer an even break they can be solved promptly. The great challenge to our economy will come when we prepare to keep business booming under peacetime conditions.

So far the Republicans have taken not a step to prepare our economy for peace. Perhaps that is why they work for peace in such a haphazard way.

We can have peace in the world. And we can keep our national income up, employment high, and enrich the lives of us all at the same time.

The future offers the greatest hope that has ever lain before the eyes of mankind.

We can begin again to control and develop our rivers and all the vast resources of our national heritage.

We can bring our school system, which each year becomes more and more inadequate, up to adequate standards. Not long ago in Florida I talked to the mayor of a relatively small town in the central part of the State. He told me that his community needed a new schoolroom every 3 days. All over America our towns and cities are growing and stretching out. The Federal Government can and must help the schools to meet these increasing needs. And the need is not just for schoolrooms and equipment, we must have better paid teachers to help our children get the better education which will fit them for the complex world of tomorrow.

We ought to be moving into the peacetime uses of atomic energy with more decision and purpose. This energy added to mankind's own plus the many other sources available to us, will open up unimagined areas of speed and power. In order to provide the leadership needed, Government itself must build reactors.

Housing is our largest industry. Yet we have failed to adequately meet the needs both of the industry and the consumer. Here, above all, we need imaginative research and planning. We know the advantage of slum clearance in building better cities and better citizens. We must press forward with low-cost public housing and veteran's housing. Particularly now, when the cost of housing and of rentals have mounted so high, do we need to press forward on this front.

Great cities all over the United States are dying from an inward rot and we must encourage our cities to undertake plans for redevelopment of rotten areas.

We can, and we should, make it simpler and cheaper to buy decent housing—or to rent it. And it seems to me that we have done less research on how to build good housing at more reasonable costs than we should have.

If we strike out purposefully and eagerly and with hope, I know that this country can live in a peaceful world, in a world in which people find it easy to communicate with each other and trade with each other, and still have a bustling economy at home.

As a party we must give the leadership and the drive to get this done.

Finally, in addition to preparing for peace and securing peace, we need to keep America the kind of nation we will want to live in in peace. We want to keep America a nation which appreciates the fact that ideas are important, that the Constitution and Bill of Rights are not only pillars of strength here at home but are also recognized as symbols of American freedom around the world. We must not abuse them.

Recently the Supreme Court once again has moved in to correct a situation which was beginning to intolerably affect our basic liberties. In its decision that security measures had no place in relationship to persons in nonsensitive jobs the Supreme Court took a long step toward forcing the administration to improve a security program which had become intolerable because of its mistakes and its inhumanity—and, as the Supreme Court now declares, its legality in part.

We must have security in sensitive places. Yet in obtaining it we must never forget those basic rights and liberties which the Constitution grants us all and which are the most precious things for which we fight. By screening everyone in the United States we might turn up 1 or 2 bad eggs, but it wouldn't be worth it, for in the process we would have destroyed that which we seek to protect—our freedom. All those of us who truly believe in our great Constitution will applaud and uphold the Court. What we must regret, however, is that the leadership in these matters must come from the Court because leadership does not come from the White House.

We need an administration that is sensitive to the Constitution—an administration that knows it and believes in it, all of it.

So let us move forward confidently to peaceful solutions in the world, to a vibrant economy in a peaceful United States. And in doing so let us determine to keep our rights and those of others intact, and even in a crowded and a complex world to keep our humanity.

As Democrats, let us speak to America with the authentic voice of America. With God's help, let us keep our aims and purposes as high as they can go—as high as the stars in the heavens above us.

Thank you.

Proposed Amendments to the Clayton Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES ROOSEVELT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 19, 1956

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, several months ago I introduced H. R. 8395 in which I proposed certain amendments to sections 3 and 4 of the Clayton Act. Hearings were held before the Antitrust Subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives.

I am now introducing two new and separate bills which I believe would obviate certain objections that were raised to the original measure.

The first of these bills proposes to amend section 3 of the Clayton Act in order to strengthen it to insure free competition and efficient antitrust enforcement.

Investigations which have been made by the Select Committee on Small Business of the House, as well as by the Antitrust Subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary, have disclosed widespread denial of freedom of choice in trade by many large suppliers which has resulted in the suppression of competition and the creation of conditions favoring the growth of monopolies.

This new bill makes no substantial change in section 3 of the Clayton Act except that "services or facilities" are added which is further enlarged by making illegal, not only those acts which prevent a lessee or purchaser from using or dealing in merchandise of the lessor or seller but also makes it unlawful to make any threat to prevent or hinder the lessee or purchaser from dealing in the commodities and goods of a competitor of the lessor or seller, or to take or withhold any action in retaliation of such lessee or purchaser dealing in the commodities, including services and facilities of a competitor, when the effect may be to prevent or to substantially lessen competition or tend to create a monopoly in any line of commerce.

This bill is designed to make illegal any conduct which prevents a dealer exercising his freedom of choice in respect to the goods he may wish to handle or display and is designed to prevent the suppression of competition through indirect means.

I feel that it is essential to write this provision into statutory law in order to implement the Supreme Court's interpretation of section 3 in the Standard Oil of California case, because that decision has been under attack by the advocates of monopoly who are the natural

antagonists and opponents of all antitrust legislation.

During the hearings held on April 19, 1956, by the Antitrust Subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary, Judge Stanley N. Barnes, Assistant Attorney General, in charge of the Antitrust Division of the United States Department of Justice, in testifying in regard to H. R. 8395, said:

On the one hand, some portions of H. R. 8395 this Department supports. I approve, for example, making explicit Clayton Act, section 3, coverage of service or facilities. Restraints on services or facilities have been held to transgress the Sherman Act. And exclusive dealing arrangements involving services or facilities have been struck down, not only under Sherman Act, section 1, but also under Federal Trade Commission Act, section 5. But present Clayton Act, section 3, coverage is of goods, wares, merchandise, machinery, supplies, or other commodities, and hence probably does not include services. In any event, no reason appears why coverage of services and facilities should not be made explicit.

Thus, we have the unequivocal statement of the head of the Antitrust Division of the United States Department of Justice in which he approves the inclusion of services and facilities in section 3 of the Clayton Act.

I, therefore, submit that this new bill is eminently desirable in order to strengthen that section of the Clayton Act.

Study Asked on Effects of Insecticides, Herbicides, and Fungicides on Fish and Wildlife

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEE METCALF
OF MONTANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 19, 1956

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Speaker, I have just introduced a bill directing the Secretary of the Interior to undertake continuing studies of the effects of insecticides, herbicides, and fungicides upon fish and wildlife.

I did so in an attempt to prevent the loss of these invaluable natural resources following spraying.

Last year, 65 million acres, just a little over one-sixth of the cropland of the United States, were sprayed. Even so, crop losses on untreated areas were estimated at $7.5 billion. Over 3.4 million acres of forest were sprayed last year and more will be sprayed this year. A total of 3 billion pounds of formulated pesticides were applied in the United States last year. The cost of applying this quantity of pesticides amounted to $256 million.

The Civil Aeronautics Administration estimates that 31 million acres of land were sprayed by airplane in 1954 and that 541,000 hours were flown by the more than 6,000 airplanes devoted to this job.

What are garden sprays and airplane spraying of forests and farmlands doing to our fish and wildlife resources? Sportsmen, conservationists, foresters, and farmers are equally concerned over the tremendous increase in spraying to eliminate insects, weeds, diseases, and other pests. Each succeeding year finds more acreage being sprayed and better and more efficient pesticides being used. More reports are made each year of fish and wildlife being killed by this spraying.

Everyone appreciates the need for minimizing the damage to forests and agricultural crops. Both are vitally needed. All of us must also be concerned about the potentially destructive effects of these pesticides and herbicides on fish and wildlife.

Despite the enormous good that is wrought by chemical controls, they must be considered in the category of mixed blessings. Being poisons they can be harmful to birds, mammals, and fish. Considerable damage to valuable fish and wildlife resources has occurred unnecessarily because the application was made without sufficient knowledge of accepted procedures or without full regard to the consequences. The toxicity of many pesticides to man, bird, mammal, or fish simply is not known. For others, it is known that they are toxic to the animals and plants required as food.

A multibillion dollar recreation and commercial fishery industry of interest to at least 40 million Americans is involved. All reasonable precautions must be taken to safeguard their interests. Research on the effects of pesticides and herbicides to fish and wildlife has not kept pace with the development of these powerful controls and the increased spraying of our crops, forests, and marshes.

The appropriation authorized by this bill will be sufficient to obtain the data necessary to protect our valuable fish and wildlife resources while at the same time allowing the proper treatment for forest and agricultural areas.

The President's Illness

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL A. REED
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 19, 1956

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, the recent illness of President Eisenhower was a cause of sincere concern to all Americans regardless of party. His rapid recovery makes us all very grateful. The following editorial which appeared on June 12 in the Evening Observer, Dunkirk, N. Y., and the article by Mr. David Lawrence, which appeared in the Washington Evening Star on June 18, should be of widespread interest:

[From the Dunkirk (N. Y.) Evening Observer of June 12, 1956]

BEYOND POPULAR AUTHORITY

The President of the United States has had two serious illnesses in the last year, a possibility which all men face at all times.

Decent employers have to consider this frailty of themselves and their employees and, in the latter case, make due allowances. The longer the affiliation of the employee the greater the consideration.

The President has been in public service a long time, that is, in your service. You are the employer. His two misfortunes have not been permanently disabling. Indeed they seem to have cleared the way for a healthier and more enduring old age.

Mr. Eisenhower has made it abundantly clear that he will be entirely frank about his condition. He will keep the American people fully informed. If a situation arises in which Mr. Eisenhower comes to the conclusion that he is no longer able to serve the American people fully and competently, he will so advise his employer, the people. The American people can rely on that for Ike's long services have completely demonstrated his honesty and the weight of his conscience.

This policy of frankness is shared by the Republican Party and its leaders. The people will not again be misinformed about the health of the Chief Executive, not in this administration.

Men do not ordinarily ascend to the Presidency until their late fifties or sixties. Consequently, there is a little more health hazard than if we elected men in their thirties or forties. Human life being subject to higher authority, the Nation must always take a gamble on the lives of its leaders. Some of our great statesmen have served well into their eighties, others have gone to an untimely end at a far earlier age. Few men get through life without occasional serious illnesses.

In the President's case, his two illnesses seem to have resulted in correctional treatments which should, in the ordinary course of events, assure him better health than he has enjoyed and over a considerable period in the future.

Taking into account the uncertainty of human life, any life, our Constitution provides for the transmission of authority without interruption in the ordinary flow of government. Such Presidents as Theodore Roosevelt, Calvin Coolidge, and Harry Truman came to power through this process of transmission. Other men such as Willkie and Taft would not have completed their terms had they been elected.

The longevity of a President, being entirely out of the voters hands, is, therefore, not an issue for them. It is beyond the authority of the people.

[From the Washington Evening Star of June 18, 1956]

POLITICS AND THE PRESIDENT'S ILLNESS—DOCTOR'S SIMPLE STATEMENT DISTORTED IN BUILDUP OF PROPAGANDA CHARGE

(By David Lawrence)

Did the doctors attending President Eisenhower at his recent operation deliberately engage in a "propaganda for the Republicans" in commenting on the President's illness?

The charge that they did has been made by certain large newspapers in Britain and by some Democratic Party politicians and their stooges in this country.

Fortunately, there is a stenographic record available which tells exactly what the doctors were asked and what they answered. A careful study of it will reveal that there has been misrepresentation and a distortion of fact.

The physicians who attended the President didn't bring up the subject of whether or not he might run again. They didn't initiate any propaganda. They didn't ask for the press conference. The newspapermen covering the story did. Here is the only question which was asked of Dr. Heaton, who performed the operation and spoke for the group of doctors assembled:

"On the 14th of February, during the winding up of the coronary, you might say, a panel of doctors who had been treating

him for his heart trouble said they saw no reason that he should not run for reelection medically. I would like to ask him (Dr. Heaton) and Dr. Ravdin, having treated him, do you see any reason, based on this, why he can't run for reelection?"

Dr. HEATON: "I certainly do not."

That's literally all that was said about it in the course of a lengthy conference with the press which covered several thousands of words entirely on other phases of the President's illness. Yet many headlines and news articles indicated that the President's attending physicians went out of their way to instigate a discussion of a political nature and that they, indeed, passed judgment on whether or not he ought to run.

Actually the only question asked was confined to the medical aspects. It was solely an inquiry as to whether the kind of illness the President encountered was in itself a deterrent factor to the acceptance of a second nomination. Plainly the doctors were not asked to answer whether it was wise for the President to take a chance or whether the strain of the job might be dangerous to him or to resolve any of the collateral issues which Mr. Eisenhower alone can decide.

The one question asked of the doctors, in effect, was whether this type of illness incapacitated any man from further service in his occupation. If the doctors had said they couldn't answer the question at all, it would have implied a gravity which the physicians didn't feel was justified. So they replied as hundreds of other physicians would have answered if the same question had been asked immediately after a surgical operation on anybody else with the same illness.

The truth is that medical data cited by doctors most skilled in handling this type of illness in thousands of cases show that the vast majority of patients have no unfavorable after-effects and the illness is not in itself related at all to the heart condition of a patient.

Two medical studies made for the benefit of the American Heart Association and just announced at Boston show that surgery for other ailments is not dangerous for heart patients. Out of 5,778 patients surveyed at the New England Center Hospital it was found that only eight-tenths of 1 percent died of cardiac trouble while undergoing surgery and that the use of anesthetics was really no more damaging for heart patients than for those with no previous heart trouble.

It is significant to note the expression of confidence and faith in the President's physicians which came last Friday from Dr. David Allman, president-elect of the American Medical Association. He said at Chicago, when asked about it by the press, that he saw "no medical reason" why President Eisenhower shouldn't run for reelection. He added pointedly that he based his comment on what the attending physicians—the best in their field—had reported.

Actually, the most interested man in the country in all this is the President himself. A few weeks ago at a press conference, when newspapermen told him that the Democrats were suggesting that a different panel of doctors be appointed to examine him to see if he had really recovered from his heart attack, the President replied that if there was anything wrong with him, he more than anybody else wanted to know it.

Honesty is one of the principal traits of Mr. Eisenhower's character and if the doctors who attended him have been political in their reports and have forgotten their ethics as medical men, the President would be the first to insist on knowing why he was being misled. Merely to state the problem is to reveal its absurdity.

It is difficult, therefore, to explain the ghoulish skepticism which some of the leading British newspapers and certain politicians in America seem to have generated about the integrity of the very fine medical men who attended the President.

A New Defeat in the Mediterranean

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES ROOSEVELT
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 19, 1956

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, yesterday was an unpleasant day for the Western World, for the West has suffered a new defeat in the Mediterranean.

Yesterday, Mr. Dmitri T. Shepilov, the Foreign Minister of the U. S. S. R., was in Cairo to join with the Egyptian Government in celebrating a national holiday—Evacuation Day—marking the end of Britain's 74-year control of the Suez Canal Zone.

All British troops are now out of Egypt. This fact in itself would not be ominous to the free world if we had any assurance that those who were taking control of that base were solidly on the side of democracy and were succeeding the British in the maintenance of a base dedicated and devoted to the support of Western freedom. However, the presence of the Foreign Minister of the U. S. S. R. makes it clear that the change in military command at the Suez is not a consolidation of Western power. On the contrary, Mr. Shepilov is not the only Russian export in the vicinity of the Suez at this moment. There are Communist submarines and Communist warships and Communist jet planes sent there by the Czechoslovakian Government as a result of its arms deal with Prime Minister Nasser of Egypt.

We must ask whether our own Ambassador to Egypt, Mr. Henry Byroade, will stand with the Foreign Minister of the U. S. S. R. in celebration of this retreat for Western prestige and power in the Mediterranean. For if anyone merits the credit—a dubious word under the circumstances—it is Mr. Byroade, who as our Ambassador to Egypt and previously as our Assistant Secretary of State for Near Eastern Affairs, supported by the campaign to organize the evacuation of the British from the Canal Zone and the transfer of that base to Egyptian authority. It was Mr. Byroade who insisted that we must do everything possible to facilitate the departure of the British, and that we must do nothing to request any quid pro quo from the Egyptian Government. It was his bland assumption that if we were to help the Egyptians in the achievement of this long-sought goal, an achievement which they considered so crucial for their sovereignty and independence, the Egyptian Government would automatically and gratefully adhere to the West and remain our firm and fast friend.

The record shows, Mr. Speaker, that others did not share Mr. Byroade's naivity. I quote from a column which appeared in the New York Times on July 18, 1954, written by Mr. Hanson Baldwin. He predicted:

The basic strategic fact about the impending withdrawal of British power is that it will create another vacuum of power in an area—the Middle East—already distinguished for its lack of power.

He continued:

It is clear, therefore, that the impending withdrawal is an undesirable military expedient undertaken partly because of the decline of British power, partly in the hopes of political and psychological gains in the Arab world. The last named is likely to be an evanescent hope; retreat, particularly under pressure, does not breed respect but more pressure.

Events of the last few months have shown that Mr. Byroade miscalculated in Egypt as he did elsewhere in the Middle East. Egypt has given no sign of friendship for the West. It has organized a coalition of Arab countries in an effort to breakdown Western influence and to frustrate the efforts of our Government to establish a defense system to secure the region against the threat of Communist subversion and imperialism.

One is moved to ask, Mr. Speaker, how many more such diplomatic defeats we shall suffer in the Near East until we come to appreciate the fundamental principle that democracy will not be able to organize the defense of freedom in the Near East if it continues to capitulate to the pressures and intrigue of rulers who have no interest in democracy and who are concerned primarily with the search for power.

Affable Simmons Enjoys Rolling Out Red Carpet

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ELIZABETH KEE
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 19, 1956

Mrs. KEE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I should like to include an article about the Honorable John F. Simmons, written by Mary McGrory, which appeared in the Sunday Star, Washington, D. C., on June 10, 1956. Mr. Simmons, our Chief of Protocol in the Department of State, is doing an outstanding job in this difficult post and is making a great contribution to the smooth functioning of our relations with other countries, especially through their representatives in the United States. The following article explains some of the reasons for Mr. Simmons' success in his exacting position:

AFFABLE SIMMONS ENJOYS ROLLING OUT RED CARPET

(By Mary McGrory)

In the person-to-person diplomacy so favored by the present administration, a key man on our side is the State Department's John F. Simmons. In the coutrship of nations which we are conducting all over the globe, this beaming tower of amiability is the go-between.

Mr. Simmons' job description reads "Chief of Protocol." His office must give aid and comfort to members of the 70 diplomatic missions now in the Capital. They meet them on arrival, present them at the White House, help them through the intricacies of how to get license plates and what to do if their dogs bite American citizens.

But the affable Mr. Simmons' most important work in these days of Soviet-American competition in the red-carpet department is to be nice to visiting dignitaries. He must

be Johnny-on-the-spot with the soothing words when the luggage gets lost, when the limousine is late, when the visiting VIP, nerves frayed from hours on public display, blows his top, puts his foot down, and absolutely balks at going to the next occasion on the schedule.

ADENAUER HIS FRIEND

As it happens, when Mr. Simmons meets Chancellor Adenauer of Germany tomorrow at the Military Air Transport Services Terminal he will be greeting an old and cherished friend. He has known the grand old man of Germany since 1932–33, when he was our Consul-General in Cologne and Chancellor Adenauer was mayor of that city.

"It was an official relationship that ripened into friendship," Mr. Simmons says. The two had many a pleasant Sunday morning visit before Mr. Adenauer, for his action in removing Nazi flags from one of the main bridges of the city was deprived of his office, and driven into retirement.

He enjoys meeting strangers, too—or at least always appears to, which is almost as important. Around the department, he is affectionately known as the "smiling boy." Nothing seems to bother him, at least not for long. On those rare occasions when matters get out of hand, the most protest Mr. Simmons ever gives vent to is a muttered side to an aid. Almost at once, he resumes the flow of pleasantries and small talk which are the coin of social exchange. In the way of a diplomat (he used to be an ambassador himself), he brushes aside such incidents.

While others fret and strain over the awesome repercussions of a fancied slight to the head of a touchy and uncommitted new republic, Mr. Simmons, who at 64, with thinning blond hair and ruddy cheeks, does not look his age, proceeds serenely on the theory that good humor and good manners are contagious.

Mr. Simmons' memory is not so good (he is in fact, notoriously absent-minded) and his office draws up the most meticulous schedule. His aplomb is remarkable.

The most celebrated instance of this came during the visit of the Crown Prince of Japan in 1953. All those expected to be in contact with this exalted personage were carefully instructed to address him as "your royal highness." Everything proceeded smoothly until a ranchhand who was to take the young royalty on a fishing trip said briskly, "C'mon, junior, let's get going."

The chief of protocol never turned a hair. "He probably thought it was a perfectly proper local form of address, if he noticed it at all," Mr. Simmons says imperturbably.

Mr. Simmons has had his job since July 17, 1950. He says there is no formula for it. A man who prides himself on ordering a different brand every time he buys cigarettes, he always tries to vary the greeting he extends as the visitor descends the ramp at a plane or steps from a train. He speaks four languages: French, German, Spanish, and Portuguese. He is most proficient in German, and is looking forward to chatting with Chancellor Adenauer in his native tongue.

Bill Under Consideration To Stop Military Landgrabs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLAIR ENGLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 19, 1956

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Speaker, on June 18, 1956, the Washington Daily News carried front-page headlines regarding the landgrabs by the Military Establishments in the western part of the United States. Mr. Jim Lucas, Scripps-Howard staff writer, is the author of an excellent article in that issue on the subject which is backed up in the same issue by an editorial, all of which I desire to make a part of the RECORD. Hearings have been going on in the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs for some months on this subject; and a bill, I think, will be voted out shortly to require the military departments to get approval from Congress for any withdrawal of public lands in excess of 5,000 acres.

The article and editorial follow:

LANDGRABBING ROW HAS SERVICES FUMING

(By Jim G. Lucas)

The military is engaged in a confused grab for public lands of a total area larger than the States of Connecticut, Delaware, Maryland, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, New Jersey, Rhode Island, and Vermont combined.

Much of this greedy scramble stems from the services' aversion to sharing with each other. Each wants its own firing ranges and testing grounds. And each wants to put its own particular bailiwick off limits to the others.

Military landholdings in the United States now total 26 million acres—an area equal to the State of Ohio. As of January 1, applications for another 9 million acres were on file. If all Defense and Atomic Energy Commission requests are granted, roughly 41,500,000 acres of public domain will be taken out of circulation.

DEVELOPMENTS

In this weird competition for public land, there have been these developments:

The Air Force has suddenly declared surplus to Air Force's needs two-thirds of a 3,500,000-acre guided-missile range in Nevada which it repeatedly has refused to share with the Navy during the past 3 years.

Almost immediately, however, it found another 800,000-acre tract—only a few miles away—it says it simply can't live without.

The Navy—its long fight for joint usage apparently won—turns out to be no longer interested. The reason: It's busily wheedling Congress out of $21 million to buy a second—exclusively naval—3,100,000-acre gunnery range 135 miles away.

The Army, meanwhile, wants Congress to give it 10,700 acres of the Wichita Mountain wildlife refuge near Fort Sill, Okla., to train GI's to fire the Corporal guided missile. This, despite the fact that it already owns a firing range the size of the State of Connecticut at Fort Bliss, Tex., where Corporal gunners now are trained. The men to be trained in Oklahoma would have to be shipped back to Fort Bliss for actual firing.

The Defense Department—which is supposed to ride herd on the services—has concurred in each proposal.

The full story of the military's 1956 land rush has unfolded during the last few weeks before subcommittees of the House Interior and Appropriations Committees.

Involved are the Air Force's Nellis-Tonapah gunnery range—a 100,000-square-mile chunk of desert near Las Vegas, Nev.—and the naval auxiliary air station at Fallon, Nebr. Also involved is the AEC's Nevada test site, which has been carved out of Nellis-Tonapah.

In 1953, the Navy first asked to share Nellis-Tonopah with the Air Force. It wanted to test air-to-air missiles from carrier planes.

ANSWER

The request was renewed last August. The Navy still got the same answer.

In March, however, the Air Force notified Congress it could do without 1 million acres at Nellis-Tonapah. Since then, it has decided to turn back another 1 million acres of public domain.

Meanwhile, however, the Navy had "looked elsewhere." In December 1954, it took over 1 million acres between Death Valley and Owens Valley in the Saline-Panamint region of California.

Early in 1955, it applied for exclusive entry to 3,100,000 acres near Fallon.

The Air Force apparently took the Navy by surprise when it gave up most of the Nellis-Tonapah range. Assistant Navy Secretary R. H. Fogler said he "could not even guess" what it meant.

"It would not only be unwise but impossible to answer 'Yes' or 'No'," he replied when asked if the Navy still wanted to move in. "I can only share with you my confusion."

Capt. William H. Dawson, head of the Navy's shore establishments branch, was more specific. Nellis-Tonapah—which once seemed so attractive—suddenly had serious drawbacks. For one thing, he said, "there is nothing there and we would have to start from scratch." It was too remote. It would add another 50 miles to his fuel and supply lines.

"We simply couldn't do it," Capt. Dawson told a House Appropriations Subcommittee. "It would take about 2 or 3 years. * * * Our need is so urgent we just cannot accept (that) delay."

THE LAND GRABBERS

No American, in these dangerous days, would stint our Armed Forces on anything necessary to their adequate strength.

The military services are our insurance against war, and our protection if war should come.

Whatever they need for training or testing and developing equipment the taxpayers willingly supply.

But need is not the same as reckless desire. Or petty obstinacy about sharing facilities.

The military forces, as much as any other part of the Government, should maintain a healthy respect for the taxpayer's dollar, and the useful and efficient spending of that dollar.

This healthy respect is not always apparent. For a glaring example, we cite an article by Jim Lucas, Scripps-Howard's well-known war correspondent and military reporter.

Mr. Lucas reports how the Army, Navy, and Air Force are competing in a huge land grab involving total acreage larger than eight of our States. They already hold 26 million acres—as much as the whole State of Ohio—and they, along with the Atomic Energy Commission, are after more than 15 million additional acres.

The Hoover Commission last year reported that the Government now owns land equal to a fourth of continental United States. Besides all that, it leases more than 2 million acres.

It was only recently that the Government even had an inventory of its holdings.

While some agencies have surplus property, other agencies are out looking for new sites. The Hoover Commission said there was "little" in the way of up-to-date property management.

We think Congress ought to take a good, hard look at this whole land-grabbing business. The armed services, for instance, ought to have necessary ranges for their new weapons, but if these programs keep up the way they are headed, there won't be much land left for taxpayers.

At least, Congress should be able to instill a little sense of proportion in the continued acquisition of land by the Government.

Ileitis Is Chronic, Often Recurs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN D. DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 19, 1956

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I have been as amazed as other citizens of this great country at the remarkable political pronouncements of the doctors who have handled the President's health during his two recent severe illnesses.

I refer more specifically to the statements that he is "fit to run again." Such statements were obviously politically inspired and not the product of careful, logical consideration of the true physical condition of their distinguished patient.

In the interest of a clear evaluation of the real state of health of the President I am inserting into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article appearing in yesterday's issue of the Washington (D. C.) Post and Times Herald by Mr. Drew Pearson, who analyzes the whole problem as clearly as I have seen the subject treated.

The article follows:

ILEITIS IS CHRONIC, OFTEN RECURS

(By Drew Pearson)

Len Hall, the astute and genial chairman of the Republican National Committee, held a night meeting with part of his GOP staff 3 days after President Eisenhower's operation.

"Listen," he told them, pounding his fist on the table. "It's still Eisenhower all the way."

Chairman Hall obviously was not interested in the wishes of the man who had just undergone a serious, sudden major operation, nor in the views of Ike's wife, or his son John. Nor did he seem to care that the medical facts about the President's latest illness as given by other eminent specialists do not seem to jibe with the rush verdict, announced a few minutes after he was off the operating table, by Maj. Gen. Leonard D. Heaton.

And unpleasant as it is to discuss the man who the American people hope and pray will recover quickly and permanently, it is imperative that the public know the absolute truth, not merely know what Chairman Len Hall thinks they should know.

The voting electorate either made a mistake or else was not given all the facts regarding Franklin Roosevelt in 1944, and the deception by Democratic politicians at that time should not condone similar deception by Republican politicians.

Accordingly, here are the facts as explained by two eminent specialists and as taken from the medical journal Gastroenterology of March 1954, official publication of the American Gastroenterological Association.

Dr. David Rutstein, head of the department of preventive medicine at the Harvard School of Medicine, is authority for the opinion that the President's ileitis is a chronic disease and that statistics prove it often recurs within 1 year.

DOCTORS VERSUS POLITICS

Dr. Rutstein stated this on an educational television program in cooperation with Harvard University in Boston on June 11. When I phoned him to confirm the quotes, I also asked whether the President would be able to recover sufficiently to run again.

"It's not a doctor's business to answer political questions," he replied, "and I don't think any other physician should, either," obviously referring to the amazingly quick statement of General Heaton that Ike was fit to run again.

Dr. Samuel Gaines, of the Polyclinic Hospital in New York also emphasized the probable recurrence of the intestinal disease and the distinct possibility that another operation would be necessary.

"The percentage of recurrence is up to 50 percent," Dr. Gaines explained. "Some fecal material is certain to pass through the bypassed portion of the intestine, which may entail another operation."

Dr. Gaines, who said he voted for Eisenhower and had previously planned to do so again, has performed the same operation many times and pointed out that the doctors must have known the President had this condition or they would not have been able to diagnose and operate so quickly.

"If this is so," Dr. Gaines pointed out, "then all the facts regarding the President's physical condition were not given to the public."

MAYO STUDY OF ILEITIS

Dr. Rutstein suggested that the best study of the President's disease had been written by Dr. Ward van Patter, of the Mayo Clinic in Gastroenterology of March 1954. Reference to this medical journal disclosed that recurrence of the disease is found to be as high as 65 percent, with a series of repeated operations sometimes necessary to remove additional sections of the intestine.

Dr. Van Patter states that the causes of the disease are unknown and no cure has yet been found.

It chiefly occurs in young adults and "is characterized clinically by abdominal cramps, diarrhea, fever, lost weight, anemia, peritoneal abscesses, and fistulas," he reported.

"The terms are characterized by a granulomatous necrotizing (putrefying) ulcerating and cicatrizing process frequently accompanied by fistulas and extending either to neighboring viscera or to the abdominal wall."

Dr. Van Patter presented a study of 237 Mayo patients who were followed up more than 2 years after operation on or partial removal of the lower bowel. In 190 cases the disease recurred again, or a percentage of 64, the deaths in this group numbered 22.

Dr. Van Patter also reported that numerous complications may follow, including abscesses, obstructions, anemia, and arthritis.

Though the facts were suppressed by Maj-Gen. Howard Snyder, his personal physician, it is known that he had one attack in the spring of 1949 and went to Key West for 2 months to recuperate. He also had a severe attack of stomach trouble which was never really diagnosed, in Paris in May 1952. He suffered another attack during the American Society of Newspaper Editors meeting in April 1953, and had a seizure after a stag dinner in the White House last March shortly after he announced that he would run again. News of most of these was suppressed.

However, it would appear that the President had suffered intermittently for at least 7 or 8 years. He was in fact the only general officer during the war who had a full-time doctor detailed to him.

Teague Praised for Stand on Vets Pension Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLAIR ENGLE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 19, 1956

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Speaker, the Washington Post of Sunday, June 17, carried an editorial commending Congressman OLIN E. TEAGUE, chairman of the House Veterans' Committee, for his vigorous fight against the treasury-raiding benefits added by his committee to the veterans' pension bill. The editorial correctly points out that the measure coming before the House makes it almost impossible to obtain needed adjustment in service-connected disability pensions which many of us support and would like to vote for. I make the editorial a part of the RECORD at this point:

BONUS GRAB-BAG

Chairman OLIN E. TEAGUE, of the House Veterans' Committee—himself a disabled veteran—deserves exceptional praise for his vigorous fight against the treasury-raiding benefits added by his committee to the veterans' pension bill. So many objectionable amendments were piled onto the measure that the President can have no alternative but to apply an emphatic veto if it ever reaches his desk. Estimates place the extra cost of the bill at $1.4 billion in the first year after passage and at a staggering $100 billion eventually.

The American Legion was behind the most dubious amendment to give all veterans of World Wars I and II and the Korean war a $105-a-month pension if their annual incomes did not exceed $1,400 for single men and $2,700 for married men. Other amendments supported by various veteran groups would boost pensions for widows of war veterans, remove the requirement that veterans of World War II and Korea must have had a service-connected disability to make their widows eligible, and increase the pensions for all veterans over 65 years of ago who served overseas.

When the Veterans' Committee attempted to satisfy every pressure organization with a grab-bag, it doomed the bill to death. The pity is that this approach makes it almost impossible to obtain needed adjustment in service-connected disability pensions as recommended by the Bradley Commission. President Eisenhower has already conveyed his objection clearly to the House committee. These ought to be made public so that the House and Senate may have the full story when they vote.

The World Patiently Awaits Announcement of a Firm Effective Foreign Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 18, 1956

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial from the New York Herald Tribune of June 18, 1956, is important. Coming from an avowedly Republican paper, it cannot be accused of partisanship. I urge our colleagues to read it and then join me in asking our President when he will get a Secretary of State who has imagination and sympathetic understanding and will give us vigorous, effective action and when will we move with unity and with speed:

It is perfectly easy for any objective observer to recognize the ironies—to put no finer point on the matter—of Mr. Shepilov's statement on his arrival in Cairo. The new Soviet Foreign Minister said that he came from "the country that has totally repudiated colonial expansion," that "has no place

for oil monopolies or any other kind of imperialist monopoly," that bases its relations with other states "on noninterference in internal affairs."

It so happened that Mr. Shepilov arrived in Cairo and delivered his pronouncement to his hosts on the anniversary of that day, 3 years ago, when a chain of events began that was to disprove every one of his characterizations of the Soviet Union. On June 16, 1953, a group of workers in East Berlin—working on a government construction monopoly imposed on the East Germans by Soviet imperialism—went on strike and touched off strikes throughout the portion of Germany under Russian domination.

The authority of the East German puppet government collapsed. It was restored by Russian tanks; German workers were shot down by Russian troops; the system of brutal exploitation whereby East Germany was milked for the benefit of Soviet policies was again put into operation. And the flicker of hope that had set up sympathetic demonstrations in other satellite States, such as Hungary and Czechoslovakia, was speedily quenched. This, be it noted, was not the work of Josef Stalin, but of the Soviet Union's collective leadership.

All of this could well be pointed out to those middle eastern peoples whom Mr. Shepilov is trying to convince of the Soviet Union's purity of purpose and zeal for freedom. But the fact remains that in Egypt, as elsewhere in the Middle East and Asia, Communist imperialism seems a distant thing, or a different thing, than the colonialism which those regions have come to regard as their first enemy. They look with greater concern on the vanishing garrisons of the West than on the technicians and salesmen and diplomats who are the vanguard of the new imperialism of the East.

There is little point, so far as western policy is concerned, in becoming angry with this state of mind, or in trying to dispel it by argument alone. It is necessary to prove, by deeds, that the path of the Western States leads to freedom for all, and the broader prosperity that a free society can produce. No one will deny that the task is both difficult and delicate; that it needs imagination, sympathetic understanding, and vigorous, effective action. But the task must be undertaken with unity and with speed—and with the firm determination of every member of the free world to demonstrate that liberty has resources, in things of the spirit as well as in material well-being, that no system of slavery however well intrenched, however shrewdly led, can match.

Counterpart Control Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY S. REUSS
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 19, 1956

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill to make certain improvements in the congressional budgetary procedure with respect to the use of local currency counterpart by committees in official work abroad. I would like briefly to explain the purposes of this bill and the improvements it proposes.

At the present time, local currency set aside under the provisions of our aid programs abroad is available, in limited amounts, for the use of the United States Government. Congressional committees engaged in official business in these countries are authorized to use these counterpart funds to defray their local expenses. This is a sound procedure, which results in savings to the American taxpayer. My bill in no way changes or limits this procedure.

However, the funds that are used in this way by committees are not subject to the regular budgeting and accounting procedures by which the Congress controls the expenditures of its committees. The appropriate committees—in the case of this House, the Rules and the Administration Committees—go through a careful and conscientious procedure each year in recommending authorization and apropriation of funds for committee use. I believe I speak for all members in saying that our respect for the judgment of these committees is so great that we rarely question their decisions in passing on their recommendations. By this procedure the activities of committees are controlled and supervised by the Congress.

These facts are, of course, well known. What is not so well known is that, by exclusion of counterpart funds from this budgetary process, we have in fact reduced the process, in many cases, to a nullity. Any committee which travels abroad and usese counterpart funds is in fact operating on an entirely different budget than the one approved—operating on a budget which has not been fully examined, authorized, or appropriated. Let us take the case of a committee which brings in a budget for $60,000 for the year, itemized to justify the various expenditures that make it up. This is examined by two committees of the House, approved by the entire body—and then made meaningless when the committee proceeds to spend $100,000, by using an additional $40,000 of counterpart.

Now I know that there has been a great deal of public comment and newspaper rumor about the use or misuse of counterpart funds by congressional committees. But it seems to me that such criticism and the facts that may or may not underlie it are a secondary consideration here. What is really at stake is this: Is this House to control its own affairs by the careful and prudent procedures it has created, or are those procedures and the labors of the committees that carry them out to be rendered meaningless by leaving a substantial part of the funds actually used outside the budgetary control system?

I do not think I am overstating the case. The figures show clearly just how meaningless the budgetary process becomes.

Just in the 3 months following the close of Congress last year, 151 Members of the Congress had begun or were preparing for official trips abroad. Of 14 House committees planning to travel, 8 were authorized to visit countries where counterpart funds were available. In fiscal 1955, I am told, $135,000 in counterpart was spent by such committees. In fiscal 1954, $157,000 was spent. Although I have not been able to ascertain the figures, it is reasonable to suppose that the eight committees traveling abroad last fall spent a comparable amount. In other words, committees authorized to spent $1.05 million by this House, probably spent well over another $100,000. Let me repeat, I am not objecting; that was a hundred thousand saved for the American taxpayer. But what sense does a budgeting procedure make when, after the budget is carefully drawn up for $1,050,000, these committees can and do spend another $100,000 to $150,000? Over a fourth of the Members of the Congress, half or more of its committees, travel abroad yearly in pursuit of congressional business, spending several millions of dollars of funds allocated to them by the Congress. In an operation of such magnitude, should we not maintain some control and accountability, by the means Congress has created for that very purpose?

It seems to me that there should be no controversy about this proposal. If elimination of this budgetary loophole were difficult or cumbersome; or if we were in any way handicapping the committees of Congress in pursuing their activities; or if we were in any way discouraging the economical and desirable practice of utilizing counterpart funds—if any of these things were so, I would hesitate to suggest a change. But, in fact, there is no such problem. All that is necessary is to require that committees include all their proposed activities and expenditures in their budgets, so that the supervising budgetary committees and the Congress may scrutinize and pass on all of the expenditures that, in fact, they propose to make whether from contingent fund or counterpart. This can be accomplished very simply by requiring that counterpart funds, when used, be used in lieu of and under the same limitations and conditions as contingent fund appropriations. In other words, use of counterpart should be charged against a committee's contingent fund balance and accounted for in precisely the same manner as though it were drawn from the contingent fund. That is all my bill proposes.

The purpose of this bill is simply to restore to Congress what it intended to have, what it should have, and what it presently does not have: control over its own operations by means of control of its budget. Because it does so, I believe this bill is sound and noncontroversial.

But I should like to touch on one more aspect of this matter which, I believe, is a further recommendation of my bill. We all know that in the past few months there has been a great deal of newspaper comment on the use of counterpart funds and a lot of rumor and speculation about its misuse. There are rumors of committees traveling abroad without authorization, solely by unauthorized use of counterpart. There are stories of extravagant use of counterpart funds, sometimes for personal expenditures. I do not pretend to know the facts or lack of facts on which these stories are based. But I am sure we have all been disturbed by them because of the reflections they cast on the dignity of this body. I think all of us would like to see them put an to, once and for all.

But stories like these flourish best in a situation of ignorance, where the facts

are not known. It is precisely because the facts about counterpart funds, escaping from the proper budgetary control of this House, are not known that rumor can circulate. I do not think any of us is willing to dignify malicious rumor by argument. But the best answer—and an answer suitable to the situation—is provided by this bill. When counterpart funds are accounted for within the regular budgetary procedure of the Congress, there is no longer any of the mystery on which rumor flourishes. So, I say, a second reason for enacting this measure is to free Members of the Congress from the necessity to answer such allegations—and to make it impossible for allegations any longer to flourish. Newspapers discussing this subject have referred to "arrogance," have commented on the "secrecy" of these funds and have talked about "freeloaders." The best answer to these charges, I submit, is this bill.

How Big Business Operates

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 18, 1956

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the following item by Roscoe Drummond, which appeared in the New York Herald Tribune of June 18, 1956, is important reading. It gives an indication of how big business tells congressional commit- It implicitly sounds a warning that what big business tells Congressional Committees must be taken with a grain of salt:

Several powerful industrialists, bitterly opposed to President Eisenhower's liberalized, two-way trade and tariff program, are resorting to some pretty shabby and shoddy tactics to prevent the most influential voice of business from being heard on this issue.

It may be too lote to counter this particular tricky, below-the-belt maneuver, but it ought to be brought out into the open for future reference—and warning.

What would you think if a few leading Senators persuaded the Senate not to act on a vital matter until there could be a national referendum as the basis for action—and then blanketed the Nation with appeals to ignore the referendum entirely? In other words, a maneuver to block the Senate from acting by holding out the prospect of a referendum topped by a maneuver to block the referendum itself. If that should happen I would suspect you would think there was more there than met the eye.

This is exactly what is happening to the authorized referendum of the Chamber of Commerce of the United States on trade policy and United States membership in the Organization for Trade Cooperation. It doesn't look good any way you look at it.

Events followed each other in this order:

The policy committee and the board of directors of the United States chamber approved a declaration suporting the Government's multilateral trade program and the machinery to carry it out.

When this resolution went before the annual meeting of the chamber in Washington in May, opponents of the trade pact argued strenuously that this issue was much too important to be settled without a direct vote of the chamber membership, that it should only be determined by the democratic process of a referendum ballot.

Thus United States Chamber of Commerce referendum No. 95 was authorized and later the ballots were put into the mail.

But then the opponents of the multilateral trade program began to show their hand. After preventing the annual meeting of the chamber from voting on the recommendation of the policy committee and the directors by a plausible appeal for a referendum, they at once started a campaign to dissuade members from using the referendum.

The principal open move was a letter addressed to the member organizations of the United States chamber by Edwin J. Putzell, Jr., secretary of the Monsanto Chemical Co., warning them against making the mistake of stepping into the middle of a hot controversy.

Having blocked action at the annual convention by proposing a referendum, the opponents of the resolution next moved to block the referendum—which they had supported—in an effort to insure no action at all.

Their tactic was to argue that the issue was too controversial to vote on without a referendum and too controversial to vote on in a referendum. Pretty cute, wasn't it?

This trade and tariff issue is controversial. That's the reason for the referendum. If the answer were axiomatically obvious, there would be no need for a referendum.

Mr. Putzell did concede in his letter to the chamber's member organizations that "it is necessary at times for you to take a stand on controversial issues, but this is not such a time." Why isn't it the very best time? The problem is before us now. This is a matter directly affecting business and the national interest. Congress will soon be acting on legislation bearing on it. The annual meeting of the chamber asked for the guidance of the membership.

Mr. Putzell concluded his don't-vote appeal with this not very subtle admonition: "It is impossible for you to vote on this referendum without antagonizing large and meaningful segments of local industry represented in your organization. Therefore, we strongly urge you to refrain from voting on referendum No. 95."

This letter has not gone unanswered. When William Blackie, executive vice president of the Caterpillar Tractor Co., found out about it, he also circularized the chamber members. To the argument that businessmen must not express their views for fear of antagonizing other businessmen, Mr. Blackie replied: "It is possible that this could be an insulting as well as a gratuitous appeal to shirk a performance of duty because some dues-paying members might not be big enough to recognize the rights of others to differ on matters of judgment. Surely Mr. Putzell is going beyond his reasonable province when he tells you how to run your affairs."

We will soon know whether the Chamber of Commerce of the United States is to be a forthright voice of business—or the voice of silence.

Drought Crisis in Missouri

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. W. R. HULL, JR.
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 19, 1956

Mr. HULL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to call the attention of my colleagues to a situation in north Missouri covering not only my own district but a part of that represented by the dean of the Missouri delegation, Congressman CANNON. I realize that no political party or administration has a monopoly upon arbitrary capriciousness or obtuse redtape, but the present drought crisis in north Missouri has developed a situation which, in my opinion, merits the attention of the Congress.

For several years that region has been in the grip of a continuing drought. Year after year of substandard rainfall has produced a progressive, creeping paralysis of that entire agricultural area. It has reached the point where livestock herds must be disposed of, and in some localities there is even an immediate danger of lack of water for human needs. The situation is so acute that it has been described in the newspapers as far away as New York. The farmers and businessmen of north Missouri are a proud and self-reliant people, who do not panic easily and who are not inclined to request outside assistance except in desperation. However, late this spring actual conditions reached such a point that they appealed to the Federal Government for emergency relief under Public Law 875, passed by the 81st Congress, with which you are all familiar.

Their urgent request was made through established procedures, but the net result has been nothing. The statements of responsible citizens, including even those of eminent Republicans, were disregarded. The urgings of Senator HENNINGS and Senator SYMINGTON were useless. The recommendations of the Governor of Missouri, based upon survey of the Missouri State Drought Committee, were ignored. The representations of myself and Congressman CANNON were brushed aside. Instead, upon the basis of a casual and partial investigation by a lone subordinate, the Department of Agriculture concluded that the situation was not sufficiently acute to warrant relief.

In the wake of a bipartisan storm of protest which this ruling evoked, the Department is now conducting another investigation and I have no doubt but that the requested relief will be in time accorded. But in the meantime, valuable time has been lost and much further suffering caused. I believe that it would be well for the Congress to fully inquire into the standards and procedures established for the administration of Public Law No. 875 to determine whether or not the intent of the Congress is being followed and the public welfare is properly served. In partial corroboration, I am inserting herewith two news articles from the St. Joseph (Mo.) News-Press, a great Missouri newspaper which is edited by a gentleman whose political affiliations differ from my own. The first article was published on Saturday, June 16 and the second on Sunday, June 17:

[From the St. Joseph (Mo.) News-Press of June 16, 1956]

ALL-OUT PUSH FOR AREA DROUGHT AID PLEDGED BY HULL—CONGRESSMAN RAPS BENSON FOR FAILING TO GRANT AID

Farmers in the crucially parched lands of 12 Northwest Missouri counties were assured by Representative WILLIAM R. HULL yesterday that he and other members of the Mis-

souri delegation in Washington will do "everything in our power" to obtain Federal emergency aid for this part of the State.

His statements were made at a luncheon in Bethany before some 180 representatives of the drought-stricken counties, midway through an 11-hour aerial and motorcar tour he and other State officials completed late last night.

In his talk, Congressman HULL told the worried farmers every effort is being made to obtain the emergency relief as soon as possible. He said he and United States Senators THOMAS C. HENNINGS and STUART SYMINGTON would call on Secretary of Agriculture Ezra Taft Benson next week to present a report of yesterday's inspection.

SERIOUSNESS IN QUESTION

The Agriculture Department last week declined to designate the 12 counties as disaster area on the grounds the drought was not serious enough.

Congressman HULL told the farmers at yesterday's meeting that northwest Missouri farms are in "much worse" condition than they were when he visited the area only 13 days ago.

The critical situation is one to be met on a nonpartisan basis, he said, "and I intend to keep it that way." But at the same time, Mr. HULL lashed out at what he termed the "inconsideration and inhumanity" that has emanated from Secretary Benson's office ever since he took over.

He added, however, that his charge against the Secretary was not political and that "I'd be just as critical if he were a Democrat."

HASTY INVESTIGATION

The administration's decision to refuse emergency aid to northwest Missouri, Congressman HULL declared, "was based on a hasty and superficial investigation by a department representative."

He referred to an inspection tour made late last month by Robert Hall, an Agriculture Department aid.

Robert Crawford of Nevada, Mo., representing Senator HENNINGS on yesterday's tour, said the Senator shared Mr. HULL's sentiments. He said Senator HENNINGS is "gravely concerned with the need for emergency stock feed assistance in the area."

Mr. HULL added that Senator SYMINGTON, whom he was representing on the inspection, was equally disturbed by the seriousness of the drought and promised "every possible consideration."

EXTENT IS OUTLINED

The extent of the drought was graphically outlined by members of the drought relief committee and a number of farmers.

George Homan, former St. Joseph fireman and now chairman of the drought relief committee of Gentry County, reported an "extreme and acute" shortage of feeds, seeds, and water in his county.

Mr. Homan, now an implement and motor car dealer at Albany, Mo., said Gentry County has 387 dry farm ponds and 344 dry wells.

In Nodaway County, 12.34 inches of rain have fallen since last July 1, critically below the normal fall of 36.94 inches for that period. Nodaway County has had a 42.50 rain deficiency in the last 2½ years, it was reported.

In De Kalb County, the 8-month deficiency was reported to be 15.11 inches.

INSECTS A THREAT

In addition to the danger to crops, farmers at the Bethany meeting expressed deep concern over the threat of crop ruin from insects whose hatchings will flourish in the dry weather.

And again, farmers continued to register concern over the diminishing amount of pasture land, and the shortage of feed and water that has forced some to sell their live stock and may force others to dispose of theirs.

The counties making reports at the Bethany meeting were Putnam, Sullivan, Livingston, Mercer, Grundy, Daviess, De Kalb, Worth, Nodaway, Atchison, and Harrison.

STATE SENATORS PRESENT

Republican State Senators James Keller, of Trenton, and Clayton Allen, of Rock Port, were among those attending. Also present was Raymond Wheeler, of Bethany, who informed the group the State board of health had ordered Bethany to remove all "approved water" signs, because water there contained impurities.

However, Mayor Wheeler said, tests showed there were no impurities and the health board issued its order instead because of Bethany's water shortage.

Congressman Hull was accompanied on the aerial and motor car trip by his secretary, F. M. Wilson, Platte City, and Gerald Massie and Dale Fearn, both of the Missouri resources and development commission, and Harold Slater, city editor of the News-Press.

A similar inspection tour will be made Monday by Kenneth Scott, director of the credit service of the Department of Agriculture; Murray Colbert, State director of the Agriculture Stabilization Committee, and Mr. Hall, who made the earlier tour.

[From the St. Joseph (Mo.) News-Press of June 17, 1956]

DROUGHT SEEN AS THREAT TO ECONOMY OF NORTHWEST MISSOURI—DISCOURAGEMENT GROWING AS LIVE STOCK, CROPS, DWINDLE

(By Harold M. Slater)

Worry etched deep in their faces, north Missouri farmers feel their economy is gone if they do not receive Federal assistance within a week or 10 days.

As those farmers talked to Congressman WILLIAM R. HILL at more than a score of places throughout the area Friday it was apparent they have another potential enemy in addition to lack of water and feed and fear of grasshopper and chinch bug infestation.

That enemy is discouragement. "We've been feeling as if we didn't have a friend in the world," one farmer told the Congressman shortly after the HULL party arrived at the Albany airport. Others during the day re-echoed that sentiment.

CORN CURLING

Emphasized was the fact the present situation in north Missouri is not one that can be ended by a long heavy rain or even a series of such rains now. It is too late for pastures. Pastures are gone; the alfalfa crop is almost nil, and the corn already has started to curl from drought effects.

Many of the farmers expressed bitterness toward Secretary of Agriculture Ezra Taft Benson. Their contention is that the decision to refuse to designate north Missouri counties as a disaster relief area was based on a hasty and superficial investigation.

The field man who made the investigation on which the aid refusal was based did not get out into the full farm area to see the damage, they told Congressman HULL.

IN ARIZONA

"He had been in New Mexico and Arizona. He reported things weren't as bad here as down there. He didn't take into consideration the economy in those Southwestern States is based on 4 or 5 inches of rain a year; that ours is based on 30 to 35 inches of rain," one farmer at Albany said.

J. N. McMichael of the Gentry County Bank at Albany said one of the real blows to the area is the fact farmers are being forced into liquidation of their cattle. He pointed to grass and weeds in the bed of the Grand River as an indication of how serious the water shortage has become.

County Agent Ray Kampschmidt of Gentry County said the drought isn't just a 1-year affair. "We're 40 inches deficient on rain in the past 4 years," he said.

NOT SEEKING DOLE

Mayor Raymond Wheeler of Bethany said the farmers weren't asking for a dole; that they didn't want to ask for help. "But the situation is such that they must now. It's desperate," he said.

Fred Howitt, King City banker, said the grasshopper menace is great.

"I saw a truck bed the other day and thought some bluegrass seed had been left in it. It turned out to be just thousands of tiny grasshoppers," Mr. Howitt, who owns the Howitt Building in St. Joseph, said.

The first farm visited by Congressman HULL after he arrived at Albany is that operated by Ora Collier, Sr., and Ora Collier, Jr. The Colliers own 430 acres and rent and farm 120 more. George Homan, former St. Joseph fireman and now chairman of the Gentry County drought-relief committee, pointed out the Colliers have gone in for all balanced farm practices and have won many farm awards.

ALFALFA PASTURED

Ora Collier, Jr., looked at his sad-appearing fields and commented: "We got 3,500 bales of alfalfa on the first cutting in 1955. This year there wasn't any for a first cutting. We pastured it down. It lasted a week.

Six of the 12 ponds on the Collier farm are dry. Some of the others have as little as a foot of water. The Colliers have 230 head of cattle. They have started selling.

Carl Akers, who farms east of Albany, has 170 acres in alfalfa for his dairy herd of 55. "That alfalfa should be lush now. Look at it." It is about 6 inches high, and scant.

Akers and his wife operate the place alone. Last year they produced and sold 435,000 pounds of grade A milk. This is the first time he has never had a first cutting of alfalfa. He doesn't have a bale of hay.

PASTURING OATS

Five miles southeast of Albany on the farm of Sam Chenoweth, a herd of 77 Angus is pasturing on oats. "That will pasture them for about 10 days. I don't know what then," Mr. Chenoweth said.

"You fellows don't need to tell me," said Congressman HULL with a wry smile. "I'm a farmer and I know what you are up against. The big thing is convincing the Secretary of Agriculture how bad your situation is. I'm going to try to help you."

Mr. HULL was optimistic, however, that the resurvey of the situation promised by the Agriculture Department might bring about a reversal of the drought aid refusal.

The Hull party was shown how the farmers throughout the area are being deprived of one of their most vital things this year—their gardens.

At the B. A. Collins farm near Bethany they were shown a garden plot that was barren. "A garden probably means $1,000 or more to the average farm family during a year," a farmer explained. "This year on account of the drought we just don't have any."

Approximately 50 farmers were waiting when Congressman HULL arrived yesterday afternoon at the Stanton Halleck farm south of Ridgeway. The pasture there—as in much of the area—looks like a lawn in September when youngsters have played baseball on it all summer.

Hay has been thrown out in the barren pasture so the cattle will have something to eat. "And the pasturage should be lush at this time of the year," Mr. Halleck said.

HAS NO FEED

Farmers gathered at the Halleck place told the Congressmen the big part of the cattle in Harrison County would be sold and moved out if something is not done within the next 10 days.

"My son has been buying water for 3 months now for his cattle. Now he has no feed. He'll have to sell," a farmer there said.

The situation was almost the same among the farm group that waited at the Joe Campbell place, north of Ridgeway, to talk to Hull, who made much of the tour in shirt sleeves and sans tie.

There he was told that hay that averaged 80 bales an acre in Harrison County last year, this year will average 7 bales or less.

The delegation that greeted HULL at the Maryville Airport told him 65 percent of the farmers in Nodaway County are hauling water. Lloyd Fine, a farmer of near Hopkins, said land that yielded 500 bales of alfalfa last year produced 71 this year. "I'm driving my cattle half a mile to the river each day," he said.

Nodaway County is like the others in the area in that many of its cattle are being sold due to the shortages.

On the window of one Bethany cafe there is a sign reading "Due to water shortage, to get water you have to ask for it."

That seemed to be the final touch.

"Our pastures are just exercising lots," a Mercer County man said. "There isn't anything left in them for the cattle to eat." The rain deficit in Mercer County is one of the heaviest in the area.

De Kalb County representatives reported a 15-inch deficit in rain for the last 8 months. In some areas there, 90 to 95 percent of the ponds are dry.

CRACKS IN FIELDS

Worth County farmers told the Congressman half the wheat has been pastured or plowed under. Forty commercial trucks are hauling water in Nodaway County. One farmer reported he had spent $496 to have water hauled since October 1.

Numerous were the reports of fields cracking.

"One of our farmers up home," said a Nodaway County man, "reports he has a crack in one field that is 80 feet long, 18 inches wide, and 4 feet deep.

"Either it is an awfully big crack or it is an awfully big story."

That was about the only humor of the day's tour.

A Bill To Strengthen the Clayton Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES ROOSEVELT
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 19, 1956

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, section 4 of the Clayton Act permits any person who shall be injured in his business or property by reason of anything forbidden in the antitrust laws to sue and recover "threefold the damages by him sustained, and the cost of suit, including a reasonable attorney's fee." The provision has been in effect for a long time and may be found in Thirty-eighth United States Statutes at Large, page 731, and is codified as Fifteenth United States Code, section 15.

Section 16 of the Clayton Act provides for equitable relief and the granting of an injunction to prevent threatened loss or damage by a violation of the antitrust laws. Yet, strange as it might seem, there appears to be an unexplained omission in this section, because it is silent as to the granting of a reasonable attorney's fee when equitable relief is given a complainant.

It should be particularly noted that when an action at law for treble damages is brought, and even if it should be concluded successfully for the plaintiff, the unfair competition, or the violation of antitrust laws, is not necessarily stopped thereby, but often continues unabated. However, in a proceeding for injunctive and equitable relief, under the antitrust laws, brought by virtue of the provisions contained in section 16 of the Clayton Act, permanent relief is afforded and fair competition and compliance with the provisions of the antitrust laws is automatically restored. Both the public interest and the complainant's advantage are better served by this than by the mere award of monetary damages even if trebled.

Unfortunately, however, and I submit, unfairly, in an action for equitable relief, the complainant not only does not recover any damages but may be obliged to bear the cost of litigation as well as the expense of paying the attorney's fee. Therefore, under the present law, there is a great incentive for the plaintiff to seek recovery of treble damages, rather than pray for permanent equitable relief and the compliance by the defendant with the provisions of the antitrust laws.

It is because of this obvious unfairness and omission in the provisions of the Clayton Act that impells me to introduce a bill to amend section 16, and thereby put the complainant who seeks a permanent cessation of violations of positive statutory law by the defendant, on par and equality with the plaintiff who brings an action at law for treble damages, and thereby award such complainant when successful his cost of the suit, including a reasonable attorney's fee.

The Federal courts have repeatedly held that the rights of persons damaged by violations of the antitrust laws to sue the defendants guilty of such violations were also for the purpose of multiplying the agencies which would help enforce these important statutes, and therefore make them more effective—*Maltz* v. *Sax* (134 F. 2d 2). They are said to be designed to supply an auxiliary force of private investigators to supplement the Department of Justice in law enforcement—*Weinberg* v. *Sinclair Refining Company* (48 F. Supp. 203)—and to aid in achieving the broad social objectives of the act—*Fanchon & Marco* v. *Paramount Pictures* (100 F. Supp. 84).

Some time ago, when I introduced H. R. 8395, it was provided, among other things, that a successful plaintiff in an equitable proceeding may recover the cost of suit, including a reasonable attorney's fee. In this connection I should like to quote the testimony of Judge Stanley N. Barnes, Assistant Attorney in charge of the Antitrust Division of the United States Department of Justice. In his testimony before the Antitrust Subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives Judge Barnes stated:

I likewise support H. R. 8395's effort to permit a successful private antitrust plaintiff's recovery of costs not only where he seeks damages but also solely equitable relief. I think that this is consonant with well-recognized principles, that a prevailing party litigant should be entitled to his costs under present section 4 of the Clayton Act, any person injured may recover treble damages and the cost of suit, including a reasonable attorney's fee. Section 16, however, enables private antitrust plaintiffs to seek injunctive relief, but does not include a provision authorizing the recovery of costs. Where a private litigant does not sue under section 4 as well as 16, no rational basis appears for denying recovery of costs. In either case he should recover costs including a reasonable attorney's fee.

I submit and advocate the enactment of this bill into law in order to strengthen the Clayton Act and thereby aid small business. For, after all, small business is the backbone of the Nation's economy and the maintenance of the growth and survival of small enterprises are, indeed, vital to the country's strength and welfare.

An Effective Foreign Policy Might Be Surprisingly Refreshing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 18, 1956

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial from the Wall Street Journal of June 18, 1956, is further evidence of our lack of effective foreign policy. Everybody appears to know that, except our President and his Secretary of State:

For many years a prime function of American foreign policy has been the manufacture of defense alliances with other countries. Apart from the United Nations, which theoretically at least is an alliance, the United States has concluded such pacts with more than 40 nations. Now circumstances are forcing a reappraisal of the value of this approach.

That, we think, is the import of the confusion which Washington has been generating about this country's attitude toward other nations' neutrality. President Eisenhower said in effect that neutrality is understandable and maybe a good thing. Secretary of State Dulles suggested that, except in unusual circumstances, it is shortsighted and immoral.

The confusion may be, as Mr. Dulles contends, largely one of language. But the problem it reflects is real enough.

The reason for the American eagerness for defense alliances was, of course, the threat and at times the actuality of Communist aggression. Some pacts, like the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, have undoubtedly helped deter further Communist aggression.

Something happened, though, at last summer's Geneva conference to alter the aspect of the Soviet threat. There was a tacit agreement that hydrogen and other new weapons had made resort to war unthinkable. In other words, the Communists would no longer pursue their aims by military means where such means might lead to global war.

That notion may be the sheerest kind of wishful thinking. It may be more likely that the Soviet will blast this country when they are good and ready. Certainly the Pentagon assumes they will. But the fact is that the no-war theory is widely accepted in the world.

And whatever the Soviets' military intentions, they have in fact turned from angry

to soft words, directed mainly at the so-called neutral nations of Asia and the Middle East. This combination of circumstances makes America's policy of military alliances increasingly unpopular in the world, and therefore increasingly ineffective.

So the United States now appears to be trying to evolve a policy which will not anger nations that have risked something to enter alliances with this country, and which at the same time will make clear that there is ample room in the world for genuinely neutral nations—that they do not have to be with us in order for us to consider them not against us.

What will come of this reappraisal is anybody's guess. But we think a couple of basic points ought to be clear.

One is that the United States has put too high a value on defense pacts. Indiscriminate scrambling for allies is a dubious way of strengthening our own security. It is fairly absurd to suppose that some impoverished, politically illiterate Asian country is going to view the Communist threat with the same seriousness or interest as the United States. It is equally unlikely that such a country would be much help if the Communists did attack.

A second point is that the answer to the declining prestige of military pacts is not vast new economic aid. There is nothing to suggest that such aid makes neutrals less susceptible to communism or, indeed, that it even significantly strengthens the economies of backward lands.

The growing unpopularity of pacts ought, in fact, to suggest to the United States that the world has been too much with us, and we too much in it. Perhaps we could just calm down for a while. Instead of proposing defense alliances all over the place, let other nations ask our military help if they want it. Instead of insisting on subsidizing them, let them ask our aid. That is the only basis on which military or economic aid can be useful anyway.

That kind of policy could be applied to allies and neutrals alike. It would go far toward resolving the neutrality problem now bothering Washington. And its result, in terms of the world's attitude toward us, might be surpisingly refreshing.

He Was Our Friend, Faithful and Fearless

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. HARRY McGREGOR
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 19, 1956

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to include two editorials relative to a very prominent figure who has recently passed away. I am referring to S. A. Horvitz, known to his thousands of friends as "Sam."

He was a successful publisher as well as a successful highway contractor. He was one who spent many hours of his life fighting for the principles he believed right and he was always unequivocally opposed to anything that was dishonest.

The two editorials I am inserting, Mr. Speaker, one by Ken Woodman entitled "He Was Our Friend, Faithful and Fearless," and one by G. J. Kochenderfer, editor emeritus, which describes the life and record of Sam Horvitz. I am sure, Mr. Speaker, that I speak the words of all who knew him when I extend sympathy to his wife and family:

HE WAS OUR FRIEND, FAITHFUL AND FEARLESS

Born the son of immigrant parents in a poor section of Cleveland, S. A. Horvitz forged his way upward to become a nationally known figure in the newspaper publishing world and a builder of some of Ohio's finest highways.

Although he was best known for the driving energy which carried him to prominence in both these fields, Mr. Horvitz had three other qualities which greatly influenced the course of his life.

He cherished his family deeply and was proud of his pleasant, attractive wife and three fine sons.

He detested dishonesty in either business or politics and constantly urged his newspapers to fight gambling and excessive utility rates.

His third quality was a rich sense of humor which flashed continuously in his dealings with old and trusted employees.

He never wanted personal glory of any kind and gave stringent instructions to his editors not to play him up in his papers "unless I do something bad, then put me on the front page."

He constantly urged improvement in his newspapers here and in Lorain, calling for the best in typography and syndicated features but always with top emphasis on local news coverage.

With employees who were loyal to him, he was generous to an unusual degree if they were overtaken by misfortune. This generosity was always without fanfare.

His immense vigor gave vitality to every project he touched. This included not only the contracting and publishing business but overflowed into politics as well where he insisted on backing candidates whom he believed were honest and supported a good program for the State and Nation.

Through his newspapers he backed innumerable civic and charitable enterprises in Mansfield and Lorain, always maintaining that the papers and not himself should get any credit that was due.

Sam Horvitz feared neither pomp nor circumstance nor life nor death. And he met his final challenge as he would have preferred to meet it—quickly and quietly in a hospital room at Hanna House in Cleveland.

To those who worked long with Mr. Horvitz and knew him well the words of Mark Anthony are earnestly appropriate: "He was my friend, faithful and just to me."

PERSONAL REMEMBRANCE

(By G. J. Kochenderfer)

It seems impossible to realize that we of the News-Journal will never again see Mr. Horvitz, as on the occasion of his final visit here a few weeks ago he appeared in excellent health and displayed his customary forward-looking attitude.

My pleasant recollection of Mr. Horvitz extends back more than a quarter century to early in 1930 when he became interested in the Mansfield newspaper situation and, in the midst of that depression, decided to establish the Journal here, and I well recall the determination with which he went about that enterprise and the success with which it was carried through.

Then came the years of operation in the old News Building, with progress which justified construction of the present home of the News-Journal, with plans for further expansion as needs appear.

Always it was the impelling force of Mr. Horvitz, recognizing his obligations to communities he served, that carried through the enterprises in which he was engaged.

From a personal standpoint, I was always greatly impressed by Mr. Horvitz's high appreciation of his associates in his newspaper enterprises and his constant efforts to improve the quality of newspapers being issued.

The three sons which Mr. Horvitz leaves were small boys when the Journal was started here. They have since grown to stalwart manhood, and Harry, the oldest, has fortunately developed such an interest in newspaper work as to make him fully capable of assuming the duties of his father in the direction of the newspaper properties which now come under his supervision.

In the death of Mr. Horvitz, I, like many others, have lost a close friend, and it was with deep sorrow that I received the news of his passing from earthly life.

Hon. George A. Dondero, of Michigan, Speaks at Gettysburg

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RAY J. MADDEN
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 19, 1956

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, our colleague, GEORGE A. DONDERO, of Michigan, was honored by being selected to make the annual Memorial Day speech at Gettysburg May 30.

Mr. DONDERO is recognized throughout the Nation as one of the outstanding authorities on Civil War history and Abraham Lincoln.

I am hereby submitting his magnificent address which he delivered on that day:

MEMORIAL DAY AT GETTYSBURG 1956

(Address of the Honorable GEORGE A. DONDERO, Member of Congress, 18th Michigan District, U. S. Military Cemetery, Gettysburg, Pa., May 30, 1956)

This is Memorial Day. It is a day of memories.

Americans everywhere around the world gather reverently, as we do here at Gettysburg today, to honor the Nation's dead. Their dust remains an inspiration to their countrymen.

Because of their sacrifice, on the Capitol Building at Washington—kissed by the sun of day and watched by the stars at night—waves the unconquered flag of your land and mine.

The struggle for freedom never ends. It was purchased with blood. It must be preserved by devotion. So Memorial Day is a day of honor, a day of remembrance, a day of reckoning, a day of accounting and above all a day of high resolve. We resolve anew today "that these dead shall not have died in vain" and with the help of God, who has never forsaken this favored land, we shall maintain our high resolve through future generations.

If the time should ever come when we no longer remember what brave men and women, living and dead, have done for us, in that day our Republic will no longer deserve preservation.

No one can stand on the battlefield of Gettysburg, on this spot, on this day and in this hour of history without a deep sense of humility. Here was fought one of the greatest and most significant battles of all time. Here were spoken, from a page and a half of ordinary ruled paper, the lines of an address that has never been surpassed on American soil. To me it has always seemed a near miracle that a man with President Lincoln's limited education, whose invitation to come here to make a few appropriate remarks was an afterthought, and whose

educational opportunities were so meager, could produce such a gem of English literature as the Gettysburg Address. Many years ago I asked Robert Lincoln, the President's son, the extent of his father's education, and he replied: "Father did not have anything to start with and hardly went to school at all." Lincoln's lines not only gave mankind the essence of the meaning of the struggle then being waged but also serve in this hour and for all ages as a prayer of deliverance for all people.

Abraham Lincoln the man, Gettysburg the place, and the soldier dead were the occasion for the ceremony on November 19, 1863. These combined to create for the free world an eternal light in man's unending struggle for the happiness God intended him to possess. Here at Gettysburg representative government ceased to be an experiment of 4 score and 7 years. The battle and the speech gave it the stature of perpetuity. Today, 4 score and 13 years later, Lincoln's question, "whether this Nation or any nation conceived in liberty can long endure," has again been tested in the crucible of war and answered affirmatively, at least for our day.

The circumstances dedicating this burial ground take on a shining luster and a sublime grandeur from the complete absence in the spirit of Lincoln's address of any note of hostility. It is weighted with the tragedy of the event and the whole war. It broods over the hero dead as though on both sides they had fought for the clarification of a great ideal and perished to realize it.

Great utterances have been delivered in many places down through the centuries. This one had the singular gift of expressing the basic meaning of the United States, in the noblest language, at a moment of deep national bereavement, by an American President forever stamped as typical, and whose entire lifework is summed up in these compactly beautiful sentences of that short oration. Never in the history of literature was so much said, so wisely, in so few words.

We know now that the address was not written on the back of an envelope, nor was it the inspiration of the moment. We know it represented the deepest soul searching of a profound and thoughtful President putting into 3 minutes of the spoken word what he had been thinking about for many years. The longer he lived the greater was his faith in the freedom of man and the stronger his conviction that it must be preserved.

What we have in the Gettysburg Address is deep thinking expressed in simple language. Its infinite compassion, its dedication, and its hope that "this Nation under God shall not perish from the earth" place it with the most sublime literature of the Hebrew prophets.

Whatever part of this Republic might be destroyed in a physical sense, its spiritual foundations, with these words, remain imperishable.

The real-headline or top attraction of the Gettysburg dedication 93 years ago was not Abraham Lincoln at all but perhaps the greatest of the great orators of that day. He was a former Member of Congress, former president of Harvard College, former Minister to Great Britain, former Secretary of State, former Governor of Massachusetts, and former United States Senator—the matchless Edward Everett. Yet the purest and most perfect prose was spoken not by the most educated American of his time who had attended temples of learning on two continents but by a most uncommon commoner from Illinois whose hands knew the feel of an ax handle and who hardly went to school at all. Yet the few appropriate remarks he was invited to deliver here stand forever as the symbol of our American philosophy of government.

There is still another circumstance equally challenging that holds us here today in this reverent hour of recollection and memorial.

"The world," said Lincoln with the humility of the lonely and the great, "will little note nor long remember what we say here, but it can never forget what they did here." Now 93 years after we find the Gettysburg Address as well as "what they did here" as much the living tradition of our country as the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution of the United States. Indeed I venture to suggest that we have to turn to the Bible and to our books of prayer to find words better remembered, more frequently quoted or vested with such moving spiritual force.

It was because of what was done here and precisely because of what was said here that we gather today to add our homage to the generations that before ours paid their tribute as will the generations that are to come after. Where we now stand is holy ground, a shrine as durable as man's love of freedom and as precious as his willingness to sacrifice life to maintain it.

We are rightly humble before the presence that watches over these sacred acres, and we should take as much as we can of inspiration from these surroundings for the tasks destiny has thrust upon us in an age where again freedom and slavery face each other in a world divided.

It may be that another American will in the decades to come add to the luster Abraham Lincoln gave to the American dream. It may be that another American taking his fire from the eternal light brought forth here will help mankind of a future day march to its hour of victory over the enemies of liberty. Perhaps we had less than 2 short years ago an approach to the Lincoln tenets of faith in the words of President Eisenhower, who stated on July 7, 1954, "I will not be a party to any treaty that makes anybody a slave."

Freedom has its life in the hearts, the actions, and in the spirit of men. This we know as we meet today in commemoration and communion; a weapon touched by the finger of God was forged here by Abraham Lincoln, a weapon of the soul and of the heart that cannot be vanquished by any force so long as man lives.

We have been obliged to forge some dreadful weapons to preserve our heritage. But no weapon we have yet forged is as enduring, no weapon is as strong, no weapon so grips our inmost conscience as that weapon of the mind that Lincoln tossed to men, like a torch, on the field of Gettysburg in 1863.

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

PRICE OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

The Public Printer is authorized to furnish to subscribers the daily RECORD at $1.50 per month, payable in advance.

Remit by money order payable to Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C.

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is located in Statuary Hall, House wing, where Mr. Frank Brodie is in attendance during the sessions of Congress to receive orders for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month, and where single copies may also be purchased. Orders are also accepted for the printing of speeches in pamphlet form.

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

SENATORS WITH RESIDENCES IN WASHINGTON

OFFICE ADDRESS: Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

[Streets northwest unless otherwise stated]

Vice President, Richard Nixon

Aiken, George D., *Vt*——Carroll Arms.
Allott, Gordon, *Colo*——
Anderson, Clinton P., *N. Mex.*——6 Wesley Circle.
Barrett, Frank A., *Wyo*——The Woodner.
Beall, J. Glenn, *Md*——
Bender, George H., *Ohio*——120 Schotts Court NE.
Bennett, Wallace F., *Utah*——
Bible, Alan, *Nev*——
Bricker, John W., *Ohio*——The Mayflower.
Bridges, Styles, *N. H*——
Bush, Prescott, *Conn*——
Butler, John Marshall, *Md*——
Byrd, Harry Flood, *Va*——The Shoreham.
Capehart, Homer E., *Ind*——The Westchester.
Carlson, Frank, *Kans*——Sheraton-Park
Case, Clifford P., *N. J*——
Case, Francis, *S. Dak*——4635 Mass. Ave.
Chavez, Dennis, *N. Mex*——3327 Cleveland Ave.
Clements, Earle C., *Ky*——The Congressional
Cotton, Norris, *N. H*——
Curtis, Carl T., *Nebr*——
Daniel, Price, *Tex*——
Dirksen, Everett M., *Ill*——
Douglas, Paul H., *Ill*——
Duff, James H., *Pa*——
Dworshak, Henry C., *Idaho*——
Eastland, James O., *Miss*——5101 Macomb St.
Ellender, Allen J., *La*——
Ervin, Samuel J., Jr., *N. C*——
Flanders, Ralph E., *Vt*——
Frear, J. Allen, Jr., *Del*——
Fulbright, J. William, *Ark*——
George, Walter F., *Ga*——The Mayflower.
Goldwater, Barry M., *Ariz*——
Gore, Albert, *Tenn*——
Green, Theodore Francis, *R. I.*——University Club.
Hayden, Carl, *Ariz*——
Hennings, Thomas C., Jr., *Mo.*——
Hickenlooper, Bourke B., *Iowa.*——5511 Cedar Parkway, Chevy Chase, Md.
Hill, Lister, *Ala*——
Holland, Spessard L., *Fla*——Sheraton-Park
Hruska, Roman L., *Nebr*——
Humphrey, Hubert H., *Minn.*——
Ives, Irving M., *N. Y*——
Jackson, Henry M., *Wash*——
Jenner, William E., *Ind*——
Johnson, Lyndon B., *Tex*——
Johnston, Olin D., *S. C*——
Kefauver, Estes, *Tenn*——4848 Upton St.
Kennedy, John F., *Mass*——
Kerr, Robert S., *Okla*——
Knowland, William F., *Calif.*——
Kuchel, Thomas H., *Calif*——
Laird, William R. III, *W. Va*——
Langer, William, *N. Dak*——2101 Conn. Ave.
Lehman, Herbert H., *N. Y*——Sheraton-Park
Long, Russell B., *La*——
McCarthy, Joseph R., *Wis*——
McClellan, John L., *Ark*——
McNamara, Pat, *Mich*——
Magnuson, Warren G., *Wash.*——The Shoreham.
Malone, George W., *Nev*——The Mayflower.
Mansfield, Mike, *Mont*——
Martin, Edward, *Pa*——
Martin, Thos. E., *Iowa*——4545 Conn. Ave.
Millikin, Eugene D., *Colo*——
Monroney, A. S. Mike, *Okla.*——
Morse, Wayne, *Oreg*——5020 Lowell St.
Mundt, Karl E., *S. Dak*——122 Schotts Court NE.
Murray, James E., *Mont*——The Shoreham.
Neely, Matthew M., *W. Va*——
Neuberger, Richard L., *Oreg.*——
O'Mahoney, Joseph C., *Wyo.*——Sheraton-Park
Pastore, John O., *R. I*——
Payne, Frederick G., *Maine*——
Potter, Charles E., *Mich*——
Purtell, William A., *Conn*——
Robertson, A. Willis, *Va*——
Russell, Richard B., *Ga*——
Saltonstall, Leverett, *Mass*——2320 Tracy Pl.
Schoeppel, Andrew F., *Kans.*——
Scott, W. Kerr, *N. C*——
Smathers, George A., *Fla*——
Smith, H. Alexander, *N. J*——Sheraton-Park
Smith, Margaret Chase, (Mrs.), *Maine.*——
Sparkman, John J., *Ala*——4928 Indian Lane
Stennis, John, *Miss*——
Symington, Stuart, *Mo*——
Thye, Edward J., *Minn*——
Watkins, Arthur V., *Utah*——
Welker, Herman, *Idaho*——4823 Tilden St.
Wiley, Alexander, *Wis*——2122 Mass. Ave.
Williams, John J., *Del*——
Wofford, Thomas A., *S. C*——
Young, Milton R., *N. Dak*——Quebec House So.

OFFICERS OF THE SENATE

Secretary—Felton M. Johnston.
Chief Clerk—Emery L. Frazier.
Sergeant at Arms—Joseph C. Duke.
Secretary for the Majority—Robert G. Baker.
Secretary for the Minority—J. Mark Trice.
Chaplain—Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D.

STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE SENATE

Committee on Agriculture and Forestry

Messrs. Ellender (chairman), Johnston of South Carolina, Holland, Eastland, Clements, Humphrey, Scott, Symington, Aiken, Young, Thye, Hickenlooper, Mundt, Williams, and Schoeppel.

Committee on Appropriations

Messrs. Hayden (chairman), Russell, Chavez, Ellender, Hill, McClellan, Robertson, Magnuson, Holland, Stennis, Clements, Johnson of Texas, Bridges, Saltonstall, Young, Knowland, Thye, McCarthy, Mundt, Mrs. Smith of Maine, Messrs. Dworshak, Dirksen, and Potter.

Committee on Armed Services

Messrs. Russell (chairman), Byrd, Johnson of Texas, Kefauver, Stennis, Symington, Jackson, Ervin, Saltonstall, Bridges, Flanders, Mrs. Smith of Maine, Messrs. Case of South Dakota, Duff, and Welker.

Committee on Banking and Currency

Messrs. Fulbright (chairman), Robertson, Sparkman, Frear, Douglas, Lehman, Monroney, Morse, Capehart, Bricker, Ives, Bennett, Bush, Beall, and Payne.

Committee on the District of Columbia

Messrs. Neely (chairman), Bible, McNamara, Morse, Frear, Beall, Hruska, Case of New Jersey, and Allott.

Committee on Finance

Messrs. Byrd (chairman), George, Kerr, Frear, Long, Smathers, Anderson, Douglas, Millikin, Martin of Pennsylvania, Williams, Flanders, Malone, Carlson, and Bennett.

Committee on Foreign Relations

Messrs. George (chairman), Green, Fulbright, Sparkman, Humphrey, Mansfield, Morse, Long, Wiley, Smith of New Jersey, Hickenlooper, Langer, Knowland, Aiken, and Capehart.

Committee on Government Operations

Messrs. McClellan (chairman), Jackson, Kennedy, Symington, Ervin, Humphrey, Wofford, McCarthy, Mundt, Mrs. Smith of Maine, Messrs. Cotton, Bender, and Martin of Iowa.

Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs

Messrs. Murray (chairman), Anderson, Jackson, O'Mahoney, Bible, Neuberger, Laird, Scott, Millikin, Malone, Watkins, Dworshak, Kuchel, Barrett, and Goldwater.

Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce

Messrs. Magnuson (chairman), Pastore, Monroney, Smathers, Daniel, Ervin, Bible, Wofford, Bricker, Schoeppel, Butler, Potter, Duff, Purtell, and Payne.

Committee on the Judiciary

Messrs. Eastland (chairman), Kefauver, Johnston of South Carolina, Hennings, McClellan, Daniel, O'Mahoney, Neely, Wiley, Langer, Jenner, Watkins, Dirksen, Welker, and Butler.

Committee on Labor and Public Welfare

Messrs. Hill (chairman), Murray, Neely, Lehman, Kennedy, McNamara, ———, Smith of New Jersey, Ives, Purtell, Goldwater, Bender, and Allott.

Committee on Post Office and Civil Service

Messrs. Johnston of South Carolina (chairman), Pastore, Monroney, Hennings, Scott, Neuberger, Laird, Carlson, Jenner, Langer, Curtis, Martin of Iowa, and Case of New Jersey.

Committee on Public Works

Messrs. Chavez (chairman), Kerr, Gore, McNamara, Neuberger, Wofford, ———, Martin of Pennsylvania, Case of South Dakota, Bush, Kuchel, Cotton, and Hruska.

Committee on Rules and Administration

Messrs. Green (chairman), Hayden, Hennings, Gore, Mansfield, Jenner, Barrett, McCarthy, and Curtis.

UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT

Mr. Chief Justice Warren, of California, Hotel Sheraton-Park, Washington, D. C.
Mr. Justice Black, of Alabama, 619 S. Lee St., Alexandria, Va.
Mr. Justice Reed, of Kentucky, the Mayflower.
Mr. Justice Frankfurter, of Massachusetts, 3018 Dumbarton Ave.
Mr. Justice Douglas, of Washington, 3701 Connecticut Ave.
Mr. Justice Burton, of Ohio, the Dodge.
Mr. Justice Clark, of Texas, 2101 Connecticut Ave.
Mr. Justice Minton, of Indiana, the Methodist Building.
Mr. Justice Harlan, of New York, 1677 31st St.

OFFICERS OF THE SUPREME COURT

Clerk—Harold B. Willey, 3214 N. Wakefield St., Arlington, Va.
Deputy Clerk—Reginald C. Dilli, 1329 Hemlock St.
Deputy Clerk—Hugh W. Barr, 4701 Connecticut Ave.
Marshal—T. Perry Lippitt, 6004 Corbin Road.
Reporter—Walter Wyatt, 1702 Kalmia Rd.
Librarian—Helen Newman, 126 3d St. SE.

UNITED STATES JUDICIAL CIRCUITS

JUSTICES ASSIGNED

TERRITORY EMBRACED

District of Columbia: Mr. Chief Justice Warren. District of Columbia.

First judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Frankfurter. Maine, New Hampshire, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Puerto Rico.

Second judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Harlan. Vermont, Connecticut, New York.

Third judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Burton, Pennsylvania, New Jersey, Delaware, Virgin Islands.

Fourth judicial circuit: Mr. Chief Justice Warren. Maryland, Virginia, West Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina.

Fifth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Black. Georgia, Florida, Alabama, Mississippi, Louisiana, Texas, Canal Zone.

Sixth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Reed. Ohio, Michigan, Kentucky, Tennessee.

Seventh judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Minton. Indiana, Illinois, Wisconsin.

Eighth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Clark. Minnesota, North Dakota, South Dakota, Iowa, Nebraska, Missouri, Arkansas.

Ninth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Douglas. Washington, Oregon, Montana, Idaho, California, Nevada, Arizona, Alaska, Hawaii.

Tenth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Clark. Colorado, Wyoming, Utah, Kansas, Oklahoma, New Mexico.

Appendix

Our Heritage of Freedom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. MIKE MANSFIELD

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, June 20, 1956

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, on June 3 I had the privilege and honor of delivering the address at the baccalaureate service at Montana State University, Missoula, Mont. I ask unanimous consent to have the address printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OUR HERITAGE OF FREEDOM

Twenty-three years ago I sat, by the grace and benefaction of the university faculty, where you graduates are sitting today.

I thought then, as you must think now, that one of the few burdens of this pleasant week which marks the milestone of 4 years of accomplishment was that I had to be subjected to the remarks of some oldster who had been selected by some process which interested me very little to give the baccalaureate service. It seemed clear to me then that while I was very little interested in what he had to say, I was quite aware that he had very little idea, if any at all, of what I really thought about anything.

But I remember well that I suffered him in silence, and I hope only that you will do the same for me. There are some significant differences, however, between my situation then and your situation now.

For one thing, I had reached the age of 30 before I managed to earn my degree. Unless my judgment is failing, I suspect most of you have some years to go before you will reach that ripe old age.

For another thing, when this university conferred the degree of bachelor of arts on me, the United States was still in the depths of a depression and jobs were few. Today, from what I know and read in the help-wanted columns, most of you won't need to worry about finding jobs.

But probably the most significant difference in the situation of the college graduate today and the graduate of 20 years ago flows from the changed situation of the United States in the world. The fact that the United States in two decades has moved from a position of chosen isolationism to a position of unsought world leadership has a most profound effect on every person in this Nation.

In the early 1930's the United States had not recognized Russia; the high tariff policies of the 1920's were strangling our international trade; we were not a member of the League of Nations and had not even accepted the statute of the World Court.

The events taking place in Europe, such as the rise of Hitler, seemed of small importance. The activities of the Japanese in Manchuria were not of particular concern. My classes at this university in the fields of Far Eastern and Latin American history were not characterized by overenrollment. The Foreign Service of the United States numbered less than 700 in 1930, and the total number of employees in the Department of State was less than 5,000. Communism was a movement that didn't seem to be of particular concern to most Americans. It was not viewed as an international conspiracy threatening our freedom. Indeed, the Communist candidate for President of the United States polled more than 100,000 votes in 1932 and some 80,000 votes in 1936.

I cite these facts so we may contrast them with the present. Today we not only recognize the Soviet Union in the legal, diplomatic sense, but we recognize her in the physical sense as the leading protagonist of international communism which poses the greatest threat of our time to individual man's freedom. We today recognize internal, as well as international, communism as an abiding enemy of free people.

Since 1934 our international trade barriers have been gradually liberalized under the terms of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act. And we have not only joined the United Nations, we take pride in the leadership we took in establishing the U. N. and its peripheral specialized agencies in the fields of health, agriculture, aviation, education, and labor. We have joined the International Court of Justice, have accepted its jurisdiction, and have abided by its judgments.

Our lack of concern with world events in the 1930's has been replaced by household familiarity with geographic areas such as Formosa, Indonesia, Indochina, Pakistan, and India. Our children literally call world statesmen by their first names. We accept as fact the proposition that events in faraway places may be of vital concern to individual Americans. We show this concern today by a Foreign Service some 4 times as large as in 1930, by a State Department which now numbers its employees at over 10,000, and by the fact that in 1955 no less than 32,000 civilian Americans were employed overseas.

These things have a direct impact on you graduating students. The status of the United States as a great power and its bastion position as defender and protagonist of freedom increases the demand for the skills you possess or will acquire.

For the foreseeable future there will be a heavy demand for men and women with foreign language ability. It daily becomes more important that more Americans than ever before learn not only the common languages of Spanish, French, Portuguese, and Italian, but the more unusual languages such as Russian, Chinese, Japanese, and the dialects and tongues of south Asia and Africa.

Combined with language ability, there is a growing need for men and women with special skills. South America, by way of example, is headed for a tremendous industrial and transportation revolution during the next decade and there will be heavy demands for help in American know-how. How many diesel engineers can General Motors send to South America who will have a working knowledge of Spanish? How many television technicians know Portuguese? How many of Montana's mining engineers understand why some Latin American states have nationalized their mineral resources?

Doctors, lawyers, teachers, psychologists, nutritionists, agronomists, mining engineers—there is scarcely a skill or profession for which there is not an international demand waiting to be satisfied. To the extent that worldwide needs for knowledge can be met by qualified Americans, we can expect to influence peoples. And I might add—to the extent the United States does not stand ready to help millions of people in neutralist states, there will be indoctrinated Communists ready to help them move toward a totalitarian life.

Now I know there are among you some who may ask why we should concern ourselves with the needs of other peoples. Why should I talk of trying to influence foreigners?

The main reason for our concern results from the fact that any diminution in the area of individual freedom, whether it results from fascism, communism, other forms of totalitarianism, or from the failure of dependent peoples to grow toward independence, threatens freedom in the United States. Undoubtedly, there are still among us some who view our relations with other nations as activities we could better do without, or in any event, matters about which only experts should be concerned. Too many of us, however, have seen wars that have taken a heavy toll of American lives, and that have disrupted our peaceful growth at home, to be indifferent to this interrelationship. We know that we cannot banish the problems of international relations by closing our eyes to them. We know we cannot—by voting Republican or Democrat—vote our international problems out of existence.

One observer put the matter clearly and trenchantly recently when he remarked, and I quote, "Every value that you and I cherish as free people, the things for which men have died on the battlefields of the world, all of the things that are woven together in the rich heritage that we call America, all of those values are in jeopardy because they cannot be preserved in a little vacuum called America. They must be preserved in the world in which powerful forces are at work threatening these basic values that we believe in."

The freedom we know will either expand and live, or be curtailed and die. Freedom is not a static thing which can be preserved in America and allowed to die elsewhere. What happens to the aspirations for liberty of the student in Indonesia will eventually effect the freedom of the men and women who walk the campus here in Missoula. I believe this thought was best expressed in a different time and a different age and in a smaller world. It was true then but it is much more true now. Let me read to you the famous words of John Donne, the 17th century poet and minister. They are taken from one of his sermons:

"No man is an island, entire of itself; every man is a piece of the continent, a part of the main; if a clod be washed away by the sea, Europe is the lesse, as well as if a promontorie were, as well as if a mannor of thy friends or of thine owne were; any man's death diminishes me, because I am involved in mankinde; and therefore never send to know for whom the bell tolls; it tolls for thee."

There are among us, of course, a few who search for a quick way to preserve freedom. They hope for the immediate creation of world government, for example, or to attain complete and universal disarmament overnight. I do not belittle the great efforts and devoted dedication of people who urge such projects as these—even though they may

well be visionary. The point I make is that there is no quick, no cheap, and no easy way to attain a Utopia in which men and nations may live in peace and freedom.

A few days ago I read a newspaper dispatch from Denver which discussed a fad that is sweeping some parts of the country. It seems that there are drugstores which sell what is known as a happy pill. These pills are advertised as being able to restore peace of mind. But the Colorado State Medical Society has cautioned that none of these drugs is curative of anything. They are only palliatives.

I want to emphasize that there is no happy pill that this Nation can take which will get rid of our international ailments—that will guarantee peace. We may as well realize that the one certain prediction that we can make for the future of our international relations is that we are in for a prolonged period of difficulty and there is no palliative for that condition.

In contrast to those who seek the happy pill treatment for international tension, there are those who believe that the way to relieve international tension is to encourage it to erupt into violence. Some even suggest preventive war. Fortunately, the number of advocates of this course is small and since the development of hydrogen or thermonuclear weapons it has become even smaller.

The difference then, between the world you graduates face and the world my generation encountered 20 years ago is that the United States is now a part of the world. We could not isolate ourselves if we wanted to.

Yet as a part of the world—and probably the most important part—we cannot singlehandedly mold the world to our own image. But we can influence the direction in which the world moves by the quality of our character as a government, and as a people.

It is important that we do our level best to influence the direction the world moves because we are at the crossroads of a fundamental conflict. Superficially we often think of this conflict as one which involves the United States on one side, and the Soviet Union on the other. But the issue is more crucial. It stems from the basic antithesis between freedom and totalitarianism. Relations between the Soviet Union and the United States are only the surface evidence of the basic conflict. The basic question underlying this conflict is whether the state exists to serve the individual, or the individual exists to serve the state. If on the one hand the individual is to find his aspirations for spiritual, political, and economic growth always hemmed in by the demands of an omnipotent state, individual freedom will constantly be curtailed and eventually it will die. If on the other hand the state exists to provide a framework within which the individual may grow, we may expect the gradual expansion of the area of man's freedom.

The origin of the cleavage is not new, although it has been a long time in becoming apparent. Over a hundred years ago Alexis de Tocqueville foresaw the conflict and made a remarkable prediction. In his words: "To achieve its objective, America relies on personal interest, and gives full reign to the strength and reason of the individual. Russia centers all authority of society in a single man. The principal instrument of the former is freedom, of the latter slavery. Their points of departure are different, they follow different paths. Nonetheless, each of them seems intended through some secret design of providence to hold in its hands the destinies of half the world."

Here then are the two fundamental alternatives which face mankind. Although the United States may be able to accommodate itself to such international tensions as grow out of boundary disputes or trade disagreements without a significant curtailment of individual freedom in the United States, it is by no means certain that a further expansion of totalitarian communism would not have a direct and immediate impact on the future of freedom in this country. As I suggested earlier, freedom cannot be preserved in a vacuum.

This is not to say that the ideological clash must lead ultimately to war. But it does seem clear to me that this conflict holds a greater threat to the peace and security of the United States than any other foreign-policy issue which we face. Indeed, the most profound foreign-policy issues of our time revolve around the ideological clash of communism and freedom. Just as the destiny of this Nation during the past century was determined by our management of our domestic resources, our destiny in this century will be determined by the way we manage our external relations.

Ultimately, it seems to me, there are only three possible outcomes to this struggle between freedom and communism. First, there could be military conflict which would relieve the present tension by the drastic treatment of destroying life as we know it.

Second, there may eventually be a stalemate in which the conflicting systems may live in fear and in the sullen acceptance of each other's presence on the earth. This would be a solution in the pattern of the great religious conflicts of the middle ages. I personally doubt, however, that the conflict between communism and freedom will end in a stalemate of that kind.

The third alternative seems to me to be the most likely. There may in time be world evolution which will result ultimately in survival of the system that is most fit to the temper of mankind.

In suggesting this possible outcome to the struggle you may think me guilty of begging the question, and I am afraid that is the case. I do not know at this point whether in the long run man will choose to move more in the direction of totalitarianism or freedom. It is my personal belief that the future of mankind lies in freedom. But you ladies and gentlemen know as well as I how perverse a creature man sometimes is. Although we have made our choice in this country, there are still great uncommitted areas of the world where men have little awareness of the fundamentals of freedom. For them there can as yet be no clear choice based on adequate understanding of the alternatives.

We are now, of course, coexisting with Soviet communism. But neither communism nor democracy are static concepts. One or the other will ultimately prevail not necessarily by force of arms, but more likely, in my opinion, by force of spirit.

This is the first graduating class to which I could ever state my belief that a world war in your lifetime may be avoided. I make this statement not because of things that have been done by Democrats or Republicans, or because nations have learned to handle their international relations on a rational basis. I make this statement because of things that have been done by educated men. The men of science from many nations have, in their pursuit of knowledge, uncovered the means by which man may light the fires of atomic destruction. This capacity which at one time was a threat may now have become a benefit in disguise because any nation which might start a world conflagration may now reasonably expect to bring about its own destruction.

The realization of the world's great powers during the past year that another war would be likely to destroy all life has imposed the "peace of mutual terror" of which Sir Winston Churchill has spoken.

The Geneva Conference, called at the suggestion of Senator WALTER GEORGE, the distinguished chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, may have had its failures, but it did, in my opinion, crystallize the unspoken and unwritten understanding of the United States and the Soviet Union that neither of them can start a war, or permit a situation between other powers to deteriorate to the point where a great war threatens.

The significance of this situation, if my judgment be correct, is not that we should abandon our readiness to meet force with force should that prove necessary. The important point is that the conflict between totalitarianism and freedom will be decided by force of spirit rather than by force of arms.

This, I suggest, is a hopeful situation, because it is in this realm of spirit where I believe the United States has before it the greatest opportunity to lead. Our greatest opportunities to advance the concept of human liberty in the next decade are to be found in the moral, political, and economic fields and not in the military realm.

The future of human liberty as a concept for man to live by is being decided in two areas of the world. It is being decided in the United States where action will speak louder than words. It is being decided in those areas of the world in the vicinity of the Equator which have newly achieved their national independence or are now in the process of achieving it.

It would require another speech for me to consider the ways in which our conduct within the United States influences our relations with the rest of the world. I suggest, however, that what we do at home is far more important than what we say. The influence of this Nation on the world is determined by what we are in fact, not by what we think or say we are.

The future of individual freedom is also being decided in that part of the newly independent world which stretches more than half way around the globe from Indonesia to Morocco. This area of the earth has for generations known Western civilization not so much as a clarion of liberty but as a source of exploitation. The western economic system which was known to the peoples of Asia was not the private enterprise we know in the United States characterized by respect for the rights of labor and a sense of responsibility to the community. Rather, Asia knew a capitalism of Charles Dickens' England, which, as a Justice of the Supreme Court has remarked, ran on a sweatshop basis, exploiting labor. It knew a capitalism that took great dividends out of a nation and in which a 25-percent return a year on capital was not uncommon.

The United States has been extremely active in the newly independent, underdeveloped areas of the world in recent years in attempting to show these areas that capitalism does not mean exploitation. We have spent more effort in these nations than all the rest of the free world and the Communist world put together. But I am not sure, despite our prodigious efforts, that all we have been doing is good. We must not make the mistake of believing that, because an operation is big, it is good. We have, I believe, placed undue stress on building defensive military umbrellas, oftentimes overlooking the concerns of the indigenous peoples who are immersed in problems of day-to-day survival. We have tended to give our economic assistance with principal emphasis on the idea that the recipient nations had to aline themselves in virtually every way with our own policies. Why help these nations move toward a better life unless they are willing to "stand up and be counted" has often been the contention.

The total impact of this kind of approach is that despite our bounty, we appear to many Asians as having a foreign policy focused on fear and arrogance. Any man who is fearful or arrogant is on the defensive, whether he knows it or not. Neither posture is fitting for a creative America.

Much of the world is not concerned with whether the United States opposes commu-

nism. We may as well realize that fact. Exhortations to others to share our opposition to communism have more often than not fallen on deaf ears. These people are not so much interested in what we are against, as in what we are for. They are not as much concerned with how much money we will put into a program deisgned primarily to assuage our own concern, as they are in sharing a partnership relationship with them as they struggle to improve the general lot of their lives.

What we should seek to create in our relations with the underdeveloped areas of the world is independence, not dependence. If we operate on the concept that the independent nations must either be with us or against us, we will in fact be creating satellites, not independent states, and a satellite has no strength of its own. If we condition assistance to these areas on the basis that they must be with us in opposition to something, we are in effect trying to buy mercenaries. Any state that can be bought is, in my opinion, not worth buying.

As long as we operate a foreign-aid program based on such a theory we are buying trouble. We will be buying tension as between ourselves and the states who hope for partnership instead of submission.

Our dealings with these new nations call for calm and caution on our part. We are not going to understand them and they will certainly not understand us if we view their future with pessimism and let our dealings with them be guided by passion.

I have suggested that there are two areas in which the future of man's freedom is being decided—in the United States by what we are, and in the uncommitted, underdeveloped areas of the world. The United States as a Nation and as a people exercises a tremendous influence in this battle for free men because the fundamentals of our Christian religion and our democratic form of government have always emphasized the importance of the individual.

Our religious attitude toward the individual is expressed by Christ's remark that not one sparrow should fall to the ground but that your Father would know. The Christian religion constantly emphasizes the importance of the individual.

Our form of government as well as our religion is also based on the ultimate importance of the individual. The Declaration of Independence states the "self-evident" truth that "all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. That to secure these rights, governments are instituted among men, deriving their powers from the consent of the governed."

In other words, government and religion in the United States have promoted the growth of the individual in freedom and in spirit.

One of our great contemporary authors has written: "Nothing was ever created by two men. There are no good collaborations, whether in music, in art, in poetry, in mathematics, in philosophy. Once the miracle of creation has taken place, the group can build and extend it, but the group never invents anything. The preciousness lies in the lonely mind of man." But individual freedom is in danger from the attack of totalitarianism. The writer continues: "And now the forces marshaled around the concept of the group have declared a war of extermination on that preciousness, the mind of man. By disparagement, by starvation, by repressions, forced direction, and the stunning hammerblows of conditioning, the free roving mind is being pursued, roped, blunted, drugged."

The preciousness of our religion and our government lies in their ability to preserve and to promote the capability of every individual to make his unique contribution to the progress of mankind.

None of us can know the contribution he may make toward man's progress. Some may develop new ideas; others will improve on our physical surroundings; some will influence the lives of their companions; others will pass their heritage on to children capable of greater contributions than their parents. We each have the capacity to leave the world a better place than it was before us.

You may have heard the story of the rich and favored King who asked a wise Athenian whether he considered the King lucky. The answer was quick. "How can I tell. You aren't dead yet."

And this is, I suppose, a characteristic of the contributions we may make. Their total impact may not be known until we have passed on.

Man as an individual has laboriously struggled upward. He understands things today he did not understand last year or the year before. He has moved ahead step by step. He con continue this progress when his spirit and mind can operate in freedom. His growth will be stunted if his freedom is impaired.

It is for this reason that it is so important that we as individuals and as a nation shape our destiny toward protecting and promoting freedom within and without this nation.

You young men and women gathered here today to take an important step in life are the product of a free people. You are here to carry on the heritage man has built. You are each fitting yourselves to make your unique contributions to man's progress so that he may live and grow in peace and in freedom.

The Late Honorable Alben W. Barkley

SPEECH
OF
HON. EUGENE SILER
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 1, 1956

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SILER].

Mr. SILER. Mr. Speaker, it was the poet, Alfred Tennyson, who gave us those lines Crossing the Bar:

Sunset and evening star,
And one clear call for me!
And may there be no moaning of the bar,
When I put out to sea.

But such a tide as moving seems asleep,
Too full for sound and foam,
When that which drew from out the boundless deep
Turns again home.

Twilight and evening bell,
And after that the dark!
And may there be no sadness of farewell,
When I embark;

For though from out our bourne of Time and Place
The flood may bear me far,
I hope to see my Pilot face to face
When I have crossed the bar.

Mr. Speaker, my fellow Kentuckian was a good man and I am confident that as he goes out to meet his Pilot face to face, he will be able to give a good accounting of his stewardship and of a life well spent and work well done.

Address of Hon. William A. Purtell, of Connecticut, Nominating Hon. Prescott Bush, of Connecticut, and Excerpts From Keynote Address by Leonard W. Hall at the Connecticut Republican State Convention

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BARRY M. GOLDWATER
OF ARIZONA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, June 20, 1956

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, today, in Hartford, Conn., the Republican State Convention is being held; and this morning it was the pleasure of our colleague, the junior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. PURTELL] to place in nomination the name of a distinguished Member of this body, the senior Senator from Connecticut, PRESCOTT BUSH. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the remarks by Senator PURTELL, as he placed the nomination before the convention, and also excerpts from the keynote address delivered by Leonard W. Hall.

There being no objection, the address and excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NOMINATING SPEECH OF UNITED STATES SENATOR WILLIAM A. PURTELL, CONNECTICUT REPUBLICAN STATE CONVENTION, BUSHNELL MEMORIAL, HARTFORD, CONN., JUNE 19, 1956

Mr. Chairman, distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen of the convention, fellow Republicans all; it is indeed an honor to be given the opportunity of addressing this convention. It is a signal honor to be privileged to present to you for the highest office to which this convention can nominate a colleague and a friend.

Four years ago in like conventions, two candidates were honored by selection for the United States Senate. I shall be forever grateful to my party and to the convention delegates who selected me as one of those candidates. I shall be eternally grateful to the citizens of Connecticut for having elected me to the Senate of the United States. We were most fortunate as a party and as a people in the selection and election of another Republican candidate for the United States Senate—the man whose name it is my privilege to place in nomination here today.

A nominating speech should embody certain basic elements. It should present, and in concise form, a clear picture of the candidate, his qualifications and his record. Now, just what do we seek in a candidate? Prime considerations are integrity, purposeful action, balance and dedication to the service of the people and to the principles and policies of the Republican Party. Certainly we have seen those most important qualities displayed and demonstrated time and time again by the man it is my honor to nominate.

There is little that I can add to your knowledge of him. You know him, you respect him, you have great admiration for him as have his colleagues in the Senate, the members of the Cabinet and as has that inspired and dedicated leader—Dwight David Eisenhower.

For the sake of the record, let me review a bit. While his birthplace was Ohio, if years of residence in, and service to a State are to be counted, and, of course, they count, then he is more native than many born here.

When a choice could be made as to where he would reside he unhesitatingly selected Fairfield County in the great State of Connecticut, not only as a place to live, but as a place to raise his fine family and as a place to work for and with his fellow man. For the past 32 years he has been not only a resident of Greenwich but a most active participant in the affairs of his community and his State, and yes, his party. His is a 32-year impressive record indeed.

He has a fine educational background which includes a bachelor of arts degree from Yale, the alma mater which has honored him with election to its board of trustees continuously since 1944. He is a veteran of World War I, having enlisted in the Connecticut National Guard as a private even before he was graduated from Yale. Before the war ended, he had won the bars of a captaincy in the field artillery—an accomplishment I speak of with great appreciation from my rank as a late but not lamented corporal in the A. E. F.

From college and the war he entered business in the realm of finance and attained a position of eminence that would have been impossible had he not possessed in substantial measure the fundamental attributes of pronounced ability, broad knowledge, integrity, and sound judgment.

Of him, too, it can be said that his private life has been as admirable as his public career has been illustrious. An exemplary father and husband he has been justly blessed with a devoted, charming, and capable wife, 5 fine children, and 9 wonderful grandchildren. He has been and is an active and prominent layman in his church, and in his home community of Greenwich he well deserves his place in the forefront of civic leadership.

Outstanding and commendable are all of these achievements, but that part of his life which I wish to emphasize here is his Republicanism and his lifelong devotion to the Republican Party and the ideals, principles, and policies for which it stands. In particular, I want to dwell briefly on his role in the United States Senate for it is there as a fellow Senator that I have seen him in action, and it is there in the Chamber of that body and in its committees that I have watched him reach a high level of respect, admiration, and recognition from his colleagues.

In the Senate of the United States he has worked tirelessly and unremittingly in behalf of our State and its local communities. He played a leading part in marshaling the forces of the Federal Government to aid our flood-stricken people. He was the leader in guiding through the Senate a program of flood insurance and flood protection. He played a major part in fighting for highway legislation beneficial not only to our State but to the Nation, both in economic growth and defense needs.

His interest in and concern for flood and other protections had been demonstrated long before the terrible disasters of last year. In 1954 it was the Bush Act—Public Law 71—which resulted in the hurricane study. He took the lead in steering this piece of legislation through the Congress. His work in the field of urban redevelopment needs no repetition here, nor does his support of a liberal housing program. He has displayed a deep interest in human needs and in the welfare of the people, not only of Connecticut, but of the country as a whole.

These are some of the reasons, but indeed not all, why I am happy to break precedent, if precedent breaking it is, to make this nominating speech here today at this convention of the Republican Party.

And I remember another convention, a convention which I and many of you attended in Chicago in 1952. You all recall, and I shall never forget, how ardently was espoused the cause of the man we selected at that convention. We chose not only the standard bearer of our party but, as he has since so ably demonstrated, we chose the standard bearer of this country and the free world. We selected and the people of this Nation overwhelmingly elected one of the great Americans—one who will in our history be recorded as one of the greatest of all Americans—our President—Dwight David Eisenhower.

Our party then in 1952 offered not only a great leader but a promise of a successful transition from war to peace. And that promise has been kept. The maiming and dying of American boys in Korea has been stopped. Economic stability has been restored in our own lives. Integrity and decency in Government now prevail. And added to all this, in the past 4 years we have seen real accomplishments in the area of human rights for all of our people. We have not given lip service to equal human rights. We have acted to make them a reality.

These were the promises made by the Republican Party. These were our goals. These too were the aspirations of the American people. They have been fulfilled. Yes, fulfilled under the administration, direction and inspiration of our President—Dwight Eisenhower.

These great achievements, and they have been great, have been accomplished because of the support and cooperation of other men as dedicated as he to the principles and policies he and they espouse, to the cause for which we have all fought shoulder to shoulder in and since 1952.

Under our system of Government, wisely divided as it is into the executive, legislative, and judicial branches, President Eisenhower could have done but little without legislators who believed in, worked for and fought for the program which he advanced for the good of America and the world.

One of these stalwart legislators who fought courageously, vigorously, and effectively for the program of President Eisenhower is my colleague and my friend—the senior Senator from the sovereign State of Connecticut. To him no job has been too big, no task too small in the service of our people. He indeed has kept faith with the people who elected him to serve them, this State and this Nation in the United States Senate.

Above and beyond all these important considerations is his deep loyalty to, his unswerving faith in, his untiring support of and his personal friendship with our great leader Dwight David Eisenhower whose administration is a blessing to every man, woman, and child in this Nation and in the free world.

Mr. Chairman and delegates, it is now my privilege to place in nomination to succeed himself to the office of United States Senator the name of my colleague and my friend, the senior Senator from Connecticut—PRESCOTT BUSH, of Greenwich.

EXCERPTS FROM KEYNOTE ADDRESS BY LEONARD W. HALL AT CONNECTICUT REPUBLICAN STATE CONVENTION, BUSHNELL MEMORIAL, HARTFORD, CONN., JUNE 19, 1956

It is an inspiring thing to appear before this convention and witness the energy, spirit, and enthusiasm of the Republican Party of Connecticut.

For many years it has been almost literally true that as Connecticut goes, so goes the Union.

This year you face a challenge: You can make a clean sweep. You already have two fine Republican Senators of whom every resident of Connecticut can be proud. BILL PURTELL and PRES BUSH. This year you can return PRES BUSH to the Senate along with your fine Republican Congressmen, HORACE SEELY-BROWN, Jr., ALBERT W. CRETELLA, JAMES T. PATTERSON, ALBERT P. MORANO, ANTONI N. SADLAK, and to take the first district back from the Democrats.

With a fine young war veteran and business leader like Ed May scheduled to run for Congress on the Republican ticket in the first district, now you have a chance—a real fighting chance—to help give Ike what he needs to do his job, a Republican Congress.

This convention has met for the purpose, among others, of renominating PRES BUSH for Senator and TONI SADLAK for Congress man at Large. They both are a credit to the Republican Party, to the State of Connecticut, and to the Congress of the United States.

Senator BUSH has shown himself to be a worthy colleague of Senator PURTELL. PRES is a man of outstanding courage and integrity. His work for hurricane and flood relief, in and out of Congress, has made him a national figure. A recognized fiscal expert and a man of broad business experience, he showed his character and courage by voting against the natural-gas bill. His yeoman work for roads and public housing further marks him a true progressive who commands the respect of his colleagues and the affection of the people of Connecticut, without regard to party. And he has supported President Eisenhower's foreign policy 100 percent.

Connecticut did a great thing for America when it sent men like BUSH, PURTELL, and SADLAK to Congress. And this year Connecticut can do it again—if we all work hard as a team.

This year's primaries showed that the voters in the larger cities and industrial areas are turning to the Republican Party. That is why the First Congressional District gives us a real opportunity to make it a clean sweep in Connecticut. You can carry it for Eisenhower and the Republican Party, if we all work together, work hard, and fight hard for victory.

• • • • •

Fortunately, this year, as in 1952, the Republican candidates have a strong appeal to the large group of independent voters. The independents not only support the warm-hearted, level-headed policies of the Eisenhower administration but they now realize that only a Republican Congress can be counted on to put those policies into effect.

This independent vote has decided the outcome of every Connecticut State election in the last generation. They are disgusted with the campaign promises that sought a Democrat Congress to support Ike in 1954, only to see that Congress turn and throttle the President's legislative program. They are bored with partisan politicking and annoyed with the Democrat campaign of misrepresentation and exaggeration.

• • • • •

We must all remember to tell the people, over and over again, that our message to America in 1956 rests on principles of government and respect for people. We stand on our record, and what a record it is.

Peace, prosperity, progress, coupled with principles of decency, honesty, and integrity in Government and above all concern for people in their homes, their rights, and their lives.

It is this record that is changing the political climate of the United States. These are the issues of the campaign and the Democrats can't meet them. So they are back at their old tricks of exaggeration, misrepresentation, fear and smear, doom and gloom.

The primaries are over and they have shown the country the internal weaknesses, the inconsistencies, the bickering, and squabbles that beset the Democrat Party.

No Republican need say any more about Mr. Stevenson than what has already been said by his own colleague, Senator KEFAUVER.

The Democrat primaries revealed an apathetic indifference to the principal contenders. First Senator KEFAUVER was ahead, then

Governor Stevenson was ahead. But I would sary that their efforts have failed to rouse any real enthusiasm within their own party.

* * * * *

The Democrats have tried—almost frantically at times—to find a real issue against the Republican Party and they have failed. They started with the gloom and doom predictions of another general depression. That fizzled and they tried Dixon-Yates, and giveaways, the hydrogen bomb, and a dozen others. They even tried to drag the newspapermen in with their silly charge of a one-party press.

But the fact is that the Democrats can't find any issue to stand up against the Eisenhower Republican record which has brought peace, prosperity, and progress to this great land of ours.

The Democrats are so short of issues that the other day Mr. Stevenson complained that the Republican prosperity was based only on money.

* * * * *

The overriding issue in this country today is peace, and the voters in my opinion will decide that President Eisenhower is best qualified to continue to lead us toward that goal.

President Eisenhower has given us not only peace but an unprecedented prosperity with that peace. This is something the Democrats could never do.

I believe the coming election will be decided on that simple issue which every American can understand.

* * * * *

It's up to us to work, to organize, and to bring out the biggest possible vote next November, because a big vote is an Eisenhower vote and a Republican vote and a vote for peace, prosperity, and progress.

Above all, it's up to us to work together as a team and to leave the feuding to the Democrats who today are bickering and squabbling over which of them will have the honor of taking a shellacking from Ike and Dick this November.

The Democrat Party is so disorganized and split that they called a meeting in Chicago last week to name a keynoter for their convention but could not get together on one name.

Yes; we can win. We must win. And we will win—but only if we organize, work, and fight—between now and election day.

And here in Connecticut you have the privilege and the duty to put your State at the head of the national parade, by sending PRES BUSH back to the Senate, by sending six Republican Congressmen to the House, and by giving President Eisenhower and DICK NIXON a resounding vote of confidence.

Butte and Montana Celebrate a Birthday

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MIKE MANSFIELD
OF MONTANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, June 20, 1956

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Butte and Montana Celebrate a Birthday," published in the Montana Standard of May 27, 1956. I believe this editorial is worthy of the consideration of all Members of the Senate, because it outlines in some detail the growth of these two fine entities, first, the city of Butte, the most picturesque city in the United States, with the finest people, and Montana, the Treasure State, also with the finest people in the Union.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BUTTE AND MONTANA CELEBRATE A BIRTHDAY

The city of Butte and the State of Montana are both 92 years old.

But the fact is cities and States do not grow old; they grow young until they die.

And both Butte and Montana are still growing young.

Ninety-two years ago last week the legislation which made Montana a Territory, separating it from Idaho Territory, was passed in Congress and signed by President A. Lincoln.

And at about the same time a couple of prospectors, G. O. Humphrey and William Allison, panned sufficient gold along Silver Bow Creek to establish a gold camp and attract other prospectors here. Within 2 years the population had reached 500.

Since then Montana and Butte have had their ups and downs, but they have continued to grow.

New mining developments and extension of old ones bring assurance that the population of Butte will increase materially within the next few years. Similarly, these developments have given the mining camp a new lease on longevity. The end isn't in sight.

Economists and scientists concluded in recent years that Montana's varied assortment of natural resources have only been scratched, thus giving the State a new lease on the future.

Although Montana's extensive deposits of minerals are irreplaceable once they have been removed from the ground, the supply as the years have passed has constantly grown larger and larger.

It has been similar with Montana's other natural resources.

New discoveries in scientific methods, irrigation, and new machinery have constantly increased Montana's agricultural productive capacity.

Montana's attractiveness as a tourist haven are only beginning to be realized. The tourist business has grown up within the memory of our young people from almost nothing to third rank in the State's income producing resources.

The State's population has been steadily increasing with the trend of the movement of people away from the crowded East to the wide open spaces of the West.

One resource which has scarcely begun to be developed is Montana's vast supply of water, a large amount of which is stored naturally in the form of snow in the mountains during the winter and seeps away gradually during the summer in clear, cool mountain streams.

Another resource which has only been scratched is that of petroleum.

In both of these categories there is room for tremendous growth, thus making the State of Montana younger even though it is growing older in years chronologically.

The migrations of people constantly westward across the United States is merely one of the signs that the areas from which they are coming are actually growing old, both chronologically and in resources.

In another field, Montana has a great opportunity to achieve still more youthfulness. This is in the manufacturing field. The trend here again is in our favor. The trend is to move the factory closer and closer to the source of raw materials needed for fabrication.

In the past, Montana has existed chiefly as a source of raw materials. Processing adds greatly to the value of a raw product. There is no reason why Montana can't grasp this advantage. It has most of the necessary ingredients.

So, here's a salute to Butte and Montana on their twin birthdays.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I notice the blushing modesty of the Senator from Montana when he says that Butte is the finest city in the country, and that the people of Montana are the finest people in the country. Does not the Senator from Montana think he should sprinkle a little modesty on such glowing statements?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I will say to the Senator from Illinois that I was being unduly modest because of my sensitive feeling for other Senators. However, I could have gone to extremes and really told the truth about Montana, the Treasure State, which, of course, words are not sufficient to express.

Mr. DOUGLAS. It is always excellent to find people with such a charitable opinion of themselves.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Especially when it is the truth.

Simon Rifkind, Special Master in Arizona's Colorado River Lawsuit Against California

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BARRY M. GOLDWATER
OF ARIZONA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, June 20, 1956

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, water is a fickle element. Here in the East the problems involved in it concern an overabundance. In the Southwest our problems with water arise because of a general lack of it. In my State of Arizona, only one surface source of this priceless fluid—the Colorado River—is left open to us; and at the moment we are embroiled in litigation with our sister State, California, as to whether Arizona's rightful share of this river will be recognized. The Supreme Court of the United States has appointed a master who is now hearing both sides of the argument in San Francisco. Mr. Joseph Stocker, an eminent author of Arizona and the West, has written a most interesting article about this master, Simon Rifkind, of New York; and I ask that the article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SOLOMON OF THE RIVER—THIS MAN MUST RULE ON A PERENNIAL AND HISTORIC PROBLEM: WATER—WATER—WHO GETS WATER?

(By Joseph Stocker)

The time was November, 1955. Scene: the New York State supreme court at Albany. A middle-aged lawyer, rather shorter than average, with slightly graying hair, an almost invisible mustache, and horn-rimmed glasses, was arguing a case. His name: Simon H. Rifkind.

Suddenly he was interrupted.

"There's a long-distance call for you," said one of the justices.

Rifkind registered surprise. "I'm afraid I can't take it, Your Honor," he said. "I'm trying a case."

"Perhaps you'd better," said the justice, smiling a little. "It's the United States Supreme Court calling."

And it was. More specifically, it was Justice Hugo Black. Would Mr. Rifkind (he asked) be willing to accept an assignment as special master in Arizona's Colorado River lawsuit against California?

You don't say "No" to the United States Supreme Court, so Simon Rifkind said "Yes." And, so saying, he moved into one of the biggest and toughest jobs in modern American jurisprudence. It's the job of sifting through the incredibly massive complexities of a dispute which has kept the West embroiled for two generations and then recommending a final adjudication to the Supreme Court.

On June 14 this historic and perennial battle of "water, water, who gets the water?" will come to trial in San Francisco. There, in a Federal courtroom, with 40 to 50 lawyers arrayed before him, Rifkind will begin working his way toward a decision on which rides the fate of Arizona.

The trial, which is expected to last about 2 months, will be an ordeal for Rifkind. Water is the stuff of life itself in the West and the parties to the case are bitter and irreconcilable.

Rifkind perceived as much when he held a pretrial conference in San Francisco earlier in the spring. In the course of the hearing, one of the attorneys observed that a certain point was not in controversy. "Everything," sighed Rifkind, "is in controversy here. I would say that even the right to the dew on the leaves is in controversy."

But if any man can pick a path through such a bramblebush of law, history, statistics, and general disagreement, Rifkind is that man. Leastwise his career and his standing in the profession he has served for 31 years would so indicate. For Rifkind, now 54, is not merely an experienced lawyer and judge. He is—in the words of a person who is well acquainted with the man and his record—"a judge's judge, known as one of the best trial men in the business."

In the first place, he is endowed with a brilliant, incisive, fastidious mind. If the hackneyed phrase, "legal scholar," fits anybody, it certainly fits Simon Rifkind. What's more, his mode of speech is as precise as his mode of thinking. He won't even split an infinitive. During the pretrial conference, he could be heard to utter such impeccably un-split infinitives as "affirmatively to prove" and "expressly to dispute."

Secondly, his great forte is expediting laggard lawsuits and cutting through to the core of an issue. Arizonians close to the Colorado River case believe, in fact, that it is this quality of Rifkind's which prompted the Supreme Court to select him as special master.

Even in his appointment there are some intriguing paradoxes. Here, for instance, is an immigrant (he was born in Russia) presiding over something so typically American—and frontier-American at that—as a controversy over water rights. Here, too, is an easterner (he's from New York City) handling a case in which the future of the West is involved. And here, finally, is a man who lives and works in tight and crowded Manhattan, deciding what somebody has described as "one of the biggest wide-open spaces cases in history."

It was back in 1911—when he was 10 years old—that Simon Rifkind was brought to this country by his parents. He took his law degree from Columbia University in 1925 and practiced awhile. Then he was appointed by President Roosevelt as judge of the United States District Court for a district embracing much of New York State and nearly all of New York City.

During the next 9 years, he handed down a variety of decisions which made a heavy impact on the body of American law. One of his decisions, for example, was the denial of diplomatic immunity to Valentine Gubitchev, the Soviet Embassy attaché convicted of being in "cahoots" with Judy Coplon in filching United States secrets for the Russians.

While he was on the bench, Rifkind was named by Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower as special adviser on problems of the Jewish DP's. He spent 6 months in Europe and won a Medal of Freedom for his work.

Federal judges don't often resign their lifetime positions, but Rifkind did that in 1950, to return to private practice. It was while he was quietly minding his own law business last November that the Supreme Court tapped him for the job of special master in the Colorado River case.

What does the job involve?

The pleadings alone would occupy more space than Dr. Eliot's 5-foot shelf. And when Rifkind gets through reading and absorbing all the pleadings he will have just begun. He then may have to read and absorb a 40-year accumulation of such things as the Santa Fe compact, Boulder Canyon Act, countless individual water contracts, the proceedings of the League of the Southwest, a seven-State arbitration board, the committees of 14 and 16, and 3 previous Supreme Court decisions, along with sundry other light and frothy pieces of legal literature.

Over and beyond this, Rifkind will have to study and understand the geography of almost the entire West and its intricate river systems. He'll have to deal with—and decide on—such abstract and highly controverted terms as "beneficial consumptive use" and "riparian rights." And, finally, he'll have to try to get along with and keep the peace among 40-odd attorneys who are at such loggerheads that, if this were the Tombstone era, they'd be required to check their shootin' irons at the courtroom door.

Understandably, therefore, Rifkind is chary about discussing the Colorado River case outside the courtroom. It's not merely that this would involve the risk of offending tender sensitivities on one side or the other. He is simply taking no chances on creating the impression that he has any prejudices one way or another. Hence he will make only this carefully guarded, judicious, and reasonably noncontroversial comment on his job of trying the Colorado River case: "It's no different from trying any other case."

That may be true, so far as Simon Rifkind is concerned. But the water case is a good deal different from any other case so far as Arizona and California are concerned. For the decision ultimately arrived at will affect the economic future of two sovereign States and the lives of millions of their citizens.

Anzac Day Speech by Hon. Robert C. Hendrickson, Ambassador to New Zealand

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLIFFORD P. CASE

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, June 20, 1956

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. Mr. President, in the past 2 days I have placed in the RECORD two recent speeches by our former colleague and my predecessor in the Senate, Hon. Robert C. Hendrickson, now Ambassador to New Zealand. It is my pleasure to submit for the record the third in a series of speeches delivered by the Ambassador during a recent swing through the islands where he now serves. In view of the Senate's interest in Ambassador Hendrickson and in the work he is doing in that strategic area of the world, I ask unanimous consent that an Anzac Day speech delivered by Bob Hendrickson on April 25, 1956, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ANZAC DAY CEREMONY, CHRISTCHURCH, APRIL 25, 1956

"With malice toward none, with charity for all, with firmness in the right as God gives us to see the right, let us strive on to finish the work we are in; to bind up the Nation's wounds—to do all which may achieve and cherish a just and lasting peace, among ourselves and with all nations."

Gentlemen, they are the immortal words of a man who was about to die in the service of his country and a free world.

I quote these historic words from the Second Inaugural Address of President Lincoln not alone because he is my favorite character in American history, but rather because they issue the challenge which confronts every returned service man or woman of every nation who has been spared by his Creator for future service to mankind.

In that awful calamity of a war which well nigh desolated my country for future use to the world abroad, more than 494,000 lives were given to determine certain basic principles of freedom and justice.

Mr. Lincoln's views had prevailed—but, sirs, his mission from the moment of final victory to death was, as he put it so eloquently, "to bind up the wounds" and to do all which may achieve a just and lasting peace, among ourselves and with all nations.

As we meet together today to pay a just and fitting tribute to those brave men of Anzac units who gave their last full measure of devotion for the cause of freedom and justice under well-ordered law, let us, if we can, reflect a bit of the spirit of Mr. Lincoln's hopes and ambitions for his country and the world in those troublesome years of 1861–1865.

It was my high privilege as a very young man to associate myself with some of Mr. Lincoln's veterans in the commemoration of their Memorial Day as we, the returned servicemen of another generation, took over the torches they had carried so modestly for the enlightenment of a nation between two great struggles for the freedom of men's souls—theirs of 1861 to 1865 and ours of 1914 to 1918.

Thus, as I stand with you today, I understand the emotions which stir within you. I fully comprehend the inadequacy which you feel as you endeavor in a formal ceremony to salute the great hearts and minds of men whose courage and heroism preserved our greatest heritage by selfless sacrifice to the end that we, the living, may complete their unfinished labors on earth.

Anzac Day, my comrades and good neighbors of New Zealand and Australia, is truly a day of rededication of the very best instincts within each of us to all the finer things of life.

It was on the 25th day of April 1915 that Anzac forces made that daring amphibious landing on the coast of the Gallipoli Peninsula in Turkey.

The deeds of heroism which were written into that magnificent effort by a generation of stalwart sons of the British Empire requires no detailed account of the great

force and power of the sacrifices made on that occasion. The complete record was written then and there and it speaks for itself with greater eloquence than any words which I could hope to marshal if I lived for a thousand years—but among the beneficiaries of the unselfishness of those who made that last valiant and supreme sacrifice there are those whose minds need to be refreshed from time to time—and it is to them that I shall be bold enough to address a few remarks in review of that heroic but tragic incident in which your kinfolk gave their all—their right to pursue their lives, their liberty on earth and their pursuit of happiness.

It was against a formidable terrain, and well-trained and courageous forces that the Anzac divisions were committed. The mission was one of great strategic importance. Basically, it was designed to obtain control for the allies of that vital waterway of the Dardanelles. Surely it takes no one schooled in the logistics of soldiering to understand that its success would have ended World War I very quickly. With a sure and easier way to obtain needed food supplies from Russia and through the same route to supply arms, ammunition, and equipment to the hard-pressed armies of His Imperial Majesty the Czar of Russia the allies might well have prevented the communistic influences we confront today. So the goal was of tremendous importance.

Let us, who live to carry on that story of devotion to God and country always be mindful that the failure of the mission does not in the slightest degree dilute the measure of courage, daring and unselfish sacrifice of more than 35,000 men who died for their homelands, any more than did Captain Scott's failure to return from his polar discoveries diminish his attainments.

War, like peace, confronts our leaders with certain calculated risks and to attain success in either, if we are true disciples of the Prince of Peace and the governments which subscribe to His principles, we must be both prepared and willing on occasions to make every sacrifice, even that of life itself—to follow God's will as He gives us to see the right of issues of our time.

We all know full well the outcome of the heroic landings in Anzac Cove, but too many of us still measure the effort by its immediate impacts. Its long-range impacts for the peace of the world are the vital effects of the heroic sacrifices which were made there.

Let no son of the United Kingdom or of her dominions overseas ever forget for one moment that the driving forces of the Anzacs at Gallipoli and on the western front in World War I, in their grim determination to defeat the evils of despotism, will forever stand as a beaconlight to free men everywhere to show the way to safer havens. To those of us in America who served with Anzac troops in the two wars, we shall ever be proud and grateful, too, that your valor and daring chilled the spines of enemy forces whenever they learned that they were confronted with New Zealand or Australian units. Your mission was inspired by great spiritual forces—and you acted accordingly. This combination inevitably spells death to any enemy of freedom and justice.

A moment ago I referred to the impact of events on history. It was at Gallipoli that were learned those lessons of beach landings that were to be used nearly 20 years later in the great and daring beach landing operations of the Second World War.

Most people scoffed at the mention of Hitler, as he was on his rise to power from approximately 1933—and as for Mussolini, we in America thought of him as a 10-day wonder. Every nation in the world knew that Japan's policy of aggression and annexation, if allowed to continue, represented a threat both to the western powers and the Asian peoples. It was a strange combination of partners by which we were confronted, but the events should have been both foreseen and halted.

They were not—with the result that the truly peaceful elements of the world confronted conflict upon conflict without adequate preparation.

After the tragedy at Pearl Harbor, this wonderful country (New Zealand) became a base for allied action to repel the southward advance of the Japanese in the Pacific. What followed is a matter of recorded history.

But lest the contribution of Anzac Forces might be overlooked by those who were either freed or kept free as a result of their heroic sacrifices, I beg of you to abide with me a few moments while I spell out a few of their unselffish efforts toward that ultimate victory which struck away the shackles of the tyranny which had already engulfed Europe.

By the end of 1941 New Zealand had 44,000 fighting men overseas. By September 1942—170,000 New Zealanders had been mobilized and within this short period New Zealand had suffered 13,000 casualties. At the time of Pearl Harbor New Zealand troops had already garrisoned the Fiji Islands. These troops and the Fijian comrades, were later to gain fame as jungle fighters in the Solomon Islands.

As the fury of battle raged in the Pacific, as inch by inch and island by island, the allied forces moved westward and northward inflicting bitter defeats upon the enemy, the Anzacs added new glory to their time-honored tradition. The Americans who fought by their side on the ground, in the air, and on the sea at Guadalcanal, the Treasury Island, Coral Sea, Midway, New Hebrides and New Caledonia will never forget their valor. But the daring of the New Zealanders and Anzac troops was not confined to the Pacific.

We who served with them in North Africa and Italy will never forget that New Zealand forces in North Africa—on the desert there lent their weight to repelling Rommel's advance against Alexandria. The exploits of the Royal New Zealand Air Force in Africa have been described as "reducing the Axis to nerve-shattering misery".

Then, they swept into Italy. There I saw them in bivouac and battle. In my eyes the New Zealanders I served with in Italy will ever be heroes.

Were they in the Battle of Britain? Well, I will say they were. Of some 10,000 New Zealanders, 2,000 gave their lives while the fate of a free world hung in a precarious balance.

But whether defending liberty on their own Pacific doorstep or in Gallipoli or the African desert, or in Normandy, Anacs have written never-to-be-forgotten chapters in the annals of determined efforts to conquer tyranny. If New Zealanders and Australians have gained fame and respect for their exploits on the field of battle, this only reflects the stanch spirit of the background from which they stem.

It is evidence, is it not, of their underlying influence, vigor, and eagerness to exert constructive influence upon the course of world affairs.

My dear friends, it is to this present-day role in which the New Zealand spirit so gallantly shone in warfare, is now dedicated to the more important business of waging peace, that we now turn our attention.

Since the end of World War II, we have witnessed the transformation of Japan and its development as a member of the family of free nations.

Today the peace of the Pacific area has been threatened not by any resurgent militarism in Japan but by the ambitions of international communism.

We saw naked aggression in Korea, an attempt launched by the Soviet Union using North Korean and Chinese Communist forces to gain territory and to subject an entire nation to totalitarian tyranny, an attempt, by the way, to which the Chinese Communists lent their full military and economic support. As a Senator of the United States, I visited our major military hospitlas and personally shuddered, as I heard the stories of these youngsters and their experiences with the Chinese Communist forces. Our casualty list in that war, you know, was more than 140,000. Ours were not the only casualties, and here I hasten to pay tribute to the British Commonwealth forces who fought so courageously with us in Korea.

Then there is Indochina. Time has become too valuable to tell this story of the Vietminh forces and their "butter and egg man."

The Communists are now making new efforts to divide the English-speaking peoples. This is especially true on Far Eastern matters such as the offshore islands of Taiwan.

Anyone living on the British Isles would certainly view with alarm any encroachment or threats to the channel islands by a continental power.

My comrades, I think the time has come to be forthright in all matters affecting our security as free people. The United States and the United Kingdom must never forget that we are partners in a common enterprise affecting our mutual interests.

It is too much to hope that we can always see all matters in exactly the same way. But we must never let our differences divide us; and we must work unceasingly to remove our differences whenever they arise.

As one who in two wars felt it a duty to give whatever small contribution I had to offer—and this was not without some heartaches and financial sacrifice—I am prepared to say today to my Anzac comrades that all the great fortunes of the world, all the power in the world could never compensate for that complete satisfaction of having served when the need was seemingly apparent to me that I might by offering a mother's son to put a small thumb in the dike in an effort to prevent the complete destruction of our great civilization. It was worth all the investment that two fine parents had made in their hopes for me.

I am quite sure that those men who wrote their record of valor for God and country at Anzac Cove look down upon New Zealand and Australia today with pride as they review the great contributions their heirs and successors have made and are making against aggression and acts of aggression. In Korea the action of the United Nations to restore peace took place after the aggression had been launched. You, my New Zealand comrades, can be so proud that your country was outstanding among the nations contributing forces to the United Nations Command in Korea—and here again your forces did credit to the very highest traditions of their forebears.

Now, in part at least, these acts of aggression and threats of aggression have been met through measures of collective security. In other areas where Communist imperialism seriously threatens, New Zealand has participated in joint efforts to stop the aggression before it can be successfully launched.

Although the people of New Zealand, Australia, and the United States have shared a common language, the same ideals, and have always had close bonds of friendship, the postwar shift of power in the Pacific area has brought about a new and closer political relationship.

While retaining their full and very appropriate responsibilities of membership in the British Commonwealth of Nations—as well as their first loyalties to the Crown—New Zealand and Australia have joined with the United States for collective defense in the Pacific region.

The Anzus Pact, concluded at the time the Japanese Treaty was signed, united the three countries in a security system. Under its

terms the three nations pledged themselves to "act to meet the common danger * * * when the territorial integrity, political independence or security of any of the parties is threatened."

Apart from the merits of collective security, I am convinced that through the regular meetings of the Anzus Council—standing alone—a closer relationship has developed among the three signatories in which each has had an opportunity to exercise its own constructive influence.

This defense alliance on the outer rim of the Pacific area afforded little security, however, for the less-developed nations of Southeast Asia which are within the immediate shadow of Communist China.

During early 1954, as the Vietminh forces, supported by Communist China, were making very rapid gains, the United States and other countries called for a united defense in Southeast Asia. At about the time a truce in Indochina was being negotiated, the nature of an enlarged collective defense organization was given detailed consideration in the Anzus Council.

Both New Zealand and Australia were firm in supporting an expanded regional system in the Pacific. Both made great contributions in the diplomatic negotiations which followed—particularly was this so on the military staff studies which were conducted in Washington.

With the signing of the Southeast Asia Collective Defense Treaty at Manila in September 1954, eight nations, Australia, New Zealand, Thailand, the Philippines, the United Kingdom, France, Pakistan, and the United States, pledged to pool their efforts in dealing with any aggressors in the treaty area. By separate protocol the states of Indochina (Laos, Cambodia, and Free Vietnam) were brought within the protected area.

Beyond this the SEATO powers agreed to pool their efforts in countering subversion in the area. At the very first meeting of the SEATO Ministerial Council, in Bangkok in February 1955, coordinating machinery was established for close cooperation in military, political, and economic activities within the scope of the treaty.

In line with these measures, New Zealand is now supplying forces to the Commonwealth Far Eastern Strategic Reserve. The dispatch of New Zealand ground, air, and naval forces within Malaya is contributing materially to the security and stability of the entire southeast Asia region. At the same time New Zealand's influence in southeast Asia has been furthered by the opening of a diplomatic mission in Singapore. In addition to these commitments and responsibilities New Zealand has continued to fulfill its military commitments elsewhere.

As for the influence of your great country, gentlemen, in the councils of the United Nations, the record itself bears witness to the continuing and constructive part which New Zealand has taken in the United Nations efforts to foster and promote—and, indeed, to enforce conditions which will bring to the world a just and everlasting peace.

A few moments ago I reminded you that what seemed a failure on the peninsula of Gallipoli was but the beginning of the successful efforts in the interests of freedom and justice which the world has known since that fateful event.

So, as we salute again the heroism, the valor, the unselfish sacrifice of the men who gave Anzac its everlasting fame, let us never lose sight of the fact that their spirit will carry on. Shall we join them then today in a firm and high resolve:

That their sacrifice was not in vain and that the principles for which they lived and died will endure forever under governments dedicated to the will of God.

Commencement Address by Hon. James A. Farley

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN F. KENNEDY
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, June 20, 1956

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an outstanding address delivered by the Honorable James A. Farley at the commencement exercises of Suffolk University, Boston, Mass., on June 12, 1956.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY HON. JAMES A. FARLEY, CHAIRMAN OF THE BOARD, THE COCA-COLA EXPORT CORP., COMMENCEMENT EXERCISES, SUFFOLK UNIVERSITY, BOSTON, MASS., JUNE 12, 1956

I felt highly honored when I received the invitation from my good friend, Judge Frank Donahue, to address the 1956 graduating class of Suffolk Law School here in Boston.

It is here in Massachusetts that the common law first got its American start. It was in Massachusetts that the greatest of English institutions, English justice, first took form as American law and as an American system of courts.

It is notable, too, that here in Massachusetts the great stream of Irish immigration, to which I belong, first found itself. As you know, I have been a politician, of Irish extraction, and proud of both. Politicians are the pick-and-shovel men of democracy, the men who bring together the endless currents of individual opinion and mobilize them through parties into instruments of political action. Without politicians, democracy would have remained an abstract idea and American law could never have reached its present development. The Irish proved to be the men of political instinct who did that work in the period of American expansion. There used to be many attacks on us. Now, books are being written about us and we have become part of the American epic.

We are part, too, of something larger. For this America of ours has reached a point where she has to be greater than herself and we with her. My views on this are the results of my observations as a businessman and, let me add, as a politician.

It is no secret to any of you that the world is in a dangerous state. For the first time in this century a hostile power, the Soviet Union, has come within hailing distance of mobilizing a majority of the world around an ideal which conflicts with the ideal of America. It is not merely that the Soviet Union is against capitalism—though as a businessman I happen to believe in capitalism. More importantly, it is that the philosophy of the Soviet Union specifically denies the value and worth of the individual human being. Most Americans, whatever their faith, are committed to the belief that all human souls are valuable as children of God. All Americans are committed to the idea that they are entitled to freedom so that they can follow the endless search for eternal truth. Any system that denies that ultimately clashes with the deepest instincts we have. This is the real conflict between us and the Communist world.

My business regularly takes me abroad. My friendships bring me the privilege of contact with many people. From observation and direct contract, as well as from the daily newspapers, I know that we are moving toward some sort of great climax.

Probably the climax will show itself in the form of a crisis in foreign affairs. During the years of my service in Washington, I came to learn that a crisis in foreign affairs builds itself long before it shows up in a dramatic event. Experts can see the moves on the board a little ahead of the newspaper readers, just as expert chess players can see several moves ahead of the actual game. In this case, we can be fairly sure now what is happening and where the direction lies.

Quite simply, the Soviet Union has gone into politics all over the world—and they are better organizers than I wish they were. On the surface they have discarded, at least for the moment, the crude method of moving soldiers into other peoples' countries. They do move propaganda in, and party organizers, and where they can they do some gunrunning, as they are doing now in the case of Egypt, Algeria, and probably Singapore. They expect to create a situation in which a group of men in Moscow can give orders to a dominant political party in France or in Egypt, in Algeria or Malaya, in Italy, Mexico or Brazil. The object of all these maneuvers is to bring the countries not already in the Soviet orbit into their political machine. They have had relatively little success in the United States, which remains their principal opponent.

Now the truth is that the United States can neither defend itself or maintain itself from within the borders of the United States. There is a good deal of attack on internationalism from some quarters, and some of it is justified. But in simple fact, the air defense of the United States rests on warning stations, bases, and so forth, which are not inside American borders but outside them. One example is the great radar net across the northern part of Canada. Others are our bases in Greenland, and the base we are beginning to abandon in Iceland, and so forth.

It is also true that to keep the United States going even in peace—let alone war—we have to draw materials from all over the world and especially from Latin America.

In the days of the Civil War, we were pretty much self-contained. But now, a century later, we are in both defense and economics part of an international combination, or rather a series of them. If we are ever deprived of that contact with other countries we shall be in a dangerous position. When that happens the Soviet Union is quite likely to drop the mask and threaten the United States militarily from an overpowering position.

There is no scheduled deadline. One of the strengths of Russian diplomacy is that it takes its time—and it thinks it has lots of time.

Because of this, the United States, it seems to me, does have an interest in a lot of places and countries which are not in its own frontiers. Before World War II there were Frenchmen who said, "Why die for Danzig?" when Hitler threatened Europe. They found a few months later that the seizure of Danzig was only prelude to a direct attack on France. So some of us say now, "What have Italian politics to do with the United States?"—and will find later that Italy and the Mediterranean are only stepping stones to the Azores and into the Atlantic Ocean to our Atlantic harbors.

This is, therefore, the time when schools and colleges, when lawyers and professional men, when businessmen and students, have to go into politics and make the case not only in and for the United States but in and for the entire free world.

My business associates commonly state this case in terms of business. That is natural; they are businessmen. They point out that the American standard of living is the highest in the world. They are right about that. They insist that a poor man in the United States has a better opportunity to succeed than anywhere else in the world. They are right about that, too. But the

strength of the American ideal and the free world is something greater than the chance of being a success in business or the ability to buy more cars and television sets than any other population.

My political friends point out that America is one of the few countries where a man or woman born in poverty can aspire to rise to the Presidency of the United States or great political position. They add that this is because in America everyone has a free vote and every American can go in and speak his piece and ask for the support of his fellow citizens. They are right about that. But there is something greater in America than the capacity to be a political success.

My friends in colleges and schools say that there is freer flow of information to America than to any other country and that men can study and become great in any field of learning. They add that this is because in America education is free and available to practically anyone who really wants to get it. That is true; but the spirit of America is deeper than the ability to become a great expert writer or teacher in mathematics or engineering or history or economics.

No two men will express the spirit of America in the same way, and I do not ask your agreement on mine. Because our idea of the free soul pursuing eternal values according to its best light is so big, each man will find his own expression of it.

To me, America is primarily a spiritual conception. She affirms eternal values. She has faith that there is a spiritual order. Every human being has possibilities different from every other and so American democracy is intended and designed to give to each of us the fullest opportunity to realize those possibilities in his search for that everlasting order.

Free democratic institutions are part of that opportunity. The Bill of Rights in the Constitution is there to protect it. A free press is essential to it. American law with its meticulous concern for individual justice is part of it. American education, which insists that every child shall be able to inform himself and use his mind, is necessary for it. American politics which permit expression and organization of endless groupings toward a common end is part of it. Taken together, the American system is intended to liberate each and every one of our growing millions for the purpose, not of stamping on someone else, but of searching for eternal law and eternal values.

No one of us will find that law, or those values. We can simply move step by step toward the light as light is given us.

But what we can do is to prevent any power from blocking that search. We can prevent distorting of men's minds by brainwashing. We can prevent the strangling of free information by false propaganda. We can prevent any combination of business from imposing poverty and degradation on other groups. We can prevent the State, or big business, or politicians, or any other combination, from trying to dictate the uses of human life. We can do this within a framework of law and order. We do render to Caesar what belongs to Caesar; but the American system reserves to God what belongs to God.

If this seems strange doctrine coming from a politician, let me say that in my case it comes from experience. I like our business system but I know that men do not die for corporations. I like our political system but men do not die merely for the pleasure of casting a ballot. It is the ideal beyond our institutions that makes American institutions alive and great and strong.

And now it seems, we have to make the American ideal as strong beyond the seas as we have made it here. We will have to meet Spaniards, and Italians, Frenchmen and Mexicans, Indochinese and Koreans, Japanese and Irish and English on their own ground. No one of these peoples will see things exactly as we do. But they all understand that their power to be Italian, Mexican, Japanese, English, Irish, or Korean will depend on a kind of tremendous union of a free world for common defense and a common ideal.

We may well need new international institutions. That will be the business of lawyers and diplomats. We may well need greater avenues of information. That will be the job of teachers and journalists. We may well need a better system of international economics. That will be the job for the bankers, businessmen, and economists.

But most of all we need strong, convinced, tolerant, and hard-hitting minds. The kind of mind, in fact, that a good politician has when he puts together clashing elements and ambitions to get a political result. This, it seems to me, is the task of Americans who, like ourselves, have had the great opportunity America offers.

I am no longer young, and the number of my years is growing. A priceless opportunity has been given me to see a great deal. Today I have tried to give you, quite simply, the lesson of those years. Perhaps you may find it useful as you come to the years of your own strength, and meet the stress of great events in a great time.

The American Merchant Marine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN MARSHALL BUTLER

OF MARYLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, June 20, 1956

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, all too often we hear speeches made, and with just cause, about the sad state of our merchant marine. However, on June 5, 1956, Mr. Alexander Purdon, executive director, Committee of American Steamship Lines, delivered a speech evidencing authoritative confidence in the future welfare of our merchant marine. I request unanimous consent that this speech be inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS OF ALEXANDER PURDON, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR, COMMITTEE OF AMERICAN STEAMSHIP LINES, BEFORE THE REGIONAL CONFERENCE, MIDDLE ATLANTIC REGION, PROPELLER CLUB OF THE UNITED STATES, VIRGINIA BEACH, VA., JUNE 5, 1956

I am glad to be here.

But when I read the list of participants in this conference I was reminded of the man who went to his doctor for diagnosis. He described all his symptoms and ended by telling the doctor that he felt inferior. The doctor examined him carefully and concluded by saying: "I'm sorry, I cannot give you a prescription or recommend treatment for the trouble is you really are inferior."

Those of us who navigate the stormy waters of the Potomac are well aware of the effective grassroots support which the Propeller Club can muster. In turn, we owe it our support, our enthusiasm, and attendance at its functions.

I met a man in Houston last week who in the last year signed up 180 new members for that port. He was really fired up with enthusiasm, but, in addition, he was selling something good.

I had the pleasure of making the Maritime Day address down there. The week before I got about as far away from salt water as it is possible to get, in Cedar Rapids, Iowa, for a talk on world trade.

Some of the things I want to say to you today are the same things I have said recently to other audiences. They may be old stuff to many of you—they may be new to a few. I hope they will be stimulating and encouraging to all.

Just last week I read a paragraph which referred to the sad state into which our merchant marine had fallen.

That kind of language disturbs me. It is all too frequent.

Those who talk about hovering on the brink of disaster—and sometimes we do—are apt to develop an inferiority complex.

Sometimes in the past we have stressed the negative when we should have accentuated the positive. There are prospects as well as problems. There can be confidence as well as concern. If I had a text for this sermon it would be the inscription on the pillars flanking the entrance to our National Archives.

It reads: "The past is but prologue—look to the future."

I have been saying that in my humble opinion the American merchant marine may well be on the threshold of one of its greatest periods—a period of greater service, more responsibility, and improved recognition. More people are talking that way today. There is a new spirit of confidence in the air.

Let me discuss with you some of the things that inspire my confidence in our maritime future. It's a long-range confidence. Believe me, it is not based solely on the present freight market—pleasing and rewarding as that is. Surely we have experienced enough peaks and valleys so that we will not be hypnotized by a period of relative prosperity.

I do not discount the difficulties we face in maintaining an American merchant marine tailored to the needs of our expanding economy. Other speakers have doubtless dealt with these—and they are many.

Carefully considered confidence based on thoughtful appraisal of the realities that confront us is quite different from foolish optimism.

Let me list the factors that in my opinion warrant a prediction of fair weather and favoring winds.

They are:

1. The increased emphasis on economic measures to combat and contain communism.
2. Our growing dependence on foreign trade.
3. Improved public understanding and support.
4. Cooperation between industry and government.
5. Technological improvement.

Let me first discuss the situation we find ourselves in vis-a-vis the Russians and their new policy of economic penetration.

It would be folly to assume that the shift in Soviet policy justifies any lessening of our military effort.

But it surely warrants a new evaluation of economic weapons and our ability to transmit the productive potential of America to the new arenas.

The "cold war" is "hotter than a pistol" on the economic front.

Commenting on what he called the "ice jam of the cold war," Bernard Baruch, in a prophetic statement, once said that when the frozen seas of international relations are opened—the passage could prove more hazardous than remaining frozen in deadlock.

We can hope and pray for sincerity behind the smiling countenances of Soviet leaders, but we do well to read their purpose in their own words.

It was Khrushchev who said to an East German group—"If anyone believes that our smiles involve abandonment of the teachings of Marx, Engles, and Lenin he deceives himself sorely."

Until events and their own actions prove the contrary we are forced to the conclusion that we are not merely faced with an expansion of Soviet trade. This is economic warfare.

The motives are the same—the weapons are different.

The Kremlin does not trade and give assistance for reasons of brotherly love. We are put to the test on a new battleground—the market places of the world. The test is not of military might but of our economic system—of democracy itself.

In either a hot or cold war we are the fourth arm of defense. But in economic war the merchant marine will not serve merely an auxiliary or supporting role. On this front we will be the cutting edge of an offensive based on our superb productive capacity.

No nation ever attained greatness without merchant ships. We know it now. Russia knows it, too, and she is building, building. Her present fleet is relatively small, but it is double her prewar strength.

We can view this expanded role as a source of confidence, but we must prepare to assume the burden of responsibility which it entails. This will require more than confidence. It will take energy, initiative, and enterprise, but we will not be found wanting.

Next we must consider our growing dependence on foreign trade to maintain our economy. Growth is the outstanding feature of the American system. We are bursting out all over. You can see the evidence of it in farm and factory across the Nation. In 15 years our gross national product increased nearly 300 percent, although our population rose only 28 percent.

With 10 percent of the earth's population we consume about 50 percent of the world's raw materials and produce 40 percent of the world's goods and services.

This very day $40 million worth of commercial exports started overseas. The same amount got underway yesterday and another $40 million sails tomorrow. The trend is upward, but even at today's levels this means jobs for 3 million Americans.

Imports added another 1.5 million jobs and are increasing concern. Our industrial machine would grind to a halt without a stream of materials from overseas.

Of 72 materials considered strategic and critical, we import our total supply of more than 40 percent and part of all the rest.

Inbound or outbound, it takes ships—it takes American ships.

For assurance of dependable supplies of raw materials—petroleum, ores, tin, etc.—is vital to our productive capacity, which is the ultimate source of our strength and well being.

We can afford to share our transportation with maritime nations willing and able to serve our needs. But our need is so critical that we cannot continue to give them almost three-fourths of our foreign trade. That's too close to a suicidal monopoly.

An increasing proportion of our increasing foreign trade must be carried on American ships. This will add strength to the maritime industry, but the justification is the security of our foreign trade and the welfare not only of those employed in our industry but those millions who depend on exports or imports for their livelihood.

This increase is logical and necessary, but not necessarily inevitable.

It will come to pass if we work at it—and we will.

One reason I am confident that we can increase our participation in the carriage of our own foreign trade is the growing public support and understanding of maritime affairs.

I know that criticism of industry public relations is a favorite topic for our Propeller Club meetings. Much of it is justified, but more is being done than ever before, and it is producing noticeable results.

Oddly enough, a byproduct of our efforts to retain the 50–50 principle has been the opportunity to tell our farmers about the merchant marine. That has been a good thing.

Attacks on 50–50 will continue, but those who attempted to drive a wedge between these 2 great industries will eventually discover that they have only succeeded in forging stronger bonds between natural allies.

Cooperation between Government and industry based on mutual confidence and respect was never greater and in itself inspires confidence in the future. The industry has reason to applaud the caliber and the character of those in both the executive and legislative branches who are responsible for our affairs. We are fortunate beyond measure in having at the helm in both branches men of understanding and integrity whose devotion to the advancement of the American merchant marine is untainted by partisan politics or personal advantage.

An industry that attracts and inspires such support has reason for pride and confidence.

Next I believe is the promise of technological advancement. The oldest form of transportation other than walking was the first to harness the atom. In time it will be economically practicable for commercial application. How soon that may be, I don't know. It will be sooner than most people think.

The glamour of nuclear propulsion should not blind us to the less spectacular but nonetheless commendable advances in other forms of propulsion including the gas turbine experiments being conducted by the Maritime Administration—roll-on, roll-off ships; combination ore-oil ships, and many others.

These developments combined with improvements in cargo handling and other technical fields represent a dynamic surge forward—a need and a desire to meet and beat the competition of other merchant marines.

They are possible because we have developed what might be termed maritime maturity. Our policies based on the 1936 act have proved that in the constructive partnership of industry and Government provided for in the act there is an economical and practicable pattern for building and maintaining an American merchant marine.

Government support in its many forms is necessary, desirable, and justified. It is a sound investment and costs less than you think and less than any alternative system.

For example, the apparent cost of operating subsidies can be vastly misleading. The real cost—taking into account taxes and recapture—is much less. Net cost on this basis from 1947 to 1954 was not hundreds of millions of dollars, but an average annual figure of less than $9 million.

If all the returns to the Nation from operating subsidies including the $500 million annually poured back into the economy in wages and supplies by the contract operators are taken into account the Government's contribution is at least balanced by the benefits.

Construction subsidy merely compensates for the cost disadvantage of building ships in American yards to American standards and at American wages. This is sound, necessary, national policy. We simply must maintain a shipbuilding industry. We cannot, we dare not do otherwise. But all the operators in the foreign trade who are eligible for construction subsidy are not benefited thereby. No advantage to them is intended. They are merely placed in the same relative position as other industries that are permitted to buy or build abroad. Industry plays a part in this, too—a very substantial one. What we have developed is an effective partnership of private investment and Government support. The replacement commitments already undertaken by our lines are a pretty substantial investment in the future of America and proof positive that our policies are essentially sound.

They have to be. For we cannot afford to be complacent although we can be confident that the genius of America—the constructive alliance of industry and Government—will forge an American merchant marine of new strength and increased effectiveness—a merchant marine planned for the future, not predicated on the past.

Let me close with a favorite quotation from Carl Sandburg:

"I see America, not in the setting sun of a black night of despair—
I see America in the crimson light of a rising sun fresh from the creative hand of God.
I see great days ahead—great days possible to men and women of vision."

He means you.

Postmen Muzzled

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN F. KENNEDY
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, June 20, 1956

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an important editorial which appeared in the Boston, (Mass.) Evening American on Friday, June 1, 1956, entitled "Postmen Muzzled," with which I am in full agreement.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be published in the RECORD, as follows:

POSTMEN MUZZLED

No better example can be found of the widespread trend in Government bureaus to keep people in ignorance of their stewardship, than section 744.442 of the Postal Manual of March 1956.

The section clamps this muzzle on post-office employees:

"A. Information relating to the policies and decisions of the Post Office Department will be released only through official channels. Employees shall not engage in campaigns for or against changes in the service or furnish information to be used in such campaigns unless prior approval has been obtained from higher authority.

"B. If an employee has justifiable reasons for favoring or opposing changes in the postal service, he shall contact the proper officials and await specific instructions before engaging in local hearings or activities."

What's wrong with this?

That the postal service is a vitally essential public service and hence the people have the right to know what's right and what's wrong with it.

That bureaucrats in command will naturally tell only what is favorable to their regime.

That the best source of dependable public information about the service comes from the ranks of carriers and clerks, not from political appointees in command.

And finally, that a public service is the people's business, and no bureaucrat has the right to censor or suppress news about it.

Postal employees are noted for their devotion to their work and their desire to improve it.

They are notoriously underpaid and often overworked, but nevertheless stick to their jobs in the hope that well-informed public opinion will help improve their lot.

Now they are told to shut up and keep their place; to let only their masters speak for them at their autocratic discretion.

The gag order has not been meekly accepted.

A resolution vigorously protesting it was unanimously adopted by the Government Employees' Council, comprising all Federal civil-service workers, at Washington, D. C.

The same action was taken, also unanimously, by the recent convention of the California Association of Letter Carriers, a branch of the national association, at Long Beach, Calif.

Section 744.442 of the Postal Manual has no title nor justification to remain on the books. It should be rescinded—by congressional action if necessary.

Shipping's 12-Hour Red Light: The Yellow Flag

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN MARSHALL BUTLER
OF MARYLAND
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, June 20, 1956

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I have just received an excellent article entitled, "Shipping's 12-Hour Red Light: The Yellow Flag," by Mr. Stacey Bender, Jr., vice chairman of the committee on foreign commerce, American Association of Port Authorities. Mr. Bender, whom I have known for many years, and for whom I have the highest admiration, is universally recognized as an expert in this field.

Accordingly, although the article will appear as a guest editorial in the official organ of the American Association of Port Authorities, World Ports, I think it would be appropriate that it also appear in the RECORD; and I, therefore, request unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SHIPPING'S 12-HOUR RED LIGHT: THE YELLOW FLAG—PART-TIME QUARANTINE INSPECTION COSTS SHIPS AND SHIPPERS MILLIONS

(By Stacey Bender, Jr.)

Six p. m.—an ordinary time of day on the clocks of the Nation, with no special significance to the great majority of our population. Six p. m.—a time for the start of the children's favorite television show; a time for the busy housewife to prepare for the family's evening meal; a time for United States Public Health Service quarantine inspectors to close their offices and wend their way homeward; a time for foreign-laden vessels entering United States ports to hoist the yellow banner, requesting quarantine inspection; a time for the Nation's legislators to ponder over the fact that on all three seacoasts of our Nation such a request will go unanswered for at least 12 hours.

For, just as surely as the hands of a seaport's clocks become vertical, anchor chains of ships rattle in quarantine anchorages, harbor pilots disembark, and our Nation turns on a red stop light, a red light of 12 hours' duration, on men and goods aboard vessels newly arrived from the ports of the world. Commerce is stopped cold—as cold as this frigid welcome to our deep-water commercial centers. Almost as though the United States didn't want, or vitally need, the raw materials and finished products stowed deep in the spacious holds of vessels flying the varicolored ensigns of friendly nations the world over, as well as our own Stars and Stripes.

This present freezing of ships, men, and goods arriving in our ports after daylight hours is of less than 10 years' duration. In the sailing days of "wooden ships and iron men" proper quarantine inspection was not deemed feasible after sundown because of the inadequacy of artificial light. Even with the advent of steam and the complex electrical systems aboard liners and freighters following the First World War, full-time inspection service did not become a reality until the passage of Public Law 796 by the 71st Congress back in 1931. Quarantine Inspection Service was then maintained by the Treasury Department, and the new legislation authorized the Secretary to receive payments for overtime wages of departmental employees so engaged from steamship owners, operators, or agents.

However, with the transfer of the Quarantine Service to the newly-formed Federal Security Agency, authorized by Public Law 410 in 1947, the provisions of the 1931 enactment did not permit a Federal security officer to receive such payments, and the service deteriorated to the present 12-hour period daily, 6 a. m. to 6 p. m.

In the ensuing years virtually all segments of the maritime industry, including chambers and associations of commerce, longshore and other labor unions, and regional, coastal, and national ports groups, have repeatedly advocated repassage of the enabling provisions of the 1931 legislation. Assuredly, there is no thought in the minds of the measure's proponents to saddle the cost of the proposal on the taxpayers of the Nation. Operational costs incurred by merchant shipping, particularly during their comparatively brief stays in port, are presently higher than at any peaceful time in the history of the world's commerce. It must be remembered that ships are primarily cargo carriers, and as their ability to deliver the goods is impaired, or delayed, needlessly, freight rates increase in direct ratio to increased port turnaround costs.

It is understood that there are certain exceptions to the clearly defined regulations, granted locally in some of the Nation's smaller ports. These harbors, the commerce of which has been unable to economically justify Federal maintenance of a quarantine anchorage, berth vessels on arrival, rather than block a main channel entrance. Too, where tidal variances preclude harbor entrances during daylight hours, berth inspection is granted on arrival. Size of quarantine anchorages play an important part in these exceptions. In the case of a limited quarantine anchorage, ships arriving after 6 p. m. drop the hook there, but after the anchorage is fully occupied, the lucky late arrivals proceed immediately to assigned berths for inspection, leaving the less fortunate early arrivals straining at their anchor chains, dismally flying their yellow flags of delay, until sunup.

In the summer of 1954 corrective legislation was overwhelmingly approved by the 83d Congress in the form of H. R. 6253. The bill provided that overtime payments by the steamship operator be made at a time-and-a-half rate for after-hours service of United States Public Health employees. Vetoed in Denver shortly after passage, President Eisenhower observed that the 24-hour service proposal had merit, that the "problems which the bill seeks to solve are real and pressing." He simultaneously ordered a study to be made, incorporating a summary of all governmental inspectional services, their need for overtime function, and a formula to be subscribed to by all Government agencies standardizing methods of payment. It is understood that the study has been completed, and that the matter is in process of being referred to the many concerned Government agencies. Legislation on this important matter has again been introduced, this time in both Houses of the Congress, but qualified Washington observers have dim hopes of enactment at this session. The survey, reportedly in the custody of an Interagency Committee on Overtime Pay for Certain Inspectors, is not moving with the speed that a 1954 real and pressing matter should.

We all know of the great need to move ships and cargoes ever faster. We are equally cognizant of the economic trend toward larger ships, with deeper drafts. The maritime industry have made their voices heard in the halls of Congress in regard to the cost of the 12-hour stop light on an estimated 40 percent of all ships entering United States ports.

But what of the transit inventory costs of this delay to our Nation's total importation—an importation well over $8 billion a year? What of the hundreds of empty, multimillion-dollar piers, waiting to berth vessels stalled under the yellow flag? What of the men on the ship, waiting to go ashore after a long voyage? And the men on the shore, waiting to unload the ship's cargo, and attend to the multitudinous details of ship's husbandry? What of the sharply diminished need for extensive quarantine anchorages under new legislation, and the taxpayer's dollars saved by reduced maintenance costs for smaller anchorage areas?

This need has far exceeded the 1954 real and pressing stage. This is 1956, and the matter affects every seaboard State in the Nation. Our Nation's commerce is being systematically halted, however briefly. This is a national issue—in need of solution—now.

Pope Pius XII

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, June 20, 1956

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, Abbot Theodore G. Kojis, OSB, of St. Andrew's Abbey, Cleveland, Ohio, recently addressed the 45th anniversary banquet of the Slovak Catholic Federation in Chicago. I ask unanimous consent that this significant address be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Cleveland Slovak News of June 7, 1956]

OUR HOLY FATHER, POPE PIUS XII

(Address by Abbot Theodore G. Kojis, OSB, of St. Andrew's Abbey at the 45th anniversary banquet of the Slovak Catholic Federation during the national convention in Chicago's Sheraton-Blackstone Hotel on May 16, 1956)

The year 1956 will remain indelibly inscribed in the hearts of all Christians who recognize the Holy Father as the visible representative of Christ on earth. For it was in the month of March of this year, when the Holy Father celebrated two jubilees, namely, the 80th anniversary of his birth and the 17th of his coronation as Pope of the Holy Catholic Church. These two jubilees of the Vicar of Christ on earth touched the hearts of all Catholics as if by a magic hand and evoked in them the deepest and

most beautiful tones of affection, fidelity, admiration, and prayer. It was like the distinct, yet indescribable feeling, one discerns in the voices of children singing songs of affection for their father on his day of days.

It was indeed a veritable chorus of all the children of the church singing a song of love and fidelity as no earthly ruler in history has yet received from his subjects. The entire world was surprised at this spontaneous expression of filial devotion to the Holy Father, Pope Pius XII. Even the unbelievers could not help but wonder at the strength of the spiritual bond which joins the living members of the Catholic Church with the visible head, the Holy Father.

These voices have not yet died out. Although the silent church in Slovakia was physically prevented from likewise expressing her joy on the occasion of the twofold jubilee of the Holy Father, we do not doubt for a moment but that she found great strength in knowing that he remains a Good Shepherd even to them. More than a thousand-year-old tradition and history of the Catholic Church in Slovakia bears witness to this and gives evidence of an unbroken fidelity to the Rock of Peter, the Vicar of Christ. Because of this loyalty to the Holy See, there are imprisoned five Slovak bishops, hundreds of priests, nuns, and religious, as well as thousands of the faithful laity, who are suffering in prisons and labor camps for their faith. Slovakia, unable to pay her homage by messages written with ink, nevertheless sent her message of love and devotion written in the blood of her valiant confessors and heroic martyrs who have suffered and died for their faith in the past decade.

We Americans of Slovak descent did not neglect to join the universal expression of joy in being the spiritual children of the Holy Father. Our Slovak press, our radio programs, our parishes, and religious institutions—all commemorated the twofold jubilee of the Holy Father with due emphasis. Now, however, since we are assembled in the great metropolis of Chicago at this 38th convention of the Slovak Catholic Federation of America, it seems very fitting that we, a united organization of all Catholics of American Slovak descent, should reassure the Holy Father of our love and fidelity. We are truly grateful that in these days of uncertainty in the world, God has specially chosen him to guide the church. His white figure stands like a veritable lighthouse near treacherous waters. His heart so closely knit by prayer and love to the heart of the Divine Master reveals God's holy will to us. Every problem sorely confronting mankind immediately elicited words of truly divine wisdom, words of encouragement and certainty from His Holiness Pope Pius XII. No physician helps his patient as the vicar of Christ helps an ailing world.

We can liken his paternal heart to a high radio tower, sending to the heavens all our hopes, our prayers, our trials, our needs—and receiving in turn from the same heavens the message of God—which becomes our strength and our light, giving us perseverance and determination no to succumb to the powers of evil.

Bumpy Going for Turnpikes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD MARTIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, June 20, 1956

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, there has been a great deal of discussion recently of the subject of roads, particularly in the Senate, and some mention has been made of turnpikes. I ask unanimous consent that a very interesting article on the subject be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BUMPY GOING FOR THE TURNPIKES

In the past couple of weeks, inflation and politics have caused important shifts by the managers of some of the Nation's toll roads.

First came the unsettling news that passenger-car rates on the Pennsylvania Turnpike, oldest and most successful of the modern toll roads, would be upped 41 percent over its whole length from the Ohio line to New Jersey. At the same time, truck rates would be cut about 20 percent in an effort to draw the commercial traffic that is the meat and potatoes of any toll diet (BW—February 11, 1956, p. 43).

The turnpike commissioners figure the moves will boost annual revenues by $4 million; the fact that a political hassle has held up the toll changes hasn't lightened the impact on other toll roads of the proposed passenger car boost, first of any consequence since the pike opened.

EXTENSIONS

The need for more revenues did not arise from the main stretch of the road, the 327 miles from King of Prussia to Ohio. This stretch, knifing through some of the roughest mountain country in the East, has always more than paid its way. Since it was started in 1939–40, it has built up an $18 million surplus, and is far ahead of the amortization schedule of the original $211.5 million bond issue.

But other, newer stretches—to Allentown in the north and across the Delaware River Bridge to the east—are not doing so well. And none of the surplus can be applied to them until the bonds on the original stretch are all paid off, probably not for another 5 or 6 years.

The commission itself listed these reasons for proposing the rate changes:

Weight limits on free roads have been adjusted, opening them to trucks that formerly had to use the turnpike. This has caused some attrition of pike traffic, especially in the less-rugged areas in the eastern part of the State, and just west of Pittsburgh.

Route 22 has been widened and rebuilt east of Harrisburg, so that trucks prefer to leave the turnpike there and take the free road directly to New York, instead of staying on the pike to Philadelphia and then paying further tolls on the New Jersey Turnpike to reach the New York area.

Maintenance costs are rising all along the pike.

Truck traffic on the new extension from Valley Forge to the Delaware River Bridge has fallen far below engineers' estimates.

On all the new extensions, revenues are running about 40 percent behind expectations, and bondholders are restive. Last year, the extensions didn't earn even enough to pay interest on the $298 million issues that were floated to build them; 1956 prospects are even gloomier. The interest deficits are made up by a reserve fund, but under terms of the indenture, the bondholders' trustee—Fidelity-Philadelphia Trust Co.—can force the commission to boost tolls if deficits continue. There is no chance that revenues will meet this year's interest. If tolls aren't raised by July 15, the bank can order a 60-day study of the situation, then force new tolls. It could even ask for lower tolls if the engineers recommended them. But odds now are that higher tolls will be the prescription.

ENTER POLITICS

As if the economics of the pike weren't confusing enough, State politics have muddled the picture further. The Turnpike Commission normally has five members, but there were two vacancies when the first vote was taken, O. K. 'ing the higher tolls. Democratic Gov. George M. Leader—with the backing of highly vocal auto clubs and Pennsylvania newspapers—assailed the moves. The two Democrats on the commission were willing to reverse the recommendation, but Republican member James F. Torrance, Jr., refused to back down. The Governor then appointed another Democrat to the commission, which voted 3 to 1, to put the higher rates in the icebox until further studies could be made.

Until the studies are made, by engineers and by the State senate, there will probably be no action on rates. However, considering the unsatisfactory performance of the eastern extensions something must be done—be it voluntary, or forced by the bondholders' trustee.

CONNECTICUT'S WOES

While Pennsylvania's legislators and politicians haggled over tolls, Connecticut's State expressway bond committee came out with an expected request for a boost in bond authorizations from $398 million to $447 million. The reason given was rising cost of materials, construction, and land for the 129-mile Greenwich-Killingly Expressway that's now being built. The road's traffic engineers also estimated that tolls would have to be raised before the road is even in operation. The proposed 20-cent minimum for passenger cars would be raised to 25 cents.

Connecticut's struggle with costs is highlighted by Pennsylvania's experience on its unprofitable eastern extensions. For instance, the stretch from Valley Forge to New Jersey cost around $98 million—around $3 million per mile. This was in 1954. By contrast, the original 161-mile section of the pike cost only $70 million, with nearly $30 million coming from Public Works Administration funds, back in 1939. Cost per mile: about $430,000.

Actually, costs of highway construction have risen as fast in the past 12 months as in any similar postwar period; Engineering News-Record's index of heavy construction stands 5.8 percent higher this week than it did a year ago.

PLANNING

Fast-rising costs of construction and maintenance, coupled with reports of mediocre revenues on many roads, could put a crimp in plans for future roads. Ohio's plans for a north-south turnpike are undergoing vigorous scrutiny in light of the east-west road's disappointing performance.

Faced with the realities of slumping revenues from its east-west pike, Ohio's commissioners pared down their original estimates for a north-south road from $525 million to around $385 million, and hoped to float bonds for that amount sometime this summer. But this week one of the road's bond advisers, T. Henry Boyd of Blyth & Co., recommended that the issue be postponed because "The time is not propitious for the issuance of the bonds."

The key to the future of the north-south road now lies in the performance of the existing pike, where the biggest disappointment has been in commercial revenues, running far behind original estimates. It had been figured that for the first 7 months of the east-west Ohio pike's existence, commercial revenues would account for 74 percent of the total—but in that time, they have been only 36 percent of total revenues. Consequently, only 75 percent of the interest charges on the original issue of bonds were covered by revenues for the first 7 months. Terms of the bond indenture provide that surplus construction funds can be used to make up deficiencies in revenues for interest, but only for the first two payments. From now on, interest must be paid from revenues,

or Ohio may find itself in the same predicament as Pennsylvania.

Texas and Oklahoma also are considering new toll roads, but aside from a handful of States there may be little activity in the future. Senate-House conferences are underway on a new Federal highway bill for paying 90 percent of the cost of a nationwide system; most States, with an eye on the few States with existing toll roads are sitting tight until a final bill is evolved.

The Illness of the President

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 20, 1956

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I herewith include an editorial which appeared in the June 10 issue of the St. Louis Post-Dispatch. The editorial, entitled "The Illness of the President," follows:

THE ILLNESS OF THE PRESIDENT

The bulletins and statements from Walter Reed Hospital following the operation on President Eisenhower are most reassuring in their forecast of his complete recovery of his health.

Public relief came first when physicians announced that the operation for ileitis was a success. This was soon followed by an announcement that the cause of the intestinal obstruction was nonmalignant. Later it was announced by Press Secretary Hagerty that he did not expect "any interruption in the official duties of the Presidency."

Even more optimistic was the statement, at the Saturday afternoon press conference, that the President's recovery would probably proceed so satisfactorily that he would be able to campaign for reelection to his high office.

Indeed it was said that he would be healthier than before his sudden attack Friday morning and that he might well leave the hospital in a week.

All this is, as we say, reassuring. The overwhelming majority of people in the United States, whatever their political affiliation, will be happy to know that the President is progressing so well in his recovery.

But they also will be glad, so we believe, to allow him all the time it takes for him to build up his health to a safe and sure state. They are less interested at this point, in our opinion, in whether or not he will be able to run again than they are in the restoration of his health so he can conduct the office of the Presidency in the term to which they elected him 4 years ago.

At best the situation will not be easy. Assuming steady progress in the President's condition, some valuable time inevitably will be lost.

In the first place Congress is in session. Moreover, the session is approaching its critical phase. Leaders of both parties have set July 10 as the target date for adjournment. That is just a month away and this means in turn that a great deal of work remains to be accomplished.

In this the role of the President is obviously highly important. There is no one to take his place even temporarily, for example, in the urgent field of foreign aid. After the President's appeal to restore the committee's reduction of more than a billion dollars of foreign assistance was rejected in the House, the fight transferred to the Senate.

But in the Senate the Republican leader is KNOWLAND, of California, who only last week took the floor to commend Senators MCCARTHY, of Wisconsin, and JENNER, of Indiana, for demanding a revaluation of the administration's aid to Yugoslavia.

As the House passed the aid bill, it conditioned aid to Yugoslavia on a determination by the President himself that Marshal Tito's nation was not dominated by the Soviets and that it had not embarked on a course hostile to the best interests of the United States.

This is only one instance of how closely the office and function of the President gear in with operation of Congress. A majority of the Republicans in the House appear to be against participation of the United States in the International Organization of Trade Cooperation, as the President desires. If the United States is to affiliate with OTC it ought to be done by vote of Congress in the next few weeks.

Yet there is no one else who can talk to GOP Members of Congress in the way that Dwight Eisenhower can. No one else is both President and head of the party. And no one else is an avowed Republican presidential candidate whose coattails many Members of the House and Senate hope to ride come November.

Many other difficult situations could be cited, including the trouble in the Defense Department arising from the bitter rivalries between the armed services.

As the convention month of August approaches there will be more and more for the President to do as head of his party. The unpleasant problem of whether to help Senator WILEY, of Wisconsin, the Eisenhower administration's chief supporter on foreign policy in the Senate, is a sample of how hard to handle these intraparty controversies can become.

Once again the men around the President—Secretary of State Dulles, Attorney General Brownell, White House Chief of Staff Sherman Adams, and the others—will be put to additional test. We trust they will use their authority wisely and well.

As for the President's political future, let him not either be counted out or automatically assumed to continue in the arena of politics. He is entitled not only to have a chance to recover from this second serious illness in 9 months but to have an opportunity to decide for himself what he thinks he can and should do at his age.

Meantime all the country and much of the world rejoice in the good news from the Presidential bedside and hope that Dwight D. Eisenhower will continue to improve until he can leave the hospital as soon as it is safe for him to do so.

The Presidency—II

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, June 20, 1956

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the New York Times this morning carries the second in a series of articles by James Reston on the Presidency of the United States. The second installment today contains an evaluation of the staff functions in the extensive executive establishment.

I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Reston's column be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times of June 19, 1956]

THE PRESIDENCY—II—AN EVALUATION OF THE STAFF KEEPING WATCH ON THE EXTENSIVE EXECUTIVE ESTABLISHMENT

(By James Reston)

WASHINGTON, June 18.—President Eisenhower was on a restricted diet of food and work today but The White House Office, which carries the main workload of the Presidency, was busier than Times Square on a Saturday night.

For example:

More than 2,100 letters poured into the White House mail room for the President.

The Special Assistant to the President for Atomic Energy, Lewis L. Strauss, who also is chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission, sent his monthly report on the peaceful uses of atomic energy to the President. It was put in his folder for tomorrow.

William H. Jackson, special Assistant to the President on Foreign Affairs, delivered a report to the White House on the Operations Coordinating Board.

A group of local and State officials met in the Fish Room of the White House and was addressed by the Assistant to the President, Sherman Adams. The Fish Room is so called because it once housed a tank of tropical fish.

There were staff discussions with the Bureau of the Budget about a legal snarl over funds to finance a research reactor for a foreign country and more discussions about when the President's plane would be available to bring visiting officials to the United States, among them Prime Minister Nehru of India.

In addition—and this was only a small part of the day's work—the President's Staff Secretary, Andrew J. Goodpaster, had to route from the White House to the various departments and agencies a vast number of communications on all kinds of things: A complaint from a citizen against allied acts of violence in the Mediterranean, an appeal from a feed manufacturer in Chicago for drought relief in Iowa, a complaint from a citizen that he could not get a Federal job and a proposal to send the National High School band and chorus overseas on a goodwill tour.

GREATER THAN ANY MAN

Anyone who studies the flow of work in The White House office will soon understand what President Wilson meant when he said:

"The office [of the Presidency] is so much greater than any man could honestly imagine himself to be that the most he can do is to look grave enough and self-possessed enough to seem to fill it."

In the first of these articles, the work that cannot be delegated to the President's staff was enumerated. But there is a mountain of additional work that can and does go on, regardless of the President's absences from the White House.

The duties and responsibilities of the Presidency have grown as vigorously as the growth of the Nation itself. For example, in 1790, under President Washington, there were nine executive departments, each doing with fairly simple duties. This had grown to only 11 under President Lincoln in 1864. Today President Eisenhower is responsible for 57 agencies and departments, many of them much larger than the whole Federal executive establishment in the 19th Century.

In 1789, President Washington approved 27 laws and 3 Executive orders; in 1955, President Eisenhower signed 390 public laws, 490 private laws, 65 Executive actions.

Similarly, in 1789, Washington transmitted 20 military and 65 civilian nominations to the Senate, while last year, President Eisen-

hower sent up 37,467 military and 3,219 civilian nominations. The civilian personnel of the Federal Government in 1789 numbered 1,000, the military 1,300, while today the civilian personnel totals 2,371,421 and the military 2,935,107.

This has, of course, meant a vast change in the buraeucracy of the White House, particularly since the beginning of World War I. President Washington had one full-time secretary, Lawrence Lewis, his nephew. Even at the turn of this century, President McKinley had less than a dozen personal aides working with him in the White House.

Today, the White House Office—as distinguished from the Executive Office of the President, which includes the Bureau of the Budget and several other large arms of the Presidency—numbers 398 persons with an annual budget of $3,375,000. In President Truman's last year, the White House Office had a total of 279, but since then, certain special projects on disarmament, psychological warfare, foreign economic policy, etc., have added 128 employees.

To think of the President, therefore, is one thing, but to think of the Presidency is something quite different. Who runs this vast establishment? Where did they come from? And how good are they?

ADAMS HEADS THE STAFF

The central figure in the coordination and direction of the Office is Gov. Sherman Adams, the assistant to the President. His principal assistants are Gen. Wilton B. Persons, who, as Mr. Adams' deputy, worries primarily about legislation; the three major secretaries, Bernard Shanley, who keeps the appointments and directs the flow of people in and out of the President's office; James C. Hagerty, who deals with the press; and Col. Andrew J. Goodpaster, who, as staff secretary, keeps the right papers going to their proper destination.

The core of this White House staff moved right into the White House with the President from his campaign train in 1952. This was true of Governor Adams, General Persons, Mr. Shanley, and Mr. Hagerty. It was also true of two of the President's main administrative assistants, Gabriel Hauge, a magazine writer who wrote speeches in the 1952 campaign, and Fred Seaton, a Nebraska newspaper publisher, who recently moved from the White House to be Secretary of the Interior.

Others on the campaign train who are now in the White House are Kevin McCann, a 1952 speech writer, who is doing the same job as a special assistant; the military aide to the President, Col. Robert L. Schulz, who was with General Eisenhower in Paris and at Columbia University, and Maxwell M. Rabb, a Boston lawyer, who worked with Henry Cabot Lodge, Jr., on the campaign train and is now secretary to the Eisenhower Cabinet.

The two innovations President Eisenhower has brought to the functioning of the White House Office are (1) a much clearer line of authority and delegation of authority to and through Governor Adams, and (2) the introduction of a corps of special assistants to the President on special subjects—disarmament, foreign affairs, foreign economic policy, etc.

Both are still controversial, probably because they are new. There is general agreement that Governor Adams has produced a tidier and more efficient administration of the White House staff. During the President's illnesses he has been both a rallying point and a source of continuity for the whole administration.

Even his critics in this political community, who are numerous—particularly in the vicinity of Capitol Hill—agree that he is a diligent, clear-headed man of character. But he is exercising vast powers beyond the scrutiny of Congress in a position where he is not accountable to anybody but the President. And the question about him is whether he is not establishing precedents that other men, of lesser character, might exercise in the absence of some other President.

ASSISTANTS IN CONTROVERSY

The appointment of special assistants for disarmament, Harold E. Stassen; foreign affairs, Mr. Jackson; atomic energy, Mr. Strauss; foreign economic policy, Joseph M. Dodge; public works, Gen. John S. Bragdon; has raised questions of conflict with the statutory authority of the heads of the established departments and agencies of the Government.

For example, Mr. Stassen has reacted in one way to the Soviet disarmament and arms-cut proposals and Secretary of State Dulles in another. There have been differences, too, between State and the special assistants on questions of wider technical and cultural contacts with the Soviet Union. These have inevitably brought the concept of the special assistants into controversy.

In general, however, there has been far less controversy between this White House staff and the departments than existed in previous administrations when powerful secretaries and White House favorites, such as the late Harry L. Hopkins, were at odds with the established Cabinet officials.

The main criticism of the White House staff is not that it has been at odds with the departments but simply that it is not as good as it could be or ought to be at a time when the responsibilities of the Presidency touch on the security of the whole free world.

The White House staff, it is generally agreed here, is loyal, technically efficient and industrious, but not brilliant. If the top men in it—those who work constantly in the White House—were compared, say, with the top men surrounding the president of any of the great industrial or commercial organizations in the United States, it is doubtful that they would be regarded as superior.

It compares well with any previous White House staff, but whether that is good enough today is a question that Washington, preoccupied with the President and indifferent to the Presidency, seldom raises.

Strengthening Social Security

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL H. DOUGLAS
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, June 20, 1956

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, as the Senate prepares to consider the Social Security Amendments of 1956, it may be helpful for us to bear in mind the growing public interest in the proposed disability provisions of the bill as passed by the House. I therefore ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Strengthening Social Security" from the Washington Post for June 7, 1956, pointing out the importance of expanding the insurance principles of social security to cover the risks of total disability.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STRENGTHENING SOCIAL SECURITY

In the interests of a stronger and more equitable social security system the Senate ought to restore the amendment to the social security bill providing benefits for persons 50 years of age or older who are totally disabled. The Finance Committee struck this provision from the bill that the House passed last year. Now it will be offered again on the Senate floor. The arguments against it are almost the same that have been used against social security legislation from the beginning—that it would encourage idleness and put a premium on disability. The arguments do not hold water, inasmuch as the House wrote in strict standards of compliance designed to guard against abuse. Payments would not begin until after a waiting period of six months and they would be suspended in the case of refusal to accept vocational rehabilitation.

As a special study last year by the American Medical Association said in discussing workmen's compensation, "inadequate indemnity can lower patient morale or force return to gainful employment in advance of clear-cut medical indications." The study, which was approved in December by the AMA's house of delegates, said it is the proper intent of workmen's compensation "that a disabled employee and his family should not suffer a serious reduction in normal living standards during the rehabilitation period." Despite the AMA's opposition to the present amendment, we think the same principles apply equally to social security. They are an appropriate guide for the Senate in its debate on the well-justified proposal to provide monthly benefits to totally disabled persons.

Hanson Baldwin on Civil Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHET HOLIFIELD
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 20, 1956

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, at this time I should like to call the attention of the House to two recent columns by Hanson Baldwin, military editor of the New York Times, relating to my subcommittee's current investigation of civil defense. These columns are appropriately entitled "Nation's Achilles Heel" and "Ostriches Versus the A-Bomb."

Since last January the Committee on Government Operations' Subcommittee on Military Operations, of which I am chairman, has received testimony from some 70 witnesses on the subject of civil defense. We have attempted to bring together the best possible thinking on this complex subject. Our subcommittee has received testimony from the Chairman and members of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, from representatives of the Federal agencies performing civil defense functions, and from State and local officials from all over the United States.

We have devoted a great deal of study to the program and operation of the Federal Civil Defense Administration, and have visited five of our major target cities to gain a firsthand understanding of local civil defense problems.

Before Congress adjourns, we plan to submit a comprehensive report of this investigation with recommendations through which we might achieve a vastly strengthened civil-defense program.

Mr. Speaker, these two articles by Hanson Baldwin, in my view, correctly interpret the first two parts of our printed hearings, and I want to commend him for his penetrating analysis of some

of the essential problems confronting civil defense in our Nation at this time. In more recent hearings we have received informed testimony on other problems of equal and possibly greater importance. These hearings have not yet been printed.

It is my belief that when these hearings are available that the same concern will be expressed with respect to these additional problems as Mr. Baldwin has related in his articles. The remaining parts of our hearing record will be printed before adjournment.

The articles follow:

[From the New York Times of June 6, 1956]

NATION'S ACHILLES HEEL—AN ANALYSIS OF WHY UNITED STATES CITIES REMAIN VULNERABLE DESPITE CIVIL DEFENSE PLANS

(By Hanson W. Baldwin)

Recent criticism of New York City's civil-defense preparations can be applied with equal validity to most of the United States.

The continuing concentration of United States populations, the vulnerability of our industry to atomic attack and the pitifully inadequate condition of our passive, or civil-defense organization represent the Achilles heel of the American security program.

Civil defense, since its inception, has been nobody's baby. Municipal, State, and Federal officials all have cooperative responsibility but no one really has authority. There are plans galore but most of them are not worth the paper they are written on. For the money, the equipment, the personnel, and the will to implement them does not exist.

A Military Operations Subcommittee of the House Government Operations Committee has been conducting inquiries about our civil-defense program. The group is headed by Representative CHET HOLIFIELD, Democrat, of California. Witnesses before this committee have been emphatic in stressing the deficiencies of our existing organization. They have repeatedly urged far stronger Federal leadership and authority, more funds, and more personnel.

BY CIVILIANS FOR CIVILIANS

The Nation's military leaders opposed suggestions that civil defense be made a part of the Department of Defense; it should remain what its name implies—passive defense by civilians for civilians, aided, of course, when possible by available military units.

All the military leaders testified that various disaster plans had been made by the military. Gen. Maxwell D. Taylor, Chief of Staff of the Army, said he had directed that 5 to 15 hours of additional instruction "in the Army's role in civil emergencies" be integrated into the Army's officer school system. The six Army commands in the United States have been instructed to start a course in martial law.

Various purchasing, storage and bomb-disposal functions for the Federal Civil Defense Admiinstration are carried out by the Army. The six Army commands and the regional heads of the Federal Civil Defense Administration collaborate in planning. Any military active or reserve units available could, of course, be used to bolster civilian defense in event of nuclear attack upon the United States.

But no units are permanently earmarked for such duty. Under present war plans all of them in fact have definite military mobilization assignments that have nothing to do with civilian defense.

State Guard units, on the other hand—intended in most States to replace the National Guard in time of emergency, when the Guard is federalized—exist only in cadre form or in blueprint.

Though some witnesses defended the principle of State responsibility in Civil Defense, virtually all agreed that Federal military aid would be needed in event of an atomic disaster. Yet no military units are permanently available, specifically earmarked or specifically trained for Civil Defense duties.

And in "Operation Alert"—a Civil Defense test evacuation of Government personnel in the Washington area—the President proclaimed as a part of the test a state of limited martial law for the Nation. The proclamation specifically pointed out that it was impossible for the Governors of the various States to meet the problem envisaged in the exercise.

This proclamation itself aroused considerable doubts and posed some difficult legal questions.

ANOMALY BROUGHT OUT

The committee then developed this anomaly:

The President had deemed it necessary to invoke martial law in a civilian defense test, thus putting the responsibility upon the Army. Yet neither the Army nor any of the other armed services desired—or where prepared for—this responsibility.

The immensity of the emergency posed by a simulated atomic disaster obviously persuaded the President that State or municipal organizations could not meet the problem. Yet the White House was not pressed for any basic change in the Federal Civil Defense Act, and the effectiveness of our Civil Defense still depends upon cooperative action between numerous Federal, State and municipal authorities. And many of these have different basic State laws and differing responsibilities.

It is this hodgepodge of organization and the obvious inadequacies of the whole program that caused Dr. Merle A. Tuve, chairman of the Advisory Committee on Civil Defense of the National Academy of Sciences and National Research Council to characterize Government Civil Defense activities as "erratic and inconsequential." Our present passive defense situation, he said, is "contradictory and irrational."

[From the New York Times of June 7, 1956]

OSTRICHES VERSUS THE A-BOMB—ANALYSIS OF HEAD-IN-THE-SAND ATTITUDE AND HOW IT HAMPERS UNITED STATES CIVIL DEFENSE

(by Hanson W. Baldwin)

The basic problem in civil defense appears to be a "head-in-the-sand" attitude coupled with a fatalistic philosophy.

"It can't happen here—and even if it does, there's nothing we can do about it."

This appears to sum up the public feeling about civilian defense preparations. This is not a universal attitude; there are thousands of public-spirited citizens who have served voluntarily in civil-defense organizations. But it does appear to be a majority viewpoint. Its essential negativism is encouraged by our completely ineffective passive defense preparations.

Willard Bascom, Technical Director of the Advisory Committee on Civil Defense of the National Academy of Sciences and National Research Council, made some telling points in recent testimony. He spoke before a House subcommittee on military operations.

"Much of the difficulty," Mr. Bascom said, "is traceable to the erroneous concept that civil defense is a State and local problem. It is not. An attack on any part of the country is an attack on the United States as a whole and as such should be defended by the whole United States; the Federal Government is clearly responsible.

"The public can scarcely be expected to have confidence in the present leadership when they turn to Washington and see that Congress does not provide for its own protection or participate in test exercises; they see that the executive branch gives only lip-service to its own talks of dispersal and continues to build its buildings and let contracts in critical target areas; they see that the capital city itself has no real civil-defense program (and budgets civil defense at one-sixth the cost of its zoo)."

CITIES CALLED VULNERABLE

Mr. Bascom was sweeping in his criticism. There is no adequate warning system, he said. Nothing is being done to reduce the vulnerability of our cities. There is "no shelter program worthy of the name." We do not have "any radiological defense plan."

Evacuation plans and procedures, measures for emergency radio broadcasting, the preparation of nonattacked areas to support devastated regions, and educational policies dealing with passive defense are all grossly inadequate, Mr. Bascom declared.

His criticisms, reinforced by many other experts who have made thorough studies of our civil-defense preparations, must be read against the background of some excellent and comprehensive industrial vulnerability studies made by the Rev. Neil P. Hurley, S. J., of Fordham University.

In an article entitled "How Vulnerable Are We?" in the December 1955, issue of Petroleum Refiner, Father Hurley finds that "four H-bombs could wipe out almost half of all United States petroleum processing plants within a few seconds. * * *"

"The hardware required for new plants and petroleum processing facilities depends largely upon steel, 74 percent of whose total annual ingot production is centralized in 10 areas of 25-mile radius. These same areas also account for 82 percent of total iron production and 77 percent of total American coke production."

Somewhat similar statistics could be adduced for other key industries.

NO DISPERSAL FOUND

Father Hurley has found that since the Nation became aware of the atomic menace Federal procedures for new plant construction—rapid tax write-off incentives, and so on—have led to the illusion of dispersal, but not to actual dispersal.

On the contrary our industry, in the chemical and petroleum refining field, at least, has become more concentrated and more vulnerable, as have our cities.

"Decentralization of industry and population for economic and sociological reasons is a spontaneous, haphazard affair," Father Hurley says. "If not directed, targets in new regions can multiply." He cites Houston, with its huge chemical and petroleum refinery concentration, as an example.

The remedial measures required to reduce our urban and industrial vulnerability and to provide an adequate Civil Defense organization imply some hard and unpleasant things.

As Father Hurley notes, they require political courage and economic sacrifice. They imply a willingness to accept the fundamental responsibility by the Federal Government; willingness of Congress to appropriate the necessary funds; willingness of the National Guard and of some regular units to train for and to be earmarked for Civil Defense duties alone.

Urban planning to reduce population densities, industrial planning to reduce vulnerability, construction of shelters and setting up evacuation procedures and the other parts of passive defense can command public support. But to do this they must be properly organized and energetically and courageously led.

The first requirement is high-level leadership. It must be willing to point the way to the hard, unpleasant and unpopular necessities essential to any hope of survival in the atomic age.

Poems Relating to Senator Morse

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, June 20, 1956

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a series of poems referring to a Member of this body, the distinguished Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE]. The poems are presented by one of his constituents, Mr. John B. Smith, of Eugene, Oreg.

There being no objection, the poems were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SENATOR MORSE

This is about our Senator MORSE,
The man who Republicans cannot endorse.
They'll tell this when they begin
This man committed the unpardonable sin.
Why he did this, these rhymes will tell,
And why the Republicans wish he was in Hell.
Once he was great, honest and wise,
But now he's a traitor and only tells lies.
Of his life he's made a horrible mess,
If you doubt that, read our one-party press.
It will tell all about his dastardly capers
When you see his name in the Republican papers.

For many long years he was a teacher of law,
And was the finest man you ever saw.
And that is what the Republicans said
Till he brought their wrath down on his head.
He became their candidate, the finest they had,
Then left their party and now he is all bad.
They search his past all he's done and said
For political mud to pour on his head.
And now we hear them rant and rave
While trying to dig his political grave.
A treacherous traitor, a political rat,
All because he became a Democrat.
They told him he must wear their political coat
And crammed their platform down his throat
It contained much he thought was wrong
But he must not think, just sing their song,
If you refuse, we will show our power,
Your political prestige won't last an hour.
We supported you in your political races
And put you in important places.
Now just defy us, if you dare
And we will shear your political hair.
All these things our WAYNE was told
Before he was kicked out in the political cold.

There is no doubt this grieved him sore,
He could not represent his State any more,
His valuable service to the world was lost
He must do something regardless of cost.
When back in Washington he arrived
Of his place on committees he was deprived.
Our WAYNE endured this a year or two
And then he decided what he must do.
The Republicans repudiated him, they did just that
So he was forced to become a democrat.
The Democrats had seen his work,
They saw his duty he did not shirk
What our WAYNE believed was right
He had the Courage to stand and fight
So Democrat political plans were laid
To welcome this man who was not afraid.
Now his character they would assassinate
Because he is a Democrat candidate.
A better man we cannot find
So let us all make up our minds.
Let's send him back with God's consent
Or else we may, of this repent.

There are few such men, honest, brave and true
With the ability to do what he can do.
He's a busy man, he gets no rest,
He's hard at work and doing his best.
Prejudice, slander, and false pretense
He must combat in self-defense.
Let's give him our support, be honest and fair,
Let's put him in the Senate and keep him there.
One more thing, please remember
This excellent man is presidential timber.
Now I suggest, with God's consent,
Later, let's make this man our President.

IKE'S PROGRAM

Of the Eisenhower program, we hear of so much,
It is this and that and such and such.
On it, many try to commentate
But none are able to elaborate.
It is a difficult subject, that is for sure
So don't expect much here, it is too obscure.
It's an abstract subject we learn at the start,
Let's see what's in it, let's take it apart.
Of campaign promises that's been forgot
To do many things that he did not.
To see what's in it there is no hope
Unless we use a microscope.

We are told to fight to the last ditch,
You know it's good if you are rich.
Observe the big companies the money they've made
And to keep this program, their plans are laid.
And they may succeed; I'll tell you why
They have every advantage money can buy.
Keep this program, do what you will
Don't mind expenses, just send us the bill.
We donate freely, we are a generous lot,
Get out and get busy, make this campaign hot.
Put Ike back in office to play golf on the green
And keep the Cadillac boys, if you know what I mean.
Those Cadillac boys, the ones up high,
They do all the work and see that Ike gets by.
They carry out his program just as they please
All over the world and keep Ike at his ease.
And if by chance his ball goes in the rough
He has NIXON at hand who is really tough.
And this we know gives Ike much joy,
Such a nice, obedient, tough chore boy.
He'll be loyal to Ike 'til the day he dies,
For he loves Ike on whose shoulder he cries.
We see this through our microscope
DICK NIXON is Ike's most fondest hope.

For this obscure program we give Ike our thanks,
It's an excellent thing for our great big bank,
High interest rates puts cash in their box,
Low taxes you pay if you own some stocks.
Just be a member of the board of trade,
They'll take care of you, you'll make the grade,
And if you are getting very high pay
We raise your wages as soon as we may.
And now we say to the far and near,
Now this program is no longer moot
When we judge the tree by its fruit.

Now that is the program here at home,
But in foreign countries where the diplomats roam
There is so much they do not tell
Makes one suspect they're worse than hell.
If things were good we'd get the facts,
Then our tense nerves we could relax,
But we know enough, I regret to say,
On the brink of war we seem to stay.
Of those terrible things we must not hear,
Just hush them up, this is election year.
Just silence of all our diplomats
And blame all wars on the Democrats.

OREGON SENATORIAL RACE

I have watched politicians, ever since my youth,
To me it is amusement, now that is the truth.
They are as fine a class of people, as any you meet
I watch them closely, but from a back seat.
Sometimes I help them, their problems to solve,
I'm an independent voter, I don't get involved
In making these statements I want you to find
I'll tell all parties I've no ax to grind,
I vote as I please, I've nothing to sell,
And if they don't like that they can go to Hell.
Now I hope I have made that all clear
For the senatorial race we go from here.
Now we go back to the recent past,
There is a lot to see if we don't go too fast.
Mr. Hitchcock, I think, is a very fine man
I can say that for him, I'm glad I can,
He made a clean campaign none can assail,
But Doug rode in on Ike's coattail.
Now Ike didn't like what MORSE had done,
He sent Doug home for the Republicans to run.
He wanted all other candidates out of the race
And you place Dougie in the very top place.
It's a free country, I know that is true,
But I'm telling Oregonians just what they must do.
WAYNE MORSE was excellent when he was Ike's friend,
But he didn't vote for him, that made him a fiend,
Now take Dougie, see that you make him win
So he (Ike) can get revenge for MORSE's sin,
Put all of your money in the pot for McKay
All other candidates are just in the way.
Do all that you can, be sure he doesn't fail
And get all other candidates off Ike's coattail.
He didn't send him home till almost too late
But his popularity you must all demonstrate.
Now we all know this is against the rule
But we also know McKay is his tool.

We Republicans know Ike what's best
To win this fall he must carry the West,
No off-shore oil to carry the south
Now about that oil, just shut your mouth.
There is nothing about it, you dare must say
That was the first of his give away.
The next on the list was the TVA,
Dixon Yates blew up, he couldn't give that away.
Now over that deal he lost some sleep
But the TVA he had to keep
When this raw deal didn't go his way,
He hired our man, the great Doug McKay.
We know this man was very bold,
Till he got mixed up in the Serena gold,
In this giveaway, we must remember
The gold was in the stand of timber,
And the game reserve where the birds and beast walk
He let the oil people have it, he knew the birds couldn't talk.
On the State of Oregon, he had his grip
Give away our big dams with his partnership.
What else he would give, no one can tell
If the Senators from Oregon hadn't raised all hell.
Now he is here on the tail of Ike's coat,
We must send him to the Senate or get Ike's goat.

Ike loves the name of Doug McKay,
It rhymes so well with giveaway.
Now behind McKay you must take your stand,
He'll lead you to the promised land,
To the land of the free where the billionaires prowl
Where in bankrupt courts the little man howls

Where our production makes the farmer groan
Where he starves to death or gets a Government loan,
Where with installment debts the workers strive
Where unemployment checks keep them alive
Where the rich billionaire after taxes are paid
Finds fat dividends at his feet are laid,
To elect WAYNE MORSE would be a sad frustration
To the Cadillac boys in this administration.

The Challenge of a New Age Looks for Leadership, for Deeds, not Words

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES ROOSEVELT
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 20, 1956

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, during the recent primary campaign in California, former Governor Stevenson, of Illinois, made an address as Press and Union League Club luncheon in San Francisco on Tuesday, May 29, which I believe deserves careful reading by all those interested in our national welfare. I am therefore inserting it in the RECORD, omitting only those parts which dealt with the local political situation. I trust that my colleagues will find the time to read it:

It seems to me that in State after State the single most important fact of this campaign is the proof, demonstrated in one outpouring of Democratic votes after another, that there is a Democratic tide running in the country this year.

The general election next fall is an election that will demand the people's decision on some of the greatest questions free people ever faced.

We do not yet know who the Democratic candidate will be—and modesty forbids even a guess.

But we do know who the Republican candidate will be. And we also know the platform he will campaign on—the President himself has told us.

He told us in a speech he made to Republican leaders on April 17 that was billed by the Republican press agents as the opening shot in General Eisenhower's campaign for reelection. The President said, "I shall work in the coming campaign to have the American people more clearly know the principles of the Republican program."

And what is this program, these principles, he has enunciated? Let us examine it with the serious consideration it deserves.

The President made 8 points:

First, he said he is unequivocally in favor of the supreme importance of the individual. And I agree with him.

Second, he proclaimed the importance of spiritual values. I take it we are agreed on that.

Third, he is unequivocally in favor of prosperity, peace, plenty, and happiness. Anybody here against that?

Fourth, he said government must concern itself with human misfortune—though, of course, he cast the usual Republican anchor to windward by saying we must be careful not to impair the initiative or incentive of the unfortunate.

Fifth, he announced that one and all should cooperate for the common good. Anybody here against that?

Sixth, seventh, and eighth, he came out boldly in favor of Abraham Lincoln, declared that America must be prepared to defend herself, and he said we must promote freedom and justice and peace.

Now that is the program that the President put forth as his contribution to the national debate of 1956. That was what the President said—and that was all he said.

And I say to you that however lofty his sentiments, however good his intentions, this is not the kind of leadership we require as we venture upon the perilous stage of history in the last half of the 20th century—particularly when there are lurking in the wings the Vice President he esteems so highly and the Old Guard stage managers of the Republican Party.

The President, in his speech, did not say a word about how we can meet the rising tensions that have followed in the train of the Supreme Court decision on desegregation.

He did not say a word about what he proposes to do to help the farmer, or the small-business man, or the old people who are trying to get by today on yesterday's pensions.

And, on another front, the Middle East smolders in uneasy truce, and North Africa is aflame, and Russia is gaining ground in the cold war every day and outstripping us in getting ready for a hot one, and reins of the free world hang loosely in our hands—but of all this, not a word.

We members of the Democratic Party are not satisfied with this sort of program—and I don't think the rest of the people are, either. I think the people want to hear the real issues of this campaign discussed this year of 1956, and I'm willing to start right now. I'll even put these issues in a package, as the Madison Avenue hucksters like to say—an 8-point package.

These issues are our national situation today.

Despite campaign promises and 3 years of drumbeating by the Republican managers, the blunt truth is that today—

First, most farmers' firm price supports have been vetoed, their markets wrecked, their credit tightened, their savings drained, and their income chopped to pieces.

Second, the farm depression is spreading to the factory centers, the cheery optimism of the Secretary of Commerce notwithstanding, and right now workingmen by the thousands are being laid off in the farm-equipment and automobile factories—today 220,000 men are walking the streets, out of work, in Michigan alone. Moreover, thousands of small-business men, ignored by a big-business administration, are being forced to the wall.

Third, nothing has been done to meet the national emergency in our schools.

Fourth, older people are trying to pay today's prices with yesterday's pensions, while the administration comes out flatly against every new proposal to improve social security.

Fifth, from Dixon-Yates to Hells Canyon, this single-interest administration has given away or tried to give away the people's resources to private interests.

Sixth, the most dangerous crisis in 100 years, the crisis over civil rights, has stretched tension near the breaking point and the President is silent.

Seventh, progress on low-cost housing has been halted, medical research programs are languishing for lack of funds, mental hospitals are jammed to the doors, and the Nation has no national health policy.

Eighth, our prestige abroad has been brought to an all-time low by attacks on individual liberty at home, by boasts to our friends and bluffs to our enemies, and by a leaderless drift in the conduct of foreign affairs.

Whenever this administration has been confronted with a hard problem it has appointed a committee to smother the problem. And the prospect for the future is even worse. For we are now asked to remake the role of the Presidency itself to meet the present unfortunate circumstances. And already we are beginning to see the consequences.

The President is kept in ignorance of our lag in guided missile development.

The President smiles at Israel while the Russians move into the Middle East and arm her enemies.

The President evidently is not informed of the confusion of self-interest in the Dixon-Yates deal and at sundry high levels of his administration.

The President gives a clean bill of health to RICHARD NIXON'S California crony—yet the Republican managers discreetly drop him from the team.

The Secretary of State announces, in a magazine article if you please, that he has led us three times to the brink of war, with the President's approval, but the President says he has not read the article.

The President and his Secretary of State issue reassuring bulletins while Soviet leaders woo Asia.

The President is not informed of controversy in the armed services until it erupts in a violent quarrel.

The President withholds the immense prestige of his office from those who seek to resolve the crisis in civil rights, and in the latest so-called security case the President says he is not familiar with it because, as he puts it, "They bring before me what has been going on, usually not in terms of names but in terms of numbers."

A member of the Subversive Activities Control Board, a Republican incidentally, and an appointee of the present administration, had called public attention and the attention of the President himself to serious injustices in the Government's present personnel-security program. He has forthrightly condemned the political distortion by the administration of the actual facts regarding the hiring and dismissal of Government personnel during the past 3½ years. He has called for Presidential action—in the interest, if you will, of the very honesty in Government and decent regard for human values which the President has repeatedly extolled.

I suggest that these charges—which obviously have no conceivable partisan motivation—raise a very serious question, not only of the sincerity of the President's protestations but the very integrity of this administration. And if as is now predicted in the newspapers, its response will be only to get rid of Board Member Cain, then the true sense of this administration's values will become unpleasantly clear.

I suggest to you that it is the duty of the President of the United States to think of people as people, not as numbers. And protestations that he believes in theory in the supreme importance of the individual are of no help to the man accused.

Those, then, are some of the issues that we propose to put before the people next fall. There will be more to follow.

We believe in high principles; yes. But we believe in programs too.

Here is a Democratic program—in fact, here are 8 or 10 programs.

First, while we hope the soil bank will work, we will make certain that the farmer gets a fair share of the national income; and we will extend, not restrict, genuine soil conservation, easier farm credit, cheap power and cheap water, and the other things the family farmer needs to preserve his way of life, and we'll have a Secretary of Agriculture who cares about the farmer and agriculture as something more than an essential industry. We'll press on toward more imaginative use of our surplus stocks of food. I refuse to count the abundance of food as a curse in a world which is half-hungry, yes, when even in this Nation there is want and hunger. By reshaping of our relief, our old age, our school-lunch, and our foreign-aid

programs, we could, I believe, put to good use much of the so-called surplus we now have on hand.

Second, we'll act at the first ominous sign of depression. And likewise we won't be timid about putting the brakes on too rapid expansion, which is the inevitable prelude to trouble, and an old Republican weakness, as we are seeing again just now. And we'll be grateful for the jobs created by the Democratic highway bill now going through Congress. We'll have an administration that represents not only big business but all of our people. What's more we'll get rid of the antiunion provisions of the labor-relations law, and we'll restore to the NLRB its proper role as an impartial umpire in labor disputes.

Third, we'll enact legislation to help small-business men with their tax and credit and Government contract problems, and we'll sincerely attempt to moderate the tidal drift toward monopoly that has gathered such momentum under this administration.

Fourth, we'll increase social-security retirement benefits, lower the retirement age of women to 62, start paying benefits to disabled workers at 50, and provide better housing and cheaper medical care for older people.

Fifth, when the time comes to readjust the tax laws, the philosophy will not be that prosperity comes from the height of the top of the economic pyramid but from the breadth of the base. Yes, and the new revenue act won't be a field day for the special exception cases, either.

Sixth, we'll restore the Democratic policy of developing our natural resources—our rivers and forests, lakes and land—to their utmost for the benefit of all the people, not for the profit of a favored few.

Seventh, we'll push on toward better education, which is certainly one of our greatest emergencies. How we raise our children will shape the future of our society. We are talking here first about crowded classrooms and too few teachers—yes, and a stable school system that can help provide the anchor children need. There is no magic cure for juvenile delinquency, which is increasingly becoming a problem of the suburbs as well as the city slums. We need many things to combat it—decent housing, full employment, an expanded national Children's Bureau, an emergency program to give teenagers who need a chance to get off the crowded streets of our cities and to perform useful work and breathe fresh air in our national parks and forests. And certainly we need better schools.

Eighth, we will not ignore the crisis in civil rights. The Supreme Court has bespoken the Nation's conscience. To ease the transition from the past to the new, social adjustment is certainly a first order of business for the Nation and its leadership.

Ninth, we will defend, and not just talk about defending, the basic freedoms of every citizen to think what he pleases and say what the thinks.

Tenth, we will try with the urgency of crisis to restore the bright image of America that once was respected and trusted around the world, and to regain the moral leadership of the free world, and we will never give up the struggle to win through to genuine disarmament and secure lasting peace.

We cannot do these things by drift, complacency, advertising, no, nor by mottoes, slogans and the moral sentiments. We must have national leadership and the apex of leadership in the American system is the office of the President. Only the President can provide the firm direction, the bold vision, and the moral strength that made this country great.

The American Presidency is the greatest temporal office on our planet. Its capacity for good or evil, for influence on human affairs, is almost without limitation. When the President leads, billions follow. When the President falters, the world trembles. When the President speaks, the world pays heed. When he is silent or when he is absent, chaos threatens.

I would remind you of what the Presidency has meant in times past, when Democrats were Presidents, yes, and when Republicans were Presidents.

Thomas Jefferson made the Louisiana Purchase that converted a handful of States to an empire bounded only by the blue Pacific.

James Monroe gave us in his Doctrine the vision of a hemisphere for freedom.

Andrew Jackson fought the people's fight against strangulation by the bankers.

Abraham Lincoln set free the slaves and saved the Union.

Theodore Roosevelt rescued our natural resources from greedy men.

Woodrow Wilson curbed the excesses of industrialism and gave us the new freedom and the first glimpse of international order.

Franklin Roosevelt broke the back of the depression and led a social revolution at home from which all have profited, and led the free world to victory over totalitarianism.

Harry Truman stopped communism in its tracks, and with the Truman Doctrine, the Marshall plan, point 4, and NATO, he created the image of an America that seeks not to rule the world but to help men everywhere.

All down the years, in war and peace, in time of trouble and time of need, it is to the White House that the people of our country and the people of the world have looked for leadership—for deeds, not words.

Today we on earth have reached a great divide in human history. We did not need the tests at Bikini last week to convince us that man now possesses the power to annihilate himself, his children, and his civiliation. And it is of the White House now that mankind asks: What shall we do with our power?

Today, too, our people at home need many things—schools, pensions, housing, highways, jobs, medical care—and it is of the White House that they ask: When will we get them? How will we get them?

And the people look ahead to the future, and they want to know what will the Government do to meet the challenge of the new age—an electronic age, an age of automatic machinery, a television age, an age of miracle drugs, an age of better living, an age of leisure, when prosperity is not to be measured merely by how much but by how good.

I suggest to you that it is only in the Presidency that the people will find their answers. And I submit to you that on the record the Democratic Party is the one best equipped to lead the Nation to the new plateau of the better, safer life only just beyond the horizon.

The Highway Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HALE BOGGS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 2, 1956

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I include herewith a series of articles from the Pittsburgh Sun-Telegraph written recently by Mr. John H. O'Brien, on the highway program embodied in the Fallon-Boggs bill.

This series is as comprehensive an analysis of the implications of the legislation now in conference as any as I have had the pleasure of reading. I commend it to all of the Members of both bodies:

[From the Pittsburgh Sun-Telegraph of May 31, 1956]

GREATEST PUBLIC PROJECT—ROAD PROGRAM TO AFFECT ALL

(By John H. O'Brien)

WASHINGTON, May 31.—When the Pharaohs built their great pyramids the economic impact was felt throughout the valley of the Nile.

When the 48 State highway departments start construction on the National System of Interstate Highways the economic impact will be felt across the continent.

When the Egyptian projects were completed the rulers had their pyramids, but when the road builders are through the American people will have 40,000 miles of superb highways, coast to coast, border to border.

No matter on what terms the highway program is described, it is the greatest public-works project ever undertaken by any nation in recorded history.

It involves more area, more people, more materials, and more money.

The construction of the Panama Canal, the pride of our grandparents, and the work on the St. Lawrence seaway could be fitted into the highway program with ease.

NOTHING IN HISTORY TO COMPARE

There is, actually, nothing in history with which it can be compared.

The great roads of the conquering Romans would be only a drop in the statistical bucket.

The combined Federal and State expenditures contemplated in the highway program will amount to something like $51,500 million over a 13-year construction period.

Only during World War II was the United States faced with any comparable expenditures. And war expenditures are economic waste.

The highway expenditures are capital investments in the economic welfare of the Nation.

The benefits will flow to all of us, even those of us who do not own or drive motor vehicles.

In fact, the weight of the evidence shows that a continuing lack of adequate highways will slow down the wheels of American commerce to the detriment of us all.

ROADS TO CONNECT 48 STATES

What is our highway system and why is its improvement so vital to us all?

The Federal program contemplates increased spending on all types of Federal-aid highways—secondary, or farm-to-market country roads; primary, or main State routes; urban, or main route connecting State roads through cities; and the Interstate System, or those routes through all 48 States that carry the great bulk of traffic.

Of the $51,500 million to be spent, some $29 billion will go for the last category, the Interstate System.

The Roman roads all led to Rome, but the Interstate System will connect all 48 States. It will connect all but 23 of the 232 cities that have populations of 50,000 or more.

The routes were selected by the 48 State highway departments in cooperation with the United States Bureau of Public Roads.

The Interstate System will be built to the highest standards that engineers now can devise.

Except in those sparsely populated areas where the very highest standards are not needed, the system will contain no crossings at grade.

NO STOP LIGHTS, STOP SIGNS

There will be no stop lights or stop signs.

Entrance and exit to the system will be planned in the interest of the motorist using the system.

Commercial establishments, with their frequent driveways, signs, and other traffic interferers will not be permitted.

The roads will be 2, 4, 6, or 8 lanes wide, depending upon the contemplated traffic for years to come.

The rights-of-way will be wide enough from the beginning to add lanes in future years when they may be needed.

The system will provide several cross-continental routes, but its greatest value to many motorists will be in and around our cities, where congestion has been slowly cutting down on the mobility of the automobile.

Main routes will no longer stop at the city limits, dumping traffic onto inadequate city streets.

The interstate system will be just that—a system of carrying heavy traffic almost anywhere it wants to travel in the United States.

[From the Pittsburgh Sun-Telegraph of June 1, 1956]

THE IMPACT OF NEW HIGHWAYS—ROAD PROGRAM TO SPUR STEEL

(By John H. O'Brien)

WASHINGTON, June 1.—The Federal highway program will require 5,200,000 tons of steel in a single year of construction.

It will require 112 million barrels of cement in its third year.

It will require 908,000 traffic signs in a single year.

It will require at least 5 million gallons of paint per year.

These are only a few of the statistics of the material requirements of the program.

In human needs, it is estimated that the labor force actually at work on the roads will rise from its present 220,000 to some 350,000 by 1958. By 1961 this figure will have grown to 500,000.

Thus within the next 4 years, 270,000 jobs will have been created.

These are all on the highway jobs.

ASPHALT INDUSTRY TO BOOM

There are no available statistics as to the number of added workers that will be needed in steel and cement plants, earth-moving machinery plants, quarries, and other material-supplying facilities, but the number can be assumed to be substantial.

What about other industries?

The roads now use about 50 million barrels of asphalt annually, five-eighths of the total production.

The asphalt industry can expand readily and it will have to, because the Federal program does not neglect county roads and 85 percent of our improved county roads use asphalt.

The aggregates industry—the suppliers of stone, sand, gravel, slag and other products—provided 357 million tons of material for highway construction in 1954.

HIGHWAY EQUIPMENT NEEDED

The industry believes it can increase production some 40 percent with existing plants but when construction reaches its peak it will need an additional 560 portable plants or their equivalent in large, stationary plants.

The manufacturers of highway construction equipment can see a rise in sales of from 150 percent to 200 percent when peak demand is reached.

One of the economic factors operating here is the length of the program.

A contractor who can depend upon 13 years of construction work is much more likely to invest his capital in new equipment and amortize it over the life of the program.

And the life of the program and its vast size also will entice more businessmen into the contracting field.

It is also expected to make the highway field more attractive to student engineers.

Contemplation of the job that will soon confront them has forced State highway departments into research.

They are busy today testing scientific tools such as electronic computers so that manhours can be saved at the drafting boards.

Thus while most of the economic impact of the highway program is in the future, actually it is with us now in the minds and efforts of many engineers and businessmen.

There are other industries that will benefit from highway construction.

Thus suppliers of timber piling will have to produce 2,823,000 more feet per year than they do now.

There will be few if any steep grades on the Interstate System and that means blasting away at rock formations that stand in the way of the road. So 18,345,000 additional pounds of explosives will be needed annually.

The same story can be told about everything that goes into road building.

Fortunately, the industries involved have a breathing spell in which to provide for the expanding needs since the early years of the program call for planning, scheduling, and securing rights-of-way.

So far the economic benefits described have all accrued to those businesses and industries directly concerned with highway construction, either as road contractors, or material suppliers, or manufacturers of machinery and equipment.

[From the Pittsburgh Sun-Telegraph of June 2, 1956]

THE IMPACT OF NEW HIGHWAYS—PROGRAM CUTS DRIVING COSTS

(By John H. O'Brien)

WASHINGTON, June 2.—A motorist who drives on the roads planned for the Federal highway program will save an average of $90 a year in car operating costs.

The experts estimate that an adequate road will save at least 1 cent per mile in travel expense.

Thus a motorist who drives 9,000 miles per year will save $90.

This is not all clear profit, however, because the added taxes on gasoline and tires to pay for the roads will cost him about $7 per year.

His profit, then, will be $83 per year. But this leaves out other factors.

SAVINGS IN LIVES

For instance, construction of the Interstate System to modern standards is expected to save 3,500 lives per year and, of course, there will be thousands fewer injured and property damage will be substantially reduced.

When this occurs it is reasonable to expect auto insurance premium rates to fall.

If the annual premium is reduced by $7 the motorist will be saved the entire cost to him of the added Federal taxes needed to pay for the new roads.

The 1-cent per mile added cost of driving on inadequate roads cost motorists something like $5,300,000,000.

This figure does not include the cost to the whole Nation of high truck shipping rates due to congestion.

Nearly everything we produce travels on a truck at one time or another and even a slight savings per mile of truck operating costs will represent an enormous economic gain for all of us.

It is difficult to put a cost figure on the death or injury of an American man, woman, or child killed in traffic.

One figure that is used puts the average economic loss per fatality at $85,000.

TIME ANOTHER FACTOR

Thus if we were able to reduce our traffic deaths a mere 10 percent we would be avoiding an economic drain of $323 million.

We killed more than 38,000 Americans on our roads last year and unless the 1956 rate drops substantially in the remaining months of the year we will kill 42,000 this year.

Another factor difficult to evaluate in money is time.

What is your time worth when you are driving to and from work?

Is your free time worth as much as your per hour wage or salary rate?

Everyone can make his own evaluation.

If the new roads, particularly through metropolitan areas, will reduce your daily work driving time by one-half, what will it mean to you in money?

If it means anything, add that to the economic gains attributable to better roads.

NEW TAX COST REGAINED

And if you estimate it is worth a mere $7 per year already you have recouped the cost to you of the Federal highway program in new taxes.

Thus the roads you buy with your $7 will return you that sum many times over through lower operating costs, lower premium rates, and time saved.

And if you do not own a car and, therefore, do not pay any tax at all for better roads, you will make a clear gain in whatever reduction occurs in truck shipping rates.

A previous installment demonstrated the economic benefits that will accrue to roadbuilders and their suppliers.

Today's relates the benefits to average motorists.

[From the Pittsburgh Sun-Telegraph of June 8, 1956]

THE IMPACT OF NEW HIGHWAYS—BETTER ROADS PUSH LAND PRICES UP

(By John H. O'Brien)

WASHINGTON, June 2.—One of the amazing side effects of better roads is the way in which the value of land along them skyrockets.

In 4 years the price of an acre along the New York Thruway soared from $714 to an astounding $6,000.

The new road has turned that acre from raw, almost useless land into a desirable industrial site.

The whole New York Thruway story reads like an account of the California gold rush.

The area around Syracuse, because of accessibility to the new road, attracted new plants constructed by such industrial giants as General Motors, General Electric, Carrier Corp., Allied Chemical & Dye Corp., and Western Electric.

ACREAGE VALUE INCREASES 20 TIMES

Near the thruway traffic interchange there was a piece of property of 23 acres. No water, sewer, or gas facilities were available. It was valued at $100 an acre, before the thruway.

After the thruway, in 1955, a machinery company bought the tract for $46,000.

The value had risen from $100 an acre to $2,000.

Thruway authorities say the road so far has attracted to it $150 million worth of new or expanded industries having an annual payroll of more than $100 million.

On the Pacific coast, along the Northern Sacramento Freeway in California, land sold for $600 an acre in 1947.

Two years after the freeway opened for traffic the price was $1,100 an acre.

LAND SELLS FOR $10,000 PER ACRE

In 1950, the price was $7,100 an acre and a year later it reached $10,000 an acre.

And to drive the point home:

There were no similar land price increases in the Sacramento area not served by the new freeway.

Here is how the chairman of the New York State Thruway Authority sums it all up:

"The tremendous toll that outmoded highways exact in lives, property damage, human misery, and sheer economic waste alone compensates for the cost of constructing modern highways against many factors, but paramount among them is the economic growth and development that have become synonymous with new expressways and major highway construction programs.

"We have underemphasized these benefits, in spite of the fact that they far outweigh the cost of providing the highways themselves."

BETTER ROADS MEAN FASTER TRAVEL

These are the main factors of the economic impact of the Federal highway program.

There are scores of other examples.

Let's look at just one—what better roads will mean to the airlines.

Today ground trips from and to airports frequently take more time than the flight itself.

Flight time between Detroit and Cleveland is 44 minutes. Ground transportation time, to and from the two airports, is 80 minutes.

Flight time between San Francisco and Los Angeles is 140 minutes. Ground transportation time: 120 minutes.

Flight time: St. Louis to Chicago: 122 minutes. Ground transportation time: 90 minutes.

Proposed expressways in 59 cities will save an average of 35 percent of ground transportation time.

AIRLINES INTERESTED IN PROGRAM

So the airlines are interested in better roads and so is just about everybody else.

Better roads do not necessarily guarantee a prosperous America, but can we have the economic expansion upon which prosperity depends if we do not have an adequate highway system?

Here is what the governors' conference reported to President Eisenhower:

"An adequate highway system is vital to the continued expansion of the economy.

"The projected figures for gross national product (the value of all our goods and services) will not be realized if the highway plant continues to deteriorate."

This statement, disregarding all others previously given on the economic impact of the Federal highway program, would seem to be the clincher.

If we want to prosper we must have better roads.

And we are going to get them.

And soon.

Tip Goes, Ex-Coxswain, Still Barks Commands

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 19, 1956

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following feature article on Clifford (Tip) Goes, famous coxswain for Syracuse University and head of the United States Olympic Rowing Committee, written by Allison Danzig of the New York Times on Tuesday, June 12, 1956:

FORMER MEMBER OF SYRACUSE CREW IS A REFEREE—ALSO HELPS OLYMPIC ROWING COMMITTEE RAISE FUNDS

(By Allison Danzig)

Clifford (Tip) Goes was born upstate in the Cherry Valley country of the Leatherstocking Tales, not many miles from Cooperstown.

By rights, any boy raised in the vicinity of pellucid Glimmerglass Lake just had to be a baseball player. For was not that where in 1839 Abner Doubleday was supposed to have taken a stick and diagramed in the dirt the field for the game he had invented and given the name of baseball? And was not that game to become the national pastime, with its heroes enshrined in a Hall of Fame on that spot of hallowed soil?

But baseball wasn't for young Tip. Like most of the lads of Richfield Springs, Warren, and Cooperstown, he knew his way around with a bat and a ball and a mitt. But destiny had tapped him for fame in a sport that has nothing in common with baseball other than the qualities required to excel. And he was to betake himself some distance from Cooperstown, past West Winfield, Bridgewater, and Cazenovia, on to Syracuse, to achieve a fame that has become international.

A LAKE BRIDGES A GAP

Yes, there was something in common. There was Onondaga, the Glimmerglass of Syracuse. It wasn't pellucid, particularly when the wind was from the wrong direction. But across its broad bosom, fragile cedar craft known as shells might venture in safety and race in equality, and it was in these spidery varnished beauties that Tip Goes rode to fame.

One of the famous coxswains of his day as the man who barked the orders and steered the course for the championship Syracuse eight of 1913 and also for the 1914 varsity, Goes has become the most famous of all active rowing referees. He has become more than that. He is Mr. Rowing himself and head of the United States Olympic Rowing Committee, and honors have come to him at home and in foreign lands where he has officiated and helped in the development of the sport.

More than anyone else, Goes was responsible for the building of the James A. Ten Eyck Memorial Boat House at Syracuse. More than anyone else, he persuaded the board of stewards of the Intercollegiate Rowing Association that Onondaga was the best and fairest body of water on which to hold the Poughkeepsie regatta. And he is the donor of the Tip Goes trophy, competed for annually by Navy, Cornell, and Syracuse, and honoring three of rowing's most famous coaches, Charles (Pop) Courtney, of Cornell; Ten Eyck, of Syracuse; and Richard C. Glendon, of Navy.

DINNER GIVEN IN 1952

No wonder that Syracuse University, from which he was graduated cum laude and which he has served so faithfully as alumni trustee, has honored him repeatedly. He has been cited, too, by numerous other organizations, including the Boy Scouts of America, for distinguished service, and the Syracuse University Club of New York, which tendered him a testimonial dinner in 1952.

While carrying on his activity in rowing, which takes him to Europe annually, Goes has gained eminence in his professional career as a tax consultant in the utility field and a contractor and realtor who designs and erects residential and commercial structures. Honors have come to him in this field, too, including appointments from Governors Alfred E. Smith, Franklin D. Roosevelt, Herbert Lehman, and Thomas Dewey.

As chairman of the United States Olympic Rowing Committee, Goes has been occupied for many months in raising the $92,000 needed to send our oarsmen and scullers to Melbourne, Australia, for the games in November and December. At the same time he has been active in lining up eights, fours, pairs and scullers to compete in the Olympic trials and in setting the stage for this event. The trials will be held on Onondaga June 28, 29, and 30, following the IRA championships there next Sunday, and he will referee on both occasions.

STOP IN JAPAN IS PLANNED

He will go to Melbourne for the games and on his return trip he will stop in Japan. Except for the countries behind the Iron Curtain, there is hardly one in Europe he has not visited. He has officiated in the European championships, in the Pan-American games in Buenos Aires, and Mexico City and the Olympic games in Helsinki.

Next to his business, rowing has been Tip Goes' big interest since he got out of the Army, in which he served 19 months overseas during the First World War. He plays golf often and while in preparatory school he was devoted to football, which he coached at Rutgers Prep and which he still follows keenly.

But nothing gives him the pleasure of standing in his launch, with the wind and sun on his face, his megaphone to his lips and a dozen boatloads of rangy athletes waiting tense and expectant for his "Ready all, row" to send their delicate shells flying over the water. And his pleasure is doubled if the water is his own Onondaga, where he achieved fame some 40 years ago and to which he has brought the two biggest regattas of this Olympic year.

Address of State Senator Thomas J. Cuite, of Brooklyn, N. Y., Delivered on Occasion of 100th Anniversary of the Church of the Holy Family in Latrobe, Pa., on Sunday, June 10 1956 at Sportsman's Hall, St. Vincent's College

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. AUGUSTINE B. KELLEY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 20, 1956

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address:

Mr. Chairman, Your Excellency, very reverend and reverend clergy, distinguished guests, and friends, although I am a member of the senate of the State of New York, and notwithstanding the fact that I have spoken on many occasions as the national and, later, as the past national commander of the Catholic War Veterans of America, it is not without some misgivings that I appear before you.

Invariably, I have found that in an audience such as this, there are men more gifted in wisdom; more abundantly blessed with understanding and knowledge; more experienced and more qualified to discuss a topic or subject than the individual who is referred to nowadays as the "guest speaker." That is certainly true this evening.

Frankly, it would be preferable and certainly much more enjoyable, from my standpoint, if our positions were reversed and if you were to give me the benefit of your views, opinions and experiences instead of having to listen to any of mine.

It has been said, and is sometimes believed, that our laws express or reflect the wisdom of the Nation, or State, as well as the people to whom they apply. We know, however, that laws—all laws—are not better than the minds in which they are conceived. We realize also—and it is only too true—that the men who make our laws, whether it is at Washington or in the 48 State capitals, have their limitations. They are just ordinary human beings. They are neither all-wise nor all-knowing. Like all the rest of us, they are prone to error, and the occasions are not altogether rare when their efforts are rudely jolted or surprised.

So, tonight, my experience may be somewhat like that of the father who decided

the time had come to acquaint his adolescent son with the some of the facts of life. After some soul-searching and not without some hesitation, he summoned enough courage to invite his youngster into the living room. After carefully closing the door he cleared his throat and said:

"Son, your're getting on in years now. I'd like to have a good heart-to-heart talk with you."

"Sure, Pop," the boy answered instantly, "What do you want to know?"

Now, unlike this bright precocious youngster I am not sure it is possible for me to tell you much or even a little of what you would like to know. In our day and age there is, indeed, much we need to know, much we would like to know. But to many of the problems and questions confronting us there are, unfortunately, no simple, readymade answers.

For example, if our positions were reversed or if we could exchange questions and answers, I am sure there is much you good folks could tell me. For instance, as a resident of Brooklyn and a loyal Dodger rooter, one of my questions to you might be: "What has suddenly transformed your Pittsburgh Pirates into the remarkable team they have become?" Then, in turn, you would be equally justified in asking me: "What's happened to the Dodgers?"

If time permitted it would be most agreeable, of course, to discuss such a diverting topic as baseball.

Again, if time allowed, nothing would please me more than to describe for you some of the things that are occuring in my hometown, the Borough of Brooklyn and the city of New York, where vast transformations are taking place almost daily.

Just recently, as many of you know, there was completed the new colosseum, a building which will help to accommodate the 3 million visitors who come to New York for conventions and exhibitions each year. We are told, the total exhibition area of this building is equivalent to nine football fields, and that if all its facilities are fully utilized, including a 20-story office building that is part of this project, the colosseum will hold a population of 30,000 people.

Although this is a great institution it could not have been built, of course, without the products of your vitally important steel mills that are so essential to our national economy and security. In our magazines we read that 13,000 tons of fabricated steel and 4,000 tons of reinforcing steel bars were used in this structure.

In my own Borough of Brooklyn the Navy completed at a cost of about $200 million, and recently commissioned, the giant aircraft carrier *Saratoga*, the largest and mightiest warship ever built. The *Saratoga* is almost three football fields in length and from her keel to top of her foremast, is higher than Niagara Falls.

Although, as I have said, the *Saratoga* was built in Brooklyn, her construction would have been impossible, of course, without the steel and other necessary materials produced in our Nation's factories.

I merely cite the coliseum and the *Saratoga* to you as two examples of our dependence upon one another—a day-in and day-out process, which helps to unite us as a nation and people, and helps to form what is known today as our American way of life—our freedom, our culture, the rights we are guaranteed under the Constitution, our economy and all the additional blessings we enjoy under our form of government.

Like your own General Assembly here in the great Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, the Legislature of the State of New York is one of the oldest lawmaking bodies of the United States. It dates from 1777, the same year which saw General Washington's army encamped at Valley Forge, and just 1 year after the signing of the Declaration of Independence.

Although it is now a number of years since I began serving in the Senate of the State of New York, I am frank to say that the legislative process is one which never ceases to impress me I am impressed, for example, and also somewhat awed, at the number of bills introduced and the number which become law each year.

Since 1946—a period of 11 years—there has not been a single year when fewer than 5,000 bills were introduced. In that same year 1946 a total of 1,002 bills were enacted into law. Since 1950 the number of bills introduced has exceeded 6,000 in each session. And this year, although less than 1,000 new laws were added to our statute books, the number of bills introduced in the 2 houses of the legislature rose to a total of 7,455.

I am not being critical of this vast amount of legislation which comes before us each year. As a matter of fact, there are a number of bills which I deem it necessary to introduce.

But, the thought keeps recurring that if, perhaps, all of us would just pay a little more attention to the Ten Commandments, it would be unnecessary for the Congress and our State legislatures to keep adding tens of thousands of new laws to our statute books.

We recognize, of course, that in changing times and under changing conditions, new laws are necessary. We would be unwise, however, if we failed to recognize, also, that our system of lawmaking, like the system of government under which we live, has its weaknesses and imperfections.

But with all these weaknesses, we know and proudly maintain that our system of government, with its democratic processes, is the best which exists on earth today. It is a system of laws, and not of men, which stands in direct contrast—yes, in striking opposition—to the Communist dictatorship which now rules one fourth of the earth's surface and one-third of the world's population.

One of our national publications pointed out with timeliness and truth not long ago that while Soviet Russia never ceases to denounce what it calls "colonialism," the empire of Soviet Russia is the only one which never stops growing and becomes larger all the time.

You know as well as I do the sorrowful fate of the many formerly independent nations—Poland, Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, Czechoslovakia and many others—which have been swallowed up, together with their brave people, so that today they have been wholly incorporated into the Soviet Union or are allowed to exist as Soviet satellites.

The fact is that, while the United States and the other free nations of the world, since 1900, have given independence to 22 countries with nearly 700 million people in 9 million square miles, Soviet Russia's domination today extends to 13,400,000 square miles and 923 million people.

These statistics are so staggering they are hard to grasp and digest. Indeed, you may inquire why I choose to emphasize them, and why I ask you to keep them in mind.

The answer, my friends, is that I and many others like me are convinced the menace of communism—the very real and grave danger this worldwide conspiracy represents to us and to all we hold dear—has never been greater than it is today.

I say this to you not only as one of your humble fellow citizens; not only as a legislator, and not only as a former national commander of the Catholic War Veterans of America, I say it as one who, like some of you younger men here and the sons of some of you older men, wore the uniform and served in our Armed Forces during World War II.

During that war Soviet Russia pretended to be our ally. She begged and demanded lend-lease, and received it along with inestimable additional aid. But while we were supposedly united in a struggle against the common enemy, during all this time Soviet Russia continued and stepped up its system of espionage and sent here its spies in the guise of purchasing agents.

To this day the Russian people have not been told the full extent of American aid which Soviet Russia received during the war.

During that struggle, as you know, solemn international agreements were made—agreements to which the Soviet rulers committed themselves—and were never kept. In fact, it became clear all too soon that the rulers of this Communist conspiracy never had any intention of keeping their pledges and violated them at almost every opportunity under their policy of treachery and deceit. The entire record of Communist intrigue is so well documented it is unnecessary for me tonight to review it in any detail.

In 1953 Josef Stalin came to his end, so we are told, from the effects of a brain hemorrhage and within a few days his mummified corpse was borne with the highest honors to Lenin's tomb in Moscow's Red Square.

During all the years of his dictatorship, and as long as it served the purposes of communism, this human monster was fawned upon by those near him and was exalted and almost deified to the Russian masses. Indeed, as the New York Times stated only a few days ago, Stalin, under communism, was portrayed as a "scientific genius, an infallible politician, a learned theoretician, a profound writer, a triumphant general, and indeed a demigod."

After Stalin's death a struggle for power ensued. Comrade Khrushchev emerged as the new Communist boss of the Kremlin and all Russia, and for 2½ years it served his purpose, along with Comrade Bulganin, Comrade Mikoyan, and Comrade Kaganovich, to consolidate their power and to devise new Communist tactics.

It is necessary to remember that these men were Stalin's favorites, his partners, and accomplices during the shocking years of hideous Communist crimes.

But, for their purposes and for the purpose of communism it was deemed necessary to present a new front to the world, a new and radically different policy, to divert attention from the monstrous record of Communist conspiracy, brutality, and terror. It was decided that a scapegoat was needed. And, so, 2½ years later—in February of this year and during the 20th Party Congress in Moscow—there began what has become known today as the downgrading of Stalin by the men who were his former partners in crime. Of course, downgrading is not the word for it. In plain language, he was to be shown, at last, for what he was, a savage, half-mad beast, complete with tail and a pair of horns. These have now been given him.

It was stated and widely reported in the press that at this congress the party boss Khrushchev placed the guilt for the politcal murder of 7,000 innocent men at Stalin's door. But with typical Communist deviousness and crookedness, the finer details of Khrushchev's speech to the party congress were never broadcast by Moscow radio to the Russian people. Instead, it was leaked to Communist agents in a gigantic whispering campaign and is only now making its appearance in foreign chancelleries and embassies. Only a few days ago, a large part of this speech appeared in our newspapers.

Here, in its audacity, was an astounding effort by the men who were Stalin's willing tools in mass murders, the forced deportations, and the enslavement of millions of human beings, to persuade the world that it was one man, Stalin, who was responsible for the crimes of the past. Nowhere in all this welter of words has there been a single admission that here was one of the bitter fruits of communism, and that a condition such as this could spawn only under a totalitarian dictatorship like Soviet Russia's.

This was a calculated effort to wash their own blood-stained hands; to absolve and

clear themselves, and to draw about them the cloak of respectability. Above all, it was a fantastic invitation to the nations of the free world, including our own, to engage in a mass demonstration of self-hypnosis; to forget all about the past; to forget the Communist slaughter of priests and brothers in Spain; the ruthless extermination by starvation and other methods of millions of people in Russia and the satellite countries; the known persecution of Jews under the present Soviet regime; the shameful mistreatment of Cardinals Mindszenty, Stepinac, and Wyszynski, and all the other horrible crimes of communism against freedom, religion, and human dignity.

If it were not an insult to Houdini's memory one would be tempted to say that Houdini at his best was but a rank amateur in comparison to what the Kremlin bosses were attempting.

My friends, before and during World War II, we learned how Hitler and the Nazis developed the technique of the big lie. Yet Hitler's big lie appears puny in comparison with the monstrous deceit Moscow is now attempting to peddle to the world.

Also during the Second World War there came into use another term—boobytrap. It is a term which deserves to be revived and remembered today when the world is being showered with Moscow's propaganda of peaceful coexistence and the almost daily exhibitions of Soviet smiles, happy talk, and receptions in the Kremlin. There is not, of course, the slightest intention by Soviet Russia to remove its heel from the necks of the nations it has subjugated. It has no intention of granting even token freedom to a single satellite.

Let us bear this in mind: No matter how much the mask of communism is changed, the more its evil intent remains the same.

As another of our metropolitan papers stated, and I am quoting from the New York Herald Tribune: "The aim of the Soviet Empire, whether it be collective or individual dictatorship, is to conquer. There is not the slightest evidence of deviation from the goal of global communism. Only the method of attack changes, and the one central challenge to the free world now is the new Soviet economic and political offensive. * * * The cold war has by no means ended; the struggle has just become more complex."

It is the very complexity of this new attack which may cause weak and wavering people in the nations of the West to relax their vigilance, to become complacent, and to fall prey to Communist blandishment.

But we of the faith know that, above all, communism at the center is a godless tyranny, which defies God, denies the God-given rights of man, and suppresses the basic freedom of speech, the press, religion and assembly.

If the world today is beset with doubt and confusion over the new Soviet policy, let the world heed the voice which has come down to us through the ages. Sometimes it whispers, sometimes its tones are stronger, but its eternal truth never varies or changes.

"Beware of false prophets, who come to you in the clothing of sheep, but inwardly they are ravening wolves."

You recognize this voice—the voice of our Divine Master—speaking to us through the Gospel of St. Matthew. And again the voice tells us:

"Every good tree bringeth forth good fruit, and the evil tree bringeth forth evil fruit. A good tree cannot bring forth evil fruit, neither can an evil tree bring forth good fruit. Every tree that bringeth forth not good fruit shall be cut down and cast into the fire. Wherefore, by their fruits you shall know them."

My friends, it is necessary to know and understand, and it is just as necessary to use the knowledge we possess.

You may ask: What is it we can do?

My answer is that you—all of us—must fight communism at every turn. We must do this both as men of faith and citizens of our beloved country. We know that just as communism and all other totalitarian doctrines suppress and destroy the individual's sense of freedom, they also relieve men of all personal responsibility, except blind obedience to the state.

As citizens of a free nation, a sense of freedom is ours, and with it there is personal, individual responsibility and no blind obedience to the state. And all of us must do our share to protect and preserve that freedom and must exercise to the fullest our individual responsibilities as citizens. This we must do, not only as citizens, but as Catholic men, for we are commanded to do it through Catholic action, as well as community action.

Less than this we dare not do; at least this much we must do, for we owe it to ourselves, we owe it to our families, we owe it to our country, and we owe it to God.

Federal-Aid Highways

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAURENCE CURTIS
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 20, 1956

Mr. CURTIS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, in extension of my remarks I include an editorial from the Boston Herald of June 8, 1956, entitled "Highways or Handouts?" It gives strong support to the House plan for the distribution of Federal aid for the 40,000-mile Interstate System in preference to the Senate plan.

The editorial follows:

HIGHWAYS OR HANDOUTS?

The recordbreaking new $37.6 billion Federal highway program is now deadlocked between the two Houses of Congress and threatens not to come out. The issue, ironically, is not the size of the program or the taxes to finance it, but how the spending is to be distributed among the several States.

It would be tragic if this vital program were killed or postponed because the two branches could not agree on this point.

In the version approved by the House funds to build and improve the National Interstate Highway System (roughly $25 billion out of the $37.6 billion total) would be distributed according to need. That is, they would be spent where the Bureau of Public Roads said they needed to be spent in order to complete the system in the next 13 years.

In the Senate version the available funds would be distributed according to a formula set down in the Highway Act of 1954. Each State would receive an annual share based two-thirds on population, one-sixth on mileage of rural free delivery routes, and one-sixth on geographical area.

Each formula has something to be said for it. Under the first, one group of States would get more money; under the second, another group would benefit. But the issue is really not that complicated.

We have only to decide what purpose the bill is supposed to serve. If, as the sponsors say, it is supposed to complete an integrated national highway system, then surely the money should be spent where and as it is needed, which is to say, according to the House plan. If the bill is aimed simply at bailing out the States by passing around some more Federal funds, then the Senate formula makes more sense. That is what it comes down to.

Under the House plan Massachusetts would get about $365 million more than under the Senate one. We can't say that this doesn't influence us. Massachusetts has been going all-out on highway building the last few years and it needs all the help it can get to complete the job. But we are not just being selfish.

Logic is all on the side of the House approach. The 1954 formula was devised not to provide a specific road system but to divide up a specific and relatively small sum of money. It doesn't fit the 1956 situation at all. Under it some States would actually get more money than they want or need to finish their part of the highway network. Others, like Massachusetts, would get less.

The Bay State would, in effect, be asked to finance both its own Federal road program and unnecessary Federal programs elsewhere, a stupid as well as an unfair arrangement.

The House and Senate conferees should agree to the House distribution plan. But, if that proves politically impractical, they should compromise on Senator BUSH's plan, which would apply the Senate formula for 2 years, then switch to distribution according to need.

That is the least that can be asked.

Labor Racketeering

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PERKINS BASS
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 20, 1956

Mr. BASS of New Hampshire. Mr. Speaker, my colleague from New Jersey [Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN] has been endeavoring to secure a thorough investigation of labor racketeering. In this he has received my full support. Under leave to extend my remarks, I should like to include in the Appendix of the RECORD two editorials; one from the June 8 edition of the Daily Eagle, of Claremont, N. H., entitled "Should Unions Be Investigated?" and the other from the June 16 edition of the Washington Post and Times Herald entitled "Racketeers in Labor."

The editorials follows:

[From the Claremont (N. H.) Daily Eagle of June 8, 1956]

SHOULD UNIONS BE INVESTIGATED?

Many of the thousands of union members of the Twin State Valley are interested in the labor movement as a whole. They realize that important trends sooner or later affect all unions, even the locals in the cities and towns of New Hampshire and Vermont.

Thus many of these union members who have the wider view must have been curious as to whether Congress would accept Victor Riesel's challenge that it investigate racketeering in unions. Although there's not much chance that such an investigation would directly affect valley locals, there's a good chance it would touch at least some of the international unions with which the valley locals are linked.

Congress has ducked this challenge.

This is unfortunate, for such an investigation would be good for the union movement.

It might, it is true, give honest men who believe intensely in this movement some unpleasant moments because it would be likely to place great stress on rotten spots.

Some of these honest men might claim that such stress would give all unions a black eye.

We admit the possibility of such a temporary reaction, but the investigation would be worth the risk because something certainly should be done to spotlight and stop the trend to brutal dictatorship, as well as direct or indirect links with gangsters in such outfits as the International Longshoremen's Association, some New York garment industry locals, and, apparently, the teamsters.

A congressional investigation would not, of course, be a complete answer, but it could be the start of an answer. We remember that the Kefauver investigation was the first step in sending a number of crooks to jail, or at least spotlighting them out of power.

If similar steps are not taken soon on the labor scene, the crooks and dictators are likely to become so firmly entrenched they can seriously contend with decent labor leaders like Meany and Reuther for the leadership of the AFL–CIO.

But that struggle for supreme power is still in the future.

It's the present situation that bothers us. Some incidents of outrageous injustice have been reported in a handful of powerful unions. It seems to us that all decent union leaders and members would want the conditions that breed such incidents spotlighted and corrected by the most effective means at hand.

Facts presented almost daily by such columnists as Riesel and Pearson and such papers as the New York Times and the Herald Tribune indicate that thousands of union members are being treated badly and even brutally. If the labor movement is to maintain its ideals and sense of justice, action is imperative.

It's true that AFL–CIO President Meany has been honest and courageous in meeting this challenge. But his power to deal with the problem is severely limited. Certainly he can slap down Teamster President Beck when he tries to aid the disowned longshoremen's association, but Meany can't do much about the bad situations existing within either the longshoremen's outfit or the teamsters.

We think a congressional investigation would bring out the facts so clearly and dramatically that men like Meany and Reuther would get the backing of the memberships of the small number of badly run unions, backing which is absolutely necessary for effective cleanup action.

Our strong desire for such a cleanup is based on deep respect for the finer elements of the labor movement, the decent methods of the great majority of labor unions and the sincere high ideals of many labor leaders.

[From the Washington Post and Times Herald of June 16, 1956]

RACKETEERS IN LABOR

Organized labor as well as the general public ought to give support to Representative PETER FREYLINGHUYSEN'S proposal for an honest, dispassionate, searching congressional look at the problem of racketeering within labor unions. Mr. FREYLINGHUYSEN is no labor baiter; and the probe he has suggested is no more an attack on organized labor than an investigation of lobbying is an attack on public utilities. The sober, responsible and public-spirited men who are predominant in the AFL–CIO continue to be plagued by elements in the labor movement who are vestiges from a less stable past; some of them have underworld connections and some are not averse to strong-arm techniques. The distardly attack on Victor Riesel a few weeks ago was only the most sensational among a number of instances of goon tactics. A carefully limited, constructive study of the problem by men of Mr. FREYLINGHUYSEN'S stamp could help labor rid its ranks of these parasites.

Gold

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALT HORAN

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 20, 1956

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, under privilege granted me to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I am pleased to include a letter by Frank Lilly, a mining consultant and economist of Spokane, Wash., on the subject of the present gold situation.

I think the Members and all readers of the RECORD will find this letter of tremendous interest.

The article follows:

SPOKANE, WASH., *May 1, 1956.*

UNITED STATES GOLD COMMITTEE,
Washington, D. C.

GENTLEMEN: The reasoning of your chairman, in his recent letter, that "a free market for gold is not very far away because as the Treasury Department, in finally lifting all restrictions on the private ownership of gold coins, has gone all the way except the final step," is sound and I share his thought that now is the time to renew the effort to obtain "gold stabilization at an increase in price based on the average increase in price which has taken place in all other commodities."

I am, therefore, glad to comply with his request for copies of my recent studies covering pertinent facts relating to the price of gold, and for an expression of my "thinking as to the attitude and procedures that may best be adopted in our effort to get the early action toward the resumption of gold coinage."

Your chairman's proposal to present the committee's views on gold to both the Democratic and Republican National Committees is right to the point. In this connection, the Democratic Committee should be reminded that President Roosevelt emphasized that the action he took in nationalizing gold was only an emergency measure and that he planned later on to reestablish gold convertibility. The Republican Committee should, of course, be somewhat curtly reminded that the 1952 Republican platform contained a plank, introduced by Governor Herter, of Massachusetts, and unanimously approved, that pledged the party to provide "a dollar on a fully convertible gold basis." Incidentally, the sound, honest money that only gold convertibility can provide should not be a partisan matter.

Since our metal commodities are, more than any other group of commodities, the essential and determining factor in this country's industrial economy, I submit the following figures evaluating their present price status in terms of the equivalent price of gold:

	Price on metal commodities Jan. 31, 1934, when price of gold was set at $35 an ounce	Present price	Price gold would now be if it had increased proportionately
			Per ounce
Copper...per pound	$0.08	$0.46	$201.25
Lead.....do	.04	.16	140.00
Zinc.....do	.04¼	.13½	123.52
Pig iron.....per ton	19.50	58.50	105.00
Average			142.44

I did not include the rare and/or strategic metals in the foregoing table, for while a strategic metal, such as nickel, for example, is absolutely essential to our industry, only very small amounts of it can be obtained except in the black market, "at prices ranging from $2.50 to $3 a pound." (See CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, pp. A2866 et seq., Apr. 10, 1956.)

Note, however, that a price of $2.80 a pound for nickel, which is the price paid for 75 percent of the nickel purchased currently, compares with 35 cents a pound on January 31, 1934; and that if gold had advanced proportionately in price, it would now command $280 an ounce.

There are, of course, many comparisons illustrative of the fact that gold at $35 an ounce is greatly undervalued or, if not, that the prices of most commodities are greatly overvalued; and if the committee so desires, I will submit tabulations on other groups of commodities it may suggest.

Of even more significance than price comparisons of most commodity groups, however, is the fact that since January 31, 1934, the volume of both our national and private consumer debts has increased tenfold and our foreign short-term dollar liabilities, which are payable in gold on demand, over eightfold. Meanwhile, our volume of gold has increased only a little over 2½ times, and most of this is in hock to foreigners.

An analysis that I made early last year of figures on United States gold assets and liabilities disclosed the surprising fact that as of January 1, 1955, our gold liabilities—consisting of the amount required as a (1) legal monetary reserve of 25 percent against Federal Reserve notes and bank balances and (2) foreign short-term liabilities—exceeded our gold holdings by over $3 billion. In other words, by 1955 we found ourselves with a gold deficit of over $3 billion as against a gold surplus of nearly $5 billion in 1934.

Under the title, "Who Owns the Gold at Fort Knox?" U. S. News & World Report on February 23 last, made an analysis, covering the figures up to September 1, 1955, from which I quote, in part, as follows:

"United States position in gold is becoming vulnerable, in the event of war or financial crisis. Billions of possible claims on United States gold are piling up in foreign banks. The result could be trouble if anything happens to weaken foreign faith in the dollar.

"The United States, which is used to thinking of itself as having an abundance of gold, now finds that, in an emergency, it could be caught short. Foreigners actually could drain away more than half the gold in Government hands, including the huge hoard at Fort Knox, Ky.

"The United States now holds $21.8 billion worth of gold. The pile seems big enough to inspire confidence. On closer study, however, it appears that $13.8 billion of the gold is in hock. Foreign governments and firms have that much in business claims and United States dollars which they can exchange for gold at any time. These claims on United States gold are officially known as short-term liabilities of the United States.

"That leaves $8 billion of United States gold. However, the law requires $12 billion of gold backing for United States money, figured on the basis of $25 gold for every $100 of currency in the form of Federal Reserve notes and deposits in Federal Reserve banks. Thus, if foreigners were to claim all the gold they are entitled to, the United States would be short of meeting the legal requirement by $4 billion."

This short position in our gold holdings contrasts with a long or surplus position of $10,772,000,000 which we had achieved in 1941 when our foreign short-term liabilities payable on demand in gold totaled only $3,679,000,000 as compared with approximately $14 billion at the present time. In other words, the $10,772,000,000 surplus we had 15

years ago is gone and we are now in the hole over $4 billion.

This is truly a dangerous position, particularly in view of its similarity to the situation that developed during the 1926–29 boom period when foreigners were gold-cashing-in on their dollar balances; and which situation continued until by 1933 foreigners had converted a full 87 percent of their balances. The conversion, presently, of only 50 percent of current foreign-dollar balances would reduce our gold holdings by $7 billion, leaving the United States with only $1 billion of gold in our monetary reserve (which should legally total over $12 billion).

Of course, such a conversion may not take place, but it could, and the possibility should not be discounted. In this connection, I quote again from the U. S. News & World Report of February 23, which I hope is correct in its view that:

"Our Government is considering what steps to take if the drain on gold approaches a danger point, because officials recall that a flow of gold out of the United States in 1931–32 hampered efforts to overcome the depressoon."

However, the magaine goes on to say:

"So far, the official decision is to study the situation but do nothing that might arouse concern abroad. Meanwhile, the United States finds huge resources of gold and dollars piling up in foreign hands, while the United States gold reserve is weakened."

Because danger signals are seldom apparent, to those who look no farther than their noses, so to speak, it appears that "all's well" with this country's present economy and that there is accordingly no reason to be disturbed about our gold situation. This was also the attitude of most people in the 1926–29 boom period. Even after the "bust" in the latter part of 1929, the nothing-much-to-worry-about attitude continued; prosperity was just around the corner. The corner, however, kept receding, and we were never able to turn it until the gold-cure-price increase was finally applied to an almost dead economy.

The best way to judge the future, of course, is by the past, especially when confronted with almost identical situations. Accordingly, in view of past experience and the situation in which we presently find ourselves, it daily becomes more evident that application of the gold-cure-increase in the working value of gold which was given to our economy belatedly in 1934 (at the depth of a depression that could have been prevented by earlier action toward meeting the higher value given to gold in the British economy through its 1931 devaluation of the English paper pound) should again be made, and as quickly as possible.

Our Government, very soon, either by congressional action, or by action of the President under powers vested in him, should go all the way in assigning to gold a price that will give it parity with the working value at which it is used in the economies of the world's leading industrial nations.

In determining the value that should be assigned to gold at this time, there are, naturally, many factors to take into consideration. For example, we must consider not only the British gold price equivalent of $102.17 an ounce, on the basis of convertibility at legal monetary parity, but also, whether we like it or not, the Russian equivalent, which is $130 to $140 an ounce. The fact that our industrial metals, on the basis of present prices as compared with January 31, 1934, have now an average working value in our economy equivalent to $142.44 an ounce for gold becomes highly significant, and indicates that the British and even the Russian equivalents are not at all out of line with gold's true value.

But regardless of the value finally settled on for gold, as an immediate step the very least that should be done is to enact into law either the Case (Republican) or Engle (Democrat) bills, which would give United States citizens the right to an open gold market in which they might, as they wished, freely buy or sell the metal, a right now enjoyed by citizens of every leading nation in the world except Russia, China and the United States.

Sincerely yours,

FRANK LILLY, *Research Statistician.*

The Constitution and the Supreme Court

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK E. SMITH

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 14, 1956

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, the Honorable Forrest G. Cooper, of Indianola, Miss., recently delivered a scholarly and thought-provoking address before the Greenville, Miss., Rotary Club. Mr. Cooper's views on the dangers confronting our constitutional system as a result of abuses in judicial power are worthy of the attention of all Members of Congress. By unanimous consent, I include his address, as follows:

THE CONSTITUTION AND OUR SUPREME COURT

(Speech delivered by Forrest G. Cooper, of Indianola, Miss., before the Greenville, Miss., Rotary Club)

I am deeply honored at the invitation of the Greenville Rotary Club to speak on the Constitution. I know that the members of this club are a cross section of the business, industrial, educational and religious leadership of this progressive community of nearly 45,000 patriotic citizens. You and I of the South crave to be understood. We have no corner on patriotism, tolerance or unselfishness, but we believe that we are also a true cross section of a Nation of people having noble ideals, unselfish purposes and the welfare of the Nation at heart.

We are troubled today because so much of the Nation does not understand us. They are the victims of a program of brainwashing. Our friends in the North and West are being swamped with propaganda through television, radio, editorials, magazine articles, from the pulpit and platform that we of the South are bigoted in our disrespect for the United States Supreme Court and in fact are rebellious in our refusal to bow down slavishly to the whims of the nine appointed judges now on said Court. Some call us traitors.

I want today to rivet our attention on the Constitution quietly without passion. We must turn first to the formation of our Government. We must hastily review the adoption of our Constitution.

When the 13 sovereign States met in convention to write a constitution and to form a government, they followed no precedent. The world has always admired our unique Government, marvelous in its imagination, profound in its soundness. It was a government of dual sovereignty. Thirteen sovereign States established a sovereign United States. The States surrendered to the United States certain specific powers. These powers are all set out in the Constitution. Time will not permit giving a detailed list of these areas of sovereignty. To illustrate: The Federal Government was given exclusive sovereignty in the fields of national defense, coining of money, operating post offices, etc. The original Constitution spelled out the Federal powers. I have read the discussions in the constitutional convention and now state that no where in the discussions was there any suggestion that the Federal Government would be given any authority or control or responsibility in the field of public education. Read the Constitution from beginning to end and you wil find not one word therein intimating that the Federal Government has any duty or responsibility in connection with schools or education.

Delegates seemed to understand that all powers and sovereignty not specifically given to the Federal Government were retained by the States and the people. But the original Constitution did not say so.

Remember that the constitutional convention merely proposed to the States the form of government and wording of the Constitution. It was then sent back to the States for ratification.

It is interesting to note that when this marvelous and world famous instrument of writing was being considered by the States for ratification, that nearly all of these States brought up the question that the Constitution failed to reserve in so many words all powers not given to the Federal Government. Without such reservation, these States felt that unmentioned powers might be automatically considered as going to the Federal Government. Therefore, a majority of the States would not ratify the Constitution until they had the specific assurance that the Constitution would be amended to this effect. For instance, Massachusetts wanted it thoroughly understood that: "That it be explicitly declared that all powers not expressly delegated by the aforesaid Constitution are reserved to the several States to be by them exercised."

Rhode Island said: "The United States shall guarantee to each State its sovereignty, freedom and independence, and every power, jurisdiction and right, which is not by this Constitution expressly delegated to the United States."

New York said: "That the powers of government may be assumed by the people, whensoever it shall become necessary to their happiness; that every power, jurisdiction, and right, which is not by the said Constitution clearly delegated to the Congress of the United States, or the departments of the Government thereof, remains to the people of the several States, or to their respective State governments to whom they may have granted the same."

South Carolina sid: "This convention doth also declare that no section or paragraph of the said Constitution warrants a construction that the States do not retain every power not expressly relinquished by them and vested in the general Government of the Union."

New Hampshire said: "First that it be explicitly declared that all powers not expressly and particularly delegated by the aforesaid Constitution are reserved to the several States."

North Carolina said: "That each State in the Union shall, respectively, retain every power, jurisdiction, and right, which is not by this Constitution delegated to the Congress of the United States, or to the departments of the Federal Government."

And finally, Virginia said: "First, that each State in the Union shall respectively retain every power, jurisdiction, and right which is not by this Constitution delegated to the Congress of the United States or to the departments of the Federal Government."

Let me further remind you that in the discussion in these States on ratification not one voice was raised anywhere that the Federal Government would have any powers except those specifically mentioned in the Constitution. When a majority of the States therefore declined to ratify without this promise, this became on the prime reasons for the famous Bill of Rights, the first 10

amendments to the Constitution. In less than 9 months after the Constitution was ratified, the bill of rights was proposed. Let me quote you articles IX and X of the Bill of Rights:

Amendment IX: "The enumeration in the Constitution, of certain rights, shall not be construed to deny or disparage others retained by the people."

Amendment X: "The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people."

For 165 years down to 1954 no leader, party, court or faction, radical or conservative, had questioned this fundamental fact that the Constitution and the Bill of Rights did not give to the Federal Government any powers not specifically mentioned therein. This Nation grew great, won the respect of the world during those years. Its form of government became the ideal for most of the nations of the world. During most of those years no one in authority questioned the fact that the sovereign States had exclusive jurisdiction, responsibility and power in the field of public schools and public education. The Federal Constitution does not mention the subject. Now look at the 48 States' constitution! You will find that everyone of them, including the Thirteen Original States, specifically mentions public education. For instance seven sections of the Mississippi constitution regulates public education.

Our leaders, including George Washington, Thomas Jefferson, Abraham Lincoln and even Franklin D. Roosevelt recognized these facts.

Now let's look at the Supreme Court and its history. Its duties and authority are clearly defined. At the same time, for 164 years, when many of the greatest jurists in the world's history were members, they recognized that public education was the providence of the States. Let's mention a few: John Marshall, Joseph Story, Samuel P. Chase, Roger Tanney, Melvin Fuller, Edward Douglass White, Charles Evans Hughes, William H. Taft and Oliver Wendell Holmes.

Then suddenly, on May 17, 1954, the present nine members of the court ignored the Constitution, its history, its formation, ignored the wisdom of all the judges who had served on the bench before, began not only to try to take away from the States their recognized sovereign rights, but to concentrate in the Central Government powers and authority not permitted by the Constitution.

My friends, the tendency of the Supreme Court to change the Constitution, to read into it what is not there, to arrogate to itself powers that are not given in the Constitution is a dangerous tendency. It must be curbed. The Supreme Court will continue to take the place of Congress in legislation, will take the place of the Executive in executing the laws and will have the Central Government take the place of the States in the domestic affairs of its people. We want the people of the North and West to realize that the public school issue is merely an outward sore which indicates a malignant disease within.

Now some profess to believe that the 14th amendment gives to the Federal Government the right to control education. Let us see if the Members of Congress had this in mind when the 14th amendment was drafted and argued. The proceedings of Congress will disclose that not one argument was made that the 14th amendment should be adopted in order that the Federal Government could usurp the responsibilities of the States in the field of education. Not only that, but Congress at that very session enacted laws recognizing segregation in the District of Columbia. At that time segregation was universal in the Washington schools.

But the propagandists say the times have changed and the Supreme Court has a right to interpret the Constitution in view of changing conditions. However, it is a fraud for the Supreme Court to change a constitution, just because they believe times have changed.

The leftwingers are trying to brainwash the American people into believing the false idea that no one has a right to question the pronouncement of the Supreme Court. Neither the Supreme Court nor Congress, nor the President can change thte Constitution. All three of them together can't do it. It takes two-thirds of the House and three-fourths of the sovereign States. If changed conditions warrant a changed Constitution, there is a legal way to do it. The States would never have ratified the Constitution if the reservation in the Bill of Rights had not been made. No one can point in the Constitution to any clause which empowers the Supreme Court to say that segregation is unconstitutional. When the Constitution was adopted, segregation was universally practiced. When the 14th amendment was adopted segregation was generally practiced.

The Supreme Court is not a law-making body; the Supreme Court has no right to amend the Constitution. The Constitution is not "what the Judges say it is." The Constitution does not change with a change of Judges on the bench. For 86 years, the Supreme Court said that education was for the States and not the Federal Government.

As an attorney, I have sworn to uphold the Constitution. But so have the members of the Supreme Court. All of us owe loyalty to that document. But I owe no loyalty to any pronouncement of the Supreme Court which tries to read into the document something that is not there. The Constitution does not mean one thing yesterday, another thing today and something different tomorrow. It is not a fluid instrument. It is not something to be bent, torn, rubbed out, and rewritten to suit the whims of nine men. If such is the case, we have no Constitution. It is merely what nine men think it is and changes everytime the Court changes. It is patriotic to interpose State sovereignty, when any one President, Congress, or the Supreme Court deal unlawfully with the Constitution. George Washington in his farewell address said:

"It is important likewise, that the habits of thinking in a free country should inspire caution in those entrusted with its administration, to confine themselves within their respective constitutional spheres, avoiding in the exercise of the powers of one department to encroach upon another. The spirit of encroachment tends to consolidate the powers of all the departments in one, and thus to create, whatever the form of government, a real despotism."

I have great faith in the intelligence and wisdom of the American people once they know the truth. We must get the truth to them. Let us remind our friends in the North and West that the usurpation of authority by the Supreme Court of the United States is dangerous to them also. The end is not in sight. They have recently begun to decide cases without giving the litigants a chance to be heard. The only precedent for this is communism. They are rapidly destroying State statutes recognized for decades as valid on the theory that the Federal Government is the only one to control the citizens. Just recently they, under the leadership of Chief Justice Warren, held that Federal and State employees could not be dismissed even though their loyalty to our form of Government had proved them dangerous. They have recently denied that the States had any right to curb its own citizens who were seeking to destroy our form of Government. Step by step, they are destroying our States, curbing the rights of our citizens to govern themselves, and concentrating power in Washington in people not selected by the people. The Supreme Court is seeking to legislate and take the place of Congress. They are even seeking to assume power to enforce the decrees in systems which invade the executive department.

The shoe pinches our foot now, but tomorrow the shoe will pinch the other fellow's foot. The Supreme Court has gone wild in its lust for power. The States may tomorrow be denied the right of taxation in certain fields, the right to elect its own officials, the right to control its election, the right to enforce its own criminal laws, the right to rely on its own laws for the protection of its citizens, the freedom to run their own business, the privilege of employing competent help. The States are being reduced to puppets. The people are being denied the right to govern themselves. We want our own people to know the truth and we want them to give the truth to our friends everywhere.

Samuel A. Horvitz

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. D. BAUMHART, JR.
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 20, 1956

Mr. BAUMHART. Mr. Speaker, on Friday morning, June 15, Mr. Samuel A. Horvitz died in Cleveland at the age of 67. During his life's span Mr. Horvitz rose to prominence in the fields of newspaper publishing, road construction, and real estate development. I am sure that many of my colleagues are familiar with Mr. Horvitz' dynamic and farflung business enterprises and are also saddened to learn of his passing.

When Mr. Horvitz was only 8, his father, an immigrant Lithuanian baker, went blind. Mr. Horvitz went to work to help his family, revealing at an early age the personal drive that was to characterize his later life.

This ambitious drive was recalled in an account of his death appearing in the Elyria Chronicle-Telegram, which, like Mr. Horvitz' Lorain Journal, is published in my district. The Chronicle-Telegram said that Mr. Horvitz "earned a reputation as a fighter and an incisive thinker capable of recalling people and details and facts encountered only briefly years earlier. Many-sided in his business interests, Mr. Horvitz gave to each of them impetus of his own driving determination to make the most of each."

In extending sympathy to Mr. Horvitz' fine and devoted family and to his business associates, I would like to include in today's CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial which was published in the Lorain Journal on June 16. This editorial reflects the sentiments of those who knew and worked with Mr. Horvitz most closely. It is a fitting and touching tribute to his memory:

[From the Lorain (Ohio) Journal of June 6, 1956]

S. A. HORVITZ, JUNE 16, 1889–JUNE 15, 1956

S. A. Horvitz possessed in generous abundance the qualities required of a newspaper publisher who measures up to his task.

Relatively few men and women in other walks of life realize either the challenge or the responsibilities involved in telling a community, day after day, what has happened

to itself and its world. Few know how much courage is required to publish a good newspaper.

Ever since the invention of moveable type resulted in journalism as we know it, this business of laying the facts on the line has been among the most significant of human endeavors. Comparatively few men have any talent for it at all, and still fewer have the perception and the fortitude to do the job as it should be done.

To meet such a challenge, S. A. Horvitz was endowed with rare attributes, and in large measure the endowment was of his own making.

Moral courage was, in truth, another name for Sam Horvitz.

It will be to the eternal credit of the Lorain Journal that the man who made it the newspaper that it is today was, throughout his career, one of the finest exemplars of the American tradition.

A poor boy forced to go to work at the age of 8 because of his father's blindness—the son of hard-working immigrant parents—he demonstrated again in his generation that America is truly the land of opportunity that has been so proudly proclaimed since the beginning of our history.

A pioneer himself in many of his endeavors, he was among those Americans who—whether in business, industry, or one of the crafts or professions—have kept alive the genius of pioneering, the process of blazing new frontiers.

On the economic side, the thing that Sam Horvitz proved basically was that whenever he set his hand to the plow the furrow was bound to be a productive one. If he built a road—and he built many of the finest the world has ever seen—it had to be the best road that could be built under the circumstances, for nothing less would meet the standards he set for himself.

When he turned to newspaper publication, he was equally insistent that the job be done well. It was ever his objective to make the Lorain Journal, in proportion to its size and readership, the best paper that could be found anywhere. To him, no edition was ever good enough so long as there was a demonstrable way of improving it.

Sam Horvitz had ideals that went far beyond the immediate job. Translated into everyday economics, those ideals were of the very essence of our free-enterprise system.

In public affairs, as in business, he was always a leader with the courage of his convictions. He was never a man to compromise with wrongdoing, never one to condone waste or sham, in politics or elsewhere. As a publisher, he was always a resolute defender of the people's interests as he saw them, and no matter how formidable his opposition, fear had no part in his makeup.

Once Sam Horvitz had decided upon a course that he believed to be right, nothing could swerve him from it. Moreover, his qualities of leadership enabled him to impart his courage to others. Always his counsel was, "If you know you're right, go ahead."

With all his ruggedness of character, Sam Horvitz was a kindly man. Again and again he quietly extended a helping hand to aid someone in need, or to further a good career, or a good cause.

Devoted to his home, he was a family man in the highest sense of the words. He reared his sons with wise counsel to carry on his enterprises and perpetuate his philosophy of achievement.

And with his tremendous record of accomplishment, he remained a modest man who shunned the spotlight of personal publicity.

When death came to S. A. Horvitz, it came with dramatic suddenness, and he faced it as he had faced life—fearlessly. As he would have wished, his career was an active one to the very end.

His accomplishments live on, and so does the inspiration of his example.

Radio-Free Europe and the Present United States Psychological Warfare

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT H. BOSCH
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 20, 1956

Mr. BOSCH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include an article by George Brada, Munich, Germany, entitled "Radio-Free Europe and the Present United States Psychological Warfare."

I commend this article to the attention of my colleagues:

RADIO-FREE EUROPE AND THE PRESENT UNITED STATES PSYCHOLOGICAL WARFARE

(By George Brada)

If we study the texts of the programs being broadcasted by American radio stations to the East, we reveal a unique picture how the so-called psychological warfare of America is being used instead of against communism against America and the cause of freedom itself.

The periodical Facts Forum News, Dallas, Tex., carried in its issues of January, February, March, and May 1956 a series of articles picturing the American psychological warfare and I shall try to give a very short condensation of these. Following are the policy lines of the private institution of Radio-Free Europe (a division of the Free Europe Committee Inc., financed by the Crusade of Freedom, by means of the "truth dollars"); however, the very same policy lines are also being carried out by the Voice of America and other United States information media.

When giving a short outline of the main policy lines of Radio-Free Europe's programs, of which quotations and samples of texts have been offered in the Facts Forum News (many identical ones of those can be given in addition), I believe that the best designation for this condensation of main lines of the United States psychological warfare would be a Handbook of Treason.

THE HANDBOOK OF TREASON

The RFE-personnel

In this outline is no place for discussing the RFE personnel. Only a few remarks are to be made. On the American side, there are many names of the Free Europe Committee, mostly New Dealers. The leading figure is the president of the Free Europe Committee, Mr. Whitney H. Shepardson, who holds speeches and makes representations. But RFE employees report that the most important man, however, is the vice president, the allegedly Russian-born Bernard Yarrow.

These Americans have hired for leading positions only former top men of the Communist-led national front regimes in the Eastern European countries (the regimes after 1945). In RFE's Czechoslovak desk, e. g., the Communist collaborators, Ferdinand Peroutka, Jaroslav Stransky, Jan Stransky, Julius Firt, Martin Kvetko, Ivo Duchacek, Ivan Herben, Vaclav Majer, Petr Zenkl, Juraj Slavik, Josef Lettrich, Milos Vanek, Frantisek, Listopad, etc., etc., are leading editors or festival speakers. They were ministers, journalists, deputies, politicians, etc., of the national front; they were Socialists, who carried out or supported the socialization of property, industries, and trade, the suppression of all non-Socialists and non-Communists. The few Christian representatives employed with Radio Free Europe are merely permitted to write religious programs. But they are not permitted to interfere with the Socialist spirit of the political and economic programs. Only the members of the former People's Party are admitted to subordinate positions, who have also cooperated willingly with the Communists and today are also cooperating willingly with the Socialists of RFE.

All those Czech and Slovak political parties and their politicians, who were not in the National Front regime or who once participated, but soon started to speak against this regime in the free world, are fully banned from RFE.

Thus RFE uses only nonrepenting national fronters in all important positions. It uses for its psychological warfare men, who, once by their unintelligence and pro-Communist attitude, helped the Communists in the East and who are today doing the same in the West.

The fact is that the psychological warfare of Radio Free Europe is led by men whom the Communists in the East had themselves chosen for that very purpose. RFE obviously chose the nonrepenting national fronters, because they have one thing in common: they do not understand the international Communist conspiracy and they are pliable tools of communism in the West as they once had been in the East.

But above all let me stress that it is because of their present activities in Radio Free Europe that these men are traitors to the free nations and the peoples in the East.

In the East it was the Communists, who had set the main policy lines, and the national fronters obediently carried them out. In the West, it is the RFE American staff who is setting up the main lines, and again the national fronters obediently carry them out.

The RFE Programs

As can be documented by the texts of its programs, Radio Free Europe observes the following policy lines:

I. Propagation of socialism and leftism and maintenance that no return to full economic freedom is possible

1. Radio Free Europe propagates socialism. As excuse the RFE bosses maintain that the eastern nations are socialistic therefore must be addressed with socialist terms.

2. In this line RFE maintains that no capitalism may be inforced on the Eastern nations and thus American economic successes, measures, and acts are being constantly interpreted by maintaining that in reality the American economy has approached socialism and is or will be socialistic.

3. RFE propagates the Czechoslovak national fronters and Communist collaborators. This, in part, is caused by the fact that former nonrepenting Eastern Communist collaborators and Socialists only are in the positions of editors, but obviously the entire line set up by the RFE American bosses is to uphold national front regimes in programs.

4. Radio Free Europe propagates appeasement toward communism and Communists. RFE has programs for members of the Communist Party and extolls "honest Communists," or Rosa Luxemburg, Karl Liebknecht, etc.

5. Radio Free Europe propagates Titoism. As an excuse for such a propagation, RFE and the American psychological warfare experts maintain that they can lure the satellite countries from Moscow and transform them into new Titoistic countries.

6. Radio Free Europe constantly states (also through the Czech editor in chief, Ferdinand Peroutka, who openly professes to be a Socialist) that, also due to the Communist movement, the world has made great progress, that we are standing on the threshold of a new era and that no return is possible to full economic freedom.

Thus, RFE is only addressing Communists, Socialists, and leftists, who rejoice; it is

leaving in full apathy all non-Socialists and anti-Communists in the East—just as the Communists want it.

II. Radio Free Europe Fights Communism in an Unintelligent and Superficial Way

Radio Free Europe is contantly telling harsh words against communism. By these words they maintain to fight communism. What does this fight look like?

1. They are telling the truth. Most of the broadcasting time has been allotted by Radio Free Europe to never ending reiteration of banalities. We might identify this curious practice as RFE's (as well as of the entire American "psychological warfare") special little game of telling the truth. It goes somewhat like this:

The Communists call the Americans imperialists. Americans are not imperialists. The Communists claim that they want peace; Communists do not want peace.

This endless repetition of these trivialities can only spread boredom and turns away listeners.

In a certain way, Radio Free Europe prides itself of being specific in the stale little game of telling the truth. Thus, they declare, e. g., that there is lack of sugar in Bulgaria, or deficiencies in supply in Hungary, etc. They like very much to quote numbers and statistics. This sort of news is, of course, no news behind the Iron Curtain, yet RFE is spending about 80 percent of time to picture to the people in the East the misery they enjoy at home.

For this method RFE has the support of many naive politicians in the West, who have considered telling the truth the best weapon against communism.

2. Radio Free Europe is preaching the people's opposition.

Until May 1, 1954, this sort of aimless and uncoordinated truth-telling seemed to be RFE's principal task. Then, suddenly, they invented a program against communism—the program of the people's opposition.

This program is a Socialist-Titoist program, calling for honest money for honest work, for the electing of labor functionaries by trade union members, for giving the benefits of production to the people and not to the Soviet Union, etc.

There is nothing in this program which could hurt the Communist system or/and which would call for real economic freedom and which would be against Communist socialism. This program, indeed, could have been devised by the Communists themselves, in order to improve their economy.

It is no anti-Communist program. There is, in the best case, nothing but the indecisive and dull suggestion to reform the present Communist system, to abolish its excesses, to turn it into some form of Titoism or national communism.

3. Radio Free Europe is deriding the Communists, playing theater, calling names, and making reproaches.

There are many plays in RFE and many posed scenes. It seems that RFE failed (or is forbidden) to fight communism on the level of intellect and reason, and therefore fights it by using theater against it. Very numerous comical sketches, fun-times, and jokes are presented every day. You will find many jokes too, among the printed material RFE is issuing for consumption in the West. Indeed, with its ideological emptiness and confusion, the whole Radio Free Europe has become one single shouting cabaret. Furthermore the employees of RFE make complaints and reproaches to their comrades in the East, who have betrayed them and socialism. Indeed, RFE does not fight communism. It is complaining against it.

RFE simply fights communism from the standpoint of unintelligent men and from the Socialist standpoint, which, practically, has the same aim as communism and also hates all capitalists, which differs from communism only by several methods and is blind toward the true system of the entire secret international Red conspiracy.

These three points—telling the truth, the people's opposition, and the cabarets and reproaches—are constituting the entire fight against communism by RFE. Everything else is full sabotage.

III. The Sabotage Committed by Radio Free Europe

Everything else of RFE programs constitutes more than mere stupidity or socialism. The other lines must be called full sabotage. They consist of the following:

1. Radio Free Europe (and the entire United States psychological warfare) gives a false interpretation of communism by representing it solely as a primitive Russian imperialism, a danger from the visible Communist Parties and the Red army, a danger only from without, and by fully suppressing all information regarding the secret international world Communist conspiracy: The danger from within, infiltration of government, universities, press, etc., the facts about the Harry Dexter White case, the real cause for the loss of China, the true reason for Communist successes of the past (including those in Czechoslovakia). RFE (and the entire United States psychological warfare) fully misinterprets the true methods, aims, and accomplishments of world communism. They simply give the Communist interpretation of communism.

2. Radio Free Europe fully protects the real bosses in the East. Radio Free Europe (and the entire United States psychological warfare) stupidly and superficially attacks small pig keepers and tractor drivers or known Communists, and fully protects the Communist system of secret informers, of officers of the secret police, who buy cooperators in using the weak and bad sides of men and nations. RFE conceals completely the truth about the nets of secret informers controlling each other and about the entire "invisible government" behind every facet of life (secret police, journalism, economy, diplomacy) in the East. RFE never mentions the mere existence of this real character of the Communist system in the East.

Radio Free Europe thus blinds the vision of the people in the East, exposing them to lethal danger, and in this manner betrays them.

3. Radio Free Europe spreads actual full lies about the Communist system in the East; it maintains that a certain international group which has formed communism in both the East and the West, since its very beginning, is being persecuted by the Communists in the East and therefore must be anti-Communist. This greatest and most perverted lie of world communism is the "No. 1 lie," which the "truth-telling" Radio Free Europe is spreading and concerns the core of the Communist system. It causes the full and complete perversion of the anti-Communist fight led today by the so-called free world, and the people in the East shiver with disgust and despair when hearing it.

Obviously those fine American politicians, who, from time to time, are coming forth full of well-sounding proposals for the revitalizing of the United States psychological warfare, should take care first of all that the very concrete cases of sabotage in this warfare be removed—above all this sabotage No. 1.

4. Radio Free Europe fully protects also the Communist system in the West. It never, I repeat never, broadcasts to the East the names of American Communists, spies, traitors, fifth-amendment Communists, who have already been rendered harmless. It fully hides before the East the true and real face of the communism in the West (in the same way as it also hides, before the West, the real face of the communism in the East).

5. RFE suppresses every mentioning of congressional investigations on communism. Absolutely never, RFE reports about the work of the legal committees of the United States Senate and the House of Representatives. The people in the East are fully unaware of the vital revelations these committees have made and they are also unaware of the existence of men like JENNER, EASTLAND, WELKER, VELDE, WALTER, JACKSON, DIES, REECE, and others. In this way the people in the East are deprived of any hope, when, by means of RFE's Iron Curtain, they are forbidden to learn any single word about those who really fight communism in the West.

6. Radio Free Europe, as a part of its false interpretation of communism, upholds past mistakes and Western assistance to communism. Thus the Yalta Agreement is being defended by RFE (in the same way as the Czechoslovak National Fronters, the Kosice program of this national front, etc.).

7. Radio Free Europe also informs falsely the East about what is really going on in America. Up to the present, RFE has fully concealed to the East which developments toward a more active anticommunism have taken place in America since the Truman era. The whole 1952 presidential campaign, the aims of Senator Taft, etc., were fully suppressed by and with the empty phrases and slogans of Radio Free Europe.

8. Radio Free Europe preaches bad military and political strategy against communism. This includes the use of great armies and of strategic and atomic weapons on European soil (so different to everything the late Senator Taft proposed)—a thing which is feared by all European nations, including those enslaved in the East.

9. Radio Free Europe discloses the secret ways of escapes of individual refugees. As sensations, Radio Free Europe has often broadcast in detail the roads of escape of those individuals, indicating in some cases even the identity of those who have helped the refugees during their flight. Thus the Communists in the East were able to shut tightly the remaining holes in the Iron Curtain, and potential helpers for future refugees were clearly advised not to do so, since otherwise they would be denounced, too.

10. Radio Free Europe broadcasts lies on individual events. This is quite explainable by the great number of direct Communist agents, who have worked for Radio Free Europe—now back in Prague—e. g., Vladimir Kucera, Marie Dvorakova, Jiri Kalas, Bohumil Lausman, etc. These agents would never be tolerated in an anti-Communist circle—but in Radio Free Europe, among the pro-Communists, they found a friendly and familiar working place.

11. Radio Free Europe wrongly handles the German problem. They do not disperse the fear of the eastern nations before an alleged German will for vengeance. They have fully suppressed every word about the goodwill and anti-Communist attitude of the German expellees. Thus, they try to keep the East afraid of the German expellees in agreement with the wishes of the eastern Communists. In the same way they uphold the expulsion of the Germans just as the Communists in the East are doing.

12. Radio Free Europe gives false economic and similar advices to the peoples in the East, e. g., the advice concerning a coming inflation in Czechoslovakia in 1952, etc.—advices which clearly play into the hands of the economic bosses in the East.

13. Radio Free Europe contributes to the liquidation of the resistance movement in the East by not warning the people of premature upheavals—on the contrary, encouraging such actions. So, in 1953, the American Radio RIAS contributed to the upheaval in Eastern Germany, broadcasting about it in such a way that the Germans believed the West will come and help. Radio Free Europe, in its programs to the satellite countries, followed the same line.

IV. Fight Against Sound Anti-Communist Forces

1. Radio Free Europe fights nationalism and is against the right for self-determination for all anti-Communist nations, e. g., the Slovaks. Radio Free Europe propagates internationalism, merger of races, world fed-

eralism, supernational superstates, the United States of Europe, and the United Nations.

While sound nationalism, together with Christianity, has been found to be the most effective enemy of communism, Radio Free Europe (and the entire United States psychological warfare) preach internationalism—like the Communists themselves.

2. Radio Free Europe broadcasts decadent literature, art and jazz. RFE's plays and books are full of suicides, show split personalities, etc. All sound literature and national music—both of the free world and the enslaved nations—are practically banned from the daily programs of RFE.

V. Use of Leftist Material

The archives of RFE contain all Communist and Socialist literature, all Communist, Socialist and international press and papers. Banned are the Chicago Tribune, the Hearst Press, the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the records of the congressional committees, etc.

Every day, selected articles from leftist or international press, (such as the London Times, the New York Times, the New York Herald Tribune, the Manchester Guardian, the French Press etc.) are being read and the voices of this press are also very often quoted in other programs.

VI. Radio Free Europe Has No Program for Liberation

While pouring daily, for many hours, its propaganda upon the listeners in the East, RFE—and the entire United States psychological warfare—except for weak consolations, has no program telling in which way the liberation might come.

VII. Praise for Certain Men, Slander Against American Patriots

In line with their leftist and poor spirit, RFE's bosses and editors have slandered in their programs American patriots, such as General MacArthur, Senator Robert A. Taft, Robert McCormick and other American conservatives and anti-Communists.

2. On the other hand, they have praised and extolled such as Adlai Stevenson, Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt, Senator Herbert H. Lehman and other, New Dealers and leftist Americans.

3. A curious, but explainable policy, has been followed regarding Senator MCCARTHY. During the many years of RFE's existence, he has never, never been mentioned. Even when the newspapers were full of his activities in 1953 and 1954, he simply did not exist for RFE. In his case, RFE set up a rigid Iron Curtain.

The reasons seem to be obvious: they do not want to praise MCCARTHY, of course; and they cannot slander the Senator to the enslaved East as somebody overdoing anti-Communist investigations, since the East would immediately see in the Senator its great hero. The people in the East would say: This is the man we need.

If the people in the East would know about MCCARTHY, they would lose their apathy. This would be the end of communism in the East. Therefore RFE—on direct orders from above—has carried no policy line more carefully than that which says: "Beware of mentioning MCCARTHY."

VIII. The General Impression Made by RFE (Besides Treason)

1. Radio Free Europe leads only a psychological warfare. To lead a psychological warfare is, on principle, a Communist device. The West should, in my opinion, rather speak on the level of the high moral principle of what is wrong and what is right. Instead, RFE and the entire United States information and broadcasting agencies are developing a sly psychological warfare (in which the Communists are to be stronger, because it is their own weapon and which always turns itself against the free world) developing "gray" and "black" propaganda, humbug and theater.

2. RFE develops sterile journalism; besides quotations from articles of leftist press and very few quotations from speeches of leftist politicians or politicians soft on communism, RFE avoids carefully any verbatim quotations of American anti-Communist statesmen, commenting the latter only in the anonymous "third person." It mostly describes only picturing circumstances—cars, houses, or similar details—and it generally enforces its propaganda on the listeners in the East by slogans. By this device RFE has reached an admirable degree of artificiality, unsincerity, and emptiness.

3. Much of the RFE propaganda has the character of advertising stunts.

4. RFE develops the entire above-mentioned propaganda, helping communism, and yet speaks strong words against it. RFE speaks against communism and yet praises those who are making business and holding conferences with the Reds, calling them anti-Communists. This gives RFE (and the entire United States psychological warfare) an expressed character of schizophreny.

5. Radio Free Europe gives the impression of anonymity. Those few of the Socialist editors broadcasting under their own names are known as weaklings and pro-Communists in the East. Most editors of RFE, however, are writing by using pseudonyms. The impression of anonymity is heightened by the feeling that the impact of RFE's leftist propaganda must have originated from some anonymous collective gang behind the scene.

6. The other impression, in my opinion, is twofold. First: the group of the bosses give the impression of slyness, cunningness, special jargon, cynicism, restless impulse ever seeking change, gabbling around things never touching the core. Second: the group of the Socialist employees seem to be lyric, passive, empty, sophistical, naive, unintelligent, superficial, and talkative as well as soft on communism. They show bleeding hearts and the appearance of weaklings.

The entire impression is confusion, a constant defensive which only answers Communist moves; quarrels, polemics, immorality making compromises for alleged experiences.

They are sometimes arrogant, cynical, inexpressedly vulgar, and always spiritually inferior.

CONCLUSION

For the American truth dollars, Radio Free Europe spreads the above-mentioned propaganda and supports leftist and pro-Communist elements from the East, suppressing all real anti-Communists.

The kind of RFE propaganda is, let me stress it, the same stuff being spread by the Voice of America, Radio Liberation (for the peoples of Russia), the RIAS (for the Soviet Zone of Germany), and other United States information agencies. For those who believe that the—generally acknowledged—ineffectiveness of the United States psychological warfare could be improved by some superficial changes and empty phrases, it must be said that the fault is located much deeper, at the very core: the entire present United States psychological warfare serves the interests and aims of international communism.

Obviously, real anti-Communist broadcasts to the East should, practically in every point, have to do the real opposite of what is being done today.

The perversion of the crusade

However, returning to the private Radio Free Europe, there is still a greater, basic perversion concerning the entire activities of the Free Europe Committee and the Crusade for Freedom. It consists in giving the impression to the American people that there is something being done for the liberation of the enslaved peoples.

The truth is, however, that nothing is being done in this respect. The American people hear and see the great circus of the Crusade for Freedom, donate their dollars and RFE pours its propaganda to the East.

Even if this propaganda would be anti-Communist, the basic fact remains that the people in the East do not need to be told, day and night, that they are bad off, that the Communists are mean, or to be taught what freedom means. They know it better than those speaking empty phrases in the West. They thirst for it every day, every hour, every minute, every second—they thirst for the freedom and not for instructions what freedom means.

Any real anti-Communist society would do something quite different: It would use the collected funds for support of American patriots fighting communism, for the support of the policy of liberation, for the policy which seeks the abolishment of communism without war, for the support of the great men in the Senate and House committees. It would use its full power to support the McCarthys, Kerstens, Jenners, Knowlands, Walters, Veldes, Reeces, Thurmonds, Brickers and Burdicks (whom the RFE bosses dislike so much). It would use its full strength for the eradication of the international conspiracy in the United States of America and for establishing the policy of liberation as the basic American foreign policy.

And to the East this anti-Communist society would simply report how far the policy of liberation has moved forward, what strides American patriots have made, what successes have been achieved in the fight against communism and for the liberation. It would simply bring true reporting instead of artificial propaganda.

When we realize that real anti-Communist private activities in the United States of America should have to be like this, we can understand how perverted are the activities of the Free Europe Committee (and the "truth-telling" humbug of the entire present "psychological warfare"), how treacherous are its bosses and how naive are Mr. Shepardson and others, who are fronting for Radio Free Europe.

Then we can easily understand how the unintelligent and Socialist former National Fronters from the East (who once obeyed to Eastern Communists, now obeying RFE bosses) are once again working for the aims of communism, while speaking harsh words against it.

Coal Facts by the National Coal Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 20, 1956

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

COAL FACTS BY THE NATIONAL COAL ASSOCIATION

America's newspapers are publicizing our need for engineers and scientists. This is an especially timely service now with thousands of boys and girls graduating from high schools and colleges, and facing the choice of a career. One of the most promising fields for a bright future in engineering is fuel technology, especially in coal mining and coal combustion. America's appetite for energy over the next 20 years will create a demand for many engineers at good pay in the coal industry.

Thirty colleges in 24 States offer mining engineering courses. The coal industry has

established more than 100 scholarships, with a total annual value of approximately $50,000, in nine States, available to coal mining engineer candidates. In addition, there are available various awards, loan funds and scholarships from non-coal industry groups.

A fine future in the coal mining industry is waiting for candidates. High school, as well as college graduates can find a place in the coal industry at high wages comparable to any other industry, and higher than most. The increasing mechanization of the coal industry makes it one of the most interesting fields at this time.

Coal is America's primary fuel. A ton of coal is required to make a ton of steel—and steel capacity is expanding. About one pound of coal is consumed in generating a kilowatt hour of electric energy—and weekly consumption of kilowatt hours is rising. Ten pounds of coal are needed to provide the energy to make one pound of aluminum—and the aluminum industry is engaged in spectacular new construction in coal fields.

Many new coal mines will be needed to supply these higher demands and to replace mines being depleted. Engineers are needed by the coal industry, entering a period which promises steady growth through production for big industrial markets such as steel, electric generating, aluminum, cement, chemicals under long-term contracts. Here is a future linked directly to America's growth, in an industry that pumps energy into America's throbbing industrial heart, and essential to national prosperity and security—an opportunity for great service.

Ghost Writers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DONALD L. JACKSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 4, 1956

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. Speaker, in this day and time it seems to be commonplace to use ghost writers, but it seems rather unusual for two people to use the same ghost writer. In the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for May 22, on page 4094, is an article allegedly written by Mr. Clyde T. Ellis, of the Rural Electric Cooperative Association. In the same issue of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on page 4104 is an article allegedly written by Mr. Claude R. Wickard, former Secretary of Agriculture.

The article signed by Mr. Ellis is 6 paragraphs in length. The last 4 paragraphs are identical, word for word, with the last 4 paragraphs of the article by Mr. Wickard.

These paragraphs warn that there are "certain interests who would like to eliminate entirely the REA cooperatives." The next sentence in these identical paragraphs mentions the Hoover report apparently attempting to convey the idea that the Hoover report recommends elimination of REA. Of course, this is not true and was evidently recognized as such by the writer since he did not say the Hoover report would destroy REA but merely tried to convey that thought by inference.

The Hoover Commission recommended that the Rural Electrification Administration be reorganized on a self-supporting basis—interest and fees should be sufficient to cover the cost of money and administrative expenses—that it secure its financing from private sources, and that as reorganized, it be made subject to the Government Corporation Control Act.

Many of the people in my district seem to agree that this is a good idea.

From this point the articles went on to make a plea for public-power development. Could it be that the public-power advocates are so hard up for support for their cause, even when not forthrightly presented, that they have to steal each others material without crediting the real writer?

Porgy and Bess in Russia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ADAM C. POWELL, JR.
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 20, 1956

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from Down Beat of June 27, 1956:

THE FIRST CHORUS
(By Jack Tracy)

Dizzy Gillespie has made many valuable contributions to jazz in his career. But what may be even more important and remembered longer is the tour he recently completed of the Mideast with a large band.

The effect he had on the peoples there has been brought strikingly home by the series of dispatches written by Marshall Stearns for Down Beat, the last of which appears in this issue, and by the almost stunned reaction of the State Department to his appearances.

Dizzy has served his country well, and the good will he and the band built, the musical education they offered, and the lesson in democracy they gave deserve bows from even the most cynical. It was only fitting that Gillespie was honored upon his return by being invited to the White House correspondent's dinner to play for the President.

Let's hope, however, that the success of Dizzy's tour, Porgy and Bess' sojourn in Russia, and other such ventures carried off under State Department auspices encourages the Government to expand its efforts. Remember that the State Department does not pay the expenses of such tours; they only guarantee that the minimum expenses will be covered if the groups lose money on the bookings. So far it hasn't happened. You can do much to guarantee more such trips and also serve jazz well by writing to the United States Information Service in Washington, D. C., in appreciation of what they already have done and suggesting what you think they can do.

The realization is beginning to dawn on a lot of persons that jazz is one of our most marketable export commodities and one which is enhancing our reputation around the world. It is a music born of this country, a music that is uniquely expressive of our way of living.

And now that the value of jazz as an overseas voice has been discovered, it is up to all of us who love the music to do all we can to see that it is used often—and properly—in this way.

A Prisoner of the New Dealers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. TIMOTHY P. SHEEHAN
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 20, 1956

Mr. SHEEHAN. Mr. Speaker, many midwestern people question the direction of our State Department. The Chicago Daily Tribune's June 4 editorial, directed to Congressman WALTER H. JUDD's testimony before the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee, gives vent to some of the misgivings of the Midwest.

The editorial is as follows:

A PRISONER OF THE NEW DEALERS

Congressman JUDD, of Minnesota, a recognized authority on the far east, testified before the Senate internal security subcommittee that pro-Communist holdovers from the New and Fair Deals are dictating State Department policy. Mr. JUDD said that these career employees early decided to give Secretary of State Dulles the "Jimmy Byrnes treatment"—that is, to keep him so busy traveling abroad that they would actually run the department. In this, he suggested, they had been eminently successful.

"I am not calling them Communists or subversives," said Representative JUDD. "They are intellectuals to whom communism has an appeal, and the things they advocate consistently work out to the benefit of Communists."

Judd said that these State Department officials function at the working paper level and draft the reports and recommendations upon which their superiors act. In this way policy at the top reflects the decisions made down below, and JUDD found the policy consistently inimical to the interests of the United States.

The problem is not new, and documentation is abundant. In 1953, seven or eight months after the Republicans took office, Scott McLeod, the State Department's director of personnel and security matters, complained before the convention of the American Legion that difficulty had been experienced in placing Eisenhower followers in responsible positions in the Department.

He said that policies originating at the top must be executed at lower working levels, where holdover personnel often not sympathetic to the Republican viewpoint was firmly entrenched.

A couple of attempts to overhaul the department ran into a stone wall. The New Dealers were wired into their jobs by civil service. Of the 18 appointive top assistants to Dulles, 12 were career officers, not one of whom was on record against the past policies of Dean Acheson, the New Deal Secretary of State.

One example that has been cited is that of Robert J. Ryan, an Acheson holdover, elevated by Dulles to the important post of head of the Division of Foreign Service Personnel. Ryan had come under fire of Senator MCCARTHY'S Permanent Investigations Subcommittee on charges of having "stripped" Department files to protect favorites whose pro-Communist slant had exposed them to investigation. He was so chummy with Acheson that, when the latter vacated the Secretaryship, Ryan was picked to conduct the goodby ceremony.

"Mr. Secretary," Ryan said to his outgoing boss, "the employees of the Department and the Foreign Service are very proud of your many outstanding achievements. Your high sense of duty, your statesmanship, your courage, your patience, and your forti-

tude have been an inspiration to all of us. You, sir, are a true public servant. As you take your leave, may we express to you our sincere thanks and appreciation for your leadership and support."

And it was to a New Dealer of such unbounded admiration for Acheson that a Republican administration turned when it sought the man to command all of its Foreign Service agents.

Another example is provided by Francis Russell, who turned up with Mr. Dulles at a meeting at which he was billed as the Secretary's "expert on Near Eastern affairs." Russell was head of the Acheson propaganda mill, but ran for the storm cellar when he saw a Republican victory coming in 1952. He was assigned to Tel Aviv as his first post abroad in October of that year, a month before the election, and, on the basis of that one brief assignment, quickly blossomed out as the official "expert" on a vast troubled political area, with the ear of the Republican Secretary cocked to his counsel.

Parallel instances could be recited at tedious length, but we believe that enough has been recounted to show that the Republican Secretary of State is a willing prisoner of the New Dealers he inherited and has made no effort to dislodge. The situation is one to cause a real Republican to throw up his hands in disgust, for we are paying $183 million a year to maintain the 30,000 in the State Department, where the New Dealers pursue their insidious purposes with as much impunity as in the heyday of Alger Hiss.

Must Small Business Face Such a Future?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES ROOSEVELT
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 20, 1956

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter from Mr. D. H. Symons, General Water Heater Corp., Burbank, Calif.

The letter quoted below has been, I believe, sent to all the Members of the Congress. It is, however, so typical of what I firmly believe is the condition of many of the small businesses of this country that I put it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD in order that we can all ponder the very serious problem which others face and with the hope that something can be done about them before others have to arrive at the same unhappy and unfortunate decision.

GENERAL WATER HEATER CORP.,
Burbank, Calif., May 1956.

To Members of the Congress Interested in the Survival of Small Businesses:

It is with deep regret that I am selling this business which my father founded in 1919, and which he, my brother, my son and I have built up from nothing into 3 plants providing employment for 320 people. We make useful products: Water heaters, furnaces, and power tools.

I am writing you about it because I believe you understand that the small businesses throughout this country constitute a large and vital segment of the economy and free enterprise system which has made possible our high standard of living.

And I believe that you might be interested in a typical example of how difficult it is for a small corporation to accumulate capital, or even survive when taxation has reached the point of confiscation of capital necessary to continue creating quality goods and jobs for a growing population, in competition with the large national corporations.

To buy up-to-date equipment or expand plant facilities, a small corporation such as ours must use its profits, or borrow the money for working capital. We have done both for years. Small business does not have access to the capital market and savings of investors. The Federal taxes take 52 percent of our gross profit (up to 90 percent during wartime), the State takes another 4 percent and we have reached our limit of borrowing from the banks. If I sell the business, the capital gains tax will take 25 percent out of money already taxed at the above rates, but if I keep the business until I die I will have a sizable inheritance tax to pay.

So in my case I can't afford to die. Or to put it another way, I can't afford not to sell while I live. So I will sell. And I write you with the hope that this case example may be useful in helping the thousands of other small and medium-size manufacturers who face the same discouraging situation.

Sincerely yours,

D. H. SYMONS.

The Flag: Our Heritage, Our Stay, Our Hope

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL CUNNINGHAM
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 18, 1956

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, on Thursday, July 14, our colleague, the Honorable FRED SCHWENGEL, of Iowa, had the honor of being the speaker at the Flag Day exercises on the Capitol steps, sponsored by the Department of the Potomac Woman's Relief Corps, Auxiliary to the Grand Army of the Republic. I have always been disturbed because I feel that the flag is a part of our heritage which we take too much for granted. Because it is always with us, we are all too prone to be passive about its value and meaning. Flag Day too often becomes just another day. Because Congressman SCHWENGEL has taken more than the ordinary interest in the Flag Day exercises both years that he has been here, and because his remarks can be an inspiration to the rest of us, I ask that his address be printed in the RECORD and commend it to every patriotic American:

THE FLAG: OUR HERITAGE, OUR STAY, AND OUR HOPE

This day, Flag Day, is consecrated to the glorious symbol of our United States. We have hailed it in love and devotion as Old Glory; we have sung its praise as the Star-Spangled Banner; we have cheered its colors, red, white, and blue; we have marched to the tune of The Stars and Stripes Forever. If the flag were only sentiment—if the flag were only cloth, and colors, and a pattern—we should soon weary of the sentiment, and tire of looking at the cloth, always striped and starred, always red, and white, and blue. But the flag is more than we see. Its heritage must be understood, for it is more real than cloth, deeper than sentiment, more filled with light and life than any color could make it, more meaningful than any pattern. The schoolbooks and legends tell a hundred stories about how the pattern came to be, and what the colors symbolize. For the most part, many of these stories are fanciful, or, at best, of doubtful authenticity, but each story, even those drawn of fancy, add their bit to the pattern of American life and thought, and to the heritage that goes to build up the flag itself. Betsy Ross may not have taken up paper, and snipped it with her scissors to show George Washington how a five-pointed star could be made simply, but in thousands of kindergartens, and in the minds and hearts of millions of children growing up today, that story lives. Barbara Fritchie may not have waved her flag out of the window as Stonewall Jackson marched his Confederate troops through Frederick, Md., but that brave picture is a part of what we all see as we look at the flag today, and the story of courage and patriotic devotion, told in Whittier's ringing words, is a part of what we hear as the flag snaps in the wind. But do not think these legends live only in imagination and feeling. That would be soft and foolish sentiment. They may not be factual, but they do carry a deeper truth of symbolism. The simple story of Betsy Ross lingers in my mind as meaning that the highest authority in this land will consent to be taught by the most humble citizen, especially when that humble citizen has the knowledge that is available to all. It means that in our country pride and power must give way before reasoning and practical good sense. This is a characteristic that separated our young American Republic from the tired monarchies of Europe, where peasant and nobleman lived forever and unchangeably apart from each other. The story of Barbara Fritchie, romantically decorated as it may be, is the story of a courage that lived then and lives today in the hearts of American men, and women, and children. For one fictitious heroine so dramatically daring and so generously spared, there have been thousands and millions who have risked their lives with equal daring and stubbornness, for the flag and for the Nation symbolized by its striped and starry folds. Let Betsy stand for each poor seamstress or laborer whose thought and work and spirit have gone into the building of this country. Let Barbara stand for the unconquerable soul of America, that stands up in each of us and is expressed year after year in different terms, by men and women, by soldiers and civilians, from Nathan Hale's beautiful phrase, "I only regret that I have but one life to lose for my country," to General McAuliffe's brief defiance, "Nuts." This sense, this equality, this energy, this courage, live in our true stories as much as in our legends, in our own lives, and in the lives of our ancestors as much as in our imaginations. The colors and patterns of the flag are the colors and patterns of our national heritage.

In our flag, as in our country, there is unity in variety. The stripes represent the Union of the Original Thirteen Colonies. The stars represent the Union of the present 48 States. But by their very existence in the flag, the stripes and the stars symbolize the fact that each Colony, each State, continues its existence as an individual entity, not merged in subjection to the absolute authority of a central government, but holding up its head in the federation of equal States just as the individual citizen in the Republic holds up his head as an equal among his fellow citizens. From the beginnings of our country until the present day, we have acknowledged one master, and only one. George Washington reminded us of this master in his Thanksgiving Proclamation of October 3, 1789, when he said that it is the duty of all nations to acknowledge the providence of Almighty God, to obey His will, to be grateful for His benefits, and humbly to implore His protection and favor. We, the people of the United States, expressed his

idea when in 1954, we added the words "Under God" to the pledge of allegiance. When I look up to the flag, I see it as raised up in the sight of God, invoking His blessing upon our land and our people, and submitting all our actions to His will.

For liberty we and our ancestors have worked and prayed and fought. Our soil is rich with the blood of those who died for liberty, and the soil of our spirit, our heritage of honor, is abundantly rich with the memory of their sacrifice. Looking into the stars and stripes of the flag, at once united and separate, connected and independent, I think how our liberty is dependent upon our union. I remember the bold pun attributed to Benjamin Franklin:

"Unless we all hang together, assuredly we shall all hang separately."

I think of how Daniel Webster built up his reply to Hayne to the ringing climax:

"Liberty and union, now and forever, one and inseparable."

All this, our heritage of glorious words and brave deeds, is built into this wonderful banner we call our flag. As we look into the flag we see the independence of our Nation from all others, the independence of each State from all others, and the independence of each citizen from all others. But at the same moment, and in the same flag, we see that intimate union of equals in which the welfare of one is the welfare of all, and the welfare of all is the welfare of each one. Back in the time of World War II, the American poet Charles Malam expressed this thought simply and tellingly in his poem, Freedom, when he said:

"Freedom, wherein we shelter us together
Against the rage of time and prowling man,
Is as a house which in the angry weather
Looks out through storm to the horizon's span.
Whatever warmth and comfort there we know
Our labor and our heartbreak made it so."

This spirit of togetherness, this teamwork, this brotherhood, is what we must work for today to perfect. We have had too many jealousies: State against State, section against section, man against man. Let us look upon the flag today in the spirit of Daniel Webster's great saying: "One country, one Constitution, and one destiny." Let us build upon this heritage of the past a firm loyalty for the present. Let us keep our constitutional system of checks and balances—our Executive operating with skill and energy, our Legislature studying carefully and acting boldly, our judiciary true to the Constitution and the laws—all three independent of one another, but all three ultimately responsive to the considered and determinedly expressed will of the people.

As I look at the light thrown back from the flag, thus raised into the heavens, I remember how, James A. Garfield, out of his lifetime devotion to the Bible, and out of the tumult and stress of a terrible moment of history, rose to heights of eloquence. A crowd in New York, gathering on receipt of the news of the assassination of President Abraham Lincoln, was swelling and milling ominously, obviously on the verge of becoming a riotous mob, when Garfield, then a young Ohio Congressman, stepped out on the balcony of the customhouse. His commanding presence brought silence. The organ tones of his famous voice carried to the farthest reaches of the crowd as he said in that dramatic setting:

"Fellow-citizens, clouds and darkness are around Him; His pavilion is dark waters and thick clouds; justice and judgment are the establishment of His throne; mercy and truth shall go before His face. God reigns and the Government at Washington still lives."

These were the words for that ocasion, having a more than magical effect in calming the turbulent multitude, and changing an aimless terror to a constructive and faith-filled grief. But they were words for all time. As Garfield picked them up out of the age-old faith of Israel, and the eloquent language of the Old Testament, I take them now, charged with all the meaning in American history of their use by Garfield on that great and sorrowful occasion. They are the words of today, as of a century ago. "God reigns and the Government at Washington still lives." There is a sense in which the center of the United States is, for me, in Iowa, as for you it may be in New Mexico, or for you, in Maine. "The axis of the earth," said Emerson, "sticks out visibly through the center of each and every town or city." But for you, and for you, and for me, the center of the United States is, in a very real sense, right here in Washington—right here in the Capitol Building—right here in the flag that waves day and night overhead. Here is the center of Government, here is the place where the representatives of the people of the United States meet to carry out the will of those people, and at once rule and serve them, under the folds of this symbolic flag. A mile off, there, is the White House—and across the street, in that direction, the Supreme Court Building. Here we are, all three, joined in a partnership to rule and to serve under this flag.

But as the past leads into the present, and our heritage from the past is our possession of the present, so the present must be our preparation for the future. No one and nothing stands still. If we do not advance, we must slide back. Neither in our country as it is today, nor in our flag, the symbol of that country, can we see perfection as now present. What we see in flag and country is something better and brighter than perfection itself, for perfection would be a State from which our only possible progression would be downward. In these Stars and Stripes we must see hope itself—the hope that the growth our country has shown in the past, growth in courage, in selflessness, in devotion to the right, will continue and increase. The hope that we shall take and keep our rightful place as leaders for all the world—the hope that we in our time will more fully understand and practice the great admonitions of our forefathers so that the spirit of truth and freedom in the hearts of good people everywhere will know "the power of the United States is a menace to no nation or people. It will never be used in aggression or for the aggrandizement of any selfish interest of our own. It springs out of freedom and is for the service of freedom" (Woodrow Wilson, 1918).

The hope that all the nations of the world will know that what Woodrow Wilson once said, "A patriotic American is a man who is not niggardly and selfish in the things that he enjoys that make for human liberty and the rights of man. He wants to share them with the whole world, and he is never so proud of the great flag under which he lives as when it comes to mean to other people as well as to himself a symbol of hope and liberty. Liberty does not consist—in mere general declarations of the rights of men. It consists in the translation of those declarations into definite action."

Then let us not ever deceive ourselves into seeing our own advantage in another's loss, or our loss is his gain. In the spirit of cooperation and partnership there is a clue to an undreamed-of future of peace and happiness and prosperity for all the world. The helpfulness that drives forward toward accomplishment for the good of neighbor and for the good of all, without thought of the individual or national self, is the spirit than can win the world in a far happier sense than any totalitarian political or military conquest.

This is the present, from which still we may build a future such as was envisoned by Henry Wadsworth Longfellow, when, in those dark days in which the war clouds of the Civil War were gathering, he looked upon the organ-like disposal of cannon in the Springfield Arsenal, and dreamed his dream of universal peace:

"Were half the power that fills the world with terror,
Were half the wealth bestowed on camps and courts,
Given to redeem the human mind from error,
There were no need of arsenals or forts:
The warrior's name would be name abhorred.
And every nation, that should lift again
Its hand against a brother, on its forehead
Would wear forevermore the curse of Cain.
Down the dark future, through long generations,
The echoing sounds grow fainter and then cease;
And like a bell, with solemn, sweet vibrations,
I hear once more the voice of Christ say, "Peace."
Peace, and no longer from its brazen portals
The blast of war's great organ shakes the skies.
But beautiful as songs of the immortals,
The holy melodies of love arise."

Let us then forever remember the rich heritage of fundamental truths that have come out of the past to point the way of a higher civilization and a better life and let us follow the admonition of Abraham Lincoln when he said on that memorable occasion at Gettysburg, "Let us dedicate ourselves to the unfinished task," being ever mindful of the important place we play in this terribly challenging time in our history.

An ancient seer once said that no doctrine, faith, or knowledge is of value to man except as it bears fruit in action. Let us then never be guilty of unconcern for and about the greatest government ever given to man and always do our part as a patriotic American in such a way that God will continue to bless America, and thus will our flag forever wave over the land of the free and the home of the brave.

Festival of Lithuanian Art

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD W. HOFFMAN
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 20, 1956

Mr. HOFFMAN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, on June 16 and 17, 1956, Americans of Lithuanian ancestry, together with leaders from the executive, legislative, and judicial branches of the Government, recalled the contributions of Lithuania to the cultural fabric of this Nation. An exhibit of Lithuanian art and handicraft, a concert devoted to works by Lithuanian composers, and a banquet attended by more than 1,000 persons were among the events of the Festival of Lithuanian Art and Music, of which Vice President NIXON was the honorary chairman.

I take particular pride in calling to your attention this festival, since the president of the National Lithuanian Society of America is Dr. Stephen Biezis, of Chicago, and the toastmaster of the banquet was Anthony A. Olis, president of the Metropolitan Sanitary District of Greater Chicago. Under leave to extend my remarks, I include articles from the

Sunday Star of June 17, 1956, in which this great Washington newspaper reported the events of the festival.

LITHUANIA WON'T ACCEPT SOVIET YOKE, ENVOY SAYS

Lithuania "has not accepted and will never accept the so-called incorporation into the Soviet Union," Stasys Lozoraitis, chief of the Lithuanian Diplomatic Service, declared last night.

Mr. Lozoraitis, visiting from his post in Rome, addressed more than 1,000 banquet guests at the Festival of Lithuanian Art and Music at the Hotel Statler, where he was guest of honor.

The Lithuanian soul, he said, "despite tragic hardships under Soviet occupation, remains free and thirsts after but one thing:

"To throw off Soviet-Communist slavery and to return to her rightful place among the democratic, Christian nations of the West, to which the Lithuanian nation belongs by right of her history, faith, and culture."

He said that his countrymen, having had "such tragic experience" with the Soviets, follow with misgivings the new tactic unveiled since Stalin's death.

In one of its aspects, he said, the Soviet Government wishes in certain internal affairs to give the impression that the political regime is now less rigid. But he said the dissolution of basic human rights remains in effect, and the Communist Party remains the supreme, deciding factor.

He also described the new foreign policy designed "to lull the alertness of the West, to bring it to political and moral disarmament and to the recognition, or at least to the forgetting, of the results of those international crimes of which the Soviet Union is guilty in attacking and occupying a whole series of nations, among them Lithuania."

CAPITALITES ATTEND FESTIVAL BANQUET

Official and residential Washington turned out last evening for the Festival of Lithuanian Art and Music, for which Vice President NIXON was the honorary chairman of the sponsoring committee. The 8 o'clock banquet in the Presidential Room of the Hotel Statler was preceded by a cocktail party.

An exhibit of Lithuanian art and handicraft for the 2-day festival, which commemorates the cultural threads of Lithuania which have been woven in the American fabric by the more than 1 million Americans of Lithuanian descent, was on display last evening and will be again today in the Congressional Room.

Music for last evening's banquet was provided by 50 members of the National Symphony Orchestra, under the direction of Alexandras Kuciunas. Music also was presented by the Ciurlionis Ensemble. Anthony Olis, a director of the National Lithuanian Society of America—of which Dr. Stephen Biezis is president—was toastmaster and chairman of the committee on arrangements.

The Administrative Assistant to the President and Mrs. I. Jack Martin were among those accepting. Other acceptances came from Assistant Secretaries of State Henry F. Holland, Francis O. Wilcox, and Carl W. McCardle and their wives; Assistant Secretaries of Defense Frank D. Newbury and Herbert B. Loper and their wives; United States Treasurer Ivy Baker Priest and Mr. Roy F. Priest; Assistant Secretary of the Interior and Mrs. Felix E. Wormser, Supreme Court Justice and Mrs. Sherman Minton, and the Deputy Director of the Bureau of the Budget and Mrs. Percival F. Brundage.

Of course, the Minister of Lithuania and Mrs. Zadeikis were there and other diplomatic missions were represented by the Ambassador of Viet Nam and Mme. Tran-Van Choung, the Dominican Ambassador and Senora de Salazar, the Afghan Ambassador and Mme. Ludin, the Ambassador of Honduras and Senora de Izaguirre, Laoation Ambassador Ourot R. Souvannavong and the chargé d'affaires of the Yemen Legation, Sayed Abdurrahman Ibn Abdussamed Abu-Taleb.

Senator planning to attend included JOHN L. MCCLELLAN, EDWARD MARTIN, JOHN STENNIS, EDWARD J. THYE, ARTHUR V. WATKINS, and HENRY C. DWORSHAK with their wives, and among those accepting from the House were Representatives STERLING COLE, BROOKS HAYS, KARL M. LECOMPTE, LAWRENCE H. SMITH, HAROLD H. VELDE, SID SIMPSON, and WALTER H. JUDD and their wives.

Residential Washington acceptances came from Mrs. Robert Low Bacon, Mrs. Nicholas Longworth, Judge and Mrs. F. Dickinson Letts, Mrs. Harry Grant Meem, Dr. and Mrs. Floyd S. Rogers, Jr., Mr. and Mrs. Roy St. Lewis, Mr. and Mrs. Arthur Sears Henning, and others.

What's Wrong With American Propaganda

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ADAM C. POWELL, JR.
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 20, 1956

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include the following article from the New York Times of May 14, 1956:

FOREIGN AFFAIRS—WHAT'S WRONG WITH AMERICAN PROPAGANDA

(By C. L. Sulzberger)

PARIS, May 13.—In this era of political uncertainty and uneasy coexistence propaganda becomes increasingly important in maintaining the views and prestige of the United States among captive peoples of Eastern Europe. Yet, despite millions of dollars spent, we are unsuccessful. A tour of the satellite nations provides convincing evidence that our propaganda is a flop.

This is not for lack of technical ingenuity. Both Government and privately sponsored organizations have demonstrated imagination in getting our ideas across barbed-wire frontiers and a wall of radio jamming. Programs beamed by stations of the Voice of America and Radio Free Europe manage to circumvent these barriers and are heard. Pamphlets dropped from airplanes and windborne balloons have so saturated some countries that not even efficient sweeping operations of the security police have kept them from wide circulation. The criticism one hears is of the ideas themselves, not their means of distribution.

One American envoy in the area complains: "Our propaganda is utterly ineffective. Frequently our radios put out 'intelligence' information that is entirely inaccurate or ridiculously late—information that could be verified within 10 minutes by any embassy or legation. Much that we broadcast no longer has any bearing on reality. Many political emigrés make good money compiling useless material."

STUNTS RESENTED

A friendly Ambassador in Czechoslovakia observes: "The BBC has its Bruce Lockhart, who is deeply respected here. But you have no one. Your balloons and leaflets bear foolish messages. For example, they sought to work up a campaign encouraging 10 popular demands for freedom. Leaflets and stickers were dropped bearing the mystic number 10. This was an advertising stunt. It never took. People resented being incited to audacity by those dwelling safely abroad."

A highly intelligent Czech with pro-American sympathies adds: "All too often your radio either misses events; or it is late; or it is wrong. Once you get it through the jamming you'd like to know something.

"But the things your propaganda speaks about are frequently silly. Broadcasters give 15 minutes of statistics. Whom do they think they are talking to, professors of mathematics? Who cares about comparative steel production figures in 1952? Sometimes our emigrants working for you will denounce a man as a traitor when it simply isn't true. They are careless. This happened to a friend of mine and was infuriating."

One of our eastern European envoys says: "The United States has always encouraged these people to overthrow the government. Our propaganda still implies this purpose. We have done nothing or said nothing to give the impression that we will ever make our peace with this regime. Yet we must do busines with it—and do. This schizophrenic attitude puzzles the local population."

The American Government sends selected films to our embassies and legations not only to entertain them but to advertise the benefits of our society to local officials and diplomats. These movies sometimes are appalling. The Austrian chargé d'affaires in Bucharest used to attend our cinema showings. Eventually he remarked to our embarrassed minister, Robert H. Thayer, "This does you Americans more harm than good."

ALL SHOWINGS CANCELED

The writer attended an evening of films sent by our Government to Thayer's Legation. The first was a 1946 picture with the sound track so worn it sounded as if Ingrid Bergman had a mouth filled with bubblegum. It had to be stopped. Then came an inferior commercial. Third was a ridiculous advertisement for Dutch tulips. Fourth was a fifth-rate thriller on Haiti. Thayer, in despair, canceled all showings scheduled for the coming week.

From Poland to the Danube Valley listeners complain that emigrees working for American radio stations have lost touch with changing local conditions. A Bulgarian anti-Communist protests: "They are like all emigree movements. They are unaware of some changes that we accept with pleasure while opposing the regime—such things as free medical care. Many people think the emigrees enjoy a better life abroad than is actually the case. Nevertheless, unfortunately, they resent it. Such is human nature."

It is embarrassing to criticize people who fled tyranny and from unhappy exile try to keep alive the flame of freedom behind the Iron Curtain. But, judging from results, their propaganda is neither conceived with sufficient skill nor adequately coordinated with our diplomatic policy.

Perhaps we should concentrate more on telling our own story, stressing forever the ideals we believe. Objective commentary and calm, straightforward news are durable psychological commodities. We cannot afford to lose touch with changing realities within the satellites. Nor should we be so blinded by emotion that we occasion resentment among those we court.

Festival of Lithuanian Art and Music

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD W. HOFFMAN
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 20, 1956

Mr. HOFFMAN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, in June 1940 the Soviet Government revealed its pattern of military conquest and political demoralization in

its unprovoked assaults upon Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia. For 16 years, the light of freedom has been extinguished in Lithuania, but the ideals of liberty, independence, and justice continue to live in the minds and hearts of persons of Lithuanian ancestry and the hope remains that this great nation will once again resume its rightful place among the sovereign nations of the world.

On June 16 and 17, 1956, America was reminded of the contribution of Lithuania to the cultural treasure of this Nation by the Festival of Lithuanian Art and Music which took place at the Hotel Statler in Washington. The principal speaker at the banquet on June 16 was the Honorable Stasys Lozoraitis, Chief of the Lithuanian Diplomatic Service, whose analysis of Soviet policy I commend to the attention of my colleagues. Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the statement of the Honorable Stasys Lozoraitis:

ADDRESS BY STASYS LOZORAITIS, CHIEF OF THE LITHUANIAN DIPLOMATIC SERVICE, AT THE FESTIVAL OF LITHUANIAN ART AND MUSIC, WASHINGTON, D. C., JUNE 16, 1956

I consider it a great privilege to be able to speak, in the capacity of chief of the Lithuanian diplomatic service, at this distinguished gathering which climaxes the Festival of Lithuanian Art and Music and which is lent special significance by the generous presence of so many representatives of the Government and people of the United States of America and other nations.

In the folk art and music presented at this festival is heard the voice of Lithuania, the beating of her heart; in them her soul is mirrored. This Lithuanian soul, despite tragic hardships under Soviet occupation, remains free and thirsts after but one thing: to throw off Soviet-communist slavery and to return to her rightful place among the democratic, Christian nations of the West to which the Lithuanian nation belongs by right of her history, faith and culture.

This is the ultimate and unshakable will of the Lithuanian people. Our nation has not accepted and will never accept the so-called incorporation into the Soviet Union. In fact, this incorporation was an act of brutal aggression, the result of force, as contrary to international law and morality as it was to the will and interests of Lithuania. This premeditated international crime was carefully planned by the Soviet Government. In August and September of 1939, the Soviet Government reached an agreement with Hitler, forming a plot which opened the gates to the Second World War. One of the most important elements of this plot was the destruction of the independence of the Baltic States and their forced incorporation into the Soviet Union. The Soviet Government enacted this criminal plan in two stages: military and quasi-elective. In October 1939, by the threat of force, the Soviet Government imposed on Lithuania the so-called Mutual Assistance Pact in accordance with which it was able to introduce Soviet garrisons into Lithuanian territory, promising, however, to respect Lithuania's sovereignty and independence. But in June 1940, taking advantage of the fact that the democracies of Western Europe had succumbed to Hitler, the Soviet Government presented the three Baltic States—Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia—with a totally unfounded ultimatum. This action was followed up by an attack on the Baltic States and their occupation by the overwhelming Red army. In Lithuania, at sword's point the Soviet indulged in electoral manipulations by which means the occupying force organized a so-called parliament composed of Communists, and authorized it to vote for the annulment of Lithuanian independence and the incorporation of Lithuania into the Soviet Union. This was the beginning of terrorist persecutions, mass deportations, and the annihilation of the most basic human rights in Lithuania, by which the Soviet Government has inflicted and continues to inflict the most grievous wounds. Only 2 days ago we marked the 15th anniversary of the beginning of one of the greatest crimes in the history of Europe—the deportation of thousands of Lithuanians, Latvians, and Estonians to certain death in the slave camps of Siberia.

Lithuania's painful experience in dealings with the Soviet Union is and remains a manifest example of how the Soviet Union interprets international coexistence. In the same way, soon after the establishment of the Soviet regime in Russia, in the days of Lenin, the Soviet Government carried on a whole series of aggressive acts toward its western neighbors of which Lithuania was one. However, a decisive defense closed the path of Soviet expansion to the west and forced the Soviet Government to change its tactic, replacing open aggression with a coexistence policy. This new Soviet tactic manifested itself in the abundant peace, nonaggression, and other security treaties which the Soviet Union concluded with its western neighbors. I surely would not be exaggerating by saying that in no other part of the world was there devised such a broad system of guaranties against every possible form of aggression as there was between the Soviet Union and her neighbors. To any person of good faith this system would certainly have seemed an inviolable barrier. Such guarantees existed also between Lithuania and the Soviet Union. Notwithstanding all these things, the Soviet Union seized the first opportunity—in 1939–40—to put an end to peaceful coexistence and to violate solemn treaties into which it had freely entered.

It is for this reason that Lithuanians, having had such tragic experience with the Soviets, now follow attentively and with misgivings the new tactic which the Soviets unveiled since Stalin's death. This tactic has two aspects.

First, it would seem that the Soviet Government is experiencing troubles within the regions which they occupy and rule, and must contend with the fact that the Soviet population and the populations of the nations enslaved by the Soviet Union abhor the political regime. For this reason, the Soviet Government wishes, in certain internal affairs, to give the impression that the regime is now less rigid. Therefore, I think it worthwhile to remember that this lessening of tension fails to affect any basic question. The Communist Party remains the supreme, deciding factor, totally beyond appeal. The dissolution of basic human rights remains in effect. In this way the Soviet regime remains what it was, as contrary to human nature as it is dangerous to world civilization.

As to the second aspect, that of foreign policy, the opposition of the West, under the leadership of the United States, to Soviet expansion, forced the Soviet Government to devise a new policy and to proclaim the watchword of peaceful coexistence. The purpose of this tactic is to lull the alertness of the West, to bring it to political and moral disarmament and to the recognition, or at least to the forgetting, of the results of those international crimes of which the Soviet Union is guilty in attacking and occupying a whole series of nations, among them Lithuania. This tactic seeks to demoralize international relations and to make expansion possible where military means would be impractical—by means of subversion. It seems to me that, although the new Kremlin leaders are second string men, their new strategy is as dangerous as was the old one. In this way the struggle of the Soviet Union, and indeed of Bolshevism, to subjugate the entire world—the struggle begun by Lenin and carried on by Stalin—is now being implemented by Stalin's successors. In this struggle, the civilized world has a silent ally. This ally is the group of millions belonging to the nations enslaved by the Soviet Union. These peoples, among them the Lithuanian nation, continue a moral resistance to the Soviet Government, and, I believe, by so doing they hinder the plans of Soviet imperialism. In this struggle the West has also a powerful weapon. Opinions are sometimes voiced that in this fight against communism a new ideal is needed. I do not think that this is the case. There are two ancient but always valid ideals: faith in God, and the devotion of people and nations to the principle of freedom. The intensified proclamation and implementation of these two ideals is that powerful weapon which I just mentioned. Its use in conjunction with peaceful coercion of the Soviet Union must bring the elimination of the danger which the Soviet Union constitutes to civilization. An indispensable condition in the elimination of this danger is the restoration of freedom to the Soviet enslaved nations which look with hope to the West for deliverance.

Ladies and gentlemen, the Soviet will never give up their proclaimed plans. It is only when they can no longer practice them that they put them aside until the times again become propitious. May the Western world not forget its plans for freedom and justice; may it carry them forward methodically and without compromise.

From that fatal day when the Soviet Union attacked and occupied Lithuania, the understanding attitude of the American Government and people in regard to the case of Lithuanian freedom, has been a source of comfort and of hope to the Lithuanian nation. Our people will never forget that from the very beginning America condemned the illegal occupation of Lithuania and refuses to recognize it. Our Nation remembers with gratitude, remembers the repeated statements of high placed American officials recognizing Lithuania's right to the restoration of her freedom. And the fact that the festival, this manifestation of the soul and culture of Lithuania, could only take place in the United States—in their Capital—will be welcomed by all Lithuanians and they will derive from it special significance.

I am certain that I express the feeling of all Lithuanians, at home and abroad when I thank the United States for their sympathy toward Lithuania. Furthermore, I am also convinced that I speak for all my countrymen in extending best wishes to President Dwight D. Eisenhower for his speedy recovery.

Ladies and gentlemen, may I consider your presence here as a sign of your sympathy for Lithuania? I will long remember this evening and I will always be grateful to the National Lithuanian Society of America for inviting me. I feel sure that this society has done much to help the Lithuanian cause and Lithuanian-American relations by the zealous organization of this festival.

Ladies and gentlemen, during the lifetime of one generation the United States of America twice was forced to take up arms and fight for the ideals of freedom, law, and justice. In this cause hundreds of thousands of American youths gave their lives but the Soviet Union blighted the ripening of the fruits of their sacrifice. I believe that those ideals, always alive in this huge Nation, will totally triumph through peaceful means, and that this will bring, to my country as well, the restoration of freedom and independence.

Foreign Aid on the Rebound

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. TIMOTHY P. SHEEHAN
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 20, 1956

Mr. SHEEHAN. Mr. Speaker, it is indeed very interesting to take cognizance of the fact that there is an alarming possibility that foreign governments might have already established control of certain segments of American industry through concealed investments.

This view has been brought out by the testimony of some officials of the Federal Reserve Bank of New York who have strongly expressed their concern.

It is most interesting to note that we have spent over $50 billion in foreign aid, while at the same time foreign investments in this country now exceed half of that amount. This gives rise to the question of whether or not, through our foreign-aid dollars, we are permitting foreign countries to take this money and reinvest it back in American industry.

The Chicago Daily Tribune in its editorial of June 19, 1956, puts the light on this subject to which it directs some interesting comments.

The editorial is as follows:

FOREIGN AID ON THE REBOUND

A Senate Internal Security Subcommittee has been told by responsible officials of the Federal Reserve Bank of New York that there is an alarming possibility that Russian and other foreign Communists have established control of segments of American industry through concealed investments. These equities are held by banks abroad, especially in Switzerland, which cover up the identity of the true owners. American Communists have also actively interested themselves in industrial investment.

The threat to American security implicit in such ownership is apparent, but an even more interesting disclosure was made by Arthur I. Bloomfield, senior economist of the Federal Reserve bank. Pointing out that there had been a large movement into the United States of speculative or flight capital, known as hot money, Mr. Bloomfield testified:

"It is evident that a significant part of the foreign aid of the United States Government has, in effect, gone to finance hot-money movements from the recipient countries to the United States and elsewhere."

Mr. Bloomfield asserted that foreign long-term investment capital and short-term dollar balances in the United States now aggregate in excess of $26.8 billion. This figure means that foreign holdings in this country amount to roughly half of the total of American postwar foreign aid, and that they are in excess of the entire national gold reserve. If all of them were translated into demands on America's gold hoard, which no American citizen may touch but which may be tapped by foreigners, there would be absolutely no gold backing for the dollar.

Thus foreign nations are in a position to do great injury to American fiscal stability, but that consideration is of less importance than the corollary—that the foreign aid giveaway has not been used for the purposes intended by the American Government, but for one quite different.

Foreign aid is supposed to stabilize the economy of friendly nations, to spur economic activity in these countries, and to enable them to expand and modernize their capital plant. But, from Mr. Bloomfield's testimony, it is apparent that the foreigners are not disposed to risk good American dollars on their own economy. Foreign aid funds pause only briefly in transit in these countries before being sent back here for investment in American industry or conversion into open credits.

We thus have the anomalous situation wherein the American Government protests that it is necessary to maintain a high flow of dollar aid abroad in order to achieve strength and stability in allied nations, while the recipient countries funnel the dollars thus obtained back to the United States. One result is that Washington imposes heavy taxes on American corporations, partly in order to finance foreign aid, while the foreign beneficiaries turn around and use the dollars sweated from American taxpayers to displace American ownership of American industry.

A more scandalous and indefensible racket would be hard to visualize. If there were no other reason for ending foreign aid without further ado, this alone would suffice.

The President's Health

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES ROOSEVELT
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 20, 1956

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, I have just received the text of a radio news broadcast by Mr. Eric Sevareid. Mr. Sevareid is widely recognized as one of the most objective and intelligent of current news analysts.

These remarks deserve careful study not only by Members of the Congress but by all Americans trying to reach a fair and just decision on a most involved and difficult matter. It would, of course, be easy to play politics with such an issue but I believe that there are millions of Americans who will vote after fairly and accurately analyzing all sides of the controversy as impartially and as factually as possible. It is for this reason that I submit this material for the RECORD:

Good evening. The President is slowly but, apparently surely, recovering from his operation; as he does so, attention is slowly turning from the immediate problem of his setback to its associated constitutional and political problems.

But what is not widely understood is that behind the front page statements about the President's physical prospects, a fierce argument is going on. It involves medical men and it involves the nontechnical journalists who must try to report all the news, even when the technicians themselves, in this case, the medical men, strongly disagree. What is happening this week is essentially what happened last winter, when Dr. Paul White publicly indicated an active life for the President of 5 to 10 years; the statement that profoundly affected public opinion and pushed the issue of the heart condition into the background. At that time, many doctors protested that White had gone too far, arguing that the life expectancy of a heart patient cannot possibly be prognosticated in specific terms of years; but, their organized fear of personal publicity being what it is, they did their protesting privately, frequently accusing reporters and editors of failing to put such a critical matter into proper balance.

This phenomenon is being repeated right now, in relation to ileitis and the statement of the operating surgeon, Major General Heaton, who said that bypassing the diseased area would improve the President's life expectancy. This statement and more especially the optimistic inferences being drawn from it all through the press are now being strongly criticized by many doctors. But again, in private. Washington journalists are now being remonstrated with by some medical men for, they contend, permitting the public to receive a badly one-sided impression of the President's prospects. They are not saying they know General Heaton to be wrong; they are saying, as I understand it, that he is only guessing and, that what is known and not known about ileitis gives no warrant for this degree of optimism. Again, these objecting doctors refuse to be quoted, but they are urging journalists to quote the standard reference works on ileitis.

For one thing, they argue, ileitis in a man of the President's age is so rare that no one can estimate even the statistical chances of post operation recurrence. Of 222 cases documented by Dr. Crohn, who first identified the disease, only 2 were in the 60 to 70 year age bracket; of 400 cases tabulated by Dr. Raydon, who attended the President, only 13 were in this bracket. Whether the President's age makes recurrence more or less likely appears to be something entirely in the dark.

But in general, Dr. Crohn has found, the disease comes back in 1 out of 3 cases after operation. And the medical reference widely used by life insurance companies, called "Risk Appraisal," has this to say about ileitis. I quote, "Short circuiting operations offer hope, but not much. Prognosis always dubious. Recurrence," it goes on to say, "is distressingly high, 1 in 3 within 2 years." This guide book recommends granting life insurance to ileitis victims only under rather exceptional rate provisions and as for disability insurance, the recommendation is in a flat negative; it regards the possibility of continuing poor health too great.

Other reference works appear equally pessimistic. The private doctors now insisting that this side of the story be given the people, are not saying that continuing invalidism is bound to be the President's fate. Medicine is by no means an exact science. Many individual cases refute both a doctor's pessimism and statistical tables and the President's case may happily turn out to be one that does. What these doctors are saying is that it is the simple duty of those who communicate to the people to communicate all the facts and the simple duty of the people to consider all the facts as they commit their Government to the future.

They must consider, in sum, that the Chief Executive has been the victim of not 1, but 2 serious diseases, both of which have a strong tendency to recur. This is Eric Sevareid in Washington.

Thailand Celebrates 24th Anniversary of National Day, June 24

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ADAM C. POWELL, JR.
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 20, 1956

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, I wish to send greetings to the people of Thailand, His Majesty Phumiphon Adundet, and His Excellency Pote Sarasin, Ambassador of Thailand, on the occasion of the cele-

bration of the 24th anniversary of National Day, June 24, 1956.

Thailand enjoys the proud distinction of being the only nation in southeast Asia, and one of the few on the Continent of Asia, which has been independent throughout its history. Although from the beginning of her history Thailand had been governed by a progressive monarchy, the people threw off the yoke of absolutism on June 24, 1932, and proclaimed a constitutional monarchy with the hopes that the new government might better meet the needs of the times.

She has known an area of unprecedented development, without regard to her internal and external security. The leaders of the nation have as their primary aim the development of the resources of the country in order to attain a better standard of living for the benefit of all its people. The Thai people along with the rest of the free world know that a free and prosperous people is communism's most formidable foe. Every well-founded and happy home is a fortress against tyranny, while poverty and wretchedness are its breeding ground.

It is Thai policy to maintain friendly relations with other nations. In amplification of this policy she has taken her place with the free nations in United Nations sessions, and has benefited greatly from membership. Thailand has maintained the best of friendly relations with the United States. It has welcomed American assistance in improving its economic well-being and keeping its political freedom.

Thailand's strategic position, its tradition as a free nation in southeast Asia, and its opposition to communism, give the country an important place in international affairs. It is an example and inspiration to other countries in the region who are engaged in the conflict with totalitarian aggression. As a bulwark against communism, the influence of the Thai may be beyond measure.

Again I salute Thailand and pray for continued mutual loyalty and respect between our countries and a continued strong purpose toward our peaceful aims.

The Last of the Three R's

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 20, 1956

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I herewith include an editorial entitled "The Last of the Three R's," which appeared in the June 11, 1956 issue of the St. Louis Post-Dispatch:

THE LAST OF THE THREE R'S

The University of Illinois a few months ago decided to drop remedial courses in basic English because it did not have time to teach hundreds of college students what primary and secondary schools should have taught them. Now the focus is on mathematics. A survey sponsored by the Carnegie Foundation finds that the teaching of mathematics in this country is in a deplorable state.

Princeton University's Educational Testing Service studied 60 classrooms in primary and secondary schools in 5 States. This is what it found:

Of 60 mathematics teachers, only 10 were fully competent; the 50 others were "confused."

Most of the teachers do not like mathematics and teach it only under compulsion.

Most of the students, naturally, also do not like mathematics and are hostile to learning it.

In fact, the testing service discovered in its year-long research that a good many teachers not only do not know their subject and are not able to interest their students in it, but also are barely able to keep ahead of the students. The conclusion is that mathematics is one of the poorest taught subjects below the college level.

These are especially serious findings at a time of increasing demand for scientists, engineers and technicians who need the fullest understanding of mathematics.

While the Princeton study lays much of the fault with the contemporary teacher, it seems probable that blame also lies with his teacher, with teaching methods and with the general educational system and the public's attitude toward it. In any case the research men recommend that the whole mathematics curriculum be brought up to date.

But perhaps the main recommendation of the survey is the creation of a remedial mathematics course for teachers of mathematics. We have now come full circle. Remedial courses used to be for pupils.

Extension of Veterans' Home Loan Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 19, 1956

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to direct the attention of our colleagues to the following very important statement of Mr. George C. Johnson, president of the Dime Savings Bank of Brooklyn, as submitted to the Veterans' Affairs Subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

STATEMENT OF MR. GEORGE C. JOHNSON, PRESIDENT, THE DIME SAVINGS BANK OF BROOKLYN, TO THE VETERANS' AFFAIRS SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE SENATE COMMITTEE ON LABOR AND PUBLIC WELFARE, CONCERNING EXTENSION OF THE VETERANS' HOME LOAN PROGRAM

Unless provision is made, before the Congress begins its recess, for extension of the home loan guaranty program for veterans of World War II beyond its expiration date of July 25, 1957, hundreds of millions of dollars worth of planned home construction must be abandoned, thousands of veterans will be denied home ownership, and the building industry—second largest industry in the Nation—will suffer a paralyzing blow, with a resulting serious setback to the American economy.

The reason is this:

Under the home loan provisions of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, all transactions as they apply to veterans of World War II must be finally completed before July 25, 1957.

In thousands of cases, such completion is impossible.

The situation is particularly acute in the New York and northeastern area of the United States. It is in these areas where exist the heavy preponderance of prime mortgage lenders—lenders which make mortgage loans only for their own account. They do not use any devices such as "warehousing" of loans; nor do they sell any Veterans' Administration loans to other lenders. Mortgage lenders in this category are termed by the VA "automatic lenders."

This means that under procedures established by the Veterans' Administration in VA Bulletin TB 4A–16 in November 1947, "automatic lenders" are permitted to allow veteran home purchasers to move into their houses and close the loans in escrow prior to completion of certain off-site work, such as paving, sidewalks, curbs, and other items subject to weather conditions.

Under this procedure (which has been followed for nearly 9 years) after the veteran takes possession of his new home, the lender files with the Veterans' Administration all documents in connection with each loan, and in return receives what is termed a "certificate of commitment." This is an expression by the Administrator of his intention to guarantee the mortgage loan when evidence is provided that all work is finished.

However, this "certificate of commitment" does not have statutory effect. It is not until the formal guaranty is received by the lender that the transaction is complete.

Because of the many factors and technicalities involved, approximately one year must pass between the time a lender makes a mortage commitment until the point of closing is reached.

After this closing in escrow, another 6 months are often needed to complete the exterior work which has been delayed by weather—work, which, in most cases, is prohibited by local building authorities during adverse weather conditions.

This 18-month gap between time of mortgage commitment and the time of finally completing the transaction to the point of receiving the VA loan guaranty, is why it is absolutely necessary to extend the veterans home loan guaranty program for at least 1 year beyond its expiration date of July 25, 1957—and provision made for orderly transition of the program into the Federal Housing Administration.

Unless prompt action is taken by the Congress in this connection, it is obvious that all those classified as "automatic lenders" under VA Bulletin TB 4A–16 must immediately—within the next few weeks—review their mortgage commitments for the purpose of cutting back all commited loans which cannot be finally processed before July 25, 1957.

I can assure you that this would be an extremely sharp cutback, and it would instantly prevent thousands of veterans throughout the Nation from buying homes on VA terms, even though the act has not expired. The VA itself has indicated that it will cease accepting home loan applications early next January.

In the case of the Dime Savings Bank of Braaklyn alone—and we are only one lender—such cutbacks would involve some $136 million in commitments and affect the construction of 13,500 new homes. Of these, we have outstanding construction loans on more than 6,000 dwelling units, and of those, more than 4,000 have been purchased by veterans.

Furthermore, the prime mortgage lenders, of which we are only one, are the chief supporters of the $600 million annual building volume on Long Island. Veterans comprise approximately 70 percent of that market.

I heartily agree with the theory that benefits under the Servicemen's Readjustment Act should not continue indefinitely.

However, I do respectfully urge that home-loan provisions in the act be extended for a minimum of 1 year and an immediate study begun to develop a substitute and machinery set up for an orderly transition into the Federal Housing Administration of the Government's entire housing program, so far as it affects private industry. Unless this is done promptly, a serious setback will be suffered by the building industry, which is so vital to our economy.

It is quite true that the Servicemen's Readjustment Act was originally conceived as a rehabilitation measure, and it has been invaluable in attaining that objective.

However, the veterans' home loan program has long since emerged from its status as a rehabilitation measure. That phase of the law now carries an enormous economic impact and is one of the strongest elements in the American economy.

Although only 4,350,000 home loans to veterans have been made, these have resulted in more than $35 billion in construction—an extremely powerful factor in providing jobs and prosperity for millions of Americans in every section of the country.

Furthermore, it is estimated that 11 million World War II veterans have not used their home-loan entitlements, but figures from the Veterans' Administration show that increasing numbers of veterans are using these home-loan privileges. Approximately 300,000 additional veterans exercise their entitlements each year.

In view of all the foregoing facts, I respectfully urge with all the emphasis at my command that you seriously and thoughtfully consider the extension of the home-loan provisions of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act for at least 1 year, and provide for orderly transition into the Federal Housing Administration of the Government's entire housing program, so far as it affects private industry.

Labor Leaders' Statesmanship

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOR C. TOLLEFSON
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 14, 1956

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Speaker, the following excellent editorial appearing on June 7, 1956, in the Bremerton Sun, points up the fine type of representation which is given to the first district of the State of Washington by our distinguished colleague, the Honorable TOM PELLY. During the years of his tenure in the House of Representatives I have observed his efforts to keep in close touch with his constituents in order that he might better serve them. He constantly seeks to ascertain their views on pending problems and legislation. As a consequence, he does an outstanding job of representing his district.

LABOR LEADERS' STATESMANSHIP

Recent remarks of United States Representative TOM PELLY in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD disclose some real statesmanship on his part and on the part of some labor leaders in this area.

Faced, as is every Congressman, with the healthy prospect of a $2 billion Federal surplus (the first time in 5 years and the fourth time since the depression) at the end of the fiscal year this month, Mr. PELLY wrote to union leaders in the Seattle-Kitsap County area. He put it squarely up to them. He pointed out that there were three things which could be done with the black-ink money: (a) use it now in a preelection tax cut; (b) wait for the President's budget recommendations in 1957, or (c) use the money to reduce the national debt.

Obviously, the first one would be the political thing to do, particularly as PELLY's Republican Party undoubtedly would gain the most ballot credit if tax cuts were to be made available just before the Nation votes this November. Many—perhaps most—Congressmen would take that stand without consulting anybody. Yet PELLY not only wrote his labor leader friends; he pointed out in his letter that low-income groups, thinking themselves profiting by a tax cut, really would be benefited more by a reduction in the national debt, a reduction which would save them from the spending pains of inflation.

Despite these plain facts, 16 labor leaders replied to PELLY that they favored immediate tax reduction.

But 17 of them said they favored reducing the national debt. And nine of them favored waiting until President Eisenhower's recommendations after the next election (he still will prepare the 1957 budget regardless of who wins in November).

The vote, then, was 26 to 16 against doing the political thing. That is statesmanship in labor circles.

PELLY, already having stamped himself as being against a ballot-box lure for votes, made it a matter for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD when, in reporting the results of his labor poll, he said: "Personally, I believe with the President that the right thing today is to refrain from the temptation of trying to write a tax reduction just before the election. If political enthusiasm runs away * * * it would be unfortunate for this country. There will be ample opportunity to reduce rates next January. And then, Mr. Speaker, let us not forget, as union leadership obviously has not forgotten, that low-income groups need relief from present high taxes. I suggest low-income family groups in particular."

Speech of Hon. A. L. Miller, of Nebraska, at Sixteenth Annual Meeting of Institute of Food Technologists

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. L. MILLER
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 20, 1956

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I insert in the Appendix of the RECORD the following speech I made at the 16th annual meeting of the Institute of Food Technologists at St. Louis, Mo., June 11, 1956:

Mr. Chairman, honored guests, ladies and gentlemen, I feel honored to have the pleasure of appearing before this distinguished group of experts who deal with the problems of food chemistry and allied subjects. You are rendering a service to the public. As a physician and surgeon I was rendering a service to the public. It is not unlike serving in Congress where you also try to be of service to your constituents. As a physician people came to me seeking relief from pain or a physical condition—as a Member of Congress people either want something from government or they want to get government out of their hair. It's a service either way.

I pay my respects to you men and women who have made such a marvelous contribution to society through your efforts to improve the processing, the packaging and the handling of food. I have reviewed the program of your 16th annual meeting. It bears evidence that science marches on to unlock doors of the scientific tomorrow. The answers we find should bring additional blessings to mankind.

We who approach three-score years in life have seen in our lifetime more advancement in science, in technology and in the art of living than have any other equivalent period of history in this world. You and I have seen the coming of the automobile, the telephone, the radio, television, and a thousand and one gadgets that make life a little easier, and that give us more time to do the things we want to do in life. We have grown from the horse and buggy period to the jet-propelled plane that travels faster than the speed of sound. Guided missiles are on the trestle board which will travel 16,000 miles an hour and 300,000 feet in the air. The atomic powered submarine the *Nautilus* is a reality. It is quite possible the ships of tomorrow may all be powered by atomic energy.

The medicine of today is far advanced over that day when I received my sheepskin to practice medicine and surgery in 1918. Many diseases have been conquered. It is estimated that 70 percent of the prescriptions being filled over the drugstore counter today were not thought of 15 years ago. I doubt if the next 40 years will witness the many changes that have taken place in our lifetime.

One of the significant changes in the last two decades has been that of the scientific improvements in the dynamic and rapidly growing business of food technology. You scientists in your meeting today have been dealing in research which has opened up new frontiers. You have helped to create new industries, new and better jobs, and more and better things for a growing America.

I believe the American standard of living is greatly benefited because of the new things that research has been able to accomplish.

Research is a process that involves basically no more than asking questions of nature and seeking the answers. What new promise will come tomorrow is still a secret to many of the chemists living today. There will always be unexplored horizons waiting for someone to unlock the mysterious door to future progress, and it takes a pioneering spirit, a never-give-up attitude to discover those horizons and open those formidable doors.

There is no question but what chemicals are needed in the preparation, preservation and use of food. Much progress has been made through research in the field of nutrition and other practical applications of chemicals, and the American public can take pride in the manner in which our scientists and industry have handled these delicate problems.

I was privileged to be a member of a Select Committee, known as the Delaney Group Committee, established in 1950. We held 59 public hearings in 1950, 1951, and 1952, and heard 217 witnesses who presented their views; witnesses from the American Public Health Association, New York Academy of Medicine, National Research Council, United States Public Health Service, United States Food and Drug Administration, United States Department of Agriculture, Association of State and Territorial Health Officers, American Cancer Society, Grocery Manufacturers of America, National Canners Association, National Agricultural Chemicals Association, Manufacturing Chemists' Association, American Plant Food Council, General Federation of Women's Clubs, Cooperative League of the U. S. A., American Home Economics Association, National Council of

Farmer Cooperatives, National Grange, National Farmers Union, and others.

The select committee had this to say about food chemicals:

"The number of chemicals entering the food supply of the Nation has increased tremendously in the last decade. Chemical substances are being introduced into the production, processing, storage, packaging, and distribution of food at an ever-increasing rate. There is hardly a food sold in the market today which has not had some chemicals used on or in it at some stage in its production, processing, packaging, transportation, or storage. These foods include those eaten by every family, ranging from staples like bread to such luxury items as the maraschino cherry. Some eminent pharmacologists, toxicologists, physiologists, and nutritionists expressed the fear that many of the chemicals being added to food today have not been tested sufficiently to establish their nontoxicity and suitability for use in food. These scientists are not so much concerned with the acutely toxic compounds, whose harmfulness can readily be detected, as with those chemicals which may produce harmful effects only after being ingested for months or perhaps for years."

In the 84th Congress, several bills have been introduced that deal with chemicals in foods, the so-called food additives. Most of them attempt to regulate through the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare the quantitative and qualitative application of these additives. I know that unwise and excessive regulations, coupled with unwise and excessive administration, can do harm to any industry. We ought to create a favorable climate, taxwise as well as healthwise, if we are to promote the best interest of our cause. American industry must be encouraged to produce more and better goods. They ought to be produced at continually lowering prices because technical progress has shown the way. All legislation dealing with the question of chemicals in food should point the way to better living conditions. If the standard of living is lowered, we are going in the wrong direction.

It is recognized that present law does not provide adequate safeguards to guarantee a food supply absolutely free of injury to the public health. The consuming public requires more protection.

While industry has done a good job, we all know that in a tough economic world there is always someone ready to cut corners. That is why the public needs protection from those who might be less scrupulous than the large majority of the food and chemical industry.

Chemicals, antibiotics, and other things that made food better are essential to many manufactured items. The proper use of chemicals and other methods of handling, preparing, and storing food has reduced the cost of food and has kept it at a higher quality. Your technology group should have a great influence in shaping future legislation.

It is my opinion that the horizons of tomorrow will show still further progress for the food and chemical industry. The scientists are uncovering the secrets of nature and helping us weave a new fabric of life that will be even more pleasant than the one we enjoy today.

The interest in food and drug administration is countrywide. It is a subject that needs careful handling. We should not make the public hysterical. We should have composure and an objective view if we are to approach the problem in the interest of the public.

We should be sure that any new chemical is safe before permitting its application to the public food supply and that it will benefit the consumer. Now, by "benefit to the consumer" I do not believe this should be confined solely to a showing of functional value. We must recognize that foods with taste appeal, eye appeal, or sales appeal in many instances benefit the consumer just as they benefit the manufacturer and the dealer, to say nothing of the "ad man." It should be the responsibility of industry to thoroughly pretest the food additive before it is made available to the consumer.

We should never have a law which might permit untested chemicals to be introduced into food, but as the law now stands, they can be introduced into food, and the burden rests with enforcement agencies to determine whether or not they are injurious to the public health.

The bill that I have introduced, while covering all phases of chemicals in food, does set up a panel or council which is advisory and may be used by the Food and Drug Administration or by industry when a dispute on a chemical arises. A panel will be selected from the members of the Academy of Science. Let met emphasize that they are merely advisory. If industry is not satisfied it may then appeal to the courts who would then make an adjudication between the opposing parties. In the meantime the new chemical could not be introduced into the food until the final decision is made. The bill requires prompt action and eliminates long delays.

There is a great need to fill the gap which seems to exist in the present law which permits untested and inadequately tested chemicals to enter the food supply. This country is fortunate that we have a highclass group of gentlemen dealing with chemicals and food problems, and so the problems are less frequent than might be supposed.

The number of bills that have been introduced which deal with this subject indicate the desirability of such legislation, and the varied approaches emphasize that there is no universal agreement on the method for dealing with the problem.

It is a technical subject. It deals with technical, scientific problems for which there are no ready or easy answers. It is also a delicate problem, because, in considering in this legislation the desirability of a mechanism for the protection of the public health, we must not lose sight of the overriding principle that free enterprise must be encouraged in its constant research for a better, a more attractive, a more abundant, and a safer food supply for the American public.

The bill I introduced in this Congress defines new food additives as "any substance or treatment used, directly or indirectly, in or on food for the purpose of affecting the appearance, flavor, texture, or storage property of such food, or for the purpose of otherwise altering the quality or property of such food, which is not recognized among experts qualified by scientific training and experience to evaluate the safety of food, to be safe for use under the conditions of such use or intended use."

In other words, this definition confers jurisdiction in the Department of Health, Education and Welfare to apply the procedural sanctions of this bill to any substance or treatment used in or on food if, in the quantity and manner of use, the substance is not recognized as safe by qualified scientists.

There are many food additives now in use that are safe and are recognized as safe. There are many food additives now in use about which we have little scientific knowledge, but which have been used without any laboratory or practical evidence of hazard to the public health. It is my feeling that legislation requiring exhaustive laboratory analysis, pretesting and reporting of the old, recognized, safe additives would serve no useful purpose and would be unduly burdensome upon both industry and Government. They should come under the so-called grandfather clause provision. If, however, evidence—scientific evidence—should be developed in the laboratory or otherwise that an additive in use presents a reasonable probability of injury to health, the industry marketing that additive should be made to examine and reexamine its data and subject this additive to the scrutiny of the Department under this law.

Most of the bills that have been introduced on this subject agree, at least in principle, with this statement of the objectives of such legislation and with the jurisdiction which should be conferred upon the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare as its enforcement agency. The bills all quite uniformly agree that any industry proposing to market a substance that comes within the definition of a "new food additive" should submit a report of the scientific pretesting that has gone into development of the substance to the Department. The bills also are in material agreement on what the report should contain, and they all agree that the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare should have certain power over the use of chemicals and other added substances in our food supply.

The significant division in thinking appears in the procedures that are to be established. Here again, however, we all agree that the public health is paramount, and we all agree that the magnificent progress of American industry must not be blocked by an unwise delegation of power to a Government agency. The procedures established by these bills all have this purpose in mind.

We are dealing here with a problem that is primarily scientific, and secondarily legal. The problem of "what is safe for public health purposes" is essentially one within the knowledge of scientists who are qualified by training and experience to evaluate safety factors.

I believe the primary responsibility for evaluating the safety of new food additives should fall upon an advisory committee, composed of scientists. Any industry proposing to market a new food additive, after submitting its report of pretesting to the Secretary, may request that an advisory committee be appointed to examine the report of pretesting, and, after completing its examination, to submit recommendations to the Secretary. It does give the applicant and the Secretary the benefit of the knowledge and the impartiality of a board of experts. Their independent and impartial knowledge can act as a brake upon any inclination that might appear on the part of the Secretary to exercise arbitrary and unreasonable control over industry. It can also serve as an arbiter between industry and the Department if sharp differences develop. The committee can be requested and consulted by the Secretary, just as it can by the applicant industry.

The advisory committee device has proved itself well in another facet of the food field since the enactment of Public Law 518 of the 83d Congress. That law, of course, deals with the use of pesticide chemicals, or the Miller bill. It established advisory committees to make recommendations to the Secretary on pesticide chemical tolerances. I have followed the same framework in writing the advisory committee into new food legislation.

To those who fear the use of the advisory committee and suggest that it would become a tool in the hands of a capricious Department, may I say that on the only occasion when an advisory committee has been consulted under Public Law 518, the Committee's recommendations were contrary to the opinion of the Secretary, but the Secretary subsequently followed the recommendations of the committee.

The Secretary is given authority to write regulations that will define the use of a new food additive. If the applicant, or any party adversely affected wishes to protest the regulations, he may file objections thereto and proceed to public hearing in the De-

partment. The Secretary will then proceed to issue an order pursuant to the findings at the hearing, and the applicant's recourse is to the circuit court of appeals.

Again, let me say I am honored to appear before this distinguished group. I trust that in your deliberation you will give some thought to not only the new legislation but the type of legislation that will be best suited to a growing, dynamic America. The type of legislation that will best protect the health of America and provide the incentive for continued research in food technology.

Your land America is a dynamic, growing Nation. Many of the good things of life that we enjoy comes about because devoted men and women of science have worked hard and long to make our land a better place to live. We have grown from the 13 original colonies with 3 million people to 48 States with 167 million people. You are a part of this parade of progress and I am sure you will continue to make scientific contributions that will be in the interests of future generations.

Marquette University Honors Chancellor Adenauer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 19, 1956

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, last week, I had the pleasure of witnessing a solemn convocation in the Milwaukee Auditorium, in the course of which the Marquette University honored Chancellor Konrad Adenauer, of the Federal Republic of Germany, with an honorary degree of doctor of laws.

This was an inspiring occasion, culminating the celebration of Marquette University's 75th anniversary.

I believe that the president of the university, the Reverend Edward J. O'Donnell, S. J., expressed the sentiments of the 5,000 persons who attended the convocation when he said:

It is most fitting * * * that at long last—in this city with its rich German sentiment and fine traditions, and at this university, where the glow of our 75th anniversary celebration still abides—we pay tribute to this illustrious statesman, stanch friend and ally, world leader and man of faith.

The city of Milwaukee was proud and happy to welcome Chancellor Adenauer, whose notable efforts to promulgate the growth of practical democracy on the national level in Germany, and whose personal integrity and courage in the face of totalitarian absolutism, have won the admiration of freemen all over the world.

The people of Milwaukee welcomed Chancellor Adenauer with enthusiasm, and they wish him well in his continued efforts to further the cause of democracy, and of lasting and just world peace.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I want to commend to the attention of the membership of this body the following text of Marquette University's honorary degree citation of Chancellor Adenauer:

ADENAUER CITATION

Konrad Adenauer is a man of Cologne. From 1876 until 1949, save for his years at the Universities of Bonn, Freiburg, and Munich, in Cologne he lived and worked as a lawyer, public prosecutor, deputy mayor, and lord mayor. There from 1933 till 1945, when he was not actually in prison, he was under house arrest by the Nazis. With poignant truth he said, "I have felt totalitarian absolute might on my own body."

But there also in Cologne he lived and learned democracy in local government that had centuries old municipal guaranties of personal liberty which had been worked out in the middle ages. Two wars have caused some to forget that these communities, whose histories go back to Roman times, developed at the town level the finest type of practical working democracy. To translate these tested safeguards of personal freedom up to the national level in Germany and then to the international level for the world is now his sole mission.

For this role divine providence has with deliberation prepared him, over the years, deepening his experience and wisdom. In 1949, at the age of 73, he was ready and became Chancellor of the Federal Republic of Germany. From that day to this he has been to the whole free world a strong symbol of a new Europe and a new hope; his sincerity, his selflessness, his deeply Christian appreciation of the rights of the individual as well as of society have stood firm both as rampart and as sign against the dark, despotic ways of godless collectivism.

Konrad Adenauer has often expressed and twice acted upon his desire to know the Midwest, the heart of America. In Milwaukee he finds a city and a university both of which have benefited from the industry and culture of men and women whose ultimate roots drew from the same Christian and European civilization which produced the ideas of Cologne and of Konrad Adenauer.

It is altogether fitting, therefore, that this university in this midwestern city, proud of its integrity and freedom, should this day declare that, because he has shown himself in private and in public life to be a man of inner strength who as a victim was not broken by tyrannical power, who as an intellectual and Christian humanist has understood Europe from within, who as a wise statesman knew how to be patient and how to be daring, who has shown to his friends and to his foes enduring strength and courage, whom all the world recognizes not as a creature of expediency but as a man of Christian and eternal principles, Konrad Adenauer has merited from Marquette University the degree of doctor of laws, honoris causa.

Encouraging Foreign Investment Through Tax Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THADDEUS M. MACHROWICZ
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 20, 1956

Mr. MACHROWICZ. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, June 19, 1956, I introduced H. R. 11838, a bill to encourage private United States investments in foreign countries by reducing the incidence of double taxation on taxpayers with more than 80 percent of their gross income from sources without the United States. I most strongly urge my colleagues to give this legislation their full support.

Our best insurance against a communistic world is to bolster the economies of our allies in foreign countries. A healthy economy and a high standard of living are rarely breeding grounds for communism. During the past decade the United States has been relying mainly on the foreign aid programs to help the underdeveloped areas of the world to improve their economic conditions.

It is doubtful that we can continue to afford these costly foreign-aid programs. Our people are coming to the realization that private enterprise must gradually take over the burden of developing the economies of these countries. Competitive, free enterprise, which has developed the United States to its present high economic level, is the best exportable product the United States possesses.

However, in order to encourage the American investor to undertake the development of foreign natural resources, industries, and markets for United States goods, the investor must be placed on a competitive level with the investors from other capital exporting countries.

Under the present United States income-tax laws, the American investor in foreign countries is at a disadvantage with his competitors. The removal of some of the tax obstacles would encourage him to take the risk of sending capital funds abroad, even in the face of exchange fluctuations, nationalistic tendencies, and the ever-present communistic influences.

One of the obstacles which causes an American investor to pay a combined foreign and United States tax in excess of the tax payable on the same investment made in the United States is the so-called per country limitation in the Internal Revenue Code.

The United States investor abroad cannot obtain in undeveloped foreign countries sufficient capital to develop and expand operations and must look to the United States capital market for funds. The fixed charges on these funds must be paid in United States dollars. Hence, the investor has found it necessary to invest in several countries; so that in the event the exchange and economic conditions in one country deteriorate then the fixed charges on the borrowings for the whole operation may be met with revenues from the other countries.

This diversity of investment in several countries is the same approach used by the United States in giving aid to several countries at the same time in its fight against communism. In this manner, if the aid to one country is ineffectual, the complete program will not be destroyed.

The per country limitation of the code does not recognize the business necessity of diversification and requires earnings and income taxes to be segregated by countries rather than allowing the taxpayer to consider the income and taxes from all countries as a single business unit. The total foreign income

taxes paid are an expense of the entire operation and the fact that in some countries the tax rate is low and in others it is high should not prevent the use of the full foreign income taxes paid as an offset to the United States income tax.

The allocation of income and taxes by countries required by the per-country limitation often results in a combined foreign and United States tax rate in excess of the present 52-percent tax rate on United States income.

The original and basic intent of the foreign tax credit provisions of the code was to avoid double taxation of foreign income. These provisions have been of real value and without them a United States company could not possibly operate in a foreign country.

The removal of the overall limitation in the Revenue Act of 1954 should have been an impetus to the investor with United States source income to invest abroad, since it enabled him to use foreign income taxes as an offset to the tax on United States income. However, the removal of the overall limitation did not afford any tax relief to the investor who derives practically all of his income from sources without the United States. Such an investor does not have sufficient United States income against which foreign taxs could be applied. This investor must still bear the inequities brought about by the application of the per-country limitation.

In order to remove these inequities entirely and thus give full impetus to investment abroad, the per-country limitation on the use of foreign tax credits should be removed from the code completely. Though this would be reasonable and in the public interest, the Congress may not consider it feasible to take this action at the present time.

However, the per-country limitation should at least be made inapplicable to the taxpayer whose gross income qualifies as foreign source income under the provisions of subchapter N, part I, of the code. Such qualified taxpayers are the true foreign investors. With the assurance that their combined taxes will not exceed the United States tax rate, these are the organizations which will send capital funds abroad to further expand and develop industry and markets for United States goods.

Power on the Line

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACK WESTLAND
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 20, 1956

Mr. WESTLAND. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial appeared in the June 7 edition of the Skagit Valley Herald, a daily newspaper in my congressional district. It points out the benefits which the area will derive from the construction of a new dam on the Baker River by the Puget Sound Power & Light Co. This newly licensed project demonstrates how the power industry of the Northwest is planning ahead, investing millions in the future of the area. I am certain that the growth of our Northwest industries depends to a large degree on power, and this project is a solid step toward meeting the needs of the future.

The text of the editorial is as follows:

BAKER RIVER DAM PROJECT

Puget Sound Power & Light Co. has taken a commendable stride forward with the construction of new hydroelectric facilities on the Baker River totaling 140,000 additional kilowatts of power output.

This $35-million project demonstrates the great faith of this private utility in the Puget Sound area. It is the largest single undertaking in the power company's life, and it comes at a time when this area is looking to the greatest economic expansion in its history.

The immediate effect upon the economy of this region will be felt as men and materials unite to build the dam. Every shopping district from Marblemount to Mount Vernon will receive direct benefit from the $11 million payroll that will be paid to construction workers in the next 3 years that the project is under construction.

The Superior Portland Cement plant at Concrete is probably another Skagit County beneficiary of the huge project.

However, it is the long-range benefit that is the greatest result of the two Baker River developments.

The additional energy made available to western Washington is of vast importance to new business, agriculture, and industry. The lessons of the past decade in the Northwest clearly show that economic expansion follows closely the development of low-cost power. It is nearly impossible to have too much power, for as soon as new energy is developed new customers appear to use the power.

Power-hungry industries so attracted spell economic development for the Puget Sound area. Puget Sound Power & Light is providing more kilowatts to turn the wheels and drive the machines or industry, machines which offer more jobs to an expanding population along the western slope of the Cascades.

Without new sources of energy the Puget Sound area's development would be stunted. Puget Sound Power & Light has recognized the opportunities and has assumed a leadership in the economic progress of the Puget Sound region.

Continued growth and prosperity for everybody from farmer and factory worker to doctor and lawyer is an inevitable result of Puget's forward stride in power development.

Resolution in Opposition to the Recommendation of the Bradley Commission

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MARTHA W. GRIFFITHS
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 20, 1956

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. Mr. Speaker, the recent report of the Bradley Commission on veterans' benefits has aroused considerable discussion in my home State of Michigan and throughout the Nation.

This is quite proper in our democracy where important questions of public policy should be intelligently evaluated at all times by our people.

In this connection the Disabled American Veterans of Michigan recently held their 31st annual convention in Detroit and adopted a resolution in opposition to the recommendations of the Bradley Commission.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the text of this resolution in the RECORD:

RESOLUTION CONDEMNING THE BRADLEY COMMISSION REPORT

Whereas the Bradley Commission has rendered a report which cruelly departs from the accepted principles of veterans' benefits established over the years by our Government since the Revolutionary War; and

Whereas the Bradley Commission report introduces new and dangerous concepts which would destroy the philosophy of veteran's benefits now existing and in its place would substitute a set of sociological principles not particularly related to veterans' problems; and

Whereas we believe the Bradley Commission report gives lip service to the obligation owed to the Nation's service-connected disabled defenders but has in fact laid the foundation for a wholesale assault on veterans' benefits: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the DAV Department of Michigan, in convention assembled this 8th, 9th, and 10th of June 1956, at Detroit, Mich., does go on record as condemning the Bradley Commission report as destructive of veterans' benefits as evolved by the duly elected congressional representatives of the grateful people of this Nation over the course of its history; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be furnished to the public press and copies mailed to each of Michigan's Representatives and Senators and to our national legislative chairman.

Approved June 10, 1956, at the 31st annual convention of the Department of Michigan Disabled American Veterans held in Detroit, Mich.

LAWRENCE R. SYLVESTER,
Department Adjutant.

Armenian Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN LESINSKI, JR.
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 20, 1956

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, on May 27 of this year, I joined with Detroit members of the American Committee for the Independence of Armenia to celebrate the 38th anniversary of Armenian Independence Day. At that meeting, I heard a fine address by Mr. Arpo Yemen, secretary of the American Committee for Armenian Independence in Detroit. I think Mr. Yemen's remarks are worthy of notice and am submitting them for the information of the Members.

The remarks follow:

May 28, 1918, represents the culmination of six-centuries-long Armenian aspirations for national independence.

In her more than 3,000 years of glorious history, Armenia was oppressed nearly by all the notorious conquerors—from Assyrian, Persian, and Roman emperors to Genghis

Khan and the even bloodthirstier tyrants of modern Turkey.

But even during the darkest periods of Armenian history the unquenchable spirit of independence was preserved in the hearts of Armenians. Massacres, horror, rape, and plunder, toil, sweat, and more blood have only strengthened the indomitable will of the Armenians to regain the paramount condition of existence—freedom, freedom of worship, freedom of thought and speech, freedom to live decently, and the right to die with dignity.

The Armenian saga of May 28 is only one of numerous other confirmative examples that the price of freedom is very high indeed, but not too high for nations determined and willing to pay it.

Today's celebration of the 38th anniversary of May 28 carries a special significance—a significance which illustrates the nature of our renewed struggle against slavery and tyranny, this time wearing the ugly mask of communism.

Representatives of five other once politically and culturally free and proud nations full of brilliant historic traditions, are joining us in our rededication to the sacred cause of liberty; they are: Ukraine, Bylorussia, Estonia, Lithuania, and Latvia. They all have a common enemy—Soviet Russia, and a common desire for freedom and a common hatred of tyranny, be it exercised by Lenin, Stalin, or his former assistants. The history of their respective countries have a striking resemblance to the history of Armenia; in fact, some of them proclaimed their national independence in the same blessed year of 1918, and were incorporated in the Soviet Union in the same dark November of 1920. The Baltic States, Estonia, Lithuania, and Latvia, were enslaved in the form of Soviet Socialistic Republics 20 years later in June of 1940.

Disregarding the statistical differences of chronology and geography, the history of all freedom loving peoples is strikingly similar to each other. Scientists and historians have long but in vain sought an equation—a mathematical expression of the course of history. Here is one, even though oversimplified:

Struggle + saerifice + perseverance + optimism + faith = freedom. You see, my dear friends, this time we are not alone in our struggle, sacrifice, perseverance, optimism, and faith, and therefore we should attain freedom more surely than before.

There are some more captive nations in the Soviet Union, nations which we must not fail to mention in this celebration commemorating freedom anywhere, anyplace. All these countries have been swallowed by Soviet Russia in one form or another.

In the form of Soviet Socialist Republics there are: Georgia, Azerbaijan, Turkestan, Uzbekistan, Khazakhistan, Kirghizia, and Karelia.

In the form of "Eastern European satellites"—a phrase we hear more often nowadays than "Soviet Socialist Republics," possibly because the memories of some influential statesmen in the free world such as George Kennan, author of the dubious policy of containment, Winston Churchill once an ardent foe of communism, and even our own Secretary of State John Foster Dulles can reach as far back as 1947; or they want to deliberately set the course of history at 1947. Anyway, these so-called satellites, equally entitled to their place in the sun of liberty are Poland, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Rumania, Bulgaria, and Albania. When free elections are permitted in those countries, Mr. Churchill would "do business" with "new Russia" and even admit her to NATO. What "new Russia" are they talking about, I do not know. But to make our list of Soviet colonies as complete as possible let us not forget China, North Korea, North Indochina, and East Germany—all once free, independent, culturally and ethnically distinctly non-Russian nations. Today they are all being oppressed in the most ruthless form of colonialism the world has ever witnessed.

Just a few days ago Mr. Khrushchev made a toast for the independence of Algeria from French colonial rule and, in general, of all nations seeking freedom from colonialism.

So let us join Mr. Khrushchev in that toast by extending his wishes to the countries I already enumerated—countries which are victims of the Soviet brand, much more vicious type of colonialism.

We can assure Khrushchev, Bulganin, and the Kremlin gang that they are not just ironically laughing at us.

There are certain implacable laws of history, among which the axiom that dictatorships are inevitably doomed to destruction and that through the somber clouds of slavery and injustice the sun of liberty and justice is bound to shine again.

In the meanwhile, every year on May 28, we are going to remind both the free and enslaved worlds that there cannot be eternal peace on earth until such time as every nation in the world, including the smallest ones, are granted their place in the family of peace and freedom-loving nations.

Live a Little Longer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ELIZABETH KEE
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 20, 1956

Mrs. KEE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I should like to include an article by Dr. William A. Sawyer, International Association of Machinists medical consultant, which appeared in the Machinist for June 21, 1956. This article is entitled "Live a Little Longer" and concerns the chain of 10 new hospitals constructed by the United Mine Workers Welfare and Retirement Fund for the benefit of soft coal miners of Virginia, West Virginia, and Kentucky. The article follows:

LIVE A LITTLE LONGER—MINERS' HOSPITAL CHAIN HERALDS BETTER HEALTH CARE

(By Dr. William A. Sawyer)

I had the privilege on June 2 of sitting with several thousand miners and their families, while John L. Lewis, president of the United Mine Workers of America, dedicated a chain of 10 new hospitals which will serve the soft coal miners of Virginia, West Virginia, and Kentucky. As President Lewis dedicated them in memory of those miners who suffered and died in the past without adequate hospital and medical care, a response of "Amens" was heard among those assembled. On their faces were expressions of warm and enthusiastic gratitude, despite the chilly, misty day. The service was held outside the 193-bed Beckley Hospital, which is the largest of the chain.

These hospitals were made possible by the welfare and retirement fund started 10 years ago by a tax of 5 cents on each ton of coal mined. Today it is kept going by a tax of 40 cents on each ton. After trying for several years to take care of sick and injured miners and their families in the too few and insufficiently equipped hospitals of these States, it was decided to provide, where needed, additional beds in more modern hospitals.

This chain of hospitals, ranging in size from 50 to 199 beds, will have a total capacity of just over 1,000 patients. They will have the services of various specialists in the three base hospitals at Harlan, Ky., Williamson and Beckley, W. Va. Training schools for registered and practical nurses, as well as for technicians and other personnel, will be located in these base hospitals also. These hospitals are located throughout the hills for 250 miles, connected by winding roads. No one hospital is more than 65 miles from its neighbor. Because of this, personnel and supplies can be changed readily.

This chain hospital system for medical and surgical care of miners and their families is new in the realm of orthodox medical care and union health and welfare plans. The buildings are of brick and glass, functional in design, attractively decorated within, and medically provided with the latest and best of equipment. No money has been wasted on nonessentials. In fact, they have been constructed at a lower per bed unit rate than is true generally. Ordinarily, it costs between eighteen and twenty thousand dollars per bed. The memorial chain averaged $16,000 per bed.

These hospitals are introducing methods of operation that hospital experts will be studying and talking about for many years to come. The basic idea back of some of these new ideas is to provide people and things at the patient's bedside as speedily and economically as possible. The object of all such planning is not merely to save money, but to put time and money where they really belong—with better patient care.

As I toured the Beckley Hospital and listened to each department head describe his or her work, it was evident that only the best and most skillful diagnosis and treatment were good enough for their patients. Doctors, nurses, technicians, and various other staff personnel are being carefully selected, trained where necessary, and paid better than is the average generally in hospitals.

From such generous support and careful selection of staff, superior care should be possible. If the art and heart of good medical care can take new and deep roots in this advanced medical service system, the memorial hospitals in the coal regions may well become new beacons of better medical care generally, for more people everywhere.

Remarks by the Honorable Wilber M. Brucker, Secretary of the Army, at Flag Day Celebration, Philadelphia, Pa., June 14, 1956

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUGH SCOTT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 19, 1956

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am inserting speech made by the Honorable Wilber M. Brucker, Secretary of the Army, at the Flag Day celebration in Philadelphia on June 14, 1956:

It is refreshing to stand here on Flag Day in the shadow of Independence Hall, where our Nation was born, and where, 179 years ago today, the Continental Congress adopted the Stars and Stripes as our national emblem.

This is also the 181st anniversary of the United States Army, which from the very

first moment of its existence has been our country's stanch defender. It is altogether fitting that the Army's new flag, which it was my privilege to receive only yesterday from the hand of Vice President NIXON at a ceremony on the steps of our National Capitol, should be unfurled to the breeze for the first time on this historic occasion. With all its proud record, the United States Army has never had a flag of its own. Its divisions, regiments and other units have had individual flags. Now the Army has its own flag, symbolizing the unity that embodies all its elements. This flag throughout all the years to come will fly alongside the Stars and Stripes as the splendid symbol of "Duty—Honor—Country" to which our great Army has ever been true, and from which it will never depart.

We are gathered here today to pay tribute to Old Glory, the symbol of our national unity, our national endeavor, and our national aspirations. It is the emblem of the courage and the indomitable spirit of a great people. It is the embodiment of the wholesome principles that have made our Nation great.

It is a flag of peace—the kind of peace that is based on justice. It stands forthrightly for the rugged determination of Americans to fight—to the death if need be—to protect their freedom against any enemy. It is a flag of power—of the material power for national security and the protection of free men everywhere. It is a flag of spiritual power that sustains free men in consolidating their hard-won freedom into workable self-government. It flies proudly over our Army posts, our ships of war, our air bases and every farflung bastion of our military strength in 73 countries around the world. It flies over our schools where our citizens of tomorrow are in the making, and recite the pledge of allegiance to the flag. It occupies in solemn dignity an honored place beside our religious altars. It adorns our courts of justice. It is a beloved member of countless households. It is a living embodiment of the faith of 167,000,000 Americans.

When the flag was born, our Nation was less than a year old. In those early days, the flag was displayed everywhere with genuine pride. It was the radiant symbol and visible evidence of the bond that welded Americans of diverse backgrounds into one people, with one purpose and with one spirit. In more recent years, some people have come to take the flag for granted. They have come to take their heritage of freedom for granted. They do not give the flag its proper place of honor. If this tendency continues, we shall have lost much of the vital stimulus and spiritual vigor which only the flag can give.

By honoring the flag, we honor our country. Flag etiquette is not just idle ritual. It is the outward evidence of inward reverence for America. We do not honor the bright silk or bunting of which the flag is made, but rather the living soul of our Nation which is incarnate in its gleaming folds. When we hoist the flag at sunrise and take it down at sunset, when we place it in its proper position at the right of the dais or pulpit, when we give it the place of honor over all other standards, when we salute it, or take off our hats as it passes on parade, we are according our country the respect to which it is entitled in our lives.

The very act of displaying the flag, or standing proudly at attention and saluting it, helps to awaken in the heart of a true American the essential spirit of our Nation. Every time he salutes that flag he strengthens immeasurably his inward patriotism by giving it external expression. Old Glory can contribute so much to enrich our lives if we only take the time to do it. Yet how careless we have become in our outward manifestations. On Memorial Day as I drove through the streets of Washington on my way to Arlington Cemetery to lay the wreath at the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier, I was struck by the absence of the American flag. Today, as I traveled to Philadelphia, I was saddened by the lack of the display of the flag. Isn't it high time we quickened our zeal by restoring respect for the flag to its rightful place?

I call upon Americans to renew their patriotic spirit by displaying Old Glory upon every appropriate occasion and rendering it the respect that is its due. No school, no public building, and no home should be without the Stars and Stripes, prominently displayed on our Nation's birthday, on Memorial Day, and on other patriotic occasions. Nothing the average citizen could do would help more positively than such action. The impact everywhere would be as astounding as it would be beneficial.

It would serve notice upon any who seek to destroy our freedom that we are solidly united. Could there be any more effective way of dismaying our enemies, and raising the confidence of our own people in this important hour?

Flag Day is a day of solemn rededication of national faith. Years ago an intrepid Army sergeant carried the flag forward in advance of the troops attacking across open ground amid a rain of bullets. So fierce was his charge that he found himself well ahead of the line, which had become pinned down by enemy fire. "Bring the colors back to the line," the captain shouted to him. "No," replied the sergeant, "Bring the line up to the colors." Inspired by his intrepid example, the troops surged forward and the line was brought up to the colors.

In like manner, we must all bring our lives up to the flag. The flag causes us to rise above lesser motives and strive to measure up to the high standards it represents. The flag inspires us to live up to what is expected of us. The flag brings out the best in all of us.

On this 179th anniversary of its birth, the flag looks down upon a Nation threatened by a vicious international conspiracy under the hammer and sickle, backed by the largest mobilized armed forces on earth. During the last 10 years, the Communists have extended their control to embrace 600 million people. They have more than 8 million men under arms at this moment, including 2½ million Red Chinese. Most of their troops are ground troops. They have 405 armed and well-trained divisions ready for immediate action.

Menacing as this may be, it is only a part of the overall challenge that we face. Of equal importance is the menace of a diabolical ideology of hate, atheism, and intellectual perversion which saps men's moral stamina, impoverishes their minds, and gnaws at their souls. The Communists know that if they could destroy America by either method—I mean, of course, with military force or this insidious ideology—they could end all effective resistance to their plans to capture the whole world for communism.

The ability of our Nation to stand firm in the face of this challenge rests upon our spiritual strength, our unswerving purpose, and our sustained vigilance. The steel of America's spirit will always be her most formidable armament.

The concept that the soldier should be called in only after statesmanship has failed and war is actually upon us is outmoded because it is moth-eaten, shoddy, and threadbare, and a part of the past. Today our Armed Forces are the strongest pillars of statesmanship by which we are seeking to compel any warlike nation to keep the peace. We are keeping ourselves militarily strong in order to cope with the military power arrayed against us. We have a magnificent Army-Navy-Air Force team. Working together, our Armed Forces constitute the greatest power for peace in the world today.

The United States Army has half its strength deployed overseas. Our troops abroad constitute visible evidence to the leaders of the Communist conspiracy that we mean exactly what we say—that we steadfastly intend to resist aggression in any form. In the future, there should never be an occasion for an aggressor to explain that he misunderstood America's position. The presence of our troops standing guard along the frontiers of freedom in Europe and Asia stimulates the morale over there, and stiffens the resistance of our friends. It is a constant reminder that we're in this together. It proves our determination to see it through together, and it constitutes a powerful deterrent to any aggression.

Although man has struggled for freedom since the dawn of time, only a few have achieved individual freedom like ours. Experience and wisdom acquired the hard way through all the ages were blended into the blueprint of America. Democracy will always be an unfinished work. We cannot take for granted its permanence because we have enjoyed its benefits for 180 years. America cannot rest upon the laurels of Washington or Lincoln. Democracy is strictly a matter of day-by-day accomplishment. Unless we translate the inspiration we derive from the achievements of the past into equally splendid achievements today, our democracy cannot long survive.

There is too great a tendency among Americans to be spectators rather than participants in our great democracy. There are too many critics and too few builders. A man who could not build a tarpaper shack can tear down a cathedral. When the Declaration of Independence spoke of the right to the "pursuit of happiness" it meant just that—the right to work out our own destiny. It did not mean that we could avoid all the unpleasantness of life. In God's economy there is no attempt to protect man against difficulties. In fact, He permits difficulties in order to temper men's souls. The same fire that burns wood hardens steel.

Our freedom and our American way of life are always under attack. Only through eternal vigilance and unremitting effort on the part of every one of us can they be kept secure. Freedom is not like a prize that can be won for all time and locked away as a perpetual treasure. It is a living thing that must be constantly nurtured by the toil and sacrifice of dedicated men and women. Freedom will continue to bless us with its presence only so long as it is vigorously cherished and zealously guarded.

America was built by patriots and it will be kept secure only by patriots. When we think of all the flag has meant to generations of Americans, can we believe the cynics who say that patriotism has become outmoded? Can we forgt that all we have today—our freedom, our civilization, and everything that raises us above the primal savage of the jungle—has been won and held by men who, loving life, loved principle more, and were willing to sacrifice their lives if necessary for their beliefs? Patriotism must remain dominant in our lives. America has a greater need today than ever before for men and women who think in terms of what they owe their country, not what their country owes them.

There still lives in this Nation the spirit that made it great and has kept it free. That spirit will lead us onward to heights as yet touched only by our dreams. Sometimes patriotism lies dormant until it is sparked by some great event or moving experience. In the meantime it continues to reside in he heart of true Amercans. It will continue to be the source of our strength through all the years to come.

Last December in the course of an inspection trip to the Far East, I visited Pearl Harbor. It was about 14 years from the time of the infamous attack, and I told the

admiral who welcomed me that I wanted to visit the spot where the battleshihp *Arizona* sank under the unexpected rain of aerial bombs that terrible day in 1941. He took me out in a small boat, and as we approached the area in the harbor where the *Arizona* lay, I noticed that the form of the great ship was outlined by small floats. Although the deck was 15 feet or more under the water, I was able to step out on the bridge which projected several feet above the surface.

While standing there, I looked down and let my eyes trace the outline of that historic ship under the dark water, and I thought of the 996 Americans who lie in eternal honor within her shattered hull—where they fell, and where they remain because their dear ones want it that way. As I stood there, I noticed the irridescence of an oil slick on the waves. As I pointed to it, the admiral said: "Yes, we've noticed it many times. It's oil, still oozing up from the *Arizona*." It was a solemn moment.

I turned toward the stern, and there an American flag was flying. I said, "Why is the flag flying out here?" The admiral drew himself up and said, "Sir, this is still the *Arizona*. Every morning we come out here and raise her flag, and every evening we take it down." We both saluted the *Arizona's* flag and her immortal ship's company—while I gulped and wiped my eyes.

After that precious experience I felt a tingle running along my spine—greater faith in my heart—and renewed determination to be fully worthy of that glorious flag. You don't have to shout about patriotism. You don't even need to talk about it. You just feel it—deep down inside of you.

There is a little couplet which expresses my faith in this Nation, and in the inherent patriotism of our people:

"America's strong, America's young,
And her greatest songs are still unsung."

Campaign Against Loud and Obnoxious Radio-TV Commercials Bolstered by TV Guide Magazine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CRAIG HOSMER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 13, 1956

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, several weeks ago I issued an interim report on my then faltering campaign against loud and obnoxious radio-TV commercials. Subsequently TV Guide, a weekly which bills itself as "America's television magazine," took up the fight and editorialized as follows:

AS WE SEE IT

Anybody have an opinion on loud commercials? Here's a chance to say something about them.

Congressman CRAIG HOSMER has undertaken a campaign against "loud, noisy and therefore obnoxious commercials on radio and TV." It's a praiseworthy endeavor if there ever was one, and certainly is worthy of support.

Breathes there a red-blooded American viewer who hasn't muttered imprecations against sponsors who insist on filming their sales messages at higher-than-normal volume? Is there one among us who hasn't dreamed happily of wonderful tortures to be tried on station executives who instruct engineers to "turn up the sound for the commercials?"

Congressman HOSMER says his campaign is "faltering." He complained to the Federal Communications Commission. No answer. He wrote the networks. No response. Now he's appealing to the people.

With a few hundred thousand letters in his mailbag, the good Congressman, who hails from California, might start impressing the men responsible for loud commercials. He might carry some weight with a well-supported complaint to the National Association of Radio and Television Broadcasters.

Let's all write Congressman HOSMER a letter. Let's tell him that we agree—or disagree—with his campaign to bring the commercials down to the same sound level as the programs.

Send your letter, or card, to: Hon. CRAIG HOSMER, room 241, House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

The result has been a deluge of mail from 48 States and 6 Canadian Provinces, too. It is being analyzed, and I shall soon be able to make a second interim report concerning my no longer faltering campaign.

Present indications are that the forthcoming report will be comforting to neither network vice presidents nor the Madison Avenue hucksters who ad nauseam try to brain wash every living American and Canadian in such things as wondering "where the yellow went" or "why grandma can't get a queen size pop bottle."

Resolution on Civil Rights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ADAM C. POWELL, JR.
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 20, 1956

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

NEW YORK COUNCIL PIONEER WOMEN,
New York, June 12, 1956.

Hon. CLAYTON POWELL,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN POWELL: We have the honor to transmit to you a resolution on civil rights, adopted by the New York Council Pioneer Women at the annual conference, held May 24, 1956, at the Belmont Plaza Hotel, New York City.

Sincerely yours,

FLORENCE SELKIN,
President, New York Council Pioneer Women.

MILLY BRANDT,
Chairman, American Affairs.

RESOLUTION ON CIVIL RIGHTS

(Adopted at the Annual Conference of the New York Council Pioneer Women, New York City, May 24, 1956)

Resolved that we, the New York Council Pioneer Women, in annual conference assembled, May 24, 1956 at the Belmont Plaza Hotel, declare our solidarity with the forces in American life which are striving for the full implementation of the Supreme Court decision in favor of desegregation in our schools, and declare this decision to be a basic step on the road to the full equality of the races which together make up our great Nation.

We pledge our best efforts to the attainment of full civil rights of all our people, regardless of race, creed or color, in the field of employment, voting, housing, education and equal protection before the law.

We urge both the Democratic and Republican parties to include in their party platforms at the coming national conventions, a courageous and liberal civil-rights plank, in keeping with the spirit of the Bill of Rights, which is part of the fundamental document of the freedom of our country.

Be it further resolved that copies of this resolution be sent to Mr. Leonard Hall, national chairman of the Republican Party; to Mr. Paul Butler, national chairman of the Democratic Party; to Senator HERBERT H. LEHMAN, and to Senator IRVING M. IVES.

Submitted by:

MILLY BRANDT,
Chairman, American Affairs Committee.

Why the Reserve Has No Technicians

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 20, 1956

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith the following editorial which appeared in the April 1956 issue of Air Force magazine entitled "Why the Reserve Has No Technicians":

WHY THE RESERVE HAS NO TECHNICIANS

(By Edmund F. Hogan)

As we have pointed out before (Air Force, January 1956) the establishment of an air technician program is a basic requirement for the Air Force Reserve. Briefly, this program uses full-time, civilian employees in place of the active-duty Air Force people who are now assigned to Reserve flying units. The civilian employees, however, must be members of the units in which they are employed, and go on active duty with their units when mobilized.

The Air National Guard has had a similar program since 1946. The years have proved it to be an unqualified success. There is every reason to believe that this program in the Air Force Reserve would be equally successful. An air technician plan for the Reserve was developed by Continental Air Command a year ago. It is specifically designed to improve the combat-readiness of the 24 Reserve flying wings. But there are other important byproducts.

First, the technician plan would release some 9,000 active-duty Air Force officers and airmen for assignment elsewhere in the active establishment. Second, it would save about $2 million a year in salaries alone and an estimated $9 million a year in hidden costs required to support the present system.

Last June the Air Force submitted the plan to the Department of Defense, specifically to Carter L. Burgess, Assistant Secretary of Defense for Manpower and Personnel. Mr. Burgess looked it over and sent it back to the Air Force for answers to questions which had risen from a review of the plan by his staff.

On August 31, Air Force Secretary Quarles sent a memorandum to Mr. Burgess, replying to the questions he had asked. One of these concerned civil service status of the technicians. The legal and technical staffs of the Civil Service Commission agreed to the plan, but the Commission Chairman wanted the endorsement of the Department of Defense. Mr. Quarles' memo urged that Department endorsement be conveyed to the

Civil Service Commission as soon as possible.

That endorsement is still to come. In fact, every attempt to get Mr. Burgess to approve the plan has failed. Even the recommendation of his own top advisory group, Defense Department's Reserve Forces Policy Board, has not moved Mr. Burgess. This board, headed by Dr. Milton G. Baker, has approved the air technician plan. Moreover, a few weeks ago Dr. Baker, in a personal appearance before Defense Secretary Wilson's Armed Forces Policy Council, specifically recommended that the air technician plan be given the green light. Still, the plan remains pigeonholed.

Recently, Congressman ED EDMONDSON, of Oklahoma, asked Mr. Burgess to tell him why he continued to hold up the plan, Mr. Burgess replied as follows:

"The plan is currently being studied in my office both with regard to its intrinsic merits and its relationship to other important elements of the program.

"When our review is completed, a determination will be made as to whether the proposal will contribute to the effectiveness of the Reserve program."

That would indicate that Mr. Burgess has no confidence in his own Reserve Forces Policy Board, much less in the Air Force itself. It would seem that he still is not convinced that the plan "will contribute to the effectiveness of the Reserve program," despite the proved success of the same project in the Air Guard, and despite the fact that everyone else concerned has approved it. But Mr. Burgess is far too smart a man to be so illogical as that.

Why does Mr. Burgess continue to sit on the plan? For the answer to this mystery we apparently must consider a few "extenuating circumstances."

Mr. Burgess happens to be directly responsible for the success or failure of the administration's National Reserve plan. This law offers young men a number of options for completing required military service. One option permits a youth to volunteer for 6 months of active-duty training, following which he has a total Reserve obligation of 7½ years.

Up to the moment, at least, the Air Force has wanted no part of this plan, on the grounds that the 6-month training cannot possibly furnish it with the highly complex skills it needs. Mr. Burgess has been almost violent in his insistence that the Air Force use the plan.

So the plot thickens. With the air technician plan in his bottom drawer, Mr. Burgess has something the Air Force wants. If the Air Force wants the technician plan badly enough it presumably can get it—by accepting the 6-months' feature of the National Reserve plan.

Mr. Burgess indicated this himself not long ago. When asked why he was holding up approval of the technician plan, Mr. Burgess replied, in effect:

"When the Air Force shows some good faith to us, we'll show good faith to them."

Now there is no connection between the air technician plan and the 6-months' training program. Each should be considered on its own merits. There is no reason why the Air Force should be required to take 6-month trainees—and jeopardize its recruiting program—in order to get civilian employees for its Ready Reserve. No reason, that is, except Mr. Burgess.

Many times in the past when the Air Force Reserve program has bogged down, it has been difficult to pinpoint those responsible. Not so in this case. The responsibility lies squarely with Carter Burgess.

We think it's high time Secretary Wilson stepped in, and stepped on his ambitious Assistant Secretary.

We hope the Air Force holds tight and refuses to make a deal in order to get air technicians, despite the obvious need for them. Once it becomes party to gangsterism, there'll be no end to it.

Congressman GEORGE MAHON of the House Appropriations Committee has promised to take a full look at the Defense Department's delaying action. We hope this will result in full support of the air technician program.

Lacking such straightforward action, many thousands of Reservists have every reason to wonder whether they are getting more lip service than sincere leadership in building a Ready Reserve.

Address by Walter V. Chopyk at Opening of Ukraine Art Exhibit at the Syracuse Museum of Fine Art

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. EDMUND P. RADWAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 20, 1956

Mr. RADWAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I submit the following address presented by Walter V. Chopyk, secretary, DPW, representing Mayor Pankow, of Buffalo, at the opening of the Ukraine art exhibit at the Syracuse Museum of Fine Art, Syracuse, N. Y., on Tuesday, June 5, 1956:

Mr. Chairman, reverend fathers, distinguished guests, members of the Ukrainian art committee, who are to be congratulated for their efforts in bringing about this wonderful art exhibit, and ladies and gentlemen, first of all I would like to convey to all of you the personal greetings and best wishes of his honor, Stephen Pankow, the mayor of Buffalo, who has delegated me to represent him here tonight and I would also like to extend sincere personal thanks, both for myself and on behalf of my beloved wife, Lee, to Mr. Kuzma, for his kind invitation to us to take part in today's festivities. Mr. Kuzma, all of our friends in Buffalo, will know of your gracious hospitality to us. That I promise you.

One of the highest mediums of expression of human spiritual activity is art. Art is the medium whereby many peoples and national groups give vent to their creative imaginations and express profound thoughts. The specific mediums of expression are broken down into such categories as literature, music, painting, sculpture, and architecture.

In the case of the Ukrainian people, where we find various sections of the country with differing historical developments among each group, still the basic economic factor all have in common is their predominantly agricultural background. This underlying condition has influenced the Nation's character, and from this have its artistic traditions, customs, and world outlook grown, and because of the unchanging and timeless quality of things associated with the land, therefore, we can say that the Ukraine's artistic traditions and national temperament have been preserved and have changed very little over a period of many centuries.

I believe the Ukrainian people express themselves artistically in their activities and habits of everyday life to an extent greater than any other national group. They decorate everything that surrounds them. Their costumes are colorful; both the peoples of the mountain regions and the plains are unique for the colors they select in their embroidery, like a rainbow, bright hues of red, blue, yellow, black, and other shades predominate, vivid with expressions of gaiety, the joy of living, faith in the eternal goodness of life. Their homes, however small or simple, are always decorated brightly. Interiors show colorfully embroidered linens, curtains, and soft downy pillows. Brightly painted icons hang in surroundings showing eternal hope and faith. The trident—national emblem of free Ukraine—is found side by side with these icons, each home having a spiritual and national shrine which is the embodiment of the Ukrainian tradition.

Why, in the Ukraine, not even an Easter egg escapes the artistic touch of the women of the household.

In a recent publication entitled "Ukraine in Pictures," by Michael Boretzky, the author states:

"Along with folk art, trades professionally tied with artistic decoration, have long existed in the Ukraine, e. g., potterymaking, goldsmithing and silversmithing, glassblowing, rug weaving, etc. Formerly there was no distinction between an artisan and an artist, artisans were often real artists while artists considered their profession a trade. Trade secrets were handed down from master to apprentice along with traditional types of execution and ornamentation. Under conditions of rural life, the latter underwent very few changes over the centuries. In the larger centers, such as cities or monasteries, however, the artists who encountered imported patterns, borrowed new ideas, transformed them to their own taste and thus Ukrainian forms of universal art styles came into being.

He goes on to say:

"In the arts, painting, sculpture and architecture, occupy a place of importance. Painting began to develop in the Ukraine towards the end of the 10th century (with the adoption of Christianity). The first Ukrainian painter whose name came down to us was Monk Alipy, the famous Kievan master of the 11th century. Lay painting was developed, as well as religious, particularly icons. The latter were executed strictly in accordance with old Byzantine tradition, but gradually Ukranian medieval painting of icons acquired some characteristics of its own, distinguishing it, especially from the Russian, also done in the same pattern. The Ukrainian icons are more decorative, designed to be looked at from a distance and having a greater harmony of color; under the influences of the mild nature of the Ukrainian people, the facial types of saints on icons have lost their austere asceticism."

In the field of architecture, Ukrainians can be justifiably proud of the contribution made to the world's beautiful edifices. The leading example is, of course, the Cathedral of St. Sophia, in Kiev, founded in the 11th century, by Prince Yaroslav, the wise Grand Prince of the Ukraine, it represents a Byzantine style joined with Ukrainian influences. It is considered one of the outstanding examples of architecture of the Middle Ages; however, unfortunately, today those that rule by force in the Ukraine have marred its beauty and disgraced its fair name, and it will be the sacred duty of all of us to see that it is someday restored with the full dignity and respect it deserves as the symbol of a free, vigorous, devout, and democratic Ukraine.

In its troubled history, the Ukraine has been coveted by foreign enemies. In the many wars and troubled times of the past, national heroes in the form of writers have arisen to the defense of their nation and heritage. Their writings served to inspire, arouse and kindle the flames of patriotism in the same way that Abraham Lincoln, Thomas Jefferson, and other Americans led American thought through the troubled times in which they lived. Such names as Ivan Kotlarevsky, Michael Gogal, Hryhory Kvitka, and Peter Hulak—and later, Toras Schevchenko and Ivan Franko, occupy an immortal place among Ukrainian artists and heroes.

The arts of a people, along with customs, language and traditions are the uniting and cohesive factors that preserve and isolate a group as a nation, far more so than the land which it occupies. History shows us that many conquerors have tried to absorb, obliterate and completely wipe out nations. They have sometimes succeeded, but for the most part, their efforts have been in vain and vanquished peoples have often lived through captivity and slavery to rise and prosper once more as strong, proud and free nations. These conquerors know that enslaving people physically is not enough, but that they must also be enslaved mentally, spiritually and completely.

Today, the nation of our forefathers is undergoing a sinister program of complete and gradual obliteration. The Soviets would like to erase the idea of Ukrainianism, to gradually stifle individuality in expression, to prevent the preservation of national traditions, to substitute their own forms and ideas for those characteristically Ukrainian. Thus, they wish to slowly and eventually destroy the very idea or memory of the Ukraine. We know this to be true because of the idealogical purging they seek in the field of art. However, as long as Ukrainian art traditions, music and culture can be preserved in this world, the Soviets cannot succeed. When the land is eventually liberated, the nation will be restored because of this preservation of ideas.

The artistic endeavors of contemporary Ukrainian artists, such as are exhibited here today, are reassuring proof that our art is alive and vigorous. Refugees from behind the Iron Curtain bring proof every day that the campaign to destroy our culture is being resisted.

Free Ukrainians in all parts of the world are deeply aware of the more sinister and undermining battle against their culture, and it is highly encouraging and good to know that they are responding with pride, defiance and resistance to this movement.

After the end of World War II, American and Canadian Ukrainians, eager to preserve their cultural heritage, established museums in Ontario, California, Chicago and Winnipeg. Even before the war, the establishment of the museum in Stamford, Conn., showed that Ukrainians were quick to realize the dangers threatening, and responded to the problem in a positive manner.

Artists in the Ukraine, who refused the cultural brainwashing of the Communist ideology, were forced to flee. These refugees have risked their lives for the sake of their art and nation. Some of their works we proudly find on display here at this museum.

While I cannot hope to mention, by name every living example, I do wish to note that in the field of music and ballet, after World War I, Dr. Alexander Koshetz with his famous choral group and Vasile Avramenko with his ballet ensemble, were the first to bring the riches of Ukraine to America.

Today, our own Bandurist chorus are not only serving as a means of entertainment, but by traveling throughout the United States and Canada, are reminding all Ukrainians and non-Ukrainians alike that we come from a distinctive culture, that our folk music and national songs of the past, telling their history and folk traditions in music, are not forgotten.

It is a sad fact in the world today that many good people, with fine intentions, do not even now fully realize or understand that we of Ukrainian extraction come from a separate and distinct national origin from that of the U. S. S. R. That our culture is distinctive, our language different, our customs and art are of our own type. How can we, who are dedicated as all true Americans are, to the liberation of enslaved peoples, promote the cause of bringing about the liberation of the Ukrainian nation from the Soviet yoke, if those to whom we appeal are blind to certain truths. The fight for liberation continues on all levels of human activity and the preservation of popularization of Ukrainian art and culture has an important part to contribute to bringing about the ultimate goal.

We are indebted to the contributors at this exhibition, to the directors of this beautiful museum and to those who worked diligently to make this exhibit a success.

Their efforts mean more to me than just having the opportunity for one happy day of art appreciation and esthetic stimulation, their efforts also contribute to a greater understanding of Ukrainian culture and to the ultimate liberation of the land of our fathers.

I shall close by reciting a few lines of poetry written by Ivan Franko, who expresses our fondest hopes and dreams far better than a thousand words:

"The time will come, once obstacles are hurdled,
When you will shine among the greatest nations;
Will shake the Caucasus, while the Beskid girdled;
Black Sea will echo with your liberation
And you'll behold, once being your own master,
A home of joy and fields of consolation."

Status of Forces Agreements

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK T. BOW
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 14, 1956

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, today a sergeant in the Marine Corps is serving a 4-year sentence in a Japanese prison. He was fortunate, through appeal, to secure a reduction in his original sentence of 8 years. This reduction was apparently only a sop thrown to the victim of foreign justice.

The observers at this serviceman's trial described the testimony on which he was convicted as not only preposterous and fantastic, but in some respects patently impossible. They further said the conviction was manifestly unfair and unwarranted. Testifying in February before a subcommittee of the Senate Armed Services Committee, General Hickman said the appeal had not cured the original defects in the trial amounting to a denial of justice.

This is but one example of the justice meted out to our servicemen abroad by foreign courts. Yet the House Foreign Affairs Committee told you in its report on the Mutual Security Act that hearings which the committee had held did not bring to light a single instance where an innocent American serviceman had been imprisoned by a foreign court, or an American sentenced for an act which in the United States would not be considered a crime. This also ignored the French practice of trying a man for an alleged crime solely to enable the prosecuting witness to assert a civil claim. Americans have been tried by the French when our court-martial board did not think the facts warranted prosecution. The penalty imposed may be only a small fine, but the serviceman is thus made a criminal statistic.

Two Eminent Detroit Octogenarians, Judges Henry M. Butzel and Charles C. Simons

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MARTHA W. GRIFFITHS
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 20, 1956

Mrs. GRIFFTTHS. Mr. Speaker, two citizens of Michigan who have distinguished themselves in the life of my State and our Nation recently celebrated birthday milestones.

They are Justice Henry M. Butzel who was a member of the Michigan Supreme Court for 25 years before his recent retirement and Justice Charles C. Simons, who has served with distinction in the Federal bench since 1923. Judge Simons is presently Chief Judge of the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

The careers of these two outstanding men were recently covered in an article in the Detroit Jewish News. I am pleased to include it in my remarks:

PURELY COMMENTARY—WE SALUTE TWO EMINENT DETROIT OCTOGENARIANS: JUDGES HENRY M. BUTZEL AND CHARLES C. SIMONS

(By Philip Slomovitz)

JUSTICE BUTZEL, 85; JUDGE SIMONS, 80

Michigan Jewry's two most distinguished citizens will observe important birthdays next week.

Former Michigan Supreme Court Justice Henry M. Butzel will be 85 on May 24.

United States Circuit Court Judge Charles C. Simons will marke his 80th birthday on May 21.

They are most important dates for all of us to make note of. In extending hearty birthday greetings to the two leaders, we are enabled to look back into the scores of years of our city's and State's history, into the annals of our Jewish community, in all of which both men played important roles.

Justice Butzel and Judge Simons represent a generation of leaders who pioneered in community building, who set forth principles and ideals that continue to serve as guides in humanitarian services for all races and creeds. They are splendid men, and it is thrilling to be able to count octogenarians among our eminent contemporaries.

JUSTICE HENRY M. BUTZEL

Justice Henry M. Butzel, the oldest of four sons of Detroit pioneers, the Magnus Butzels, was born in our community on May 24, 1871. One of his brothers, Fred M. Butzel, became one of America's most distinguished Jewish leaders. Justice Butzel's birthday is marred by a sad memory: it is the eighth anniversary of the death of his brother Fred.

Referring to the family background of the Butzels, in an article he wrote for us 10 years ago, Judge Simons recalled: "Justice Butzel's mother was Henrietta Hess, known to her intimates as 'Tante Yeta.' She was always looking for maids, until one morning she undertook to take a buxom lass home with her from Central Market in her electric and was arrested as a white slaver. The brothers never tire of that story."

Henry Butzel received his doctor of philosophy and bachelor of laws degrees from the University of Michigan in 1891 and 1892. His brother Fred, who also was graduated from the University of Michigan, joined him as a law partner in the firm of Butzel & Butzel in a modest office in the Union Trust Build-

ing in 1897. That office grew into the distinguished law firm of Butzel, Levin & Winston in 1915, and still functions under that name.

Henry encouraged Fred in his social service efforts. He assumed most of the burdens of the law firm, and Fred acquired much free time for his public services.

Henry Butzel was always the generous man, aiding many causes and encouraging humanitarian efforts. He was one of the very early members of the American Jewish Committee in which he and Brother Fred were leaders for many years. He was president of Temple Beth El and the United Jewish Charities. He was chairman of a Legal Advisory Board in World War I. He taught law at the University of Detroit and guided many distinguished lawyers in their paths toward leadership in their profession.

He was for many years among the most active figures in the Jewish Welfare Federation and the Allied Jewish Campaigns.

Governor Fred Green appointed him as Associate Justice of the Michigan State Supreme Court on July 25, 1929. The governor praised him as a man with "the broad and understanding outlook on life and the qualities of good citizenship which are as necessary as profound legal knowledge to a correct solution of the important problems that come before our highest court."

Justice Butzel was reelected in 1931, 1940, and 1950 to full terms of office and retired from the Supreme Court last year.

In his tribute to Jtustice Butzel, Judge Simons wrote: "He brought to the court a sound legal scholarship, a breadth of human sympathy and understanding, an intimate knowledge of the problems that beset business and industry * * * he has been a great influence on that court * * * in clearing the way to progress by departure from obsolete doctrine."

An entire community is blessed by the things he has done, by his mature judgment, by his friendship and sincerity. His birthday is a blessed day for the entire State.

We wish Justice Butzel many happy returns of the day.

JUDGE CHARLES C. SIMONS

Those of us who enjoyed the friendship of David W. Simons, one of Detroit's most distinguished Jewish leaders in the first three decades of this century and a member of Detroit's first Nine-Man Council, and who are privileged to continue a similar friendship with his eminent son Charles C. Simons, must take special pride in being able to congratulate him on his 80th birthday.

Charles Simons was born in Detroit, May 21, 1876. He was educated in Detroit schools and received his B. A. and LL. B. degrees from the University of Michigan in 1898 and 1900. He was one of the youngest men to be elected—in 1903—to the Michigan State Senate and gained national fame for his sponsorship of the first direct State primary Law, a step that was revolutionary at that time.

He was Wayne County circuit commissioner from 1905 to 1906. He was a member of the Michigan State Constitutional Convention in 1908. In 1916 he was a Republican Presidential elector at large. He was a director of the Detroit Board of Commerce in 1918.

President Warren G. Harding appointed him to the United States district court in 1923, and in 1929 he was elevated by President Herbert Hoover to the United States circuit court of appeals, the highest court in the land next to the United States Supreme Court.

One of Michigan's most brillian orators, Judge Simons traces his speaking ability to his college days, having won the Northern Oratorical League contest as the University of Michigan representative in 1899.

Active in many causes, a leader in local, State, and Federal bar associations, Judge Simons devoted himself for a number of years to congregational affairs, as a leader in Temple Beth El, the Union of American Hebrew Congregations, and Hebrew Union College. In 1941 he was president of the biennial council of the Union of American Hebrew Congregations.

In 1946 he was as disturbed as most of us by the actions of the anti-Zionist (now pro-Arab and anti-Israel) Council for Judaism, and he made this statement to us:

"I would have the Council for Judaism reevaluate the logic and reexamine the effect of the impact of a purely subjective concept upon a harrassed and homeless people whose tragically realistic experiences deny it. If this be naivete, make the most of it."

He wrote this in the days when there was no Israel but merely a "harrassed and homeless people" whom a group of frightened Jews were harrassing further, perhaps even more brutally, that the anti-Semites. Judge Simons expressed his rebuke out of his sense of fair play and his contempt for injustice.

This is what has motivated his activities—in behalf of allied Jewish campaigns, in support of religious concepts, as a leader in and worker for humanitarian causes.

The fact that the Michigan Patent Law Association, the State Bar of Michigan and the Detroit Bar Association are combining to honor Judge Simons, with a birthday dinner, on May 21, is an indication of the esteem in which he is held by all.

It is as an able jurist, as a just man, as a defender of the downtrodden, that we think of Judge Charles C. Simons whom we greet on a great day in his life: his 80th birthday.

The Freedom Crusade

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUGH J. ADDONIZIO
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 20, 1956

Mr. ADDONIZIO. Mr. Speaker, I wish to associate myself wholeheartedly with the Freedom Crusade to effect the release of the Americans in captivity in Red China. Of the 13 who have been in confinement, 2 were released June 15, but they are still in Shanghai and our State Department has no further information on them.

The Freedom Crusade is a nationwide letter-writing campaign to Chairman Mao Tse-tung, head of Red China's government, politely petitioning the release of all the Americans still held prisoners by the Chinese Reds. This crusade has been launched by the Very Reverend Harold W. Rigney, SVD, a Divine Word missionary whose 10-year prison sentence in Red China was cut down to 4 years and 2 months by prayer, publicity, and letter writing. I am sure all Americans will respond willingly and generously to Father Rigney's plea in behalf of these prisoners. It is so little for each American to do, and every letter will be a powerful instrument in bringing these Americans back home.

I respectfully urge the membership to enlist the participation of their constituents in this noble crusade. All Americans must have a feeling of anger and sorrow when they think of their fellow Americans suffering prison life in Red China, and all should be willing to cooperate in the Freedom Crusade which can be productive of so much good.

House Resolution 541

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANTE B. FASCELL
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 20, 1956

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, last Thursday, June 14, 1956, I introduced House Resolution 541 which calls for disapproval of Reorganization Plan No. 2 of 1956. This proposes a separation of the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation from the Federal Home Loan Bank System. The proposed plan is undesirable in principle and deficient in technical draftsmanship and should be rejected. The affected agencies have never publicly proposed such a plan, nor has it the endorsement of any of the leaders of the savings and loan business which it affects.

Contrary to the explicit grounds for reorganization as defined in the Reorganization Act of 1949, Reorganization Plan No. 2 does not reduce the number of agencies, does not eliminate overlapping and duplication of effort, does not group or coordinate, or promote economy, or promote the better execution of laws, or increase efficiency.

The primary purpose of reorganization plans and the primary objective of the Hoover Commission was to promote economy. This proposed plan does the opposite. Where there is now a single board and a single agency, it would create two boards and two agencies. The Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation and the Federal Home Loan Bank Board now use the same personnel for legal work, personnel work, publicity work, and so forth. The plan would require the establishment of separate departments to handle each of these functions.

Even the President's accompanying statement admits that it will not promote efficiency or economy by the following language:

> There will be a modest increase in the overall operating expenses of the Corporation and of the Federal Home Loan Bank Board which are financed from the receipts of assessments, fees, premiums and investment income of the Corporation and of the Board, not from ordinary Government appropriations.

In addition to these general objections about which more will be said later, there are certain technical inadequacies of great importance and which make the entire plan either illegal or contrary to all previous congressional intent. One blaring deficiency is that no term of office is provided for the trustees. In the Reorganization Act of 1949, as amended, it specifically prohibits increasing the term of office beyond that provided by law for such office, and in no event in excess of 4 years. Secondly, there is no requirement or provision in the reorganization plan that requires bipartisan appointment of the trustees. This gross omission would mean that the board of trustees of the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation could consist of three members of the same party.

Reorganization Plan No. 2 is in the opposite direction from the President's own declared intentions of reducing the number of independent agencies. Last year administration spokesmen opposed the establishment of an independent Federal Home Loan Bank Board, making the following statement:

The administration believes that new independent agencies reporting to the President should be created only upon the showing of clear and compelling reasons for such action and of persuasive advantages to be derived from it. In signing the Housing Amendments of 1955, President Eisenhower stated: "I also have serious objections to the provisions of the bill which would create still another independent agency in the executive branch by detaching the Home Loan Bank Board, including the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation, from the Housing and Home Finance Agency."

Yet less than a year later the President is asking for the establishment of another new agency.

The administration cites the Hoover Commission report as one of the justifications for the proposed reorganization plan. There is a big difference between the Hoover Commission recommendation and this plan. The Commission report simply recommends that—

No person be permitted to serve as a member of the Home Loan Bank Board and the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation at the same time.

The reorganization plan, however, goes far beyond the personnel of the respective boards and requires the establishment of a separate agency and a separation of all personnel, records, and so forth. Ironically, the President's plan is not even consistent with the brief recommendation of the Commission. Under Reorganization Plan No. 2, the Federal Home Loan Bank Board Chairman would serve as a member of both the Federal Home Loan Bank Board and the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation, and thus would be in violation of the Hoover Commission recommendation that no person serve on both the boards.

More significantly, the plan is directly opposite of the recommendation of the Hoover Commission task force on lending agencies which made a thorough study of the operation of both the Federal Home Loan Bank Board and the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation. The task force report on lending agencies concluded its discussion of the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation with this statement:

Except for the general recommendation on management presented earlier in this report, the task force has no recommendation to offer with respect to the organization of this mutual insurance trust.

As a matter of fact, the task force specifically approved present organizational structure of the Board and Insurance Corporation with the statement on page 38:

This appears to be a natural grouping of functions which requires no change.

Thus, the experts after careful study of this field, recommended the continuation of the organization as Congress has established it.

Conclusive evidence that the objective of the plan is, to say the least, on shaky ground, is borne out by the fact that the task force on lending agencies of the first Hoover Commission in 1949 recommended that the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation be placed under the Federal Reserve Board. This recommendation is directly contrary to one of the basic arguments for separating the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation from the Federal Home Loan Bank Board; namely, because "the FDIC is an independent agency." As noted above, Reorganization Plan No. 2 is not a Hoover Commission recommendation and, in fact, violates the recommendations of both task forces and the overall Hoover Commission report. In addition to these inconsistencies, the Housing and Home Finance Administrator and the Chairman of the Federal Home Loan Bank Board have both, in the past, been recorded as opposed to the separation of the Insurance Corporation and the Board.

One of the most singular sections of the reorganization plan is section 3 (b), which in straight, simple language says that the Corporation and all the matters under the jurisdiction of the board of trustees shall be subject to the "direction and control of the President of the United States." To my knowledge, there is no precedent for this provision, and the question that comes to mind is what is the purpose and intent of this unusual provision? The Reorganization Plan No. 3 of 1947 dealing with housing agencies contained no such provision. Under present law, the Insurance Corporation reports to Congress, and Reorganization Plan No. 2 would appear to be an effort to bypass the Congress and have the agency solely and completely subservenient to the President.

In reviewing the general effects of the plan the following points should be considered: First, it would increase the number of effective agencies by making two out of the one now existing; second, it would create duplication of reports, regulations, and so forth, both by the Government and the individual associations; third, it would add an additional group of high-salary-bracket employees to the operating expenses of the Insurance Corporation; fourth, the expenses of the Insurance Corporation are borne by the individual institutions, yet they were not consulted on this measure to increase these expenses; fifth, the law required that all Federal institutions, in effect, would still be controlled by the Federal Home Loan Bank Board, since they have the sole power to charter new member institutions; sixth, as a practical matter, the Insurance Corporation and the Board have always worked closely in supervising, regulating, and chartering institutions. In fact, the Insurance Corporation's regulations are sometimes used as a means of strengthening the operations of all savings and loan associations.

I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to join in support of House Resolution 541.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

PRICE OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

The Public Printer is authorized to furnish to subscribers the daily RECORD at $1.50 per month, payable in advance.

Remit by money order payable to Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C.

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is located in Statuary Hall, House wing, where Mr. Frank Brodie is in attendance during the sessions of Congress to receive orders for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month, and where single copies may also be purchased. Orders are also accepted for the printing of speeches in pamphlet form.

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

Appendix

UNICO National and Columbus' Heirs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HENRY S. REUSS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 19, 1956

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, the annual scholarship award banquet, sponsored by the Italian Civic Association, chapter of UNICO National, was held Sunday, June 17, at Milwaukee, Wis. True to UNICO's motto, "Service Above Self," the society honored six young Milwaukee County high school graduates of Italian descent with $1,000 scholarships. Each of these young people was chosen on the basis of outstanding scholastic achievement and participation in extracurricular activities: Robert F. Romeo, 18, of 2776 South 44th Street, a graduate of Pulaski High School; Anthony Tarantino, Jr., 17, of 815 East Lyon Street, St. John Cathedral High; Daniel A. DiLeo, 17, of 732 South 23d Street, Pius XI High; Ronald F. De Battista, 18, of 2231 South 21st Street, Don Bosco High; and Mary Ann Maglio, 17, of 518 North Van Buren Street, Lincoln High School. The chapter's annual athletic trophy was awarded to Joseph Sansone, 18, of 521 East Lyon Street.

Presiding at the presentations were Angelo Provinzano, president of the Milwaukee chapter; Dr. James J. Balistreri; Dr. Gabriel E. Ceci; and Mrs. Marion Conte. Among the officials of UNICO National assisting at the presentation were Mrs. Joseph Fontanazza, president, Milwaukee Ladies Chapter; William J. Calvano, past president, UNICO National; Theodore Mazza, past president, UNICO National; Emil Santacrose, scholarship director, UNICO National; Dominic H. Frinzi, vice president, UNICO National; and Dr. D. M. Nigro, athletic director, UNICO National.

The principal address of the evening was made by the Honorable Rocco C. Siciliano, Assistant Secretary of the United States Department of Labor. Mr. Siciliano's inspiring message, entitled "Columbus' Heirs," follows:

It gives me very great pleasure to be with this group tonight and to see another concrete evidence of the consistent records of scholarship and achievement being attained throughout our Nation by young Americans of Italian ancestry Let me first then, congratulate all of you as well as the honor graduates who have achieved such distinguished scholarship records.

This occasion, like all graduations, is a time for joy and good feeling. I hope, therefore, to make my short talk completely informal.

Let us start by listing the things we all have in common and then discuss them one by one and with appropriate brevity.

To begin with, we all have our Italian ancestry. This gives us a heritage we hold with high pride. Next, there is our unquestioned love of America, which gives meaning and direction to our school efforts and our subsequent employment goals. Third, there is the deep recognition that our love of America imposes certain obligations which require us to examine critically our loyalties, our beliefs, our plans, and our ambitions. And, finally, since much of our contribution to this Nation and to the world will be expressed or achieved through our vocational endeavors, it is important that we consider together the kind of jobs we look forward to holding.

On the first point, I have already said that we hold our Italian heritage in high pride. The reasons are numerous and need not be described in detail. A few of the more important points will serve our purpose. Christopher Columbus pioneered a watery trail into the New World which has been followed through the years by several million of his countrymen. Few of them have had the chance to go down in history as he did, but for all there has been the open door of continuing opportunity and the Italian people have been quick to grasp the chances which the New World has offered them.

The motivations which brought Columbus to these shores were completely consistent with the best ideas in contemporary American international relations. He had been moved by a desire to stimulate the trade that would bring the good things of life more quickly and more cheaply to the people of Europe, and to open new exchanges of commerce, friendship, and understanding between Europe and the Orient. To him, the avenues of commerce were worthy of his highest dedication and devotion because they meant providing better things for better living throughout the world.

Ever since the Italian Renaissance, Italy has contributed perhaps more than her share of achievement in the fine arts and music. Even the Italian language is the most nearly related to Latin of all the romance tongues, and Latin, as we know, has been the tongue for transmitting through the ages the clear concepts of Roman law and the legislative process.

Many of the finest artistic achievements of the Italian people have remained in their homeland—Michelangelo and Leonardo da Vinci—but in more recent days the leading artists—Eleonora Duse, Madame Galli-Curci, the great Caruso, Tetrazzini, Toscanini—have come to our shores to share the richness of their art with the people of the Americas. In the field of science, Marconi and Fermi have left distinguished marks upon their professions. The list can go on, of course.

The elements of the Italian arts and sciences have been blended into the mainstream of American life so that their names are as familiar in the average household as the names of our own American artists and scientists—Mary Garden, Eli Whitney, and Thomas A. Edison.

Before leaving this brief discussion of Italians in America, I should like to mention one very important element—that is, our attitude toward our Italian extraction. It has been said that Americans of the first generation recall their European roots only with embarrassment, while for the second generation the fact of having a European-born grandfather is a matter of indifference, seldom remembered and lightly regarded. Only the third generation considers itself sufficiently settled and a part of this western world that it can show a proper pride in its roots which extend back to older cultures. It's too bad if we have to wait for the third generation to recognize its tradition. All of us are better Americans if we know whence we, and the American culture, came. Each corner of the world has contributed to what we have and cherish.

If attitudes about our ancestry are allowed to develop into feelings of inferiority, we defeat ourselves, our ambitions, and thus limit the contribution we can make to American life. If, on the other hand, we take reasonable pride in our origins and strive in all ways to put our best foot forward, then we achieve more for ourselves and contribute more to our Nation.

Let us next consider briefly the second point I mentioned in connection with our interests in common: our love of the United States and the kind of life it symbolizes, fosters, and promotes for all its people. The rich mixtures of bloods and cultures, of languages, sciences, and arts which it has assimilated from all parts of the world, have given it a heritage all its own. I dislike the notion that America is, or ever has been, a "melting pot." America has not melted and molded all the peoples and cultures which have come to it into any homogeneous, dull, gray, mediocre standard "type." I prefer to say that the American society is like a great piece of mosaic art, composed of distinct and distinguishable ingredients, each contributing its own peculiar virtues and strengths, but blended together into a single, unified, meaningful picture which tells one great, central story. Thus, our culture is variegated. Our speech is diverse. Our art is manifold in its forms.

Just as our country cherishes the variety of its culture and admires the uncommon, just as it has room for its people to express their own opinion and personalities, so its Government, if it is to reflect the people, must be a liberal and flexible instrument for the expression of the people's will and the satisfaction of human needs. It is because these ideals are real and true that we love America as we do. In most nations of the free world, these qualities stand as goals for the future, but in the United States they stand as landmarks of what we have already achieved.

The third point to be discussed briefly is the question of our responsibilities and loyalties to the Nation we cherish. Our times call for a dedication of each of us to work together for the common good—to build and maintain a government which does for us those things we cannot do at all or do very well, as individuals. A grave threat from a vigilant and implacable enemy hangs over us and, whether we like it or not, may well continue to hang over us for the rest of our lives. America needs the active participation of all our people in the processes of government to keep our system strong and healthy.

I am concerned that, as an American, I do the best job I know how to promote the interests and the welfare of all the American people. I am sure that each of you, whether preparing to enter one of our great universities this coming autumn or preparing to enter the world of work, will dedicate yourselves earnestly to these same ends.

And now it is time to consider the fourth point in my outline. That embraces the important task of selecting and building our

careers in such fashion as to bring maximum satisfaction to each of us as individuals and workers and, at the same time, to make the greatest possible contribution to our national life and national security.

A moment ago I distinguished between the two major groups here this evening: those who will go on to college this fall and those who will start their work lives without further education at this time. For both groups there is a world of almost unprecedented opportunity.

During March of this year, of 31,142 jobs being cleared between offices, almost half (14,968) were in the professional and managerial categories. Clearance openings in skilled occupations increased moderately; semiskilled openings dropped radically—from 2,370 in February, to 1,110 in March. These data would indicate that the fields which are not expanding in today's labor market are the unskilled and casual occupations. The Nation's accelerated programs for research and defense production would indicate that for a long time to come the great demands will be on the scientific, professional, managerial, and skilled occupations. Current studies indicate that plant and equipment outlays are expected to set new records in 1956, exceeding the 1955 outlay by some $6 billion. With this fact in mind, we are not surprised that industry is taking all reasonable steps to be sure that the skilled manpower will have been found and will be ready for work as the new production facilities swing into operation. It is significant that the figures just cited from our public employment offices reflect these trends.

In recognition of these unquestioned trends, the Department of Labor has, in the last year, undertaken a special project devoted to the expansion and improvement of the skills of the work force. Of very great importance are the expanded apprenticeship programs. Of equal importance is the counseling responsibility of the public employment offices, so that workers of the Nation may be kept abreast of technological developments and their effects upon employment outlook in the several professions and crafts. The Department's program considers not only the public responsibility of the community to provide needed training for the development of labor-force skills, but also works diligently with industry to promote better on-the-job training, directed toward the advancement of young workers and the development of systematic plans for replacing older workers as they approach retirement age. This program is still in an early stage of development, but we have high expectations for substantial achievements during the next 2 or 3 years.

Each time a worker changes jobs, he has a chance to improve his skills, or by making a poor job choice, allow them to deteriorate. The Federal-State system of public employment offices constitutes one of the Nation's major instrumentalities for assuring the smooth functioning of the labor market. This system is now making an average of almost 15 million placements a year, more than 6 million of them in nonagricultural employment. Both figures represent new all-time peaks in the history of the Service. Reflecting the Nation's greater demand for skilled workers in all the major professional fields, in managment, and in the several crafts, placements made by this system show a steady increase in these categories.

Whether your present plans call for going on to college or entering the labor market this autumn, you will be interested in a few simple facts about what we call the occupational outlook—that is, our best estimate of which occupations will be in the greatest demand in the coming years. To name a few, occupational opportunities look good for tool-and-die makers, machinists, and electricians in the skilled occupations. Stenographers and typists, computers and key-punch operators, draftsmen and laboratory technicians are other occupations in which long-run employment prospects are good.

Even without considering the vital element of competition with other powers, we find ourselves hampered by growing shortages of scientists, engineers, and skilled craftsmen to meet the needs of our own rising standard of living at home.

We envisage a day not too far distant when automation, the emergence of nuclear energy, the growth of new industries and production processes, and the demand for more and more complicated civilian and military products will make the worker without skills a very hard man to place in a decent job. From the viewpoint of the worker's own self-interest, there is no law, no program, no protection as effective in promoting his own security as his skill.

Today, the Armed Forces, with a strength of only 3 million men, are roughly 30 percent short on fully qualified skilled personnel needed to fill many thousands of critical military jobs. For example, there is a need for some 35,000 aircraft mechanics and electronics technicians; about 25,000 electronic equipment operators; 18,000 communications equipment mechanics, and so on. These shortages reflect similar shortages in private industry. For every 3 skilled persons or technicians that the armed services require, only 2 are currently available, and many of the individuals in these positions have been pushed in without adequate training.

There are many factors apparent in the national picture which give us real concern about the future labor market in this country. Less than half of our most gifted young people—those in the upper 10 percent of their high-school classes—even start to college. Tens of thousands do not even finish high school. Only half of the fraction who do enter college stay to graduate. All in all, about 100,000 of those in the upper 10 percent of the high-school classes drop out below the college level each year. An even heavier attrition occurs among those in the next 20 to 30 percent of our high-school population.

Whatever the causes—and there are many—the obvious starting point is to work toward an educational and guidance setup which helps each individual, regardless of race, religion, color, or financial status, to understand his potentialities and at least give him a chance to choose to develop them as fully as possible.

Today there are only 8½ million skilled craftsmen and 6 million professional and technical workers in a total civilian labor force of 65 million. We cannot create a larger working force by wishing it, but we can create a more highly skilled work force by consciously developing it. And each of you, in making his individual job decisions, can contribute significantly to the development of the needed labor force.

Domination by Soviet Troops of Communist Satellites and Free Nations on the Black Sea

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM E. JENNER
OF INDIANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, June 21, 1956

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, we have recently been hearing of Soviet plans to demobilize a million or more members of the armed forces.

Recently I pointed out that Soviet troops are apparently still on the soil of Rumania and Hungary, although all shadow of justification for their presence ended with the signing of the Austrian peace treaty.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article from the New York Times of October 18, 1955, showing how important is the role of those Soviet troops in dominating not only the Communist satellites, but also the Black Sea and the free nations on its shores.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SOVIET DOMINATES PORT IN RUMANIA—RUSSIAN TROOPS EQUAL NATIVE SOLDIERS IN CONSTANTA—PEOPLE WARY OF AMERICANS

(By Jack Raymond)

CONSTANTA, RUMANIA, October 17.—In contrast with Bucharest, Rumanian capital, the presence of the Soviet military forces is very much in evidence in this Black Sea port.

Here Soviet troops have requisitioned hotels and housing. Russian soldiers guard office buildings and other installations.

Russian officers stroll about the streets with their families, pushing baby carriages. Russian soldiers march through the city. Military trucks carrying equipment and personnel give Constanta a busy air to counteract the absence of private vehicles.

The port itself also seems busy, although it is far from being crowded. Among the tankers and small cargo vessels are small military ships.

BUILDINGS ARE NEGLECTED

The city has many handsome buildings. However, city officials obviously feel there are more important things to do than maintain them, for the buildings are shabby and run down.

When one arrives at the small rickety railroad station the impact of the overwhelming number of soldiers present is immediate. It seems that 2 out of every 3 young men is in uniform.

The second impression is that there are easily as many Soviet uniforms as Rumanian. Discipline is evident. Enlisted men and junior officers rarely neglect to salute their superiors.

The first impression of local residents is the great number of poor peasants as well as gypsy women. Gypsy women and children swarm over the main streets selling sunflower seeds. They do a good business.

Communist slogans are prevalent. Communist murals have been painted on the walls of buildings in City Hall Square. One billboard in another square carries the text of the Warsaw pact grouping the Soviet Union and its East European satellite states into a military bloc formed to counterbalance the Atlantic alliance.

Shops seem adequately stocked but the prices are high. A big casino restaurant offers a limited menu, but its food is tastily served. In the evening many young Rumanian and Russian couples dine and dance there.

As everywhere else in Rumania, this reporter aroused immediate curiosity wherever he went. But striking up acquaintanceships proved virtually impossible. The statement that I was an American elicited wide-eyed wonder—then quick goodbyes.

There were 1 or 2 exceptions. From them one received the impression that most Rumanians felt they would be better off if they did not have contact with foreigners, particularly Americans.

Yet, the people did not seem to be unfriendly. It appeared only that they were not certain what to make of the presence of a United States reporter carrying a camera in

the port city and they preferred not to be involved.

The same held true of Russian soldiers with whom several efforts to start conversations failed.

A young Rumanian sailor said he had not seen an American in Constanta since a United States ship docked here 5 years ago. He, as well as some others, expressed surprise that a Uited States reporter had been permitted to come to Constanta. I was allowed to visit this port, although I was forbidden to go to Jassy or Galatz, north of here, or to Ploesti.

How a Senator Promotes His State's Hotel Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, June 21, 1956

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, recently it was my privilege to prepare for the Hotel Gazette an article entitled "How a Senator Promotes His State's Hotel Industry." As printed in that distinguished magazine, the article was accompanied by a picture of President Eisenhower and his brothers on a visit to Wisconsin's famed North Woods, where they caught a number of large pike and muskellunge. I ask unanimous consent to have the article printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HOW A SENATOR PROMOTES HIS STATE'S HOTEL INDUSTRY

(By Hon. ALEXANDER WILEY, senior Senator from Wisconsin)

What are the usual duties of the average United States Senator?

If you were to ask Mr. Ordinary American that question, he would probably answer, "A Senator's duties are basically legislative—to work on bills and laws in the State's and his Nation's interest."

That answer is absolutely sound.

But in addition to the legislative challenge, as such, there are dozens of other duties performed by the average Senator. These duties include: Keeping the home folks informed of major issues affecting them, and helping on many constituents' problems with Government agencies in the public interest. An example of the latter work would be assisting on a veterans' claim with the Veterans' Administration, helping on a farmers' problem with the Department of Agriculture, and so forth.

All in all, a Senator must basically fulfill the broad needs of his entire State.

Inevitably, serving the interests of one's State also means helping to boost the industries of the State.

And, since so many of the 48 States now rely heavily upon the tourist industry for major income, it is perfectly natural that a United States Senator should interest himself in focusing national attention on his State's tourist attractions.

As Wisconsin's senior Senator, representing as I do a State where tourism is perhaps our second greatest industry, I am vitally interested in the well-being of the Badger Hotel and related industries.

I am pleased, therefore, to report to the readers of Hotel Gazette regarding my efforts along this line.

I do so because I think that other Senators and Representatives may be in a position to help their own hotel industry. Thereby, they will help America's sound leisure-time activity, its sound pursuit of happiness.

TIPS ON SPOTLIGHTING A STATE

Let me therefore list some of the ways by which I have helped throw the friendly national spotlight on Wisconsin tourism:

1. Each year, on the Senate floor, I have issued an open invitation to Senators and Representatives to come and visit wonderful Wisconsin.

In hot humid Washington in June, July, and August, Congress wends its weary way toward adjournment, handling hundreds upon hundreds of bills. And, so at that time, I have said to my colleagues, "Come and relax in the 56,000 square miles of superb vacation land, which is Wisconsin. Enjoy the unexcelled fishing and hunting of my State."

I have said, in effect, "for months, we legislators have been fighting one another. Now, let's get wise and go out and relax. Let's fight—on the fishing line—one of Wisconsin's famed muskies. Let's enjoy the thrill of the best outdoor sports in the Nation."

My comments as published in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD have been reprinted in tens of thousands of copies.

The prints have been forwarded to all the resorts of my State, and thereafter to their guests and clients for other States.

2. Pictures have played a very important role in this publicity. I use pictures of Wisconsin's tourist attractions in my weekly newsletter, which is distributed not only to the newspapers of my State, but to other press men all over the country. Included are pictures of Wisconsin fishing, boating, swimming, hunting, and just plain outdoor relaxing—pictures which adorn my office too, and which prominently feature articles which I have prepared from time to time.

3. When word came that President Eisenhower might not vacation in Colorado this year, I wrote to him and issued a press release which "broke" in the national wire services, urging him to come back to Wisconsin. Ike responded most graciously with assurance that he would certainly bear Wisconsin in mind when he picks his vacation spot.

4. On the occasion of the holding of important national conventions in Milwaukee or Madison, or elsewhere, I have spotlighted these functions by remarks in the Senate. I have warmly welcomed the convention delegates from the 48 States. I have pointed out that I know they will enjoy our splendid hotels and restaurants.

This has helped, I believe, to encourage other conventions to meet in Wisconsin. My readers know how crucial national convention business is to a State.

5. A great boost to Wisconsin hotels has been provided by the wonderful Milwaukee Braves which have broken all National League attendance records.

"Come on and watch baseball's greatest team," I've said to the Nation, before personally heading for opening day and other games at Milwaukee County's greatest stadium.

6. In visiting abroad, and meeting with prominent foreign leaders, I have not hesitated to mention in interviews with foreign correspondents this fact: While I enjoy visiting foreign parts, I have unhesitatingly invited the distinguished leaders of those countries to come to the United States and visit wonderful Wisconsin.

These, then, are a few of the phases of my pro-Badger tourist activities.

All this has, of course, required close liaison with the Wisconsin State Convention Department, the Wisconsin State Hotel Association, the Wisconsin State Chamber of Commerce, with various county and regional resort groups, and a wide variety of other folks, designed constantly to boost Wisconsin tourism.

I have done this not simply to serve the Wisconsin hotel industry, of course, but that vast variety of other groups in our society which benefit from tourist dollars, from the gasoline station on the highway to the cheese stand, the roadside restaurant, the fishing lodge, outdoor guides, and everyone else who benefits from tourist income.

In conclusion, I certainly like Wisconsin hotels. They are clean, efficient, well run, friendly. They pride themselves on the traditional high quality of their personal service.

I won't ever let them down. I'll do all that I can to constantly build them up. They are worthy of all my devoted efforts because they are a mainstay of the economy of Wisconsin.

A Constitutional Congress Can End World Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM E. JENNER
OF INDIANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, June 21, 1956

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the remarks made by me on June 7 at a meeting of For America in Los Angeles.

These remarks point out that NATO also has, from the beginning, had political, economic, and propaganda authority sufficient for any activities in these fields, and that it is developing a system of governmental agencies for dealing with these powers on a supranational basis.

The remarks further point out that neither the executive branch nor the judicial branch can reverse the drift to a one-world government. Congress can reverse the drift if supporters of national sovereignty will turn their attention to the congressional contests and nominate and elect constitutionalists, in both parties, so they can tip the balance in Congress back to nationalism by the same methods by which Harry Hopkins and Sidney Hillman tipped the balance in doubtful areas to collectivist internationalism.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A CONSTITUTIONAL CONGRESS CAN END WORLD GOVERNMENT

You have been hearing expert testimony on the fantastic taxes you are paying your Government today. I will try to show you something of what you are getting for your money.

Let me take, as an example, one of Mr. Acheson's most curious achievements, NATO.

I mentioned, at the New York meeting of For America, that the North Atlantic Treaty area includes not only Britain, France, Benelux, and the other Western European Powers, but the African territories of the member nations, their airplanes and their ships at sea. I received a doubting letter from someone in California, who asked if I hadn't made a mistake. Wasn't NATO, he said, limited to the nations of Western Europe?

I quoted from the North Atlantic Treaty, and added, "The NATO area also includes the Atlantic Ocean, Canada, and the United

States. San Francisco is as much NATO territory as Paris."

Why do our people have this propaganda picture of NATO as something limited to Western Europe, instead of a vast empire stretching from Alaska to the borders of Iran? Perhaps someone planned it that way.

Another evidence of NATO's importance is its financial resources. A report in the New York Times of April 22, from the North Atlantic Council, datelined Norfolk, Va., stated that the NATO nations had spent $316 billion on defense in the past 7 years.

Of that amount, the United States spent $252 billion, or about 5 times as much as the other 13 nations combined. It is true that part of our expenditures were for the Pacific area, but it is also true that most of the NATO members have Pacific territories. We also make nonmilitary contributions to help support the budgets of member nations.

You may wonder why American defense expenditures are included in the NATO figures. Just remember that NATO is a holding company which silently directs the defense programs of member nations as Sam Insull's holding companies used to direct your local light and power companies.

THE NATO GOVERNMENTAL STRUCTURE

NATO does not stop with pious statements of intention. It has governmental organs to put its intention into effect. Some one planned it that way.

NATO has a secretary-general and other officials, and a permanent international civil service. This purely executive operation is nowhere subject to any limits on its powers.

NATO has organs for budgeting, purchasing, letting of international contracts, accounting, auditing, and inspection. Like Topsy, these agencies just "growed" but how they "growed."

The NATO Council of Foreign and Other Ministers is the top policymaking layer. Their permanent deputies come next. The Joint Chiefs of each member nation form a third supervising layer, and a military executive committee in Washington is a fourth layer, all above the military commander who sits in splendor at the headquarters called SHAPE.

These powerful but almost invisible agencies give political guidance and strategic directions to the commander of the NATO forces.

NATO has its own armed forces in being. This is the crucial test of sovereignty. Its forces are made up of parts of the armed forces of the West European member states assigned to it, and the components of our army stationed in western Europe.

Whoever is guiding the evolution of NATO has been careful to avoid anything which would arouse American suspicions. The comamnders of NATO forces have always been Americans—Generals Eisenhower, Ridgway, Gruenther. But the military commander is low man on the totem pole of the policymaking hierarchy in NATO.

Now it is perfectly clear, if you read the record, that these military contingents from the members nations form one integrated NATO armed force.

It is the duty of the Supreme Commander to see that they are integrated. Great care has been used to avoid visible signs of this integration. Uniforms are different. Titles are different. All the unimportant things are different. Some members of our armed forces sincerely believe the national contingents are still legally and militarily independent, but I see no grounds for any such illusion. This hope is part, I believe, of the natural tendency of professional military men to believe our powerful Military Establishment is unchanged, if the only change is in the fine print of a legal document.

NATO'S POLITICAL-ECONOMIC POWERS

From the beginning, NATO has had political, economic, and social as well as military responsibilities. Article 2 of the treaty proclaims the intention of the signers to promote conditions of "stability and well-being." Words like "stability and well-being," in present-day legislative drafting, are designed to cover the waterfront. The Ismay report on the first 5 years of NATO, says, and I quote, "Peace is not merely the absence of war. Its maintenance requires continuous cooperation by governments in the economic, social, and cultural as well as in the military field." Article 2 is, in fact, merely a restatement of articles 55 and 56 of the United Nations Charter.

NATO's aim is to unite all the member states into one community. What will be left of the American experiment, when we have been integrated with the political system of France, the economic system of Turkey, the social system of Italy? I do not know, but someone knows.

I cannot understand the present hullabaloo over giving NATO economic and political responsibilities. Certainly Mr. Dulles, Prime Minister Mollet, Foreign Minister Lester Pearson, and the other ministers of NATO nations know what was in the treaty and is now in full operation. The three wise men who were assigned to present a program for enlarging the role of NATO may be needed to prepare public opinion, but not to provide any new powers.

Military responsibilities are in themselves both economic and political controls.

Armies consist of men, supplies, weapons, and the command and staff structure. Supplies and weapons are economic problems. Command and strategy are political. NATO moved early to authorize its bureaucratic agencies to oversee the production of weapons and supplies, and the financial operations involved in defense production by member nations.

The significant area of economic and political control is the planning of expenditures yet to come. Here the key word is "coordinated."

In the mushroom growth of the governmental network all over the world today, the coordinators have all the fun. If any of you are ambitious to get a place in one of these hierarchies, get a job as a coordinator. Then everybody will be working for your nod of approval, and their fate will be in your hands.

NATO puts what its members should do, in the form of recommendations to member governments. But what recommendations NATO has made to the American Government I do not know. They are classified. You have to be a high official in the executive branch before you can be told. Members of Congress, the press, and the people lack the necessary intelligence or discretion or something. The facts on NATO must be kept from them.

At this point let me remind you that there is nowhere in the North Atlantic Treaty system any provision for keeping Communists out of either its governing councils or its permanent international staff.

We know the high proportion of Communist voters in France and Italy. We know that, in Britain and Canada, communism is strong, as it is in our country. How much vital military information is channeled to the Communists by the NATO machinery? I do not know, but I consider it the neatest espionage setup the Communists have yet devised, not excluding the agreement which put a Soviet national at the key point in U. N. through which military reports are funneled. You remember how all General MacArthur's military reports on the Korean war were sent to a U. N. official from the U. S. S. R. How many such reports our busy bureaucrats are sending to NATO links in the Communist net, we cannot know. Judging from the information we obtained under oath on the so-called international civil service of the United Nations, I fear the worst.

IS NATO REPLACING NATIONAL MILITARY FORCES?

We have one test case of how NATO planning works. That is in the mystifying developments in the rearming of West Germany.

Somewhere in the maze of NATO it has been decided that West Germany may enlist her manpower, put her men in uniform, and train them. But the West German Government may not do certain other things. It may not have a military general staff. It may not have atomic weapons, chemical weapons, or the most modern planes.

Germany is the front line for the defense of all Western Europe. Who gains from a system which makes the German troops a mere armed horde, without its own general staff and without modern weapons of war?

Suppose we should face the threat of a war with the Soviet Union, and Germany wants to fight with us, but the other West European countries go neutralist? German troops will be bound hand and foot. Someone planned it that way.

I am troubled about another question. I wonder if this amputation of the essential organs of military power, in the case of Germany, is the pilot model for all national armies in the future? Are we moving, by deliberate plan, to the day when no nation will have a general staff, or atomic weapons, or airpower?

NATO has a curious interest in civil defense. Now some of you are worried about the constitutional dangers implicit in civil defense. These doubts were intensified in Washington, when our executive branch held a dress rehearsal for dispersal after an imaginary atomic-bomb attack, and the President proclaimed martial law. Apparently it was a mistake in signals. The connection between atomic attack or even rumor of atomic attack, and martial law here at home, was not supposed to be brought out so clearly.

So far NATO has operated with a velvet quiet. But it is getting too large and too important for secrecy. So what is the alternative? NATO is stepping up its machinery for saturating our minds with propaganda, through the printed word, motion pictures, radio, student tours, and all the other devices for political brainwashing.

HOW NATO ERODES OUR CONSTITUTION

Constitutionally NATO is not responsible to the people of the member nations. Only the executive branch has any influence on the policies of NATO. Only the executive branch is permitted to learn what NATO decides. The growth of NATO is a continuation, in another form, of the mushroom growth of the executive power, far beyond the point where it can be influenced by Congress, the courts, the press, or the people.

But note this: Under the American Constitution, when the people wanted to change their Government policies, they voted the administration out of power, and out it went. Today our elected officials, and their advisers, are wedged tightly between an internationalist bureaucracy above them and an independent self-guiding bureaucracy below them. The officials in the front windows may be changed by a national election, but they can make almost no change in our policies.

I have given you the simplest, most unemotional and undramatic presentation I could make of the information about NATO, from its own published reports.

NATO is part of a system of regional pacts which includes SEATO, and the Organization of the American States, that strange new agency, which has locked the Pan American Union firmly into the United Nations, where we of the Americas can now act only with approval of Soviet Russia in the Security Council.

Do you like this silent relentless drive to world government?

Do you think global executive supremacy is superior to American constitutional freedom?

Do you think the clever men who planned this devious political straitjacket should be trusted with making American policies, in the life and death struggle with the Communist elite?

CONGRESS ALONE CAN DEMOLISH WORLD GOVERNMENT

You ask what you can do, to help destroy this superstructure which cages us in.

There is no slightest hope that anyone in the executive branch can cast off the chains that bind us. The weaving of the net was too cleverly done.

You know well that our Supreme Court will not do it.

The only power that can restore constitutional liberty is the Congress. On February 11, I said "We must put none but constitutionalists on guard in Congress." But people say, "What do you mean. How can we do that?"

Isn't it pitiful that Americans do not know how to get a Congress that represents them?

Let me give you a short-cut method of electing a constitutionalist Congress. Study how the leftwingers have year after year elected their leftwing, collectivist, internationalist spokesmen in Congress!

The collectivists understand something we have forgotten. The political contest to win the executive branch is entirely different from the contest for control of Congress. The executive branch operates as a unit. It is a Roosevelt administration, or a Truman administration, or an Eisenhower administration. The fight at election time is for large blocs of votes in key States, to win or lose all, for 4 years.

Congress is entirely different. Nearly 50 percent of the Members of both Houses speak for the party out of power. The problem is to tip the balance in Congress. A few districts mean victory. Every congressional district, every Senatorial contest, in large or small States, is critical. It may be the battle which wins the war.

COLLECTIVISTS HAVE A GRAND STRATEGY TO WIN CONGRESS

The collectivists have carefully planned the strategy and tactics for congressional elections. Sidney Hillman taught them, many years ago, to fight for the marginal districts, to win where the other party's margin was small.

The collectivists see the congressional campaign as a chessboard on which is clearly marked the margin of victory, and the record of opposing candidates, in every congressional district in the United States.

The objective of their strategy is to help collectivists to defeat constitutionalists. They work in both parties, because they know the constitutional struggle is far more fundamental than the contest between parties.

The collectivists have perfected three techniques.

First, they build a vigorous organization in every district, to ring door bells. It is directed by their national agencies, but appears to work through local people.

Second, they build up a nationwide propaganda to indoctrinate people with the leftwing policies which their candidates will be supporting.

Third, they mount an intensive campaign, backed by all their resources of money, propaganda, and organization, to destroy the leadership candidates on the conservative side, and to elect outstanding candidates on their side.

For many years the collectivists have worked together brilliantly, along all three roads, regardless of party, to elect men to Congress who will serve their purpose, and to pass a political death sentence against those who oppose communism, socialism, big spending, or internationalism. The attack on the 80th Congress, which exposed wartime communism, was their most blatant, but not their only, victory.

CONSTITUTIONALISTS CAN BEGIN TO FIGHT FOR CONGRESS

The constitutionalists have no comparable organization to help American nationalists in their districts, to create a tide of opinion in favor of constitutionalism, or to strengthen the leadership on their own side in both Houses, and defeat the leaders on the other side. They have never tried to tip the balance in Congress to the conservative side.

For decades, the voters who revere the Constitution have sulked in their tents like Achilles, while collectivists were out ringing doorbells, keeping up a continuous barrage of collectivist ideas in the press, over the air, and in a thousand papers and magazines, and sending their best teams to drive from public life the leaders of constitutionalism in Congress.

For decades conservative voters have watched the balance of power in Congress being pushed toward the left, a little more every year, and done nothing. Then they wonder why Members of Congress who were elected by the leftwingers vote for foreign aid and big spending.

Jim Farley had a saying which we ought to heed. He kept repeating, "In politics, you can't beat something with nothing."

It is now June. Congressional elections are 5 months away. For all of those 5 months the collectivist political machine will be in high gear, working in and through both parties, to destroy the remnants of American constitutionalism. What will you be doing?

If you wish, you can do something. Now is the moment. You can take your eyes off Washington, and ring doorbells in your own district. You can ask for America to compile a list of the hard core of leadership on the left and try to defeat it. Also a list of the hard core of leadership on the American side, and reinforce it. You can study how the collectivists spread their slogans and symbols and then tell the story of our Constitution as it affects the fight today.

You may not win a majority in Congress on the first try, but you can begin to tip the balance your way. In each succeeding Congress you can do a little more. In a few short years you can have a constitutionalist Congress. Then your Congress can cut down big spending and demobilize the bureaucratic elite.

Or, if you wish, you can do nothing.

Let me end with this. While you do nothing, the mesh of world government is being woven tighter and tighter, in the U. N., in NATO, in SEATO, in UNESCO.

It is moving to control your money, your foreign policies, your armies, and the minds of your little children.

The collectivists are watching. They will know the moment when they dare spring the trap.

Once they spring the trap, my friends, I promise you, you will be helpless to do anything, because you will have had it.

Fiftieth Anniversary of First Conference of State Governors on Conservation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARTHUR V. WATKINS

OF UTAH

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, June 21, 1956

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs has been holding hearings on Senate Joint Resolution 139, relating to the observance and commemoration of the 50th anniversary of the First Conference of State Governors on Conservation. Statements were made by various representatives of conservation groups. Mr. William E. Welsh, secretary-manager of the National Reclamation Association, submitted a statement which was received too late for printing in the hearings. I ask unanimous consent that the statement be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT SUBMITTED TO SENATE INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS COMMITTEE ON SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 139, RELATING TO THE OBSERVANCE AND COMMEMORATION OF THE 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE FIRST CONFERENCE OF STATE GOVERNORS ON CONSERVATION, BY WILLIAM E. WELSH, SECRETARY-MANAGER, NATIONAL RECLAMATION ASSOCIATION, WASHINGTON, D. C., JUNE 1956

My name is William E. Welsh. I am secretary-manager of the National Reclamation Association. I am submitting this statement on behalf of that Association.

The National Reclamation Association is a private, nonprofit, voluntary organization entirely independent of both Federal and State Governments which represents the irrigation and water resources interests of the 17 Western States. These States comprise approximately 60 percent of the area of the United States.

The association was organized in Salt Lake City, Utah, in 1932, upon the call of the then Governor, later Secretary of War, George H. Dern, primarily to save reclamation for the Western States. Although the scope and functions have been broadened considerably during the past 25 years, the overall objectives as indicated in the constitution remain fundamentally the same—"The development, control, conservation, preservation, and utilization of the water resources of the reclamation States."

MEMBERS

The membership of the association is made up of public-spirited citizens who come from every walk of life, including farmers and waterusers, businessmen, professional men, lawyers, bankers, newspaper men, and many others. A large majority of the members, however, are officers and directors of irrigation districts and canal companies who are officially authorized to speak for the irrigation farmers of the West on matters pertaining to the conservation and development of the water resources of the West.

CONSERVATION IMPORTANT TO THE WESTERN IRRIGATION FARMERS

Therefore, we of the National Reclamation Association are very much in sympathy with the overall objectives of Senate Joint Resolution 139 because of the emphasis that it places upon conservation at this critical time. Not only does the future growth, prosperity, and well being of our Nation depend upon the continued conservation and wise use of our natural resources, but to the irrigation farmers of the West, conservation of water is the only means of existence.

The irrigation farmers of the arid and semi-arid West have perhaps a better reason to be interested in conservation than any other group of citizens in the United States. In that area man cannot survive upon water as it is delivered to him by nature, largely coming in the form of snow falling on the mountains during the winter months. Water must be stored and conserved and made available for the hot, dry summer months. A well-sustained stream flow runoff is essential to the growing of crops in the West. This means that there must be an adequate and

well-planned program of watershed protection on all of the watersheds of the streams throughout the West where irrigation farmers are dependent upon that stream to yield a well-sustained, late season run-off for the growing crops.

CONSERVATION STUDIES, BOISE RIVER WATERSHED, IDAHO

I hope that I may be pardoned for referring to my own experiences to illustrate this point. For 24 years I have served as watermaster on the Boise River in southwestern Idaho. The Boise River is only 115 miles long. It rises among the Sawtooth Mountains 10,000 feet in elevation and empties into the Snake River at 2,000 feet elevation. In other words, it falls 8,000 feet in a little more than 100 miles. Under such conditions, the danger of erosion is very great. The Boise Valley is a highly developed and intensely farmed agricultural area of more than 300,000 acres, and with considerably more than 100,000 population. The successful growing of crops in this fertile valley and the well being of the population of the valley depends upon an adequate supply of water during the entire growing season. There must be a well-regulated and sustained stream flow runoff. In 1929 I took the initiative in having a forest and range experimental station established on that watershed by the United States Forest Service for the purpose of determining the manner and extent to which the timber could be cut and the range lands grazed without doing injury to the watershed itself. My latest information was to the effect that this experimental station is still in operation.

In my opinion, that is conservation at its best. It is based upon commonsense. It contemplates the wise and fullest use of all of the resources of this area, keeping ever in mind the necessity of maintaining a well protected watershed for the benefit of the entire population of the area. At the same time the scenic and recreational attractions of the watershed are not only unimpaired but enhanced. Tourists and vacationists who visit and enjoy the scenic and recreational attractions at Lucky Peak, Arrowrock, and Anderson Ranch Dams and Reservoirs on the Boise River watershed exceed the number who visit and vacation in other areas of the watershed.

ABUSIVE USE OF WATERSHED: EROSION, FLASHY RUNOFF

The attitude of the western irrigators not only in the Boise Valley but throughout the entire West was well illustrated by a statement by the chairman of the Boise Valley Waterusers, submitted before a congressional committee quite a number of years ago in which he said:

"Any use or abuse of the watershed of the Boise River is of vital importance to every citizen of this valley. We believe that every acre of this watershed should be so utilized as to protect and preserve to the fullest possible extent this great natural resource—the water—for the benefit of all those who are dependent upon it for their subsistence."

It is generally recognized throughout the entire West that abusive use of a watershed results ultimately in erosion and siltation of reservoirs as well as quick and flashy stream runoff. For these reasons, the members of the National Reclamation Association, over a long period of years, have been very strong supporters of conservation, including particularly watershed protection on the watersheds of the West.

THEODORE ROOSEVELT AND GIFFORD PINCHOT

The conservation movement as we know it today was given its greatest momentum under the leadership of President Theodore Roosevelt and Gifford Pinchot. The extent to which Theodore Roosevelt, in all of his messages dealing with this subject, related reclamation to the entire conservation program indicates his deep feeling as to the importance of reclamation. In fact, it appeared to be a major part of his ultimate goal and objective in all of his messages dealing with conservation.

Following are quotes from President Theodore Roosevelt's messages to Congress:

From his first annual message, December 3, 1901

"The forests are natural reservoirs. By restraining the streams in flood and replenishing them in drought they make possible the use of waters otherwise wasted. They prevent the soil from washing, and so protect the storage reservoirs from filling up with silt. Forest conservation is therefore an essential condition of water conservation. * * *

"* * * The forests alone cannot, however, fully regulate and conserve the waters of the arid region. Great storage works are necessary to equalize the flow of streams and to save the floodwaters. * * *

"* * * The Government should construct and maintain these reservoirs as it does other public works. * * *

"* * * The reclamation of the unsettled arid public lands presents a different problem. Here it is not enough to regulate the flow of streams. The object of the Government is to dispose of the land to settlers who will build homes upon it. To accomplish this object, water must be brought within their reach. * * *

"* * * There remain, however, vast areas of public land which can be made available for homestead settlement, but only by reservoirs and mainline canals impracticable for private enterprise. These irrigation works should be built by the National Government. The lands reclaimed by them should be reserved by the Government for actual settlers, and the cost of construction should so far as possible be repaid by the land reclaimed. The distribution of the water, the division of the streams among irrigators, should be left to the settlers themselves in conformity with State laws and without interference with those laws or with vested rights. The policy of the National Government should be to aid irrigation in the several States and Territories themselves, and as well stimulate needed reforms in the State laws and regulations governing irrigation. * * *

"* * * The reclamation and settlement of the arid lands will enrich every portion of our country, just as the settlement of the Ohio and Mississippi Valleys brought prosperity to the Atlantic States."

From his second annual message, December 2, 1902

"Few subjects of more importance have been taken up by the Congress in recent years than the inauguration of the system of nationally aided irrigation for the arid regions of the Far West."

From his third annual message, December 7, 1903

"The work of reclamation of the arid lands of the West is progressing steadily and satisfactorily. * * *

"* * * The Nation as a whole is, of course, the gainer by the creation of these homes, adding as they do to the wealth and stability of the country, and furnishing a home market for the products of the East and South."

From his fourth annual message, December 6, 1904

"The Reclamation Act has been found to be remarkably complete and effective, and so broad in its provisions that a wide range of undertakings has been possible under it."

From his fifth annual message, December 5, 1905

"The creation of small irrigated farms under the Reclamation Act is a powerful offset to the tendency of certain other laws to foster or permit monopoly of the lands."

From his sixth annual message, December 3, 1906

"The conservation of our natural resources and their proper use constitute the fundamental problem which underlies almost every other problem of our national life. We must maintain for our civilization the adequate material basis without which that civilization cannot exist. We must show foresight, we must look ahead. * * *

"* * * The Government dams should be used to produce hundreds of thousands of horsepower. * * *

"* * * Irrigation should be far more extensively developed than at present. The Federal Government should seriously devote itself to this task, realizing that utilization of waterways and waterpower, forestry, and the reclamation of lands are all interdependent parts of the same problem. * * *

"* * * The work of the Reclamation Service in developing the larger opportunities of the western half of our country for irrigation is more important than almost any other movement. The constant purpose of the water resources of the public lands for the ultimate greatest good for the greatest number; in other words, to put upon the land permanent homemakers, to use and develop it for themselves and for their children and children's children."

I was especially impressed by the marvelous statement presented to this committee by Mrs. Gifford Pinchot in which she outlined the history and the background of the conservation movement as it was developed into a national policy by her distinguished husband. I was particularly impressed by her statement that "Conservation to Gifford Pinchot was never a vague, fuzzy aspiration * * *. The conservation he preached dealt with protection of the forest in terms of wise use and sustained yield. It dealt with the relation of these forests to the fertility of the soil, to erosion, and flood prevention." The first of the three great purposes of Mr. Pinchot, she said, was "To wisely use, protect, and renew the natural resources of the earth." Then she summarized by saying, "In other words, the greatest good, for the greatest number, for the longest time."

It is truly refreshing to note that Theodore Roosevelt and Gifford Pinchot never for a moment advanced the theory that conservation meant to set aside vast areas where all of the natural resources should be bottled up and denied to the public, except as something to look at. These two great conservationists adhered to the commonsense theory that these great God-given natural resources were created for the benefit of man to enjoy and to use—but to use wisely.

Six million acres of reclamation projects scattered throughout the entire West constitute an enduring testimonial to these two great leaders in conservation a half a century ago. The construction of these projects was made possible because of the farsightedness and aggressive leadership of Theodore Roosevelt. The water supply necessary to keep these projects operating successfully has been greatly enhanced by conservation programs on all western watersheds which were initiated and promulgated by Gifford Pinchot while he was our first Chief Forester.

These reclamation projects have created prosperous American communities with beautiful and well kept homes which will be there for the enjoyment of generations yet unborn and for centuries to come.

To paraphrase the prophecies of Theodore Roosevelt, "the reclamation and settlement of the arid lands" has enriched "every portion of our country." Reclamation has used "the water resources of the public lands for the greatest good for the greatest number."

The Gifford Pinchot ideal "the greatest good for the greatest number for the longest time" is being fulfilled.

History may well record the enactment of the National Reclamation Act signed by President Theodore Roosevelt on June 17, 1902, along with the passage of the Homestead law signed by President Abraham Lincoln on May 20, 1862, as two of the greatest legislative enactments for the conservation, development, and wise use of our Nation's natural resources ever adopted by the Federal Congress.

The National Reclamation Association is happy indeed to endorse Senate Joint Resolution No. 139, because we are in sympathy with the overall objectives as they are outlined in that resolution. We believe that the establishment of a National Conservation Memorial Commission, as provided for in this resolution, will prove to be a very helpful stimulant to the cause of conservation.

Mr. Chairman, we are very grateful indeed for the opportunity to present this statement.

Respectfully submitted.

WILLIAM E. WELSH,
Secretary-Manager, NRA.

California Weighs Giant Dam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ESTES KEFAUVER
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, June 21, 1956

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a news article from the Christian Science Monitor of March 13, 1956, concerning a proposed giant dam through which California hopes to start solving its last big long-range water problems.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CALIFORNIA WEIGHS GIANT DAM

(By Harlan Trott)

SACRAMENTO, CALIF.—California is hoping to make a good start toward solving its last big long-range water problems at a special session of the legislature.

Full development of the State's marvelous water resources will cost close to $13 billion.

Gov. Goodwin J. Knight will be satisfied if the legislature authorizes the start on the $1½ billion Feather River project.

The Water Project Authority has recommended that the State spend $27 million to start damming the Feather at Oroville and its related San Joaquin Delta diversion project.

Governor Knight has partially implemented this in the current budget by inserting an item allotting $5 million for surveys and construction plans. This includes buying the Oroville and Delta dam sites and rights-of-way for the relocation of the State highway and the Western Pacific Railroad.

HOPES FOR 1957 START

Legislative approval would commit the State to the next big step of building the $400 million Oroville Reservoir. The dam, 6,780 feet long and 730 feet high, will hold back 3,500,000 acre-feet of water. It would contain more concrete than Grand Coulee.

Governor Knight says he is hopeful that shifting the highway and the Western Pacific tracks up through the beautiful Feather River Gorge could get under way not much later than July 1957.

The legislature will have to decide how to finance the plan to dam the Feather River where it tumbles out into the coastal plain close to Oroville. The California engineering firm of Bechtel, builder of the trans-Arabian pipeline and other giant engineering feats, has issued a report saying the Feather River project is feasible to build and finance.

For almost a generation now, the notion has permeated people's thinking that multipurpose reclamation projects costing billions are beyond the ability of any one State to pay.

The United States built California's Central Valley project ostensibly for that reason.

WEIGHED BY LEGISLATORS

Now the California Legislature is considering a water project costing nearly 10 times as much. The reason is that California's representatives in Congress have been told that there is no chance of Congress appropriating $1½ billion to have the Department of the Interior do the work.

So California is tackling the job. The challenge to California's future growth will have to be faced by California alone, or the State which now ranks second only to New York in population will stop growing.

Already the population exceeds 13 million, and in another decade California may pass New York.

Legislators from as far south as San Diego and in the semiarid parts of the lower Central Valley are excited about the prospects of storing up the winter rains and diverting the winter runoffs from northern to southern California.

Harvey O. Banks, acting State engineer, has assured legislators from the thirsty south that when the water project authority submits its report by June 30 of this year it will show the feasibility of bringing water to almost every arid spot.

POLITICIANS ELATED

Politicians are elated. Assemblywoman Dorothy Donahoe from Bakersfield, for example, says she has been trying for 3 years to get the State engineer or his staff to make this commitment.

The land in her district is wonderful cotton land when the holders can get water to it. Water would greatly accelerate the development of industry and agriculture in eastern Kern County, which she represents.

How the State will finance these great engineering works is said to be important. If they are financed in the traditional California way, the danger of land speculation will be greatly minimized, small family-size farming will be encouraged, and the threat of inflation will be curbed. That is California's experience in regional as opposed to State or Federal financing of water and power projects.

Los Angeles and neighboring communities and districts have financed their water developments without either Federal or State subsidy. Those familiar with the California success pattern, engineers such as Samuel Morris, of Los Angeles, advocate regional financing.

STATE CODE CITED

The California water code is adequate for this purpose. Under its provisions the people could by popular vote bring all of California's land, or any part of it, into an irrigation district or superdistrict.

The underlying factor in the success of California's local reclamation projects is that the cost of all water developments can be paid by the holders of land which the project makes more productive and desirable, without putting any burden on those using the land, as users. This is the method David E. Lilienthal has just advocated in Colombia's new water project.

Those who side with pioneer "doers" such as Sam Morris, of Los Angeles, say that former Secretary of the Interior Harold L. Ickes defined the basic question a decade ago when he said:

"It is the age-old battle over who is to cash in on the unearned increment in land values created by a public investment."

Will the businessmen and wage earners of California—in other words the consumers—be required to pay for the projects? Or will the holders of the benefited land be required to pay for public works which increase the value of their land?

Spokesmen for California's hundred-odd irrigation districts, labor unions, and others who see and support the traditional California way are expected to make themselves heard when the legislative committees get down to work on the great opportunities confronting them at this special session here.

Shortage of Scientists and Engineers: Are We Losing the Race With Russia?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 21, 1956

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith an editorial written by Donald C. McGraw, president of the McGraw-Hill Publishing Co., Inc., entitled "The Shortage of Scientists and Engineers: Are We Losing the Race With Russia."

This is one of a series of editorials prepared by the McGraw-Hill department of economics to help increase public knowledge and understanding of important nationwide developments of particular concern to the business and professional community served by the company's industrial and technical publications.

THE SHORTAGE OF SCIENTISTS AND ENGINEERS: ARE WE LOSING THE RACE WITH RUSSIA?

There is new confidence in the Kremlin. One key reason is expressed in a recent boast of Communist Party Secretary Khrushchev: "The capitalists always regard our people as being backward, but today we have more engineers and more supporting engineering technical personnel than any capitalist country." He promised that this lead would be widened and that communism would be victorious without war.

This boast cannot be dismissed as Communist propaganda. Adm. Lewis L. Strauss, chairman of the United States Atomic Energy Commission, has warned: "In 5 years our lead in the training of scientists and engineers may be wiped out, and in 10 years we could be hopelessly outstripped. Unless immediate steps are taken to correct it, a situation already dangerous, within less than a decade could become disastrous."

This second editorial in a series on the shortage of scientists and engineers is designed to explore as carefully as possible the facts and the implications of the new emphasis on technical training in the Soviet Union. It draws heavily from the authoritative book Soviet Professional Manpower, prepared for the National Academy of Sciences and the National Research Council by Nicholas DeWitt of the Russian Research Center of Harvard and released recently by the National Science Foundation.

TREND IS AGAINST US

If the Soviet Union already has a lead in technical manpower, it is not very great. Both the United States and Russia now have around a million scientists and engineers.

About a third of the Russian engineers were trained on inferior pre-1935 standards. It's the trend that is alarming.

Over the last 5 years we have turned out only 142,000 engineers, compared to an estimated 216,000 in Russia. In 1955 our output was around 23,000 compared to their 63,000. Over the next 5 years our projected output is 153,000, against at least 400,000 in Russia. There will be an additional 150,000 or more in the satellites and Red China.

In Russia, 30 percent of the college students are in engineering, compared to 8 percent here. Another 30 percent or more take degrees in natural sciences. Moreover, unlike ourselves, the Russians are ploughing back a large proportion of their science graduates into teaching, which implies a rapid buildup in the future.

QUALITY AS WELL AS QUANTITY

It would be foolhardy to assume that these new Russian graduates are inferior to ours in the quality of their technical training. They start out with much more intensive mathematical and scientific preparation at the high school level. They study harder and longer in college, with more laboratory work and more practical training. Their courses and textbooks seem to be as thorough as ours. Even though the Russian graduates may be overspecialized, they get results.

These results have been striking. The Russians developed both A-bombs and H-bombs faster than we expected, and it's not certain that they had to rely much on espionage. They pushed ahead of us for a while in jet fighter design, and they showed up with a fleet of long-range bombers well ahead of schedule. They are crowding us on nuclear power, electronics, and automation. There are grave fears that they have established a lead in the vital field of military rockets.

The goal of Soviet scientific manpower policy includes not only weapon supremacy but also leadership of the neutral and uncommitted areas of Asia, Africa, and the Middle East. The Soviet leaders may be bluffing in their offers to export capital, but they are preparing to export Russian scientific and technical know-how in a big way.

HOW THEY DO IT

The Russians are determined to win the race for scientific supremacy, and they do not count the cost. They pay their scientists and engineers salaries that seem fantastic when compared with other Soviet incomes.

Senior professors, research scientists and top engineers are a major segment of the Russian elite. Their incomes are frequently 6 to 10 times the average industrial wage. (In the United States 6 to 10 times the average industrial wage would be $25,000 to $40,000 a year.) Housing and other privileges are correspondingly lavish. While preaching equality, the Soviets use capitalistic incentives far more boldly than we do. Indeed, practicing engineers and scientists have been complaining about the exalted status of professors and top research people, and salary scales are now being adjusted to give greater emphasis to practical results.

The Russians are also generous in their aids to education. Tuition has just been made free at all levels. Undergraduates receive 200 to 500 rubles a month and graduate students 800 rubles (about equal to an industrial wage) to cover living expenses. The biggest stipends go to science and engineering students. College students are deferred from military service, and engineers and scientists often enjoy continued deferment even after graduation.

Finally, the Soviet leaders can channel engineers and scientists—and all other human and material resources—into any area they choose. And the areas the Soviet leaders choose are predominantly those that contribute to military or political objectives, rather than to a better life for consumers.

WHAT'S OUR ANSWER?

We are certainly not going to adopt Soviet methods. We do not want scientific robots, but free men, able to understand and add to our democratic heritage. At the same time, our world leadership in technology—and perhaps even our survival as a Nation—will be threatened if we allow ourselves to lag far behind Russia in the training of scientists and engineers. Ways to keep the United States in the race will be discussed in a later editorial in this series.

Green Bay Road

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MARGUERITE STITT CHURCH
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 21, 1956

Mrs. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am inserting the following article on the Green Bay Trail, for which the Illinois Historical Society recently selected William Koretz as one of 37 statewide junior historians. William Koretz, an eighth grader in Elm Place School, Highland Park, Ill., was awarded the society's certificate by Gov. William G. Stratton at a ceremony in Springfield.

GREEN BAY ROAD

(By Bill Koretz, eighth grade, Elm Place School, Highland Park)

The Green Bay Trail originated as an Indian foothpath between fur trading posts at Detroit, Mich., and Green Bay, Wis. The French established St. Francis Xavier Mission at Green Bay about 1670. After the French and Indian War the British replaced the French mission with Fort Howard. An important trading station along the trial, situated where Waukegan is now, was named Waukeganence (an Indian word for little fort). It was probably built in 1695.

The Green Bay Trail was active with trading of furs—beaver, otter, and mink. French-Canadian missionaries used it when trying to convert Indians to Christianity. In this area, the trail was used most by French-Canadian trappers and by Potawatomi Indians. Directions were marked by Indian trail trees.

The Indians gave up this territory to the Government in 1833. Soon afterward soldiers were ordered to widen the trail, as it was too narrow for wagons. The soldiers were in a hurry and lacked money to straighten the road, so they followed the Indian path in its complicated windings around ravines. The men laid rough rafts and log bridges over creeks and blazed trees along the way. Settlers who came later called the trail the Military Road. In its improved form the road began on North Clark Street in Chicago, continued past Rosehill Cemetery, followed the shoreline to Winetka and the Hubbard Woods Ravines, turned west to the north limits of Glencoe, and followed the current road to Highwood Avenue. The path ran through Fort Sheridan to Sacred Heart Academy, and then returned to its present route.

A stagecoach line was established in 1836, carrying mail and passengers from Chicago to Green Bay. This was an improvement over previous postal service. In good weather the mail carrier on horseback arrived in this area about once every 2 weeks. In winter or in rainy weather he was often unable to travel the muddy or snowbound trail. Passengers on the stagecoach found travel along the trail uncomfortable because of the many ruts and stops when wheels were stuck in mud.

Several taverns or inns were constructed beside the trail. One of these was the Green Bay Tavern, near the present Moraine viaduct. The farmers who inhabited most of the land beside the trail until the Civil War used it in the Highland Park area when they made their rare trips to Chicago markets. The railroad (present North Western) was opened through Deerfield Township in 1855. Highland Park was incorporated in 1869.

Additional Scientific and Professional Positions in the Federal Government

SPEECH
OF
HON. JOHN E. HENDERSON
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 21, 1956

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H. R. 11040) to advance the scientific and professional research and development programs of the Departments of Defense, the Interior, and Commerce, to improve the management and administration of certain departmental activities, and for other purposes.

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Chairman, with respect to H. R. 11040, it is not news to anyone that the United States no longer has the tremendous lead that it once enjoyed in military strength, airpower, and international prestige. Other nations of the world have challenged our position and as they offered the challenge, have themselves begun energetically to work at the task of assuming a prominent role in world leadership.

Nor is it any secret that our Government is facing grave difficulties in obtaining the necessary key scientific personnel to keep pace with the requirements of modern-day warfare.

Our committee hearings on this legislation disclosed that inability to attract and retain competent top-level scientific professional, technical, and administrative personnel is one of the most pressing problems faced by the Department of Defense, the National Security Agency, and the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics. Private industry has found the necessity for such top-level personnel, and private industry is prepared to pay substantially higher wages than is the Government, under existing legislation.

Witnesses before our committee pointed out that although it is possible to keep key personnel when the wage differential may be 50 percent, that those people who are in key positions with the Government are devoted to their work and hesitate to change, when the monetary difference between what industry is paying and what Government is paying is not too great. But, tell a man with a growing family who wants to own his home and have a better car that he can go into private industry at 2 or 3 times the salary that he is receiving from Gov-

ernment and it takes a unique type of loyalty to keep him there.

And that is just what our departments of Government have discovered to be the case. The condition is particularly evident in the field of research and development. These programs have increased in size. They have grown more complex, and the demands are far more urgent. This bill is designed to help those departments of Government to attract and retain the talent which is necessary for the programs. They are not able presently to attract and retain these talents because of the shortage of higher level positions. This legislation would increase from 45 to 275.

A number of scientific and professional positions in the Department of Defense under Public Law 313 as amended, provide 56 positions for use by the National Security Agency, increased from 10 to 60 the number of such positions in the headquarters and research stations of the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics under Public Law 313, as amended, and authorize the Secretary of the Interior to establish and fix the compensation for not to excede 10 such positions in the Department of the Interior, and finally to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to establish and fix the compensation for not to exceed 35 such positions in the Department of Commerce, making a maximum total of 375 such positions. These positions would pay not less than $10,000 or more than $15,000 as provided in Public Law 313, as amended.

I would like to point out here very emphatically that these are positions in the classified Civil Service, and that the salaries thereof as well as the qualifications of proposed appointees will be subject to prior approval by the United States Civil Service Commission.

Now, in addition to those positions, one other section of the bill provides that the Secretary of Defense may place 285 positions in grades 16, 17, and 18 of the general schedule of the Classification Act of 1949 in lieu of 236 such positions now allocated to that Department by the Civil Service Commission. The difference between 236 and 285 is a net increase of 49 such positions. This is done by adding a subsection F to section 505 of the Classification Act of 1949. The 236 positions thereby released will return to the Civil Service Commission and be available for allocation to other departments and agencies of Government in accordance with section 505 of the Classification Act.

One further change is made wtih regard to section 505 by the enactment of this bill, as follows: Under section 505, as previously established, allocation of these so-called supergrades has been left exclusively to the Civil Service Commissioners in accordance with their determination of the needs. By the enactment of this legislation, Congress is saying that of the supergrades authorized 285 of them will be for the exclusive use of the Department of Defense.

The bill provides for a detailed system of reporting so that the Congress may maintain very close watch over the use of the scientific and professional positions. This is done two places in the bill—one on page 4, section 3, of the act of August 1, 1947, as amended, and again on page 6, where a new section of law is being enacted with regard to the reporting of supergrades by those agencies to whom they are assigned by the Civil Service Commission and by this act.

Insofar as the individual positions are concerned which are being filled by this act, each of them were detailed to us in the hearings, and in the opinion of our committee were fully justified. The day has come when, unless our strategic branches of Government can recruit and retain its key professional, scientific, and top executive career personnel, it cannot keep pace in this battle of wits, in this struggle for ideals, and in the campaign for military strength in which it is engaged in this day of democracies versus communism.

Steel Wage Dispute

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. RAY J. MADDEN

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 21, 1956

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, the Nation's No. 1 heavy industry, the manufacturers of steel, is now engaged in conferences over a new contract between labor and management.

The following letter from David J. McDonald, president of the United Steel Workers, set out facts which are important for the information of the Congress and the American public:

JUNE 18, 1956.

To the Officers and Members of All Local Unions of the United Steelworkers of America.

DEAR SIR AND BROTHER: I am writing this letter to each local union so that our members can have the facts—the straight facts rather than industry propaganda—about the current situation in our bargaining with the basic-steel industry.

On June 13 the representatives of the industry made us a take-it-or-leave-it offer. In making this offer the representatives of the industry stated quite clearly that, although we could bargain about details and the allocation of the costs of the fringe benefits, the total package was a fixed package. They also said that the only basis upon which they would conclude an agreement with us was a fixed contract, without reopeners or room for later negotiations on any subject, for a 5-year term.

The international wage policy committee unanimously rejected the industry offer as too little, too late, and too long. The wage offer is too little and would result in a take-home pay increase to the average steel worker this year of about a nickel an hour—about 2 percent. The fringes offered by the industry to dress up this unacceptable wage proposal are inadequate and become effective too late to have any significance. The whole contract, instead of being modernized, is to be extended, with its obsolescent features under the industry's proposal for 5 years—far too long a period.

The industry has advertised far and wide that the package which they have offered us costs 17⅓ cents in the first year of the contract and, over the 5-year term, would cost 65 cents an hour.

I want to label these industry figures as propaganda rather than fact: The industry has not offered us either 17⅓ cents this year or 65 cents for 5 years. This is what they have offered, in their own words:

EFFECTIVE DATE AND IMPROVEMENT

July 1, 1956: Advance all job class 1 employees to job class 2 and combine the 2 classes.

July 1, 1956: Increase all standard hourly wage rates by 6 cents and increase increments between job classes above job class 2 by two-tenths cent.

July 1, 1956: Establish supplemental unemployment benefits plan in form attached, with company contributions of 5 cents per hour.

November 1, 1956: Establish improved insurance program in accordance with insurance proposal attached.

July 1, 1957: Increase all standard hourly wage rates by 6 cents and increase increments between job classes above job class 2 by two-tenths cent.

July 1, 1957: Add a seventh paid holiday.

5. Vacations: The industry offered, effective 1958, to increase the vacations of employees with 3 and 4 years, and with 10–14 years of service, by one-half week. They coupled this offer with a new method of computing vacation pay on the basis of a percentage of the average of the previous year's earnings. And they also required, as a price for this benefit, that the companies be given the unilateral right to require employees to forego their vacations and take vacation pay instead.

6. Shift differentials: The companies offered to increase shift differentials by 1 cent per hour for the second and third shifts in 1958 and again to increase the differential by 1 cent for the second shift and 2 cents for the third shift in 1960.

7. Sunday premium pay: In answer to our request for double time for Sunday work and time and one-half for Saturday, the companies offered to pay the night-shift premium for Sunday work; that is, they offered a premium of 10 cents per hour effective 1959, and a 12-cent-per-hour premium effective 1960. Even this offer was carefully restricted. First, the companies stipulated that not even this night-shift premium would be paid for hours worked on Sunday if they were overtime hours. And to make sure that this restriction would apply wherever possible, they propose to change the regular workweek, which now begins on Sunday, to a week beginning on Monday, so that Sunday instead of Saturday would be the seventh day.

8. Jury pay: The final fringe benefit offered by the companies was jury pay, and this not to be effective until July 1959.

What is this whole package worth to the steelworkers? Our research department has computed the value of each of these items, and, giving the companies the benefit of every doubt, estimates that ultimately the value of these benefits, when they all finally go into effect in 1961, would be 45.3 cents per hour. This includes not only the companies' payments into the supplemental unemployment benefits fund, which will average about 3 cents per hour, but also the companies' payments into the insurance fund of 1.5 cents per hour—neither of which, as presently proposed by the companies, will provide any real benefits to the steelworkers.

But, even counting these in, while the package at the end of 5 years will be 45.3 cents, the average benefit over the 5-year term of 1956–61 amounts only to 28.5 cents per hour. The reason for this is simply that we will not get many of these benefits for several years.

What this actually means is that the industry has offered a package worth, on the average, for the 5 years, a total of 28.5 cents per hour. In return they insist that we execute a firm 5-year contract, forbidding us to negotiate on anything until 1961. We

would have to give up, for 5 years, every one of the changes which we have asked be made in our contracts to bring them up to date. At the same time, the companies insist, as part of their offer, that if the Government should impose controls at any time during the 5-year term, they would have the right to reopen and cancel all of the future benefits.

November 1, 1957: Increase pension benefits in accordance with pension proposal attached.

January 1, 1958: Increase vacation pay of employees with 3 to 5 years of service to 1½ weeks and increase vacation pay of employees with 10 to 15 years of service to 2½ weeks.

July 1, 1958: Increase all standard hourly wage rates by 6 cents and increase increments between job classes above job class 2 by two-tenths cent.

July 1, 1958: Increase shift premiums to 7 cents for afternoon shift and 10 cents for night shift.

July 1, 1959: Increase all standard hourly wage rates by 6 cents and increase increments between job classes above job class 2 by two-tenths cent.

July 1, 1959: Establish new premium for Sunday shifts equal to night shift premium.

July 1, 1959: Grant jury pay.

July 1, 1960: Increase all standard hourly wage rates by 6 cents and increase increments between job classes above job class 2 by two-tenths cent.

July 1, 1960: Increase shift premiums to 8 cents for afternoon shift and 12 cents for night shift.

July 1, 1960: Apply new night shift premium to Sunday shifts.

The above does not tell the whole story. The actual increase for take-home pay in the first year under this package would be less than 5 cents an hour. A steelworker in job class 8 (the average job class) would receive a wage increase of 6 cents plus an increment increase of 1.2 cent, or a total of 7.2 cents. From this average wage increase would have to be subtracted 1.5 cent which the companies insist must be added to the employee contributions under the insurance program. Therefore, the net increase for job class 8 would be 5.7 cents. When taxes are subtracted from this net increase, the total in take-home pay is less than 5 cents per hour.

The companies' package includes a similar increase in each of the 4 years after this year. In addition, it provides for certain fringe benefits. I think you are entitled to know precisely what these other benefits are:

1. Supplemental unemployment benefits: Under the plan offered by the industry practically no benefits would be paid to any of our members. This is because the industry has invented a new gimmick in supplemental unemployment benefits plans. Under other plans that have so far been negotiated, such as our can plan, the total unemployment benefit (including State unemployment compensation) is 65 percent of 40 hours' take-home pay. The steel companies propose that the total benefit should be 65 percent of take-home pay for the hours actually worked in the 3-month period immediately before the layoff. Since, in most cases, our members work a short week (often down to 32 hours) in the period before they are laid off, this would mean that in many cases the total benefit (including the State unemployment compensation) would be 65 percent of the take-home pay for 32 hours of work. In almost every State in which we have any number of members, this total benefit would hardly be larger than the State unemployment benefit. Therefore, under the plan offered by the industry—unlike any other supplemental unemployment benefits plan—virtually no benefits would be paid out of the fund.

In addition, the companies refused to make adequate provisions by which our members in Ohio, Indiana, and Virginia would be guaranteed benefits if the authorities in these States persist in their rulings that supplementation of State benefits is not permissible. Under the plan offered by the companies no benefits would be paid out of the fund in any State in which supplementation or the payment of substitute benefits is not permitted by State law.

2. Insurance: The industry offered us an improved insurance program. The actual cost of the new benefits which they offered us is $2.25 per employee per month. But they insist, as a condition of this improvement, that the average employee contribution be increased by $2.55 per month. They did agree to increase the company contributions, also by $2.55 per month, but all of their money would be retained as reserves.

3. Holidays: The companies offered a seventh paid holiday, but not until the day before Christmas in 1957. They refused even to consider our proposal that premium pay be paid, in addition to the holiday pay, for hours worked on the holiday.

4. Pensions: The companies offered to increase minimum pension benefits to $2.50 a month for each year of service, but they offered to make this effective only with respect to years actually worked after 1957. This means that it would be 1987 before an employee could retire with 30 years of service at $2.50 per month—the pension benefit we negotiated with the can industry last year. In can, a worker retiring today with 30 years of service, or more, receives a pension of $2.50 per month for each year of past service.

For service up to November 1957, the steel companies offered an increase in the minimum pension from the present $1.83 a month per year of service to $2 a month per year of service, effective next year. But even this small increase would not be given to present pensioners. In the can industry we not only negotiated a $2.50 a month pension, effective last year, but the companies agreed to apply it retroactively for all present pensioners.

In addition, the companies insist on an additional penalty clause, under which every worker who, during the 5 years, participates in a work stoppage or any interference with production, would lose, in addition to his wages, 1 day's vacation and 1 week's supplemental unemployment benefits for every day's work lost.

The industry's 28.5-cent package for 5 years is not a fair offer. This is a year of record prosperity. Despite this, the industry is offering us, for this year and each of the 4 following years, much less than we have received on the average during the past 10 years.

The international wage policy committee, in rejecting this offer, said that it was "too little, too late, and too long." In the words of the wage policy committee:

"The wage offer is too little and would result in a take-home-pay increase to the average steelworker this year of about a nickel an hour—about 2 percent. This trifling 2-percent increase would be the steelworkers' reward for increasing their productivity by a recordbreaking 11 percent last year."

In rejecting the industry's offer, the policy committee reaffirmed the union's desire to achieve a fair and reasonable settlement. It said:

"Insofar as the union is concerned, the union's negotiators, without stipulating any prior conditions, are ready to meet both day and night, with the industry representatives for the purpose of hammering out a decent settlement.

"We call upon the leaders of the steel industry to meet with the union in the same spirit and without attaching conditions which roadblock give-and-take bargaining."

I am confident that our membership will support this unanimous action of the wage policy committee.

Sincerely yours,

DAVID J. MCDONALD,
President.

Work of Representative Dante Fascell, of Florida

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE A. SMATHERS
OF FLORIDA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, June 21, 1956

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an excellent editorial highly complimentary of the work of Representative DANTE FASCELL, representing Florida's Fourth Congressional District.

The article is entitled "FASCELL Is Right on the Right To Know," and it appeared in the Miami Herald under date of June 14, 1956.

We of the Florida delegation are justly proud of the very fine work being done by DANTE FASCELL, who is completing his first term in the Congress. His fine qualities and outstanding ability as a legislator are known to many of us in the Congress. He justly merits the confidence and overwhelming support of the people of his district.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FASCELL IS RIGHT ON THE RIGHT TO KNOW

Representative DANTE FASCELL of this city is a member of the House Subcommittee on Government Operations.

This subcommittee inquired into the availability of information from Federad departments and agencies. It investigated whether Government agencies were denying or restricting the people's right to know what their officials were doing with their business.

During the hearings Representative FASCELL made this statement.

"It is my thinking that the right to know does not stem solely from the Constitution; rather it flows through the Constitution and that by ordaining and publishing the Constitution the people of this country established the principle that all powers and rights are vested in the people. • • •

"That principle would guide my thinking • • • even though it may have been restricted by Executive act, by congressional act, by judicial decision, or otherwise. I am just as interested in the individual's right, whether it might be exercised by him personally, or exercised through the press."

Representative FASCELL recognizes that in this day and time the people's right to know—whether as individuals or as a group—can be effectively exercised only through the press, or other communications media, having access to the records of departmental and other agencies of Government.

When officialdom seals off the press from its meetings and its records as a governing and continuing policy, the people's right to know has not only been negated but the people can't know what's what with their business.

Steel Wage Dispute

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RAY J. MADDEN
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 21, 1956

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, the following is a breakdown of important issues now in discussion between labor and management concerning the renewal of the present contract between the United States steelworkers of America and steel management.

These comments and analaysis are submitted by the United States Steel Workers Union:

COMMENTS ON PROPOSALS OF BIG THREE STEEL COMPANIES

1. WAGES

The annual increase of 6 cents plus increase of two-tenths of a cent in increments (worth a total of 7.3 cents per year in United States Steel) gives a 2-percent increase in wages for an 11-percent increase in productivity. For 5 years, wages go up 7.3 cents each year, but since 1946 wages have been raised as follows:

	Cents
1946	18.5
1947	15
1948	13
1950	16
1952	16
1953	8.5
1954	5
1955	15

Deducting the additional 1½ cent employee insurance contribution, discussed below, results in a take-home increase of less than 6 cents. Deducting income tax, the total will be less than a nickel.

2. SUPPLEMENTAL UNEMPLOYMENT BENEFITS

(a) Sixty-five percent of weekly wage earned in period just preceding layoff is offered. Since layoffs usually are preceded by short weeks—32 hours—65 percent of 32-hour average would not exceed State benefits. Therefore, no supplemental benefits would be paid except in States where unemployment compensation is low.

(b) Employees in Ohio, Indiana, and Virginia get no supplementary benefits under the company proposals and the union's practical proposal to make the full benefits payable despite the legal problems raised by the denial of supplementation in these States has been rejected.

3. WEEKEND PREMIUM PAY

Ten cents for those Sunday hours not subject to overtime, effective July 1, 1958, and 12 cents effective July 1, 1959. This equals about one twenty-fifth time.

No Saturday premium.

Workweek to start Monday to increase possibility that Sunday be an overtime day and therefore excluded from premium rate.

4. INSURANCE

Addition of 3 cents to fund—1½ cents from company and 1½ cents from worker (which will cost the worker $2.55 additional per month). Increased benefits offered by company cost $2.25. The remaining $2.85 would stay in the fund as a reserve against increasing the company's costs in the future according to the company and would be used for excessive funding of life insurance for retired workers. Effective November 1, 1956.

5. PENSIONS

Effective November 1, 1957, increase minimum for each prior year of service from $1.83 to $2. With respect to the years of service after November 1, 1957, the minimum pension for each of such years would be $2.50. The 30-year maximum retained. The full benefit of the $2.50 minimum will not be available until 1987.

No increase offered for those on pension prior to November 1, 1957.

No vested rights offered for employees leaving before age 65 regardless of age or years of service.

6. UNION SHOP

Rejected full union shop but proposed making checkoff subject to restrictions contained in State right-to-work laws, even though such laws are superseded by the Federal law with which the present contractural provisions conform.

7. HOLIDAYS

United States Steel and Republic propose an additional holiday, December 24, effective 1957. Bethlehem proposes an additional holiday to be agreed on effective subsequent to July 1, 1957.

Union request for premium pay in addition to holiday pay for hours worked on holiday rejected.

Bethlehem refuses to agree to count holiday hours worked for purposes of computing overtime for hours worked over 8 in a 24-hour period, as now provided by United States Steel and Republic.

8. VACATIONS

Extra half week of vacation for 3-to-5-year men and for 10-to-15-year men effective July 1, 1958, coupled with percentage formula which reduces vacation for employees on short weeks, out sick, off on union business, etc.

Management wants unrestricted right to deny time off for vacation.

Republic proposes to require work in 60 percent of the payperiods in prior year to qualify for vacation instead of present system of disqualifying only those absent for 6 consecutive months.

Refuse protection against forcing employees to take their vacations during plant shutdowns.

9. SHIFT PREMIUMS

From 6 to 7 and 9 to 10 cents per hour, effective July 1, 1958.

From 7 to 8 and 10 to 12 cents per hour, effective July 1, 1960.

10. OVERTIME

United States Steel proposes eliminating overtime for 6th and 7th day worked in any 7 consecutive day period crossing 2 payroll weeks. This was company's answer to union's request to eliminate requirement of making claim to foreman to obtain this benefit.

Republic and Bethlehem refuse to grant such 6th and 7th day overtime provision as now provided by United States Steel. All three companies refuse to provide penalty against schedule violations.

11. REPORTING PAY

Refuse increase from 4 hours to 8 hours.

12. SENIORITY

Refuse to liberalize the 2-year break.

13. LOCAL WORKING CONDITIONS

Bethlehem refuses to accept the industry pattern.

14. SAFETY AND HEALTH

Refuse to liberalize provisions for furnishing safety equipment.

Refuse to provide the union with accident reports.

15. DISCIPLINE

United States Steel persists in refusing to permit arbitrator to modify discipline.

16. JURY PAY

After finally agreeing to jury pay, refuse to make it effective until July 1, 1959, with the right to cancel this benefit and all others not yet in effect in the event of a national emergency.

17. INCENTIVE

United States Steel wants right to adjust incentives without guaranteeing prior earnings.

United States Steel refuses to agree to convert all incentives to standard hourly wage rate base but proposes it will do so only when it chooses.

18. WAGE REVIEW

Refuse joint review of incentive problems.

United States Steel and Republic agree to review manual only to see if additional specimens should be developed. They refuse a review of job classifications.

Bethelehem agrees to review manual but refuses to review classifications which average out to lowest in industry.

19. STRIKES

Company proposes a penalty of one day's vacation and one sub "credit unit" for each employee for each day he participates in a strike or "other action which shall interrupt or interfere with work or production at any of the plants or shall prevent or attempt to prevent the ingress or egress of any person to or from any of the plants," in addition to any other discipline imposed by the company.

20. FIVE YEARS DURATION OF CONTRACT

No reopenings unless there is a national emergency.

On such a reopening all wage increases and fringe benefits not yet made effective are cancelled out.

Dual Anniversary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 21, 1956

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial which appeared in the Wilkes-Barre Times Leader Evening News on June 16, 1956, which lauds Rev. Thomas Hughes, pastor of the Welsh Baptist Church, Edwardsville, Pa., who marked two important milestones in his life on Sunday, June 17, 1956:

DUAL ANNIVERSARY

The Reverend Thomas Hughes, pastor of Welsh Baptist Church, Edwardsville, will mark two important milestones on Sunday when he will observe the 25th anniversary of ordination and the 25th anniversary of his pastorate. He has had only one charge since entering the ministry.

The Reverend Mr. Hughes also has the unique distinction of being the only individual to serve as moderator of the Welsh Baptist Association both as a layman and as a clergyman.

Although he is regarded as one of the best informed clergymen in his denomination, he is selfeducated. As a boy, he worked in the breaker and later he was a railroader. Incidentally, he was one of the breaker boy models for the statue, erected on the River Common in memory of Mrs. Ellen Palmer.

The Reverend Mr. Hughes has been an untiring worker in the vineyard of the master. His modesty, zeal, and deep religious convictions have added to his stature through the years. The rich rewards of his ministry have been shared by the community and congregations from Olyphant to Shenandoah.

The President's Health

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 19, 1956

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the following item by Marquis Childs, from the Washington Post and Times Herald of June 20, 1956, is must reading for all Americans:

PRESIDENT'S HEALTH CERTAIN TO BE ISSUE
(By Marquis Childs)

The issue of President Eisenhower's health will not be ruled out no matter how optimistic the assurances of his doctors and associates. As a candidate for a second term, he will be confronted with it until election day.

Those close to the President profess to be not in the least concerned at this prospect. They are confident that the President's recovery from his operation and his own optimistic temperament will answer any and all insinuations about his capacity to serve for another 4 years. Moreover, they say that any effort to exploit the health issue is certain to backfire and build up sympathy for Mr. Eisenhower.

There are indications that the Democrats, too, are afraid any effort to capitalize on the President's illnesses will bring a sentimental reaction on the part of many people who will want to show Ike that they are sorry for him and they believe in him no matter what has happened.

The Democratic line is likely, therefore, to be also one of sympathy—sympathy for a gallant soldier pressured by self-seeking politicians into the intolerable ordeal of another 4 years in the White House when he should be allowed to retire to well-earned peace and quiet.

But health will be uppermost in the minds of many politicians in both parties. Photostats are being circulated in Washington of a news story from the Milwaukee Journal headed, "Ike Had Wrong Operation, Philadelphia Surgeon Says."

This was based on an interview with Dr. Robert B. Laucks of the University of Pennsylvania Graduate School of Medicine, who said that the bypassing operation would not relieve the President's symptoms of pain and discomfort although it did get around the intestinal obstruction.

Another University of Pennsylvania specialist, Dr. Isidor Ravdin, was one of the team of the surgeons in the operating room at the time of the President's operation. Dr. Ravdin, who joined with the other doctors in the optimistic report that Mr. Eisenhower would recover sufficiently to run for reelection, has stayed at Walter Reed Hospital virtually all the time since the emergency operation was performed.

Some Democrats have gone so far as to suggest, strictly in private thus far, that a committee or commission to pass on the fitness of the President is in order. If anything like this were publicly proposed before the President's convalescence, it would certainly be resented by everyone.

The unhappy precedent is being recalled of the Republican Senators who invaded the sick room of the ailing President Woodrow Wilson, ostensibly on a matter of state, actually to see what condition he was in.

One of them, the late Senator Albert Fall who was later disgraced in the Teapot Dome case, is said to have suddenly pulled back the covers on the bed to determine if Wilson was paralyzed.

One of the noted specialists attending Wilson declared that he was "organically sound, able-minded, and able-bodied." Mark Sullivan, in Our Times, notes that this went "as far in minimizing Wilson's condition as a natural wish for allaying public concern would temper scientific accuracy."

There then was no question of a presidential race, since Wilson was in his second term and the two-term tradition had not yet been violated. Wilson was able in his last months in the White House to function only fitfully.

Stricken on September 26, 1919, he died in retirement on February 3, 1924.

Another and less sensational proposal, still in the idea stage, is for a commission to inquire into the Office of the Presidency to determine whether it should be diminished or whether the effort to delegate certain powers is a contradiction of the nature of the American Government, which makes the President the sole unifying force under the Federal system.

This would, as now discussed, be a bipartisan commission on which medical experts, political scientists, and others would serve.

Whether with the conventions and the campaign so close, it is possible to take the whole subject, so vital to the future of America not just for 1 campaign or 1 election, out of the realm of speculation, rumor, propaganda, gossip, and downright malice is doubtful. But few would dispute that it should be put on a higher plane.

Promising Partnership

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 21, 1956

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial which appeared in the Sunday Star, Washington, D. C., on June 17, 1956, calling attention to the fact that labor and capital in the soft coal industry have created a shipping corporation to carry their product to European markets:

PROMISING PARTNERSHIP

Labor and capital in the soft coal industry are entering into an unusual and promising venture in their creation of a shipping corporation to carry their product to the booming European market. With 2 coal-carrying railroads also participating, a group of coal-producing companies and the United Mine Workers are putting $50 million into the new shipping concern. The announced plan is to acquire ships—presumably by lease or purchase—for American flag operation under direct management of the new company.

European demand for American bituminous coal has been mounting steadily for the past several years and industry authorities express confidence the trend will continue. Our exports to that market totaled 27 million tons last year and will be higher in 1956. By 1960, the market is estimated at 44 million tons and by 1975 at 55 million. Purchases currently are being made on contracts covering as long as 5 years. Delivery poses two problems in the transportation field alone, first of all the question of enough shipping space and, secondly, the question of keeping costs low enough to hold the market. Existing cargo space not only is being strained already but there is always danger of it being diverted to other traffic. By operating its own ships, the group joined in this current venture hopes to assure itself of an important part of the needed transport capacity. It hopes, likewise, to maintain a rate structure that will help solve the cost problem.

Described by one of the railroad spokesmen as an "unprecedented partnership," the plan is credited to an initial proposal by John L. Lewis, UMW president. Its implementation, however, reflects an imaginative as well as businesslike approach to a problem of mutual interest to both the labor and industry sides of the partnership. It is a good example of teamwork in the economic world.

The Late Honorable Alben W. Barkley

SPEECH
OF
HON. HAROLD D. COOLEY
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 1, 1956

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPENCE. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, for many years I have enjoyed the friendship of the great man whose memory we at this moment honor. I have been very closely associated with our beloved colleague and I have known him intimately and well; I have admired and loved him through the years.

ALBEN W. BARKLEY was a citizen of the world, and today the liberty-loving people of the universe are mourning his death. This great man was not only loved in Kentucky; he was not only loved in America; but he was loved and admired by the men of many races in all parts of the world.

Because of our mutual interest in the welfare of the tobacco farmers of our Nation and of our mutual interest and activities in the Interparliamentary Union, we have been very closely associated with each other. Mr. BARKLEY, as chairman of the American group of the Interparliamentary Union, designated me as a delegate to the first meeting of that great organization, which I attended approximately 10 years ago. It was because of his great interest in the activities and the affairs of that organization that I became interested and finally was elected as a member of the nine-man executive committee of the Interparliamentary Union, in which the lawmakers of 46 nations of the world are now participating.

I recall with pleasant memories our visit together to the Holy Land, the place where Christ was born, en route to Cairo for the first postwar meeting of the Union. Our distinguished colleague was loved and respected and held in high esteem by members of that great organization which has labored through the years for peace and a better world understanding. He is the only member of the American Senate to my knowledge who has served on the executive committee of the Interparliamentary Union. When I was elected to the executive committee, I, of course, deemed it a great honor. During the Easter holidays the executive committee met in

Dubrovnik, Yugoslavia. It was an important meeting; but as chairman of the House Committee on Agriculture, it was necessary for me to remain in Washington and to forego this meeting in Yugoslavia because the farm bill was in conference. I knew that Red China was seeking admission to the Interparliamentary Union and that the petitions of Red China would have the support of Russia and all of its satellites. The State Department had urged me to attend this meeting, but I considered the farm problems of America of paramount importance and could not abandon my post of duty here.

In this situation I turned to my beloved friend, the distinguished statesman of the world, ALBEN W. BARKLEY. I discussed the matter with him in the Democratic cloakroom in the Senate, and he agreed with me that under no circumstances should I leave Washington because of the importance of the farm bill. I then asked him if he would go as my alternate and substitute to attend this very important meeting. Mr. BARKLEY said, "I will talk it over with Mrs. Barkley; and if I can possibly do so, I will."

He finally advised me that he would represent me at the meeting of the executive commitee in Yugoslavia. I went to the airport to see them off and to bid them bon voyage. On that day the Barkleys were happy and lighthearted as we waved to them on their last voyage together across the sea.

Mr. BARKLEY was successful in his efforts at the meeting at Dubrovnik.

This great man, whom we honor at this moment, could not have died more gloriously nor could he have lived more magnificently. When I think of his political life and the political campaigns in which he has engaged, I know that he was always guided and directed by the impulses and sentiments expressed in these brief words:

When the one great Scorer comes to write against my name,
He will write not that I won or lost but how I played the game.

I also think of a poem:

Oh, heart of mine, we shouldn't worry so
What we've missed of calm we couldn't have, you know!
What we've met of stormy pain and of sorrows driving rain
We can better meet again if it blow!
For we know not every morrow can be sad;
So forget all the sorrow we have had.
Let us fold away our fears and put by our foolish tears,
And through all the coming years just be glad.

I am glad that I knew ALBEN W. BARKLEY: May we through all the coming years just be glad that we have known and loved this great man and have worked and labored with him here in the Halls of Congress.

We need not build a monument to the memory of ALBEN W. BARKLEY. He has built for himself many magnificent and beautiful monuments in the hearts of his friends throughout the world. His life was a blessing and a benediction to all mankind.

Mr. Speaker, I extend to his lovely and devoted wife and to all the members of his family my very deep and profound sympathy. May God bless them all.

A Happy Hospital: Veterans' Hospital at Coral Gables, Fla.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE A. SMATHERS
OF FLORIDA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, June 21, 1956

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "A Happy Hospital," written by Francis A. Adams, a volunteer veteran of the Spanish-American War and also of World War I.

The article lauds the members of the staff and the employees of the veterans' hospital at Coral Gables, Fla., for the excellent treatment accorded veteran patients. It is heartening to know of the fine work performed by these public servants and its effect on the welfare of our veterans.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A HAPPY HOSPITAL

There is an atmosphere of calmness that is absolutely free of tension in the Veterans' Administration hospital at Coral Gables, Fla. It furnishes an example of the happy union of three elements—the patient, the doctor, and the staff. There is an air of confidence at this place which envelops the patient upon arrival.

The routine of a great medical organization is not neglected, yet there is no harsh and hurried process that would tend to disturb a sick man. The common denominator in everything is quiet, efficient team work. Things go along smoothly. After a few days the patient realizes that this is indeed a "happy hospital," a term of endearment that is bestowed in only rare instances.

Arrival at the hospital is an event that the patient will never forget. It is the culmination of a long series of events. He is greeted in the reception room where he has been notified to report, by an attendant who shows a genuine interest in every case. No matter how many applicants may be in the room, the latest arrival is not left to cool his heels, but is given a friendly nod and told to take a seat.

Then in only a few minutes, the attendant's words are: "Let me have your notification card." This is the opening of the interview that will speedily lead to your being assigned to the proper ward.

There is endless paper work in operating a hospital that cares for hundreds of patients. This is essential and inescapable. It can be made a torment to the sick or imbue one with hope. The latter is the happy approach that exists at Coral Gables. You are not treated as an intruder.

To get the story of how a veteran gains admittance you have to go back to some necessary preliminary steps. A veteran has to establish his status. This requires that he get in personal contact with his county medical officer, his county service officer, and through him get in touch with the VA regional representative.

Service papers showing honorable discharge from the Armed Forces of the United States of America have to be produced; some are photostated and an identification card is established.

With thees steps taken in the veteran's home town or nearest VA office, the wheels begin to turn and within a period of 10 days to 2 weeks a notice is sent to the veteran that his papers have been examined and that he is duly registered as qualified for hospital treatment or surgical care.

In the case of surgery the patient is advised to arrange his personal affairs so as to be absent from home for a period of 2 to 3 weeks, according to the nature of the operation.

When the applicant decides upon a time that he can go to the hospital he asks for a definite date of entry. Upon getting a letter from VA notifying him of the date of admission he also is given a memorandum sheet of instruction telling him what to bring with him in the way of personal effects, and listing things that cannot be brought with him, stipulating firearms or drugs.

At the reception desk on the date of arrival the veteran's papers are immediately available. Take the case of No. 48986B—who arrived 10:30 a. m., July 27, 1955. He had made original application in May, on proper forms and following a local medical examination by Dr. J. D. Parker, Stuart, Fla., Martin County medical officer. The papers had been forwarded to VA through Martin County Service Officer H. B. Kraft. The regional contact representative C. T. Sheehan, of Fort Pierce, had examined the applicant and inspected his papers. Because the operation was not critical, but curative, entry had been delayed until there was an available vacancy.

With the VA notice in hand, the veteran, whose service number is C-911609—handed it to the receptionist. It was compared with the papers assembled at the desk and found to be in order.

"We've been looking for you," the attendant said in a friendly voice. It was noted that on May 18, 1955, the applicant had visited VA hospital, Coral Gables, and had received emergency examination by Dr. Maxwell at the ambulance emergency entrance. It was further noted that the case would be accelerated.

"Now you may go to the clothing room at the end of the hall," the attendant directed, "and change your clothes for hospital dress."

At the clothing room civilian clothing is changed and checked for storage so as to be available upon your discharge. With hospital cost, pajamas and bathrobe, the entrant passes on carrying with him the few toilet articles he has brought. Dressed in hospital attire you return to the induction center near the reception room, where a clerk gives you a card for a blood test; a urine test and an X-ray heart test. To go through these processes may take an hour or more, so it may be well along toward noon before you arrive at your ward.

Here a nurse at the ward control station will ask what diet you have been on, and if you say "I've been eating regularly," she will issue you a diet card stamped "Regular," and tell you to go to the mess hall on the main floor for lunch.

Thus begins your introduction to hospital fare. At Coral Gables the food is excellent in quality, is well prepared, and is served attractively cafeteria style. Regular schedules are observed, with orthopedic cases having the first period and with their tables reserved nearest to the entrance and food counters. There is no rush and no evidence that you are being put through the mill. The mess hall at Coral Gables is the former grand diningroom of the fabulous Miami Biltmore.

Upon return to your ward after lunch on your first day, you are visited by the doctor in charge. He is accompanied by the head nurse. An identification tag is tied to the foot of your bed.

You have become one of the patients in the ward, and your welfare and comfort are placed under strict hospital supervision, including that of a dietitian who designates what you are to have at each meal.

Throughout the day and night nurses or attendants stop at your bed to take your temperature and pulse and to ask if you have evacuated. Orderlies bring ice water, towels, washcloths, and changes of clothing. Those

in need of special diet or feeding are cared for with scrupulous attention.

For the first day or so a patient is restless and inquisitive. The time hangs heavy, and he wonders why he is not whisked off to the operating room so that the affair may be over with.

Why these endless visits by groups of doctors who look at some records and pass on?

Things cannot go as fast as you might wish. It is only in an emergency case that action is speeded up. One night in July 1955 an emergency patient entered the ward at 11:30 p. m. and was operated on for acute appendicitis and was back in his bed in less than an hour. The actual operation was performed in 25 minutes.

But for the patient who is being cared for in preparation for surgery that does not call for posthaste, the process is gradual. He is conditioned for the ordeal.

After several days in the ward the patient begins to get the swing of things. He hears that his blood test has been completed; that the cardiograph report from the X-ray room has come through and that it is favorable; that the other tests, taken upon the day of entry, have all been collected and made part of his record; that the facts have been studied and his case properly diagnosed.

The case of No. 48986B is growing into a carefully compiled hospital record. It is getting so elaborate that the doctors can begin to see the true condition of the patient and can act with accuracy.

A nurse, while taking temperature and pulse in the morning routine, will say in a confiding voice, "We will have to stop feeding you through the mouth today. We want to get you ready for the operation."

Then for 24 hours the red tag dangles from your bed. It reads: "No food by mouth."

During the 24 hours of restricted feeding, the patient has been readied for the hour when he will be wheeled on a stretcher to the operating room. For several days he has become accustomed to visits from the chief surgeon and his associates. They have chatted with him and have established a friendly relationship. The physicians are men of fine caliber and are dedicated to their profession. They possess the rare quality of human gentleness that affects their patients with feelings of admiration and confidence.

The individual case of No. 48986B disclosed that the patient was in his 81st year. He was a veteran of the Spanish-American War 1898–1902 and of World War I. Dr. M. H. Todd, senior surgeon, said encouragingly, "Your heart is all right and we can fix you up with a local anesthetic."

Turning to his associate Dr. R. G. Reid, he said, "I'll perform this operation tomorrow."

Next day it was less than an hour when the patient was back in his bed and resting comfortably. The hernia operation has been painless.

It was during the period of convalescense that the amiable atmosphere of the hospital is appreciated. Every week there is general inspection of the hospital, when E. F. Zimmermann, M. D. chief of professional services, accompanied by visiting general officers, makes a tour of the wards and other facilities.

These men find time to stop at a bedside and talk with the patients, not in a perfunctory manner but in a friendly spirit. Their inspection includes a survey of the entertainment features that are staged for the patients, under the direction of chief of special services, Claude Lipscomb. For the convenience of the entire staff and the patients and their visitors, there is a well appointed PX. When the patient can leave his ward there are places to go. The library, the recreation hall, the swimming pool.

For the next several days the period of recuperation was a time of varied activities and pleasant association with the staff and fellow patients. At the same time the faithful stream of callers came each day to offer help in little things; there was the representative of the United Spanish War Veterans, who confided the news that, "Two other comrades are here"; the callers from the Veterans of Foreign Wars stopped to give a cheering word; the Red Cross resident representative and the Women's Auxiliary of the American Legion found something they could do for veterans. Mail and floral remembrances were delivered daily.

Callers each day included the chaplain, relatives and friends during the afternoon 2:30 to 4 p. m. These visitors from the outside were helpful in bringing a human touch to the period of confinement. Floral remembrances brightened the sickrooms and were a constant reminder that people are not forgotten in a time of affliction. Most patients were assigned three to a room. There was no overcrowding.

For recreation those who are at Coral Gables have a wide variety of entertainment. The weekly program includes card games, bingo and concerts. These affairs are sponsored by fraternal organizations and prizes are furnished.

The 10 a. m. Sunday services held in the great hall by Chaplain James A. Boston is an event that is well attended. On every floor and in almost every ward there are TV sets and radio that patients bring with them, and share with roommates, when they are unable to go to the amusement centers.

Of course everyone who goes to a hospital wants to get well and be back home. But that day of departure is not hurried just to meet the desire of the patient. The doctors and nurses have to take care that everything is all right. The diet must be reestablished to normal and a final check made to see that there is no aftermath from the operation.

Then the checkout gets underway. The patient goes through a dental examination; again the blood tests and ultimately the record shows that case No. 48986B can be closed.

Like running a picture in reverse, one goes to all the checking points and finally to the clothing room. The silent efficient system works, for there at the appointed hour, are your clothes. You shift from the hospital pajamas and robe. You return to the reception room in civilian attire and you are free to go home.

The lesson you have learned in 3 weeks is that human kindness is the best medicine in the world; that a hospital can take on personality, and be a place where happiness manifests itself and that service is a matter that springs from the heart. The VA hospital at Coral Gables, Fla., is, indeed, a happy hospital.

FRANCIS A. ADAMS.

STUART, FLA., *September 8, 1955.*

Youthful Federal Attorney

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 21, 1956

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the folowing editorial which appeared in a recent edition of the Wilkes-Barre Record commenting on the appointment of Attorney Robert J. Hourigan, a member of a prominent Wilkes-Barre family, as senior assistant to the United States attorney for the middle district of Pennsylvania:

FEDERAL ATTORNEY

Appointment of Attorney Robert J. Hourigan of Forty Fort to the post of senior assistant to the United States Attorney for the middle district of Pennsylvania is impressive recognition for one of the younger members of the Luzerne County bar.

Attorney Hourigan, member of a family with many ties in the legal profession and the community, is a man who obviously is going places in a hurry, as he makes up time lost by his service in the Second World War. Admitted to the bar only 7 years ago, he has served as assistant district attorney under two Luzerne County prosecutors and as a special deputy to the attorney general of Pennsylvania, an unusual record of public service. He also has sandwiched private practice between these assignments.

Attorney Hourigan enters upon the duties of his new office with considerable experience beyond his years. United States Attorney J. Julius Levy has acquired the services of a seasoned, capable and conscientious aide who will measure up to the responsibilities he has been called on to assume.

What Do You Know About CD?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 21, 1956

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, the attached editorial entitled "What Do You Know About CD?" which appeared in the June 7 issue of the Observer, of Kearny, N. J., is a timely one. I wish to commend the editor for calling this subject to the attention of the people in such a forceful and pointed manner. The editorial follows:

WHAT DO YOU KNOW ABOUT CD?

Are you one of the citizens who poke fun at the neighbor who is an ardent volunteer in civil defense?

It is amazing how many people there are in this country who, as taxpayers, think it is perfectly all right to spend $40 billion a year to maintain the Army, Navy, and Air Force, and yet scoff at civil defense. These people seem to forget that our military force is a standby organization, ready to move against an enemy when necessary. But the men of this vast Army and Navy are not producers—they are consumers of food, clothing, transportation, weapons, and a hundred other things.

Who produces all this? You, the citizens, who are not in the military organization. The minute this huge military organization goes into action, civil defense, the fourth branch of the service, is critically necessary. This fourth branch is composed of the citizens who must produce the equipment, food, transportation, etc., that the Army, Navy, and Air Force must have, and these citizens must do one thing more, they must protect the homeland because your military will be busy elsewhere.

This cannot wait until calamity is upon us. Emergencies require a trained force that knows what to do, and you, if you want to be a good citizen, should be part of it. We have heard all the answers. You are too busy or you can't be bothered; you must earn a living, etc. You won't be doing any of these things if international relations get out of hand and an enemy decides to send a bomb or two our way.

There Is No Reason To Be Proud in Announcing Again "I Told You So"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 21, 1956

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial from the Washington Post and Times Herald of June 21, 1956, emphasizes an important moral principle. There are some who think it is of no great moment that Egypt violates the Suez Canal Treaty, its own obligations and the United Nations resolutions, when Egypt blockades the Suez Canal against its use by the State of Israel.

It is of great moment, that what Egypt does today against Israel, tomorrow she may do against Britain and the next day against the United States.

When will our Secretary of State wake up to the fact that you cannot violate a principle just a little bit? Violation of a principle is tantamount to its destruction.

The editorial is as follows:

SHEPILOV IN EGYPT

The visit of Dmitri Shepilov, the Soviet Union's new foreign minister, was the high feature of the Egyptian celebration of the end of the British occupation of the Suez Canal zone. It was his first excursion in foreign affairs as the responsible minister—a bold reminder that the "focal point" of Soviet aspirations which Stalin outlined to Hitler 16 years ago is well on the way to achievement. The Soviet Union is in the Middle East to stay.

Egypt is now completely independent, but for how long? Colonel Nasser's jubilant speech had little in it about reconstruction at home and much about freeing Palestine and helping the Arab countries get rid of the westerner. It looks more and more as if the colonel intends "to busy home minds with foreign quarrels." How different from his predecessor, the domestic-minded Colonel Naguib, who wanted the new Egypt to tend its own garden. However, Nasser has little power of his own to do much more than swashbuckle. It is Soviet armed might—given to Egypt under the "commercial transaction" with Soviet Czechoslovakia and prominently on display in the air and on the ground during this week's celebrations—which imparts more than local authority to Colonel Nasser. It did not require Shepilov at his side to demonstrate that the revolutionary junta in Cairo is leaning more and more on what Shepilov called its "reliable friend" in Moscow to achieve its vaunting ambitions.

The spectacle at Cairo should apply a spur to the Western allies to integrate their diplomacy under article 2 of the North Atlantic Alliance. Egypt's control of the Suez Canal confers a world responsibility upon Colonel Nasser and his successors. The responsibility is to world shipping. Noninterference was laid down in the original 1888 convention and revalidated in the Anglo-Egyptian agreement under which the British have quit the area. How has Colonel Nasser interpreted the agreement? By using his new power over the canal to intensify his blockade practices at Israel's expense. In other words, control of the key to this vital world artery is being misused to pursue a national quarrel—altogether contrary to the letter and spirit of the 1888 convention.

All this, moreover, is in flat violation of a U. N. Security Council resolution. A fresh effort should be made by the Western Powers to bring Egypt's violation to Russia's attention with the view of getting Colonel Nasser to lift the blockade. Before Bulganin and Khrushchev went to Lindon, they said they would cooperate in promoting Israel-Arab peace. Here is the place to begin. Perhaps it is useless to expect any such cooperation. Shepilov at Cairo was not belligerent, but he stressed once again the oneness of the Soviet Union with the Soviet world. In any event the Western allies must work together or face the prospect of complete extrusion not only from the Middle East but also from the eastern Mediterranean.

Civil Rights—Cleveland, Ohio, Style

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES C. DAVIS
OF GEORGIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 19, 1956

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago the press of the Nation reported a most remarkable and almost unbelievable incident which occurred in Cleveland, Ohio, a place which is noted as the seat of some of the most ardent agitation for so-called civil rights. According to these reports, a judge of one of the Cleveland courts issued an exile order, under which one of his court employees was required to place a Negro woman and her minor children on a train or a bus and send them back from Ohio to Alabama.

Section 2 of article IV of the United States Constitution reads:

The citizens of each State shall be entitled to all privileges and immunities of citizens in the several States.

It is an unquestioned constitutional right of every citizen to live anywhere in the United States where he or she may desire to live.

According to the newspaper stories, this Negro woman protested tearfully that she and her children desired to live in Ohio and did not want to live in Alabama. Over this tearful protest and in violation of a clear constitutional right, they were not only ordered back to Alabama; they were sent back to Alabama.

Undoubtedly this is a violation of civil rights, but I have not heard of the Federal Bureau of Investigation being placed on the case.

Undoubtedly this is a violation of civil rights, but I have not heard of any protest from Ohio or elsewhere on the part of those who work themselves into a frenzy of protest whenever any violation of so-called civil rights is reported south of the Mason-Dixon line.

Is there a double standard of conduct on the question of civil rights? Does the fact that the act is committed in Cleveland, Ohio, convert into a laudable and praiseworthy act something which would be denounced and excoriated if committed in the South?

It may well be that this Cleveland judge feels that he has as much right to ignore the Constitution of the United States as the Supreme Court has, and that he is following established precedent in doing so.

Although this order of banishment has not created any furor, or even a ripple of protest, in the North and East, it has attracted some notice in the South. The Metropolitan Herald, of Atlanta, Ga., carried an editorial in its June 13 issue calling attention to this unconstitutional deportation order. I insert the editorial from the Metropolitan Herald herewith as a part of my remarks:

CIVIL RIGHTS—CLEVELAND, OHIO, STYLE

In America a man can choose to live where ever he pleases. There are no passports required for crossing State lines as is true in Europe where many small countries, each with their borders guarded, prevent free travel.

The right to live and work where one pleases is as much a part of civil rights as is the right to mix and mingle, regardless of race, color, or creed, as is being advocated on a Nationwide basis today.

These being facts of life, it is rather incongruous to read where a jobless Negress was, under a court order, placed on a bus with her eight minor children and told to leave Cleveland and go back to her native Livingston, Ala.

We can understand why this woman could be denied public relief from the State of Ohio because she had not been a legal resident for a year, but we can't help but chuckle when a judge in a State which would force integration on the South under a civil rights belief, deports a resident of another State and orders her to catch the bus and get going. She had broken no law apparently, although the article telling of her plight did have some funny angles. It seems her children ranged in age from an 11-day-old infant to a 17-year-old girl. However the dispatch said, "Mrs. Winston and her husband separated 5 years ago. She came to Cleveland 4 years ago because she could not earn a living in Alabama."

A later dispatch said, "A Negro woman and her eight dependent children who were forced to leave Cleveland, Ohio, because they were not eligible for State relief there, returned home today. The husband met his family when they arrived by train from Cleveland."

Maybe the civil rights belief in the North is like the gooney bird, which can't see where it is going and don't give a hoot.

The Freedom Crusade

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH B. KEATING
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 14, 1956

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, under terms of the Geneva talks the Communist Government of China agreed to release all American prisoners. The action of the Reds in keeping in captivity 13 Americans after having made this promise is a matter which rankles us all.

We have been fortunate that one of those imprisoned has subsequently gained his freedom and has returned to this country to tell of the horrors of captivity. He has made vigorous efforts since his return to arouse Americans to the plight of those who remained behind.

This man, Father Harold Rigney, S. V. D., in conjuction with the Back Yards

Council of Chicago, is spearheading the freedom crusade in an endeavor to free those innocent American citizens who are still held in prison. The crusade is a national letter-writting campaign aimed at convincing publicity-conscious Mao Tse-tung of the advisability of releasing our countrymen.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all Members and all other citizens of our Nation to join in this great movement. I have a special interest in the freedom crusade because one of my constituents, Rev. Joseph Patrick McCormack, of Palmyra, N. Y., is among those being held, but I feel the seriousness of the situation should impel all Americans to take pen in hand to aid this program.

Gen. Horacio Aguirre Muñoz, Outstanding Nicaraguan, Is Dead

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 3, 1956

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my own remarks and to include other material, I submit for insertion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial from the Americas Daily on the death of Gen. Horacio Aguirre Muñoz. This outstanding citizen of Nicaragua is survived by his widow and by two distinguished sons, Dr. Frencisco Aguirre and Dr. Horacio Aguirre. I am sure my colleagues join me in extending sympathy to the bereaved.

GENERAL HORACIO AGUIRRE MUÑOZ, OUTSTANDING NICARAGUAN, IS DEAD

Gen. Horacio Aguirre Muñoz, outstanding personality in the political and social circles of his country, Nicaragua, as well as the other Central American Republics, died at 12:35 a. m., Monday, after 4 days of being gravely ill.

For the Americas Daily the death of Gen. Aguirre Muñoz is, besides a news item of interest for the Latin American circles, a reason for deep mourning, since he was the father of our publisher and editor, Drs. Francisco and Horacia Aguirre, respectively, and because he gave us his experience as veteran newspaperman at the service of the noble ideals, inspiring always he Panamericanist work of this newspaper, edited in Miami to promote a better understanding among the peoples of the Americas.

General Aguirre was attended by the distinguished physicians, Dr. Manuel Lores, as family doctor, and Dr. John Broward. Rev. Father Antonio Navarrete, distinguished member of the Catholic clergy of Miami, administered the last religious services.

The funeral services for Gen. Aguirre Muñoz will take place tomorrow, Wednesday, at 4 p. m. The funeral cortege will leave from Philbrick Funeral Home, located across the street from the main entrance of Barry College. His remains will rest at Woodlawn Cemetery.

It was only 2 years ago, in June 1954, that General Aguirre Muñoz came to live in Miami together with his distinguished wife, Mrs. Pilar Baca de Aguirre Muñoz. They established their home here in order to be near their sons, and to lend orientation, with his spirit and intelligence, to the Panamericanist work of the Americas Daily. When the paper was inaugurated he was here contributing to the laying of the foundations of this enterprise to which he was connected by spiritual and ideological bonds.

Here in Miami, where he lived with his son, Horacio, as well as in Washington, residence of his son, Francisco, General Aguirre Muñoz made numerous friends—social, diplomatic, and political, conquering the good will and respect of all those who knew him well.

Gen. Aguirre Muñoz was born in León, Nicaragua, on May 22, 1873, the son of Gen. Horacio Aguirre and Mrs. Mercedes Muñoz de Aguirre, who was a daughter of the illustrious Central American hero, José Trinidad Muñoz, who was the first one to face, in the middle of last century, the foreign invasion of Central America.

On several occasions, not only during administrations directed by the Liberal Party to which he belonged and gave prestige, Gen. Aguirre Muñoz was a genuine representative to the Congress of the Republic. Among other important positions he held, in difficult Central-American eras, delicate diplomatic functions, as Nicaragua's Plenipotentiary, and it was his lot also to be outstanding figure at the First International Conference of the Central American Republics, held at the beginning of this century. Also, during 3½ years he was Secretary of the General Command of the Nicaraguan Republic (1933–36). Years after he was Comptroller General of Exchange Operations and later director of the National Bank of Nicaragua.

In Honduras, where Aguirre Muñoz was Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary of Nicaragua, in another occasion he discharged the duties of private secretary to the President of the Honduran Republic, General Rafael López Gutiérrez. In El Salvador and Guatemala, Gen. Aguirre Muñoz in the first steps of his life, had military duties which he discharged, as when he was in the same service in his own country, with a high sense of honor, manifested in absolute loyalty and always proven valor.

In the course of his long and honest public life, Gen. Aguirre Muñoz took part in the struggles of journalism, dignifying with his opinions and his decorous and elegant writing ability, the high function of the journalist.

In the city of León, Nicaragua, on March 14, 1919, he was married to his now widow Doña Pilar Baca de Aguirre Muñoz, dignified lady, and together founded a home of exemplary virtues, inspired on the most healthy principles of Christian morality and Catholic religion. Descendants of said marriage are his sons Francisco and Horacio and his daughter Merceditas, who died at an early age in Tegucigalpa.

The Americas Daily, when informing on this irreparable loss, sends its expressions of deep condolence to the inconsolable widow of the illustrious deceased, Doña Pilar Baca de Aguirre Muñoz, to his sons, Francisco Aguirre and Mrs. Gladys de Aguirre and Horacio Aguirre and Mrs. Helen de Aguirre, and likewise to his brother, Don Ignacio Aguirre Muñoz, and sisters, Miss Concepción Aguirre Muñoz and Mrs. Mercedes Aguirre de Argüello, the last two residing at León, Nicaragua.

Fiftieth Anniversary of the Ordination of Father Jurica, of Pittston, Pa.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 21, 1956

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial which appeared in the Wilkes-Barre Times Leader Evening News on Saturday, June 16, 1956, which calls attention to the 50th anniversary of the ordination of Rev. Father Andrew J. Jurica, of St. John the Baptist Church, Pittston, Pa., which was celebrated on Sunday, June 17, 1956:

FATHER JURICA'S JUBILEE

The Reverend Andrew J. Jurica, who will observe the 50th anniversary of his ordination tomorrow with a solemn high mass of thanksgiving in St. John the Baptist Church, Pittston, has had a most unusual career.

When his health failed as he was approaching his prime, he resigned his pastorate and, for the greater part of the past 3 decades, he has assisted at St. John's and other parishes where his services were needed. Between assignments, he has been making his home at Harveys Lake.

Thus, Father Jurica is known not just to his home parish, but to a score of others where he has celebrated mass, conducted special devotions, and filled in at other times.

Father Jurica's life has been one of continuous prayer, service, and sacrifice. He is known far and wide for his piety. In addition to the regular retreats for the clergy of the diocese, he makes private retreats as frequently as opportunities present themselves.

That he has been spared all these years and continues to discharge his priestly duties will be a source of great joy and comfort to countless admirers on the occasion of his golden jubilee.

Foreign Aid and Our Friends Abroad—Address by Hon. Clement J. Zablocki, of Wisconsin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY S. REUSS
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 19, 1956

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, it was my great privilege last week to be present at the State convention of the Democratic Party of Wisconsin when my distinguished colleague, the Honorable CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI, presented a memorable address on United States foreign policy. An audience of some 2,000 gave it undivided attention to a brilliant examination of the strength and weaknesses of our present foreign policy, particularly with reference to our foreign aid programs. This statement by a Member of Congress, whose devotion and diligence has won the deep respect of his fellow members of the Foreign Affairs Committee and of this House generally, deserves an even wider audience. For this reason, I am glad to be able to insert the complete text below:

ADDRESS OF HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI, OF WISCONSIN, AT THE WISCONSIN STATE DEMOCRATIC CONVENTION, SUPERIOR, WIS., JUNE 16, 1956

I am pleased to have this opportunity of reporting to you on the subject of our foreign policy.

Specifically, I want to address myself to that rather unpopular topic known as foreign aid. Our foreign-assistance programs have been under a particularly serious attack

for a number of months, and they will be a campaign issue. It is incumbent upon us, therefore, to acquaint ourselves thoroughly with this subject.

It is a matter of record that never in the history of mankind did any single nation extend as much aid and assistance to others as did the United States during the past decade. The generosity and the far-sightedness of our people find no parallel in history. We have spent billions of dollars to help our friends abroad, even though we had to shoulder the burden of tremendously high taxes to do it.

As of the first of this year, we have spent a total of $53 billion on foreign grants and credits: $26 billion between the end of World War II and the outbreak of the Korean conflict, and $27 billion since the beginning of the Korean war. Of this amount, $42 billion consisted of outright grants, and $11 billion of loans. As you know, Western Europe was the primary beneficiary of our assistance, receiving about $34 billion in grants and credits. The remaining $19 billion were distributed all over the world.

The figures which I have just mentioned are staggering. It is no wonder, then, that many of our people are questioning the need for any further sacrifice on our part, and calling for an end to all forms of foreign aid. They do this in the belief that we can cut off our assistance to our friends abroad without any adverse effect on our own Nation—and in the hope that the termination of foreign aid will enable us to reduce our tax burden at home.

I personally believe that neither of the two expectations can be fulfilled, and I shall briefly outline the reasons for my convictions.

In the first place, let me say that I shall not attempt to justify our past foreign-aid programs. They are already a matter of history. Their value has been well established. We have spent the $53 billion on projects considered necessary for the reconstruction of the economies of our allies, for the creation of a collective defense against communism, and for the establishment of a sound basis for lasting world peace.

These were not only noble—but at the same time very practical goals. I am certain that if we had not pursued our past policies, many of the free nations would have been unable to withstand Communist advances. Without our aid, the borders of the Communist-dominated territories would not be in Eastern Europe, but would probably reach today to the very shores of the Atlantic Ocean.

What concerns us today, however, is how shall we conduct ourselves with respect to our friends abroad in the years to come. Shall we continue our foreign-aid programs? If so, which programs would be best suited to further our own national interest, and at the same time meet with the wholehearted support of our people?

Let me digress here for a moment to stress the importance of a public acceptance and support of our foreign programs and policies. If we are divided on this subject at home, our action in the international field loses much of its effectiveness. Our assistance becomes as bitter as gall to its recipients when they read that some Americans refer to their countries as "ratholes," to their people as "worthless, backward savages," and to the aid itself as charity extended against the donors' will. I am certain that we would feel the same way if we were in their position.

We can be proud indeed that the American people on the whole have actively supported our foreign-aid programs in the past. The Democrats have established an enviable record for themselves in this regard. As you well know, we have supported the United States foreign policy without indulging in partisan considerations—even though during the last 4 years all-out support became quite a chore.

Just this week, all three of the Democratic Congressmen from Wisconsin again voted in favor of the President's request for an extension of the mutual-security program—while only 1 of the 7 Republican Representatives from our State stood up and backed his President.

The Democrats in Congress have consistently given President Eisenhower more support on issues vital to the welfare of our country, than did the members of his own party. On the Mutual Security Act of 1956, 163—or 76 percent of the Democrats—supported the foreign policy of the United States, while only 112—or 62 percent of the Republicans—backed the bill. Even among the Republicans who voted for the bill, many did so only because they wanted to get through the forthcoming election on President Eisenhower's coattails—but they will be among the first to leave him as soon as the election is over.

For this reason, I do not see much sense in a man running for the President of the United States when he cannot even command the loyalty of his own party members when the chips are down. I think that it would be much healthier if the Republicans were honest with the people, and picked for their candidate a man who professes their own ideals. In that way, the people would know the programs and policies they are voting for, and there would be no need for the Democrats to bail the administration out whenever it gets into trouble. I believe that the legislative record of the 84th Congress would have been a sorry sight indeed if the American people had given the President a Republican Congress that he campaigned for in 1954.

Regardless of whom the Republicans pick for their candidate, however, I am confident that we shall not face this situation in the years to come because the American people, come November, will elect a Democratic president and Democratic majorities in both Houses of Congress.

The first point we ought to bear in mind as we look to the future is that extensive foreign aid, of the kind which we granted in the last decade, is a thing of the past. The staggering job of post-war reconstruction is virtually completed. Foreign aid today has come to represent only a small fraction of our Federal budget—and two-thirds of it is military in nature.

During the last couple of years, we have spent about $4 billion annually on foreign assistance. If we subtract the portion which went to military preparedness, and for defense support, we find that nonmilitary aid to our allies has been running at the rate of about one-fourth billion dollars to one-half billion dollars a year. This is the figure we should bear in mind when we speak of foreign aid today.

Personally, I believe that we ought to classify foreign military assistance together with our own defense expenditures. There are ample reasons for this. Everybody knows very well that today no single nation can stand alone very long, and try to match the Communist military might bolstered by forced conscription and requisitioned resources from the captive nations. Such a course would prove economically unfeasible in the long run.

Our strength against the Communists rests today on the foundations of the collective security arrangements which have been established together with other independent, self-governing nations. A wing of jet bombers stationed in England, in France, in Turkey or in Greece, means as much to our own security against a common menace as if it were based in Wisconsin. Consequently, the $36 billion which we have put aside this year for our own Defense Establishment, and the $2 or $3 billion that Congress may appropriate for the mutual security program, are actually being devoted to the same purpose: the security of the United States and—in a larger sense—of the entire free world.

There is, however, one difference; each dollar that is spent through the mutual security program produces 4 to 10 times as much defense as a dollar actually expended for a like purpose in the United States. In other words, our country would have to spend an additional $12 or more billions a year at home in order to obtain as much security as we are getting for $2 or $3 billion through the mutual security program.

You can see, therefore, that if we discontinue our military cooperation and assistance to our allies, we will have to spend proportionately much more for our own defense budget—and we will either have to increase our taxes to do it, or cut corners on such vital domestic programs as highway construction, hospital building, veterans benefits, social security increases and the like.

Furthermore, by departing from the framework of the collective security arrangements which we have constructed with such great effort, we would have to increase our own Armed Forces and be prepared to send more of our boys overseas when necessary—an eventuality which, I am certain, does not appeal to anyone of us.

In the long run we cannot hope to save by eliminating the mutual security program. On the contrary, such action can prove uneconomical and expensive both in terms of dollars and in terms of national security.

We come, then, to the second portion of our foreign-aid program: the $1¼ to $1½ billion spent annually for technical and economic assistance to the other free nations. This assistance consists of outright grants, of loans, of gifts (or sales below world prices) of our surpluses, and of the expense of sending American technicians and specialists to foreign countries for the purpose of aiding them in raising their standard of living.

The question before us is: Can we eliminate this annual expenditure without any bad effects on our national economy and well-being?

The answer to this question is almost as clear as the answer to the issue of foreign military assistance. Before we come to it, however, let us look at a few facts.

Very few people seem to realize to what extent our American security, prosperity, employment, and standard of living depend on our friendly relations with the rest of the world. Last year, the United States exported almost $20 billion worth of goods and services, exclusive of military aid. This tremendous export trade means jobs for our workers, and profits for our industries.

Can this trade continue unless we remain on good terms with the rest of the free nations and unless they have the income with which to buy our goods? The answer should be self-evident. And we should also remember that increased purchasing power abroad can only come through an increase in the standard of living of those peoples. As a result, whatever we do to aid our friends in their own efforts to improve their standard of living will ultimately increase their ability and willingness to trade with us.

Let us look next at the other side of our foreign trade—our imports. Did you know, for instance, that of the 184 materials needed for the production of automobiles and other motor vehicles, some 50 items are being imported from abroad? Did you know that the production of a simple telephone requires 48 imports? Or that we must have imported metals to produce light bulbs, television and radio tubes?

And you, ladies, did you know that the essential ingredients of various beauty creams and lipsticks must be imported from abroad?

We depend on foreign sources for a great portion of our copper, zinc, lead, tungsten, and other needs. In addition, over 90 per-

cent of our domestic consumption of manganese ore, long-fiber asbestos, nickel, strategic mica, chromite, tin, tantalum, and industrial diamonds comes from abroad.

The list of items which are vital to our high standard of living—and whose production depends on imports from foreign lands—is extremely long. What is perhaps more important is the fact that, with a growing population and with an ever-increasing standard of living, we are going to become even more dependent on foreign sources for strategic materials and other commodities than we are today.

Now it is only commonsense to stay on good terms with the people on whom you depend for something—and that you help them when they require your assistance to produce the goods which you need. These commonsense principles are observed by every businessman in our country. They apply with even greater force in the realm of our foreign affairs. This fact ought to be clearly understood by every one of us—but unfortunately it is not. It is our job, therefore, to go out and talk sense to the people, to show them in concrete terms how much our foreign programs mean to our own welfare and security—and that, by cutting them off, we will be—so to speak—cutting off our nose to spite our face.

I am afraid that I have taken a little more time than I intended to on this subject. However, the pressures against all forms of international cooperation and assistance have been growing each day. This came about, I believe, in the first place, as a result of the misinformation spread around by some of our public officials and certain newspapers, and, secondly, because too little has been done to stimulate and promote public understanding of these issues.

I am confident that if we bring the facts to the people—and show them what is at stake—the reaction will be entirely different. We Americans are known world over as practical, sensible people. Our countrymen will act without hesitation in our own best interest—but it is our job to help push aside the cobwebs of misunderstanding, of prejudice, of emotionalism, and of partisanship, which at times obscure the exact nature and location of our national self-interest.

Before concluding, I want to say a few words about the foreign policy of the present administration.

In general, the Eisenhower administration has tried to follow the policies and programs initiated under the previous Democratic administrations—but its efforts have been feeble and often confused. The only truly new proposal that the present administration can claim is the "open sky" plan of disarmament inspection—which, by the way, was reportedly introduced against the advice of some of the President's counselors, and even today does not have the wholehearted support of some people in the Pentagon.

Even though President Eisenhower has tried to follow the collective security and economic aid programs established before he took office, the foreign policy of the United States has suffered tremendously under his leadership. This happened because the present administration has failed to follow a consistent, straightforward course in world affairs. There have been so many contradictory, confusing, and completely unintelligible statements made on this subject by the President and his assistant, that today nobody seems to know where we stand, and where we are going.

Let me illustrate this inconsistency and bungling of the administration for you with a few examples:

In 1952, the Republicans condemned President Truman's action in assigning the 7th Fleet to guard Formosa, by claiming that the former administration was holding Chiang Kai-shek back from invading and recapturing the China mainland. In following up on these statements, the President, in his first state of the Union message, made a great ado about "unleashing" Chiang Kai-shek and his army of the Chinese Nationalists. I would venture to say that, following that announcement, the whole world—and particularly Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek—expected to see the Nationalists, with our help, driving the Communists from the China mainland.

But what really happened? After this initial grand gesture, the President not only told Chiang Kai-shek to sit tight on Formosa, but even went a step further and insisted on the turning over to the Communists of some of the off-shore islands. This completely confused everyone concerned. The people, particularly in Southeast Asia and the Far East, no longer knew where we stood, or what the United States would do next.

There are many similar examples. The Democrats were criticized, for instance, for the containment policy which was intended to stop any further Communist expansion. This was not good enough for the Republicans. The Communists had to be driven back, and the captive countries liberated. Many persons took the Republican spokesmen at their word.

But the grand pledges, as it turned out, were directed only with an eye on the political ballot box at home—not at the realities of the world situation. No sooner did the administration take office, than the hedges and contradictions began. Instead of containment, we saw retreat and compromise in Korea, and in the China Sea, and in Indochina. Communist domination and influence began to spread. And thousands of refugees and escapees who crossed the Iron Curtain at the risk of their very lives—believing that the United States and the free world were waiting for them with open arms—soon discovered to their great disillusionment that prolonged, aimless existence in a displaced persons' camp was not too much better than the suffering to which they were accustomed under Communist rule.

These things are a matter of record. And so are the confused efforts of the present administration, on the one hand to arm the free world against the Communist threat, and, on the other hand, to enter into the "friendly spirit of coexistence," engendered at the Geneva conference.

To mention another contradiction—just last week the President, in his press conference, took time out to tell the American people that neutrality is a sound position for the nations—particularly in the Middle East and Asia—which have but recently won their independence. The President argued on behalf of neutrality for those countries, pointing out that the United States followed a neutral path during the first 100 years of our national existence. He added that the Secretary of State, Mr. Dulles, would have something more to say on this subject.

Mr. Dulles did have something to say—but what he said contradicted the position taken by his Commander in Chief. Speaking at Ames, Iowa, only 3 days after the President's press conference, the Secretary of State insisted that, and I quote him, "except under very exceptional circumstances," neutrality is "an immoral and shortsighted conception."

How could any two statements be more contradictory? How can the American people know what the administration's policies are when our President says one thing, and the members of his Cabinet something entirely different? How can the free peoples of the world—whose friendship and cooperation are important to us—know where we stand, and what the United States is going to do, when our foreign policy is as full of contradictions and uncertainties as it has been during the last 4 years? How can we attempt to lead them when, from all appearances, our own Government does not know where it is going?

These considerations are not trivial, because they cut to the very core of our security, and of our future. Is it any wonder that the NATO military structure is crumbling, and that the SEATO alliance is dragging its feet? If the spirit of Geneva—that precocious offspring of the Eisenhower foreign policy—has really opened a new era in East-West relations, why should the nations of the free world devote their meager resources to expensive armaments, when they can use that wealth to improve the standard of living of their peoples? If the United States is content to trade with the Communists, and if the world outlook is really as rosy as our administration would have us believe that it is, then why is Mr. Dulles asking our friends abroad to sacrifice and to build stronger defense? And why, in view of these things, should they listen to him?

I fully realize the dangers inherent in any attempt to make specific recommendations on the subject of our foreign policy because, even as members of the Foreign Affairs Committee, my colleagues and I receive very little information about the true state of world affairs from the White House. The recommendations which I venture to make are based on my personal observations during several study missions, and on the information gleaned during my 8 years of service with the Foreign Affairs Committee. I hope that they may merit your consideration.

In the first place, I would suggest that we face facts squarely and put the cost of our collective security where it belongs, together with our overall defense and preparedness expenditures. As long as our long-range security planning relies to a large extent on the combined resources of our allies, we ought to stop deceiving ourselves by passing off the cost of military international cooperation as a charitable donation for the benefit of some foreign country.

Secondly, I would suggest that, as far as nonmilitary assistance is concerned, we make it perfectly clear that we shall cooperate with the free nations as a matter of policy—rather than on emergency basis—to an extent consistent with our capabilities and our national interest. The Foreign Affairs Committee included a declaration to this effect in the 1956 mutual security bill, and the House approved it. I believe that it should become the cornerstone of our foreign policy, consistent with our present role in world affairs.

Thirdly, in extending nonmilitary assistance, we should return to the spirit of the original point 4 program, outlined under the Truman administration. In this respect, we ought to aid the underdeveloped nations—within the limits of our capabilities—in their own plans and efforts to develop their resources in a manner consistent with their own cultural and economic frameworks. We should stop trying to rebuild the world in our image, which tendency has become all too apparent in the last few years under the impact of the grand visions of some of our overzealous planners.

Fourthly, we must not condition our cooperation with other countries on their un-

qualified acceptance of permanent dependence on the United States—both in terms of military and of economic ties. We should not try to make independent countries into satellites of the United States. They will grow much faster, and will become truer friends, if we help them to achieve real independence—rather than if we try to buy them thereby turning them into our mercenaries.

Finally, elaborating on the above point, I would suggest that we face the facts of life in the relationships which must exist between truly independent nations: that we do not become outraged whenever anyone dares to criticize us, or threaten to sever our ties with any nation which chooses to make an independent decision without receiving prior approval from Washington. As any parent knows, family ties become much stronger, and much more meaningful, when proper respect is shown for any grownup member's right to his or her own opinion. We should adopt more of this kind of thinking in the area of our foreign relations. We should deal with our sister nations—whether they be small or large—on an adult basis. We must recognize their equality and their right to their own opinion.

We are a Nation of free men and women, and we prize our liberty and our independence. Let us allow others to enjoy their blessings, without begrudging them the exercise of their sovereignty. It is only in this manner, if we follow the advice of the founding fathers of our own country, that we hope to remain friends with the free peoples of the world and work together for lasting and just peace in the world.

More Evidence of Our Lack of Foreign Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 21, 1956

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I direct our colleagues' attention to the following article by George Sokolsky, which appeared in the Washington Post and Times Herald of June 21, 1956:

THESE DAYS
(By George Sokolsky)
NASSER'S VICTORY

The celebration in Egypt over driving the British out of the management of the Suez Canal means more than taking over the ditch that played such a role in the Victorian British Empire. Realistically, it means that Soviet Russia, Nasser's ally and underwriter, has developed a big role in the Middle East and that the system of air bases which the United States has erected in North Africa may well be liquidated by political action.

The key American base, the Wheelus Air Base, is in Libya, which has been receiving a subsidy of approximately $17 million a year from the United States and Great Britain.

Egypt and Saudi Arabia are offering Libya the same amount of money if Libya will join them and drop the United States and Great Britain. Saudi Arabia gets its funds from American oil companies which have developed the natural resources of that otherwise barren land. It would not at all be surprising if some day Saudi Arabia drives out the American oil companies and sells the product to Soviet Russia. It might prove to be a profitable deal to Saudi Arabia for a while.

Will we protect American property and national interests by armed force? Probably not, under the theory that if a nation wants to be neutral, it ought to be permitted to be neutral because the United States was neutral in the early years of its history. This will go down in American history as the Eisenhower doctrine alongside the Monroe Doctrine and the John Hay doctrine of the open door.

The inadequacy of the Eisenhower doctrine on neutrality is that it does not explain to any country, for instance to Libya or to France or Italy, why all nations should not be neutral, bargaining as they can with anyone that will bargain with them.

Or better still, why should not Libya take its $17 million from the United States, take whatever it can from Egypt and Saudi Arabia and from anyone else that is handing out money as foreign aid while their own people suffer privations? Why not grab whatever is lying around while the grabbing is possible? Maybe before long some country will get wise to the futility of handing out money with no strings attached.

It would be interesting to read a verifiable account of what Ibn Saud has done with the hundreds of millions which have come to him, apart from proliferating harems. How much of this great wealth has worked its way to the Arab peoples?

The real measure of the value of foreign aid, certainly from this country, is not what goes to governments but what goes to the people in the form of higher standards of living, more education, better facilities for improving health, etc. How much of the money that the United States has paid out to any nation is used in this manner and how much goes to the coffers of the ruling families?

This has been an important problem since the days of UNRRA when we discarded the World War I and post-World War I relief experience and adopted a pattern which benefited governments. The discarding of all prior experience was characteristic of the 1940's, which suffered from what might be called a Marco Polo complex; that is, each man became an original discoverer of what had already been discovered and fully explored.

But we are now in 1956 and it would seem that we should have learned something by experience and one thing we might have learned is that there is no value in giving our wealth away except on the basis of doing something to help the people of a country raise their standard of life and doing it with an American label.

Status of Forces Agreements

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK T. BOW
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 14, 1956

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, an examination of the reciprocal features of the NATO Status of Forces Agreement as they have worked out in 3 years of practice discloses that reciprocity exists only on paper. The numerical results, from any approach, fail to sustain the claim.

We have a million of our men serving abroad. There are only a few thousand foreign servicemen in our country at any one time, the total who may come and go during the year being about 12,000.

As of November 30, 1955, a total of 10,249 of our personnel had been accused of offenses subject to the primary jurisdiction of foreign courts throughout the world. In the same period only 3 foreign servicemen had been charged with any offenses in our courts.

Invariably proponents of the status agreements will say that we would not want to give up the right to try foreign servicemen in our courts, usually offering some unjustified hypothetical case of murder or rape. Again, this thought is not supported by the fact. In 1944 we adopted an act to implement the jurisdiction of service courts of friendly foreign sovereigns within the United States. The American Legion has favored granting the right of trial to foreign troops if the United States is given the right to exercise complete jurisdiction over its servicemen.

We should recall that our troops are serving abroad in complete organizations and prepared to try their own men. In many cases the foreign servicemen are in such small numbers that it would not be possible for them to hold a trial by their own nationals. We also have the Uniform Code of Military Justice which was provided by Congress in carrying out its constitutional right and duty to make rules for the Government and regulation of the land and naval forces.

The code contains all the safeguards provided for an accused under our Constitution and more safeguards than afforded by any foreign court under any system of jurisprudence or by treaty. It was adopted so that all serving in our Armed Forces would be treated alike.

The Status of Forces Agreement, and similar agreements with countries outside NATO, have thwarted the will of Congress. Our servicemen in this country enjoy a favored position, while our servicemen stationed abroad are exposed to almost as many systems of justice and degrees of punishment as there are agreements.

Radio-TV Commercials

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CRAIG HOSMER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 13, 1956

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I promised a second interim report on my campaign against loud, noisy, and obnoxious radio-TV commercials. This is not it, but a special report on certain types of commercials originated mostly by local stations, not excluding those in the Washington area or in any congressional district except my own, of course.

Thanks to one of Jim Derby's old columns in the Chicago Tribune, I can offer the following updated, but still hypothetical, letter to an airways advertiser:

DEAR SIR: I have just heard about the horrible tragedy that has befallen you and I wish to offer you my deepest sympathy. It seems to me that you should appeal to the Federal Emergency Disaster Commission or

to the International Red Cross. Maybe even to the President himself.

Surely in this humanitarian age there is some agency that looks out for such things. Because of storms, snow, rain, other upleasant elements of the season, cursedness of your competitors and landlord and a once in a lifetime combination of other dire circumstances, every single item of your merchandise will be ruined if your big sale fails to go over and you're forced to dump 98 carloads of furniture into the streets.

I heard about all this just last night when I failed to go to the kitchen for a sandwich and listened to the commercial instead.

I know that these must be anguishing hours for you and I hesitate to write you a long letter. However, I know of your great philanthropies and the announcer told us about how your pluck and sagacity makes it possible for us to buy from you much cheaper than from anybody else, with such E–Z credit, too.

So I don't want to see you lose your wealth, and I wonder if it has ever occurred to you that you might be surrounded by incompetent men.

Your announcer mentioned your loss of 10 warehouse leases within the last year. Despite that, one of your trusted employees seems to be wandering around the country ordering trainload after trainload of furniture when you don't have an inch of space to store it in.

The upshot is that you virtually have to give away everything you have on hand. Macy's and Gimbel's don't make such bobbles. Why do you let your underlings make you look like a chump?

But you can take heart in the fact that you are not the only one in such a fix. This morning alone other advertisers on the station confessed they were stuck with the following mountains of merchandise: 10,000 golf clubs, 8,000 shotguns, 131 carloads of automobiles, a gigantic floor full of dresses, 5,000 fur coats, and an entire square block of TV sets.

Almost every businessman in town seems to be on the brink of ruin because of overordering. If what the announcer says about you and all those other sellers is true, it is obvious that the economy is on its last legs; it simply can't totter along much longer if everything is being sold at a loss.

Remembering how Henry A. Wallace approached the farm problem so sanely back in the thirties, paying a bounty for the ears of every slaughtered pig, and how this program put an end to surpluses and wiped out hunger throughout the world, I'm writing my Congressman today. I'm sure if the Government would just begin paying handsome sums to you and these other merchants for burning every stick of surplus furniture, destroying every auto, every shotgun, every TV set, every brandnew item they can't get into their overcrowded warehouses, the terrible situation will be cleaned up.

Yours sympathetically,

A. LISTENER.

P. S.—If you are not really in distress, please let me know right away and I'll send the following letter to your announcer:

"DEAR MR. ANNOUNCER: Are you tired of screaming hysterically about the stupidity of your advertiser who is always goofing things up by ordering too much and is forever forced to sell at a loss?

"Would you like to have a calm, dispassionate script to read in which you could explain that your advertiser is a sane and solid American, thoroughly honest, of the finest integrity, but out to make a buck?

"I'll help you out by boycotting any product you're forced to shout about.

"A. L."

Israel's Meaning

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 19, 1956

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to direct the attention of our colleagues to the following article written by Joseph Alsop from Jerusalem, which appeared in the Washington Post and Times Herald of June 20, 1956, as well as in other newspapers:

MATTER OF FACT

(By Joseph Alsop)

ISRAEL'S MEANING

JERUSALEM.—In a whole series of different ways, it is an eye-opening experience to visit Israel. After a long struggle with redtape, you pass through the Mandelbaum gate from Arab Jerusalem to Israeli Jerusalem. Instantly you are breathing a new air, observing a new landscape, and seeing the future in a new perspective.

Essentially, Israel is so different from the surrounding Arab lands, and, indeed, from the countries of the West, too, because this is a place where they believe in miracles. They believe in miracles, in turn, because they have accomplished miracles.

When you consider the massive counterforces that were overcome, the creation of the State of Israel was in itself a miracle. So was the transformation of this once barren and unfruitful land into a rich and smiling landscape of vineyards and orchards, fertile fields and grassy meadows, populous busy towns and productive industries.

Again, the transformation of the people themselves is also touched with the miraculous. For here the Jews of the Diaspora have been gathered, from both sides of the Iron Curtain, from Africa and from Asia. Peddlers from the Casablanca Casbah have been made into sturdy farmers, as I saw at a new cooperative farm. Long-locked Jews from the premedieval ghettoes of the Yemen have become steelworkers of a high technical category, as I was shown in a new pipe extrusion plant. And these and all the others in this enormous gathering in of the tribes are being rapidly merged into the national whole, and turned into Israelis in the full sense of the word.

The state, the land, the people, in short, all in different ways represent achievements which any rational, practical forecaster would have held to be utterly impossible only 10 or 20 years ago. Therefore, there is a mood here going far beyond the mood of the old Scotch song—"What other men dare, we can do." Here the mood is, "We can dare and do far beyond other men."

The prevalence of that mood makes the very air of Israel quite remarkably exhilarating to anyone accustomed to the moods of other lands, where defeatism and materialism, self-indulgence and despair, suspicion and self-seeking so often seem to compete for dominance. But while this Israeli mood is so exhilarating in itself, it is also a hard political fact that must be judged coldbloodedly, like all other hard political facts.

The Israeli mood, for instance, makes nonsense of the State Department's complacent trumpetings about the success of U. N. Secretary-General Dag Hammarskjold's Middle Eastern peace mission. So far as can be observed, Hammarskjold had no long-range success of any kind.

He certainly did not succeed in persuading the Arabs to accept the existence of the State of Israel. More immediately important, he certainly did not succeed in persuading the Israelis to abandon those policies which may lead to an outbreak of war with the Arabs.

On the contrary, from Prime Minister Ben-Gurion to the simplest private in the Army, the Israelis are all but unanimous that their national security depends on meeting Arab terroristic acts along their borders with stern military reprisals against the Arab governments. And from Prime Minister Ben-Gurion to the poorest farm worker, the Israelis are all but unanimous that their national future depends on going forward with the Jordan water diversion scheme, which the Arabs have said will mean war.

The Israelis are people, moreover, who think very little about risks, including even the risk of war, when they are convinced that their national security and national future are genuinely at stake. They must further be expected to be even more careless of all risks, if Soviet Foreign Minister Shepilov climaxes his Cairo visit by announcing the Kremlin's support for a reduction of Israel to the frontiers proposed in the U. N. partition scheme of 1947. That will be a threat to end Israel as a workable State; and the Israelis will be all the more inclined toward an early showdown.

In another way, too, viewing the mood of Israel as a hard political fact makes nonsense of the opinions now prevailing in Washington and London. It is highly unlikely that the Arabs will ever make peace in return for the little bits of Israel that Prime Minister Eden and Secretary of State Dulles have tried to persuade the Israelis to sacrifice. The effort to persuade the Israelis to make serious territorial concessions was even more unrealistic. As Prime Minister Ben-Gurion bluntly informed Prime Minister Eden, the Israelis will fight first. There should be no mistake about that.

In short, grim courage and ruthless self-denial make Israel intensely admirable as a human accomplishment, but this same courage and self-denial also make Israel highly intractable as a political fact. There is no use saying about the Israelis, "They ought to do differently." They will not behave as many Western policymakers think they should behave, because that is not their nature. And, one must add, they only exist today because that is not their nature.

At Last—Flood Protection

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK M. KARSTEN
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 21, 1956

Mr. KARSTEN. Mr. Speaker, I should like to bring to the attention of the House the following editorial from the St. Louis Globe-Democrat for June 19.

In order to conform with the rules, it was necessary to delete a few of the words, but it expresses most eloquently the thanks of the people of my city to the Congress for the granting of preconstruction planning funds for the St. Louis flood wall:

AT LAST—FLOOD PROTECTION

Old Man River was given his come-uppance by Washington when the United States Senate voted to spend $551,000 to get an antiflood program under way in St. Louis. By one of those eversights hard to explain, the biggest city on the Mississippi is the last to get the dikes and wall that will protect it from high water in floodtimes.

In the past, Washington dished out millions to cities like Memphis and Kansas City to protect them from ravages of the rivers along which they sit. The inland streams are the wards of the Federal Government, and Washington's responsibility to keep them from running amok is long recognized.

Earlier, the House approved the same $551,000 grant that will enable Army engineers to begin final planning for a $130,987,000 antiflood protection system for St. Louis. This item is included in a larger appropriation bill that now has to be approved by a joint Senate-House Conference Committee and again approved in final form by both Houses.

But the $551,000 for St. Louis should get over these hurdles without difficulty.

St. Louis civic and political leaders effectively presented the case for the city in the hearings at Washington.

* * * * *

St. Louis is grateful to them and to Congress for getting an antiflood program for the city underway.

What Direction Should Our Foreign Aid Program Take?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 19, 1956

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I want to commend to the attention of the membership of this House an editorial which appeared in the Milwaukee Journal of June 13, 1956, entitled "What Direction Should Our Foreign Aid Program Take?"

I believe that this editorial very aptly summarizes and analyzes the sentiment in Congress, and throughout our Nation, with respect to the dire need for a reappraisal of our foreign policy. Such a review should be undertaken to determine where we are going, and to what extent our present programs should be modified to meet the recent changes in world conditions. Finally, such a reappraisal should lead to the outlining of new methods and tactics which our Nation can undertake to continue energetic and constructive leadership in the efforts to achieve just and lasting peace.

Even the administration has recognized the need for such a re-evaluation of our foreign-aid programs, by suggesting the appointment of a Presidential Commission to accomplish that task. The Committee on Foreign Affairs gave serious thought to that suggestion. In the final analysis, it was decided to defer action pending congressional approval of the Mutual Security legislation requested by the President.

Even at that time, there was an understanding within the committee that a review and a continued careful study of our foreign-aid programs would be undertaken as promptly as possible—either by the whole committee, by a special ad hoc committee, or by the existing subcommittees which are responsible for legislation affecting different areas of the world.

The results of these studies would provide the groundwork for the analysis of the overall effect of our programs. In this manner, the basic work could be accomplished by the time the next Congress convenes in January of 1957.

The fact that we must bear in mind is that fundamental changes have taken place in the world situation and in the relative strength of countries both friendly and unfriendly toward the United States since the inception of our foreign-aid programs. At the same time, there has been no public, nonpartisan examination of our programs and policies since the beginning of the Marshall plan.

Because an important portion of our national budget has been, and continues to be, devoted to foreign-assistance programs, the need for a reappraisal of our policies is urgent. As the following editorial so succinctly points out "a sound, comprehensive nonpartisan study of the whole problem" is needed:

WHAT DIRECTION SHOULD OUR FOREIGN AID PROGRAM TAKE?

The drastic House slash in President Eisenhower's foreign-aid proposal cannot be blamed simply on isolationists, "aginners," economizers, irresponsibles, and election-year opportunists. The margin for passage of the reduced bill was too large for that.

There is evidence here that more and more House Members, like a growing number of citizens, are not satisfied that the United States is getting its money's worth in the present foreign-aid program.

It isn't necessarily that too much money is being spent. It's more that the world situation has changed, thanks to the new look in Russia following Stalin's death, and we're still going on in the same old pattern. It was a good program when we were trying to save Europe economically, and when we were trying to rearm the free world after outbreak of war in Korea, but is it a good program now that Europe is in good shape, that the free world is partially rearmed, and that the Russians are talking and inaugurating economic and political competition instead of primarily military competition?

What's needed, pretty obviously, is a sound, comprehensive, nonpartisan study of the whole problem. This has been proposed many times, but nothing has come of it. The President and his administration better do something about it now, and quickly, or next year's foreign-aid program may run into even more trouble than this one.

There are many questions that need answering. Is present emphasis on military aid wise? Is the military buildup we are supporting the proper kind in view of the shift to nuclear weapons? Would it be better if we funneled more economic aid through the United Nations, the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, the Colombo plan and like groups instead of pasting United States labels on practically all our aid?

Would it be desirable to place less emphasis on grants and more on long-term loans? Technical assistance programs (point 4) are usually considered one of our more successful aid ventures. Should we dramatically expand them? Should we concentrate more on short term aid projects—streets, highways, bridges, public buildings, etc.—rather than on such long-term projects as dams, hydroelectric and industrial plants?

What should be our aid policy toward neutrals? How far should we go in competing directly with the Soviets for the favor of uncommitted countries?

An independent study resulting in logical answers to these questions would go far to get the foreign-aid program back in public understanding and favor.

As for the immediate program, it would seem that the House has cut too deeply. We liked what Representative MCCORMACK, Democrat, of Massachusetts, said the other day during the debate: "I'd rather err on the side of strength than the side of weakness."

The Senate would seem well advised not to try to restore the full sum recommended by President Eisenhower, but at least not to slice our security so thin as the House has.

Our Judicial System Is Still the Finest Civilization Has Yet Produced

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 21, 1956

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial from the Washington Post and Times Herald of June 21, 1956, should cause some of our colleagues to temper their remarks:

SNIPING AT THE COURT

The intemperate criticism of the Supreme Court that is heard so frequently these days is a reflection of the emotionalism that has grown up around many public issues. Some men in public life are not willing to discuss court decisions on their legal merits. Rather, they fly to the ridiculous conclusion that members of the high tribunal have been brain-washed or influenced by subversive propaganda. Such far-fetched charges can ordinarily be dismissed as the product of anger or imaginations running riot. But the prevalence of such charges in recent weeks must be a matter of concern to thoughtful citizens who place a high value on the judicial process.

Undoubtedly much of this criticism stems from the Supreme Court's decisions in the segregation cases. Some men who do not like those decisions have deliberately set out to discredit the Court which handed them down. In other instances, however, the attacks upon the Court are much broader than the segregation issue. The country's noisiest superpatriots are firing recklessly at the Court because many of its decisions are out of tune with their schemes and objectives.

Criticism of the Court is not, of course, anything new in American history. The Court over which Chief Justice Marshall presided came in for much abuse from the Jefferson administration and its successors. The Taney Court was much abused, and Lincoln became the chief critic of the Dred Scott decision in the pre-Civil War period. During the thirties the Court again came under severe attack for its so-called anti-New Deal decisions. Fortunately, the Court survived all these and other assaults because of its high standing with the rank-and-file of the people. No doubt it will continue to do so if the people are kept aware of what it has done and why.

Most of the present criticism seems to be based on the mistaken notion that the Court is a kind of judicial slot machine which, when a case is presented to it, merely grinds

out the appropriate precedent by which it should be decided. To be sure, the Court does give great weight to precedent. But it is also constantly engaged in a reexamination of principles and legal relationships to keep its interpretation of the law in tune with present realities. Our constitutional system could scarcely be expected to outlast a generation if our judicial system did not have within it sufficient flexibility to correct its own past mistakes and to look at the law as an instrument serving a dynamic society.

It would be foolish to pretend that the Court is infallible. This newspaper often criticizes decisions of the Court and will continue to do so. But we respect the integrity of the justices. We believe they voice their honest views of what the Constitution and the laws require, and that is the acid test of an independent court. No court will ever fully satisfy a country as large and varied as ours. But critics ought to voice their complaints in a spirit of respect for the institution itself; for the preservation of a strong and independent Supreme Court is one of the basic requirements of our Federal system.

Can the United States Continue To Be Wasteful of Its Human Resources?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 20, 1956

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith an editorial which appeared in the June 19, 1956, issue of the Belleville (Ill.) News-Democrat. The editorial Can This Waste Go On? follows:

CAN THIS WASTE GO ON?

There is optimism in Washington in Federal agencies that have been trying to find ways and means of influencing industry to discard the standard, automatic, arbitrary, 65-year retirement age.

Officials, who say their problem is to chase away the hobgoblins which many in industry see, reported at a conference of the Federal Council on Aging and the Council of State Governments that they believe the phantasms eventually will be dispelled. The first of these is an idea that hiring older workers unduly increases pension costs. The other is that older workers are inferior to younger in productivity and performance.

Of course, government isn't the only level at which the retirement question is being studied. Industry is greatly interested. So is science. At the University of Chicago researchers have been looking for some way, other than birthdays, to measure age.

The approach is that while some workers wear out physically and emotionally more quickly, and ought to be retired earlier than 65, others should be graded for the degree of maturity they display—particularly if their skills or talents have been little impaired by time.

With the future promising to continue to add years to man's life expectancy, it is quite apparent that if retirement at 65 is to be the hard and fast rule, an ever-increasing share of the Nation's wealth will be diverted to the support of these nonproducing elders. Some will have ample resources of their own but many will be dependent upon others, directly or through government.

A large percentage of these individuals would, if permitted to do so by industry or government, continue to work and supply their own needs. It is the vast store of human resources which they represent and which will grow as their numbers mount that should be of concern to all.

Can the Nation continue to be wasteful of these human resources?

The Doctors and the Presidency

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 21, 1956

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the following item by Walter Lippmann, which appeared in the Washington Post and Times Herald of June 21, 1956, and other papers, is important reading:

TODAY AND TOMORROW
(By Walter Lippmann)
THE DOCTORS AND THE PRESIDENCY

The President, it appears, is taking it as a matter of course that the country is expecting him to decide once more whether he will run again. It may be useful to remind ourselves that the situation in which he finds himself is peculiarly difficult for him. For the doctors who must advise him, and for the press which must keep the people informed, the root of the difficulty is not so much medical as it is constitutional.

The President is the key figure in the American system; without his active guidance and control the system does not work. The President is elected for a fixed term of 4 years, and if he becomes in some measure incapacitated, there is no one to take his place. When, therefore, the President has had a serious illness, the crucial question is not his life expectancy. If he dies, the system provides that the Vice President take over. The crucial question is whether he can count on his energy and his personal powers over a period of 4 years.

For the system, as now established, makes no provisions for invalidism or for failing powers. This is what is in the back of peoples' minds when they listen to the medical opinions of the doctors. They are waiting to be reassured about the President's health for the next 4 years.

It is here that a misunderstanding, such as it is, has arisen between the doctors and the public. The doctors have been talking about the President's recovery from his heart attack and from his operation. The politicians, who are playing for very high stakes, have been treating what the doctors say as an expert verdict on the President's fitness to carry the burden of the Presidency for a second term. These are not one and the same.

Owing to the fact that the President has a fixed term of office and that there is no one to substitute for him if he cannot carry the burden, the doctors are being pressed to make a prognosis which must in the nature of things be highly speculative. They are expected to say not only whether he has recovered from his heart attack and is recovering from the ileitis but really whether he will be in full vigor during a second term. If this were a parliamentary government on the British model, this question would not arise. The head of the government would not be committed to a fixed term, and therefore it would not be necessary to do any medical guessing about what will happen in the future over a period of years.

The question does arise here, and in the case of President Eisenhower, given his age and medical history, it is a momentous question. The American system, as it works now in practice, cannot do with a sick or a failing President.

It can be said that the system is more defective than it needs to be, and that some of the worst features of it—as they were exhibited when Garfield and Wilson were disabled—could be remedied. It should become the established practice that when the President is ill, the Vice President takes over until the President recovers. There is little doubt that this is what the authors of the Constitution intended.

Any sick President—it might have been Eisenhower himself—can put this constitutional arrangement into effect. He can invite the Vice President to sign official documents, let the action be challenged in the courts, and have its validity tested promptly in the Supreme Court. The Vice President would not, of course, be sworn in as President. He would remain the Vice President, temporarily discharging the powers and duties of the President.

The alternative is the device of the regency, as operated by Mr. Sherman Adams during the two illnesses of President Eisenhower. This device was worked well enough because the President has not been badly incapacitated for a long time. The device would not work at all well in case of prolonged disability, such as invalidism or the failing powers of age. For the country would not long like the Office of President administered by men who have not been elected to any office.

But when all has been said and done about remedying the gross defects of the system, it will still be true that there is no substitute in a presidential system of government for a strong President in the full possession of his powers. This truth is the point of reference for the decision that must be made by the President, and, if he decides to run, then later on by the country.

From what the President said when he was making his first decision we know that after the doctors have said all that they are able to say, he has no choice but to reach his conclusions by applying his commonsense, informed by his experience of the Office of President. The country will have to make its judgment in the same way.

Vice Admiral Francis C. Denebrink, USN

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 20, 1956

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, after a long and honorable career in the United States Navy, Vice Adm. Francis C. Denebrink, USN, is retiring to inactive service.

At the beginning of World War I in 1917, Admiral Denebrink received his commission as a youthful ensign in the Navy. His service has spanned two world wars and the Korean conflict, and reached its zenith upon his promotion to the grade of vice admiral in 1952. He was one of the capable officers chosen to attend the Naval War College course in naval warfare. His excellent war service was recognized when he had con-

ferred upon him the coveted Legion of Merit.

During the last years of his active service, Admiral Denebrink has been the able Commandant of the Military Sea Transportation Service, the organization that has done such a splendid job in transporting our Armed Forces across the seas of the world.

Upon his retirement from active service and upon his birthday, which he will celebrate tomorrow, Admiral Denebrink is to be congratulated by his many friends in the armed services and in civilian life. It is their sincere hope that he will have many years during which he may enjoy the fruits of his excellent service.

I Am Old Glory

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON CANFIELD
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 6, 1956

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I was very happy last Tuesday to present to the ninth grade classes of the Thomas Jefferson Junior High School of Passaic, N. J., an American flag which had flown over our Capitol on June 14, 1956, Flag Day.

Old Glory means a lot to this splendid group of young American citizens who for some time have felt that many good Americans have been remiss about flying the flag on holidays and other appropriate occasions. They determined to do something about it and under the leadership of their principal, Mrs. Margaret McCarthy Nordstrom, and their teacher, Mr. Andrew Bacha, they canvassed an area near their school which on last Memorial Day had 78 homes displaying flags. Joyce Graeter and Joel Gersmann were student chairmen.

Do you have an American flag? If so, will you remember to display it on Flag Day? If you do not have a flag, will you consider the purchase of one? These are the questions the boys and girls asked and at every home they left a leaflet on the proper use of the flag prepared by the Gerald V. Carroll Post of the American Legion. What happened? Came Flag Day, June 14, and the covered area had 235 flags flying where 78 flew on the holiday 2 weeks before.

I am very proud of my young constituents and their graduation project honoring Old Glory. What is Old Glory? The flag pamphlet of the United States Marine Corps gives the answer in these words:

I am Old Glory: For more than eighty-score years I have been the banner of hope and freedom for generation after generation of Americans. Born amid the first flames of America's fight for freedom, I am the symbol of a country that has grown from a little group of Thirteen Colonies to a united Nation of 48 sovereign States. Planted firmly on the high pinnacle of American faith my gently fluttering folds have proved an inspiration to untold millions. Men have followed me into battle with unwavering courage. They have looked upon me as a symbol of national unity. They have prayed that they and their fellow citizens might continue to enjoy the life, liberty, and pursuit of happiness, which have been granted to every American as the heritage of freemen. So long as men love liberty more than life itself; so long as they treasure the priceless privileges bought with the blood of our forefathers; so long as the principles of truth, justice, and charity for all remain deeply rooted in human hearts, I shall continue to be the enduring banner of the United States of America.

I am Old Glory.

Clean Elections—Now or Ever?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STEWART L. UDALL
OF ARIZONA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 8, 1956

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, 10 days ago I attempted to point out to our colleagues the vital stake this Congress has in enacting prior to the political campaign this fall a respectable Corrupt Practices Act which will compel honest elections.

No action has been forthcoming, and it would appear that my remarks have fallen on deaf ears.

It is still my belief that Congress cannot afford to finish its work this summer without writing an election code which will stifle the suspicions and charges which will otherwise fill the air during the political contest this fall. As evidence that this opinion is shared by responsible organs of public opinion, I present the following editorial, which appeared last Sunday in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch:

FOUR MONTHS, NO ACTION

It is now almost 4 months to the day—a third of a year—since LYNDON JOHNSON, of Texas, the majority leader, solemnly promised on the floor of the Senate tht there would be no postponement of legislation to tighten up the all-too-loose controls on campaign spending.

The promise was made when JOHNSON and Senator WILLIAM KNOWLAND, of California, the Republican leader, introduced a substitute for the carefully prepared bill sponsored chiefly by Senator THOMAS C. HENNINGS, JR., of Missouri. Extended hearings had been held on this measure, and it had been on the Senate Calendar since June 22, 1955.

Senator O'MAHONEY had demanded action on the Hennings bill by the end of March—or, if a majority of the Senate so desired, on the much weaker Johnson-Knowland substitute. But the Hennings bill has been sidetracked, and the Johnson-Knowland bill is all but forgotten in the Rules Committee. The word is that it will stay there until the Senators go home in July.

If so, there will be another presidential campaign under conditions which are a standing invitation to scandal. Fletcher Knebel, of Look's Washington bureau, estimates that $200 million will be spent preliminary to November's voting. He also estimates that $140 million of this will come from less than 20,000 people.

Unless the law is changed, nobody will ever know how good those estimates are. But they serve as approximations of the situation which Senator HENNINGS and other honest men in public life have long sought to improve. Under the existing law national committees and individual candidates are under impossibly low limits on what they may spend in soliciting votes. They also must report contributions. But any number of independent campaign committees may be formed, and for these, for all practical purposes, the sky is the limit.

Individuals are not supposed to contribute more than $5,000 to a candidate; but they and their families may give money to every candidate on the ticket. Thus, a University of North Carolina study of 1952 campaign contributions showed that the Pew family of Philadelphia gave the Republicans at least $148,480. The Rockefellers gave the party $150,000; the Du Ponts, $81,000; the Vanderbilts, $57,000; the Mellons, $51,000; the L. C. Hunt family of Texas, $46,800; the Guggenheims, $42,000; the Weirs, $29,000, and the Luces, $25,000.

The Democrats did not do so well, but they got $56,000 from the family of Joseph P. Kennedy of Boston; $26,000 from Albert M. Greenfield of Philadelphia; $23,000 from the Reynolds family of North Carolina, and $23,000 from the Wade Thompsons of Nashville, Tenn. These and similar large gifts were legal. And they probably were more disinterested than smaller contributions from contract hunters and favor seekers.

There is no getting away from the fact that a modern campaign of national scope costs a lot of money. And the largest contributions naturally are to be expected from those who have the most to give. Nobody has yet introduced legislation calling on the Treasury to assume the cost of campaigning as a part of the cost of Government. The solicitation of small gifts is still novel and therefore still relatively unproductive.

Some Senators excuse themselves from pushing for this publicity on the ground that labor unions do not want attention called to their campaign contributions. If so, the unions are wrong. There is nothing shameful about an honest campaign contribution. But Senators put themselves in a false light indeed when they are unwilling to have the voters know who is financing campaigns. If the people were given the full facts, candidates might be able to look to the many rather than to the few for support; might be able to look to those with no axes to grind rather than to those who may ask a return—and perhaps a questionable return—for their help. Surely this would be better for all concerned.

Must another oil company offer another Senator a check before Congress reduces the temptations in electioneering?

Education Is the Function of Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 21, 1956

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following editorial from the Washington Post and Times Herald of June 21, 1956:

A VOTE ON SCHOOLS

For the first time during the decade or more that Federal aid to education has been before Congress the House of Representatives is going to have a chance to vote on the issue. The Rules Committee, by a division of 8 to 3, decided yesterday afternoon to give the Kelley bill an open rule. This will mean that it should come to the House floor some time next week.

Amendments, including the Powell amendment which would inject the irrelevant controversy over racial relations into the school-aid problem, could be offered by any Representative. No doubt efforts will be made to kill the Kelley bill by loading it with such amendments. But, given a fair chance to debate the question and vote on it, the House, we are confident, will dodge these entrapments and send a simple, solid, and practicable school-aid measure to the Senate. We congratulate the House Rules Committee on having done a most constructive piece of work yesterday. There is now real hope for the future of America's public schools and for the future of the children attending them.

The U. S. S. R. Atomic Energy Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 20, 1956

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I would like to call the attention of the House and Senate to a story which appeared in the April 27, 1956, issue of Colliers, The Red Atom, which gives a revealing look inside Russia's supersecret atomic laboratories, as follows:

THE RED ATOM
(By Lin Root)

Last November seismograph needles around the world were suddenly agitated by heavy shock waves, and rain lashing down on Japan began clicking off a radioactive count of 4,000 to 30,000 a quart per minute instead of the normal 20 to 40.

The cause of this violent activity soon became apparent: the Soviet Union had exploded its second hydrogen weapon. And when all the scientific evidence was in, there were hurried reappraisals of Russia's nuclear potential in the chancelleries and nuclear laboratories of the Western World.

British estimates put the Soviet weapon in the 15-megaton class—the equivalent of 15 million tons of TNT, and almost as strong as the H-bomb which the United States had exploded in the Bikini Atoll in March 1954. It was the most powerful device yet tested in the Soviet Union. But even more significant, it had been touched off at a very high altitude—tens of thousands of feet, in the opinion of some informed sources.

What was the Russian weapon and how did it get there? Some scientists think that the explosion was that of a missile warhead. If so, it was the first; neither the United States nor Britain has yet joined a thermonuclear (hydrogen) warhead to a missile. Others think the weapon might have been dropped from a plane. If so, it is also a first, for we have no plane capable of attaining such heights with a thermonuclear load; in United States tests, hydrogen devices have been placed atop steel towers for detonation. Still other scientists speculate the weapon may have been suspended from a balloon.

Whatever the Soviet weapon was, it clearly calls for a reevaluation in our thinking. The conviction that the U. S. S. R. has not the knowhow to catch up with our atomic lead is widespread and extends into high places. On November 17, even as the shock waves of the Russian H-weapon were being recorded, Commissioner Thomas E. Murray, of the United States Atomic Energy Commission was proposing an international demonstration of an American thermonuclear explosion at Eniwetok in the Pacific to cancel out Soviet propaganda "that they have overtaken us in atomic and thermonuclear weapons."

The need is urgent, therefore, for a clearer understanding of what has been and is going on in research laboratories behind the iron curtain—of the real story of the Soviet Union's nuclear and thermonuclear progress in terms of accomplishments, equipment, technology and manpower.

Fortunately, a realistic assessment of the U. S. S. R.'s nuclear program is now possible. Most of the evidence comes from Dr. Arne Lundby, chief of the Reactor Physics Department in the Norwegian Atomic Energy Institute, who recently made an unprecedented 2-week tour of Russia's atomic installations, attending scientific meetings and talking freely with its scientists. Among those with whom he spoke at length was Dr. Bruno Pontecorvo, formerly a senior scientific officer at Britain's Harwell atomic laboratories, who disappeared behind the Iron Curtain in 1950. The conversations are among the first—and certainly the most detailed—Pontecorvo has had with a Western scientist since he threw in his lot with the U. S. S. R.

Dr. Lundby is particularly well qualified to appraise what he saw and heard in Russia; he has worked on all types of atomic machines in the United States, Britain and Norway, and is fully conversant with Western nuclear progress. His observations supplement reports read by Soviet scientists at the Atoms for Peace conference which I attended in Geneva last year, and other bits of information that have seeped through the Iron Curtain.

From these sources, then, we can set down this partial score sheet of Russia's nuclear progress:

The U. S. S. R. exploded what was probaby the world's first true H-bomb in August, 1953. The United States exploded an H-bomb 7 months later. (Although we had touched off the world's first thermonuclear explosion in November, 1952, the most reliable information indicates that no bomb as such was involved, but rather a hydrogen device too heavy to be transported by plane and not feasible as a weapon.)

The U. S. S. R. has been producing nuclear source materials (U–235, plutonium) for 10 years and has made them freely available to its scientists for all kinds of experiments and research. The United States began production of nuclear source materials 3 years earlier, in 1943, but until recently has kept a tight rein on their use.

The U. S. S R has the world's largest synchro-cyclotron and will put into operation this year the world's largest proton-synchrotron. The United States has the next largest synchro-cyclotron and the currently largest proton-synchrotron. Both machines are accelerators with which the secrets of the atom can be studied.

The U S. S. R. has one 5,000-kilowatt atomic power station in operation, supplying electricity for a community, and a 100,000-kilowatt plant under construction; by 1960 it plans to have nuclear power stations in operation with a greater total capacity (2,000,-000-2,500,000 kilowatts) than those contemplated in the United States and Britain together. The United States still has no nuclear power stations in regular operation, and as this is written the capacity of plants planned for completion by 1960 totals only 689,000 kilowatts. However, we have a much bigger and more diversified research program under way than Russia—we are experimenting with 5 to 10 different types of reactors; Russia, with only about half as many.

Eyewitness Lundby sums up the overall picture of Soviet nuclear progress this way: "There is no longer any doubt that the U. S. S. R. is among the foremost countries of the world in the development of atomic energy. All the time I was in the Soveit Union I had the strangest feeling of experiencing something I could not believe was true * * * discussing the most advanced experiments with Soviet scientists, problems that we never imagined the Russians were investigating * * * examining reactors, giant accelerators, massive engineering structures of which we had never heard a word before."

How has Russia, a late starter in the nuclear race, been able to catch up so quickly? The answer seems to be that Soviet leaders recognized early that conquest of the atom gave them the means to close the gap between the country's agrarian past and technological future in one leap. They turned loose the nation's best scientific and mathematical brains, provided everything needed in the way of money and equipment—and got results.

Dr. Lundby was given an unexpectedly look at much of the work—and the results. He was impressed not only with the advanced nature of the experiments he saw under way, but with the amounts of U–235, thorium and plutonium that went into them. He was even more impressed, however, with the quality of Russia's nuclear laboratories—and the equipment in them.

Take the Institute for Nuclear Problems. Until Dr. Lundby's visit, Western scientists had not even been aware of the existence of this highly organized, ultramodern establishment devoted exclusively to study of what goes on inside the atomic nucleus.

The institute is situated 83 miles north of Moscow at the junction of the Moscow Canal and the Volga River. To get the hydroelectric power needed for the institute, the Russians evacuated several villages and created an artificial lake so big you can barely see across it in some places. The institute itself lies a few miles east of the main Moscow road, and clustered around it are numerous houses, 2 to 3 stories high, of brick and concrete and usually painted mustard color. These are the homes of the scientists and technical personnel employed at the institute.

The world's largest synchro-cyclotron is housed in the institute. A synchro-cyclotron is one of several types of acceleration machines, all of which have the same main objective: to speed up charged particles (protons, the heavy positively charged particles in the nucleus of the atom; or electrons, the light negatively charged particles) in order to find out more about their structure.

Dr. Ernest O. Lawrence of the University of California developed the general principle of the accelerator in 1930. He showed that charged particles moving within the field of a magnet can be regularly kicked up to a higher velocity each time they cross a point in their orbit where they are affected by an electric field. Lawrence's original-type cyclotron accelerated the protons to 20 to 30 MeV—millions of electron volts. Russia's synchro-cyclotron, based on a modification of Lawrence's principle, achieves 680 MeV, and develops such a heavy stream of speeding protons that 5 percent of them can be channeled off to other areas for special study. The diameter of the maget-pole pieces is about 20 feet, and the magnet itself weighs 7,000 tons.

Dr. Lundby spent several hours examining the huge synchrocyclotron; he was especially interested in it because he had worked for 2 years with a smaller one in Chicago. "The giant Russian model is supposed to have been completed in 1949," he told me, "but it seems to have been running at maximum energy only during the last couple of years. It's very nicely engineered—windows to look into the vacuum chamber between the pole pieces, double vacuum seals to introduce or extract samples inside the chamber, automatic equipment to start the machine or shut it off, and so on.

"It's not as compact as the synchrocyclotron in Chicago—the control room is in a building a hundred yards away, and therefore very inconvenient—but there's more

working space around the machine itself. The Russians had more than a dozen experiments lined up behind the shield of the machine when I was there, among them studies on high-energy protons, neutrons, mesons, and the like. And they were using the most modern equipment—just like that used in the United States."

It was at the synchroclytron that Dr. Lundby had one of his long talks with Bruno Pontecorvo, who does his research there. (Their other conversations were at scientific meetings in Moscow.) "He looked very well, a little fidgety and restless maybe, but then he's a nervous type," Dr. Lundby recalls. "He was dressed better than the other scientists I saw, not more expensively but in better taste—more as though he knew what to select.

"As we talked, he had a little difficulty expressing himself in English at first. He laughed about it, and said he was out of practice—but after a couple of days it came more easily and he seemed quite pleased. He seems to speak Russian without difficulty."

The Italian-born Pontecorvo is now a Soviet citizen, has won a Stalin prize and has been elected a member of Russia's highest scientific body, the Academy of Science. What share ideology may have played in his decision to leave Britain could not be determined by Dr. Lundby, but I learned from some of Pontecorvo's former British colleagues at Harwell that the superior working and living conditions offered him by the Soviets may have been a decisive factor. According to the Britons, Pontecorvo is primarily a scientist with his roots in the laboratory, has no national ties whatever, and likes the creature comforts of life. Apparently frustrated and impatient because there wasn't enough of anything in England in 1950—laboratory equipment, food, heat, light—Pontecorvo took off for the East.

I asked Dr. Lundby whether Pontecorvo seemed to have any regrets. "Not that I could notice," was the reply. "He seems perfectly satisfied with his life. He lives with his wife and three children in one of the yellow brick garden houses in the institute community. His children go to the village school. He also has an apartment in Moscow, and often drives to town."

Dr. Lundby said he asked Pontecorvo whether he wouldn't like to have the award made by the United States Government to him and six other physicists as payment for a patent claim they had filed for their early work with neutrons. "He told me he wouldn't mind if his relatives got the money," Dr. Lundby said, "but he claimed he wasn't interested in it himself."

At the institute, Pontecorvo works in a small chamber set up inside a shield behind one yoke of the synchrocyclotron magnet. He is studying pimesons—short-lived particles created in a burst of energy when a proton traveling at high speed smashes into an atomic nucleus. They are believed to be the particles responsible for binding the nucleus together.

"Still higher-energy meson work has been done with the United States Atomic Energy Commission's Cosmetron at Brookhaven National Laboratory," Dr. Lundby told me, "but the accuracy of Pontecorvo's work is far greater because he has a higher intensity (more mesons) to work with. Furthermore, the mesons travel directly into his little room, enabling him to work with greater ease and concentration.

"His experimental skill is great, and from the amount of work he has done he must spend practically all his time at the synchrocyclotron. He enjoys the work very much, and his experiments have a direct bearing on one of the most fundamental problems in physics today—namely, how the finest building stones in nature, the atomic nuclei, are constructed. Even if the final solution is not immediately at hand, there is great satisfaction in making any basic contribution. Pontecorvo also has the pleasure of designing his own equipment, and whatever he wants is always built for him."

Pontecorvo showed Dr. Lundby a "bubble chamber" the Russians had built. A "bubble chamber" is a vessel full of liquid, usually hydrogen, into which a stream of protons may be directed. When the speeding protons crash into a hydrogen nucleus, energy is released, forming minute bubbles. These bubbles dissolve too fast for visual observation, but they can be photographed by a built-in camera, and thus the behavior of high-energy particles may be charted.

Not satisfied with having just the world's largest synchrocyclotron, the Russians are now building the world's largest proton-synchrotron—another type of accelerator which speeds up protons into the BeV (billions of electron volts) range. Its main advantage over the synchro-cyclotron is the increased speeds which it gives the proton stream; its disadvantage is that the protons tend to smash themselves against the sides, leaving comparatively few in the mainstream for study.

At present, there are only three proton-synchrotrons operating in the world. The largest of them—the Bevatron at the University of California—yields up to six BeV. The model under construction in the Soviet Union was designed by Prof. Vladimir L. Veksler, Russia's synchrocyclotron pioneer, to achieve 10-BeV speeds, and it has a magnet weighing 36,000 metric tons. It will go into operation later this year. Design studies for even higher-energy machines are being made in both the United States and Europe, but these devices will not be completed for 3 to 5 years.

To Dr. Lundby, the new 30-story Moscow University building on the road from the Moscow airport to the capital itself was another eye opener. "Going through the laboratories of the university, which is almost entirely devoted to science studies, I was amazed by the abundance of apparatus," he says. "In the physics department there were all kinds of devices for making cosmic-ray experiments—arrays of Geiger counters, scintillation detectors, and ionization chambers, all very cleverly arranged. It looked as if there were no limit to the amount of apparatus available." Dr. Lundby said he asked some of the instructors what arrangements they had to make to get money for apparatus. All they had to do was ask for it, they told him.

"Most of the apparatus I saw at the university and elsewhere in Russia was pretty much like American equipment," Dr. Lundby says. "Some of the devices—for example, the bubble chamber at the Nuclear Institute—were copied from descriptions in United States scientific journals. However, the Russians have made one device which no one elsewhere has been able to achieve—a special-type solid scintillator. With this, it is possible to photograph particles and their movements inside the scintillator—an admirable, original detector which clears better and permits even faster photographs than is possible with a bubble chamber."

Dr. Lundby spent considerable time visiting atomic reactors—devices in which controlled chain reactions are staged, usually for research purposes or to make power. When natural uranium is used as fuel in a reactor, pieces of the uranium ore must be distributed in a moderator—graphite, heavy water, beryllium—to keep the chain reaction going. If enriched uranium (containing a higher percentage of U-235) is used, ordinary water will serve as a moderator. A chain reaction creates terrific heat, and in a power reactor this heat is carried off by a circulating coolant—water, metal or gas—to make steam which turns conventional turbines.

The U. S. S. R. built the world's first atom-fired electric power station on the Oka River, 67 miles south of Moscow. This 5,000-kilowatt plant, whose reactor furnace is fueled with enriched uranium having 5 percent U 235, moderated with graphite and cooled with pressurized distilled water, has been serving Obinskoje, a billage of 10,000 people, since June 1954. But the station is probably more important as a propaganda weapon than as a power station; it is strictly a small-scale experimental project and its design has proved to be highly uneconomical. "Russian scientists and engineers are aware of its shortcomings," Lundby said, "but they have the advantage of several years' operating experience." (Actually, the first full-scale atomic-power reactor was built by the United States in 1953, but it was designed to propel the atomic submarine *Nautilus*, not to light up a community.)

Far more significant to Lundby than the atomic-power station were Russia's research reactors. He said their construction was preceded by extensive study of the changes which uranium, graphite, steel, insulating materials and coolants undergo in reactors. The research types included:

A light-water reactor. It runs on enriched uranium and is moderated and cooled with ordinary water. In principle it is much like the United States swimming-pool reactor. Both the United States and U. S. S. R. have offered to sell this type of research reactor at essentially construction costs to other countries under bilateral agreements.

A heavy-water reactor. In operation since 1949, it is cooled and moderated by heavy water (water in which the hydrogen nucleus is twice as heavy as in ordinary water). Dr. Lundby, who had worked for more than 3 years with a heavy-water reactor of similar design and power rating told me: "The old natural-uranium rods in this Russian reactor are now being replaced with enriched-uranium fuel elements, which will increase its 500-kilowatt power level to 10,000 kilowatts. In principle, the reactor will now be like one of the most advanced research models in the United States—the C. P. (Chicago Pile) 5. Moreover, as result of their experience with this reactor, the Russians are now building a 100,000-kilowatt electric-power station with a heavy-water-moderated, gas-cooled reactor."

A graphite reactor for physical and technical research. It also is of unique Russian design. It is cooled with distilled water, moderated with graphite and fueled with enriched uranium. This model provided experience and ideas which were incorporated in the atomic power station reactor.

So much for equipment. Now for the other factor that has enabled Russia to keep up near the lead in the nuclear race—manpower. Soviet scientists soon may, if they do not already, outnumber their American counterparts. More significant, enrollment in the sciences is increasing in the Soviet Union, decreasing in the United States. This year, for example, Russia is graduating 130,000 or more scientists and engineers, the United States 70,000.

Dr. John R. Dunning, dean of the School of Engineering at Columbia University, and a member of the Congress-appointed panel on the Impact of the Peaceful Uses of Atomic Energy, attributes Russia's tremendous increase in scientific manpower to a decision taken in the Kremlin more than 25 years ago. The decision: To make science and engineering, and the growth of young scientists and engineers, "a keystone of national policy."

"The success of this propaganda and educational venture, using all media open to the state in these last 25 years, has been little short of astounding," Dr. Dunning said in a recent speech. "All of us who have studied the campaign have been generally far too conservative in appraising its effectiveness. * * * Now the Russians are passing us in numbers, but what is even more

serious, their rate of growth is 2 or 3 times that of ours."

While the tendency in the United States is to look down on scientists and engineers as bookworms, Dr. Dunning said, Russia idolizes its scientific personnel. Dr. Lundby agrees. "While Russian girls dream of becoming ballerinas," he told me, "Russian boys dream of becoming scientists. The true place of science in the Soviet Union is so different from what I believed that it took my breath away. In the supposedly classless Soviet society, the scientists are the favored sons. Even beginners are paid about 10 times more than a skilled laborer. They have cars, town apartments, country places, TV sets. Most important, and contrary to western impressions, research scientists have complete freedom in their choice of work."

From other sources, I learned that most Soviet scientists can ignore politics—provided they appear at the right public functions and parrot the right phrases on such occasions. Nor do they seem to mind doing these things, or to miss the right of political discussion. They love argument and dispute violently over every scientific idea and theory, but they don't question the Communist regime. They simply accept it, like the weather.

They keep abreast of what is going on in the outside scientific world by reading scientific journals and reports in English, French, and German; their libraries, in fact, have more copies of important scientific magazines and textbooks than would be found in most American institutes, according to Dr. Lundby. And far from downgrading western work, he says, Russian scientists have a high respect for it. They know all the places in the United States where nuclear research is going on, and discussed it with him.

Surprisingly, Dr. Lundby reports, he found Soviet scientists more eager to talk about their experiences, explain their accomplishments and discuss future research than most American scientists. The Russians showed no awareness that they were talking to a westerner, he says.

One of the questions most frequently asked in the United States about Russia's nuclear progress is what part espionage played in the Soviet advance. In other words, how much time did the atomic secrets betrayed by Dr. Klaus Fuchs, the British scientist, and other western sources save the Soviets? Dr. Lundby sought the answer during his visit to Russia.

Here is his report: "All during my stay—during my visits to institutes and installations—I tried to see to what extent the activities of spies had helped the development of atomic energy in the U. S. S. R. However, I found that Soviet scientists work differently than those in Western countries; they seem to do the same type of job with their own particular techniques.

"Doubtless, facts transmitted by spies have saved the Soviet scientists some time. But from the amount of basic work the Russians have done, and from the experimental results they showed me and the individually designed engineering apparatus they have developed, the indications are that whatever time was saved could not have been much—certainly not a matter of years. After all, Russian scientists have essentially the same background and experience as any other scientists."

Some people have blamed security leaks and Soviet spies for the fact that the Russians were able to explode a hydrogen bomb before we did. The facts indicate otherwise.

Ash from the first Soviet H-bomb explosion fell in Japan, and analysis showed that it contained lithium. That element was the secret of the Soviet success, and all evidence indicates that the Soviets developed the technique for its use themselves. Up to that time, most Western researchers had believed that expensive tritium—triple-weight hydrogen—was necessary for a hydrogen bomb, and it took 90 pounds of then-scarce plutonium to make 1 pound of tritium. The Soviets showed that a light, cheap, plentiful lithium salt could cut down, perhaps even eliminate, the need for tritium. Further, lithium combined with the other essential ingredient in the H-bomb, deuterium (double-weight hydrogen), so that it could be carried in an easy, compact form instead of having to be compressed into liquid and transported under vacuum.

Therefore, Fuchs and others familiar with Western research probably could not have contributed anything valuable to the Soviet discovery of lithium as the key ingredient of the H-bomb. Even if they had known some of our thermonuclear plans, their information presumably would have been about the experiments that resulted in our impractical device of 1952.

Not that the 1952 device did not serve a useful purpose. It did—it proved that the heat created by the fission of an A-bomb was enough to cause the fusion of heavy hydrogen and release its even more destructive power. By the time the Russians exploded their first H-bomb the following year, we, too, were on the trail of lithium—although obviously not so far along it. We exploded our own lithium-based H-bomb in March 1954, adding a further factor of fission in the uranium blanket around the bomb to the fission-fusion mass. The explosion set a new high in destructive power—possibly as much as 20 megatons (equal to 20 million tons of TNT)—and from this point on there seems to be no limit to the size and strength of fission-fusion-fission devices.

Last November's high-altitude Russian explosion seems to be of this order. We still don't know the size of the atom-bomb trigger used by the U. S. S. R., but Russia's Communist boss, Nikita Khrushchev, said the Soviets were working on "minimum amounts." This is the way to the thermonuclear warhead for guided missiles, ballistic missiles, projectiles—transportable thermonuclear devices of all kinds.

Such, then, is the state of Soviet nuclear science today. In the opinion of leading American scientists, it poses a challenge to the United States which cannot be ignored. The terms of that challenge were laid down by Columbia's Dr. Dunning in a recent speech. Either we must correct the imbalance caused by our approach to science and engineering, he said, or "we might just as well write this country off the books."

Anniversary of the Proclamation of the Republic of Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ADAM C. POWELL, JR.

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 21, 1956

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, in observance of the celebration of the second anniversary of the government of President Ngo Dinh Diem, of Vietnam, on July 7, 1956, and because Congress will not be in session on the occasion of the celebration of the first anniversary of the proclamation of the Republic of Vietnam, October 26, 1956, I wish to take this opportunity to extend sincere felicitations and best wishes to President Ngo Dinh Diem.

Under the leadership of a dedicated man, President Ngo Dinh Diem, the people of Vietnam shook themselves loose from both the shackles of colonialism and the tentacles of communism. By the referendum of October 23, 1955, the majority of the Vietnamese people clearly manifested their desire to get away from all forms of corruption of the past. In the October 26 election of the Chief of State of Vietnam, Premier Ngo Dinh Diem, and the subsequent proclamation of the republic, for the first time in modern history, the people of Vietnam had an opportunity to vote in a national election. The elected leader of the Vietnamese people is a man whose patriotism, courage, and honesty are renown the world over.

Political independence can only be complete where economic independence is also genuine. The National Government of Vietnam has been fighting a valiant struggle against the exigencies of forces which have served to disrupt and dislocate the economy. Possessing considerable potentialities for a country whose development is still in its beginnings, Vietnam devotes most of its resources to economic reconstruction.

That President Ngo Dinh Diem is unwilling merely to give orders without seeing for himself the progress being made in the national reconstruction policy he has followed since coming to office is evidenced by his frequent tours throughout the Provinces.

The press and information service of the Embassy of Vietnam in the United States reports in its volume 2, No. 1, edition:

These Provinces are almost entirely agricultural and their population of nearly 1 million is almost completely made up of farmers. As a result, President Ngo's visit has emphasized the importance of the Government's agricultural policy and the value of gifts of all kinds made by the Government to the farmers of the area.

Under the leadership of President Ngo dinh Diem, the government has as its main objective the well-being of the people, without political or religious discrimination:

We are only beginning. Thanks to the help of friendly countries, especially the United States, we can see our way to achieving our aim of raising the standard of living and contributing to the happiness of every member of the rural community as much as possible.

An address given by the Minister for Foreign Affairs, Mr. Vu van Mau, to the ministerial conference of the Colombo plan at Singapore further underscored the economic problems facing the nation:

Our economic troubles, resulting from 8 years of war, are still cause for concern: factors include the dwindling of the production potential, a chronic trade deficit, the unaccustomed obstruction of channels of distribution to the detriment of production. * * * Immense mining and forest resources, essential for our growing industries, have been taken from our control, we hope, at least, temporarily. Deprived of the coalfields of Hongay and Dong Trieu, we, and the whole free world, find ourselves without any important source of thermal energy and at the same time robbed of a considerable reserve of exportable materials. * * * The reestab-

lishment of these * * * will necessitate considerable investment and cannot be achieved without difficulty and delay.

The development of a strong public administration, the raising of the economic level of a nation, are difficult tasks. The free world must cooperate wholeheartedly in achievement of the common goal which is to build a free and strong Vietnam. The president of Vietnam and the National Government are working toward peace and social progress—silently, steadily, without fanfare. In this struggle for national survival, a survival necessary to the whole Far East, Vietnam asks the understanding of its allies, and believes that "From this understanding we will draw the strength necessary to achieve a purpose which is more than just."

The Vietnamese people are very grateful for the generous help given by the United States and France and also for the aid given within the framework of the Colombo plan, by Britain, Australia, Canada, and New Zealand. They appreciate this aid fully in that it is making it possible for them to conquer communism by combatting poverty.

As one who deeply believes in freedom, democracy, and the importance of achieving a better understanding among all nations, I want to take this opportunity to wish President Ngo Dinh Diem and the people of Vietnam every success which they so richly deserve.

How To Argue With a Republican

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEE METCALF
OF MONTANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 19, 1956

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Speaker, the Democratic Party will win the coming election if it can get the facts to the American people. The following article in the May issue of the Democratic Digest presents impressive and factual refutations to some of the most commonly heard arguments made by members of the opposition:

HOW TO ARGUE WITH A REPUBLICAN

IN MILITARY MATTERS, IKE KNOWS BEST

GOP argument: "Fortunately, the man who is President of the United States is one of the greatest military leaders in the world today. He is an expert * * * and I believe that we can and that we should have confidence in his decision in [military] policy."—Vice President NIXON, March 13, 1954.

The answer: No man's judgment is infallible, no matter how expert he is, and President Eisenhower's judgment about our defense policies has been proven imperfect by his own reversals of policy in the defense field. Examples:

On March 29, 1950, less than 3 months before the Communists attacked, General Eisenhower told Congress "I have strongly urged that [$15 billion for defense] not be exceeded." He expressed his belief that we could "work out an effective defense at that level." Only a few months later, after the Korean attack Congress was appropriating $60 billion for defense—four times what General Eisenhower thought sufficient.

In 1947, as Army Chief of Staff, Eisenhower said: "The one place the current days and times we must not cut is the Air Forces." Yet in 1953 Eisenhower cut the Air Force $5.5 billion, reducing Air Force goals from 143 to 120 wings. In 1954, Eisenhower in effect admitted the error of this by increasing the Air Force budget and upping the Air Force goal to 137 wings.

WORKINGMEN AND WOMEN SHOULD SUPPORT THE GOP

GOP argument: I do not fear the participation of union leaders in the next campaign * * * they will find that union members are better off today than they have ever been in the history of unions."—Vice President NIXON, February 13, 1956.

The answer: Compare the increase in workingmen's wages versus corporation profits between 1954 and 1955:

	Percent
Corporation profits	up 28
Industry wages	up only 6
Jones & Laughlin Steel Co	up 100
Steel workers	up only 14
General Motors	up 48
Auto workers	up only 10
General Tire & Rubber Co	up 116
Rubber workers	up only 11
Monsanto Chemical Co	up 78
Chemical workers	up only 5

SURPLUSES TO BLAME FOR LOW FARM PRICES

GOP argument: "Why are farm prices low? The major reason is the tremendous farm surpluses which hang over the market."—Vice President NIXON, January 20, 1956.

The answer: Farm prices have declined drastically on commodities in which there is no Government-held surplus (such as beef cattle, which have suffered a 29-percent price drop; and hogs, which have dropped 39 percent). Therefore, surpluses are by no means the major cause of the farm slump.

What is more, farm surpluses are not as large as GOP spokesmen would have us believe. On only two commodities (cotton and wheat) was there more than an 8 months' supply in Government hands as of December 31, 1955. On other important commodities, this was the supply on hand (at 1952 rates of domestic consumption and exports):

Months and days present supply will last

Commodity:	
Corn	3 months 19 days
Butter	1 month 14 days
Oats	24 days
Rye	7 months 25 days
Rice	7 months 8 days

INFLATION HAS BEEN HALTED

GOP argument: "Inflation has been halted; the cost of living stabilized."—President Eisenhower, January 5, 1956.

The answer: The costs of many necessities of life have risen substantially under the GOP, costing United States consumers billions (see table below). The reason the over-all cost of living has been steady is the drastic 17.7-percent drop in farm prices, which has brought about a much smaller drop (3.2 percent) in food prices.

Percent price increase, 1952 to 1955:

Rent	11
Gas and electricity	6
Other fuels	5
Household operation [1]	7
Medical care	9

[1] Includes such items as furniture, kitchen appliances, laundry, telephone, and domestic services.

Total added cost to United States consumers:

Rent	$2,196,000,000
Gas and electricity	537,000,000
Other fuels	383,000,000
Household operation [1]	4,416,000,000
Medical care	1,842,000,000
Total	9,374,000,000

[1] Includes such items as furniture, kitchen appliances, laundry, telephone, and domestic services.

GOP HAS CUT GOVERNMENT SPENDING AND WASTE

GOP argument: "Government waste and extravagance were searched out. Nonessential activities were dropped. * * * Total spending was cut by $14 billion."—President Eisenhower, January 5, 1956.

The answer: Of the cuts in total Government spending between the first Eisenhower budget and the most recent GOP budget, every penny has come out of the defense budget—with the result that Air Force build-up has been delayed 2 years, and the Russians are outproducing us in many aircraft types.

Actually, the cost of civilian Government (nondefense spending) has gone up under Eisenhower (from $21.3 billion in the first GOP year to $25.5 billion in the most recent GOP budget). Even spending over which the administration has complete control—i. e. spending not fixed by law or national security requirements—has gone up under Eisenhower (from $8 billion in the first GOP year to $9 billion in the most recent GOP budget).

GOP GAVE RECORD TAX CUTS

GOP argument: "[GOP economies] made possible * * * the largest tax cut in any year in our history. Almost $7½ billion were released and every taxpayer in the country benefited."—President Eisenhower, January 5, 1956.

The answer: Of the $7.4 billion in tax cuts that took effect in 1954, $6 billion was actually enacted by a Democratic Congress before the GOP took office. And in the $1.4 billion tax-cut bill that the GOP did sponsor, the tax-relief dollar was distributed this way:

Seventy-three cents went to corporations.

Eighteen cents went to families over $5,000.

Only 9 cents went to families under $5,000.

GOP "FLEXIBLE" FARM SUPPORTS NOT YET TESTED

GOP argument: "We should not scuttle and run before the flexible price support system, advocated by Secretary Benson and President Eisenhower, has been tried out."—Senator KNOWLAND, Republican of California, October 29, 1955.

The answer: For most farm commodities, the "sliding scale" system has been in effect ever since Benson took office in 1953, and Benson has taken full advantage of it. He has lowered supports on every commodity on which he had authority to do so. The following table shows how Benson has lowered farm supports, and how this has raised production, rather than reducing it, as Benson claims it should.

Between 1952–55 price support went down

	Percent
Sorghum grain	24
Rye	17
Barley	23
Flaxseed	23
Oats	22
Soybeans	20
Milk	17

Between 1952–55 production went up

	Percent
Sorghum grain	173
Rye	75
Barley	71
Flaxseed	42
Oats	30
Soybeans	30
Milk	9

GOP ACHIEVED WAR-TO-PEACE TRANSITION WITHOUT DEPRESSION

GOP argument: "Under President Eisenhower • • • the country has passed from a wartime economy to a peacetime economy • • • a major dislocation. This economic miracle has never before been accomplished • • • in all recorded history." (Postmaster General Summerfield, October 27, 1954.)

The answer: This is hardly a peacetime economy, with defense spending higher today than it was during the height of the Korean fighting. ($40.8 billion in 1955, compared with $37.3 billion in 1951).

Moreover, after World War II, the Democrats succeeded in leading the United States through a much more drastic war-to-peace transition with less unemployment than we have today. Here are the facts:

Drop in defense spending:

	Billion
1945–47 (Democrats)	$62.6
1953–55 (Republican)	8.1

Average unemployment:

	Million
1947	2.1
1955	2.7

GOP FOREIGN POLICY HAS STRENGTH AND FIRMNESS

GOP argument: "Strength, firmness, and courage is the way to peace without surrender. And the American people want four more years of that kind of decisive leadership. (Vice President NIXON, January 20, 1956.)

The answer: Does the GOP consider Secretary of State Dulles' "three times to the brink of war" misadventure an example of "strength, firmness and courage" in foreign policy?

Does the GOP consider the recent confusion over American policy on the tank shipment to the Middle East (in which the State Department reversed its policy twice in 2 days) an example of "decisive leadership?"

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is located in Statuary Hall, House wing, where Mr. Frank Brodie is in attendance during the sessions of Congress to receive orders for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month, and where single copies may also be purchased. Orders are also accepted for the printing of speeches in pamphlet form.

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

LAWS AND RULES FOR PUBLICATION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

CODE OF LAWS OF THE UNITED STATES

TITLE 44, SECTION 181. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; ARRANGEMENT, STYLE, CONTENTS, AND INDEXES.—The Joint Committee on Printing shall have control of the arrangement and style of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and while providing that it shall be substantially a verbatim report of proceedings shall take all needed action for the reduction of unnecessary bulk, and shall provide for the publication of an index of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD semimonthly during the sessions of Congress and at the close thereof. (Jan. 12, 1895, c. 23, § 13, 28 Stat. 603.)

TITLE 44, SECTION 182b. SAME; ILLUSTRATIONS, MAPS, DIAGRAMS.—No maps, diagrams, or illustrations may be inserted in the RECORD without the approval of the Joint Committee on Printing. (June 20, 1936, c. 630, § 2, 49 Stat. 1546.)

Pursuant to the foregoing statute and in order to provide for the prompt publication and delivery of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the Joint Committee on Printing has adopted the following rules, to which the attention of Senators, Representatives, and Delegates is respectfully invited:

1. *Arrangement of the daily Record.*—The Public Printer will arrange the contents of the daily RECORD as follows: First, the Senate proceedings; second, the House proceedings; third, the Appendix: *Provided*, That when the proceedings of the Senate are not received in time to follow this arrangement, the Public Printer may begin the RECORD with the House proceedings. The proceedings of each House and the Appendix shall each begin a new page, with appropriate headings centered thereon.

2. *Type and style.*—The Public Printer shall print the report of the proceedings and debates of the Senate and House of Representatives, as furnished by the Official Reporters of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, in 7½-point type; and all matter included in the remarks or speeches of Members of Congress, other than their own words, and all reports, documents, and other matter authorized to be inserted in the RECORD shall be printed in 6½-point type; and all rollcalls shall be printed in 6-point type. No italic or black type nor words in capitals or small capitals shall be used for emphasis or prominence; nor will unusual indentions be permitted. These restrictions do not apply to the printing of or quotations from historical, official, or legal documents or papers of which a literal reproduction is necessary.

3. *Return of manuscript.*—When manuscript is submitted to Members for revision it should be returned to the Government Printing Office not later than 9 o'clock p. m. in order to insure publication in the RECORD issued on the following morning; and if all of said manuscript is not furnished at the time specified, the Public Printer is authorized to withhold it from the RECORD for 1 day. In no case will a speech be printed in the RECORD of the day of its delivery if the manuscript is furnished later than 12 o'clock midnight.

4. *Tabular matter.*—The manuscript of speeches containing tabular statements to be published in the RECORD shall be in the hands of the Public Printer not later than 7 o'clock p. m., to insure publication the following morning.

5. *Proof furnished.*—Proofs of "leave to print" and advance speeches will not be furnished the day the manuscript is received but will be submitted the following day, whenever possible to do so without causing delay in the publication of the regular proceedings of Congress. Advance speeches shall be set in the RECORD style of type, and not more than six sets of proofs may be furnished to Members without charge.

6. *Notation of withheld remarks.*—If manuscript or proofs have not been returned in time for publication in the proceedings, the Public Printer will insert the words "Mr. ——— addressed the Senate (House or Committee). His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix," and proceed with the printing of the RECORD.

7. *Thirty-day limit.*—The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD any speech or extension of remarks which has been withheld for a period exceeding 30 calendar days from the date when its printing was authorized: *Provided*, That at the expiration of each session of Congress the time limit herein fixed shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee.

8. *Corrections.*—The permanent RECORD is made up for printing and binding 30 days after each daily publication is issued; therefore all corrections must be sent to the Public Printer within that time: *Provided*, That upon the final adjournment of each session of Congress the time limit shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee: *Provided further*, That no Member of Congress shall be entitled to make more than one revision. Any revision shall consist only of corrections of the original copy and shall not include deletions of correct material, substitutions for correct material, or additions of new subject matter.

9. The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the full report or print of any committee or subcommittee when said report or print has been previously printed. This rule shall not be construed to apply to conference reports.

10. *Appendix to daily Record.*—When either House has granted leave to print (1) a speech not delivered in either House, (2) a newspaper or magazine article, or (3) any other matter not germane to the proceedings, the same shall be published in the Appendix except in cases of duplication. In such cases only the first item received in the Government Printing Office will be printed. This rule shall not apply to quotations which form part of a speech of a Member, or to an authorized extension of his own remarks: *Provided*, That no address, speech, or article delivered or released subsequently to the final adjournment of a session of Congress may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

11. *Estimate of cost.*—No extraneous matter in excess of two pages in any one instance may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by a Member under leave to print or to extend his remarks unless the manuscript is accompanied by an estimate in writing from the Public Printer of the probable cost of publishing the same, which estimate of cost must be announced by the Member when such leave is requested; but this rule shall not apply to excerpts from letters, telegrams, or articles presented in connection with a speech delivered in the course of debate or to communications from State legislatures, addresses or articles by the President and the members of his Cabinet, the Vice President, or a Member of Congress. For the purposes of this regulation, any one article printed in two or more parts, with or without individual headings, shall be considered as a single extension and the two-page rule shall apply. The Public Printer or the Official Reporters of the House or Senate shall return to the Member of the respective House any matter submitted for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which is in contravention of this paragraph.

12. *Official Reporters.*—The Official Reporters of each House shall indicate on the manuscript and prepare headings for all matter to be printed in the Appendix, and shall make suitable reference thereto at the proper place in the proceedings.

SENATORS WITH RESIDENCES IN WASHINGTON

OFFICE ADDRESS: Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

[Streets northwest unless otherwise stated]

Vice President, Richard Nixon

Aiken, George D., *Vt*.....Carroll Arms.
Allott, Gordon, *Colo*.....
Anderson, Clinton P., *N. Mex.*.....6 Wesley Circle.
Barrett, Frank A., *Wyo*.....The Woodner.
Beall, J. Glenn, *Md*.....
Bender, George H., *Ohio*.....120 Schotts Court NE.
Bennett, Wallace F., *Utah*.....
Bible, Alan, *Nev*.....
Bricker, John W., *Ohio*.....The Mayflower.
Bridges, Styles, *N. H*.....
Bush, Prescott, *Conn*.....
Butler, John Marshall, *Md*.....
Byrd, Harry Flood, *Va*.....The Shoreham.
Capehart, Homer E., *Ind*.....The Westchester.
Carlson, Frank, *Kans*.....Sheraton-Park
Case, Clifford P., *N. J*.....
Case, Francis, *S. Dak*.....4635 Mass. Ave.
Chavez, Dennis, *N. Mex*.....3327 Cleveland Ave.
Clements, Earle C., *Ky*.....The Congressional
Cotton, Norris, *N. H*.....
Curtis, Carl T., *Nebr*.....
Daniel, Price, *Tex*.....
Dirksen, Everett M., *Ill*.....
Douglas, Paul H., *Ill*.....
Duff, James H., *Pa*.....
Dworshak, Henry C., *Idaho*.....
Eastland, James O., *Miss*.....5101 Macomb St.
Ellender, Allen J., *La*.....
Ervin, Samuel J., Jr., *N. C*.....
Flanders, Ralph E., *Vt*.....
Frear, J. Allen, Jr., *Del*.....
Fulbright, J. William, *Ark*.....
George, Walter F., *Ga*.....The Mayflower.
Goldwater, Barry M., *Ariz*.....
Gore, Albert, *Tenn*.....
Green, Theodore Francis, *R. I.*.....University Club.
Hayden, Carl, *Ariz*.....
Hennings, Thomas C., Jr., *Mo.*.....
Hickenlooper, Bourke B., *Iowa.*.....5511 Cedar Parkway, Chevy Chase, Md.
Hill, Lister, *Ala*.....
Holland, Spessard L., *Fla*.....Sheraton-Park
Hruska, Roman L., *Nebr*.....
Humphrey, Hubert H., *Minn.*.....
Ives, Irving M., *N. Y*.....
Jackson, Henry M., *Wash*.....
Jenner, William E., *Ind*.....
Johnson, Lyndon B., *Tex*.....
Johnston, Olin D., *S. C*.....
Kefauver, Estes, *Tenn*.....4848 Upton St.
Kennedy, John F., *Mass*.....
Kerr, Robert S., *Okla*.....
Knowland, William F., *Calif.*.....
Kuchel, Thomas H., *Calif*.....
Laird, William R. III, *W. Va*.....
Langer, William, *N. Dak*.....2101 Conn. Ave.
Lehman, Herbert H., *N. Y*.....Sheraton-Park
Long, Russell B., *La*.....
McCarthy, Joseph R., *Wis*.....
McClellan, John L., *Ark*.....
McNamara, Pat, *Mich*.....
Magnuson, Warren G., *Wash.*.....The Shoreham.
Malone, George W., *Nev*.....The Mayflower.
Mansfield, Mike, *Mont*.....
Martin, Edward, *Pa*.....
Martin, Thos. E., *Iowa*.....4545 Conn. Ave.
Millikin, Eugene D., *Colo*.....
Monroney, A. S. Mike, *Okla.*.....
Morse, Wayne, *Oreg*.....5020 Lowell St.
Mundt, Karl E., *S. Dak*.....122 Schotts Court NE.
Murray, James E., *Mont*.....The Shoreham.
Neely, Matthew M., *W. Va*.....
Neuberger, Richard L., *Oreg.*.....
O'Mahoney, Joseph C., *Wyo.*.....Sheraton-Park
Pastore, John O., *R. I*.....
Payne, Frederick G., *Maine*.....
Potter, Charles E., *Mich*.....
Purtell, William A., *Conn*.....
Robertson, A. Willis, *Va*.....
Russell, Richard B., *Ga*.....
Saltonstall, Leverett, *Mass*.....2320 Tracy Pl.
Schoeppel, Andrew F., *Kans.*.....
Scott, W. Kerr, *N. C*.....
Smathers, George A., *Fla*.....
Smith, H. Alexander, *N. J*.....Sheraton-Park
Smith, Margaret Chase, (Mrs.), *Maine.*.....
Sparkman, John J., *Ala*.....4928 Indian Lane
Stennis, John, *Miss*.....
Symington, Stuart, *Mo*.....
Thye, Edward J., *Minn*.....
Watkins, Arthur V., *Utah*.....
Welker, Herman, *Idaho*.....4823 Tilden St.
Wiley, Alexander, *Wis*.....2122 Mass. Ave.
Williams, John J., *Del*.....
Wofford, Thomas A., *S. C*.....
Young, Milton R., *N. Dak*.....Quebec House So.

OFFICERS OF THE SENATE

Secretary—Felton M. Johnston.
Chief Clerk—Emery L. Frazier.
Sergeant at Arms—Joseph C. Duke.
Secretary for the Majority—Robert G. Baker.
Secretary for the Minority—J. Mark Trice.
Chaplain—Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D.

STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE SENATE

Committee on Agriculture and Forestry

Messrs. Ellender (chairman), Johnston of South Carolina, Holland, Eastland, Clements, Humphrey, Scott, Symington, Aiken, Young, Thye, Hickenlooper, Mundt, Williams, and Schoeppel.

Committee on Appropriations

Messrs. Hayden (chairman), Russell, Chavez, Ellender, Hill, McClellan, Robertson, Magnuson, Holland, Stennis, Clements, Johnson of Texas, Bridges, Saltonstall, Young, Knowland, Thye, McCarthy, Mundt, Mrs. Smith of Maine, Messrs. Dworshak, Dirksen, and Potter.

Committee on Armed Services

Messrs. Russell (chairman), Byrd, Johnson of Texas, Kefauver, Stennis, Symington, Jackson, Ervin, Saltonstall, Bridges, Flanders, Mrs. Smith of Maine, Messrs. Case of South Dakota, Duff, and Welker.

Committee on Banking and Currency

Messrs. Fulbright (chairman), Robertson, Sparkman, Frear, Douglas, Lehman, Monroney, Morse, Capehart, Bricker, Ives, Bennett, Bush, Beall, and Payne.

Committee on the District of Columbia

Messrs. Neely (chairman), Bible, McNamara, Morse, Frear, Beall, Hruska, Case of New Jersey, and Allott.

Committee on Finance

Messrs. Byrd (chairman), George, Kerr, Frear, Long, Smathers, Anderson, Douglas, Millikin, Martin of Pennsylvania, Williams, Flanders, Malone, Carlson, and Bennett.

Committee on Foreign Relations

Messrs. George (chairman), Green, Fulbright, Sparkman, Humphrey, Mansfield, Morse, Long, Wiley, Smith of New Jersey, Hickenlooper, Langer, Knowland, Aiken, and Capehart.

Committee on Government Operations

Messrs. McClellan (chairman), Jackson, Kennedy, Symington, Ervin, Humphrey, Wofford, McCarthy, Mundt, Mrs. Smith of Maine, Messrs. Cotton, Bender, and Martin of Iowa.

Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs

Messrs. Murray (chairman), Anderson, Jackson, O'Mahoney, Bible, Neuberger, Laird, Scott, Millikin, Malone, Watkins, Dworshak, Kuchel, Barrett, and Goldwater.

Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce

Messrs. Magnuson (chairman), Pastore, Monroney, Smathers, Daniel, Ervin, Bible, Wofford, Bricker, Schoeppel, Butler, Potter, Duff, Purtell, and Payne.

Committee on the Judiciary

Messrs. Eastland (chairman), Kefauver, Johnston of South Carolina, Hennings, McClellan, Daniel, O'Mahoney, Neely, Wiley, Langer, Jenner, Watkins, Dirksen, Welker, and Butler.

Committee on Labor and Public Welfare

Messrs. Hill (chairman), Murray, Neely, Lehman, Kennedy, McNamara, ———, Smith of New Jersey, Ives, Purtell, Goldwater, Bender, and Allott.

Committee on Post Office and Civil Service

Messrs. Johnston of South Carolina (chairman), Pastore, Monroney, Hennings, Scott, Neuberger, Laird, Carlson, Jenner, Langer, Curtis, Martin of Iowa, and Case of New Jersey.

Committee on Public Works

Messrs. Chavez (chairman), Kerr, Gore, McNamara, Neuberger, Wofford, ———, Martin of Pennsylvania, Case of South Dakota, Bush, Kuchel, Cotton, and Hruska.

Committee on Rules and Administration

Messrs. Green (chairman), Hayden, Hennings, Gore, Mansfield, Jenner, Barrett, McCarthy, and Curtis.

UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT

Mr. Chief Justice Warren, of California, Hotel Sheraton-Park, Washington, D. C.
Mr. Justice Black, of Alabama, 619 S. Lee St., Alexandria, Va.
Mr. Justice Reed, of Kentucky, the Mayflower.
Mr. Justice Frankfurter, of Massachusetts, 3018 Dumbarton Ave.
Mr. Justice Douglas, of Washington, 3701 Connecticut Ave.
Mr. Justice Burton, of Ohio, the Dodge.
Mr. Justice Clark, of Texas, 2101 Connecticut Ave.
Mr. Justice Minton, of Indiana, the Methodist Building.
Mr. Justice Harlan, of New York, 1677 31st St.

OFFICERS OF THE SUPREME COURT

Clerk—Harold B. Willey, 3214 N. Wakefield St., Arlington, Va.
Deputy Clerk—Reginald C. Dilli, 1329 Hemlock St.
Deputy Clerk—Hugh W. Barr, 4701 Connecticut Ave.
Marshal—T. Perry Lippitt, 6004 Corbin Road.
Reporter—Walter Wyatt, 1702 Kalmia Rd.
Librarian—Helen Newman, 126 3d St. SE.

UNITED STATES JUDICIAL CIRCUITS

JUSTICES ASSIGNED
TERRITORY EMBRACED

District of Columbia: Mr. Chief Justice Warren. District of Columbia.

First judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Frankfurter. Maine, New Hampshire, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Puerto Rico.

Second judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Harlan. Vermont, Connecticut, New York.

Third judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Burton, Pennsylvania, New Jersey, Delaware, Virgin Islands.

Fourth judicial circuit: Mr. Chief Justice Warren. Maryland, Virginia, West Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina.

Fifth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Black. Georgia, Florida, Alabama, Mississippi, Louisiana, Texas, Canal Zone.

Sixth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Reed. Ohio, Michigan, Kentucky, Tennessee.

Seventh judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Minton. Indiana, Illinois, Wisconsin.

Eighth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Clark. Minnesota, North Dakota, South Dakota, Iowa, Nebraska, Missouri, Arkansas.

Ninth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Douglas. Washington, Oregon, Montana, Idaho, California, Nevada, Arizona, Alaska, Hawaii.

Tenth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Clark. Colorado, Wyoming, Utah, Kansas, Oklahoma, New Mexico.

Appendix

Brief History of the Oregon State Federation of Labor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, June 22, 1956

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, a most interesting historical presentation of the long annals of the Oregon State Federation of Labor which, during recent years, has celebrated its 50th anniversary.

The article, which was published in the Oregon Labor Press of June 15, 1956, was written by Kelley Loe, who served for 17 years as a member of the staff of the Oregon Federation of Labor, and prior to that was an active figure independently in the labor movement of the Pacific Northwest. Mr. Loe is a most able reporter and historian.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATE FEDERATION'S COLORFUL STORY DATES FROM 1902

(By Kelley Loe)

(This brief history of the Oregon State Federation of Labor is excerpted from a longer history written for the federation's 50th anniversary convention in 1952. Its author, Kelley Loe, served for 17 years as a key member of the federation's staff prior to his retirement in April 1954.)

The birth of the Oregon State Federation of Labor on May 5, 1902, was the culmination of labor organization growth during the preceding 20 years. However, the intensive work leading to organization was in the preceding few weeks, largely through the efforts of G. Y. Harry, a sheet metalworker who became the federation's first president.

During the 1880's a number of local craft unions were formed in Oregon, most of them in Portland. In the 1890's a larger number were formed. In the late 1880's a Portland city central body was organized, largely at the urging of Samuel Gompers. This was named the Federated Trades Council.

It had a stormy career and in the 1890's an attempt was made to form a dual council, but its career was brief—probably due to the AFL frowning upon the dual movement whose sponsers' purpose was to supplant the existing council. Fragmentary evidence indicates that the backers of the new and dual movement were dissatisfied because the existing council did not meet their desire for greater political action.

The Federated Trades Council saw continued dissension even after organization of the State Federation, and in 1908 was reorganized under the name Central Labor Council of Portland and Vicinity. It consisted of subcouncils such as the building trades, metal trades, label trades, and others. Each of them then, as now, did much of their work within the section.

At the time of organizing the State federation, three other city central bodies had been organized and were represented in the organizing convention. These city central bodies were at Astoria, Baker, LaGrande, and Portland.

Agitation for organization of a State branch of the AFL was begun by Mr. Harry in 1901, first in the Portland Building Trades Council which then was regarded as the backbone of the labor movement, being the leading group in fighting for the 8-hour day, a battle that was paralleled throughout the Nation.

Organizer Harry lost no time in making good his prediction that organization could be accomplished in a short time. He went up the Willamette Valley and into eastern Oregon. Where he found an insufficient number of workers to obtain a craft charter, and that was true in most localities, he organized Federal unions, that is, unions which accept in membership a worker in any craft. Most of his organizing success was in that field, as is shown by the number of Federal unions which sent delegates to the first convention in 1902.

The Oregon experience is a glowing example of what can be accomplished by a determined man, or small group, whose vision does not include failure. Had G. Y. Harry not persisted, the Oregon Federation might not have been born for many years after 1902.

Some of the oldtimers insisted that one of the motives which kept Harry active in his agitation was his desire for political action. He was an active party man (Democrat) but the official record indicates that his first interest was in legislation beneficial to labor.

Mr. Harry declined renomination for president of the State Federation at the second convention held at LaGrande in May 1903. Verbal reports, not supported by any official records, are that partisan political considerations entered into the election of the second president of the Federation. Charles Gram a teamster who was later to serve as State labor commissioner for 24 years (1919 to 1943), was elected in 1903 and served for 5 years.

Neither the president nor the secretary received a salary for many years, being only paid for time devoted to the Federation. Many years later salaries were fixed for both officers.

First officers of the federation, in addition to President Harry, were: secretary, William H. Barry, Portland printer; treasurer, Chales Mickley, Portland tailor; vice presidents (now known as executive board members), J. F. Welch, Astoria fisherman; George Hornby, Portland longshoreman; G. F. Johnson, baker, member of a federal union, employed in county assessor's office; W. E. Miller, Salem federal union; Fred Langever, Pendleton painter.

Pictures of the first federation officers, appearing in the Oregonian and in the Labor Press, disclose that 7 of the 8 officers were bewhiskered, President Harry sporting a heavy handlebar mustache. Unfortunately the photographs cannot be obtained.

The initiative and referendum amendment to the State constitution was on the State ballot to be voted upon a month after the Oregon State federation was organized. Members of labor unions had been in the forefront, along with farm organizations promoting the amendment.

The organizing convention was unanimous in support of the amendment which was to give the citizens of the State the last word in legislative enactment. Popularity of the measure was attested when it was adopted by the voters of Oregon on June 2, 1902, by a ratio of approximately 11 to 1.

Labor, agriculture, and other groups thought the interests of the people were secure forevermore. Later it was discovered that reactionary interests would attempt to use the initiative and referendum for their own selfish ends.

The first convention also declared for nomination of party candidates for public office by primary elections, for election of United States Senators by popular vote, to abolish contract labor by prisoners, an 8-hour day by statute, regulation of public utilities, and creation of a department of labor in the State government.

The initiative and referendum was adopted in less than a month after the convention. The labor bureau was created at the session of the 1903 legislature, and direct primaries, election of United States Senators by popular vote, and the recall of public officials all were written into the State law within a few years.

Eight years later the State adopted an initiated measure known as the employers' liability law, which removed the common law defenses against personal injury claims by workers. The State federation of labor and farm organizations initated the bill by petition. In 1913 the workmen's compensation law, placed upon the ballot at a special election, was adopted.

In all this popular government trend, union labor took a leading part and was almost unanimous in its support. Labor then was voting perhaps 90 percent, as were farmers—indicating an interest in Government that has regrettably declined in recent years. Unanimity of labor voting then was effective, and when joined by farmers always prevailed in elections.

The degree to which the legislature bowed to the will of the people is further shown by enactment of a measure creating the Industrial Welfare Commission in 1913. The Commission was given power in regulating hours and wages for women and minors employed in industry.

The 1919 legislature enacted the first Oregon law specifically barring labor injunctions, prohibiting courts from granting restraining orders involving or growing out of a dispute concerning terms or conditions of employment.

Gradually the courts—or some of them—by interpretation weakened the law. Effective relief was had when in March 1933 the Oregon Legislature adopted what is known as the Little Norris-LaGuardia Act, patterned after the Federal law enacted by Congress in 1932.

A number of antistrike bills have appeared in the State legislature, but generally they have been defeated. In 1938 opponents of union labor initiated an antistrike or antilabor bill which, owing to much industrial turmoil at the time, was adopted by a majority of almost 50,000. It was invalidated by the State supreme court 2 years later, without a single attempted prosecution under its drastic provisions.

Since that time industrial relations have steadily improved until now Oregon stands in the forefront in amicable relations between employers and unions.

Antilabor measures have been introduced in almost every session of the State legisla-

ture. But in most cases labor has persuaded a majority of legislators that they were unwise. Some antiunion measures have been invalidated in appeals to the courts.

Labor has been required to fight a two-front battle—one for the enactment of beneficial legislation and the other a defensive fight to prevent enactment of legislation discriminatory against labor.

The State federation was the first organization to officially state its opposition to the general retail sales tax and has been the leader, along with progressive farm organizations, in defeating the sales tax in five elections.

Membership in Oregon labor unions has increased 1,700 percent since the first convention of the State Federation of Labor, from an estimated 12,000 in 1902 to more than 200,000 today.

This growth in membership is paralleled by an increase in the number of local unions. Oregon had 77 local unions in 1902; it has more than 600 today.

But numerical growth is not the only factor showing labor's gains. Wage increases, both in dollars and in buying power, also reflect labor achievement.

In 1902 the average wage in all union crafts was $3 per day. Most men worked 10 hours a day and 6 days a week—and premium pay for overtime was unheard of. Most union craftsmen were glad to take home $18 for a 60-hour week.

WHO'S WHO SINCE 1902

Since its founding in 1902, the Oregon State Federation of Labor has elected these men as its top officers and has held its conventions in these cities:

Year	Convention city	President	Secretary
1902	Portland	O. Y. Harry	William H. Barry.
1903	LaGrande	C. H. Gram	George E. Shaver.
1904	Oregon City	do	Do.
1905	Portland	do	H. G. Kundret.
1907	do	do	W. E. Ritschke.
			T. M. Leabo.
1908	Astoria	do	James F. Cassidy.
1909	Salem	Will Daly	Do.
1910	Portland	do	Do.
1911	Salem	do	Wm. F. Noffke.
1912	The Dalles	do	E. J. Stack.
1913	Salem	T. H. Burchard	Do.
1914	Astoria	do	Do.
1915	Salem	do	Do.
1916	Portland	O. R. Hartwig	Do.
1917	Salem	do	Do.
1918	Astoria	do	Do.
1919	Portland	do	Do.
1919	Bend	do	Do.
1920	Pendleton	do	W. E. Kimsey.
1921	Portland	do	E. J. Stack.
1922	Salem	do	Do.
1923	Astoria	do	Do.
1924	Eugene	do	Do.
1925	Marshfield	B. W. Sleeman	C. U. Taylor.
1926	Klamath Falls	William Cooper	Ben T. Osborne.
1927	Corvallis	do	Do.
1928	LaGrande	William Cooper	Ben T. Osborne.
1929	Tillamook	do	Do.
1930	Medford	do	Do.
1931	Salem	do	Do.
1932	Astoria	do	Do.
1933	Portland	do	Do.
1934	do	do	Do.
1935	do	D. E. Nickerson	Do.
1936	Klamath Falls	do	Do.
1937	Marshfield	do	Do.
1938	Tillamook	do	Do.
1939	Eugene	Paul E. Gurske	D. E. Nickerson.
1940	Klamath Falls	do	Do.
1941	Astoria	do	Do.
1942	Marshfield	do	Do.
1943	Eugene	do	Do.
1944	do	J. D. McDonald	Do.
1946	Astoria	do	J. T. Marr.
1947	Bend	do	Do.
1948	Salem	do	Do.
1949	Eugene	do	Do.
1950	LaGrande	do	Do.
1951	Klamath Falls	do	Do.
1952	Seaside	do	Do.
1953	Coos Bay	do	Do.
1954	Astoria	do	Do.
1955	Medford	do	Do.

Address By Hon. Alexander Wiley, of Wisconsin, to the National Association of Plumbing Contractors

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, June 22, 1956

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, during my recent tour throughout Wisconsin, I was pleased to address a splendid organization which is a pillar of the United States construction industry. I refer to the National Association of Plumbing Contractors.

I was glad to refer, in the course of my remarks, to the importance of labor management teamwork in realizing the highest possible goal for United States construction.

It was a pleasure to praise one of the outstanding leaders of this industry, another man with deep roots in my own State, the able president of the Plumbing Contractors, Mr. Peter T. Schoeman. I ask unanimous consent that excerpts from my address be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the excerpts from the address were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SENATOR WILEY SAYS UNITED STATES GOLDEN AGE IS HERE—URGES UPGRADING OF AMERICA'S HOMES TO CREATE INFINITELY BROADER MARKET

(Excerpts from address by Senator WILEY to the National Association of Plumbing Contractors convention at Milwaukee on Tuesday, June 12, 1956)

I am delighted to attend your outstanding convention—the greatest in history.

It is a particular pleasure for me to add my personal word of gratification that you have honored America's vacation land, Wisconsin, by meeting here in this great convention city.

I hope that you have been enjoying the opportunity to see all you can of this great port city, and that you will be seeing more of the Badger State, as well.

ENJOYING LIFE'S GOOD THINGS

Why? Because to do so is to enjoy more of the good things of life—wholesome leisure in pleasant, attractive surroundings. And that is precisely my theme to you this morning: America's enjoying more of life's good things.

This great country of ours has entered upon its true golden age—an age where Mr. and Mrs. Average Man are going to enjoy a better home, broader comforts, more stable security than they have ever known before.

Of course, no one can foresee through the veil of the future. A grim cloud can appear on our national horizon—such as that cast by the illness of our great President. But with God's help, all will be well.

My theme is that the motto of America can well be "Future unlimited" if we but choose to make it so, if we but use our God-given ingenuity and understanding, if there be genuine and continuing labor-management teamwork in fact and in spirit.

TRIBUTE TO BUILDING LABOR

I am delighted that among our honored guests is, of course, the distinguished president of the plumbers' union, Mr. Peter T. Schoeman, a former Milwaukeean, as you know.

Pete Schoeman is truly representative of the highest type of leader of American organized labor. We are proud of him and of other leading representatives of the officers and rank and file of the building trades. They constitute a traditional cornerstone of the labor movement. They are builders in every sense of the word—literally and figuratively—skilled builders side by side with the skilled building and repairing contractors in this vast audience.

It is you who are—day in and day out—truly building, you who are contributing to almost every structure that extends below the surface and silhouettes against the prairies or the villages or the skylines of our Nation.

CONSTRUCTION—KEYSTONE IN ECONOMY

The building industry, as you well know, has become an ever more important keystone in our expanding American economy.

"As the construction industry goes, so goes America." Not only home construction but also as home repair and home improvement go—as factory repair and improvement and expansion go, so goes America.

Our whole vast economy, with its $400 billion total of goods and services, pulsates with the beat—the tempo—of the huge construction industry.

MODERNIZE 12 MONTHS A YEAR

The month of August, as you know, is designated Plumbing, Heating, and Cooling Month.

But I would like—as you would like—August to be just the start of a year-long forward surge of modernized plumbing, heating and cooling for our country.

This is the challenge confronting us.

The building of new homes, improvement of older houses, the needed expansion of industry, the construction of nonresidential buildings such as churches, schools, office buildings; hospitals, playgrounds, hotels, motels, restaurants: All of this is a tremendous opportunity, a new and bigger market for your sales and service.

SIZABLE ESTIMATES FOR 1956

It means more jobs, more pay envelopes, more expansion of companies, a greater income for more people.

As you know, there were about 1.3 million houses built last year. It is expected there will be slightly less, but still, perhaps, a million two hundred thousand houses erected in 1956.

I'd like to see that total topped. It can be topped, if we pursue the right governmental and private policies.

As for improvement on homes, the estimated goals range between $10 billion and $12 billion in total value annually.

The potential for new commercial and other nonresidential construction ranges up to $15 billion.

These amount to a significant proportion of our whole economy.

CHANGING THE FACE OF AMERICA

Residential construction has, of course, long been our No. 1 interest.

The pattern of America has almost been revolutionized by the new type of suburban living. Whole new developments—whole new shopping centers—whole new towns, have almost completely changed the face of many countrysides.

But even in the center of cities, as you know, modernization programs have been changing the face of America.

For homemakers, modernization means better living in many ways:

1. Extra space by finishing off basements and attics, enclosing porches, and utilizing other unused areas.

2. More efficient and more comfortable heating and cooling systems.

3. Remodeling for improved beauty and greater livability.

THE BEST HOUSED PEOPLE ON EARTH

We are all rightly proud of the trend. We're proud of the free enterprise system which has shot up the percentage of individual home ownership to more than 55 percent, making ours the best housed people on earth.

SHOCKING CONDITIONS FACING SOME HOMEMAKERS

Unhappily, however, it is necessary to point out some disturbing conditions in American homemaking.

Of more than 50 million homes in our great country almost 10 million are in slum areas; more than 20 million are in need of repair and improvements.

According to a recent survey, about 40 percent of homeowners actually spend nothing—I repeat, nothing—on home maintenance and improvements.

To illustrate, I cite these familiar statistics: 13 million homes have no bathtubs or showers; 7 million have no kitchen sinks; 7 million have no running water.

This is the challenge:

Of course, a considerable proportion of these statistics are represented in some depressed areas. Fortunately, these areas are relatively few in number; fortunately, we are making progress in revitalizing them.

But we Americans, however, proud of our past accomplishments, rightly proud, I may say—we are, nevertheless, realistic, and we are not going to just rest on our laurels. We are going to roll up our sleeves and go to work—harder than ever before.

We Americans are never 100 percent satisfied. We are a restless, dynamic people. We are constantly seeking new horizons, new and higher goals. This is our natural talent—our natural genius—improve, improve, improve.

SUPERSALESMANSHIP NEEDED

To attain our goals for peak home improvement is going to require a tremendous selling job. This does not mean, of course, high-pressure salesmanship.

Instead, it requires bringing the facts of the situation and the knowledge of opportunity to American homemakers.

If we succeed, the effect will be better living for all our American families.

Our objective, of course, is to raise the American standard of living to a higher plateau—even though our standard is presently the highest in the world of any major power.

ENTERPRISE NEEDED FOR ALL TO BENEFIT

To achieve our goal will require a renewed display of imaginative and enterprising work, public relations, and service, such as you yourselves have demonstrated.

The result, however, will be for the benefit of everybody.

1. For every plumber and plumbing contractor in the country:

2. For the suppliers, manufacturers, retailers, distributors, the transporters, and others;

3. For home owners;

4. For industry and manufacturers; and

5. For the overall economic well-being of our great country.

Fortunately, your United States Congress is helping.

NEW HOUSING LEGISLATION

As you are aware, the Senate recently passed the Housing Act amendments for 1956. This is an important step toward providing homes for more people. The principal features of this extension of the Housing Act are:

1. Extend home improvements and repair loans until September 30, 1959.

2. Increase the loan maximum from $2,500 to $3,500.

3. Extend the repayment period from 3 years to 5 years.

4. Increase FHA mortgage insurance authority by about $1 billion.

5. Gives more favorable terms to provide housing for elderly persons.

6. Provide for slum clearance and urban renewal. Increasing authorization from $200 million to $250 million for 1956.

7. One year extension of FHA home loan program. (I had personally introduced a bill for longer extension of this splendid program, but I'll settle temporarily for 1-year extension.)

These important features need to be brought to the homemakers of the Nation.

The bill, of course, now goes before the House of Representatives to be acted upon. If enacted—and it should be—this will be a boon to our economy.

AVOID EXTREMES OF INFLATION AND DEFLATION

Inevitably, when one discusses the construction topic, we come full face with the issue of our national credit policy. As we are all aware, America has faced a twin problem at opposite extremes—how to avoid the evil of inflation, on the one hand, and how to avoid the evil of deflation, on the other hand.

Fortunately, the value of the dollar has been relatively stabilized following years of of depreciation.

Now, however, a great many of us are inclined to feel that the antiinflation brakes may have been put on too hard on our economy, by the Federal Reserve Board. There is at present too much of a credit pinch—too much of a deflationary tendency.

No thinking person wants overly loose credit, wild speculative credit. None of us wants to see the average American get so deeply into debt that he became hopelessly swamped with bills, bills, bills.

We want sound credit. But we want ample credit.

I personally am inclined to feel that a liberalization of credit is in order. At the same time, we must maintain constant caution to prevent the sort of loose practices which can lead to default on personal or company debts.

SMALL-BUSINESS CREDIT PROBLEM

The credit problem of many small-business men has, as you know, become particularly acute. Many a small man simply cannot get sufficient bank or other credit at attractive terms.

Yet, all America, of course, is or should be aware of the indispensable contributions of our 14 million small-business concerns—particularly those in the construction industry.

A symbol of our free enterprise system, the small-business men is basic not only to the economic well being, but to the stability of our Nation.

In view of his importance, it is imperative that we provide the "economic climate" in which the small-business man may prosper and expand his operation.

SMALL BUSINESS COMMISSION

Wisely, the President has recently appointed a seven-man Commission for the purpose of keeping in touch with the problems of small business.

The primary responsibility of the Commission is to recommend both administrative action and new legislation to resolve problems faced by small business.

The main factors to be considered by the Commission include the following:

Loans and defense contract assistance provided by the Small Business Administration;

Antitrust enforcement by the Justice Department;

Various managerial and technical aids available from the Commerce Department;

Efforts by the Office of Defense Mobilization to strengthen the productive potential of small firms in our defense program, and helping small business in the housing field.

These are sound objectives.

ANTIMONOPOLY ACTION IN CONGRESS

One continuing threat to the future of small business is monopoly and monopolistic practices. More and more, small business is being faced with competition from chains, merged corporations and big business in general.

As you may know, I am a member of the Senate Judiciary Committee. Currently, we are examining proposals for protecting the small-business man.

Many people feel that the recent increase in corporate mergers may jeopardize somewhat the freedom with which the small-business man may operate. So, our monopoly subcommittee is considering, among other matters, the problem of mergers, as well as diverse monopolistic practices as they affect the free economy of our Nation.

Our objective, of course, is to determine legislative action which is necessary to provide a fair competitive climate for the small-business man.

PROGRAM FOR 1956

Meanwhile, our large job—our overall job—is to blueprint a program that will pave the way for full speed ahead progress. The objectives of this program are to:

1. Provide and preserve a fair competitive environment for the small-business man.

2. Continue to assist the small-business man with access to financing, technical guidance, and other aids.

3. Continue the VA home and FHA loan programs to provide better homes for more Americans.

4. Make a thorough study of reserve material—to avert shutdowns due to shortage of building materials.

5. Assist in "selling" the "Better Living for More Americans" theme to all America.

6. Provide more adequate homes for our elder citizens.

7. Meet the needs of business and industry expansion—relative to erection of more factories, machine shops, service buildings, and other construction.

8. Enact tax relief for small-businessmen. I recently joined in cosponsoring such a bill.

9. Provide ample credit to enable businesses to operate at maximum efficiency.

10. Expand the program of nonresidential buildings, churches, schools, and other construction.

The new Federal-State highway law will be a tremendous boost. It will involve $37 billion in road work over a 13-year period. And this, in turn, should mean a vast amount of new buildings alongside the roads as well.

SPOTTY UNEMPLOYMENT IN UNITED STATES

I said, at the outset, that we have entered into a "golden age." I firmly believe this.

But I am a realist, not a Pollyanna. I do not wear rose-colored glasses.

We all know that there are trouble spots here and there.

In the State of Wisconsin, we have hit a few bumps in the road, particularly in auto-producing centers and in areas where farm implements are manufactured, as well as in some other places.

Coming as you do from the 48 States, you know that here and there, some of your own State's industries have had to cut back, and there is unemployment and shrinking of purchasing power.

Meanwhile, our American productivity is so enormous—our mass producing of washing machines, air conditioners, dryers, and all the other vast variety of appliances is constantly growing to such an extent that, inevitably, we must open up whole new markets, if we are to absorb the productivity.

I think we can do so. In fact, we must do so.

MORE MIDDLE CLASS AMERICANS

Fortunately, the record of the past few years shows that more and more Americans are graduating upward into the middle class. That means more people who want better home heating and who want air conditioning and other essential features of comfortable living.

The so-called lower income brackets are shrinking in percentage of the total population. And the percentage of our people who are in what we call the middle class is increasing.

But if ever there was a country which is truly "classless", it is ours.

That does not mean that there cannot be a wide difference of income, because obviously there is.

But it does mean that ours is a ladder-of-success society. A man of humblest origin can rise from his shirtsleeves and can accumulate considerable means by his own hard work.

It is my task as a legislator to keep our society this way. I want to keep it expanding, dynamic, rather than to see it become frigid, frozen—with people unable to climb up the ladder of success.

To do so, we must, of course, have a sound tax system, a sound credit policy, sound labor-management teamwork.

And we must have a government which gives overall encouragement to you and your associates in serving America's expanding needs.

CONCLUSION

It has been a great pleasure to be with you today. I hope that when you return to your States you will carry with you the most pleasant memories of this convention. And I hope that the day will not be long distant when you will return to the Badger State.

Age Analysis of Members of Airline Pilots' Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. S. MIKE MONRONEY

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, June 22, 1956

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, for the information of Senators and the country, I may be allowed to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a table showing an age analysis of all apprentice, active, executive, inactive, and executive active members of the Airline Pilots' Association. This material was furnished me by Mr. Larry Cates, Washington representative of the Airline Pilots' Association. I think it will be of interest to the Nation.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Airline Pilots Association age analysis of all apprentice, active, executive inactive, and executive active members, Mar. 15, 1956

Year of birth	Age	Number of members	Accumulated total (older than)	Percentage	Accumulated total (younger than)	Percentage	Weighted age
1892	64	1	1	0.01	10,788	100.00	64
1893	63		1	.01	10,787	99.99	0
1894	62	3	4	.04	10,787	99.99	186
1895	61	5	9	.08	10,784	99.96	305
1896	60	12	21	.19	10,779	99.92	720
1897	59	3	24	.22	10,767	99.81	177
1898	58	14	38	.35	10,764	99.78	812
1899	57	15	53	.49	10,750	99.65	855
1900	56	35	88	.82	10,735	99.51	1,960
1901	55	13	101	.94	10,700	99.18	715
1902	54	28	129	1.20	10,687	99.06	1,512
1903	53	37	166	1.54	10,659	98.80	1,961
1904	52	43	209	1.94	10,622	98.46	2,236
1905	51	65	274	2.54	10,579	98.06	3,315
1906	50	85	359	3.33	10,514	97.46	4,250
1907	49	135	494	4.58	10,429	96.67	6,615
1908	48	151	645	5.98	10,294	95.42	7,248
1909	47	175	820	7.60	10,143	94.02	8,225
1910	46	178	998	9.26	9,968	92.40	8,188
1911	45	210	1,208	11.20	9,790	90.75	9,450
1912	44	236	1,444	13.39	9,580	88.80	10,384
1913	43	251	1,695	15.71	9,344	86.61	10,793
1914	42	335	2,030	18.82	9,093	84.29	14,070
1915	41	412	2,442	22.64	8,758	81.18	16,892
1916	40	459	2,901	26.89	8,346	77.36	18,360
1917	39	575	3,476	32.22	7,887	73.11	22,425
1918	38	765	4,241	39.31	7,312	67.78	29,070
1919	37	773	5,014	46.48	6,547	60.69	28,601
1920	36	946	5,960	55.25	5,774	53.52	34,056
1921	35	1,042	7,002	64.91	4,828	44.75	36,470
1922	34	796	7,798	72.28	3,786	35.09	27,064
1923	33	713	8,511	78.89	2,990	27.72	23,529
1924	32	682	9,193	85.22	2,277	21.11	21,834
1925	31	480	9,673	89.66	1,595	14.78	14,880
1926	30	278	9,951	92.24	1,115	10.34	8,340
1927	29	225	10,176	94.33	837	7.76	6,525
1928	28	288	10,464	97.00	612	5.67	8,064
1929	27	158	10,622	98.46	324	3.00	4,266
1930	26	92	10,714	99.31	166	1.54	2,392
1931	25	38	10,752	99.67	74	.69	950
1932	24	22	10,774	99.87	36	.33	528
1933	23	9	10,783	99.95	14	.13	207
1934	22	5	10,788	100.00	5	.05	110
		10,788					398,594

Average age: 36.95.

Federal-Aid Highway Construction Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD MARTIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, June 22, 1956

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, the new road bill will increase the taxes of Americans more than a billion dollars a year during the next 16 years.

The Wall Street Journal discusses the matter in today's issue in an editorial, and I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE STICKING POINT

When the conferees between the House and the Senate took up the new highway construction bill they quickly agreed to pay out $27.7 billion of Federal funds over the next decade or so. Then they stuck on the point of how to pay for these roads.

Of course, with Congressmen and Senators this familiar sticky point is usually got over, given enough political push, just as it was yesterday. The House-Senate conferees agreed to pay for these roads by boosting the road taxes you already pay.

Still, there is a touch of symbolism in this momentary boggle over the bill. It is refreshing that the Congressmen should pause. It would be even more refreshing if the pause should make them reflect.

Whenever anyone claims that the country could use more roads or schools or houses or hospitals than we happen to have, he is usually stating an almost self-evident proposition. In any event, only a curmudgeon would argue that the country ought not to build more schools or hospitals.

But it surely ought not to make a curmudgeon out of a man if he pauses over the question of how to pay for these things. A nation no more than a man has unlimited resources; the real problem is how best to use those resources to get the most from them.

Take road construction. The United States has without question the finest road system of any country in the world. These roads have been built almost entirely by State efforts; Federal funds have been a drop in the bucket. Yet now somebody says we need even more roads—which is probably true enough—and right away Congress thinks it has got to vote billions of Federal funds or the roads won't get built.

But the Federal funds, of course, have to be supplied by the people and businesses of the several States; there's no other source. That means more Federal taxes. That, in turn, means less tax resources for the States. That means the people in many States will have less money for other things they would like to do—building hospitals, for instance.

The higher taxes also mean the citizens themselves will have less money of their own—for building their own houses, for example, or paying for a new addition to a local school. As the Federal budget grows bigger and bigger, the taxes grow larger and larger, and the squeeze on everybody gets tighter and tighter.

This is not an imaginary squeeze. Local school boards and local hospitals are already caught by it. Many a man in the lower income brackets can no longer provide for his own old age because the Government is taking his money away from him to spend for what it thinks he needs.

Well, the Federal Government is going ahead with this multi-billion-dollar road program. When they get built we will be happy to ride on them, if by that time we can afford to. In spite of our arteries we will always welcome new schools, and because of them we'll welcome more and better hospitals. Like others, we are always pleased to see more of all good things.

But we are also pleased to see even a small pause at the sticking point. For the man who doesn't reflect on how he's going to pay for all these things, soon or late finds he can't pay for any of them.

Report by Director of International Rescue Committee, Saigon

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN F. KENNEDY
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, June 22, 1956

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a most informative report made to the board of directors, International Rescue Committee, for the month of April, by R. MacAlister, director, International Rescue Committee, Saigon.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INTERNATIONAL RESCUE COMMITTEE,
New York, N. Y., May 12, 1956.

To: Board of directors, IRC.
From: R. MacAlister, director, IRC, Saigon.
Subject: Report to board for month of April.

I gather from the American newspapers and magazines, which I am able to get here in Saigon, that there is currently a great deal of discussion in our country about foreign aid. Because I feel that this is a vitally important subject for all of us, I am going to digress this month from my usual practice of giving you a factual report about IRC activities in Vietnam. Instead I should like to take this opportunity to discuss the human side of foreign aid. I will use Asia for the purpose of my discussion, since this is the area I know best.

America's position in Asia is an ironic one today. Never before in history has any nation spent so much on foreign aid. Even so, we find ourselves becoming increasingly disliked. Why is this? I can offer no simple answer, because America's position in the world today is a complex one; and certainly Asia presents a panorama of vast complicated societies.

However, on the basis of extensive travel, and having lived for almost 4 years in this part of the world, I definitely feel that one of the major reasons we are disliked and misunderstood is because our aid has not been human enough. We—the most generous nation in the history of the world—have been selling ourselves short. We have spent millions of dollars on propaganda alone to impress on Asians that the main reason we are helping them is because of the Communist threat. In stressing primarily the negative aspect of our aid, we have played into the hands of the Communists. This was bad enough as long as the open aggression policy of Stalin was evident. However, with the coming of Bulganin and Khrushchev's sweetness and light, our continued stress on negatives becomes a policy of national suicide for us in Asia.

Picture, gentlemen, the vast areas of poverty, squalor, and ignorance which exist on this continent. Picture sick and undernourished men, women, and children. Picture new nations who are determined to rise from the degradation of the past. We have sent aid to these people—yes—but what in essence do many of the pronouncements of the legislative and executive branches of our Government tell them. In essence we continually tell them, "the main reason we are helping you is because of communism." Sensitive Asians are quick to grasp the corollary of this approach; namely, "if it were not for communism Asia could live in misery." There are, of course, plenty of Communist propagandists just waiting to seize on such negative remarks of our leaders and use them for their own destructive ends. Naturally, those who are poor, those who suffer from malnutrition, those who are sick will take our aid; but it should be quite evident by now that offering help on a negative basis doesn't build good will and understanding for us.

What a tragedy that Khrushchev and Bulganin, the products of one of the most destructive systems ever known to man, should be able to march into Asia and proclaim, "We come as brothers to help you because communism believes in the brotherhood of man." Please recall that they have never said, "We come to help you because we are against the Americans." Once again we find ourselves on the defensive, when we, of all peoples, should be on the offensive, when it comes to demonstrating our concern for human beings.

You and I know that we are a most generous people. You and I know that we don't like to see people go hungry or be sick. You and I know that as a Nation which was once a colony, we feel a warm kinship with the newly independent countries of the world. Why then don't we say so more often? Why not export the best ideals of America—the positive force that has made our country great?

You have the most successful example of what I am talking about in the Philippines. For 50 years we built up the Philippines not because we were against communism, but because we felt a responsibility toward the Philippine people themselves as human beings. What is the result? We have one of the stanchest allies in the world. Moreover, the Philippines really like us. We have our differences but the Philippines are not neutralist, there is no great anti-American sentiment and they are the most thoroughly democratic country in Asia. I am not proposing that we try actually to administer all of Asia as we did the Philippines. Those days are gone forever. I do propose that without attempting to assume political control of Asian countries, we announce loudly our feeling of responsibility for the human beings of Asia, not because we are against communism but because we are for democracy and the dignity of the individual. If we worry more about stressing democracy, human kindness and the dignity of the individual when explaining our aid we can afford to worry less about communism.

To cite the Philippines again, I believe that the minor deterioration which has taken place in our relations recently is partly due to the fact that we now stress, all too often, that our assistance to the Philippines is on an anti-Communist basis rather than because of a personal interest in the Philippines as human beings.

I realize that our burdens are heavy, but even if we keep our aid on the scale on which it now operates, let's use it to make friends. Let us stress the human side. Even better, let us seriously consider our Government going to the American people and requesting funds for a great worldwide crusade against sickness, hunger, illiteracy, poverty, etc. Perhaps it can't be done; but America is known for its willingness to try new ideas. Let us at least make the attempt. If in the presentation of this request the American people are shown pictures of hungry people, sick people, poverty-stricken people, I think they will respond as they always have. We cannot support the world, but we can help it to become self-supporting.

As I stated in the beginning of this letter, the question of foreign aid and all of its ramifications are most complex. Naturally, I would never contend that the basic approach which I advocate can be divorced completely from economic, political, and social factors. In other words, in stressing the human approach I do not believe that it is a panacea for all of the problems which confront us in Asia. Nor would I maintain that the human approach would make every Asian avidly pro-American. Neither would it convince every Asian nation to join SEATO or always vote on our side in the U. N.

However, I do feel that the human approach would go a long way toward stemming the growing tide of anti-Americanism in this area today, preserve the true independence of these new nations and provide our country with a wonderful opportunity to demonstrate what we really believe in, thus building for us a solid relationship based on mutual respect and confidence with our Asia friends.

I do not worry about disagreement on policies which arise among nations who have mutual understanding and confidence for each other. However, thinking in terms of the present and the future, I am frightened when I see over half the people of this world disagreeing with us because of a basic lack of understanding and confidence coupled in some cases with downright distrust of us. If this situation is not corrected, the consequence could be extremely grave for America as a nation and for all that we stand for.

Before I close, let me spend a short time on IRC. Private voluntary organizations like IRC are the essence of the human approach. We can become personal as Government never can. In our work here I have been stressing the fact that IRC's presence in Vietnam is not only motivated by our antitotalitarian interests but by the direct personal concern of individual human Americans for individual human Vietnamese. Financially, we are a drop in the bucket compared to Government aid but our influence in human relations is multiplied many times in proportion to our economic resources. Because of all that I have written previously, I hope you will agree with me that IRC must certainly stay in Vietnam.

I would like to make it clear that I do not intend this to be a report. In my opinion, both the Democratic and Republican administrations have been guilty of negativism in the fields of foreign aid. Above all, this is a subject so vital that in no sense should it become a political football for narrow purpose.

Faithfully yours,

ROBERT J. MACALISTER,
Director.

Reaching the Russians

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. S. MIKE MONRONEY
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, June 22, 1956

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter to the New York Times from Dr. Charles Wesley Lowry, former pastor of the Chevy Chase Episcopal Church. The letter is dated June 5, 1956, and was published in the New York Times of June 10, 1956, under the headline "Reaching the Russians." I ask also to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a brief personal history of Dr. Charles Wesley LOWRY.

There being no objection, the letter and history were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times of June 10, 1956]

REACHING THE RUSSIANS—AID AND ENCOURAGEMENT FOR PEOPLES SUBJUGATED BY SOVIET URGED

(The writer of the following letter, an Episcopal theologian and author, now is chairman and executive director of the nonsectarian Foundation for Religious Action in the Social and Civil Order.)

To the EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

I have just read your editorial, Khrushchev on Stalin, in your issue of June 5.

May I especially compliment you upon the insight and strength of your key sentences:

"The essence of the matter is that the real defendant before the bar of history is not Stalin or the Stalinist group. The real defendant, the real culprit, is the Communist ideology itself."

In these words you put your finger unerringly upon the central issue of our epoch. It is of the utmost importance that intelligent citizens of the free world everywhere see this and hold fast to it at the present dangerous moment when the successors of Stalin are attempting to use his degradation as a propaganda ladder on which to hoist Lenin and Marxism-Leninism to new heights of glory and promise for the future.

It was the greatest of all Russians, Feodor Dostoievsky, who said: "To be a genuine Russian means to become the blood brother of all human beings."

BETRAYAL OF MULTITUDE

This beautiful declaration points to the great betrayal of our time, the betrayal of the Russian people and of the hopes and dreams of the hungry and thirsty multitudes of the 20th century. It is a betrayal which cannot be foisted on the demigod whose body rests in state beside that of Lenin, but whose ghost will not so easily be confined to a solitary perdition.

In some sense this massive and shattering betrayal of man goes back more than 100 years to the thoughts and acts of will of the premier architects of totalitarianism, Marx and Engels. These apostles of universal revolutionary violence dismissed religion as "the opium of the people," asserted that the Judaeo-Christian ethic of justice, mercy, and love was a rationalization of outmoded property relationships and branded the principles of traditional jurisprudence as "only economic reflexes" (Engels).

In a nearly absolute sense the great betrayal lies at the door of Lenin, the first and foremost exemplar of 20th century totalitarianism in theory and practice. At an early stage of the bloody and chaotic period which followed the "October Revolution" of 1917 colleagues took Lenin to task for spilling so much Russian blood. With perfect consistency this emancipated son of the great Mother Russia replied: "It isn't a question of Russia at all, gentlemen. I spit on Russia. * * * This is merely one phase through which we pass on the way to a world revolution."

RESPONSIBILITY OF WEST

In a real sense, also, the betrayal of which we speak and the agony of man in our period are realities in which we of the West have a responsibility. I well remember encountering more than two decades ago Albert Schweitzer's account in his autobiography of his realization well before the end of the 19th century that something had happened to the moral and spiritual foundations of civilization.

Out of moral decline and spiritual poverty world war was born, followed by the totalitarian political religions. A Lenin, a Hitler, a Stalin, a Perón became possible. The hollow and deceitful lament of a Khrushchev became possible. Still more ominous—it became possible that such a gesture might take in a large part of a globally unified and interrelated world. This is a real and present danger—it is by no means imaginary.

For such a situation no people is without blame, and no educated, knowledgeable person is without responsibility. But this also means that there is a way out. There is a solution. This solution is a quickening of conscience on a world scale; it is a new universal realization that knowledge and science are not enough and can never by themselves create a great civilization. Civilization requires at its heart a profound sense that the ethical perfecting of the individual and society matters.

America at her best believes this and would confess this as her democratic faith. The hope of a better world lies in a more sincere practice on our part of this faith and a more effective witness to it by word and deed before other nations and peoples.

MESSAGE OF TRUST

May it not be, also, that the time is now ripe for conveying to the Russian people over the heads of the Kremlin oligarchy this message and our trust that the country which could produce a Dostoievsky and a Tolstoy has a unique and decisive contribution to make to a new and finer age?

There are not a few signs that the people of the Soviet Union are mentally and spiritually very hungry. This hunger and the realization still more poignantly of the monstrous baseness and evil of the Communist system, as a result of the Khrushchev accusation and confession, present a priceless opportunity if we have the wit, the imagination and the humanity to offer this long-suffering people bread and not a stone.

This "bread," I suggest, is the aid and encouragement that our Government and private organizations should give to the Russian people (great Russians as well as others) to seek freedom and self-government. Such an approach will make an indispensable contribution to the rebirth of man under God and the renewal in a global setting of humane civilization.

CHARLES WESLEY LOWRY.

WASHINGTON, June 5, 1956.

PERSONAL HISTORY: DR. CHARLES WESLEY LOWRY

Dr. Charles Wesley Lowry was born in 1905 in Indian Territory (now Oklahoma). After attending the public schools of Oklahoma, he received his B. A. degree from Washington and Lee, his M. A. from Harvard, his B. D. from Episcopal Theological School, Cambridge, and, January 1933, his Ph. D. from Oxford.

On his return to the United States, Dr. Lowry became Episcopal chaplain at the University of California, Berkeley, and lecturer in theology in the Church Divinity School and the Pacific School of Religion.

In 1934 he became a professor of theology at the Virginia Theological Seminary, Alexandria. In 1943 he became rector of All Saints' Church, Chevy Chase, Washington, D. C. Since 1943, he has been a stated lecturer at Virginia Theological Seminary, General Theological Seminary, and Philadelphia Divinity School. In 1937, 1939, and 1950 he attended ecumenical conferences in Great Britain, Holland, Switzerland, and France. In 1949–50 he was vice president of the American Theological Society and is at present treasurer of this society.

In 1952, Dr. Lowry was sent abroad by the State Department to represent the United States at the first International Convention on Peace and Christian Civilization in Florence, Italy. Here in the famed Palazzo Vecchio he lectured on The Present State of Christian Civilization.

He resigned his rectorship in 1953 to concentrate in the field of religion and public affairs with special reference to the philosophy and psychology of communism and the need for a spiritual revitalization of democracy. That same year he became a special consultant to the Administrator of Federal Civil Defense and, with Dr. Edward L. R. Elson, minister, National Presbyterian Church, as cochairman, established in Washington the Foundation for Religious Action in the Social and Civil Order.

Dr. Lowry is widely known as an author and a lecturer. His books include the internationally famous Communism and Christ (now in its fourth printing); The Trinity and Christian Devotion (1946), a joint Lent selection of the archbishop of Canterbury and the presiding bishop of the American Episcopal Church; and Anglican Evangelicalism (1943; with others). Among his special monographs and studies are Conflicting Faiths (1953), Where Is the Conscience of the West? (1953), Christianity and Materialism (1948), and Origen As Trinitarian (Journal of Theological Studies, 1936). He has been a contributor to numerous volumes, including 18 articles in the Encyclopedia of Religion (Ed., Ferm, 1945), and to various periodicals.

Dr. Lowry has lectured extensively throughout his professional life. More recently he has concentrated on the general theme of Communism, Christianity, and Democracy. During the past 3 years he has lectured in numerous universities and colleges, at the Air War College, the Naval War College, and the Pentagon, and in many American cities and towns under varied auspices.

Dr. Lowry is a Rotarian and is Protestant chaplain of the Variety Club of Washington.

Political Propaganda About the Health of President Eisenhower

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM E. JENNER
OF INDIANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, June 22, 1956

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, on behalf of my colleague, the senior Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article by David Lawrence, appearing in the Washington Star of June 21, 1956; and an editorial which appeared in the Indianapolis News of June 20, 1956, on the sub-

ject of political propaganda about the health of President Eisenhower.

There being no objection, the article and editorial were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Star of June 21, 1956]

ATTACKING AN AILING PRESIDENT—TREATMENT OF EISENHOWER BY DEMOCRATS CONTRASTED TO RESTRAINT ON ROOSEVELT

(By David Lawrence)

When Presidential Secretary James Hagerty said he wasn't going to engage in a debate with newsmen on what some doctors have been quoted in the press as saying about the President's illness because, as he points out, they don't know this particular case, it was, of course, a commonsense decision.

There is a certain puzzlement, however, as to why there are such persistent attempts in the press to try to knock down what the President's physicians have said.

It's a strange contrast to the way the press behaved from the time Franklin D. Roosevelt became a candidate for the Presidency in 1932 till the day he died in April 1945. Not a single movie newsreel and not a single news photograph that this correspondent ever saw or heard about told the people that the President of the United States actually couldn't walk, that special ramps had to be built at the White House and the Capitol, that he couldn't stand when greeting foreign visitors, or that he never stood up at a single press conference. When he campaigned, his entrances to and exits from meeting places were carefully screened.

None of the news dispatches of the President's inauguration on January 20, 1945, moreover, reported that Roosevelt had to be lifted up by members of his family and supported while he took the oath of office and read the inaugural address from the White House balcony. There was no adverse comment on why he didn't go to the Capitol for the occasion.

Throughout Roosevelt's public life—as Governor of New York and as a candidate for the Presidency and while he was in the White House during a period of more than 12 years—no appreciable number of the American people ever knew of the physical disability of the man they elected four times. Some newsmen hereabouts were told in 1944 about the comment of an eminent Boston physician that a paralysis such as Roosevelt had suffered would cut down his life expectancy. But they didn't write the story.

Was this a mistake on the part of the press and its photographers? Not at all. It was good taste and decency. It was a respect for the high office of the President. The only question that was germane then and that is germane now is whether a President is mentally capable. A man with the type of heart attack Eisenhower has had doesn't suffer any injury to his mind—and neither does anyone with his experience with ileitis.

Then why is so much prominence given to the speculation by 1 or 2 doctors that the illness might recur, when the doctors handling the case say they believe it will not recur? Why is there so much emphasis on the alleged damage of the stomach ailment expressed by Democratic politicians and their henchmen who keep on thinking up every day new angles for skepticism?

The theory usually heard in defense of such tactics is that the American people are entitled to all the facts about their President. They certainly are, but the implication that, when once they know the facts, they will not vote to reelect Eisenhower is just partisan thinking of a wishful nature.

The best refutation of the theory that the American electorate will not elect a man with a physical handicap is the way the people reacted toward Franklin Roosevelt. Does anybody who is an admirer of Roosevelt really believe that, if his ardent supporters throughout the country had known in November 1944 that Roosevelt was not a well man, they would have refused to elect him and would have voted for Dewey? Did the people know whether an obscure Senator from Missouri who had been nominated for Vice President would make a good President?

It will be said in reply that, of course, there was a war on then. But today there's a crisis almost as important to the world—the maneuvers of the cold war and the threat of world war III.

The electorate naturally will discuss a candidate's health whenever the opposition party spokesmen bring it up. But looking back to 1944 and assuming that the Republicans had had the bad manners and bad taste being exhibited today by the Democrats, few persons who have studied the trends in presidential elections will agree that this would have elected Thomas E. Dewey.

Restraint is better in the long run than smear campaigns which violate the Nation's sense of decency. Attempts to picture Eisenhower as a hopeless invalid or to imply that he isn't carrying on the duties of this office because he doesn't do everything the partisans want him to do are bound in the end to lose votes for their sponsors. The American people react to wrong tactics because they have an innate belief in fair play.

[From the Indianapolis News of June 20, 1956]

PLAYING CYNICAL POLITICS WITH THE PRESIDENT'S HEALTH

President Eisenhower isn't the only one who is sick.

We—and surely millions of Americans—also are sick. Sick of the way some Democratic leaders are trying to make it appear doctors are in some sort of conspiracy to force an unfit man on the people for a second term as President.

This propaganda movement, obviously aimed at bringing about Mr. Eisenhower's withdrawal from the presidential race, is headed by Democratic National Chairman Paul Butler, of South Bend.

It was joined yesterday by Representative RAY MADDEN, Democrat, Indiana.

Mr. MADDEN even dragged in the American Medical Association and its own propaganda movement against socialized medicine.

Just what that has to do with Mr. Eisenhower's physical fitness for another term is beyond our understanding.

The only medical voices that should be heeded are those of the doctors who have treated or examined President Eisenhower. In response to sharp questioning from the press—not in volunteered comment—these doctors have expressed belief Mr. Eisenhower should be well enough to serve again.

But Mr. Butler has complained about the doctors "inventing a new science—political medical science." Seemingly, he would be satisfied with nothing less from them than a pronouncement that Mr. Eisenhower should not run again.

And there appears to have been some Democratic shopping around for doctors who have not examined the President but who will say, at least in effect, he should retire.

Actually, the White House staff has bent over backward to spread the facts about the President's health before the people.

Yesterday, in response to further questioning by reporters, the President's doctors reaffirmed their opinion that he is physically able to run for reelection despite his recent operation. Maj. Gen. Howard M. Snyder, the President's personal physician, emphasized that politics had nothing to do with their opinion. "We can't recognize a Democrat from a Republican," he said.

The Butler team's attack is particularly unseemly when one recalls 1944, when the Democrats controlled the White House and made every effort to hide the facts about a dying President from the press and the people.

In contrast, the honesty of President Eisenhower about the state of his health has been almost unprecedented in the history of government. His staff officers have been forthright in presenting the people facts to which thye are entitled. There has been no provable effort to hide or distort anything, despite innuendoes of opposition politicians.

We believe citizens can have confidence they are getting the truth.

The International Nickel Co., Inc., Cartel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEE METCALF
OF MONTANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 19, 1956

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Speaker, on June 5, 1956, I placed in the RECORD on page A4473 a letter I had addressed to the Secretary of the Interior concerning a proposed lease of Government-owned lands to the International Nickel Co. for a reported period of 50 years.

In the letter to the Secretary I raised the question of whether or not the proposed lease had been cleared with the Antitrust Division of the Department of Justice in order that the monopoly aspects, if any, of the lease could be considered.

I now wish to call to the attention of my colleagues two letters which have come to my attention concerning the workings of the International Nickel Co. monopoly, or cartel, as it applies to businessmen in the United States.

These letters indicate that even a South African concern may not sell nickel to an American businessman without the transaction going through the International Nickel Co., Inc., of New York. I am advised that the International Nickel Co. actually carries out a governmental role in the allocation of nickel to American consumers.

The ridiculous aspect of this allocation system, which is done in agreement with our executive agencies, is that both the Commerce Department and the Office of Defense Mobilization stoutly contend that they do not believe that controls should be exercised by the Government over the allocation of nickel which is in short supply largely because the Government takes some 40 percent of all available for defense and stockpiling purposes.

I submit, Mr. Speaker, that this is, indeed, a most extraordinary example of what some people choose to call free-competitive enterprise. Small-business men call it something quite different.

NICKEL ANODES
NEGRETTI & ZAMBRA
SOUTH AFRICA (PTY.), LTD.,
June 5, 1956.

ROCKWELL MANUFACTURING CO.,
Pittsburgh, Pa.

DEAR SIR: It is with regret that we have to advise of our inability to be of assistance in procuring for you the nickel anodes—your letter of April 11, 1956, reference ACB: gas referring.

The attached copy letter from Imperial Chemical Industries will show the position as advised to us.

Yours faithfully,

NEGRETTI & ZAMBRA S. A. (PTY.) LTD.,
ARTHUR A. PASSMAN.

NICKEL ANODES FOR EXPORT

IMPERIAL CHEMICAL INDUSTRIES
(SOUTH AFRICA), LTD.,
Johannesburg, May 14, 1956.

NEGRETTI & ZAMBRA SOUTH AFRICA (PTY), LTD.,
Johannesburg.

(Attention: Mr. A. A. Passman.)

DEAR SIRS: Further to our letter FS/WH of April 13, we would advise that we have heard from our principals regarding supplies of nickel anodes to the United States and are given to understand that all nickel sales to that market should be referred to the International Nickel Co., Inc., 67 Wall Street, New York.

The supply position for anodes being even more acute in the United States than in this country, deliveries are strictly controlled between customer/supplier on the basis of previous purchases. There is, therefore, nothing further we can do in the matter, except suggest that the Rockwell Manufacturing Co. approach the International Nickel Co., Inc., of New York for their requirements, for even if we were allowed to supply nickel to the United States, we would definitely not be permitted to ship to any one particular concern without the consent of the International Nickel Co., Inc.

We trust the above information is of assistance to your customer.

Yours faithfully,

IMPERIAL CHEMICAL INDUSTRIES
(SOUTH AFRICA), LTD.,
E. SIEBERT.
WATER TREATMENT AND ENGINEERING TRADES,
W. R. STEPHENS.

An American Jewish Hero

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 24, 1956

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the following articles about David Marcus, familiarly known to his friends as Micky, appeared in the June 1, 1956, issue of Israeli Speaks. June 8, 1956 marks the eighth anniversary of his tragic death in Israel, while fighting to keep that new state free. Colonel Marcus went to West Point from my congressional district.

AN AMERICAN JEWISH HERO

(Judge Arthur Schwartz)

The saga of David Marcus has yet to be told. Colonel Marcus came out of a community peopled by immigrants. Trained in the public schools of New York, he evidenced at an early age the mature judgment and the constructive and aggressive characteristics so vital to achievement. He received an appointment to West Point. After graduation, while in the service, he studied law.

Upon the completion of his term of military service, he became an assistant United States attorney under the late George Z. Medalie, an inspiring public servant. That was the beginning of my tie with him. That public position was one of a series of public service achievements. He was deputy commissioner of corrections, then commissioner under Mayor Fiorello LaGuardia, was active in innumerable community groups. Then even before war broke out, he voluntarily returned to the military service to train American men for World War II.

His career in World War II was as unique as it was varied. As Secretary of War Patterson said, he was the only man in the United States Army who, although assigned to the Judge Advocate's Office, had the authority to lead men in combat. He served in every area of military activity, both geographically and functionally—from training Rangers to preparing peace treaties, from jumping on D-day with the paratroopers to preparing orders and procedures for the government of the defeated countries, from visiting the vanquished areas and concentration camps to attending the Yalta Conference with President Roosevelt.

When Israel was battling for freedom and independence in an energetic but comparatively ineffective military manner, his services were sought out. He had just completed his service to his country and was on the verge of a real respite and the commencement of a private law practice which promised to be lucrative. His early history, his war experience, and his love of man only served to intensify his desire for the maintenance of freedom-loving places and democracy. As a Jew, it was easier for him to sacrifice his family contentment and personal safety in order to enrich the life and history of Israel.

Some day the story will be told publicly of how he, an American, came to Israel and trained a modern effective army, in a miraculously short period. He was no phantom general. He was an experienced handler of men. He was able to get along with the convict, the worker, the public servant, the leaders in the community, mayors, governors, presidents, and heads of foreign governments. The United States tacitly approved of his going. Although he died in Israel while training his forces, his body was finally laid to rest at West Point. He was Israel's Kosciusko or Lafayette.

Legends of great heroes come into being 50 or 100 years after death, but the Marcus legends started even before he entered the Israeli picture. They grew while he was in Israel, and have grown ever since. There is no need to create a Marcus legend. We need not wait 100 years to appraise his contribution by fostering wishful thinking or by exaggeration. Every Israeli person who has paid me a visit because of his contact with Marcus has only served to confirm what we all knew for many years.

Our foundation has sought to perpetuate his memory here. We know his memory is eternal in Israel. Here in the United States, there are many chapters of fraternal and community organizations named after him. New York City has honored his memory by naming a junior high school after him, by naming a playground after him, and by declaring June 8—the anniversary of his death—as David Marcus Day. Private industry has utilized his name by naming a theater after him. Boys High School, where he attended, awards a prize in his name, as does West Point. We are on the eve of greater recognition by the possibility of a book or a movie production based on his life and career.

One public servant said of him: "In 1 day (the day of his death) he has achieved an eternity which men struggle a lifetime to accomplish." That is not strictly true. He never struggled for eternity in his lifetime. He fought for what was right, and for basic truths. That was eternal. The world's events and his willingness to become a part of what many thought was a remote and minor event, the founding of a new nation against almost impossible odds and which turned out to be an important facet of international activity, brought him eternal recognition. May he rest in peace.

Statement by Assistant Secretary of Defense Carter L. Burgess on Defense Personnel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN STENNIS
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, June 22, 1956

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, recently Assistant Secretary of Defense Carter L. Burgess appeared before our Department of Defense Appropriations Subcommittee to give us firsthand information in regard to personnel losses and technical shortages in the Armed Forces of the United States. I believe that this is the best and most informative current statement on this subject, and I ask unanimous consent that Secretary Burgess' statement be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being on objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SPECIAL STATEMENT ON DEFENSE PERSONNEL BY ASSISTANT SECRETARY CARTER L. BURGESS BEFORE THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE OF THE SENATE APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE, MAY 15, 1956

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, for some time there has been a great deal of activity in the Halls of Congress, statements by administration officials and widespread coverage in the press and columns on the subject of personnel losses and technician shortages in the Armed Forces of the United States.

Rather than risk the impression that any responsible Government body or executive department is standing idly by while these problems continue or grow, I consider it high time that we take stock, count our progress and blessings and at the same time review our long-range problems and outline actions that are underway or are proposed.

Because of the intense interest and action that the Senate Appropriations Committee has taken in these matters and because the sizable financing required for each program comes before this distinguished group, I consider it imperative that I render for your personal consideration this detailed statement.

The problem of personnel losses and critical technical needs is not a problem that faces the Department of Defense and the armed services alone in today's American world.

Solving our personnel problems is more important in many respects than providing additional funds for additional items of complex equipment.

But let's take a look at the total American picture as of today and then later get on with a detailed analysis of Defense's administrative and legislative program for improving our personnel outlook.

In the New York Times of the Sunday just passed, May 13, 1956, the following was noted with respect to our Nation's present educational and industrial activities:

1. The average United States national high-school enrollment in physics is 4.4 percent; in chemistry 7.5 percent; in geomerty 11 percent; and in algrebra 25 percent.

2. A statement on education which read: "In recent months the Nation's attention has been focused on the shortage of scientists and engineers, particularly in view of the fact that the Soviet Union is making the training of technical men its major educational effort."

3. A special feature stressed that "with atomic energy, jet engines, automation, and other scientific revolutions erasing the boundary between university and factory, scientists are becoming as fundamental as salesmen in industry's scheme of things."

4. Finally, in turning to the business section, you find page after page of industrial block advertisements offering endless business opportunities for engineers to handle turbojet controls, engine vibrations, missiles systems, inertial navigation, supersonic and transonic aerodynamics, infra-red physics, and on and on.

The Sunday nearest May 13 in 1950 was Sunday, May 14, and for curiosity I carefully scanned the New York Times for that date because of its proximity to the beginning of the Korean war and to the period of this year.

In the 1950 business edition of that Sunday's Times there is but 1 wanted block advertisement for 1 radar engineer-physicist, as compared to the 62 or more block ads in this Sunday's section just past which announces openings for such industrial personnel on a grand scale.

But let's deal with today.

The Armed Forces and their personnel programs and problems are part and parcel of this change to produce a better tomorrow.

And this administration and this Congress are doing a great deal to keep abreast and ahead of this change.

Let's take a look at the elements of the change and the reasons for them:

An aggressive national industrial might providing the latest in research and development for new product needs.

The largest-sized Armed Forces maintained by America in times short of going war with 800,000 deployed outside continental United States and another 370,000 afloat and mobile.

The highest industrial employment rate in America's history.

Factors such as these set the stage for a sizable requirement on the quality production from our high schools and colleges of technically and professionally trained individuals. It places large-scale industrial activity and large-sized military forces in competition for personnel to construct and then later utilize and maintain the tools of modern war.

But all's not lost.

We plan to maintain a force of approximately 2,850,000 for the indefinite future. Reenlistment rates have gone up to over 40 percent, but within this range we are still not retaining our specially qualified military personnel at optimum combat effectiveness rates. Industry is benefiting from the trained contributions it receives from the military services. But our problem of maintaining a force of this size is a greater challenge than when we were at one-half this strength only 6 years ago. Pay and related military and civilian personnel costs, excluding housing, represents $16 billion out of our overall defense budget of $35 billion.

We must have a personnel system which is alive, responsive to changing needs. We need such a system even though we realize the size of our work force takes time to permit its problems to be identified. Then they must be understood, corrective action developed, and, when appropriate, tax dollars obtained.

Forward thinking must be applied in the personnel field or our hardware will outdistance the ability of our people to employ it.

AREAS OF APPROACH

In motivating our people toward military careers of a proper duration, I would like to discuss three general areas of approach to the problem:

First, is the broad one of better circumstances under which men and women of the Armed Forces serve. By this I mean better housing, reasonable tours of continental duty as compared to duty in overseas or outlying and remote areas, assured medical care for dependents, adequate schooling, and so on.

Second, the elimination of many inequities which cause discontent within the Armed Forces.

Third, reimbursement—and when I say reimbursement I am not talking just money. I am talking about status in the community and standard of living. I mean pride in profession and accomplishment as well as ability to provide for their families in a manner which compares more favorably with what similar talents could attain in industry.

EARLY RECOGNITION OF PROBLEM

More than 2 years ago the elements of our problem began to be apparent. The great expansion of our military personnel during the Korean war was by volunteers, but volunteers motivated by patriotism rather than a desire to make the military service a career. These men were coming due for discharge and, with the termination of the shooting war, they were not reenlisting.

We had a mass exodus of experienced personnel. Our military force was widely deployed overseas. With industry at peak employment levels and with a decision to maintain a military force of double that of pre-Korea, it was reasonable to encounter reenlistment problems. The reenlistment rate for regulars dropped to an all-time low of 23.7 percent in fiscal year 1954.

REENLISTMENT BONUS ACT

The first corrective action taken was the passage by Congress of the Reenlistment Bonus Act in July 1954. This new act sharply increased the amounts of the bonus, with the largest amounts going to those reenlisting for the first time.

This was an across-the-boards measure; it gave the same reenlistment compensation to leaders and technicians. It was a proper step at the time to check the flood of specially qualified military personnel moving toward the greater stability of civilian life.

CAREER INCENTIVE ACT OF 1955

In November 1954, it was determined that an overall adjustment in military compensation and certain allowances was vitally needed to make the military career more competitive with opportunities in civil life and to compensate for the 13-percent increase in the cost of living. The result was the prompt passage of the Career Incentive Act of 1955 which became effective on April 1, 1955.

This bill gave selective increases to military personnel after an initial period of service. These increases ranged from a maximum of 25 percent to a minimum of 6 percent.

This act also provided for improvements in situations which are peculiar to military life. It increased hazardous duty pay for officers and enlisted; it established a dislocation payment of 1 month's quarters allowance for each permanent change of station; and it authorized a special mileage allowance for movement of trailers for those families who occupied this mode of living.

We anticipated that this act would possibly give us an increased reenlistment rate of approximately 10 points. It would also protect an investment in basic training of those who would reenlist of about $320 million.

We were right in this prediction. The overall reenlistment rate changed from a low of 23.7 percent in fiscal year 1954 to a 33.8-percent rate for the final quarter of fiscal year 1955.

CIRCUMSTANCES OF SERVICE

Housing

All over the world, commanders rank housing as a priority item for discussion when I arrive. Annual increments of new housing are being constructed in the United States and abroad. This is helping our situation but we still have quite a distance to go in this area.

Meanwhile, we have some of our personnel occupying inadequate quarters for which they are charged the full amount of their rental allowance. We have proposed in S. 1947 that such quarters be occupied on a rental basis without loss of quarters allowance. This would require the serviceman to pay a fair value for the housing but not the inflated value he now pays.

We recognize the deficit in dependent housing cannot be corrected overnight but this does not take off our hands the unhappy families who must do duty in these locations when there is no housing available.

Tours of duty

This is an area where administrative competence can continue to correct whatever problem exists. The services have established normal tours of duty in various geographical locations with the shorter tours in the less favorable locations. Tours have been shortened when dependents are not with the principal.

We still have too many and too rapid transfers of personnel but continued policing of this subject and hard-boiled administrative competence within the Department of Defense can work on this problem.

There are other elements of what I have called the circumstances of service such as schooling for dependents and absentee voting which I will not develop with you but which cast their shadow to make up the gray area between a wanted and a not-wanted career.

DEPENDENT MEDICAL CARE

Final action by the Congress on the dependent medical care bill is imminent in view of the Senate vote in support on this measure yesterday.

We estimate the 40 percent of our military dependents are not near medical facilities or that overcrowded conditions prevent their treatment in these facilities. This 40 percent would get medical treatment under this bill. The other 60 percent would be assured that they would continue to receive dependent medical care. It would also improve retirement medical care for the principal and his dependents.

The worth of this bill in giving peace of mind to the serviceman that, regardless of where he is his dependents will have adequate medical protection cannot be priced out in terms of dollars and cents or predicted in terms of specific increases in the reenlistment rate. We feel certain that it will reduce one of the major deterrents to continued service for some of our personnel.

ELIMINATION OF INEQUITIES

I would like to cite three specific examples of inequities which have been identified and for which proposed corrective action in specific legislation is now before this Congress. These are survivors benefits, Academy-ROTC longevity credit, and retirement in highest grade held.

SURVIVORS BENEFITS

The inequities in the present survivor benefits system have come about unintentionally through piecemeal changes in the various programs over a long period of time. Legislation is now before the Senate (H. R. 7089) which would eliminate many of the existing inequities and modernize the overall survivorship program.

To illustrate the inequity in survivor benefits which exists under the present law, I might mention that if two captains, one a reservist and the other a regular, were killed in the same aircraft crash, they would leave their surviving wives and children with vastly different benefits. The family of the Reserve officer, with entitlements under the Federal Employees Compensation Act, would receive

about twice as much as the family of the regular officer while the children are of minor age. The widow of the reservist would receive almost four times as much as that of the regular after the children come of age.

These facts prompt this question: "Why be a regular?"

And here is a hard fact—almost 75 percent of our officers on active duty are reservists. We may have that very question asked us: "Why be a regular?" by the officers we plan to augment into the regular officer structure if S. 3124 on regular officer augmentation is passed as we are recommending.

I do not want to go into how the proposed survivor's benefits bill and regular officer augmentation will operate to correct these inequities but, if they are corrected, we can predict that they will have positive and far-reaching benefits on the overall problem.

ACADEMY/ROTC LONGEVITIY CREDIT

In the Army in fiscal year 1956 about 90 percent of the officers expected to enter the Army will come from ROTC sources. In the Air Force in fiscal year 1956, the great bulk of the 5,974 pilots they propose to train will come from the officers they expect to commission from ROTC sources.

Actually there are some 12 methods of training leading to a commission in the armed services. The route to officership via the military academies and the Reserve Officer Training Corps are the only ones in which the officer candidate does not earn longevity for pay purposes.

This is an unintentional affront which we just cannot explain. It means that the monthly base pay of an Academy or ROTC graduate on commissioning is $222 per month; an individual commissioned via other sources may earn as much as $296 per month on commissioning. Surely, it is not the intention nor the attitude of the Congress that these groups of officers should continue in a secondary category within the Armed Forces.

I invite your attention to H. R. 10212, the Cole bill, which has the endorsement of the executive branch. Its passage would have a favorable influence on reducing turnover in our officer personnel.

RETIREMENT IN HIGHEST GRADE SATISFACTORILY HELD

Present laws authorize the retirement of officers of the Navy and Marine Corps in the highest grade they have held satisfactorily on active duty. Similar temporary authority for officers of the Army and Air Force will expire December 31 of this year.

Most officers in the Air Force and many in the Army serve in temporary grades, many times two grades higher than their permanent grades. It is unreasonable to expect them to understand and accept this inequity.

There is a bill now before Congress to correct this. Unless this bill is passed, many of our best officers must look forward to years of additional service before retiring in a grade lower than that in which they have satisfactorily performed their duty. This does little to persuade such individuals that they are pursuing a wanted career.

The illustrations I have given you of inequities and our proposed action outline one of our major fields of continuing endeavor and that is to build a strong foundation for our personnel system based on equality among the various members of our Armed Forces.

STANDARD OF LIVING

The composite effect of what we have done and are doing will do much to advance both the status and the compensations—in monetary values and in personal values—for our military personnel. We must remember always, however, that we are working with an alive subject—it does not stand still. Nor does industry.

The military and civilian employees of the Department of Defense are, by far, the largest single work force in the country. To motivate our personnel to stay with us on a career basis, we have to be prepared to offer them community recognition and a standard of living which will compare reasonably favorably with that to which the individual could aspire to in industry.

CAREER RETENTION

In the current discussions of retention of personnel on a career basis we have normally talked on a gross numbers basis. You will recall that I have cited an upward trend in reenlistments in the last 2 years. Some would believe that this in itself will give us the balanced defense work-force we need. This is not so. Do not be deceived by the apparent.

We need to look more closely at the elements of this overall picture to see if we are in balance. We need to examine what is happening to the people with special military qualifications. By special military qualifications I mean the infantry squad leaders, the aviation mechanic, the propulsion technician in an atomic submarine, the K-bomb sight mechanic, the demolition specialist, and so on, and their officer counterparts. These are the men with the military talent needed to deal with today's complex equipments and to react to the more demanding problems of independent action by smaller formations of men and equipment in today's fission and fusion world.

REENLISTMENT RATES BY SKILLS

A study of the reenlistment rates for first termers by selected skills in the Army, Navy and Air Force shows that there is wide difference in reenlistment experience when we analyze it by skills.

Our retention rate is the lowest in the skills which are the most expensive to train, demand greater learning ability of the trainee, and take the longest time to train. We aren't keeping enough of the people we most need.

I well recognize the benefits to our economy as a whole derived from ploughing back into industry the millions of dollars of training accomplished in the Armed Forces. This is a beneficial byproduct of the continued maintenance of large Armed Forces but it must not be permitted to imperil the primary mission or combat effectiveness of the Armed Forces.

The training time needed to bring an individual to a usable level of training in selected skills is quite different. This means that the portion of an enlistment available after training has been completed varies widely. Possibly we need to adjust the length a man serves by the amount of training he receives during that service.

If this be a break with tradition, let us so label it and bring it into the open. The cold fact is that there is a general marketability to industry of the in-service training an individual receives and we may need do more to protect the investment we make in a man's training.

We would like that step to be one which the individual chooses for himself—a military career. But if this is not possible, then other measures appear necessary.

REENLISTMENT COMPENSATION

One such measure which suggests itself is flexible reenlistment compensations. Right now we pay the same reenlistment compensation to all men of the same grade and length of service regardless of the in-service demand for these individuals or industry's demands for them.

As the demands for personnel of certain talents change inside the service due to the changing weaponry and conditions of service, we generate excesses of certain talents. Unless the individual has a capacity for retraining into some other skill for which a demand exists, it may be that this individual should no longer be permitted to remain in the service.

This would break with the traditional view that a man who has merely kept out of trouble has a place in the military service for as long as he elects to stay. It is time we break with such tradition.

I have the feeling that we can do more with the same amount of money we now use for reenlistment compensations. I visualize a system with flexibility in it. The system would pay a higher reenlistment compensation to the individuals who are in short supply and a lower amount to individuals in oversupply. This would be an incentive system at work within the services which, by the law of supply and demand, would compensate for overages and shortages in personnel with special military qualifications by motivating individuals with the needed talents to enter the shortage fields.

RETENTION OF NEEDED PERSONNEL

In my discussion, I have tried to show how successive steps have been taken in this problem of career personnel. We have used stopgap legislation like the reenlistment bonus and the more sophisticated Career Incentive Act; we have pressed to eliminate inequities which detract from career service.

At each step upward on this ladder, we have attempted to apply the lessons learned on the previous step; we have attempted to focus from the broad general picture to the specific problem areas.

We believe we are at the point on the ladder of success where we need to refine our procedures more precisely to the point that we attract to and keep in the services, for careers of proper duration, the proportion of personnel with special military skills—leaders and technicians, officers, and enlisted—that we really need. This is not only a question of dollars. It is a question of prestige, acceptability, self-respect, first-class citizenship, and dollars.

The Congress recently took a step in the direction of paying more for special talents which are in short supply when it granted additional compensation to doctors and dentists. The need for this kind of incentive compensation has long been recognized in the hazardous duty areas of aviation, submarine, and parachute duty.

But the rest of the military machine grinds along with no discrimination between men of the same grade and length of service for different levels of special military qualification. All receive the same. This leads men in the hazardous and nonhazardous fields to seek out the less arduous and less demanding assignments because the compensations are the same. That is why we are 25 percent short in the combat arms MOS of the top three pay grades in the Continental Army and 25 percent over in administrative specialists.

ACTIVE PROGRAM

The Secretary of Defense has just appointed Mr. Ralph J. Cordiner, president of General Electric Co., as Chairman of the Defense Advisory Committee on Professional and Technical Compensation.

The committee is charged with responsibility of submitting to the Secretary of Defense recommendations for legislation that may be necessary to strengthen and stabilize the status of career personnel with special military qualifications. These recommendations are to be submitted before the next session of Congress convenes.

Further, the committee will recommend at the earliest practicable time any administrative or personnel policy improvements that can be instituted without the necessity of additional legislation.

Meanwhile, we are continuing our analysis of the administrative possibility of adjusting periods of service to equate training re-

ceived with obligation accepted; of adjusting our health standards so that individuals with motivation and skills which are in short supply will not be denied the opportunity of career service for some physical reason which limits general duty but which does not affect the area of his special talent; of expanding the portion of defense work which is done under contract by industry.

These legislative and administrative measures represent our continuing evaluation of where we are and where we should go in this changing and competitive personnel game. As I indicated in my opening remarks, we share this personnel problem with much of industry. We have come a long way with your help. In charting our future course, we must maintain contact with reality and recognize that even the most forward step by Mr. Cordiner's committee, the Defense Department and the Congress will not be the last step. It will only be the next step in this changing world.

May I say again, if our Armed Forces are to be manned with competent people, dedicated to the security of their country, we must make military life a wanted career.

Another Warning to Secretary Dulles

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 18, 1956

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, from the bulletin of June 18, 1956, of Economic Trend Line Studies, I excerpt the following:

Winston Churchill, in his book The Gathering Storm published in 1948, gave the most dramatic story of the prelude to World War II which has ever been written. It is a lesson for all time and worthy of quotation again and again.

"In this sad tale of wrong judgments formed by well-meaning and capable people, we now reach our climax. That we should all have come to this pass makes those responsible, however honorable their motives, blameworthy before history.

* * * * *

"Still, if you will not fight for the right when you can easily win without bloodshed; if you will not fight when your victory will be sure and not too costly; you may come to the moment when you will have to fight with all the odds against you and only a precarious chance of survival.

"There may even be a worse case. You may have to fight when there is no hope of victory, because it is better to perish than live as slaves."

This, then, is Winston Churchill's eloquent comment on appeasement. We hope that China or Eastern Europe or Indochina do not correspond to Czechoslovakia. We hope that there is not a future Poland in a Communist government that suddenly dominates France or Italy or the Middle East. It probably will not happen, because the parallels of history do not repeat with such exactness. Nevertheless, we cannot escape the fact that Communist doctrine is spreading in the world while traditional democratic doctrine is receding.

The decisive battle of the cold war will probably be fought over the next several years in Asia, Africa, and the Middle East. It is not likely to involve atomic weapons, but it may involve planes, guns, and tanks. It will also involve propaganda, foreign aid, trade deals, and all sorts of political and economic pressures. The pawns in the game will be the millions of uneducated and poverty-stricken natives. The West, if it is to win, will have to show more courage and boldness in the next 10 years than it has in the past 10.

Annual Address by Master of the Oregon State Grange

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, June 22, 1956

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, the Oregon State Grange, the largest farm organization in Oregon, recently held its 83d annual session in Pendleton.. The Oregon Grange has been a stalwart fighter for full development of our natural resources and for a forward-looking agricultural policy to benefit the family-size farms.

I am proud to say I am a member of the Oregon Grange, and I have long had a deep personal interest in the problems affecting our farm people. Mrs. Neuberger was born on a farm near Cloverdale, Oreg., and her mother now owns a dairy farm.

Mr. President, Elmer McClure has made a distinguished record as master of the Oregon State Grange, and I request unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD that portion of his annual address at the 83d session of the Oregon State Grange, in Pendleton, which refers to national or Federal issues so that Members of the Senate and the public will have the opportunity to study some of the basic questions which deeply concern the people of Oregon.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ANNUAL ADDRESS OF ELMER MCCLURE, MASTER OF THE OREGON STATE GRANGE, PENDLETON, OREG., TUESDAY, JUNE 5, 1956

* * * * *

2. AGRICULTURE

Right now the Government is proposing to pay farmers for retiring land from the production of surplus crops and it looks like the cycle is beginning again. Personally, I cannot envision how the present administration's so-called land bank can be of substantial benefit to farmers of the West. The wheat farmer already has had his acreage reduced to the point that any request that he "bank" additional land may be likened to asking a man to join a bond-a-month savings plan when it takes every penny he can earn to buy groceries.

As to our family-size farms in western Oregon doing much soil banking, the amount they can take out of production will not go far in solving the present surplus problem.

The biggest blow to western agriculture came when the President vetoed the certificate plan for wheat. Under it, poultry, dairy, and livestock producers, who make up a substantial part of western Oregon's agricultural economy could look for sizable cuts in feed costs, cuts which in many instances could mean the difference between profit and loss. Wheat men were confident—a confidence resulting from more than 30 years' study of the plan—that it would provide the solution to the wheat surplus problem. The veto was a severe setback in this respect but I urge that we not let it discourage us too much and that we make another try at getting it enacted next year.

In contrast to the shoddy treatment handed the wheat folks, the Midwest corn growers, where the heavy farm vote is to be found, came out exceptionally well. Growers planting within their allotments would have their corn supported at $1.50 per bushel, but the catch is that those who ignore allotments completely would still have supports at $1.25 per bushel. If the wheat man would do that, he'd have a lot of "hot" wheat on his hands, with severe penalties to pay.

Later this summer the wheat folks are going to be asked once again to vote on marketing quotas, which, if rejected, would drop the support price to 50 percent of parity to somewhere around $1.16 per bushel, f. o. b. Pendleton. That would put the support level below the world market price and bring it down to the 1929 level.

The cost-prize squeeze continues to tighten and it is only those things that farmers buy from other farmers that are lower in price.

Credit restrictions are such that in some instances reported to me farmers are paying as much as 8 percent interest on crop loans. Eight percent interest on a crop loan is almost usury.

Farm-wage rates are up more than 230 percent since 1940 and machinery and equipment costs have just about doubled. During 1955, farm income dropped 10.6 percent to slightly more than $10½ million, about on a level with 1939. And they tell us that the end is not in sight.

Hardest hit is the small, family-size farmer. None of the present programs are of tangible benefit to him and, to my knowledge, no effort is being made to bring him relief from the cost-price squeeze. He is the forgotten man of American agriculture and may soon be the nonexistent man if economic trends continue along the present course.

* * * * *

5. HELLS CANYON DAM

In treating with the present status of the Hells Canyon Dam controversy there comes to mind an old quotation which goes like this:

"When you study the past or contemplate the present, do so at least without despair in your heart, and if possible, with all the hope you can muster."

Frankly, I am more optimistic about ultimate victory in this long drawn out fight than I have been at any time since the Federal Power Commission granted Idaho Power Co. the licenses to build the three small dams.

This briefly, is the current status of the controversy:

On May 15, oral arguments were heard in the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia on our appeal from the Commission's findings. In the brief filed by the National Hells Canyon Association a very strong case is made for cancellation of the Idaho Power Co.'s licenses and I would not be the least surprised if that were done when the court renders its decision within the next few weeks.

The bill to authorize Federal construction of the high dam has been stymied in the Senate Interior Committee because it lacked but one vote of having a committee majority to bring it out on the floor. Recent developments have brought a change in the personnel of the committee, giving the advocates of the measure the necessary votes to bring it to a full vote of the Senate. Thirty Senators, including MORSE and NEUBERGER, are cosponsoring the bill and once it gets on the floor, favorable action is anticipated. A court decision in our behalf would make this almost a certainty.

If neither of these things come to pass, we will have recourse to the United States Supreme Court and to the courts here in Oregon. Oregon's attorney general has ruled that Idaho Power Co. is in violation of State law in proceeding with the construction of Brownlee Dam without a license from the Oregon hydroelectric commission and has referred the matter to the Baker County district attorney for prosecution. It is hoped that the district attorney will institute criminal proceedings immediately in keeping with his sworn duty to uphold the law.

A still further opportunity for legal action against the company recently fell through when the Secretary of the Army and the Department of Justice declined to prosecute the company for commencing construction of a bridge across the Snake at the Brownlee site before plans for the bridge had been submitted to and approved by the Chief of Engineers and the Secretary of the Army.

The fight for Hells Canyon still goes on and it is far from being the lost cause Idaho Power Co. would have us believe. This battle has been going on only since 1948, and, relatively speaking, that is but a short time when compared to the 30-year struggle to have Coulee Dam authorized and built. In that fight the proponents of the dam faced every obstacle that we have encountered in the Hells Canyon controversy, plus many more, but through dogged persistence they won out—and so will we.

6. PELTON DAM

The tactics used by Idaho Power Co. in proceeding with construction in disregard of Oregon law are being emulated by Portland General Electric Co. in the building of Pelton Dam on the Deschutes.

The Grange is opposing the Pelton project because it violates the spirit of the Columbia Basin Interagency compact reserving the tributaries of the lower Columbia as a fish sanctuary and also because the Federal Power Commission license for the dam assumes that the Federal Government rather than the State of Oregon has the highest priority over water rights, an assumption which, if allowed to go unchallenged at this juncture, could imperil every State-granted water right.

Sportsmen's groups are also vigorously opposing the project but for slightly different reasons than those of the Grange.

In any event, construction has started on the dam in defiance of State law and the attorney general has referred the matter to the Jefferson County district attorney for prosecution.

With both of the companies openly defying the State of Oregon in this respect, the time may soon be at hand when the question of jurisdiction over waters of the State must be tested in the courts.

Senator NEUBERGER has introduced legislation (S. 3250) which would revoke the Federal license for the Pelton project. It should have our support.

• • • • •

8. THE COST OF POLITICKING

In this election year it should be painfully obvious to everyone that the major offices being contested for do not always go to the most competent but instead to those with the most money to spend.

A conservative estimate is that the major 1956 campaigns will cost some $200 million. Where is the money coming from? Not from the candidates, certainly, because in the average senatorial campaign, for example, many times the total 4-year salary a Senator would earn is expended in just promoting his candidacy.

I need not tell you that huge contributions to political campaigns are not made for charitable purposes. They are considered by the donors as investments and tangible returns are expected. With the cost of getting elected to public office continuing to spiral, few candidates reach their goals without being committed to work for special interest groups.

One of the biggest items in the campaign cost ledger goes for radio and television time. Newspapers generally are liberal with their space in publicizing the words and deeds of top candidates, but not radio and TV. Time was in the early days of radio when broadcast time was allotted to candidates as a public service, but no more. Political broadcasting today is a mighty lucrative business, in some instances taking an even higher rate than regular commercial programs. A half hour on a national TV network will cost upward of $40,000.

Radio and television stations operate under monopoly licenses granted them by the Government. To get those licenses they pledge to devote a substantial part of their time to public service programs, a pledge which all too many forget about once the license has been granted. What greater public service could they render than granting the use of their facilities free to responsible candidates so that the public could be better informed at the polls?

Several moves are afoot to cut the cost of campaigning. What better way than to require radio and television stations to live up to their public service pledges and grant major candidates free and equal air time.

The Farmers Should Not Be Surprised, Although They Have a Right To Be Disappointed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 18, 1956

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the following interesting item appeared in Drew Pearson's syndicated column which appeared in various papers, including the Washington Post and Times Herald:

THE WASHINGTON MERRY-GO-ROUND
(By Drew Pearson)
BENSON SWITCHES CONFUSE FARMERS

City folks sometimes wonder why the farmer is confused, bewildered, and irate. The manner in which the man who is supposed to help the farmers, Ezra Taft Benson, backtracked, flip-flopped, and reversed himself on the question of the soil bank illustrates one reason why.

Here is the record of how the Secretary of Agriculture has gyrated on what has been heralded as the key to the Eisenhower farm policy:

Flip-flop No. 1: Benson's Department sent official letters to Congress July 27 flatly vetoing the so-called soil bank as impractical and too expensive. (It was originated by Henry Wallace in New Deal days.)

Flip-flop No. 2: President Eisenhower proposed the soil bank in his State of the Union message January 5.

Flip-flop No. 3: Despite previous opposition, Benson chided Congress in March and April for being slow in passing the soil-bank program. "Time is of the essence," he said on March 23. "The soil-bank proposal has been before Congress for 3 months, even though the President urged quick action," he said on April 5.

Flip-flop No. 4: On May 29, as Mr. Eisenhower signed the soil-bank bill, Benson announced: "We are moving immediately to put the soil-bank program into effect. Initial procedures have already gone out. The needed contract forms have already been discussed with State farmer-committeemen."

Flip-flop No. 5: At a jampacked press conference May 31, Benson further announced that price-supported crops could be plowed up "if not too far advanced," and payments would be made for them under the soil-bank program. This was adoption of the Henry Wallace plow-up program which Benson has repeatedly ridiculed.

Benson further explained that farmers were to call at local agricultural stabilization and conservation committees and enter into "agreements with committees" for soil-bank payments.

Flip-flop No. 6: Next day, farmers reading Benson's advice in the newspapers, called at ASC committees, found no contracts to make out, no instructions as to whether they were qualified to participate. Irate farmers then fired back at Washington. Farm-area newspapers also began querying Benson's office. It then developed that Agriculture Department attorneys were still studying the law. It would be 2 or more weeks, it was stated, before instruction would go to local farm committees.

Flip-flop No. 7: Speaking in Beaver Dam, Wis., on June 4, Benson stated that farmers who lose crops because of drought and flood would get no soil-bank payments. The program, he said, was to be a cut-back program.

This brought an immediate protest from Congressman CLIFF HOPE, of Kansas, a leading Republican. He called the White House privately, demanded that Benson reverse himself. A delegation also descended on the White House, including HOPE, Senators CARLSON and SCHOEPPEL of Kansas, HILL from drought-stricken Colorado, and LOVRE, of South Dakota—all Republicans.

Flip-flop No. 8: On June 8, Benson was called to the White House. This was on the day Eisenhower was rushed to the hospital for an emergency operation. He did not see Benson, but White House aides are now accustomed to assuming considerable prerogative for Ike. They told Benson he would have to reverse himself.

Later that day he did. He issued a statement that payments of $6 per acre would be made for wheat lost through drought, wind, or flood.

Flip-flop No. 9: This was a press conference called by Benson to explain there had been no flip-flop.

Newsmen had made an advance agreement not to ask Benson whether he had reversed himself on drought payments. They knew he expected to be asked, so they didn't ask him. After some awkward hemming and hawing, Benson finally took the initiative and referred to press statements that he had reversed himself.

"Of course that has not been done," he said.

He explained that when he spoke at Beaver Dam the lawyers were still interpreting the law, so he couldn't have reversed himself on drought payments.

West Virginia To Supply Coal to West Germany

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT C. BYRD
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 2, 1956

Mr. BYRD. Mr. Speaker, the recent announcement in the press that one of West Germany's biggest steel companies has completed negotiations for the pur-

chase of 3 million to 4 million tons of coal from producers in West Virginia, to be delivered in 1956, is indeed heartening news. There, however, is a disheartening side to the report, and that concerns the critical shortage of railroad freight cars. The shortage has been continuous since the end of World War II.

I should like to point up the irony in the problem of the boxcar shortage. During the recent foreign-aid hearings before the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, of which I am a member, testimony was presented to the effect that India obtained some $18.5 million in railroad rolling stock during the fiscal year 1955—much of which was purchased in the United States. I thereupon directed attention to the serious shortage of freight cars that exists in the coalfields of West Virginia, as well as in other States. Accordingly, I asked that this contribution on the part of the United States be translated into units. In response to my request, the following information was supplied for the record:

Under operational agreement No. 17, Railway Rehabilitation, the United States committed a total of $38.5 million to India during fiscal years 1954 and 1955.

The above funds were to provide the following: 100 type WG broad gage locomotives (steam); 4,365 broad-gage freight wagons; and 4,365 meter-gage freight wagons.

Country of source	Item	Value
United States	50 WG locomotives	$8,940,650
Do	1,650 MC cars	7,080,299
Do	1,650 O cars	5,846,546
	Total	21,867,495
Japan	25 WG locomotives	2,038,750
United Kingdom	do	2,036,750
Do	2,215 MC car bodies	6,176,115
Do	1,715 O car bodies	
Austria	1,000 O car bodies	1,942,000
Japan	2,715 MC wheel and axles	2,533,910
Do	2,715 O wheel and axles	
France	500 MC car bodies	750,000
	Total	15,477,525
	Grand total	37,345,020

In my opinion, the comment which I made during the hearings is apropos. It follows:

Mr. BYRD. I am quite sure that the American people, who haven't been too well pleased with the treatment that we Americans get from the Indians, as voiced by Mr. Nehru himself, are not happy and will continue not to be happy when we supply the Indians with implements of equipment that we ourselves are doing without.

The following article, which appeared in the June 20 issue of the Wall Street Journal, reports the arrangements that have been made for the supply of coal by West Virginia to West Germany:

WEST GERMAN STEEL PRODUCER GOES TO WEST VIRGINIA FOR COAL SUPPLY—BUYS 3 MILLION TO 4 MILLION TONS, TAKES OPTIONS ON LIKE AMOUNT FOR 1957

NEW YORK.—An executive of one of West Germany's biggest steel companies has completed negotiations for the purchase of 3 million to 4 million tons of American coal to be delivered in 1956.

Dr. F. W. Siebert, director of the Phoenix-Rheinrohr A. G., which describes itself as West Germany's second biggest producer of steel ingots and Western Europe's biggest maker of pipes, said he had arranged for the purchase of this quantity of coal from "a number of wholesalers and producing companies in West Virginia."

Dr. Siebert also disclosed he'd also made arrangements on options for a similar quantity of coal to be delivered next year. He said he believed the United States would remain a "permanent" supplier of coal to West Germany, despite the fact that American coal landed in his country is currently about $10 a ton more costly than other supplies.

Neither British, German, nor any other coal-producing nations of Western Europe can meet West Germany's soaring need for coal, he said. He estimated Western Europe's purchases of American coal this year would amount to some 42 million tons, compared with approximately 27 million tons in 1955.

According to the latest statistics of the United States Bureau of Mines, the United States in the first 2 months of 1956 had exported close to 1½ million tons of coal to West Germany, compared with less than 400,000 tons in the corresponding 1955 period.

But the Bonn Republic isn't the only foreign customer beating a broader path to America's coal counter; Italy, the Netherlands, Japan, and Argentina are all showing substantial increases in their purchases of coal from the United States, according to the Bureau of Mines. Total United States coal exports, over 90 percent of them bituminous, amounted to 8,735,657 tons in the first 2 months of this year. They were 4,907,638 tons a year earlier.

The president of the biggest commercial coal producing company in the United States, George H. Love of the Pittsburgh Consolidation Coal Co. told the company's annual meeting in April he expected United States coal exports this year to "reach or slightly exceed" 500 million tons, compared with 470 million tons in 1955. The company, which has properties in West Virginia, Pennsylvania, Ohio, and Kentucky, recently began a $20 million project aimed at opening up a new mine and processing plant near Moundsville, W. Va.

Coal exports, along with increased demand for coal on the part of chemical producers and atomic-energy plants, are credited with much of the improvement in coal industry fortunes in recent months. It's been a sharp turnabout, too. Pittsburgh Consolidation, for example, showed first quarter earnings of 51 cents a share after its 3-for-1 stock split, compared with 37 cents a share on present stock in the first quarter of 1955. The West Kentucky Coal Co. in the same period reported earnings of 57 cents a share compared with 19 cents a year earlier.

Shipping companies operating tramp steamers and railroads moving the coal to United States ports are also participating handsomely in coal's recovery. Overseas coal movements have proved an important prop under tramp shipping rates, pushed so high of late that coal producers in combination with several railroads and the United Mine Workers of America are currently organizing a $50 million corporation solely for the transportation of coal overseas. Railroad companies such as the Chesapeake & Ohio, Norfolk & Western and Virginian railway credit coal clients for much of the 20 percent or more improvement in profits in the early months of 1956, compared with the like 1955 months.

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

PRICE OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

The Public Printer is authorized to furnish to subscribers the daily RECORD at $1.50 per month, payable in advance.

Remit by money order payable to Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C.

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is located in Statuary Hall, House wing, where Mr. Frank Brodie is in attendance during the sessions of Congress to receive orders for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month, and where single copies may also be purchased. Orders are also accepted for the printing of speeches in pamphlet form.

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

REPRESENTATIVES WITH RESIDENCES IN WASHINGTON

OFFICE ADDRESS: House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

[Streets northwest unless otherwise stated]

Speaker, Sam Rayburn

Abbitt, Watkins M., *Va*----
Abernethy, Thos. G., *Miss*--6278 29th St.
Adair, E. Ross, *Ind*--------4200 Cathedral Ave.
Addonizio, Hugh J., *N. J*---
Albert, Carl, *Okla*---------
Alexander, Hugh Q., *N. C*--
Alger, Bruce, *Tex*---------
Allen, John J., Jr., *Calif*---
Allen, Leo E., *Ill*----------University Club
Andersen, H. Carl, *Minn*---4545 Conn. Ave.
Andresen, August H., *Minn*-
Andrews, George W., *Ala*---3108 Cathedral Ave.
Anfuso, Victor L., *N. Y*----
Arends, Leslie C., *Ill*-------4815 Dexter St.
Ashley, Thomas L., *Ohio*---
Ashmore, Robert T., *S. C*---
Aspinall, Wayne N., *Colo*--Arlington Towers, Arlington, Va.
Auchincloss, James C., *N. J*-113 S. Lee St., Alexandria, Va.
Avery, William H., *Kans*---
Ayres, William H., *Ohio*---

Bailey, Cleveland M., *W. Va*-
Baker, Howard H., *Tenn*---
Baldwin, John F., Jr., *Calif*-
Barden, Graham A., *N. C*--2601 Woodley Pl.
Barrett, William A., *Pa*----
Bass, Perkins, *N. H*--------
Bass, Ross, *Tenn*----------
Bates, William H., *Mass*----
Baumhart, A. D., Jr., *Ohio*-
Beamer, John V., *Ind*------110 Maryland Ave. NE.
Becker, Frank J., *N. Y*-----
Belcher, Page, *Okla*-------
Bell, John J., *Tex*---------
Bennett, Charles E., *Fla*---1530 38th St. SE.
Bennett, John B., *Mich*----5804 Bradley Blvd., Bethesda, Md.
Bentley, Alvin M., *Mich*---
Berry, E. Y., *S. Dak*--------2720 Terrace Road SE.
Betts, Jackson E., *Ohio*----
Blatnik, John A., *Minn*----
Blitch, Iris Faircloth, *Ga*--
Boggs, Hale, *La*-----------
Boland, Edward P., *Mass*---
Bolling, Richard, *Mo*------3409 Lowell St.
Bolton, Frances P., *Ohio*---2301 Wyo. Ave.
Bolton, Oliver P., *Ohio*----
Bonner, Herbert C., *N. C*--The Dorchester
Bosch, Albert H., *N. Y*-----
Bow, Frank T., *Ohio*-------4301 Mass. Ave.
Bowler, James B., *Ill*------
Boykin, Frank W., *Ala*------The Washington
Boyle, Charles A., *Ill*------
Bray, William G., *Ind*------
Brooks, Jack B., *Tex*-------
Brooks, Overton, *La*--------4413 46th St.
Brown, Clarence J., *Ohio*--Alban Towers
Brown, Paul, *Ga*----------Boston House
Brownson, Charles B., *Ind*-
Broyhill, Joel T., *Va*-------
Buckley, Charles A., *N. Y*--
Budge, Hamer H., *Idaho*---
Burdick, Usher L., *N. Dak*--
Burleson, Omar, *Tex*------2737 Devonshire Pl.
Burnside, M. G., *W. Va*----
Bush, Alvin R., *Pa*---------
Byrd, Robert C., *W. Va*----
Byrne, James A., *Pa*-------
Byrnes, John W., *Wis*-----1215 25th St. So., Arlington, Va.

Canfield, Gordon, *N. J*-----
Cannon, Clarence, *Mo*------
Carlyle, F. Ertel, *N. C*------The Washington
Carnahan, A. S. J., *Mo*----
Carrigg, Joseph L., *Pa*-----
Cederberg, Elford A., *Mich*-
Celler, Emanuel, *N. Y*-----The Mayflower
Chase, Jackson B., *Nebr*---Sheraton-Park
Chatham, Thurmond, *N. C*-
Chelf, Frank, *Ky*----------
Chenoweth, J. Edgar, *Colo*-
Chiperfield, Robert B., *Ill*--1713 House Office Building
Christopher, George H., *Mo*.
Chudoff, Earl, *Pa*---------
Church, Marguerite Stitt, *Ill*. 2122 Mass. Ave.
Clark, Frank M., *Pa*-------3735 Gunston Rd., Alexandria, Va.
Clevenger, Cliff, *Ohio*------The Jefferson
Cole, W. Sterling, *N. Y*----1610 44th St.
Colmer, William M., *Miss*--
Cooley, Harold D., *N. C*----2480 16th St.
Coon, Sam, *Oreg*----------
Cooper, Jere, *Tenn*--------The Washington
Corbett, Robert J., *Pa*-----
Coudert, F. R., Jr., *N. Y*----
Cramer, William C., *Fla*---Hunting Towers, Alexandria, Va.
Cretella, Albert W., *Conn*--
Crumpacker, Shepard J., Jr., *Ind*.
Cunningham, Paul, *Iowa*--
Curtis, Laurence, *Mass*----3314 O St.
Curtis, Thomas B., *Mo*-----

Dague, Paul B., *Pa*--------
Davidson, Irwin D., *N. Y*---
Davis, Clifford, *Tenn*------4611 Butterworth Pl.
Davis, Glenn R., *Wis*------2550 South Joyce, Arlington, Va.
Davis, James C., *Ga*-------
Dawson, William A., *Utah*--
Dawson, William L., *Ill*---
Deane, Charles B., *N. C*----
Delaney, James J., *N. Y*----
Dempsey, John J., *N. Mex*--2500 Q St.
Denton, Winfield K., *Ind*--
Derounian, Steven B., *N. Y*-
Devereux, James P. S., *Md*-
Dies, Martin, *Tex*---------
Diggs, Charles C., Jr., *Mich*-2705 13th St. NE.
Dingell, John D., *Mich*-----
Dixon, Henry Aldous, *Utah*-
Dodd, Thomas J., *Conn*----
Dollinger, Isidore, *N. Y*----
Dolliver, James I., *Iowa*----3752 Jocelyn St.
Dondero, George A., *Mich*--The Continental
Donohue, Harold D., *Mass*-
Donovan, James G., *N. Y*--
Dorn, Francis E., *N. Y*-----
Dorn, W. J. Bryan, *S. C*----
Dowdy, John, *Tex*---------
Doyle, Clyde, *Calif*--------3877 30th St. N., Arlington, Va.
Durham, Carl T., *N. C*-----The Lee House
Eberharter, Herman P., *Pa*-3101 4th St. N., Arlington, Va.
Edmondson, Ed, *Okla*-----
Elliott, Carl, *Ala*----------
Ellsworth, Harris, *Oreg*----4301 Mass. Ave.
Engle, Clair, *Calif*---------3840 Lorcom Lane Arlington, Va.
Evins, Joe L., *Tenn*--------5044 Klingle St.
Fallon, George H., *Md*-----
Fascell, Dante B., *Fla*-----
Feighan, Michael A., *Ohio*-
Fenton, Ivor D., *Pa*--------3725 Macomb St.
Fernandez, A. M., *N. Mex*--200 C St. SE.
Fino, Paul A., *N. Y*--------
Fisher, O. C., *Tex*---------Calvert-Woodley
Fjare, Orvin B., *Mont*-----
Flood, Daniel J., *Pa*-------The Congressional
Flynt, John J., Jr., *Ga*-----
Fogarty, John E., *R. I*-----3627 Chesapeake St.
Forand, Aime J., *R. I*------4108 Dresden St., Kensington, Md.
Ford, Gerald R., Jr., *Mich*--514 Crown View Dr., Alexandria, Va.
Forrester, E. L., *Ga*--------
Fountain, L. H., *N. C*------The Westchester
Frazier, Jas. B., Jr., *Tenn*--Fairfax Hotel
Frelinghuysen, Peter, Jr., *N. J*. 3014 N St.
Friedel, Samuel N., *Md*----
Fulton, James G., *Pa*-------

Gamble, Ralph A., *N. Y*---
Garmatz, Edward A., *Md*---
Gary, J. Vaughan, *Va*-----
Gathings, E. C., *Ark*-------6377 31st Pl.
Gavin, Leon H., *Pa*--------
Gentry, Brady, *Tex*--------
George, Myron V., *Kans*---3801 Rodman St.
Gordon, Thomas S., *Ill*----
Grant, George M., *Ala*-----4801 Conn. Ave.
Gray, Kenneth J., *Ill*------
Green, Edith, *Oreg*--------
Green, William J., Jr., *Pa*--
Gregory, Noble J., *Ky*------2401 Calvert St.
Griffiths, Martha W., *Mich*-
Gross, H. R., *Iowa*---------
Gubser, Charles S., *Calif*---
Gwinn, Ralph W., *N. Y*-----

Hagen, Harlan, *Calif*------
Hale, Robert, *Maine*-------2722 N St.
Haley, James A., *Fla*-------
Halleck, Charles A., *Ind*---4926 Upton St.
Hand, T. Millet, *N. J*------
Harden, Cecil M., *Ind*-----The Congressional
Hardy, Porter, Jr., *Va*------
Harris, Oren, *Ark*---------1627 Myrtle St.
Harrison, Burr P., *Va*------4519 So. 34th St., Arlington, Va.
Harrison, Robert D., *Nebr*--
Harvey, Ralph, *Ind*--------110 Maryland Ave. NE.
Hays, Brooks, *Ark*---------314 2d St. SE.
Hays, Wayne L., *Ohio*------The Woodner
Hayworth, Don, *Mich*------
Healey, James C., *N. Y*------
Hébert, F. Edward, *La*------104 Cockrell St., Alexandria, Va.
Henderson, John E., *Ohio*--
Herlong, A. S., Jr., *Fla*-----
Heselton, John W., *Mass*---
Hess, William E., *Ohio*-----
Hiestand, Edgar W., *Calif*--
Hill, William S., *Colo*------110 Maryland Ave. NE.
Hillings, Patrick J., *Calif*--
Hinshaw, Carl, *Calif*-------
Hoeven, Charles B., *Iowa*--100 Maryland Ave NE.
Hoffman, Clare E., *Mich*---Methodist Bldg.
Hoffman, Richard W., *Ill*---
Holifield, Chet, *Calif*------
Holland, Elmer J., *Pa*------
Holmes, Hal, *Wash*---------
Holt, Joe, *Calif*-----------
Holtzman, Lester, *N. Y*----
Hope, Clifford R., *Kans*----3541 Brandywine St.
Horan, Walt, *Wash*---------
Hosmer, Craig, *Calif*-------
Huddleston, George, Jr., *Ala*.
Hull, W. R., Jr., *Mo*-------
Hyde, DeWitt S., *Md*-------

Ikard, Frank, *Tex*---------

Jackson, Donald L., *Calif*--
James, Benjamin F., *Pa*----200 C St. SE.
Jarman, John, *Okla*-------
Jenkins, Thomas A., *Ohio*--The Mayflower
Jennings, W. Pat, *Va*------
Jensen, Ben F., *Iowa*------2120 16th St.
Johansen, August E., *Mich*-
Johnson, Leroy, *Calif*------630 North Carolina Ave. SE.
Johnson, Lester R., *Wis*----3816 Pope St. SE.
Jonas, Charles Raper, *N. C*-
Jones, Paul C., *Mo*--------3613 Greenway Pl., Alexandria, Va.
Jones, Robert E., Jr., *Ala*---
Jones, Woodrow W., *N. C*--
Judd, Walter H., *Minn*----3083 Ordway St.

Karsten, Frank M., *Mo*----
Kean, Robert W., *N. J*-----2435 Kalorama Road
Kearney, B. W. (Pat), *N. Y*-
Kearns, Carroll D., *Pa*-----Sheraton-Park
Keating, Kenneth B., *N. Y*-1612 34th St.
Kee, Elizabeth, *W. Va*-----
Kelley, Augustine B., *Pa*---
Kelly, Edna F., *N. Y*-------
Keogh, Eugene J., *N. Y*----The Mayflower
Kilburn, Clarence E., *N. Y*-The Gen. Scott
Kilday, Paul J., *Tex*-------3507 Albemarle St.
Kilgore, Joe M., *Tex*-------
King, Cecil R., *Calif*-------
King, Karl C., *Pa*----------
Kirwan, Michael J., *Ohio*--
Klein, Arthur G., *N. Y*-----
Kluczynski, John C., *Ill*---
Knox, Victor A., *Mich*-----
Knutson, Coya, *Minn*------
Krueger, Otto, *N. Dak*-----112 Schotts Court NE.

Laird, Melvin R., *Wis.*
Landrum, Phil M., *Ga.*
Lane, Thomas J., *Mass.*
Lanham, Henderson, *Ga.*
Lankford, Richard E., *Md.*
Latham, Henry J., *N. Y.*
LeCompte, Karl M., *Iowa*—Sheraton-Park
Lesinski, John, Jr., *Mich.*
Lipscomb, Glenard P., *Calif.*
Long, George S., *La.*—2136 31st St. SE.
Lovre, Harold O., *S. Dak.*—1605 Sherwood Road, Silver Spring, Md.
McCarthy, Eugene J., *Minn.*—419 Raymond St., Chevy Chase, Md.
McConnell, Samuel K., Jr., *Pa.*
McCormack, John W., *Mass.*—The Washington
McCulloch, Wm. M., *Ohio*—Westchester Apts.
McDonough, G. L., *Calif.*
McDowell, Harris B., Jr., *Del.*
McGregor, J. Harry, *Ohio*—The Westchester
McIntire, Clifford G., *Maine*—220 2d St. SE.
McMillan, John L., *S. C.*—1201 S. Barton St., Arlington, Va.
McVey, William E., *Ill.*—The Coronet
Macdonald, Torbert H., *Mass.*
Machrowicz, Thaddeus M., *Mich.*—812 Park Ave., Falls Church, Va.
Mack, Peter F., Jr., *Ill.*
Mack, Russell V., *Wash.*
Madden, Ray J., *Ind.*
Magnuson, Don, *Wash.*
Mahon, George H., *Tex.*—Alban Towers
Mailliard, William S., *Calif.*
Marshall, Fred, *Minn.*
Martin, Jos. W., Jr., *Mass.*—The Hay-Adams
Mason, Noah M., *Ill.*—The Baronet
Matthews, D. R. (Billy), *Fla.*
Meader, George, *Mich.*—8360 Tennyson St.
Merrow, Chester E., *N. H.*
Metcalf, Lee, *Mont.*
Miller, A. L., *Nebr.*—2801 East-West Highway, Chevy Chase, Md.
Miller, Edward T., *Md.*—2901 Conn. Ave.
Miller, George P., *Calif.*
Miller, William E., *N. Y.*—3708 Calvend Lane, Kensington, Md.
Mills, Wilbur D., *Ark.*—2701 Conn. Ave.
Minshall, William E., *Ohio.*
Mollohan, Robert H., *W. Va.*
Morano, Albert P., *Conn.*
Morgan, Thomas E., *Pa.*
Morrison, James H., *La.*—4301 Mass. Ave.
Moss, John E., Jr., *Calif.*—204 Jefferson St., Alexandria, Va.
Moulder, Morgan M., *Mo.*
Multer, Abraham J., *N. Y.*
Mumma, Walter M., *Pa.*—The Coronet
Murray, James C., *Ill.*
Murray, Tom, *Tenn.*
Natcher, William H., *Ky.*—5108 Bradley Blvd., Bethesda, Md.
Nelson, Charles P., *Maine.*
Nicholson, D. W., *Mass.*
Norblad, Walter, *Oreg.*
Norrell, W. F., *Ark.*—2301 Conn. Ave.
O'Brien, Leo W., *N. Y.*
O'Brien, Thomas J., *Ill.*—The Hamilton
O'Hara, Barratt, *Ill.*—The Congressional
O'Hara, Joseph P., *Minn.*—2813 31st St.
O'Konski, Alvin E., *Wis.*—4201 Mass. Ave.
O'Neill, Thomas P., Jr., *Mass.*
Osmers, Frank C., Jr., *N. J.*
Ostertag, Harold C., *N. Y.*—100 Maryland Ave. NE.
Passman, Otto E., *La.*
Patman, Wright, *Tex.*—117 Carroll St. SE.
Patterson, James T., *Conn.*
Pelly, Thomas M., *Wash.*
Perkins, Carl D., *Ky.*
Pfost, Gracie, *Idaho.*
Philbin, Philip J., *Mass.*
Phillips, John, *Calif.*
Pilcher, J. L., *Ga.*
Pillion, John R., *N. Y.*
Poage, W. R., *Tex.*—2309 Skyland Pl. SE.
Poff, Richard H., *Va.*
Polk, James G., *Ohio.*
Powell, Adam C., Jr., *N. Y.*
Preston, Prince H., Jr., *Ga.*
Price, Melvin, *Ill.*
Priest, J. Percy, *Tenn.*—The Berkshire
Prouty, Winston L., *Vt.*
Quigley, James M., *Pa.*
Rabaut, Louis C., *Mich.*
Radwan, Edmund P., *N. Y.*
Rains, Albert, *Ala.*
Ray, John H., *N. Y.*
Rayburn, Sam, *Tex.*
Reece, B. Carroll, *Tenn.*
Reed, Daniel A., *N. Y.*—The Woodner
Rees, Edward H., *Kans.*—1801 16th St.
Reuss, Henry S., *Wis.*—1650 30th St.
Rhodes, George M., *Pa.*—1809 Franklin St. NE.
Rhodes, John J., *Ariz.*
Richards, James P., *S. C.*
Riehlman, R. Walter, *N. Y.*—3210 Wis. Ave.
Riley, John J., *S. C.*
Rivers, L. Mendel, *S. C.*
Roberts, Kenneth A., *Ala.*—6102 Cromwell Dr.
Robeson, Edward J., Jr., *Va.*
Robsion, John M., Jr., *Ky.*—1500 Delafield Pl.
Rodino, Peter W., Jr., *N. J.*
Rogers, Byron G., *Colo.*
Rogers, Edith Nourse, *Mass.*—The Shoreham
Rogers, Paul G., *Fla.*—Sheraton-Park
Rogers, Walter, *Tex.*
Rooney, John J., *N. Y.*
Roosevelt, James, *Calif.*
Rutherford, J. T., *Tex.*
Sadlak, Antoni N., *Conn.*
St. George, Katharine, *N. Y.*
Saylor, John P., *Pa.*
Schenck, Paul F., *Ohio.*—3801 Conn. Ave., Apt. 307
Scherer, Gordon H., *Ohio*—The Mayflower
Schwengel, Fred, *Iowa.*
Scott, Hugh, *Pa.*
Scrivner, Errett P., *Kans.*—2331 Cathedral Ave.
Scudder, Hubert B., *Calif.*—4545 Conn. Ave.
Seely-Brown, Horace, Jr., *Conn.*
Selden, Armistead I., Jr., *Ala.*—4625 B 36th St. So., Arlington, Va.
Sheehan, Timothy P., *Ill.*
Shelley, John F., *Calif.*
Sheppard, Harry R., *Calif.*
Short, Dewey, *Mo.*
Shuford, George A., *N. C.*—Sheraton-Park
Sieminski, Alfred D., *N. J.*
Sikes, Robert L. F., *Fla.*
Siler, Eugene, *Ky.*
Simpson, Richard M., *Pa.*—5205 Lawn May, Chevy Chase, Md.
Simpson, Sid, *Ill.*—2100 Mass. Ave.
Sisk, B. F., *Calif.*
Smith, Frank E., *Miss.*
Smith, Howard W., *Va.*—204 W. Walnut St., Alexandria, Va.
Smith, Lawrence H., *Wis.*—2480 16th St.
Smith, Wint, *Kans.*
Spence, Brent, *Ky.*—Sheraton-Park
Springer, William L., *Ill.*
Staggers, Harley O., *W. Va.*
Steed, Tom, *Okla.*
Sullivan, Leonor K., *Mo.*
Taber, John, *N. Y.*
Talle, Henry O., *Iowa.*—4613 Harrison St.
Taylor, Dean P., *N. Y.*
Teague, Charles M., *Calif.*
Teague, Olin E., *Tex.*—6015 Mass. Ave.
Thomas, Albert, *Tex.*—2901 34th St.
Thompson, Clark W., *Tex.*—Sheraton-Park
Thompson, Frank, Jr., *N. J.*
Thompson, Ruth, *Mich.*
Thompson, T. A., *La.*—1600 Kenwood Av., Alexandria, Va.
Thomson, E. Keith, *Wyo.*
Thornberry, Homer, *Tex.*
Tollefson, Thor C., *Wash.*
Trimble, James W., *Ark.*
Tuck, William M., *Va.*
Tumulty, T. James, *N. J.*
Udall, Stewart L., *Ariz.*
Utt, James B., *Calif.*
Vanik, Charles A., *Ohio.*
Van Pelt, William K., *Wis.*
Van Zandt, James E., *Pa.*—Arlington Towers, Arlington, Va.
Velde, Harold H., *Ill.*
Vinson, Carl, *Ga.*—4 Primrose St., Chevy Chase, Md.
Vorys, John M., *Ohio.*—2032 Belmont Rd.
Vursell, Charles W., *Ill.*—The Congressional
Wainwright, Stuyvesant, *N. Y.*
Walter, Francis E., *Pa.*
Watts, John C., *Ky.*
Weaver, Phil, *Nebr.*—9408 Crosby Rd., Silver Spring, Md.
Westland, Jack, *Wash.*
Wharton, J. Ernest, *N. Y.*
Whitten, Jamie L., *Miss.*—5804 Nebraska Ave.
Wickersham, Victor, *Okla.*
Widnall, William B., *N. J.*
Wier, Roy W., *Minn.*
Wigglesworth, R. B., *Mass.*—3257 N. St.
Williams, Harrison A., Jr., *N. J.*
Williams, John Bell, *Miss.*—1001 26th Road S., Arlington, Va.
Williams, William R., *N. Y.*—1241 Pa. Ave. SE.
Willis, Edwin E., *La.*
Wilson, Earl, *Ind.*
Wilson, Robert C. (Bob), *Calif.*
Winstead, Arthur, *Miss.*
Withrow, Gardner R., *Wis.*
Wolcott, Jesse P., *Mich.*—3707 Thornapple St., Chevy Chase
Wolverton, Charles A., *N. J.*—1336 HOB
Wright, Jim, *Tex.*
Yates, Sidney R., *Ill.*
Young, Clifton (Cliff), *Nev.*—2705 Westminister Pl., Alexandria, Va.
Younger, J. Arthur, *Calif.*—4545 Conn. Ave.
Zablocki, Clement J., *Wis.*
Zelenko, Herbert, *N. Y.*

DELEGATES

Bartlett, E. L. (Bob), 1718 33d Pl. SE. *Alaska.*
Farrington, Mrs. Joseph R., *Hawaii.*

RESIDENT COMMISSIONER

Fernós-Isern, A., *P. R.*—2210 R St.

OFFICERS OF THE HOUSE

Clerk—Ralph R. Roberts.
Sergeant at Arms—Zeake W. Johnson, Jr.
Doorkeeper—William M. Miller, 1732 S St. SE.
Chaplain—Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., 1421 Montague St.
Postmaster—H. H. Morris.

OFFICIAL REPORTERS OF DEBATE

SENATE

James W. Murphy, 7 Primrose St., Chevy Chase, Md.
John D. Rhodes, 3535 Williamsburg Lane.
Gregor Macpherson, 3111 44th St.
Herbert N. Budlong, Kurtz Rd., McLean, Va.
J. Chester Wilfong, 4408 Fourth Road North, Arlington, Va.
Charles J. Drescher, 3738 North 4th St., Arlington, Va.
Francis J. Attig, 3919 Livingston St.
Nicholas J. Cinciotta, 400 Williamsburg Dr., Silver Spring, Md.
Elmer L. Koons (assistant), 826 Aspen St.
Willard W. Pruett (clerk), 1200 North Stuart St., Arlington, Va.
Placidino Zagami (clerk), 5805 10th Place, Chillum, Md.

HOUSE

W. L. Fenstermacher, 2929 Connecticut Ave.
Roy L. Whitman, 4820 Linnean Ave.
F. S. Milberg, 5032 Massachusetts Ave.
E. B. Clark, 604 Bennington Dr., Silver Spring, Md.
Frank E. Battaglia, 957 East-West Highway.
Claude S. Scheckel, 6 East Blackthorne St., Chevy Chase, Md.
Albert Schneider, 7516 14th St.
Paul L. Miller (clerk), Shadyside, Md.
Sidney W. Williston (assistant clerk), 1830 Longford Drive, Hyattsville, Md.
Bjarne J. Sigurdsen (assistant clerk), 1921 You Place, SE.

Appendix

Foreign Policy Address by Former Senator William Benton

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. WILLIS ROBERTSON
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, June 25, 1956

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address by former Senator William Benton, publisher of the Encyclopaedia Britannica, before the Union League Club of Chicago on June 14, 1956. I am informed by the Public Printer that the address will require 2¼ pages of the RECORD, at an estimated cost of $180. Notwithstanding this estimate, I ask unanimous consent that the address be printed in the RECORD, because it deals with the vital question of foreign policy.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE SOVIET CHALLENGE

(Talk by William Benton, publisher, Encyclopedia Britannica, Union League Club of Chicago, June 14, 1956)

Since 1928 when I spent the first year of my married life in Chicago, this great city of yours, the greatest business city of all the world, has been my second home. Thus I was honored to accept your invitation. Perhaps I was pleased also because you had invited a businessman who believes the Democrats may have been better for business over the past half century than the Republicans. If you want me to document that belief, just write me and I shall do so.

Colonel McCormick, whom I counted among my friends, never could quite bring himself to an all-out crusade against monopoly. But he opposed what he called "absentee ownership." Though I am absent from Chicago most of every month I do not regard myself as absent in any but a merely physical sense. As chairman of two Chicago companies each day I am in intimate touch with the city of the broad shoulders. Still today, as I approach 60, I spend at least one week each quarter in Chicago. I have no personal connections or responsibilities which mean more to me than my role as trustee of the University of Chicago and the Cradle Society. Here from this community came 3 of my 4 children. Here now lives the fourth, my oldest son, and here live also many of my closest friends and business associates. But among you are many far more competent than I to sing the glories of Chicago and its great institutions. You have asked me today to talk to you about the Soviet Union.

Until about a year ago you and I, as businessmen, couldn't learn much about the U. S. S. R. We couldn't do much about anything we learned. Russia seemed to be a problem for the technicians. It was a problem for the military men, and for the intelligence officers, and for the diplomats—all with their information classified and secret and for a handful of scholars and newspapermen.

The picture is changing today. It is becoming visible and it is developing in ways that are extremely significant to all of us. The basic aim of the Soviet Union hasn't changed. That aim is still to communize the world—and to dominate the world once it is communized. It is the strategy and tactics that have begun to be transformed. This process started shortly after Stalin's death. It is symbolized in many people's minds by the Geneva Conference of last summer—the summit conference—and by the great Soviet propaganda phrase, "the spirit of Geneva."

This new strategy seeks to play down the use of force, and the threat of force, in the international arena. It softens the crude, harsh manners of Stalin's last years. It lifts the Iron Curtain a fraction. It strives to place new emphasis on ideological competition and on economic competition.

I spent 2 years, just after the war, as Assistant Secretary of State in charge of our meager American worldwide information program. I said then, and I say now, that we are taking an ideological beating from the Communists in many key areas of the world. The Communists have poured the men and the money and the talent into ideological warfare. We have not. They have learned the propaganda techniques. We still haven't.

Western observers now seem agreed that, as a consequence of these new tactics, the Soviets will be far more difficult for us to meet and outmatch in the future. At the same time these tactics can produce greater insight into the world problem—and greater participation in it—for our citizens. We can hope that this greater understanding may prove to be one clear gain for our free democracy.

As between military competition—hydrogen bomb competition—on the one hand, and ideological and economic competition on the other, all of us most fervently prefer the latter. Further, rightly or wrongly, we Americans happily choose to think we are pretty good at ideological and economic competition. At least it is in the open. We can follow it and try to take part in it.

At first, shortly after the death of Stalin, some western observers claimed the new Soviet dictators were leading from weakness—that the Soviet strategy was switched because of failure and desperation. As recently as last autumn our Secretary of State told a congressional committee that the Soviets seemed on the verge of callapse. Today most experts believe that Khrushchev and Bulganin and the Presidium are leading from strength. They often seem confident they can win the world without a war—and so why fight? Khrushchev attacks Stalin for his unwarranted and unjustified fears. A few weeks back, when the Soviets cut down their military force by 1,200,000, our Secretary of State decided that their purpose was still further to build up Soviet power by putting the soldiers into industry. On this, I think he was right. This is the new front of the new cold war, but backed, as always, by military power.

Last week Khrushchev told the Young Communist League of Moscow, "We believe that communism will vanquish capitalism without war." That phrase "without war" is new. A staple of Communist dogma has been the Marxist teaching that the capitalist nations, after fighting among themselves, would in their death throes lash out at communism.

As seems to me fitting in this capital of world business and industry, in the balance of this talk today I shall describe to you briefly some aspects of Soviet competition as I have observed them, as they are unfolding on the economic front. Competitive coexistence, I believe, is going to prove plenty competitive. The Russians may prove just as formidable competition in the economic sphere as in the military or ideological.

Underestimating his competition, as every good businessman knows, is the worst of the deadly economic sins. Let us therefore not sneer at the cards the Reds hold—even though the cards be stained with blood. Let us remember that we may be competing with the Russians for higher and ever higher spirals of productivity for the rest of this century. The prize is the uncommitted billion of the earth's population who may hold the world balance of power.

The most dramatic postwar development in the U. S. S. R. is the striking growth of its economy. Today the Soviet Union stands second only to the United States as the world's largest industrial power. It produces virtually every conceivable product from hydrogen bombs to television sets, from jet passenger planes and automation equipment to toys.

Even more dramatic is the gigantic future growth planned by the Soviet leaders. They propose to surge forward another 70 percent by 1960. They have committed themselves to sensational new goals by the 1960 target date of the current 5-year plan. Coal output is to increase from 390 to 590 million tons, which would make the U. S. S. R. the largest producer in the world. Steel tonnage is to rise from 48 to 68 million tons—metric tons, 10 percent heavier than hours. The projected steel increase is greater than the total present output of great Britain. Sixty-eight million tons is greater than the combined production of Britain and West Germany. Electricity is projected to rise in the 5 years from 166 to 320 billion kilowatts—to about half of the United States output. And so forth, across the industrial boards.

This proposed rate of expansion is much higher than that of any Western country, including the United States. Even more significant, as a long-range trend, is the fact that whereas in the West 70 percent of industrial resources goes into consumption, in the Soviet Union it is only about 40 percent. The Soviet steel doesn't go into cars and refrigerators and dishwashers—it goes into armaments and into machine tools and into facilities for making more steel.

This tremendous effort, of course, comes out of the hides of the Russian people. It is drawn literally out of their blood, sweat, and tears. But it comes also out of the use of their brains and their talent. This we must not overlook. Audiences I have been talking to since my return from Russia seem astonished when I tell them that there are more students above the secondary school level today in the Soviet Union than in the United States, that the U. S. S. R. graduated 63,000 engineers last year—competent and Communist-indoctrinated—to our 23,000. By 1960 they will have as high a proportion of their youth completing high school as we do. Indeed, they project compulsory high school for all, in contract to our current graduating rate of 80 percent. Perhaps more important, the Communists

have developed a system for stimulating and prodding and propelling their ablest students to reach their maximum potential. This is in contrast to the disgraceful statistic that has recently come to light about our own system, under which more than two-thirds of the ablest 20 percent of our high-school students—14 out of 20 of our best—fail to finish college. Some never finish high school, some don't bridge the gap to college, others drop out of college—mostly, in my judgment, for economic reasons.

I would call the Russian school system a system of training, rather than education. Our American aim is to develop each student to his highest potential as an individual, for his own happiness and for the good of society. The Russian goal is to produce highly trained human instruments for the service of the state. Nevertheless, the Soviet training system is going to be a mighty force in the competitive coexistence that lies ahead.

I have 6 reasons for believing the current Soviet 5-year plan—the sixth 5-year plan, and by far the most ambitious of the six—will succeed. This current plan not only predicts a 70-percent increase in U. S. S. R. production but a 65-percent increase in capital goods as well.

My first reason is simple. It is history. Though they have consistently failed to meet agricultural goals in the five previous plans, the Soviets have just as consistently confounded western skeptics by achieving or overachieving their objectives in heavy industry. Stalin's visions, which made western experts scoff, are today's industrial realities.

My second reason for refusing to underrate Russian industrial achievement is what I have just been talking about—their tremendous rate of production of trained specialists. I saw evidence of this with my own eyes in Leningrad, Moscow, and Kiev. At the Community Party congress in February, Bulganin said:

"Specialists are our gold reserve. We are proud of them and we value them. Altogether, 4 million specialists are to graduate under the sixth 5-year plan. That is nearly as many as were trained during the last two plans."

Bulganin added: "It is no wonder certain figures in the capitalist state are not without concern that their own countries are behind us in the training of specialists."

I happen to think that Bulganin may have been referring to me. I have been writing and speaking widely on this subject. I met him at a reception in Moscow, and, incidentally, it was only due to this meeting that I was able to arrange to meet the top Soviet educational and cultural officers and ministers, not previously interviewed by any westerner.

This ever-increasing crop of Soviet technicians will pour into the Soviet economy like an accelerating flow of adrenalin. Our American corporations, in their frantic competition for young engineers and scientists, know the productive value of a great stream of highly trained specialists.

Third, the Russians seem slowly to be veering toward their own version of two capitalistic ideas—decentralization and internal competition. We in the United States know these have been keys to our own productivity. The Soviet leaders are now giving more authority, both in planning and operations, to local managers. Inefficient bureaucrats are being lambasted in Russia even as in the United States. As for competition—which they call "socialist competition"—that is growing between different ministries, different regions in the same industry, between industries and between different geographical regions and political units.

It is not the competition we here know so well. But in some ways it's not so different. The fact that the Soviets have three complete airplane industries competing with each other for government largess is said to be a major reason for the excellence of the Soviet planes.

Fourth, the Communists may begin to obsolete equipment faster than we do. They don't have to worry about treasury rulings on amortizing their equipment. They can often junk it more casually. This is an advantage in moving toward widespread application of automation.

Fifth, the new men in the Kremlin, though their ultimate aims are the same as Stalin's, seem more flexible and confident. They are willing to admit the West may have some useful know-how. Their magazines are saying in effect, "Comrades, let us not be arrogant; we have much to learn from the West about productivity." Thus the Soviet leaders want to trade technical know-how with the rest of the world. They ask for "exchanges of personnel," and through these you may be sure they expect to learn and to benefit.

Finally, and sixth, the new generation of administrators and managers—and I interviewed some 40 or 50 in various ministries—struck me as men of ability who would rise in any society. Most were in their forties, thus were small children at the time of the revolution. They are able and dedicated, self-possessed, and relaxed. Further, they are thoroughly indoctrinated Communists, ready to sacrifice themselves and others for the Communist cause. They are, of course, frighteningly ignorant of the West, of its values and its hopes and goals.

If I'm right in my estimate of accelerating Soviet economic productivity, this is a vital deduction to the calculation of American policy. Every day's newspaper brings fresh stories bearing on this epochal issue, I am discussing today. The New York Times carried a story from Moscow datelined just a week ago today, reporting the issuance of the first statistical survey of the Soviet economy since 1939. It covers the period 1913 through 1955. The fact such a report has been published is in itself significant. I find the figures believable. Most Soviet statistics have been so. The record varies widely from field to field. But the overall figure on gross national product is impressive: Taking the 1913 output at 100 the figure for 1939 is given at 578, for 1945 at 593 (observe that there was some growth even during the war years, despite the fact the Soviets lost nearly half their industrial capacity in the first months of the Nazi invasion); for 1955 the figure is given as 2,723—27 times 1913. Thus if the U. S. S. R. achieves its current 5-year goal of another 70 percent step-up, this percentage by 1960 will be 4,349 percent of 1913.

What does this rising curve mean for American businessmen, and for the Western World in general? It seems to me the Soviet economy flings three obvious challenges at us.

The first challenge stems from the fact that most of the world's population lives in what have come to be called the underdeveloped countries: Chiefly in Asia, Africa, and Latin America. To the people of these lands, the Communists argue that they have the system which will solve their problems of poverty and backwardness. "Look how we have pulled ourselves up by our own bootstraps," they say. "Follow us and you can do likewise." The Soviets argue that the tremendous progress of their industry in less than four decades proves that the Communist way of life is the quickest and surest means for propelling a nation forward. Free enterprise, they argue, is just a propaganda phrase for what they call monopoly capitalism. It means continued backwardness, continued exploitation by the advanced industrial nations of the West, and slow industrial growth if any.

This Communist argument isn't new. What is new is that the Soviet Union and its satellites are now in a position to back it up through the export of capital and technical assistance on a major scale and for the first time. Up until now, they've largely had to employ words instead of deeds, promises instead of performance. Now they have a few deeds for sale, and some performance. And with their genius for propaganda they'll know how to exploit this.

The old argument, therefore, now becomes much more impressive. After all, in India the Soviets are today providing a steel mill of 1 million tons annual capacity. In Egypt they are laying the groundwork for an Egyptian atomic-energy industry. In Burma they are building a technological institute which they will staff themselves. They are building roads in Afghanistan and pouring $100 million into her economy.

All signs indicate that this Soviet-type point-4 program will be extended. It will be most surprising, for example, if Latin America does not receive enticing offers from Deputy Premier Mikoyan when he visits there later this year.

The second challenge the Soviet economy flings at the West is the challenge to western unity which will be created by Soviet and Communist-bloc trade offers. The cement of our western unity has been fear of Soviet military and political aggression. We have been fully justified in that fear. But if and as this recedes, as it becomes less obvious and less dramatic, the lure of profiting from Soviet trade will grow and the cohesion of the West will be harder to maintain.

For several years, and most recently during Khrushchev's and Bulganin's visit to Great Britain, the Communists have been arguing that only American obstructionism prevents the free world from selling billions of dollars worth of goods to the Soviet Union, to Eastern Europe and Communist China. In Birmingham. Mr. Khrushchev spoke contemptuously of present trade as the exchange of Russian crabs for British herrings. He offered to buy almost $3 billion worth of British goods if only the present embargo on strategic exports was removed. This may be only a propaganda offer. But it is the kind of propaganda that can create strains among the Western nations.

Now for a third Soviet challenge and this alarms me less than the first two—though it may surprise you more. This is Soviet competition as a seller on world markets. Some of you here today may shortly begin to feel that competition. I suspect we shall find Soviet automobiles, Soviet tractors, Soviet machine tools, and a wide spectrum of Soviet industrial products offered for sale abroad. The terms may be more advantageous to the buyer than ours. There have already been hints that the Soviet Government is thinking of offering for sale the new two-jet passenger planes that were displayed in London several weeks ago. When I was in Finland last fall, the Soviet Government was exerting pressure for permission openly to flood the Finnish market with Soviet television sets, which could receive the Soviet TV broadcasts beamed to Finland and at the time of my visit only available to bootlegged sets.

The Soviets will have several important advantages in this new kind of product competition. The Soviet aim is always more political than economic. On any particular product or commodity, they do not have to make a profit on what is sold abroad. Soviet books and newspapers carrying Soviet propaganda are sold abroad for ridiculously low prices—prices that have no relationship to cost. Similarly, if it suits Soviet propaganda purposes, automobiles or tractors or machine tools can be sold at prices below those of western producers. I am told that the cheapest automobile on sale today in the Argentine is a Soviet model.

In the product competition of the next few years it seems to me that Western products should usually have a decided edge in quality. However, this cannot be taken for granted. Not long ago General Partridge of the Air Force testified to a Senate committee

that the Soviet Bison bomber flies 5,000 feet higher than our best pursuit planes—yes, and also faster. We read how Dresser Industries has been seeking rights to manufacture a Soviet turbodrill for oil wells, said to be 10 times faster than conventional rotary drills. The Soviets have not yet turned their technological skills to the products produced by many of us here today.

• • • • •

I shall not attempt to prescribe policy to meet today these new challenges. I am myself still seeking orientation. There is often, however, a great gap between Soviet statements and Soviet reality. Take Mr. Khrushchev's complaint about British-Soviet trade being confined to herrings and crabs. If you look at the trade statistics, you will find that Soviet purchases in the British Commonwealth have been shooting up because of increased buying of copper, rubber, and textile machinery. Those are strange herrings indeed. This kind of falsification and misrepresentation is common Soviet practice.

The most potent answer, of course, to the economic gauntlet the Soviets are flinging at us is the continuing demonstration that our kind of economy—with its infinite variations—is more productive than the Soviet system.

A further and most important answer lies in the query whether we can speed up economic development throughout the non-Communist world, and not just here in the United States, so that as Communist strength increases, ours of the free world increases even more rapidly.

The new competition that is developing across the globe is between the Soviet economic system, poisoned by ruthless disregard of human values but arguing that it gets fast results, and the American system, represented by you here in this room, you who build businesses on individual incentive, enthusiasm, and conviction.

A new report by the Committee for Economic Development analyzes America's role in the underdeveloped countries. Yes, these countries need capital. Yes, they need technical know-how. But the CED points to a third great need—that for entrepreneurial talent. That is a talent the Russians haven't cultivated as have we. It is a talent that is in short supply even in Western Europe, with its cartels and its rigidities and its class systems. We like to think it is an abundant natural resource of this country, springing out of our feerer economic system.

As I conclude I suggest that we businessmen must understand better and become clearer in our minds about the values America seeks. We Americans pride ourselves because we cherish political and personal freedom. With varying degrees of passion, every people on the face of the earth cherishes these same values. Up to the present moment we Americans have been able to argue that our competitive system leads not only toward political and personal freedom, which are good in themselves, but toward a uniquely high material standard of living. We have had it both ways—freedom and material well-being. In our minds, the two go together.

We shall always have the freedom argument, so long as the Communists remain Communists. In my judgment we shall also have the standard of living argument so long as we keep our system free and competitive. But our economic advantages overseas seem about to become less dramatic. Freedom was always the higher argument. But I do not believe the world is sure that we know this. Many people overseas, even among our friends, are not sure that if ever we Americans had to choose between freedom and material well-being—we would unhesitatingly choose freedom. Yet freedom is the great value which the American people historically cherish.

I would like to hope that business leaders such as you here today will begin to apply your skills to these new problems around which the future of our country revolve. I hope you will apply your skills not only to raising the American standard of living, but to raising a nobler standard—a standard which is the finest product of the ages—the standard of personal, of civil and political freedom—the standard of our American freedom of which you leaders of the American business community should be the proud advance guard.

Proposed National Physical Fitness Commission

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 25, 1956

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, recently in Annapolis, some of the Nation's physical education specialists and prominent figures from the sports world were assembled in a physical-fitness conference at the request of the President.

The direction much of the thinking is taking comes to light in an excellent article which featured the February 1956 issue of the Physical Fitness News Letter from the University of Oregon. It was written by Dr. H. Harrison Clarke, an eminent authority on the subject of physical fitness.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that the article entitled "What the Country Needs: A National Physical Fitness Commission" be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHAT THIS COUNTRY NEEDS: A NATIONAL PHYSICAL FITNESS COMMISSION

(By H. Harrison Clarke)

CONSIDERATIONS

1. An essential starting point in developing physical fitness throughout the Nation is to redirect physical education as it is practiced in our schools and colleges. During the origins of physical education in this country (1825–1914), physical fitness was the major function of physical education; today, in general, it is subordinate to such objectives as social efficiency, recreational competency, athletic skill, and the like. These objectives are important but do not justify neglect of physical fitness. Therefore, a basic need nationally is to motivate physical education's return to a primary consideration of physical fitness.

2. Several recent events have tended to awaken anew the consciousness of physical educators to physical fitness, especially the Kraus-Hirschland statistics comparing the fitness of European and American children, President Eisenhower's interest in this problem, and a national press devoting space to this issue. However, such stimulation alone will not solve the problem. In fact, the fitness program proposed by the President and others, while well intended, is not properly conceived as it is geared to the athlete and not those who most need physical development, the physically subpar boys and girls.

3. Thus, we need redirection, but we also need a properly designed program and assistance in conducting it. The Oregon physical fitness program, previously described in this News Letter is directed toward boys and girls who are subpar in fundamental physical fitness elements; is based upon the identification of such individuals through the use of the most valid tests available to physical education and is designed to meet the individual needs of each low fitness individual. We feel strongly that this program will vastly improve the physical fitness of the children of this State in ways which are fundamental to their growth and their development into manhood and womanhood.

4. But, even a relatively small-populated State like Oregon, must go slowly in inaugurating such a program, as there are serious problems to overcome. These problems include: A lack of testing instruments, the cost of these instruments, the need for skilled testers, inadequate professional understanding of the program proposed for those who are physically subpar, and the necessary staff and program time to conduct such a fitness program. So, what has Oregon done? The answer: Establish pilot physical fitness centers in at least 1 school in each of 10 areas of the State, with a minimum of 100 boys and 100 girls included at each center. Actually, 12 schools will be involved this year with a total of approximately 3,000 pupils. The plan provides means to expand the program each year. The belief is that every step should be correctly conceived, even though progress is slow but, at least progress should be made at once. This project depends on the voluntary services of many people; the financing is very little, being limited to travel, lodging, and meals for the testing teams. A great deal more could be done if ample funds were available.

5. An effort is now being made to form an interstate physical fitness council. The issue is currently before the Oregon and Washington associations for health, physical education, and recreation. This council would permit concerted action by States toward effective physical fitness programs; and would provide an opportunity for the exchange of ideas and experiences.

PROPOSAL

What this country needs is a physical-fitness Commission. The Commission should have central, regional, and State offices to be completely effective. It should be able to carry out such functions as the following:

1. To devise and promote adequate physical fitness procedures and programs, which may be adapted to various localities and types of institutions: for both sexes and for all ages.

The program proposed should be directed toward identifying those who are subpar in basic physical fitness elements and meeting the individual needs of those so identified. Rather than political appointments, members of the Commission should be those who have had the best experience and have contributed most through field work and research to the development of such fitness programs.

2. To provide an opportunity for professional physical educators and related specialists throughout the country to serve as consultants in proposing and reviewing physical fitness practices adopted by the Commission.

These consultants should provide representation by geographical area, type of institution involved, various age levels, both sexes, and the like. They should be well qualified professionally and should serve both the national Commission and the regional and State offices.

3. To provide field services for inaugurating and conducting the physical fitness program.

In Oregon, it was immediately realized that considerable field help was essential if the physical fitness plan was to get into operation effectively. Thus: the pilot centers, the

visits of the testing teams, the holding of clinics and seminars, and the provision for future expansion. The Commission could logically provide such field services as: conducting special courses to acquaint personnel with the fitness program, holding regional and State conferences to stimulate widespread adoption of acceptable procedures, consulting with State and local personnel on fitness processes, and holding clinics and otherwise aiding in the training of personnel in the understandings, procedures, and techniques involved.

4. To mobilize and disseminate existing knowledge relative to the effective development of physical fitness.

Scientific information related to physical fitness is widely scattered over many fields, including physical education, health education, medicine, physiology, anatomy, nutrition, chemistry, anthropology, growth and development, psychology and psychiatry, and others. To assemble, analyze, and evaluate this mass of material and make it readily available to the field, especially to those planning and conducting fitness programs, should constitute an essential function of the Commission.

5. To stimulate and subsidize needed research in the area of physical fitness to the end that such programs will become as completely scientific as possible.

Through research, the physical-fitness program should become increasingly effective until it becomes par excellent in the world today (outreaching by far, let us hope and pray, similar programs in Russia and other Communist-dominated countries). The research program should emphasize basic studies in physical fitness. Funds should be provided for the development of more scientists in this field through fellowships and grants to individual researchers and institutions for conducting studies sponsored or approved by the Commission. A number of universities now have research laboratories in physical education and in its closely related area, physiology of exercise; probably without exception, these laboratories badly need subsidization to increase their productivity. Also, the number of qualified research workers in these fields has increased markedly since World War II; this number is capable of increasing many fold in the years ahead if research moneys are provided.

SUBSIDIZATION

Many physical educators will argue that the greatest handicaps to conducting widespread physical-fitness programs throughout the United States are inadequate facilities, equipment, personnel, and the like. Therefore, to solve this problem, they would contend that extensive Federal subsidization to the States is essential. There is, of course, considerable validity to this contention. Even for in-school youth, lack of these essential factors is obvious in many States and in many communities in all States. This will become increasingly pressing as school enrollments rise in the years immediately ahead, necessitating new buildings, more teachers, and greater cost for the services of education. To contemplate similar needs to serve the physical fitness of the entire population greatly magnifies this problem.

It is the contention of this observer, however, that such subsidization will not bring about the desired result, to increase the physical fitness of all, unless physical activity and other regimes are directed toward effective physical fitness processes. Thus, any such subsidization should be coordinated with the adoption and conduct of a proper physical-fitness program by the State and/or local community. Initial Federal grants, if contemplated, might better be made for the establishment of a National Physical Fitness Commission.

Foreign Service a Growing Force

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MIKE MANSFIELD
OF MONTANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, June 25, 1956

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I desire to call attention to an article entitled "Foreign Service a Growing Force," written by Gould Lincoln, and published in the Washington Evening Star of June 24, 1956. In the article Mr. Lincoln points to the improvements which have been made in the Foreign Service in recent years, and quotes Dr. Wriston as follows:

I believe the Foreign Service to be the very best in the world.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article by Mr. Lincoln be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE POLITICAL MILL
(By Gould Lincoln)
FOREIGN SERVICE A GROWING FORCE

Uncle Sam's Foreign Service—the Foreign Service arm of the State Department—has made important strides toward a goal of 3,800 Foreign Service officers during the last 2 years. This has been accomplished with painstaking care through integration of competent State Department civil service officers with the Foreign Service and through improved and broadened recruitment methods. The program grew out of the Secretary of State's Public Committee on Personnel, headed by Dr. Henry M. Wriston, then president of Brown University. It has been carried forward with the sympathetic interest and legislative aid of Congress.

More than 3,800 officer positions in Washington and the United States missions abroad have been designated as Foreign Service positions. Almost two-thirds of these are now filled by Foreign Service, as compared to 1,285 when the program was initiated.

The Foreign Service is a hard working corps, highly trained for diplomacy, capable of dealing both with the problems of foreign politics and of economics, foreign and domestic. It differs from the civil service in the State Department in that its officers are at all times available for foreign service—no matter how remote.

Vital force for the United States

The importance of this force becomes all the greater in the light of the shift in tactics of the Communist countries to the economic field. The future of the United States and of the free peoples all over the world is becoming increasingly dependent on the skill and ability of those who work in the State Department and the missions, now more numerous than ever before.

Foreign Service officers must man 68 embassies, 9 legations and 167 consulates in 105 countries. If and when the Iron Curtain is lifted, the demands for additional personnel will increase.

Not only have there been strides in personnel of the Foreign Service, but the morale of the Service and of the whole State Department is on the up and up—morale that suffered during the McCarthy investigations. Also, the recruitment of the best and most efficient of the graduates of colleges and universities in this country has gained, with a changed attitude toward the State Department on the campuses. The Department is making intensive efforts to establish close relationships with the colleges and universities. Its success is shown by the fact that applications for the last three written examinations have totaled 4,504, 5,394, and 4,960 in contrast to the 1,261 applications received in 1954.

When the Secretary of State's public committee made its report there had been no appointments to class 6 (the beginning Foreign Service officer class) for 2 years. Since then more than 300 new class 6 officers have been appointed. The Department expects to appoint a large number of junior officers this year and to continue appointing 250 each year, in order to keep the Foreign Service staffed largely by those who enter at the bottom and through training and ability climb the ladder to positions of greatest responsibility.

Examinations facilitated

The examination of applicants for the Foreign Service has been streamlined, not through any lessening of standards but by shortening the time, making the examinations more easily accessible to applicants all over the country. The written examination may be taken in one day in any of 65 cities in the United States and its Territories. The oral examination no longer requires the applicants to travel to Washington. The State Department sends examining panels to at least 15 regional centers.

The integration of officers in the other personnel systems has worked exceedingly well and a further 300 appointments to the Foreign Service under this program are expected by early fall. One of the valuable accomplishments growing out of the buildup of the Foreign Service has been the return to this country of men who have served long periods overseas, for assignment in Washington. Many foreign officers have served a score of years or more outside the country with only 2 years or less in America. The Department now plans to rotate Foreign Service officers so that they will be in the United States for 4 out of every 10 years. In Washington they perform valuable services, for which they are prepared by their experience abroad, and at the same time they are kept more in touch with the important facts in this country.

Congress has gone far toward making possible the improvements in the Foreign Service recommended by the Wriston Committee. It still has some amendments to the Foreign Service Act to enact. Dr. Wriston himself said recently: "I believe the Foreign Service to be the very best in the world."

Need for Neater Polling Places

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, June 25, 1956

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very effective and cogent editorial from the Saturday Evening Post of July 17, 1954, entitled "Neater Polling Places Might Get More Voters." I heartily endorse the policies expressed in the editorial.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEATER POLLING PLACES MIGHT GET MORE VOTERS

We have in mind a woman who takes a keen interest in public affairs, but admitted reluctantly that she might not vote in November.

This is what she said: "I want to vote more than ever, but I know that when election day comes around, I'll find myself putting it off simply because I can't face the ordeal. Walking through that maze of party hacks, waiting in line in that cold garage, is too embarrassing."

To the average American male, for whom politics, stale cigar smoke and rooms littered with sample ballots are inextricably mingled, this lady may appear unduly squeamish. But it does seem absurd to put on protracted and expensive get-out-the-vote campaigns if sensitive people are kept from the polls because they can't endure the mess. In many cities polling places are located in garages, firehouses, warehouses, basements, barbershops, grocery stores or any old place which a faithful party hack wants to rent to the city for the purpose. Thousands—particularly the women—are not going to vote as long as polling places are set up in such depressing surroundings.

Unlike most problems, this one has a simple solution: Transfer polling places to the American schools, as has been done already in many communities. Each school can easily handle 2 to 5 election districts. Make election day a school holiday. This would make voting a dignified, important and pleasant experience, and might easily increase the number of those who participate in elections by convincing them that, physically at least, politics need not be a dirty game.

Bolivar Blazed the Trail

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DENNIS CHAVEZ
OF NEW MEXICO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, June 25, 1956

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, in the New York Journal-American of June 20, 1956, there was published an article entitled "Bolivar Blazed the Trail," written by Bob Considine. I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BOLIVAR BLAZED THE TRAIL

(By Bob Considine)

"We have plowed the sea," the immortal Simon Bolivar said with bitterness before he died. He had led the forces that liberated most of South America. He had called a great conference at Panama (1826) and found only suspicion of his dream of a united continent. And so he died, unwept and in poverty and rancor, with the despairing thought that he had dug only a short-lived furrow in memoryless water.

In death, the Venezuela-born creole liberator grained incomparable stature. Many of the dreams he nurtured came to fruition after he was dust. His work continues. Late next month, if all goes well, President Eisenhower and the presidents of all other sovereign states in this hemisphere will meet in Panama in perhaps the most momentous conclave of its kind since the Bolivar conference of 130 years ago. Bolivar considered Panama the perfect meetingplace. The Organization of American States seems to have no reason to question that appraisal. In fact, although the date has not yet been officially set, there is a great scramble on for rooms in Panama's elegant El Panama Hotel.

IKE KEEN ON CONFERENCE

Since Canada will not attend, being under the aegis of the British Crown, we will be the only English-speaking nation represented at what would in all probability be history's greatest meeting of presidents. Jim Hagerty, the President's press secretary, flew to Panama a week before the President's illness to inspect the situation and make preliminary plans. The President is very keen on this conference. It could be his first big post-operative engagement and have a bearing on his political future.

But there was no political aspect involved when Eisenhower came up with the conference plan while talking with the President of Mexico and the Prime Minister of Canada at White Sulphur Springs in April. Nor will there be any political flavor attached to his presence when/if the conference comes off next month, except that his presence there would demonstrate that he's back in harness. Eisenhower feels more keenly about bettering Pan American relations than any outstanding American since Cordell Hull.

Eisenhower's chief instruction to Hagerty before the latter flew there was to assure the host president, Panama's Ricardo Arias Espinosa, that the United States delegation wishes to be treated exactly as the representatives of the other 21 countries will be welcomed. There will be no special red carpet treatment; no cause for any mention of the colossus of the north.

Hagerty made a very good impression in Panama. He brought back to his boss a souvenir from the desk of President Arias, the latter's latest golf card. Arias shoots in the low 70's.

Israel's Meaning

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERBERT H. LEHMAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, June 25, 1956

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very interesting and informative article entitled "Israel's Meaning," written by Joseph Alsop, and published in the New York Herald Tribune of June 20, 1956.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MATTER OF FACT

(By Joseph Alsop)

ISRAEL'S MEANING

JERUSALEM.—In a whole series of different ways, it is an eye-opening experience to visit Israel. After a long struggle with red-tape, you pass through the Mandelbaum gate from Arab Jerusalem to Israeli Jerusalem. Instantly you are breathing a new air, observing a new landscape and seeing the future in a new perspective.

Essentially, Israel is so different from the surrounding Arab lands, and indeed from the countries of the West, too, because this is a place where they believe in miracles. They believe in miracles, in turn, because they have accomplished miracles.

When you consider the massive counterforces that were overcome, the creation of the State of Israel was in itself a miracle. So was the transformation of this once barren and unfruitful land into a rich and smiling landscape of vineyards and orchards, fertile fields and grassy meadows, populous busy towns, and productive industries.

Again, the transformation of the people themselves is also touched with the miraculous. For here the Jews of the Diaspora have been gathered, from both sides of the Iron Curtain, from Africa and from Asia. Peddlers from the Casablanca native quarters have been made into sturdy farmers, as I saw at a new cooperative farm. Long-locked Jews from the premedieval ghettos of the Yemen have become steelworkers of a high technical category, as I was shown in a new pipe extrusion plant. And these and all the others in this enormous gathering in of the tribes are being rapidly merged into the national whole, and turned into Israelis in the full sense of the word.

The State, the land, the people, in short, all in different ways represent achievements which any rational, practical forecaster would have held to be utterly impossible only 10 or 20 years ago. Therefore there is a mood here going far beyond the mood of the old Scotch song—"what other men dare, we can do." Here the mood is, "we can dare and do far beyond other men."

The prevalence of that mood makes the very air of Israel quite remarkably exhilarating to any one accustomed to the moods of other lands, where defeatism and materialism, self-indulgence, and despair, suspicion, and self-seeking so often seem to compete for dominance. But while this Israeli mood is so exhilarating in itself, it is also a hard political fact that must be judged cold-bloodedly, like all other hard political facts.

The Israeli mood, for instance, makes nonsense of the State Department's complacent trumpetings about the success of U. N. Secretary General Dag Hammarskjold's middle eastern peace mission. So far as can be observed, Hammarskjold had no long-range success of any kind.

He certainly did not succeed in persuading the Arabs to accept the existence of the State of Israel. More immediately important, he certainly did not succeed in persuading the Israelis to abandon those policies which may lead to an outbreak of war with the Arabs.

On the contrary, from Prime Minister Ben-Gurion to the simplest private in the army, the Israelis are all but unanimous that their national security depends on meeting Arab terroristic acts along their borders with stern military reprisals against the Arab governments. And from Prime Minister Ben-Gurion to the poorest farmworker, the Israelis are all but unanimous that their national future depends on going forward with the Jordan water diversion scheme, which the Arabs have said will mean war.

The Israelis are people, moreover, who think very little about risks, including even the risk of war, when they are convinced that their national security and natural future are genuinely at stake. They must further be expected to be even more careless of all risks, if Soviet Foreign Minister Shepilov climaxes his Cairo visit by announcing the Kremlin's support for a reduction of Israel to the frontiers proposed in the U. N. partition scheme of 1947. That will be a threat to end Israel as a workable state, and the Israelis will be all the more inclined toward an early showdown.

In another way, too, viewing the mood of Israel as a hard political fact makes nonsense of the opinions now prevailing in Washington and London. It is highly unlikely that the Arabs will ever make peace in return for the little bits of Israel that Prime Minister Eden and Secretary of State Dulles have tried to persuade the Israelis to sacrifice. The effort to persuade the Israelis to make serious territorial concessions was even more unrealistic. As Prime Minister Ben-

Gurion bluntly informed Prime Minister Eden, the Israelis will fight first. There should be no mistake about that.

In short, grim courage and ruthless self-denial make Israel intensely admirable as a human accomplishment, but this same courage and self-denial also make Israel highly intractable as a political fact. There is no use saying about the Israelis, "they ought to do differently." They will not behave as many western policymakers think they should behave, because that is not their nature. And one must add, they only exist today because that is not their nature.

We Have the Kind of Government Americans Want

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BEN F. JENSEN
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 25, 1956

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial by A. M. Piper, editor of the Council Bluffs Nonpareil:

WE HAVE THE KIND OF GOVERNMENT AMERICANS WANT

The American people elected Dwight Eisenhower President in November 1952, because they wanted peace, security, thrift, and integrity.

We have peace. President Eisenhower, as he promised the Nation in the 1952 campaign, ended the war in Korea—after 157,000 American soldiers had been killed and wounded during Democratic rule.

Incidentially, it was the third war in the 3 Democratic administrations of this country.

We have security. The spread of communism has been checked. Under Roosevelt and Truman 18 nations were taken over by the Communists. Millions were enslaved by the Reds.

Under Eisenhower the Communists have been thrown out of Central America. The Communist advance in Europe has been halted. Progress has been made in the atoms for peace program. Communists and Communist sympathizers no longer occupy high places in our Government.

We have security in terms of money. Under Republican policies your dollars are worth as much as they were when Eisenhower became President. The $100 you saved in 1953 is worth the same today. Under the Democrats the $100 saved in 1939 was worth only $52.20 by 1952.

We have thrift in Government. Republican policies cut $10 billion from the budget recommended by President Truman just before his term expired. Republican policies have, in not quite 4 years meant savings of $1,000 for a family of 4. Republican savings made possible the greatest tax cut in the history of the country—reducing everybody's taxes.

We have honesty in Government. The men and women President Eisenhower appointed to office have given the United States the kind of honest Government you want.

Our Government officials are not cheating the taxpayers. They are not pulling crooked deals. They are working hard to give the country good government.

Under President Eisenhower we have peace instead of war. We have security instead of irresponsibility. We have thrift instead of waste. We have integrity instead of corruption.

We have the kind of Government the overwhelming majority of Americans want for their country.

Necessity for Expansion of Foreign Economic Aid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD J. THYE
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, June 25, 1956

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the text of an address delivered on June 21, 1956, by John Cowles, publisher of the Minneapolis Star-Tribune. The address is most timely because the foreign aid and mutual security questions will be before the Senate in the near future.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WE MUST EXPAND ECONOMIC AID TO KEEP NEUTRALS OUT OF RED ORBIT

(By John Cowles, president of the Minneapolis Star and Tribune Co.)

Although the Russian leaders in recent months have changed their tactics, are now talking about peaceful competitive coexistence, and are frequently putting on false masks of pretended friendliness toward the West, there is not as yet the slightest evidence that their basic aim of absolute Communist world domination has changed an iota.

Recently a friend of mine who holds one of the most important posts in our Government reminded me of what in 1931 a then leading Russian Communist, Dimitri Manuilsky, said at the Lenin School of Political Warfare in Moscow.

Let me quote: "War to the hilt between communism and capitalism is inevitable. Today, of course, we are not strong enough to attack. Our time will come in 20 or 30 years. The bourgeoisie will have to be put to sleep, so we will begin by launching the most spectacular peace movement on record. There will be electrifying overtones and unheard of concessions. The capitalist countries, stupid and decadent, will rejoice to cooperate in their own destruction. They will leap at another chance to be friends. As soon as their guard is down, we shall smash them with our clenched fist."

I need not in this audience add 30 years to 1931 to make 1961.

Now I am entirely aware that many of you may be thinking, "Yes, but things have changed and are changing in Russia." My answer is, undoubtedly, in some ways, but let's be certain we don't do anything that might jeopardize our national security until and unless we are absolutely sure that the Communists are not simply engaging in a temporary tactic to lull us into a feeling of false security.

The philosophy of Lenin, the whole system of long-term strategy and short-term tactics that he outlined for the Communists to follow in order to take over the entire world, is far more of a sacred bible to the Russian Communists than even Hitler's "Mein Kampf" was to the German Fascists. The program that the Russian leaders are currently following fits in exactly with the strategy that Lenin set forth.

Of course we should all hope that there has actually been, or will at some future date be, a fundamental change in the Russian Communists' ambitions for world dictatorship and the destruction of the capitalist democracies. But anyone who is naive enough to accept Russian words, before there is unmistakable evidence in the form of deeds, that the Communists have had a basic change of heart is a dupe who deserves to retain neither his liberty nor his life.

MUST KEEP VIGILANT

Since our aim is peace, we should, of course, welcome and encourage every indication that the Communist system is becoming less inhumane and less menacing. We should at the same time try to demonstrate to human beings all over the globe that our free society holds more promise for them than does communism, whether they live in Europe or Asia or Africa or Latin America, and whether their skins be brown or yellow or white or black. But we must nevertheless keep vigilant and maintain our military strength unimpaired for the indefinite future.

Until we have attained universal global disarmament, under complete, continuous and unqualified international inspection and control, we can never be sure that Russia may not be planning a sudden, cataclysmic atomic attack on us.

I personally think it extremely unlikely that Russia will precipitate a major war in the few years immediately ahead. It is, nevertheless, a possibility, and when one is dealing with such a thing as our freedom, or our very survival, we must take no chances involving national security.

What worries me far more than the remote possibility of Russia's launching a surprise attack on us in the near future is the grave possibility that the Communists may be able in the next 5 or 10 years, without open war but through propaganda and economic and political pressures, progressively to absorb into the Communist orbit most of the presently neutral or uncommitted nations. If that should happen the free world would be in dire peril.

POPULAR FRONT PRESSURES

In addition, I fear that in some of the nations of Western Europe, such as France or Italy, the pressure for so-called "popular front" governments will grow to a point where the Communists will again hold cabinet seats in coalition governments as they did just after World War II.

The Communists now control one-third of the human race. Neither the Roman empire at its greatest, nor Islam at the height of its expansion, nor any other system at any previous time in history ever controlled such a proportion of the world's population.

The uncommitted nations of Asia and Africa contain roughly half the world's population. If they should slide into the Communist orbit—and there is a frightening likelihood that unless we in the United States adopt a much bolder, more understanding and more imaginative foreign policy many of them will—then the Communists would control about five-sixths of the population of the world.

But what is even more important than mere population totals is the fact that the Communists would then control the sources of many of those minerals and raw materials which are vital to the functioning of the free world's industrial economy.

If that should come to pass, possibly or even probably, some of the countries now a part of the so-called free woird would conclude that they had better come to terms with the Communists. It is even conceivable that T. S. Eliot's phrase about the end of the world coming not with a bang but with a whimper might be prophetic.

DANGER OF COMPLACENCY

I hope I am much too pessimistic, but I fear that unless the American people become far better informed upon the realities of international affairs, the United States will not do the things that are necessary to reduce or avert the possibility of the Communists' absorbing so much more of the globe as to lead to possible future disaster. We are, I think, in danger of becoming too complacent about the long-term Communist threat, simply because there is no hot war raging today.

I express no opinion as to how long it may be before the Communists might take over most or all the rest of Asia and most of Africa, unless we take moves to prevent it, but certainly within the lifetimes of most of us here today and possibly in a very few years.

What can we do, you ask, to avert this calamity?

The first part of the answer is to find some way to educate the American people as to the potential future danger in the existing international situation, so that an informed public opinion will induce the Congress and the executive branch of the Government to do certain things that they are not now doing, either because they are themselves uninformed as to the urgency of the situation or because they think the public, that is, the voters, would not approve.

We should promptly adopt a much larger and far more imaginative program of foreign economic aid—not military aid—to help raise the productivity and standards of living of the poverty-stricken countries of Asia, most all of whom have just emerged from colonialism. I do not think President Eisenhower asked the Congress for as much money for foreign economic aid as he should have asked, but I suspect he asked for the maximum he thought the Congress would conceivably appropriate, and it now appears that Congress is going to approve only a part of what he requested.

I believe we could reduce our foreign military-aid expenditures by an amount approximately equivalent to what we should add to our foreign economic aid. I am in general agreement with the congressional belief that the amount of foreign military aid that the administration requested is larger than necessary, but I think Congress is probably cutting it too much.

However, I think it is utterly silly for us to provide Thailand, for example, with squadrons of modern jet planes when those funds could be used far more beneficially for more economic assistance in southeast Asia. Whether Thailand does or does not have some jet planes will not determine whether or not not we have a third world war, or who wins it if it comes.

In view of Russia's shift in tactics we are, I believe, grossly exaggerating the value of some of our foreign military pacts and alliances. I think the antagonism and distrust created by SEATO (the Southeast Asia Treaty Organization) and the Baghdad pact outweigh their possible military advantage.

STRENGTHEN BRITISH TIES

Let no one get the mistaken impression, however, that I am belittling the value of all military alliances. Quite to the contrary. We should strengthen our ties to the limit with Great Britain and such other countries as we believe would be dependable and effective if the Russians should launch war. We should coordinate to the maximum our military forces and Canada's so that we would have a really unified continental air defense against a possible Russian attack over the arctic.

Let no one get the erroneous idea, either, that I advocate any sizeable reduction in America's own national defense expenditures. I doubt if we are now spending enough in the fields of research and development.

The American people have a grossly exaggerated idea as to the amount of money we are currently spending on foreign economic aid. The bulk of our foreign aid is for direct military purposes even though much of it is labeled economic aid. Moreover, four-fifths of all our foreign aid is going to South Korea, Formosa, Indochina, Pakistan, and Turkey.

Only a tiny trickle of the funds of the International Cooperation Administration (formerly called the Foreign Operations Administration and previously to that called ECA or point 4 or the Marshall plan) is going to the economic development of such presently uncommitteed nations as India, Indonesia, and Burma.

ASIAN DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION

I have read or heard most of the arguments advanced against America's continuing foreign economic aid. Of course there is waste in the program, probably considerable waste. Perhaps the time has come when most of this economic aid should be in the form of loans, however soft, instead of in grants. Probably it would be wise to create an Asian Development Corporation, for example, and give the Asian countries actual control, with a majority of its board of directors, even though we put up 80 percent of the capital. Or conceivably it might be wise for us to offer to channel our economic aid through the United Nations, and invite Russia to do likewise.

Those Americans who call foreign economic aid a "give-away program," and say it is of no benefit to the United States, for the most part fail to realize its real purpose. Primarily, it is simply an effort to enhance our own national security by reducing the likelihood that the underdeveloped nations, with their manpower and natural resources of minerals and raw materials, will slide over from their present positions of neutrality into the actual Communist orbit.

Wholly in addition to helping to enhance our own national security, economic aid can be justified on humanitarian or spiritual grounds. We Americans believe every human being was born to live his life as a free individual, not to be submerged in collectivist totalitarian slavery. We thus have a moral obligation to try to help the poverty-stricken, largely illiterate, politically immature new nations that have only recently emerged from colonialism.

DETERMINED TO ADVANCE

The billion people who are living in almost indescribable poverty in these underdeveloped areas of the world are just as determined to industrialize their economies in an effort to raise their standards of living, as they are to maintain their recently secured independence from colonialism.

The Russians are offering the loans, contingent on the recipient nation's spending the money for Russian-made machinery and equipment, with Communist engineers moving into those countries to supervise its initial installation and future operation and maintenance.

Unless the United States helps these underdeveloped nations help themselves, it is overwhelmingly likely that many or most of these countries will end up as an integral part of the Communist political as well as economic empire. Critics of foreign economic aid fail to realize how gravely jeopardized America's national security would be if anything approaching five-sixths of the people of the world with all their natural resources slipped into the Communist orbit.

These underdeveloped countries are determined to industrialize in an effort to raise their standards of living and make themselves more economically self-sufficient. If the United States does not help them, most of them will accept Russian aid, probably without fully realizing that in so doing they will inevitably enmesh themselves progressively in communism.

NO FREE CHOICE UNLESS—

The critics of foreign aid fail to appreciate the fact that the presently uncommitted peoples of Asia and Africa will not be in position to make a free choice as between "going Communist" and staying outside the iron or bamboo curtain until and unless the United States offers them, as the Russians are now offering them, some of the capital and scientific and technological know-how that they so desperately need.

Perhaps our giving them economic aid will not prove sufficient to prevent these countries from going Communist, but I ask those who oppose giving the aid: "What alternative do you propose?"

We and the Russians are in a long-term struggle to see whose way of life will prevail.

Americans must be made to understand that our growing educational crisis directly affects our national security. Russia is currently graduating each year many more engineers, physicists, and chemists than is the United States. Estimates indicate that before long Russia may be turning out twice as many as we. Unless we strengthen the teaching of mathematics and sciences in our high schools, and unless we see to it that a much higher proportion of our talented high-school students go on to—and through—a good college or university, we may well find the Russians far ahead of us in brainpower.

If we are to preserve permanently our free institutions here at home, if we are going to be able to live in peace and security and prosperity, we must not only greatly improve the quality and quantity of all phases of our educational system, and intensify our research and development in the field of national defense, but we must also learn more about all the distant lands of the world and the strange peoples that dwell in them.

MUST KNOW EAST

Our cultural heritage comes from Europe. Almost all Americans have been consciously or unconsciously oriented toward Western Europe. The time has come when we must learn more about the East, both the Near East and the Far East, lands of ancient civilizations long before Columbus discovered America. We must not look down on Asians because of the color of their skin; their, to us, peculiar religious beliefs; their lack of past technological progress; their almost indescribable poverty.

We have much to give them but they also have much to give us, if we are humble enough and intelligent enough to recognize and accept it.

If we Americans will first come to understand the nature of the long-term threat of world communism, and then will rise to the challenge and employ all our resources of intelligence and strength to meet it, I have no doubt as to the eventual outcome. Freedom will prevail, and the world can live in peace, amid both material and cultural abundance that will far surpass that enjoyed by any previous generation.

Delay on Action on Nomination of Simon E. Sobeloff To Be Associate Judge of the United States Court of Appeals

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. GLENN BEALL

OF MARYLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, June 25, 1956

Mr. BEALL. Mr. President, it has been almost a year since President Eisenhower nominated the Honorable Simon E. Sobeloff, Solicitor General of the United States, to be an associate judge of the United States Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit. It should distress all of us to realize that numerous delays have prevented definite action on the nomination, thereby depriving the court and the people associated with it of the vitally needed services of this distinguished citizen. Members of the Maryland State Bar Association recently reemphasized their strong feelings on this

matter during their annual meeting in Atlantic City. To show the sentiments of these men, most of whom have had close contact with Mr. Sobeloff, I request unanimous consent that the message sent to me by the bar association secretary, Mr. S. Vannort Chapman, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the telegram was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Senator J. GLENN BEALL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

This resolution was unanimously adopted at the 61st annual meeting of the Maryland State Bar Association, Atlantic City, N. J., June 23, 1956:

"Whereas the United States Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit, a tribunal only one degree below the Supreme Court of the United States, is currently manned by only one judge in active service status, namely, Chief Judge John J. Parker; and

"Whereas Hon. Simon E. Sobeloff, Solicitor General of the United States, was nominated by the President of the United States on July 15, 1955, as an associate judge of the said court, and the failure to take action on the said nomination, which has been pending for almost a full year, is unfair to litigants, to the court, to the attorneys that practice therein, as well as to the nominee; and

"Whereas in the opinion of this association there is no doubt as to the eminent qualifications of General Sobeloff by reason of his character, training, temperament, experience, and learning to fill with the highest distinction the position to which he has been nominated; and

"Whereas his qualifications have been recognized by the subcommittee of the Judiciary Committee of the United States Senate, which after hearings has reported favorably General Sobeloff's nomination; by the Honorable Chief Judge John J. Parker of the United States Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit, who has twice urged before the Judiciary Committee of the United States Senate the immediate confirmation of General Sobeloff's appointment; by the American Bar Association's committee on Federal judicial appointments; by the Bar Association of Baltimore City; and by the endorsement of the leaders of his own community, and great numbers of other distinguished citizens throughout the Nation; and

"Whereas an extraodinarily long and searching inquiry has utterly failed to develop the slightest basis whatever for any reflection upon his long and distinguished career, during which he has served as United States attorney for the district of Maryland, city solicitor of Baltimore City, chief judge of the Maryland Court of Appeals, the highest judicial tribunal in Maryland and Solicitor General of the United States, in which position he is now serving; and

"Whereas this experience with both state and Federal laws, and as the highest judicial officer in Maryland, preeminently qualifies him as a judge of the United States Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the Maryland State Bar Association*, That the association hereby approves the action of its committee on Federal judicial appointments in recommending the confirmation of Judge Sobeloff, and respectfully but urgently requests the Judiciary Committee of the United States Senate to take immediate action to report favorably the nomination of Honorable Simon E. Sobeloff as an associate judge of the United States Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That a copy of this resolution be sent by the secretary of this association to the chairman and each member of the Judiciary Committee of the United States Senate and to Senators JOHN MARSHALL BUTLER and J. GLENN BEALL, of Maryland."

S. VANNORT CHAPMAN,
Secretary, Maryland State Bar Association.

The Role of the CIO in Oregon and in the Nation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, June 25, 1956

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, an article from the June 15, 1956, issue of the Oregon Labor Press, by Mrs. Emsie Howard, describing the history of the Congress of Industrial Organizations in the State of Oregon, on the occasion of the official merger between the CIO and the AFL in the State of Oregon. Mrs. Howard's able article highlights the progress and history of labor organizations in our State in recent years.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CIO PLAYS VITAL ROLE IN OREGON AND NATION

(By Emsie Howard)

In the mid-thirties a family quarrel within the American Federation of Labor exploded.

Basis of the quarrel was the impatience of one group that sought to organize workers, primarily in mass production industries, on an industrial or vertical basis. This meant that all workers in a given industry would be organized into one large union.

The other faction clung to the principle of horizontal organization—that workers in various crafts be organized into the unions representing those crafts.

The differences divided and weakened organized labor for almost two decades. The faction urging industrial organization withdrew from the AFL and formed their own group which later became the CIO—Congress of Industrial Organizations.

Now in the mid-thirties the two organizations are reunited as the AFL–CIO. Implicit in the reunions is the admission that the division was a mistake.

On November 9, 1935, the CIO was established. The following months produced frenzied and successful organizing drives.

In early 1936 a 6-week strike gave the United Rubber Workers a strong foothold in the rubber industry. Meanwhile major organizing drives were under way in the steel and automobile industries.

The first big break came in Flint, Mich., after a 44-day sit-down strike against General Motors. This victory gave the United Automobile Workers a beachhead in the automobile industry but only after days of struggle and anxiety. The police used tear gas but failed to drive the strikers from plants. The governor of Michigan, sympathetic to the workers' plight, steadfastly refused to call in the militia.

Then came the dramatic announcement that the steel industry, one of the strongholds against unionism, had signed with the Steel Workers Organizing Committee which was to become the mighty United Steel Workers of America.

These victories touched off a string of organizing successes for the CIO. But the two great basic industries, automobile and steel, have remained the firm core of the CIO.

The CIO has exerted influence in other areas, including organization of newspapermen into the American Newspaper Guild, but its basic strength has always been in mass production industries.

Almost from the moment of its birth, the CIO has been a hard-fighting and effective national political force. Its Political Action Committee has exerted strong influence at all levels since its inception in 1943.

John L. Lewis of the United Mine Workers was the first president of the CIO. In 1940 he opposed the reelection of Franklin Roosevelt. Lewis resigned shortly after Roosevelt's sweeping triumph over Wendell Willkie.

He was succeeded by Philip Murray, the soft-spoken president of the Steel Workers. A native of Scotland, Murray, like Lewis, had been a miner. He was an outspoken and vigorous opponent of communism and all foreign ideologies. His calm and statesmanlike leadership commanded national respect throughout the war years.

Murray died in late 1952, a few days before the death of AFL President William Green.

Leadership of the CIO then passed to Walter Reuther, the fiery, tireless leader of the UAW. George Meany was elected president of the AFL. Almost immediately after taking over the leadership of the CIO and AFL, Reuther and Meany launched plans for the merger that was accomplished last December.

Red-headed Walter Reuther is a rare combination of idealist, scholar and fighter. His uncompromising stand against Communist elements seeking to gain a stronghold in the UAW resulted in a dastardly attack on his life. An assassin's bullet fired into the Reuther's kitchen was almost fatal and permanently crippled his right arm.

The CIO's stand against communism and its views on international affairs closely parallel those of the AFL.

The CIO has urged active participation of its State and local industrial union councils in community affairs. It has worked vigorously to promote racial and religious tolerance, better housing, industrial safety, and other measures for human welfare.

The first Oregon union to receive its CIO charter was the International Woodworkers of America. Its organization in logging and sawmill operations has remained the backbone of CIO organizations in Oregon.

The IWA was chartered in August 1937 and was followed within a few days by the International Longshoremen & Warehousemen's union.

Less than 18 months later, in January 1939 organization had proceeded to the point where delegates from 45 local unions met in Harmony Hall, Portland, for the first convention lof the State Industrial Union Council.

The local unions represented were affiliated with the IWA, Longshoremen, Textile Workers, Steelworktrs, Amalgamated Clothing Workers, Cannery Workers and the Columbia River Fishermen's Union.

John Brost of the Longshoremen was elected first president of the council and Ralph Peoples of the IWA was named secretary-treasurer. The delegates voted a monthly salary for both officers.

The council was organized to serve as the political arm of CIO unions. From the outset, all of its efforts were directed toward organized political action.

Steady and rapid growth followed. When the 1941 convention opened, 81 local unions were affiliated with the council.

The CIO had taken its place in Oregon. President Brost reported to the convention that "we are represented on nearly every major committee in the State."

Secretary Peoples reported that paid-up affiliation was 3,000 above that of 1940.

Turning to the council's activities at the State legislature, he had this to say:

"We coordinated our lobbying activities with the Oregon Commonwealth Federation and depended greatly upon Monroe Sweetland for his knowledge of politics to help put over or defeat bills which affected labor. Our relations with the federation were profitable."

Peoples also cited the close cooperation of the State Industrial Union Council with the Farmers' Union and the Oregon State Grange.

(The Oregon Commonwealth Federation was a group of labor, farm and community leaders working for liberal legislation and to wrest control of State government from reactionaries by supporting liberal candidates.)

The council's offices were moved in 1941 from the Governor building to more desirable quarters in the Platt building. Peoples reported further that "we secured more dignified furniture." They were moved again a year or two later to the Woodlark building, where they have remained.

The first endorsing convention for the purpose of recommending candidates for local, State, and National offices was held in September 1942. Adoph Germer, grand old man of the national CIO, bespoke the underlying philosophy of the CIO that the gains of unions must be protected on the political front when he told the convention: "It costs so little to vote right. It is far cheaper to vote than it is to strike."

Growth of the CIO locally was further demonstrated by the reestablishment in 1942 of the Portland industrial union council, which has remained an active force ever since. In 1942 the local council undertook an educational program by sponsoring a weekly radio broadcast.

The national CIO's war relief committee, described by President Philip Murray as "an example before the whole world of the wartime service which industrial unionism is giving to the United Nations" had its local counterpart. Oregon was served during the war years by a CIO community services committee with offices in Portland.

In 1943 the State industrial union council sent its first delegate, Stanley Earl, to the national convention in Philadelphia. Earl had succeeded Peoples as secretary-treasurer.

The CIO was represented on the principal war-time Government agencies as well as the Red Cross, United War Fund and the Community Chest. Its place in the community was secure. Its voice was heard, its influence felt.

An increasing awareness of the importance of public relations was reflected by a resolution at the 1945 convention urging the national CIO to establish a research and education department and to provide trained personnel to serve throughout the country.

Again in 1948 the convention urged the national CIO to develop education programs for local unions to arouse and sustain interest in such subjects as current events, labor history, politics, economics, candidates for public office and community problems.

By 1947 a total of 83 unions had affiliated with the council. As it grew in strength, action on the legislative and poltical fronts was broadened. Political action included support of public utility district, school legislation, old-age pensions and logging and trucking legislation.

Always in the forefront of every program was a militant fight for civil rights and against discrimination.

Safety in industry was recognized as an important issue demanding legislative action and education among union members.

Climaxing the efforts of Oregon CIO unions was the national CIO convention held in Portland in November, 1948, which brought President Philip Murray, Walter Reuther, Jim Carey and almost all top CIO leaders here.

Local civic and business leaders thronged the convention halls to listen to some of the Nation's top labor spokesmen.

In reporting to the 1950 convention, George Brown, who had succeeded Earl as secretary in 1949, said that important gains in the registration of workers had been accomplished through the combined efforts of the AFL, CIO, Machinists and Railroad Brotherhoods "working as a unit with various civic and fraternal organizations."

Recognizing the value of coordinating their efforts toward their common purpose, the AFL and CIO were moving closer together in the field of political action.

In 1953 the council joined with the State Federation of Labor in all-out support of the National Hells Canyon Association. And in 1954 the CIO legislative committee joined with the State Federation and threw all its strength behind Richard L. Neuberger and Edith Green. Both candidates were elected.

In 1956 the AFL and CIO of Oregon have worked closely with one another.

Together they made their recommendations for candidates and for measures that were deemed worthy of organized labor's support in the primary election.

Speaking of the merger, George Brown said: "For many years we have worked together in the legislative field. As we have consolidated our efforts and pulled together we have become increasingly successful.

"If our union members will register and will vote in their own interest on election day, our united efforts can mean increased security and improved conditions for all of us."

Use of Compulsory Union Dues for Political Purposes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BARRY M. GOLDWATER

OF ARIZONA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, June 25, 1956

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, the statement made by President Eisenhower, on the occasion of the merger of the CIO and the AFL, that "the rights of minorities holding differing social, economic, and political views must be scrupulously protected and their views accurately reflected," is being recognized across the length and breadth of this great Nation as a true and proper position not only for the Republican Party to occupy, but, I suggest, also for the Democratic Party. The use of compulsory union dues for political purposes is exactly what the President was getting at in his statement. The recent announcement, by the head of one of our major unions, to the effect that his union will have more than $500,000 dollars available for contributions to candidates, has caused one of the most highly respected editors in the Southwest, Mr. W. P. Stuart, to comment on the subject in an editorial entitled "Double Standard in Politics," published in the Prescott Evening Courier, of Prescott, Ariz. I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DOUBLE STANDARD IN POLITICS

It has long been illegal for corporations to make contributions to candidates for political office. This legal restriction, obviously, is based on the theory that corporations otherwise would use their economic power to elect men who would serve special interests

Whether or not such laws are wise is debatable. What is not debatable, however, is that similar restrictions do not apply to organizations which also have great economic power—the unions.

The head of a major union, the International Ladies' Garment Workers, has said that his union will have more than $500,000 available for contributions to candidates in this year's national election campaigns. He said also that the combined AFL–CIO political fund may reach $3 million.

What conceivable justification can there be in forbidding corporations from financing political candidacies—and at the same time permitting powerful unions to spend money on a huge scale for political purposes and political ends? And how do the vast number of corporation stockholders feel about the situation?

United States Should Be Generous to Retired Employees

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BEN F. JENSEN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 25, 1956

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial by A. M. Piper, editor, the Council Bluffs Nonpareil:

UNITED STATES SHOULD BE GENEROUS TO RETIRED EMPLOYEES

Bills are pending in Congress to increase substantially the retirement and family survivorship benefits of Federal employees.

Senate bill 2875 would increase the annuities of Federal employees who retire in the future by about 25 percent and boost family survivorship benefits by more than 50 percent.

It would also increase disability retirement benefits and permit retirement after 30 years of service with less financial penalty.

In return for the various benefits provided employees would pay 7 percent of their salaries into the retirement fund instead of the present 6 percent.

Other bills are pending which would increase the annuities of former Federal employees now on the civil-service retirement rolls, in line with the annuities provided for those who retire in the future.

The most satisfactory of these is Senate bill 3731 introduced by Senator CARLSON, of Kansas, with Senators JENNER, of Indiana, and MARTIN, of Iowa, as cosponsors.

It provides substantial annuity increases for retired Government employees and does not require a special appropriation.

Many thousands of Government employees who retired years ago when the cost of living was much lower than at present need increased annuities this year.

The pending bills mark a forward step in the fight for adequate annuities for Federal employees who retire in the future and for aged former employees who have retired in the past, for those who are sick and disabled and modest annuities for widows of certain employees.

Congressional committees and Members of Congress are coming to realize that annuities of retired employees should be adjusted in conformity with increases in the pay of active Federal employees.

The American people can well afford to be generous to employees who have devoted their lives to the service of the Nation.

Observations on Round-the-World Tour by Former Dean Edward Steidle, College of Mineral Industries, Pennsylvania State University, University Park, Pa.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 25, 1956

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, upon his return to the United States in May 1956 after a round-the-world tour, former Dean Edward Steidle, College of Mineral Industries, Pennsylvania State University, University Park, Pa., made available to me the following observations.

Dean Steidle, who is currently Chairman of the Federal Coal Mine Safety Board of Review, was accompanied by his lifelong friend, Dr. A. C. Fieldner, both of whom traveled at their own expense.

Dean Steidle's observations are as follows:

OBSERVATIONS ON ROUND-THE-WORLD TOUR, JANUARY 11–MAY 16, 1956

(By Edward Steidle)

The tour included more than 35,000 miles of travel in 15 countries. I was accompanied on the entire trip by Dr. A. C. Fieldner, retired chief fuels technologist of the United States Bureau of Mines. The following viewpoints are concluded from my observations and experiences in interviewing former students, mineral leaders, American businessmen, and members of our foreign services, in the various countries.

Cuba is reported to be revolt-ridden and depends upon the Army to keep order; and crush any localized revolts. The people appear to be going along very much as usual.

The Panama Canal is guarded by American servicemen from ocean to ocean, especially from aerial attack. Panama wants the canal internationalized, and the more radical members of the government claim full possession, in spite of the fact that the rent has been tripled, and vast real estate holdings have been granted to Panama since World War II. There is strong evidence of resentment, especially to the Americans living in the Zone.

Near Gatun, I took note of the big hole for a third lock, near Miraflores another hole—monuments to futility on which about $75 million was expended before the project was abandoned. The solution of the canal problem is long overdue. It is reported that a commonsense plan for this was developed in 1943, known as the Terminal Lake plan.

Honolulu does a beautiful job in carrying out the spirit of aloha—love, welcome, goodbye. The ocean water at Waikiki was much too warm to be exhilarating. The population is about 35 percent Japanese. There is a feeling among some longshoremen as well as pineapple and sugarcane workers, that one word from Harry Bridges could paralyze the island and that, as a consequence, the United States Government will be slow in taking action against him.

Upon our arrival in Japan, the Japan Coal Association initiated us into the ancient Japanese tea ceremony, and followed with a banquet in our honor.

The people in Japan still respect MacArthur very highly. He was the benevolent leader which appeals to the Japanese temperament. The occupation was nonvindictive and aimed at getting Japan on its feet again as soon as possible. The former prosperity of the country was the result of generations of work, and although it is difficult and slow work to rebuild after a war, even with industrious folk like the Japanese, they are recovering with amazing progress. By way of contrast, the Koreans appear to be unprogressive and we can be pessimistic about that country.

United States security forces in Japan are gradually diminishing by mutual agreement. Reaction to withdrawal is mixed since the security forces employ many thousands of Japanese in offices, shops and private homes. We buy millions of dollars worth of supplies from Japan annually.

Nonmilitary spending by Security Forces' personnel is currently averaging about $30 million per month; military spending is approximately as much more. This income gives strong support to the Japanese economy. A strong spirit of patriotism and self-respect fosters a vague desire to encourage our withdrawal, but officials of the Japanese Government weigh the advantage of the income from American occupation.

There does not appear to be any anti-Americanism in Japan. This country might prove to be a "friend in need," but it must have more space, more food, more raw materials of industry, and more markets abroad in order to gain a peaceful prosperity. Population growth is a serious matter throughout the Orient, and Japan is the only country that is taking positive steps toward some control.

Formosa was a pleasant surprise. Our ship was the first passenger ship to land on the island in 6 years; consequently, we were tendered a genuine fireworks, firecracker welcome. We expected to find everyone on the defensive, but saw nothing on sea, land, or air at Keelung, our port of call, or in the capital that would make one conscious of possible attack. Apparently, major defense efforts are on the west side of the island. Formosa is making progress, but it is doubtful whether the country can ever stand without United States aid. Coal on the islands of the Far Pacific is generally low grade, and difficult to mine economically and safely.

Hong Kong is truly a fabulous city in every respect, and is a convenience, a listening post for Great Britain. It seems evident that Red China could capture the city any time she desired, and is willing to face world opinion. The United States does not need Hong Kong for strategic reasons. It is not impossible that Hong Kong might be handed over to Red China outright. The city could also be lost to the Communists by infiltration, as evidenced by the fact that the British Government is considering a proposition for allowing people from the Communist mainland to come to Hong Kong freely. The refugees from Red China who have escaped across the border live in fear of their lives. These poor people, especially the Christianized, will be the first targets to be wiped out as soon as the Communists just across the hills can lay their bloody hands on Hong Kong.

The Philippines are making rapid recovery from the ravages of war, with United States aid. The Philippine people appear to have complacent confidence in continued United States support. The Japanese are still busy salvaging the vessels sunk in Manila Bay, first by Japan and later by the United States, in part payment of their reparations. Trade between the Japanese and the Philippines is "a natural" and growing slowly. Corregidor stands as a peaceful monument today. It was not difficult to appreciate the value of the battle for the Leyte Gulf with respect to General MacArthur's return to the Philippines. The United States National Cemetery with 22,000 Italian marble crosses, on the outskirts of Manila, is very impressive but, in retrospect, one contemplates whether it is equitable and fair to force our men to fight and die in the jungles on the other side of the world for a cause they cannot understand.

The Malay Federation is 80 percent Chinese. In fact, the wealthy Chinese control most of the banks and the business houses, including tin and rubber. And much of the tin and rubber is available to the communistic countries who want it and can pay the price. The rich Chinese are on the fence ready to fall whichever way the wind blows in their favor. The leaders are well aware that North China tried to make a deal with Red China and failed in the effort. The secretary general of the Communist Party in Malay is reported to have talked with the Singapore Chief Minister, David Marshall, before the Minister visited London recently to negotiate an independence deal for Singapore. Some local people feel that Britain has already agreed to writeoff Singapore. But Singapore is one of the world's pivotal ports, and the gateway to the Far Pacific, and others feel that Greatin Britain will fight to hold it, perhaps with United States help.

In this connection, the press has reported that the British Colonial Secretary, Alan Lennox-Boyd, told Mr. Marshall, on April 23, that Britain will not permit Singapore, one of the few remaining footsteps of British power in the southeast Asia area, to fall under Communist domination and become a Chinese Communist outpost. Singapore is still a British Crown colony and its importance has been heightened by the threatened loss of naval and airbases in Ceylon as a result of the Celyonese election which took place shortly after our visit there. Singapore is doomed to be another world's hotspot within 6 months.

Indonesia is made up of a number of states having independent local politics. The people are different and are mostly illiterate and poor, and will probably try anything new that will promise fuller stomachs and better living conditions, in spite of the fact that the vast majority of the people are not Communist at heart because of their religious beliefs.

Thailand is surrounded by hostile communistic countries, but is not afraid to show its appreciation for the economic and military help of the United States. It seemed clear that her recent border dispute with Cambodia was inspired by Red China. It appears that Thailand is the envied rice basket of the Far Pacific and will have to fight to hold her independence.

Ceylon is a beautiful island, and the drive to Kandy was equaled only by the mountain drive in Formosa. Ceylon is the first place where we could observe elephants at work. Tea, rubber, and coconut oil are the base of the economy of the country. The new Prime Minister of Ceylon was quoted in the press, as saying, "Bases must go, that is, British forces based on Ceylon. * * * Having foreign bases on our soil is not at all consistent with our sovereignty as a nation. * * * Agrees with Nehru's spirit in foreign policies * * * that no danger of Communist subversion is possible in Ceylon." The platform of the New Prime Minister called, also, for higher wages, and lower costs, including food.

The social evils and the living standards of the masses of India have not changed appreciably through the years, in spite of the fact that the country is blessed with a bountiful supply of primary wealth. There is no

unity, thus making the position of neutrality partly understandable. India appears to be fearful of its internal complexities, of all imaginable kinds, many of which cannot be legislated. Secondly, India looks vulnerable from end to end and too weak to defend herself. She will take help from anyone, but does dot want interference. She accepts United States aid, but also hires Russian technicians. Some industrial progress is being made, but principal objectives, including higher standards of living, may require generations. India is very critical of United States policy. Mr. Reuther arrived in New Delhi while we were there and, in his first press interview, represented American labor in taking exception to several policies of our State Department. For example, one headline read: "United States Workers Want Goa To Be Free." According to the press, he favored more help on the part of the United States and called upon the workers of the world to work collectively for eradicating poverty, hunger, and social injustice throughout the world.

Mr. Nehru, a Kashmir Brahman Hindu, persists in his claims that Kashmir is an integral part of India, in spite of the fact that 95 percent of the people of Kashmir are Moslems, and naturally favor Pakistan. It is significant that India urged the Hindus in Pakistan to move to India, and Pakistan urged the Moslems in India to move to Pakistan at the time of the partition of the two countries, thus creating additional refugee problems.

The Iron Pillar of Delhi is a unique example of corrosion-resistant iron that has withstood the corrosive action of sun and storms for 1,500 years. It is a solid shaft of wrought iron about 16 inches in diameter and more than 20 feet high. Its smooth surface shows no visible corrosion.

Taj Mahal at Agra is the most beautiful and impressive man-made edifice in the Orient.

The Persian Gulf is the waterway to Middle East oil. Empty tankers coming into the gulf and loaded tankers sailing out can be seen at all times, evincing the importance of the Middle East in present-day world economy. Most of the tankers head for the Red Sea, Suez Canal, and points west.

The Suez Canal is a strange contrast to our Panama Canal. The former is a sea-level ditch through flat desert country, while the latter is in tropical climate and requires a system of locks to raise and lower ships 100 feet. Ships travel through the Suez in convoys that can pass only at two points, which makes it necessary for one convoy to tie up 3 or more hours. There is no interrupted travel through the Panama Canal. No British soldiers were seen along Suez, but Egyptian soldiers guarded the railroad crossings at Isnailia and El Qantara.

A nationalistic spirit runs high in Egypt, and the country is militarized, a striking contrast to my visit in 1936. Armed forces were observed at Suez, Port Said, Alexandria, and Cairo, and soldiers were on guard at the docks in Alexandria and at the railroad stations between Alexandria and Cairo. Nasser is being hailed as the George Washington of Egypt in the same manner as Ataturk is recognized as the George Washington of Turkey.

The Egyptian Gazette—Cairo—April 18—Arabic Press Review headline, "Britain's Idea of Peace Is Not Ours," condemns British policies in the Middle East, including Balfour Declaration, arming and supporting Israeli, followed by proposing intervention and preservation of peace.

The Red China delegation arrived in Cairo at the time of our visit. A good example of what happened in their deliberations with Egyptian officials is Egypt's recognition of Red China announced in the press on May 17. According to the press, this action was taken because of the West's attitude toward her and the Arab national cause.

Communism appears to be on the wane in the northern industrial areas of Italy, and on the increase in the southern part of the country, as far north as Florence. It seems incongruous to see Rome and Florence plastered with posters, "Vota Communista," and showing the Russian hammer and sickle. There are 2½ million people out of work, mostly laborers, yet there is a shortage of skilled workers. The unemployment situation has been greatly increased by the loss of her colonies, especially Ethiopia. Nationalization is stifling development of a much-needed oil and gas industry, in contrast to Sicily which is still leaning to private industry.

Communism does not appear to be too serious in the northern or heavy industrial areas of France, but communism is holding its own in other parts of the country, including the Mediterranean area. In the pro-Communist areas, there are too many small shopkeepers who avoid taxes and render inefficient service at relatively high prices. Loss of her African colonies would reduce France to a second-class nation, and all of Europe will be affected.

The armed forces of Spain are alert against anarchy and fifth columns. Low wages are a sore spot in Spanish economy that may lead to serious unrest, especially if Franco should die, as there appears to be no one qualified to assume his leadership. Spain must make a serious effort to develop her colonies, both by encouraging planned emigration and by economic means.

Our policy in the Orient must be based on a better understanding of the people, and a respect for their culture and traditions. No one country has the power to foresee absolute solutions. A true understanding can only be attained by living associations within the various countries, and a sincere study of their peculiar individual problems—a study of man's relations to his natural environment. In stamping out malaria in the South Pacific and sleeping sickness in Africa, pollination was also interrupted, thereby killing life itself by chain reaction. We must maintain an earthy approach to all problems, rather than jump to absolute conclusions.

The refugee problem has created manmade sores in Formosa, Hong Kong, the Malay Federation, India, Pakistan, Saudi-Arabia, Jordan, and the Gaza Strip. Living conditions of refugees in many instances are not fit for human beings by any standard, and sanitation of refuges, especially in Karachi, capital of Pakistan, is so wretched, one simply cannot believe one's eyes. Progress will be slow in Pakistan, although recently geologists have reported favorable structures for oil.

If Red China were admitted into the United Nations at this time, it is my considered opinion that all of southeast Asia, including Indonesia, Ceylon, and India, would slowly move into Communist hands through infiltration. The people are religious, but there is a high rate of illiteracy in most of these submarginal countries. The people would have nothing to lose but freedom which they do not comprehend and cannot eat.

Some people feel that recognition would further weaken the prestige of the United States in the Far Pacific, but that some solution will be found to trade with Red China. They point out that we have long-term political commitments with Formosa but that, when Chiang dies, the Peking Government will merge with Formosa, and the United States is likely to close its eyes to the trade that will result.

It is questioned whether any of the oriental countries, excepting Japan, is ready for democracy or self-government. Some of the politicians do not appear to know what is meant by democracy and are quick to point out the weak spots in democracy as practiced in the United States. SEATO is meant to function like NATO is supposed to function, but does not. Perhaps it is time to consider that Japan is the colossus of the Orient and that a defense organization built around Japan wuld be more likely to prosper and preserve freedom in the Orient.

Russia offers materials for construction and development projects, and necessary experts to lead in the work, all on a loan basis, and this plan seems to match the needs of the states receiving this aid. Russian loans are long term, at low interest, and payments are to be made in the products of the states, bringing economic stability to the states concerned.

It would seem that the vertex of British domination in the Orient was the sinking of the battleships *Princes of Wales* and *Repulse* in the sea directly north of Singapore in December 1941. Obviously the Pearl Harbor fiasco 2 weeks earlier contributed to the circumstance of face-losing of the white man. But many responsible nationals freely admit that the British and Dutch colonization was in the best interests of the people in spite of high profits, and question whether the people concerned will have peace among themselves upon their own responsibility in the next 100 years.

The Moslem world, 350 million strong, stretches across northern Africa, through the Middle East, into Pakistan, Afghanistan, and Nashmir (and Turkenen, Uzbek, Tadzhik, and Kazakh under the U. S. S. R.), thence into Malay where 50 percent of the population is Moslem. Moslems also make up 9-percent of Indonesia, 4 percent of Burma, 3 percent of Thailand, 4 percent of Philippines, and 5 percent of China.

The Moslems seem to be uniting in their resentment of Israel, and it is not inconceivable that they will one day fight as a unit to restore that area to the Moslems. Russia is taking full advantage of the situation in order to get a foothold in Africa, and with an eye on Middle East oil. Due to the increasingly large numbers coming into Israel, the Moslems fear that they will eventually seek expansion. They have no faith in the proposed Jordan Valley project. Compensation for the Arab refugees will not solve the problem. The feeling of injustice is said to be too deep to be satisfied by money compensations, and it is already evident that freedom-loving countries need the support of the Moslem world in their fight against communism.

The British Government publishes a sales and trade information news sheet periodically in which it lists sales possibilities from all foreign gifts and loans in terms of pounds and dollars. The United States Government should give more aid to United States business representatives in this and similar ways. United States dollars or credit should be used to purchase American-manufactured goods unless the same quality and price is available elsewhere, which is not likely anywhere under present conditions.

I doubt whether the oriental peoples understand what the United States means by "standards of living." Some are quick to point out our lack of respect for all of the great religions of the world. They know that we cannot put a "bottle of milk on everybody's doorstep," and can question why we talk so much about "two cars in every garage," great wealth, great strength, when we depend upon our military expenditures and foreign-aid programs for our current economy and much of our way of living, including high wages, and are dependent upon the rest of the world for many raw materials of industry, and for markets for our manufactured products. They could wonder how the United States can meet the annual deficits of foreign countries when it cannot meet its own deficits. They could wonder how it will all end if and when the current

submarginal countries have their full share of wealth created by manufacture and are taking their rightful place in world affairs. They could believe that the United States will be a "have-not" long before India, for example, is a "have" nation, and that a decent and honorable Russia with its unscratched natural resources can become, with due amount of native brains, initiative, and skills, the dominant nation of the world. They could believe that our economy is based on helping and protecting them, and that we could not turn off the faucet without destroying ourselves. From my own point of view, we have just reason in every respect to sing "God bless America," but perhaps a new, companion song, "God help America," would help us to be a bit more nationalistic, and give more concern to the politics of our own best interests.

Nature Pitches One of Her Curves; Armless Girl Clouts It Out of Park

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES E. BENNETT
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 25, 1956

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. Mr. Speaker, when I picked up a copy of the Jacksonville Journal the other day I saw the beautiful face of Jo Beth Johnson, a little girl who is receiving medical care in the district which I represent. Some years ago I saw her at Dowling Park, Fla., where she was a student and I, as the Congressman in that area, was making a little talk to the school in which she was being instructed. I was then inspired by her courageous approach to life; and by her happy and healthy outlook on life, despite the fact that she has neither of her arms. She was an inspiration to me then and she is now. I am particularly happy that the news is that perhaps modern medical attention and surgery may make it possible for her to live a more normal life than she has in the past. At this point I call attention to the newspaper article to which I have referred, written by my dear friend, Mrs. Beth Van Zile, as follows:

WHAT SHE DIDN'T GET, SHE DIDN'T NEED—NATURE PITCHES ONE OF HER CURVES; ARMLESS GIRL CLOUTS IT OUT OF PARK

(By Beth Van Zile)

Nature pitched her a curve but Jo Beth Johnson caught it squarely—not with two brawny arms and a huge catcher's mitt, but with two beautiful, dainty, nimble feet.

But don't feel sorry for this little 11-year-old girl, because she counts her troubles as experiences—experiences that day by day have developed faith to combat her difficulties, no matter how adverse they are, because, you see, she "keeps God in her pocket."

The Lord and Jo Beth are more than friends. They walk along together, so she really hasn't needed the arms that failed to develop.

Jo Beth has been a patient at Hope Haven Hospital for the past 5 or 6 weeks where she has undergone a series of operations that will make possible the attaching of artificial arms to the muscles in her shoulders. Within the next week or 10 days she will leave for Atlanta and the rehabilitation program that will open up a new world for her.

But she really hasn't needed what nature deprived her of. She has taken piano lessons, she sews, paints, feeds and dresses herself and handles her dainty little toes as well as the average person uses fingers and hands in accomplishing the things they want to do and are necessary in day to day living.

Recreation enters into her program, too, in her school and home life. She plays baseball with the skill of a big leaguer. Anyone who can hit a four-bagger can be assured that Jo Beth will make the home run. With one strike against her, her life has been a continual scoring game.

She attends public school in Dowling Park, near Live Oak, Fla., where she lives with her parents and younger sister, Ann. Not only is she a good student, but she takes an active part in all school activities, has a flair for mathematics, but hates history and English. She'll be an eighth grader next year.

At home she is capable of making as big a mess as any of the other children, but has equal responsibilities in cleaning it up, her mother says.

A painting of a red rose won a blue ribbon at the Jacksonville Beach Art Exhibit yesterday for this little artist. Each brush stroke a success story of determination in an obstacle race run by a child who has to prove to herself that she can't do a thing before she gives it up.

Mrs. Johnson recalled putting a pencil between Jo Beth's toes and giving her a piece of paper, when she was very young.

"I think she would have done it anyway, if I hadn't. Since that time she has never had any trouble doing the things she wanted to do."

When it came time for the operations that will open up a new adventure for this brave little girl, the decision was hers to make. "When she decided she wanted to go through with it, we brought her to Jacksonville and to Hope Haven," her mother said with a note of genuine pride in her voice.

It hasn't been easy these last few days, and there have been nights when "it never quit hurting" for the little girl who someday hopes to drive a car and to have some pretty clothes, for like all little girls, she loves pretty things. Straightening her bandaged shoulders and with the true faith of a little child, she expressed her fondest desire. "Maybe someday I can go to college and be a teacher • • • that's what I'd like to be."

Putting a final stroke on a modern lamp she was painting in the physical therapy workshop at Hope Haven, she laid down the brush, swung around, placed her tiny feet in her patent leather slippers and prepared to leave the room that "has been so much fun to work in" and go back upstairs to her bed where she will proceed to cut out paper dolls for the little patients in nearby beds "who are handicapped."

Jo Beth has run her obstacle race and won—not only a blue ribbon for her painting of a red rose, but a blue ribbon for her living portrait of life—the life of a little girl who cannot fail because she "has God in her pocket."

Bicycling for Health

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. TIMOTHY P. SHEEHAN
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 25, 1956

Mr. SHEEHAN. Mr. Speaker, the city of Chicago, working in conjunction with the forest preserve district and the park district, has put a great deal of time and thought on the development of special facilities for bicycle riders in the public parks. With the number of youngsters using bicycles in a metropolitan city and with no other place to ride except in streets often carrying heavy traffic, the provision of bicycle paths is a safety measure as well as a source of healthful pleasure.

Chicago can well be proud in taking the lead in this development. June 2, 1956, at the inauguration dedicating a series of safe bicycle paths in 27 Chicago parks, the very famous doctor who has been working closely with President Eisenhower since his heart attack, Dr. Paul D. White, of Boston, Mass., delivered the main address. Dr. White's address delivered at Ogden Park in Chicago was as follows:

Mr. Mayor, ladies, and gentlemen, it is with great appreciation of your kind invitation that I welcome this opportunity to present to you some of my thoughts about bicycling in the United States of America. Today may prove to be a red letter one in history both for the people of Greater Chicago, including the present group of 250,000 cyclists and those who should and will become such, but especially as a spur for the rest of the cities and towns in the country. From this acorn I hope that there will grow a huge oak of development for the sake of the health and happiness of the Nation.

PERSONAL EXPERIENCE

I would like to give you first some personal experiences as a cyclist. Of course, like other children I had a bicycle as a boy and used it in play and in going to school and doing errands. In those days, 50 or more years ago, there were relatively few automobiles in the streets and this method of locomotion was relatively safe. As a freshman going to college, I used to ride my bicycle morning and afternoon to Cambridge from where I lived in Roxbury and back again, a 5-mile distance twice a day, which was perfectly easy and practical. In later years with my wife, I took many bicycle trips in Europe where there had already been developed much better facilities for the use of the bicycle. This is especially true in Holland where we spent a week cycling around the country on paths both broad and narrow reserved entirely for cyclists. It was a delightful experience and a pleasant and inexpensive way to see the country. We cycled also in Sweden, in England, and in France. Finally, in our personal experience, our family continues to ride bicycles although more, of course, in the country where we have a small place at Harvard, Mass., 30 miles outside of Boston. However, on occasion, we have cycled in other places, for example, in New Hampshire, and only last summer my son and I cycled around Martha's Vineyard on a very pleasant day. We put our bicycles on the train leaving Boston for Woods Hole, transported them across a short bit of water by boat to Vineyard Haven, and after a pleasant night's sleep, we started off and cycled to Squibnocket, Menemsha Bight, and West Tisbury, and onto Edgartown where we spent the second night. This day's ride covered about 30 miles. It was perfectly easy and pleasant and because we were not accustomed to cycling very much, it left us pleasantly tired at the end of the day. Actually, such a distance is less than a third of that which our fathers thought very little of when they did a century, that is, 100 miles a day, but in these days of softness and lackadaisical exercise, a 30-mile ride leaves many of my friends and associates aghast. This is a ridiculous situation and certainly needs correction.

AS A MEASURE OF HEALTH

There are many health reasons why cycling, like a good many other exercises, is to be highly recommended if it can be done safely. In the first place, it is an aid to good muscle tone, much needed by the American people today. It aids (a) the circulation and thereby the heart and its work by keeping the blood actively moving in the legs (muscular contraction squeezes the veins which with their valves direct the blood back toward the heart); (b) the lungs which through good tone of the diaphragm make it easier to bring oxygen into the body and pump out carbon dioxide; (c) the brain, by keeping down the cobwebs therein; (d) the nerves through improving sleep and maintaining equinamity and sanity (vital needs in this country today and a help in combating the hysteria about a red Indian behind every tree or a witch in every college classroom along with the current ridiculous slavery of our people, men, women, and children to the television and other pushbutton devices which should be our tools and not our masters); (e) our digestion, whereby it may even protect against peptic ulcers if we don't try to establish new speed records every day; (f) our weight, in its control, if we at the same time keep the caloric and fat content of our diet where they belong; and (g) finally, our longevity, since it may quite possibly help in the long run (like other healthy exercise) in reducing the amount of high blood pressure, coronary thrombosis, and diabetes which have engulfed us—this we must, of course, determine by further detailed research, but there is a strong likelihood that this is true.

ECONOMY

Certainly both for private individuals and for the community and country at large, the substitution of at least a small fraction of the excessive traffic on the roads today by bicycles on safe paths should be a very useful step in economy. There are various arguments that can readily be deduced.

(a) The initial cost of the bicycle is much less than that of the automobile, it requires little attention, is able to stand hard use, and repairs can be made easily.

(b) It requires no gas for operation.

(c) It can traverse all types of roads. If a road is blocked, the rider can walk and remount at the first clearing.

(d) Almost everyone aged 4 to 90 can ride a bike or can be taught to ride in a few hours.

(e) When accidents between bicycles occur, there is much less danger of serious injury to either passenger or machine than in the case of the automobile.

(f) It is possible even to equip bicycles with sidecars to transport passengers and one correspondent has said that it might be possible to attach a small truck to carry supplies.

The argument about its difficult use in severe weather is, of course, of some importance, but in almost all cities and towns in this country, it can be a practical method of transportation for 8 or 9 months of the year with some added protection in inclement weather during those 9 months.

A PRACTICAL FORM OF EXERCISE, NOT LIMITED TO CHILDREN

Bicycling, of course, can be a useful sport as well as enjoyable. It can become and should do so, as in Europe and many places abroad, a routine of daily life to take us to work or to visit our neighbors, friends, or relatives, to go to plays, movies, and concerts, or to sport events such as ball games as in the Old World. Thus we can be more than passive participants in all these entertainment devices that are ours today. Many adults have told me, however, that they are embarrassed in getting on bicycles today because it is supposed to be a child's game. This attitude or point of view, which is current and which does deter many persons, must be combatted. It is quite unnecessary—witness the routine bicycling in the course of a normal way of life in the Old World.

CYCLING BRINGS US BACK TO EARTH AND TO THE ENJOYMENT OF NATURE

In travel it is the common experience that we get to places fastest by airplane but we see the least en route. The train and automobile come next and we are so engrossed by our method of transportation that we can hardly enjoy the country through which we pass. Walking is, of course, the best way of all, but not infrequently it is impractical if one wants to go any distance. Thus, of all methods of transportation bicycling gives us the opportunity to see the country through which we ride, to become acquainted with the beauties of the scenery, and to learn about the people themselves. This is perhaps one of the most potent of all arguments in favor of bicycle touring on vocation. This custom is much appreciated abroad and I have had letters from Americans, living in Germany or other places abroad, who see and have participated in the enjoyment of the people resident there who, every day or every week, go off on bicycles with their families to enjoy the countryside.

CYCLE PATHS MUST BE SAFE

After all these arguments re cycling, we come to the vital issue of the day and that is that this means of transportation and exercise must be made safe. It should not be reserved simply for children in parks. It should become a routine measure to bring thousands of our people to their daily jobs safely from their homes 5 or 10 miles away in every city or town.

Just as important as what I have said about the safe bicycle paths coming into the cities is the opportunity now to build safe bicycle paths into the new highway program just being planned throughout the country and in every State in the Union. It can and should be done to give an opportunity for people to tour the country by bicycle, going from one town to another. My father told me that when he was a young man he and a few others rode their bicycles from Boston to Albany, from Albany to New York City, and back to Boston. This is hard to conceive of today, but the opportunity should be reestablished.

CONCLUSIONS

Thus, depite all the relatively minor difficulties in getting this idea started and in planning and building the actual paths, with the expense involved, I feel certain that the establishment of cycling as a routine in the daily life of Americans young and old, can become one of the most vital steps in restoring health and vigor to us all in the important days ahead. Let us bequeath to our children who will be the citizens here tomorrow more than the gadgets that surround us. The bicycle will not, of course, alone do this, but it can become a symbol of the red-blooded vigor, personal independence, economy, and restoration of a mens sana in a corpore sano so much needed in our beloved country today.

First Junior High Diploma Is Awarded at Hope Haven

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES E. BENNETT

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 25, 1956

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I recently read a very inspiring article about Gwen Chung, a lovely young constituent who has faced serious obstacles and met them well. I believe that my colleagues, and Americans everywhere, will have a feeling of humility and inspiration when they read of the quiet heroism of this sweet youngster. The article by my good friend, Mrs. Beth Van Zile, is as follows:

FIRST JUNIOR HIGH DIPLOMA IS AWARDED AT HOPE HAVEN

(By Beth Van Zile)

Gwen Chung, lovely 15-year-old Chinese-American girl, held an important document in her crippled hands yesterday, a document that spelled scholastic achievement and fortitude, for it marked her graduation from junior high school at Hope Haven Hospital.

Commencement exercises could not take long for this little girl, whose bed was rolled into the hospital auditorium for the ceremony that gave her the distinction of being the first graduate of the hospital's junior high school. Released from an oxygen tent only a few hours before the long-anticipated event, Gwen, with champagne bubbles in her black eyes, showed the same dauntless spirit that has carried her through the years with an affliction that has kept her bedridden most of her life—rheumatoid arthritis with a heart complication.

An A-B honor student, this girl graduate is a living document of the ancient proverb of her people: "The longest journey begins with a single step." Her steps in education, taken one at a time, have been long and rugged.

Rolled to and from her classroom in her bed, this brave girl, even though not feeling well, never tried to shirk her responsibilities. She could always be counted on to hand in her school assignments on time. Getting out of homework because of not feeling well never entered her mind, because she has been thinking forward and working forward to the limit of her ability.

With a deep love of life, people, and things, she believes that you can reach any goal in life if you are willing to work for it. Conquering her ills with no thought of defeat, Gwen yesterday passed another milestone toward her next goal, graduation from high school. With all her handicaps, she looks with pleasure on things she has today and with gratitude on the happiness of yesterday.

The daughter of Mr. and Mrs. S. C. Chung of Dinsmore, Gwen started her schooling in the Pickett Public School. Later, because of her illness, she received instruction through the homebound program of the Duval County Board of Public Instruction. Unable to attend public schools, she became the pupil of Mrs. Nathan Finney until the time it became necessary to be hospitalized at Hope Haven. Here she has been under the supervision of Miss Nancy Graham, teacher of grades 5 through 12.

"I've never heard Gwen mention any particular school subject that she didn't like," Miss Graham said yesterday, in reviewing her ninth-grade record. "She likes them all."

Books are among her most treasured possessions, her teacher said. The thought of completing her ninth grade has kept her moving along up to the very day—with a few stops out for oxygen.

There have been many rainy days for Gwen, but the puddles in her life have reflected the light of the sun. She hasn't her thoughts fixed on her difficulties, nor does she complain about them. She takes a positive angle and lives joyously—truly a blessing to those around her and associated with her.

There were no large crowds at this commencement; the band didn't play, and only her doctors, nurses, teachers, and members of her family attended.

But it was commencement day, right on, and one of the happiest days in this girl's life—the little girl who has tapped the secret of the universe, the secret of victorious living.

Address by National Commander of the American Legion Before Graduates of the FBI National Academy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. STYLES BRIDGES

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, June 25, 1956

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address made by Mr. J. Addington Wagner, national commander of the American Legion, before the graduating class of the FBI National Academy on June 8, 1956.

In this address Commander Wagner gives a penetrating analysis of the menace to our country represented by the Communist philosophy. I am sure his address will be of special interest not only to Members of Congress, but to the general public, as well.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY NATIONAL COMMANDER J. ADDINGTON WAGNER OF THE AMERICAN LEGION BEFORE THE GRADUATES OF THE 57TH SESSION OF THE FBI NATIONAL ACADEMY, WASHINGTON, D. C., JUNE 8, 1956

I am very happy to be here. I consider it a privilege and an honor for myself, and for the American Legion, to be invited to speak to this distinguished class of graduates of the 57th session of the FBI Academy.

The opportunity extended me to speak to you is a tangible evidence of the continuing friendly association, and the cooperation between the American Legion and the FBI. We are proud of this association, and of the many years it has prevailed. We look forward to its continuance, and we hope that it will grow even stronger in the years to come.

This graduation is another milestone in a wonderful program which began almost 21 years ago—in July 1935. Since then, 3,163 law-enforcement officers including the 98 from this class, have graduated from the Academy. They represent every State, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, Canada, and many foreign countries. What a great contribution, indeed, this Academy has made to the honorable profession which all of you represent.

Every graduate—each of you here—exemplifies the progress which has been made in the field of law enforcement. Today the police officer is much more than a person who apprehends criminals. He is also looked upon as an honored citizen, a skilled technician, and quite often, a civic leader.

But before all else, the law-enforcement officer is a highly trained professional in a specialized field. The social development of our people has made it clear that the problem of dealing with the criminal is essentially the problem of dealing with the maladjusted citizen. And as in the case of medical science, which more and more seeks to cure disease by preventing it, those responsible for law enforcement have come to realize that the most effective way to reduce the number of criminals is to find out why people break the law, and then to deter them from doing so.

The focal point of this thinking, of course, has been the youth of the Nation. And, certainly, one of the great pioneers in the study and the alleviation of the problem of juvenile delinquency has been the distinguished Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, Mr. J. Edgar Hoover. I believe it is a demonstrable fact that Mr. Hoover has done more than any other single person in the United States to make the American people aware of the many aspects of the problem of juvenile delinquency, and to urge that something positive be done about them. For his unremitting efforts in this field alone, the Nation owes him a very great debt of gratitude.

The American Legion shares the interest of all other good citizens in seeing this problem relieved. We have devoted a substantial part of our own activities to the promotion of juvenile opportunity. That is why we maintain our vast junior baseball program; our boys and girls State programs; our oratorical and essay contests. These American Legion programs afford healthful recreation, as well as sound training in good sportsmanship and good citizenship for more than a million young men and women this year. In addition we are very active in scout work. At present American Legion posts sponsor more than 4,000 Boy Scout troops. And also, of course, there is our child welfare program, which has spent more than $125 million in direct aid to needy children since 1925.

Our work in the fields of youth activity and child welfare derives from our deep interest in the security of America. We know that the national security depends to a great extent upon the physical and mental vigor, the moral strength and the social well-being of America's youth.

I mention these things because I want each one of you to know that the American Legion post back home is your ally in the cause of maintaining public order.

You know the very existence of the FBI Academy is an excellent example of the difference between the idea of a policeman in the mind of a free American citizen, and in the mind of a citizen slave of the Communist tyranny.

In this country, the policeman is the guardian of the rights and of the personal safety of the individual citizen. In the Communist world, the policeman is the guardian of the rights of the state, and his principal duty is to watch the citizen and compel him to conform to the will of the state.

These two concepts are accurate reflections of two philosophies so basically different that there can be no bridge between them. America is a society of individuals. The State has been organized to serve their common needs. Law enforcement is one arm of the State—providing a necessary and limited service.

Communism is a society of the mass, organized to serve the state. Under communism, law enforcement is absolute and repressive. It is that arm of the state which is designated to see that each citizen renders the required service to the state—or else.

Thank God, in America we have no police state. Here we do not even have a Federal police force. The FBI, for example, is an investigative agency. The maintenance of law and order is the responsibility of the community. The local police are recruited from among the citizens of the community, and they are answerable for the performance of their duty, not to a central government, but to their fellow citizens. In this system is one of the greatest strengths of individual freedom and of the preservation of our democracy.

The necessity of keeping in mind this and other essential differences between the Communist philosophy and that of the Free World is becoming more difficult in the face of the current changes in Communist tactics. The important thing to remember, of course, is that although there is presently evident a marked change in Communist procedures and methods, both within and without the borders of the Communist empire, there has been no repudiation of the basic principles of Communist doctrine. This doctrine still professes the ascendency of the state over the individual, the coming of the world triumph of communism and the justification of the use of any means to achieve this goal. According to their own words these things are still believed by the leaders of communism both in Soviet Russia and in other Communist lands—including Red China.

And whereas Khrushchev and Bulganin appear to have adopted the expedient of enclosing the mailed fist in the velvet glove, Mao Tse-tung and his comrades have as yet seen no necessity to do the same thing. In Red China, communism continues to display the naked tyranny and the overwhelming oppression that is a true reflection of what it actually is, and what it stands for.

It is certain that communism has not changed and as long as this condition remains there cannot possibly be any common ground on which the two worlds—slave and free—can meet. For the United States to accept Red China into the family of nations would be to betray the memory of thousands of American soldiers who died in Korea to emphasize the essential difference between our world and theirs.

In this election year, I believe the issue of any such acceptance must be faced. To understand why, it should be sufficient to review the record of our experience with the Red Chinese regime.

It is a fact that Red China, without provocation, joined in the hostilities against the Republic of Korea and the United Nations troops which were defending that country.

It is a fact that the Red Chinese tortured and mistreated American prisoners of war. The Red Chinese Government imprisoned American soldiers on trumped-up charges and some of these American citizens are still unaccounted for.

Red China has violated the terms of the Korean Armistice agreement.

The Red regime has imprisoned and murdered American and other missionaries.

Red China poses a constant threat of renewed warfare in Korea and in the Formosa Strait, requiring us to keep substantial forces of our own on the scene.

And in addition to all of these things, the Communist revolutionaries in China have launched what is generally recognized as the greatest blood bath in the history of the human race. Hitler, and Stalin himself, in their bloodiest purges did not approach the wholesale human destruction which Mao Tse-tung and his henchmen have carried on since 1948.

This is the regime which some Americans propose to do business with. With all of the seriousness at my command, and in the name of the entire American Legion, I pray and hope that the proposal will fail.

If the other nations of the world are so devoid of moral responsibility that they would admit the Chinese Communists to the United Nations—then that body is no place for the United States of America.

Both of the major political parties will hold their conventions during this summer. The American Legion calls upon each of them, and the candidates for office whom they will select, to make clear whether they will actively oppose the admission of Red China to the U. N., and the granting of diplomatic recognition to Red China by the United States.

The American people are entitled to an unequivocal declaration on this subject.

I have spoken to you on some matters which go beyond the scope of your immediate interest and duty. However, it is natural to think of such issues here, in the seat of our National Government and in the company of those who are dedicated to American ideals of justice and liberty. Acknowledging that all of you are primarily interested in law enforcement, it is well to

remember that the enforcement of international law and morals is an obligation which devolves, at least to some extent, upon the shoulders of each American. This is so because we are free citizens, and we have the privilege and the responsibility of sharing in every decision of our Government. Only to the extent that we do so shall we continue to be free.

All of you are charged with the solemn obligation of working for America in a very special way, in keeping with the traditions of the profession of which you are members.

With the help of the knowledge you have gained at the FBI Academy, I am sure that you will fully meet the measure of your obligation. And I am sure, too, that by virtue of what you have learned here, you will be able to help your fellow officers in the agencies which you represent, to increase their effectiveness, to the end that American citizens can live safely in their homes, and walk safely on their streets—secure in the knowledge that they are guarded by vigilant men and women, dedicated and trained in the American tradition of equal justice under law for all men.

In your endeavors you have the warm support and encouragement of the American Legion.

We honor you for your willingness to serve in the public interest. We admire your work—and especially your desire to do your work even better, which is manifest in your attendance at the FBI Academy. We pledge you the continuing cooperation of American Legionnaires.

Rural Electrification Administration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM LANGER
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, June 25, 1956

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a radio broadcast concerning the Rural Electrification Administration.

There being no objection, the broadcast was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GTA DAILY RADIO ROUNDUP—MONDAY, JUNE 18, 1956

REA. Every farmer knows—and certainly most city people, too—that those three letters stand for Rural Electrification Association. And what a blessing it's been to farm people. How could you possibly get along without it on the farms? REA, today, provides the electricity to light the house, the barn, the chicken house and farm machinery sheds. It refrigerates the food—does countless chores for farmer and farm wife.

Yes; REA and the power it supplies to farm people is taken for granted these days—has become a vital part of farm living. Actually, though, the program is only 20 years old. This year marks the 20th anniversary of REA. It came into being through the passage of a law passed by the Congress back in 1936 and signed by President Franklin D. Roosevelt.

One of the authors of the law that gave birth to the REA was the late Senator George Norris of Nebraska. The other was SAM RAYBURN—Speaker of the United States House of Representatives. Recently the cornerstone was laid in Washington for a new building for the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association. And SAM RAYBURN was the principal speaker. His speech was a very significant one. You'll find it carried on the editorial page of your Farmers Union Herald. Hope you've read it. If not, check back on that issue—the last one you've received—and read what SAM RAYBURN had to say.

Less than 10 percent of the farm homes in America had the comforts and conveniences of electricity back at the time REA was born. Today, well over 90 percent have electric power. Farm people have come a long way—in 20 years—in getting the benefits of rural power. RAYBURN discussed what that's meant to farm families. But he also stressed what it has meant to business, to manufacturers, to wholesalers, to retailers. He said that conservative estimates from all available sources are that farmers have purchased in the neighborhood of $15 billion worth of merchandise which they could not have used without electricity for their homes.

And, as he noted, "This made profits for manufacturers and every business concerned that touched these products. It made profitable labor for thousands of unemployed men and women." Here's another fact he cited: the rural market today is the largest user of electrical energy per average consumer by about 50 percent. And—listen to this—surveys show that more than 200 different services are now performed on farms and ranches by electricity.

So, you see that REA is a prime example of a program that has been a marvelous help to not only farm people, but city people, as well. REA is one of the many programs developed in giving farmers a helping hand. And, other key laws have provided price support programs to help give farmers some measure of protection for their prices.

And when farmers vote in the wheat referendum on July 20, they will be voting not only to save the wheat program—and assure themselves of at least 75 cents a bushel more—but they'll also be voting to help preserve the whole price-support program built up over many years by farmers working together. The farmers who own and operate GTA—the co-op way, urge all wheat growers to be sure to vote—and to vote "yes."

Chief Judge Finis James Garrett

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JERE COOPER
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 25, 1956

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution passed by the United States Customs Court upon the death of Chief Judge Finis James Garrett of the United States Court of Customs and Patent Appeals:

RESOLUTIONS PASSED BY THE UNITED STATES CUSTOMS COURT UPON THE DEATH OF CHIEF JUDGE FINIS JAMES GARRETT OF THE UNITED STATES COURT OF CUSTOMS AND PATENT APPEALS

Whereas members of the United States Customs Court have learned with deep sorrow of the passing of Chief Judge Finis James Garrett of the United States Court of Customs and Patent Appeals in Washington, D. C., on May 25, 1956, after having served on that court with great honor and distinction since March 5, 1929; and

Whereas Chief Judge Garrett possessed a background of rich judicial and legislative experience, having served with honor as a judge in his own beloved State of Tennessee and later, for a quarter of a century, as a distinguished Member of Congress from his State; and

Whereas such rich and distinguished background, together with his keen analytical mind, his indefatigable energy, innate wisdom, and even temperament fitted him so admirably for the high position he occupied on the United States Court of Customs and Patent Appeals; and

Whereas the contribution which Chief Judge Garrett made to the jurisprudence of customs law and will live on and on for all time as a revered monument to his fairness, industry, integrity, and profound thinking, as well as serve as a guidepost for future generations; and

Whereas he was widely known, honored, and highly respected, not only as an outstanding jurist, but also for his courtesy, dignity, and clarity of expression, and

Whereas he was a devoted Christian gentleman who sincerely and consistently practiced the tenets of his religious faith, a recognized Bible scholar and historian, who, being possessed of a golden eloquence, was over a period of many years in great demand as a lecturer on the Bible and ancient culture; and

Whereas he was a kind, generous, and devoted husband, father, and grandfather, a true and affable friend and colleague, and an inspiration to all who knew him or with whome he came in contact: Therefore be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of the judges of the United States Customs Court, in regular conference assembled, that they express their irreparable loss in the death of Chief Judge Finis James Garrett of the United States Court of Customs and Patent Appeals, and extend their deep and abiding sympathy to his bereaved family, his colleagues and friends who mourn his passing; be it further

Resolved, That a copy of these resolutions be spread on the minutes of the meeting of the United States Customs Court and that copies be sent to the United States Court of Customs and Patent Appeals for transmittal to his family.

Webster J. Oliver, Chief Judge, United States Customs Court; William A. Ekwall, Judge; Charles D. Lawrence, Judge; Irvin C. Mollison, Judge; Jed Johnson, Judge; Paul P. Rao, Judge; Morgan Ford, Judge; David J. Wilson, Judge; Mary H. Donlon, Judge.

A Resolute People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 25, 1956

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks I include an editorial, "A Resolute People," appearing in the Boston Post of June 19, 1956. As this editorial well said:

Striving to restore the fertility of a desert land, hauling themselves up by their bootstraps and performing these extraordinary exertions with a rifle in one hand to fight off attacks—the people of Israel have earned something more than expedient treatment.

I thoroughly agree with this editorial, and particularly "that the people of Israel have earned something more than expedient treatment" from our Government.

The editorial follows:

A RESOLUTE PEOPLE

The Soviet Union has wasted no time in demonstrating its new power and importance

in the world of the Middle East, where basic Russian anti-Semitism is being exploited to the fullest extent.

No course is left for Israel but to prepare to take bold measures or to tamely submit to the crushing pressure which the Soviet Union is applying through the Arab states. The visit of Soviet Foreign Minister Shepilov to Egypt and the Arab states was heralded by demonstrations against Israel and the west in Syria, where the government was toppled. In Jordan the Arab legion pressed King Hussein to establish diplomatic and treaty ties with Russia. In this situation the responsible head or government in Israel—Premier David Ben-Gurion—had no choice but to discard the moderate foreign policy of Moshe Sharett and stiffen against the aggression in the making.

It is tragic that the United States at this hour has been worked into a position where it has no freedom of choice. The justice of Israel's cause is manifest to a pioneering people like Americans. They believe in energetic tackling of problems, courage in defending their rights, and the adage that God helps those who help themselves, which is what has made the state of Israel the doughty country it is today.

The oil of the Middle East is weighed aaginst the righteousness of Israel's cause and claims, and Israel hasn't been given the best of it. There is risk of war in espousing the cause of Israel—but there is that risk in defending any righteous cause.

Shepilov's mission to the Middle East is to put the finishing touches on the alliance against Israel. Moshe Sharett had striven for 8 years to bring about peaceful settlement within the framework of the United Nations and, quite apart from the internal politics in Israel, was viewed in the world as an apostle of moderation.

But the appointment of Shepilov to the Soviet foreign ministry after he had arranged the Cairo arms deal to enable Egypt to become militarily superior to Israel was an urgent signal that Israel had only one recourse—to appeal for help to the United States and to the other western powers and, if it were not forthcoming, to prepare for all-out war.

There may be some salve for the western conscience in the efforts of the Secretary General of the United Nations to implement the truce and to arrange for a cease fire. But the western nations already knew that UN was impotent in the task of putting down aggression against the very nations it had created.

Striving to restore the fertiltiy of a desert land, hauling themselves up by their bootstraps and performing these extraordinary exertions with a rifle in one hand to fight of attacks—the people of Israel have earned something more than expedient treatment. To their eternal credit they are prepared to meet any new threat to their nation with resolution and courage.

Statements Made at Small Business Administration Meeting, Baltimore, June 21, 1956

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. DeWITT S. HYDE

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 25, 1956

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include an article with respect to the Small Business Administration meeting held in Baltimore on June 21 in cooperation with the Baltimore Association of Commerce and the partial statements made by the following individuals in connection with this meeting:

Mr. Wendell B. Barnes, Administrator, Small Business Administration; Mr. Ormonde A. Kieb, Assistant Postmaster General, Bureau of Facilities, Post Office Department; Mr. John Hamlin, Director of Small Business, Office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense; Mr. Frederick H. Mueller, Assistant Secretary for Domestic Affairs, United States Department of Commerce; Mr. Clifton E. Mack, Commissioner of Federal Supply, General Services Administration; Mr. John S. Patterson, Deputy Administrator, Veterans' Administration; Mr. Harrison Garrett, president, Baltimore Association of Commerce; Mr. T. M. Baldauf, Chief of Procurement and Property Management Division, United States Department of Agriculture; Mr. David F. Shaw, Assistant General Manager for Manufacturing, Atomic Energy Commission; Mr. D. Otis Beasley, Administrative Assistant Secretary of the Interior.

It is hoped that meetings such as this result in some real benefit to our small-business men.

Approximately 1,000 owners of small businesses assembled in Eastern High School, in Baltimore, last Thursday and heard top Washington officials say that opportunities to do business with the Government are countless, and contracts are available to those with the "sharpest pencils"—the lowest qualified bidders.

Representatives of the Department of Defense, the Atomic Energy Commission, the General Services Administration, and other Federal agencies appeared before the group, which included operators of small firms from Maryland and adjacent States, and revealed that a large percentage of their purchases are made from small businesses.

Samples of products the Government regularly buys were on display, along with hundreds of sample-bid invitations from the Department of Defense, and other Government agencies.

Gov. Theodore R. McKeldin of Maryland, who designated June 21 as "Small Business Day," greeted the small-business men and emphasized the importance of small business to the Nation's economy.

Harrison Garrett, president of the Baltimore Association of Commerce, which cosponsored the meeting with the Small Business Administration, extended a welcome and there were speakers representing all of the departments and agencies of the Government which buy goods and services.

United States Senator J. GLENN BEALL, of Maryland, said in a welcoming message sent to the small-business men that such meetings are designed to be "mutually beneficial to you, who are representatives of small businesses, and to our Government, which relies on you so much for its continued strength." He added that it had been extremely gratifying to him to be able to cooperate with the "men of action" in the Small Business Administration and the Baltimore Association of Commerce in planning for the conference.

Wendell B. Barnes, Administrator of the Small Business Administration, in hailing the meeting as a success in disseminating information on how to do business with the Government, said that his agency plans to hold similar Government procurement conferences in other parts of the country. The 15 Regional Directors of the Small Business Administration attended, and Clarence P. Moore, Richmond, Va., regional director for the area, presided. Mr. Barnes said:

"It is the plan of the Small Business Administration, with the cooperation of other Government departments and agencies, to hold procurement conferences in other parts of the country after the pattern of today's conference.

"Requests have come from various parts of the country for such a conference as this one. Where the local trade associations and civic-minded citizens express this desire, we shall do all that we can to comply.

"As I see it, nothing but good can result from this Small Business Conference and others to be held. Every one benefits: Small business, the communities, and the Government through broadened sources of supply.

"One of the major continuing responsibilities of the Small Business Administration is to see to it that small firms have an opportunity to get a fair share of Government business.

"This is important. The United States Government is the largest purchaser of goods and services in the world. It is only fair and just that small firms share in supplying their Government's needs. Indeed, small firms with their specialized skills often can underbid large companies.

"Small businesses often have an inherent advantage over big business. Not all products can be mass produced. In this complex mechanical age great individual skills are often required—and it frequently happens that these skills, the devotion to detail and pride in craftmanship, are most marked in small firms. That is why large firms often call on smaller firms to provide them with the highly specialized component parts they must have to make the complicated machines our industry requires.

"President Eisenhower, recognizing that fostering of small business should be a team operation, recently created a Cabinet level committee embracing major activities of the Government in the small business area. As Administrator of the Small Business Administration, I have the honor of serving on this new committee. We are studying all the areas in which Government fosters small businesses. The committee has the continuing assignment of making specific recommendations to the President for administrative action, and where necessary, for additional legislation, to strengthen small business."

David F. Shaw, assistant general manager for manufacturing, Atomic Energy Commission, said that more than $250 million in materials, equipment, and supplies were produced for the Commission in 1955 by small business firms. Mr. Shaw said:

"At the subcontract level in 1955 we handled 335,000 individual transactions, totaling $338 million. Of this amount $250 million went to small business concerns to purchase materials, equipment, and supplies.

"These purchases were made on a fixed-price, competitive basis. They represent standard, semistandard, and off-the-shelf items. An ever increasing number of business owners are making inquiries to discover the extent to which the Atomic Energy Commission offers a market for their products and services and are participating as suppliers or manufacturers for the AEC programs.

"Those of us who are associated with the AEC purchasing operations are very pleased with this turn of events, since an increase in the number of prospective suppliers inevitably means keener competition, superior products and services and better prices.

"Typical purchases for construction include electrical equipment, such as control panels, transformers, substations, and cables, tanks; valves, piping, compressors, evaporators, structural steel, lead, process control instruments, and heavy construction equipment.

"Purchases for operating purposes include inorganic and organic chemicals, such as nitric acid, aluminum nitrate, trybutyl phosphate, trichloethylene, and other items such as tubes, housings and covers, gloves, shoes and overalls, nuts, bolts and washers, graphite and graphite molds."

PARTIAL TEXT OF ADDRESS BY D. OTIS BEASLEY, ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR, AT SMALL BUSINESS PROCUREMENT CONFERENCE, EASTERN HIGH SCHOOL AUDITORIUM, BALTIMORE, MD., JUNE 21, 1956

Turning to the matter of primary interest at this conference, I will describe the procurement procedures followed in the Department of the Interior. The basic procedures are, of course, controlled by statutory provisions generally applicable to all Government agencies.

As you know, procedures require that Federal procurement as a rule be accomplished after advertising for competitive bids. The exceptions consist of purchases under $500, emergency purchases, purchases made from the only available source, and certain service contracts. In addition, we may request the Administrator of the General Services Administration to permit us to negotiate certain types of contracts under the provisions in the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949. However, there must be a clear demonstration of need to exercise this authority.

It is the policy of the Department of the Interior to use to the fullest extent possible the so-called open market purchase authority, i. e., we do not solicit formal bids on purchases of $500 and under. Our purchasing officers are expected, however, to check current market prices and where feasible, secure informal quotations in advance, to assure themselves that the Government obtains the lowest prices for the supplies needed.

We are making full use of the short form purchase order, Standard Form 44, which permits a field employee to purchase items over the counter with a minimum amount of difficulty for both the supplier and the Government.

We also use the imprest cashier fund procedure for purchases under $25. This has cut our cost of paperwork by several thousands of dollars in the past few years.

For purchases ranging in excess of $500 to many thousands which might be spent for a single piece of high-voltage electrical equipment—or in the case of construction, the many millions involved in building a major dam—we solicit bids by general advertising. We award the contract to the lowest bidder meeting the specifications. All such bids are publicly opened at established times and places, and the amounts and details of all bids are readily available as public information.

The remainder of our procurement, a very small proportion of the total, consists of contracts negotiated for supplies or services which are authorized by section 3709 of the Revised Statutes, or by a delegation from the General Services Administrator. Occasionally a clear showing can be made that it would be in the public interest to negotiate a contract rather than to advertise for bids. In such cases we have a procedure permitting this method to be used.

In general, its use has been restricted to contracts covering technical and professional services, although in certain cases involving manufacture of equipment needed for research programs, it has been impossible to draft specific specifications and have used the proposal and negotiation method to meet objective performance specifications.

To simplify the explanation of our purchasing and contracting policies, I would like to quote briefly from a recent Interior regulation governing negotiated contracts: "Contracting by negotiation does not require compliance with the rigid limitations of formal advertising, bid and award procedures and determination of the person or concern to be awarded the contract is less automatic. It allows, to a greater extent than formal advertising, the exercise of sound business judgment but in no way decreases the responsibility for properly protecting the interests of the Government. The fact that a contract is to be negotiated does not relax the requirements for competition."

The recent working agreement between the Department of the Interior and the Small Business Administration brings into focus a policy of long standing in our operations. For instance, in the fiscal year 1953, participation by small business in the total Government procurement was 20.2 percent. In that year small business received 42.4 percent of Interior's purchases. Interior has continued to have an impressive record in the division of its purchases between big and small businesses. In 1954, small business received 57.4 percent of Interior's business and only 46.2 percent of the total. For 1955, small business received 63.9 percent, nearly two-thirds, of Interior's purchases against 49.1 percent of the total Government business. The small business proportion of our purchases has increased by 50 percent in 2 years, from 42.4 percent in 1953 to 63.9 percent in 1955.

Interior's operations are conducted in a manner that favor small business. Our hundreds of field installations are predominantly suburban, drawing on small local retail outlets for their needs. In a few instances, experience has shown that centralized purchasing will result in some saving of the taxpayers' money, and we have recently created such offices.

As a stafeguard against the possibility that purchases by these larger offices may be channeled into big business through their increased size, we have adopted the recommendations and criteria of the Small Business Administration. We are now screening prospective orders prior to issuance of bids or placing of purchase contracts, and under certain specific conditions, we reserve those quantities for small business concerns where the needs of our service can be met at a reasonable price.

Prior to April 12, 1956, the general rule of placing contracts with the lowest responsive bidder gave our contracting officers no flexibility which might be exercised to recognize the value of small business concerns to the national economy. There was one minor exception to the rule which did allow award of contracts to small business when the lowest bids received were tie bids. However, the number of instances in which this was applicable was quite small.

In April 1956 new procedures were installed in all procurement offices doing annual business in excess of $500,000. These procedures were worked out with representatives of the Small Business Administration and are authorized by section 214 of the Small Business Act of 1953.

Under our new program, each major field office will be advised by its counterpart field office of the Small Business Administration, and will screen every contemplated purchase over $1,000 before invitations to bid are issued. Whenever it is feasible, purchases will be reserved for small business, if a sufficient number of small business suppliers are available, and if the prices and delivery terms are considered acceptable. These last two conditions are necessary to insure that our appropriated funds are wisely expended and that our work is carried out on proper schedule.

We selected our largest field offices for this new procedure for one principal reason. They are the ones handling most transactions over $1,000 and are staffed to be effective in this effort. I might add it is our feeling that the area of potential gain to small business rests with procurement by those 21 offices. Most of the other offices deal in very small sums, and by far the largest majority of their purchases already flow into small business channels.

In summary, I want to repeat that our Department and all its bureaus are fully aware of the vital necessity for preserving and encouraging the small operator of our basic resources and the small-business man in our industrial and distribution channels. We have in the past been constantly alert to protect his interests, and we are cooperating with the Small Business Administration in every way proper to further the program of that agency in our current activities.

PARTIAL TEXT OF ADDRESS BY DAVID F. SHAW, ASSISTANT GENERAL MANAGER FOR MANFACTURING, ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION, AT SMALL BUSINESS PROCUREMENT CONFERENCE, EASTERN HIGH SCHOOL, BALTIMORE, MD., JUNE 21, 1956

More than $250 million in materials, equipment, and supplies were produced in 1955 by small business firms for the Atomic Energy Commission, according to David F. Shaw, Assistant General Manager for Manufacturing, Atomic Energy Commission, in an address before the Small Business Administration's six-State procurement conference today at Eastern High School, Baltimore.

"At the subcontract level," said Mr. Shaw, "in 1955 we handled 335,000 individual transactions, totaling $338 million. Of this amount $250 million went to small business concerns to purchase materials, equipment, and supplies. These purchases were made on a fixed price, competitive basis. They represent standard, semistandard, and off-the-shelf items. An ever-increasing number of business owners are making inquiries to discover the extent to which the Atomic Energy Commission offers a market for their products and services and are participating as suppliers or manufacturers for AEC programs.

"Those of us who are associated with the AEC purchasing operation are very pleased with this turn of events, since an increase in the number of prospective suppliers inevitably means keener competition, superior products and services and better prices."

Mr. Shaw explained that the AEC works closely with the Small Business Administration. The design, construction and operation of the Atomic Energy Commission's facilities, said Mr. Shaw, are handled by private industry on a contract basis and he advised small business operators attending the conference that contracts are consummated continuously in the Commission's 10 field offices throughout the country. Mr. Shaw said:

"The small business share of the AEC subcontract dollar has been increasing steadily during the past 5 years and for the first three quarters of 1956 business companies have been awarded $149,300,000 out of $318,500,000 of subcontract totals."

Only contracts which are very unusual in character or involve very large dollar totals require Washington approval, Mr. Shaw pointed out. Contract authority delegated to the 10 AEC managers throughout the country, makes it possible for the Commission's field offices to make individual $2 million purchases and "in some instances," said Mr. Shaw, this authority ranges upward to $5 million, "depending upon the character of the work."

The products used in the atomic energy programs, explained Mr. Shaw, represent almost all industrial classifications. He said:

"These classifications are listed in our publication Selling to AEC, along with a list of AEC and contractor purchasing offices which buy them most frequently. With the exception of a few initial equipment requirements for new facilities, large production-

run orders are not characteristic of AEC procurement."

Mr. Shaw cited wide varieties of items and services purchased from small concerns by AEC in its various operations throughout the country. Products purchased by the New York City office include, for example, the following products which are bought from private suppliers to operate its health and safety laboratory and the administration of a substantial number of research contracts: electrical equipment, pumps, gas liquefiers, refrigeration systems, spectrophotometers, and other products typically associated with scientific laboratory work.

At New York in 1955, Mr. Shaw disclosed, commercial suppliers received contracts amounting to $4,600,000.

At its Oak Ridge operations office in Tennessee and its field offices at Fernald, Ohio, Paducah, Ky., St. Louis, Mo., and Portsmouth, Ohio the AEC, said Mr. Shaw, is concerned "with the construction and operation of plants for the processing of uranium concentrates and other source and raw materials.

"Typical purchases for construction," explained Mr. Shaw, "include electrical equipment, such as control panels, transformers, substations and cables, tanks, valves, piping, compressors, evaporators, structural steel, lead, process control instruments, and heavy construction equipment. Purchases for operating purposes include inorganic and organic chemicals, such as nitric acid, aluminum nitrate, trybutyl phosphate, trichloethylene, and other items such as tubes, housings and covers, gloves, shoes and overalls, nuts, bolts and washers, graphite and graphite molds."

AEC expenditures to subcontractors for supplies in the Oak Ridge region alone in 1955 amounted to more than $119,300,000, Mr. Shaw revealed.

In other AEC operations throughout the country, including Hanford and the Savannah River areas, Chicago, Ill., Schenectady, N. Y., and Idaho Falls, Idaho, contracts awarded to small concerns totaled additional millions of dollars and, according to Mr. Shaw, "they are increasing moderately."

PARTIAL TEXT OF ADDRESS BY HARRISON GARRETT, PRESIDENT, BALTIMORE ASSOCIATION OF COMMERCE, AT SMALL BUSINESS PROCUREMENT CONFERENCE, EASTERN HIGH SCHOOL, BALTIMORE, MD., JUNE 21, 1956

It is most gratifying to have the Small Business Administration conduct today's conference for business executives in this area, comprising six States and the District of Columbia. I assure you that the Baltimore Association of Commerce appreciates the opportunity to cooperate with the Small Business Administration in arranging for this meeting.

Sometimes it is difficult to define "small business," but I believe the great majority of the members of the Baltimore Association of Commerce would qualify for this classification. That is one reason why our association and other chambers of commerce throughout this area are interested in today's meeting. They want to help their members to broaden the base of their operations—to add Uncle Sam to their list of customers.

I am told that small-business concerns in Maryland alone are now receiving more than $1 million in Government orders each month. That's a lot of business. And undoubtedly that is one reason for the large attendance here today. You are all interested in securing a share of this business—and the speakers on today's program are here to tell you what the various Government agencies buy and how to obtain these contracts.

I am sure you all will benefit from the information to be disseminated today and as a result you will be in a better position to bid for Government contracts.

And so, on behalf of the Baltimore Association of Commerce, I should like to thank our speakers for coming here today to help the small-business man in his dealings with the various Government buying agencies.

PARTIAL TEXT OF ADDRESS BY T. M. BALDAUF, CHIEF OF PROCUREMENT AND PROPERTY MANAGEMENT DIVISION, UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE, AT SMALL BUSINESS PROCUREMENT CONFERENCE, EASTERN HIGH SCHOOL, BALTIMORE, MD., JUNE 21, 1956

Seventy percent of all goods, supplies, and services purchased annually by the Department of Agriculture are bought from small business concern, T. M. Baldauf, Chief of the Department's Procurement and Property Management Division, told small-business owners and representatives attending the Small Business Procurement Conference today at Eastern High School, Baltimore.

Mr. Baldauf explained that the Department of Agriculture buys more than $50 million in goods, services, and construction each year through its 6,000 field offices in a total of 360,000 individual commercial transactions.

"Almost all of our buying," said Mr. Baldauf, "is done on a competitive-bid basis and 70 percent of these transactions are consummated with small-business concerns.

Citing a variety of services which call for equipment and goods supplied by private manufacturers and merchandisers, Mr. Baldauf said:

"We fight fires, we control insect epidemics using chemicals and airplanes. We build buildings, roads, dams, and other structures. We maintain buildings, camp grounds, forests, streams. We maintain laboraories using many chemicals for research. We provide market news service and statistical services involving high-speed electronic equipment. We buy and store agricultural commodities. We maintain loan and insurance services. We seed range pastures and maintain a radio communication network for our forest-fire lookouts, and many more."

In describing the wide range of items, supplies, and services purchased under his direction, Mr. Baldauf explained that the prospective business bidder can quickly learn from Government publications whom to see at the Department's field-procurement offices and discover what the Government is buying or will be looking for from private suppliers.

PARTIAL TEXT OF ADDRESS BY CLIFTON E. MACK, COMMISSIONER OF FEDERAL SUPPLY, GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION, AT SMALL BUSINESS PROCUREMENT CONFERENCE, EASTERN HIGH SCHOOL, BALTIMORE, MD., JUNE 21, 1956

Clifton E. Mack, Commissioner of Federal Supply for the General Services Administration, said today at the small business procurement conference at Eastern High School, Baltimore, that more than 57 percent of all GSA purchases are now being placed with small business concerns.

GSA is the central civilian buying agency of the Government. It purchases standard supplies and equipment for all Federal agencies to the extent of nearly half a billion dollars per year.

"Small business firms play an integral role in our supply system," Mr. Mack said. "Not only do they share in our local purchasing throughout the country, but they get a portion of our national purchasing programs from which all agencies are supplied."

Mr. Mack said GSA solicits small firms to bid on its purchases "because our requirements are peculiarly adapted to what small firms make and sell. We buy principally standard items of manufacture, such as tools, motors, wire and cable, and about 50,000 other items."

Mr. Mack told the meeting of small business firms that GSA has a standing agreement with the Small Business Administration to set aside a portion of its total purchases so that only small firms can compete. In addition, he said, GSA has developed a nationwide network of business service centers from which small concerns can get accurate, daily information about what GSA is buying, where it is buying, and when.

He told the conference that one of the best methods GSA has of protecting the Government's interest in purchasing is to stimulate as much competition as possible, and that GSA's door was wide open for any supplier to share in the day-to-day purchases GSA makes.

Mr. Mack outlined to the group the GSA system under which a small firm desiring to introduce a new product to the Government supply system can get immediate attention.

He estimated that in the coming year, as a result of increasing emphasis on getting purchasing facts to small firms that the percentage of business going to such business will probably increase.

"The record of small business with GSA is good," he said. "We will take every possible action to make sure that our buying needs are known to small firms and that they get their fair share of our market."

PARTIAL TEXT OF ADDRESS BY JOHN S. PATTERSON, DEPUTY ADMINISTRATOR, VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION, AT SMALL BUSINESS PROCUREMENT CONFERENCE, EASTERN HIGH SCHOOL, BALTIMORE, MD., JUNE 21, 1956

Out of the Veterans' Administration's purchases of more than $148 million in supplies, equipment, and plant improvements in 1955, small-business concerns were awarded more than $69 million in contracts, John S. Patterson, Deputy Administrator of the Agency, revealed today at the Small Business Procurement Conference at Eastern High School, Baltimore.

"This constituted 60 percent of the Veterans' Administration's total purchases," said Mr. Patterson in an address before the conference of business owners from Maryland and adjacent States.

"We use approximately 10,000 items in our hospitals, centers, homes, regional offices, and supply depots," said Mr. Patterson, "items that range from every medical supply and equipment used in a clinic and a hospital, every type of food and equipment used in a dining room and cafeteria and numerous articles of clothing, both in hospital and civilian categories."

The Veterans' Administration purchases approximately 6,500 items to stock its supply depot system, Mr. Patterson explained.

"Many items are described in our catalogs," Mr. Patterson stated, adding: "We recognize that the advancement and success of small business redounds to the betterment of all business and sustains the economic welfare of our country.

"A large segment of the business of our Nation is composed of veterans. The importance of small business to the economy of the Nation cannot be too seriously emphasized. All industry is in accord with the thought that the preservation and promotion of small business is an essential safeguard for our competitive system of free enterprise and this the Congress stressed in the enactment of the Small Business Act. With this policy the Veterans' Administration wholeheartedly subscribes. It regards small business as the backbone of our giant industrial system.

"We have always encouraged small business to complete in furnishing our requirements. We endeavor to keep our purchase quantities small enough to be attractive to small business. Our invitations permit offering partial quantities in cases where small business cannot conveniently handle our full requirements. In fact, 97 percent of our purchases are in amounts of less than $10,000. In addition, in cooperation with

the Small Business Administration, we set aside certain purchases specifically for award only to small business concerns, in pursuance of the authority granted by Congress in the Small Business Act."

PARTIAL TEXT OF ADDRESS BY FREDERICK H. MUELLER, ASSISTANT SECRETARY FOR DOMESTIC AFFAIRS, UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE, AT SMALL BUSINESS PROCUREMENT CONFERENCE, EASTERN HIGH SCHOOL, BALTIMORE, MD., JUNE 21, 1956

In its own purchasing activities the Department of Commerce always has small business in mind. Our procurement of items costing more than $25 during the last half of 1955 involved 31,994 different orders or contracts, and of these, 23,609 orders, or 73.8 percent, went to small business.

Dollarwise, this procurement totaled $116,015,295 and the small-busniess portion was $25,052,886 or 21.6 percent. This overall percentage would be much greater except for the fact that about 70 percent of our procurement was by the Maritime Administration, mainly in contracts for construction and repair of oceangoing vessels which could be handled only by large shipyards. Except for the Maritime phase, about 61 percent of Commerce Department procurement was channeled to small business.

In connection with the maritime work, it should be remembered, however, that shipyards are mainly assembly yards. The building and equipping of a ship involves a great number of smaller contracts and an infinite variety of products—small motors, conduit and wiring, bolts and nuts, pots and pans for the galley, furnishings for the staterooms, and all the rest. The shipyards farm out two-thirds of the work that goes into a large ship.

* * * * *

In addition to common-use items, Commerce Department buying creates many opportunities for small business of this region. For example: the Weather Bureau buys a wide variety of items, especially meteorological instruments such as barometers, theodolites and thermometers, special graph paper, and electronic and electrical parts—transformers, cable clamps, sockets and switches, and so forth.

The National Bureau of Standards purchases annually about $1½ million worth of optic, scientific and electronic equipment and machinery. It also purchases about $1½ million worth of materials such as chemicals and shop supplies.

The Civil Aeronautics Administration during the last half of last year spent $7.7 million for materials and construction, of which $3.6 million, or 46 percent, went to small business. Some of this is electronic equipment for radar and communications along the Federal airways.

* * * * *

Our new public works programs will make business for small business. The Civil Aeronautics Administration is starting a 5-year, $246 million program for improvement of the Federal airways system. Expenditure of $40 million in the year beginning July 1 will break down to about $26 or $27 million for equipment and the remaining $24 million for construction. In the past small concerns have furnished many of the CAA's transmitters and receivers, engine generators and other electrical equipment, and built many of its control towers and other installations along 72,000 miles of Federal airways.

After the President's great new highway program is passed by Congress, those of you who are in construction work—or who furnish equipment and supplies to contractors—will feel the effects of the steady nationwide buildup of roadbuilding.

* * * * *

Traditionally in this country we look to small business as the seedbed for economic harvests of plenty for all the people. Men starting up new small firms are constantly injecting new ideas, new products, and new rivalries into business. They keep free enterprise an enterprising thing, and stimulate improvement in the standard of living. This creative drive in business is a very precious thing which we must preserve.

* * * * *

The entire Eisenhower administration has been vigorously at work findings ways to strengthen the position of small business. One way, of course, is the Government's procurement operations, the subject of this meeting today. During the last half of last year, throughout the civilian agencies, of the items costing $25 or more, nearly one-half the dollar volume—49.1 percent, to be exact—went to small business.

The welfare of the United States demands maximum participation in public projects by our small-business firms. Everybody benefits. More concerns get orders which help them to prosper and increase employment. Your payroll and tax dollars promote the development of your communities and the expansion of other businesses. And the Government is able to shop for its needs in a broader market and get better prices, thus benefiting all taxpayers.

* * * * *

I wonder if all of you gentlemen know about the daily Synopsis published by the Commerce Department? I should think it would be a must for those interested in getting Federal business. It gives current information received daily from military and civilian procurement offices of Federal agencies.

There is a list of unclassified invitations to bid and requests for proposals or quotations, with description, quantity, invitation number, and opening date. Grouped together are the proposed procurements especially set aside to be awarded to small business, although the entire list is, of course, open to small business.

Also listed are contract awards, both advertised and negotiated, showing contractor and address, with dollar amounts and quantities, for contracts of $25,000 and over. This gives you leads to subcontracting opportunities.

A third section lists proposed sales of Government surplus property by all executive agencies of the Government.

The full title of this publication is the "Synopsis of U. S. Government Proposed Procurement, Sales and Contract Awards." It is published daily, Monday through Friday, from Chicago by the Commerce Department field service, and the subscription price is $7 a year for 252 issues. You can get it by sending a check for $7 to the Commerce Department field office in Chicago.

PARTIAL TEXT OF ADDRESS BY JOHN HAMLIN, DIRECTOR FOR SMALL BUSINESS, OFFICE OF THE ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF DEFENSE (SUPPLY AND LOGISTICS), AT SMALL BUSINESS PROCUREMENT CONFERENCE, EASTERN HIGH SCHOOL AUDITORIUM, BALTIMORE, MD., JUNE 21, 1956

During the past 2 years the Department of Defense has revised its small-business policies with the objective of doing a better job of assuring a fair share of defense procurement to small-business firms.

We have found that generally speaking there is full agreement about what small firms want. They want a fair chance at the existing business. They feel that if they get this chance they will get a fair share and I am pleased to report that the statistics show this to be true. Small concerns are getting from 60 to 65 percent of the military business which is within their capabilities and are doing this in open competition with all comers.

So our program, insofar as prime contracts are concerned, has aimed at making sure that the military departments conduct their procurements in such a way that the small firms will have this equal opportunity.

Within the past year we have undertaken to extend this concept to the important area of subcontracting. The defense business that small firms get as "primes" has been over $3 billion a year and we think the volume of business they receive as subcontractors, while not precisely known, may amount to $2 billion. We are presently enlisting the cooperation of our large prime contractors in this program. They are showing themselves very willing to go along with our objectives.

Beginning July 1 many of these large contractors will record and report on their subcontracting to small firms, and a year from now we will have some significant figures on this area of small-business assistance.

Our responsibilities to small business under the law are shared with the Small Business Administration. We have been working well as a team on our common objectives. The Department of Defense is giving the Small Business Administration its full cooperation on the program to earmark certain procurement exclusively for small business. Under recent policy changes classified contracts are being reviewed for such set-asides, and further set-asides will be made unilaterally by military departments when Small Business Administration personnel are not present to share in the determination.

All these programs have the continuous and vigorous leadership and support of Secretary of Defense Charles E. Wilson and of Assistant Secretary of Defense T. P. Pike.

The present share of prime contract awards going to firms with fewer than 500 employees is running around 20 percent. It is possible that the total share going to small firms as prime or first tier subcontractors might be as high as 30 percent. What they get as lower tier contractor would have to be estimated and added to that to get a grand total. It is a plain fact that the increasing cost and complexity of modern weapons is making it harder and harder to increase the share of prime awards to small concerns, but in spite of this handicap the share during recent periods is actually higher than the average for the past 5 years. We are proud of that record.

Sound small-business policy is the starting point for any well-conceived effort to help small business. We believe we now have that policy in the Department of Defense. But we recognize that it is a starting point and that its full fruition depends on the understanding and consistent implementation of these policies by the military departments. We are getting that kind of implementation. I am glad that we have here representatives of the military departments from the procuring activities who see these policies in their day-to-day operations, and who can tell you how they are working in the field, and how they are producing more awards for small-business concerns.

PARTIAL TEXT OF ADDRESS BY ORMONDE A. KIEB, ASSISTANT POSTMASTER GENERAL, BUREAU OF FACILITIES, AT SMALL BUSINESS PROCUREMENT CONFERENCE, EASTERN HIGH SCHOOL AUDITORIUM, BALTIMORE, MD., JUNE 21, 1956

"Of a total annual procurement for goods and services of approximately $565 million in 1955, approximately $385 million is limited as to source, either by statute or market peculiarities, to big business such as railroads, airlines, utilities, prison industries, truck manufacturers, Government Printing Office and others. However, of the remaining $180 million which represents procurement for which the Department exercises policy and administrative control and final contracting authority, over 90 percent or approximately $165 million was spent with small business contracts in 1955.

"These figures are interesting not only from a standpoint of private enterprise but to small business concerns. If we add to this figure the approximately $25 million of capital investment required for construction of new buildings under our leasing program in 1955, the Department entered into over 87,000 small business contracts all over the United States, totaling about $190 million."

Mr. Kieb discussed briefly the urgent need for a postal rate increase this year. "A modest increase in postal rates," Mr. Kieb said, "would enable us to provide in the next 5 years more of the modern equipment we so vitally need today. Material handling equipment of all kinds such as baskets, basket dumpers, conveyers, lift trucks, modern sorting cases, automatic sorting equipment, modern lighting, air conditioning, stools, vehicles, business machines, automatic stamp dispensers, patron mail sorting racks, new bank-type counter lines and other patron service facilities to make possible modern work-flow production lines to bring our postal plant up to date and to serve the increasing growth of this great country of ours."

In the 3 years it has been in operation the Small Business Administration has been able with the cooperation of other Government departments and agencies, to have set aside for competitive award to small firms, more than $1 billion in Government contracts.

This represents Government business that, through our cooperative efforts, is reserved exclusively for small firms. We are proud of this record, but we are also determined to improve upon it. This conference is one facet of our continuing effort in this regard.

Government assistance to small business is spread over many departments and agencies, each having a definite area of operation. All of the departments and agencies represented by speakers at this meeting are intimately in contact with countless thousands of small businesses—Department of Defense, Department of Commerce, General Services Administration, Post Office Department, Department of the Interior, Department of Agriculture, and Veterans' Administration, to name a few.

Then there are the Treasury Department on tax laws, Federal Trade Commission on fair practices, Securities and Exchange Commission, and Department of Justice in antitrust matters.

President Eisenhower, recognizing that fostering of small business should be a team operation, recently created a Cabinet Level Committee embracing major activities of the Government in the small-business area. As Administrator of the Small Business Administration, I have the honor of serving on this new committee. We are studying all the areas in which Government fosters small businesses, with a view to recommending to the President strengthening where advisable, either by administrative action or legislation.

And so, you see, there is a wealth of information available to small businesses simply for the asking—a gold mine of knowledge. An example, relevant to this conference is the Synopsis of United States Government Sales and Contract Awards, published by the Department of Commerce. Assistant Secretary of Commerce Mueller will tell you more about this publication when he speaks.

Yes, this small-business conference exemplifies how Government, Federal, State, and local, can work together in close cooperation with private groups and individual concerns. Our thanks go to all who have cooperated in making this conference a success.

Never before, I think, has anything of this magnitude been attempted. The services, the skills, the exhibits assembled here are for you proprietors of small firms to see. All of this is before you to make the most of.

The men who will speak to you know all the answers. So now, let's move on and when you have learned what you came here to learn and go to sharpening your pencils, may good luck be with you.

PARTIAL TEXT OF ADDRESS BY WENDELL B. BARNES, ADMINISTRATOR, SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION, AT SMALL BUSINESS PROCUREMENT CONFERENCE, EASTERN HIGH SCHOOL, BALTIMORE, MD., JUNE 21, 1956

As Administrator of the Small Business Administration I extend to all of you a cordial welcome to this Small Business Conference. Here we see in this representative gathering live evidence of the vitality and enterprise of owners and proprietors of small businesses.

Some of you have come many miles to attend, thereby giving added evidence of your enterprise and eagerness to grow, provide more jobs and in all improve the welfare of your respective communities.

We have been honored by the presence and welcoming remarks of Governor McKeldin, who gave further indication of his concern for the welfare of small businesses by issuing a proclamation designating this day as Small Business Day.

This, indeed, is high recognition of the importance of forever maintaining freedom of opportunity. Of course, this phrase "freedom of opportunity" is all-inclusive. It includes freedom of choice and freedom to do business under fair ground rules and freedom to share in supplying goods and services to the Government.

I believe that all of you as well as all of us in Government thank the Baltimore Association of Commerce for cosponsoring this Small Business Conference. Mr. Harrison Garrett, president of the association, has been very active in helping to make this conference a success.

It is the plan of the Small Business Administration, with the cooperation of other Government departments and agencies, to hold procurement conferences in other parts of the country after the pattern of today's conference.

Requests have come from various parts of the country for such a conference as this one. Where the local trade associations and civic-minded citizens express this desire, we shall do all that we can to comply.

As I see it nothing but good can result from this Small Business Conference and others to be held. Every one benefits: Small business, the communities and the Government through broadened sources of supply.

This is a work conference. We have a lot of ground to cover and I know you are eager to get started. One of the great values of a conference such as this is that it provides an opportunity for us in Government to become acquainted with you men who are in business.

The Small Business Administration has only one job assigned to it by the Congress and the President. That job is to help small business.

We have services to help small firms. We are proud of what we have done, but we are not complacent and resting on our oars. As you know the problems of small business are manifold and with your help we shall meet the challenge eager and determined.

We want to know you better, and to provide you with a means of finding out at first hand the services available to you in your Government. We want to know your problems, your needs, and we want to improve our services to meet these needs.

We will be frank with you, and I know you will speak frankly to us. From such an exchange of viewpoints, I am sure much good will come.

One of the major continuing responsibilities of the Small Business Administration is to see to it that small firms have an opportunity to get a fair share of Government business.

This is important. As you know, the United States Government is the largest purchaser of goods and services in the world. It is only fair and just that small firms share in supplying their Government's needs. Indeed, small firms with their specialized skills often can underbid large companies.

It is the main purpose of this conference to provide a means for proprietors of small firms in this area to find out what products and services the Government wants to buy that they can perhaps furnish, and to show them how they can compete effectively for this business.

Our Federal Government is large and diverse. There are, there must be, many complexities in dealing with any branch of it. I know how bewildering, how frustrating it can be, sometimes, to businessmen, large or small, when they visit Washington.

Here is where larger firms frequently have an advantage over smaller firms. They not only have whole departments that are concerned only with selling to the Government, but they also have representatives in Washington who are constantly on the job helping them sell their products to the Government.

There is a widespread belief among businessmen, particularly proprietors of small firms, that it is futile to try to deal with the Government unless you can have a representative in Washington, a "5 percenter."

That is not true, and I am sure that when this conference comes to a close, you will be wholeheartedly in agreement with me on this.

But we must never forget that small businesses often have an inherent advantage over big business. Not all products can be mass-produced. In this complex mechanical age, great individual skills are often required—and it frequently happens that these skills, the devotion to detail and pride in craftmanship, are most marked in small firms. That is why large firms often call on smaller firms to provide them with the highly specialized component parts they must have to make the complicated machines our industry requires.

We want to help you make the most of the unique skills you may have.

The Small Business Administration is so organized that it can and does provide all of the essential services needed to help small firms bid competitively on Government contracts.

At our procurement center, right here in Baltimore, we have on file every day up-to-date bid invitations from all of the major procurement centers in this area. This procurement center provides a ready means for firms to learn authoritatively what the Government is buying in this area. Many businessmen make use of it regularly to increase their business.

John Hamlin, Director for Small Business, Office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Supply and Logistics), said that during the past 2 years the Department of Defense has revised its small-business policies with the objective of doing a better job of assuring a fair share of defense procurement to small business firms. Mr. Hamlin said:

"Small concerns are getting from 60 percent to 65 percent of the military business which is within their capabilities and are doing this in open competition with all comers.

"Our program, insofar as prime contracts is concerned, has aimed at making sure that the military departments conduct their procurements in such a way that the small firms will have this equal opportunity.

"Within the past year we have undertaken to extend this concept to the important area of subcontracting. The defense business that small firms get as 'primes' has been over $3 billion a year and we think the volume of business they receive as subcontractors, while not precisely known, may amount to $2 billion. We are presently enlisting the cooperation of our large prime

contractors in this program. They are showing themselves very willing to go along with our objectives.

"Our responsibilities to small business under the law are shared with the Small Business Administration. We have been working well as a team on our common objectives. The Department of Defense is giving the Small Business Administration its full cooperation on the program to earmark certain procurement exclusively for small business.

Under recent policy changes classified contracts are being reviewed for such set-asides, and further set-asides will be made unilaterally by military departments when Small Business Administration personnel are not present to share in the determination.

"All of these programs have the continuous and vigorous leadership and support of Secretary of Defense Charles E. Wilson and of Assistant Secretary of Defense T. P. Pike."

Frederick H. Mueller, Assistant Secretary for Domestic Affairs, United States Department of Commerce, said that the "entire Eisenhower administration has been vigorously at work finding ways to strengthen the position of small business." Mr. Mueller said:

"During the last half of last year, throughout the civilian agencies, of the items costing $25 or more, nearly one-half the dollar volume—49.1 percent to be exact—went to small business.

"The welfare of the United States demands maximum participation in public projects by our small business firms. Everybody benefits. More concerns get orders which help them to prosper and increase employment. Your payroll and tax dollars promote the development of your communities and the expansion of other businesses. And the Government is able to shop for its needs in a broader market and get better prices, thus benefiting all taxpayers.

"In its own purchasing activities the Department of Commerce always has small business in mind. Our procurement of items costing more than $25 during the last half of 1955 involved 31,994 different orders or contracts and of these, 23,609 orders, or 73.8 percent, went to small business.

"Dollarwise, this procurement totaled $116,015,295 and the small-business portion was $25,052,886, or 21.6 percent. This overall percentage would be much greater except for the fact that about 70 percent of our procurement was by the Maritime Administration, mainly in contracts for construction and repair of oceangoing vessels which could be handled only by large shipyards. Except for the Maritime phase, about 61 percent of Commerce Department procurement was channeled to small business.

"In connection with the Maritime work, it should be remembered, however, that shipyards are mainly assembly yards. The building and equipping of a ship involves a great number of smaller contracts and an infinite variety of products—small motors, conduit and wiring, bolts and nuts, pots and pans for the galley, furnishings for the staterooms, and all the rest. The shipyards farm out two-thirds of the work that goes into a large ship.

"Our new public works programs will make business for small business. The Civil Aeronautics Administration is starting a 5-year, $248 million program for improvement of the Federal airways system. Expenditure of $40 million in the year beginning July 1 will break down to about $26 million or $27 million for equipment and the remaining $24 million for construction. In the past, small concerns have furnished many of the CAA's transmitters and receivers, engine generators and other electrical equipment, and built many of its control towers and other installations along 72,000 miles of Federal airways.

"After the President's great new highway program is passed by Congress, those of you who are in construction work—or who furnish equipment and supplies to contractors—will feel the effects of the steady nationwide buildup of road building."

John S. Patterson, Deputy Administrator of the Veterans Administration, said that out of the VA's purchases of more than $148 million in supplies, equipment, and plant improvements in 1955, small-business concerns were awarded more than $69,000,000 in contracts. Mr. Patterson said:

"This constituted 60 percent of the Veterants' Administration's total purchases. We use approximately 10,000 items in our hospitals, centers, homes, regional offices and supply depots, items that range from every medical supply and equipment used in a clinic and a hospital, every type of food and equipment used in a dining room and cafeteria and numerous articles of clothing both in hospital and civilian categories.

"We have always encouraged small business to compete in financing our requirements. We endeavor to keep our purchase quantities small enough to be attractive to small business. Our invitations permit offering partial quantities in cases where small business cannot conveniently handle our full requirements. In fact, 97 percent of our purchases are in amounts of less than $10,000. In addition, in cooperation with the Small Business Administration, we set aside certain purchases specifically for award only to small business concerns."

D. Otis Beasley, Administrative Assistant Secretary, Department of the Interior, said that the Department uses to the fullest extent possible the so-called open market purchase authority for purchases of $500 and under. Mr. Beasley said:

"Our purchasing officers are expected to check current market prices and where feasible, secure informal quotations in advance, to assure themselves that the Government obtains the lowest prices for the supplies needed.

"For purchases ranging in excess of $500 to many thousands which might be spent for a single piece of high voltage electrical equipment—or in the case of construction, the many millions involved in building a major dam—we solicit bids by general advertising.

"In April 1956 new procedures were installed in all procurement offices doing annual business in excess of $500,000. These procedures were worked out with representatives of the Small Business Administration.

"Under our new program, each major field office will be advised by its counterpart field office of the Small Business Administration, and will screen every contemplated purchase over $1,000 before invitations to bid are issued. Whenever feasible, purchases will be reserved for small business, if a sufficient number of small-business suppliers are available, and if the prices and delivery terms are considered acceptable."

Clifton E. Mack, Commissioner of Federal Supply for the General Services Administration, the central civilian buying agency of the Government, said that more than 57 percent of all GSA purchases are now being placed with small businesses. Mr. Mack said:

"Small business firms play an integral role in our supply system. Not only do they share in our local purchasing throughout the country, but they get a portion of our national purchasing programs from which all agencies are supplied.

"We buy principally standard items of manufacture, such as tools, motors, wire and cable, and about 50,000 other items."

T. M. Baldauf, Chief, Procurement and Property Management Division, Department of Agriculture, said that the Department buys from commercial sources about $50 million annually of goods, services and construction, and practically all of it is on a competitive bid basis. Mr. Baldauf said:

"Seventy percent or more of our orders and purchasing dollars go to small business.

"We fight forest fires, we control insect epidemics using chemicals and airplanes; we build buildings, roads, and other structures; we maintain buildings, camp grounds, forests, streams, etc.; we maintain laboratories using many chemicals for research; we contract for research; we provide market news services and statistical services involving high-speed electronic equipment; we buy and store agricultural commodities; we maintain loan and insurance services; we seed range pastures; we maintain a radio communications network for our forest fire lookouts; and many more."

Ormande A. Kieb, Assistant Postmaster General, Bureau of Facilities, Post Office Department, said that of a total Post Office annual procurement for goods and services of approximately $565 million in 1956, approximately $385 million is limited as to source, either by statute or market peculiarities, to big business such as railroads, airlines, utilities, prison industries, truck manufacturers, Government Printing Office and others. Mr. Kieb added:

"However, of the remaining $180 million which represent procurement for which the Department exercises policy and administrative ocntrol and final contracting authority, over 90 percent or approximately $165 million was spent with small-business contracts in 1955."

Twenty-three displays, most of them featuring products needed by large Government prime contractors and by the Department of Defense, that are suitable for small-business manufacture, were set up in the corridors of Baltimore's Eastern High School, where the conference was held.

Three exhibits, showing products needed for various atomic energy programs, were arranged by three prime contractors for the Atomic Energy Commission. The displays were provided by E. I. duPont de Nemours Corporation's Savannah River project, Aiken, S. C.; General Electric Corporation, Schenectady, N. Y., and Westinghouse Electric Corporation, Pittsburgh.

The Air Research Development Command, Baltimore, headquarters for the Air Force's research and development, sent to the conference the entire outer assembly of its "Falcon" guided missile. Many of the parts for the missile are supplied by small firms under subcontracts.

Other displays of products suitable for manufacturing by small firms were arranged by Flight Refueling Corp., Baltimore; Fairchild Aviation Corp., Hagerstown, Md; Bendix Aviation Co., Towson, Md., and the Glen L. Martin Co., Baltimore, which has the prime contract for the Air Force's flight refueling program.

The Supreme Court Again

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM M. COLMER

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 25, 1956

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, the Supreme Court is at it again. The latest act of the Court in the field of legislation, a field set aside by the Founding Fathers for the legislative branch of the Government, the Congress, in its decision removing the teeth from the security loyalty program. This program was set up by the executive department and subsequently ratified by the Congress. The Court has ruled by majority decision that the security loyalty law does not apply to Federal employees not working in so-called sensitive jobs. This act, of

course, if permitted to go unchallenged is a fatal blow at the efforts of the executive and legislative departments of the Government to root out and keep out of the Government subversive employees.

In holding that the law only applies to sensitive jobs, the question is raised: Who decides what is sensitive? Who can say, for instance, that a messenger transmitting highly classified Government papers is not as capable of sabotaging the defense program or the Government itself as the Secretary of Defense? Who determines whether a mechanic who might be called upon in an emergency to repair some minor part on an automobile or an airplane used by high-ranking Government officials occupies a sensitive position or not?

Mr. Speaker, several days ago two splendid editorials pointing up these and other questions appears in a number of the papers of the Hearst newspaper syndicate. Under leave to extend our remarks we submit them herewith:

[From the New York Daily Mirror of June 13, 1956]

THE COURT INTRUDES

The United States Supreme Court, 6 to 3, has knocked the props from under the Eisenhower administration's security-loyalty program in a curious decision, bitterly dissented from, which holds that only those Federal workers who hold sensitive jobs may be dismissed as security risks.

This is another invasion by the Court of the legislative and executive arms of the Government and interference with their functions, contrary to the provisions of the Constitution.

Justice Tom Clark, speaking for himself and the other two dissenters, Justices Stanley F. Reed and Sherman Minton, noted clearly both the intent of Congress and the authority of President Eisenhower to extend the security program to the whole Government—an intent and authority which the majority of the Court now denies.

"By this action," says Justice Clark, "the Court so interprets the act (a 1950 statute) as to intrude itself into Presidential policymaking. This the Court should not do and especially here where the Congress has ratified the President's action."

Now the Government faces the prospect of returning to its payrolls many discharged "security risks" who also may be compensated for lost pay.

Is a Federal job a vested right? The Supreme Court—acting where both the district court and the court of appeals refused to take action—appears to believe so.

President Eisenhower's standard was "complete and unswerving loyalty." The Court has tumbled that standard and, in the dissenters' words, "stricken down the most effective weapon against subversive activity available to the Government."

The field is open. The Government now cannot demand loyalty in all jobs. Federal employment is no longer a privilege, but a right—bulwarked by a decision which is a blanket invitation for subversives of all kinds.

[From the New York Journal-American of June 13, 1956]

DANGEROUS RULING

The majority decision of the Supreme Court limiting the administration to dismissing disloyal employees only when they are working in so-called sensitive jobs seems to us to be based on a dangerous and distorted interpretation.

When you boil away the technicalities involved you arrive at the implicit assumption that a security risk is a risk only when he or she is in a postion to influence the Nation's defense or policy procedures, and otherwise is comparatively harmless. This is an appalling fallacy.

We are in absolute agreement with the dissenting minority of three Justices that the majority decision "has stricken down the most effective weapon against subversive activity available to the Government."

In 1950, when Congress passed the law permitting dismissal of security risks in 11 sensitive Government units, it very carefully included in the act permission to the President to extend its provisions to other agencies as he deemed necessary in the national interest.

President Eisenhower thereafter by Executive order extended them to the entire Government.

He was incontrovertibly right. As the dissenting opinion points out: "One never knows just which job is sensitive. The janitor might prove to be in as important a spot securitywise as the top employee in the building."

One Communist in any branch of the Government, in any level of job, is dangerous. He or she is committed to the overthrow of the United States, and under the pattern of party discipline will try to establish a nest of fellow conspirators, and to infect other employees with the poison of treachery.

The administration and Congress ought to act promptly against this threat to the security program. Either the Executive order ought to be revised to nullify the technicalities raised in the majority decision, or the act itself ought to be rewritten.

There should be no sanctuary anywhere for a security risk in the Government.

Indoor Farmers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM E. MINSHALL

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 20, 1956

Mr. MINSHALL. Mr. Speaker, with more than 350 acres under glass the Cleveland area has the greatest concentration of greenhouses in the United States. Since a large portion of this extensive acreage is located within the 23d congressional district which I am privileged to represent, it is with a great amount of pride that I insert in the RECORD at this point an article appearing in the June 1956 issue of the Clevelander entitled "Indoor Farmers." It is the success story of an extremely important segment of our agricultural economy—the vegetable growers of America—and I heartily recommend it to your attention.

The article follows:

INDOOR FARMERS

It all began 70 years ago in the winter of 1886 when Martin L. Ruetenik, a truck farmer on Schaaf Road, combined a sashbed—a hillside with southern exposure—and heat from the flue of a wood- and coal-burning boiler, to produce the first vegetables raised under glass in the Cleveland area. Today, the annual crop of Cleveland greenhouse grown vegetables, valued at $12 million is raised in the greatest concentration of greenhouses in the country—and third largest in the entire world.

Mr. Ruetenik's neighbors quickly realized, as he did, that raising fresh vegetables out of season was profitable and by 1900, there were 5 acres under glass. Now there are more than 350 acres under glass in the Cleveland area with a total valuation of $25 million.

While it was by chance that the greenhouse industry was started on Schaaf Road, on the rim of the industrial Ruhr of America, the Cuyahoga Valley, it was not by chance that it prospered and grew to its present stature.

During the early 1900's there was great reluctance on the part of the few successful greenhouse operators to share their knowledge of either plant operation or growing procedures. Fortunately, this feeling did not last long and soon the hothouse operators, as they were called then, were meeting with some regularity to discuss their mutual problems. In 1926, these forward-looking indoor farmers formed the Cleveland Hothouse Vegetabls Growers' Cooperative Association, whose purpose was "to establish standards for grading, packing, and wrapping; to study production and markets, and otherwise to promote the welfare of the hothouse vegetable industry."

A. C. Bartter, who today operates the Columbia Hills and Butternut Ridge Greenhouses, was the first president. John Hoag, operator of John Hoag & Sons Greenhouses in Rocky River, was elected vice president and later became the second president of the association.

The original articles of agreement were signed by 19 members representing 25¾ acres of farms under glass. At the last annual meeting held in April of this year, the Cleveland Greenhouse Vegetable Growers' Association (name changed in 1949) numbering almost 100 members and representing almost 350 acres, unanimously reelected Paul Ruetenik, son of the pioneer greenhouse grower, as president; E. D. Hoag, son of the second president of the association, as vice president; and C. W. Sanderson, son-in-law of the association's first president, as secretary-treasurer.

For the past 30 years, this organization has handled many matters including national and local legislation, research, study and distribution of seed, purchase and supply of greenhouse materials, membership and news and information about greenhouse-grown products.

In 1951 the Cleveland Greenhouse Vegetable Growers Association made history by spearheading a drive to be the first industry to make a gift to the Government. A greenhouse, valued at $18,000, was presented to the Ohio Agricultural Experiment Station at Wooster on behalf of the Ohio Vegetable Growers Association. John Hoag, president of the local association at the time, stated:

"Our purpose in this gift is to help the Government to help us to help ourselves. We have many problems that are peculiar to our own industry—problems upon which the scientists at the experiment station work constantly. It did not seem fair to us to ask the State to foot all the cost of this work, or to ask others in the farm field to pay for the solution of our problems. The idea of this greenhouse was first put to our Cleveland group. It was approved and we contacted associations in Toledo, Columbus, and Cincinnati and the State organization. They all went along as did growers not in the associations. We appreciate the work done for us here and we hope that this house will help the fellows who are helping us."

In accepting the gift, on behalf of the State, Dean L. L. Rummell, of the Ohio State University College of Agriculture and head of the experiment station, commented:

"This gift marks an event unprecedented in farm annals in this State. It typifies the spirit of this vegetable segment of our great agricultural economy. The vegetable growers comprise the only major farm segment which has never received the benefits of Government price supports, marketing agreements, or acreage allotments. They

have run their own show in peace and war and always given the American consumer the best bargain in the market basket."

Greenhouse operators from all over the State now gather each year at Wooster for Ohio Greenhouse Day. The results of hundreds of experiments with seeds, plants, fertilizers, and greenhouse methods and procedures are tabulated, explained, and evaluated in an all-day session.

An aggressive research program under the direction of Walter Pretzer, chairman of this committee, son-in-law of Martin L. Ruetenik, and operator of the original Reutenik Gardens, keeps the Cleveland greenhouse vegetable growers in the leading position in the country in the production of tomatoes, leaf and Bibb lettuce, cucumbers, radishes, and watercress. In addition to numerous field trips throughout the year to other greenhouse areas in this country, sponsored by the association last summer, Mr. Pretzer organized a 45-day tour of Europe to study and report on greenhouse conditions abroad.

The active procedures and policies of the Cleveland Greenhouse Vegetable Growers Association are best exemplified by a recent statement of Paul Ruetenik who, in addition to being head of the local association, is also president of the Vegetable Growers' Association of America. Commenting on President Eisenhower's recent veto of the farm bill, Ruetenik said:

"The bill as finally approved by the Congress fell far short of solving the current farm situation. The continuance of the worn-out inadequate piecemeal approach which attempted to facilitate a social need by preventing the accomplishment of an economic need should have been terminated at the close of the Korean war."

Pointing with pride to the policies of the vegetable growers, he said:

"We have never asked for Government supports and our members are in a far better economic position under the law of supply and demand than those commodity groups who have relied upon Government price supports. Rigid price supports have not only aggravated the present farm price situation but have shifted the difficulties to vegetable growers and other unsupported commodities when restricted acreage was diverted to these other crops."

Mr. Ruetenik added that the Vegetable Growers Association recommends a compulsory across-the-board application of the soil-bank program as a means of solving overproduction supplemented by an aggressive marketing program.

With this fine spirit of cooperation, plus the individual and collective efforts of these indoor farmers, it is no wonder that Cleveland became the greenhouse center of the country.

Commencement Address by John S. Patterson, Deputy Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, at Consolidated Community High School, Mount Carroll, Ill., June 1, 1956

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEO E. ALLEN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 25, 1956

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include a commencement address which was delivered by my good friend, John S. Patterson, Deputy Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, at the Consolidated Community High School, Mount Carroll, Ill., on June 1, 1956, together with the commencement program:

YESTERDAY, TODAY, AND TOMORROW

You are kind indeed to invite me to join you on this occasion.

Just as you regard this as your school, so did I regard it as mine. For here I spent 4 of the most memorable years of my life. Here I formed habits of mind and spirit that have guided me to this day.

I don't mind telling you—I went through a lot of soul-searching, thinking about this evening's commencement. What message could I bring you that might have some iota of permanent value?

As I thought about it, I recalled a story my son Dick told me. Dick is a medical student at the University of North Carolina.

North Carolina has an economics professor who's noted for his tough exams. If you think exams at Mount Carroll were tough, try to visualize one 10 times as hard.

Well, just before Christmas midterms were coming along, and the students had studied for long weeks. The fateful morning arrived, and the professor walked into the classroom and wrote one single question on the blackboard:

"What caused the depression?"

A tow-headed young man, sitting in the back of the room, pondered a bit, then wrote the following words in his examination blue book and left the room.

"God only knows. I don't. Merry Christmas."

In due time, the professor returned the blue book. And here's what he had written:

"God gets 100-percent. You get zero. Happy New Year."

The question I'm going to attempt to answer this evening is even tougher. What guideposts of life can I point out to you? What thoughts can I share with you, as you embark upon new ventures? No man on earth can presume to have the answers. All that one can do is point to those principles that have served him well * * * and hope that they will have some validity for others.

What we are doing here this evening is being repeated in schools throughout the length and breadth of our land. Our earliest colonists, and the pioneers after them, set the pattern of education for all. From those days forward, the pattern has been enlarged. Today, publicly supported education has become as widely accepted as the air we breathe.

We Americans dislike inequality. In educational matters * * * ever since the days of our earliest colonists * * * we have despised it. Our goal in this country has always been * * * an opportunity to learn, and to go to school, for every boy and girl in our land, regardless of social and economic background.

We spend countless millions of dollars a year to reach this goal * * * but we're really not spending the money; we're investing it. We're investing it in the future of the most precious asset of America * * * our children.

If you young men and women are experiencing any of the emotions I felt the day I graduated from this school, you're probably keenly aware that in your hands, this night, you hold opportunity—golden opportunity. And it's a good feeling, an exhilarating feeling.

And it's a feeling you're justified in having, for the road you have traveled has been rough in spots, but you have made the grade. There will be other rough roads in the future. They can't be avoided in life. But you, I know, will travel them successfully, because we have faith in you, and you have faith in yourselves.

Tonight we honor you for your achievements. And we also honor others who have played a part in helping you reach this most wonderful of nights—an important part, yet a part performed with self-effacing modesty.

Standing out in front are your fathers and mothers, fathers and mothers who have devoted their lives to making the dream of tonight come true. As a father, I share the rejoicing of all you parents, for refusing to allow setbacks and heartaches blunt your determination to help your children seek the opportunities, assume the responsibilities, and receive the benefits which are their due as free Americans.

You young people may not realize it, and perhaps you won't until you marry and have youngsters of your own, but we parents have worked pretty hard at bringing you up. It's been a labor of love and we've relished nearly every minute of it. All we ask in return is that, as year follows year, you take our places in the world. All we ask is that you pass along to your children that which we inherited from our parents.

Then there are your teachers. How fully they merit our honor on this night. We must never forget them. For they have done far more than teach the "three R's." They have molded character. They have instilled ideals. They have helped you learn to distinguish right from wrong. They have given not just knowledge but wisdom.

They have helped immeasurably to build good, true, young Americans, thinking Americans, Americans better equipped to exercise their rights of citizenship by virtue of their education.

One other group, an unsung group, deserves recognition tonight for the part it has played in the education of our children. I am thinking of those men and women who have no children of their own. Yet we find them in the forefront in supporting the principle of education for all.

To them all honor is due. Their passing unnoticed in these exercises would reveal an ingratitude beyond the ken of fairminded people.

Education begins in the cradle and ends in the tomb.

How true that is. Education is a continuing process, going on from infancy to old ago. Perhaps that is why occasions like this are known as commencements. You young graduates are about to commence a new phase of your life, a new phase of your learning. The knowledge and wisdom you have acquired thus far are but a beginning.

Surely, any high school or any college graduate who feels that his education is complete is shooting wide of the mark.

Schooling provides the foundation, schooling set up directional markers for the life that lies ahead.

Commencement marks the beginning of education, not the end.

And so tomorrow begins a new chapter of your education, a chapter that in large measure will determine the course you follow the rest of your life. Plato, back in the days of ancient Greece, said it much better: "The directions in which education starts a man will determine his future life."

Patterns of life are as varied as they are intricate. Each of us is a weaver. Each must choose his own pattern. Some choose with extreme caution, others with no caution.

But choose you must.

Young men and women graduating from high schools will, in later time, become our business executives, lawyers, doctors, teachers, ministers, artisans, farmers, nurses, salesmen. You can be among them. But you must show wisdom in choosing your pattern of life.

Every once in a while, some young man or woman takes great relish in pointing out to me that some of the most successful people in America never finished high school, while some college graduates have made dismal failures out of their lives.

I used to wonder about it myself. Then, after observing successful people for a good number of years, I came to realize they all had one quality in common:

They had set themselves a goal. They knew where they were headed.

The unsuccessful, regardless of their education, usually had no goal. They were drifting aimlessly. So a goal is essential. And how much easier it is to reach, if you have the education to go along with it.

The pattern of life, the goal, is up to you: Butcher, baker, candlestick maker, doctor, lawyer, merchant chief * * * postman or President * * * farmer or financier. Any goal is worthy, if it's the right one for you.

But choose you must.

As you go forth into the world, you graduates will find that you can place little dependence on cut-and-dried formulas for success. Success does not come in 10 easy lessons. You get success the hard way * * * by exercising discernment to cut through the maze of sideroads and byroads of life on to the basic fundamentals.

Each and every one of you will have to find your own way. And as you get along in life, you will find that the task becomes a bit easier. But you never can afford to relax your discernment, your search for the fundamentals.

And what are the fundamentals of life?

I have several in mind.

The first has to do with industriousness, a characteristic sometimes overlooked by young people. Hard work may be out of fashion in some places, but take my word for it: No one has yet found a suitable substitute.

Once, when Mr. Edison was complimented on his genius, he hastened to reply that whatever success he enjoyed came from industriousness, and little else. I'm sure you'll hear the same thing from any other successful person you might ask.

Too often young persons are misled by appearance. What may look like idleness may not be idleness at all. It can be, instead, a reflection of deep mental concentration. Anyone engrossed in meditation is even busier than he would be, were he devoting physical energy to the problem at hand.

The moral to all this is that undirected movement may very well be little more than fruitless motion. Therefore it is vital to give guidance to whatever we do.

Otherwise * * * if we slash out in all directions at once * * * we'll find welling within us a growing spirit of frustration. And frustration has no place in a life dedicated to service and happiness.

Young persons owe it to themselves, and to their Nation, to develop imagination.

I like John Masefield's remarks about imagination. Here's what he said: "Man consists of body, mind, and imagination. His body is faulty, his mind untruthworthy, but his imagination has made him remarkable. In some centuries, his imagination has made life on this plant an intense practice of all the lovelier energies."

Yes, imagination is an important fundamental. But it, too, must be coupled with proper direction. Undirected imagination merely squanders man's precious energies.

The apex of a career, whatever its nature, is far more important than the beginning. High school graduates are too much inclined to lay stress on the years immediately ahead. Better it is to visualize the position you hope to occupy in middle-life—then set out to reach that position.

The world is not as hungry for young endeavor as it is for mature accomplishment.

Industry and imagination lack much when not bolstered by persistency. Too many of us exert ourselves in spurts. Too many of us are derelict in following up great plans created by an active imagination.

Dripping water wears away the stone. What we need these days is tenacity of purpose that allows nothing to turn us aside. Want to travel the high-road of life? Try tenacity.

Now let's turn to another of the eternal virtues of mankind, the truth.

Old Josh Billings—you might call him the Will Rogers of the 19th century—had something to say about truth that always will stay in my mind: "It is better to know nothing," he said,, "than to know what ain't so."

Or Francis Bacon said it a bit more elegantly: "No pleasure is comparable to the standing upon the vantage ground of truth."

We should remember forever that magnificent beacon of light from the Scriptures: "The truth shall make you free."

Many of the ills of mankind spring from the soil of falsehood. Truth, no matter how much it may hurt, is to be preferred over rumor, gossip or half-truth. The man or woman who refuses to face the truth, wherever it might lead, lacks a fundamental ruggedness.

Such a person lives in fear, in uncertainty. Success does not come to those prone to evade the truth, to those unable to face up to it. For life is full of obstacles that can be met only by truth, obstacles that cannot be skirted by falsehood.

Closely akin to truth is honesty. Those who seek the truth, and have no fear of the consequences, are honest above compare.

Unfortunately, for too many of us, honesty consists of little more than abstaining from picking your neighbor's pocket. But honesty goes further, much further, than that.

I've heard people speak disparagingly of "vested interests" in things material. But do you realize we also can develop vested interests in ideas?

Such "vested interests" retard growth. They stifle social progress. Truth and honesty can help us brush away the cobwebs of the mind caused by vested interests in ideas.

Certainly, well-established notions and ideas have a place in our thinking * * * but not to the point where conflicting notions and ideas are cast away without notice or evaluation.

It is well to change cautiously. In the presence of standpat no-change, progress cannot exist. Be willing to admit your errors and move on if you wish to progress.

The wise man or woman maintains an open mind and an inquiring mind. Every new idea is weighed and weighted. If it is found sound and sensible, it is placed alongside those long-established ideas that have withstood the test of time.

We cannot maintain the open and inquiring mind without truth and honesty. We must strive forever to bring those two vital characteristics of civilized man to full fruition. Truth and honesty. Live by them, and a good and satisfying life is in store for you.

"Know thyself," said Socrates. "Know thyself, control thyself, deny thyself."

"Know thyself," and your days will be full and productive and satisfying upon this earth.

"Control thyself," harness your energies, give them direction, and success will be within your reach.

"Deny thyself," avoid life's excesses, be moderate, don't look for the easy way, and you will discover the true meaning of your existence.

I have given expression to only a few of the thoughts that dwell in my mind on this commencement day.

There are other basic verities of life * * * and you young men and women will discover them for yourselves as you go out into the world. It's all part of the continuing process of education that will remain with you for the rest of your days.

As you go forth into the world, you carry the best wishes of all your fellow Americans. We shall mark your progress with pride and satisfaction.

May you ever be a credit to this great Nation of ours, to the institution which you are now leaving, to your beloved parents.

May the God of Hosts shower His blessings upon each and every one of you.

MOUNT CARROLL COMMUNITY HIGH SCHOOL COMMENCEMENT, JUNE 1, 1956

Processional, Janice Whitehead.

Invocation, Rev. John Main.

Duet No. 4 (Garibaldi), flute duet, Sharon Isenhart and Sharon Spealman.

Address, Mr. John S. Patterson, Deputy Administrator, Veterans' Administration.

Presentation of awards: Lions Club Award, DAR Good Citizenship Award, recognition of scholarship, M. J. Siebert, superintendent.

Presentation of diplomas, Mr. Judson Grove.

Benediction, Rev. John Main.

Recessional, Janice Whitehead. (Audience is requested to be seated during the recessional.)

Class roll: Gerald Bork, Eugene Brinkmeier, Harlan Brunner, Kenneth Buck, Karen Christensen, Ted Colehour, Jr., Bradley Davis, James Eaton, Fred Flickinger, Leo Frederick, Eric Frost, Patricia Fulrath, Leo Gelwicks, William Gengenbach, Leroy Getz, Judson Grove, Barbara Hamilton, Shirley Hicks, Jeanine Hovorka, Martin Judd, Ruby Kaufman, Joan Kearnaghan, Arvilla Keller, Charles Kinney, Jr., Arlan Kneale, Herbert Law, James McDearmon, Gary Morhardt, Carol Preston, Miles Raab, Ruby Randecker, Betty Rausch, Dennis Remrey, Glenda Richter, Sharon Shiley, Linda Siefert, Mary Sue Sisler, Carol Smith, Earl Smith, Mary Glennis Thomson, Michael Williams, Dorothy Wubben, Karen Zugschwerdt.

Junior escorts: Alice Crouse, Carolyn Mackay, Keith Dauphin, James Rogers.

A Mission for Nixon

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PATRICK J. HILLINGS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 25, 1956

Mr. HILLINGS. Mr. Speaker, I wish to place in the RECORD an editorial from the New York Times of Sunday, June 24, 1956, which discusses the forthcoming visit of Vice President NIXON to the Philippines. The editorial follows:

A MISSION FOR NIXON

Vice President NIXON has several times been called upon to undertake missions of what is called "good will." The newest call is from the Philippines, and Mr. NIXON and his wife will go there to represent the United States at the July 4 celebrations of the 10th anniversary of the establishment of the independent Philippine Republic. This mission can be of great importance, and Americans will wish the Vice President the highest possible degree of success.

It must be confessed, with deep regret, that our relationships with the Philippines in recent months have been less satisfactory than we want them to be. Philippine President Ramon Magsaysay is a stanch friend of this country, and that very fact has helped to inspire a sort of anti-American campaign in Manila whose object, in part certainly, is to embarrass the President.

The United States has contributed to the discontent in the Philippines through the failure to take more prompt and decisive action on the matter of American bases in the archipelago, and also through the failure, in some Congressional quarters, to under-

stand some of the more sensitive aspects of the Philippine-American trade relationship. Recently there has also been the complaint voiced in Manila that the United States has neglected or by-passed the Philippines in its eagerness to aid or to woo some other Asian states such as Thailand, India, and Indonesia.

This last charge will not bear scrutiny when the entire Asian picture is put into focus. Our assistance has been large and will, we confidently hope, continue to be so.

But relatively minor irritants can have an unfortunate effect on the attitudes of peoples where there is inadequate intercommunication and possibly an inadequate basis of understanding. That seems to have been the case in respect to the Philippines.

It seems appropriate that the United States should be represented by its highest available public officer at this celebration. The Filipinos will be the first to appreciate the propriety of this international gesture, and it was wise and right to make it. From that vantage point Mr. NIXON has a chance to do a solid job in representing his country and contributing to the solution of vexatious problems. He should do it well.

Mr. Speaker, I also wish to include in the RECORD an editorial from the San Diego Union of Sunday, June 24, 1956, which discusses the Vice President's direction of the Youth Fitness Conference. The editorial follows:

VICE PRESIDENT HANDLES STRONG ROLE

The able manner in which Vice President NIXON took charge of the Youth Fitness Conference last week again showed his versatility. Mr. NIXON has the facility for filling in ably wherever needed.

The Vice President's keynote speech to the sports, military, and recreation leaders attending the fitness conference was similar to the kind of talk Mr. Eisenhower would have given. The address was packed with facts. It pointed up the problem directly. It contributed materially to the conference's success.

During his 3½ years as Vice President, Mr. NIXON has been called upon to handle a great variety of important assignments.

He has made diplomatic tours of Asia and Central America which have strengthened American friendships. His ability as a diplomat is well recognized.

Mr. NIXON has served as the President's top-ranking liaison force with Congress. His ability to argue the merit of a measure has turned probable defeat into victory for several administration measures. On occasion, the Vice President himself has been called upon to cast key votes.

Mr. NIXON has been an important member of the President's strategy team, studying domestic and foreign problems. His ability in presiding over Cabinet and National Security Council meetings has won for him the respect of Washington's top officials.

These are a few of the important facets of Mr. NIXON's duties which his critics seldom mention. The Vice President's successful execution of these assignments has made a major contribution to the success of the Eisenhower administration.

GOP Labor Program: Divide and Conquer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE M. RHODES

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 25, 1956

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, the attack upon organized labor, coming from the Republican spokesmen since labor unity was achieved by the merger of the AFL and CIO, are shaping up as official Republican Party strategy—the Old Guard strategy of divide and conquer.

In this connection, an article appearing in the April 1956 issue of the Democratic Digest forcefully points up this strategy to divide labor leadership and rank and file labor membership. Under leave to extend my remarks, I include this article, entitled "The GOP Unveils Its 1956 Labor Program: Divide and Conquer":

THE GOP UNVEILS ITS 1956 LABOR PROGRAM: DIVIDE AND CONQUER

After 20 years of separate and sometimes conflicting operations, the two largest labor unions in the United States have now made merger a reality. But that hard won unity now faces a new threat from the Republican Party's open campaign to discredit labor's leadership.

The GOP strategy is clearly revealed in a serious of attacks by leading Republican spokesmen, aimed at driving a wedge between rank-and-file union members and their duly elected officials, using the same divide-and-conquer technique that helped the late Senator Taft of Ohio to victory in his 1950 Senate campaign.

While a few enlightened Republican spokesmen try to maintain the pretense that the Eisenhower Administration is friendly to labor, the overwhelming sentiment of the Republican Party can be seen in the intensity given the GOP divide-and-conquer campaign leading up to and since the merger of the AFL–CIO.

Secretary of Labor Mitchell, for example, told the delegates at the historic merger meeting in New York last December that they should speak out in politics. But Harold Stassen, President Eisenhower's own White House assistant, predicted dire consequences to the Nation if they did. Stassen, the President's Special Assistant for Disarmament, and a frequent Republican presidential candidate, marked the inaugural unity meeting with a speech forecasting that labor's political activity would increase to the point where it would become "a dangerous trend for the future well-being of the workers and of the Nation."

Speaking in Detroit, the home of the CIO Auto Workers, Stassen followed the divide-and-conquer theme by blaming "top leadership of a number of the large labor union," for what he considered a potential menace to the Nation.

Organized labor leaders, wrote Robert C. Albright in the Washington Post, "say speeches of the Stassen type have been so many and so persistent, and stem from Republicans so highly placed in the party, that they add up to a '1956 Republican pattern of attack.'"

One of these highly placed Republicans was Senator KNOWLAND, Minority Leader and heavy contender for the 1956 Presidential nomination, who saw in the newly-merged AFL-CIO some "who visualize taking over control of the Democratic Party in this country * * * and making it into the American equivalent of the British Labor Party."

To another Californian, Representative EDWARD W. HIESTAND, the unanimously-elected AFL-CIO vice president, Walter Reuther, is "Public Enemy No. 1 * * * a Socialist with Communist-Russian background." His prediction is that if Mr. Reuther has his way, the Democratic Party will be forced to adopt "the socialistic measures which have been the political policy of the AFL-CIO." What both these Californians conveniently overlooked is that organized labor consistently supported Republican Earl Warren for Governor of their home State.

Then there was Senator BARRY GOLDWATER, one of the prime movers in the divide-and-conquer campaign against labor. He charged that labor unions were out to build up huge political slush funds for the Democrats and labor leadership would let nothing stand in its way. As chairman of the important Republican Senatorial Campaign Committee, he issued a report accusing labor leaders of "using violence and coercion" in a "conspiracy of national proportions" aimed at controlling the 1956 election results.

The Arizona Senator was quickly backstopped by New Hampshire's Senator STYLES BRIDGES, head of the Senate Republican Policy Committee. With great fanfare, Senator BRIDGES circulated the already published "tabulation of political spending by major labor organizations," in an obvious effort to support his colleague's charges. While these figures were already a matter of public knowledge, an interesting comparison was made between GOP and labor expenditures by the CIO Political Action Committee. The Republican Party spent more than $7 million, while all 41 labor groups spent only $2.5 million during the same period, the CIO reported, and "while labor groups received from their total membership of about 18 million contributions in small amounts totaling $1,882,156.58, the Republican Party received nearly an equal amount—$1,434,084.30 to be exact—from only 738 contributions of $1,000 or more."

The breakdown shows: 10 members of the Rockefeller family gave $66,000 to the GOP; 14 members of the Du Pont family gave at least $51,500; the Mellons of Pittsburgh contributed $40,000; and the Pews of Philadelphia, $25,000.

What it boiled down to, the CIO pointed out, was that for every member of a trade union who gave a dollar to his political action committee, labor league or other trade-union group, one of the GOP's 738 contributors came up with more than $1,934.14.

While most industrialists maintained a wait-and-see attitude as to what labor merger would mean, one prominent businessman had no hesitancy in joining the campaign. He is Frederick Coolidge Crawford, chairman of the "Salute to Eisenhower" dinners held in January, at which prominent GOP leaders keynoted the coming Presidential campaign. As chairman of the widely-publicized fund-raising dinners, Mr. Crawford told a group of political and business leaders that labor leaders are a "small, powerful group" bent on moving into American political life. He pointed out that the rise of the Nazi Party in prewar Germany was "a supreme example of how a few people" could rise to power. His invidious observation that the Nazi rise in Germany developed about the same time that labor was acquiring new strength through organization in this country, came as no surprise to those familiar with Mr. Crawford's anti-labor record.

As present of the Thompson Products in Cleveland since 1933, Mr. Crawford has successfully maintained an open shop by defeating all efforts of his employees to organize. In the process, he has been cited for unfair labor practices by the National Labor Relations Board.

Nor is it a surprise to those familiar with Mr. Crawford's earlier attempts to discredit those he opposes. In a speech in Cleveland in 1939, according to the Cleveland Plain Dealer, Mr. Crawford had this to say: "And what difference does it make if the dictatorship of Germany is consuming one-fourth of production for military grandeur or whether the bureaucracy of the New Deal is consuming one-fourth of production to maintain itself?"

Mr. Crawford, a past president of the National Association of Manufacturers, was quickly joined by the newly-elected NAM president in the GOP divide-and-conquer

campaign. Cola G. Parker, elected last December, saw in labor unity "implications of a very great danger to the American people."

Another approach came from Senator Goldwater in the form of a poll, which he claimed showed that a majority of trade unionists don't like their unions to participate in politics.

Don Montgomery, director of the UAW's Washington office, pointed out that the Arizona Senator used "a partial and distorted summary" of a poll made by one Wayne University student in Detroit who interviewed only 70 persons. The UAW director reported that "a Wayne University poll of 1,150 workers showed that far from being critical of their union's political activities, UAW members are predominantly loyal to the union's political endeavors."

By February of 1956, the open drive against labor took legislative form in a bill sponsored by GOP Senators Curtis and GOLDWATER, which goes far beyond the Taft-Hartley Act in its efforts to destroy union programs to enlighten their members on the issues in Congress and report their voting records.

The labor newspaper, the Machinist, points out that participation of a local union in a citizenship campaign during the past 2 years, or affiliation with an international union that has participated in such a campaign for good government, would bring automatic cancellation of union security provisions in a contract it may have negotiated, if the Curtis-Goldwater bill is enacted. To the Machinist, "the bill could immediately cancel every union security provision in the country," since "there are no AFL-CIO unions that we know of that have not supported one or another of labor's political leagues during the past 2 years."

This GOP concern over labor's political activity had been brought up by President Eisenhower himself, in his brief message to the labor merger meeting in New York, transmitted by telephone from Gettysburg, where he was convalescing. The New York Times headline indicated where the President's emphasis lay. It read: "President bids labor heed minority political rights: greets AFL-CIO." The Times story pointed out that the President's tone was friendly, "but he put unmistakable stress on his belief that labor must develop means for guaranteeing that minority political opinions would be 'accurately reflected.'"

Senator GOLDWATER promptly interpreted this to mean that the President and other prominent Republicans were on his side. "That is what I have been fighting for," commented the Senator, "and I intend to keep on fighting for human freedom in labor unions as well as elsewhere."

Not content with the GOP efforts to drive a wedge between union members and their leaders, Agriculture Secretary Benson's approach to the antilabor campaign is seen in his efforts to turn farmers against city workers. Last September, Mr. Benson charged that wages of city workers are responsible for the farmer's plight. Since the merger meeting, Mr. Benson has issued a report implying that farmers would be better off if wage earners made less, in a divisive effort to use organized labor as a scapegoat for failures in the administration's farm program.

Another Cabinet member, Secretary of Interior McKay, has clearly revealed his hostility to labor. When his Salem, Oreg., automobile agency was under strike by the International Association of Machinists, Mr. McKay crossed the picket lines to inspect his company's books. Referring to members of the striking union, his comment was: "I don't happen to go along with some of the goons they've got running things."

Contrary to the frequent GOP charges being tossed around that unions are dictatorships, a recent study by the National Industrial Conference Board shows the most popular system for election of officers is through international union conventions.

The conservative Wall Street Journal agreed that these democratic processes would continue. "The divergencies of interest among union members themselves * * * remain," said the Journal in commenting on the merger. "All this divergence has been, we think, good for labor. * * * The labor movement is itself stronger by virtue of its differences and the freedom for those differences to express themselves."

The New York Times saw "no cause for alarm" in labor's role in American political life. "It isn't as if the AFL–CIO were to nominate candidates or control those who are elected," said the Times, which agreed with Mr. Reuther that "labor's program may well serve to raise the level of political understanding in America."

Both AFL–CIO President Meaney and Vice President Reuther have repeatedly said that neither they nor anyone else could tell a union member how to vote.

"Organized labor in America," Mr. Meany declared, "will not subjugate itself to any political party. It will endorse liberal and progressive candidates from all parties. It will make known to the workers of this country the records of all candidates. It will urge all citizens to register and vote."

The Republican Party had reason to fear an informed union membership at the polls next November.

Early in 1953, the administration backed down on its pledge to amend the Taft-Hartley law, forcing the resignation of the late Secretary of Labor, Martin Durkin, a stanch trade unionist.

Would informed working men and women vote for an administration that now claims credit for the $1 minimum wage voted by the Democrats, when President Eisenhower himself held out for only 90 cents? Or would they believe this administration is opposed to the State antilabor right-to-work laws when Labor Secretary Mitchell opposes them but is brushed off by President Eisenhower?

Nor has the Eisenhower administration shown friendliness to labor in its appointments to the National Labor Relations Board, which has tightened up Taft-Hartley in practice to the point where Fortune magazine frankly stated that "Management is unquestionably getting a better break at NLRB than it has in many years."

The Republican Party's antilabor attitude is shown again in the move to curb labor's political activities through State legislation. In Wisconsin, for example, where the GOP majority rammed through a bill limiting labor's political activities despite vigorous Democratic opposition. And in Michigan, where the Eisenhower administration joined in the GOP State party's attempts to curb labor on the local level. Acting on a complaint from the Michigan GOP State chairman, the administration indicted the United Auto Workers for sponsoring a radio show endorsing certain candidates for office.

The union did not deny sponsorship of such a program, but contended such sponsorship did not violate the law. The United States district judge, hearing the case, dismissed the indictment, upholding the union's contention.

Organized labor has shown that it does not intend to sit idly by while those who do not believe in the principles of trade unionism attempt to destroy its gains. One Republican spokesman, Gov. Fred Hall, of Kansas, blames the Republican loss of Congress in 1954 on his own party's opposition to Taft-Hartley reforms, pointing out that the Republican Party has been "at odds with labor for 25 years." His frankness serves to point up the 1956 GOP efforts to "get labor" through its attempts to discredit labor leadership.

It's Ike's Farm Depression

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LESTER R. JOHNSON
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 25, 1956

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, Secretary of Agriculture Ezra Benson has received considerable criticism in the past 3 years. Some of the criticism was probably well justified; however, for the most part he has been an excellent chore boy for the administration.

The recent veto of the farm bill showed that the man who has not been too concerned about the economic plight of farmers is the President of the United States. Under leave to revise and extend my remarks I wish to insert in the RECORD an article from the May issue of the Democratic Digest titled "It's Ike's Farm Depression." The text of the article follows:

EZRA TAKES THE BLAME BUT IT'S IKE'S FARM DEPRESSION

When President Eisenhower announced that he would run for a second term, Washington's current joke was that he figured he couldn't make a living on his Gettysburg farm while Ezra Taft Benson was Secretary of Agriculture.

The gag was funny for everyone but farmers, who have watched their net income fall about $1 billion a year since Ike was inaugurated and have been personally caught in the drop of the parity ratio to 80 percent of "fair"—the lowest point since 1941.

To farmers, Benson is a fighting word, although they can't help chuckling once in a while at his incredible ability to put his foot in his mouth.

But Benson's performance has been so bad that farmers have been slow to believe that it really reflects President Eisenhower's personal feelings. Many seem to think that Ike has no connection with his Cabinet officer, although such an official can be fired instantly. The same polls that show Benson with practically no friends among farmers show no corresponding dip in Ike's popularity. But the facts are that Ike has strongly backed Benson's every move, and the GOP farm program has come straight from the President, not from Benson.

In 1954 the administration's first recommendation for a change in the price-support laws was submitted to Congress in the form of a special message from Eisenhower. This was the occasion on which Ike officially broke his famous campaign promises about 90 percent and 100 percent of parity and adopted sliding-scale or flexible supports as low as 75 percent of parity. He took to the radio and television on June 11 to urge passage of the lower supports, and he wrote the Republican chairmen of the House and Senate Agriculture Committees on August 12 to oppose a bill raising the support level on dairy products above the level to which Benson had dropped it.

When Congress adopted the sliding scale, over Democratic opposition, Eisenhower told a press conference that he was "delighted" with the measure. And, according to the New York Times, "he rapped his knuckles sharply on the table to emphasize the point that the administration in this case had succeeded in turning one Chamber of Congress away from rigid high price supports."

At another press conference, the President had been asked for his opinion of a Senate

committee version of the bill which would have raised price supports on dairy products from 75 to 80 percent of parity. Ike's reply was that he "thought it was a grave error."

A few months later, in the congressional campaign of 1954, Ike gave a major farm speech at Indianapolis in which he vigorously defended his administration of the farm program.

This year in another special message, Eisenhower asked Congress to keep the minimum price support in the flexible scale at 75 percent of parity and—in the case of corn—suggested leaving the price-support level entirely up to Secretary Benson. He also called for a "soil bank" after having rejected it twice the previous year when it was suggested by Democratic Members of Congress.

Throughout the weeks of debate which followed, Eisenhower frequently urged lower price supports and refused to deny persistent statements by his Secretary of Agriculture that the President would veto any bill returning to high price supports. When the Senate voted, in early March, for his sliding scale of price supports, Eisenhower's press secretary told reporters that the President was "delighted."

Ike also backed Benson's refusal to do anything about the ruinous prices of cattle and hogs. In spite of his famous campaign promise at Kasson, Minn., to find a method for supporting perishable commodities such as livestock, Ike told a press conference 3½ years later:

"I would believe that to go in this whole perishable field and begin the business of price supports would be dangerous. I would want to study it more before expressing myself definitely on it." Hog prices were then at a 14-year low.

In addition to the many instances in which Ike assumed personal command of the farm program, he has shown by personal association great interest in the farm program, rather than the detachment or even ignorance which farmers might want to believe. This began, of course, with his personal selection of Ezra Benson for the Cabinet. As Benson narrated it to a Brigham Young University audience shortly after his selection for the post, Benson gave the President-elect four reasons why he should not be named to the Cabinet. All were rejected, of course, by Eisenhower, who has continued to praise Benson warmly.

During his first year in office, Ike chose Ezra to appear with a couple of other Cabinet members on a coast-to-coast TV show in which the Republican farm program, among others, was stoutly defended. Benson has been the President's guide for inspection trips to the agricultural experiment station at Beltsville, Md., to an animal experiment station at Front Royal, Va., to a demonstration of soil conservation held in the Department of Agriculture and on surveys of both flood and drought damage in the Middle West.

The President's brother, Milton, whom Ike publicly credited in 1952 with "having the brains in the family," is constantly in and out of the White House and keeps in close touch with Republican farm leaders. One of his closest associates is W. I. Myers, dean of agriculture at Cornell University and the man Ike chose to be chairman of his National Agricultural Advisory Commission.

Eisenhower has come to Benson's support countless times. In fact, a critic has said that Eisenhower supports Benson more than he does the farmers. And Benson returns the affection. For instance, the newsletter of the American Farm Bureau Federation quoted Benson as declaring, "There is only one view on farm policy in the executive branch of the Government," and "that is the view held by the President, which I fully support."

The same source quoted Benson as having the full approval of Ike in reorganizing the Department of Agriculture and told its farm readers on another occasion that "Eisenhower last week declared that he has seen no one more dedicated to America than Mr. Benson."

This remark, and many like it, were made by the President in response to reports that Benson would be fired. The Minneapolis Star reported on October 21, 1953, that Ike "backed Agriculture Secretary Benson's policies to the hilt today," adding, "Benson has moved in farm policies with his approval, the President said."

Marquis Childs had a similar report on a Cabinet meeting held after Benson returned from an inspection of the drought disaster of 1953. After Benson detailed what his Department was doing about it, Childs wrote, "the President warmly congratulated him." (At the time, beef cattle had dropped to $16 from $19.70 at inauguration.)

In January of 1954, when the administration's flexible price-support program was first sent to Congress, the Ike and Ezra theme grew louder. The United Press reported Benson as saying that "President Eisenhower himself made the final decision for the administration on the new farm program," adding this clincher: "Earlier Benson told a news conference that Eisenhower spent more time studying the farm program than the Agriculture Department had expected."

In mid-1954, the Washington Star reported that, next to Treasury Secretary Humphrey and, perhaps, Defense Secretary Wilson, "Benson is regarded as the strongest member of the White House's inner circle. Undoubtedly, he is the most respected."

The Washington Daily News found about the same situation. "Through a terrible battering," the News reported, "Mr. Benson remained calm. He knew he had the one thing that counted most—Dwight Eisenhower's support." And Lyle C. Wilson, Washington bureau chief of the United Press, wrote about the same time that flexible supports were voted by the House in 1954 because Eisenhower "adopted a realistic understanding of the necessity for a leader to lead—and to slug, on occasion, if circumstance required it." Wilson recalled that "word around town last year was that Benson was on the way out," but concluded that "he is counted by many today as the most effective man in the Cabinet."

By the fall of 1954, the United Press was able to quote Republican spokesman as saying that Benson is "probably the busiest" Cabinet official in the congressional campaign.

The third year of Ezra's life with Ike, 1955, started with more reports that Benson was leaving the Cabinet, but all were denied. One report, carried in the Washington Post-Times Herald, had it that Benson had asked Ike to relieve him, now that 2 years were up. "After hearing him through," the Post reported, "the President told Benson his resignation was out of the question. When Benson left the job, the President also would be leaving his, the Chief Executive is understood to have added."

The New York Times reported on March 15, 1955, that Ike had assured Benson "of full backing" in any congressional fight over the restoration of high price supports and that Ike would intervene personally if necessary to keep flexible supports. (He did, too. The Washington Post reported in March of this year that "President Eisenhower is personally using the telephones in an effort to rally Senate support for flexible farm price supports and other features of his farm program.")

A few headlines tell the story for the remainder of 1955:

"President Girds to Fight High Supports for Crops"—Christian Science Monitor, May 4, 1955.

"Eisenhower Supports Benson Completely, Backs Six-Point Plan"—Washington Post and Times Herald, October 30, 1955.

"Eisenhower Approves Benson Farm Polices"—Washington Star, October 30, 1955.

Then there were some more denials that Benson was leaving the Cabinet. "The White House flatly and emphatically denied today that Agriculture Secretary Ezra Taft Benson might resign," began an INS dispatch. The Baltimore Sun's report of the same denials, made by Presidential Press Secretary James Hagerty, began: "President Eisenhower has never even thought of replacing his embattled Secretary of Agriculture, Ezra Taft Benson."

Thus, in spite of wishful thinking by the Nation's farmers, Benson has had 3 years of full support from Eisenhower. Yet, as the Washington Star recently analyzed the political picture of agriculture, "President Eisenhower has escaped blame for the farmers' plight. Critics center their attacks on the people around him."

Similarly, the farm writer of the New York Times, William M. Blair, analyzed the situation as recently as February 5, 1956. Benson occupies "an unusual position—even affection—with President Eisenhower" he wrote. "It is as though he were the 'spiritual adviser to the crusade.' Mr. Benson probably is more dedicated to the President and his views on government in the lives of the people than any other Cabinet officer. Thus, he is anchored. He may stumble but President Eisenhower will support him."

If further proof were really needed that Ike is running the farm program, the GOP provided it early this year with a series of newspaper ads and radio announcements estimated to cost $250,000. The ads were headlined, "Help Eisenhower Pass the New Farm Program" and carried the President's picture and signature. A coupon was included for mailing to one's Congressman with the message: "Yes, I am in favor of the Eisenhower Farm Program." Benson's name was never mentioned.

Noting the new emphasis on Eisenhower, himself, the Wall Street Journal concluded: "Republicans figure the farm chief is a political liability. But they have little hope of ditching him because Ike likes him too much.'"

Branch of Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JAMES A. HALEY

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 25, 1956

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Speaker, the Members of Congress should awaken to the fact that Congress is and has been in the process of delegating too much of its power to the various bureaus and agencies of the Government. If we continue to do this, before long there will be no need for the Congress. The trend for this procedure has been going on for a long time, and I think that it is time that we make a definite reappraisal of the situation.

The Sarasota Herald-Tribune discusses the matter in an editorial of June 22, 1956, and under unanimous consent I am having it printed in the Appendix of the RECORD:

BRANCH OF GOVERNMENT

In the tremendous expansion of Federal Government the last quarter century, the Congress has delegated its powers to some 70 administrative agencies which actually formulate and issue more laws annually than

does Congress; and 20 of them try more cases than all the Federal courts combined.

The loss to Congress of a substantial part of its constitutional function of determining legislative policy is such, that the late Supreme Court Justice Robert H. Jackson, in a dissenting opinion, called these administrative agencies a veritable fourth branch of the Government.

In wartime, the civil agencies which exercised wartime controls were accepted as necessary for the successful prosecution of the war. But there has been growing dissatisfaction with the grab for power that followed the war by the various administrative agencies that arrogate to themselves legislative policy without consulting Congress.

Congress has finally looked into the abuses charged to its creature agencies. A special subcommittee of the House Rules Committee heard noted jurists and lawyers, who were unanimous in condemning the lack of direction and control of these administrative agencies.

This is not an abstract matter of law, however. These agencies affect intimately the lives of all of us, directly or indirectly. Their jurisdiction ranges over almost all aspects of social and economic life. They go their way with little restraint. Review by the courts is necessarily limited, as they are invoked only in extreme cases.

The solution seems to be in setting up new standing committees of Congress to oversee the powers it has delegated to these agencies, study the complaints concerning abuses of administrative authority and correct them. Congress must regain its constitutional legislative functions and not let administrative officials exercise them without direction and control.

Antarctic Airstrip Named for Oregon Serviceman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SAM COON
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 21, 1956

Mr. COON. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I am having printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a tribute to an Oregon boy who was killed in the Antarctic while serving with the United States Navy on Operation Deepfreeze. The Navy has seen fit to name an airstrip for this lad who gave his life in the service of his country.

Max R. Kiel Airstrip in Little America V commemorates a Joseph, Oreg., Navy man who was killed in the Antarctic while participating in Operation Deepfreeze last March 5.

A Seabee driver second class, Kiel was killed when the 35-ton tractor he was driving crashed into a snow crevasse about 110 miles from Little America V.

He was the son of Mrs. Roma Irene Kiel, Box 32, Joseph, Oreg. Kiel was a member of a tractor train carrying drums of fuel oil and gasoline to a point 250 miles from Little America.

The airstrip was named for Kiel on March 10 and appropriate ceremonies were held.

It seems fitting to me that this Oregon serviceman should be honored for sacrificing his life while helping our country to conquer the vast unknown that characterizes this area of the world.

To me, Max Kiel is a hero just as are those who died in battle, for he, too, was participating in a battle—a battle against the elements of that land of the unknown.

Although I did not know Max personally, I have heard many fine reports about his character and devotion to duty. Mrs. Kiel, the State of Oregon, and the Nation can be proud of this boy.

The South Is on the March

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE HUDDLESTON, JR.
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 25, 1956

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Speaker, on December 23, 1886, the spokesman of the New South, Henry W. Grady, in an address delivered to the New England Society in the city of New York, made a statement which is still widely quoted throughout these United States. On that day, the people were slowly seeing the first ray of hope from those times of both economic and mental depression, following reconstruction. In his speech, entitled "The New South," Grady declared:

> There was a South of slavery and secession—that South is dead. There is a South of union and freedom—that South, thank God is living, breathing, growing every hour.

The words of this illustrious citizen of both the South and the Nation, gave new hope to people throughout the southern part of the United States. Also, it allayed the fears of our brothers from the North that the South would drag the entire country down into bankruptcy.

The great vision and wisdom of Grady have been reflected by the constant and progressive growth and vigor of the South ever since his memorable speech. The truth of his words have never been more apropos than they are today. The South is truly on the march.

Mr. Speaker, as further evidence that the South's destiny is to become one of the world's wealthiest areas, it is my pleasure to include in the RECORD a fine article which appeared Wednesday, June 20, 1956, in the Birmingham Post-Herald, one of the excellent daily papers in my district, under leave to extend my remarks:

SOUTHEAST IS VISIONED WEALTHIEST IN WORLD

TUSCALOOSA, June 19—A Columbia University economist said today the Southeast is destined to become the world's wealthiest area because of climate and water supply.

Dr. Harold F. Clark, Columbia professor of economic education, said the water supply will draw industry, boost agriculture and the climate will attract a large labor force.

Clark, who has studied all areas of the earth for economic potential, made the remarks at a convocation at the University of Alabama's opening of "Education Week."

He said the Southeast's 50 inches of rainfall annually is "enough to sustain a widespread, irrigated, commercial agriculture" and "a highly diversified industry."

Clark said many industries need water, particularly the heavy metals industry, many parts of the paper industry and the chemical industry.

Because the work week is steadily shrinking, Clark said the time is near when labor will select locations "by leisure hour possibilities and not by working conditions."

He explained, "When this attitude hits full force, people are going to come where they can be outside the year around. You couldn't find a better place for that than the Southeast."

He said this area's hot Summer temperatures are merely setbacks that will be overcome with air conditioning in homes, automobiles, factories and offices.

Foreign Policy and the Law of Charity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 25, 1956

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I am including an article by Father James L. Vizzard, S. J., which appears in the World Alliance News Letter for June.

While one need not agree with all that Father Vizzard states in his article, nevertheless, it is timely and challenging. In this day and age, there is no denial of the fact that our Founding Fathers clearly intended that the moral law should be the basis of our political way of life.

The writer of this article points out that we have erred, perhaps, in our world relationships by insisting that our national interest be geared to military and economic security. The article follows:

FOREIGN POLICY AND THE LAW OF CHARITY

(By James L. Vizzard, S. J.)

In this Nation founded by men who spelled out clearly the moral basis of our political society, it is strange and discouraging to have to insist that our national interest is a much broader concept and reality than mere military security, political stability or economic advantage. Unless this Nation has interests and responsibilities which are rooted in moral principles, how do we differ from the arbitrary legality of totalitarian states? Unless national interest is based upon moral interest, our objectives can claim no superiority over those of the Communist nations. If our foreign economic policy fails to recognize that the very fact of our abundance creates opportunities and obligations which far transcend any narrowly conceived selfish and temporary interests, then we deserve to be weighed and judged by the world and by God in the same balance as Russia.

In public debate and private discussion a great variety of reasons are given to justify programs of international aid; we have smothering farm surpluses; our expanding industrial economy demands overseas markets and raw materials; we need to win friends and bolster our national security; if we don't the Communists will.

But the moral reasons for these programs, if they are mentioned at all, are brought in only parenthetically, or with embarrassed apology. Patronizing realists clearly imply that charity and justice have no pertinence to the issues, that they represent only the sentimental idealism of international do-gooders.

Yet, in fact, love of neighbor and justice not only have validity, even in terms of na-

tional interest, but are motives for programs of aid which are more urgent, more far-reaching, and of far greater value than any other motives. Moreover, these motives, if properly explained, could win much more sincere and practical approval here and abroad. Finally, programs undertaken for these motives are more likely to achieve, as byproducts, the aims of our foreign policy.

It is likewise strange to hear the uncompromising air of finality with which opponents of foreign aid remark, "The giveaways have to stop. Charity begins at home." For them, there ends the argument. It is difficult to understand why, for all the statement claims is that charity begins at home. It doesn't end there. It is not completed and perfected until it reaches out to the farthest ends of the earth to all who are in need.

The law of love, the law of charity in all great religions is stated tersely by Christ, "Love thy neighbor as thyself." And lest we wonder who is our neighbor, He told the parable of the Good Samaritan. The lesson of that story is that every man is our neighbor.

Moreover, to communicate to us the importance and the practical nature of such love of neighbor, He went further and spelled out a graphic account of the judgment: "I was hungry and you gave me to eat; I was thirsty and you gave me to drainк * * * naked and you covered me. * * * Amen I say to you, as long as you did it for one of these, the least of my brethren, you did it for me" (Matthew 25:35–40). It is on this basis that at the end of time we as individuals will be judged. We have no reason to believe that nations will be judged differently—perhaps sooner than we think.

But the objection has often been raised that charity is the responsibility of the individual. Such an attitude ignores the fact that the state comes into being to fulfill for us collectively what we cannot do alone. In our vast world, we cannot reach all who need and have a claim on our charity and, thus, the state acts as our agent. When it gives, it is ourselves giving.

But charity is not fulfilled by mere giving. Emergency will dictate that food and other necessities be distributed quickly and freely. But continued alms tend to destroy the basic self-respect and initiative of the recipients. And by a strange and universal quirk of human nature, the donors come to be hated.

Every effort, therefore, must be made to develop methods and programs which also fulfill the needs of the human spirit. When food, clothing, and other necessities are distributed, the beneficiaries should be required to do some work for themselves or their community. To plan such works, to carry them out, to reward willing cooperators, may seem burdensome, but it would certainly increase the recipient's self-respect and aid in developing self-help and improvement.

This idea is not new. It has been successfully carried out. Government and private agencies could develop these methods. We feel sure that Congress, the United States people, and the peoples of the recipient nations would not object to such practical and fruitful charity.

Alaska Friend

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. L. BARTLETT
DELEGATE FROM ALASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 25, 1956

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Speaker, an editorial appearing on June 1 in the Fairbanks (Alaska) News-Miner, put into words the gratitude felt by Alaskans toward Senator NEUBERGER for his effective assistance in connection with inclusion of Alaska in the highway bill as it passed the Senate. Under leave to extend my remarks, I should like to include that editorial here:

HATS OFF TO THE OREGON SENATOR

Senator RICHARD NEUBERGER, of Oregon, has submitted a very important amendment to the Federal highway construction bill now being considered by Congress. He tacked on a provision that gives Alaska a fair share of the benefits as well as a share of the special taxes that will be levied. As things stood before he wrote this amendment, Alaska was destined to get the taxes, but none of the benefits.

There is a strong possibility that his amendment will be clipped off the bill before is is passed by both Houses. Nevertheless, Senator NEUBERGER has proposed this aid to Alaska, and he is fighting for it. Maybe he'll win.

We doff our hats to the Oregon Senator. He is standing up in Congress for a voteless Territory, and he certainly can be counted as a real friend of Alaska.

Joseph Capsin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARK W. THOMPSON
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 25, 1956

Mr. THOMPSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, some years ago a Navy veteran, Mr. Joseph Capsin, faced total disability due to severe arthritis. Once he became convinced that his condition was apparently incurable, at least by the medical standards which then prevailed, he made up his mind to put his long bedridden hours to useful purpose. From his modest home in Honolulu he undertook what has become a prodigious correspondence in behalf of those who might need his assistance. Anyone who is downtrodden, or otherwise in need of a friend, particularly if he is a veteran, has only to make his case known to Joe Capsin to secure the active and vigorous asistance of Joe and his remarkable ability to present each case to someone who will help to carry on the fight.

On the 19th of April 1956 the Oahu Chapter No. 1, Disabled American Veterans, passed a resolution, the text of which reads as follows:

RESOLUTION

Whereas Joseph Capsin, as chairman of the committee on employment security, Oahu Chapter No. 1, DAV, has rendered outstanding service to Disabled American Veterans; and

Whereas despite his own physical handicap which keeps him confined to bed, said Joseph Capsin has brought good cheer and hope to Disabled American Veterans in need: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Disabled American Veterans, Oahu Chapter No. 1, That Joseph Capsin be and is hereby highly commended for his meritorious work which he has performed for the benefit of his fellow DAV members as chairman of the committee on employment security; and be it further

Resolved, That Joseph Capsin be and is hereby recommended for the award of the certificate of merit to be issued by the national commander of the DAV; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be forwarded to said Joseph Capsin at 426 Namahana Street, Honolulu, T. H., and to the national commander, DAV, national headquarters, Cincinnatti, Ohio.

Adopted in Honolulu, T. H., this 19th day of April 1956, by Oahu Chapter No. 1, DAV, Department of Hawaii.

WALTER SIN NING WONG,
Adjutant, Oahu Chapter No. 1.

Approved:

AH KEE LONG,
Commander, Oahu Chapter No. 1.

Joe's reaction to the resolution is quite typical of the man. He wrote me the following letter which he asked that I place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD so that it would reach the attention of those who he feels played a part in the service he has rendered mankind:

HONOLULU, T. H., *June 13, 1956.*

Hon. CLARK W. THOMPSON,
Member of Congress, Committee on Agriculture, House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR CLARK: I have been honored more than I deserve by Oahu Chapter No. 1, DAV, Honolulu, for my casework in behalf of various of their members. The chapter has recommended me for the award of the certificate of merit to be issued by the national commander of the DAV.

Much as I appreciate this recognition, I want even more to share it with yourself, with your colleagues and others who helped me nail these cases down.

May I say "Mahalo" and "Aloha" to the wonderful people whose names follow, without whose strong and ready hands I could have done nothing:

Senators: Wayne Morse, Alexander Wiley, Estes Kefauver, William Langer, Barry Goldwater, Hubert Humphrey, Lister Hill, Lyndon B. Johnston, Paul H. Douglas, Ralph Flanders, A. S. Mike Monroney, Clinton Anderson, Stuart Symington, James H. Duff, Robert S. Kerr, J. William Fulbright, Dennis Chavez, John J. Sparkman, Olin D. Johnston, Charles E. Potter, Thomas C. Hennings, Warren G. Magnuson, "Scoop" Jackson, Albert Gore, Mike Mansfield, James E. Murray, Richard L. Neuberger, George A. Smathers, William F. Knowland, Arthur V. Watkins, Matthew M. Neely, Margaret Chase Smith, Homer E. Capehart, the late Alben W. Barkley, Joseph R. McCarthy, John J. Williams, William E. Jenner, Warren G. Magnuson, George W. Malone, John O. Pastore, Walter F. George, Richard B. Russell, Theodore F. Green.

Representatives: Yourself; George P. Miller, John F. Shelley, Clair Engle, Charles S. Gubser, Harlan Hagen, Chet Holifield, Cecil R. King, John A. Blatnik, Philip J. Philbin, John Lesinski, Wayne L. Hays, Victor Wickersham, Aime J. Forand, Frank M. Karsten, John W. McCormack, James Van Zandt, Joseph W. Martin, Jr.; Lenore Sullivan, John W. Byrnes, John D. Dingell, James P. S. Devereux, E. L. (Bob) Bartlett, John E. Fogarty, Charles M. Price.

Governors: Edwin C. Johnson, James Folsom, Frank Clement, Adlai Stevenson.

Columnists: Drew Pearson, Joseph C. Harsch.

Cartoonists: Daniel R. Fitzpatrick, Ross A. Lewis, Herblock, Walt Partymiller.

And from Honolulu: Hon. Delbert E. Metzger, my good friend and legal adviser; Ellsworth W. Taylor, my good friend and tutor in history and English; Earl J. Dye, of Ellen Dye Candies, my good friend and supporter;

and finally, there are many others, but the list is too long.

With warm regards and all good wishes.

Sincerely,

JOE CAPSIN.

It is of interest to Members of Congress to know that the recommendation of the Oahu Chapter has been forwarded to the national commander, DAV, Maj. Gen. Melvin J. Maas, United States Marine Corps, retired, who was for many years a Representative in Congress from the State of Minnesota.

Fancy Footwork on the Washington Post and Times Herald

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 25, 1956

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, when the Washington Post and Times Herald failed to carry Drew Pearson's column, which had today's dateline and which appeared in other papers, I began to check into the situation. I believe I have come up with some information which my colleagues in the House may find interesting.

First, I want to point out that I am very often in agreement with the Washington Post and Times Herald, which is, as this newspaper itself so often and so proudly points out, 1 of the country's 10 leading newspapers. Secondly, the vice president and executive editor of this great newspaper, James Russell Wiggins, was president last year of the Commission on Freedom of Information of the American Society of Newspaper Editors.

But what happens when the Washington Post and Times Herald, which has run many editorials praising the Moss committee for its stand on the uninterrupted flow of news relating to the activities of the Federal Government, itself refuses to print "all the news that is fit to print"?

This is a very interesting point and it is raised by the fast footwork of this great newspaper in substituting a local news column by Pearson for his regular column for today which appeared in such newspapers as the Wheeling (W. Va.) News-Register. Some of these other newspapers that carried Pearson's column today have not made such a career of freedom of the press as the Washington Post and Times Herald has.

We are getting along toward elections now and I remember well that during the last campaign the Washington Post and Times Herald chose that particular time to drop for several days the biting cartoons of its world-famous Herblock which happened to favor the Democrats. Perhaps now, despite its lip-service to the cause of freedom of the press, lip-service which has taken in a lot of people and helped greatly in building this newspaper's vast national prestige, the Washington Post and Times Herald is getting ready for this year's campaign by dropping other columns with which it disagrees. The excuses made by this newspaper for dropping Herblock were, I recall, quite pitiable and unworthy.

It is with sorrow then, and some anger, that I submit for the information of my colleagues Drew Pearson's column which they, otherwise, would not have an opportunity to see. After all, the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is really an organ of free expression not just some of the time, or part of the time, but all of the time. This freedom of expression, Mr. Speaker, is basic to the freedoms which are our glory and our great heritage—freedoms which we must ever maintain for all, whether we agree with these opinions or not:

(For release, Monday, June 25, 1956)

THE WASHINGTON MERRY-GO-ROUND

(By Drew Pearson)

WASHINGTON.—The most important question, next to the status of Eisenhower's health, is whether the American people are getting the true facts about his health.

There have been so many conflicting statements by distinguished doctors, some of them at the top of their profession, regarding, ileitis that the public is confused. It's quite possible also that the President himself may be confused.

To ascertain whether the public has been getting the whole truth, here is a review of the various health incidents in the President's life and the public statements made about them by his personal doctor, Maj. Gen. Howard Snyder and his press relations expert, Jim Hagerty.

On August 4, 1953, a statement that Eisenhower had high blood pressure was flatly denied by Hagerty. Yet in 1948, Kay Summersby, the British WAC who was Eisenhower's secretary during the war, wrote in her book, Eisenhower Was My Boss, on pages 30 and 167: "He was inclined to suffer from high blood pressure and neuritis was likely to visit his shoulder." "The general suffered bad headaches and complained about his blood pressure."

The neuritis, now diagnosed as bursitis, is still with the President, while high blood pressure is contributory to a heart condition.

SECRET ILLNESS IN PARIS

In May 1952, just before Eisenhower was to leave Paris, he suffered a 10-day siege of what was probably ileitis. Several high Republicans were in Paris to see him to prepare for the GOP convention, but were told Ike was busy with final plans concerning the defense of Europe, could see no one. Meanwhile he was running such a high fever that he was delirious and talked of moving troops and calling General Staff meetings.

Meanwhile, newsmen who did not know he was sick wanted a farewell press conference; the GOP politicians were getting restless; and General Ridgway was soon to arrive. A public appearance became inescapable.

Finally a French specialist was called in to assist Dr. Snyder. He took Ike off antibiotics, and shortly thereafter the general was well enough to ride to the airport to welcome Ridgway, though wearing dark glasses. His car was rushed to the privacy of an airplane hangar immediately afterward to let Ike rest.

This incident was never revealed to the public, but it was known to the doctors who pronounced him fit from "head to toe."

DIGESTION IN DENVER

On September 24, when Ike was first stricken in Denver, Dr. Snyder first announced at 8 a. m. that the President had suffered a "digestive upset." At noon the summer White House announced the President was suffering from "indigestion."

It was natural for Dr. Snyder to suspect indigestion, because Ike had a long history of what is now publicly called ileitis. Not only did it occur in Paris but in Key West, and several times in Washington. Later, it was admitted at the summer White House that Snyder had noted the "first sympton" of a heart attack as early as 2:45 a. m. though at 8 a. m. he called it a "digestive upset."

On February 15, 1956, immediately after Dr. Paul Dudley White's preduction that Ike could carry on "5 to 10 years" of active life, Dr. Samuel Levine, of the Harvard Medical School, challenged that anyone could predict a heart patient's life. Whereupon White agreed with Dr. Levine and pointed out that he had hedged his own prediction with such qualifying phrases as "uncertainties of the future," "chances," and "should." The public, however, didn't get Dr. White's fine print.

On May 12 when Eisenhower was given his "head to toe" physical examination, he was pronounced in splendid condition. Not a word was said about his long history of stomach upsets, now called ileitis.

On June 10, Dr. Snyder blandly told newsmen that Ike had had ileitis before. When newsmen inquired how the doctors could make an accurate diagnosis so rapidly, it was explained that they were familiar with his previous trouble.

On June 14, when newsmen asked Hagerty why the ileitis condition hadn't been given to the public after the "head-to-toe examination" he replied: "It didn't show up," and he referred newsmen to a previous statement by Snyder.

"In the head-to-toe examination," Snyder had previously explained, "there was no inflammation of the ileum."

Yet Snyder had cared for Ike in repeated cases at Key West, in Paris, in Washington, and had blandly admitted to newsmen that the President had a history of ileitis.

That is part of the record of how the American people have not been told the truth about the President's health. It's strongly suspected that perhaps the President himself has not been told the entire truth either.

The President's Health

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 25, 1956

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, because of the great interest in the matter, I ask permission to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article by Drew Pearson and one by Walter Lippmann on the President's Health. The articles follow:

[From the Washington Post and Times Herald]

PRESIDENT'S HEALTH IS PEARSON TOPIC

(By Drew Pearson)

Most American newsmen, along with this writer, were remiss in not reporting the real health of President Roosevelt when he ran for reelection in 1944. Less than 6 months after that reelection he was dead.

There were some legitimate reason's why F. D. R.'s health was not reported, among them wartime censorship, the fact that we did not see him much during the war, plus a natural hesitancy to report the unpleasant possibility that a man may die in office.

But when the Presidency of the United States influences, as it does, the peace and prosperity of the world, it is essential that American voters know the real facts of health, even beyond the medical bulletins, before they nominate or elect any man to the most important office in the world.

President Eisenhower himself has frankly expressed grave doubt about his health, even while the politicians, exactly as in Roosevelt's case, have been determined to make him run again.

Accordingly, here are some of the facts beyond the brief medical bulletins regarding the health of the man for whose speedy recovery the American people pray today.

Before the President was given his emergency operation it was necessary to administer a vitamin K, intravenously, in order to thicken his blood in preparation for the surgery. This was because he has been given an anticoagulant (Dicumarol) ever since his heart attack in Denver, which makes the blood so thin that if care is not taken there is a danger that it may seep through the body tissues.

If the thinning effect of the anticogulant had not been counteracted there could have been serious, even fatal, bleeding during the operation.

ANTICOAGULANTS

The administration of Dicumarol at Denver, though it can be dangerous, is considered one of the most important factors in Ike's heart recovery. Dicumarol was first recommended by Col. Thomas Mattingly, the heart specialist of Walter Reed Hospital, who had recently been studying at the Cornell Medical School under Drs. W. T. Foley and Irving S. Wright, two of the Nation's top experts on anticoagulants.

Dr. Foley had worked in a Japanese prison camp during the war, where he found that the nonfatty prison diet almost compeltely eliminated heart disease.

Dr. Wright, who his past president of the American Heart Association and is in charge of the vascular research section of the New York Hospital-Cornell Medical Center, recently gave significant testimony regarding anticoagulants before the Senate Appropriations Subcommittee.

At the beginning of his testimony, Dr. Wright noted that anticoagulants have been used on thousands of heart patients.

"Included in these," he observed, "is the President of the United States."

At one point, Senator LISTER HILL, of Alabama, asked: "Well, now, these anticoagulants you only use where the patient has had some form of thrombosis?"

"No," replied Dr. Wright. "We use them mostly after they have had one or more attacks, because it is not possible at present to predict with accuracy whether they are going to have an attack in the future."

Dr. Wright acqnowledged that administering anticoagulants can be dangerous.

"An anticoagulant should never be given except under careful laboratory and clinical supervision," he warned. "Because if a patient takes an excessive amount of anticoagulants he may have hemorrhage."

Dr. Wright sounded one optimistic note when he said:

"Though the use of anticoagulants for the acute episode is not completely established because of lack of time and study, there is strong evidence that following their episode these patients tend to live with fewer complications, and probably longer when they are on anticoagulant therapy."

While the Nation prays that the anticoagulants will reduce the complications, the public must realize that the chance of complications does exist. Any doctor who says otherwise is mixing politics with medicine.

[From the Washington Post and Times Herald of June 21, 1956]

TODAY AND TOMORROW

(By Walter Lippmann)

THE DOCTORS AND THE PRESIDENCY

The President, it appears, is taking it as a matter of course that the country is expecting him to decide once more whether he will run again. It may be useful to remind ourselves that the situation in which he finds himself is peculiarly difficult for him. For the doctors who must advise him, and for the press which must keep the people informed, the root of the difficulty is not so much medical as it is constitutional.

The President is the key figure in the American system; without his active guidance and control the system does not work. The President is elected for a fixed term of 4 years, and if he becomes in some measure incapacitated, there is no one to take his place. When, therefore, the President has had a serious illness, the crucial question is not his life expectancy. If he dies, the system provides that the Vice President take over. The crucial question is whether he can count on his energy and his personal powers over a period of 4 years.

For the system, as now established, makes no provisions for invalidism or for failing powers. This is what is in the back of people's minds when they listen to the medical opinions of the doctors. They are waiting to be reassured about the President's health for the next 4 years.

It is here that a misunderstanding, such as it is, has arisen between the doctors and the public. The doctors have been talking about the President's recover from his heart attack and from his operation. The politicians, who are playing for very high stakes, have been treating what the doctors say as an expert verdict on the President's fitness to carry the burden of the Presidency for a second term. These are not one and the same.

Owing to the fact that the President has a fixed term of office and that there is no one to substitute for him if he cannot carry the burden, the doctors are being pressed to make a prognosis which must, in the nature of things, be highly speculative. They are expected to say not only whether he has recovered from his heart attack and is recovering from the ileitis but really whether he will be in full vigor during a second term. If this were a parliamentary government on the British model, this question would not arise. The head of the Government would not be committed to a fixed term, and therefore it would not be necessary to do any medical guessing about what will happen in the future over a period of years.

The question does arise here, and in the case of President Eisenhower, given his age and medical history, it is a momentous question. The American system, as it works now in practice, cannot do with a sick or a failing President.

It can be said that the system is more defective than it needs to be, and that some of the worst features of it—as they were exhibited when Garfield and Wilson were disabled—could be remedied. It should become the established practice that when the President is ill, the Vice President takes over until the President recovers. There is little doubt that this is what the authors of the Constitution intended.

Any sick President—it might have been Eisenhower himself—can put this constitutional arrangement into effect. He can invite the Vice President to sign official documents, let the action be challenged in the courts, and have its validity tested promptly in the Supreme Court. The Vice President would not, of course, be sworn in as President. He would remain the Vice President, temporarily discharging the powers and duties of the President.

The alternative is the device of the regency, as operated by Mr. Sherman Adams during the two illnesses of President Eisenhower. This device has worked well enough because the President has not been badly incapacitated for a long time. The device would not work at all well in case of prolonged disability, such as invalidism or the failing powers of age. For the country would not long like the office of President administered by men who have not been elected to any office.

But when all has been said and done about remedying the gross defects of the system, it will still be true that there is no substitute in a presidential system of government for a strong President in the full possession of his powers. This truth is the point of reference for the decision that must be made by the President, and, if he decides to run, then later on by the country.

From what the President said when he was making his first decision we know that after the doctors have said all that they are able to say, he has no choice but to reach his conclusions by applying his commonsense, informed by his experience of the office of President. The country will have to make its judgment in the same way.

Custer's Last Stand

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BARRATT O'HARA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 25, 1956

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, today is the 80th anniversary of a tragic and historic event. It was 80 years ago today that Custer with 224 men under his command fell in combat with the Sioux Indians, one of the few times in our natiinal history when an entire command of American soldiers was destroyed, without a single survivor left to tell the story.

That the story of Custer's last stand has lost none of its interest to Americans is evidence by the Chicago Tribune of this morning devoting the larger part of four columns on its first page to a reproduction of Walter S. Oschman's famous painting and the beginning of John R. Thompson's account of the battle of June 25, 1876, which by unanimous consent I am extending my remarks to include, as follows:

LAST STAND OF CUSTER BATTLE AGAINST ODDS

(By John H. Thompson)

Mrs. Elizabeth Custer, astride her own horse, watched beside her husband, Lt. Col. George Armstrong Custer, mounted on his favorite sorrel, Vic, as the 7th Cavalry Regiment, almost 600 strong, rode out of Fort Abraham Lincoln in the Dakota territory.

The date was May 7, 1876. The band played "Garry Owen," the 7th's new anthem, and then broke into "The Girl I Left Behind Me," bringing tears to the eyes of wives who lined the street. For a great many, including Mrs. Custer, it was the last time they saw their husbands.

BATTLE 80 YEARS AGO

On June 25, 80 years ago today, Custer, not yet 37, known as the daring boy general of the Civil War, made his last stand on the bluffs above the Little Big Horn River in southeastern Montana. His foe, the Teton Sioux Indians, annihilated a major portion of his command. Custer reverted to his permanent rank of captain after the Civil War and then was promoted to lieutenant colonel.

That battle, one of the most controversial in the Army's history, originally had been called, inaccurately, Custer's massacre. It was, in fact, a true battle, a last stand against what has been called the finest light cavalry in the world, the plains Indians.

Custer was found amid a heap of dead soldiers on a hill. With him died 224 other men. Not one soldier who was with Custer that afternoon survived to tell the story, but 2 miles away other members of the regiment held out until relieved by a column of infantry.

CUSTER GIVEN LEEWAY

Brig. Gen. Alfred H. Terry, commanding the department of the Dakotas, had expected to find the Sioux camped near the junction of the Big Horn and Little Big Horn Rivers. Custer's cavalry was to hit them from the south, pinching them against Terry's slower moving infantry, coming down the Yellowstone and Big Horn Rivers from the north.

But Custer's orders gave him considerable leeway. It was estimated that he would face 1,000 Sioux, or at the most 1,500. What lay ahead were 2,000 tepees, and 4,000 to 8,000 warriors.

Custer did not know that he was following the trail used by reinforcements of Chief Crazy Horse. Only a week before they had routed another Army column on the nearby Rosebud River, a defeat unknown to Custer.

Early on June 25, believing his dusty column moving north had been spotted by the enemy, Custer split his command into four sections and pressed forward. He told his officers he was certain the 7th cavalry could take care of anything. He ignored the warnings of his Indian scouts.

RIDES IN SUPPORT

Maj. Marcus A. Reno was given Troops A, M, and G, told to ford the Little Big Horn to the left (west), and attack with his 112 men when he came in sight of the teepees. Capt. F. W. Benteen, with Troops H, D, and K, was to sweep far out on Reno's left flank.

The pack train was left with 85 soldiers of Troop B for escort, while Custer rode off with Troops I, F, C, E, and L, on Reno's right, but separated from him by the river and high bluffs. Custer said he would support Reno with the main column.

Coming in sight of the Indian village, Reno was surprised at its apparent strength. Before him lay the lodges of the Hunkpapa, most fierce of the warrior societies, under Chief Gall, the Santee, Ogala, Brule, Minneconjou, Sans Arc, Blackfeet, and Cheyenne.

"Left front into line" called Reno. "Load pistols. Gallop."

"And away we went down the valley," Trooper John (Big Fritz) Siversten was to recall later.

TAKEN BY SURPRISE

Other members of Reno's command remember seeing Custer, "Yellow Hair" or "Long Hair" as his Indian enemies called him, with others on the high bluff across the river, cheer the charge and wave their hats, before they rode off and disappeared.

Gall, Chief Rain in the Face, and other Indian warriors later said the attack took them by surprise—but this is doubtful. While they rushed to their grazing horses, all was confusion in the village as old men, women, and children fled south.

Reno, new to Indian fighting, and apparently worried over the size of the enemy force, halted his charge short of the village. He ordered his men to fight dismounted. They had single shot carbines and pistols, while the Indians had new Remington and Winchester repeating rifles in addition to bows and arrows.

Had Reno held on with his charge, say the Indian veterans, he would have split the village, leaving it wide open to an attack by Custer from the north. His halt gave the Indians time to form their lines.

RENO ORDERS RETREAT

Reno fell back into a strong position in timber, near the river. As the Indians advanced, he ordered a withdrawal across the river to the opposite high bluffs. Confusion resulted, and in the retreat he lost 35 men.

As the Indians were pressing their attack, Chief Gall received word of Custer's presence, north of the village, where he had come under attack from forces led by Crazy Horse, Rain in the Face, Red Horse, Two Moons, and other chiefs.

Leaving a covering force to contain Reno, Gall and his whooping warriors raced back to join the attack on Custer. About this time, some of Reno's people heard two volleys fired, 5 miles downstream, in Custer's direction, in what was later interpreted as a distress signal.

It was about this time, too, that Custer's last message got through. It was to Benteen, on the far left flank, and it said: "Benteen, come on. Big village. Be quick. Bring packs."

INDIANS LAUNCH ATTACK

Benteen came on, at a gallop, but was only able to reach Reno's beleagured forces, pinned down by Indian sharpshooters. Custer remained alone downstream.

In later years, Chief Gall told how the Indians formed their lines on a ridge, lower than Custer's, and then launched their final attack.

Gall hit Custer's left flank, using both mounted and dismounted fighting men, while Crazy Horse, Crow King, White Bull, Sitting Bull, Hump, and other chiefs drove hard against the center.

Some writers, trying to reconstruct the battle, have it that the battle lasted from noon until evening. Gall and other chiefs said that Custer's last stand was over in 35 minutes, before the warriors cut their scalp locks and others looted and mutilated the dead.

Custer escaped mutilation. Among the dead were his younger brothers, Thomas and Boston, and a New York war correspondent, Mark Kellogg.

With Custer disposed of, the Indians turned their full force on Reno and Benteen, for 2 more days. The Indians were readying for the kill on June 27 when they spotted the dust of Terry's feared infantry, and escaped to the south.

Many reasons have been offered for the Custer tragedy. Captain Benteen [later a general], had this to say:

"Too many Indians, good shots, good riders, and the best fighters the sun ever shone on."

Foreign-Aid Program Should Be Scrutinized

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 25, 1956

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I am including at this point an article that appeared in the Beloit Daily News on the subject of our foreign-aid program.

The overwhelming evidence is that our people are demanding that this program be carefully examined in the light of present-day world conditions.

The article follows:

[From the Beloit Daily News of June 16, 1956]

FOREIGN AID PROGRAM SHOULD BE SCRUTINIZED

Although the Senate Foreign Relations Committee upped the foreign-aid bill by some $715 million more than the House proposed, supporters of program are not so sure that the full Senate will give its approval.

The drastic House slash in President Eisenhower's foreign-aid proposal cannot be laid entirely at the door of isolationists, economizers or those who may be seeking political capital because it is an election year. The margin of passage of the bill was too large for that.

There is ample evidence "back home" that a growing number of citizens is not satisfied that we are getting our money's worth out of the foreign-aid program, not especially now, but for some months past.

When the program first was launched it was designed to get European countries on their feet economically, and to help rearm the free world in the face of Russian, and later, Chinese threats.

Now that Europe is in good shape and the free world is partially rearmed, some consideration should be given to the present world situation with Russia inaugurating seductive manners along with new economic and political approaches.

There are a number of questions that need answering. How wise is the present emphasis on military aid, especially because of the shift to nuclear weapons? Would it be more desirable to place less emphasis on grants and more on long term loans? Should we step up our technical assistance programs (point 4) which are generally considered one of our more successful aid ventures?

Should we give more attention to short term projects—those that are more immediately beneficial—such as streets, highways, bridges, sanitary developments—rather than long term projects like hydroelectric and industrial plants? What should our attitude be towards neutrals?

Proposals have been made for a comprehensive, nonpartisan study of our entire foreign aid program. It is too late now to expect such a study would produce results applicable for this present measure. But a study now would be beneficial for next year.

Candidates in either party who stand for an overhauling of our foreign aid will find voters receptive.

Fifteenth Anniversary of Deportation of Over 40,000 Lithuanians by the Soviet Union

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 25, 1956

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following petition submitted to President Eisenhower by the Lithuanian-American youth organizations calling attention to the cruel and unjust deportation of more than 40,000 Lithuanians from their homeland by the Soviet Union:

PETITION

JUNE 14, 1956.

The Honorable DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER,
President of the United States,
The White House, Washington, D. C.

On this sad date, June 14, commemorating the 15th anniversary of the cruel deportation of more thaln 40,000 Lithuanians from their native land to suffering and death in the Siberian wastelands, we the undersigned members and supporters of the Lithuanian American Youth organizations, consider it our duty to submit respectfully to you on this occasion the following statement:

On June 15, 1940 the Soviet Union, by force and in violation of treaties, invaded and occupied, and continues to occupy and despoil Lithuania. After 1 year, mass deportations of the Lithuanian people to Siberia and other Asiatic regions of the Soviet Union were begun. As a result of these deportations up to the present day more than 150,000 Lithuanians have been banished from their homeland and imprisoned in slave-labor camps of these regions.

Many of those deported died because of hunger, intense cold and overwork. However, numerous letters from Siberia which are being currently received in the United States show that a part of those deported are still alive and that they are suffering intensely under difficult conditions in these desolate areas of the Soviet Union.

Therefore we respectfully petition you, Mr. President, and the Government of the United States of America to explore all possibilities for righting the wrongs done to Lithuania and to take all possible measures to:

1. Restore sovereign right and self-government to Lithuania;

2. Return as soon as possible our deported parents, sisters, and brothers to their native country of Lithuania.

Following are the signatures of 38,324 members and supporters of the Lithuanian American Youth organizations.

Kennedy for Vice President?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 18, 1956

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am happy to call to the attention of the Members of Congress a very noteworthy editorial appearing in the Chicago Daily Sun-Times today.

I know that it reflects the feelings of the majority of the citizens of the great Commonwealth of Massachusetts, who, regardless of political party, are proud of the record that Senator KENNEDY has established in the State and the Nation.

The editorial follows:

KENNEDY FOR VICE PRESIDENT?

There has been increasing talk that if Adlai Stevenson is the Democratic presidential nominee, his running mate may well be Senator JOHN F. KENNEDY, of Massachusetts.

To the practical politician the possibility of a Stevenson-Kennedy ticket has a certain allure. For one thing, KENNEDY is a Roman Catholic, and, as some of the politicians see it, KENNEDY's presence on the ticket might tend to offset the antagonism toward Stevenson that arises from his being a divorced man.

Moreover, many politicians of both parties feel that the day is now past when a Catholic, particularly one seeking the vice presidency, would necessarily be a handicap to a national ticket. In fact, they feel that under certain circumstances such a selection might be helpful.

But apart from such considerations, the politicians who look favorably on KENNEDY cite his youth—39. He is only a few months younger than Senator RICHARD M. NIXON, of California, was when he received the Vice Presidential nod in 1952.

In addition, KENNEDY comes from the strategically important Bay State which, after years of voting for Democratic presidential candidates, went overwhelmingly for Dwight D. Eisenhower in 1952.

Yet, despite Ike's better than 200,000-vote margin over Adlai in Massachusetts, KENNEDY managed to beat one of Mr. Eisenhower's principal supporters, the then Senator Henry Cabot Lodge, by 70,000 votes. Many Democrats feel that KENNEDY's unquestioned personal popularity in his home State might serve to return it to Democratic ranks in 1956 if he were No. 2 man on the ticket.

That belief may be no more than wishful thinking. For just as it has been proved that a popular President cannot transfer his glamor to a congressional candidate he wants elected, neither is there any evidence that a Vice President who is popular in a given State could carry it for his running mate who might not be as popular or even downright unpopular.

Nevertheless, there is no doubt that young KENNEDY has an extremely pleasant personality with a broad appeal. He is respected by many business leaders no less than by many labor leaders. Rank-and-file political workers are drawn to him and, conversely, so are many intellectuals.

His recent address at Harvard commencement ceremonies have been favorably commented upon by the intellectuals and scholars whose cause he defended against attacks by anti-intellectual politicians.

"The political profession," KENNEDY told the graduates of his alma mater, "needs to have its temperature lowered in the cooling waters of the scholastic pool. We need both the technical judgment and the disinterested viewpoint of the scholar to prevent us from becoming imprisoned by our own slogans."

KENNEDY is himself a scholar of some ability. His recent book, Profiles in Courage, is a scholarly study of United States Senators who had the intestinal fortitude and firmness of principle to risk sacrificing their careers by supporting causes that were unpopular—though right—in their day.

But a politician, to remain in office, has to be a politician first. It was only when he was laid up for many months, recovering from an operation to correct World War II combat injuries, that KENNEDY found time to write his book.

His frank admission at Harvard that scholars might be better trusted than pressure-beset politicians to find real solutions to such matters as the long-range farm problem was itself a courageous concession.

The fog of anti-intellectualism that has lately gripped this country is contrary to American tradition, as KENNEDY pointed out. In trying to help to lift it, he was rendering the country a real service.

It is easy to see why the youthful KENNEDY appeals to so many ordinary citizens—and to the politicians of his party.

"Snow Job" Seen To Run Ike Again

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN D. DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 25, 1956

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, a very interesting chronicle of how a sick man is being driven by desperate politicians to an arduous 4 years of toil at a job for which he has neither enthusiasm nor health was written in the Washington (D. C.) Post and Times Herald of Wednesday, June 20, 1956, by Mr. Drew Pearson.

That man is, of course, Dwight D. Eisenhower, and the task is the Presidency. Parenthetically it is a job which would probably last longer than the life expectancy of one who has undergone two such serious attacks according to standard insurance mortality tables. The desperate men are the White House staff and the Republican Cabinet members and politicians who see their hold on their jobs slipping with each new attack the President undergoes, and weakening as the public awareness of the seriousness of the President's two sicknesses increases.

While I sympathize with these men, it is said to have one's job depend on so slender a thread, nevertheless, the good of the country demands a more sound base than the shaky state of the President's health, the crumbling sands that the job security of these men rests upon.

The article is as follows:

"SNOW JOB" SEEN TO RUN IKE AGAIN

(By Drew Pearson)

There's been a heat wave in Washington. Despite this, the greatest snow job ever seen by newspapermen is taking place in the Nation's Capital.

It's a snow job to convince a 65-year-old man who has had a serious heart attack plus a major operation, who's laid up for 4 days with an intensely uncomfortable tube reaching to the pit of his stomach, and a tube stuck in the veins of his arm to get nourishment, and who didn't want to run in the first place, that he must, come what may, run again.

It's also a snow job to convince the American public that this man will be hopping out of bed in a short time, more fit than ever to run, and that he's making major decisions affecting the peace of the world despite a post-operation fever and the excruciatingly uncomfortable tube through the nose to the depths of his bowels.

Vivisection with all its cruelty could be no more inhuman than the almost public torture to which a little group of aids have put this man for the purpose of convincing him, as much as the public, that an unwilling, weary body must be thrown into the political breach again.

SETBACK FOR PEACE

However, there are things more important than winning an election or keeping a political party in power.

This country was shaken and set back in the quest for peace when a Democratic White House staff and a President's wife hid from the country the fact that Woodrow Wilson was incapable of performing the duties of his office.

The country again was set back in 1944 when a group of willful Democratic leaders bent on staying in power, rammed through the nomination of the aging, perhaps dying, Franklin Roosevelt as the war was coming to an end, when Harry Truman had little preparation for the great postwar task ahead.

Today a little group of willful Republicans are determined to make history repeat.

However, one man who will not put political greed ahead of country, I am convinced, is Dwight D. Eisenhower—if he knows the facts. But the cabal around him has been conducting a careful psychological snow job as he lies helpless in bed, not only to keep the facts from him but to keep them from the public—facts which the Mayo Clinic and the New England Medical Journal report regarding the probable recurrence of his stomach ailment.

PSYCHOLOGICAL BUILD-UP

The pattern is exactly that followed at Denver and thereafter to convince an un-

willing, reluctant, even protesting President, that he must be the vehicle for their return to power.

That pattern is ably described by Fletcher Knebel of Look magazine, published by Ike's close friend, Mike Cowles.

"Hall decided on a huge bluff," says Look, in describing how the GOP chairman carefully built up the public's and Ike's own confidence that he could run after his heart attack. "He decided to face the New York newsmen and tell them that nothing had changed. Hall had not the faintest hope that Ike ever would run again * * * but he boldly told the incredulous newsmen there had been no change.

"Gradually he erected a psychological framework * * * and gradually Ike came to believe it was quite natural that a man who had had a heart attack should run for President.

"Had the wrong thing been said at that time," revealed Knebel, "the idea of a second term might never have been considered seriously. Milton said privately there wasn't 'one chance in a hundred' that Ike would seek another term. Mamie assumed her husband would be through with politics."

But the men around Ike, using astute psychological build-ups, saying the right thing at the right time, completely reversed that negative attitude.

FATAL MIDNIGHT

The rest of the story is well-known—except the manner in which the work piled up, the tempo of the White House pace stepped up. First, there were few appointments, then a full schedule. First, there were to be no ceremonies, no dinners, then a round of Gridiron Club, White House Correspondents, White House Photographers dinners. At first there was to be no campaigning, then definite hints, in fact, demands that there must be some barnstorming, that Ike would have to tour the restless farm belt.

Politics is a cruel business. The more the Democrats talked about a part-time President, the faster became the pace—until that fateful midnight June 7 when the pace proved too much.

Then within minutes after the patient had come out from the anesthetic, the psychological build-up, the snow-job began all over again.

"He will be able to run as planned," announced Maj. Gen. Leonard Heaton, who if the same patient were still in the Army would have retired him for both health and age, but who now pushed him as he lay dazed and helpless with a tube down his stomach and a tube sticking in his arm, into the much more crushing burden of another 4 years as President.

A New Thought on Foreign Aid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 25, 1956

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, recently Benjamin F. Fairless, president of the executive advisory committee of United States Steel Corp., said:

Sometimes I think that instead of merely continuing to pour gifts into these backward nations, we would serve them better by devoting more of our efforts to showing them how everyone makes a profit when people exchange goods and services with each other. We should explain to them that no person can make a legitimate and honest profit without serving or supplying other people with something they want and need.

I believe that a correct understanding and acceptance of that idea would do far more to feed and clothe the world's people than would all the charity of which we are capable. Further, it would increase the self-respect of people who would no longer be objects of charity. They would become skilled and proud producers, and thereby earn the service of others by serving them in turn.

And to serve each other better is—I suspect—the real reason why we were put on this earth in the first place.

Mr. Speaker, this suggestion by Mr. Fairless has considerable merit; however, our Socialist friends and do-gooders will reject it immediately. They believe that only the Government is capable of making decisions for the people and directing production and services for all of the people without profit but to the state.

Status of Forces Agreements

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK T. BOW
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 25, 1956

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, in an extension of remarks made in debate on the amendment I offered to the Mutual Security Act of 1956, my colleague from Minnesota said that for us to insist on full sovereignty over every American soldier off duty wherever he is would require us to withdraw United States troops from all foreign bases, that it would mean abandoning the world to the Kremlin. He said the adoption of the Bow amendment would force us to give up the whole program of world security and withdraw from all our foreign bases; that at one stroke the Kremlin would have won. This is a good example of the scare argument which proponents of the status of forces agreements advance as a last resort.

There has never been any proof offered that this would be true. In hearings before the Foreign Affairs Committee no country was named as having demanded the right to prosecute our servicemen as a condition for permitting them to help defend that country. Granting Iceland exclusive criminal jurisdiction over our troops has not prevented a demand that we leave. If our troops are permitted to stay it will not be because they can try our men in their courts. It will be because the money we pour into Iceland through manning the air base there accounts for about 20 percent of the gross income of that country.

Tied in with the scare argument is a bit of smear technique. There is the covert suggestion that anyone who now seeks to recover constitutional rights for our servicemen is in league with Russia. The smear has often been substituted for argument by advocates of a cause when not sure of their position. I do not think it will receive credence in this instance. There are too many loyal, forthright, patriotic Americans who are demanding that the status of forces agreements be changed. The agreements contain provisions and the procedure for seeking modification. I presume even the molders of the agreements thought these might be needed and used. "Such agreements are often revised," a court in Japan observed in an opinion last month in a case in which an American officer was a defendant.

This Japanese court, in the same opinion, also said:

It is a well-established rule of international law that an armed force stationed in a foreign country in accordance with a treaty, is not subject to civil or criminal jurisdiction of the receiving state.

The same persons who seek to scare and smear will also sneer at that statement. They will say that a similar declaration by Chief Justice Marshall in 1811, the opinions of our Supreme Court in two later decisions, our position taken in the Supreme Court of Canada in 1943, the declaration of this rule of international law in the Uniform Manual of Courts-Martial, are all wrong. In order to ignore authority to the contrary they announce dogmatically that such a rule did not exist and seek to quell remonstance with this scare, smear, and sneer logic. Our internationally minded statesmen stubbornly refuse to make an effort to improve the position in which they forced our servicemen. They refuse to use the provisions of the agreement which make revision possible.

Tax Discrimination Against Good-Neighbor Travel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL J. KILDAY
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 25, 1956

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an editorial from the San Antonio Evening News of June 19, 1956, with reference to H. R. 5265. I agree that the present discrimination as to travel taxes should be removed. I hope final action on this proposal can be had before adjournment.

The editorial follows:

END COSTLY TAX DISCRIMINATION AGAINST GOOD-NEIGHBOR TRAVEL

Currently stalled in congressional conference committee is a bill (H. R. 5265) that is of major importance to San Antonio and all south Texas. Adjournment is nearing; and unless the people in this region are heard from in no uncertain terms, the bill may die in that pigeonhole. Should that happen the depressing effect on commercial air travel will touch most everyone's pocket, however indirectly.

Briefly, the history of the issue is this: The Federal Government during World II imposed a 10-percent tax on transportation, not to raise revenue particularly but to discourage travel on war-burdened facilities.

Currently, the transportation tax is still levied on all domestic travel. But travel to foreign countries is not taxed at all, except to Mexico, Central America, the Caribbean, Alaska, Canada, and Hawaii.

That is obvious discrimination. And it is discrimination that hurts one of San Antonio's major sources of commercial income—tourism. We are, of course, primarily interested in removing the tax discrimination against travel to Mexico, Central America, and the Caribbean, for which San Antonio is a major air gateway.

Both Houses of Congress have approved a tax-removal bill, thus agreeing to its propriety in principle. And Uncle Sam, in the Inter-American Economic Conference at Rio in 1954, pledged its good neighbors that the tax discrimination would be eliminated.

The Texas congressional delegation has worked hard to reform the transportation-tax law for equitable treatment among all travelers and all areas. Civic and business groups of the major Texas cities, including San Antonio, have added much to the effort.

All that should not be allowed to go wasted by failure to reach conference agreement on minor differences before congressional adjournment. Write your Congressman and Senators today; let's get this costly discrimination removed.

A Personal Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 25, 1956

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the following column by Stewart Alsop, as it appeared in the Washington Post of June 24, 1956, makes interesting reading:

JOE GETS THE LOWDOWN ON IKE

(By Stewart Alsop)

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—This is a personal report from Stewart Alsop to his brother and partner, Joseph Alsop, who has returned from abroad.)

DEAR JOE: You will find that the President's second serious illness in 9 months completely overshadows the political scene here at home. Indeed, you will feel, I think, as though you were hearing a cracked record playing over and over the refrain that became so familiar last fall and winter: "Will he run? Will he run? Will he run?"

But there is a difference this time. You remember how, in the first weeks after the heart attack, it was universally assumed that the President would withdraw. This time, you will find, almost everybody assumes that the President will stay in the race.

You remember also how, as the weeks and months passed after the heart attack it seemed more and more likely that the President would run, until his announcement in February came as no surprise at all. I wonder if the same thing might happen again in reverse?

As I wrote a few days ago, the Republican high command expresses absolute confidence not only that the President will run, but that he will so announce very shortly. It is of course vitally important to the Republican leadership that the President end the current speculation by making his "positive" announcement as soon as possible.

But Press Secretary Jim Hagerty swears that the President has given no hint of his intentions. So there may well be more than a pinch of wishful thinking in the confidence I reported.

The President himself, as he lies stricken for the second time in 9 months, must be thinking long and hard whether he can carry on for four more years. As you know, we newspapermen have all become amateur physicians since the President's heart attack and operation. But it is not necessary to go to a medical school to understand a few harsh facts.

Coronary thrombosis is a serious disease. So is ileitis, especially within a few months of a coronary. There is a risk of recurrence in both diseases. And, in the President's case, the risk is, obviously, compounded.

A few days ago, we got a letter from an insurance executive, from which I quote excerpts:

"Mr. Eisenhower is not an insurable risk on any basis because of the coronary attack. * * * Expectation of life according to the standard mortality table would be about 4.30 years. Now take the recent ileitis. * * * Here expectation of life if 3.54 years. What the life expectation is in combination we don't know. We all know that while the mortality table is quite an accurate guide there are people who outlive it. Mr. Eisenhower will get more than normal care. But if he is not an acceptable risk for life insurance on not 1 but 2 counts, is he an acceptable candidate for the presidency?"

After the President's heart attack, you remember, we discussed at length the problem of writing about matters that had both profound political implications and painful personal implications.

It is repugnant to write in cold statistical terms about the life expectancy of a well-loved human being. But when the office of the presidency is involved, we agreed, the risk that its occupant may die in office, or become incapacitated, simply must be considered.

The risk is always there, of course, because we are all mortal. But it is irresponsible to pretend that the risk is not especially great in the President's case. Perhaps the risk is worth taking.

You and I have been critical of the Eisenhower administration, particularly in the defense field (and you should read the testimony before the Symington committee—we owe an apology to our readers for having been blithering optimists). But it is true, as you wrote at the time of the President's heart attack, that "Dwight D. Eisenhower's greatest single contribution has been bringing us all back to a sense of true American style."

Very great risks may be worth taking, in order to continue that contribution. A candidate for the presidency need not necessarily be an acceptable risk for life insurance.

But I think you will be angered, as I have been, by the attempt to propagate the myth that the President is already in fine shape; that he has his hands firmly on the reins of Government; that the very serious operation he has undergone has been as good for him as a nice long vacation, and so on.

Where so much is at stake, the facts must be faced. No doubt the President, as he lies in his hopital bed, or sits in his wheel chair, is facing them squarely.

Can Any Nation Keep Neutral?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN D. DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 20, 1956

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, occasionally in these troubled times it happens that voices of great men rise to clearly enunciate issues and to dispel the fog of misunderstanding, ignorance and distrust which cloud our understanding of basic problems. Such a problem has been that of the new policies of neutralism and nonalinement which have begun to manifest themselves throughout the world, particularly in Asia. This problem has been especially difficult because of the nature of the peril of Communist Russia and its expansionism, which although it changes its form in many subtle ways, to deceive the gullible, never really changes its ultimate end: the conquest of the world, and the subjugation of the remaining freemen throughout the world.

Such a voice is raised by a true friend of America, the Honorable Carlos P. Romulo, Ambassador to the United States from our sister democracy and ally, the Philippine Islands. I here insert into the RECORD an excerpted version of a speech which I took from the Detroit (Mich.) Times of June 11, 1956, together with the editorial comment which precedes it, which is also worthy of note:

CAN ANY NATION KEEP NEUTRAL?

(Editors Note.—The fatal flaw in the neutarlism policies of some Asian-African nations was brilliantly set forth in the speech to graduates of the University of Richmond by Carlos P. Romulo, Philippines Ambassador to the United States. The speech has significance in view of the recent visit here by President Sukarno of Indonesia, advocate of neutralism. Because of that the Detroit Times publishes here an excerpted version of the Romulo address.)

(By Carlos P. Romulo)

During the Asian-African conference held at Bandung in April of last year, President Sukarno of Indonesia and other Asian leaders spoke eloquently and with reverence of the ideas of the men who made revolutionary America.

They invoked the names of Jefferson, of Washington, of Paul Revere. They saw, and rightly so, in the gathering power of 20th century Asia, a special affinity with the 18th century American revolutionaries.

But they did not always reveal their understanding of the message that came to us of this century from your forebears of another era.

Some of the participants at the Bandung conference used the names of your illustrious men of 1776 to justify a stagnant neutralism in these days of conflict between Soviet imperialism and democratic freedom.

No man, no nation, wanting to be free or to remain free, can be neutral today.

Neutralism assumes, by the very meaning of the word, that there is some good in both sides, some evil in both sides.

Neutralism means that one can stand aside and let others fight out the great issues of modern man.

Neutralism is the wife who watches the bear chase her husband, and who says impartially, "Go it, husband. Go it, bear."

CAN YOU BE A NEUTRALIST?

Is it really possible to stand aside today? Is it really possible for anyone, anywhere, to be a neutralist?

If there is little difference between freedom and totalitarianism, then the answer is "Yes."

If there is no important difference between being a free man and being a slave, then the answer is "Yes."

If slave-labor camps, ridicule of religion, suppression of free ideas and thinking, dishonesty and duplicity in human affairs, idolatry of a man as a hero and a patriot for over a decade and then suddenly debunking him as a murderer and a traitor—and this by his former associates and accomplices—if all these mean nothing to us, then the answer is yes, we can stand aside and be neutral.

Communism prepares for world conquest, whether by war or by the clever uses of cold peace.

To fail to see the difference, superficial as well as basic, between the United States of America and the Soviet Union is to dispute the facts of life of this century.

Is it possible to conceive that Thomas Jefferson, alive today, would be neutral between his credo and the Soviet philosophy?

Yet we find some of the Asian and African neutralists—and Europeans as well—using the principles of America's great men of freedom as arguments for neutralism.

What Jefferson and Washington said about colonialism, about man's freedom, is as true as it was in the days of the American revolution.

The subjugation of man is as wrong today as it was then.

The evils of colonialism were bad then. They are bad today.

REAL PURPOSE OF COMMUNISM

But to use the desire for freedom from an old colonialism to blind oneself to the menace of the new colonialism, communism, is to play the ostrich.

It is worse, for the ostrich has only himself to lose. The neutralist leader today endangers all his own people and the rest of the world as well.

We know now that self-government is the neutral state of organized man. It is compounded of self-knowledge, self-respect, and self-control. It is the product of love for one's homeland and for one's countrymen.

But it will not work at all without an overriding love of that abstract idea—liberty. You cannot have proper government without liberty, and you cannot have liberty without proper government.

That is why I am disturbed by the new neutralism, which accepts the old fallacy that liberty is a sometime thing—like the curate's famous egg, good in spots.

The Dutch, the French, the British colonial powers had faults. Refusing to understand the tremendous urge of great peoples for self-government, they stayed so long that they had to be removed, sometimes forcibly.

But if Dutch or British or French imperialism was wrong, how wrong then is Soviet imperialism.

Never in the history of man has there been an imperialism so destructive of the free spirit, so ruinous of man's yearning for self-respect, so cynical about the dignity of the individual, so designed to degrade men rather than improve their lives, as the imperialism of the Soviet Union.

The actual purpose of the Soviet imperialists is to destroy the free powers, not to gain freedom for the colonial peoples.

THAT KIND OF APPEAL IS SUICIDE

The true nationalist leader understands this—he should understand it instinctively. He wants freedom for his people. He does not equate the Soviet Union with the free world. He does not insist that the conflict between the Soviet Union and those nations which are still free is no concern of his.

He does not say:

"I shall walk on the other side of the street."

Instead he says:

"I am for freedom; therefore I am against communism."

Some neutralist leaders say to the free world:

"We want your help. Give us food. Give us know-how. Give us capital. Give us the tools, and we will build our freedom. But do not ask us to be your partners. We do not want you to give us arms.

"We want no military assistance. For we are neutral between you and the Soviet imperialists. It is only a matter of degree between you and the Soviet."

I suggest that this kind of appeal is not neutralism but suicide. The differences between the free world and the Soviet world are not academic. They are real.

The new imperialism which today smiles and bows and tips its hat in courtesy is not interested in Asian freedom or African nationalism. Soviet imperialism is interested only in the advancement of the Soviet Union and the suppression of those ideas which are the basis of the free world, the hope of oppressed people everywhere.

It does not allow a special category for those who would be neutral, any more than Hitler or the Japanese did in World War II.

Petition in Support of the Siler Bill, H. R. 4627

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH A. ROBERTS
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 25, 1956

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statements. All signers of these petitions are bona fide residents of Alabama:

ALABAMA WOMAN'S CHRISTIAN TEMPERANCE UNION,
BIRMINGHAM, ALA., *June 7, 1956.*

Hon. KENNETH A. ROBERTS.

DEAR SIR: We should appreciate you using your influence to help get those beer ads off the air. Don't let us down please. Vote to report Siler bill, H. R. 4627, favorably.

Please find enclosed petition with 26 names favoring the Siler bill.

Any service rendered to help bring about better legislation will be deeply appreciated.

We are,

Very truly yours,
Mrs. MAE S. WALTON,
State Legislative Director of Alabama and W. C. T. U. Members of 45 Local Unions Over the State.

To Our Senators and Representatives in Congress:

We, the undersigned, respectfully petition you to exercise the proper discretion vested in you by passing legislation to prohibit the transportation of alcoholic beverage advertising in interstate commerce, and its broadcasting over the air, a practice which nullifies the rights of the States under the 21st amendment to control the sale of such beverages. At a time when 1 out of 10 drinkers is becoming an alcoholic there should be no encouragement to increase the use of such beverages. Children and youth are being misled to consider them harmless, especially by the powerful audio and visual suggestions of radio and television.

R. E. Sansing, Woodstock, Ala.; Bertha S. Martin, Vance, Ala.; Mrs. A. G. Sansing, Mrs. R. E. Sansing, Woodstock, Ala.; Mrs. R. C. Ellison, Birmingham, Ala.; Mrs. N. C. Oglesby, Gadsden, Ala.; Mrs. J. D. Sansing, J. D. Sansing, Woodstock, Ala.; Mrs. Blanche Hubbard, Mrs. Leonard Kornegay, Eoline, Ala.; Mrs. W. T. Reaves, Jr., Centreville, Ala.; Mrs. Charles I. Murphy, Brent, Ala.; Mrs. Troy Sansing, Woodstock, Ala.; Kurtis Martin, Centreville, Ala.; Mrs. H. P. Beluin, Randolph, Ala.; Mrs. Bill Bolding, Maplesville, Ala.; Mrs. Ralph Lovelady, Randolph, Ala.; Mrs. Roy Martin, Mrs. Annie Lou Ambrose, Centreville, Ala.; T. Z. Martin, Vance, Ala.; A. G. Sansing, Woodstock, Ala.; Mrs. P. M. Walton, Birmingham, Ala.; Mrs. Lois Maxwell, Mrs. R. M. Livingston, Hueytown, Ala.; Mrs. H. C. Laudreville, Mrs. H. W. Walker, Birmingham, Ala.

ASHLAND, ALA., *June 11, 1956.*

The Honorable KENNETH ROBERTS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. ROBERTS: We, as members of the Woman's Missionary Union of the First Baptist Church, of Ashland, Ala., wish to express our approval of bill H. R. 4627, which, if passed, will outlaw alcoholic beverage advertising from radio, television, and national magazines, and also bills H. R. 7922 and H. R. 800, which will prohibit the serving of alcoholic beverages to passengers on aircraft in flight.

Mrs. Thurman Brewer, Mrs. Harold Green, Mrs. Doster Jordan, Mrs. J. W. Sertell, Mrs. Clarence Haynes, Mrs. Cecil Jenkins, Mrs. Cecil Sims, Mrs. C. C. Workman, Mrs. Herbert Pace, Mrs. Lena Stephens, Mrs. C. M. Pruit, Jr., Mrs. Bill Carpenter, Mrs. Lewis Walker, Jane M. Hardegree, Mrs. J. M. Herren, Mrs. J. J. Kirk, Mrs. R. Y. Gilbert, Mrs. Hal Haston, Mrs. E. W. Yorbrough, Miss Olin Thorp, Miss Dosia Haynes, Mrs. J. W. Stewart, Mrs. Claude Thomas, Mrs. A. G. Cusick, Mrs. Rita Allen, Mrs. B. C. Hooton, Mrs. J. R. Allen, Agnes Thorpe, Mrs. W. F. Saxon, Mrs. Amon Waits, Mrs. J. T. Nichols, Mrs. W. B. Robertson, Mrs. Robert Piltard, Mrs. A. T. East, Mrs. J. Y. Allen, Mrs. John Ferman, Annie Belle Workman, Mrs. F. B. Carpenter, Mrs. H. W. Hooton, Bertie R. Cason, Mrs. Radford McMath, Mrs. E. D. Riley, Jr., Mrs. Loellys Jordas, Mrs. Lester Gilbert, Mrs. Homer Yarbrough, Mrs. Elwood Gaither, Mrs. W. B. Dozier.

Address by George Meany, President of the AFL-CIO, Before the Graduates of the FBI National Academy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STYLES BRIDGES
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, June 25, 1956

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by Mr. George Meany, president of AFL-CIO, before the graduating class of the FBI National Academy on June 8, 1956.

Mr. Meany in his address emphasizes the dangers of communism and the necessity for being alert to those dangers. It is interesting to note that his views are very similar to those of Mr. J. Addington Wagner, national commander of the American Legion, and that the leader of the Nation's largest veterans organization and the leader of the largest labor organization both continue to express the absolute opposition of their groups to the Communist threat.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY AFL-CIO PRESIDENT GEORGE MEANY TO THE 57TH GRADUATING CLASS OF LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICERS AT THE FBI NATIONAL ACADEMY

I sincerely appreciate the honor and I welcome the opportunity of addressing you today. We are living at a time when the protection of American institutions is largely synonymous with the defense and very survival of human freedom everywhere. The

graduation exercises of a select group of men who are to bear such important responsibilities in the protection of our American institutions are, therefore, most unique and meaningful.

It is now 15 years since a president of the American Federation of Labor was honored with an invitation to address your commencement exercises. In the decade and half that has elapsed since my distinguished predecessor, the late William Green, addressed your institute many profound changes have taken place in the lives of whole nations—yes, in the lives of each and every one of us too. Much history has been made during these years. Sometimes I think too much history has been made. Humanity would be far better off today, if it had been spared some of this history.

It is not my purpose to talk about waters which have flown over the social, economic, and political dams of yesterday. Nothing would be more futile. I will instead try to deal with some of the most pressing problems which you of the American law-enforcing world and we, of the labor world, face in common. We face them as citizens of a great democracy. We face them as patriotic members of a free nation on whom there now rests the primary responsibility for preserving and protecting freedom while promoting peace.

What a task. And what an enemy we face. I do not take to mincing words. It takes just as little sense, and spells out just as much nonsense, to refuse to call an enemy of freedom what he really is, as it would to refuse to call a spade a spade. This is commonsense. This is good citizenship. This is truth. And that is why this is healthy democracy, that is, good Americanism.

Since the close of World War I, human freedom and individual dignity, which are the very essense of the American way of life, have made much progress in some countries. But human liberty and decency have also been increasingly menaced by a new enemy. This foe of freedom is a total enemy of all cherished values and individual dignity. His enmity to free institutions is organized on a total basis. His movements and activities, aspirations, and actions are totalitarian in nature. The common aim of all totalitarian movements—whether they be Communist, Nazi, Fascist, Falangist, Peronist, or Titoist—is to grab all power for the total destruction of all free institutions and freedom and for the setting up of a dictatorship. This dictatorship is to have total power over every human being in every phase of life, political, economic, cultural, spiritual, and whatnot.

That such a dictatorship leads to the horrible debasement of society, to outraging every human value, to savage brutality instead of rule by law, was most painfully dramatized in the latest revelations by Khrushchev regarding some of the crimes committed under the instructions of his late mentor and master, Stalin.

Of course, these various totalitarian enemies differ here and there, or now and then, in the degree of the total power they actually achieve and exercise. They never differ in the degree of total power they would like to wield over the people.

In varying degrees, these sworn enemies of all our democratic institutions pose as militant radicals. They use high-sounding phrases to hide their objectives. But none of them is actually progressive or really radical. One may be a reactionary without being totalitarian. But no one can be totalitarian without being reactionary. There is nothing as retrogressive, as ultrareactionary, as the totalitarian party organization—or front—whether it be of the red, brown, black, or yellow hue.

The Communist brand of dictatorship is, in many respects, the most subtle, sinister, and dangerous enemy of freedom. It demagogically poses as a higher form of democracy. It poses as a political movement, though it is anything but a political party in the normal democratic sense as we know it and live it. Furthermore, it operates as a worldwide conspiracy, as a fifth column, in every free country, with its head and heart in Moscow.

The only patriotism the Communist knows is loyalty to the clique or despot who happens to be at the helm of the Russian dictatorship at any particular moment.

That is why we of American labor have always said: There are no American Communists—there are only Communists in America. These subversives are fanatical believers in the doctrine that their end—Soviet world domination—justifies any and every means.

In view of the illusions some people who specialize in wishful thinking now have about the Soviet orbit moving toward democracy, it is most urgent that we take a sober and realistic look at the Communist "new look" and "big smile" tactics. You need no agitation or explanation from me on this score. The Communist criminals, like other dangerous criminals, are no less dangerous when they are well masked. In fact, when they are well masked they are even more dangerous. Political subversives who seek to rob the American people of their liberties are not good citizens or gentlemen merely because they say they are for freedom, or merely because they wear kid gloves in the process of their criminal operations. Well masked, fully camouflaged Communists, do not make the face of communism less ugly or its aim less sinister.

Any system of government in which a party is the government—particularly when there is only one party with absolute power over every walk of life—cannot be government by law. And without government by law, there can be no freedom.

No confessions in New York, no self-denunciation in Prague or Warsaw, no revelations in Moscow, no popular front or united front maneuver can alter this truth. Where the party is the state and has all power, there tyranny is unbridled. Tyranny cannot be reformed. It must be abolished.

Perhaps the most important reason why communism is the most dangerous totalitarian enemy of human liberty and human decency is because the Communist conspiracy has chosen the ranks of labor for their principal field of activity. The Communists have made the capture of the trade unions their main purpose and chief road to the seizure of power.

In modern industrial society, in the days of large-scale production and automation—on the threshold of the atomic age—control of the trade unions by Communists would enable the agents of a hostile foreign power to subvert our economic life, impose industrial paralysis on the land, and establish a firm foundation for overthrowing our democratic government and replacing it with a dictatorship over all our people—including the workers. This is exactly what happened in Czechoslovakia.

In our own country and in every other land outside the Iron Curtain, the Communist Party and its network of front outfits are a dangerous military installation of a hostile foreign power. Here we have a subversive conspiracy, a fifth column, employing the camouflage of a national political party and masquerading as a movement of social reform.

Can you imagine what chance democracy would have in present-day Germany, if the trade unions of the federal republic had fallen into Communist hands? Imagine what could happen to human freedom in our own country if the Communists were in control of the AFL–CIO. Consider the frightening instability of democracy in France and you will find it is, in small measure, due to the fact that the Communists have won commanding positions in the trade unions of that country.

Here, I must add that thanks largely to the special activities of American labor in support of the democratic free trade union organizations in Italy and France, the Communist grip on labor has been shaken there. These Soviet agents can no longer call the paralyzing political general strikes they used to inflict on the people of France and Italy.

We of American labor approach this Communist problem and face the Communist menace as citizens and as trade unionists. We fight this enemy unrelentingly, without a letup. We don't fall for any of the Communist maneuvers, because we do not believe in doing business with them—on a partnership or any other basis. We fight this enemy with the philosophy of democracy. We fight communism with practical deeds as well as hard-hitting publications in many tongues. We expose their fallacies and frauds and put communism in its proper and ugly light by comparing its Soviet paradise with our human American institutions and achievements. These are not always perfect—but they are always getting better.

If you will take a look at the Communist press in our country or in any other country, on either side of the Iron Curtain, you will see that we are under constant bitter attack. This obviously because our policies and activities really hurt the enemies of freedom everywhere.

Our philosophy as American citizens is that democracy and dictatorship cannot mix. The one is the very opposite of the other. They have nothing in common. They negate each other.

Our philosophy as trade unionists is that without democracy there can be no free trade unions and without free trade unions there can be no democracy.

To us of American labor, freedom is not only an ideal but a most vital and vested interest. That is why we do not go in for delegation exchanges with Moscow, Peiping, Warsaw or Bucharest. We have nothing to get from them and nothing to sell them. Not until there are free trade unions in these countries will there be freedom in these lands. As we see it, not until the Russians are free to visit each other and exchange opinions and have freedom of communication with each other will it be possible for Russians or Americans to correspond and communicate freely with each other and really get to know each other. That applies to Cabinet members and military experts no less than to union officials.

We have refused and will continue to refuse to lend respectability or provide democratic friendship and approval to any regime which has destroyed democracy at home and is dedicated to the destruction of democracy abroad. We did not send delegations to Fascist Italy, Nazy Germany, of Falangist Spain and we won't send any to Russia, Mao Tse-tung China, or to any other paradise behind the Iron Curtain. We were militantly anti-Nazi and not just non-Nazi. We are militantly anti-Communist and not merely non-Communist.

No change of facial expression or gestures by the Soviets—no formal dissolution of the Comintern or Cominform—will cause us to relax in our opposition to communism. Nor will we reduce our activity, demobilize our forces or dismantle our machinery for fighting communism.

As we see it, communism is no longer a spectre in the sense Karl Marx once spoke of it. Communism has become a deadly reality. Millions of Russians, Chinese, Poles, Germans, Balts and others whose unmarked graves have yet to be revealed—tell only a very small part of the gruesome story of the transformation of communism from spectre to reality. The curse of communism is not the cult of the individual but communism itself. It is the cult of communism which is the enemy we face and must vanquish. I am

confident American labor will adhere to its principles of devotion to freedom and our free institutions above all else. As long as communism adheres to the doctrine of world subversion and domination, the Communist powers will constitute a real threat to the way of life, to the progress and even to the very survival of our country and every other free country. As long as any government is totalitarian, that is—as long as it denies to its own people the enjoyment of democratic liberties, no real and enduring peace—based on genuine mutual trust—can be achieved through agreements with that government.

In our own midst, at home as well as abroad, the Communists have also redoubled their talk of coexistence with the rest of us. In the name of the Geneva spirit, the Communists and their dupes are now calling for an end to every legal effort to curtail their subversive activities and their efforts to infiltrate our free institutions. The Communists like nothing better and want nothing as much as to be given a free hand to use our democratic liberties for the purpose of subverting and destroying our democratic society.

In the interest of self-preservation, governments and societies founded on the principles of liberty must protect themselves by taking measures against subversive movements and their activities. He is no liberal who does not believe in safeguarding democracy and its liberal institutions. True liberalism is the very opposite of every brand of totalitarianism.

Communism, however, is not only a threat. It is also a challenge. It has been well said that "the practice of freedom is freedom's best defense." Yes, the challenge of Communism must be met with sound economic, social, and cultural policies—with policies and practices aimed at eliminating every vestige of racial discrimination in our community—with policies aimed at elevating the levels of human dignity and raising the standard of living. Here, we of the American trade union movement have a great role to play. I can assure you that we will seek to play this role in the spirit of the best of American traditions and in furtherance of the highest American ideals.

The better the America we build, the stronger and the greater the America we will have to meet the Communist challenge. I urge with equal vigor that we be strong enough in a military sense and help make our allies strong enough to deter Soviet aggression.

I hope I have shed some light on the way we of American labor look at the world we live in—on the way in which we are trying to build up our country at this critical hour. The tasks we face are not simple. They are complicated and difficult. We will meet them through trial and error. I do know that if we all pull together we shall certainly be able to pull apart any enemy that seeks to undermine and threatens our democratic way of life.

Upon your return to your respective communities, you will undoubtedly come into contact with trade-union organizations and representatives. First of all, keep in mind that there is no more dangerous fallacy than the notion or suspicion to which some still cling—the notion that to be pro-labor is to be pro-Communist. Any law-enforcement officer who makes sympathy for the great cause of free labor synonymous with support of communism can only injure the most vital interests of the American people and the highest ideals of our Nation.

Remember, trade unions, like other institutions of human beings, are not perfect. We are not free from error. We are not above the law. However, we want you to realize that our trade-union movement is basically clean, healthy, and patriotic. We hold that no one can be a good trade unionist if he is not a good citizen in the best sense of the word and in all his relations with the community. In this spirit, I wish you the fullest success in the fulfillment of your special duties as well as in the furtherance of our great common goal—to keep America the land of the free, the land which shall be unstinting in its devotion to democracy and human well-being—a nation worthy of the destiny history has chosen for the American people.

Motor Skyway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH A. ROBERTS
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 25, 1956

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the article Motor Skyway in Dixie, which appeared in the Ford Times. Motor Skyway in Dixie describes the infinite pleasure possible for motorists when traveling through this magnificent mountain region, located in Talladega County, a few miles south of the Bankhead Highway near Anniston, Ala. Its beautiful scenery and inspiring vistas bring pleasure to many motorists; and its colorful history of Indian wars—the country where Andrew Jackson defeated the Creeks—is of special interest to children. For years I have advocated additional roads to this park and have urged the Forest Service to make this beautiful recreation center, which is the highest spot in the foothills of the Blue Ridge Mountains, more available to the people of Alabama and all the Nation's tourists. I expect to continue to urge such action.

The article follows:

MOTOR SKYWAY IN DIXIE

(By John McCormick)

If you examine a road map of Alabama closely you will see, a few miles due south of Anniston, a faint little trail labeled "Motor Skyway," traversing a rather blank portion of the map in a northeasterly to southwesterly direction.

This small portion is uncluttered with map symbols because it is in the center of the Talladega National Forest. On its winding, lofty course, the Motor Skyway goes through Cheaha State Park and to Cheaha Mountain, which, with an elevation of 2,407 feet, is the highest point in Alabama.

The Talladega National Forest covers 92,000 acres and is part of the old stamping grounds of the Creek and Cherokee Indians. It extends from the Georgia border southwestward into Alabama, reaching the Coosa County line near Sylacauga.

To drive the Motor Skyway, go south from Anniston to United States Highway 78 and turn toward Heflin. Before you get to Heflin you'll see the sign pointing to the narrow road that turns right toward Cheaha Mountain. This twisting stretch of dirt, gravel, and a dab of blacktop is the Motor Skyway.

It's a rough, dusty journey, but riding this blue ridgeline that angles upward to the rooftop of Alabama is an adventure when compared with rolling over conventional highways. After 8 or 10 miles you come to a forest tower where you can stop and be welcomed by the ranger and his wife. From the tower top on a clear day the view extends more than 50 miles—clear into Georgia.

From the ranger station the Motor Skyway continues its climb westward. At a distance you see the State's new television tower, and several miles later come to the stone observation tower near its base, built on the mountain's highest rock. Not far away you discover a 14-room lodge with a fine kitchen and dining hall, and cabins scattered through the pines. There are local oddities, too—the rock garden, Noah's Ark, and the old standby, a balancing rock. From this rock it seems that most of northern Alabama is in your view.

There is also a remarkable little mountain lake in a natural bowl below the lodge where guests swim and fish. It's stocked with bass and bream.

Continuing from the lodge there's a drive of something over 20 miles to historic Talladega, just north of where the motor skyway ends. Here, at Fort Leslie, Andrew Jackson defeated the rebellious Creek Indians in 1813. In 1847 Talladega was the gold-mining center of east Alabama.

Of present and immediate interest in Talladega, however, is the renowned Purefoy Hotel, which serves an "all you can eat and eight kinds of meat" dinner, along with perhaps 30 supporting side dishes, all for a ridiculously low price. Relax after dinner at the Purefoy until nightfall before taking the motor skyway back through the cool night air. It's good to stop now and then to see tiny lights speckling off in the darkness of the rolling countryside as if they had just fallen from the deep, starlit sky. You will suspect that maybe the composer of Stars Fell on Alabama got his inspiration on this very drive.

After a time the lights of Talladega fade away behind and the lights of Anniston begin to glow in the distance. Back on Cheaha's top, you've seen the motor skyway from northeast to southwest and halfway back again.

Arab Defiance of the United Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 25, 1956

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, those who would undrstand the Arab-Israeli situation should read the following letter, as published in the New York Times of June 22, 1956:

ARAB VIOLATIONS CHARGED—POLICY TOWARD ISRAEL DECLARED TO CONTRAVENE U. N. CHARTER

To the EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

In your issue of June 7 Rafik Asha, permanent representative of Syria to the United Nations, taking exception to an editorial you published on June 2, makes a number of statements that call for comment.

Mr. Aha attempts to demonstrate that the representative of Syria, Ambassador Ahmed Shukairy, did not make the outrageous statements before the Security Council to which your editorial refers. According to the official United Nations verbatim record of the Security Council meeting held on May 31, Mr. Shukairy stated:

"To advocate the idea of a mutually acceptable solution must inevitably lead to a reversal of all the resolutions of the United Nations * * *. The establishment of Israel, its membership in the United Nations and all other resolutions * * * will have to be revoked. Then, and only then, can the United Nations look forward to a solution 'on a mutually acceptable basis.' "

It is difficult to see how Mr. Asha can claim that the conclusion that Mr. Shukairy urged the revocation of "the establishment

of Israel, its membership in the United Nations and all other resolutions" does not correspond with the facts.

CLAIM OF COMPLIANCE

Mr. Ash claims that "the three pillars of Arab policy on the Palestine question" are in compliance with the Charter, the armistice agreements and the resolutions of the General Assembly. Seen in the light of Arab practice and propaganda, these pillars appear to be of extremely frail construction.

The duty to comply with the provisions of the Charter did not prevent Syria, together with six other Arab States, from committing armed aggression in Palestine in 1947–48, nor did their regard for U. N. resolution, so often professed since then, prevent them from committing that aggression for the purpose of defeating the U. N. resolution on Palestine of November 29, 1947.

Respect for the Charter does not seem to deter the Arab States from persisting in their deliberate violation of other sections of the Charter, such as article 2. Though themselves members of the United Nations, they refuse to recognize "the principle of the sovereign equality of all its members" (art. 2, par. 1). As Mr. Shukairy explained to the Security Council, one of the member states of the United Nations—Israel—and all the rest of what was formerly Palestine, "is nothing but southern Syria."

BOYCOTT POLICY

The Arab pillars also do not seem to be obstacles in the way of an actively pursued policy of economic, political and diplomatic boycott against a fellow member of the United Nations. Nor do they stand in the way of the imposition of an illegal blockade by sea and air against a neighboring state.

The only Arab policy these pillars do support is that of obstinately refusing to abide by Security Council decisions, such as the one of September 1, 1951, on the Suez blockade, which outlaws the maintenance of a state of war against Israel, and of deliberately sabotaging some of the most important provisions of the general armistice agreements, thereby frustrating the very purpose of those agreements, that of "promoting the return of permanent peace."

The fact that Mr. Asha endeavors to explain away some of Mr. Shukairy's statements may possibly indicate that Mr. Asha does not share Mr. Shukairy's views about the wisdom of uttering them. But, unfortunately, there is nothing in his letter to show that his government disowns their substance.

JOSHUA H. JUSTMAN,
Director of Press Relations, Delegation of Israel to the United Nations.
NEW YORK, *June 15, 1956.*

Importance of a Vote

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PATRICK J. HILLINGS
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 25, 1956

Mr. HILLINGS. Mr. Speaker, I wish to place in the RECORD an editorial from the San Diego Union for Friday, June 22, 1956, which discusses the outstanding representation of his district and splendid showing made by our colleague, the gentleman from California [Mr. WILSON] in his contest for the Democrat nomination on Tuesday, June 5, 1956. The editorial follows:

IMPORTANCE OF A VOTE

The importance of each individual vote will be dramatically apparent as absentee ballots are counted today.

One vote either way could determine whether Representative BOB WILSON, Republican, will be elected in the primaries or if he will go into a runoff in November against George Cheney, Democrat.

Representative WILSON has a total Democratic and Republican vote of 95,786 as against 35,062 for Mr. Cheney. In the contest for the Democratic nomination, however, the Son Diego Congressman trails his opponent by 210 votes.

Whatever the result of the absentee count, the total vote cast for Mr. WILSON is indicative of the outstanding representation he has given San Diego. Now seeking his third term in office, his popular vote margin has increased substantially with each election.

The Single-Weapon Fallacy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES T. PATTERSON
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 25, 1956

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call the attention of this distinguished body to a thought-compelling article entitled "The Single-Weapon Fallacy," written by Dr. James D. Atkinson which appeared in the June edition of the magazine Army.

Dr. Atkinson is an assistant professor of government at Georgetown University and has written extensively on international policy and military defense for a number of magazines. So significant is his recent article that I would like to here insert it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

THE SINGLE-WEAPON FALLACY

(By James D. Atkinson)

In every crisis at arms since the dawn of time, nostrums guaranteed to solve the most complex problems of military security have found anxious buyers, looking for a cheap way out. The artlessness Barnum found in all of us comes out at such times; perplexed people faced with massive complexities are easy targets for slogans that discourage thought and provide an emotional escape hatch. Whether the slagon is "the Maginot Line begins where it is required and ends where it is no longer needed" (1929) or "security through air power" (1956), rational inquiry and discussion are shut off.

We may be sure that in the fourth century before Christ the Indian general, Porus, believed that his elephants would defeat Alexander's Greco-Macedonian army. Yet the battle at the Hydaspes River was decided by the teamwork of Alexander's infantry and cavalry.

THE FIXED IDEA OF A SUPER-CANNAE

Count von Schlieffen dominated German planning in the years before World War I. Unfortunately for Germany and fortunately for her enemies, Schlieffen was himself dominated by a fixed idea. He had found the one simple answer that guaranteed victory. Like Douhet, Mitchell, "Bomber" Harris, and other fixed-idea airmen of a later period, Schlieffen believed that one big battle—a super Cannae—would decide the future war. In fact, the parallel between Schlieffen and the air extremists is even greater since the German held that a battle which annihilated the bulk of the enemy forces in the opening phase of the war would paralyze the will of the enemy and, correspondingly, the will of his allies, and victory would be quick and relatively cheap. Schlieffen's belief in a super-Cannae battle of annihilation was reinforced by his conviction that industrial organization would force wars to be violent but short. Just as the air extremists of 1956 speak of a future war in terms of days, so Schlieffen in the years before 1914 ruled out a long war as being impossible in the modern age.

The fixed-idea people, whether soldiers, sailors, airmen, or statesmen, are, however, always running into unforeseen circumstances—which is a part of war itself. As Maj. Gen. J. F. C. Fuller has written: "It is absolutely true in war, were other things equal, that numbers—whether men, shells, bombs, etc.—would be supreme. Yet it is also absolutely true that other things are never equal and can never be equal. There is always a difference, and it is the differences which by begging to differ so frequently throw all calculations to the winds."

The dangerous and tragic truth was, however, that Schlieffen's simplification and the younger Moltke's acceptance of it so permeated the thinking of the German general staff that few ever questioned it and none seriously challenged it. Germany went down the road to war committed to a fixed strategy—a one-shot proposition which, if anything should go wrong, would lead not to victory but to defeat. And something did go wrong. As Dr. Gordon A. Craig states in his penetrating analysis, The Politics of the Prussian Army, Schlieffen's single-mindedness "disregarded not only the demographic, technological, and industrial factors which affect the war effort of great powers * * * but also the political and psychological forces which are apt to make peoples fight even against hopeless odds."

THE SINGLE IDEA OF SHELLS AND MORE SHELLS

The German commitment to a single idea in planning for the war was matched by the Allied belief after the war had dragged on that victory could be achieved by the accumulation of a massive weight of explosives that would literally batter the western front into rubble. The cry was for shells, shells, ever more shells. General Fuller cites the case of the distinguished British general who "proved" mathematically that ending the war was only a matter of dividing the front into sectors 15 miles long by 2 miles deep and then firing one shell per yard into the tiny little subdivisions. Unfortunately this kind of thinking differs little from that of 1956 air extremists who equate war with total destruction and forget that the great military leaders of history from the Duke of Wellington to Generals Eisenhower and MacArthur always knew that war destruction was incidental (and to be avoided as much as possible) to the object of achieving a more perfect and enduring peace.

Before the Second World War German military planners took notice of the lessons of the First World War and developed close cooperation among all ground arms and services and excellent air-ground cooperation. General von Mellenthin, for example, in his careful study, Panzer Battles, points out that German success in the Battle of France was due to the reintroduction "into warfare (of) the decisive factor of mobility," and that this was possible because of the close cooperation of all arms, especially the "expert handling of the latest modern arms—Luftwaffe, parachutists, and armor."

Partly because of Hitler's lack of appreciation of sea power and partly because his military advisers were likewise too continental-minded, German planning did not include sea power. Thus, the Wehrmacht ar-

rived at the English Channel in June 1940 with tremendous ground-air capabilities, but with extremely limited naval capabilities. Hermann Goering had assured Der Fuhrer that the Luftwaffe would eliminate the need for naval power, but the single-idea strategy failed again, and Hitler turned on the Soviet Union. Even there, however, effective sea power would have been of great advantage to Hitler. Admiral Friedrich Ruge's Der Seekrieg, 1939–45, suggests that an understanding of sea power would have dictated the capture of Leningrad and the creation of a Baltic Sea supply route that would have relieved the arm's transportation and communication difficulties along the far-flung eastern front.

THE SINGLE IDEA OF RACIAL SUPERIORITY

If, as Dr. Craig has indicated, Schlieffen's strategy had failed to appreciate the political factors in warfare, Hitler was completely blinded to the political-psychological elements of warfare by his almost pathological belief that the world was roughly divided into Herrenvolk and Untermenschen with, perhaps, some races occupying a rather gray shade in between. Somewhat as mass bombings hardened the resistance of the German people, so did the Hitlerian racial concepts fix the pattern of resistance in the occupied countries, especially in eastern Europe and the Soviet Union. Thus the Germans tossed away the opportunity to bring about the collapse of the multinational Soviet state. Since 1945 we have learned that Soviet leaders themselves feared appeals to their oppressed minority peoples more than German bombs, and now that Stalin is being toppled from his pedestal, the unwillingness of millions of Soviet minorities to fight for communism is being attributed to Stalin's preparedness failures.

On the Allied side, the World War II successors of Douhet and Mitchell were ready with an undated version of the old "shells, more shells, and still more shells" of World War I. The new version was "bombs, more bombs and still more bombs" and the argument again hinged on a statistical basis which proved that Germany could be easily and quickly knocked out of the war. The most amazing of the many arguments presented is that cited in Flight Lieutenant Blunt's The Use of Air Power, in which he states that "the C.-inC., Bomber Command, is said to have made the statement that if we could send 1,000 bombers a night over Germany, the war would be over in 6 months; whilst, with 20,000 aircraft, he would finish it in 1 night."

THE SINGLE IDEA OF BOMBS AND MORE BOMBS

The 1956 air extremists have really added nothing new to this now old "shells, shells and more shell" argument. In essence, this is the argument of mass destruction, and whether it is 20,000 aircraft with high-explosive bombs or 1,000 or 100 aircraft with hydrogen and atomic bombs, the concept is quick victory through pulverization of so many square feet of enemy land and buildings and the atomization of so many hundreds of thousands or millions of people. Unconsidered is the possibility that if each side completes this neat mathematical formula there might be other factors and other forces which would have a final effect.

Fortunately, the pulverization concept was only partially accepted by President Roosevelt and Prime Minister Churchill. These great wartime leaders not only proved that a coalition could coordinate its efforts and wage war successfully, but they also understood the necessary interrelation of economic, political, and psychological factors with elements of ground-sea-air warfare. It was the teamwork of ground-sea-air forces which made possible the successful invasion of north Africa, Sicily, and Italy, the channel crossing, and the sweep through France and into Germany. The very efficiency of this teamwork obscured its successes. And so after the war the advocates of the one-service solution found they could totally disregard such truly outstanding work as that of the Tactical Air Force in isolating the battlefield and functioning as an integral part of a winning air-ground team, and promote the thunderous explosions of the two atomic bombs dropped at the end of the war. One of the few voices raised in the analysis of what might have been done with greater tactical airpower was that of Gen. Sir Giffard Martel who wrote that "it can be argued with much reason, however, that we would have won the European war more quickly and efficiently if we had put rather more weight on cooperation between the Army and the Air Force from the start, instead of depending so much on the power of air bombardment alone."

The introduction of the atomic bomb into warfare at the close of World War II launched a debate on military policy which is still going on. The atomic bomb was, of course, a most spectacular development, and its use in warfare left an impression on men's minds as no previous weapons, even gunpowder, had done. Thus Sir William Beveridge expressed the immediate reaction of many when he wrote in the London Times, August 14, 1945, that "the atomic bomb has almost certainly relegated all other weapons of modern war—tanks, battleships, guns, rifles, and trained conscript masses—to the museum." This line was quickly taken up by the air extremists and has, with little change, been reiterated ever since. Perhaps the mere repetition over so long a period of time has had much to do with its success, since it has depended but little on historical analysis or proven fact.

The atomic destruction nostrum did not go completely unchallenged, however, and in 1947 Milton Shulman, in Defeat in the West, seriously questioned the theory that "given enough atom bombs, any power could guarantee for itself ultimate victory in a future war." The record of "Germany's defeat in World War II convincingly destroys such theories," he asserted.

THE SINGLE IDEA OF VICTORY THROUGH ATOMIZATION

This military policy debate came to one climax in the United States in 1949 with the controversy over the B–36 bomber. This occasioned a reexamination of the entire question of United States strategy. Testifying before the House Armed Services Committee in October 1949, Adm. Arthur W. Radford struck at the heart of the matter when he said: "The plane itself is not so important as the acceptance or rejection of the theory of atom-blitz warfare which it symbolizes. It is fortunate that honest doubts as to the adequacy of the B–36 have served to bring this more vital issue before the country. I do not believe that the threat of atomic blitz will be an effective deterrent to a war, or that it will win a war. Admiral Radford then went on in terms which indicated that he saw the entire picture rather than the one-service eye view. He pointed out that the atom blitz was a "fallacious concept" which promised a "short cut to victory" but that there were grave dangers in the panacea way to win a war. "We must realize that we cannot gamble that the atomic blitz of annihilation will even win a war," he said. "We must realize if war is forced upon us, we must win it, and win it in such a way that it can be followed by a stable, livable peace."

The Korean conflict temporarily interrupted the great debate over military policy. It also came as a cold shower to the air extremists for, contrary to the theories which had seemed so logical "unforeseen circumstances" intervened, upsetting their previous theses as to what kind of war would occur.

To begin with, the deterrent power of the world's greatest air force, possessing as it did the only significant nuclear weapons at the time (June 1950), did not deter the Communists one iota. Far more shocking to the air extremists was the fact that the real deterrent had obviously been army forces, for these, to the Soviet mentality, were a measure of American intent, of American will. Thus, when the United States Seventh Infantry Division was withdrawn from Korea, the interpretation of this event by the Soviets was that the United States had no firm commitment to the defense of the area and hence a "liberating" army of North Koreans could simply walk in. (A thought-provoking article on this which I earnestly recommend to all readers appeared in the April 1956 issue of Military Review by Lt. Col. Wallace C. Magathan, Jr.) No amount of air gymnastics or bomb rattling was sufficient to prevent the launching of the kind of war which the United States was, because of a weakened Army, unprepared to fight. True, the mighty Strategic Air Command did serve the role of a force in being, and no fair-minded observer would denigrate this fact. But, as so often in the history of warfare, the best sounding theories of the air extremists proved the wrong kind of practice when a concrete situation arose.

The conclusions drawn from the Korean war are equally worthy of attention. Thus, General Van Fleet has stated that "after the battle for White Horse Mountain during which American artillery had reduced a Chinese Communist division of 30,000 men to 15,000 and the crack 15th Army of the Chinese Communists had failed to rout the ROK 4th Division, we could have accomplished just about any mission we chose." The General then went on to say that our forces could "have sent an armored column through the weakened part of the Red lines and enveloped their entire front-line army."

A Navy leader has gone farther. Admiral C. Turner Joy has stated that military victory in Korea "was not impossible, nor even unusually difficult." In this instance, Admiral Joy viewed war in its entirety—as an effort which required the cooperation of all contributors in achieving, in terms of human life, an economical victory.

A distinguished Air Force officer has indicated that mass destruction was not really necessary to win in Korea. General George Stratemeyer has said that "when MacArthur launched his attack to gain the Yalu River, I had enough air strength to stop the Chinese and prevent their troops being supplied."

CONTROVERSY IS PREFERABLE TO INADEQUATE SECURITY

As the United States faces an uncertain future in which a plenitude of nuclear weapons and their means of delivery will be in the hands of the Soviet Union, it becomes the urgent duty of every American to reexamine the past and peer into the future. Neither propaganda smokescreens nor sincere assurances that all is well should deflect us from the duty of examining not only the kinds of war which we may be called upon to fight, but also the kind of deterrence most likely to prevent wars—total and limited. The former Chief of Naval Operations, Admiral Denfeld, expressed the military man's point of view plainly 7 years ago during the B–36 hearings: "Public airing of service differences, while regrettable, is preferable to inadequate national security." Those who strongly believe that the Army has a commanding role to play not merely in winning a war, but even more in preventing one, have, in the national interest, a right and a duty to speak up.

Prof. Arnold Wolfers, writing in the winter 1956 issue of the Yale Review, helped to clear the atmosphere on the entire problem of deterrence by questioning whether the suppositions that we must fight an all-out war are tenable. "If (these suppositions) are correct, military preparations for anything but total war in Europe would be meaningless

and wasteful; if they are erroneous, exclusive concern for unlimited warfare might prove disastrous."

An interesting facet of the thinking which is so preoccupied with this single-idea warfare is laid in the May 1956 issue of the magazine Air Force. In a staff study called the Army's Atomic Dilemma, the statement is made with reference to airpower that "as long as it is broken into bits and pieces, and parceled out among three individual services with one mission, it will not be used effectively." The staff students go on, however, to reveal their actual trend of thought by stating that "as long as there are three individual services, it is difficult to see how overlapping, duplication, and waste in manpower, money, and facilities can be prevented." The allegation that there are duplication and waste is incidental to the implication that not "3 individual services" but only one (obviously the Air Force) is necessary.

We have here once more the one-big-answer technique. Before World War I it appeared in the guise of the super-Cannae, the one big land battle which would end the war. Before World War II it appeared under the Douhet doctrine, as when Maj. Al Williams wrote, "If the issues between England and France on one side, and Germany on the other are destined to be settled by force, the decision, win or lose, will be reached in a matter of 72 hours, in short, via a true air war." Now, in 1956 it seems that our defense troubles can be settled by putting all our eggs in one basket, the all-out air basket. And wonderful to relate, we can save money. But can we save human lives? Can we save our world? Will not our commitment to a single course of action and to one weapon deny us freedom of action?

AIR-MINDED OR WAR-MINDED

Is it not time that the air extremists should, to use General Fuller's apt expression, "cease to be air-minded and become war-minded"? Then they will view warfare not in the Ludendorff and Douhet concepts of total war and total destruction, but rather in the sense that war is the servant, not the master, of policy. From such a base effective deterrent forces can be established, and war, should it come, can be limited.

Airpower has men who are war minded. Asher Lee, the author of works on the German and Soviet air forces, is one. In his 1955 book, Air Power, he devotes several sections to parachute and airborne troops, supporting the Army, naval airpower, and the like. Even more significantly, he attempts to examine the future without any dogmatic presumptions that ground and sea forces will not have a major role. Thus he states: "To what extent will guided missiles used in defense and offense affect future air operations? They will clearly impose much greater coordination between the services. They will mean that the Army must have greater control over tactical offensive operations than in World War II. They will call for a unified air defense system in which interservice differences are completely sunk in a supranational interest." Here speaks an authority on airpower who is war minded rather than single-service minded. Asher Lee examines the job to be done. He is unwilling to permit the weapons or the delivery system to dictate what should be done. The distinguished naval historian, Samuel Eliot Morison, reveals the United States Navy's adherence to the same position. "The commander of an operation or mission uses any necessary weapons or forces, whether they be ground troops, ships, tanks, or planes," Morison wrote in his latest volume on United States naval operations in World War II.

The constant reexamination of our military policy is not an academic exercise. Soviet power and Soviet policy are never static. Even before it was emphasized at the 20th party congress in February 1956 that communism might triumph in some areas through parliamentary means, Khrushchev had hinted at the way in which Soviet tactics might deal with an American one-solution air policy. For, on November 4, 1955, Mr. Khrushchev reportedly told the Turkish Ambassador that "Turkey was foolish to remain in NATO since, if there is any difficulty, Turkey will be the first to be eaten up and your friends will not be able to help you." As Soviet policy has unfolded, we can see that Mr. Khrushchev was hinting to Turkey that she was in grave danger by remaining in NATO while the United States, committed to the one-big-war-or-none military policy, was gradually losing both the means and the will to engage in either limited or unconventional (cold) warfare.

American armed forces are more and more being tailored for fighting one big war. Yet Secretary of Defense Wilson, testifying before the House Appropriations Subcommittee on 24 January 1956, stated that "actually, there is no way of knowing exactly what Russia will do; how she will attack." It is no secret that the United States Army, as presently constituted, lacks the capabilities for limited operations, although land forces would be the key to success in all types of warfare. Further, the concentration on one big war or none raises grave doubts as to whether the Air Force could give any support to the Army. The story of Korea and the many failures of air support are too well known to bear repetition, but have we learned anything about air-support and airlift requirements from Korea? Must we be the victims of Soviet freedom of action because we are the prisoners of a one-big-war-or-none idea?

Fortunately, a master of coordinated warfare has shown how the United States can regain freedom of action and do so with the least risk of an all-out war of mutual destruction. General of the Army Dwight D. Eisenhower wisely wrote in Crusade in Europe: "Our Mediterranean experience had reaffirmed the truth that unity, coordination, and cooperation are the keys to successful operations. War is waged in three elements but there is no separate land, air, or naval war. Unless all assets are efficiently combined and coordinated against a properly selected, common objective, their maximum potential power cannot be realized."

General Eisenhower's view of warfare looks toward the future rather than the past. It holds that the United States must have a reasonable degree of readiness for fighting the one big war, but that the United States can and must afford a readiness for all the likely types of war. Such a military policy offers America the freedom of action necessary to meet the tactical changes for world conquest instituted by the Soviet leaders with the liquidation of the Stalin myth.

Crocodile Tears

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 25, 1956

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, I should like to call to the attention of our colleagues the following truism which appeared as an editorial in the New York World Telegram and Sun on June 21, 1956:

THOSE CROCODILE WEEPERS

Our country is suddenly filled with curbstone experts on ileitis—folks who didn't know there was an ileum in the human body until a couple of weeks ago when Ike went to the hospital.

All the doctors who participated in the President's diagnosis and operation agree there should be no serious after-effects, and Ike should be up and about his business soon. But some doctors who have never examined Ike's insides are rushing into print with contrary testimony.

We've always believed any M. D. is entitled to respectful attention on medical matters, especially if that M. D. has intimate knowledge of the patient.

But it is not hard to discount the crocodile tears of the left-wing politicians and pundits who are crying out against the "awful conspiracy of the GOP heirarchy to force a sick and reluctant President to run again."

If Ike doesn't feel like running, he won't. If he feels like running, he'll run.

Never mind those Jeremiahs who are lugubriously muttering that Ike doesn't really know how sick he is—they weren't for him in 1952 and won't be for him this year, even if Ike qualifies for the Olympic team as a high hurdler.

Support of Mine-Subsidence Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 25, 1956

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter and resolution drawn up by the Coaldale (Pa.) Advisory Council supporting my bill, H. R. 9073, and Senator LEHMAN'S bill, S. 3137, which provide for the same type of relief for the victims of mine subsidence as for the victims of floods and other disasters:

COALDALE ADVISORY COUNCIL,
Coaldale, Pa.

GENTLEMEN: Attached is a copy of a resolution passed Monday, June 14, 1956, by Coaldale Advisory Council with representatives from nine additional coal-region towns concurring in its purpose by their presence at the meeting and by pledging their support to our effort.

It was decided to ask all municipal authorities, all veterans' organizations, all service clubs, and all interested coal-region residents and property owners to join us in petitioning Congress for passage of H. R. 9073, as introduced in the House of Representatives by Congressman DANIEL J. FLOOD, of Luzerne County, Pa.

H. R. 9073 is a bill to provide insurance against flood damages and for other purposes. It contains this phrase: "And land subsidence due to an underground cave or man-made excavation." If passed by Congress the proposed legislation will provide a means for insuring 1- to 4-family homes to the extent of $10,000 and any other personal property in 1 location to the extent of $100,000.

We urge your organization to adopt this resolution, or one similar to it and forward same with your request for action to the Representative from your congressional district and to the two United States Senators from Pennsylvania.

Inasmuch as Congress may adjourn in July, time is important. Any action taken by your organization should be taken as soon as possible.

You may further aid this cause by circulating this resolution to other organizations

in your particular area and by seeking to enlist as much help as possible from individuals in your area and from your local newspapers.

If additional information is desired, contact the undersigned.

Sincerely,

W. E. PISKLAK,
Secretary, Coaldale Advisory Council.

Whereas, extensive portions of the Borough of Coaldale have been affected by mine subsidence, thereby causing great financial loss to real-estate owners; and

Whereas said real estate owners, under present laws and statutes, have no redress and no possibility of recovering damages due to said mine subsidence; and

Whereas there has been proposed before Congress bill H. R. 9073 jointly sponsored by Representative DANIEL FLOOD and Senator HERBERT LEHMAN providing for the same type of relief for the victims of mine subsidence as for the victims of floods and other disasters: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved and it is hereby resolved by the Advisory Council of the Borough of Coaldale, That the Representatives and Senators from Pennsylvania furnish their complete and entire efforts to do all things necessary for the passage of said bill H. R. 9073 before the adjournment of the present session of Congress.

The Presidency Today

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS M. PELLY
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 2, 1956

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, a former president of the Washington State Bar Association, and one-time dean of the University of Washington Law School, Alfred J. Schweppe, has reviewed a book called The Presidency Today for the American Bar Association Journal. This book, by two authors, Edward S. Corwin and Louis W. Koenig, is a 1956 publication of the New York University Press.

Since Mr. Schweppe concludes his review with an observation that this book, The Presidency Today, should be a must for every Member of Congress, I include the text of the review for the edification of all Members interested in the growth of power by the office of the Chief Executive:

THE PRESIDENCY TODAY

In this small, timely, and provocative volume, the authors rapidly review the Presidency in perspective from Washington's time to the present day, with stress on the historical growth of Presidential powers, especially in wartime—powers which first burgeoned large in Lincoln's administration and came to a climax in that of the second Roosevelt and in the Korean "police action" of Mr. Truman. They observe with Norman J. Small that "Nothing is more evident in the history of the Presidency than the steady accumulation of power by that office."

In the area of Presidential prerogative, based on the conduct of the office by the second Roosevelt, they tend to overenlarge the Commander in Chief area without consideration of such decisions as *ex parte Quirin* (317 U. S. 1, 25–6, 29 (1942)) and *ex parte Milligan* (4 Wall 2, 139 (1866)) which appear to limit the Commander in Chief function to "the command of the Armed Forces and the conduct of campaigns," except as Congress may otherwise provide under the "necessary and proper clause." As pointed out in the Quirin case, the Commander in Chief area is subject to reasonable regulation by Congress under the "necessary and proper clause," the scope of which with respect to the other two departments, the Presidency and the courts, is not always remembered. (See Constitution of the United States of America. Annotated 1952). Government Printing Office. Edward S. Corwin, Editor, p. 307; United States Senate hearings, S. J. Res. 1, April-May 1955, p. 600.)

While criticising the 50-destroyer deal just prior to World War II as violative of existing statutes, they appear dissatisfied with the Steel seizure case, largely, however, as being inconsistent with prior precedents of Presidential seizure of power in emergencies. They do not advert to the basic theory of the Court's decision as perhaps best expressed in the concurring opinion of Mr. Justice Jackson where after pointing out that "much" of what is said in *United States* v. *Curtiss-Wright Corp.* (299 U. S. 304 1936)—partly relied on by the authors—is "dictum," he continued:

"It was intimated that the President might act [in external affairs] without congressional authority, but not that he might act contrary to an act of Congress."

They speak of a "presidential emergency power to adopt temporary remedial legislation [executive orders] when Congress has been, in the judgment of the President, remiss." And they say this notwithstanding article I of the Constitution vests "all legislative power" in Congress, which was the basis of the Steel Seizure decision, and notwithstanding the Court has repeatedly said in other cases that the President cannot "make laws." The nullity of the executive order in the Steel Seizure case ought to settle this point. On this phase they conclude: "The best escape from presidential autocracy in the age we inhabit, is not, in short, judicial review, which can supply only a vacuum (sic?), but timely legislation."

The authors mildly query the claimed enlargement by treaty of the power of the President to make war, without declaration by Congress, in case of an attack on one of our treaty allies in Europe or Asia, and discuss also the great inroads on the constitutional treaty role of the Senate by the wide use of executive agreements, published and unpublished.

They sympathetically analyze the problem of Presidential confidences and refusal to furnish executive records and papers to Congress.

They wisely suggest "a closer working relationship between the President and Congress" and to this end comment on the recurrent proposal to give cabinet members seats in Congress. For themselves they urge consideration of a new type of cabinet consisting of legislative leaders and department heads with seats in Congress.

One of the currently timely discussions is the excellent defense of the present electoral-college system as against various proposed reforms which they convincingly establish would have the practical and highly detrimental effect of irreparably damaging the two-party system, of greatly increasing the danger of electing minority Presidents, and of actually destroying the device invented by the Founding Fathers to minimize popular emotional influence of the moment in the selection of the President.

They forcefully condemn the idea of a presidential primary as being ineffective, misleading, often unattractive to the bulk of the voters, characterized by uneven participation of candidates who tend to handpick their battleground, impossible for conscientious persons holding public office with current duties to perform, inordinately expensive, prohibitive for many competent but inadequately financed candidates—indeed, an antidemocratic instead of a democratic device, which would generally limit candidates to the few who could command big campaign money, while, at the same time, having a disastrous effect on party cohesion. (Note statement of Adlai Stevenson, March 28, 1956.) They make a convincing case that presidential primaries should be abolished.

With the illnesses of Presidents Wilson, Roosevelt, and Eisenhower as the take-off point, the writers stress the increasing importance of the Vice Presidency. They quote President Eisenhower in 1952 as saying that the "national conventions should choose the Vice President primarily for his acceptability as a close working partner" and that "a Presidential nominee should step aside if the convention did not abide by his preferences."

The authors conclude, as they began in the preface, with the assertion that "methods must be devised for making the national legislative powers more readily available when need for important action arises"; and, if not at hand, the need "will be filled by the power that is at hand at all times, that of the President."

The contents of this timely book deserve the attention of every American and should be a must for every Member of Congress. Congress could well give immediate heed to the problems and suggestions which it puts forward.

Who Are Our Friends?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 25, 1956

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I direct the attention of our colleagues to the following editorial which appeared in the New York Times of June 21, 1956:

TITO IN MOSCOW

It must be said that Yugoslav President Tito's visit to Moscow and the two Yugoslav-Soviet statements issued yesterday contain elements that are disturbing. These elements were perhaps summed up best by Marshal Zhukov when he expressed his confidence that in any future war Yugoslav and Soviet troops will fight "shoulder to shoulder." There was no adequate reply to this remark in the subsequent statement of the Yugoslav Foreign Minister that he hoped there would be no future wars.

Moscow, it is true, went all out in its effort to woo the Yugoslav visitors. The warmth and scale of the reception given these visitors are without precedent. Under these circumstances there was great pressure on Tito to respond with equal warmth and expression of friendship. The result was the creation of an atmosphere in which Marshal Zhukov's remark becomes understandable, whether or not there was specific basis for it. Further in the governmental comunique it became more difficult to distinguish the Yugoslav and Soviet positions on foreign policy. And in the party communique we are promised a joint effort by both Yugoslav and Soviet Communists to form what seems in effect a world bloc of Leftist forces.

All this must raise questions before American public opinion. We welcome Yugoslav Vice President Kardelj's statement in Foreign Affairs that his country desires American friendship irrespective of whether American aid continues. But we must wonder why no opportunity was taken publicly in Moscow to point out explicitly that Yugoslavia's own experience is the best proof that American aid does not "enslave" a nation, the latter notion being a Soviet stereotype which still prevails.

Yugoslav-United States cooperation has benefited both countries in the past and could benefit both in the future. This cooperation does not require Yugoslav-Soviet enmity and therefore has not been disturbed by this past year's normalization in Moscow-Belgrade relations. That cooperation would be disturbed, however, by any evidence that Yugoslavia has abandoned its hard-won independence and again become an instrument for the accomplishment of Soviet aims.

Los Angeles County, Calif., Resolves in Favor of First $50 Exemption Earned by Blind Persons

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLYDE DOYLE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 12, 1956

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, I have just received the following letter, dated June 19, 1956, together with the following resolution from the assistant city clerk of the city of Los Angeles, Calif. And since I am cordially in favor of the purport of this resolution, I take particular pleasure in making these brief remarks about it and place it in the Appendix of our daily CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

It is my good fortune to count amongst my friendship list a goodly number of blind persons; totally blind most of them. Several of them have frequently spoken to me of what a great economic and personal blessing it would be to them if they could not only be permitted to earn $50 a month but how encouraging it would be to their hearts, souls, spirits, and daily needs also, if the first $50 which they might earn could be disregarded in computing the aid to them.

It appears crystal clear to me that the earning ability of folks who are under the social security law should be capitalized upon more than it is to the end that their independence of action and ambition should have worthy recognition and that thus the dignity of the individual should be further maintained and fostered instead of having them accumulate a further sense of dependence on aid of any sort at any level, or as a result of the benevolence of government.

CITY OF LOS ANGELES, CALIF.,
June 19, 1956.

The Honorable CLYDE DOYLE,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: At the meeting of the Council of the City of Los Angeles held June 19, 1956, resolution was adopted memorializing the Congress of the United States to enact such legislation as is necessary to permit recipients of aid to the aged to earn $50 a month, which amount shall not be deducted in computing aid to such recipients.

Certified copy of said resolution is transmitted herewith for your information.

Very truly yours,
WALTER C. PETERSON,
City Clerk.
By A. M. MORRIS,
Assistant City Clerk.

"Whereas in 1950 the Congress of the United States amended the social security law to provide that the first $59 per month of income earned by a blind person shall be disregarded in computing aid to such person, thereby allowing a blind person to earn this amount in addition to his aid; and

"Whereas legislation is presently before the Congress of the United States which would extend this same benefit to recipients of aid to the aged; and

"Whereas it is the belief of the City Council of the City of Los Angeles that there is an abundance of odd jobs and temporary employment in this State that could be capably filled by aged persons; and

"Whereas the present public-assistance program discourages these aged persons from seeking such employment by requiring that any and all earnings be deducted from their aid: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, That the City Council of the City of Los Aneles respectfully memorializes the Congress of the United States to enact such legislation as is necessary to permit recipients of aid to the aged to earn $50 a month, which amount shall not be taken into consideration in computing aid to such recipients; and be it further

"Resolved, That the city clerk of the city of Los Angeles is hereby directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States."

Presented by Ernest E. Debs, councilman, 13th district.

Seconded by Don A. Allen, councilman, seventh district.

I hereby certify the foregoing to be a true and correct copy of resolution adopted by the Council of the City of Los Angeles at its meeting held June 19, 1956.

WALTER C. PETERSON,
City Clerk.
By A. M. MORRIS,
Assistant City Clerk.

Results of 1956 Questionnaire

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PATRICK J. HILLINGS
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 25, 1956

Mr. HILLINGS. Mr. Speaker, following my custom of previous years, I recently sent an opinion questionnaire to the Democrat and Republican voters who reside in the 25th Congressional District in order to obtain their views on some of the important issues facing our country.

Thousands of replies have been received in response to my questions. So many replies have been received that it is an impossible task to answer each individual. A large number of people added comments to the questionnaire which have increased the value of the poll as a gage of public opinion.

Mr. Speaker, we who serve the American people have an obligation to seek out the views of those whom we represent. I am pleased and gratified at the response of those public-spirited citizens who have written to me and I wish to take this opportunity to thank each of them.

The following is the compilation of answers:

1. Are you satisfied with the Eisenhower-Dulles foreign policy? Yes, 72 percent. No, 18 percent. No opinion, 10 percent.

2. Should the United States send arms to Israel? Yes, 17 percent. No, 67 percent. No opinion, 16 percent.

3. Are the United States immigration laws too severe? Yes, 16 percent. No, 69 percent. No opinion, 15 percent.

4. Should the Federal gasoline tax be increased to provide more adequate highways? Yes, 42 percent. No, 48 percent. No opinion, 10 percent.

5. Do you believe existing Federal laws provide adequate old-age benefits for our senior citizens? Yes, 43 percent. No, 43 percent. No opinion, 14 percent.

6. Should the Federal Government encourage private industry to provide workers with a guarantied annual wage? Yes, 32 percent. No, 53 percent. No opinion, 15 percent.

7. Should the Federal Government spend money to help the individual States build more schools? Yes, 58 percent. No 33 percent. No opinion, 9 percent.

8. Local authorities have primary responsibility for control of smog. Should the Federal Government assume a more active role to help solve the smog problem? Yes, 56 percent. No, 36 percent. No opinion, 8 percent.

9. The Federal Government has eliminated segregation in the armed services and in the District of Columbia. It has also supported racial integration in the public schools. Do you believe these measures are sufficient? Yes, 64 percent. No, 19 percent. No opinion, 17 percent.

10. In your opinion, whose legislative policies would be best, if serving as President of the United States? Eisenhower, 88 percent. Kefauver, 4 percent. Stevenson, 8 percent.

Dr. Wesberry Heads Baptist Pastors' Group

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES C. DAVIS
OF GEORGIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 25, 1956

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, Members of the House of Representatives were gratified to learn that on May 29th Dr. James P. Wesberry, pastor of the Morningside Baptist Church in Atlanta, was elected president of the Southern Baptist Pastors' Conference in Kansas City, Mo.

Dr. Wesberry served as Acting Chaplain of the House of Representatives in 1949, and formed many devoted and lasting friendships among the Members of the House while serving in that capacity.

Dr. Wesberry is one of the most beloved and outstanding ministers of the Baptist church. His talents and ability have received recognition not only in Atlanta and in Georgia, but throughout the entire Baptist denomination.

It is with pleasure I insert herewith a news item from the Atlanta Journal announcing Dr. Wesberry's election as president of this great group of Baptist pastors:

[From the Atlanta Journal of May 30, 1956]

DR. WESBERRY HEADS BAPTIST PASTORS' GROUP

(By John J. Hurt)

KANSAS CITY, MO., May 30.—Dr. James P. Wesberry, pastor of Atlanta's Morningside

Baptist Church, is the new president of the Southern Baptist Pastors' Conference.

Dr. Wesberry was elected at the closing session Tuesday night when the report of the nominating committee was accepted.

The Atlanta minister will arrange the program and preside over the conference when it meets in Chicago next year for 2 nights and a day preceeding the Southern Baptist Convention sessions.

The Southern Baptist Convention received Wednesday from its home mission board a report showing it had loaned $5,510,000 for church construction in the last 29 months. Loans for an additional $2,190,000 have been approved and will be made.

G. Frank Garrison, assistant executive secretary of the board with headquarters in Atlanta, made the report for the period since January 1954, when the convention provided additional loan funds. Mr. Garrison also said that when the convention projects its next budget for capital needs additional funds should be provided. He did not indicate the specific amount.

The report showed that of the $5,510,000, allocation of $3,189,000 had been made to churches in the 20 Western States and States where Southern Baptist work is comparatively new. In Georgia, 33 churches received $466,000, while 7 others have been approved for $106,000.

Woman's Missionary Union, which closed its 3-day session Tuesday night, re-elected Mrs. J. I. Alford, of Covington, as one of its vice presidents. She also was named a trustee of the organization. Mrs. Alford is president of Georgia's Missionary Union.

Mrs. David Boyd, of Atlanta, and Mrs. Guy N. Atkinson, of Norman Park, were elected trustees of the Carver School of Missions and Social Work at Louisville. Miss Janice Singleton, of Decatur, executive secretary for Georgia, was made a member of the committee on nominations, with Mrs. John J. Hurt, Atlanta, as an alternate.

Essay by Willowbrook Junior High School Student, 23d District, California, on Daniel Webster

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLYDE DOYLE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 12, 1956

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, by reason of unanimous consent heretofore granted me so to do, I am pleased to insert the text of an essay written by Verna Dean Gates, a student of the Willowbrook Junior High School.

This very interesting and important junior high school is in Compton, Calif., and the principal thereof is William W. Jones. At this significant school are several companies of California Cadet Corps which have made an outstanding record in junior high school functions in California.

The occasion of Miss Gates writing this essay grows out of her visit, accompanied by her distinguished school principal, to the Nation's Capital several weeks ago after they had the honor and privilege of visiting Valley Forge, as Willowbrook Junior High School was one of the winners of the annual Freedoms Foundation competition against the junior high schools of our great Nation. Mrs. Jones accompanied Miss Gates and Principal Jones on their pilgrimage to Valley Forge to receive the award for the school which they ably represented. The wording of the award is as follows: "For outstanding achievement in bringing about a better understanding of the American way of life."

The reason Miss Gates wrote her essay on Daniel Webster was because when I called her attention to the fact that the only quotation or verse on the walls of the House of Representatives was one by Daniel Webster I asked her to tell me something about him and she frankly stated she did not know very much about him so I invited her to read up about him and write me her report. Following is the text thereof:

DANIEL WEBSTER

(By Verna Dean Gates, Willowbrook Junior High School, June 11, 1956)

When I had the privilege of visiting our Nation's Capitol last spring under the sponsorship of Freedoms Foundation, our Congressman, CLYDE DOYLE, personally guided us into the assembly room of the House of Representatives. He pointed out many interesting features of this historical room and particularly called my attention to an inscription on the wall. The only words on the wall of that room. They were the words of a great American named Daniel Webster. These are the words of that quotation:

"By the blessing of God may these United States become a vast and splendid monument, not of oppression and terror, but of wisdom, of peace and of liberty upon which this world may gaze with admiration forever."

Daniel was a great compromiser. He did many great and wonderful things. He made a treaty with Canada. This enables tourists from the United States and Canada to go across each other's borders with a minimum of redtape and as little investigation as possible.

In Daniel's lifetime there was great controversy between the Northern and Southern States. Daniel's compromising kept the States together for a long time.

Daniel had a very good friend named Colonel Mannings. He was always trying to persuade Daniel to agree with the North instead of the South. In Daniel's heart he thought slavery was the most inhuman thing that a person could do. But he wanted to be President so much that he would not express his feelings. Colonel Mannings thought this was a very cowardly way to act.

In an address before Congress he told the Congressmen that he fully agreed with the South. This shocked the northerners very much. By saying those words he did not become President. Colonel Mannings was very disgusted and thought he would never forgive Daniel.

Four years before Daniel died Colonel Mannings forgave him for what he had done and once more was his friend.

Daniel Webster was human and like the rest of us apparently had his faults, but he will always be remembered as one of America's greatest orators and a statesman who lived for his country above everything else.

PRICE OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

The Public Printer is authorized to furnish to subscribers the daily RECORD at $1.50 per month, payable in advance.

Remit by money order payable to Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is located in Statuary Hall, House wing, where Mr. Frank Brodie is in attendance during the sessions of Congress to receive orders for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month, and where single copies may also be purchased. Orders are also accepted for the printing of speeches in pamphlet form.

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

SENATORS WITH RESIDENCES IN WASHINGTON

OFFICE ADDRESS: Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

[Streets northwest unless otherwise stated]

Vice President, Richard Nixon

Aiken, George D., *Vt*.....Carroll Arms.
Allott, Gordon, *Colo*.....
Anderson, Clinton P., *N. Mex.*.....6 Wesley Circle.
Barrett, Frank A., *Wyo*.....The Woodner.
Beall, J. Glenn, *Md*.....
Bender, George H., *Ohio*.....120 Schotts Court NE.
Bennett, Wallace F., *Utah*.....
Bible, Alan, *Nev*.....
Bricker, John W., *Ohio*.....The Mayflower.
Bridges, Styles, *N. H*.....
Bush, Prescott, *Conn*.....
Butler, John Marshall, *Md*.....
Byrd, Harry Flood, *Va*.....The Shoreham.
Capehart, Homer E., *Ind*.....The Westchester.
Carlson, Frank, *Kans*.....Sheraton-Park
Case, Clifford P., *N. J*.....
Case, Francis, *S. Dak*.....4635 Mass. Ave.
Chavez, Dennis, *N. Mex*.....3327 Cleveland Ave.
Clements, Earle C., *Ky*.....The Congressional
Cotton, Norris, *N. H*.....
Curtis, Carl T., *Nebr*.....
Daniel, Price, *Tex*.....
Dirksen, Everett M., *Ill*.....
Douglas, Paul H., *Ill*.....
Duff, James H., *Pa*.....
Dworshak, Henry C., *Idaho*.....
Eastland, James O., *Miss*.....5101 Macomb St.
Ellender, Allen J., *La*.....
Ervin, Samuel J., Jr., *N. C*.....
Flanders, Ralph E., *Vt*.....
Frear, J. Allen, Jr., *Del*.....
Fulbright, J. William, *Ark*.....
George, Walter F., *Ga*.....The Mayflower.
Goldwater, Barry M., *Ariz*.....
Gore, Albert, *Tenn*.....
Green, Theodore Francis, *R. I.*.....University Club.
Hayden, Carl, *Ariz*.....
Hennings, Thomas C., Jr., *Mo.*.....
Hickenlooper, Bourke B., *Iowa.*.....5511 Cedar Parkway, Chevy Chase, Md.
Hill, Lister, *Ala*.....
Holland, Spessard L., *Fla*.....Sheraton-Park
Hruska, Roman L., *Nebr*.....
Humphrey, Hubert H., *Minn.*.....
Humphreys, Robert, *Ky*.....
Ives, Irving M., *N. Y*.....
Jackson, Henry M., *Wash*.....
Jenner, William E., *Ind*.....
Johnson, Lyndon B., *Tex*.....
Johnston, Olin D., *S. C*.....
Kefauver, Estes, *Tenn*.....4848 Upton St.
Kennedy, John F., *Mass*.....
Kerr, Robert S., *Okla*.....
Knowland, William F., *Calif.*.....
Kuchel, Thomas H., *Calif*.....
Laird, William R. III, *W. Va*.....
Langer, William, *N. Dak*.....2101 Conn. Ave.
Lehman, Herbert H., *N. Y*.....Sheraton-Park
Long, Russell B., *La*.....
McCarthy, Joseph R., *Wis*.....
McClellan, John L., *Ark*.....
McNamara, Pat, *Mich*.....
Magnuson, Warren G., *Wash.*.....The Shoreham.
Malone, George W., *Nev*.....The Mayflower.
Mansfield, Mike, *Mont*.....
Martin, Edward, *Pa*.....
Martin, Thos. E., *Iowa*.....4545 Conn. Ave.
Millikin, Eugene D., *Colo*.....
Monroney, A. S. Mike, *Okla.*.....
Morse, Wayne, *Oreg*.....5020 Lowell St.
Mundt, Karl E., *S. Dak*.....122 Schotts Court NE.
Murray, James E., *Mont*.....The Shoreham.
Neely, Matthew M., *W. Va*.....
Neuberger, Richard L., *Oreg.*.....
O'Mahoney, Joseph C., *Wyo.*.....Sheraton-Park
Pastore, John O., *R. I*.....
Payne, Frederick G., *Maine*.....
Potter, Charles E., *Mich*.....
Purtell, William A., *Conn*.....
Robertson, A. Willis, *Va*.....
Russell, Richard B., *Ga*.....
Saltonstall, Leverett, *Mass*.....2320 Tracy Pl.
Schoeppel, Andrew F., *Kans.*.....
Scott, W. Kerr, *N. C*.....
Smathers, George A., *Fla*.....
Smith, H. Alexander, *N. J*.....Sheraton-Park
Smith, Margaret Chase, (Mrs.), *Maine.*.....
Sparkman, John J., *Ala*.....4928 Indian Lane
Stennis, John, *Miss*.....
Symington, Stuart, *Mo*.....
Thye, Edward J., *Minn*.....
Watkins, Arthur V., *Utah*.....
Welker, Herman, *Idaho*.....4823 Tilden St.
Wiley, Alexander, *Wis*.....2122 Mass. Ave.
Williams, John J., *Del*.....
Wofford, Thomas A., *S. C*.....
Young, Milton R., *N. Dak*.....Quebec House So.

OFFICERS OF THE SENATE

Secretary—Felton M. Johnston.
Chief Clerk—Emery L. Frazier.
Sergeant at Arms—Joseph C. Duke.
Secretary for the Majority—Robert G. Baker.
Secretary for the Minority—J. Mark Trice.
Chaplain—Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D.

STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE SENATE

Committee on Agriculture and Forestry

Messrs. Ellender (chairman), Johnston of South Carolina, Holland, Eastland, Clements, Humphrey, Scott, Symington, Aiken, Young, Thye, Hickenlooper, Mundt, Williams, and Schoeppel.

Committee on Appropriations

Messrs. Hayden (chairman), Russell, Chavez, Ellender, Hill, McClellan, Robertson, Magnuson, Holland, Stennis, Clements, Johnson of Texas, Bridges, Saltonstall, Young, Knowland, Thye, McCarthy, Mundt, Mrs. Smith of Maine, Messrs. Dworshak, Dirksen, and Potter.

Committee on Armed Services

Messrs. Russell (chairman), Byrd, Johnson of Texas, Kefauver, Stennis, Symington, Jackson, Ervin, Saltonstall, Bridges, Flanders, Mrs. Smith of Maine, Messrs. Case of South Dakota, Duff, and Welker.

Committee on Banking and Currency

Messrs. Fulbright (chairman), Robertson, Sparkman, Frear, Douglas, Lehman, Monroney, Morse, Capehart, Bricker, Ives, Bennett, Bush, Beall, and Payne.

Committee on the District of Columbia

Messrs. Neely (chairman), Bible, McNamara, Morse, Frear, Beall, Hruska, Case of New Jersey, and Allott.

Committee on Finance

Messrs. Byrd (chairman), George, Kerr, Frear, Long, Smathers, Anderson, Douglas, Millikin, Martin of Pennsylvania, Williams, Flanders, Malone, Carlson, and Bennett.

Committee on Foreign Relations

Messrs. George (chairman), Green, Fulbright, Sparkman, Humphrey, Mansfield, Morse, Long, Wiley, Smith of New Jersey, Hickenlooper, Langer, Knowland, Aiken, and Capehart.

Committee on Government Operations

Messrs. McClellan (chairman), Jackson, Kennedy, Symington, Ervin, Humphrey, Wofford, McCarthy, Mundt, Mrs. Smith of Maine, Messrs. Cotton, Bender, and Martin of Iowa.

Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs

Messrs. Murray (chairman), Anderson, Jackson, O'Mahoney, Bible, Neuberger, Laird, Scott, Millikin, Malone, Watkins, Dworshak, Kuchel, Barrett, and Goldwater.

Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce

Messrs. Magnuson (chairman), Pastore, Monroney, Smathers, Daniel, Ervin, Bible, Wofford, Bricker, Schoeppel, Butler, Potter, Duff, Purtell, and Payne.

Committee on the Judiciary

Messrs. Eastland (chairman), Kefauver, Johnston of South Carolina, Hennings, McClellan, Daniel, O'Mahoney, Neely, Wiley, Langer, Jenner, Watkins, Dirksen, Welker, and Butler.

Committee on Labor and Public Welfare

Messrs. Hill (chairman), Murray, Neely, Lehman, Kennedy, McNamara, ———, Smith of New Jersey, Ives, Purtell, Goldwater, Bender, and Allott.

Committee on Post Office and Civil Service

Messrs. Johnston of South Carolina (chairman), Pastore, Monroney, Hennings, Scott, Neuberger, Laird, Carlson, Jenner, Langer, Curtis, Martin of Iowa, and Case of New Jersey.

Committee on Public Works

Messrs. Chavez (chairman), Kerr, Gore, McNamara, Neuberger, Wofford, ———, Martin of Pennsylvania, Case of South Dakota, Bush, Kuchel, Cotton, and Hruska.

Committee on Rules and Administration

Messrs. Green (chairman), Hayden, Hennings, Gore, Mansfield, Jenner, Barrett, McCarthy, and Curtis.

UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT

Mr. Chief Justice Warren, of California, Hotel Sheraton-Park, Washington, D. C.
Mr. Justice Black, of Alabama, 619 S. Lee St., Alexandria, Va.
Mr. Justice Reed, of Kentucky, the Mayflower.
Mr. Justice Frankfurter, of Massachusetts, 3018 Dumbarton Ave.
Mr. Justice Douglas, of Washington, 3701 Connecticut Ave.
Mr. Justice Burton, of Ohio, the Dodge.
Mr. Justice Clark, of Texas, 2101 Connecticut Ave.
Mr. Justice Minton, of Indiana, the Methodist Building.
Mr. Justice Harlan, of New York, 1677 31st St.

OFFICERS OF THE SUPREME COURT

Clerk—Harold B. Willey, 3214 N. Wakefield St., Arlington, Va.
Deputy Clerk—Reginald C. Dilli, 1329 Hemlock St.
Deputy Clerk—Hugh W. Barr, 4701 Connecticut Ave.
Marshal—T. Perry Lippitt, 6004 Corbin Road.
Reporter—Walter Wyatt, 1702 Kalmia Rd.
Librarian—Helen Newman, 126 3d St. SE.

UNITED STATES JUDICIAL CIRCUITS

JUSTICES ASSIGNED

TERRITORY EMBRACED

District of Columbia: Mr. Chief Justice Warren. District of Columbia.

First judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Frankfurter. Maine, New Hampshire, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Puerto Rico.

Second judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Harlan. Vermont, Connecticut, New York.

Third judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Burton, Pennsylvania, New Jersey, Delaware, Virgin Islands.

Fourth judicial circuit: Mr. Chief Justice Warren. Maryland, Virginia, West Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina.

Fifth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Black. Georgia, Florida, Alabama, Mississippi, Louisiana, Texas, Canal Zone.

Sixth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Reed. Ohio, Michigan, Kentucky, Tennessee.

Seventh judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Minton. Indiana, Illinois, Wisconsin.

Eighth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Clark. Minnesota, North Dakota, South Dakota, Iowa, Nebraska, Missouri, Arkansas.

Ninth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Douglas. Washington, Oregon, Montana, Idaho, California, Nevada, Arizona, Alaska, Hawaii.

Tenth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Clark. Colorado, Wyoming, Utah, Kansas, Oklahoma, New Mexico.

Appendix

Commencement Address by Hon. Lister Hill, of Alabama, at Woman's Medical College of Pennsylvania

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LISTER HILL
OF ALABAMA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, June 26, 1956

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a commencement day address which I delivered at the commencement exercises of the Woman's Medical College of Pennsylvania, at Philadelphia, Pa., on June 7 last.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS OF THE HONORABLE LISTER HILL, UNITED STATES SENATOR FROM ALABAMA, AT COMMENCEMENT EXERCISES OF THE WOMAN'S MEDICAL COLLEGE OF PENNSYLVANIA AT PHILADELPHIA JUNE 7, 1956

President Gordon, doctors, distinguished guests, graduates, students, and friends, I am happy and honored to be with you on this auspicious occasion. I share your pride in this splendid institution, which enjoys the distinction of being the only woman's medical college in the United States, this institution that has become so important a part of our Nation's great center of medical education, this institution that has made historic contributions in securing for women their rightful place in medicine.

I come as one who has deep roots in the medical history of Philadelphia and I rejoice at the opportunity to nourish them once again.

It was in Philadelphia that my father, a suregon and practitioner of medicine for more than 50 years, was privileged to study at Jefferson Medical College under the renowned Samuel D. Gross.

It was here that my father acquired much of the foundation as a student and seeker of medical knowledge that prepared him to go forth into the night and by the light of a kerosene lamp in a crude cabin in Montgomery, Ala., perform the first successful suture of the human heart in America.

It was here that he formed warm friendships which endured throughout his lifetime.

And it was from here that he went forth to study under Joseph Lister, whose name I proudly bear, and it was at the time that great benefactor of mankind was enunciating and fighting for the acceptance of the principles of aseptic and antiseptic treatment of wounds, the treatment which gave birth to modern surgery.

Being with you today has a special significance for me—not only because of my father's association with Philadelphia; not only because of my efforts in the United States Senate in the field of health; but as the son of a doctor, the nephew of a doctor, the brother-in-law of two doctors, the first cousin of five doctors, and as one early imbued with a deep and abiding interest in doctors, and in the progress of medicine and medical care in our Nation. I appreciate the more the signal honor of having the opportunity to say to you on this your graduation day that which tens of thousands of men and women and children will say to you through the years yet to come.

Some will say it with their voices, some with their eyes, all in their hearts will say that which I would be the first to say to you:

Thank you for what you have done.

Thank you for what you will do.

Thank you for what you are.

Thank you for becoming doctors; for having taken the hard way; for having fought off the easy; for having worked and studied; for having sacrificed so much. Thank you for having had so early in life the wisdom to know that only in a life of constant study and service to your fellow man can your own lives be rich and meaningful.

We need you as doctors. People—some in fear, some in pain, some in danger—need you and need the art and the science you have learned.

In our society you have achieved a place of stature and of honor. The place you have won carries with it a formidable array of responsibilities. These responsibilities are many; they are varied; some are difficult to discern; too many are easy to forget; all are a challenge.

The first challenge is the challenge which confronts the woman in medicine in her capacity as a citizen. In matters of economics, of sociology, of social welfare, and particularly of the relationship of health and Government, that which you say and do will be accorded a respect unsurpassed by that given to any other member of your community.

In the past few years the revolutionary strides in the field of health have been achieved largely because of the willingness of men and women in medicine to assume the responsibilities of citizenship. Through vigorous leadership and cooperation with professional and lay leaders, and with legislators, doctors have contributed mightily to an ever-expanding pattern of progress in medicine and its related fields.

This progress is attested by the fact that last year in Congress under our Hill-Burton program, which will celebrate its tenth anniversary in August, we sharply increased the funds for the construction of hospital and health facilities.

The Hill-Burton program has helped States, communities and nonprofit organizations to build critically needed hospitals, health centers, laboratories and expand facilities for medical education. Already more than 2,000 hospitals and health facilities have been built. Hundreds of them are in communities where there had never been a hospital. Almost 900 additional projects are now under construction or will soon be started. Last year for the first time funds appropriated were designated for the constuction of rehabilitation facilities, diagnostic and treatment centers, nursing homes and facilities for the care of patients with chronic illness, as well as for research in the management and administration of hospital care.

With the active and indispensable roles played by men and women in medicine, we established the National Institutes of Health at Bethesda and inaugurated the programs for medical research—research through which we have already accomplished so much and which is so vital for the future progress of medicine and the health of our people.

It was through the initiative of members of the medical profession that we discovered to our consternation that the greatest library of medicine in the world, the Armed Forces Library, the library on which so much of our research depends and the contents of which are irreplaceable, is currently housed in a building constructed in 1887 and condemned over 30 years ago. Congress acted promptly, and I think I can promise you that soon we shall have a truly national library of medicine, adequately housed and properly located.

These programs and many others have been hammered out and shaped with the aid of members of the medical profession and suchs professional organizations as the American Medical Association and the American Hospital Association and similar groups. We in the Congress could never have developed such programs without the counsel, the cooperation and the leadership of the medical profession.

In determining the role of Government in the field of health, the leadership of women doctors is all important. The humanitarian concern for people and for their welfare, with which you as women are so richly endowed, coupled with the training and experience you have gained as physicians and scientists, bids you accept the responsibilities of citizenship and exercise the leadership which your position demands. Your determination to do so can mean the difference between an age of progress or an age of stagnation in the field of health.

United in the cause of bringing health and happiness into the lives of our people, we must go forward into a new day of health.

We must continue to carry forward the great programs already inaugurated and already proven so successful.

We must intensify and enlarge our medical research. Through research we will find the keys to unlock the doors to the cause and cure or prevention of so many diseases that have plagued and baffled mankind through the centuries.

We must train more doctors and dentists.

We must meet the crucial shortage of professional nurses, practical nurses and auxiliary hospital and health personnel.

We must provide more protection against catastrophic illness. We must extend voluntary health and hospital insurance to more of our people. We must meet the special and difficult problems involving the aged, the indigent, and the unemployed.

In these and many other fields government at its different levels—Federal, State, county and municipal—can and must do much. I am happy to tell you that last week the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, of which I happen to be chairman, recommended to the Senate a bill authorizing Federal funds for training nurses and other health personnel, for training doctors in mental health and in public health and for the establishment of research projects in these fields. I hope that we shall soon recommend a bill providing funds to assist in construction of medical educational and research facilities.

As we move forward along the whole front in the battle for better health for our peo-

ple, we must remember that the doctor is ever the central figure in the drama of medical care. All else is but to assist him, to help him achieve the best possible results. And I hasten to add that I use the masculine "him" in a generic sense only. If the doctor is to do his best he must remain free and uncontrolled. Only as the doctor finds the inspiration and enjoys the right of individual action that freedom gives—to explore, to inquire, to discover, to serve in his own way—only then can we give his best, only then can we continue the marvelous progress of American medicine.

We must preserve the incentives of our free medical system, the incentives for individual effort, iniative and resourcefulness, the incentives to give the best we have, the incentives that flow from the free choice and personal relationship of the doctor and his patient.

Equally as important as the responsibilities of citizenship is the challenge which will confront you as individuals entering into a noble profession. From the days of women doctors in ancient Greece until little more than a century ago, women were excluded from the medical profession. The belated reentry of women into medicine—marked by the historic founding of this school—and the skepticism which unfortunately and unjustifiably is still in the minds of many may cause any lapse in meeting your responsibilities to be regarded more gravely than might be the case of a man.

Of utmost importance is constant vigilance in maintaining your intellectual integrity and the high standards which your profession calls upon you to uphold: Thou shall not bear tales but shall guard thy patient's confidence; thou shall not gamble with a patient's life; thou shall scrupulously avoid the temptation to let moneymaking and cupidity supplant ethics—the ethics with which I know you are now imbued. Nourish and hold fast to the ideals which led you to enter the medical profession; the ideals which won for medicine universal recognition as the most idealistic of all the secular professions.

Another challenge to you as individuals is the responsibility of understanding the importance of the cross-fertilization of knowledge and of the necessity for close and continuing contact between practitioner and scientists that is the hallmark of today's medicine.

My father once illustrated the importance of the relationship between doctor and scientist by telling me how in 1864 Joseph Lister, walking home with the professor of chemistry, Thomas Anderson, heard of certain papers on fermentation and putrefaction which had been recently published by a then little-known French chemist, Pasteur. Lister read these papers and found himself convinced that minute living particles floating in the air often turned the surgery of his day into a charnel house.

This casual meeting with Anderson, plus the reading of a newspaper article on carbolic acid, led, in 1867, to Lister's laying down the great principles of the modern treatment of wounds.

A fourth challenge that will present itself to many of you is that of preserving the wonderful missionary spirit that characterizes so many outstanding graduates of your school—to name but a few, Drs. Clara Swain, May Selye, Sara Seward, and Anna Kugler in India; Drs. Coombs, Reifsnyder, Root, and Fuller in China; and Dr. Rosella Sherwood Hall in Korea.

These and other valiant women missionaries, graduates of the Woman's Medical College of Philadelphia, have added splendor to the traditions of women in medicine. They have shown us in this distraught world in which we live today that through personal discipline, through wisdom and compassion, we can win for our people the affection, the understanding, and the loyal support of other peoples.

Through your dedication and devotion to the ideals of your profession you will add years to the lives of our people. And when the time comes for some of your patients to leave this earth, it will be your understanding, your compassion, and your gentle ways which will convert moments of fear and anguish into moments of peace and serenity. Never forget the admonition of the gentle Joseph Lister, "Let not mercy or truth forsake thee; bind them about thy neck."

I hope that you will also accept the responsibility of encouraging more women to enter the field of medicine. I was surprised to learn that last year, out of 28,000 students of medicine in this country, only some 1,500 were women and that the percentage of women students of medicine is now less than 5 percent of the total. We need not fewer men but more women in medicine.

Those who preceded you and passed down through the ages the traditions of women as doctors were few in number. So, relatively speaking, are you few in number. Yet your opportunities to enrich these traditions are as boundless as are the limits of today's ever-expanding world of medicine—the world you are about to enter.

On this your graduation day, as you pass through the portals of your beloved college into a profoundly challenging way of life, I wish you health, goodness, and usefulness as doctors, as scientists, as citizen, and as individuals. I pray that the blessings that befall you may be as abundant as will be the happiness I know you will bring to the lives of others.

It must ever be a glad distinction to have consecrated your lives to serve as those who have gone before have served—healing the sick and making whole the maimed, protecting the mother in childbirth and watching over the infant so newly come to this world, bringing life and health and happiness to your fellow man—following in humility and with faith in the footsteps of Him who nearly 2,000 years ago was called the Great Physician. I salute you, doctors, on the commencement of your service to mankind.

Campaign Fund-Raising Drive in Alexandria, Minn.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, June 26, 1956

Mr. HUMPHREY of Minnesota. Mr. President, several references have already been made on the Senate floor to the imaginative bipartisan campaign fund-raising drive which was recently conducted in Alexandria, Minn. An article appearing in the current June 25, 1956, issue of the New Republic describes this Alexandria experiment. This article was written by a talented young Minnesotan, John Obert, of the Park Region Echo in Alexandria.

Mr. Obert has just received an unusual recognition of his journalistic talents by being selected a Nieman Fellow for study at Harvard University. Mr. Obert is the only newsman from a nondaily newspaper to receive this award in the history of the Nieman Fellowships. I ask unanimous consent that his article on the Alexandria fund-raising campaign be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AN EXPERIMENT IN CAMPAIGN FINANCING

(By John C. Obert)

When FRANCIS CASE of South Dakota took the Senate floor on February 3 to reveal that he had been offered $2,500 for his forthcoming campaign by an oil man interested in passage of the Harris Natural Gas Bill, he precipitated a deluge of newspaper headlines, the veto of the bill by the President and an effulgence of pious declarations of intention by the Senate itself.

Many things were going to be done to make sure such a thing never happened again, the Senate said, and, with admirable alacrity, a special committee was appointed to conduct a specific investigation into the Case episode, a general investigation of lobbying, and campaign contributions was authorized and preliminary work on a new corrupt practices bill was begun. The new legislation was aimed, it was reported with much fanfare, at requiring complete reporting and publicity of all campaign contributions and with establishing a realistic limit on contributions and expenditures.

Majority opinion in both parties has always frowned on financing elections with big gifts from potential favor seekers. But the question has been: If not their money, whose?

In Alexandria, Minn., we have proved that the public is willing to shoulder the responsibility.

It was on a cold, blustery day in late February when Minnesota's commissioner of agriculture, "Barney" Allen, bumped his broad-hipped frame through the door of the editorial offices of our newspaper, the semi-weekly Park Region Echo to ask for and receive the Echo's pledge of promotional support for the testing of a mass fund-raising plan, conceived jointly by Philip Graham, publisher of the influential Washington Post and Times Herald, and himself, the test to be conducted in Douglas County, Minn.

Nine weeks later, on a wind-swept, rain-drenched night in early May, Joe Tomlinson, district manager for an automobile club, and Wayne Bye, a young farmer, walked up the steps of a home in Alexandria, rang the doorbell, collaborated on a sales pitch, accepted a contribution for political campaigns. Tomlinson was Douglas County Democratic-Farmer-Labor chairman, and Bye was Douglas County Republican chairman. Their joint solicitation of that home in Alexandria, Minn., launched the Nation's first bipartisan fund-raising drive.

From the day Barney Allen first broached the experiment to the night it was carried out, many obstacles were met and overcome. Not the least of these was the outspoken condemnation of the plan by Ed Willow, State Republican finance chairman. Though Philip Graham supported Eisenhower in 1952, the fact that Allen and the Park Region Echo are allied with the Democratic-Farmer-Labor Party aroused understandable suspicion in some Republican circles. Willow, for one, contended that the all-party plan would "sap the vigor of the individual political parties" and "blur traditional party lines." National Republican Committeeman George Etzell, who later recanted, initially charged that the plan was "a Democratic scheme loaded in favor of the Democrats." This in spite of the fact that the Republican Party will get the largest share of the money raised by the bipartisan campaign.

For the money is to be divided into three equal parts, one earmarked for the Presidential campaign, one for the Congressional campaign and one for the gubernatorial campaign, and each third is to be divided among the parties on the basis of the party

vote cast for these respective offices in Douglas County at the last general election.

In three nights of formal canvassing by 40 teams of solicitors, each made up of a Democrat and a Republican or a party member and an independent, 75 of every 100 Alexandrians approached contributed to the all-party campaign. And only 200 people earmarked their entire contribution for one or the other party. To date, with a large number of follow-up calls still to be made, a total of $1,200 has been collected from 930 contributors, far better than the $1-a-voter average sought.

As an editorial in the Kansas City Star pointed out, this should indicate that there is a source of some $62 million in campaign money, with no strings attached, awaiting the political parties if they'll only join hands to go after it. Some of us here in Alexandria are convinced that the Graham-Allen plan, implemented by certain Congressional actions, can raise nationally three times $62 million.

The Alexandria experiment was a success for a number of reasons, not the least of which was community pride in pioneering something new. The next community to try out the all-party fund raising plan will not have that extra incentive and will meet with similar obstacles. Something more is needed to excite the public's imagination and challenge the political parties to cooperate. That somthing might be Federal sanction of the plan, official bipartisan approval and encouragement in the form of a charter granted a national foundation for political campaign contributions, coupled with a new Corrupt Practices Act clearly defining the rules for raising and spending campaign money and requiring full reporting and publicizing of such contributing and spending. But the special Senate committee set up to reexamine the present system has done nothing since the Case incident disappeared from the news headlines.

Alexandria, Minn., has shown that it is practical to pay for campaigns without relying on potential influence-buyers to write the checks.

The United States Senate has the next move.

The American American Legion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STYLES BRIDGES
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, June 26, 1956

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD a guest editorial from the Newport Argus-Champion, of Newport, N. H., published by Nicholas J. Mahoney, entitled "The American American Legion."

I feel that this editorial is outstanding, and I commend it to all.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Manchester (N. H.) Union Leader of June 25, 1956]

THE AMERICAN AMERICAN LEGION

At a time when a considerable segment of the population is puzzled by the penchant of educators for inviting men of questionable loyalties to address college students, it is refreshing to have the American Legion come to Newport.

The Legion represents basic, intelligent Americanism. It is comprised of those who have made sacrifices to maintain our method of government. Its membership is composed of American citizens who fought in the three bloodiest wars in history. The Legion and its auxiliaries are the hard core of America.

It is inconceivable that the Legion would invite Alger Hiss to address its members, as Princeton did for its student body. No Oppenheimer, adjudged a security risk, would be welcomed as a lecturer as he is at Harvard. No Sweezy, * * * while appealing a verdict of contempt of court, would be granted the privilege, * * * as he was at the University of New Hampshire.

Such men are strange to the activities of the American Legion.

It is doubtful that those who hide behind the fifth amendment, or secretly pledge their allegiance to a system which exists to overthrow our Government, could understand the fervor with which the Legion promotes activities which are designed either to strengthen America or to aid those who have suffered as a result of sacrificing for America.

The Legion, as an entity, is but 37 years old. Yet in that comparatively short span, as the age of countries is computed, it has become a proud tradition in America. It is militant in its efforts to maintain America in the forefront, strong but just.

Members of the Legion do more than uphold the Constitution. They foster a respect for it in others, including the young. They engage in a myriad of causes, all designed to keep alive the spirit which is America's greatest heritage. They influence legislation to assure fair treatment for those who have fought for America.

They shelter with a protective mantle the wives and orphans of veterans. They aid veterans and their families to secure the full benefits due them by law.

Under the legion's sponsorship, boys all over America play baseball in junior leagues. The organization conducts nationwide oratorical contests, promotes Boy Scout troops, encourages scholarship below college level, fosters interest in good government with its Boys' State and Girls' State.

It works hand in hand with the Federal Bureau of Investigation in exposing subversives.

Conceived during war, the American Legion is dedicated to peace, but not peace at any price. Its members, already having offered themselves in defense of their country, are motivated by the determination never to let America become weak and subservient to a tyranny.

To that end, its chorus of almost 3 million voices is raised and its indefatigable efforts are devoted.

That's the organization whose New Hampshire department has chosen Newport for its convention. Our town is proud to be host to the American Legion, its ladies, and its auxiliaries.

We hope its deliberations are successful and fruitful and that the visit of legion members to Newport is so pleasant they will want to return again and again, not only as legionnaires but as welcome visitors.

The latchstring will be out.

The Presidency

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, June 25, 1956

Mr. HUMPHREY of Minnesota. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that two columns by Mr. James Reston, relating to the Presidency, which columns have been very educational and informative, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the columns were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times]

THE PRESIDENCY, III—A COMMENTARY ON THE LOSS OF LEADERSHIP IN LEGISLATION DURING PRESIDENT'S ABSENCE

(By James Reston)

WASHINGTON, June 19.—Tuesday is legislative day at the White House, and Maj. Gen. Wilton B. Persons, who runs interference for the President on Capitol Hill, was in his office this morning at 7:40 a. m.

He looked decidedly unmilitary—a tall, ruddy, 60-year-old man with receding gray hair, sportily dressed in a rough raw silk tan sports jacket, tan trousers, braided sports belt, two-toned shoes, white shirt, and a maroon tie figured with Republican elephants.

On his desk, in keeping with the medicinal quality of Washington these days, was a large sign:

"While in this office speak in a low, soothing tone of voice and do not disagree with me in any manner.

"Please be informed that when one has reached 'my age' noise and nonconcurrence cause gastric hyperstalsis, hypersecretion of hydrochloric acid, and rubus of the gastric mucosa * * * and I become most unpleasant."

"Slick" Persons has seldom been unpleasant to anyone in his life, which is why he is the President's liaison man with Congress, and he wasn't unpleasant this morning. In fact, he was entirely relaxed, for the normal Tuesday morning routine had been canceled.

TUESDAY'S SIGNIFICANCE

To anyone interested in the responsibilities of the modern American Presidency, the normal routine of Tuesday morning at the White House is significant.

It is a reminder that the President is not only Commander in Chief, principal administrative officer, ceremonial head, and keeper of the public conscience, but that he is party leader and legislative leader as well.

Coincidentally, the Tuesday morning meeting illustrates President Eisenhower at his best. It clashes with the illusion, now being carefully projected here, that everything goes on as before, regardless of the President's illness.

Normally, the President presides over the legislative council meeting at 9 a. m. in the Cabinet room. (It was moved up from 8:30 a. m. at the suggestion of the physicians after the President's heart attack last September.)

Usually in attendance are the Republican leader in the Senate, WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND; the Republican leader in the House of Representatives, JOSEPH W. MARTIN, Jr.; the chairman of the Senate Republican policy committee, Senator STYLES BRIDGES, of New Hampshire; the Republican whip in the Senate, Senator LEVERETT SALTONSTALL; the Republican deputy House leader, Representative CHARLES A. HALLECK, of Indiana; and the Republican whip in the House, Representative LESLIE C. ARENDS.

In addition to the President, Sherman Adams, the assistant to the President; General Persons, Gerald D. Morgan, the White House special counsel, and the other White House congressional lioson officers—I. Jack Martin (Senate) and Bryce N. Harlow (House)—represent the executive branch.

Depending on what is up for discussion, the ranking Republican members of the congressional committees handling the topics on the agenda and the Cabinet members principally concerned will also attend.

President Eisenhower's leadership in these meetings was at first tentative and respectful toward the congressional leaders. For the first year of his administration, he reigned but did not rule. Then slowly, until his first illness, he changed his tactics.

Unlike Franklin D. Roosevelt, who tended to use the rubber-truncheon approach to Congress, and Harry S. Truman, who increasingly tended to taunt his former associates on Capitol Hill, President Eisenhower always has used the cooperation approach.

He put the legislative program on an organized basis. General Persons prepared for the Tuesday morning meeting by calling a session every Saturday morning of all the principal legislative representatives of the various departments and agencies. Here proposals for the Tuesday agenda were drafted.

On Monday, after consultation with the Republican legislative leaders, General Persons then prepared the agenda, briefed the President on it early Tuesday morning, and left the leadership to the President.

PRESIDENT ENJOYS IT

This is precisely the type of meeting the President enjoys. He runs it informally, and tends to take the judgment of the legislators on what can and cannot be achieved in Congress. But more and more he had tended to be assertive, to put all his powers of persuasion into the meeting, and to work personally with recalcitrant members in the hope of persuading them to back the administration's requests.

Much more than is generally realized, the President has been in private contact with Members of the Senate and House of Representatives by telephone, letter, and in unpublicized meetings at the White House on legislative matters. The general impression here is that these personal contacts have paid off.

For much of the last 9 months, however, the President simply has not been available to carry on this role as legislative leader. It was, of course, impossible during much of the time from his heart attack in September until he resumed his full duties in January. And while he has tried to carry on during his present illness by issuing public statements this week from his hospital bed, the all-important Eisenhower personal touch has been missing.

These absences have also, inevitably, cut the President's contacts with other members of the administration more than is generally realized or officially admitted.

For example, he used to have a regular meeting every Monday with Arthur F. Burns, Chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers, and Gabriel Hauge, the administrative assistant who keeps an eye on the growth of the national economy.

These meetings are no longer held on a regular basis, as part of the system of conserving the President's strength. Messrs. Burns and Hauge still do see the President if something of unusual importance comes up. But today, for example, they held a breakfast meeting at the White House not with the President but with Mr. Adams, General Persons and Mr. Martin of the White House staff.

CONFLICT OF CONCEPTS

The history of the Presidency, as Prof. Edward S. Corwin of Princeton has pointed out, reflects a struggle between two different conceptions of how the President should conduct his office.

First is the conception that the Executive ought to be subordinate to the supreme legislative power.

Second is the conception that it ought to be, within generous limits, autonomous, self-directing and assertive in initiating and pressing for the legislation it wants.

President Eisenhower tended at the beginning of his administration to adopt the first concept. For a time he tended to subordinate himself in the legislative process of the Congress.

In his second, and particularly in his third year, however, he moved close to the second concept, at least to the point of adopting Theodore Roosevelt's conviction that "the action of the Executive [often] offers the only means by which the people can get the legislation they demand and ought to have."

President Eisenhower never did go so far as to agree with the first Roosevelt that the Presidency was "the bully pulpit" of American life. But he did seek more and more to use the Tuesday meeting, the personal contacts and occasionally the persuasive power of patronage on the Congress.

The trouble is that this is an endless battle, requiring the unremitting attention of the President. And unfortunately his illness and absences from the White House have made this impossible.

[From the New York Times]

THE PRESIDENCY, IV—A STUDY OF EISENHOWER'S ATTEMPT TO MAKE UNITY A GUIDING PRINCIPLE OF GOVERNMENT

(By James Reston)

WASHINGTON, June 20.—President Eisenhower came into American political life in a convulsive era as a symbol of unity. Fortunately, he has tried to extend the principle of unity into the machinery of the Presidency.

The essence of his personal power is that nobody is mad at him. Men may differ with him, or feel sorry for him, or ridicule his ingenuous copybook-maxim approach to life and Government, but even then they seldom regard him with personal hostility.

This is a powerful factor that has contributed to his record as Chief Executive, legislative leader, mentor to a divided party, head of a mighty coalition, and even as negotiator with the Russians.

But what happens when he is stricken twice within 9 months and cannot use all his personal powers of persuasion?

The answer to this is that his leadership is seriously weakened by absence and doubts about the future. But while the President is temporarily on the sidelines, the Presidency as an institution has not been uninfluenced by his passionate interest in unity and teamwork.

For example, promptly at 12:30 this afternoon 8 men walked into the Secretary of State's dining room on the fifth floor of the new State Department Building on Virginia Avenue.

The host at luncheon was the Under Secretary of State Herbert Hoover, Jr. The others were William H. Jackson, the Special Assistant to the President for Foreign Affairs; Reuben B. Robertson, Jr., Under Secretary of Defense; Harold E. Stassen, the President's Special Assistant for Disarmament; Lt. Gen. C. P. Cabell, Director of the Central Intelligence Agency; John B. Hollister, Director of the International Cooperation Administration; Theodore C. Streibert, Director of the United States Information Agency; and one of their aids, Elmer B. Staats.

OPERATIONS BOARD MEETING

This was the weekly Wednesday meeting of the Operations Coordinating Board, the least known but probably the most important Eisenhower contribution to the machinery of the Presidency.

The OCB is not a policymaking committee. It has nothing to do with the operations of the Government within the United States. Its sole function is to see that the overseas operations of the Government are being carried out by all departments and agencies in accordance with the policies recommended by the National Security Council and approved by the President.

In short, it is an anticonfusion device. It was grafted on to the Presidency to see that a big Government that is getting bigger does not have one department carrying out overseas policy one way and several other departments carrying it out some other way.

There are so many officials from so many departments operating overseas—on information, agriculture, atomic energy, commerce, labor, immigration, intelligence, and defense—that harassed United States Ambassadors have trouble recognizing them all, let alone keeping tabs on what they are all doing.

Consequently, the OCB was created under the President and the Security Council to coordinate and follow their overseas operations and see that they stayed coordinated.

This is a big job, roughly equivalent to seeing that all mortals operate in accordance with the Ten Commandments. But the idea is clear it is to carry out Eisenhower's passion for teamwork.

It would be wrong to suggest that this was a wholly original idea. In September of 1939, a week after Germany invaded Poland, President Franklin D. Roosevelt established the Executive Office of the President.

This was Mr. Roosevelt's realization, after almost 7 years in power, that the President, without an elaboration of Presidential staff services, could not possibly supervise and unify both Executive policy formulation and execution.

TRUMAN SET UP NSC

This was greatly improved under President Truman with the creation of the National Security Council, a committee of the Cabinet, ably staffed and charged with coordinating security policy.

Since then, however, it has become increasingly (and sometimes painfully) evident that coordinating policy was not enough. Carrying out of that policy had also to be coordinated if United States officials, who have a weakness for thinking in narrow departmental terms, were not to interpret the coordinated policies in a dozen different uncoordinated ways.

The OCB's headquarters are at Jackson Place and Pennsylvania Avenue in an old house once owned by Gen. William T. (if nominated I will not accept, if elected I will not serve) Sherman. It has subcommittees working all over this town.

There are, in fact, more than 40 of them, some "watchdogging" information operations overseas, some studying certain countries, others following whole regions, some checking on atomic energy operations.

At least once every 6 months, each of these committees produces a progress report which goes to the National Security Council and the White House.

Whenever they find that a policy is so obscure that it defies coordinated execution, they yell to the security council for a better one. When they find some eager beaver overseas conducting his own private foreign policy, they blow the whistle on him.

HAS ITS DETRACTORS

That, at least, is the theory. The OCB, of course, has its critics. There are some officials here who think it is the greatest time-killer since the invention of golf. Others blanch at the thought of all those committee meetings, all those bootless, vainglorious speeches, and all those progress reports, which, they charge, are never read by the President.

Nevertheless, the OCB is by general consent a useful new device of the Presidency that is developing authority and coming out of its early development stage.

It has not managed to keep the officials it is intended to serve from making countless contradictory statements. And since its members have vastly different ideas about many operations, the old question arises:

"Who will coordinate the coordinators?"

Just the same, in any study of the President and the Presidency, the Operations Coordinating Board is bound to interest the historians. It cannot make up for the absences of the President. It cannot persuade the Congress to vote the President's foreign aid funds; it cannot coordinate policy (that is the function of the NSC); it cannot provide the leadership necessary to get the United States into an effective international trade organization. But it can help produce some unity in the operations of policies that are already on the books.

Thus, it draws attention to a fact that is seldom noticed, namely that the President has tried to institutionalize his concept of teamwork. And institutions such as the OCB, while far from perfect, are helping carry on as best they can while the President is away from the White House.

How the Mob Moved in on Labor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STYLES BRIDGES
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, June 26, 1956

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Blinded But Unbowed," which was published in the Manchester Union Leader, Manchester, N. H., on June 25, 1956, as well as the article written by Victor Riesel "How the Mob Moved in on Labor," to which the editorial refers.

The subject matter is certainly of vital importance to the Nation and I am sure these insertions will be of interest to all.

There being no objection, the editorial and article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Manchester (N. H.) Union Leader of June 25, 1956]

BLINDED BUT UNBOWED

The blinded eyes of Victor Riesel see clearly, as you will understand if you read the article over the masthead today. His special series relates the ugly picture of what happens to a nation when the "mobs" of criminals take over vast areas of its business and its labor unions. The story that Victor Riesel tells is not pretty, but it is true.

Responsibility for these conditions rests clearly on all of us, but special responsibility rests on politicians of both parties, not only in Washington but in the city halls and in the State capitols, all over the Nation which preferred to use the fantastically huge treasuries for gangsters to get elected, and thereafter wouldn't do anything about the lawlessness.

It rests also on the businessmen, who found it easier to make deals with the gangsters than to fight them.

As far back as December 1952, gang rule was the order of the day on the docks of New York City. The outstanding fact was that it wasn't poor, helpless, small steamship lines and merchants who were forced to make deals with these gangsters. It was the great steamship lines owned by immensely wealthy corporations or families.

In a letter dated December 15, 1952, this writer wrote to the president of one of the steamship lines, an inheritor of untold millions: "It is a little difficult to point the finger of scorn and shame at corruption in Washington when this type of corruption has been encouraged by deals between outstanding American businesses on the one hand and union leaders and gangsters on the other. It is true that you are in a difficult position, but at no time were you and your fellow steamship and stevedore concerns prevented from going en masse to the proper legal authorities and calling for action, as well as presenting your case simultaneously to the public."

In reply, the president of the company wrote back this illogical statement: "While the cost to the —— line was approximately $25,000, this money was not paid direct by the —— line to the boss leader, but was paid for a man on the payroll whom, we understand, did not actually work, which amount, we understand, went to the boss leader who, in turn, was capable of preventing labor disturbances."

In other words, it seemed perfectly all right for this steamship magnate to pay the money to another man who paid the gangsters. Apparently he thought it was ethical as long as he didn't pay the gangsters directly.

The gutless bowing down to the demands of the mobsters and the mob rulers by both Government and big business, not to mention big labor in this country, is not only an immoral and terrible thing which is sapping the vitality of the Nation internally, but it is this same moral indifference, this same boxing to brute force, that has prepared the way for this Nation's surrender to Communist gangsters all over the world. Once you start getting down on your belly to blackmailers and to gangsters, it becomes a habit.

Read Riesel's articles and find out how deep the habit and the cancer have eaten into this Nation's strength.

[From the Manchester (N. H.) Union Leader of June 25, 1956]

HOW THE MOB MOVED IN ON LABOR

(By Victor Riesel)

Only America has a racketeering labor underworld.

This mob has corroded unions, politics, and sections of the business world as deeply as the acid hurled at me burned into my eyes.

It has shot down hundreds of labor officials in the past decade. It has looted union welfare funds of millions of dollars. It has bombed the homes of more than 50 unionists. It has broken the skulls and spirit of thousands of rank-and-file dues papers. It has sold strong-arm squads to unions and employers—squads numbering as high as 500-man raiding parties which have beaten police officers and ripped apart stores and factories. It has even beaten women.

It has forced more than 100 honest union leaders to live under daily bodyguard. Most prominent of these are Walter Reuther and his brother and top aid, Victor, who were shot-gunned by the mob.

When it blinded me, the mob set the world aghast. President Eisenhower was outraged. He decided to move personally.

The President of the United States is but one of America's aroused citizens. Upward of 60,000 persons have written to me since I was attacked. Nearly 1,000 offered their eyes to help me see. (Although my doctors and I know these kindly offers are in vain—there is no possibility of corneal grafting.)

Thousands more proffered other forms of assistance.

I report this as a reflection of the seething but hitherto uncrystalized hatred of the mob by the angered American people who finally are ready to move against the organized crime combine.

CAN RESTORE DECENCY

They can't restore my sight but they can restore decency to their communities. If the people succeed, they will unshackle themselves of the mob which has ridden the backs of workingmen and their employers for 75 years.

The mob? Just what is it, anyway?

Inside labor, the mob is a crime cartel. It is a combination of specialists who have graduated beyond old-fashioned crime—outmoded bootlegging, smuggling, gambling, prostitution, white slavery, and even narcotics. It has moved in and taken over unions across the country, just as the old-time Capone mob moved in and took over theaters, night clubs, restaurants, and other types of businesses.

This labor mob loves the respectability that comes with union positions. They are enthralled by the huge treasuries and the use of other people's money as though it were their own. They aim for more than the billions of dollars in the unions' treasuries. Their greedy eyes are also on the easy money they can make by cutting in on the unions' stock market portfolios, real estate and other investments.

The mob is made up of a series of local barons. They deal in favors which they call "contracts." They throw up picket lines and they remove picket lines on short order.

GET CASH ON THE LINE

They pressure other union officials into making easy wage contracts and they frighten employers into yielding to their own union friends. For each favor there is cash-on-the-line or an obligation which the other fellow must fulfill on demand at a later date.

The mob uses the unions for its businesses. To stay in these businesses, it must stay in office. To stay in office, it must terrorize the opposition. For such terror you need muscle. The mob has it—in abundance.

It has had the muscle and the rackets for 75 years—but the skillfully organized thievery of today dates back to the 1920's—to the days when Lepke and Gurrah and another powerful but little known fellow by the name of "Curley" (tougher even than Lepke) took orders from a polished financial genius with a flair for organization—a man named Arnold Rothstein.

Rothstein was a methodical business expert. He organized and rationalized crime as an efficient and unified industry, just as the legitimate men of big business such as the Rockefellers, Fricks, and Morgans tried to unify the oil, steel and railroad industries.

Rothstein was a man of varied criminal tastes. He bribed the Chicago White Sox to throw the 1919 World Series to the Cincinnati Reds. He controlled gambling, prostitution and narcotics in New York. His fame, his money and his "troops" soon spread across the Nation. Before long, he was the underworld's chief financier.

BOUGHT JUDGES

He bought judges as casually as you or I buy a suit or a dress. He owned hotels, theaters and night clubs, to name just a few enterprises. Soon the labor field intrigued this smooth-as-silk crime tycoon.

When strong-arm men were hired by unions or employers in a strike—although neither side knew it—the muscle men on both ends, who waited in special depots for the word to rush to the attack, all were in Rothstein's pay. For example, back in 1926 the Communists seized the International Ladies Garment Workers Union and looted a million dollars in special funds from the union's treasury. The comrades used this money to finance a strike that same year.

The Communists were the first to bring big-time hoods into the labor field. In the fur industry, they hired a gang of Greek mobsters known as the Black Gloves to keep people in line.

In the 1926 strike in the ladies' garment industry, they hired the Little Augie gang of Brooklyn to smash shops and employers. The businessmen then retaliated by retaining Legs Diamond. Both hoods were ac-

count executives, in charge of muscle, for Arnold Rothstein.

Rothstein was killed in New York Central Hotel in November 1928. Legs Diamond was shot down on the streets. Little Augie went the way of all gangster flesh. But two of Rothstein's other lieutenants survived—for a while. They were Louis Lepke Buchalter and his partner, Gurrah Shapiro.

Lepke was the loving nickname for unlovely Louis. And Gurrah came from the gutteral noises Shapiro would make when he shouted at pushcart peddlers who wouldn't pay him a buck apiece for protection—Gurrah here.

MURDER, INC.

By the midthirties these two men moved into enough businesses and unions to take home $2 million a year before taxes—and who would dare ask them for taxes. After all, they also owned a business called Murder, Inc. They invaded the flower, trucking, bread, and apparel industries, among others. They cut up the field with Lucky Luciano, who once disciplined the Mafia by knocking off 40 underworld insurgents in 36 hours, according to what Murder, Inc.'s Abe Reles and other informants told the Brooklyn District Attorney at that time.

They operated mostly through their terrorization of truckdrivers—who were easily intimidated because they could be picked off alone on the streets and highways.

Slowly they moved across the land, tying up with the Capone mob, the Purple Gang in Detroit and on to the hoods on the west coast.

In the mid-thirties Tom Dewey swooped down on Lepke and Gurrah. He made things so hot for the mob that Lepke went into hiding. Finally the mob could no longer jeopardize its huge take. It warned Lepke to give himself up. Lepke did—he died for murder in the hot seat at Sing Sing. But, as in the days of Rothstein, the mob left many lieutenants. Some of them paid their debt to society and became influential, respectable businessmen in their communities. Others became the modern manicured mob—the kind I've been fighting since I was a kid on the streets of the East Side of New York.

Ileitis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. RICHARD B. WIGGLESWORTH

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 14, 1956

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following extracts from "Three-Star Extra" broadcasts on medical testimony concerning ileitis:

FROM THREE-STAR EXTRA BROADCASTS OF JUNE 19, 20, AND 21, 1956

Ray Henle: It is evident that the President's doctors are highly pleased with his progress toward full recovery. But in other quarters, more political than medical, there has been what appears to be almost a campaign to make it appear that the ailment which necessitated the President's operation will force the President to withdraw as a candidate for reelection.

Because of the mushrooming character of this campaign, Three-Star Extra tonight presents some important facts which heretofore have not been given.

Here is the story:

Ned Brooks: President Eisenhower's doctors this afternoon took official notice of the rash of reports, chiefly by antiadministration columnists, that the President's intestinal trouble is likely to return and perhaps cause him to reconsider his decision to run for a second term.

The doctors rejected the claim that his ailment is chronic and they reaffirmed their belief that he will be physically able to continue in office.

For some days, White House press officers have been besieged for clarification from the doctors on the matter of the possible recurrence of the President's ailment.

A number of the inquiries were prompted by the syndicated columns of Miss Doris Fleeson, writing from Washington.

She has quoted a number of medical authorities, all to the effect that the chances of recurrences are strong among ileitis patients.

Among those quoted was the famous Dr. Charles W. Mayo, of Rochester, Minn. In a book written last year, he noted that the rate of recurrence is high, regardless of surgical technique.

Fred Morrison of our staff, has been on the telephone with Dr. Mayo:

Fred Morrison: I reached Dr. Mayo by telephone at his office in Rochester, Minn., this afternoon. I asked him if the quotation from his book, used by Miss Fleeson, represents his opinion of the President's illness. He said that it certainly does not, that Miss Fleeson had not talked to him, and that he did not know she was using the quotation.

He said that from what he knows of the President's case, he thinks he has an excellent chance for full recovery. Dr. Mayo told me that most cases of ileitis occur between the ages of 25 and 40. He said those are the cases he was speaking of in his book. He said when the disease strikes persons older than that, each case must be considered individually, and that is what should be done in the case of Mr. Eisenhower.

He said he saw the President only the day before his illness and that he had never seen him look so well. He then repeated that he believes he has an excellent chance for full recovery.

Ned Brooks: Another authority quoted in Miss Fleeson's column was Dr. Frederick Boyce, professor of clinical surgery at Tulane University, New Orleans.

He likewise has written on the recurrence of ileitis.

But when I talked to Dr. Boyce by telephone today, he said his observations could not apply to the President because he has never had an ileitis patient of the President's age.

He said his experience has been with younger patients, among whom the disease is more prevalent—persons 20 to 40 years old.

He said the records of others are inconclusive as to the older age group and his own experience would throw no light on the case of the President.

To further clarify this medical opinion, Three-Star Extra tonight presents the views of the man who discovered ileitis and whose name is used by medical men to identify the disease.

He is Dr. Burrill Crohn, of New York.

Dr. Crohn also is among those who have been quoted in support of the theory that the President runs the danger of another attack. He has said that the disease recurs in some 30 percent of the cases, but those who quoted him ignored the age factor which enters importantly into the case of the President.

On Sunday, Dr. Crohn appeared on the Smith, Kline, and French television program, March of Medicine, from Philadelphia.

We have the recording of that program and we're going to bring you the significant portions in Dr. Crohn's own voice.

He was asked, "How serious was the President's attack?"

His answer:

Dr. CROHN. I should say the President's attack was a relatively mild attack except that obstruction, which occurs in about 5 percent of the cases, is a complication which calls for immediate surgery.

But the fact that the obstruction occurred does not in any way mitigate his chances for a future recovery. In fact, it is almost an encouragement to believe that he will be perfectly well. The obstruction in itself represents a healing process—a late healing process in a chronic disease. It represents the end stage of a healing process and if the mechanical difficulty is overcome, then you would expect that patient to be well.

NED BROOKS. Dr. Crohn then was asked, "What are the facts about the recurrence of ileitis?"

Dr. CROHN. Recurrence is usually mild. They're limited, usually, to a few inches of the small bowel, they do not spread, they're considered now as medical rather than surgical problems, and it is exceedingly rare to have to go back and reoperate such a case.

The type that the President had—I should say that in his case, with obstruction which represents healing, that the chances are that this surgical procedure will be eminently successful and you should not expect any recurrence of the disease.

NED BROOKS. That was Dr. Burrill Crohn, outstanding authority, the man who first identified the disease ileitis.

Fred Morrison: Three-Star Extra has in its possession tonight a report on the most thorough study of the history of ileitis made since the President's illness. And this report has direct reference to the current political and journalistic campaign to build Mr. Eisenhower's illness into a serious disease which must require him to withdraw as a candidate for reelection.

This study, and the report, were made by Frederick F. Boyce, professor of clinical surgery at Tulane University. Dr. Boyce is one of the medical authorities quoted by some columnists to support their claims that the President's illness is serious and will continue to be so in spite of his successful operation.

He says that an extensive review of the literature and reports on ileitis shows there is no available record of the disease among persons of the President's age. He says that out of all the hundreds of cases reported, there is only one case comparable to that of Mr. Eisenhower. In this case, reported from Chicago, the patient was operated on at the age of 64. Nine years later he is well and there has been no recurrence, with the exception of 1 day's illness 5 months after the operation.

Dr. Boyce says that he never had personal experience with an ileitis patient 60 years of age, or older. He says, however, that his personal experience with older patients bears out the opinion of President Eisenhower's doctors that a recurrence of the disease at the President's age would be highly unusual.

Dr. Boyce said that one of the columnists who quoted him in an effort to show that he believes the disease is likely to recur failed to quote the part of his book which states that the situation is different with patients over 50.

So, Dr. Boyce joins Dr. Mayo and Dr. Crohn in correcting columnists who have incorrectly used their quotations.

But the campaign to picture the President's illness as a serious one continues. The Reporter magazine, which frequently opposes Eisenhower administration policies, joins the campaign today. It is out with an article in which it views with alarm the prospect of the President running for reelection, in view of his illness.

And in an editorial adjoining this article, the Reporter magazine endorses Adlai Stevenson for President.

So, politics roll on around the President's illness.

Text of Adenauer's Address Cautioning West on Soviet Moves

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 14, 1956

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, Chesterton is reported to have said, "Hell hath no fury like that of a noncombatant." Those farthest from the battlefield are often the ones who are surest that they know and are most vociferous in declaring just what the enemy's objectives and strategy are, and how the war should be fought.

But wise persons generally pay more attention to those who have had the closest and most extensive first-hand contact with the enemy—just as sensible persons pay more attention to the judgment of the doctor who is actually in charge of a patient than to the theories of the doctor who has seen only the patient's chart, or the latest communique.

Mr. Speaker, nearly every day one hears or reads theories and speculations, some of them utterly fantastic, regarding supposed benevolent changes in the Soviet Union. In the midst of the voices of confusion, it was most wholesome to have in our midst recently one of the great men of our time, Chancellor Konrad Adenauer, of the German Republic. His record for being right in his appraisals of Soviet actions is as good as that of so many others has been bad. In his address at Yale University on June 11, 1956, he has given us clear warnings regarding the unchanged mail fist of the Communists behind their recently-donned velvet gloves.

Americans and all peoples who want to preserve their freedom are indebted to Chancellor Adenauer for telling us the plain truth. Will we be wise enough to hear and to heed?

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I enclose Chancellor Adenauer's address:

TEXT OF ADENAUER'S ADDRESS CAUTIONING WEST ON SOVIET MOVES

President Griswold, ladies and gentlemen, I look upon it as a great honor that Yale University today has awarded me the honorary degree of Doctor of Laws.

It is a great distinction to receive an honorary degree from Yale, in particular. I am especially happy to be able to speak at one of the most venerable abodes of American intellectual life.

Let me avail myself of the opportunity to thank your university for having cultivated—in pursuit of its noble ideal of education—the study of German letters even in a dark age. A number of scholars of German origin hold high academic degrees from your university, and the Goethe collection of the Yale library is considered one of the best if not the best outside Germany.

It is, therefore, only an inadequate expression of our thanks that the German Federal Government has made available to scholarships for students of this university in the next academic year. We are glad to be able to receive your young compatriots as welcome guests in Germany and we hope that the exchange of young students, so fruitful for both sides, can be further encouraged in the future.

Ladies and gentlemen, you will now expect me to make some comments on the political situation as it appears to German eyes. Subject to the qualification that discussion of this broad subject within the compass of a short address is bound to remain sketchy, I would like to say this: it seems that we find ourselves at present in a new phase of the great conflict between East and West. The present leaders of the Soviet Union have pushed from his throne—after his death, it is to be noted—Stalin, the exponent of the policy of cruel hardship, of intimidation, of threat and violence. They have struck a fresh note.

AN IMPORTANT QUESTION

It is undeniable that they are making an impression thereby on some people. We cannot tell with certainty the reasons which led them to disavow Stalinism but one thing can be said with assurance: there are no signs to indicate that the disavowal of Stalinism means the acceptance of those spiritual principles which are the foundation of the free world. Instead, there are only new forms and methods used by a new, more dexterous leadership in the Kremlin in order to achieve the old objectives of the Bolshevik regime—the domination of the world by communism—more surely and with fewer sacrifices.

All the free nations are faced here with a question of the utmost importance, with the question: Is an unarmed peace possible? For the German people this question has special significance. Because of their geographic situation they are neighbors of Soviet power—by the Iron Curtain they are cut into two parts. Consequently they are especially disposed, perhaps, to place their hopes in a change of Soviet policy which would achieve the redemption of 17,000,000 Germans of the Soviet zone from enslavement.

Therefore, they are particularly ready to welcome with pleasure any evidence of a genuine change of mind in the leadership of the Soviet Union. But our own experiences have been too bitter and we have seen too clearly the meaning of communism, the methods it uses and the diabolic skill with which its propaganda operates not to react to the latest events in Moscow with the utmost skepticism.

One thing, I believe, is certain—and this was also clearly borne out by the Twentieth Party Congress in Moscow: The leaders of the Soviet Union continue to believe that capitalism is doomed to destruction and their aim is to make communism the dominant power in the world. The theory of "peaceful coexistence" currently being advanced by them does not by any means signify that they are prepared to respect the ideology of the West or even its continued existence.

As far as the Soviets are concerned, "peaceful coexistence"—which they had used advantageously before—is merely another tactical phase in their campaign to weaken the cohesion of the free world and to improve their own position. In line with their goal, they are addressing themselves at present chiefly to the Asian-African nations.

PROOF STILL IS LACKING

So far, I think, the men in the Kremlin still owe us proof that they are ready also in their policy toward the free nations to act in accordance with their repudiation of Stalin. So far, we have heard words but not seen any deeds. We have not seen any significant corrections of the most flagrant manifestations of Stalin's imperialism. Even the allies of the Soviet Union are still denied those rights to which the Soviet Union, by signing the Charter of the United Nations, pledged itself. In this connection I recall to you article II, paragraph 4, of the charter and would ask you to compare the principles laid down there with the reality as it exists in Eastern and Central Europe.[1]

The men in the Kremlin are still not prepared to remove the main causes of the tension in the world. They also refuse to make any real concessions on the German issue—for example. In fact, with regard to the German issue, Mr. [Nikita S.] Khrushchev expressed himself more ruthlessly to French Premier [Guy] Mollet and French Foreign Minister [Christian] Pineau during their visit to Moscow when he stated that he would rather have 17 million Germans on his side than a reunited neutral Germany. Can you think of a more emphatic endorsement of brute force?

I beg you, ladies and gentlemen, to consider the German question, the question of German reunification not only as a German rights but also as a question of natural law. The question of German reunification is the pivot on which European stability hinges and, consequently, world peace depends. Khrushchev quite evidently also sees it in that light.

Throughout the world the Soviets aggravate existing conflicts and endeavor to undermine the West's position in an unscrupulous manner. Their course seems clear to me: They want to lull the vigilance of the free world and to weaken its readiness to defend itself. Above all, however, they want to smash first the mighty protective shield of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization and to drive the United States from Europe so that Europe will fall like a ripe fruit into the Soviet lap and through its industrial potential and the skill of its people will lend the Soviets decisive superiority over the United States.

I consider the new tactics of the Soviet Union more dangerous than the former aggressive conduct, since it plays upon the longing for peace which lives in all men.

What, then, can the West do, what can we all do in this situation? I think it is the task of the responsible statesmen and of all the peoples of our free world to insure that the Soviet scheme does not succeed. First this requires one thing: We must on no account relax even one moment in our vigilance.

It is undeniable that recently the cohesion of the West has weakened and that there are clear indications of a lack of coordination in its foreign policy. Fortunately, the West possesses a great and strong organization which has, so far, deterred the Soviet Union from an attack. I refer to NATO, which was established at a time when the danger of a hot war existed. This danger is not at present acute because the Kremlin hopes to achieve world domination through the slow undermining of the West. The new task is now to prevent this breakup of the West. For this purpose, too, NATO—further developed—is the proper instrument.

FOREIGN POLICY UNITY NEEDED

To my mind one cannot very well pursue an agreed military policy toward a nation without having, at the same time, maximum conformity in foreign policy aims in respect to that nation. The West must not let the Soviets believe that, while it does pursue a common military policy, it is, on the other hand, possible for every single NATO member to pursue its own foreign policy—free from all restrictions—in relation to the Soviet Union.

The mere impression that that is so must be avoided. The Soviet leaders live, after

[1] The text of this paragraph of the Charter reads as follows: "All members shall refrain in their international relations from the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any state, or in any other manner inconsistent with the purposes of the United Nations."

all, by the hope that the alliance of the free nations will, in the end, be torn by such deep dissensions as to let final success drop into the Soviet lap, as it were.

The utmost vigilance and justified distrust toward the policy of the Soviet Union does not, however, exclude the necessity for the West to be ready at all times to reexamine its policy to make sure it corresponds to developments in world policy. Thus it is our duty to watch constantly for indications of a genuine change of mind and a genuine readiness for understanding on the part of the countries behind the Iron Curtain. The path we are following in common has so far, in principle, proved to be correct. We must continue this path unwaveringly and no Soviet smile, however enticing, should tempt us to relax in our common efforts before the Soviet side has shown concrete proof of a change of mind—especially with regard to its attitude to other nations oppressed by it.

An essential contribution toward the maintenance of peace must be made by the free nations of Europe. It cannot be denied that, as the immediate threat of war receded in Europe, a selfish way of looking at national interests threatens to spread once more. In spite of this we can state that, through the work of the OEEC [Organization for European Economic Cooperation] and of the Coal and Steel Community, through the admission of the Federal Republic to NATO and through the establishment of the West European Union, a degree of poltical cooperation has been achieved in free Europe from which point the work of the political unification of the old Continent can be successfully carried on.

The concept that the states of free Europe must join in a political and economic unit is a positive result of the last war. Many millions of Europeans, especially also in the Federal Republic of Germany, have been imbued with this idea and it is the guiding principle of the foreign policy of the German Federal Government. The freedom, the very existence of Europe depend more than ever on Europe's ability to realize this concept.

EISENHOWER TALK CITED

Disrupted and disunited Europe must sooner or later succumb to the power threatening the Continent. Europe, however, can survive the difficult and protracted period of growing together only if the United States of America continues to maintain its strong protection of the old Continent. It gave me great pleasure, therefore, that the United States recently demonstrated once again its readiness to do so and its undiminished interest in the creation of a united and free Europe.

President Eisenhower told Baylor University in Texas on May 25 that the United States was patient in this matter. I know how difficult this waiting must be for you as American citizens and what annoyance the Europeans' slowness must cause you. In spite of all the impatience which you might feel, may your great people always realize that by defending in Europe the moral and spiritual values of the West as a whole they are also defending themselves.

The Federal Republic of Germany is prepared to make every possible contribution toward the creation of a united Europe, and I think, when you study the years since 1949, you will find that we have, indeed, achieved quite a few things in this field. In this context a good relationship between Germany and France appears to us to be the nucleus of any European integration. Since the establishment of the Federal Republic we have worked with all our strength to improve this relationship and our efforts are bearing fruit. For example, look at the way in which our two countries during the last few months have dealt dispassionately and constructively with the thorny question of the Saar.

I think I can say that without the European policy pursued by Germany and France this difficult problem could never have been mastered in the way it was. Negotiations with M. Mollet and M. Pineau at Luxembourg on June 4 have strengthened again my conviction of the power and the force of the European idea. The policy of European integration has put on an entirely new basis our relations with those of our neighbors who enjoy the blessing of freedom.

With many of them we cooperate most intimately today in all kinds of European organizations—for the benefit of all of us. Although only 11 years have passed since the end of the last war, we are joined through a military defense alliance with several of our neighbors. Within the framework of the West European Union and the NATO—this seems to me a fact of particular importance—we are linked for the first time in our history, through a partnership which is of the greatest value to us, to that European power with which you have special ties. With Britain. As a result of this policy, a great deal has been achieved in an amazingly short period to overcome old disputes and conflicts.

Let me add a few words on the question of Germany's reunification; better, on the question of the liberation of 17 million Germans in the Eastern Zone. It is not only a question concerning the Germans, not only a question of right, not only a question of the obligation of the four victorious powers to bring about reunification in peace and freedom. In the course of the last few years' developments it has become a European question, a question of great importance in world politics.

A THREAT TO THE WORLD

The control of Germany by the Soviet Union, the exercise of Soviet influence on Germany would mean a shift of power in the world in favor of the Soviet Union which would threaten the whole world, and, also you in the United States.

Unification remains a question of common concern both to the German people and to the four powers who have undertaken to bring it about. We are most grateful to the Western Powers for the attitude which they have adopted on this question. They have stated again and again that reunification of Germany in freedom and liberty constitutes one of the most important elements of a genuine easing of tension, and that the implementation of any general disarmament—in which they are most interested—is not conceivable without simultaneous progress toward reunification of Germany.

As regards the German attitude, it is clear: We shall stand by the obligations which we have assumed. In particular, this concerns also the German contribution to the defense of the free world. In spite of great psychological difficulties confronting us after two World Wars, with disastrous consequences for the German people, and after complete demilitarization, the plans made by NATO and by the German Federal Government regarding the establishment of German forces will be carried out. The announcement of a redutcion in the Soviet Armed Forces will have no repercussions on our defense efforts. Germany wants to be and will remain a reliable partner of the West.

I have referred to the necessity for the West to remain vigilant and not to relax in its defense efforts, although the conflict in which we find ourselves cannot be won by military means alone. This is the reason for my reference to the absolute need for strengthening the West's political cooperation with regard to the Soviet Union. The maintenance of the defensive strength of the West, however, is the first and most indispensable condition for the maintenance of peace and freedom in the world.

The German people in the West and the East are imbued with profound longing for this peace and this freedom. The German people do not want any political adventures in the East. The German Federal Government, therefore, will continue the straight course of its policy pursued so far which, I am sure, will bring us the reunification of Germany. For this the Federal Government and the German people need also in the future the confidence and trust of their allies.

President Griswold, ladies and gentlemen, allow me to end by assuring you of my firm conviction that in the struggle between totalitarian oppression and free self-determination of the peoples a vigilant and united West, upholding its spiritual and moral values, can never be defeated.

I thank you.

Federal Aid to Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HAROLD H. VELDE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 26, 1956

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Speaker, I should like to call to the attention of my colleagues the position taken by the education committee of the Peoria Association of Commerce and approved by the board of directors of that organization relative to H. R. 7535, the bill on Federal aid to education. Following is a statement furnished me by the Peoria Association of Commerce:

FEDERAL AID TO EDUCATION

Currently there are two bills pending in the National Legislature relative to education. They are H. R. 7535 and S. 2905. An analysis of these bills presents several features which are quite undesirable in the opinion of the Special School Study Committee. Therefore, the committee would recommend opposition to both of these bills.

We believe that the responsibility and control of schools belongs to the local community. We object to the Federal control that would exist if either of these bills are passed. This control is indicated when, under the language of the present bills, the Secretary of Labor would have the authority to determine the prevailing wage rate for any particular locality basing it on whatever overall geographical area he selects. The law does not provide for appeal from the Secretary's determination.

Both bills provide that a Federal Administrator would have the authority to rule on such questions as relative effort, relative needs and relative urgency. There are other provisions in these bills which make them less than desirable.

One of the greatest strengths of the United States is an educational system relatively free from Federal control. It is the opinion of the committee that it is impossible to provide Federal funds without resultant Federal control. Therefore, the Special School Study Committee recommends opposition to any Federal grants to local communities or States for educational purposes as provided by these two bills. (This includes both building construction and operational costs.)

Further there is a question as to the need of Federal money to help provide school buildings. Statistics show that current classroom construction is well above the amount needed to house enrollment increases. And that this construction is increasing about 10 percent a year. The recent White House conference on education in reporting on "What are our school building needs," stated:

"No State represented has a demonstrated financial incapacity, to build the schools it will need during the next 5 years, but, with the exception of a few States, none of the States presently has plans which indicate a political determination powerful enough to overcome all of the obstacles."

This would indicate that there is no State unable to meet their school-building needs, if they have got the courage to do it. This is particularly true in the local situation where Peoria has one of the highest tax evaluation per pupil ratio in the State, and one of the lowest tax rates for educational purposes.

A Railroad Dies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLIFFORD G. McINTIRE
OF MAINE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 26, 1956

Mr. McINTIRE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I insert an article that appeared in the June 20, 1956, issue of the Bangor Daily News, a newspaper in my congressional district:

A RAILROAD DIES WITH SIGNING OF DECREE HERE

A railroad died Wednesday.

In an interlocutory decree signed by Chief Justice Raymond Fellows, of the Maine Supreme Court, the corporate existence of the European & North American Railway was dissolved after having been on the books since 1871.

European & North American was unique in the annals of railroading in that it was organized and its stock sold under the slogan of "The new short route to Europe."

The line was organized with the plan in mind of being a connecting link to New York with the Canadian maritime provinces and Halifax, serving a vast area and speeding traffic to Europe.

Its founders felt that such a line going through Maine to Halifax would expedite European travel and freight by at least 1 day.

Plans for the E. & N. A. were actually discussed as early as 1850, but it was some years later before they became a reality.

BANGOR EXTENDS CREDIT

The city of Bangor extended credit to the extent of $1 million to aid the enterprise and the Maine Legislature granted 734 acres of land for right-of-way, so the road was established for $4 million, or about $40,000 a mile.

Toward the turn of the century steamship companies began to improve their service out of New York, with the result that the voyage to Europe was stepped up from New York.

As a result, European & North American, which was a connecting link to Nova Scotia, began to lose business to such an extent that the bondholders finally foreclosed, reorganized the company with themselves as stockholders, and leased tracks, stations, and rolling stock to the Maine Central Railroad.

That occurred April 1, 1882, on a 999-year basis.

ROLLING STOCK SOLD

Last November European & North American sold its tracks to Vanceboro, the station in Bangor and its rolling stock to Maine Central for $3,152,000.

With that transaction there was no further need for existence of the corporate organization and petition was filed in the supreme court for its dissolution.

Signing of the decree Wednesday by Chief Justice Fellows accomplished the dissolution.

George F. Eaton, Bangor attorney, was the last president of European & North American and on the board of directors with him were Charles V. Lord, Harold M. Pierce, Dexter S. Smith, Horace S. Stewart, Henry J. Wheelwright, Wade F. Brackett, Malcolm E. Morrell, Jr., and Harry B. Wyman, the latter two treasurer and clerk, respectively.

Qualifications of Appointees to the United States Supreme Court

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENDERSON L. LANHAM
OF GEORGIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 26, 1956

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Speaker, some weeks ago I introduced a bill designed to require certain qualifications for the confirmation of appointees to the United States Supreme Court. It is my opinion that the only way to prevent the Supreme Court from straying away from judicial precedents and reasonable interpretations of the Constitution, is to be certain that men appointed to the Supreme Court are not mere political hacks but are men of legal training and experience. Fundamentally, this approach to curbing and restraining the Supreme Court from usurping the powers of Congress and the States and overriding the rights of the States guaranteed to them by the Constitution, is the proper approach. It is a long-range remedy but is the most promising in the end.

Confirmation of my position on this matter is found in an article which appears in the Wall Street Journal for Tuesday, June 26, by John A. Grimes, and I ask unanimous consent that this article be included with my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

Commenting in its editorial columns on the Grimes article, the Wall Street Journal corroborates my contention when it says:

> The only other protection, really, is a more careful regard for the men appointed to this independent judiciary * * * the justices should be men of judicial mind—which means essentially that they shall have the character of self-discipline. They must see themselves as judges of the law, not legislators.

This corroborates the statement I placed in the RECORD made by one of the great legal minds of America, the Honorable Samuel H. Sibley, judge of the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Judicial Circuit, retired.

Under unanimous consent of the House I include also with my statement and the article by Mr. Grimes, the entire comment by the editors of the Wall Street Journal on the article:

[From the Wall Street Journal of June 26, 1956]

SUPREME COURT—SOME RECENT RULINGS BY THE HIGH TRIBUNAL HAVE SET OFF A HOT POLITICAL CONTROVERSY

(By John A. Grimes)

WASHINGTON.—Two decades ago the United States Supreme Court was caught in a political controversy. On that occasion it was Congress, still controlled by its more conservative Members, which frustrated President Roosevelt's attempt to mold the Court into the image of the New Deal.

Now once again the Supreme Court finds itself buffeted in the winds of political controversy. This time it is primarily the conservative Members of Congress, with support from like-minded State and other political leaders, who would like to see the Court remolded, or at least curbed in its apparent tendency to use judicial authority to increase the central power of the Federal Government.

Why this turnabout in 20 years? And how are the battle lines forming?

Part of the answer to the first question goes back to that earlier battle. Although President Roosevelt was balked in his attempt to pack the Court with Judges subservient to the New Deal philosophy, nevertheless time, death, and circumstances slowly altered the Court's ideological complexion. All but two of the present Justices—Chief Justice Warren and Justice Harlan—are appointees of either Presidents Roosevelt or Truman. Meanwhile, the power of the Federal Government has grown, and with it there has come an altered attitude of the Judges toward Federal power.

SHRINKING LOCAL AUTHORITY

The immediate source of the present controversy, however, is something more recent. In a series of decisions, the Supreme Court has expanded the power of the Federal Government while shrinking the power of State and local governments. To conservatives in and out of Congress the Court his thus seemed to distort the intent of both Congress and the Constitution.

The result has been more than 70 bills proposed in the present Congress which would either reverse some previous decision of the Supreme Court or one way or another, curb its jurisdiction and its power.

The most important of the Court's decisions touching off this counterattack is, of course, its desegregation ruling. In the South this has led to the interposition movement, a plan for the several State legislatures to adopt resolutions holding in effect that the Supreme Court decision was unconstitutional and proposing that the segregation question be settled directly by constitutional amendment.

Criticism of the segregation decision has not been limited to the South. Many lawyers and political leaders elsewhere questioned it on purely legal grounds; they consider it an improper encroachment not only on States rights but on the prerogatives of Congress. Congress had repeatedly refused to legislate what the Supreme Court did by decrees.

But this ruling is only a part of the conservatives' complaint.

In the High Court's last session alone, the conservatives were stirred by decisions that:

Knocked out State sedition laws and held that Uncle Sam has exclusive power in this field. Voided a New York City law which made taking the fifth amendment grounds of discharge of municipal employees. Ruled invalid State laws which ban the union shop for railroads and airlines.

The total effect of these and like decisions over the past few years has been to narrow the field of local autonomy and broaden the power of the Federal Government to act as it will.

Naturally there have been exceptions; the Court, for example, ruled against the Government in the Du Pont antitrust case. Further, the judges do not agree with each other or—from one case to another—always with themselves. This leads to a second complaint, that the Court today is mercurial and undependable.

DIVISIONS OF THE COURT

The alinement of the justices, indeed, is one of the interesting aspects of this contro-

versy. Justices Douglas and Black have long been confirmed liberals—in this instance meaning supporters of Federal authority—and they have been joined by Chief Justice Warren in enough decisions to suggest that the duet is becoming a trio. The conservative bent of Justices Reed, Burton, and Minton has meantime become more clear, particularly through their dissenting opinions.

This has tended to leave Justices Frankfurter, Clark, and Harlan as the floaters, very often holding the balance of power. Lawyers find Frankfurter unpredictable, Clark rather easily s ayed by the majority, and Harlan as yet an unknown quantity—although the most experienced lawyer, he is the newest appointee. In many recent cases enough of these three have floated over to the liberal side to affect the decision.

Most of the 70-odd congressional bills aimed at the Court are designed to overrule one or another of the Court's decisions. Congress has power to do this when the Court decides a case on its own interpretation of the congressional intent in the law or where it finds that Congress has expressed no legislative intent.

For example, the union shop cases were decided on the grounds that Congress specifically authorized this type of labor contract and did not authorize States to legislate differently. Thus Congress could if it wished to, change this decision by changing the law.

But some of these Supreme Court bills would go much further. Just a few days ago the Senate Judiciary Committee approved a proposal which would directly limit the High Court's power to interpret laws passed by Congress.

CURBING THE COURT

If passed, this law would attempt to take away from the Supreme Court the power to interpret Federal statutes as overriding State laws. This, should it come to pass, would be a great abridgment of the Court's present powers.

However, such a law would raise an interesting point. Actually there is no law that says the Supreme Court can declare a congressional statute invalid; it is simply a power assumed by the Court in its early days and now hallowed by tradition. But under this tradition, could the Supreme Court rule invalid a congressional statute aimed at reducing its own power? No one knows for sure; it would certainly stir up a furious storm.

Actually, it is doubtful whether any of these seventy-odd anti-Court measures will get anywhere in the remaining weeks of this congressional session. And when the Supreme Court reconvenes this fall, it is possible that it will alter its own course. It has done so before—just 20 years ago, for one instance—and, as Mr. Dooley once remarked, it follows the election returns (and public sentiment) pretty closely.

But be that as it may, the Supreme Court, which in theory is supposed to be above politics, is once more the center of a major political controversy. Even if next year it adds no more fuel to the flames, the pot is already boiling.

[From the Wall Street Journal of June 26, 1956]

REVIEW AND OUTLOOK—CONGRESS AND THE COURT

When President Roosevelt, in the height of his New Deal days, was frustrated by the Supreme Court his reaction was to pack the Court with justices more subservient to his political philosophy.

Now once more the Supreme Court finds itself in the midst of a political controversy. There are, of course, many similarities that could be drawn between the situation today and that of 20 years ago. But there are also, we think, more important differences, and not the least of them are the remedies proposed now by the Court's critics and the remedy proposed by Mr. Roosevelt. And this difference reflects a better understanding of both the role of the Supreme Court and the problem of the Supreme Court.

In our governmental system of checks and balances the High Court occupies a unique position. The Executive has no real authority to do anything without the sanction of Congress, and where he oversteps his bounds (as has happened) he can be called to task either by the legislature or by the Supreme Court (which has also happened).

The Congress in its turn is held in check by both the Executive and the Court. The President has the authority to veto congressional enactments; there is a countercheck on the abuse of the veto power, for Congress can override a veto by a two-thirds vote. A congressional statute that is unconstitutional can be thrown out by the Court.

It is true that in theory there are also checks upon the Supreme Court. Any act of the Court can be altered by a direct amendment to the Constitution; the Court's rejection of the Federal income tax, for example, was reversed by the passage of the 16th amendment. But this is extremely rare for the reason that the method is cumbersome. Also, in some instances, Congress can correct the Court's interpretation of a congressional statute by changing the language of the law. But this does not apply to major constitutional questions.

So in practice the Supreme Court is by all odds the least restricted of our Government institutions. It can, as its critics have claimed, do just about what it will.

Well, what can be—or ought to be—done about it? How can the public protect itself from Justices who overstep the judicial boundaries when those boundaries are themselves set by the Justices?

One way, of course, is to end the independence of the judiciary. This, in essence, was Mr. Roosevelt's proposal. Established as a precedent, his plan would have made the Court a simple pawn of the White House. It would probably have assured rulings in accord with the dominant political ideas of the times. But it would have also ended once and for all the Supreme Court's functions as a judicial overseer. We would have thus lost the last protection against the momentary whims of the Executive or the legislature.

The only other protection, really, is a more careful regard for the men appointed to this independent judiciary. Within narrow limits, perhaps the Court's field of action can be directed by laws, but all finally boils down to the necessity that the Justices be men of judicial mind—which means essentially that they shall have the character of self-discipline. They must see themselves as judges of the law, not legislators.

If the current criticism of the Court reawakens the public attention to this necessity, it will serve well. And we find it reassuring that among the seventy-odd Court curbing measures, referring to in John A. Grimes' article this morning, there is no serious proposal to revive the Roosevelt treatment.

Guiding Lines for American Overseas Economic Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 26, 1956

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to call to the attention of the membership of this body, a statement adopted by the executive council, AFL–CIO, on the subject of the United States foreign economic policy.

The statement draws attention to the need for a reappraisal of our foreign aid programs and suggests guiding lines along which our foreign aid programs, in the opinion of the AFL–CIO executive council, ought to move in the years ahead.

I believe that these recommendations merit thorough study and I want to commend them to the careful consideration of my colleagues.

GUIDING LINES FOR AMERICAN OVERSEAS ECONOMIC POLICY ADOPTED BY EXECUTIVE COUNCIL, AFL–CIO, JUNE 7, 1956

American labor has been among the first to urge our Government and other democracies to offer the economically underdeveloped countries adequate help to assure their economic progress, human freedom, and national security. Toward this end, we of organized labor have supported such plans and proposals as point 4, Colombo plan, the U. N. Technical Assistance Program, and President Eisenhower's plea for a universal war against poverty.

The threat of Soviet aggression has compelled the free nations to divert to their defense needs large sums which might otherwise have been used in promoting the well-being of the underdeveloped areas. But since mass poverty and hunger constitute a potentially grave threat to freedom and peace, we strongly urge our Government to increase its assistance to the peoples of the underdeveloped areas.

For more than 3 years, and especially since the 20th Bolshevik Party Congress, the Kremlin has laid marked emphasis on economic and political means for furthering world communism. Realizing that the intensified Soviet economic penetration of underdeveloped countries aims to bring these areas into the Soviet imperialist orbit rather than to promote human well-being and freedom, our constituent convention thus correctly stressed the urgency of American initiative in defeating this sinister Soviet strategy:

"Undeveloped and underdeveloped continents and regions, where many hundreds of millions nurse their grievances and their hopes, constitute a fertile field for Communist operations.

"In dealing with rudimentary human problems the world over, we must be concerned primarily with two immediate needs—the need for food, health, and irrigation in the underdeveloped countries, and the burning desire for independence and equality. By ministering to such fundamental needs we will be on firmer ground as we seek to win new adherents to the free world.

"Integration of our foreign political and economic policies is essential, if the great technical resources and mighty industrial potential of the United States are to be geared to increasing the productivity, raising the purchasing power, and improving the living standards—especially of those economically underdeveloped countries which are devoted to human liberty and peace."

In line with the above evaluation, the AFL–CIO executive council proposes the following guiding lines for an effective American overseas economic policy:

1. Demonstrate to the peoples of the underdeveloped regions, in word and deed, that our interest in their well-being is free from any desire to exploit or dominate them.

2. No interference in each other's domestic affairs or political life.

3. In all countries which have not yet attained their full national independence, representatives of the population are to be drawn into participating in the planning

and application of all assistance programs in order to further the progress of self-determination.

4. Wherever practical, our Government should seek joint efforts with other democracies in undertaking technical aid and economic assistance projects.

5. When such projects are undertaken through the United Nations and its special agencies, their operation must not be subject to the exercise of the veto power.

6. The workers in each country must be guaranteed full opportunity for genuine collective bargaining and decent working conditions in line with the standards established by the ILO and free from racial discrimination and forced labor.

7. The working population of the countries receiving technical assistance should be helped to learn the organization of free and democratic trade unions, farmers' and consumers' associations.

8. In order to secure the maximum cooperation of and support by the working people in attaining the above goals, the respective free trade unions should be adequately represented in all important planning and project commissions.

9. Increasingly, the principal control and ownership of important projects should be placed in the hands of the country aided and in accord with the economic forms their own people democratically determine.

10. Our Government should join with other democratic governments in preparing, through the U. N., an international code to which the recipient nations should subscribe so as to reduce to a minimum the risks and difficulties surrounding private foreign investment and encourage this great reservoir of capital to serve in promoting a healthy and nonimperialist development of the industrially underdeveloped countries.

11. While technical and economic assistance should be accorded to all countries devoted to human freedom and peace, whether or not they are in alliance with the United States, the critical world situation created by Soviet imperialism and the limits on funds available for such economic aid require that countries which have shown in deed that they are ready to join with the democracies in the preservation of peace and freedom should be given priority of consideration in such assistance projects.

12. Expanded economic and technical assistance is of vital importance in the struggle against communism, because it makes people less prone to fall victim to Communist propaganda and subversion. However, the resulting economic improvement is an indispensible supplement to, but not a substitute for, military preparedness and cooperation with other freedom-loving peoples.

In accordance with the above guiding lines, we recommend the following for immediate action by our Government:

1. Enactment into law of the foreign aid bill now before Congress.

2. Set up machinery for coordinating all programs for economic aid and technical assistance to the economically underdeveloped countries "devoted to human liberty and peace."

3. Toward furthering free European unity, economic aid and technical assistance should be rendered to such specific projects for European integration as the establishment of the European Atom Authority (EURATOM); the construction and operation of continental oil pipelines; the unification of the European rail, water, and air transport systems; coordination of electricity and waterpower systems, etc.

4. Toward promoting prosperity in the free world, our Government should call for an international economic conference of nontotalitarian countries to join in preparing a program for eliminating trade barriers among themselves, expanding their respective domestic markets, increasing their productivity and purchasing power, improving their standards of living, securing stability of prices and rational international utilization of surplus manpower. At this conference, our Government should seek the establishment of an international consumers' credit fund of $10 billion to facilitate long-term installment credits especially for the peoples of the economically underdeveloped areas of Asia, Africa, and Latin America.

A Bill To Oblige the Armed Forces To Issue Honorable or Dishonorable Discharges Based Solely Upon the Performance of the Serviceman While Under Military Jurisdiction

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES ROOSEVELT
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 26, 1956

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I introduced a bill which would oblige the Armed Forces to issue their discharges either honorable or dishonorable discharges, based solely upon the performance of the servicemen while under military jurisdiction. The bill would entirely eliminate unsatisfactory, undesirable, or less-than-honorable discharges based, in most cases, on supposed actions or derogatory information about supposed actions, allegedly performed in civilian life prior to induction.

There has been a steady encroachment by the military into the sphere of civilian jurisdiction. My bill is intended to curb this encroachment. No agency of the Armed Forces should arrogate unto itself the power of punishment for offenses allegedly committed by a civilian in civil life and, most especially, should this not be done when the manner of doing it is such that, in most instances, the victim is seriously hampered in his defense by imperfect knowledge of what he is charged with and no knowledge whatever of who is making the charges.

I am introducing the bill to give ample opportunity for discussion, although I realize that it is too late to get action on it in this session of Congress. It is my hope that my bill will focus attention upon an increasingly unsatisfactory situation and that, when I reintroduce it next year, opinions will have been formed and speedy action will be possible.

The armed services have been promising to do something about this for a long time, and just recently have stated that all undesirable discharges issued of late years will be reviewed. Now, however, we are informed that such reviews will not only take into consideration the man's actual service in the Armed Forces, but will also evaluate the derogatory information previously supplied about him while in civil life. This is exactly what they have been doing all along, and it is exactly what I object to.

If the military has information in its possession which indicates that a certain man would be undesirable in his country's service, they should not induct that man. Once a man is accepted for such service, he should be judged solely on how he carries out his duties while under military jurisdiction. Any other manner of procedure is, at best, an unwarranted encroachment on civil functions and, at worst, a deliberate entrapment.

For the information of the Members, I include the text of the bill:

H. R. 11921

A bill to provide that persons discharged from the Armed Forces who are proferred discharges other than honorable may reject such discharges and receive a court martial, or if not court martialed, shall be given honorable discharges; to provide for correction of records in the case of certain persons not given honorable discharges in the past; and for other purposes

Be it enacted, etc., That subsection (a) of section 9 of the Universal Military Training and Service Act is amended by inserting "(1)" immediately after "(a)," and by adding at the end thereof the following:

"(2) Any member of the Armed Forces who, at the time of his discharge, is proferred a discharge under conditions other than honorable may reject it, unless such discharge is being proferred to him pursuant to a sentence of a court martial. When he rejects such discharge, he shall be tried by a court martial for the offense or offenses on the basis of which he was offered such discharge, unless the military department concerned determines that the evidence in its possession is not sufficient to sustain a conviction of any such offense, in which case he shall be given an honorable discharge. If he is tried by a court martial and found guilty of any such offense, the court martial (whether or not a summary court martial) may prescribe as part of its sentence that he be given a discharge under conditions other than honorable; if he is not found guilty of any such offense, he shall be given an honorable discharge."

SEC. 2. Article 17 of the Uniform Code of Military Justice is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"(c) No court martial shall have jurisdiction to prescribe any punishment for any person subject to this code for anything done or not done by such person while not subject to this code, or for any exercise of a legal or constitutional right or privilege."

SEC. 3. Subsection (a) of section 207 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 is amended by inserting "(1)" immediately after "(a)" and by adding at the end thereof the following:

"(2) Any person given a discharge under conditions other than honorable before the effective date of this paragraph and after March 21, 1947, may apply to the appropriate board for the correction of his record on the ground that he was given such a discharge solely because of something done or not done by him while not subject to either the Uniform Code of Military Justice, the Articles of War, the Articles for the Government of the Navy, or the Disciplinary Laws of the Coast Guard. If a review of the applicant's records do not indicate that the applicant was given such a discharge solely on such ground, the board shall grant the applicant an opportunity for an early hearing, at which the applicant or his counsel, or both, may be present. After such hearing, or opportunity for a hearing, the board shall consider all briefs, evidence, and arguments presented by the applicant, and all evidence in the possession of the military department concerned, and determine whether or not the applicant was given such a discharge solely on such ground. If, before or after a hearing, the board finds that the applicant was given such a discharge solely on such ground, the board shall correct the applicant's records in the military department

concerned so as to show that the applicant was honorably discharged as of the date of his original discharge, cancel the applicant's original discharge, and issue to him an honorable discharge bearing the same date as the date of his canceled discharge."

Conflicting United States Policies Tend To Cancel Each Other Out

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 14, 1956

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

CONFLICTING UNITED STATES POLICIES TEND TO CANCEL EACH OTHER OUT

(By Edgar Ansel Mowrer)

To most foreigners, and to many Americans, the foreign policy of the United States, sword and buckler of the free nations, seems confused. The more frequently Government leaders attempt to explain it, the more confusing it becomes.

Recently I expressed the opinion that what looks like confusion results from the fact that the administration has not 1 but 3 or possibly 4 separate policies which cannot be made to dovetail.

There are (1) the policy of seeking allies in the work of containing communism militarily; (2) the policy of seeking to "relax tensions" by direct relations and negotiations with the U. S. S. R., hence emphasis upon waging peace, disarmament, piecemeal settlements of outstanding questions like German reunification and, where no settlement is possible, truces, as between Jews and Arabs in the Middle East; (3) competing with the U. S. S. R. for the favor of various neutrals, chiefly by economic support. To these three you may, if you wish, add a fourth policy, that of favoring the liberation of colonial peoples.

Now each of these policies makes sense, taken separately. It is when you pile one upon the others that complications arise.

WEAKENED ALLIANCES

Take the effort to obtain military allies. This offends certain neutrals like India, Indonesia, and Egypt, who haven't enough political perception to notice the Communist threat. The neutrals like the lessening of tensions and the anticolonialism but insist upon their right to flirt with Communists and, like the Arabs in the case of Israel, to wage local half wars.

What is worse, the more the policy of relaxing tension seems to be successful, the more difficult it is to keep our allies upon their military toes. Why, they ask, spend all that money on armaments when the danger of overt Soviet attack is steadily becoming less? And for purposes of negotiation with the U. S. S. R., the thermonuclear power of the United States is enough anyhow.

In short, the more the United States succeeds in improving the diplomatic atmosphere with the U. S. S. R., the weaker its alliances become. Which is obviously the chief reason why the Soviets are so frantically seeking to relax tensions wherever it costs them absolutely nothing. (Actually, as Soviet Foreign Minister Shepilov explained, the Kremlin has no intention of "sacrificing its friendship with the Arabs for the sake of the West.")

Wooing the neutrals is also disruptive of serious military alliances. For if a country can remain neutral, work both sides of the street and still obtain full support from the United States, why not pull out of the military alliance? India, Yugoslavia and Indonesia are getting what they want without the embarrassment of any military commitments.

ANTI-COLONIALISM BACKFIRES

Favoring the liberation of colonial peoples has in every recent case weakened the United States militarily. Tunisia as a French protectorate was a part of the military strength of France, hence of NATO including the United States. Free Tunisia immediately announced that it is joining the Arab League, which is neutral on the Communist side. When Morocco and Tunisia gain their full independence they immediately start helping to liberate Algeria, which the United States has said it hopes France will keep. So long as Britain held the Suez Canal, Egypt was impotent. Once the Egyptians with American help persuaded the British to withdraw from Suez, Egypt's dictator started off on an imperialism of his own, seeking to exercise leadership not only of all the world's Arabs but of black Africa as well. This leadership is certainly not being directed in a way favorable to the United States.

These are some of the main complications that result from having several policies. I think they explain the apparent confusion. If one may criticize, it should not be that they make the United States somewhat ridiculous in the eyes of the world. Our country can take any amount of ridicule—and laugh at it. Their weakness is that—as shown above—they tend to cancel each other out.

If this diagnosis is correct, the time of "agonizing reappraisal" is not far ahead, the moment when Washington policy makers will find themselves compelled to choose what they want most—and drop the rest.

A Strange Situation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
CLARE E. HOFFMAN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 29, 1956

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, history teaches that whenever a nation prints an excessive amount of money, first comes inflation; then a depression inevitably follows.

The expression "not worth a continental" was created in Revolutionary days because the dollar purchased less and less of life's necessities, until it was worthless. One citizen, disgusted with the ever-decreasing value of his savings, caught a dog, plastered it from nose to tail with Continental currency, and turned it loose.

Despite subsequent periods of inflation and depression—we had a depression and panic in 1837, another in 1857, another in 1893, one in 1907, in 1920, and again in 1929—we refuse to profit by our experiences. Last week we made the temporary statutory national debt limit $278 billion. It carries an annual interest charge of more than $7 billion.

Annually Congress appropriates more of your dollars than are paid in taxes because pressure groups insisted. That is no excuse. It is a reason.

Just remember that this is a government "of, by, and for the people." The Congress is only doing what the people or, more accurately, those who make the most noise, demand.

Greater efficiency and economy in the Government's activities I have always, both by speech and vote—and a vote is what counts—endeavored to bring about. But we will never get lower taxes, a balanced budget, until the people accept a share of the responsibility for Federal expenditures.

I am not making any excuse. Not offering any alibi. I will stand on my record. But attention is called to the fact—and it is a fact—that some of those who elect us have, in recent years, been demanding ever-increasing services from the Federal Government, all of which cost dollars; the payment of ever-greater benefits of all kinds.

Because we have appropriated and spent more money than the Government was able to collect, the national debt has increased, until it more than equals the value of all our property. The value of the dollar has shrunk, until it equals but half of what it was before.

The spenders are not a majority, but they make the most noise.—Until those at home who want a sound economy become more vocal, more active, the present procedure will continue. Individuals and pressure groups have been yelling for cake. They cannot get it, eat it, enjoy it, and still keep it. When they call for a particular tune and it is played, they will have to pay the fiddler.

Just as long as the people elect spenders, those who believe that the Federal Government has an unlimited income, can give other nations unlimited billions, meet every demand made for home spending, we will have what I think are excessive taxes, and if we do not mend our ways, ruinous inflation. Make your choice.

Presentation of West Virginia's Daughter-of-the-Year Award to Miss Corma Mowrey

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. M. G. BURNSIDE
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 25, 1956

Mr. BURNSIDE. Mr. Speaker, I was privileged to attend the annual West Virginia Society dinner honoring this year's State son and daughter. The State's son was the late great United States Senator Harley M. Kilgore. Selected daughter was Miss Corma Mowrey, a distinguished West Virginia educator. Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I should like to include a speech presented that night by Mr. William G. Carr, executive secretary of the National Education Association of the United States:

PRESENTATION OF WEST VIRGINIA'S DAUGHTER-OF-THE-YEAR AWARD TO MISS CORMA MOWREY

(By William G. Carr, executive secretary, National Education Association)

It gives me great pleasure to attend this meeting. In inviting the executive secretary of the National Education Association to present the Daughter-of- the-Year award to Corma Mowrey, the West Virginia Society of the District of Columbia honors the association and the 651,000 teachers of the United States who are members of it.

Apart from the opportunity to join you in paying tribute to your guests of honor, Miss Mowrey and Mrs. Kilgore, there are several other reasons why I am enjoying this meeting with West Virginians:

1. We who engage in nationwide activities depend upon help from the States and local communities. The National Education Association has received magnificent support from the teachers of West Virginia.

2. Many members of the NEA staff formerly lived in your State. At the moment, I can think of six such staff members, each of whom carries important responsibilities.

3. West Virginians have held and still hold some of the most important elective and appointed positions in our association.

4. The association is, as you all know, greatly interested in Federal legislation affecting schools, children, and teachers. Whenever we need the help and counsel of Members of Congress, the office doors of the West Virginia Congressmen have always been open. For instance, from his first day in Congress, Representative CLEVELAND BAILEY has given outstanding leadership in educational legislation. The school-construction bill now before Congress and the Nation is a committee version of a bill which Congressman BAILEY introduced in the first week of this present session. The National Education Association is indebted to the West Virginia congressional delegation for a long record of support on all measures to help children and the schools.

It is an inspiration to meet with an organization that presents its highest award to a member of the teaching profession. These are serious days for education. Never have our schools faced more critical problems. School people need the inspiration that comes from any act which shows that the teaching profession is appreciated. The West Virginia Society of the District of Columbia recognized the importance of education when it selected Miss Corma Mowrey for the Daughter of 1956.

She is worthy of the honor. She has a record of outstanding achievements for education both in your State and in the national sphere.

She is a true West Virginian—born, reared, and educated in your State. During the years since she entered the teaching profession, Miss Mowrey has done outstanding things for young people, for teachers, for Clarksburg (her hometown), and for other communities in your State. Her professional activities soon won recognition. The classroom teachers of the State elected her as their president for 2 years. Immediately afterward, she was elected president of the West Virginia Education Association. So outstanding was her ability that she was employed as a staff member of that organization.

While she was active in education, she found time also to participate in other activities. She is one of West Virginia's 4–H Club All Stars. She is active in church and community affairs.

Two of your West Virginia colleges have granted her honorary degrees. Her citation from West Virginia State College reads:

"True representative of the cause of education—teacher extraordinary—advocate of those qualities which result in high professional status for those who teach—leader for democratic government and for the freedom of the minds of men."

Miss Mowrey's activities in her own State alone would merit the high honor you confer upon her. In addition, however, are her contributions on the national scene.

In 1947 the teachers of America elected her to the executive committee of the National Education Association. In 1949 they made her vice president. In 1950, by unanimous vote, they elected her president—the highest office in our association. And because the National Education Association is the largest professional organization in the world, it may be said that its presidency is the greatest elective responsibility that can be conferred by teachers anywhere in the world.

As the NEA president, Miss Mowrey traveled the length and breadth of our country to visit 45 States, Puerto Rico, and Canada. And she made friends for education everywhere.

During her year as president, our association started its preparation for our centennial year with a plan which we call the centennial action program. This project unites the teachers of America in their efforts to provide better schools for the Nation's youth. That program was launched during Corma Mowrey's presidency. It has been a major influence in the progress of education.

As I look back to the beginning of that program, I recall vividly the presiding officer at our convention. Her sincerity and vision inspired the membership to bold decisions. One of the most dramatic sessions at that convention was the appearance of a choir from Victory High School, Clarksburg. This was the school in which Miss Mowrey had taught. The boys and girls, members of the choir, had solicited funds from loyal citizens in Clarksburg and Harrison County to finance their trip to San Francisco, where they might honor their former teacher.

Miss Mowrey delivered the president's message in her usual inspiring manner. At the end, the audience of some 7,000 paid her a standing ovation. But those young people, her students, were the greatest tribute for her—as they would be for any teacher.

Many achievements for education during these last years have come about because of the influence of Miss Mowrey. Perhaps the most tangible one is her contribution to the new NEA building under construction here in the Nation's Capital. Plans for the new building were initiated in 1952. Since that time over $4 million have been pledged by the teachers of America—mostly through life membership in our association. Back in 1952, we asked our life members to invite other teachers to join their national organization for life and by so doing help to construct an educational center in Washington. Miss Mowrey today has enrolled 602 teachers as life members. This is a national record without a near rival. She alone has been instrumental for having pledged for our building almost $100,000. Since 1952, she has been a member of the NEA trustees.

Miss Mowrey has represented the teaching profession on many foreign assignments. Our association, in order to help in the promotion of international understanding, takes an active part in the World Organization of the Teaching Profession. Miss Mowrey was one of our delegates to two meetings of this world organization—in Canada and in Malta. Her most recent responsibility on the international scene was a 4 weeks study tour of Germany during June 1955 as the guest of the German Federal Government.

The West Virginia Society of the District of Columbia has chosen wisely in its selection of Miss Corma Mowrey for its daughter of 1956.

Miss Mowrey, as a representative of the teachers of America, I am honored to present to you this plaque from the West Virginia Society of the District of Columbia, in recognition of your unselfish, devoted and distinguished service in education. May it inspire you to continued effort and success.

Frozen Orange Concentrate

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES W. VURSELL
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 5, 1956

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, with leave to extend my remarks, I am placing in the RECORD the transcript of a radio broadcast I made recently in Illinois, pointing out the great benefits that have been brought to the orangegrowers of the State of Florida, as the result of the work of our research scientists in the United States Department of Agriculture in cooperation with the Florida Citrus Commission, which I believe will be of interest to most Members of Congress:

This is your Congressman, CHARLES W. VURSELL, in my ninth broadcast in this session of Congress, on the value of agricultural research and extension service to the farmers of our country.

Today, I want to show you how research found a market that greatly increased the price of the farmers' product of an entire State, making it possible for the farmers to more than double their production of that product. I refer to one you have been using in your homes during the past few years—frozen orange concentrate.

This popular drink was developed in 1944 at Winter Haven, Fla., by the United States Department of Agriculture and the Florida Citrus Commission. At that time there was a surplus of oranges. The price was low and orangegrowers were in a bad way financially. The growers needed a new outlet for their crop. Now let's see how this concentrate development helped that situation. Commercial production of frozen orange concentrate was increased so rapidly that production jumped from a quarter-million gallons in 1946 to 31 million in 1949, 47 million in 1952, and to 65 million in 1955, and it's still going up. That is enough to give each person in the United States 9 of those frosty little cans of frozen orange concentrate which, when reconstituted with water, would make 36 glasses of orange juice for each person in this country.

But that's not all. Every gallon of concentrate uses one 90-pound box of fresh oranges. In 1948, Florida produced 58 million boxes of oranges, but only 8 million went into the frozen concentrate since it was just getting started. But by 1952 the story was different. That year Florida produced 72 million boxes of oranges and 32 million went into the frozen concentrate. In 1955 they produced 88 million boxes and 44 million or about half of the crop went into concentrate. In other words, this one piece of research has developed a new market for half of the entire Florida orange crop, which has almost doubled as a result of the development of the concentrate, and the orange-growing farmers are happy.

There are several reasons why frozen orange concentrate has been such a success. One of these is that it tastes like fresh orange juice. Then, too, it is so easy to handle. The housewife does not have to squeeze the oranges. She just opens a can of frozen concentrate, adds three cans of water, stirs it up a little, and she has delicious, ice-cold juice. This development has given the children and adults of this country a wholesome, nutritious orange drink with the fresh juice taste and the vitamin C content of fresh orange juice.

After a satisfactory product was developed, it was necessary to solve a number of problems in transporting and distributing it, from the processing plant to the consumer.

Railroad cars refrigerated with ice did not provide sufficiently low temperatures for the ideal handling of the frozen concentrate. This fact stimulated the development of mechanically refrigerated railroad cars and trucks which can provide any temperature desired.

There are also large savings in transportation costs to the producer and consumer. For example, 1 carload of frozen concentrate contains the equivalent of 12½ carloads of fresh oranges. Transportation costs, including refrigeration, from Lake Wales, Fla., to Chicago is about $715.50 for a carload of concentrate. But this same movement for the 12½ carloads of fresh oranges would cost over $8,000, or more than 11 times as much.

With the solution of the transportation problem it became necessary to provide more freezer storage space in warehouses. Wholesale frozen food distribution plants had to be established and properly equipped. Research people helped determine the best design for these facilities and the most efficient equipment for handling products in such facilities. Frozen food cabinets had to be installed in retail stores throughout the country.

The development of the new product of satisfactory quality, convenient to use, and the facilities necessary to handle it properly throughout the marketing channel brought a tremendous expansion in the market for Florida oranges. Since the juice keeps indefinitely in frozen storage, Florida orange juice became available throughout the year, instead of only a part of the time. With lower transportation costs the area of distribution increased. With its convenience to serve, consumption was increased both in the home and in public eating places and soda fountains where dispensers were installed. Research people even helped with the development and installation of the dispensers in order to make sure that a satisfactory product was served, and that their use would increase sales.

The research which went into the development of this new product, and the research to provide proper transportation, storage, handling, and marketing facilities cost the United States Department of Agriculture about $300,000. The success of the program is indicated by the fact that the housewife is now paying less for frozen orange juice than she paid for orange juice 8 or 9 years ago, despite the rise in the general level of prices. At the same time Florida growers have received an average on-tree price during the past 8 seasons of $1.44 per box, which is more than twice the amount received in the 1947 season. Florida orange production during this same period has increased by 62 percent. Hence, the growers are not only receiving a better price per box, but they also have more boxes to sell. Yes, research pays back big dividends.

I have recited the frozen orange concentrate story today because it shows clearly what research can do to help us find new and more profitable uses for our agricultural products. But we should not wait until the surpluses are breaking the backs of our farm people before we start the research. I'm in favor of keeping our research going all the time in the hope that we may be able to prevent some of the surpluses from developing.

For example, our scientists are now working on a tomato powder, as well as powders from other fruits and vegetables. Right now these things are mostly peeps around the corner but they are encouraging peeps, and our committee believes it would be a dividend-paying investment for us to continue research in these promising agricultural fields. The results will not only help our farmers and consumers, but will also contribute to the steadily rising standard of living of all our people.

United States Pollution Bill Is Backed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. M. G. BURNSIDE
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 25, 1956

Mr. BURNSIDE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I should like to include the following news item entitled "United States Pollution Bill Is Backed," by Aubrey Graves, which appeared in the Sunday Star, June 5, 1956:

UNITED STATES POLLUTION BILL IS BACKED

(By Aubrey Graves)

Three antipollution bills, introduced by Maryland and Virginia legislators to reduce pollution in the steadily worsening Potomac River, are aging on Capitol Hill with little prospect for even a committee hearing before Congress adjourns.

But quietly last week, the House Committee on Public Works reported out favorably a proposed measure of nationwide scope. If enacted into law, it could accomplish many of the benefits envisioned in the dormant proposals of Representative JOEL T. BROYHILL, Republican, of Virginia, Representative DEWITT HYDE, Republican, of Maryland, and Senator JOHN M. BUTLER, Republican, of Maryland.

The measure (H. R. 9540) was introduced last February by Representative JOHN A. BLATNIK, Democrat, of Minnesota. It would extend and strengthen greatly the Taft-Barkley Water Pollution Control Act of 1948, due to expire next year. It would apply equally to prevention and control of pollution wherever it exists in the waterways of the Nation.

For a 10-year period, beginning with the fiscal year starting June 30, 1956, H. R. 9540 would make a maximum of $50 million in Federal funds available each year to the States as grants-in-aid to construct sewage treatment and disposal plants.

The procedure would be for the Surgeon General to give formal notification to any State in which pollution was discharged into waters which in his opinion endangered the health or welfare of persons in a State other than that in which the discharge originated.

The next step would be a conference between the water pollution control agencies of the State in which the discharge occurred and of the State or States claiming to be adversely affected.

If the Surgeon General believed, after such conference, that effective progress toward abatement of such pollution was not being made and that the health or welfare of others was being endangered, he would be obliged to recommend to the appropriate State water pollution control agency that it take necessary remedial action.

Should this not be accomplished within 6 months thereafter, the Secretary of HEW would be empowered to request the Attorney General to bring a Federal suit to secure the abatement.

H. R. 9540 is in most respects identical to a bill (S. 890) passed by the Senate at the last session of Congress. The Senate bill, however, provided only $2 million a year for grants to States for personnel training, research, and administration costs. The Senate version did not make any provision for grants-in-aid for sewage treatment and disposal plants.

Sanitary officials here are hopeful that funds provided for this purpose in H. R. 9540 would be included in whatever bill comes out of conference committee.

Another $5 million a year would be authorized to help the States train personnel in water control work, to conduct research and to administer their programs.

Local jurisdictions would have to put up at least one-third of the money spent for personnel training and administrative functions. They would be obliged to put up twice the sum of the Federal grants for construction.

At least half of the construction funds appropriated would be used to build treatment works servicing municipalities of 125,000 population or under.

The act would be administered by the Surgeon General of the United States Public Health Service under supervision of the Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Proposals for projects would originate with the various State water pollution control agencies.

To aid the Surgeon General, a water pollution control advisory board would be set up, consisting of nine members appointed by the President, none of whom could be Federal officers or employees.

The Blatnik bill would give the Surgeon General strong enforcement powers wherever State agencies were slow in combatting pollution. Lack of such power in the past in many cases has caused remedial action to be long delayed or not take at all.

Wings for the World

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DONALD L. JACKSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 26, 1956

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. Speaker, the tremendous strides taken by commercial aviation in the United States have not been the result of happenstance. Into the growth of the aviation industry of this country has gone dedicated vision, years of unremitting toil and the visions of men who looked away from the earth to the arches of heaven and contemplated the conquest of the skyways. They were called visionaries by some and fools by others, but history has recorded that they, and not their critics, truly forsaw the future.

One of those who implemented his visions of the future was Donald W. Douglas, president and chairman of the board of Douglas Aircraft Co., Inc., of Santa Monica, Calif. I well recall one of the first Douglas factories, which was located in an old moving-picture studio on Wilshire Boulevard in Santa Monica, and which was the predecessor of the great and modern plants where Douglas planes are fabricated today in several cities throughout the country. Still later, as a schoolboy I recall the thrill that was mine, when the schools in Santa Monica were recessed for a day in order that the youngsters might witness the departure of the Douglas planes on the famous round-the-world flight of the early 1920's.

What was a breathtaking and challenging vision to Donald Douglas during the early days in the aviation industry has, in part, become a reality. The

highways of the air are today almost as numerous as those that thread across our Nation on the ground. World commerce and transportation today looks to the air more and more, and the unfolding era before us hold promise of new adventures and new conquests to match or exceed those which we have witnessed during our own lifetime.

Donald Douglas has been paid many tributes for his contributions to American aviation, but the greatest living memorial to his genius, his faith and his steadfastness is the sleek outline of the great plane that bears his name as it streaks through the skies of the world on the many missions upon which it is employed.

Donald W. Douglas is a great American industrialist, and his career is a study in the possibilities of life under the system of legal and free enterprise. With a dream and a dollar Don Douglas did it the hard way, but in going to the top his success assured hundreds of thousands of jobs and unexcelled opportunities for his fellow men.

At a recent dinner given by the Newcomen Society in North America at San Francisco, Calif., Mr. Douglas was the guest of honor and the principal speaker. He was introduced to the guests by Mr. C. R. Smith, president of American Airlines. Mr. Smith's introduction, and Mr. Douglas' remarks on that occasion were as follows:

WINGS FOR THE WORLD: THE "DC" FAMILY IN GLOBAL SERVICE

INTRODUCTION OF MR. DOUGLAS, AT SAN FRANCISCO ON JUNE 2, 1955, BY C. R. SMITH, PRESIDENT, AMERICAN AIRLINES, INC.; MEMBER OF THE NEW YORK COMMITTEE, IN THE NEWCOMEN SOCIETY IN NORTH AMERICA

My fellow members of Newcomen, I have had the privilege of knowing Donald Wills Douglas for 25 years, and each of those years has added to the cumulative respect and affection I hold for him.

A gentleman, a fine friend, a sportsman, an outstanding eingineer, a talented business executive, a courageous pioneer of great vision, and a splendid American citizen. What more can you ask for in one individual? Newcomen honors him for the reason that he deserves honor, and we are privileged to participate.

Mr. Douglas has often been honored by our Government, especially so for the participation of the Douglas organization in the aircraft production program during the recent war, when Douglas produced about one-sixth of the total weight of airplanes manufactured in the United States of America.

If you traveled by air during that war, in any theater, it is probable that you traveled in an airplane built by Douglas, because the Douglas DC–3, and later the DC–4, were the backbone of our military air transportation program. I remember at one time seeing so many Douglas planes on the line in India, bound for the Hump and China, that I thought I was on the flight line at the Santa Monica plant.

And, if you have traveled by air since the war, it is probable that you travel with Douglas, because the Douglas-built transports have been the most popular in the world; they are as well known abroad as in our own country.

Donald Douglas never has been content to rest on the laurels of past achievement. He has been willing to pioneer in the field of supersonic flight. The airplanes of his design can, it seems, most casually exceed the speed of sound; and no one was especially surprised some months ago to learn that a Douglas Navy plane had exceeded 1,200 miles per hour.

Douglas Aircraft is a great institution and Donald Wills Douglas is a great individual. The country is a better country, and a safer country, by reason of his genius in producing outstanding aircraft, for civilian aviation and for military aviation. I have never known Douglas to produce a poor airplane, and I believe that it never will because Donald Douglas would not be content with a product which did not substantially exceed the reasonable requirement for the job to be done.

We salute him.

REMARKS OF DONALD W. DOUGLAS

My fellow members of Newcomen, it is indeed a rare privilege to be here tonight and to have the unique opportunity of speaking to a group so representative of the finest traditions of three continents.

Through the inspiration and lofty ideals of the Newcomen Society, many important developments in the material and spiritual progress of mankind have been brought into sharper focus, for all the world to see and better comprehend. Before groups such as this, in many lands and stretching back through years teeming with progress and accomplishments, the annals of this society have enriched the heritage of history of the English-speaking peoples.

From Dartmouth, in Devonshire, to Detroit, U.S.A., from Bermuda to Boston, from Montreal to Milwaukee—all over the world—significant chapters in the history of industry, invention, engineering, economics, and transportation have been presented at Newcomen dinners such as this. Respect and reverence for the past and confidence and courage for the future have always been your guide and goal.

In a world torn and perplexed by the clash and clamor of conflicting ideologies, in the atmosphere of doubt and dread so prevalent today, it is reassuring to know that solid groups of leaders in our national and international affairs remain steadfast and serene, determined to preserve and promote good will, good deeds, and good manners everywhere.

It is against this rich and colorful background and before this distinguished audience that I hope you will permit me to tell something of the story of our "DC" family.

I am grateful, Mr. Chairman, for the high honor that has been paid the company I represent. I come before you in all humility because I know that this recognition is not accorded to me alone. If deserved, it properly belongs to 76,000 of our present employers and to literally hundreds of thousands who served us so faithfully during the last war and in the intervening years. To them, and not to me, tribute should be paid.

In a great measure, the story of the "DC" family is the story of the Douglas Aircraft Co. It is the story of men and women whose skills and workmanship, devotion and loyalty, and faith in the future have done so much to build wings for the world. Just as that great "practical philosopher" whose name your society bears contributed so vastly to the industrial revolution by the development of the steam engine, so too, I like to think, have our craftsmen and engineers, those "dynamic dreamers of the drawing board," helped give modern transportation a new dimension.

Back in our shops and laboratories we like to think that the story of the first Douglas commercial airplanes closely parallels, and is indeed a part of, the story of commercial aviation as it is known today.

Manmade wings have become the common denominator of international trade and good will. Their use has made it possible to hurdle barriers of race, creed and geography which for so many centuries have divided mankind into rigid and hostile compartments.

A few years ago, when aggressors threatened our shores and institutions, wings of commerce were turned into wings of defense, and the cargo airplane became the workhorse of military operations. Today global aviation is as commoplace as it is indispensable. People everywhere casually make reservations to hop across continents and oceans overnight, and the great airports of the world are beehives of activity.

It was the military necessity and challenge of the Second World War that laid a foundation for today's universal air travel. It is of interest to note that in that war the military members of our "DC" family, the C–54's, made almost 100,000 crossings of the Atlantic and the Pacific to pioneer the transoceanic services of today. Aviation's tremendous impact on our times and lives is well known. In previous years and at similar gatherings a number of my close friends, and your fellow Newcomen, have told this society how commercial aviation serves this Nation at every level and each hour of its daily life. It is a source of great pride to us of the Douglas organization that our "DC" family from the very beginning played an important part in the aviation accomplishments of the last quarter of a century.

Just what and how big is this Douglas "DC" family? When and how did it begin? Where does it live? What useful service does it perform?

A few vital statistics may help outline in the time available the history, dimensions, and scope of this sturdy and prolific family tree of air transportation.

In our business it is almost impossible to keep accurate, up-to-the-minute records. Our rugged offspring, free to roam over the oceans and continents of the earth and the limitless horizons of the sky, are scattered around the globe. They move about like the four winds and make their homes in strange and faraway places. The latest figures compiled from our own records indicate that more than 52 percent of all aircraft operated by airlines throughout the world are Douglas-built.

Of the 4,765 aircraft of all makes and of all manufacturers and all nations operating in scheduled service, 2,481 belong to the Douglas-winged family.

Of the 165 million passenger-miles flown every 24 hours by scheduled airlines all over the world in all types of aircraft, 81 million, or approximately 50 percent, are logged by Douglas models. Airplanes built by our next highest competitor in commercial aviation fly only 20 percent of the world's total. Our statisticians think that the actual numbers in mileage are considerably greater. The figures I have quoted are based on our sales and service departments reports and do not take into account literally hundreds of Douglas-built aircraft in private or unscheduled operations.

It may be of interest to take a closer look at our DC family by individual models now in operation and consider the daily, regularly-scheduled passenger-mileage they fly. Officially reported by the airlines, there are 1,673 DC–3's accumulating 17 million passenger-miles of service a day, 377 DC–4's accounting for more than 20 million passenger-miles per day, and 164 DC–6's with a total of 15 million. Twenty-three DC–6A's fly 2 million passenger-miles per day and 180 DC–6B's, many of them in transocean service, add another 20 million passenger-miles each 24 hours. The DC–7, the fastest and latest DC family member, now in actual service in North America, contribute 7 million passenger-miles per day or a grand daily total, for all known DC family members currently in service, of 81 million passenger-miles.

This daily mileage is sufficient to send 1 airplane filled with passengers around the world 108 times every 24 hours. Astronomical figures, perhaps, but not mere statistics. They represent people—35 million passengers

on United States-owned airlines alone in 1954, and probably 20 to 25 percent more this year.

All other makes of aircraft, combined, are made up of 10 different models of American types, 12 types built in Great Britain, 2 different types of Canadian manufacture, 3 French, 1 old German make, and 374 miscellaneous. All of them together account for 83 million passenger-miles.

So numerous has become this lustry brood of ours that a few years ago the sharp penciled boys who play around with statistics and shuffle huge stacks of international airline timetables assured me that on the average a Douglas-built airplane takes off or lands somewhere around the world every 6 seconds. This, they said, goes on every minute of every hour, 24 hours a day, Sundays and holidays included.

And these figures, they apologetically explained, are more than 2 years old and are most conservative. Surely here is an airborne empire on which the hurrying sun never gets a chance to set.

Even in modern times genealogy tables and family trees are, at best, risky and uncertain. One recalls a comedian's jesting remark about an experience with a genealogist hired to trace his family tree: "He worked 2 days and I have been paying him hush money ever since." We in the aircraft industry are more fortunate although for us, too, it is difficult to trace every development—to know just when and how a new idea or an improved model was born.

I suppose that in a way it all began for us with the old *Cloudster*, the first airplane to lift its weight in payload, designed and built in Santa Monica in 1920. From the *Cloudster*, 4 years later, came the *World Cruiser* in which the United States Army flyers first circled the globe by air. Built of wood, with fabric-covered wings, these early structures—followed by our C–1 and then by the M–1, 2, 3, and 4—first airplanes designed expressly to carry the airmail, laid the foundation for the DC's that were to come.

Fortunately, the birth certificate and documentation of the DC–1 are available. A brief, two-paragraph letter, dated August 2, 1932, and signed by my friend Jack Frye, then vice president in charge of operations of Transcontinental and Western Air, Inc., started it all. This letter accompanied a two-page specification for a new type of airline transport needed to meet competition in the newly developing transcontinental air travel.

The letter asked if Douglas was interested in building an all-metal, trimotor monoplane with a maximum gross weight of 14,200 pounds with a fuel capacity for a cruising range of 1,000 miles at 150 miles an hour, a crew of 2 and at least 12 passengers.

Needless to say, our answer was an emphatic "Yes." In what now seems an incredibly short time the airplane was designed, built, flown, and tested. It became the DC–1. It emerged with 2 engines instead of 3, carried 12 passengers, had a gross weight of 17,500 pounds, a speed considerably higher than the original specifications. In the spectacular acceptance test, the DC–1 took off from Winslow, Ariz., and proceeded to Albuquerque, N. Mex., on one engine. By the middle of 1935 it had established 19 world records for speed and payload-range-carrying feats.

Rapid changes and improvements in the line followed. Almost as soon as the DC–1 was finished, the DC–2 began to take shape. It carried 14 instead of 12 passengers. Fuel and cargo capacity were increased, and by 1934 the revised model became the DC–2. From an initial order of 26 airplanes, the DC–2 production quantity rose to 138 in 1938, and sales of the model spread around the world.

Then came the now famous DC–3. This is an ideal time and most certainly the right place publicly to acknowledge our debt of gratitude to my good friend C. R. Smith for his part in the development of the DC–3. His tremendous faith in us and in the future of air travel, his boundless energy and clear vision and his uncanny knack of making and inspiring the right decision at the right time, were the catalytic agents that greatly influenced us in taking the steps to build that famous and historic airplane.

The first DC–3 flew in December 1935. It had a gross weight of 24,000 pounds and carried 21 passengers. A few airplanes were designed as sleepers. Before production ceased on this model and its variations, 803 had been built as commercial airplanes and 10,123 as military versions. In addition to the 1,541 in airline operation, it is estimated that approximately 3,000 are still flying and that additional hundreds are in private service by corporations and individuals. And these figures also are conservative.

Over the years people everywhere have told us that without question the DC–3 is the best-known and most beloved airplane ever built in aviation's history. Its exploits in the Second World War are endless and legendary. Affectionately known in the military services as the "gooney bird," it was equally at home and equally useful from the Burma Road to Alaska, from New Guinea to Panama, from the Yalu River to Tasmania. In many lands and in many languages it become a household word. The British called it the *Dakota* and before the war, in Bagdad, street urchins used to point to the sky when KLM's airliners lumbered by and say "there goes a Dooglas Dooglas." Maj. Mahmoud al Hindi told me in 1940 that the word "Douglas" was uniformly applied to all airplanes in Arabia shortly after KLM's DC–2 flew over the country for the first time on its way to Melbourne in the London-to-Australia race.

It would take days to recount the exploits of the DC–3 (C–47) in the last war. This branch of the "DC" family was praised and honored everywhere. In awarding Douglas the exceptional service award the Air Force said the airplane ranks as the best single airplane ever built. With Montgomery at El Alamein, with Eisenhower in Normandy, and in the battle of the bulge, and with MacArthur and Kenney in the Pacific, it was unequaled and indispensable.

If I seem to linger a bit too long in telling the story of this aging member of our family, it is because, like millions everywhere, I love the "old faithful." It always will remain close to my heart.

Progress of the DC's became more rapid, if less colorful, as the years went by. The first prototype DC–4 (and, incidentally, it had three tails when it first flew on June 7, 1938) was sidetracked during the last World War to make room for the C–54, its military version. The C–54 was test flown in March 1942. It began to roll off our production lines in Santa Monica and Chicago in increasing quantities. Before V–J Day, 1,089 of this model had been built. After V–J Day, 74 were finished as commercial transports and several hundred of the cargo versions were subsequently converted to passenger liners and placed into airline operation.

In its own way, the DC–4—(C–54)—was equally outstanding and memorable. It, too, served with distinction on the Burma Road operation, in India, China, South America, Australia, and after the war, in the Berlin airlift, where practically unaided by other aircraft in that operation these rugged Skymasters helped score American's great victory in the cold war with Communist Russia.

The C–54's roamed over Asia's highest mountains, criss-crossed African deserts and equatorial swamps, supplied arctic outposts, carried the mail to our service men everywhere, and brought our wounded from distant war theaters to American hospitals.

The DC–6, America's first postwar passenger transport, completed its test flight on February 15, 1946. It was a distinguished descendant of a truly remarkable family. It was longer and more comfortable than the old DC–4, had a pressurized cabin, a top sped of 370 miles per hour and a range of 2,100 to 3,200 miles. It was followed by the DC–6B. To date, 384 of the DC–6 series have been built and 72 are on order. Its popularity continues undiminished.

On November 29, 1953, a new member of the "DC" family made its debut in spectacular fashion. This was the DC–7, which American Airlines sent streaking from Los Angeles to New York nonstop. Two days later, coast-to-coast nonstop service in both directions was officially scheduled, and a new era in air transportation began.

Longer than the DC–6 and with more powerful engines, this fastest of all commercial transport planes has a top speed of 410 miles an hour and cruises at 365. It has a payload of nearly 16,000 pounds. By contrast, the DC–3 had a payload of 5,000 pounds, cruised at under 200 miles an hour and had a maximum speed of 235. The DC–7 swiftly became the blue-ribbon carrier for such top airlines as American, United, Delta, and National. Pan American and Eastern also ordered DC–7's and are now integrating them into their services.

These postwar DC–6 and 7 planes—if I may indulge in a few more statistics—fly about a million miles a day all over this globe, or the equivalent of 40 times around the world every 24 hours.

The splendid accomplishments of the DC–7 in our domestic service quickly attracted wide attention abroad and brought an immediate demand for a longer-range, overwater version. The DC–7C, designated the *Seven Seas*, was our answer.

We believe it will write a great new chapter in the history of American transportation, worthy of the fine tradition established a hundred years ago by the famous clipper ships which sailed the seven seas and brought America fame and fortune.

Already, from one end to the other of our mile-long Santa Monica plant, rivet guns are beating a tattoo in preparation for the date when the DC–7C will take to the air for the first time.

We confidently expect it to set a new standard in intercontinental air service, just as the DC–7 has done in transcontinental service. Pan American World Airways was the first purchaser of the DC–7C and, in rapid succession, we have added BOAC, Braniff, KLM, Northwest, Sabena, SAS, and Swissair to the list.

With an operating range of nearly 5,000 miles, the *Seven Seas* will be capable of such nonstop flights as Chicago to Amsterdam, New York to Zurich, Cairo to Capetown, Sydney to Manila, and Seattle to Toyko.

The pace of aircraft development is swift and relentless. Before the *Seven Seas* models are in scheduled operation, a newer, more powerful and probably even swifter member of the DC family will be taking shape on our drawing boards and in our laboratories and shops, for in the air, as on the ground, progress, like opportunity, does not linger very long.

Probably the most compelling characteristic of our industry is that it cannot stand still and rest on its laurels. Always we, and the airlines, must move ahead.

Many millions of people have flown many billions of miles since the first of the DC family line stretched its manmade wings and headed skyward. A great many things have happened in and to the world. If this history of our winged family were only a statistical accounting of Douglas activities and commercial results, it would be like sounding brass and tinkling cymbals. We at Douglas like to think that the DC family story is more than mere numbers or dollars. We like to think of it as a chapter in the saga of man's conquest of the air, a story of his progress in the new dimension, both

physically and spiritually. The fact that wings of commerce have also been wings of war and defense, and that the shadow of nuclear destruction was brought closer to us by the airplane, does not entirely dim the hope that the airplane will one day be converted entirely to its constructive uses.

I have great faith in aviation and in the future. Should the days toward which Tennyson cast a poetic glance come in our own time and we enter the era in which "the war drums throb no longer and the battle flags are furled," the airplane will come into its own. It will transport most everyone and everything from every place to everywhere.

It will bring closer to each other all nations and races. It will place any city or village on earth within a few hours' journey from any other. It will multiply commerce and good will and understanding. New skylanes, new trade routes, new and stronger bonds of friendship will replace the old.

Today we stand at the crossroads of destiny. Let us pray that wings for the world will take the right turn to climb higher and serve mankind everywhere.

Look to the Future

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. T. JAMES TUMULTY
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 20, 1956

Mr. TUMULTY. Mr. Speaker, in the belief that the House will be interested in the wonderful work being done in New Jersey on old-age assistance, I include the following article by Phyllis Page Bradshaw entitled "Look to the Future":

LOOK TO THE FUTURE

(By Phyllis Page Bradshaw)

You probably feel that old age is millions of years away. Yet your chance of reaching old age, of liking it, and of being useful depends upon what you, in the years to come, do for yourself and for your community.

A CONTINUOUS PROCESS

Aging is like living. It is a continuous process beginning at birth. Approximate classifications have been set up—infancy, childhood, adolescence, young adulthood, middle age, and old age. From a count of birthdays, you may think you belong in one of these groups. Undoubtedly, a part of you does belong there. But aging is a complicated process. It goes forward at different rates for different people. And for each person, aging goes ahead at different rates for different parts of the individual.

Physically, an individual may be very old, but mentally, socially, and emotionally, he may be young. The reverse is usually true, however, physically not so old, but aged mentally, socially, and emotionally. This is the old codger who seems to be 100. He has no friends, no interests, and is a problem to his family. But by counting birthdays, you find he is 20 years younger than that interesting fellow you met at the club the other night.

PEOPLE ARE LIVING LONGER

Interest in our older years is more important than formerly because so many more people are living longer. Life expectancy is about 20 years longer than it was in 1900. The population increase in 1950 for New Jersey was 16.2 percent over that of 1940. Contrast this with the increase of 46 percent in persons 65 and over during the same period. This population shift to more older persons is pronounced in urban industrial areas. This is particularly important in New Jersey—the most urban of all the 48 States. New Jersey is also eighth in population of the States and one of the greatest industrial areas in the country.

ALL OF LIFE CAN BE SATISFYING

Life has been made longer. We now need to make longer life worthwhile. How can this be done? One way is to help people understand that each part of life is different and good, that each part of life can be satisfying. All of us have the capacity to enrich our lives. Usually, this doesn't happen by accident, it takes planning. As with other things, the art of growing older successfully is best learned beforehand. Young adults and middle-aged persons can prevent many of the problems of later life. Some of these problems may be anticipated so that you can prepare for them. The secret of happy later years is preparation.

America has always been geared to youth. This is natural because our tradition shows America as a young, vigorous country. In 1900 the average American lived to the age of 40. Now the average American lives to the age of 70. People can look forward to older years when they live in the present and not according to the customs of the past.

Living in the present includes understanding some of the new problems in life brought about by our increasing older population. Problems are much nearer solution when they are recognized and faced with courage. We will all be affected by the problems, now or later. These solutions are everybody's business. Although each person's problems are individual, nevertheless, certain patterns are found. Some of the problem areas are employment; income; physical, mental, and emotional health; housing; and personal relationships. Much of the difficulty is found not in the problem itself, but in the individual's adjustment to it. The solution to many of these problems depends upon how you feel about them. How you feel determines what you will do about them. Some of them can be solved by your own feelings and actions. Others need community action.

EMPLOYMENT AND RETIREMENT

People value work. It means prestige, position, income. Everyone needs to do something useful, and at present paid employment answers this need better than other activities. We have been brought up in the tradition that people must work to be self-respecting and to insure the respect of others. Many persons do not feel that volunteer service, no matter how important, satisfies this need. Nor does the puttering or "busy-work" relegated so often to older people satisfy them.

Opinions differ with regard to retirement. Some persons look forward to retirement. To others, being put out to pasture when they are still productive seems unjust and leads to personal problems of frustration, lack of income, loss of self-respect. The sore point in the whole problem of retirement seems to be that of setting an arbitrary age limit—usually 65. Individuals differ considerably. Some lose their productiveness before 65, others continue to be capable long past that age.

The individual's attitude toward retirement is most important in determining whether his future will be pleasant and profitable or dreary and miserable. Individual attitudes toward retirement need to be emphasized. When retirement is looked upon as a reward for service, rather than the beginning of uselessness, individuals will retire with confidence. The person who lives for his work alone will be miserable when retirement becomes necessary. Life is an empty void, there is nothing to look forward to. This person feels useless. He resents being put out of his job. Instead of finding other interests, he frets and stews about his own problems. He becomes unpleasant, irritable, faultfinding, and sick.

The person who looks forward to and plans for retirement makes a better adjustment. It is always difficult to change habits and routine. But when life continues to be interesting, when there is something pleasant to do, the retirement days stretch into years of happy living.

FINANCES

Some persons feel that the main problem of age is the money problem. Finances cannot be dismissed lightly. Yet, in many instances, it is the person's attitude toward money, rather than money itself, that creates the problem. Many persons strive to amass money in an attempt to gain security. This is a never-ending struggle, because money alone does not bring security. The frantic search is in reality for emotional security.

Money, however, is our medium of exchange for housing, food, recreation, clothing, and many other necessities. Pensions and social security help here, even though it is often difficult to adjust to reduced income. Today's high cost of living often makes fixed incomes inadequate. Many older persons are financially dependent upon their children who are now middle aged. This, in turn, makes it difficult for the children to make provisions for their own old age. The fear of charity or of becoming a burden is strong. This fear or the reality is one of the main reasons for the unpleasant feeling associated with age.

Take a little time now to figure out what your financial resources will be when you retire. Is there a pension in your future? Will you be able to count upon savings, income from investments, or insurance? Should you do more about your financial future than you are doing now? Do your retirement plans fit into your financial situation? Your income will be reduced. If you can't afford to travel now, is it wise to plan so many trips after retirement? Are your hobbies and interests expensive? If so, you still have time to cultivate some of the many interests that don't cost money. Plan thoroughly and carefully so you won't be caught short when retirement comes.

HEALTH

Poor health does not necessarily go hand in hand with advancing years. Chronic illness is usually associated with old age. Yet the report of the New Jersey Temporary Committee on the Chronic Sick stated that half of the chronically ill are under the age of 45; and almost one-fifth are under 25. Doctors are continually working to control diseases. The life span has lengthened because medical science has succeeded in bringing many diseases under control. People are being educated to public health measures and to preventive medicine.

Regular physical check-ups are important. It's better to keep your health than it is to try to regain it. Begin early to acknowledge your capacity for activity. Make the most of your skills and abilities instead of tackling the more strenuous sports and giving your all to win. This extra effort may not only do physical damage, but brings mental anguish with the realization that it's no longer possible to win.

Face the facts that physical energy, power, and endurance decrease. Speed of movement slows down, vision is reduced. What is often not realized is that skills and precision of movement continue. If energy is carefully used, satisfactory productivity is entirely possible.

There is more to health than the bodily changes that come with years. Mind and emotions are interrelated. Health concerns the whole person, not just the physical body. The familiar expression "You're as old as you feel" is quite sensible. Your feelings—emotions—are a very important part of you. How you feel about something determines to a great extent what happens to you. A zest for living instead of apathy can make

the difference between a full life and a barren one. Too many persons wither away through lack of interests, responsibilities, activities, and social opportunities. The machinery rusts when it is neglected and not used.

USEFUL ACTIVITY

Useful activity is a fundamental need of everyone, young and old alike. This is not always recognized. Persons who have worked all their lives look forward to the leisure of retirement. Without some purposeful activity, time hangs heavily. They feel useless. There seems to be no reason for living. They feel themselves a burden, financially or morally, on relatives. Severe emotional crises follow, which may result in physical or mental breakdowns.

There are many satisfying and even fascinating possibilities to enlarge activities and interests. Learning can open up a whole new world. Education is for the lifetime and is not just a compulsory chore for youngsters. The ability to learn grows through use. Maybe it isn't possible to teach an old dog new tricks. But are we dogs? Some persons may believe we are, but they are the ones who need education to find out that age is no barrier to learning.

Education for adults means much more than catching up with things missed before. Some persons have set out to learn something new and have lost themselves in the subject. This can happen with intellectual pursuits such as history or science. Or it is possible through learning new skills. Often these new skills can help a person to be self-supporting.

One man bought an old table to refinish it. Furniture refinishing became a hobby while he was employed. When he retired, it became a major interest. It also turned into a profitable small business as he purchased furniture, refinished it, then sold it at a profit.

In the last 20 years, great strides have been made in knowledge about people. Education can help people to make better adjustments to changed family and social relationships, to understand and adjust to the physical aspects of aging, to prepare for an active and productive life after retirement.

There is a tremendous need for more activity of citizens in community affairs. Every person is important in a democracy. But democratic living cannot be continued unless citizens participate in civic affairs and in government. Many of the problems of older people cannot be solved individually. Some of these are employment, pensions, social security, housing, public health. Solutions to these problems will depend largely on community action in the future. What can you do now to help solve these problems that will affect you? What are you planning to do when you have more time available?

Many worthwhile services need volunteer help. Tastes differ. What is of interest to one is dull to another. But there is wide variety in civic and service organizations. Many persons have the mistaken belief that their services are valuable only when paid for in money. Some of the most important community work is done on a volunteer basis. One man, upon retirement, was persuaded to serve on a civic committee. Much to his surprise, he became interested. One thing led to another, and he is now one of his community's civic leaders and performs invaluable work.

PERSONAL RELATIONS

Loneliness is one of the most serious hazards of age. Old friends may move away or be lost forever. But there are always new friends waiting to be found. Plan now to make new friends. Create opportunities to meet new people with similar interests. The best way to win friends is to be friendly. The embittered, self-centered, irritable oldster complains about loneliness. He berates relatives for lack of interest and affection: "Nobody cares whether I live or die." Has he forgotten that love is not only receiving? It is giving, too. A friendly, pleasant person who is interested in others never lacks friends. Man is a social animal, and love and affection from others are necessary parts of happy living.

Family relationships change. The parent must realize that children grow up and become adults. Close, loving parent-child relationships can continue throughout life, but only when the parent accepts the child as a grown adult and lets him lead his own life. The dominant parent who tries to force his will on his middle-aged son or daughter can be sure he will be resented and pushed aside as much as possible.

Frequently, problems arise when several generations live together. All of us are aware of or have experienced the situation in which the middle-aged person is caught in the conflicting pull of his responsibility to his children and to his parents. Understanding of personality needs, of human relationships, brings about a better awareness of the problems of each generation and is a beginning in their solution.

INDIVIDUAL PERSONALITY

Although each person is individual and different from anyone else, there are certain basic needs which are common to all. Every person needs love and affection. We must feel needed. We must have a sense of belonging. We need companionship. All of us need to feel important, at least some of the time. We need purposeful and creative activity and recognition for our achievements.

People like to believe they are self-sufficient, but man is a social being and is dependent upon others for the human relationships that make life satisfying. Denying these needs leads to maladjustments and unhappiness. Use them to measure your activities, to determine how satisfactory your plans for retirement will be. Do you have friends who can provide affection and companionship, or must new ones be made? Will your plans for activity satisfy your needs for usefulness, for creativeness, and for a feeling of importance? Other people can help you and make suggestions, but the final decision is up to you.

AGE IS WHAT WE MAKE IT

You are better able to plan ahead when you know what to look for. To retire successfully, you need to do more than look forward vaguely to a time of leisure. Successful retirement needs planning. Those 8 hours of every day will become empty after retirement unless you give some thought to them. Cultivate a variety of interests including purposeful activity, creative work, hobbies, the ability to enjoy recreation, and education. The key to successful retirement is to plan ahead so you can retire to something interesting rather than retire from the job.

When you see and face problems, you have started to solve them. Some you can solve by yourself. Some need community work. Some involve changed attitudes toward age, your own age as well as that of other persons. Greater knowledge about aging, better preparation for as well as a finer appreciation of age will help make all of life satisfying and good.

Glenford W. Lawrence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL H. DOUGLAS
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, June 26, 1956

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, Glenford W. Lawrence was one of our Nation's most dedicated and effective social workers and leaders in the field of adult education, who for many years lived and worked at the internationally known social settlement, the Chicago Commons, founded by Dr. Graham Taylor and long directed by his daughter, Miss Lea D. Taylor.

From my own long acquaintance with Glenford Lawrence and my knowledge of his unceasing service to his fellow men, I came to regard him as a true Christian in the very best sense of that word. While no brief résumé of his activities can fully measure the contribution which Mr. Lawrence made to the Chicago community and to the Nation, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, the very moving remarks by Anthony Scariano, a Chicago attorney, who grew up in that area, at the memorial service for Mr. Lawrence held May 10, 1956, at the Chicago Commons, in tribute to Glen Lawrence and to the great help that he gave to those with whom he lived and worked.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS OF ANTHONY SCARIANO AT THE MEMORIAL SERVICES FOR GLENFORD W. LAWRENCE, AT CHICAGO COMMONS, MAY 10, 1956

I have been asked by Miss Lea Taylor to participate in this memorial service for Glenford W. Lawrence, and to speak to you especially about Mr. Lawrence's influence on young people. I can best do this by telling you of his influence upon me as a young man. And, again, I can best do this by reading to you portions of a speech I gave recently before some of the Democratic leaders of the First Representative District.

In giving my personal history as a candidate for public office, I told these good people that my father had died when I was 10 years old; that my mother was forced to go to work in a factory to support her four small children; that I had to drop out of high school after my second year in order to help support my family; that after 1 year of full-time work I became unemployed; and that thereafter I became engaged in what seemed to be an endless quest for another job. This was in 1934—the very depths of the great economic depression. I continued:

"During this time I became exposed to forces and influences which were to have a great and lasting effect upon me.

"Chicago Commons, a settlement house very much like the more famous Hull House, was only two blocks from my home. Dr. Graham Taylor, a University of Chicago School of Divinity man, founded the Commons in the nineties, and ever since it has ministered to all types of ethnic, religious and cultural groups in that neighborhood. Dr. Taylor tells the fascinating story of that settlement in his book Pioneering on Social Frontiers.

"I was practically raised at the Commons. My mother was too busy with household chores morning and night, before and after her work at the factory, to devote much, if any, time to her children. All of my spare time was spent at the Commons from the time I was 10 years old. There I played in the gymnasium, danced, attended wood shop, art classes, and current events discussion groups together with Catholics, Protestants, Jews, Negroes, Orientals and Mexicans. I did not know what prejudice really was until I left the tenement-infested area of the near Northwest Side of Chicago for the civilization of university life.

"At any rate, during this period of trying to obtain work, the Commons was very much my second home. I was taught to type in

a WPA-sponsored project there to help me obtain a suitable job, but in vain.

"During all of this time I was being encouraged in all sorts of ways, by Lea Taylor, who had by this time become head resident of the Commons, succeeding her father. By a young divinity student at Chicago University, who was working at the Commons, he gave me his personal copy of Will Durant's The Story of Philosophy for helping him with a study on population trends in our neighborhood. By another young student from Baltimore, a social worker at the settlement, who turned over to me his copies of the Baltimore Sun when he was through with them. By Glenford W. Lawrence, a nationally known social worker and a leader in the field of adult education, a devoted trade unionist who smoked Raleigh cigarettes because it was the only brand to carry the union label. By a young woman attorney who donated her spare evenings to lead current events discussion groups at the Commons.

"We were a happy and yet a serious group; we published our own newspaper and we carried on all sorts of projects relating to the burning issues of the day.

"But, above all, I began to think. A consciousness, a deep awareness of society and its problems began to dawn on me. I was then 18, an age at which most lads would be going off to college in more auspicious times.

"Franklin Roosevelt had been in the White House just 2½ years, and what history had been packed into such a short period of time! We went over Durant's and other good books together. We read the great newspapers together: The New York Times, the Christian Science Monitor, the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, and the opinion magazines such as the Nation and the New Republic.

"We were all set to thinking, especially by Glenford Lawrence, and especially about the great paradoxes which existed in the United States then, and which still exist in nearly all parts of the world today:

"The paradox, for example, of appalling hunger in the midst of busting granaries.

"The paradox of a vast army of unemployed in the face of a great need of products and raw materials of all kinds.

"The paradox of prolonged life and useless and dependent old age.

"The paradox of nations preaching peace while arming to the teeth and preparing for war.

"The dismal spectacle of a lost generation of young people, drifting, deprived of an education, putting off marriage and the raising of families, practically faithless, and already falling prey to foreign influences.

"The climate was an exceedingly conducive one for encouraging the idea of returning to school."

Glenford Lawrence literally led me by the hand back to high school after an absence of nearly three years. He helped many others, too, I know, to "find themselves." I'm quite sure he helped countless others of whom I don't know.

Glenford Lawrence taught that a democracy did not let its worthy unemployed go hungry. He felt deeply that Government had a continuous responsibility for human welfare. He aspired for liberty and justice and the good life. He voiced the deathless cry of good men and good women for the opportunity to live and work in freedom, the right to be secure in their homes and in the fruits of their labor, the power to protect themselves against the ruthless and the cunning. He recognized that man is indeed his brother's keeper, insisted that the laborer is worthy of his hire and demanded that justice shall rule the mighty as well as the weak. He sought to cement our society, rich and poor, manual workers and brain workers, into a voluntary brotherhood of free men, standing together, striving together, for the common good of all. He kept that vision always before his eyes and in his heart, insisting steadfastly that it could and would be attained.

Glenford Lawrence believed that poverty could be stamped out; that the disgrace of involuntary unemployment could be eliminated; that class hatreds could be done away with; that peace at home and peace abroad could be maintained; and that one day a generation might possess this land, blessed beyond anything we have ever known, blessed with those things—material and spiritual—that make man's life abundant.

If any of the young people whose lives he touched ever have any part, be it great or small, in alleviating the complex problems which plague our society, it will be largely, if not solely, because of Glenford Lawrence.

To us young people he was friend, teacher and counselor. He will always be an inspiration to us.

A Case History: The Effect of Changing Patterns in Competitive Sources of Energy on the Industrial Growth and Development of the Kanawha Valley

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. M. G. BURNSIDE
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 25, 1956

Mr. BURNSIDE. Mr. Speaker, the Kanawha Valley in West Virginia is one of the great industrial centers of our Nation. Its future for potential development is extremely promising. At the annual meeting of the Charleston, W. Va., Chamber of Commerce on November 10, 1955, Mr. Philip Sporn, president of the American Gas & Electric Co., discussed the growth of this valley and the effect of the development of new sources of energy upon this expansion. His address will be of interest, I believe, to everyone, and I want to include it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. It is as follows:

The growth of industry in the Kanawha Valley in the past 35 years has been based on a number of factors—character and quality of its people, climate, transportation, water, salt, coal, natural gas, and electric power. These assets in combination have led to the establishment of a thriving industrial valley and one of the world's centers of chemical, electrochemical, and electrometallurgical production. This and adjacent areas constitute also a great center of coal production.

Among the resources with which we have been endowed in this valley, an abundant supply of low-cost energy has been of key importance. In the past our industry has relied for its energy upon hydro power, coal, and natural gas; oil has played only a minor part. Now a new source, nuclear power, is on the horizon and is likely to have significant effects upon the growth and location of industry here and elsewhere.

These competing energy resources, their relative availability and prices have never been static; their relationships to each other display an ever-changing pattern and the prospects of further change in the availability, price, and location of one fuel vis-a-vis others will continue to influence industrial development in the several regions of the country and in this section. It is necessary to understand the past and present role of energy resources in order to evaluate the effects that may result from changes in the future pattern of supplies.

Hydroelectric power had a prominent place in the early industrial development here. In 1901, hydro from the Kanawha River produced the first high carbon ferrochrome in the electric furnaces at Glen Ferris, a plant which has since led to the large Electromet operation at Alloy. Dependence upon hydro power from the Kanawha yielded many years ago to coal and natural gas. These two fossil resources are now important not only for fuel but also raw materials, and their dual uses are exemplified by the Union Carbide and du Pont plants begun in 1920 and 1925, respectively, and by the two powerplants at Cabin Creek and Glasgow. Today we can discern that coal, presently the main source of energy in this region, will play a primary role in future developments, even though nuclear power may also enter the picture.

The great industrial and powerplants just mentioned illustrate coal's importance in three forms: first, as chemical raw materials; second, as the means of producing heat for industrial purposes; third, as the dominant source of the abundant electric power which the valley has continued to enjoy. I would not minimize the part which our fortunate combination of many human and natural resources has played in giving this area its character as a center of the chemical industry. But low-cost electric energy based upon local coal has been and can continue to be one of the decisive factors.

An examination of the chemical industry's history during recent decades, in relation to the changing pattern of fuel supply, may indicate the possible direction of future growth in the Kanawha Valley. I am not going to quote a bale full of statistics, but some figures do help.

The data I am going to cite will not be precise because of changes in classification and other inconsistences over a long span of years, but they are indicative of trends.

Until the beginning of World War II, the Kanawha Valley was the pacemaker in the rapid expansion of chemicals. Comparative figures for all of the United States and for West Virginia show that the total United States chemical industry, as measured by value added, increased from some $200 million per year in 1921 to some $1,820 million in 1939. We may fairly take 1921 as the date of the country's emergence as a major producer of chemicals. The overall expension for the country from 1921 to 1939 was 900 percent. For the State of West Virginia it was roughly $1 million for 1921 and $47 million for 1939, or a ratio of more than 4,700 percent.

Between 1939 and 1947, however, ratios changed. The chemical industry still showed a very rapid increase but the national figure of annual value added rose to $5,360,000,000 while the increase for the State was some $176 million. The growth ratios in this interval were 295 percent for the country and 375 percent for the State.

In the last interval for which we have information, 1947–53, the national figure of value added climbed to $9,300,000,000 and the State figure to $353 million. The growth ratios in this period are 174 percent for the country and 201 percent for West Virginia.

Thus we see that, although this State pioneered the phenomenal development of our chemical industry which started with World War I and, although it maintained a marked advantage for a long time, since 1939 it has been losing position. The growth ratio of West Virginia to the country was 5 to 1 for the interval 1921–39; dropped to 1.27 to 1 in 1939–47; and dropped further to 1.17 to 1 in 1947–53. In recent years, in other words, West Virginia has just about been keeping up with the country as a whole. The experience of the Kanawha Valley, in which so large a part of the chemical industry of West Virginia is located, has tended to parallel

that of the State. Among the numerous reasons for this temporarily discouraging trend, one is outstanding: In the last decade new petro-chemical plants have been moving toward supplies of petroleum and natural gas, especially in the Southwest.

One region in Texas will illustrate the shift, the Sabine area in the upper Texas gulf coast, which takes in principally the cities of Beaumont, Port Arthur, and Orange. Between 1940, when employment in the chemical industry in that part of Texas was a bare 100, it grew to 4,100 in 1953, and at that time ground had already been broken for 3 more major chemical plants.

In the same interval, I know of three very large new chemical plants that we lost to the Southwest. That we lost them was not the result of any lack of enterprise here. We had brought two of these along very far on the road to final negotiations for power supply on the Appalachian Electric Power system; one of them actually had commenced engineering work on a local site. In the end, the principal attraction of the Southwest, since all these operations involve large quantities of power and hydrocarbons, was the abundant, lower cost fuel—gas and oil—that was offered by that territory. The combination of new technology and the competitive advantage which oil and natural gas then held in the Southwest brought about the shift to that area.

The position of the Southwest in this respect can be seen clearly if we compare prices of natural gas in Texas and West Virginia. Price at the well in West Virginia in 1953 was 23.6 cents per thousand cubic feet, or over 3 times the 7.6 cents in Texas. This differential is somewhat less but still striking if we compare average prices at points of consumption. The average revenue of gas utilities per million therms in 1953 in West Virginia was $36,984 and in Texas it was $20,366. West Virginia cost for gas, therefore, in 1953, was more than 80 percent higher than in Texas at the point of consumption.

Happily for us in the Kanawha Valley a partially compensating factor has now set in. From 1933 to 1946 revenue per million therms fell in both States as the Southwest's vast natural gas resources began to be tapped more extensively. Since the end of World War II, however, with the great expansion in consumption of natural gas, prices have risen steadily in West Virginia until they are now about 35 percent above 1946. But in Texas, while it is true that prices have not risen the same amount above the 1946 level, the trend in prices is upward, with every indication that the pressure of demand will result in a continuation of this trend.

These figures all relate to average prices. They take into account, therefore, long-term contracts made, in many cases, years ago. And they are not entirely indicative of what can be done today by a new industrial operation where fuel need is relatively large and its use in process is so large as to constitute a significant item in total cost of production. For such cases there are few locations in the Southwest where gas can be obtained today at less than somewhere between 13.5 cents to 15 cents per million British thermal unit. It is this situation that has materially altered, and promises to alter even more in the future, the competitive position of coal.

It is interesting to look at what has been happening to coal in this same period. The 1939 average price at the mine in West Virginia was $1.76 per ton. In 1945, the price had gone to $3.20 per ton, and by 1953 it was $5.18. For the country as a whole the corresponding figures are $1.55, $3.06, and $4.91. But in the past 3 or 4 years there has been some decline in the price of coal and these prices now show signs of leveling off. This is very significant since the stabilization is taking place in the face of higher wage rates. It is a reflection of technological progress and improvement in labor productivity in coal mining. Gas prices, on the other hand, give every indication, even in Texas, of being in the early stages of a long-term price increase which is likely to become more pronounced as the demand for gas grows and begins to strain the maximum capacity available. Should legislation remove Federal Power Commission control at the wellhead, this trend is likely to be accelerated.

In electric power the State has fared very much better than it has with gas and much better than with coal. The cost per kilowatt-hour for industrial customers of Appalachian Electric Power Co. has declined steadily from 1.23 cents in 1929 to .91 cent in 1953, and thus far in 1955 it is only .88 cent. For the country as a whole there has been a decline from 1.38 cents in 1929 to 1 cent in 1953. The decline has occurred despite the rise in the cost of materials, equipment, supplies—particularly fuel—and the rise in labor costs. It has been made possible entirely by the technical strides in design, construction, and operation of electric power generation, transmission, and distribution facilities, and by the increase in demand and use that declining costs have induced which in turn have provided opportunities for further reductions in cost. And the promise of further advances in power system technology, together with the coal resources available in the State and the hope of stabilizing coal costs, should assure the Kanawha Valley of a continuing abundance of low-cost electric power.

The new competitive energy resource, atomic or, more precisely, nuclear power, is now at the threshold. It is important to emphasize that, while nuclear power is here, competitive nuclear power is yet to come. In order to give perspective, I should say that we cannot say that we are on the brink of competitive atomic power, but it is rash to overlook the fact that competitive atomic power is coming.

Nuclear energy is a major advance in bringing forth a new source of thermal energy; its importance lies, however, in the prospect it opens up of meeting the expanding requirements not in the immediate future but 20 to 25 years from now and beyond. This does not mean nuclear fuel will have no immediate impact on the energy picture—worldwide and United States of America. While at the present time no firm data of nuclear power generating costs are available, there are indications that nuclear power may soon be competitive with conventional power in limited parts of the world and may even be so in some especially high-fuel cost areas in the United States.

But in the Kanawha Valley and in other places where abundant conventional energy resources are economically available, nuclear power is likely to make relatively minor inroads over the next 2 decades on the markets for fossil fuels and the expected growth in these markets. I must say, however, that my confidence in the future of the coal market is based upon certain assumptions about the coal industry. I think these assumptions are valid but it is also necessary that I state them. I am assuming that the coal industry is determined to meet the challenge of competitive nuclear energy and that it will see that challenge clearly. I can amplify this statement in the following way:

(a) The coal industry has both an opportunity and a responsibility as the supplier of one of the basic energy raw materials.

(b) Competitive nuclear fuel will be a freightless fuel and, therefore, it is imperative that coal should meet it on a delivered basis.

(c) The coal industry will need to have the most intimate contact with principal classes of use and independently and cooperatively will have to develop more economical coal and more economical use of coal.

If coal responds to that challenge, then by 1965, when the electric power industry of the country is likely to reach a generating capacity of over 200 million kilowatts, nuclear fuel may power only 5 million kilowatts of that capacity. By 1975 nuclear power, although at that point accelerating its successful penetration, probably will still represent only a fraction of the 400-million kilowatt total industry capacity. If matters eventuate so, then coal will continue to carry the principal share of the country's energy burden for some time to come. Even beyond these next two decades its seems likely that nuclear power, rather than displacing coal, will be required to complement our coal resources and assist coal to meet our total energy requirements by filling some of the gaps likely to be left by dwindling oil and gas supplies.

What does all this mean for the further industrial development of this valley? The decline in the additions to the known reserves of oil and particularly gas and the rise in prices at which they will have to be sold is bound to lower the position of these alternative fuels vis-a-vis coal. These developments can be given a powerful further impetus by the coal industry's vigorous reaction to the challenge of atomic power. Any successes in getting coal out of the ground more economically than at present will be of enormous significance in enabling the industry to hold and expand present markets. And it will be particularly helpful to an area such as the Kanawha Valley, where mining is so close to power-generating plants that here at least coal, like nuclear fuel, can be virtually independent of the effect of freight charges. This view of our situation should open a new era in the expansion of chemical, electrochemical, metallurgical, and electrometallurgical industries. I think there are signs that this new ear may have begun already. Until just a few months ago, it seemed that the economics of lower fuel cost gave the Southwest an unbeatable advantage. But now industries which are so basic to our economy are going through major expansion programs, and they are looking to coal-fired electric power for their source of energy. The present cycle of expansion in aluminum reduction and fabrication, to cite but one example, cannot, it seems to me, be completed without their being located 1 or more, perhaps as many as 3 or 4, such operations in a coal-based area. A number of these are bound to come, I venture to predict, to the Kanawha Valley or to areas very close to it. Such industries, in turn, can attract numerous, important satellite industries built to supply them and be supplied by them.

These possibilities can materialize because the fundamentals for their attainment are here. We have an established, thriving industrial valley; we are rich in natural resources: climate, ample water, salt, fuel; we have excellent transportation facilities. We have a skilled and experienced population from which to draw and we have proximity to markets. Finally, there is every promise of the competitive position of coal coming into relatively more favorable position than has been the case for more than a decade. We have only to back up our optimism with hard work and enterprise to realize a solid, broad based, further growth of industry, and the chemical industry in particular, in the Kanawha Valley. I believe that the industrial future that is open to us in this section can be one of almost boundless possibilities.

Effects of Inflation Upon the Life Savings of Citizens

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. WILLIAMS
OF DELAWARE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, June 26, 1956

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, in the June 25 issue of Newsweek there appears an article entitled "The Great Swindle," written by Mr. Henry Hazlitt.

The article emphasizes the manner in which the life savings of the citizens of a country can be undermined or destroyed as a result of the inflationary policies of a politically motivated government.

I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE GREAT SWINDLE
(By Henry Hazlitt)

We live in the Age of Inflation. It has become a fixed idea among governments that their paramount economic aim must be to maintain "full employment," and that full employment can be maintained only by deficit financing, artificially cheap money, or direct recourse to the printing press.

Once underway, inflation sets in motion powerful special interests which demand its continuance. For it benefits some groups of the population at the expense of all the rest. Inflation is a tax—the cruelest and most wanton of all taxes. Under it, all creditors are systematically swindled.

CYNICAL DEFENSE

"He that would hang his dog," says an old proverb, "gies out first that he is mad." He that would swindle a creditor must first give him a bad name. The late Lord Keynes did this by calling him the "rentier." He implied that the rentier was simply an idle plutocrat who lived on unearned interest at the expense of the struggling workers. In his General Theory, Keynes spoke of "the euthanasia of the rentier, and, consequently, the euthanasia of the cumulative oppressive power of the capitalist to exploit the scarcity-value of capital. Interest today rewards no genuine sacrifice."

But who in the modern world are the creditors, the "rentiers"? They include, in addition to the holders of mortgages and corporate bonds, the thrifty, the small people who put their money in savings deposits or life-insurance policies, and all the owners of Government bonds, who were induced to take these bonds for patriotic reasons. And who are the debtors who are being relieved of the allegedly dreadful burden of having to pay interest and repay capital in currency units of the same value as those they borrowed? They include the big corporations, the big holders of common stocks, and the speculators who have learned how and when to jump in and out and exploit the value of a depreciating currency.

I append a table compiled by Franz Pick for his forthcoming 1956 edition of Pick's Currency Yearbook. This shows the depreciation of 53 currencies in the 10 years from 1946 to 1955, as measured by each government's own cost-of-living index. This table, it will be noted, shows that the United States dollar, the world's monetary pivot, shrank 17 percent in buying power over the past decade. The British pound sterling lost 35 percent; the French franc, 66 percent. The currency units of Chile, Paraguay, Bolivia, and Korea had their purchasing power practically wiped out.

Some of the countries whose currencies suffered worst, such as Formosa and Korea, were struggling with special war or defense problems. But this was obviously not true in Chile, Paraguay, or Bolivia. The truth is that this shocking swindle by governments of their own citizens was brought about in most cases by deliberate monetary or credit inflation. And it was all done under the pious pretense that inflation is a sort of calamity visited on a country by malevolent outside forces, which the politicians and monetary managers profess to be incessantly combating.

Currency units: Loss of purchasing power, 1946–55

	Percent
Portuguese	0
Dominican	2
Egyptian	2
Haitian	3
Indian	10
Pakistani	10
Ceylonese	11
Lebanese	16
United States	17
Belgian	19
Swiss	19
German	22
Honduran	24
Irish	24
Italian	24
Guatemalan	25
Costa Rican	27
Danish	27
Ecuadoran	27
Canadian	28
Netherlands	29
Norwegian	29
Iranian	30
Venezuelan	30
South African	31
Spanish	31
Swedish	31
El Salvador	32
Turkish	32
Hong Kong	33
Thailand	33
Malayan	34
New Zealand	34
British	35
Colombian	46
Uruguyan	46
Icelandic	48
Mexican	48
Nicaraguan	49
Australian	50
Finnish	52
Austrian	54
Peruvian	59
Brazilian	60
Greek	61
French	66
Japanese	67
Israeli	68
Indonesian	69
New Taiwan	85
Chilean	91
Paraguayan	91
Bolivian	95
Korean	99

More About Our Lack of Foreign Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 26, 1956

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the following article by Dorothy Thompson from the Washington Star of June 22, 1956, is interesting, if not terrifying reading:

PRESIDENT'S HEALTH SERIOUS ISSUE—SETBACKS IN FOREIGN FIELD CALLED SIGN CHIEF'S ABSENCE IS FELT BY STAFF

We have not discussed the President's second illness because we felt we could add nothing to the thousands of words of report and comment.

However, the idea that the President's two illnesses have actually improved his health and capacities is preposterous. According to this argument, just what anyone over 60 needs is a coronary thrombosis followed by an intestinal obstruction requiring surgery. Nobody, of course, believes this, although many people want to believe it. They want to believe it because the President is greatly and justly beloved; the country, in general, is doing well despite some sticky segments of the economy; and the popular mood is still about dead center.

So the argument that comes increasingly to the fore is that the President always has operated as a Chief of Staff, delegating authority to subordinates and making decisions only when major questions of policy are involved.

This is the way the country has been governed largely during the 9 months which the President has been more or less incapacitated for just about half the time.

But if the staff work is satisfactory, what does it matter? The question is whether it has been satisfactory, and in one respect it certainly has not. In the field of foreign policy Western setbacks have been alarming. We have not made progress on a single front, and there is no substitute leadership in the Western Alliance.

Eden, with the lamentable situation in Cyprus, is beset at home. The French Government, without popular authority, is in a desperate situation in Algeria. Dr. Adenauer's regime is deteriorating daily. The uncommitted nations are increasingly committing themselves eastward. Marshal Tito has made his peace with Moscow. In Italy and France the Communist Parties are purging themselves, not only of the old Stalinists, but of all the leaders who have been subservient to Moscow, enabling them to make overtures to the Social Democrats for a return of the popular fronts.

The House of Representatives has cut over a billion dollars from the foreign aid bill. Although the Senate committee has reinstated most of this, the House vote indicated a grassroots conviction that the vast export of money, arms, and know-how is not paying off.

Dulles suffers from something worse, perhaps, than hardening of the arteries—namely, hardening of the categories. He insists that everything is going satisfactorily and that all we need to do is more of the same thing, although events have pulled the rug from under his feet.

He lacks the foresight and historic insight to envisage probable developments, the elasticity to provide for alternative courses, the imagination to appeal to wide masses of men, and even that fifth sense, essential to all diplomacy, which is tact.

The President and Dulles contradict each other, and then one or another explains that they meant the same thing, though the identity is impossible to establish in understandable English.

The President's leadership and personal responsibility need to be more, not less, strongly exerted.

"Major decisions of policy" are created day by day, in every action of a Cabinet official and every vote in Congress.

This is especially true in foreign policy, where every speech has international repercussions.

To be a world leader a nation must have visible, clear, and responsible leadership.

Nothing can be said against a staff system, but its chief must always have the last word and be on hand to speak it.

The President's age and condition of health are therefore very serious matters.

Our people know it. If they continue to back the President for another term, it will not be because they are not perturbed, but because they have little faith in anybody else. This also is no cause for satisfaction.

Commencement Address Delivered by Gen. Carlos P. Romulo, President of the Fourth Session of the United Nations General Assembly and Philippine Ambassador to the United States, Before the 1956 Graduates of the University of San Francisco, Sunday, June 10, 1956, at War Memorial Opera House

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 26, 1956

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, before the University of San Francisco in California a commencement address was delievered by our former colleague and one of the great statesmen of the world, Gen. Carlos P. Romulo that carries a message for all America. It is a ringing address for those who believe in freedom to close ranks against communism. It is also an appeal to us Americans to understand Asia better, its ideals, its aspirations.

Here is a true friend of America who speaking for his country underscores the need of our respecting national sovereignty and national dignity and self-respect of those who are tested friends and allies. I agree with him. He addresses us with frankness and because we cannot doubt his loyalty to democratic ideals his message must be heeded.

Under unanimous consent, I make his speech part of the RECORD:

Exactly 11 years ago this month, an event took place in this hall which will be remembered long after wars and the fear of wars will be forgotten. In this Veterans Memorial Hall, delegates from 50 nations adopted the United Nations Charter.

At the end of the worst war mankind had experienced, representatives of many lands sat down to build man's hope for a better future, a future where men would be brothers under God, where no man's hand would be raised against another, where human dignity and human rights would be respected.

That event, I think, should mean more to each of you today that it did to those of us who took part in it. Not because the United Nations is perfect. It isn't. Not because the signing of the charter has brought an end to man's inhumanity to man. It hasn't. But because of the vision which men saw of the future, a future which belongs to you young people who now enter a world that has need of your idealism, your work, your faith.

The drafting and the unanimous acceptance of the charter was a kind of world-wide commencement for the tired, worried peoples of the earth. I remember well the hours we studied and wrote and worked over the words of the preamble which even today makes me thank the fate that gave me the opportunity to have a hand in it.

Let me read to you from the preamble of the charter:

"We the peoples of the United Nations, determined to save succeeding generations from the scourge of war, which twice in our lifetime has brought untold sorrow to mankind, and to reaffirm our faith in fundamental human rights, in the dignity and the worth of the human person, in the equal rights of men and women and of nations large and small, and to establish conditions under which justice and respect for the obligations arising from the treaties and other sources of international law can be maintained, and to promote social progress and better standards of life in larger freedom.

"And for these end to practice tolerance and live together in peace with one another as good neighbors, and to unite our strength to maintain international peace and security, and to insure, by the acceptance of principles and the institution of methods, that armed force shall not be used, save in the common interest, and to employ international machinery for the promotion of the economic and social advancement of all peoples, have resolved to combine our efforts to accomplish these aims."

Those were brave words. They had a vital meaning to us. Remember that the enemy had just been vanquished. Totalitarianism had been defeated. German nazism had been halted. Japanese militarism had been brought low. The enemy which had wrought such havoc, which had trampled on freedom, on human dignity, on the rights of man, had been conquered. But that did not end man's struggle to be free. For as fascism was the enemy of human decency then, so is communism today. Yesterday it was Hitler and Mussolini and the Japanese militarists. Today it is communism, the negation of human personality, the denial of faith in God. The face of freedom's foe has changed; his character is the same.

After Stalin's death many people were hopeful that the Soviet Union would no longer be a threat to those who believe in the sacredness of human personality. There were those who hoped, because the new rulers in the Kremlin cooed like doves, that communism had changed. When Khrushchev and Bulganin smiled, many hoped that a new era was dawning. When the first criticisms of Stalin dead came from men who had praised Stalin alive, many hoped that this was the beginning of a new Soviet Union.

Wishful thinking—every one of these hopes. The evil is not Stalin or any of his successors alone. The evil is the system of communism itself, which denies the rights of the individual, which uses terror and destruction as tools of power, which allows no man to think for himself or express his beliefs or do as he may please.

Just last week, your Department of State released the fullest available text of Khrushchev's attack on Stalin. This horrendous tale of murder, of fear, of lies, of cynicism, of madness in the Kremlin was intended to persuade us that there was a deep difference between Stalinism and pure Soviet communism. We are not convinced.

For the Khrushchev revelations tell us another story. They provide a historic revelation, not of one man, but of an entire wicked system of suppression and hatred.

Who are the present leaders of the Soviet Union but men raised up by Stalin and bred in the Communist system? Who are the Communist leaders but creatures of the ideology which denies that man was created in God's image?

The Stalins may live or die. The Krushchevs and Bulganins may live or die. But as long as the Communist ideology remains alive, free men everywhere are in mortal danger.

This is the lesson that must be learned by those nations which assert a doubtful claim to neutralism in the deep conflict now facing the world.

There can be no standing aside. No nation can be neutral in the face of a clear and present danger.

Some Asian leaders think that, having broken the chains of British or French or Dutch imperialism, they can now ignore an imperialism which is incomparably worse. Some of them say that they are only following in the footsteps of America which in its early years as a republic they claim insisted on its neutrality.

They have either misread or misjudged American history. For the historical facts are: In 1801, a few years after American independence, when Tripoli interfered with American shipping in the Mediterranean, the young, immature United States did not remain neutral. She declared war. A few years later, in 1812, America sided with France against Britain. She was not a neutralist then. In 1821, the United States challenged a Russian order closing the Bering Straits to other than Russian ships. She did not remain neutral. In 1823, the United States established the Monroe doctrine which was a warning to all European nations not to encroach on the territorial rights of the two Americas. That was not neutrality. In 1895, the United States sternly told Britain not to interfere in Venezuela and that the United States was ready to resist any such interference by "every means in its power." Neither was that neutrality. In 1898, America was not neutral when she declared war on Spain, nor did she ride the fence in 1900 when together with a number of European powers, American marines participated in the fight to suppress the Boxer rebellion.

And that is why America is the world leader today. In her youngest years as a nation she did not hesitate to take sides with whatever in its national conscience it believed to be right. America's nationalism was based on a strong devotion to human freedom. Whenever and wherever freedom was imperiled, America was there on the side of freedom.

The nations of Asia and Africa which have recently emerged, or are struggling to attain their freedom, have a strong national feeling. But that new nationalism will have no meaning unless it understands that neutralism between the free world and the Soviet world is impossible.

You cannot strike down one tyranny and smile neutrally upon another which is far worse. These great new peoples of Asia must recognize that their only hope to remain free depends on their joining hands with those peoples committed to the defense of human liberty.

I recall the words of an English writer, George Orwell, who said:

"When one thinks of the cruelty, squalor, and futility of war—and * * * of the intrigues, the persecutions, the lies, and the misunderstandings—there is always the temptation to say: 'One side is as bad as the other. I am neutral.' In practice, however, one cannot be neutral, and there is hardly such a thing as a war in which it makes no difference who wins. Nearly always one side stands more or less for progress, and the other side more or less for reaction."

George Orwell was talking about war in the military sense. But his point is even more important in the war of ideas which engulfs us today. In this war, it makes a very great difference who wins. Our side, yours and mine, does stand for freedom and progress. Their side, Stalin's and Krushchev's, does stand for dictatorship and reaction. You Americans should be proud that you have taken your stand before the world. We of the Philippines are proud to be your partners. And as for our friends in India, and Burma, and Ceylon, and Indonesia, and

elsewhere—well, I hope they profit by our example before it is too late.

These are the days of decision for Asia. But they are also days of decision for America. You cannot maintain your own freedom without friends and allies. And to have friends and allies you must make a conscious effort to win the new nations of Asia.

You young people, who are decision makers in a free society, must make great decisions. And one of them is to decide to understand Asia, its new nationalism, its aspirations, its hopes. You must strive to understand one of the great facts of the 20th century: The rise of Asia.

It isn't enough for America to be on the right side of the fence. It isn't enough to be convinced that communism is evil. You must understand, because you need their help and friendship, why the peoples of Asia feel the way they do.

I believe that the key to the future of the world lies in Asia. Half the earth's population, old in culture, is emerging into a new consciousness of Asia's new political and strategic strength. No longer are they dwellers in a political backwater.

By their numbers, by their resources, by their vitality, the peoples of Asia hold the world in balance, and they know it now as they never did before. You must know it, too, for the good of the world as a whole and for your own particular good as well.

It isn't easy to understand other peoples. It isn't easy to understand your own sometimes. I suspect that it sometimes isn't even easy for the people of San Francisco to understand some of the actions of those who live in Los Angeles.

You graduates will be faced with many problems as you go forth into this confused world. But none will be more important to you than that of understanding of other peoples, peoples of faraway lands, different religions, different backgrounds, different color, different ways of life.

It may be difficult, but not too difficult. What it needs most of all is the desire to understand others—and to make the effort. Unless understanding, sympathetic understanding, is forthcoming, there will be no future for the freeman.

Think back over the history of the emergent nations in Asia. Think of how the ordinary people were treated through the centuries, how they were exploited, how they were looked down upon by the colonial rulers more interested in extracting wealth than in promoting the general welfare.

How would you have felt if your country was run by outsiders who considered you so unimportant that your culture was sneered at; your natural wealth and hard labor exploited while little or no attempt was made to provide schools and hospitals. How would you have felt if you were treated by strangers as if you were less than human?

Would you, with such a background, be so all-fired anxious to join with those who, until so very recently, treated you so thoughtlessly—who felt you did not deserve even the opportunity to learn to read and write and live decently?

That is all over, you may say. It is, in a way. But folk memory lingers for a long time. The resentment built up over centuries cannot be dissipated in a decade. It takes time and above all it takes understanding until the new nations of Asia believe that the European and the American really recognize them as equals, with feelings and rights and desires even as other children of God.

Perhaps you may think some of the Asians are hypersensitive. Perhaps some of us are. But remember that the child is the father of the man. What has happened in the past cannot be wiped out in a moment. Every student of human nature knows that what happens to the child molds the man. That is as true of nations as it is of individuals.

That is why you will find the Asian insisting, sometimes, on what you Americans may take for granted. The Asian insists that he be treated with equality and respect. He has a culture of his own, a future of his own, a way of life of his own. He knows it—but he is not yet sure that you know it. He may not yet be as strong as you are—in the economic or military sense. But he soon will be. He has vast natural resources, his very millions of fellow Asians, his zest for rapid and revolutionary progress, assure him of this. He knows it—but he is not yet sure that you know it.

And this is important: You have friends in Asia, true and loyal friends. Tested friends. But do not make the mistake of taking them for granted. In your endeavor to win new friends don't overlook that friendship, like a plant, must be cultivated if you want it to grow and flourish and fructify. You may, from your own perspective and in all honesty, believe that to take a people for granted is a tribute to it, that you do not question its attachment to you and its adherence to your ideals. Don't forget, however, that 10,000 miles away such an attitude can be misinterpreted as indifference or neglect and it can be distorted to suit Communist ends.

The Asian is proud of his new-won national dignity. He is zealous of his country's sovereignty. God has given him his country and his land and no one can make him believe that that is not his God-given property. No legal formalism will make him give up ownership or title to that land. This you must recognize. Military narrowmindedness that reveals itself in brazen disregard of a people's national self-respect and dignity must not be countenanced by your government in countries where the people's trust and loyalty are imperative for your own national security.

My message to you today is simple: If you do not know these things, you must learn them before it is too late. And you must transform your knowledge into understanding. In return, your rewards will be great. You will have won the friendship and loyalty of a billion human beings—the very kind of friendship and loyalty that the Filipino soldiers demonstrated on Bataan in the first days of World War II—the kind of friendship and loyalty which impelled the common people of the Philippines to stand firm against the Japanese through 3 harsh and terrible years of enemy occupation. Such are the rewards of understanding—and they can be matters of life or death.

But there is a deeper reason for the effort to understand. It is the only way to world peace.

The last world war, in many ways, came about for lack of understanding. Hitler did not understand the psychology of the democracies. The Germans did not understand that free men would fight. On the other side, we did not understand clearly enough, first, why the German people turned to Hitler, and, second, what Hitlerism meant as a threat, not just to Germany, but to the whole free world.

The Japanese did not understand Americans. Because Americans loved fun and games, because they were easygoing, the Japanese thought you were decadent. On the other side, you did not understand the deep Japanese resentment at the slurs and injuries of the white man.

If we are to have peace, if we are to build a world that is peaceful, happy, and humane, then we must learn to understand one another. As a man of Asia, I have no hesitation about telling you frankly that this is your job. In the same way, at Bandung and elsewhere, I have told my fellow Asians that we must recognize our half of the duty to understand the ways of the West.

The burden is not alone for the white man; it is for all men. But it falls most heavily on the most powerful free Nation in the world: The United States of America.

To succeed in your world leadership, to safeguard the freedom that is yours, there must be understanding. On that depends all our futures, yours, mine, and the children you do not yet have. In the new Asia, a giant stands, flexing the muscles of his newfound freedom. He will never again be a slave. He can be—if you want him—your partner.

Clarence Wesley Explains Real Indian Issues

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BARRY M. GOLDWATER

OF ARIZONA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, June 26, 1956

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, we hear much from non-Indians concerning what they refer to as the Indian problem. It is rare, indeed, that we have the opportunity to listen to the wise words of an Indian on the same subject; so it is with great pleasure that today I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article written by one of Arizona's outstanding citizens, a San Carlos Apache, Clarence Wesley. The article, which appeared in the Arizona Republic of June 23, is entitled "Wesley Explains Real Indian Issue."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WESLEY EXPLAINS REAL INDIAN ISSUES

(By Clarence Wesley, president, Inter-Tribal Council)

American citizens, including public officials, generally don't know what the Indian issues really are. The issues are not assimilation, or integration, or emancipation, or Government control over the Indian person, or civil rights in the usual sense of the words.

The real issues are continuing ownership of land; development of human and natural resources; protection of rights solemnly promised by treaty and law; honor in Government dealing with conquered peoples; our day in court on our claims; real opportunity for education of the same quality as is available to non-Indian citizens; adequate Federal assistance in reservation development toward the end our communities may thrive and contribute to the prosperity of the fine State in which we are located; an end to bureaucratic dictatorship and unnecessary Federal regulations; an end to wasteful and constantly changing, insensitive administration of our affairs in favor of a constant policy of minimum interference and maximum assistance to us to help ourselves.

There is something radically wrong with the kind of Federal supervision of Indian affairs we have had when after 135 years of Indian administration, Indians face more problems than ever. The only bright, constructive spots have been a few years under the Indian Reorganization Act, the enactment of the Indian Claims Commission Act which has been inadequately implemented, a rehabilitation act for one tribal group only, and rare, minor measures. Both for the sake of Indians and the general public, this should not be allowed to continue, even for another decade.

What are some of the things that are wrong? Some of the things that could be done to help? Indian tribes in this country today need long-term loans and grants for resources development, both natural re-

sources and human resources. They need a minimum of regulation and control and a maximum of encouragement and technical assistance. Indian tribes need the kind of program that this Nation is making possible in underdeveloped countries in other parts of the world.

As to Federal appropriations for Indian affairs: True, the United States Congress has appropriated millions of dollars to the Bureau of Indian Affairs and does so each year. Beyond that fact, several questions need to be raised. (1) Indians don't receive any payments from the Government, or any services that other citizens don't receive out of tax moneys, from the same source. Indians don't get payments from the Federal Government just because they are Indians.

(2) How much of the Federal appropriation for Indian affairs actually benefits Indians? Many of us who work and plead for development of our resources contend that most of this appropriation goes into salaries—in the central office in Washington, D. C., in eight area offices over the Indian country, and in many reservation field offices. All of them have huge staffs compared to anything that Indian tribes or Indian organizations have to work with. Indian tribes and leaders have protested bitterly against the operations of the area offices on the grounds they furnish just another layer of bureaucrats, they form another buckpassing stop, they duplicate services.

The general attitude of tribal officials and Indian leaders is that authority and responsibility should be vested in the local reservation superintendent where it used to be. Problems of tribes vary widely, and if the reservation superintendent is a good man and tries to work with the Indians, he can do more good than all the higher brass put together. A good superintendent and the tribe's governing officials working together can accomplish wonders and bring about changes of lasting and permanent value on a reservation.

(3) Very few people realize that many tribes pay many of their own tribal employees and administration costs—in other words, many tribes pay much of their own way out of their own tribal income.

Public officials, including Congressmen and American citizens who complain of appropriations for Indians, should ask themselves what all the county, State, and Federal costs of schools, roads, medical care, law, and order for white communities similar in size and number and location to the Indian communities would amount to if they were all lumped together and shown as one appropriation of tax moneys. The totals would be sto staggering that Indian appropriations would look puny.

Money and political power are needed to protect what little is left of our once great natural resources and to develop them not only for our own improved conditions, but for the general prosperity of our State. Modern tribal business corporations, healthy, prosperous, wholesome communities are our goal. The greed of the invaders has gradually taken our wealth from us. We have left only our political power with which to improve our conditions.

Since the courts settled the matter of allowing us to vote only in 1948, our people need much information and encouragement to exercise this effective tool in our behalf. Our Congressmen in Washington are showing more respect for our wishes and our needs as we become more active in our voting citizenship.

Our votes are our greatest hope for the future. The vote of the poorest one among us is just as powerful as the vote of the richest man in Arizona. In counting the votes, at least, we are equal to any other man. Let us not let the golden opportunity of this national presidential election year slip through our fingers. Let us devote ourselves to an all-out effort in voter education among our people in these next few months. Let us make use of the great American tradition and opportunity of political campaigning to get our issues fully aired and discussed, to sound out the candidates who will be seeking our votes, to making our views and our wishes known, to asking for pledges and commitments in advance of the time to cast our votes—this is the only time for political bargaining. When enough of us vote—on the basis of the issues and the records of the men and women who ask for our votes—we can and we will change our conditions, and we will bring about a new respect for ourselves as functioning American citizens, a new respect for our needs and wishes.

Pan American World Airways and the Friendship International Airport

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. GLENN BEALL
OF MARYLAND
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, June 26, 1956

Mr. BEALL. Mr. President, about 2 weeks ago I spoke before this body on the reasons why Pan American World Airways should be allowed to provide service for the east coast through Friendship International Airport. Since then, reaffirmations of support for Pan American's application to the Civil Aeronautics Board have been announced from Baltimore and Philadelphia, and the city of New York has also joined in the indorsement. Many of the reasons behind this widespread support were outlined in an editorial entitled "Why Pan American?" published in today's Baltimore Sun. I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be included in today's RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHY PAN AMERICAN?

The most heavily traveled air route in the world is between the northeast and Florida points. It has been the monopoly of two airlines, Eastern and National. Some time ago the Civil Aeronautics Board decided that the density of this traffic warranted certification of a third carrier and entertained applications. Numerous airlines, including Pan American, made application for certification as the third carrier.

The procedure is that a preliminary decision is reached by a CAB examiner, but with rehearings and a final determination by the whole board on appeal. The examiner rejected the Pan American application in favor of another carrier; and Pan American, convinced of the merits of its case, is now appealing to the whole board. What gives this appeal a special interest in that briefs in support of Pan American's application have been submitted by Baltimore City, the Baltimore Association of Commerce, the Greater Baltimore Committee, and the State Aviation Commission. The decision of these 4 to back the application of 1 private airline against the others is unusual. But there is the best of reasons for this intervention.

The reason is this: that of all the applicants only Pan American proposed to use Friendship Airport to serve the Washington-Baltimore area. All the rest proposed to use Washington's National Airport. Baltimore has argued all along the merits of Friendship Airport as a joint Baltimore-Washington terminal, particularly in the case of long-distance flights and for the benefit of the northeastern Washington and suburban Washington areas. Only Pan American, among all these applicants, proposes to exploit the neglected advantages of Friendship, thus at the same time serving Washington without further congesting National Airport and providing for Baltimore the adequate schedule of north-south flights in first-line equipment which it has never had.

We need not suppose that Pan American specified Friendship rather than National for sentimental reasons. On the contrary, it chose Friendship for sound business reasons.

It sees, first, a passenger potential that has never had adequate service. It sees, second, an enormous potential for a through-air cargo service to Latin America which is at present nonexistent; and since such cargo would originate in industrial and commercial Baltimore rather than Washington, Friendship is the logical terminal. Pan American's election of Friendship rather than National was a business decision.

Over and beyond these matters of immediate interest to Baltimore, there are merits in Pan American's case which were inexplicably disregarded by the examiner. One is that Pan American, on entering the Northeast-Florida service, would link this service with its overseas routes (to Europe in one direction and to Latin America in another) by through flights. This would give both Washington and Baltimore something that they have never enjoyed. Another is that Pan American is admirably prepared to provide first-class equipment immediately. That is because Pan American's present peak European traffic is in the summer—whereas the maximum demand for equipment between the Northeast and Florida is in the winter. The two types of service dovetail perfectly. A third—and this should be particularly impressive to the CAB—is that all profits accruing to Pan American in the Northeast-Florida business would automatically be deducted from the subsidy which it currently enjoys on its overseas flights. The potential saving to the taxpayer is estimated to be in the neighborhood of $8 million a year.

The case for certifying Pan American is an impressive one from every point of view. The special need of Baltimore for the service which Pan American proposes fully justifies our intervention and ought to carry great weight with the Board.

Federal School Subsidy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN V. BEAMER
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 13, 1956

Mr. BEAMER. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I enclose an editorial from the Huntington Herald-Press under date of June 24, and ask that it be included in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

FEDERAL SCHOOL SUBSIDY

Opponents of Federal aid to education are more concerned about Federal control over instruction of our children than the high cost and waste of Federal participation in costs of school-building construction. Most of all, they are unimpressed by that frequent rejoinder of proponents that "because there has been no Federal control in the past there is no danger of it occurring." In the first

place, such a statement does not hold up under examination. In the second, such naivete is colossal when viewed in the light of liberty's history-old struggle with tyranny. Authoritarian penetration does not begin until the apparatus is set up.

But the Kelley bill, which has been reported out of committee and is scheduled to come before the House of Representatives for action this week, provides for Federal aid for local school construction. Principally, its meaning is more cost, more waste, and the frustrating interference of bureaucratic red-tape as compared to local financing and construction.

Indiana is one of the majority States charged a premium for the luxury of Federal aid. Indiana sends more to Washington in taxes than it takes out of the kitty for construction. Because the Kelley bill has arrived at the stage of floor debate in the House, there may be special interest in a recent study by the education committee of the State chamber of commerce of Federal school subsidy as it pertains to Indiana:

"Indiana public-school enrollment was 801,080 pupils in the 1954–55 school year; * * * is expected to grow to 930,000 by 1958–59.

"Expenditures on Indiana public schools have increased from $89 per pupil in the 1939–40 school year to $280 per pupil in 1954–55. * * * From $58,858,000 to $224,575,000 in total outlays.

"The State's contribution to the support of local schools has increased from $29.58 per pupil in the 1940–41 school year to $85.37 per pupil in 1954–55.

"Classroom teachers' salaries in Indiana have increased from a median of $1,321 in the 1940–41 school year to $4,165 in 1955–56.

"The number of teachers in Indiana schools is gaining on the expanding enrollments. As compared with an average of 31 pupils for each teacher in 1933–34 and 28 for each in 1943–44, the ratio was 27 pupils for each teacher in the 1954–55 school year.

"One of the most extensive school-construction programs in the State's history is now in progress. In the last school year, 1,510 new classrooms were built—or 547 more than the number necessary to keep pace with the enrollment increase that year.

"Indiana school communities will need some 1,000 new classrooms per year to keep pace with enrollment increases immediately ahead, plus many more to relieve a backlog of overcrowding and to replace old and unsatisfactory buildings, but they are constructing an estimated 2,000 classrooms this year and planning probably an even larger number for the following year.

"To finance school construction, Indiana school communities may utilize general obligation bonds, cumulative school building fund levies, local school building corporations and emergency credit facilities made available by the State through the common school fund and the veterans school construction fund.

"The Indiana Legislature has been and will continue to be in a position to make available outright grants of State funds for school construction purposes if such grants are found by the legislature to be needed.

"Due to Indiana's economic growth and other factors, expenditures on schools now equal only 2.6 percent of the income of Indiana residents, as compared with 3 percent in 1940. No one contends that there is lack of financial capacity to meet school needs that may exist or arise in the State.

"Under the pending Kelley bill for Federal school construction aid, Indiana could expect to receive an annual grant of $9,177,340—but the cost of this grant in Federal taxes paid by Indiana residents and businesses would be approximately $9,640,000 annually.

"Typically, Indiana is a contributing State in all types of Federal aid. For example, Federal grants of all kinds to Indiana totaled $47,402,499 in the 1954–55 fiscal year—but the estimated cost to Indiana taxpayers of the same grants was $76,477,441."

John J. Eagan Was a Conscientious Politician

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. T. JAMES TUMULTY
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 20, 1956

Mr. TUMULTY. Mr. Speaker, the death of John J. Eagan, a great American and a magnificent Congressman, has left a sorrowing community. Mr. Eagan preceded both myself, Mr. Edward J. Hart, and Mr. Oscar L. Auf der Heide, now deceased, as the Representative of the 14th Congressional District in New Jersey. He was known throughout the district as a man of great devotion to his country, kindness for all, and of a character unequalled anywhere. The following personatorial from the Hudson Dispatch gives a brief review of his colorful life in public service:

PERSONATORIAL: JOHN J. EAGAN WAS A CONSCIENTIOUS POLITICIAN

One of the most conscientious politicians we ever knew was John J. Eagan of Weehawken.

Mr. Eagan, who died on June 13, also had a strong independent nature. Independence and conscientiousness do not mix too well with politics when one owes his election to the organization.

However, Mr. Eagan was elected for his first term in Congress from the 11th district, comprising North Hudson, Hoboken, and the Horseshoe in Jersey City, in 1912. His first and second terms came during that interregnum in Hudson County politics between the iron-hand rule of "Bob" Davis and the equally dictatorial control of Frank Hague. During this interlude there had been various leaders striving to take up the mantle of Mr. Davis, who died Janauary 9, 1911, but none succeeded until the welding together of the Hague organization in 1917. Mayor H. Otto Wittpenn, of Jersey City, came nearest to being the county leader of Democratic organization between 1911 and 1917.

So, Mr. Eagan, having been elected twice to Congress, with the support of Hudson Dispatch and its publisher, the late Thomas F. Martin, did not feel any particular obligation to Mr. Hague until after the 1918 election when he got the aid of the Hague organization in his fourth time out for representative. But there came a time, as it inevitably comes when the county leader has succeeded in making his position unchallengeable.

But, while Mr. Eagan conferred with Mr. Hague and tried to follow orders within the limit of his independence, that was not enough. He could not agree with Mr. Hague on all his machinations of a political nature. Mr. Eagan had a final conference with the leader telling him what he thought was good for the party and organization. But Leader Hague was of the strong opinion that he, not Mr. Eagan, knew what was best for both the party and organization. That conference was the last between them.

Mr. Eagan met one of his bitterest disappointments in politics in 1920 when he was defeated in the Warren G. Harding landslide for reelection from the 11th District. Dr. Archibald E. Olpp of West Hoboken, the Republican nominee, was elected by a small majority.

That, Leader Hague believed, would finish Mr. Eagan in politics and planned to have Oscar L. Auf der Heide, former mayor of West New York and then director of Board of Freeholders, to become Representative from the 11th. But after much persuasion from Mr. Martin and others, Leader Hague decided to allow Mr. Eagan just one more term to expiate the ignominy of having been defeated in the Harding landslide. Eagan, always a popular politician, beat Representative Olpp, seeking reelection, and won back the congressional honor in 1922. He sought to run again in 1924, but Leader Hague said Mr. Auf der Heide had been sidetracked for one term so that Mr. Eagan could redeem his political prestige and, having done that, could not forestall the nomination of Mr. Auf der Heide, who was elected.

The first speech we heard made by Mr. Eagan—and he was an orator of local fame—was in the basement of St. Michael's Monastery Church where Holy Name Society used to meet, in 1915. We were then reporter for that territory. William J. Tighe, Union City welfare director, presided at the meeting.

Mr. Eagan was known as a man of his word. While he might not be inveigled into making a promise very easily, if he did so, he did his utmost to keep it. Just as he did when there was a scramble for the West Hoboken postmastership in 1916, and he said that he would recommend the man who got the majority of votes of West Hoboken Town Committee. He did that even though Edward W. Bovers, chairman of the committee, had but a one-vote majority over Theodore "Teddy" Bernhardt, leader of the third ward, who operatde a saloon at Elm and Spring Streets, that town. Mr. Bovers had to vote for himself to break the tie vote.

Mr. Eagan helped many a young man on the ladder of politics. One of these was John G. Meister, who in later days as mayor of Weehawken, had the opportunity to return the favor. In 1941, when things weren't going so well with Eagan School of Business, which the former Congressman had founded, Mayor Meister appointed him township collector in Weehawken. He served in that office, being elected every time he ran until 1955, when his health made him retire from business and seek the quiet of a sanitarium. Before becoming collector he had served on Weehawken Board of Education, part of the time as president.

Mr. Eagan, a stanch Catholic, had been a member of St. Augustine's Roman Catholic Church, since it was built, 70 years ago. He had made his home in Weehawken for 47 years.

In 1897 he married his long-time sweetheart, Miss Susan Hasbrouck, of New York City, a Protestant. They lived in Hoboken until 1909, when they came to Weehawken. Their homelife was built on a great devotion and loyalty, and when Mrs. Eagan, a lovely woman we can attest, died in 1950, Mr. Eagan's heart was broken. After that he began to go down, until 1954 when he became ill and never recovered. He was 84 when he died, and he had crowded into those long years a career of which he was justly proud.

Enough Penalty?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACK WESTLAND
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 20, 1956

Mr. WESTLAND. Mr. Speaker, passage last week of H. R. 11619 will pro-

vide heavier penalties for dope peddlers, and for persons in possession of narcotics. Such legislation has been long needed in our country.

There are about 60,000 dope addicts in our Nation today. These unfortunate persons have been led into a practice that can only be described as living death. Many of them are young and face shattered lives and early death because of the nefarious activities of "pushers" or dope peddlers.

This bill has firmed up the policies on imprisonment of these purveyors of narcotics. We have upped the mandatory minimum and extended the permissive maximums for first offenders. I do not think the degree of offense should be of major consideration in this type of traffic. The first offense may have cost the useful lives of hundreds of our citizens. Stiff penalties for any traffic in narcotics would be an effective means of curtailing the number of persons willing to risk capture to engage in this degrading crime.

I voted for the House bill as a step in the right direction. The Senate bill goes much further. I wonder if we in the House have taken maximum advantage of the opportunity to stamp out dope traffic by making the penalties so severe that criminally minded persons would shun it? The saving of thousands of lives every year would be worth millions to the Nation, in addition to being one of the most humane actions that Congress could take.

An illustration of the effective curtailment of the dope racket is the city of Seattle, part of which is in my congressional district. Two Federal judges in that city, Judges Bowen and Lindberg, have taken firm stands against narcotics violators and have issued stiff sentences to convicted peddlers. The drug traffic is considered one of the most profitable of crimes, but the penalties inflicted in Seattle have succeeded in making the business unattractive to the criminal element, and, narcotics authorities agree that it is one of the cleanest port cities in the United States as far as dope peddling is concerned. They credit these two judges with keeping the traffic down to a furtive minimum.

One factor in the apprehension of narcotics violators on which we in the House have not fulfilled our duty is the necessity for telephone surveillance. This is called wiretapping in the vernacular and has been bruited around as a nasty word. By use of the telephone tap, narcotics agents can trace the activities of the behind-the-scenes "big boy" who directs the activities of his underlings from the safety and obscurity of a telephone.

We in the House kept this provision out of our bill because it was opposed in the Senate committee. I believe the public has faith in the Narcotics Bureau, and would like to see them have every weapon at their command to haul in these big shots who are masterminding this terrible, killing, depraved traffic in human destinies. Without peddlers there would be no addicts. I believe we have the obligation to carry this legislation further, if not in this session, early in the next, to include the telephone tap. The Bureau of Narcotics has stated that this device would be one of the greatest deterrents to dope peddling that could be employed.

Thomas J. Watson, Sr.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. ERNEST WHARTON
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 26, 1956

Mr. WHARTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I should like to pay tribute to a great American, the founder and late chariman of the board of the International Business Machines Corp., who passed away in New York City on June 19, 1956, at the age of 82 years.

Thomas J. Watson, Sr., was born in Campbell, N. Y., February 17, 1874, educated in local schools, and began his career as a bookkeeper in Risley's Market at Painted Post, N. Y., at a salary of $6 per week. He soon learned that his greatest interest was in salesmanship and shortly joined the National Cash Register Co. in that capacity at Buffalo, N. Y. Progressing rapidly, in May 1914 he was selected to head the Computing-Tabulating-Recording Co., which later became the IBM. When Mr. Watson became president of the organization, it had fewer than 400 employees. Today there are more than 59,000 on its payroll. Its offices in the United States number nearly 200, doing business in some 80 other countries as well.

IBM's factories in this country at Endicott, Kingston, and Poughkeepsie, N. Y.; Washington, D. C.; San Jose, Calif.; and Greencastle, Ind. Two more will soon be constructed at Owego, N. Y., and Rochester, Minn.

A short time ago, Mr. Watson selected Ulster County, N. Y., for the further development and expansion of this worldwide industry, and the sentiments of the people of my district at this time are very aptly expressed by the following editorial of the Saugerties Daily Post:

THOMAS J. WATSON, SR.

"The cornerstone of all values is the man, himself, whatever his job," Thomas J. Watson told stockholders of International Business Machines Corp., April 28, 1953.

He was speaking of benefits given to workers, saying that they were not expenses but investment in human assets. It was easy, he said, to send statements of IBM material assets, but these were worthless until the men and women put them to work. There are some 60,000 employees on IBM payrolls. They constitute a closely knit family. It was 42 years ago that Mr. Watson became head of the small organization (Computing-Tabulating-Recording Co.) which later became IBM, now a $629 million company, operating in 80 nations.

To build a worldwide organization out of ideas and ideals in such a brief period is something that resembles a miracle.

The beloved administrator, the esteemed employer, the influential humanitarian, Thomas J. Watson, did far more than give jobs in good surroundings, under good conditions, and with all the advantages which IBM employees have. He was dedicated to improving the lot of humanity as a whole and his benefactions reached worldwide, and touched about every phase of education and public service. He hinged it all on the word "think" and his organization followed through in the community as Kingston and Ulster County well knows from brief acquaintance.

Thomas J. Watson and his organization did more for this area than had been done before. We were about to dedicate a new era by giving to the IBM chairman the greatest community expression, the largest community greeting that he had had in all his illustrious careers. We wanted Thomas J. Watson to feel more at home in Kinsgton than he could feel in any other part of the world, though we well realized that in every community he had gone, he had been given the highest possible honors. Such is our appreciation to the man, and organization which did so much for us, and promised by the accomplishments of a few months, that much more would be done here.

We were saddened to hear Tuesday afternoon that he had died at 1 o'clock in Roosevelt Hospital, a victim of a heart attack. The world, like Kingston and Ulster County, could ill afford to lose Mr. Watson. We would have been much enriched had we more of his philosophy, his principles, and his practices. In the fullness of his years he did marvelous things here. But not here alone. There was great breadth to his interests such as religious, philanthropic, social welfare activities, the problems of youth, education, innumerable charities, and good government.

It is with heavy hearts that we say farewell at a time we counted on a warm greeting and a display of our affection. And yet, how thankful, how appreciative, and how grateful we feel that the life of Thomas J. Watson touched us here in Kingston and Ulster County.

Some Interesting Facts Regarding Our Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE A. DONDERO
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 25, 1956

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I include therein an editorial from one of the great newspapers of Michigan, printed and published in the congressional district which I represent here in Congress, the Birmingham Eccentric, of Birmingham, Mich., on United States Presidency Is Not a One-Man Job.

It is worth the attention of the Members of Congress and I commend it to their reading:

UNITED STATES PRESIDENCY IS NOT A ONE-MAN JOB

The President of the United States is no longer a person. The Presidency is a huge bureaucracy. It reads the topman's mail, writes his speeches, dictates his correspondence, decides who is permitted to talk with him, does his research and helps to formulate his judgments and policies.

When Grover Cleveland was President in the 1890's, his staff consisted of 8 secretaries and clerks, who had 1 telephone. Everybody knew who was President then. The name was Cleveland. We then had a population of 65 million.

Mr. Eisenhower has 266 assistants, clerks, and stenographers in the While House offices. Other functionaries who gather information and report directly to him number 809, or a total of 1,075. We now have about 167 million people.

Since Cleveland's time, population has increased approximately 154 percent, and presidential assistants about 13,000 percent.

Other civilian employees of the Executive in the Cabinet Departments are as follows; State, 20,000; Treasury, 80,000; Defense, 1,149,000 (this does not include men in uniform); Justice, 31,000; Post Office, 507,000; Interior, 57,000; Agriculture, 76,000; Commerce, 42,000; Labor, 5,000; and the last and newest Department, created by the present administration, Health, Education, and Welfare, has 37,000 to keep us well, see that we educate ourselves, and nurse us when decrepit.

Grand total of civilian executive employees—about 2,004,000.

In addition, we have 47 other independent agencies, with about 343,000 employees.

No wonder the President is overwhelmed. So are we.

Redtaped Hero

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. T. JAMES TUMULTY
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 20, 1956

Mr. TUMULTY. Mr. Speaker, with the approach of the Fourth of July, I thought it would be fitting to recall the heroic services to his country of Comdr. Charles G. Pape, who is employed in my congressional district. Unfortunately the redtape of the Army prevents Commander Pape from receiving a proper decoration for his activities. Although I saw the Secretary of the Army personally and I know he did what he could the technical regulations of the Army forbade that the commander receive the decoration he so justly deserves. The following editorial from the Jersey Journal of August 21, 1955 sets forth the facts clearly. However, in gratitude to Commander Pape for his glorious exploits in behalf of our country, I am setting forth this article for inclusion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, as a tribute to his patriotism and heroism. The editorial follows:

REDTAPED HERO

Someone should issue a set of leather medals for the Army brass that thought up the reasons for withholding a medal for Comdr. Charles G. Pape, USNR, of North Bergen.

The facts are clear. The record tells how Pape, a Navy engineering officer, worked under fire for hours and hours without rest in order to get into service the port facilities at Safi, Africa, so that the Army could unload the supplies which enabled us to take Casablanca.

Maj. Gen. E. N. Harmon, who commanded that operation, certified the facts and recommended Pape for a Bronze Star.

That wasn't good enough for the Army; the Navy officer got no medal and no reason for not getting it.

It seems that the whole matter is bound up in a mess of redtape, statutes of limitations, and the like. Happily, the new Secretary of the Army, Wilbur Brucker, has decided to review the entire matter now that the case has been brought to his attention by Congressman TUMULTY.

Here's a perfect opportunity to sacrifice a little redtape in the interest of justice and unity among the services.

The Swedish Nightingale

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT P. MORANO
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 26, 1956

Mr. MORANO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include an editorial from the Bridgeport (Conn.) Post of June 20.

Bridgeport, the largest city in my district, is well known for many outstanding attributes. But it is undoubtedly thought of most affectionately as the birthplace of the greatest showman of them all—Phineas T. Barnum. Each July 4, the city of Bridgeport goes all out in a gala P. T. Barnum festival. In connection with this year's event, the city was visited last week by the Swedish Ambassador Erik Boheman, who received the keys to the city from Mayor Jasper McLevy, a symbolic gesture of friendship toward the Nation which gave Mr. Barnum, and the world, the Swedish Nightingale, Jenny Lind.

The editorial follows:

OUR LINK WITH SWEDEN

What a pleasant bond is constituted between the city of Bridgeport, Conn., and the nation of Sweden, through the memory of Jenny Lind, "the Swedish Nightingale," who attained the peak of her worldwide fame under the inspired theatrical management of Bridgeport's great showman, P. T. Barnum. It is a bond which is treasured on both sides and which is kept alive by observance from year to year as, for instance, in the presentation of the symbolic keys of the city of Bridgeport to Swedish Ambassador Erik Boheman on Monday morning by Mayor Jasper McLevy.

It was a meeting arranged appropriately by the Barnum festival committee, since no celebration of the great showman's life in Bridgeport would be complete without the story of Jenny Lind coming into it.

Jenny Lind "had everything" as the saying goes—a soprano voice of a scope and beauty that occurs perhaps once in a century, with a great musical personality and the face and figure of a beautiful woman to crown it all. No wonder everybody wanted to see and hear her when they were made acquainted with the facts. (Barnum took care of that.)

We cannot help thinking how different the situation would have been today when she might have performed on radio and television, and in that manner might have reached as great an audience in one evening as she did during her lifetime in the middle of the last century. But would it have been the same?

For our part we are inclined to say "No." Those actual audiences which fought their way into crowded concert halls for the sake of getting a glimpse of Miss Lind and hearing her sing at first hand, were rewarded for their pains. The electron waves have never been able to carry the same authority or glamor and, we doubt, ever will.

Lieutenant Robertson Made His Decision

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE HUDDLESTON, JR.
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 26, 1956

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Speaker, on June 14, 1956, Lt. John A. Robertson, 31-year-old Naval Air Reservist of Birmingham, Ala., died heroically and in the highest traditions of the naval service. He had just taken off from the United States Naval Air Station, Municipal Airport, Birmingham, in an F4U Corsair Navy fighter on a routine cross-country flight, when a faulty aileron caused loss of control of his plane. He had no chance to parachute to safety since his plane never gained an altitude of more than 500 feet.

As Lieutenant Robertson approached Tarrant City, a small suburb of Birmingham, trying desperately to extend the plane's glide to an old rock quarry a few hundred yards away, he apparently abandoned all though of saving himself and directed his crippled aircraft to crash in an almost deserted street nearby. He was killed instantly.

Without thought to himself, Lieutenant Robertson waved people on the ground below out of his line of flight and chose to crash his plane where others would not be hurt rather than to try to keep it airborne for a few seconds longer.

The manner of Lieutenant Robertson's death will stand as a memorial to the courageous qualities possessed by the members of America's Reserve fighting force.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an editorial account of Lieutenant Robertson's death, which appeared in the June 15 issue of the Birmingham News, one of the fine daily newspapers of my district:

LIEUTENANT ROBERTSON MADE HIS DECISION

With his plane floundering, controls apparently not functioning properly, Lt. John A. Robertson, of Birmingham, married, the father of two, Thursday made the kind of decision few are called upon by circumstance to make. No harder decision presumably could face a human being.

As his aircraft failed to respond, flying over a residential area in Tarrant, the naval officer is reported by some who saw him to have waved persons below away, and then to have steered his crippled craft so that instead of crashing into homes, or into a chapel where a number of Vacation Bible School children were at play, it plunged into an empty street between houses, indeed, only some 35 feet from 1 where 2 men sat upon a porch.

Lieutenant Robertson, reporters, and officers examining the facts have concluded, chose to take his plane down where others might not be hurt, instead of trying to keep it up perhaps seconds longer, with time's chanceful prospect that, somehow, he might yet get out of it alive.

The lieutenant died heroically, and not only in the service of his country. The decision he made was of the highest order. In time, that may be some comfort to his family, though it will not now lessen grief which this whole community is sharing.

Secretary Wilson Deserves Support

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL B. DAGUE
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 26, 1956

Mr. DAGUE. Mr. Speaker, it is quite evident from a perusal of the transcript of the remarks of Secretary of Defense Wilson that his use of the word "phony" referred to the reporter's question rather than to the move to increase appropriations to the Air Force by an extra billion dollars. Be that as it may, it is also quite evident that the furore over the use of the word stems from the usual alacrity with which the opposition is bound to pounce upon an unguarded remark by an administration leader in an election year.

To say, however, that by appropriating a billion dollars, or 10 billions for that matter, we shall automatically and overnight attain a military advantage, which we quite evidently have anyway, is extremely phony reasoning, to say the least. And when additional billions are appropriated in the face of the refusal of the executive department to justify the extra money, then we find ourselves in the position of having the Congress dictate our miltiary strategy, which in our system logically rests with the Executive. And when we have a group of amateur military strategists in the Congress pitting their judgment against the considered opinion of the greatest military strategist this age has produced—namely President Eisenhower—then the argument for additional money becomes ridiculous, if not phony.

I am glad to note that the editor of a leading daily newspaper in my district, the Daily Local News, West Chester, Pa., entertains somewhat the same views, and I am pleased to include his article with these remarks:

[From the West Chester (Pa.) Daily Local News of June 23, 1956]

MR. WILSON IS DIFFERENT

This is written in defense of those Government officials who believe in speaking plainly.

Right now it's Secretary of Defense Charles E. Wilson, former head of General Motors, a hard-hitting businessman who speaks his mind and who knows nothing about the niceties of diplomatic language and, furthermore, shows no inclination to learn.

For this fact, we are thankful. There are enough officeholders in Washington so careful as to what they say and how they say it that they never get anything said. Not so, Mr. Wilson.

The Senate is up in the air today because he referred to congressional efforts to boost Air Force funds as phony. As a result the news dispatches out of Washington are carrying the names of Senators who jumped to their feet indignantly and demanded that something be done with Mr. Wilson for making such a remark. It served one good purpose, however. It got into print the names of some Senators of whom we had never heard.

One Member, Senator LYNDON JOHNSON, of Texas, called the remark "revolting to all patriotic Americans." That's typical of the way Texans talk. STUART SYMINGTON, Democrat, of Missouri, a former Air Force Secretary who may be a dark horse at the Democratic Convention this summer, said: "The usefulness of this Cabinet member has come to an end." That's the unpardonable sin in the Senate, jumping at conclusions. And Senator STYLES BRIDGES, of New Hampshire, leading Republican on the Armed Services Committee, said he was "amazed and shocked." Come, come, Senator, surely it can't be that bad to a man who has been in the Senate 20 years.

After the defense chief said what he did, he admitted to reporters that "maybe I shouldn't have said it." Later, however, he said: "But it's all right." Explaining further, Mr. Wilson remarked that what he really wanted to do was to declare "in my shop language" that any increase in the Air Force budget was "unnecessary" and would not stand "analysis." He added that he would like to see the people "who vote for the expenditure also vote for the taxes to produce the money to pay for it." He has a good point there for he has put himself in the position of telling Congress not to give him so much money to spend, and that is indeed a unique position in these days. He's in a class by himself.

When Senator SAM J. ERVIN, North Carolina Democrat, heard of Wilson's phony speech, his blood pressure shot up as he exclaimed: "He is much more concerned about the security of dollars than of our national defense."

That's a phony if we ever heard one. It's Wilson's turn to become indignant and demand a retraction.

Whither Tito? That's Question

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALVIN M. BENTLEY
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 26, 1956

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I wish to insert the following editorial from the June 24 issue of the Detroit Free Press by Roscoe Drummond entitled "Whither Tito? That's Question":

WHITHER TITO? THAT'S QUESTION

(By Roscoe Drummond)

WASHINGTON.—The question most often asked about Marshal Tito's visit to Moscow, as a means of trying to measure what is happening, seems to me to miss the mark.

It is a leading question and almost inevitably brings a misleading answer.

The question is: Have the new Soviet leaders taken Yugoslavia's Tito into the Kremlin camp?

The honest answer is "No"; but it is the question that is wrong, not the answer.

The real question is not whether Tito was taken into the Kremlin camp but whether he walked in voluntarily, sat down and felt quaintly at home.

It is going to be very tempting, very easy, for the West to drop Tito like a hot hammer and sickle and maybe the time will come when we should. But it would be foolish not to wait for a fuller disclosure of exactly where Tito is taking his country.

If he is to become an uncritical ally of everything the Kremlin wants, there is no reason why the United States should help strengthen Yugoslavia in order that Yugoslavia can more effectively work for the same anti-West ends Moscow seeks.

Tito's conduct throughout his visit to Moscow seems to me to raise the gravest doubts about where he is headed, and I should think that we would need to take a hard, new look before deciding whether Yugoslavia is a trustworthy neutral.

But all the evidence is not on one side and it is possible that after the first warm glow of Soviet hospitality, Tito may see some things a little differently.

Bear in mind that Tito has asserted his independence and equality at the front door of the Kremlin. It was Khrushchev and Bulganin who came to Tito, not Tito who went to them.

In 1948 Tito threw off the discipline of Stalin. Now in the joint communique from Moscow Tito has successfully asserted the independence of the Yugoslav Communist Party from Kremlin dictation. He forced the Soviet leaders to recognize in principle the equal status of non-Soviet Communist parties.

But of what value is it to the free world to have Tito successfully flaunt his independence before the Soviet leaders, if he uses that independence to follow uncritically, almost totally, the Soviet line?

It seems to me that there are significant changes in Tito's foreign policy and that they are almost wholly anti-Western, pro-Soviet.

In the past, Tito has said that the future of Formosa ought to be settled by peaceful means. But in Moscow, he said that the future of Formosa ought to be settled in accordance with the rights of Communist China—in other words, given to Red China forthwith.

In the past, Tito has said that East-West disarmament ought not to be made conditional upon the reunification of Germany. This time he said that we ought to recognize the existence of two Germanies.

If Tito uses his equality to hew to the Soviet line voluntarily, he would be even a more useful ally of Soviet purposes.

All the facts are not yet in. We need to wait and see—but not too long.

Los Angeles Examiner's New Format

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PATRICK J. HILLINGS
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 26, 1956

Mr. HILLINGS. Mr. Speaker, on Monday of this week the Los Angeles Examiner introduced a new typographical design and format. I wish to extend my congratulations to Publisher Franklin S. Payne and Editor Warden Woolard for this innovation which will benefit the readers of this great newspaper.

At this point I include in the RECORD an editorial from the Examiner of Monday, June 25, 1956, which sets forth the policies which guide the newspaper. The editorial follows:

OUR NEW EXAMINER

Today's Examiner establishes a journalistic landmark in the fine art of newspaper design and typography.

It has been made entirely new, with three purposes in mind.

The first is to give our readers a newspaper that will be beautiful in aspect and also be read with fluency and ease.

We are confident that has been accomplished.

The second aim is to add important, entertaining and provacative features and writers to the great array of old favorites who have won such popularity among our

readers. This, too, we believe we have accomplished and hope our regular readers as well as the new friends will enjoy the many reader bonuses.

The third purpose is deeper and more important.

It is to make the Examiner an exact reflection of the vibrant and creative spirit of Southern California, and also a guidepost to its progress.

This requires a newspaper that is independent politically, that informs its readers accurately and impartially, and whose editorial policy is invariably to further the best interests of our country and our community.

Beautiful design and typography alone cannot do that.

It can only be done by a spirit of enlightened dedication to the welfare of the immediate and greater community we serve.

This means greater and wider emphasis on principles the Examiner has always upheld. They spring from the deep conviction that our first duty is to give people the facts, and to comment on the facts with intelligence, courage and integrity.

This attitude applies to everything that touches our lives and fortunes as Americans: education, social stability, spiritual and moral values, the arts and sciences, commerce and industry—but above all, the heart and soul of our entire society, which are American freedom and justice.

That is a large order to fulfill. We are unalterably pledged to do so.

The new Examiner we firmly believe to be the ideal instrument for the purpose.

Its new dress, its new features, its consructive action in public affairs and its independent spirit, form a single unit in the work we have set out to do.

As it progresses and unfolds, we shall count as our greatest reward the share we had in accomplishing it with the people of Southern California.

Postmasters Asked To Deliver Speech Praising Administration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 25, 1956

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include herewith an article appearing in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch on June 20, 1956. The article, entitled "Postmasters Asked To Deliver Speech Praising Administration," follows:

POSTMASTERS ASKED TO DELIVER SPEECH PRAISING ADMINISTRATION—COPIES OF TEXT PREPARED IN WASHINGTON DISTRIBUTED BY REGIONAL POST OFFICE HERE

Copies of a proposed standard speech praising the Eisenhower administration and the "dynamic leadership" of Postmaster General Arthur E. Summerfield, were sent to all first and second-class postmasters in Missouri, Iowa, and Arkansas from the post office's regional office in St. Louis with the request that they present it before various groups, the Post-Dispatch was told today.

George J. Gross, assistant to the regional director of the post office here, said he received the prepared speech from Washington. He sent it last August 30 to the postmasters with a memorandum which said, "It is requested that the attached speech for postmasters be used before business, civic, and church groups and/or radio and television interviews."

The memorandum said that "in every instance" copies of any talks presented should be available for local press outlets in event the speech was delivered.

CITES DEFICIT REDUCTION

The text of the prepared speech praised the Eisenhower administration for having "drastically reduced the annual postal deficit. In 1952 the deficit was $727 million; in 1954 it was down to $339 million; and in 1955 it will be about $365 million despite substantial increases in wages and salaries and other employee benefits."

The eight-page speech continued with considerable detail on "the outstanding accomplishments of the Post Office Department under the leadership of Postmaster General Summerfield."

In the field of employee relations the speech said that "great strides have been made. The lot of the postal people has improved greatly. * * * They are aware of these and other advantages resulting from what the present administration has done to protect the Federal worker and give him greater benefits under overall personnel policies which clearly reflect the friendly climate toward Federal employees that now prevails in Washington."

MORE ACHIEVEMENTS

"In concluding let me emphasize that the accomplishments in your Post Office Department are being matched in other branches of your Federal Government," the text continued. "They are, in actuality, the preliminary steps to more magnificent achievements in the future.

"Every source, every economic guidepost, shows that this present year of 1955 will be the greatest year in the history of our national economy. This peacetime prosperity, not based on the whirligig of inflationary forces artifically created by manmade crises, is a solid platform from which to advance rapidly and far.

"The program for all America is rooted in the tried and proved American formula—individual freedom plus competition plus group cooperation equals prosperity for all, fairly shared. When enacted in its entirety, the program will guarantee that the America our children and their children inherit will be a better, a stronger, a nobler home for human living."

Survivors' Benefits for Our Military—Reserves Versus Regulars

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 25, 1956

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I herewith include an editorial which appeared in the St. Louis Globe-Democrat on Saturday, June 23, 1956. The editorial, entitled "Reserves Versus Regulars," follows:

RESERVES VERSUS REGULARS

With the submission of the Bradley report embodying suggested changes in the Veterans' Administration, there has been a great deal of comment and controversy revolving about the Government's obligation to its civilian soldiers.

In the midst of this hullabaloo, the problems of the career soldiers have been almost obscured. It is time to take a hard look at the Regular Establishment, the core around which any expansion of the military in time of war must revolve.

In recent years, the discouraging fact is that the United States has done vastly better for its civilians who have gone into the military service in time of war or crisis on a voluntary or draft basis and who have been on active service as Reserves than we have done for the professional soldier who makes military service a career.

This is due, of course, almost entirely to the fact that the veterans and reserve groups representing the civilian soldier have maintained a continual pressure campaign, whereas a professional soldier has no lobbyist to fight for him.

A typical example of this inequality which presently exists can be illustrated by the case of two captains, one a reservist and the other a regular, with identical family situations, killed in the same aircraft crash. The family of the Reserve officer would receive twice as much as the family of the Regular officer, while the widow of the reservist will receive almost four times as much as that of the Regular after the children come of age.

The widow of a reserve captain with three children under age 18 would receive $661 a month, whereas the widow of a regular captain with three children of identical ages would receive $264. The widow of the Reserve captain would receive $264 when the children come of age and on reaching age 65 would receive $317 a month, while the widow of the Regular captain would receive $70 a month when the children are of age and only $123 a month at age 65.

This illustration simply shouts the question, "Why be a regular?" And it is multiplied in actual operations thousands of times a year.

Perhaps the answer is not that we have paid the Reserve dependents too much but that we have paid Regular officers' dependents too little.

The Nation must depend on its Regular Establishment in times of peace just as much as in times of war. The benefits between the Reserve and the Regular must be equalized if we are to continue to have a regular establishment with high reenlistment rates, and with a morale sufficiently high to be the core of an expanded Military Establishment if war should come.

International Toastmistress Clubs, Inc., Conference Has Original Narration With Observation of Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag of the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLYDE DOYLE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 12, 1956

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, in connection with my emphasis upon the revised Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag of the United States wherein the two words "under God" were officially inserted in said pledge, it came to my attention that the Southwest Region Conference of International Toastmistress Clubs, Inc., were to be in conference in Long Beach, Los Angeles County, Calif., June 2 and 3, 1956. This region includes the clubs located in California, Arizona, Nevada, Japan, and the Hawaiian Islands. In that region are 152 clubs and at the conference there were 534 members registered.

The narration hereinafter set forth having been written by Lee Adelman, of Lynwood, in the great 23d congressional district, I asked permission for unanimous consent to insert the text of the full ceremonies in the Appendix of our daily CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The letter hereinafter set forth to me, dated June 9, 1956, identifies the originators of this very interesting and informative and unique ceremony and no doubt this splendid idea will be adapted by many organizations and clubs of American citizens who wish to further emphasize their ceremonies in connection with the Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag of the United States.

I am sure you and all my distinguished colleagues desire to join me in complimenting the International Toastmistress Clubs on this worthy achievement:

JUNE 9, 1956.

HON. CLYDE DOYLE,
1030 New House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: This is your permission to insert into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the narration of our presentation of the Pledge of Allegiance as it was given at the recent conference of the southwest region, I. T. C., held in the Wilton Hotel, Long Beach, Calif., June 2 and 3, 1956, provided due credit is given to the two undersigned.

The idea for this particular style originated with Grace Payne Hall, of Altadena, Calif.; and the narration and presentation on the program was the assignment of Lee Adelmann, of Lynwood, Calif.

We are honored to have this inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by such a distinguished person as you, Mr. DOYLE.

GRACE PAYNE HALL.
ALTADENA, CALIF.

LEE ADELMANN,
LYNWOOD, CALIF.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

(Narration by Lee Adelmann, chairman, Council No. 10, Southwest Region, ITC, June 2, 1956)

Purpose: In repeating our Pledge of Allegiance we should savor the exact implication and obligation of every word. In light of a better understanding, we will reflect an increased beauty and sincerity in our delivery.

Leader: Will you repeat with me, following the outline placed at each table, and please take special note, there are no pauses nor punctuation in the first portion that we will repeat as a group.

Group: "I pledge allegiance to the flag of the United States of America and to the republic for which it stands——"

Leader: The flag is the symbol of our country. It represents to the nations of the world a "Government of the people, by the people, and for the people." We have just promised our support and undivided loyalty to our democratic way of life, and to defend that right at home and abroad.

Group: "One Nation under God, indivisible."

Leader: We have become a united nation, but the cost has been great. Men have fought and died that this Nation might live. Throughout the ice, snow, and starvation of Valley Forge; through the humid jungles and coral islands of the Pacific; and on the barren hills of Korea; across the land of Continental Europe; in the air; on the sea and beneath it's surface; they have prevented the enemy from invading our shores. Because of their courage and sacrifice, we here today are safe and enjoy our freedoms.

Our leaders, with God's help have always tried to solve differences of opinion by arbitration with honor. Lincoln said, "A house divided against itself cannot stand."

Today, as in Lincoln's day, we have grave issues of policy that must be decided: But let us not lose our family solidarity in the attempt. Let us be tolerant of the other person's viewpoint, and conscientiously strive for a meeting of minds.

As we say "one Nation," let us each be deeply aware that we are one in principles and ideals—and differ only in our ways of preserving our mutual objectives.

Group: "with liberty and justice for all."

Leader: There is no restriction expressed here. Let us not express a vow we do not intend to fulfill. These few words require some heart searching—let us all do it.

Now that we have clarified, each in his own mind, our feeling on this sincere and inspiring expression of our belief. Let us repeat together, uninterrupted the "Pledge of Allegiance"—with our faith in it's interpretation obvious to all who listen.

Please rise, have both hands empty. Place the right hand over your heart, and give every word its full meaning.

All "I pledge allegiance to the flag of the United States of America and to the Republic for which it stands; one Nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all."

(Please be seated.)

Leader: The red stripes for courage, the white for liberty and justice for all, the stars of every State on the field of loyalty. That's Old Glory.

Long may she wave, over the land of the free and the home of the brave.

Foreign Aid's Failures Prove Cut Long Overdue

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALVIN M. BENTLEY
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 26, 1956

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I wish to insert the following editorial from the June 24 edition of the Detroit Free Press entitled, "Foreign Aid's Failures Prove Cut Long Overdue":

FOREIGN AID'S FAILURES PROVE CUT LONG OVERDUE

(By John S. Knight)

Since World War II, United States taxpayers have shucked out $55 billion in foreign aid.

This lavish spending program began with the so-called Marshall plan which, we were told, was a temporary arrangement to help rehabilitate Europe and restore the war-torn continent to economic health.

But, as with all Government spending, we have seen not an end to foreign aid, but actually a series of increasing commitments all over the world.

From Harry Truman's ECA to President Eisenhower's ICA, such alphabetical agencies as MSA and FOA have poured out an unending stream of dollars. In fact, foreign aid seems now to have become a permanent part of our foreign policy.

SELLING THE PEOPLE THE SAME OLD BUNK

No one begrudged helping Europe to recover from the ravages of World War II. But Europe has long since been enjoying years of prosperity.

Yet the clamor for more and more aid has been outshouting all objections. True, the House of Representatives finally summoned up enough courage to slash the administration's $4.9 billion foreign aid bill by $1.1 billion. But the Senate Foreign Relations Committee has tentatively restored $700 million of this cut under pressure of administration claims that great injury will be done if the House's slash is allowed to stand.

This is the same line of bunk that was sold to the American people when our dollars were supposed to be winning friends, building alliances, and buying off communism.

A POLICY OF INTEREST

But the record shows, as stated so well by a French editor, Raymond Cartier, "the decline of every liberated country into communism or neutralism" and "the dizzy growth of anti-Americanism in decolonized Asia."

Mr. Cartier mentions that "boundless idealism * * * a 'good will' concept of foreign policy * * * still reign firmly in Washington."

But, he adds, "there would be less anti-Americanism in the world if America abandoned its philanthropic aspiration, its vocation of Santa Claus, its transcendential morality, all its missionary trappings, all its Boy Scout gear, and if, at last, it followed openly and intelligently the policy of its own interest."

This is sound advice. But will we take it? Of course not.

We will keep on with our meddling into the lives and habits of people who either do not like or are not yet ready for a Coca Cola civilization.

CAVES TO MANSIONS AND BACK AGAIN

The Hoover studies show that FOA moved a group of Italians out of their hillside caves and built them a modern village. The caves had to be sealed with cement to keep these people from moving back.

In Iran, ICA spent $1.2 million for a road to a dam that was never built. ICA also invested half a million dollars for a survey of Egypt's industrial potential. The report is gathering dust in an Egyptian file cabinet.

These may seem like small items in our multi-billion-dollar adventures in foreign aid, but they are not untypical of what goes on abroad in our naive attempt to repackage the world American style.

OPPORTUNITIES VS. BENEFITS

The incredible John Foster Dulles cries for more foreign aid to win friends; then scares the daylights out of our European allies by his shrill outbursts against the presently smiling Russians.

Two-way Tito, the Yugoslav Communist who shot down several of our airmen some years back, is an old timer on the United States handout list. But Russian Defense Minister Zhukov assured Tito last week that in the event of war, the Soviet Union would fight "shoulder to shoulder" with Yugoslavia.

At Oxford, former President Harry Truman declared that "every person born in the 20th century is entitled to the benefits of the 20th century."

As our barber said: "Harry can talk plainer than that." It may be presumed, however, that Truman means the United States, with its 5 percent of the world's population, is somehow responsible for raising the living standards of the other 95 percent.

Had Truman substituted "opportunities" for "benefits," he would have sounded more like a statesman, and less like a politician.

PLENTY OF PLACES FOR OUR MONEY

The fuzzy thinking on foreign aid is not found exclusively in Washington. All of the professional do-gooders, the one-worlders, and a large segment of a gullible public profess to believe that the world would collapse of these appropriations were cut.

Yet state and local taxes are rising, billions must be spent for a national highway system, new schools and mental insttiutions are needed, colleges and universities seek addi-

tional funds and no relief from high Federal taxes is in sight.

But typically, we stubbornly refuse to pursue our own enlightened self-interest.

THROUGH PROPER CHANNELS

The desirability of assisting other nations to solve their economic problems is not open to argument.

But let us do it with loans through the World Bank, or by privately financed arrangements that are mutually beneficial.

The World Bank, under the leadership of President Eugene Black, has been tremendously effective in meeting these situations. Black, recently described by Time as "the world's leading salesman of the benefits of capitalism," is no mere dispenser of funds. His loans are safeguarded by conditions which meet sound business principles.

Our Government, on the other hand, unrealistically prefers the outdated handout method which has provoked nationalistic antagonisms everywhere.

OUR AID PROGRAM NEEDS REVIEW

Our whole foreign-aid program is sadly in need of review. Are its benefits commensurate with the costs? Is it being wisely administered? Should it be a continuing element of our foreign policy?

The restlessness that is now evident in Congress over the cost of foreign aid is an encouraging development.

Neither Democratic Leader LYNDON JOHNSON nor Republican Leader WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND is satisfied that the administration has made a good case.

Since nothing will be done in a campaign year, the next administration, whether it be Republican or Democratic, should face up to this problem and produce some answers.

STILL TIME FOR CUTS

Meanwhile, the Senate would do well to follow the example of the House and whack at least $1 billion from the $4.9 billion requested by the White House.

Senator GEORGE BENDER, Republican, of Ohio, says he will vote for the bill because the President is for it and "he knows more about foreign aid than I do."

The question should not be resolved by voting blindly for the President' recommendations.

The President can be wrong, and I think he is wrong in this instance.

A $1 billion cut in foreign aid will not damage our prestige in the world, as has been claimed.

On the contrary, it may even win us a grudging measure of respect in those areas where we most need it.

Dio Indicted Here in Union Sellout

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PETER FRELINGHUYSEN, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 26, 1956

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, another case of labor racketeering was reported in the New York Times June 20, 1956. It furnishes another example of the need for a determined, objective, and responsible investigation of labor racketeering by the Federal Government.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I should like to include an article from the New York Times of June 20, 1956, entitled "Dio Indicted Here in Union Sellout":

DIO INDICTED HERE IN UNION SELLOUT—ACCUSED OF $30,000 BRIBERY PLOT TO GUARANTEE LABOR PEACE TO TWO CONCERNS

A New York County grand jury returned an indictment yesterday against a racketeer described by District Attorney Frank S. Hogan as "one of the most powerful underworld figures in the field of labor."

John Dioguardia, better known as Johnny Dio, a 42-year-old hoodlum previously convicted of extortion and State income tax evasion, was named in a four-count true bill accusing him of conspiracy to accept $30,000 in bribes.

Indicted with him in an alleged plot to sell out a legitimate union and guarantee freedom from labor trouble to two electroplating companies were officials of two local unions with strong racket ties.

One was Samuel Goldstein, president of Local 239 of the International Brotherhood of Teamsters. This union started as a unit of the old United Automobile Workers, AFL, in the days when Dio was its regional director here.

The other indicted unionist was Max Chester, secretary-treasurer of Local 405 of the Retail Clerks International Association until he was expelled by the parent union last March. His ouster came after his indictment in another case on shakedown charges.

Dio, who now describes himself as a "labor consultant," is vice president and sole officer of an organization called Equitable Research Associates, with offices at 250 West 57th Street.

Assistant District Attorney Harold A. Birns, who presented the evidence against the three men to the grand jury, said his investigation showed that the Dio organization was in the business of "selling labor peace for a price."

So confident was Dio of his ability to control unions that he offered to post a $50,000 bond to assure fulfillment of his commitment to bar strikes in the two companies, Mr. Birns reported.

The conspirators actually collected $10,000, according to Mr. Hogan, but their confidence in their ability to deliver labor peace proved misplaced. The union they were seeking to dislodge, a unit of the left-wing United Electrical, Radio and Machine Workers, independent, refused to have anything to do with them.

HICKEY TO INVESTIGATE

The indictment of Goldstein brought a new investigation last night into Dio's influence in the International Brotherhood of Teamsters. Thomas L. Hickey, international vice president of the truck union, said he would look into all aspects of the affairs of local 239.

Mr. Hickey said he had questioned Goldstein in response to earlier complaints of shady activities by the local. At that time, Mr. Hickey declared, Goldstein said he had nothing to do with Dio—that he hated him, in fact.

"It must be a case of love and hate being the same thing," Mr. Hickey observed wryly.

Dio's role in obtaining charters for seven newly established teamster locals already is under study by District Attorney Hogan and United States Attorney Paul W. Williams. Six of the locals are carryovers from Dio's term as regional director of the auto union, recently renamed the Allied Industrial Union.

Mr. Hogan has named Dio and Anthony (Tony Ducks) Corallo as the spearheads of an underworld drive to capture control of the teamsters joint council here. The district attorney called Goldstein a go-between in the relations between Dio and Corallo. He said both had thrown their power behind John J. O'Rourke in his fight to oust Martin T. Lacey as president of the union council.

In an unrelated development yesterday the United States court of appeals refused to upset a Federal court injunction restraining Mr. O'Rourke or the international union from taking any steps to remove Mr. Lacey. However, the court did clear the way for a hearing by the union's general executive board on a Lacey appeal in connection with the council's bitterly disputed election last February 14.

HOFFA PRESSES FOR ACTION

Lawyers for Mr. Lacey and his rival signed a stipulation agreeing that the original injunction by Judge Edmund L. Palmieri should not prevent processing of the appeal within the union. However, it was specified that no decision dislodging Mr. Lacey from his $25,000-a-year post could be made effective without court review.

James R. Hoffa, midwest teamster chief and principal supporter of Mr. O'Rourke, was reported pressing for quick action by the parent union to declare his candidate the election victor. However, Dave Beck, the union's president, was understood to be reluctant to get caught in the middle of the Lacey-O'Rourke battle.

How the parent union rules on 16 challenged ballots and on 49 impounded votes cast by the 7 new locals will determine which teamster official is declared the winner.

With the joint council rendered virtually ineffective by the internal battle, Mr. Beck has notified all teamster locals in this city that a special organizing office has been set up here to carry on the unionization functions that would normally be performed by the council.

Joseph Konowe, secretary-treasurer of the Merchandising and Distribution Employees Union, Local 210, was named as Mr. Beck's personal representative in charge of the new office. In a circular letter, Mr. Beck said the office was to be devoid of all personalities and politics. He added that it was to operate on a basis of organizing activity exclusively.

When the idea of a special New York headquarters was set forth originally at a meeting of the union's executive board in Honolulu 3 months ago, Mr. Beck and the board declared that one of its functions would be to establish all necessary procedure to guarantee clean, honorable trade-union conduct. However, there was no mention of antiracketeering in his notice to the locals here.

DIO PLEADS INNOCENT

Dio, who lives at 109 Freeport Avenue, Point Lookout, L. I., pleaded innocent to the conspiracy and bribery indictment in general sessions court yesterday. A similar plea was entered by Goldstein, whose home is at 210-01 Northern Boulevard, Flushing, Queens. Both were freed in $2,500 bail.

Chester, who is at liberty in $15,000 bail on his March extortion indictment, informed the district attorney that he would surrender this morning. His home is at 61-11 229th Street, Douglaston, Queens.

The story of intrigue and failure that led the three men into court started last June when Leonard Kornblum, a partner in the Kings Electro Plating Co., of Brooklyn, and the Kings Automatic Plating Co., of Maspeth, Queens, complained to friends that he was having union trouble.

The union was local 475 of the United Electrical Workers. It had been bargaining agent for the 150 Brooklyn electroplaters for 19 years and it had represented the 50 Queens workers for 5 years. One friend told Mr. Kornblum that if he wanted to get the union off his back, Chester would prove "the answer to your prayers."

That, according to Mr. Hogan, led to some collective bargaining between the businessman and Chester, not over wages and hours, but over how much Chester should be paid for his services.

Chester, then in command of local 405 of the retail clerks, set an asking price of

$35,000, but came down to $30,000 after bringing Dio and Goldstein into the picture.

SUGGESTED MOVE TO YONKERS

At one stage the three adventurers proposed that Mr. Kornblum move his Brooklyn plant to one of the abandoned mills of the Alexander Smith Carpet Co., in Yonkers. But this project fell through when officials of the electrical union reminded the company that their contract required high-severence payments to any stranded workers. It also specified that the electrical local would continue as bargaining agent in the new location.

The three suspects then concentrated on efforts to stop a threatened strike at the Queens plant. They said they would infiltrate the electrical local and arrange for a decertification election that would switch the bargaining rights to Chester's local. Again their efforts came to nothing, but Mr. Kornblum never got back the $10,000 he paid them in two installments during his trusting period.

Mr. Hogan expressed no sympathy for Mr. Kornblum's loss. The prosecutor said the businessman had paid money to escape dealing with an honest union and had chosen instead to "deal with corrupt union officials who, for a price, offered to accompany any employer who didn't care to be burdened by the standards of legitimate unionism."

Each of the indicted men could receive a maximum sentence of 4 years in jail and $2,000 fine.

People Do Want Good Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE M. RHODES

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 25, 1956

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include herewith an article from the current issue of Textile Labor by the former mayor of Philadelphia, the Honorable Joseph S. Clark, Jr.

Mayor Clark's outstanding record as head of a great city government is an achievement that won him the respect and admiration of citizens of Philadelphia and the people of Pennsylvania. Liberals and progressives in Democratic, Republican, and independent groups have joined in commending Mr. Clark as an able exponent of the kind of governmental philosophy that is needed in the Nation's Capitol. His strong character, vision, courage and humanitarian principles well qualify him to serve Pennsylvania as a United States Senator.

In introducing the former mayor to its readers, Textile Labor commented:

Clark, like Franklin D. Roosevelt before him, is an aristocrat whose deep feeling for democracy made him a liberal. A graduate of private schools, Harvard and Pennsylvania, he made his political debut in support of Al Smith in 1928.

After service as an Air Force officer in World War II he became leader of the reform movement he describes in this article. He was elected city controller in 1949 and mayor 2 years later. Currently he is the Democratic candidate for the United States Senate.

Through the miracle of television Mayor Clark became well known and respected in my district and in many communities surrounding Philadelphia. He inspires confidence and possesses the quality of leadership needed in these most serious times.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include with my remarks this Philadelphia story published in the current issue of Textile Labor:

PEOPLE DO WANT GOOD GOVERNMENT

(By Joseph S. Clark, Jr.)

For 67 years—from 1884 to 1951—Philadelphia was ruled by an unbroken succession of Republican mayors and Republican city councils. Since 1951 it has geen governed by a Democratic reform administration which won election in 1951 by a majority of 120,000 votes, and reelection in 1955 by an even larger margin.

What caused this upheaval, which has been hailed as one of the most significant events in the recent history of American city government? Is it of purely local significance, of interest only to the 2 million citizens of the Quaker City? Or are there broader implications in this Philadelphia story?

It seems to me that the peaceful revolution which removed the label "corrupt and contented" from America's third largest city, and converted it into a Mecca to which students of city government from all over the world are now making mass pilgrimages, has given much cause for rejoicing to those of us who believe that politics in America is making steady and sometimes spectacular progress.

There was only 1 issue in Philadelphia's elections of 1951 and 1955. That issue was good, honest, liberal government in city hall. The Democrats won in 1951 because they promised to give the people this kind of government. They won again in 1955 because the voters felt that they had made good on this promise.

The appeal of this issue cut across all traditional party lines. While the Democratic Party became the standard-bearer of reform in Philadelphia, the good government victories were actually won by a coalition of many forces.

A look at voter registration will illustrate what I mean. In 1951, 700,000 voters were registered as Republicans and less than 400,000 as Democrats, but in the mayoralty election 450,000 voted Democratic and only 325,000 Republican. In all presidential elections since 1936 Philadelphia voters had similarly disregarded their nominal registrations; Philadelphia had gone Democratic by whopping majorities for Roosevelt in 1936, 1940, and 1944, and by a small margin for Truman in 1948. But the election of 1951 was the first in which Philadelphians declared their independence from party labels in the selection of a mayor, a district attorney and the city council. The Democrats won because they were joined by both branches of the trade union movement, scores of normally nonpartisan civic organizations and thousands of independents.

Lesson No. 1 from the Philadelphia story: The American voter has come of age. His vote can no longer be delivered by party bosses and party hacks. He thinks and acts for himself. The controlled vote is becoming more and more a thing of the past.

Lesson No. 2: Americans are expecting increasing services from all levels of government, and they expect these services to be rendered honestly and efficiently.

Traditionally we have mistrusted government. From our frontier days we have carried into the 20th century the naive belief that politics is unimportant, that the strong can take care of their own, and that the least government is the best government. There has been a serious lag between the realities of a day in which we have delegated more and more vital functions to government to do collectively what we cannot accomplish individually, and an ideology which looks upon the politician with disrespect, if not contempt, and which has, consequently, discouraged many of our best and ablest people from entering government.

For 67 years Philadelphians got the kind of city government which they deserved as long as a majority of them persisted in this old-fashioned attitude. They got either no services from city hall, or they had to buy what little service they got by selling their votes to one of the most ruthless political machines in history. They got subways which had never heard the rumblings of a train, but whose construction had enriched the contractors who built them. They had a police force which protected the rackets and swung its clubs on union picket lines at the bidding of the machine and its financial beneficiaries. You were admitted to the city hospital, if you knew the right people, even though you could afford private medical care; and you could die in the street if you didn't have pull.

Playgrounds were located where favorite sons wanted to unload real estate at exorbitant prices. City contracts were rigged in the interest of favored bidders. Every job in city hall—civil service or otherwise—required political sponsorship, and unless the machine needed 1 honest worker to do the work of 5 drones, you had to pay cash to get it or to kick back part of your salary to keep it.

We won in 1951 because we convinced enough voters to apply the time-honored remedy against tyranny in a democracy: "Throw the rascals out."

Economy and efficiency on one side and expanding municipal services on the other have often been regarded as mutually exclusive. That is another outmoded concept. Increasing numbers of Americans have matured sufficiently in their thinking about government to realize that you cannot have something for nothing—not even in politics. If they are assured that they will receive 100 cents worth of service out of every dollar paid in taxes, they will decide for themselves what they want most—better services or lower taxes. In 1951 they voted for honesty and efficiency—and for better services. They voted for "reform" in the old-fashioned economy sense and at the same time for expanding Roosevelt's and Truman's "liberalism" from the White House to their own city hall.

There is no simple formula to explain why the Democratic reform administration received an overwhelming vote of confidence at the end of its first term. You cannot wipe out 67 years of neglect in 4 short years. Obviously the voters felt that we had made substantial progress on both fronts of our good-government campaign.

Maybe the greatest single change had come about in what we might call the "atmosphere" of city hall. Armed with the rigid provisions of a new home rule city charter, we transformed the city's civil service—Philadelphia has 26,000 municipal employees—from a sham into a reality: Employment based on merit, tenure of office, and promotion based on performance. Once word got around that civil-service examinations were on the level we were swamped with applications from men and women who in the past would have been ashamed to tell their friends they wanted to work in city hall.

Republican holdovers who did not want to work quit; those who stayed started to perform, thousands of them with the pride and enthusiasm of a man who has suddenly been liberated from a bullying boss. In every contact with city hall people began to learn that they no longer needed "pull" to get services to which they were entitled—and that you could not get something illegal no matter how influential you or your "sponsor" were.

We raised taxes by almost $20 million at the end of the first year of our administra-

tion without getting the slightest political repercussion. Last year—8 months before election— I announced in my annual state of the city message that further substantial tax increases would be inevitable, yet in November the Democratic majority increased from 120,000 to 133,000.

There is a tremendous need today for more able, ambitious and devoted people to go into politics. There is a continuing need for more and more political education of more and more people. Our Philadelphia experience is encouraging in two respects: That the American voter is rapidly becoming a highly discriminating judge of issues and candidates; and that he will respect and reward the politician who lives by a single standard of decency and service.

Address by Maurice Simmons, Justice of the Court of Special Sessions, at the Soldiers and Sailors Monument, New York City, May 30, 1956

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ARTHUR G. KLEIN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 26, 1956

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an address by Maurice Simmons, justice of the court of special sessions, retired; past commander in chief, United Spanish War Veterans; and honorary chairman, United War Veterans of New York County, at the Soldiers and Sailors Monument, New York City, May 30, 1956:

In annual memoriam we revisit the secret places of our heart to hold communion with our heroic dead who gave their all to make and keep us a free people. The flintlock of 1776 has become the H-bomb of 1956. And the earth trembles under the march of the Reds to world conquest. For the defense of western civilization we have built foreign bases on the expanding perimeter of dynamic communistic imperialism. The Godless criminals of the Kremlin have joined hands with the supersheiks of the mideastern deserts to forge the Moscow-Cairo axis—in substance a replica of the Berlin-Baghdad axis which in World War I welded together the Kaiser and the Arab chieftains against the West.

The firm Arabian objective is the expulsion of the West and all its works from their oriental terrain. In the mideast lie two-thirds of the world's proven petroleum deposits. This is being wrested from the barren wastelands by Western brains, courage, and capital. Thereby the feudal despots of the deserts have enriched themselves beyond the dreams of the Arabian Nights. By agreement this oil fuels not only our air and naval forces abroad but also the Western European lands. Denied access thereto, their national economies would be gravely jeopardized. Suddenly in this vital area we find the footprints of the Russian bear. The strategic seaways nearby could lead the Russian vandals to their goal of world dominion.

Into Egypt the Soviets are pouring massive armaments. With these, Nasser of the Nile and his Moslem cohorts are readying for the annihilation of Israel. We cradled this oasis of freedom as a sentry at the crossroads of the eastern continents. Together with Great Britain and France we pledged ourselves to prevent the violation of the Palestinian armistice. If now we deny Israel's minimum request for defense armor against the Arabian Goliath will we not be charged with retreat and repudiation?

Appeasement feeds the arrogance of the aggressor. The most powerful nation on earth, shall we tread that treacherous road? Have we so soon forgotten how the British Chamberlain bent the cringing knee to Hitler? The betrayal of Czechoslovakia opened the floodgates of World War II. How much longer shall we vacillate and supplicate under the blackmail of the Arabian sheiks and their Communist bedfellows? While we palaver and procrastinate the match may be dropped into the mideastern oil tank that will explode into world war three. Clear visioned and with heads unbowed should we not as American war veterans be guided by the policy formulated by our comrade, Theodore Roosevelt, "Walk softly and carry a big stick"?

Under Which Plan Are the People Paying for Dams?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN E. MOSS, JR.
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 13, 1956

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial which appeared in the Sacramento Bee of June 20, 1956, "debunking" recent paid magazine advertising attributed to America's independent (sic) electric light and power companies.

The editorial points out that the advertising in question is "rankly deceptive" in purporting to show a State-by-State breakdown of the cost of the proposed Government project on the Snake River in Idaho. It points out that if the Idaho Power Co., a Maine corporation owned in large part by New York and Boston investors, is permitted to develop Hells Canyon as a private enterprise, the people of the United States will be robbed one one of the Nation's last great natural resources.

The editorial in question reads as follows:

UNDER WHICH PLAN ARE THE PEOPLE PAYING FOR DAMS?

Paid magazine advertisements attributed to America's independent electric light and power companies contain this statement:

"Here's about how much the people of each State save in taxes because the local independent electric company, instead of the Government, is building the Hells Canyon power project."

Then follows a State-by-State breakdown of the cost of the proposed Government project on the Snake River in Idaho. The power company statisticians allocate $42,900,000 to the people of California, $68,700,000 to the people of New York, and so on.

It is not stated how this allocation is arrived at, whether on population or the proportion of Federal taxes paid by each State. But either way, the statement is rankly deceptive.

In the first place, money advanced from the Federal Treasury for the Western water and power projects is repaid by the water and power users, and in the case of power at 3 percent interest.

At the end of the payoff period, generally around 50 years, the Federal Treasury is reimbursed. The residents of the area have enjoyed low water and power rates. And the people of the United States are the owners of the dam.

Thus, the cost of the irrigation and power features to the taxpayers in the various States is zero. And the economy of every State and the District of Columbia has been improved by the development of areas which otherwise would be semideserts.

A private company does not build a dam by waving a fairy wand. It costs a private utility as much to build a dam as it does the Government.

And the customers pay for it at higher rates every time they turn on an electric light or a washing machine. The profits and the interest go not to the Federal Treasury but to the utility, its officials, and stockholders.

At the end of 50 years the dam belongs not to the people but to the private company. And to say a local independent electric company is building the Hells Canyon Dam is further deception, inasmuch as the Idaho Power Co. is a Maine corporation owned in large part by Boston and New York investors.

With the construction of three small power dams by the Idaho Power Co. in Hells Canyon, lost will be the opportunity to develop the site for irrigation, flood control, and recreational and navigation benefits which would come from the Government's multiple purpose project.

The people are not being saved anything. In fact, they are being robbed of a chance to utilize one of their greatest and most precious natural resources.

Poor People of United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 25, 1956

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith an editorial from the East St. Louis (Ill.) Journal of June 24, 1956, entitled "Poor People of United States":

POOR PEOPLE OF UNITED STATES

Senator PAUL DOUGLAS thinks the Federal Government should be as interested in the poor people of Illinois as it is in the poor people of Paris. So he is supporting legislation approved Thursday by the House Banking Committee which would set up a domestic point 4 program. Much of the bill includes ideas long advocated by the Senator. Representative GRAY, of Illinois, also is backing the legislation.

The bill would establish an Area Development Administration to make loans and grants to areas like southern Illinois which need more industry. The agency would also help people who are unable to make a living at farming because of poor soil, or the lack of capital, to build up their farms or else learn a more profitable way of making a living. Funds would be available to the agency. Most of the money would be loaned to communities, businesses and publicly owned utilities and reclamation agencies.

The legislation appears to be a sincere attempt to get at the three causes of the poverty and near-poverty conditions which continue in many parts of the United States amid the general prosperity of most Americans. (The Franklin D. Roosevelt Foundation estimates that 19½ million Americans "had insufficient resources in 1950 to meet individual needs at an adequate level of living.") The usual causes of these "pockets of poverty" are lack of industry, soil too poor

for profitable farming and the failure of many people to move from these areas to places where they can get jobs.

However, it will take more than Federal aid for most areas to pull themselves into prosperity. While Federal assistance such as is proposed in the committee-approved legislation can be of considerable aid, it is up to distressed communities themselves to do most of the job of attracting industry and helping its residents to get better-paying jobs.

Unfortunately, the chances for passage of the Area Redevelopment Act are not good. The legislation may be approved by the House, but there is little likelihood that the Senate will get to the measure before the expected mid-July adjournment of Congress.

Nevertheless, Senator DOUGLAS and Representative GRAY are to be commended for the special efforts they are making on behalf of the poor people of Illinois, constituents who have become isolated from the mainstream of Federal Government assistance as well as from prosperity.

White House Secrets Denied Congress Leaked to a Reporter

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMANUEL CELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 26, 1956

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, it is shocking to learn that the White House has given unlimited and complete access to a friendly newspaper correspondent the confidential minutes of all its Cabinet meetings as well as other documents of a confidential nature. All this material was used in the preparation of a book. This book has been summarized as "a history of the private deliberations of Mr. Eisenhower and his deputies in various fields." For an administration which has grimly fought to uphold the principle of Executive privilege and in so doing has gone to such extremes as to deny legitimate requests of duly constituted committees, this unprecedented dumping of confidential files for public perusal insults the intelligence of the electorate and mocks the serious efforts of the Congress to keep itself informed of the processes of government.

The accusation has been made, and in my judgment justly so, that no other administration has withheld so much information from the people and from the press as has this administration. Yet in one swoop, it has permitted one member of a friendly newspaper to go behind the curtain of the deliberative processes for what seems to be an election advantage to the glorification of the Eisenhower administration.

When I, as chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, requested the files of the Business Advisory Council from the Secretary of Commerce, this information was denied, even though the BAC is not a Government agency and its records could not be deemed confidential. It is now disclosed that this request was discussed at a Cabinet meeting where Mr. Eisenhower favored denying the request and took a firm stand against congressional attempts to encroach on the prerogatives of the President. It is unconscionable that the administration would cavalierly deny requests of elected officials of the Government, seeking access to records of this sort, and at the same time freely supply them to a journalist who is neither elected nor appointed to any office.

While the matter of leaks is not new to government, in no instance can I recall such irresponsible exposure of Cabinet deliberations en masse, damaging to the Office of the Presidency, to the counsels of his advisers, and disrupting the coordination between the executive and legislative branches of our Government.

It is a shabby use of the advertising techniques so prevalent in promoting this administration. You do not sell the product, you sell the packaging. It is my fervent hope that the President himself was unaware of this monumental mistake of his palace guard.

I insert at this point a most interesting article written by Richard H. Rovere, called Letter from Washington, which appeared in the June 23, 1956 issue of the New Yorker magazine, discussing this subject in detail:

LETTER FROM WASHINGTON

Quite possibly the most unorthodox thing the Eisenhower administration has done to date has been to grant a White House correspondent the privilege of examining the minutes of all its Cabinet meetings and a large number of other documents involving confidential proceedings within the executive branch. The privileged correspondent is Robert J. Donovan, of the New York Herald Tribune, who is widely considered here to be among the ablest and most conscientious members of his profession, and one consequence of his examination of the records is a remarkable book entitled "Eisenhower: The Inside Story," which is to be issued by Harper & Bros. approximately two weeks from now, and which has already served as the basis for a series of articles syndicated by the Herald Tribune in newspapers throughout the country. The book has a number of notable features, but by far the most striking of them is a reproduction, often in diary form and with what is plainly a minimum of paraphrase, of a recording secretary's minutes of the arguments, agreements, and animadversions of the President and his closest associates in camera; though Mr. Donovan has drawn to some extent on information available to anyone and to some extent on his own memory and firsthand observations, his book is actually a history of the private deliberations of Mr. Eisenhower and his deputies in various fields. It is to be assumed that the preparation of such a history was the end sought by the official, or officials, who—assuredly with the President's approval, for the step was too drastic a one to be taken without it—invited Mr. Donovan to inspect the documents and authorized him to make use of them entirely at his own discretion, free from any pressures other than those that might be exerted by his conscience and by his highly developed sense of propriety and feeling for the public interest. It is almost certain, however, that the invitation will have consequences extending far beyond the publication of Mr. Donovan's interesting and instructive book. For what the administration has done is more than merely to make available to a gifted and friendly journalist the materials for a report on its activities; it has given a person unconnected with the Government in any way, and subject to no disciplines or restraints beyond those to which any citizen is subject, the right to acquaint himself to the limits of his curiosity with transactions of a sort that have in the past been withheld both from the courts and from congressional committees authorized to investigate the executive branch and armed with the power of subpena. In effect, as the situation is understood here, the administration armed Mr. Donovan with his own power of subpena and tendered a pledge to comply with his summones except when, in its judgment, matters of national security were involved. And it gave him the further right to acquaint the entire American public—indeed, the entire world—with the details of its affairs.

Needless to say, Mr. Donovan has sought to make the most of his opportunity. He has not gained entrée to the deliberations of the Cabinet simply in order to celebrate harmony and achievement. He shows the President and his advisers in moods of exasperation with one another; he reveals that Mr. Eisenhower had the idea of increasing tax exemptions for lower-income families before the Democrats made it part of their program, and that this Presidential heresy had to be exercised by Mr. Humphrey, who, when the Democrats got around to advancing the plan, called it "silly" and "a quickie gimmick;" he reveals that there were those—the President not among them—who thought in the spring of 1955 that it might help matters considerably if Mrs. Oveta Culp Hobby returned to her successful career as a newspaper publisher and who were, presumably, not enchanted when she finally said that she thought she would go back to Houston and open a branch office of the administration. Mr. Donovan's access to the minutes produces the further intelligence that Mr. Dulles expressed dissatisfaction with the competence of security boards and that Mr. NIXON expressed dissatisfaction with the low rate at which security risks were being turned up in the United States Information Agency, an organization large enough, he seemed to think, to produce a bumper crop of unreliable employees. The Vice President is also shown in a continuing dispute with Postmaster General Summerfield, who wanted to raise postal rates, in order to put his Department on a sound business basis, while Mr. NIXON pointed out that there are some things more important than a sound business basis, among them political support of the kind that might be lost through an increase in mailing costs. A persistent theme is what Mr. Donovan at one point describes as "the muting of emphasis on balancing the budget." Another theme is Mr. Eisenhower's mounting and later subsiding annoyance with what is sometimes referred to as the conservative wing of his party. In his first 2 years, the President could scarcely contain his frustration, and at one time, in 1953, he gave serious thought to leaving the Republican Party and starting a party of his own, as Theodore Roosevelt did; he was dissuaded by the very recollection of Roosevelt's unhappy experience, but he continued, Mr. Donovan says, to ask "whether, after all, the [present] Republican Party was represented by men with the vision and understanding of what was required to lead the United States through the perils of the mid-20th century." After 1954, the question troubled him less, for his own leadership of the Party was more firmly established and the power of the opposing faction was even more than correspondingly diminished; Senator Taft had died, Senator WATKINS had disposed of Senator MCCARTHY, Senator BRICKER had temporarily withdrawn his amendment (which had been by far the greatest source of Presidential annoyance), and the 1954 elections had removed several persons whom the President found offensive and had weakened the authority of quite a few others. One of the many conclusions that may be drawn from Mr. Donovan's study of the Cabinet

minutes is that the factional wars in the administration party are mostly over and done with. Ironically, the one thing that may lead to their resumption is the action of the White House in allowing Mr. Donovan to make public the contents of the minutes, which are a history—necessarily one-sided—of those wars and which contain such encouragements to Party unity as the suggestion made at one meeting that small, or tactical, atomic bombs might be used "to good effect" against supporters of the Bricker amendment. It was a joke, naturally, but Senator BRICKER is unlikely to think it funny. The book is by no means only a narrative of factional strife, or strife of any sort; indeed, if a true balance of its contents were to be taken, the administration and the Republican Party as a whole would doubtless come off very well. But a kind of Gresham's law operates in the reader's mind, with the news of progress and concord being driven back by the news of frustration and schism. The memory of a suggestion to blow up Senator BRICKER and his friends outlasts the memory of how smoothly agreement was reached in the question of tightening credit controls in 1953.

The act of turning over the minutes of Cabinet meetings to a private citizen is more than just unprecedented; it is one for which no precedent could have existed, because this administration is the first in our history to keep regular minutes of Cabinet meetings. If minutes were ever kept before, it was only for a limited period of time and for some end other than the enrichment of the archives. In the past, to be sure, individual Cabinet members and certain Presidents have made notes of their own in the course of their meetings, and have prepared memoranda on the outcome of discussions. A few Cabinet officers have been enthusiastic diarists and have reproduced from memory or from notes the tenor—or even the precise language—of specific colloquies, and have then published them in books or magazines, or have left them to be published posthumously. Various Presidents, from John Quincy Adams to Harry Truman, and various Cabinet members, from Lincoln's Secretary of the Navy, Gideon Welles, to Harold L. Ickes and James V. Forrestal, have been responsible for disclosing details of Cabinet discussions after their return to private life. And since it is characteristic of Presidents and department heads in office to wish to have their views—and information that tends to support their views—transmitted to the public, on innumerable occasions they have advised their journalistic friends of what was said on particular subjects at particular meetings. But never before have there been official records of Cabinet proceedings; never before has the Cabinet had a recording secretary, nor has any Cabinet member ever been charged with performing the functions of one. (It is generally taken for granted here that the minutes Mr. Donovan has used are the work of Maxwell M. Rabb, who in November of 1954 was appointed Secretary to the Cabinet by the President, and was given a staff of assistants; Mr. Rabb had been with Mr. Eisenhower since 1952, as chief aide to his chief aide, Sherman Adams, and it is probable that his appointment in 1954 merely formalized an existing setup. The pre-1954 minutes placed at Mr. Donovan's disposal are also thought to have come from the hand of Mr. Rabb.)

While no one in the Government may ever have itemized the reasons for the nonexistence of recording secretaries and Cabinet minutes, it has always been assumed that one of them was the reluctance of Presidents and Presidential advisers to inhibit discussion by setting down and preserving records. This would be a sufficient reason even if there were no others, but as it happens, there have been several others, the most important of which, perhaps, is that very few Presidents have regarded the Cabinet as in any real sense a deliberative body or council of advisers. The Cabinet is not an official agency of the Government. As far as the Constitution is concerned, there is no such thing as the Cabinet. In law, it has no powers, no duties, no rights, and no definite composition. In practice, it is an institution that takes its form partly from tradition and partly from the temper and passing fancies of the incumbent President. Custom and precedent would make it awkward for any President not to regard a Postmaster General as a Cabinet member in good and assured standing. Customs and precedent would also make it awkward for a President to request the Secretary of State to stay away from Cabinet meetings and to request the under Secretary to attend in his place. (For a while during Franklin Roosevelt's administration, it was frequently said that Sumner Welles, the Under Secretary, had more effective control over American diplomacy, and more influence with the President, than Cordell Hull, yet it was Hull who sat with the Cabinet—a dubious privilege, since Roosevelt made very little use of that body and merely endured its meetings.) On the other hand, the President could, on nothing more than a whim, make the chairman of the Civil Aeronautics Board a Cabinet member, and if he wanted to satisfy tradition, he could ask Congress to change the agency's name to Department of Civil Aeronautics—tradition seeming to dictate that a bureau whose head sits with the Cabinet be called a department rather than a board or commission or agency or administration.

If the delay of 165 years in inaugurating the keeping of minutes can be explained to some extent by the Cabinet's lack of prescribed duties, it is also in good measure attributable to the intimate, confidential, sometimes trivial and sometimes grave nature of Cabinet discussions. For while the Cabinet as an organization has never had the statutory power to do anything or decide anything, as a group of advisers and friends of the President it has often been of great importance. Though most Presidents have at times acted on the principle employed by Lincoln when he took a Cabinet vote and announced the results as "noes 7, ayes 1, the ayes have it," most of them, including Lincoln, have used the Cabinet as a forum for discussion of the most delicate political questions, as a court of arbitration for jurisdictional disputes and conflicts of personality, and as a staging ground for important political operations. Mr. Eisenhower, more consistently than any of his recent predecessors, has used the Cabinet for these purposes. It might be supposed that the more a President relied on the Cabinet as an advisory council, the less inclined he would be to incur the risks of keeping detailed reports of its discussions. But to make this supposition in the case of President Eisenhower is to overlook his military background and the business backgrounds of most of his associates. Indeed, with the advantage of hindsight it is possible to say that the Cabinet innovations instituted by the Eisenhower administration were almost inevitable from the start. The President, as has always been known, is addicted to the staff system and the chain of command. In sizing up the Cabinet, he found it to be a piece of machinery that, with the rust wiped off and a few nuts and bolts tightened, could be put into service as a kind of general staff. Early in his tenure, he made the Cabinet appear more like a staff by inviting the regular attendance of the Vice President and appointing him deputy chief, by bringing in such officials as the Director of the Budget and the Chairman of the Civil Service Commission, and by setting up a formal agenda. From a formal agenda to minutes was only one short step, and in any event the idea of minutes or transcripts would surely have occurred to the merchant princes and captains of industry who are so numerous among the President's advisers and who must be veterans of many thousands of sales conferences and board meetings. Modern business efficiency seems to be largely a matter of the proliferation of records, and as the President himself remarked, according to Mr. Donovan, in a Cabinet meeting on March 20, 1953, the administration is exceedingly proud to be called a business administration when this is taken to mean that it is devoted to a businesslike approach to the problems of government.

But if it was only to be expected that the administration would adopt methods reminiscent of military and business procedures, it could never have been expected that it would shatter precedent by giving a newspaper reporter carte blanche to scrutinize the most confidential records and to ask all the readers he can attract to join him in a consideration of the passages he regards as the most interesting. Such a development would have seemed particularly unlikely in view of the administration's general policy on public information, which in the main has been less permissive than the policies of most of its predecessors. Mr. Donovan, in his book, offers no clue to why so large and sudden an exception was made. Neither he nor his publishers explain who in the White House conceived this strange enterprise in the first place or what any of those who authorized it had in mind at the time they did so. It can be taken for granted, of course, that whoever was responsible had at least partly in mind the political good of the administration. One can easily imagine some proud and confident participant in Mr. Eisenhower's crusade reasoning to himself that the record of the administration has on the whole been so good and so nearly above reproach that any examination of it by a fair-minded man would be bound to produce a broadly favorable report. Mr. Donovan, in addition to being universally looked upon as a fair-minded man, writes for a newspaper that has seldom, if ever, failed to appreciate the accomplishments of the present administration. It requires no great mental agility to understand how a member of the White House staff—perhaps Mr. Sherman Adams—might have arrived at the conclusion that a history of the administration by Mr. Donovan would have its points of interest and might be of positive value in the 1956 election campaign. But a proper respect for the intelligence of members of the White House staff also leads one to assume that those who perceived the possible benefits of encouraging such an undertaking would at the same time perceive its hazards. It seems almost impossible that anyone in his senses could fail to see that a person who opens the Cabinet minutes to a reporter on a take-what-you-want basis rivals Pandora in rashness, if not in insubordination.

While the rashness may have been a calculated risk, there can be no doubt that it is a Pandora's box that the White House has opened. Once Mr. Donovan's book has appeared, the administration is likely to find that by releasing the material it has destroyed much of its power to resist congressional trespassing. This is a power it has frequently used and has steadily sought to preserve. In the Army-MCCARTHY hearings, the President refused to allow the Army counsel to tell Senator MUNDT's committee about a discussion that was held by administration officers, mostly of lower than Cabinet rank, on administration strategy in dealing with Senator MCCARTHY. Last March, Senator MCCLELLAN, now chairman of the committee that Senator MUNDT presided over for a while, asked for some working papers concerning the development of policy on trade with Communist nations. The administration refused, on the ground that, as it was stated in Mr. DONOVAN's newspaper, "to supply such papers would be to violate the historic principle of separation of powers which permits the executive branch to keep secret

the process by which it reaches decisions." Mr. DONOVAN's book tells about the Cabinet's discussion of an investigation by a subcommittee of the House Judiciary Committee at which the chairman, Representative EMANUEL CELLER, of New York, requested certain files in the Department of Commerce. At that meeting, Mr. Eisenhower took a firm stand against congressional attempts "to encroach on the prerogatives of the President," and favored denial. He told the Cabinet, Mr. DONOVAN says, that "he was never going to yield to the point where he would become known as the President who had practically crippled the Presidency." Henceforth, it will be much more difficult to sustain this kind of argument. If in the time that remains to the Eisenhower administration it should again feel the need to keep Congress in the dark about any of its internal business, it will have to strain its ingenuity to find an argument for denying requests of high elected officials of the Government seeking access to records of the sort it has quite freely supplied to a journalist neither elected nor appointed to any office. Its ingenuity may meet the test, or the administration may simply stand on what are still its rights and refuse to comply, without making any argument at all. In the latter event, it is not hard to imagine the taunts it will have to endure from offended Congressmen.

The problems raised by the delivery of this material to Mr. Donovan are almost without number. There are already serious unresolved questions about the ownership of papers prepared by Government employees on Government time for Government use, and their exploitation for private gain. Such questions have been raised when Presidents or Cabinet members have used as income-producing literary properties papers they themselves have written or have ordered to be written. Now there is the case of a private citizen's being given a monopoly on a whole category of Government papers. A decision will have to be made on whether the monopoly is to be permanent or temporary. Normally, when Government records are made public, the principle of "equal accessibility" is observed and the archives are opened not to one person but to all qualified persons. The largest of the questions, however, revolves around the keeping of confidences. No doubt every member of the President's Cabinet was aware that minutes were being taken and that any observation he chanced to make would probably go into the record. No on could have known, though, that the minutes would form the basis of a book and a series of newspaper articles. It is safe to assume that this plan had not been hatched at the time; it is also safe to assume that if the Cabinet members had known of the existence of any such plan, they would have been more guarded in their speech. Certainly Mr. Philip Young, the chairman of the Civil Service Commission, would not have spoken even jestingly of vaporizing Senator BRICKER and his followers if he had suspected that the remark might turn up in a book that is being groomed for the best-seller derby. Many members of the Cabinet must now feel somewhat as Aristide Briand did when he learned, in 1930, that Gustav Stresemann's papers were to be published and that they would describe conversations between the two men. "If such a policy is to be followed hereafter," he said, "no statesman would ever dare to speak frankly * * *. And certainly this would not be in the interest of mankind."

Mr. Donovan's book is expected to produce many American echoes of M. Briand's sentiments. It is a unique piece of work in that it is a campaign document that provides as much ammunition for one side as for the other.

RICHARD H. ROVERE.

JUNE 14.

Educational Benefits to Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. TORBERT H. MACDONALD

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 26, 1956

Mr. MACDONALD. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill in the House to amend Public Law 346, 78th Congress, which grants educational benefits to World War II veterans, and Public Law 550, 82d Congress, which grants educational benefits, among other things, to Korean war veterans.

Certain deficiencies in these two laws should be corrected and corrected at once. These deficiencies came to light early this year when a Senate subcommittee, investigating the Communist ownership of GI schools, discovered that under the existing provisions of these laws the Veterans' Administration is required to expend Federal funds for tuition of veterans attending schools which are Communist-owned. In fact, over $3 million was paid out by the Veterans' Administration to four schools which because of their Communist connections should be ineligible to participate in the veterans' training program. These four schools are the Cartoonists and Illustrators School, Inc., of New York City; the Radio and Television Technical School, of Allentown, Pa.; the Robert Louis Stevenson School, of New York City; and the California Labor School, of San Francisco, Calif.

During the hearings it was brought out that under the provisions of Public Laws 346 and 550, the approval of veteran training schools is left solely to the local State-approving agencies, customarily a local department of education, and unless the local department rules otherwise the Veterans' Administration must pay the tuition for the veteran at these Communist-owned schools or Communist-dominated schools.

In order to correct this situation, my bill requires private schools, below the college level, which are training veterans or seeking approval to train veterans, to submit to the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs affidavits signed by the owner or owners and by the members of the governing body that he is not and never has been a member of the Communist Party or any organization that believes in or teaches the overthrow of the United States Government by force or by illegal or unconstitutional methods.

It is estimated that there are approximately 2,400 schools throughout the country that will file affidavits under this proposal. The bill also provides that in the event a school fails to file an affidavit, the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs will not approve the enrollment of veterans in such school. On the other hand, an individual who has been a member of the Communist Party in the past can comply with provisions of the proposed legislation if he files an affidavit that he has terminated his membership and since such termination is opposed to the doctrines, program, principles, and ideology of such organizations. Obviously this bill does not affect colleges or academic preparatory schools.

Mr. Speaker, it is my hope that the Veterans' Affairs Committee will act promptly on this measure so that it can be reported to and acted upon by the House before the 84th Congress adjourns. Passage of this bill will prevent millions of Americn taxpayers' money from being expended to train veterans at Communist-owned or at Communist-dominated schools.

English Honor Truman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. MELVIN PRICE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 25, 1956

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith an editorial which appeared in the East St. Louis (Ill.) Journal on June 24, 1956. The editorial, entitled "English Honor Truman," follows:

ENGLISH HONOR TRUMAN

Oxford University, one of the most ancient and honorable, last Wednesday gave former President Harry Truman the honorary degree of doctor of civil laws.

More than that, Oxford gave Mr. Truman, who is traveling in Europe as a private citizen, so warm a welcome and paid him such high compliments that the man from Independence whipped out a handkerchief, wiped his eyes, and blew his nose.

The Oxford chancellor, Earl Halifax, former British Ambassador to the United States, had eulogized the former President of the United States as: "Trust of allies, direct in your speech and in your writing, and ever a pattern of simple courage."

The Missourian who has a reputation for direct speech, was touched by the Oxford tribute. He has not had much praise since he left the White House.

The British press has been most cordial to Mr. Truman. The London Times wrote editorially of the direct and personal part President Truman played in shaping the policies which saved Europe after the war from economic chaos and possibly also from political disaster.

The London Daily Express commented that "he has a warm and homespun personality, but this is only one side of the character of this man who has won such a tremendous place in history."

The News Chronicle said editorially:

"Mr. Truman has done as much as any man living to defend the values which Oxford at her best represents. Mr. Truman's bold decision to give aid to the struggling countries of Europe when Communist conspiracy had nearly overwhelmed them not only gave us a breathing space to recover from the ravages of war: it also marked the assumption by the great republic of the leadership of all the nations who aspire to something better than the one-party state."

When Mr. Truman pastes up his English press clippings for preservation in the Truman library at Independence, he may write across the top of the page: "A prophet is not without honor, save in his own country." (Matthew XIII: 57.)

Appendix

One Thousand Years of Christianity in the Ukraine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 25, 1956

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, my colleague, the Honorable THOMAS F. DODD, of Connecticut, has submitted an important resolution, House Resolution 482, condemning the persecution of Christianity in Ukraine. It appears to me that at this time it is most fitting for us to give serious consideration to this resolution for several reasons. First, the observances in this country of the existence of Christianity in Ukraine for a thousand provide an excellent occasion for the passage of this resolution. Second, in contrast to the religious institutions of the other captive nations in eastern Europe, the Ukrainian Catholic and Orthodox Churches have been totally subjected to Russian Communist genocide. They exist today in the underground. And third, this resolution is a challenge to the sincerity of the oligarchical dictatorship in Moscow which ascribes mass murder and genocide to the past Stalin regime. If it is sincere in its touted liberalization program, it would rehabilitate also the Ukrainian Catholic and Orthodox Churches which Stalin liquidated.

The importance of this measure may be gleaned from the dominant facts presented in a statement prepared by Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky, professor of Soviet economics in the Graduate School of Georgetown University and also chairman of the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America. This statement introduces a short memorandum on the persecution of Christianity in Ukraine and messages received by the Ukrainian Catholic Exarchate on the occasion of the 1,000 years observance in this country. As a brief background to the Dodd resolution, I request that this material along with a revealing editorial on "Russian Orthodox Guests—Exponents of Stalin's 'Religion,' " which appears in the current issue of the Ukrainian Bulletin, be printed in the RECORD:

STATEMENT BY DR. LEV E. DOBRIANSKY

The impressive messages that were received on the occasion of the solemn observance of 1,000 years of Christianity in Ukraine furnish eloquent testimony to the superlative thoughts of the eminent Catholic scholar and philosopher of history, Father Don Luigi Sturzo. In his classic work on nationalism and internationalism, this world renowned scholar conclusively observes that the three great ideas which have shaped the history of mankind are religion, national independence and liberty (p. 13). These three majestic ideas constitute a veritable trinity of thought predicating moral and political action that necessarily must encompass the manifestation of all three in the harmonious existence of societies, nationals, and peoples. To contemplate an act upon one embraces correlative contemplation and action upon the others—in the natural spirit of Amor Dei et Patriae.

In Ukraine, which today in its state of captivity is the largest non-Russian nation not only in the primary empire constituted by the Soviet Union but also behind the European Iron Curtain, these fundamental ideas and natural drives have cast the very foundations of the sovereign existence of this nation. In their fixed interrelationship they have formed the essential source of strength and hope to the liberation movements of this freedom-loving people in different periods of enslavement under some imperialist foreign yoke. The contemporary struggle of the Ukrainian nation against the colonial and imperialistic domination of Russian communism—highlighted by the gallant military defense of its independent state following World War I, the brave opposition of its intellectuals to the strangling centralization of colonial control by Moscow in the twenties, the stern resistance of its hardy peasantry to the politico-economic collectivist measures of the foreign oppressor in the thirties, the heroic battles of the famous patriotic and nationalist forces of the Ukrainian Insurgent Army against both Nazi German and Russian Communist totalitarianism in the forties, and the underground operations in political warfare against alien Moscow by all sections of its population in this decade—draws its chief inspiration from the undying faith that Deo adjuvante, non timendum.

In the light of all this, is it little wonder that the religious institutions and clergies of Ukraine were the first and prime objects of attack and liquidation by Russian Communist totalitarianism? This sordid story of our times is well described in summary form in the following memorandum which based a petition leading to House Resolution 482, submitted by the Honorable THOMAS J. DODD, of Connecticut. The many messages following this, received from the highest authorities in the Catholic Church here and abroad, were written in the intimate knowledge of this background on current Russian Communist policy of religious persecution and genocide.

The Ukrainian Catholic Church survives in the underground of Ukraine today. Its existence and free emergence are dependent on the reality of the three great ideas of history—religion, national independence and liberty. Priest and patriot are but one. In this country, hope and encouragement for the eventual liberation and freedom of church, nation and people in Ukraine are steadfastly sustained by the prayers and work of the Ukrainian Catholic Exarchate of the United States of America. Under the great spiritual leadership and guidance of the Most Reverend Archbishop Constantine Bohachevsky and the Most Reverend Ambrose Senyshyn, O. S. B. M., the faithful pursue this work in the certitude of its value to the basic national interests of our own country, the United States of America, and in the certain knowledge that for all nations, including Ukraine, Beata gens, cujus est Dominus Deus eorum.

MEMORANDUM

Christianity has been existing in Ukraine for more than 1,000 years. It has fostered a profound faith in God among the people, and has begotten abiding moral principles, and nourished a new culture and erudition.

In December 1917, Communist Russia invaded Ukraine and in 1919–20 occupied the eastern provinces of this country. The Soviets were bent on extirpating Christianity from these regions. In their coup d'etat they published aggressive antireligious propaganda and terrorized the people with threats of exile, torture, and death.

First, the Communists attacked the church in Eastern Ukraine. Within 10 years, from 1921 to 1931, they unjustly arrested and ruthlessly murdered 34 Ukrainian Orthodox bishops and more than 3,000 priests. Hundreds of thousands of the faithful were inhumanly tortured in prisons or deported to concentration camps in Siberia; a greater part of these innocent people died martyrs to their faith; the remainder still endures the appalling trials and hardships of imprisonment.

The Reds destroyed 80 percent of the churches (many of these churches contained precious historical relics, as for example the golden domed Michalivsky Monastery in Kiev from the 12th century); other churches were despicably converted into warehouses, theaters, and convention halls; monasteries were outraged and cemeteries profaned.

By 1930 the Communists had completely liquidated the entire Ukrainian Orthodox Church, barring it from all public activity.

Though article 123 of the Soviet constitution, which is binding in Ukraine as well as the U. S. S. R., explicitly recognizes freedom of religion, yet, during the first Red occupation of western Ukraine (1939–41), the Communist regime overtly persecuted the church, arresting many Ukrainian priests and ruthlessly murdering 27 of them.

This antichristian terror adopted more hideous means of exterminating Christanity in Ukraine during the second occupation of this country beginning in 1945. On April 11, 1945, the Soviets arrested the metropolitan of Halych and archbishop of Lviv, Joseph Slipyj, 80-year-old Bishop Gregory Khomyshyn, Bishop John Latyshevskyj, Bishop Nicholas Charnetskyj, C. SS. R., and Bishop Nykyta Budka. On June 25, 1946, Bishop Josaphat Kotsylovskyj, OSBM, and Bishop Gregory Lakota were imprisoned. All these bishops were condemned to forced labor for 8 to 10 years and even life; the imputation was lawfully unjust. Some of these bishops (for instance Bishop Gregory Khomyshyn and Bishop Josaphat Kotsylovskyj) later died from maltreatment in prison. Still more, when Archbishop Slipyj's or other bishops' term expired, the Reds would not release them from prison.

In the autumn of 1947, the Communists murdered Bishop Theodore Romza, Uzhorod, Carpathian Ukraine, and in 1950, the Bishops Paul Gojdich, OSBM, and Basil Hopko, Pryashiv, Czechoslovakia, were imprisoned. On January 15, 1951, Bishop Paul Gojdich was tried and unjustly condemned to forced labor for life. Bishop Basil Hopko is now in a concentration camp.

Altogether 10 Ukrainian Catholic bishops have been liquidated by the Reds.

In 1946, the Soviets enjoined the legal continuance of the Ukrainian Catholic Church in Ukraine. Thus, in our own 20th century,

it has been reduced to the sorrowful plight of the Church of the Catacombs, as was the primitive church during the Neronian persecution.

Two thousand secular priests and monks, for rightfully refusing to acknowledge the Patriarch of the Russian Orthodox Church as their head—this church is now subservient to the Communists—were arrested and deported to slave-labor camps. The Reds exterminated all 5 dioceses of the Ukrainian Catholic Church, desecrated 4,440 of its churches and chapels together with 195 religious houses. The Communists continue to oppress mercilessly the Ukrainian laity for remaining steadfast to its Christian heritage, church, and faith.

AUGUST 23, 1955.

His Excellency, the Most Reverend CONSTANTINE BOHACHEVSKY, STD,
Archbishop, Ukrainian Greek Catholic Diocese, Philadelphia, Pa.

DEAR ARCHBISHOP BOHACHEVSKY: With a sense of fraternal charity and devotion I join in spirit with you and Bishop Senyshyn and with your clergy and laity of the exarchate as, on September 5, you commemorate the coming of the true faith to the Ukraine 1,000 years ago.

I shall deem it a duty and a joy to unite with you in prayers of thanksgiving for the blessings of these 1,000 years and in imploring the merciful God to pour out the comfort of His grace upon our sorely afflicted brethren in the homeland.

With friendliest wishes, I remain, dear Archbishop Bohachevsky,

Very sincerely yours,

PARKE L. LEACH,
Bishop of Harrisburg.

TOLEDO, OHIO, *September 3, 1955.*

Most Rev. AMBROSE SENYSHYN,
Stamford, Conn.

DEAR BISHOP SENYSHYN: On the occasion of the 1,000th anniversary of the conversion of St. Olga, Princess of Ukraine, to the one truth faith, I should like to unite with you, Archbishop Bohachevsky, D. D., and all the faithful of the Ukrainian Catholics of the United States of America in commemorating the historical event with a solemn Mass of Thanksgiving.

Through the intercession of this noble Saint may our Heavenly Father, according to His infinite wisdom, bring every consolation into the lives of those people behind the Iron Curtain who are suffering physical and mental torture for their unswerving fidelity to Him and His eternal truth.

Fraternally yours in Christ,

Most Rev. GEORGE J. REHRING, *Std.*,
Bishop of Toledo.

ARCHDIOCESE OF LOS ANGELES,
Los Angeles, Calif., August 17, 1955.

His Excellency, Most Rev. AMBROSE SENYSHYN, O. S. B. M.,
Auxiliary Bishop, Vicar General, Ukrainian Catholic Exarchate, U. S. A., Stamford, Conn.

MY DEAR BISHOP SENYSHYN: I am very happy to learn that you and your devoted Ukrainian people will, on September 5, in Stamford, Conn., commemorate the anniversary of St. Olga, Princess of Ukraine.

I am confident that this recognition of the saintly princess will bring much stimulus to the faith and zeal of your people, and shall be happy to join with them in our supplications on that day.

With sentiments of esteem and respect to your beloved self, I am,

Faithfully yours in Christ,

J. QUORUM MCENSIGN,
Archbishop of Los Angeles.

DIOCESE OF COLUMBUS,
Columbus, Ohio, August 15, 1955.

His Excellency the Most Reverend
CONSTANTINE BOHACHEVSKY,
Philadelphia, Pa.

MY DEAR ARCHBISHOP BOHACHEVSKY: It is with great rejoicing and a feeling of profound gratitude to the Eternal Father in heaven that I join with you and your brother Ukrainian Catholics in observing the memorable anniversary of the baptism of Saint Olga and the beginnings of faith among her heroic people.

The faith of Christ which has perdured for 1,000 years among the Ukrainian people has been an inspiration to the Catholic world and an impetus to the church in Eastern Europe. In these days when they are undergoing a persecution excelling the terror of the Roman emperors the glory of martyrdom is being added to the diadem which crowns their loyalty to Christ. We fervently pray for their deliverance but, at the same time, and admiration of their love for the crucified Savior reaches sublime heights as we witness their unfailing steadfastness in the faith. Certainly, they are examples, dying and living again in Christ, to their brethren in free America.

With sentiments of esteem and joy on the occasion of this anniversary.

Devotedly in Christ,

MICHAEL J. READY,
Bishop of Columbus.

DIOCESE OF ALTOONA,
Altoona, Pa., August 15, 1955.

Most Rev. AMBROSE SENYSHYN, O. S. B. M.,
Auxiliary Bishop, Vicar General, Ukrainian Catholic Exarchate, U. S. A., Chairman, Anniversary Committee, Stamford, Conn.

YOUR EXCELLENCY: I am delighted to learn that the Ukrainian Catholics of the United States will observe this significant anniversary of the baptism of St. Olga, Princess of Ukraine.

May the freedom which they possess here in this country, and which is denied their fellow Catholics in the land of their origin, make them more faithful in the exercises of their religious duties, and may God, through the powerful intercession of St. Olga, grant to the suffering people of Ukraine a new day of liberty.

Sincerely yours in Christ.

R. FINEFAGLE,
Bishop of Altoona.

[From the Ukrainian Bulletin, New York, N. Y., of June 1–15, 1956]

RUSSIAN ORTHODOX GUESTS—EXPONENTS OF STALIN'S "RELIGION"

The Reverend Dr. Eugene Carson Blake, president of the National Council of Churches, announced a few weeks ago that his organization will be host to a nine-man delegation of "Christian leaders" of the Soviet Union to arrive early in June. It is said that their visit is in return for Reverend Blake's own visit to the U. S. S. R. last March.

The nine-man group includes Metropolitan Nikolai (Krutitsky), right-hand man of Patriarch Alexei; Archpriest Konstantine Ruzhnitsky; Archpriest Michael Slavnitsky; Prof. Vladimir Talizin; Archbishop Jan Kiivit of Estonia; Archbishop Gustav Turs of Latvia; Prof. Ararat Saakovich Garivian, of Armenian Orthodox Church; Rev. Alexei Karpov, Evangelical Christian Baptists, and Rev. Alexei Andreev.

Independent of this group, there is already in the United States a five-man group of Russian Baptists, including Rev. J. Zhidkov, president of the All-Union Council of Evangelical Christian Baptists; Nikolai Levindanto, vice president; Alexander Karev, general secretary; Ilya Ivanov, treasurer, and Klaudia Tyrtova—all from the same council.

SPURIOUS RUSSIAN ORTHODOX CHURCH

When all other Russian delegations arrive in this country, it is taken for granted that they represent the Soviet Government and its communist and totalitarian philosophy. In the case of this religious delegation, however, there is danger that far-reaching and misleading confusion may develop in the minds of the uninformed among us as to the true religious situation in the Soviet Union.

Ever since 1941, when Stalin deemed it opportune to suspend systematic religious persecution in order to win the Western Allies to his side, much has been said and written on alleged religious freedom within the Soviet slave empire. There is no need to dwell here upon the basic orientation of Soviet Russian philosophy as enunciated by Lenin toward religion, as it is well known. It has never been repudiated by the present collective leadership.

Although article 124 of the Soviet constitution states that "freedom of religious worship and freedom of antireligious propaganda is recognized for all citizens," Article 122 of the Soviet Penal Code, says:

"The teaching of religious doctrine to children and minors in public and private educational institutes and in schools, or violation of the dispositions respecting the same, [is punishable by correctional labor for 1 year]."—(Matter in brackets added.—Editor.)

Article 126 of the same code goes even farther:

"The exercise of religious rites in state and social schools and factories, as well as erecting in these institutions or factories of any kind of religious emblems—[are punishable by correctional labor for 3 months]." (Cf. Bolshevism and Religion, by Wladyslaw Kania, pp. 11–12.)

When Stalin allowed the reopening of the Russian Orthodox Church, he picked out leaders who were either Communists at heart, or at least in sympathy with communism and its goal of world conquest. Patriarch Alexei, head of the Russian Orthodox Church, is known for his unqualified loyalty and devotion to Stalin the atheist. He called Stalin "a wise leader selected and appointed by God's providence to lead the Motherland along to prosperity and glory." (Cf. Patriarch Alexei, His Words, Speeches and Messages, Moscow, p. 206.) In Zhurnal Moskovskoi Patriarkhii, No. 1, p. 2, 1950, Alexei said of Stalin: "[Our holy church has in him a faithful protector]." (Matter in brackets ours—Editor.)

In like manner, the Soviet Government supported Patriarch Alexei and his church. He occupies the enormous building of the former German Embassy in Moscow, and receives 50,000 rubles a month (compare that with the 2,000–4,000 rubles of a qualified worker's wage.—Editor). He has received many decorations and medals from Stalin for his services to the Communist Party. Since the cold war began, Patriarch Alexei has organized powerful propaganda channels throughout the entire world; he organized, supported, and directed various "peace congresses"; protested against "United States bacteriological warfare" in Korea; attacked the NATO and SEATO systems, and in general, has tooted the Kremlin line, using for this purpose his connections with church groups in the satellite and neutral areas.

DESTRUCTION OF CHRISTIANITY IN UKRAINE BY MOSCOW

This history of the Russian Orthodox Church, as manifested in its activities in non-Russian areas, is exceedingly sad and un-Christian. That church in the time of the Czars was a powerful instrument of Russification and oppression of non-Orthodox populations. Now, under Communist Com-

missars it has become a tool of Bolshevik machinations. The Russian Orthodox Church never forgot nor forgave the Union of the Ukrainian Greek Catholic Church with Rome in 1596, and in its imperious big-brother spirit of "Be my brother or I'll slay you" has acted accordingly. Religious persecution and genocide were integral parts of the Russification programs launched by Peter the Great, Catherine the Great, and Czar Nicholas I. This program was merely perfected by Stalin and his able pupils, Khrushchev, Bulganin, and Molotov.

The Soviet Government's record of religious persecution in Ukraine dates back to the early twenties. However, the all-out genocidal attack on the Ukrainian Authocephalous Orthodox Church took place in the period 1926–1932 and this led to a total annihilation of church organization in Ukraine. Our well-meaning, but politically unsophisticated, hosts of these Russian "Christian leaders" would do a great service for the peace of the world by confronting them with certain pertinent questions. Some which might be asked are:

Where were these Stalin-appointed "Christian leaders," when Stalin and his bloodthirsty NKVD and MVD were liquidating the Ukrainian Autocephalous Orthodox Church on a mass scale? What happened to the four metropolitans of the Ukrainian Autocephalous Orthodox Church—Mykola Boretsky, who disappeared in 1937, and Vasyl Lypkivsky, Ivan Pavlovsky, and O. Vzovenevsky—all of whom were arrested and done away with in 1938? What became of 3,000 Ukrainian Orthodox priests and 34 Ukrainian bishops and archbishops, as well as thousands of lay and monastic clergy arrested by Stalin, the faithful protector?

It might also be pointed out to the visiting church leaders and especially to Metropolitan Nikolai Krutitsky that Prof. Ernst Tallgren (Forced Labor in Soviet Russia, by David J. Dallin and Boris Nicolaevsky) has stated that the most numerous of the political prisoners in the slave labor camps are "Ukrainian farmers, Catholics, and members of the Ukrainian Orthodox Church."

PATRIARCH ALEXEI LED ATTACK ON UKRAINIAN CATHOLICS

In 1945, when Soviet troops occupied western Ukraine, Patriarch Alexei spearheaded a Kremlin-inspired drive to liquidate the Ukrainian Catholic Church. He invited the Ukrainian Catholics to apostatize, using language hitherto unknown in any church: "Where is the Vatican leading you at this present time, by the Pope's addresses at Christmas and at the New Year? To complicity with the abetters of Fascism and to mercy toward Hitler, the greatest scoundrel the world has ever seen." (Cf. Martyrdom in Ukraine, by Walter Dushnyck, the America Press, p. 23.)

On April 11, 1945, the NKVD launched a brutal attack upon the Ukrainian Catholic hierarchy, which included the arrest and trial of 10 Ukrainian Catholic bishops. Out of 3,600 Ukrainian Catholic priests at least 50 percent were arrested, tried, and executed or deported to slave labor camps; many went into hiding while only a small minority succumbed to pressure and accepted the imposed "orthodoxy."

Patriarch Alexei gave an ultimatum to the Ukrainian priests after ordering the arrest of their hierarchy to "break, tear the bonds which bind you to the Vatican." Immediately the Soviet Government, by an official note signed by P. Khotchanko, representative of the Council of People's Commissars for the Affairs of the Russian Orthodox Church on the Council of People's Commissars of the Ukrainian SSR, took oppressive measures. An appeal of 300 Ukrainian Catholic priests to Molotov sent on July 5, 1945, was totally ignored.

The hierarchy went down the path of martyrdom without breaking their ancestral faith or betraying their own people. They included: Metropolitan Joseph Slipy, Bishops Kotsylovsky, Khomyshyn, Budka, Lakota, Latyshevsky, Charnetsky. Some of them were sentenced for collaboration, and some found death in accidents, like Bishop Romzha, of Carpatho-Ukraine; some were kidnaped, like Msgr. Peter Verhun, Apostolic Visitator in Germany, Msgr. Augustine Voloshyn, President of Carpatho-Ukraine, and others.

Thus was the Ukrainian Catholic Church brutally destroyed with the active help and participation of Patriarch Alexei's insidious apparatus, known as the Russian Orthodox Church, supported and financed by the atheistic government of the Kremlin.

On two occasions Pope Pius XII issued special encyclicals, Orientales Omnes (December 23, 1945) and Orientales Ecclesias (December 15, 1952) in defense of the persecuted Ukrainian Catholic Church, which has since come to be known as the "Church of Silence" and the "Church of the Catacombs."

SECRET POLICE-CONTROLLED CHURCH

The National Council of Churches should also be cognizant of the fact that Metropolitan Nikolai Krutitsky has been used by the Kremlin, with his consent and approval, for various international gatherings, where he, behind his ecclesiastical garb, endeavored to promote the political aims of the Soviet Government.

That many Russian Orthodox priests are selected and trained by the MVD is a secret to no one. In 1949 there were rumors that 3,000 agents were trained in the U. S. S. R. and dispatched to the West as ministers of religion. (Cf. Der Kampf des Kommunismus gegen die Religion, by Gary MacEoin, Aschaffenburg, 1952; Communist War on Religion, New York, Devin-Adair, 1951, p. 13.)

Lt. Col. Yuri Rastvorov, who defected from the Soviet secret police in 1954, recently testified before the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee on Communist Infiltration of Churches in the U. S. S. R. He stated that during World War II, when Stalin decided to present an appearance of greater religious freedom, he appointed Maj. Gen. Georgi Karpov of the MVD as the head of the Council of Ministers Committee on Religion in the U. S. S. R. The MVD general's principal task was to see that the Russian Orthodox Church remained completely under secret police control. Rastvorov testified that he knew of two MVD agents who were assigned to enter seminaries as divinity students. "These men," he said, "are now bishops in the Russian Orthodox Church."

Who knows, maybe some of them are in the group invited by the National Council of Churches?

It is gratifying that the number of prominent American leaders who understand the essence of Russian communism and its multiple arms of operation is steadily growing. In our own Congress the resolutions submitted by Senator HUMPHREY, of Minnesota, and Congressman DODD, of Connecticut, on the genocidal persecution of Christianity in Ukraine are aimed to test the supposed reasonableness of the collective leadership, which attributes the horrors of the past to Stalin. The rehabilitation of the Ukrainian Orthodox Church and the Ukrainian Catholic Church would not be posthumous, for they are not dead functionally.

Therefore, the visit of the Russian Christian leaders presents a most appropriate occasion for their responses to questions on the attempted genocide of the church in Ukraine. It is not in the interest of our national security and our moral beliefs to permit uncontested dissemination of regimented misrepresentations on freedom of religious worship and conscience in the Soviet Union, when, as we know well on the basis of irrefutable facts, such do not exist.

Politics in Hells Canyon and What It May Cost the Taxpayers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CRAIG HOSMER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 26, 1956

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, an interesting report has been prepared by Eugene F. Rinta, research director for the Council of State Chambers of Commerce, on the Hells Canyon issue. The report discusses not only the politics currently embroiled in the issue, but accurately shows what the cost of the project would be to the taxpayers of each of the States.

Unfortunately, the report does not include in its State-by-State tabulation of costs the very substantial additional and hidden cost of the Federal project represented by the interest the taxpayers must pay on the money borrowed to build the project. On a 50-year repayment schedule at 2½ percent per year, 125 percent interest would be paid on the gradually diminishing balance of principal.

Elsewhere in today's RECORD, I am discussing the contrasting approach to water-resources development being adopted by the State of California. My hope is that it will be read and compared with the following report on Hells Canyon by Mr. Rinta:

POLITICS IN HELLS CANYON AND WHAT IT MAY COST AMERICAN TAXPAYERS

The majority leadership in Congress seems determined to put through a bill which would add a totally unnecessary burden of one half billion dollars on American taxpayers. The first official move in this direction was made last week by the Senate Interior Committee when it favorably reported S. 1333. This bill, introduced by Senator MORSE, of Oregon, authorizes construction of a Federal hydroelectric project at Hells Canyon in the Snake River between Idaho and Oregon. A similar bill, H. R. 4719, introduced by Representative FROST of Idaho, will be voted on by the House Interior Committee June 26.

Federal construction of this project is unnecessary for the simple reason that the power potential of the Hells Canyon reach of the Snake River is already in process of development with private financing. On August 4, 1955, the Federal Power Commission, acting in accordance with its responsibility under the Federal Water Power Act of 1920, issued a license to the Idaho Power Co. to construct three hydroprojects in the Snake River. Three months later construction workers and equipment were at the site of the first dam to be built and work on it has now been under way over 7 months.

If the Federal Hells Canyon project should be authorized and started, however, the private development would, for practical purposes, have to be stopped. Moreover, the millions of dollars spent and the work done to date would be wasted because the Federal project would be located at a different site than the first dam under the company's plan. There is the probability, too, that the taxpayers would have to bear this loss since the company is proceeding under a duly authorized Federal license.

Since a move is on, nevertheless, to authorize the Federal project, the obvious question is, Why? In considering the question,

account should be taken of these facts from proceedings of the Federal Power Commission on the matter:

1. The decision of the FPC in granting the license to Idaho Power Co. was no hurried action. It was made after lengthy hearings and study and after opponents, as well as proponents, of private development of Hells Canyon had been given ample opportunity to be heard.

2. There is very little difference in the power-producing capacity of the company's three dams and the proposed single Federal dam. The dependable capacity of the former will be 767,000 kilowatts as compared to 785,000 kilowatts for the Federal dam. The Federal project, however, would cost a quarter billion dollars more than the three-dam project.

3. The FPC found that other benefits, such as flood control, navigation, and recreation, "could be effectuated to about the same extent under either the private or Federal plan of development." The Commission noted, however, that under private development these benefits "will be realized without expense to the United States."

4. The Commission concluded that the private company's three-dam project "is best adapted to a comprehensive plan" for developing the Snake River in the Hells Canyon area. It also stated its judgment that "the United States itself should not undertake the development of the water resources of the Hells Canyon reach of the Snake River."

THE POLITICAL ANGLES IN THE HELLS CANYON BILLS

It is clear from the findings of the FPC that the power needs of the Pacific Northwest will be served sooner and just as well by the company's plan as by the proposed Federal project. The main difference is that the Federal project requires involuntary financing by all taxpayers while the private project is being financed by investors. A second difference is that the private project will help finance Government to the tune of almost $10 million a year in taxes.

What, then, is the reason for the present effort to substitute the Federal project for private development at Hells Canyon? The only apparent logical reason is that its supporters believe it will serve a political purpose. Here are some of the political angles in connection with it:

1. The 2 bills being actively considered in the Senate and the House were introduced by 2 Members of Congress who have campaigned in the past and continue to campaign on the basis of putting through a Federal Hells Canyon bill.

2. The granting of the license to the Idaho Power Co. has been termed by some administration opponents as a "giveaway" by the administration; and this charge is being made in spite of the fact that it was a unanimous decision by a bipartisan commission. Nevertheless, some politicians seem to think political hay can be made from the charge, not taking into account, of course, the fact that they open themselves to the charge of taking away money from taxpayers of all the States for an unnecessary purpose.

3. The Federal Hells Canyon project was included in Senate Majority Leader LYNDON JOHNSON'S 13-point program "from the heart" which he announced last November as the legislative objectives of his party in 1956.

4. Representative CHENOWETH, Republican, of Colorado, who has previously opposed the Federal project, informed the press June 11 that he had made a deal with House Speaker RAYBURN to get the Hells Canyon bill out of the House Interior Committee, of which he is a member. By his agreeing to vote for the bill, or abstain from voting, the deadlock in the committee would be broken. In return for this action, he said, Speaker RAYBURN agreed to use his influence to get the $156 million Fryingpan-Arkansas bill cleared for House action. This Colorado project, incidentally, was also included in Senator JOHNSON'S 13-point program.

WHAT THE FEDERAL PROJECT WOULD COST EACH STATE

So that taxpayers of each of the States can see how much money will be taken unnecessarily out of their States to finance the Federal Hells Canyon project if it is approved by Congress, the table below allocates its cost to the States on the basis of their respective shares of the present Federal tax burden. The $508.3 million total cost consists of $356.8 million for project construction, $22 million for interest during construction, and $129.5 million for transmission facilities.

	Percent of Federal tax burden borne by the States	Cost of project to the States
Alabama	0.91	$4,625,530
Arizona	.42	2,134,860
Arkansas	.46	2,338,180
California	9.29	47,221,070
Colorado	1.14	5,794,620
Connecticut	1.88	9,556,040
Delaware	.52	2,643,160
Florida	1.62	8,234,460
Georgia	1.34	6,811,220
Idaho	.25	1,270,750
Illinois	7.59	38,579,970
Indiana	2.41	12,250,030
Iowa	1.26	6,404,580
Kansas	.98	4,981,340
Kentucky	.99	5,032,170
Louisiana	1.10	5,591,300
Maine	.37	1,880,710
Maryland	2.19	11,131,770
Massachusetts	3.24	16,468,920
Michigan	5.66	28,769,780
Minnesota	1.70	8,641,100
Mississippi	.45	2,287,350
Missouri	2.47	12,555,010
Montana	.30	1,524,900
Nebraska	.74	3,761,420
Nevada	.17	864,110
New Hampshire	.27	1,372,410
New Jersey	3.71	18,857,930
New Mexico	.30	1,524,900
New York	14.95	75,990,850
North Carolina	1.41	7,167,030
North Dakota	.19	965,770
Ohio	6.26	31,819,580
Oklahoma	1.02	5,184,660
Oregon	.93	4,727,190
Pennsylvania	7.12	36,190,960
Rhode Island	.52	2,643,160
South Carolina	.62	3,151,460
South Dakota	.23	1,169,090
Tennessee	1.17	5,947,110
Texas	4.22	21,450,260
Utah	.33	1,677,390
Vermont	.15	762,450
Virginia	1.49	7,573,670
Washington	1.60	8,132,800
West Virginia	.66	3,354,780
Wisconsin	2.00	10,166,000
Wyoming	.15	762,450
District of Columbia, Hawaii, Alaska, etc	1.25	6,353,750
Total	100.00	[1] 508,300,000

[1] Estimate as submitted by a representative of the Department of Interior to the Senate Interior Committee during its hearings on the bill.

New History of the Democratic Party

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN LESINSKI, JR.
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 27, 1956

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, no chapter of the history of the Democratic Party glows with greater brilliance than the chapters which record the ideals and the leadership of President Franklin D. Roosevelt.

The fifth part of the New History of the Democratic Party was carried in the April issue of the Democratic Digest and is entitled "F. D. R. Leads America to New Frontiers." I ask unanimous consent that this further chapter in this great political story be included in the Appendix of the RECORD.

I should like to point out in particular the first paragraph of the article, in which we are told of how in 1921, when the Republicans took over our Government they brought in high-priced publicity men to dress up their schemes to benefit favored interests. We have seen the same thing, only in the modern garb of TV, and high-pressure advertising, occur in 1952 and the succeeding years. How long do the Republicans feel they can continue to hide the truth of their actions behind the high-powered pitchmen of Madison Avenue advertising agencies.

F. D. R. LEADS AMERICA TO NEW FRONTIERS: FROM NORMALCY TO THE NEW DEAL—PART 5 OF A NEW HISTORY OF THE DEMOCRATIC PARTY

When the Republicans took over the National Government in 1921, back into control came the men representing the same groups that were the favored interests of Hamilton's day. They moved more carefully now. They hired high-priced publicity men to dress up their schemes in fine-sounding slogans like "normalcy" and "rugged individualism." Instead of openly opposing laws which regulated big business in the public interest, they sabotaged their administration.

But the results were the same: The tariff went up; speculation and credit schemes increased, creating an illusion of prosperity. There was a series of scandals and a long farm depression. Then the whole economy came toppling down in the greatest depression in history.

Deprived of Wilson's leadership, Democrats became confused once again. The party became tangled up in the prohibition issue. But although the party lost three consecutive elections, some victories were achieved. Led by Senator Thomas Walsh, of Montana, Democrats in Congress exposed the corruption of Teapot Dome, a plot to rob the people of hundreds of millions in oil reserves. These were the years of bitter struggle for farm-relief legislation. Though the McNary-Haugen farm bill was vetoed by Coolidge, and again by Hoover, and though the farm program which was written into law in 1929 was an inadequate stopgap, the champions of farm parity in this period laid solid groundwork for the constructive measures for agricultural recovery which came in the New Deal years.

One of the Democratic leaders of this time deserves special mention. His career shows how, in the Democratic Party, men from the humblest beginnings have been able to make important contributions to good government. Al Smith was an orphan boy. He grew up in a tenement house in New York's lower East Side, where lived Irish, Italians, Poles, and other new Americans. Al Smith never had a formal education. But he had a deeper understanding of the common people, of which he was surely one, than any leader of the time. He started in politics at the bottom: poll watching for his ward organization. Through native brilliance and hard effort, he worked his way through every level of government to become four times the governor of New York. In his administrations were nurtured many of the programs later to be adopted on a national scale. Nominated for President by the Democratic Convention of 1928, Smith was beaten in a cam-

paign in which religious bigotry was callously exploited for political advantage. But, like Bryan before him, he had awakened a new spirit which was to contribute enormously to the party's future success.

What ultimately brought victory, setting the stage for the longest continuous period of Democratic government the Nation had seen, was (1) the inability of the Republican Hoover administration to deal with the great depression, and (2), the Democratic response to that challenge. Volumes have been written trying to explain the causes of the national catastrophe which struck the country in 1929 and deepened through the next 3 years. But whatever the cause, the Republicans had no cure. Trapped by their own philosophy of negative government, they waited vainly for the stricken business community to right itself. At the depth of the depression, unemployment stood at 14 million persons. Wages were down 60 percent, business income down 50 percent. One of every four farms was bankrupt, and two-thirds of the Nation's banks were closed. Without jobs, often without food, millions saw their savings disappear and their years of work and education go for nothing.

In this crisis, the people turned once again to the Democratic Party. They elected as President, Franklin Delano Roosevelt who had pledged them a New Deal and fresh opportunity in their economic life. From that day and for the next 20 years, under Roosevelt and later under Harry S. Truman, the Democratic Party worked to make good on these promises. The story of the Democratic Party durng these years is partly the story of how a party helped a country convert economic disaster into unparalleled prosperity, partly the story of how a great leader turned the country away from isolationism to undertake tasks which made it the foremost Nation in world affairs.

Few need to be reminded of Franklin D. Roosevelt. The confident smile, the jauntily-tilted cigarette holder, the magnetic personality are deeply etched into the American memory. Roosevelt combined Jefferson's philosophy and Jackson's courage with Wilson's ability to tap the moral reserves of the people.

When he took office, Roosevelt frankly surveyed the desperate conditions about him, but he did not despair. "The only thing we have to fear," he said, "is fear itself." He regarded the crisis as an opportunity for a modern application of Jefferson's faith in the people and the pioneers' faith in themselves. He said:

"These unhappy times call for plans that build from the bottom up instead of from the top down * * * that put their faith once more in the forgotten man at the bottom of the economic pyramid * * * I, for one, do not believe that the era of the pioneer is at an end; I only believe that the area for pioneering has changed. The period of geographical pioneering is largely finished. But, my friends, the period of social pioneering is only at its beginning. And make no mistake about it—the same qualities of heroism and faith and vision that were required to bring the forces of nature into subjection will be required—in even greater measure—to bring under proper control the forces of modern society."

With these words, the Roosevelt administration set in motion a program that reached to every major source of economic distress.

In retrospect, the speed and the orderliness of the New Deal achievements seem almost equally as remarkable as their magnitude. These features of the Roosevelt leadership are emblazoned on the record of F. D. R.'s first 100 days.

In that relatively brief period, the main structure of the New Deal was built. All of that was done without any semblance of Executive dictation. Measures were submitted to the full test of unfettered debate in Congress and the other public forums. Action resulted not from the cracking of Executive or legislative whips, but from general recognition that the proposals constituted urgently needed reforms. This represented Executive leadership and governmental teamwork in their finest sense.

From the White House came a series of Presidential messages dealing with emergency banking legislation, economy in Government, repeal of prohibition, agricultural and unemployment relief, a new farm program, safeguards on stock-market trading, mortgage relief, railroad coordination, Government reorganization, industrial recovery, world disarmament, and other major questions.

From Congress came legislative enactments which set the Nation on the highroad to recovery and expansion—the Emergency Banking Act, Agricultural Adjustment Act, Civilian Conservation Corps, National Recovery Administration, Public Works Administration, Securities and Exchange Act, Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, Home Owners Loan Corporation, Tennessee Valley Authority, and the Farm Credit Act, among others.

None of these programs passed without opposition. Roosevelt's New Deal was accused of subverting the American system of free enterprise. Actually, it was designed to save it. The New Deal was based on a concept it took America five depressions to learn: that the roots of free enterprise are in a prosperity that is broadly shared by all elements of the population. The soundness of these programs show up in the fact that, 25 years later, they are an accepted part of American life.

At the same time that it combatted the depression, the Democratic New Deal had vision enough to make longer range plans for the prosperity of the country. America's soil and forests had become depleted through reckless use. A large-scale conservation program was instituted, so that Americans in the future could have the full benefit of this natural wealth.

The potentialities of another resource, water power, had long been neglected. But in programs like the Tennessee Valley Authority, it was used to bring the comforts of modern civilization to people who had never seen an electric light.

Under President Truman's leadership, the major New Deal programs were broadened and extended. The fight against monopoly was stepped up, and slum clearance projects were started to give decent housing to those whom large-city life had crowded together. At the end of 20 Democratic years, the Nation could look with pride at this record:

	1932	1952
Unemployment	14 million	1.9 million.
National income	$87.8 billion	$289.5 billion.
National product	$110 billion	$328 billion.
Worker's weekly paycheck.	$17	$65.
Net farm income	$1.9 billion	$14.1 billion.
Corporation income (after tax).	$3.4 billion (minus).	$18.3 billion.

In 1954 and 1955, the Nation had particular reason to recall with gratitude the constructive work that was done under the New Deal and Fair Deal. President Eisenhower, in his economic report to Congress in 1955, spoke with gratification of economic safeguards which had been erected since the last depression, giving the Federal Government means which had been instrumental in enabling this Nation to ride out the recession of 1953–54. The bulwarks to which he referred included 17 measures—all of New Deal-Fair Deal origin. But, of course, Mr. Eisenhower did not mention either the New Deal or the Fair Deal, or their architects, in pointing with pride to the Federal Government's greater capacity to deal with abrupt swings in the business cycle.

The Nation had occasion to recall Roosevelt's first hundred days somewhat earlier—on April 29, 1953—when the first hundred days of the Eisenhower administration came to an end. It is doubtful if there is one instance of Eisenhower initiative in that period which will be remembered. If anything is remembered, it will be Eisenhower's irresolution in those days—an attitude which is a continuing feature of his administration.

The contrast between Presidents has been preserved in the comments of independent observers, whose appraisals reflect the responsible opinion of the two different periods. For example, on April 30, 1933, the New York Times said:

"The solution of one difficulty after another has been so steadily adopted by the President as now to seem almost his fixed policy. * * * Mr. Roosevelt's courage and resourcefulness and versatility in pressing one high matter after another upon the attention of the Congress are as admirable as they are unprecedented."

On April 17, 1953, Walter Lippmann, sizing up the Eisenhower administration's record in its first 3 months, said: "There is a rather general feeling in Washington that the administration has not yet shown the leadership, direction, and purpose which the country expected and the times require."

As was the case in the times of Roosevelt and Truman, world unrest and a revolutionary system of terror and tyranny were casting threatening shadows when Dwight Eisenhower took office. In the records of his two Democratic predecessors is etched the type of Presidential leadership which strengthens the Nation during a time of crisis, and prepares it for the greater tasks that lie ahead.

The Trend Toward Ignorance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 27, 1956

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following column of Mr. George Sokolsky's which appeared in the Washington Post and Times Herald on Wednesday, June 27, 1956:

THESE DAYS

(By George Sokolsky)

THE TREND TOWARD IGNORANCE

As we approach the election of a President, how much do we really know about the business of our Government? This question is not asked facetiously; it is a realistic response to the difficult problem of getting at the facts. For instance, at this moment of writing, I hear over the radio that Nasser of Egypt is considering a billion dollar loan from Soviet Russia. What are all the factors which brought about the complete failure of American policy in the Middle East?

It is possible to get at some data, particularly by reading British newspapers and noting the debate in parliament, but the data is inadequate. Too much is hidden.

James S. Pope, executive editor of the Louisville Courier-Journal, made this point:

"To me the most insidious and dangerous thing about this fight for freedom of information is that it goes on day after day. It accumulated to such an extent we could hardly grapple with it. I think one of the most valuable things the newspapermen of this country could do, or the committee of

Congress could do, would be to try to understand why this basic right, of all basic rights, is so disregarded and permitted to slip away from us. I am inclined to think it actually might be more dangerous to vote out of ignorance than not to have the right to vote at all."

Unfortunately our people have become accustomed to voting for a glamorous personality rather than over issues. There has been no realistic debate over domestic issues or the foreign policy since the 1932 campaign, which is very far off.

The fact of the matter is that the American people are not being adequately informed by their Government. Things leak out and the reporters and columnists dig out items, but officially there is too much secrecy for our good, and were it not for a few congressional committees and the occasional off-the-cuff remarks at the press conferences of the President and the Secretary of State which give leads to what has been suppressed, we would indeed be in an informational blackout.

One of the major difficulties is that we are in the shadow of war and officials tend to make use of that to label items as secret which cannot reasonably be regarded as secret. J. R. Wiggins, executive editor of the Washington Post and Times Herald, testifying before a congressional committee, gives this example:

"An example of classification of material not really classifiable, under Executive Order 10501, in our opinion, was the Gen. Matthew Ridgway letter of June 27 (1955). This was classified as 'confidential,' but in explaining the classification at his press conference, the Secretary of Defense said it was withheld because it might be misunderstood if published at the time of the Geneva Conference. We have not found in the definition of the 'confidential' category any mention of matter that might be misunderstood. That the Secretary has thought this appropriate classification gives us some unease about the standards that the Defense Establishment may be applying generally."

Here was an item suppressed for obviously political reasons. But what of the American people? Are they not entitled to know what is going on, why our taxes are so high, and why the expenditures do not achieve the desired results?

We have recently witnessed the spectacle of generals and admirals and members of the Cabinet appearing before a Senate committee and announcing to all the world with some detail that the Russians are beating us in the armament race. On this subject there should be a free debate during the forthcoming election and the facts should come out. Undoubtedly the Russians know what the facts are and perhaps will publish them in Pravda.

Mutual Security Act of 1956

SPEECH

OF

HON. EDMUND P. RADWAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 7, 1956

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H. R. 11356) to amend further the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended, and for other purposes.

Mr. RADWAN. Mr. Chairman, I want to join with the other members of my committee and the many Members of the House who are taking this opportunity to pay tribute to our retiring chairman, JAMES RICHARDS.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a unanimous consent request?

Mr. RADWAN. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all Members of the House may extend their remarks in praise of the chairman at any point in the RECORD they may desire.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. RADWAN. Mr. Chairman, it is said that some men are born great, that some achieve greatness, and that some have greatness thrust upon them. I am not prepared to say which of these categories would apply to JIM RICHARDS, but I think we can all agree that when the gavel falls for adjournment of the present session, this legislative body will have lost the services of a great man. It has been my good fortune and privilege to have served with Chairman RICHARDS on the House Foreign Affairs Committee and to have received the benefit of his fine leadership. My best wishes go with him as he leaves us for greener pastures.

Mr. Chairman, it is because I hold JIM RICHARDS, our illustrious committee chairman, in such high esteem, that it is all the more difficult for me to disagree with him at this time. Yet I was among those who, in committee, supported President Eisenhower's original request, and I want to lend my support at this time to the Hays amendment which would restore a substantial portion of the cut made by our committee. JIM RICHARDS would be the last person to expect one of his colleagues to act contrary to his firm legislative convictions.

I have always believed in the wisdom of our mutual-security program. I most firmly believe today that this program has been a success from its inception under a Democratic President, to its present state of development under a Republican President. I mention this, Mr. Chairman, because I recognize no partisanship in the field of international affairs. That is why it had my sincere support under a Democratic President just as a great number of Democrats now support it under the leadership of President Eisenhower. I have accepted this program because it coincides with my firm convictions. Even if it did not, I think I could still do so on faith. I speak of my faith in the leadership of the United States of America, and that leadership today is President Eisenhower. As that great American and distinguished Democrat, the illustrious Speaker of this House, Mr. SAM RAYBURN, has pointed out, we have only one President of the United States. He is the voice of America, or we have no voice in the world.

This program is essential to our national security and well-being as a nation and could be justified solely on the basis of our own self-interest. If this program were a part of our defense budget, no Member here today would vote against it. Yet, who can deny that it is just as essential to the defense of this country as are the dollars which we have appropriated for defense this year? It is an absolute fact that the money which we include here for foreign military aid represents a present and future saving in our defense budget. It could just as well be appropriated under the heading of defense. At the present time, we have only 2 divisions in Korea, compared with 6 a few years ago. Why? Simply because the Koreans themselves now have some 20 divisions in the field thanks to our aid and help.

It is as simple at that. It costs us far, far less to equip a Korean soldier in Korea, or a Turkish soldier in Turkey, to hold the line against Soviet communism, than it does to wrench an American boy from his family, and send him off to some foreign land, at the end of a supply line thousands of miles long. The foreign military aid requested by this administration would support about 200 divisions in the armies of our cooperating allies. That is many times the strength of the American Army. Yet those who would cut that request of President Eisenhower today, are the very ones who express great fear that our defense budget is being too drastically curtailed. The fact is that if we were to eliminate $2 billion in foreign military aid this year, our defense budget would have to go up at least $6 billion. You cannot "rob Peter to pay Paul". Neither can those who expres fear that our foreign military aid program is too large, and that our defense appropriations are too small, blow out of both sides of their mouths at the same time.

President Eisenhower is not only our present Commander in Chief, but he led us to victory in the greatest war in history. I do not follow him slavishly when I suggest that his recommendations are entitled to great weight.

There is no lessening in world tension. Everyone agrees that we must remain strong to survive. We are alarmed that some of our European friends feel that the Soviet military threat has ended. Yet there are those who would encourage them in that belief by cutting down the military program for Europe to the point where it cannot operate.

The $600 million which Representative HAYS would restore to this bill by his amendment is a lot of money, by any standard. But measure it against the productiveness of this Nation and our faith that it will survive and flourish. That sum is only fifteen one-hundredths of 1 percent of our gross national production. And we do not offer it in a world-destroying war. We are asked to appropriate it as a deterrent to war. On that basis alone, it is justified. Add to this, the overseas markets we create for our own products, with resultant prosperity in our own land, and add to this the strength we provide to those underdeveloped nations which would otherwise fall prey to Russian communism, and the arguments against the President's recommendations must fall.

The peace of the world and the welfare of those peoples allied with us in an effort to resist the aims of world communism cannot be measured in dollars and cents.

In brief gentlemen, passage of the Hays amendment is essential to the future security of our country.

Why Not Permit an Unbiased Commission of Nine Members To Appraise the Progress and Direction of the Nuclear Electric Power Program of the United States?

SPEECH
OF
HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 27, 1956

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, for many weeks the Congressional Joint Committee on Atomic Energy has listened to numerous witnesses comment on S. 2625, introduced by Senator GORE of Tennessee, which would direct the Atomic Energy Commission to construct six nuclear plants for industrial or commercial use in selected geographical regions.

As a result of the hearings on S. 2625 there has developed three definite trends of thought. One group feels that unless we accelerate our nuclear powerplant program we will lose the nuclear kilowatt race with Russia; another group is of the opinion the present program of the Atomic Energy Commission is in keeping with the development of the art; while the third group contends that the construction of six nuclear industrial and commercial powerplants would destroy the incentive of American industry in the nuclear field where millions of dollars have already been obligated.

Even though S. 2625 has been modified in many ways by the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy there still remains in the minds of many that the most logical approach in determining the progress and direction of the nuclear electric power program in the United States is through the appointment of a nonpartisan Commission on Nuclear Power. The Commission, after a thorough study, would make suitable recommendations as to where we stand as a nation in the kilowatt race with Russia and whether a crash program as now being advocated and costing millions of dollars is necessary.

Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Congressional Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, I have attended most of the hearings and I find myself greatly disturbed as to charges and countercharges regardless of their sincerity. It appears that everyone is groping for the right answer and that unbiased, nonpartisan, expert guidance is the need of the hour. It is for that reason that I have introduced the following joint resolution which would create a commission of nine persons all experts in one or more fields of nuclear science, engineering, economics, and electric utilities.

It will be the duty of this Commission, after a thorough study of the state of the art of electric power generation from nuclear sources in the United States and such other countries as the Commission may deem appropriate, to recommend, if any, revisions of the present nuclear power program of the United States and suggest legislation deemed necessary as a result of its study.

The joint resolution is as follows:

Joint resolution to establish a Commission to appraise the progress and direction of the nuclear electric power program of the United States of America

Whereas the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 declares it to be the policy of the United States that the development, use and control of atomic energy shall be directed so as to make the maximum contribution to the general welfare; and

Whereas the possibility of developing economically competitive generation of electric power from nuclear sources gives promise of making a major contribution to the general welfare of the United States and to the promotion of world peace; and

Whereas questions have been raised whether the present direction and progress of the nuclear power program of the United States are appropriate and adequate to the rapid achievement of these goals: Be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

(1) That there be appointed a Commission on Nuclear Power consisting of 9 members of which 3 shall be appointed by the President, 3 shall be appointed by the President of the Senate, and 3 shall be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

(2) That members of such Commission shall be chosen for their expertness in one or more of the fields of nuclear science, engineering, economics and electric utilities. They shall serve without compensation but shall be reimbursed for travel and other expenses.

(3) That the Commission shall study and report to the Congress not later than January 1, 1957, with respect to—

(a) the present state of the art of electric power generation from nuclear sources in the United States, and such other countries as the Commission may deem appropriate;

(b) the present state of the economics of conventional electric power generation in the United States and such other countries as the Commission may deem appropriate;

(c) its recommendations, if any, for revision of the present nuclear electric power program of the United States and for whatever legislation it deems necessary as the result of its study.

(4) The Commission is empowered to appoint such experts, consultants, technicians, and clerical and stenographic assistants as it deems necesary and advisable. No member of the Commission or individual in its employ shall be permitted to have access to restricted data unless and until the requirements of section 145 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 shall have been fulfilled with regard to such member or individual. The Commission is authorized to utilize the services, information (including restricted data subject to the requirements of the preceding sentence), facilities, and personnel of the departments and establishment of the Government.

(5) Vacancies in the membership of the Commission shall not affect the power of the remaining members to execute the functions of the Commission, and shall be filled in the same manner as in the case of the original selection. The Commission shall select a chairman and a vice chairman from among its members.

(6) The Commission, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to (a) hold such hearings, (b) sit and act at such places and times, (c) require, by subpena or otherwise, the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, (d) administer such oaths, (e) take such testimony, (f) procure such printing and binding, and (g) make such expenditures, as it deems advisable.

(7) The expenses of the Commission, which shall not exceed $_____, shall be paid one-half from the contingent fund of the Senate and one-half from the contingent fund of the House of Representatives upon vouchers signed by the chairman of the Commission. Disbursements to pay such expenses shall be made by the Secretary of the Senate out of the contingent fund of the Senate, such contingent fund to be reimbursed from the contingent fund of the House of Representatives in the amount of one-half of the disbursements so made.

Clover for the Kremlin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 27, 1956

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following column written by Mr. Joseph Alsop which appeared in the Washington Post and Times Herald on Wednesday, June 27, 1956:

MATTER OF FACT
(By Joseph Alsop)
CLOVER FOR THE KREMLIN

The more you study the Middle Eastern crisis, the more you suspect that the essential preliminary of the Soviet intrusion in the Middle East was the famous summit meeting at Geneva, with all its adman's hopes and glories.

Tentative discussions of the crucial Soviet-Egyptian arms deal had, of course, been opened in the month or two before the summit. Yet before boldly probing for the very vitals of the Western alliance, the Soviet leaders must at least have wished to know how the West would react. They got the answer at the summit.

The President of the United States and the Prime Ministers of Great Britain and France went to Geneva with the singular purpose of proving that the great powers of the West were passionately, unshakably dedicated to peace at any price. There was no better way to encourage the Soviets to take any cold war risk they chose.

In addition, it is now known that President Eisenhower actually mentioned the Soviet offer to sell arms to Egypt, to Bulganin and Khrushchev. According to authentic report, the President was airily told that this was "just an ordinary commercial transaction." Apparently this piece of arrant nonsense was not treated with the contempt and indignation it deserved. So the Soviet leaders left Geneva with complete assurance that they could safely stick a shiv right into the most vulnerable point of the Western Alliance.

Even then, energetic action might well have prevented the worst from happening. Egypt's President Gamal Abdel Nasser had asked for a small quantity of American arms long before he began his talks with the Soviets His sole concern was then to get some arms—any arms at all—to satisfy the army on which his power depended. All competent observers in Cairo agree that Nasser did not foresee the volume results that the Soviet arms deal would produce.

On this point, the American Government had received a long series of frantic warnings from our Ambassador to Cairo, Henry A. Byroade (who is now apparently to be made a scapegoat). These warnings were ignored.

The American arms were withheld. The Soviet-Egyptian arms deal went through.

Thus Nasser emerged as the predominant figure in a greatly strengthened Arab nationalist movement, made independent of the West by Soviet support. Thus the Soviets took the first long step toward capturing Arab nationalism, and using this nationalist movement as the instrument to strike at the vital Middle Eastern oil sources of the Western Alliance.

The American reaction to these tremendous developments was uncertain, to say the least. After the fall of Glubb Pasha in Jordan, however, the British reaction was violent. The British Cabinet decided that Britain would use troops in the Middle East, if this were needed to save the oil that is Britain's lifeblood.

Wisely or unwisely, they proved their resolution by ordering the fight for Cyprus.

Such was the situation when Bulganin and Khrushchev went to London. It can now be revealed that British Prime Minister Sir Anthony Eden and Foreign Minister Selwyn Lloyd used the strongest tone possible in their discussion of the Middle Eastern problem. They flatly accused the Soviets of an intentional attack on an area of vital British interest. They warned they would fight to avoid losing the oil. Khrushchev and Bulganin only replied by hinting that they might agree to limitation of arms shipments to the Middle East if the British would abandon the Baghdad Pact—which they knew was impossible.

The upshot was deadlock. In Cairo and Damascus, the Soviet ambassadors subsequently told the utterly false story that the main theme of Khrushchev and Bulganin in London was the Soviet bloc's determination to give solid support to the Arabs against the Israelis. This was hardly less than an incitement to Arab-Israeli war. If the Kremlin chooses to take that risk, such a war will be a clear gain for the Soviets if the Israelis are defeated, for that will amount to the defeat of the West. And it will also be a clear gain if the Arabs are defeated, for then the Arab nationalist regimes will almost surely be supplanted in the end by Arab Communist regimes.

All the same, in his recent visit to Cairo, the new Soviet Foreign Minister, Shepilov, did not take the final step to bring on an Arab-Israeli war. He did not take the Arab position on Israel's proper frontiers. Shepilov's caution suggests that British firmness, despite its somewhat desperate tone, has made the Soviets at least think twice about the risks in the Middle East. And this in turn suggests that a firm, clear and united Anglo-American policy, if it can ever be worked out, may yet save the day in this critical area.

Writing to Legislators

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON CANFIELD
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 20, 1956

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, the Greater Paterson Chamber of Commerce, of Paterson, N. J., has recently begun the publication of a monthly bulletin with news editorials and advertisements designed to keep its membership appraised of the chamber's programs and opportunities. In the current issue of the bulletin there appears on the editorial page a guide for communicating with legislators and other Government officials issued by the Greater Boston Chamber of Commerce. This guide appears under the caption "Writing to Legislators," and reads as follows:

WRITING TO LEGISLATORS

Chamber of commerce members are frequently asked to make their views known to their legislators, and sometimes businessmen wish to do so without being asked. A guide for communicating with legislators and other Government officials has been issued by the Greater Boston Chamber of Commerce, and we think it worth repeating here:

Don't look down on government and politics: They have their faults but so has business. A disdainful attitude is an expensive luxury these days.

Be understanding: Put yourself in a legislator's place. Try to understand his problems, his outlook, and his aims.

Be friendly: Don't contact your legislator only when you want his vote. Invite him to visit your place of business. Take pains to keep in touch with him throughout the year.

Be reasonable: Recognize that there are legitimate differences of opinion. Never indulge in threats nor recriminations. These are confessions of your own weakness.

Be thoughtful: Commend the right things which your legislator does. That's the way you'd like to be treated.

Don't be a busybody: Legislators don't like to be pestered or scolded or preached to. Neither do you.

Be cooperative: If a legislator or Government official makes a reasonable request, try to comply with it. Don't back away for fear it's a deal or that you're getting into politics.

Be realistic: Remember that most controversial legislation is the result of compromise. It always has been so and it always will be so in a democracy. Don't expect that everything will go your way, and don't be too critical when it doesn't.

Present accurate facts and good arguments: The mere fact that you want or do not want a piece of legislation to go through isn't enough. Present the best case that you can, without unnecessary words.

Give credit where it is due: If an issue goes the way you wanted, remember that legislators always deserve first credit, for their votes decided the issue. Remember, also, that on all the big issues, many organizations and individuals participated on your side.

Learn to evaluate the issues: The introduction of a legislative bill doesn't mean that it will become law. It usually is a long process. Whether you're for or against a bill, take the time to learn the who, what, and why of it, and don't get excited until you have learned. And don't use a cannon to kill a fly. An absurd bill generally kills itself, and it's not wise to attract too much attention to it.

Support your legislator actively: Don't become aloof at the time when he needs help the most, if he is deserving of election.

Bunker Hill Monument Address by Rear Adm. Bartholomew W. Hogan, Medical Corps, United States Navy, Surgeon General of the Navy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 27, 1956

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I include the Bunker Hill, Mass., address made on June 18, 1956, at Charlestown, Boston, Mass., by Rear Adm. Bartholomew W. Hogan, Medical Corps, United States Navy, Surgeon General of the United States Navy.

This address was made by Admiral Hogan on the occasion of the celebration which took place this year on the anniversary of the Battle of Bunker Hill.

There is no man better qualified to have been the orator on such an occasion than Rear Admiral Hogan as he was born and brought up in Dorchester, Mass., which is in close proximity to Charlestown, and, like Charlestown, is a part of the city of Boston.

The address follows:

Here on glorious Bunker Hill we are commemorating today the 181st anniversary of an event which the great seal of the United States memorializes in two famous words—"Annuit coeptis"—God favored our beginnings. And as surely as that half of our national inscription is true, so surely also is its other half true of the Battle of Bunker Hill, that it was the first beginning of the new order of the ages.

Paradoxically, the event we are commemorating was an American defeat, if viewed on the military level. Due chiefly to the exhaustion of their ammunition, the embryonic American forces were here compelled to retreat. But what that bloody hour and a half on this very hillside brought into view of the embattled Boston militia—their mettle and stamina in standing up undaunted to the superior armaments of regular and seasoned troops, their unshakeable will to defend their freedom against any and all forces of oppression—that was indeed a triumph in whose effulgence was effaced the last slightest shadow of the military defeat. And so true is this claim of a triumph that Washington, when informed of the action on this hillside, and told of the gallantry with which our militia had withstood the first two double-column assaults of the British, foresaw at once the final outcome of our revolt clearly enough to announce: "Then the liberties of the country are safe."

About what precisely were they quarreling here on that bygone Saturday in June 1775? Was it an affair, as the great Webster asserted on this spot in 1843, when we were celebrating the completion of this magnificent memorial—was it an affair without "any just cause"? Was it simply, as in the next breath he added, that both combatants merely "wished a battle and wished it at once"? Was it no more than their itch of pugnacity, as I might say, that impelled them to "Cry havoc. And let slip the dogs of war"? Was that, in the words of Webster, "the true secret of the movements on this hill"? As he then told his auditors, he was speaking entirely from a military point of view. This hill, he was saying, in other words, had absolutely no strategical value at the time for either side.

Even when thus understood, they are baffling words; and to me, as both a doctor and military man, they are doubly confusing. Nothing so favors a sick person as a strong will to live. Nothing is so fatal to a soldier as the loss of morale. And so to me, as it ever has been and shall ever be, the true secret of the movements on this hill that glorious June 17 was the staggering blow it struck, first of all, to the spirit and morale of England. For months after that glorious 17th, British journals and magazines were venting their dismay over the astonishing fact that our citizen forefathers had here slaughtered more Redcoats in an hour and a half than the land forces of England, then the best in the world, had seen fall previously in any one engagement, not excluding their greatest—as for example, the cap-

ture of Quebec. And in the same grand measure, secondly, the movements on this hill that memorable afternoon steeled our morale and consolidated the Colonists anew in their noble determination.

"The threats of pain and ruin to despise,
To scatter plenty o'er a smiling land,
And read their history in a nation's eyes."

I grant you that these two results I have just mentioned were not the cause of the Bunker Hill engagement, but the consequences of it. What I am denying, and trust I have also disproved, is the assertion that the true secret of the movements on this hill was a mere itchiness to fight. Unless I have misread entirely the history of those early years, the true secret of the movements on this hill was the gage of steel then thrown by our forefathers to their arrogant overlords across the sea. Its true secret was the Declaration of Independence here made a full year in advance of July 1776. In brief, and in the vivid language of Shakespeare, the true secret was the forthright manly way in which our forefathers here told the world, that they were no longer going to pay tax or servile respect to anybody for wearing their own noses.

We may now return to our former question—what was it they were quarreling about on this hillside? Most heartily I accept Mr. Webster's eulogy of our American Revolution, when he said of it, at the cornerstone-laying of this monument in 1825, that it was "the prodigy of modern times, and at once the wonder and the blessing of the world." That prodigy, that wonder and God-given blessing, commenced here at Bunker Hill. So our question actually asks—what stake were we fighting for in our prodigious revolution? We all know perfectly the answer—the right of men to govern themselves. Or, in other terms, the right of men to their due enjoyment of social justice.

What must be here emphasized, because it is of supreme moment, is the order in this whole business. First the men—which of course means the family—father, mother, and children. For it is not the individual, the bachelor, it is the family that is the cell of civil society. Next, their rights—rights, you will notice, that they derive immediately from one source alone—the superlative fact and title that men are human beings—that they are persons—and were never intended to ask other human beings for permission to wear their own noses. Then, in the last place, and there in that place only, the government that these families freely choose for themselves. We may now reply to our question by saying, that we fought our revolution for the right of each human being to be properly free in the whole orbit of that universal order in which a loving Creator had placed each and every human creature.

Here we touch on one of the most significant issues of our day: The real, true, essential meaning of democracy. It is this living issue that will engage us during the remainder of this address—which I here promise you will not be too long.

I am not going to waste your time and mine in pointing out how widespread and various in our world of today is the disease that the late Henry Adams called the degradation of the democratic dogma. Rather I will get at once to our consideration of this dogma. And the best beginning, as we all admit, is a definition.

President Eisenhower, in his inaugural address, gave us his understanding of democracy in the following words: "It is our faith in the deathless dignity of man, governed by eternal moral and natural laws. This faith," he said, "defines our full view of life." If we reduce this to its elements, we are left with three factors—man, society, and their mutual relation. And again allow me to insist on your noticing the order. This view, this ideal, did it produce the democratic form of government? Or did the form of government produce the ideal, the view? Our whole future depends on the answer. And the answer—mark you—is one, and can be only one. For it is the answer of the eternal law. And the answer of the moral law. And the answer of the natural law. That answer has been graven ineffaceably into the very fiber and texture of your being. For it is also the answer of reason, it is the ideal, the view, that brings into existence the form of government. And any so-called government that goes counter to this ideal, this view, or dares to set aside the corollaries of the ideal, or the view, that travesty is a degradation of the democratic dogma.

Our ideal, our full view of life, was long since explained to us in language which is as precise as it is moving, and as profound in its meaning and import as it is familiar and dear to our hearts:

"We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. That to secure these rights, governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed."

We should not have time here to develop all the doctrine that is implied in this second paragraph of the Declaration. Into our Declaration of Independence, as one commentator said, shortly after it was published, Jefferson "poured the soul of a continent." In 1823, when Jefferson was 80 years of age, he wrote his good friend, "Light Horse Harry" Lee, that his manifesto "was intended to be an expression of the American mind." Much as this soul and this mind deserve our study, the present forbids us to pause for it a moment. But I should like to submit to your consideration three conclusions that follow immediately from our great manifesto and charter.

First. The terse quotation from it that I have just read you contains in germ or seedwise, everything essential to an effective democracy. It is a compact blueprint for the democratic form of society.

I am not making this boast simply because the manifesto is an American document. The boast would be just as true, and we in turn would acknowledge the sagacity of the manifesto just as completely, had it been formulated in France, or Spain, or Italy. As a matter of historic fact, the ideas our Declaration of Independence summarizes did not originate in our country, nor were they even elaborated by us. They testify to the slowly accumulated wisdom of man, garnered in the course of many centuries of thought, reflection, and experience, to which harvest many civilizations have contributed a share. But the everlasting glory of America—her greatest in my judgment—is that she was the first to bring these generous concepts and enfranchisements down out of the ivory tower of philosophical speculation—to proclaim abroad that they are relevant and even necessary to the forum of practical living—and to make them the bedrock of a giant nation. On July 4th, 1776, when the Declaration was adopted, postriders carried the news to all of the 13 colonies. Each rider carried also a copy of a letter from John Hancock, the President of the Congress. You can read there what I have just said—that the articles of the Declaration were to be "The ground and foundation of a future government."

Second. Our great manifesto or charter is primarily a view of man and society and their mutual relationships.

The three self-evident truths it enunciates relate exclusively to man. He is created, it says, on a footing of basic equality with his fellow man. He is endowed by his Creator, it continues, with certain rights, of which he cannot dispossess himself nor be dispossessed of by others. Among these and preeminently so, the Declaration concludes, are man's right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

Having thus delineated man by some of his judicial attributes, the manifesto then turns to society. Civil society, it tells us, is a voluntary association of men equally created and equally endowed juridically, who have come together for the purpose, first, of securing these rights, and as a consequence and secondly, of prospering through their enjoyment of them, who ceased being just a crowd and became a society by their own free grant to their elected officers of the moral power to govern them—which we call authority. This is what our Founding Fathers meant by their declaration, that governments derive their just power from the consent of the governed.

They well knew the multiple inequalities by which one man has more, or less, than another. They were not concerned with this petty disparity, but with that paramount equality and essential parity by which each man is the equal of another and of every other. Also, they well knew from history how often and how completely man had been despoiled of these rights, even as their own experience under the crown told them directly what their reading had indirectly taught them. As well, then, as any Wordsworth, they had "reason to lament what man has made of man." And therefore, the more reason for asserting as they did, that these rights are integral and intestine to man, being rooted in and royally anointed by his nature. In other words, the Declaration of Independence says of man and his rights just what Christ said of man and his wife—"What God hath joined together, let not man put asunder."

We come now to the third conclusion we have drawn from our Declaration of Independence. Before entering upon its consideration, however, I must first prepare the way for it. For I am afraid it would be quite a surprise to many of our day, to be told of our Founding Fathers, that they were decidedly religious minded men. Yet, they were. About 5 years ago, a scholarly work on the church and state in the United States was brought out in 3 large volumes of 3,000 pages. Its author, Anson Phelps Stokes, was once the secretary of Yale University and also canon of the Washington Cathedral. It took 12 years of research and study to complete this history of church and state. The following quotation will serve, I trust, to predispose you properly for our third consideration: "Much less recognized, but equally clear, is the conviction of the founders of the vital importance of religion to the new nation. I expected, before I began this study, to find this true as far as President Washington and some of his associates. But I have been surprised at the mass of evidence to support the claims of religion in a republic as expressed by men like Thomas Jefferson and Benjamin Franklin, who have often been classed as freethinkers—the founders saw clearly and definitely that, without religion, a democratic government could not succeed. If men are all, as the Declaration of Independence stated, "created equal" and "endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights," the maintenance of communion with that Creator, which is the heart of religion, would seem both logical and vital."

Nothing could be truer. Happily it anticipates our third conclusion, that the Declaration of Independence set the foundations of democracy unmistakably on man as a being with religious responsibilities. Let us glance at this in detail.

Democracy, in its final analysis, is based on two axiomatic truths—human equality and human inherent rights. In formulating these truths into its articles, the declaration describes them as "self-evident" truths. What reason does the declaration give us for

accepting these truths as self-evident? One only, and it is this: That human equality and human inherent rights are the handwork and effects of the mind and will of the Creator. The Creator creates men equal. The Creator endows them with certain rights. Men are this because God made them such. Immediately it follows, then, by an imperative of reason, that God had a purpose in this work of His. If a purpose, then also an end. So the conclusion confronts us immediately—if God has established for man an end, toward which his justice expects man to tend throughout his entire life, then man must be free to seek that end. Which necessity was as clear to God in creating man as it is to us now in discussing it. Accordingly, God himself implanted in man an inalienable right to be free. The inference from this, which our Founding Fathers saw with almost inspired lucidity, might be expressed as follows: If the citizens of this Republic should ever become oblivious to their duties to their Creator, it must follow, as night does the day, that in still greater measure they will become oblivious also to their duties to their country. And that can mean only one thing—that our heroic experiment in government of the people, by the people, for the people must straightway and ingloriously perish from the earth.

I might now bring this part of your ceremony to its conclusion. I can think of no better way of doing so, nor do I know a note on which I might close half so appropriate to this occasion, as the following tribute to our illustrious forefathers of Bunker Hill, which was delivered to them 4 months after the battle, in the British House of Commons:

"To a mind who loves to contemplate—the glorious spirit of freedom—no spectacle can be more affecting than the action of Bunker Hill. To see an irregular peasantry, commanded by a physician, inferior in number, opposed by every circumstance of cannon and bombs that could terrify timid minds, calmly wait the attack of the gallant Howe, leading on the best troops in the world with an excellent train of artillery, and twice repulsing those very troops who had often chased the chosen battalions of France, and at last retiring for want of ammunition, but in so respectable a manner that they were not even pursued, who can reflect on such scenes and not adore the Constitution of Government which could breed such heroic men."

Iceland's Disaffection

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 27, 1956

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial which appeared in the Washington Post and Times Herald on Wednesday, June 27, 1956:

ICELAND'S DISAFFECTION

Iceland's election is a reminder of the great difficulty of attaining security through an alliance. In 1949 Iceland adhered to the North Atlantic Treaty, and in 1951 she felt sufficiently insecure to authorize the construction of a great NATO airbase at Keflavik. In the interest of protecting Iceland as well as the United States, this country has spent $150 million on that base. Now the people of Iceland have returned to the Althing a majority of members representing parties that want the United States to withdraw its Armed Forces from that country. Even though a complete withdrawal may not be demanded, the vote is undoubtedly a blow to the cause of security in the Atlantic community.

Unlike the Soviet Union's relations with its satellites, NATO is a voluntary association of nations. State Department spokesmen have already indicated that the United States will withdraw its troops from Iceland if it is so requested. The result would be, however, to leave Iceland dangerously exposed and all of the free world less secure. It is difficult to believe that free Icelanders will carry their protest against the American base to the extent of destroying the only means of defense they have.

On the other hand, it is unmistakably clear that changes will have to be made if Iceland is to remain a valuable ally in the NATO system. The construction of an enormous air base in a country with only about 160,000 inhabitants has strained its economy, caused inflation, created labor shortages, and given the people a feeling of excessive American influence in the handling of their affairs. Aside from this, Britain's long controversy with Iceland over fishing rights brought the Soviet Union into the position of best customer for Iceland fish. Moscow's repudiation of Stalinism has also had its effect. In other words, the United States and Britain have taken Iceland too much for granted while the Soviet Union has been wooing her ardently.

The incident throws new emphasis upon the tightening of cultural and economic as well as political and military ties among the NATO countries. It is up to the United States to find out in detail the causes of Iceland's dissatisfaction over the operation of a NATO base on its shores, and, so far as possible, to remove those causes. Grievances on the part of one ally are almost certain to spread, unless corrected. NATO must not be permitted to fall apart at the seams for want of understanding of our allies or for want of the cement of economic and cultural cooperation.

Education Aid Bill May Fail

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SID SIMPSON
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 27, 1956

Mr. SIMPSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Macomb (Ill.) Daily Journal of June 19, 1956:

EDUCATION AID BILL MAY FAIL

Odds are increasing that the proposal for Federal aid to education will not be adopted at this session of Congress. Time is becoming an important factor.

Merit or lack of merit should decide whether proposed legislation is adopted or defeated. None should be left to the chance of being caught in the logjam that comes with the tail end of a legislative session. But to counterbalance the loss of good legislation in such logjams, it is in order to count the gain of the death of bad legislation. The aid proposal comes under the latter heading.

It is now at rest in the House Rules Committee. If reported out, a minimum of 2 weeks will be required for House action. There is a question whether the Senate would have time to act in the remaining 3 or 4 weeks of the session.

Federal aid to education is not only unnecessary and undesirable. It would be grossly unfair to the many States and communities that have assumed additional tax loads to meet their responsibilities to public education. Having obligated themselves to pay for the facilities they need, they would have to contribute to the schools of States and communities that have not met their responsibilities.

It has been demonstrated here at home that adequate schools are more a matter of willingness to pay than ability to pay. The Colchester Unit District has a very low assessed valuation on a per pupils basis, compared to other districts. But the people of the district met their responsibilities. They not only voted bonds for needed construction, they also voted an increase in the tax rate for education so that they could pay their teachers at the going rate.

The promise of Federal aid would retard local effort. If all States and communities knew definitely that they could not expect Federal aid at this or any future session of Congress, they would be looking to their own resources to meet needs.

Aside from unfairness, there is the objection of Federal interference. It has been contended that the Federal Government can hand out school money and still exercise no control over local schools. Maybe it can but would it? If it did it would be the first time. A measure of control always goes hand-in-hand with Federal subsidy.

There is also the matter of waste. There is always a heavy loss of dollars when the Federal Government collects money and distributes it to States and localities.

Daniel Wolsey Voorhees

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CECIL M. HARDEN
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 27, 1956

Mrs. HARDEN. Mr. Speaker, today it was my privilege to participate in a ceremony at the Library of Congress honoring the late Senator Daniel Wolsey Voorhees, of Indiana. The ceremony, and the presentation of a plaque to the Library in honor of the contributions made to the Library by Senator Voorhees, was arranged by my friends and fellow townsmen, the Business and Professional Women's Club of Covington, Ind. Several of the club's officers and members were here for the presentation, and I know you will join with me in bidding them welcome to our Nation's Capital.

Following are my remarks in connection with the ceremony in honor of Senator Voorhees and the inspiring remarks of the Honorable K. M. LECOMPTE, Representative from Iowa, member of the Joint Committee on the Library of Congress:

ADDRESS BY MRS. HARDEN

We have gathered here today to honor the memory of a great son of Indiana, and a great American, who died nearly 60 years ago, but whose works live after him, and nowhere more visibly than in this main building of the Library of Congress. This man is Daniel Wolsey Voorhees, who entered Congress on the day that Abraham Lincoln became President of the United States, and represented Indiana in the House for 9 years, and in the Senate for 20.

A fitting memorial to this statesman has been a long-time dream of my friends and

neighbors, the Business and Professional Women's Club, of Covington, Ind. The great-grandmothers and great-grandfathers of many of them were the friends and neighbors of Daniel Voorhees and his family when he was growing up and when he was entering on his distinguished career.

Daniel Voorhees was born, not in Indiana, but not far from it—in Butler County, Ohio, whose western boundary is the Indiana State line. He was still a mere child when his parents brought him to Fountain County and settled on a farm in Van Buren Township about 10 miles from the county seat, Covington. When he entered college in 1845, he went only some 57 miles southeast of Covington, to Greencastle in Putnam County, where Indiana Asbury University was located, or DePauw, as it is now called. When he entered the office of a law firm for his professional training, he chose the partnership of Lane & Wilson in Crawfordsville, Ind., less than 30 miles east of Covington. In April 1850, well before his 23d birthday, he was ready to hang out his shingle as a young attorney, and he hung it out in Covington, where he practiced for the next 7 years.

By 1857 he was ready for a larger sphere of action and transferred his law office to Terre Haute, some 60 miles south of Covington but, like it, on the left bank of the lovely Wabash River, and still within my Sixth Congressional District. Four years later he went on to Washington, but to us he has always been a Covington man, who left our farm county for the world of larger towns and cities and the stage of national politics.

If we did not forget him, still less did he forget us. All through the 30 years following the Civil War, Daniel Voorhees spoke and acted in the interest of the dirt farmers from whom he sprang—the men who took over from the buffalo and the Indian, cleared the ground, and first brought it under cultivation. During those three decades, the Nation's economic development went forward at an immensely accelerated pace, but it was a one-sided development which vastly enriched certain forms of enterprise, and left the average farmer with little beyond his subsistence. Speaking on tariff reform, Voorhees told the Senate of the United States in March 1890:

"Over 20 million of the present population of the United States, counting all ages and both sexes, are engaged in the cultivation of the soil, and on their productive labor, not only the Government itself leans for support, but also all other classes of citizens derive from the same source their prosperity, their wealth, and, too often, their profuse and criminal luxuries."

The remedies of his time for the inequities that he saw are not our remedies, but he believed with us that a healthy and prosperous agriculture must be at the base of any sound economic structure.

Senator Voorhees' championship of "the farmers and other over-taxed and underpaid laborers of the United States," as he called them, went hand in hand with another kind of advocacy which it does not always, or perhaps even often, accompany. Throughout his career this graduate of a frontier college and of a small-town law office displayed an unsurpassed zeal for the things of the mind. Few practical statesmen of his own or any other day, of his own or any other country, have possessed so clear an understanding of the whole sweep of the civilized tradition, and of the importance of the human mind in social progress. He was a firm supporter of natural science and the increase of human power which it makes possible. But, as he exhorted the literary societies of the University of Missouri in 1874: "No man can properly understand and appreciate the present without correct information of the past. Combine, therefore, as far as possible, the practical and useful ideas of your brilliant age with a full knowledge of the various developments of the human races in other ages and under different circumstances."

It was for this triple purpose—the maintenance of tradition, of scientific progress, and of civilization itself—that he stood out among the statesmen of his day as a friend of the Library of Congress. During his 20 years in the Senate, Daniel Voorhees sought unceasingly to obtain for this Library the physical setting in which its huge potentialities might be realized, as they could not possibly be in the cramped and crowded quarters of the Capitol. The end may well remind us of the Old Testament story: Like Moses, Daniel Voorhees was vouchsafed a sight of the Promised Land, but he might not enter and possess it. In the spring of 1897, this building in which we stand—the new library building—was rapidly nearing completion, and on April 10 the transfer of the special collction present by Dr. Joseph M. Toner, which had been in storage, was begun. On July 24 Congress adjourned, and on the last day of the month the old Capitol Library was closed forever, and the mass transfer of the collections to this building was begun. On November 1, 1897, the new Library of Congress opened for service. Daniel Voorhees could not be there to see it. His health had been failing for several years, and on April 10—the very day on which the transfer of the Toner collection began—he had died at his home, a stone's throw away on Maryland Avenue, and he was buried beside the Wabash in Terre Haute.

Although Senator Voorhees himself could never be in this building, yet his hopes, his aspirations, and his efforts over many years were focussed here, and this building owes its existence in large measure to him. It is only fitting, however, that he should be commemorated here, and we women of Covington have arranged a simple memorial, such as we believe Senator Voorhees himself would have approved, to signify and perpetuate the record of his relationship to this great establishment which has so fully justified his expectations and his dreams. It is my great privilege, on behalf of the Business and Professional Women's Club of Covington, Ind., to dedicate and to present to you, Mr. Librarian, this memorial plaque to Daniel Wolsey Voorhees, which I now unveil.

ADDRESS OF CONGRESSMAN LECOMPTE

Representative HARDEN, Mr. Mumford, Miss Dice, distinguished guests and friends, as a long-time member of the Joint Committee on the Library, I am happy to be given this opportunity to honor a great man of vision, Daniel Woolsey Voorhees. We are indebted to the Business and Professional Women of Covington, Ind., who have afforded us this event as an occasion to remember him.

Indeed, this very building in which we stand is his monument. It was his advocacy, as well as his concept of a national library, to have a separate congressional library building to be located on the grounds of the Capitol, that has had so much to do with this institution's place and standing in the world. Senator Voorhees, more than any other public figure, in 1880, first realized that the American people's library collections would someday exceed the national collections of the older and more populous nations. His was the prediction also that the United States would succeed in its determination to have as complete a repository of human learning and printing as had been known since the beginning of time.

In his endeavors we know how he was assisted by Representatives Reed, of Maine; Cox, of New York; and by his colleagues in the Senate, Senator Timothy Howe, of Wisconsin, Senator Bayard, of Delaware, and one more of very great prominence, Senator Morrill, of Vermont. Much could not have been accomplished, however, had not Senator Voorhees provided the spirit. When he arose in the Senate on May 5, 1880, to sponsor the first important measure for a new library, there were many obstacles to overcome if his idea was to materialize. The congressional collection was a jumble of books and manuscripts, organized like a country store, in the west front of the Capitol. Maps and bulletins were stacked in piles, rather than in files. Every fourth book was shelfless. Another obstacle at that time was the fact that the Congress was undecided as to whether to undertake the expansion of its east front to accommodate its library, or to construct a building to house its collection on Judiciary Square. Even the plans for the design of such a building had varied seemingly between Romanesque, French Renaissance, and the red-brick architecture of the old Pension Building.

There is a picture today which shows a proposed extension of the east front of the Capitol, utilizing turrets, to house the Congressional Library. Fortunately, this was never done. The measure which Senator Voorhees sponsored in 1880 set up a joint select committee, with himself as its chairman, and authorized a commission of three experts to advance plans, designs, and estimates on the feasibility of a new Library building on a new site. The unanimous report of these experts, in substance, led later to the location of the present building and its design along modified Renaissance lines. We find Mr. Voorhees also at the front of those voting for its final creation in 1886, and we can well suppose, as he continued to live in Washington, that he saw and walked in the new building before its completion.

To him, certainly the concept of a great national library was an integral part of a great constitutional government. Senator Voorhees could see that the wealth and store of learning which he knew his Nation must assemble would in the end identify it as a treasure house of truth and information before the world. He knew, as we know, that in this building we would preserve the writings of the past, as well as provide space for the writings of the future. So long as it stands, so long as its collections are for the free access of scholars, there will be liberty in this Nation. The most indestructible thing on earth is a book. It may be burned or disappear, but its ideas and hopes invariably live beyond it.

A philosopher has said: "Some men have only one book in them; others a library." We see now how applicable this phrase is to Senator Voorhees, and we pay him tribute for his vision, fortitude and work in establishing the Library of Congress.

A National Lottery

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL A. FINO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 27, 1956

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, I read with keen interest John O'Donnell's column in the June 22 issue of the New York Daily News. I am happy to learn that Mr. O'Donnell agrees with me that what this country needs is a good national lottery.

As the Members of this Congress well know, for the past 4 years I have urged the enactment of my bills for the creation of a national lottery. I have recommended this type of legislation as the best means of cutting taxes, reducing

our national debt, and balancing the budget.

Because of my long-standing interest in the establishment of a national lottery, which would enrich our Government coffers to the tune of $10 billion, I have placed a discharge petition on the Speaker's desk on my bill, H. R. 6626.

The realization of a tax cut—as much as $250 a year per person—for the American people lies within the power of this Congress. If the Members will have the courage to banish hypocrisy, we will have opened the door to a lucrative industry. At present, every other country and gamblers are the recipients and beneficiaries of these funds.

This O'Donnell column makes very interesting reading. I urge every Member of this Congress to take time out and digest a few words of wisdom:

CAPITOL STUFF

(By John O'Donnell)

WASHINGTON, June 21.—The Mother of Parliaments, Britain's House of Commons, has just given birth to a perfectly swell legislative child (how to make taxpaying fun and exciting) and we recommend the procedure to our Congress.

Furthermore we challenge the masterminds of our Republican and Democratic Parties when they gather in national convention 2 months hence to think up a more painless method of black-jacking the taxpayer than has been legally accomplished by our overseas cousins.

What the British have done is to run a government lottery. It has all the attraction of the Irish Sweepstakes. It is honest and we should pick up the idea. The correct British term is "premium bonds." The plan works this way: A Briton slaps down 1 pound ($2.80) for his bond. He gets no interest on it, but after holding it 6 months, he qualifies for the lottery draw.

Starting next June there will be monthly drawings by the government and the prize money will be awarded to the holders of lucky numbers. These monthly prizes will total, initially $28,000. The top lucky monthly winner gets 1,000 pounds ($2,800). There are 2 other prizes of 500 pounds ($1,400); 4 of 250 pounds ($700); 10 of 100 pounds ($280); 20 of 50 pounds ($140), and 200 of 25 pounds ($70).

Basically the present British lottery (beg pardon, premium bonds) idea, differs not at all from our own ancient American lottery plan as practiced in lustier days of our republic.

Our first Postmaster General, wise old Benjamin Franklin, set up and ran a successful lottery in Philadelphia to raise funds for constructing artillery defenses against the French and Spanish naval marauders off the Capes and up into Delaware Bay.

The current British idea ran head-on into some religious opposition but weathered the storm. The Archbishop of Canterbury disapproved of the idea—and he lost.

THE PROCEEDINGS ARE ENLIGHTENING

When the same propsal comes up in a future United States Congress, as we hope it does, it may be profitable for Members of House and Senate to read the proceedings in Commons as reported in Hansard (Britain's version of the United States CONGRESSIONAL RECORD) during the June 18 debate—when the lottery idea won, 232–176.

In the Commons debate, distinguished members from Oxford and Cambridge, both Conservative and Labor, found themsleves on opposing sides of the issue. We imagine the same Ivy League battle might take place on Capitol Hill, when and if our Congress gave a legal O. K. to the Treasury to sell $10 or $25 Government bonds to our populace with the inducement that every month the lucky numbers would be pulled out of the hat.

If we ever get into that happy fight, we hope and pray that the educated boys on Capitol Hill will point out that the idea of getting money by lotteries was enthusiastically practiced for profit by Harvard, Yale, Princeton, Dartmouth, Brown, and Kings College in New York long before it changed its name to Columbia.

The interesting feature of the British lottery victory was the personalities and arguments of the leading debaters. Against the lottery bonds and backing up the Archbishop of Canterbury was Laborite James MacColl, distinguished barrister and graduate of Balliol, Oxford.

HE LEARNED ABOUT GAMBLING IN CHICAGO

MacColl pursued his higher education in the University of Chicago during the Capone era and is against gambling, lotteries and above all the exposure of innocent children to the temptation of lucky bond buying by putting bond advertising posters in schools. Furthermore, he was shocked by the fact that his old college friend, Financial Secretary Henry Brooke, who once taught logic at Oxford, could now be so illogical as to put into the official record such "nonsense as to say that a premium bond is not a lottery."

Whereupon Brooke rose in defense of the bond proposal and tartly observed that it was his great regret that he had not the opportunity at Balliol of tutoring the honorable member more thoroughly in logic. Then the argument moved into the attitude of the Catholic Church toward gambling, juvenile delinquency, and bingo (over there it's called bob-a-time).

At any rate, even before passing the bond lottery measure, Commons had legalized "all over Britain bob-a-time sweeps for sport, church and charity."

LOTTERY WILL ATTRACT YANKEE DOLLARS

But it's the British bond lottery which will immediately attract the pounds of American tourists—and their stay-at-home relatives—with the same gambling lure of the Irish Sweepstakes.

Unlike a sweepstakes ticket there is no sudden V-day. Your bond remains in the pool, you can always get your money back and there—natch—is the chance that next month your number will come up. Now a British citizen can buy only 500 of the bonds at a pound ($2.80) each. But an American operation—and we think this is bound to happen—will soon get started, buy the "premium bonds" or lottery tickets through intermediaries and peddle them here to the eager purchasers of sweepstake tickets. They can't be cashed here, but any individual or group can go back to Merrie England and have fun on what he collects.

Well, what are we waiting for? How about one of our national conventions coming up with this idea as a campaign platform? About time we had some fun.

A Bill To Extend the GI Home-Loan Guaranty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANTE B. FASCELL

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 27, 1956

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a bill to extend the GI home-loan-guaranty program. This is the second of such measures that I have introduced. The first proposal, H. R. 10469, was introduced April 12, 1956. The merits of this proposal and the principles set forth therein have been recognized and endorsed by numerous national organizations. They include veterans' groups, labor groups, savings and loan associations, home builders, realtors, and furniture and electrical-appliance manufacturers, wholesalers' and retailers' organizations.

The original intent of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 was to provide a period in which our veterans could rehabilitate themselves. That they have not been completely rehabilitated is evident by the fact that some 11 million of these World War II veterans have not yet been able to avail themselves of their GI entitlement.

In an effort to provide a solution to an extension of this program that will be agreeable to all, I am submitting the following for the immediate consideration of my colleagues:

A bill to amend section 500 of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 to provide an additional period for World War II veterans to obtain guaranteed loans

That (a) subsection (a) of section 500 of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 (38 U. S. C., sec. 694) is amended by striking out "Any loan made by such veteran within 10 years after the termination of the war," and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "Any loan made by such veteran within 11 years after the termination of the war, plus the period determined under the next sentence of this subsection,".

(b) Such subsection is further amended by inserting immediately after the fourth sentence thereof the following new sentence: "The period referred to in the preceding sentence shall equal, in the case of each veteran, 3 months for so much af his active service after September 15, 1940, and before July 26, 1947, as exceeds 6 months and does not exceed 12 months, plus 3 additional months for each 6 months (or fraction thereof) of active service performed by him in excess of 12 months between such dates, but in no event to exceed 24 months; however, if such veteran was discharged or released from active service between such dates under conditions other than dishonorable by reason of an injury or disease incurred in or aggravated by such service in line of duty, then such period shall equal 24 months."

This measure provides for a gradual 3-year termination of the program, as did H. R. 10469. It, however, provides a straight 1-year extension of eligibility to all World War II veterans. Thereafter, during the next 2-year period, it would provide for nine separate stepdowns. However, it allows disabled veterans the benefit of the full 3-year extension. I am advised by the Veterans' Administration that the following would be the effect of this bill for the remaining 2-year period:

First. July 1958 there will be 280,000 eligibles cut off.

Second. October 1958, 670,000 cut off.

Third. January 1959, 805,000 cut off.

Fourth. April 1959, 1,045,000 cut off.

Fifth. July 1959, 1,149,000 cut off.

Sixth. October 1959, 1,595,000 cut off.

Seventh. January 1960, 1,550,000 cut off.

Eighth. April 1960, 860,000 cut off.

Ninth. July 25, 1960, 1,316,000 cut off—including 325,000 disabled veterans.

The Veterans' Administration advises me that it is estimated that there will be 14,178,000 veterans with World War II service only in civilian life as of July 25, 1957, and that 4,912,000 will have made some use of their GI entitlement by that date, leaving 9,266,000 veterans whose entitlement would expire under the exist-

ing law on July 25, 1957, without having used any GI entitlement.

This proposal merits your most serious study and consideration. I am hopeful that my colleagues in the House will join me in calling for immediate consideration of an extension of this all-important program.

Address Delivered by Mr. G. L. Mehta, Ambassador of India, to the Conference on the Forward Look in Technical and Economic Development, Hotel Statler, Washington, D. C., on Tuesday, April 10, 1956

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANTONIO M. FERNANDEZ
OF NEW MEXICO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 27, 1956

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Speaker, on April 10 of this year I had the privilege of listening to a dispassionate, thought-provoking speech by His Excellency, Mr. G. L. Mehta, Ambassador of India, which reveals the character and commendable attitude and aspirations of the people of that great country more clearly than anything I have ever read.

Just now when Congress is in the process of considering aid to India and other Asian countries, an appreciation of India's point of view, which no doubt reflects that of other Asian people, would be, I think, of considerable interest. The Ambassador's speech, which obviously was prepared with great deliberation, certainly was of immense interest to me.

I shall not attempt to summarize it, for the speech in its entirety must be read to be appreciated. I shall merely quote two sentences, and will then include the entire speech in the RECORD. Speaking of economic development programs and of external aid which is appreciated in helping to carry them out, he said at one point in his address:

> Too great dependence on others is as undesirable as it is unworthy. Nations like individuals have to achieve their own salvation.

At another point he said:

> In the last analysis, economic development of a country can only come about through the whole-hearted efforts of its people; external aid can act as a catalyst, can supplement but cannot supplant national effort.

And again:

> It is far more important that such programs should take root and be continuous than that they should be mere showpieces. Above all, these programs should develop the initiative and self-confidence of the people rather than seek to achieve physical targets by manipulation and coercion.

By unanimous consent, I am inserting herewith in the RECORD Mr. Mehta's speech in full:

PLACE OF TECHNICAL COOPERATION IN ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

(Address by Mr. G. L. Mehta)

I am grateful to your organization for inviting me to speak here tonight on the subject of technical assistance and economic development in India. The subject is a vast one, and I can only give, within the limited time at my disposal, a brief account of the problems that face us and the way we are seeking to solve them, partly with the help of generous contributions from some of the more economically advanced countries of the world, but mainly, if you will allow me to say so, through the efforts of our own people.

We in India are experiencing in social and economic spheres a transformation which is in many ways revolutionary, while at the same time orderly, democratic, and largely based on India's cultural heritage. Independence released social forces and national energies for purposive action, almost for the first time in modern Indian history, and their effects have only begun to be felt. New ideas and new forces are at work, social patterns are changing, there is a great spurt of economic activity over the entire country, and a firm resolve to give content and meaning to political independence; all this "sea change" does not, however, imply too violent a change from the past but is being brought about through democratic processes of consultation and consent in which the best of old traditions is sought to be merged with new techniques, in which freedom and initiative are to be reconciled with social justice and equality. In this bold experiment, external assistance from friendly countries is gratefully accepted but so as not to inculcate in our people a psychology of dependence on such assistance. For in the last analysis, economic development of a country can only come about through the wholehearted efforts of its people; external aid can act as a catalyst, can supplement but cannot supplant national effort.

This basic principle is embedded in our development plans, including the technical-assistance programs and community-development projects. Thus out of a total outlay of $4.7 billion, in the first 5-year plan, the finances made available from external sources amounted to $600 million (nearly $500 million from the United States of America), or about 13 percent of the total outlay. Likewise, in a total planned outlay of $200 million on the community-development projects (to which I shall refer later in greater detail), a total of just $12 million (6 percent) was provided by external sources. And this is as it should be, for too great a dependence on others is as undesirable as it is unworthy. Nations, like individuals, have to achieve their own salvation.

Which is also the basic philosophy underlying the various programs of technical cooperation which are referred to as technical-assistance programs. I myself prefer, if I may say so, the term "technical cooperation" to "technical assistance," because programs of this sort should be a two-way operation. It is, and must remain, the responsibility of the recipient countries to initiate requests for assistance, and the speed and effectiveness of the technical-assistance programs depend primarily upon them. Again, it should be a two-way operation in the sense that insofar as such countries can afford it, they must also provide technical assistance and training facilities for other countries similarly situated. In this connection, I should like to state that the development of an extensive technical cooperation program has been a notable achievement of the Colombo plan. There has been an increasing emphasis on the development of training facilities within the Asian countries themselves, which has helped to insure not only a more effective use of the financial resources available but also a deeper understanding of the approaches to economic development. According to the fourth annual report of the Colombo plan, up to the end of June 1955, under the various technical cooperation programs, India secured training facilities abroad for 1,360 candidates and received 734 foreign experts, while 191 Indian technical experts were sent to assist other countries, and 181 foreign nationals were trained in India.

Now, what is this technical assistance of which we hear so much? Technical assistance covers expert advice, training facilities, compilation and dissemination of information, and supply of equipment. As you will appreciate, for underdeveloped countries, the provision of finance alone is not sufficient for development plans to be carried through. Finance is, no doubt, indispensable and yet it does not provide the complete answer. There is a constant need to put available resources to the best possible use; and this postulates the need for experts, technicians, skilled workers in ever larger numbers both for drawing up schemes and for implementing them. Stated simply, whenever a more efficient technique can be substituted for a less efficient one, something is obtained for nothing and this provides, in my view, a good reason for technical aid programs. The acquisition of technical knowledge and skills is, indeed, one of the notable achievements of the first 5-year plan whose period has just ended; and it is even a greater achievement in international cooperation at personal level.

And if I may digress for a moment, I should like to pay tribute to the vision of President Eisenhower's address on December 8, 1953, before the General Assembly of the United Nations in which the atoms-for-peace program was born. Atomic energy is a new and tremendous source of power for a better life, which, if constructively harnessed, offers endless prospects for the nations of the world, and especially the underdeveloped areas for raising the levels of economic activity and standards of living of their people, much more quickly than would be possible under schemes based on the use of conventional power. It is a hopeful sign for the future that efforts are being made by the nations of the world to set up an agency providing for international cooperation in this new field and for the pooling and sharing of raw materials, fissionable materials, and exchange of technical atomic energy information and personnel. It is a matter of gratification that the United States, which is the most advanced country in the field of atomic energy development, is alive to the need for cooperation with other nations in the development of peaceful uses of atomic energy and has already entered into bilateral agreements with a number of countries providing for varying degrees of technical assistance in this new field. We ourselves signed recently with the United States Atomic Energy Commission an agreement providing for the sale to India of heavy water for use in connection with research into and the use of atomic energy for peaceful purposes. Some of our scientists are attending the reactor training school at Argonne and the isotope courses offered at Oak Ridge; others are in Canada and the United Kingdom. As humanity is entering the threshold of an atomic age symbolizing the birth of a new industrial revolution, we may well remember the lessons of history and avoid the pitfalls which led to so much suffering, inequalities, and exploitation in the wake of the first industrial revolution. We should seek, through programs of international cooperation, to utilize this energy as an instrument of common welfare and prevent inequities and imbalance between nations in their use.

The atoms-for-peace program thus also partakes of the nature of technical cooperation programs of which we have been speaking. I may now return to the less spectacular forms of such cooperation. The broad aggregate of outlays on technical cooperation schemes covers a myriad of activities and accomplishments ranging from the reduction of deaths by malaria and other endemic diseases and marked declines in infant mortality to improved strains of agricultural stock and grains and technical advice on such diverse matters as multipurpose irriga-

tion and hydroelectric projects, educational systems, and family planning.

What are the types of technical assistance programs now operating in India? First, there is what has been called in the past point 4 program, now being looked after by the ICA. Under this program the United States provided training facilities for 403 Indian candidates up to the end of June 1955 and nearly 220 American technicians and experts have been working on various projects in India. Then there is the Colombo plan program which was started in 1950 and with the broad features of which most of you, I believe, are familiar. Under the Colombo plan, India has been both receiving and giving technical assistance, once again illustrating the two-way character of these programs. Up to the end of June 1955 326 trainees from other southeastern Asian countries have been undergoing training in subjects such as civil and mechanical engineering, medicine, communications, mining, geology, tobacco, cultivation, flood control, suction-dredging, etc. In addition, 94 nominees of the countries in the region have been given training at the Indian Statistical Institute. Also a total of 12 Indian experts have been provided to Nepal and Ceylon in the fields of banking, irrigation, administration.

There is, again, the U. N. technical assistance program. The number of technicians supplied to India under this program is 402, and training facilities have been obtained for 334. One hundred and ninety-one Indian technicians have been sent to Burma, Indonesia, and other countries and 181 foreign nationals have been trained in India.

And finally, the Indo-United States Technical Cooperation Agreement signed in January 1952 provides for the undertaking of joint projects laying emphasis on agricultural development and in the fields of community development, tube wells, river valley development, fertilizers, and steel for agricultural purposes. I should like to say a few words about the community development project because, being essentially a program for stimulating self-help in rural communities for the all-round improvement of their life, it constitutes an enduring basis for the economic betterment of our people. As Mahatma Gandhi used to say, India lives in her villages—560,000 villages, in which the bulk of the population (80 percent) live. No program which either ignores the village community or does not make adequate provision for their improvement can, therefore, make a real dent on the poverty of the countryside and consequently of the country as a whole.

The revitalization of village life was one of the first tasks of our National Government. And the program was begun on Gandhiji's birthday, October 2, 1952. Roads began to be built, schools, community centers, hospitals, demonstration farms, breeding centers, fruit and vegetable nurseries began to come up. New wells, reconditioning of old wells, paving of village lanes and drains assumed the form of a new mass movement. Men and women, young and old, joined the program in increasing numbers and in the spirit of dedicated service.

Soon, there was a demand for an increase in the number of projects from the 55 the program was started with; but our resources were limited in terms of technical personnel. Therefore, the Government drew up a less intensive program which could be extended more rapidly. This was the national extension service which was designed to provide the essential basic staff and a little finance with which the people could go ahead on the basis of self-help.

According to the latest statistics prepared by the Community Projects Administration, 1,140 community projects and national extension service blocks were allotted throughout India up to February 20, 1956. These covered 124,957 villages and a total population of 81.1 million. Up to the end of September 1955, a total area of 895,000 acres had been reclaimed and 1,557,000 acres brought under irrigation. Substantial progress was also achieved in the fields of education and social education. Twelve thousand new schools were started in various community development areas and 4,359 ordinary schools were converted into the basic type. Thirty thousand adult education centers were functioning at the end of September 1955 and about 605,000 adults had received training. A total of 28,631 miles of roads were constructed, of which 3,361 miles were metaled roads. The people's contribution in cash, kind, or labor to the physical achievements under the community development program during the period October 1952 to September 1955 was of the value of $39,270,000, as against Government expenditure of $65,100,000.

United States assistance to the community development projects has largely been in the shape of machinery for roadbuilding, agricultural demonstration equipment, mobile cinema units for instruction, transport vehicles, and a large variety of other supplies and equipment. A total of $12 million was provided for this purpose against a total planned outlay of roughly $200 million by the Government of India, itself small in budgetary terms relative to the return in the form of general village improvement and restoration of the people's faith in themselves.

A useful yardstick of the success of community development projects and national extension service is the extent of voluntary contributions of the people under the various schemes. The estimated total voluntary contribution of the people in cash, labor, materials, etc., has been nearly half the Government expenditure during the same period. This is the most hopeful sign in programs of national development. For it is far more important that such programs should take root and be continuous than that they should be mere show pieces. Above all, these programs should develop the initiative and self-confidence of the people rather than seek to achieve physical targets by manipulation and coercion.

I do not wish to weary you with the details of other aid projects, but mention must be made of the tube wells program. A tube well irrigates on an average over 400 acres of land and lack of adequate rainfall in many parts of India makes it important that every available water resource be developed for irrigation purposes. Under the Indo-United States joint program, the construction of 3,000 tube wells was undertaken, in addition to 2,000 to be built by the Government from its own resources. A major part of the program has been completed.

This account of the technical cooperation programs operating in India would be incomplete if no mention were made of the programs financed by private organizations like the Ford and Rockefeller Foundations. The total assistance provided and promised by the Ford Foundation is of the order of $11 million and covers a broad range of programs such as the training of personnel for rural development, development of small-scale industry, education, public administration, and research. With a grant from the Ford Foundation, an agency has been formed for evaluating the methods and progress of the rural development program.

A basic feature of all these programs is that they have been integrated into our national plan of development. The responsibility for drawing up programs and formulating schemes rests where it should properly belong, namely on ourselves; and although there is continuous consultation and collaboration between the Government and the foreign agencies concerned, final decisions are made by the Government of India, which not only insures that risks of overlapping and duplication of effort are obviated but also that the programs decided upon are such as to stimulate popular effort, sustain the people's spirit of self-reliance and develop initiative. Perhaps because of this and also thanks to the excellent spirit of comradeship that has developed between the foreign technicians and the local officials and nonofficials engaged on the various projects, the technical cooperation schemes have on the whole worked well and proved effective in promoting economic development.

I may conclude with a few general observations on what has been achieved under our first 5-year plan and on the draft proposals for the second 5-year plan.

The primary object of the first 5-year plan was to lay the foundations on which a more progressive and diversified economy could be built. There were certain urgent problems such as shortages of food and raw materials and persistent inflationary pressures which it had to attend to. But the plan was intended essentially as a preparation for a more rapid advance in the future.

India's economy has responded well to the stimulus of the first plan. Agricultural and industrial production has recorded substantial increases. Prices have attained a reasonable level. The country's external accounts are virtually in balance. Important targets proposed in the first plan have been realized and some of them have, in fact, been exceeded. Some 17 million acres of land have been brought under irrigation in these 5 years and the installed capacity for the generation of power has been increased from 2.3 million kilowatts to 3.5 million kilowatts. Considerable progress has been made with the rehabilitation of railways. A large number of industrial plants both in the public and private sectors have gone into production. The plan has introduced a new dynamic element in conditions which have been stagnant for long. The national income over the last 5 years is estimated to have risen by about 18 percent as against the original expectation of about 11 percent. The development expenditure in the public sector in 1955–56 is over 2½ times the level in 1951–52. Investment in the private sector has also been close to expectations.

The second 5-year plan of which the draft outline was published in February this year, seeks to secure a more rapid growth of the national economy and expand employment opportunities. In the new plan, a total outlay of $10.08 billion has been proposed for investment in the public sector over the next 5-year period. A larger proportion of the resources will be devoted to industrial development than in the first plan. Adequate provision has, however, been made for schemes to augment agricultural production and insure rural development. The plan proposes, for example, an increase of 21 million acres to be brought under irrigation and an increase of 3.3 million kilowatts in electric power capacity. Transport and communications will receive greater attention, being so vital to the development of the economy. The outlay on these projects would amount to 29 percent of the total outlay. The community development program will be further extended so as to cover a population of 325 million—almost the entire rural area—by 1960–61. The main stress, however, is on industrialization. If the power projects are also taken into account as a part of industrial development, the outlay works out to 57 percent. We hope to increase cement production from 4.3 million tons to 10 million tons a year, raise coal production from 37 to 60 million tons, and that of steel from 1.3 to 4.3 million tons by 1960–61. The planning commission believes that as a result of the outlay proposed, the national income would rise in 1960–61 to $28.3 million (22.7 in 1955–56)—a 25-percent increase. Put in another way, the outlay is

expected to produce an increase of 18 percent in the per capita income.

I have endeavored to give you an idea of the magnitude of the problems we face and of the great efforts our people are making to solve them. It is a noble adventure in which I am sure we shall have, as we have had in the past, the understanding and cooperation of all those who value constructive endeavor. We are seeking to build a society of free men and women enjoying the blessings of an economic democracy.

State Sedition Statutes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANTE B. FASCELL
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 27, 1956

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill which would restore to the States authority to enforce their State sedition statutes.

I was privileged to be a member of the Florida State Legislature when that body enacted the Subversive Activities Act in 1953. I supported and voted for this measure because I felt that it was a proper field of legislation for a State. Every State and all the citizens within its borders have a major interest in opposing any activity which is designed to overthrow or destroy our constitutional form of government. Our Florida law makes it a felony for any person to knowingly and willfully participate in any way in such activity and prescribes a fine of not more than $20,000 or imprisonment for not less than 1 year nor more than 20 years, or both. Membership in a subversive organization carries the penalty of not more than $5,000 or imprisonment of not less than 1 year nor more than 5 years, or both. Persons convicted of subversive activities are prohibited from filing for or holding public office or of voting in any election. The attorney general of the State, all prosecuting attorneys, the secretary of state, and all law-enforcement officers of the State have the duty and authority to enforce this law.

As we all know, the recent Supreme Court decision in the Nelson case decreed that because the Congress enacted the Smith Act of 1940, the Internal Security Act of 1950, and the Communist Control Act of 1954, the Federal Government had a dominant interest in the legislative field of sedition which precluded the enforceability of the Pennsylvania Sedition Act, thereby nullifying every State statute dealing with seditious activity. This decision constitutes an unwarranted and unnecessary invasion of the rights of the State of Florida.

I do not believe it was the intent of Congress in enacting legislation dealing with subversive activities, to give to the Federal Government exclusive jurisdiction over the prosecution of those who are engaged in such activity within our country, thereby depriving the States of all authority to enforce their sedition laws.

The Attorney General of the United States states there is no conflict from the standpoint of administering Federal and State law. The United States Attorney General is of the opinion that this dual jurisdiction allows for a beneficial and necessary degree of flexibility in meeting the crises of the present and of the future in the field of subversive activities.

It certainly seems to me that the ever-increasing congestion of the Federal docket would make cooperation and participation in this type of court action on the part of the States not only feasible, but judicious. If court actions on sedition charges can be expedited by means of proper prosecution by a State, the Federal Government which is both the individual State and the Nation, will come that much closer to effectively meting out full justice to those who seek to overthrow or destroy it.

To Amend the Federal Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDITH GREEN
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 27, 1956

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include an editorial from today's New York Times entitled "For Better Injury Pay":

FOR BETTER INJURY PAY

Almost a year ago the Senate passed a bill, by voice vote, designed to remedy a serious inequity in the Federal Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act. The present law follows the widely accepted pattern of most States in providing that those covered by it shall receive compensation equal to about two-thirds of their regular pay while incapacitated by injuries received on the job. It also sets a ceiling on such payments—in this case $35 a week. (The New York State figure is $36.)

The main provision of the Senate bill raises the ceiling to $50. The change would affect over half a million longshoremen and others who handle cargo aboard ships while in port and also most privately employed workers in the District of Columbia and those working overseas for firms with United States Government contracts.

After the bill had gone to the House, the Committee on Education and Labor reported it favorably, but with a $54 ceiling. This was done after thorough consideration and five public hearings at which the arguments, pro and con, were fully aired. In the absence of Government data as to the workers involved, the committee based its ceiling on the official figure for "average wages in manufacturing"—about $80 a week. Two-thirds of this amount would be about $54.

H. R. 10765 went to the Rules Committee almost 2 months ago where it has since lain dormant. It is high time the committee released it for a vote by the House. It should be promptly passed and sent to a conference committee for reconciliation with the Senate bill. In view of the House committee's report $54 would seem to be a more reasonable ceiling than $50 for final, and we hope favorable, congressional action. Such a lead by Congress should be followed by those States in which the ceiling is now lower. Also, the Bureau of Labor Statistics should begin at once to compile, and keep current, the wage data needed for future revisions of these laws.

California Solving Its Own Water Problems

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CRAIG HOSMER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 26, 1956

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, the refreshing sight of Americans handling their local problems at the local level, instead of running to Washington for aid, is being presented in the State of California today.

Not only are the problems of areas within the State being approached via the self-help route, but as well, statewide water problems involving total expenditures which are large even by Federal Government standards.

The following article appearing in today's Christian Science Monitor details California's wholesome actions. I hope it will be compared with data I have placed elsewhere in today's RECORD respecting the Hells Canyon project:

CALIFORNIA IS DIFFERENT

(By Harlan Trott)

SAN FRANCISCO.—The lure of Federal aid to the States is no lure at all to some Californians. To them it is a delusion they are anxious to dispel.

Look at what is happening in southern California's Metropolitan Water District where the people have voted to furnish water to considerable land annexed by the district. The law says that any land so annexed must pay its fair share of taxes to the district, the same as if the land had been in the district since it was formed in 1928.

The newly annexed land has been subjected to $171 million in back taxes which the holders are to pay in installments during the next 30 years. The district will issue bonds in anticipation of collecting this $171 million and use the proceeds to pay for improvements that will bring water to the recently annexed land and better serve all land within this great community undertaking that has contributed so much to all other growth and economic use of the land within its boundaries.

California law governing the MWD (Metropolitan Water District) is very different from the Federal law pertaining to the Tennessee Valley Authority which puts no tax or charge upon the holders of the land benefited by the TVA works. Had the newly annexed land in southern California been adjacent to the TVA region, its holders would not have had to pay that $171 million "admission fee." Instead that tax would have been collected from Federal taxpayers in every State regardless of whether the TVA benefits them.

Vernon Kilpatrick, a member of the California Assembly, has an effective way of stressing why we must adopt a way to pay for these essential and expensive public-works projects that is fair and equitable and just. In weighing how the proposed $1.5 billion Feather River project would be

financed in California, Mr. Kilpatrick points out that among those who would reap the great benefits are the large landholders and speculators who now hold vast acreages which the new project would benefit.

Unless these vast public works are properly and fairly financed, this California legislator warns that speculators will make the cost of a brandnew Cadillac for each and every acre they own, and we'll all be paying for it.

More than 4 million acres have been reclaimed in California under State laws very much like those governing the MWD. This is several times the amount of land reclaimed by the Central Valley project under the Federal Bureau of Reclamation and for which people in all the States are taxed to pay.

The method used to finance the MWD is very similar to the California irrigation districts law. It is the traditional American way, dating back to earliest town-meeting times. It echoes the theme running through the Federalist Essays in which Alexander Hamilton, for example, argued in behalf of the new Constitution that under it the power to tax land values would remain independent and uncontrollable by Congress in the most absolute and unqualified sense. Yet he is usually regarded as the greatest Federalist of them all.

Without a dependable supply of water for farms, orchards, homes, and industry, most of California would still be the empty waste of sagebrush and cactus the early geography books showed it was. But California irrigation districts which function much like public-school districts have used the long traditional ad valorem land tax to reclaim more than 4 million acres of desert.

It would be interesting to find out how much the multibillion Federal highway program will increase the value of land. Some experts, for instance, claim the value of the land benefited by the New York subway construction went up seven times the cost of the subways. The multibillion Federal roads project will be paid by taxing road users of the whole Nation, not the holders of benefited land. Wouldn't it be fairer to share the costs?

May not this kind of Federal aid which relieves property owners from taxation explain why the price of land, especially farmland, is shooting up today while prices of farm crops are declining?

The Metropolitan Water District's current expansion program shows that there is a vast tax base potential close to home which hardly anybody mentions these days—outside of California. It shows how significant it is when holders of land willingly obligate their land to pay the district's $171 million admission fee.

California is different, don't you think?

The Veterans Bill, H. R. 7886

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY ALDOUS DIXON
OF UTAH
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 27, 1956

Mr. DIXON. Mr. Speaker, the veterans bill, H. R. 7886, as amended, has lost, through amendment, many of the features which I supported most, retained the features which I supported least, and added discriminatory features which I cannot support at all.

The amendment to limit additional aid to World War I veterans only discriminates against World War II and Korean veterans, their widows, and children. It is, therefore, unfair.

A second amendment cuts almost in half the pension increase to disabled and service-connected World War I veterans, their widows and children. I have the conviction that all service-connected disabled veterans, their widows and children, should have received the full amount of the original bill, with no reduction whatever.

The measure goes so far as to assume every veteran of World War I to be permanently disabled veterans in World War II and the Korean war, together with their widows and children, will receive not one extra cent under this bill.

The fact that the motion to recommit the bill was passed by a majority of 159 to 107 on a standing vote, is evidence that a majority of the Members who were on the floor felt this way, at least before they were subjected to the pressure of a rollcall vote. The best way to help our veterans, their widows and children, would have been to recommit the bill and revise it. Had this been done, its chances to help those who need help most, of passage in the other House, and of escaping a veto would have been greatly increased.

A Vital Victory for Legislative Procedure

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 25, 1956

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, on June 20 the Milwaukee Sentinel carried an interesting editorial entitled "Vital Victory." It pointed out the parliamentary fight waged in the House by the beloved chairman of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, Representative JAMES RICHARDS, who insisted that the House trim the request for foreign aid by more than $1 billion. The House supported Mr. RICHARDS and the editorial indicates the grounds upon which he made his fight.

Mr. Speaker, the other body is considering a restoration of the full amount originally requested which conflicts with House action. Many of us who feel that Mr. RICHARDS was on sound ground when he waged his fight will support him again in insisting that the cuts made should be adhered to.

The editorial follows:

VITAL VICTORY

Representative JAMES RICHARDS, South Carolina Democrat, scored a vital victory over the administration recently.

He managed to marshal sufficient support from both sides of the House to reject the $600 million foreign aid compromise increase which the administration had sought.

This compromise had followed the $1,100,000,000 cut which Chairman RICHARDS and his Foreign Affairs Committee had made in the administration's original request for $4,700,000,000 worth of more foreign aid.

This was not a victory for Mr. RICHARDS alone. Nor was it a partisan victory. Nor did it stem from irresponsibility, lack of knowledge, or enmity for a sound foreign aid program as such.

It came, instead, from Mr. RICHARDS' and his committee's expert knowledge of the subject:

Their travels and studies in foreign lands, their 2 months of arduous and painstaking hearings, and their reflection of the opinion of the American people that a period of world prosperity is time to taper off foreign aid.

Over the opposition of Democrat Speaker RAYBURN and GOP leader MARTIN, Mr. RICHARDS effectively made several vital points:

That even with the cut, the administration would be receiving some $800 million more for foreign aid than in the last fiscal year.

That the danger to the foreign aid program lies not in its principles but in the possibility of "overspending."

That the House, under our constitutional separation of powers, must not be a rubber stamp to the Executive.

He charged, bluntly, that Messrs. MARTIN and RAYBURN "don't know anything about this bill," that their appeals were emotional, that they were "surrendering to the executive department without facts and figures."

All this becomes all the more important and significant when it is remembered that Mr. RICHARDS is and has been an internationalist.

Yet, as perhaps the foremost expert in the overall field of foreign spending, he is convinced that the extra moneys demanded by the administration would be wasteful.

We hope this great victory for America, and for commonsense, is not upset in the final, formal vote of the House, nor in the subsequent decision of the Senate.

A Public Servant Retires

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 27, 1956

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to include the following editorial tribute to my good friend and a dedicated public servant, Raymond Del Tufo, Jr., which appeared in the June 24 issue of the Newark Star Ledger:

A PUBLIC SERVANT RETIRES

A dedicated public servant, Raymond Del Tufo Jr., will step down from his position as United States attorney for New Jersey at the end of this month.

During the 3 years, less 9 days, that Del Tufo has served the Federal Government and the people of this State, he has amassed an enviable record of faithful and energetic devotion to duty, often in the face of great personal sacrifice.

Elsewhere in the Sunday Star-Ledger, the factual record, the cold statistics of the operations of his office during these 3 years, is related. It is impressive. Despite a heavy rate of new criminal and civil cases within the jurisdiction of his office over this period, Del Tufo and his hard-working staff succeeded in appreciably reducing the backlog of such cases.

In the past 3 years, too, the public has received great benefit from the quick, intelligent handling of trials, investigations, and problems by the United States attorney's office under Del Tufo's direction. All this has been achieved without great stir, without excessive publicity, but with a quiet

efficiency highly commendable in any public office.

Del Tufo leaves the United States attorneyship at the end of this week to return to private life and private practice. In so doing, he leaves for his successor a fine example of public service in an important public office and a high standard to be upheld.

Here's the Whole Question on the Niagara Power Redevelopment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM E. MILLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 27, 1956

Mr. MILLER of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from the Niagara Falls Gazette in addition to an article which appeared in the June 25, 1956, edition of the Gazette by Paul Martin, the chief of the Gazette News Service here in Washington, giving an analysis of the Niagara power redevelopment question. Mr. Martin has spent hours of research and study on this question. He is highly regarded in the field of journalism. I feel it is of the utmost importance to bring his article to the attention of not only my colleagues in the House of Representatives, but the Members of the Senate. This subject is scheduled to be brought up for further consideration and action in executive session by the House Committee on Public Works tomorrow, Thursday, June 28, 1956.

The editorial and Mr. Martin's article follow:

[From the Niagara Falls Gazette of June 25, 1956]

IS SOMETHING COCKEYED IN DEMOCRATIC PROCESS?

"Is this the voice of the people? Can a dedicated, disciplined minority dictate the final Niagara decision, in the heat of an election year? If so, then something is indeed cockeyed in the democratic process."

That is the conclusion of Paul Martin, able and informed chief of the Gannett News Service in Washington, after a complete and careful review and study of the Niagara power development issue.

Martin's analysis of the Niagara question—a completely frank and detailed account of political maneuverings in Albany and Washington during the last 6 years—is published on this page of today's Gazette. It should be read and most carefully studied by every resident of the Niagara frontier who has the future economic welfare of the area at heart.

Information collected and set down orderly by Mr. Martin presents the whole Niagara power picture in a way that should refresh memories of those acquainted with the problem and inform those who have not given the problem much attention.

The article supports the position of Representative WILLIAM E. MILLER and this newspaper and confirms the arguments that have been presented time after time in favor of the redevelopment of Niagara power by private enterprise.

It is such an exact statement of a question of so great nationwide importance that it should also be prescribed reading for every Member of the Congress. We hope Mr. MILLER will have it printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD where it can be read and studied by the Nation's lawmakers.

[From the Niagara Falls Gazette of June 25, 1956]

HERE'S THE WHOLE STORY: PRIVATE DEVELOPMENT OF NIAGARA POWER BLOCKED BY STATE GOP, MILLER ASSERTS

(By Paul Martin)

Representative WILLIAM E. MILLER, Republican, New York, of Lockport, blames the Republican leadership of New York State for blocking free enterprise development of the proposed new $400 million hydroelectric project at Niagara Falls.

Otherwise, he says, "we would have passed a bill in Congress 3 years ago providing for private enterprise, and we would be getting power off the line today."

Instead, a Democratic controlled Congress appears on the verge of enacting legislation that would turn this new industrial development over to the New York Power Authority for State ownership and operation.

It would enable the State Authority to issue tax-free bonds to finance the venture, create an additional bureaucracy to administer it and place a potent source of economic power over labor and industry at the disposal of the politicians.

The new Niagara project will generate more than triple the amount of electricity provided by the largest hydro plant in the entire Tennessee Valley. It will develop more than double the output of Bonneville Dam on the Columbia River.

The Army's Corps of Engineers has 25 federally owned hydro projects in the Nation. The largest, McNary Dam in Washington State, has an installed capacity of 840,000 kilowatts. The Niagara project will produce 1,200,000 kilowatts of firm electric power.

The instrument for bringing this resource under political control, and putting the State government into business on its own account, is S. 1823, known as the Lehman bill.

It is sponsored by Senator HERBERT H. LEHMAN, 78-year-old New York City Democrat, who comes up this for reelection to another 6-year term. The bill is being pushed by Gov. Averell Harriman and the Democratic administration in Albany.

Most controversial feature of the Lehman bill is the so-called preference clause, which would require the New York Authority to give lower rates and first priority in the sale of Niagara power to municipalities, cooperatives, and other public agencies.

New York State is highly industrialized. It had a well-developed pattern of private industry, and a flourishing trade and commerce, long before the so-called public power areas of the Nation were even conceived.

The first hydroelectric plant in the world was developed by private owners at Niagara Falls in the 1880's. This was Adams station, which is still generating power today for the Niagara-Mohawk Corp., successor to the original developers.

Approximately 95 percent of all electric consumers in New York today are served by 5 privately owned utilities. They have been seeking the right since 1950 to develop the new Niagara project as a taxable investment.

These companies are Niagara-Mohawk Corp., Rochester Gas & Electric Corp., New York State Electric & Gas Corp., Central Hudson Gas & Electric Corp., and Consolidated Edison Company of New York, Inc.

MILLER represents the district where the new Niagara project would be built. He has been elected to the House three times in campaigns where the "public-versus-private" power controversy was a major issue.

MILLER reports that the people of his district are overwhelmingly in favor of private enterprise development. He has won consistently on this platform.

The economic transmission distance for Niagara power lies entirely in western New York. Polls taken by Congressmen show a considerable majority of the people in this area favor private development of the project.

An outspoken opponent of State socialism at Niagara Falls, MILLER says:

"The Lehman bill is so socialistic that it threatens the entire power industry in the State of New York. The underlying purpose of the preference clause is not to prefer 5 percent of the people, but to discriminate against 95 percent of them.

"It is designed to force municipalities and cooperatives to condemn existing utility installations in New York to take advantage of the preferential rates. It will destroy the privately owned electric light and power companies.

"If we destroy the established electric light and power industry in New York, what justification is there for keeping it in any other State? If you socialize the power industry of the Nation, every other industry will be dependent on it. We will have gone a long way toward socializing the entire economy of America."

The 5 companies serve more than 14 million customers in New York. They are owned by 310,000 shareholders, and paid more than $80 million in dividends last year, on which the shareholders in turn paid taxes.

The companies have a net worth of more than $3 billion. They have approximately 43,000 employees, and paid approximately $195 million in Federal, State, and local taxes last year.

Former Gov. Thomas E. Dewey has attacked the "preference clause" in the Lehman bill as "bending the knee to Moscow." State Attorney General Jacob K. Javits has rendered a legal opinion that it is contrary to public policy in New York.

But Governor Harriman and Chairman Robert Moses, of the State Power Authority, contend that if the Niagara license is awarded to New York with the "preference clause" they will be able to accept it under existing State law.

From a purely political viewpoint, if Congress now authorizes the Niagara development, 6 years after the enabling treaty was negotiated with Canada, the Democrats will get the credit.

It will be known as the Lehman bill, and may enhance its sponsor's chances of reelection. Its passage will have occurred in the administration of Harriman, who is an aspirant for teh Democratic Presidential nomination, not under Dewey.

It will confront President Eisenhower with a difficult decision on whether to sign or veto the bill. If he signs the measure, he will be repudiating the Republican leadership in Congress.

All this could have been avoided, as Miller point out, except that the GOP State leaders in New York had a devious political hand to play.

They weren't wholeheartedly for free enterprise in this segment of the national economy, and they weren't unreservedly for public power. They wanted to be somewhere in between.

The architects of this curious political philosophy include Assembly Speaker Oswald D. Heck, of Schenectady; State Senate Leader Walter J. Mahoney, of Buffalo, and GOP State Chairman L. Judson Morhouse, of Ticonderoga.

It seems ironical that in the foremost State in the Nation, where there are two major parties and several minor ones, not a single political party can be found that is

willing to stand unequivocally against the Government going into business on its own account.

After the United States signed the Niagara Redevelopment Treaty with Canada in 1950, Lehman and former Representative Franklin D. Roosevelt, Jr., introduced a bill calling for Federal development of the power project by the Truman administration.

To prevent establishment of a Federal TVA-type authority in New York State, Dewey persuaded the GOP-controlled legislature in 1951 to amend State law to include Niagara as well as the St. Lawrence River within the purview of the power authority.

This had never been contemplated in the original 1931 act, drafted by Leland Olds, of Rochester, former secretary of the New York Authority and later a member of the Federal Power Commission.

All during the days that Al Smith, Franklin D. Roosevelt, and Herbert H. Lehman occupied the Governor's chair in Albany, when there was great political propaganda against the so-called "power trust," there was no thought of State ownership at Niagara Falls.

To counteract the Lehman-Roosevelt bill, Senator IRVING M. IVES and Representative STERLING COLE, of the Binghamton-Elmira district, sponsored a measure calling for State development of Niagara. COLE subsequently asked that his name be stricken from the bill.

Before the 1952 election, IVES said that, "If we can get a change in the complexion at the White House and on the Hill, then we will be able to get the right kind of a bill through Congress."

President Eisenhower was elected in 1952 by a landslide, and Republicans took command of both the House and Senate.

The House took up the Niagara issue in 1953, and passed a free enterprise bill by a 262 to 120 margin. All New York Republicans voted for the measure except Javits. Six new York Democrats also voted for it, including Representative LEO W. O'BRIEN, of Albany.

At that time, the private industry bill would have sailed through the Senate. But Dewey used his influence to block it. The Governor came to Washington and made a personal appearance before the Senate Public Works Committee against the bill.

Eight GOP leaders in Albany, including Dewey, Heck, and Mahoney, joined in a telegram urging Members of Congress to vote against free enterprise.

The key man at the White House in blocking the measure was Sherman Adams, chief of staff and former Governor of New Hampshire.

The GOP controlled 83d Congress expired without even again taking up the Niagara issue. In the 1954 campaign, Democrats regained control in Congress, and elected new governors in a number of States, including New York, Pennsylvania, Connecticut, and Maine.

It should be noted that the stand taken by Dewey and GOP State leaders in Albany apparently produced no salutory results in the 1954 election. It won no "liberal" votes in New York City. If anything, it weakened the appeal of the GOP State ticket to normally Republican voters in the Niagara Frontier.

President Eisenhower has consistently taken the position that it is "up to the people of New York" to decide who should develop the Niagara project.

This is an evasion of the issue, of course, since the Federal Power Commission, dominated by Eisenhower appointees, eventually will have to issue the Niagara license.

It also is incompatible with the administration's basic philosophy of getting the Government out of business, and its "partnership" policy in watershed developments.

The administration has championed private enterprise in other power projects, such as Hells Canyon, Idaho, and the Dixon-Yates contract in the TVA region.

It has proceeded to sell to private owners the Government's synthetic rubber industry, inland waterways barges, ropewalks and other business-type enterprises operated by the Armed Forces.

At Niagara, for the first time in the American history of watershed development, a project is presented with no "multiple use" features—no irrigation, reclamation, navigation, or flood control—which have been used in the past to justify "public power" developments.

Privately owned companies stand ready, willing and able to undertake the investment, without the necessity of Government tax-free financing. The companies are subject to regulation of their rates and service, by the New York Public Service Commission, and the Federal Power Commission.

The New York Power Authority, it appears, is beholden to virtually no one. Once it issues its tax-free bonds through the usual New York City investment houses, it operates as a politically appointed corporate entity with almost sovereign powers.

President Eisenhower's position, however, has raised the question: "What do the people of New York want?"

This is a question which the politicians have never allowed the people to answer for themselves in a public referendum on the Niagara issue.

Such a referendum was proposed earlier this year in a telegram which Congressman COLE sent to Robert Moses, power authority chairman. Moses immediately rejected the proposal.

Bills calling for a plebiscite were introduced in the State legislature, but were never brought to a vote. The bills were spiked by GOP State leaders who did not want to "put the party on the spot" in an election year.

Yet the record shows that where polls have been taken, on a local or regional basis, results were uniformly in favor of private industry at Niagara.

This was true in the case of polls taken by Representatives KENNETH B. KEATING, of Rochester, HAROLD C. OSTERTAG, of Attica, and JOHN R. PILLION, of Buffalo. The margin was 5 to 1 in favor of free enterprise.

Even in New York City, Representative JOHN H. RAY conducted a poll on Staten Island and in Queens that ran 4 to 1 in favor of private development of Niagara.

It should be added that the residents of New York City have no practical interest in the Niagara project since they do not stand to benefit by a single kilowatt from the power to be produced at the falls.

Citizens of Ogdensburg—within 30 miles of Moses' new Massena works on the St. Lawrence—voted 2,694 to 1,730 in a special election against converting to a municipally-owned electric system. More than 60 percent of the voters were in favor of private industry.

Hearing records of the House and Senate are filled with petitions from labor unions, farm organizations, chambers of commerce, county supervisors, business groups, and other citizens, favoring the free enterprise development of Niagara.

Testimonials in favor of State ownership are few indeed, and what little there are come from professional pleaders before Congress for the socialization of American industry.

Is this the voice of the people? Can a dedicated, disciplined minority dictate the final Niagara decision, in the heat of an election year? If so, then something is indeed cockeyed in the democratic process.

The Annual Convention of the Fleet Reserve Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BOB WILSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 27, 1956

Mr. WILSON of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from Our Navy of February 1, 1956:

OUR NAVY'S SPECIAL REPORT: ANNUAL CONVENTION OF THE FLEET RESERVE ASSOCIATION

The more than a thousand delegates assembled at the Hotel Sherman in Chicago, Ill., from the 28th until the 30th of October 1955 for the 28th National Convention of the Fleet Reserve Association. The delegates elected William F. Hickey, a former CPO now a retired lieutenant from Lemon Grove, Calif., as its 1955–56 national president. He is a native of Troy, N. Y., and has been associated with the Navy since 1916. Mike Catania, the man Hickey relieves as national president, moves to junior past president of the organization.

Many important items came out of the annual convention which were of great interest to the average bluejacket. Admiral Grenfell, the Assistatn Chief of Navy Personnel, informed the shipmates present at the convention that the planned promotion figure for men being advanced to CPO in fiscal year 1956 more than doubles those actually advanced during 1955.

Other planned promotions in fiscal year 1956 are 17,600 to petty officer first class, 59,500 to second class, and about 129,700 will sew on their crows for the first time. To enable nonrated men to become petty officers third class faster, the service requirement has been cut from 6 to 3 months.

At the present time it is believed that all sailors passing their third class test will be upped; the same will probably hold true for second class except in 3 or 4 rates. There will probably be about 12 rates that will be kind of cold to men going up for first class, otherwise, it is estimated that all, or at least the majority, of those passing will be advanced. A total of 210,300 promotions to the various PO grades are anticipated.

Admiral Grenfell also mentioned that legislation is now being prepared for future use which will remove the 10-year commission-service in the 20-year span criteria (which has passed as Public Law 318 last session of Congress). He extended for his immediate superior, Vice Adm. James L. Holloway, Chief of Naval Personnel, who is an honorary member of the FRA, his personal greetings and best wishes for a successful 1955 convention.

Sam Rose, long time friend and shipmate of the FRA, attended the convention on behalf of Mr. Harvey V. Higley, Administrator of Veterans' Affairs. Sam Rose, however, is more than just a friend and shipmate to the men of the Fleet Reserve Association and the Navy.

He has personally aided those mentioned previously more than it is possible to say. He informed the delegates that he was often asked "What does the VA do?" "It spends some four billion dollars a year," Mr. Rose continued "but examine its true perspective." Actually, $4 billion compared with the total amount of money Uncle Sam collects from us is not so much.

Out of every tax dollar you give to Uncle Sam, only 6 percent of it is spent in behalf

of veterans. It takes a lot of 6 percents to add up to $4 billion a year.

Where does it go? How does the VA spend it? Taxpayers should be pleased with the answer. Out of every VA dollar, Mr. Rose disclosed, that less than 5 cents of it is used for administrative expenses.

In Sam Rose's words, "The common purpose of VA benefits is the complete and total readjustment for millions of fighting men into the peaceful framework of the productive economy of our country." GI education and training, GI loans and GI insurance are the major benefits from the VA for able-bodied veterans. There are special readjustment programs for our war-disabled. Many of them need things such as artificial appliances, aids for the blind, wheel chairs, etc.

At the present time 1 out of every 8 persons in the United States is a veteran and that is more than 22 million. You will find them anywhere from a housing development to the campuses of our American colleges. They have used their well-earned benefits wisely to better our Nation and make it stronger.

Wilson H. Sandefer, of Jacksonville, Fla., a member of Yukon branch No. 126, was elected national vice president. Charles E. Lofgren, national secretary for the past 22 years, was reelected to office. However, he informed the delegates that this was his last term and would not be up for election after this tour was over. He asked the delegates to provide an understudy to carry on.

Schuyler S. Pyle, the national financial secretary, and Charles A. McCarthy, the editor of Naval Affairs, have not yet completed their present terms, and were not up for election.

National President Hickey appointed John C. Clarke of Philadelphia branch No. 1 as national chaplain, Edward E. Keeley, a past president of the FRA, as national parliamentarian and Christopher C. Sanders as chairman of the national finance committee. J. H. "Doc" Stone, of Spring Valley, Calif., will be the new chairman of the public relations committee. Carl A. Viken of Camden, N. J., was elected national treasurer.

It was anticipated that a good debate would come up over the proposed change of name for the FRA, however, it was comparatively quiet. The fact that 16 of the 19 living past national presidents of the FRA signed a letter to all branches asking for their support in changing the name of the 30-years-plus organization carried little or no weight with the delegates present in Chicago.

The special committee on changing the name appointed Shipmate Leo A. LaBelle, San Francisco branch No. 48, to speak for the change. Shipmate James W. "Pop" Mullins, of Seattle branch No. 18, spoke against. The 2 shipmates each received 20 minutes to present their arguments and 10 more minutes for rebuttal.

They both gave very good talks in presenting their cases and received a standing ovation. Following that the shipmates on the floor were given the opportunity to vote their opinions and after their words a motion was placed before the assembly to change the name of the Fleet Reserve Association.

A rollcall vote resulted in 1,461 nays and 133 ayes. The Fleet Reserve Association was still the Fleet Reserve Association.

In the annual report of Charles E. Lofgren, national secretary, he referred to the past association year as a "remarkable" one, both membership wise and finance wise. Membership statistics showed a 19-percent gain in per capita tax and MAL dues. Eighteen new braches were instituted during tthe year and as of June 30, 1955, there were 177 chartered branches in active commission. Membership increased from 37,748 members (June 30, 1954) to 43,660 (June 30, 1955), for a net increase of 5,912. However, since 9,480 members were dropped from the rolls for one reason or another, actually 15,392 shipmates were recruited as new or reinstated members during the year. New branches accounted for 1,568 and the national circulation brought in 1,475, the remaining new men were the results of hard work by the national membership chairman, Cliff Warren, and cochairman, J. C. Ellison, and the branches.

Branch No. 70 at Guam was awarded the Fleet Reserve Association Trophy for membership promotion. It started the fiscal year with 14 members and ended with 346, a gain of 332. Only three members were actually suspended during the time. Membership committee presented a gold wrist watch to Shipmate Robert H. O'Malley, SKC, USN, of Naples Branch No. 187, for having sponsored the greatest number of new and reinstated members. He signed up more than 300 members.

Schuyler S. Pyle, the national financial secretary, gave the organization answers to the three questions always asked: How much did we take in, how much did we spend, and how much do we have left. We will only mention the last part in our article. The total worth of the Fleet Reserve Association at the time was $114,078.71. Pretty good for a bunch of sailors, don't you agree? However, besides the good news, one major matter of grave importance exists.

Mr. Pyle referred to their present national headquarters as a firetrap and called it time to formulate plans to do something about bringing our ship to anchor. The FRA has outgrown those present quarters. The present lease on Rhode Island Avenue, in Washington, D. C., has less 2 years to run, and it costs the FRA approximately $3,000 in rent yearly. Time is running out and if appropriate steps are to be taken to meet the situation head-on, immediate action must be taken now.

Two steps were recommended by Shipmate Pyle. One was to appoint a special committee with broad powers to delve into the matter of our future housing needs. The second step he suggested was to take steps to devise and formulate plans for a building fund raising campaign, utilizing the services of the branches.

This year the national convention delegates elected 10 shipmates to honorary membership in the Fleet Reserve Association. Those shipmates are listed below:

Rear Adm. Dale Harris, USN.
Capt. J. H. S. Johnson, USN.
Capt. James F. Byrne, USN.
Capt. James H. Flatley, Jr., USN.
Capt. A. G. Dibrell, Jr., USN.
Lt. (jg.) Harold R. Davis (SC), USN.
Congressman HORACE SEELY-BROWN, JR., of Connecticut.
Maj. Gen. John C. McQueen, USMC.
Mr. Leonard Weinstein.
Judge Luis N. de Leon.

Certificates of merit were presented by the delegates to Roy A. Mears, a member of the firm of optical dispensers in Long Beach, Calif., an ex-Navy man, and Shipmate Ambrose H. Redmond, the secretary of branch No. 9 (San Diego), for outstanding contributions to the FRA.

The assembly also took action on several resolutions. A brief synopsis of the action is noted as follows:

1. Support of H. R. 721, which amends the World War Veterans' Act of 1924 to mature United States Government life insurance when the holder reaches age 70.

2. National Service Committee to support best medical care bill possible and when taken up.

3. Request amendment of Public Law 370 (Philippine Rehabilitation Act of 1946) to provide full payment of balance of approved claims for wartime damage.

4. Support H. R. 5395 to provide "in hiding" benefit of $2.50 per day to members of the United States Armed Forces in hiding to evade capture by the enemy during World War II or Korean conflict.

5. Support the survivor benefit bill (H. R. 7089), now pending in the Senate Finance Committee.

6. Cooperate to the fullest extent in recruiting for the Navy and in obtaining reenlistments.

7. Support the Armed Services Uniform Retirement Act, with such amendments as may be deemed necessary to preserve existing retirement benefits and correct apparent injustices.

8. Urge enactment of legislation to forgive checkages for personnel who drew sea pay while attached to vessels in the Great Lakes and the U. S. S. *Sequoia*, and refund checkages already made.

9. Urge enactment of legislation to validate payments of reenlistment allowance made in good faith, on which checkages are pending due to a recent Comptroller General decision.

10. Carefully analyze the report on the President's Commission on Veterans' Pensions when issued.

11. Increase burial expenses from $150 to $250.

12. Vigorously favor enactment of legislation to provide non-service-connected death pensions for widows and children of World War II and Korean veterans on a parity with World War I veterans.

13. Favor increase of annual income limitations for entitlement to widow's pensions from $1,400 to $1,800, and from $2,700 to $3,000 for widows with minor children.

14. Protest any curtailment of contact service in Veterans' Administration agencies.

15. Support enactment of H. R. 6274 to provide no fee be charged veterans for obtaining duplicate discharges or statements of service.

16. Continue to favor establishment of a standing Committee on Veterans' Affairs in the United States Senate.

17. Repeal of 1894 act prohibiting employment of retired officers in Federal civil service under certain restrictions.

18. Exert every effort to obtain preference for enlistment in the Navy of some of fleet reserve and retired personnel in the Philippines.

19. Substitute current rates of subsistence and quarters for enlisted men in the payment of accrued leave, in lieu of lower specified amounts as set forth in the Armed Services Leave Act of 1946.

20. Support revision of the Uniform Code of Military Justice to incorporate provision for reestablishing the responsible chain of command concept.

21. Support the movement of other major veterans organizations to seek abrogation of treaty agreements for trial of United States Armed Forces personnel by foreign courts for civilian offenses incurred while off duty in foreign countries.

22. Explore the possibility of initiating action to effect remedial legislation to correct existing inequities in dollar exchange rate, including use of military pay certificates by United States Armed Forces in foreign countries.

Everything was not all work, though, as the delegates assembled early Saturday morning along with members of the Naval Reserve Association to hear several guest speakers. Headlining them was Under Secretary of the Navy, Thomas S. Gates. On Friday the convention heard speeches by Rear Adm. Elton W. Grenfell, Assistant Chief of Naval Personnel; Sam Rose, of the VA; Rear Adm. Emmet P. Forrestel, Commandant of the 9th Naval District; and Capt. J. B. McLean, commanding officer of the Naval Training Center at Great Lakes. That evening at the Sherman, the association held its convention banquet and dance.

During Admiral Grenfell's remarks, he praised shipmates Bill Stomski, lieutenant (retired), United States Navy, and his wife as the Navy's good-will ambassadors. Upon completion of the admiral's address, Charlie Lofgren presented the admiral with a pen set on behalf of the FRA and said he hoped the admiral would have occasion to use it in signing or initialing many directives benefiting the morale of the enlisted men of the Navy.

The delegates were greeted by many "high-ups" at their opening session both military as well as representatives of the mayor of Chicago and the Governor of Illinois.

Remember the "ole" saying about you can't teach an old dog new tricks? Well, on Saturday morning the old salts took time to listen to a Navy career incentive team. The benefits now received are quite a bit changed from the time when some of the men sitting out front had first joined. Jesse F. Nichols, of Gloucester, Mass., and Alexander Steele, of Washington, D. C., both 82 years young, were sailors when the pay and benefits were not up to the present standards. Shipmate Nichols first joined in 1893 but "boot" Steele didn't sign up until 1898. Both sailed (and we really mean "sailed"), on Monitor-type vessels. Their pay at the time? $14 per month. That $14 per month pay is just a little more than a seaman now makes just on sea pay.

The time and place committee received two bids for the 1957 convention site. The two bids were from Long Beach, Calif., and St. Petersburg, Fla. That committee recommended Long Beach which was approved by the delegates present. The 1956 convention had been O. K.'d last year to be held in Philadelphia. The dates for the 1957 conclave will be October 25, 26, and 27.

One of the most important factors to come out of the Chicago convention is the mandate that national headquarters employ Shipmate Russel A. Langdon, of Branch No. 4 as the understudy of Shipmate Charles E. Lofgren. The Fleet Reserve Association has been blessed with the outstanding work and accomplishments of Shipmate Charlie for the past score of years and more. It is with regret that the FRA must think of a replacement. But the national secretary will not run again for office. And a better man than "Lucky" Langdon will not be found. It is anticipated that Shipmate Langdon will report to 522 Rhode Island Avenue for duty about the first of April, when he retires from the naval service as a lieutenant commander. He has a wonderful knowledge of the workings of this association and has served on national service committees for years. He is just the man for the job.

When the convention was over, the last sea-story told, the last beer drank, and the last shipmate checked out from the Hotel Sherman, it was just another convention gone by. But it was a convention which met several problems which were harmoniously solved in true shipmate spirit. Shipmatism prevailed above all as resolutions were acted upon and the work was taken care of in orderly fashion.

He Deserves It

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT W. CRETELLA
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 27, 1956

Mr. CRETELLA. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include an editorial from the Bridgeport (Conn.) Post of June 26 commenting on the renomination of my good friend and colleague AL MORANO for a fourth term as Congressman from the Fourth District of Connecticut.

All those who know AL MORANO, or are familiar with his work in Congress, will share my sentiment that the editorial comment is well deserved.

The editorial follows:

MORANO IS NAMED AGAIN

Representative ALBERT P. MORANO, whose congressional district includes Fairfield County, has been nominated unanimously by the Republicans for his fourth consecutive term.

This sounds very much as though the energetic Congressman from Greenwich had satisfied the party leaders by his past service, just as he has satisfied the bulk of the people in the fourth district.

Sheriff Platt, who had said a couple of harsh words about the Representative last April because it was impossible for him to dash up here from Washington to attend a political dinner, put all that difficulty behind him, and publicly praised Congressman MORANO as a "good worker, a good Congressman, who understands the need of the people in his district, and does what he can to help them."

That, we believe, just about sums up the way the average citizen of Fairfield County feels toward the Representative. He is a hard worker, and his voting record is one that he can be proud of and hold up before any Democratic opponent.

There is one thing that will always mean good will, and therefore votes, for Representative MORANO. No matter what his constituents ask him to do, whether by mail, telephone, or in personal visits, he starts the wheels moving and usually gets results. Having been in Washington so long, first as secretary to Congressman Austin and then as secretary to Ambassador Clare Boothe Luce, when she represented this district in the House—AL MORANO knows his way around and knows how to get things done.

Sheriff Platt said one more thing which seems to be something in the nature of a forecast, "the Democrats can't nominate anybody who can beat him." That is pretty much the way it looks to us. Congressman MORANO will go back to Washington because he has done such a good job for all of us, Democrats as well as Republicans, and he deserves another term.

Resolutions Adopted by the General Federation of Women's Clubs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD H. REES
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 24, 1956

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent approved by the House, I am including herewith a copy of resolutions adopted by the General Federation of Women's Clubs at their convention in Kansas City, Mo., on May 14–18, 1956.

The General Federation of Women's Clubs is one of the great, unselfish, outstanding, and influential organizations in America. I am sure the Members of Congress will be interested in the proposals they have submitted in the resolutions that are included herewith.

GENERAL FEDERATION OF WOMEN'S CLUBS RESOLUTIONS ADOPTED IN CONVENTION, KANSAS CITY, MO., MAY 14–18, 1956

1. ADVERTISING THROUGH MASS MEDIA

Resolved, That the General Federation of Women's Clubs initiate, sponsor and seek appropriate cooperative action by the Federation, State federations, local clubs, publishers, producers, and distributors of mass media which will eliminate objectionable matter, including covers, titles and contents of paperback books and magazines; and further

Resolved, That the General Federation of Women's Clubs urges the use and passage of effective control measures (that is, education in discrimination by the buying public; self-regulative codes strictly adhered to; and legislative enactment only when absolutely necessary) for all advertising by mass media which, in itself or through the effects of the product advertised, is a threat to the physical, mental, or moral well-being of our people.

Presented by Mrs. Dexter O. Arnold, chairman, communication department; Mrs. Walter V. Magee, chairman, community affairs department.

2. RESEARCH ON EFFECTS OF MASS MEDIA

Whereas the General Federation of Women's Clubs has expressed repeatedly its concern about the effects on children of salacious literature, crime and horror comics, television, radio, and motion picture programs, Therefore

Resolved, That the General Federation of Women's Clubs in convention assembled May 1956, commends and recommends the further development of research projects by private foundations and organizations, educational centers at colleges and universities, and a governmental commission to make scientific studies of the extent and nature of the effects of questionable mass media.

Presented by Mrs. Walter V. Magee, chairman, community affairs department; Mrs. Dexter O. Arnold, chairman, communications department.

3. CONSERVATION OF YOUTH

Whereas the American philosophy of living is to give to every one of its people the opportunity to develop the best of which he is capable; and

Whereas the future of America is dependent on the fullest development of the capabilities of the youth of our nation, including those of superior ability, those of normal gifts and talents, and those who are socially, physically, or mentally handicapped; and

Whereas appropriate education, remedial treatment, and rehabilitation where indicated are the most valuable and most economical methods of developing the capacities of youth with lifelong institutional care and support utilized only when the above methods have failed: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the General Federation of Women's Clubs in convention assembled, May 1956, urges members to initiate, promote, and support programs to—

1. Impress upon parents the fact that the home is irreplaceable in supplying the basic needs for development of well-adjusted children;

2. Develop to the fullest extent the child with special talents and abilities;

3. Educate, treat, and rehabilitate the physically and mentally handicapped and those with behavior problems;

4. Educate the youth in our schools as to their total responsibilities;

5. Accept the migrant child as a part of the community responsibility.

Presented by Mrs. Joseph M. Perkins, chairman, education department; Mrs. Walter V. Magee, chairman community affairs department.

4. RECREATION AREAS IN NATIONAL FORESTS

Whereas the numbers of people using the national forests for recreation increases annually; and

Whereas funds appropriated are presently insufficient to maintain and develop recreational areas in national forests which will meet the demand for their use; and

Whereas the income from the national forests exceeds the cost of their administration: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the General Federation of Women's Clubs urges the Congress of the United States to provide for the return to the Forest Service of sums sufficient for the maintenance and development of recreation areas located in the national forests.

Presented by Mrs. Marion T. Weatherford, chairman, conservation of natural resources department.

5. COMMERCIAL SLAUGHTER OF ANIMALS

Whereas studies reveal instances of cruel methods in the handing and commercial slaughter of animals, although more humane procedures have been developed and are available and practicable: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the General Federation of Women's Clubs endorses the objective of slaughter reform and asks club members to investigate as to conditions in their own communities and to require humane practices where needed.

Presented by Mrs. A. M. Satterlee, chairman, consumer division.

6. PRAYER AT THE UNITED NATIONS

Whereas the permanent representative of the United States to the United Nations has proposed to the representatives at the United Nations of each of the other 75 member nations, that future meetings of the General Assembly be opened with prayer and that God be audibly invoked at the United Nations in accordance with any one of the religious faiths represented there; and

Whereas we have learned through our own early experience as a Nation, the need for divine guidance in all our undertakings: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the General Federation of Women's Clubs in convention assembled in Kansas City, Mo., May 1956, endorses and supports the proposal for opening the General Assembly of the United Nations with prayer; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to Ambassador Henry Cabot Lodge, United States Permanent Representative to the United Nations, to Dag Hammerskjold, Secretary-General of the United Nations, to the President of the United States, and to the Secretary of State.

Presented by Mrs. V. B. Ballard, chairman, United Nations and specialized agencies division; Mrs. Norbert J. Klein, chairman, international affairs department.

7. HEMISPHERIC SOLIDARITY

Whereas promotion of Western Hemisphere solidarity long has been an established policy of the General Federation of Women's Clubs; and

Whereas the women of the countries of the Americas have it within their power to further better understanding between the peoples of their respective nations as has been demonstrated by the exchange of ideas and experiences in the Inter-American Conferences: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the General Federation of Women's Clubs in convention assembled, May 1956, calls upon its members to enlist the aid of women of the American nations in urging their several governments and people to increase mutual understanding and cooperative action in order to further common interests in cultural, economic, and political well-being.

Presented by Mrs. Norbert J. Klein, chairman, international affairs department.

8. INTERNATIONAL EXCHANGE PROGRAMS

Whereas the General Federation of Women's Clubs believes that an understanding of the cultural background, history, political aspects, economy, and the everyday pattern of living of the nations of the world is necessary to the maintenance of peace; and

Whereas the General Federation of Women's Clubs has for many years been an active participant in the international exchange of persons programs and believes the programs to be effective means of bringing about world understanding: Therefore

Resolved, That the General Federation of Women's Clubs express its approval of the international exchange programs and urges Congress to:

1. Appropriate adequate funds for the effective continuation of the programs.

2. Provide that exchange students be required to return to their own countries for a period of not less than 2 years, in order that they may interpret to their own people our American life in accordance with the purpose of the program.

3. Provide opportunities whereby the experiences of American exchange persons can be used constructively in the education, understanding, and appreciation of other nations by our people.

4. Create a commission of carefully selected persons, including Congressmen, educators, and community leaders who are especially fitted to study the international exchange of persons programs for the purpose of effecting the best coordinated program for the mutual advantage of the people and countries concerned.

Presented by Mrs. Joseph M. Perkins, chairman, education department; Mrs. Norbert J. Klein, chairman, international affairs department; Mrs. Harry W. Schaal, chairman, fine arts department.

9. TRAINING SCIENTISTS

Whereas it is evident that there exists a critical shortage of scientists and qualified science teachers in the United States and that present facilities will not provide the trained personnel demanded by Government and industry if we are to meet world competition; and

Whereas the inability of many students to meet the requirements of courses in advanced science and mathematics when offered in high schools and colleges demonstrates the need for teaching the fundamentals of mathematics and elementary science at the grade school level: Therefore

Resolved, That the General Federation of Women's Clubs in convention assembled May 1956, advocates, supports and urges member groups to participate in a concerted effort to:

1. Discover special scientific aptitudes at an elementary school age through the use of testing programs.

2. Strengthen the teaching of mathematics and science in the schools of the United States at all scholastic levels;

3. Recruit science teachers and encourage students to major in science through the establishment of scholarships and fellowships and other incentives;

4. Seek auxiliary teachers from the ranks of industry and from among retired scientists;

5. Secure for local schools adequate laboratory and other necessary facilities.

Presented by Mrs. Joseph M. Perkins, chairman, education department; Mrs. W. H. Hasebroock, chairman, national defense division and public affairs department.

10. THE SECOND HOOVER COMMISSION

Whereas the Second Hoover Commission was appointed because of the insistent need of economy in Government without sacrifice of essential services; and

Whereas the General Federation of Women's Clubs has a continuing interest in the objectives and reports of the Second Hoover Commission and in the implementation of certain recommendations contained in the reports: Therefore

Resolved, That the General Federation of Women's Clubs in convention assembled, May 1956, recommends that clubs study carefully the details of the report of the Second Hoover Commission; and further

Resolved, That the General Federation of Women's Clubs support congressional action which would implement those provisions in the report which are in accord with duly established policies of the General Federation.

Presented by Mrs. A. Paul Hartz, chairman, legislation division; Mrs. W. H. Hasebroock, chairman, public affairs department.

11. CORRUPT PRACTICES ACT

Whereas the General Federation of Women's Clubs is an organization engaged in legitimate lobbying activities which we construe to be our constitutional right of petition; has operated always within the letter and spirit of the law; and is concerned deeply and on a volunteer basis with those measures which mean the advancement of the best interests of our country and its people; and

Whereas the General Federation of Women's Clubs has been cognizant of and has deplored violations of the Corrupt Practices Act and the weaknesses contained therein; and

Whereas the General Federation of Women's Clubs has noted the excesses in political campaigning and has proposed measures which might be taken by the two major political parties which would tend to reduce these excesses, notably a shortening of the period devoted to political campaigning and a devotion in campaigning to issues only: Therefore

Resolved, That the General Federation of Women's Clubs in convention assembled, May 1956, records its approval and support of bipartisan efforts to strengthen and improve the Corrupt Practices Act; to curb illegal lobbying; and to raise the standard under which political campaigning shall be conducted.

Presented by Mrs. W. H. Hasebroock, chairman, public affairs department; Mrs. Walter W. Brewer, chairman, citizenship division.

12. UNIFORM MARRIAGE AND DIVORCE LAWS

(NOTE.—It is recommended by the policy committee and Mrs. A. Paul Hartz, Mrs. Gilbert F. Loebs, and Mrs. Walter V. Magee, that the following paragraph 4 be substituted in the existing uniform marriage and divorce laws resolution, which merely recommends an educational campaign to acquaint its members, and the general public, with the extent and nature of the social problems resulting from existing laws and the advantages of uniform legislation pertaining to marriage and divorce.)

Resolved, That the General Federation of Women's Clubs advocate the education for and adoption of uniform concurrent legislation concerning marriage and divorce and urges State federations and local clubs to work toward securing such legislation in their respective States.

Presented by Mrs. A. Paul Hartz, chairman, legislation division; Mrs. Gilbert F. Loebs, chairman, home department; Mrs. Walter F. Magee, chairman, community affairs department.

(This is the complete resolution:)

Whereas the great number of divorces and almost as many remarriages which are taking place in the United States annually are creating alarming social and economic problems; and

Whereas lack of uniform laws often results in illegal divorces, illegal remarriages, and children branded as illegitimate, with a consequent breakdown of moral standards, confusion in property rights, and much unhappiness: Therefore

Resolved, That the General Federation of Women's Clubs approves an amendment to the Constitution of the United States giving Congress power to enact uniform marriage and divorce legislation; and further

Resolved, That the General Federation of Women's Clubs advocate the education for and adoption of uniform concurrent legislation concerning marriage and divorce and wishes State federations and local clubs to work toward selling such legislation in their respective States.

13. CIVIL DEFENSE

(NOTE.—It is recommended by the policy committee and the national-defense chairman that the following resolution be substituted for the existing one on civil defense.)

Whereas the destructive power of nuclear weapons poses the constant threat that they may be used against civilian populations; and

Whereas an effective civil defense is a powerful deterrent to aggressors; and

Whereas civil-defense organizations have demonstrated repeatedly a peacetime usefulness as in times of national disaster and other emergencies; and

Whereas successful civil defense requires interest, acceptance, and participation by individuals, families, and communities, with special need for information and training of women in the home on their responsibilities for home and family survival in any hazard: Therefore

Resolved, That each club member be urged:

1. To heed civil-defense instruction, accept personal responsibility and take positive action toward insuring family survival;

2. To promote public civil-defense education and participation through effective, challenging club programs and projects;

3. To assist in establishing local civil-defense organizations where none exist, and to support community civil defense by personal participation;

4. To dedicate themselves to the cause of civil defense as an indispensable peacetime emergency service, a national defense survival necessity, and a major safeguard and strength of democracy.

Presented by: Mrs. William H. Hasebroock, chairman, public affairs department, national defense division.

EMERGENCY RESOLUTION

Crusade for Freedom

Whereas the captive European peoples behind the Iron Curtain are constantly bombarded by Communist propaganda designed to break their will, to resist and destroy the hope for a better future; and

Whereas in the continuing work of combating false propaganda the crusade for freedom, in the best American tradition, reflects the collective efforts of private citizens dedicated to keeping alive the hope of enslaved peoples that they may regain their rights of freedom, independence nd self-government: Therefore

Resolved, That the General Federation of Women's Clubs urges its member clubs to continue their support of the program of the crusade for freedom.

Presented by the policy committee.

Arab Attacks Continue

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 4, 1956

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I direct the attention of our colleagues to the following item which appeared in the June 1, 1956, edition of the Israel Digest:

TWO ISRAELIS KILLED, THREE WOUNDED IN CONTINUED ARAB ATTACKS

Two Israelis were killed, three wounded and fields were set on fire in a series of Arab attacks from across the borders in the past 2 weeks.

These Arab attacks on Israel life and property further marred the renewed cease fire assurances given U. N. Secretary General Dag Hammarskjold on his recent mission to the Middle East.

Following is a partial list of the incidents:

On May 24, a tractor driver, working in the Lachish area was ambushed and killed. His tractor was pierced by bullets and blood-stained. The driver's body, shot in the head and back was found a few meters away.

The incident took place 10 kilometers from the Jordan border, Israel lodged a complaint with the Israel-Jordan Mixed Armistice Commission.

On May 25, a party of surveyors working in the area east of Beersheba, on the Hebron road near the Israel-Jordan armistice line, was fired upon from the Jordan side. There were no casualties.

For the third night in succession, infiltrators stole irrigation pipes from the settlement of Nir Oz. Traces of five persons wearing rubber soled shoes, led to the Gaza strip.

A 40-duman crop of barley was stolen from Kibbuts Lahay during the week. Settlers saw Arabs fleeing from the fields in the direction of the territory of the el Huzeil tribe.

On June 3, 3, Jordanians opened fire on the Pagi quarter of Jersualem. The gunfire set a field of tinder-dry brush and bramble ablaze. One rabbinical student was killed.

The same day, an Israeli patrol dispersed a group of Syrian fishermen who were fishing at the southern end of Lake Huleh.

On June 4, a number of Arab Legionnaires penetrated into Israel territory east of Kiriat-Auavim. They retreated without incident.

On June 5, a patrol scattered an Arab Legion unit which entered into Israel territory in the Shaar-Hagai sector.

Jordanians opened fire on a group of workers in the vicinity of Yad Hanah. Two Israelis were wounded.

On June 6, a group of some 70 Syrians set fire to the fields of Kibbutz Dan, in the upper Galillee, destroying some 10 acres of crop.

The Syrians attempted unsuccessfully to kidnap one of the settlers who rushed out to extinguish the blaze. Settlers from the kibbutz did manage to save a combine from the ravages of fire by speedily removing it from the area.

Two cases of Jordan troop penetrations into Israel territory, in the area overlooking the Jerusalem-Tel Aviv highway, were reported on the same day. In one case, the Jordanian forces withdrew at the approach of an Israeli patrol; in the other, one watchman from Kibbutz Ofkin was wounded by gunfire opened by infiltrators from aeross the Gaza strip.

International Exchange in the Arts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 27, 1956

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by the Honorable George F. Kennan at a symposium sponsored by the International Council of the Museum of Modern Art in New York City on May 12, 1955:

INTERNATIONAL EXCHANGE IN THE ARTS

(Address by the Honorable George F. Kennan at a symposium sponsored by the International Council of the Museum of Modern Art, May 12, 1955)

Mr. Chairman, members of the International Council, friends and guests of the Museum of Modern Art, all that I can offer to the discussion this evening consists of a few reflections based on about a quarter century of experience in the profession of diplomacy, which bears a somewhat peripheral but always friendly and, I think, sympathetic relation to the arts. I have the feeling that what I am about to say will seem to many of you to fall into the realm of the commonplace and really ought to be said to the audience that is not here rather than to the audience that is. But they are my thoughts, and if they seem to you to be commonplace, I can only say and hope that it will at least be interesting to know that what you believe in also commends itself to those who are long immersed in Foreign Service work.

The first thought to occur to me in this connection is one that may surprise some of you, coming from a person who is commonly supposed to be preoccupied exclusively with the international connotations of all phenomena; but it represents a very deep conviction, and I give it to you for what it's worth. It is the belief that however great the importance of international culture exchange from the standpoint of our relations with other countries, this is not the main reason why we Americans have need for cultural contacts with other peoples at this time. The main reason lies rather in our own need as Americans for just this sort of enrichment of our national spirit.

I am persuaded that any really creative development in the field of art or of literature is intimately connected with international contact and is, in fact, unthinkable without it. To test the proof of that proposition, I think you have only to glance at the roots of our own American culture and see how varied they are, and from how many types of soil, both in time and in space, they spring. No such culture could ever have developed in isolation, and, what is more important for us today, I am sure that no such culture can continue to retain its spiritual vigor if it is kept in isolation.

Now there are people, I am afraid, who think that cultural activity, once it is part of the tradition of a nation and once the educational facilities are there, is something that just proceeds by itself and would go on even though the respective country were entirely walled off from contact with the outside world. I am persuaded that there could be no more shallow nor dangerous assumption than this. When water is taken out of this great stream of international thought and inspiration and channeled into a closed national backwater—I have seen this happen to some extent in the Soviet Union—it quickly becomes stagnant and sterile. This is, of course, because creativeness is so intimately associated with divergence and contradictions. It is only in the reconciling of contrary phenomena that new perceptions arise as new form is created. There cannot be any progress of the spirit without trial; and trial, as Milton once observed, is by what is contrary.

It is particularly important for us Americans to be conscious of this, because in this respect great continental countries like our own are in a particular danger. In the smaller countries (I am thinking here especially of the small maritime countries of Europe), association with other people is something that you can hardly avoid.

Travel becomes absolutely necessary, a knowledge of foreign languages likewise. The use of foreign educational and cultural media is common and known to practically everyone. But in the great interior spaces of our country—and, incidentally, this same thing applies to Russia—conditions are different. Here people can lead their lives with scarcely a single confronta'ion with that which is foreign or different.

The tendency of our own mass media today, involuntary perhaps, but nonetheless compelling, is to eradicate even those divergencies in cultural stimuli and outlook that might otherwise spring from the real variety of tradition and psychology which we have inherited from the past of our own country. These media, as I don't need to point out to you, are centralized today and are becoming more so. Their product is increasingly standardized. They are aimed at passive amusement rather than at creative challenge. They are adjusted to mass needs rather than to the needs of that minority of people (and I think it always must be a minority) who are capable of participating in creative artistic effort and of leading other people to new levels of appreciation and expression.

I think this is a matter of great seriousness for us. I recently completed a trip across the country and back. I come from the Middle West, and I always look at it and the whole interior of this country with particular curiosity. I have no question as to the immense potential creative resources of our people in the world of the spirit. But I cannot help questioning whether those resources are likely to find anything resembling a normal degree of development and expression today, unless we can see some way or other of breaking through, as an educational experience, the monotony and what I might almost call the narcotic effect of the modern commercial cultural product, and finding types of stimuli that are more kindly to the development of the creative spirit. In such a country as ours, faced with these facts of geography and of modern technology, the impact of foreign cultural values is needed just as rain is by the desert. And needed—I would like to reiterate this—for our sakes alone, for our development as individuals and as a Nation, lest we fall into complacency, sterility and emotional decay; lest we lose our sense of the capabilities of the human spirit, and with it much of our sensitivity to the possible meaning and wonder of life itself. For this reason I would be prepared to say: let us by all means have the maximum cultural exchange, even if America had before it no problem whatsoever of outside opinion; even if we had no need of any sort for other people, and all that was concerned was our own development here at home.

Actually, of course, we have at this time the greatest and most urgent need to correct a number of impressions that the outside world entertains of us, impressions that are beginning to affect our international position in very important ways. I think we are gradually becoming aware for the first time of the frightening extent to which negative conceptions about us prevail to one degree or another abroad; but many of us still do not realize how largely these negative feelings are related to cultural rather than to political conditions. Here I, whose training has been in the political field, would say that I believe that many of the feelings about us which other people would think are political have their origins in the impression that we are a Nation of vulgar, materialistic nouveaux riches, lacking in manners and in sensitivity, interested only in making money, contemptuous of every refinement of esthetic feeling. Now, it is true that this impression is in part deliberately fostered by others who wish us no good and would like to make us hated. It is also true that in some parts of the world, and particularly I think in Western Europe, these feelings are due to the fact that we have become identified in the minds of people with things and impulses of the modern age which they hate in themselves—such things as modern technology, standardization and mass culture, which they themselves are rapidly acquiring. And while they abuse us, they follow helplessly in what they believe to be our own path. But there is certainly a large area, and probably the predominant one, in which the prevalence of these negative feelings is the result of our own carelessness and neglect, our own failure to take any adequate measures to see that the impression we create abroad actually does reflect the real values of our civilization.

It seems to me that by and large until quite recently we have been content to leave the external projection of our cultural life almost exclusively to the blind workings of commercial interests, with results that from time to time, I can testify from personal experience, were absolutely frightening. This, of course, really has been the result of our failure to realize what the life of the spirit means to people abroad. I can think of few countries in the world where the artist, the writer, the composer or the thinker is held in such general low esteem as he is here in our country. To the people in many other countries, for whom the prospects for material development are not so favorable as they are here, and who have never been taught to see personal relationships, and particularly the relationship between the sexes, as having the same sort of romantic glorification that distinguishes our folklore and literature—to many of these people, cultural life appears as the highest and the most hopeful form of human activity. And these people are apt to measure other civilization by the degree to which they are considerate of cultural values and cause cultural activities to flourish within their confines.

Beyond this, of course, this world of art and the spirit has a symbolic value in international life which has been the subject of an appalling number of clichés, but is no less significant on that account. It is a fact that in the creation of beauty and in the great monumental works of the intellect, and there alone, human beings have been able to find an unfailing bridge between nations, even in the darkest moments of political bitterness and chauvinism and exclusiveness. In many years of living in totalitarian countries, both Germany and Russia, I have been struck time and time again by the fact that where every other manifestation of human life has been given some sort of a political coloration and planed, so to speak, for the political process, artistic creation and the higher forms of scholarly thought have remained the only areas in which it was conceded, even by the totalitarians, that men of different faith and allegiances might conceivably find a bond. Even at the blackest moments of the cultural isolation forced on the Soviet Union by Stalin—and those moments were black indeed—never was the principle really challenged that there were cultural values, universal in their meaning and their appeal, in the appreciation of which all men, regardless of class or social allegiance, could meet and find a common subject of understanding. Not even the crushing extent to which the Soviet regime tried to force the Soviet intelligentsia into the service of its own political purposes could obviate this underlying reality. In fact, subconsciously it was in a gesture of profound respect and, in a way, humility that the Soviet leaders were forced to come to the artists, to cultivate their favor and to seek their assistance in the propaganda activities of the party, knowing that these intellectuals enjoyed a form of confidence in the minds of men elsewhere which no political ideology could ever rival, and that they were capable of bestowing upon the regime a certain pattern of approval and legitimacy that nothing else could bestow. In this long, tortuous contest between the Soviet leaders and the cultural world of the people under their rule, a contest that has gone on now for some 3 decades, for all the terror and all the brutality, it has really been the politicians who were the supplicants, and the people who wield the pen and brush whose influence was courted. The totalitarians recognized that only if they appeared outwardly to enjoy the confidence and enthusiasm of the artists could they plausibly claim to have created a hopeful and creditable civilization. And I find it sad to think that they should have come to this appreciation so much sooner than many of our own people.

It is for these reasons that I personally attach such high importance to cultural contact as a means of combating the negative impressions about this country that mark so much of world opinion. What we have to do, of course, is to show the outside world both that we have a cultural life and that we care something about it—that we care enough about it, in fact, to give it encouragement and support here at home, and to see that it is enriched by acquaintance with similar activity elsewhere. If these impressions could only be conveyed with enough force and success to countries beyond our borders, I for my part would willingly trade the entire remaining inventory of political propaganda for the results that could be achieved by such means alone.

There are two reservations that I would like to voice about that proposition. One is concerned with what we give to others, the other is concerned with what we take from them. The first is this: We must not make the mistake of thinking that any sort of cultural product will do for interchange, as long as it is American, and that the content of our contribution is a matter of secondary importance. Of course, we can't be perfect in the arts; our things are always going to have deficiencies. A great deal is also going to depend on the modesty, naturalness and humility with which we bring these things to other people. But we can be selective. There are a great many Americans who don't understand this. Fortunately, I think, not many of them are concerned with matters of international cultural interchange, though many of them are concerned with governmental affairs and with diplomacy. There are many who feel that we are such an interesting and glamorous people that any and all manifestations of American culture ought ipso facto to be welcome and helpful anywhere. I have seen American ambassadors, for example, in more than one instance exhibit one silly and inferior American film after the other to invited foreign audiences, in the happy confidence that no product of Hollywood could fail to be impressive and enjoyable to the foreign observer. So when we deliberately enter into this sort of exchange, let us by all means see to it that what we send is the best we can muster, and that it is something that is comprehensible and acceptable elsewhere. Above all, let us not make the common American mistake, so characteristic of the commercial mediums, of thinking that contributions of weak artistic talent or content are going to be acceptable if only they are packaged in pretentious and elaborate frameworks of technical execution.

My second reservation relates, as I said, to what we take from others. It concerns, quite simply, our graciousness as a host to foreign cultural activities in this country. It is not enough to let other people send things here and come here themselves. It is, of course, important to see that any cultural activity sponsored by foreigners that takes place within our borders is surrounded at all times with an atmosphere of hospitality and warmth, friendliness, and perceptive sympathy. Now, artists are peculiar people, sensitive people. They move unceasingly in

a sort of painful half-world between the feeling of the artist and the level of public taste and appreciation. I think they can take a great deal of criticism, as long as they feel that it is honest and disinterested, but what they cannot stand is disrespect for their art itself, and they have not quite the same tolerance that most of the rest of us have for minor frustrations and tactlessness, stupidity, and bureaucracy.

Here, of course, is where our Government could be of help. Perhaps these words will reach it. The experience of foreign artists with American hospitality begins when they first come into contact with American officials abroad with regard to their visas. It is only too evident that this experience today is rarely a happy one, and I would like to raise the question once more whether this is really necessary, whether it is really beyond the resources of a great nation like ourselves to make arrangements whereby such visitors and others, too, would be given their visas in a relatively relaxed and civilized way. I would raise the question whether we have no alternative but to fingerprint them like common criminals. Let's remember that what was offensive to the Soviet student editors (and I think needlessly and undesirably so) is no less offensive to visitors from those countries with which we have long been associated by bonds of friendship. And, of course, these things are only symbolic of the treatment at all stages of their contact with this country. We have already created a situation, or we have had a situation in recent years (I hope it is passing now), in which the holding of scientific and cultural gatherings in this country has been so difficult that many well-meaning people quail at the thought of initiating them and refrain from doing so if they can. It is absolutely essential, to my mind, that we correct these conditions, that we learn as a nation to make distinguished foreign artsists feel, whatever their origin or whatever the merits of their art, that they have come to a country where cultural values are respected for their own sake, where the obligations of hospitality are inviolable, and where they are surrounded at all times by appreciation and tact and good will.

While we are on these unhappy problems of security, let me mention one more thing. In recent years, it seems to me, there has grown up among us a most reprehensible habit, a totalitarian habit, in fact, of judging the suitability of cultural contributions by whatever political coloration we conceive their creators to have acquired. I know of nothing sillier than this. A painting is not more or less valuable because the artist once belonged to this or that party or contributed to this or that group. The value of a symphony concert seems to me to be quite unaffected by the nature of the political regime under which the conductor may once have plied his trade. If we are going to encourage any form of artistic expression, for goodness' sake, let's do precisely that, and let's look, like mature people, to the content of what we are promoting and not to irrelevant personal attributes of those who participate. After all, cultural events are not political livestock exhibits in which we put forward human figures to be admired for the purity of their ideological features. And, no matter how overwhelmingly important or significant those things may seem to some of us, they are not going to seem either interesting or pertinent to peoples abroad. To the extent that we let this sort of childishness enter into our approach to international cultural exchanges, to that extent, it seems to me, we are going to weaken rather than strengthen the effect of what we do.

All this is admittedly going to require something in the nature of a revolution in the attitude of many of us toward cultural activity generally as well as toward our obligations here in the international field—and that is not going to be easy. A country which is an indifferent home to its own cultural life, a country which, for example, can spend millions annually on horse racing or on the slot machines, but cannot have an open opera house in its own National Capital, has a good distance to go, and I think there is no use deceiving ourselves about it. But we can at least begin with the realization that the realm of the spirit has a far higher rating outside of our borders than we have been accustomed to giving it at home; that a larger part of the hopes and enthusiasms of mankind are oriented to this realm than most of us have been inclined to believe; and that we are not going to make our way as we would like to make it, or find that pathway we seek to the feelings and understanding of other people, unless we learn to share something of this appreciation and this hope in the capacity of the human being to create beauty and to reach the higher and more subtle forms of apprehension of this life.

If we can learn to do this, if we can come to attach to this whole field of human endeavor a respect and a significance comparable to what is given to it abroad, then, I think, we will have come a great step on the way to the improvement of our international situation generally. But, as I said at the outset of this discussion, if we do that, it will not be in our external relations, nor in what we mean to other people, that our gain will be the greatest. These things will be important, to be sure. But our most important gain will be the gain for our own sakes, the gain in what we mean to ourselves—and in what, I suspect, life means to all of us.

Essay on Know Your Government by Marcia Frost

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUGH J. ADDONIZIO
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 27, 1956

Mr. ADDONIZIO. Mr. Speaker, among the visitors to the House of Representatives today are Miss Marcia Frost and Mrs. H. W. Kiley, of West Orange, N. J. Thirteen-year-old Marcia, a student at Roosevelt Junior High School, in West Orange, won a 3-day trip to Washington for submitting the best essay in a Know Your Government contest sponsored by the Young Democrats of West Orange. Mrs. Kiley was designated to accompany Marcia by Mr. Walter Hoffman, the chairman of the contest committee. A series of weekly contests was held over a number of weeks, and the final award was made on the basis of all the essays submitted. The contest was open to students ranging from 12 to 19 years of age attending schools in West Orange. Marcia, is the daughter of Mr. and Mrs. Louis Frost, of 17 Porter Road, West Orange.

The judges of the contest were the Honorable Walter Quinn, the mayor of West Orange; Mrs. Lucille Mathisen, and Mr. Robert McRoberts.

Mr. Milton Malkin, chairman of the West Orange Young Democrats, Mr. Hoffman, and the members of this fine organization deserve great credit for sponsoring this contest which was designed to stimulate interest in government and to make our young people aware of the obligations and duties of citizenship.

I know all the Members will be interested in reading Marcia's splendid essay which follows:

(By Marcia Frost)

If phillip Nolan, who was a man without a country, could return to the United States he probably would be a perfect citizen.

A perfect citizen is one who takes advantage of his voting privileges, obeys all laws, improves his education, furthers his religious knowledge, helps build a better community, and all in all helps keep the United States the best it can possibly be.

This year, an election year, is a perfect time for people to show how well they understand our great American heritage of the freedom to elect the person we feel best qualified to office. We should listen to as many campaign speeches as possible. These will help by giving the voter a short synopsis of the candidate's feelings toward the foreign policy of the United States, the things he thinks are necessary to require special attention, plus many other pointers that would help you, the voter, decide. When election primaries come in your State everyone should go to the polls and vote. Many people feel that primaries aren't important. Well they are. When there is an election for some small post or local referendum in your town don't pass it by with the "I don't care" attitude. For all voting whether large or small has either a direct or indirect effect on you.

When you vote in elections you usually vote for the people who have your ideas or who you feel are strong, capable, and sincere leaders. If their ideas are similar to yours the laws that they and their admintration pass should be in your favor. All laws, however, which are passed should be obeyed even if you would have enjoyed it a little better if it was worded differently. Most laws are made to better your community, your country, your health, et cetera.

Parents, as well as children, must continue to further their education. This will enable them to better understand the operations of his community's and National Government.

Taking part in religious activities helps mold a person's attitude towards his neighbor, community activities help to better and accomplish the objectives necessary for the improvements of our country. This includes the keeping of a clean and healthy community.

All these things help to round out a perfect United States.

In a bird's eye view Phillip Nolan would now see a United States which is a leader among nations in educational, cultural, economical and diplomatic fields. Its representatives are its people who have gained experience and ability through their interests in good government, the country's laws, and community. All of these factors help to create a perfect citizen in a perfect United States.

Good Will Ambassadors

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. DODD
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 12, 1956

Mr. DODD. Mr. Speaker, the people of Connecticut may well take deep pride in the accomplishments of a group of

New Britain youngsters who have been chosen to entertain our troops overseas and to act as unofficial good-will ambassadors in the Far East. Twenty-eight New Britain boys, selected in competition by the USO and the Armed Forces Service Organization, will leave by plane July 2 on the tour.

These young people are members of the band of the Catholic Youth Organization Music Club, sponsored by Father John B. Malley, of St. Ann's Church, New Britain, Conn, and developed by Father Augustine H. Giusani, Mr. Samuel R. Constanzo, and Mr. Dominic Constanzo.

This fine musical group will be able to make a significant contribution toward easing world tensions and mistrust by showing the people of the Far East both the friendliness and the culture of American youth. Their selection from among competing bands is a tribute to the skill and unstinting generosity of their adult advisors, but laymen and clergymen.

Under leave granted, I include an editorial by Mr. Jim Butler, of the New Britain Herald, as a part of my remarks:

GOOD WILL AMBASSADORS

(By Jim Butler)

A bunch of our New Britain neighbors, mostly teen-agers, are uniforming for overseas service in a mission whose success could operate to save them, and others like them, from being called on to make another crossing in a uniform of different color and purpose.

Few communities have the fortune of having their sons and daughters selected for international chores. A century ago it was Elihu Burritt, New Britain's learned blacksmith who was to bring the people of the world together in commerce, and sentiment, through his universal postage-rate system. Now it's an aggregation made up mostly of the kids who knock the baseballs through our windows or swish by, bobby-soxing their way to school: the 28 musicians, vocalists and other entertainers who will taxi down an airport runway July 2 and head for the Far East with the aspirations of the free world riding their willing shoulders.

JOINT AUSPICES

These are the New Britain CYO music club band members and entourage. They are on their way under joint auspices of USO and their neighbors to bring a part of the home town to service personnel who, it must be, are homesick. And, not at all incidentally, to try to play their way into the friendship and hearts of many people of strange languages, customs, and unfamiliar races.

They'll be on their way, next month, to test the theory that shiny musical instruments and friendly smiles can do more to obtain and preserve peace than can shiny guns and the practiced growls of youth transformed into military machine.

The USO will pick up the tab for the principal items of travel and subsistence. New Britainites and their neighbors will raise the rest. It's about $5,000, to be gathered voluntarily and without the means or organization for full-fledged "drive." It isn't a drive in the truer sense. It's more an opportunity. It is a chance, for a buck or two, or less or more it is a means permit, to buy participation in the biggest mass expression of local civic pride and an assertion of belief in the decency of people everywhere, that has ever been presented to us at home. It will be giving the kids a chance to show that they can do more to bring the message of peaceful intent to people overseas than has been accomplished by the big men with the gray flannel mouths.

PEOPLE, NOT LEADERS

The philosophy of winning the cold war and a permanent peace by associating ourselves in bonds of friendship with the people (not the foolish, fat leaders) of other lands, is a good one. USO, the State Department, and the Department of Defense have tried it out in practice. Entertainers have gone to every corner of the globe where United States servicemen are stationed and they have left favorable impressions on the nationals of those countries who shared the benefits with the men in uniform.

But it seems there is something missing when the show uses the hardened professional with the hackneyed impersonal routines of stage and screen. Washington thinks the answer was found right here in New Britain. What was wanted was something new that spoke for the world of youth. It had to be acceptable to all levels of political and economic thought and it had to surmount language barriers.

That meant music—music of universal appeal, played with skill and versatile touch, and on a professional level one expects of a show window of the United States of America. The needs wrote the specifications for CYO's New Britain facilities and skills and to this city came its government with a commission of good will and diplomacy.

So the kids and their directors and guides are packing their instruments for a job of magnitude and distinction that we just, well, we just never thought anything like it could happen. But that's the story. Meanwhile, the bucks are needed to make the dream a reality. Washington is betting on New Britain and the CYO. They're ready to play their heads off. If you'd like to bet the kids will come back in August to report "Mission accomplished" Father Augustine H. Guisani says he'll handle that kind of wager.

Lost Fellow Travelers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELIZABETH KEE

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 6, 1956

Mrs. KEE. Mr. Speaker, all of us have been deeply interested in the recent developments within the Soviet Union and the attempts of its present leaders to deglorify Stalin. Whatever may be the purpose of the Kremlin leaders of today in their policy of degrading their dead boss, it would appear that their performance has had a profound effect upon Communist and fellow-traveler groups in other countries. A very interesting statement about this effect in Italy is contained in the following editorial from the Washington (D. C.) Evening Star of Monday June 25, 1956. Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I should like to call the attention of my colleagues to this editorial:

LOST FELLOW TRAVELERS?

Pietro Nenni, leader of the extreme left-wing faction of the Italian Socialist Party, has now cut loose with a long and bitter ideological article that is likely to be read with some sobriety by Russia's "collective leaders." Among other things, it suggests that he and his followers—heretofore communism's most dependable western allies—have been lost by the Kremlin and that they will henceforth travel on their own, or perhaps even throw their considerable parliamentary weight on the side of Premier Segni's anti-Red coalition government.

In its potentials at least, that is a highly significant development from the standpoint of Italy's internal politics. For the Nenni Socialists—who in the recent local and provincial elections gained added strength at the expense of the Communists—have long been close collaborators of the Reds, and if they now cease to be fellow travelers, if instead they begin to vote like the other Socialists and generally lend their support to the middle-of-the-road coalition, Italian governing stability should be appreciably enhanced. And that in turn should benefit the West as a whole.

Moreover, in the free world beyond Italy, the Nenni article should have a marked impact on all extremist political groups that still tend to be ardently pro-Kremlin. In that respect, it should serve to impede Moscow's efforts to promote Red-Socialist "popular fronts" in Western parliaments. And it should intensify the embarrassment of the bewildered and divided Italian, French, British, and other non-Russian Communists whose heads are still reeling from the shock of what Mr. Nenni describes as the profound crisis imposed on international communism by the official Soviet revelations of Stalin's monstrous crimes. For his own part, he does not doubt the truth of those revelations. On the contrary, he accepts them for what they are—unquestionable fact—and he sees in them good reason to brand Nikita Khrushchev and company with a large measure of the awful guilt involved.

Indeed, in effect, Mr. Nenni contends that the post-Stalin Kremlin—if it is to purge itself of that guilt—must do much more than just deglorify the dead tryant; it must overhaul the entire Soviet system by eliminating the last vestiges of terrorism and by permitting genuine individual and group liberty both within Russia and in the satellite lands. Certainly, to have him say this, after all his years of fellow-traveling, is a striking thing that should have wholesome repercussions not only in Italy but far beyond.

Hats Off to Mr. Culp

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM A. DAWSON

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 26, 1956

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, the drive, devotion and capabilities of another Utahan have been recognized by one of America's great civic organizations—Kiwanis International. Kiwanians this month elected Reed C. Culp as their international president. I want to take this opportunity of congratulating the 250,000 members of Kiwanis on their choice. I have known Reed Culp for years and I want to assure the Members that he exemplifies all that Kiwanis stands for. Since so many Members of Congress are Kiwanians, including myself, I am submitting for the RECORD a copy of an editorial on Mr. Culp which appeared recently in the Salt Lake Deseret News and Telegram of June 22, 1956:

HATS OFF TO MR. CULP

Election of Reed C. Culp of Salt Lake to the presidency of Kiwanis International brought special honor to Utah and the Mountain West, but came as no real surprise to the host of friends and coworkers

of the hard-working, devoted Mr. Culp. For more than 20 years, Reed Culp has been active in Kiwanis and has helped materially to build that fine organization, as well as splendidly exemplifying Kiwanis principles.

Mr. Culp is not only the first Utahan, but also the first man in the Mountain West area to be named president of the quarter-million-member organization. It is not, however, Mr. Culp's first major office in the international. After serving as president of the Salt Lake City club and of the Utah-Idaho District, he filled two terms as an international trustee and was treasurer of the international organization last year.

The Deseret News and Telegram joins all Salt Lake City and Utah in congratulating Mr. Culp on his new honor and the honor he has brought to the State. And we congratulate Kiwanis International, too, on selecting a man of Mr. Culp's caliber to lead it during the coming year.

The American of Tomorrow Needs the Boy Scout Movement

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RUSSELL V. MACK
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 25, 1956

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Speaker, the Boy Scout movement reached an alltime high in America last year. It now has a grand total of 4,175,-134 members—men and boys. There are 104,150 Boy Scout units in the Nation.

Since Boy Scouting first came into being 48 years ago, the number of boys and leaders who have been or are now members of the Boy Scout movement total 24,675,000.

The effect of Scouting on these almost 25 million Americans and their families has been tremendous and, in turn, their influence upon the Nation and its thinking and morals has been enormous.

The American people and the people of the world are better and happier because Boy Scouting has existed.

We Americans live in a constantly changing world and this constant change creates the need for training youth in greater numbers than ever before to go "onward for God and country."

Boy Scouting serves with the home, church, and school to build a greater and a better America.

Nothing finer has been said about the need for the Boy Scout movement than was expressed in a recent message on meeting the needs by Arthur A. Schuck, chief scout executive of the National Council of the Boy Scouts of America.

Mr. Schuck's inspiring message on Scouting follows:

MEETING THE NEEDS

In establishing our Nation, our forefathers embarked on a great experiment in government by the people, for the people. They recognized the supremacy of the individual and that the objective of government was to contribute to the fullness of life, liberty, and happiness of every citizen. This ideology has made us a great Nation.

We must recognize, however, that democracy can never be static. Each generation is called upon to make its contribution not only to the maintenance of democracy but also to its growth and development. This is particularly important in these times when we live in a world of tension because of Communist philosophy that would subjugate the individual to the state and to rule by force. The cold war is a real war—a battle of ideas and ideals.

The program of the Boy Scouts of America involves much more than building youth physically or providing attractive leisure-time activities. Its fundamental purpose is to train the boys of America in qualities of character and citizenship that are essential to maintaining our free way of life and, through these boys, to demonstrate to the world the values of freedom.

The citizen should be developed to be physically strong, mentally awake, and morally straight. Health and education are important in the free world, but to remain free ideals and spiritual convictions are basic. To these principles we are dedicated.

The Boy Scouts of America—as a supplementary program to our Nation's basic institutions, the home, the church, the school—has always sought the cooperation of religious, civic, business, labor, and educational interests. With this cooperation in two campaigns, "Strengthen the arm of liberty" and "Forward on liberty's team," we made great progress.

This report reveals not only our growth in boy membership, but the way in which over 1 million men and women of America have enlisted to serve our country through Scouting and thus to meet the needs of our times. This represents one of our strongest bulwarks against communism and a potent force for strengthening our democracy. This is a heartening realization in consideration of the importance of even greater achievement in our 4-year program. "Onward for God and my country."

Socialism's False Promises

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 27, 1956

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to insert in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the following 2 articles from U. S. News & World Report, 1 entitled "Miners Try Again," and the other an excerpt from the "Business Around the World" section, each from the issue of June 29, 1956.

The purpose of inserting these articles is to call attention to the unreality of the gains that socialism promises. The argument for private enterprise over socialism is not an emotional argument or one based upon tradition. It is based upon the proven fact that the personnel system of private enterprise is superior to a personnel system of a political government. I never have understood why certain top labor leaders are anxious to have Government take over more of private enterprise. Under this setup, the laboring men lose their basic rights. Certainly the situation of the Welsh miners should convince our American labor leaders that the government is the most uncompromising employer to have to deal with.

The articles follow:

MINERS TRY AGAIN

A "reprieve" has been granted a mining town of 4,000 in the coal fields of South Wales. Coal mines at Gwaun-Cae-Gurwin had been closed down for good by Britain's National Coal Board, which runs the nation's coal mines. That ended the jobs of 1,065 miners, and threatened the life of Gwaun-Cae-Gurwin.

A series of strikes and slowdowns—249 of them since 1947—was cited by the Board as the reason for the shutdown. When the miners asked for a second chance, the Board agreed to allow 279 men to go back into the mines for a few weeks to demonstrate that they could produce a proper standard of work.

On June 15, the Board found that production, per man, had doubled in the test period. They agreed to open the mines again. But they warned: "This is not an unconditional reprieve."

Another of Britain's problems is pinpointed in a recent editorial appearing in the Financial Times, a business newspaper published in London:

"The real problem of the nationalized industries is the problem of efficiency. So far as one can tell, managerial standards in these industries are deplorably low. Absenteeism in the coal mines is so much higher than prewar that a return to prewar levels by itself would be worth an extra 40,000 men or about 11 million tons a year. British Overseas Airways Corporation has only managed to obtain considerably less than 10 percent of the North Atlantic passenger traffic, compared with over 50 percent carried by American airlines. British Railways is technically one of the most backward in the world, although in 1939 the British system was one of the most efficient. British Electricity takes between 75 and 100 percent longer to build a power station than do foreign electrical producers, or than did private British companies before the take-over. These are the facts which ought to cause anxiety."

New England Moves in Flood Control: Major General Holle's Address at Ground-Breaking Ceremonies at Barre Falls Dam, Mass.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 18, 1956

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, the ground-breaking for the Barre Falls Dam and Reservoir at Barre, Mass., on June 15, marked the regeneration of the planned flood-control program for the Connecticut River Basin. It is one of the initial units in the comprehensive plan carrying present monetary authorizations of approximately $73 million.

The Barre Falls Dam and Reservoir will give much needed flood protection in the Ware and Chicopee River watershed areas, wherein are situated 30 industrial plants employing some 6,000 persons, many of whom are engaged in defense production. The New England Division of the Corps of Engineers will supervise construction of the Barre Falls Dam and Reservoir, under direction of Brig. Gen. Robert J. Fleming.

Present with me to hear Maj. Gen. Charles G. Holle, Deputy Chief of Engineers for Construction, at the Barre Falls ground breaking, were my colleagues, Congressman Dodd and Sadlak, of Connecticut; Walter G. White, of Concord, N. H., chairman of the Connecticut River Valley Flood Control Commission; Ward Duffy, of Hartford, Conn., president of the Connecticut River Watershed Council; the selectmen from the towns of Barre, Rutland, Oakham, and Hubbardston; members of the Springfield Chapter, Izaak Walton League, and the Westfield River Watershed Association. Col. Francis L. Rimbach, of Boston, represented the Commonwealth of Massachusetts.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to have included with my remarks an editorial that appeared in the Springfield, Mass., Union on last Monday, June 18, entitled "Belated Start," and the remarks of General Holle following the Barre Falls ground-breaking ceremony:

FULFILLING THE PLEDGE

(Remarks by Maj. Gen. Charles G. Holle, Deputy Chief of Engineers for Construction at groundbreaking of Barre Falls Dam, Mass., June 15, 1956)

Ten months ago the Connecticut Valley was being ripped to pieces beneath an avalanche of water. Areas that escaped inundation were caught in the backwash of economic dislocation. State, local, and Federal agencies joined the fight to rescue lives and restore communities. As they worked, they pledged themselves to do everything possible to assure that such a disaster should never happen again. Our presence here today is evidence that those pledges were made in earnest.

Seldom, indeed, has a disaster been so closely followed by physical construction. It is not a simple thing to launch the building of a major Federal dam. Even the selection of the site where a dam can do an effective job requires, first, a study of the entire watershed. The project must be authorized, the detailed designs made, the money appropriated after deliberation by Congress, specifications prepared, and contracts let.

Fortunately a considerable amount of preliminary work had already been done in this area by Federal and regional agencies. But not all of it was up to date. Nevertheless, in order to begin construction today, processes and procedures have had to be telescoped. The Congress, the Corps of Engineers, and the State and local governments all have worked with zeal and urgency to provide this great valley with the project the need for which was demonstrated so tragically last summer.

In the emergency supplemental appropriation bill passed by Congress after the floods, $300,000 was included for advancing the construction of Barre Falls Dam. In the budget for the year 1956–57 the President asked the Congress to appropriate $1,150,000 more, a sum which would provide for carrying the dam about half way to completion by a year from now. This appropriation has been approved by both Houses of Congress and will be available for expenditure as soon as the President signs the appropriation bill.

Barre Falls Dam is but 1 of 6 dams in the Connecticut River Valley for which money to start planning or construction was requested by the President this year. To appreciate the significance of this request—6 projects in this valley being included in a single appropriation bill—we must recall that only 5 Federal dams have been built in this valley in the past 19 years.

We are off to a fast start. Now it is up to all of us to make sure that our momentum does not slacken in years to come, as last summer's floods recede into memory. It is a natural but sometimes unfortunate characteristic of we humans that good times and good things remain in our memories and often seem even better as we look back on them; while bad times and bad things tend to be forgotten. Generally this is a blessing. But sometimes it lets us fall into a sense of false security—to neglect precautions that should be taken. We have an example in the history of this very valley.

Last year's floods were by no means the first to spread havoc in the Connecticut Valley. Looking back some 30 years we find that there was a bad flood in November of 1927 and another in March of 1936.

Immediately after the 1936 flood Congress passed the Flood Control Act of that year, under which for the first time the Federal Government assumed responsibility for flood-control work throughout the Nation. At once the Army engineers set about preparing comprehensive plans for controlling the waters of various rivers, including the Connecticut. The Connecticut Basin plan, published in 1937, called for 20 reservoirs—13 in Vermont, 3 in New Hampshire, and 4 in Massachusetts—plus levees, flood-walls, channel improvements, and similar local protective works in many places. It is important to note that this system of works was planned to operate as a unit. The reservoirs were planned to supplement the local works by holding back floodwater only to the extent that it could be contained by the improved channels and levees downstream.

Hardly had this been announced than the valley was stricken by the flood of 1938, the worst of record up to that time. That flood, too, was followed by a great outcry to get on with the flood-protection plan. Within the next few years additional projects were authorized by Congress for flood protection in the Connecticut Basin—among them this Barre Falls Dam, which was authorized on August 18, 1941.

But then an even worse catastrophe, World War II, came along and flood control was necessarily assigned a lower priority. By the time the war was over the old zeal to get on with the flood-control job had abated. The war had brought enormously increased taxes and other burdens. The Army engineers' plan for the Connecticut Valley called for relatively large expenditures for construction, and people began asking themselves whether it were really needed. Year after year went by without a flood. Vivid recollection of the disaster of 1938 disappeared, along with other unhappy memories of the depression period.

Then, after having stayed her hand for 17 years, nature struck again. In the northeastern area during the August 1955 storm 180 people lost their lives, 161,000 were left homeless, and 6 to 7 hundred million dollars of flood damage was suffered—all within a few hours.

And Barre Falls Dam, which was authorized just after the almost forgotten flood of 1938, is now finally being started while the disaster of 1955 is fresh in our memories.

But the comprehensive Connecticut River Basin plan of which it is a part is no longer the same. Changes in that original plan had been contemplated even before the flood, as a result of the work of the New England-New York Inter-Agency Committee.

Circumstances in the valley have greatly changed since the plan was first formulated in 1937. This very locality is a good example. During the 1938 flood about $6,500,000 worth of damage occurred in the Chicopee River Valley below the Barre Falls damsite. If the same flood were to occur today, the damage would total well over $11 million. That increase reflects the increase in the value of development that has taken place in this area and all through the Connecticut Valley. For example, the damage to industrial plants alone would cost more than the total dollar damage in 1938 if a comparable flood were to occur now. When converted to an annual basis, the yearly value of the damage to be prevented is almost three times as great as the yearly prorated cost of the dam.

Because of the constantly changing pattern of economic development in this or any other valley, all flood control plans, all over the Nation, must be periodically reviewed. The Connecticut Valley is no exception, and, as I say, the long-dormant plant for that valley was in process of alteration when last summer's floods struck, bringing about still further changes.

Despite the eagerness of all concerned to get into construction in this valley, I am sure that all will agree that the construction must be soundly planned. Consequently the Corps of Engineers is now engaged on another review of the entire New England area, restudying existing plans to see whether further modifications may be needed and that all foreseeable contingencies are adequately provided for. The survey in the Connecticut Valley is scheduled to be completed within about 2 years, and in the entire New England region in about 5 or 6 years. The result of the survey will be to make us all as sure as mortals can be that our construction is properly adapted to the present economic development of the region and to the newly revealed destructive potentialities of Nature.

Needless to say, your local and National Governments are not going to stand still while waiting for the survey to be finished. Certain works are known to be needed in any plan, and Barre Falls Dam is one of them. So are the other dams for which money has been requested in this year's budget—Otter Brook Dam in New Hampshire and Ball Mountain, Townsend, and North Springfield Dams in Vermont, all of which will be put into construction as soon as funds are appropriated, and North Hartford Dam in Vermont, for which planning money is requested.

Each of these dams will protect the reaches directly downstream from it. But their work does not stop there. Taken together, they are parts of a system of reservoirs which will reduce the stages of large floods to levels that can be contained by downstream levees and floodwalls. Barre Falls Dam, for example, is in this way an indispensable part of the protection of such major industrial centers as Chicopee, Springfield, West Springfield, Hartford, and East Hartford. For this reason it is important to the national welfare and defense.

For this reason, too, the flood-control effort in this valley must not stop when Barre Falls and the other dams are completed. All the dams in the modified comprehensive plan will be needed to secure the prosperity and welfare of the Connecticut Valley. We learned last year that areas in the valley which escaped inundation nevertheless suffered severely from the dislocations caused by the flood. Unless the entire valley is protected, every part of it is subject to serious losses.

Bad as it was, the flood of 1955 was not the worst flood that possibly could strike this region. Had the rainfall pattern of last August been oriented a mere 70 miles eastward of where it actually occurred, the entire Connecticut Valley would have been devastated. No one can predict just where the next great storm will strike. Completion of the entire plan is needed if the valley is to consider itself reasonably safe.

Hence, the construction job in the Connecticut Valley must be approached not only with resolution and initiative, but with an unshakable determination that this time the effort shall not be allowed to slacken until the job is finished. Barre Falls Dam will not render its full measure of service to this

locality, to the Connecticut Valley, and to the Nation until every part of the revised plan has been built. The task will take many years and will cost large sums of money, but it will cost only a fraction as much as floods that this valley has repeatedly seen. The memories of last year may fade away, but steadfastness of purpose must not. This is a great day in the Connecticut Valley, but it marks only the beginning of the fulfillment of the solemn pledges made last year. In our celebration of this groundbreaking, all of us may well renew our pledges. We must not rest until we have done everything humanly possible to insure that a disaster like last summer's can never occur here again.

[From the Springfield (Mass.) Union of June 18, 1956]

BELATED START

Fifteen years after Congress authorized its construction, work got underway last week on the Barre Falls Reservoir, an important link in the flood-control program for the Connecticut Valley. The dam is designed to help control floodwaters and prevent any repetition of the disasters of 1955—though originally its goal was to prevent repetition of earlier flood disasters.

The project will cost about $2 million. Valley residents are happy that actual construction has started. In the belated start, however, there is a lesson for them, as well as for all the public agencies involved. As disasters fade into the background of the years and their effects become less and less discernible until they disappear, the necessity for protection against their recurrence becomes less evident and so loses its urgency. We are lulled into a sense of false security and by agreement or indifference allow the money to be spent for other purposes without effective protest.

The Barre flood-control dam was only one in a series of control construction projects that Congress approved many years ago. Had they all been completed, we still would have suffered from destructive floodwaters last year because they were not adequate to do the whole job of protection. But it goes without saying that the damage would have been much less, in proportion to the amount of flood protection actually in existence as the result of carrying out the approved construction.

Perhaps this particular situation will not occur again. We hope it does not. But to prevent its recurrence, New England's Members of Congress and New England's people must be vigilant and insistent on complete execution of flood-control projects now on the blueprints and equipped with appropriations to see them through. More than that, we must maintain an active regard for further expansions and improvements of the control system until it reaches its limit of perfectability. Success will crown the region's fight for flood control only after everything that can be done has been done.

Compulsory Inspection of Poultry and Poultry Products

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. DODD

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 7, 1956

Mr. DODD. Mr. Speaker, on May 16, 1956, I introduced H. R. 11245, calling for the compulsory inspection of poultry and poultry products by the United States Department of Agriculture. I believe this to be urgent and important legislation.

I would, however, like to emphasize as strongly as possible that my own State of Connecticut has achieved a very high standard in regard to adequate poultry inspection, as have a few other States.

It is unfair to ask these good poultry raisers in Connecticut and elsewhere to compete with poultry raisers in other portions of the country who do not conform to these high standards.

It is important to realize that only a handful of poultry processors are responsible for the unfit products placed upon the market, and are exploiting the present laxity of inspection laws to make a quick dollar.

Since the publication of Upton Sinclair's famous book, The Jungle, in 1906, the public has become increasingly aware of the need for a workable program of inspection to make sure that no unwholesome meat product ever reaches an American table. Sinclair exposed truly shocking conditions then prevalent in the meat-packing industry, and helped to bring about sweeping reforms.

Today, a housewife can buy almost any meat product from her grocer with confidence that she is not risking the health of her family. Unfortunately this is not necessarily true of poultry or poultry products she may select.

Present laws governing the sale of poultry in interstate commerce are completely inadequate. The average family spends an estimated 12 cents out of every food dollar for poultry, but unlike almost every other important food product on the market, it may be processed and sold with almost complete disregard of sanitary standards or wholesomeness. It is by no means an overstatement to say that effective inspection hardly exists on a Federal, State, or local level.

The problem is of direct concern to poultry farmers, workers, and consumers, all of whom have a community of interest in the achievement of a workable solution. The poultry industry has undergone an almost fantastic growth in the last few years. This is especially true in Connecticut where broiler production increased by 177 percent in the decade between 1940 and 1950. These startling figures indicate both the importance of the industry and the growing need for effective inspection laws on a Federal level.

At the present time one agency of the Federal Government does perform a nonregulatory inspection service for poultry, but only on a voluntary basis and for a fee that must be paid by the processor. It seems obvious that the processor who uses these services and pays for them is at an economic disadvantage with competitors who do not.

The gravity of industrial health hazards to the poultry worker cannot be overlooked. The poultry worker is, of course, constantly exposed to danger of serious infection from diseased products.

Almost a half century ago, largely because of the impetus of Sinclair's book, the Federal Government recognized the need for an effective, compulsory program of inspection to protect the public from unsanitary processing of meat products. Excellent legislation was enacted as early as 1906 that curtailed most of the abuses then prevalent in the industry. Through the years the American public has come to have great and deserved confidence in any meat product backed by inspection of the United States Department of Agriculture.

Unfortunately, at the turn of the century poultry was of minor importance to the diet of Americans, and compulsory inspection of poultry was not included in the provisions of the law. In those days there was no poultry industry as we know it today. The housewife usually bought her poultry directly from the farmer, and did most of the dressing of the bird herself. However, with the development of excellent refrigeration facilities, frozen and pre-cooked foods and other innovations, the industry has expanded to its present prominence in the food field.

We can no longer tolerate the shipment in interstate commerce of any food product of a questionable nature. Once again I would like to emphasize that the great majority of individuals in the poultry industry are honest and sincere. As in every other occupation, however, there are always the few whose only interest is in making a fast dollar, regardless of the cost to the consumer, and ultimately to the industry itself. The occasional sharper among their ranks, by deliberately offering defective products to the public, is endangering the livelihood of all.

It is significant that much of the growing demand that Congress do something about this situation originates from within the poultry industry itself. Every ethical businessman is interested in good legislation that will promote public confidence in his product, and tend to eliminate the few individuals whose methods discredit the entire industry.

I have talked at length with a number of poultrymen from Connecticut who have assured me that the voluntary inspection program of the Department of Agriculture is no longer satisfactory. They are convinced that it is the responsibility of the Government to devise and enforce reasonable standards of sanitation to protect both the industry and the consumer. The cost of voluntary inspection is ultimately passed on to the consumer, making it difficult for inspected products to compete for the housewife's poultry dollar.

I am confident that H. R. 11245 provides a workable solution to the problem of poultry inspection. This bill declares it to be the policy of Congress to provide for the inspection of poultry and poultry products by the Inspection Service of the Department of Agriculture so as to prevent the shipment in interstate commerce of poultry that is considered unfit for human consumption. Under the authority provided by the Poultry Products Inspection Act, the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to ascertain from time to time the cities or areas where poultry or poultry products are consumed in such volume as to affect the movement of inspected poultry products in commerce. Whenever, after public hearings, he finds that the designation of

such a city or area will tend to effectuate the purposes of the act, the Secretary shall by publication in the Federal Register give public notice of such designation and the effective date. After the effective date, all poultry and poultry products processed, sold, received, or delivered in any such designated city or area will be subject to the provisions of this act.

This measure would also authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to make inspections and examinations as he considers necessary, and to destroy poultry found to be unfit for human food purposes. It would also set up a standard of sanitation in the facilities and practices relating to poultry. H. R. 11245 provides for the labeling of poultry products with an official inspection mark giving the name of the product, an accurate statement of the quantity, the weight, measure, and the name of the plant where the product was processed. Further, the sale of uninspected poultry products could be prohibited in areas designated by the Secretary.

The Department of Agriculture has had 27 years of experience in the administration of the present, voluntary system of poultry inspection, and I have no doubt that this branch of the Government is best equipped to undertake the broader program contemplated under H. R. 11245. It would appear highly discriminatory to require the poultry industry to continue to bear the cost of inspection, when the inspection of so-called red meat products is subsidized by the Federal Government. In passing, I must mention the outstanding job done by the Department of Agriculture in the inspection of red meat products. Since the enactment of the Meat Inspection Act of 1906, the public has come to have great confidence in both the integrity and thoroughness of the Department's inspection program.

I am confident that the enactment of H. R. 11245 will be of incalculable value to everyone concerned with the wellbeing of the poultry industry, whether as farmers, processors, or consumers.

Address of Gov. Averell Harriman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 27, 1956

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, I am extremely happy to give my colleagues in both Houses of Congress the opportunity of reading an address on foreign affairs and the importance of the foreign language press in this country by one who has no peers in the field of foreign diplomacy and our relations with other nations. That gentleman, of course, is the Governor of the Empire State, Averell Harriman, of New York.

In his address Governor Harriman mentions, for example, the contribution made by the foreign language press in alerting Americans of Italian extraction concerning the situation during the 1948 elections in Italy. The thousands of letters which poured into Italy at that time from relatives and friends in this country helped turn the tide against the Communists and were responsible for the election of a government friendly toward the United States. I know that story personally well because I participated in that campaign.

I sincerely doubt whether the American people are sufficiently informed and properly alerted to the Communist threat to the free world. This doubt is based on the mistakes we continually make, thus causing us to lose precious time in the cold war struggle.

Governor Harriman, by experience and background, as I have repeatedly stated, is eminently qualified to speak for the American people. I was with him in Paris nearly a year ago in July 1955 on the day after the Big Four Conference at Geneva. To a supposedly well-informed audience who believed in the "Spirit of Geneva" just then enunciated, Governor Harriman spoke fearlessly on the meaning of the Geneva spirit. He bluntly told them that the new Kremlin approach was a "phony" and urged that we should not relax our guard for one single moment. The people who were present were stunned to hear this warning so soon after the Geneva meeting when everything on the surface appeared to be peaceful. It did not take long before the world realized that Governor Harriman's analysis was proven right, as he had been consistently in the past in matters of foreign affairs.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am glad to insert the text of Governor Harriman's address on June 22, 1956, at a luncheon of the editors and publishers of the foreign language press:

TEXT OF ADDRESS BY GOV. AVERELL HARRIMAN AT A LUNCHEON OF THE EDITORS AND PUBLISHERS OF THE FOREIGN LANGUAGE PRESS OF NEW YORK AT THE OVERSEAS PRESS CLUB, NEW YORK CITY, FRIDAY, JUNE 22, 1956

I am glad to meet with the editors and publishers of the Foreign Language Press of New York and to talk with you about our foreign policies and about the role you are playing and can play in helping our country reach wise decisions.

Arthur Hayes Sulzberger, president and publisher of the New York Times, said at a college commencement last week that to meet the challenge of the cold war—which is now being waged in terms of economics and politics—the thing the citizens of this country must have is more information. It is only by having a thoroughly alert and informed electorate that a democracy can survive in the world, and win in the contest against totalitarianism. "A few wrong answers and we flunk out for good," said Mr. Sulzberger, and added "Read a good newspaper—one which specializes in information."

The American foreign language papers are such papers. They are papers that specialize in information. They are read by more individuals per copy than are the English papers. They hold a special place in the lives of the 22 million Americans who read or speak some language other than English—and they influence directly the great community of more than 34 million of our citizens who either were born abroad, or count one parent born abroad.

These papers are edited by you men and women whose ties with other countries are intimate—and whose sources of information are direct and sensitive. The readers of your papers, likewise, have closer and more sensitive sources of information, and more continuing and critical interest, as to many fields of foreign policy than do many of our other citizens. When it comes to our Nation's foreign affairs, the readers of your papers are therefore among our best citizens, because they are among the best informed in these fields.

To a reader of one of the Czech papers, for example, an event taking place today in Prague is not just another sentence from a State Department report or from a wire service dispatch buried in fine print: it is something that he understand in its full meaning, and about which the editor gives him enough details for him to be really intelligent in evaluating the news.

I still have vividly in my mind the 1948 Italian elections. Long before the rest of our people realized that a crisis faced democracy in its struggle with world communism, the editors of the foreign language press had alerted our Italian-speaking citizens. They responded with a great outpouring of letters to relatives abroad, and with other effective actions, so that they became our political shock troops against communism even as far away as Italy. And the election returns there showed their effectiveness..

Long before the OWI, the USIA, the Voice of America, Radio Free Europe, or Radio Liberation, the foreign language press was performing the task of building up specially informed bodies of American citizens, and carrying the news of democracy to multitudes of people abroad. You were doing this sincerely and effectively and often at real sacrifice, financialy and in other ways, on the part of devoted editors.

I wanted to have the pleasure of meeting you personally again and paying tribute to you today for these services. I had the privilege of serving our country abroad under Presidents Roosevelt and Truman, and I can assure you that when I speak to you in this way, I speak on the basis of my own observation and experience. What I have just said about the service of the foreign-language press is a tribute which I am ever glad to pay.

But now I have something else to say. No matter how important these services that your papers have already performed, there are still more urgent jobs before us now.

The worldwide struggle against atheistic Kremlin-led communism has taken on a direction which is very difficult for many Americans to understand. It is the same menace, but with a new face. The so-called spirit of Geneva to which President Eisenhower himself contributed when he credited the Kremlin leaders with a desire for peace no less earnest than our own created a psychological disarmament among free people. Defense efforts were slackened and the ties of NATO were loosened. This, of course, is precisely what the Kremlin wants and has been aiming at. The breakup of NATO is a principal objective of the Kremlin.

We know of the effort of the present leaders of the Kremlin to downgrade and repudiate Stalin and to disassociate themselves from the horrors of the Stalin era. But Stalin is being repudiated and attacked for murdering Bolsheviks, not for his betrayal of Poland, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, and the other countries of Eastern Europe, and the murder of their freedom-loving people. Until the present Kremlin leaders are ready to repudiate those great wrongs, we cannot put any trust in their good intentions.

Today more than ever we need to have the facts go out because of the confusion that reigns in the Eisenhower administration. President Eisenhower says one thing one day, and Dulles says something quite different the next. Much of the information from this administration is clearly false, as when they tell us that the Kremlin is working from

weakness, when everything shows that it is working from strength.

Think of the most recent confusion that was caused by President Eisenhower's statement on neutrality. At a press conference just before his unfortunate illness, the President said:

"If a nation has announced its military association with another power, things could happen to it, difficulties along its borders, and people would say, 'Good enough for it—they asked for it.' "

Those were the President's words. The United States has military alliances with some two score countries which have withstood Communist threats to stand along side of us. The Kremlin has been trying to break up those alliances, and here the President of the United States played right into their hands.

The demand or clarification came immediately from our allies and the White House had to issue a statement saying that the President didn't mean what he said at all. And the next day Dulles made a speech taking quite a different tack. But much damage had been done.

I must say to you it is high time we have a national administration that knows what it is doing and where it is going, an administration that will inspire our country to give leadership for unity of purpose among the free nations. In this way and in this way alone can we effectively deal with the evil purposes of the Kremlin.

Another job that you have is answering the new barrage of propaganda which the Soviets have been releasing in an attempt to persuade refugees from behind the Iron Curtain to return to these enslaved lands. There is no other group in America so qualified to deal effectively with this dangerous line of Soviet propaganda as are you editors of the foreign-language press.

Finally, there is the whole problem of presenting America to the rest of the world in its real spirit. How can we be a land of democracy, as seen from abroad, while we tolerate the vicious and discriminatory McCarran Act on our statute books?

I am proud of the fact that in June 1952, when this bill had passed Congress and was before President Truman for his consideration I sent him a letter, from which I quote: "I personally feel very strongly that it does such violence to the traditions and heritage of this Nation that I am compelled to urge you to veto it."

That is what I said in 1952, and I feel no less strongly today. Among the broken promises of Candidate Eisenhower is that he promised when he became President to eliminate the objectionable features of this act, but nothing has been done. If we are really to convince the rest of the world of the genuineness of our democracy, the discriminatory national origins quota system must be abolished. You are fighting for this, and I am fighting by your side for fair immigration laws which truly reflect our American ideals of fairness and equality.

We have been spending billions of dollars abroad in an attempt to build the mutual security of the free nations. All too often in recent years, this has been done in a way so inept, so bullying, and so regardless of the interests of other peoples that our effort has been self-defeating. Friendship is something that cannot be purchased with dollars, and security cannot be built with armaments alone. The mere indiscriminate handing out of military equipment, indeed, may be in many cases more harmful than helpful.

In short, what we need to export—even more than dollars and guns—is the true spirit of America: dedication to freedom and the dignity of the individual.

In this job, you can be our ambassadors, and your readers can be our information agents, through their letters and in their travels.

From my experience I know that the people of the world want to believe in us. For generations, oppressed peoples have looked for inspiration to our Declaration of Independence—to the principles on which our Nation was founded.

I know that we can reestablish our prestige, regain the confidence of the free peoples, and work together to guard freedom in the world and expand it. It is clear that if we stand together, strong and confident, we can protect and enlarge the areas of freedom and hasten the day when the peoples now imprisoned and enslaved behind the Iron Curtain can again enjoy the blessings of independence and freedom under God. In the achievement of these noble purposes I know that you will continue to play your full part.

Christian Tolerance: Freedom's Finest Flower

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD D. DONOHUE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 11, 1956

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, I should like to include a very timely and most scholarly address delivered by the Reverend L. J. Twomey, S. J., on May 13, 1956, at a lecture forum in the Worcester (Mass.) Memorial Auditorium under the sponsorship of the Worcester Chapter, National Association for the Advancement of Colored People.

Father Twomey, who is director of the Institute of Industrial Relations at Loyola University in New Orleans, La., emphasized, in his patriotic appeal, that continuing freedom in the world depends almost entirely on America. He pointed out with most convincing clarity that both the remainder of the free world, as well as the Communist leaders, are ceaselessly watching us to determine whether or not we modern Americans have the courage and the character to live in the spirit of our revered Declaration of Independence.

Father Twomey further explained that for our own security and survival we must attract by our living example and hold the allegiance of the vitally important one-third of the earth's population who as yet have pledged themselves to neither communism nor democracy. He declared that his objective was simply to try to awaken Americans to the foundation importance of human relations, not so much as a sectional problem in the United States, which he emphasized it was not, but as a world problem, and the problems of the world will be settled only when the basic race problem is equitably settled.

Summarizing his thesis, Father Twomey stated that the United States and the world are passing through one of the great turning points of history and if Americans unite in practicing the true principles of a democracy under God, we need have no fear of a Communist triumph, as the lights of Divine understanding and brotherly love shining from our shores will rekindle the lamps of liberty all over the world.

The Messrs. George A. Strait and George E. Spencer were cochairmen of the program held for the benefit of the freedom fund of the NAACP. The Rev. Philip M. T. Lenud, minister of John Street Baptist Church, gave the invocation, and Rabbi Abraham P. Kazis gave the benediction.

Father Twomey's address follows:

The route from New Orleans to Worcester and return covers about 3,000 miles. My willingness to travel that distance is in some small way a measure of my esteem for the distinguished Bishop of Worcester, His Excellency, the Most Reverend John Wright. By warmly urging that I accept the invitation of the Worcester Branch of National Association for the Advancement of Colored people, he is principally responsible for my being here this evening. It is further a measure of the importance I attach to the problem of race relations in the United States. I say in the United States advisedly. For not only to southerners but to all Americans in New England and everywhere else, this problem is of acute concern. If we cannot or will not solve it in the tradition of genuine Americanism, then your future and mine is in serious jeopardy.

Whatever inconvenience may be involved, then, in scheduling this affair, is slight indeed, if only from our meeting can come a deeper appreciation of the gravity of the problem and a firmer resolve to make democracy truly operative in this as well as in all other aspects of our individual, community and national lives.

Throughout our history, the matter of human relations has been a challenge to our sincerity in professing the American creed. But in no other particular has the disparity between what we preach and what we practice been as glaring as in our failure to make the equality of man and the dignity of the human person working principles regarding our Negro citizens.

To put this discussion into sharper focus, it will be helpful briefly to survey the setting in which are cast race relations in America. Basic to the problem is undoubtedly the white man's assumption of superiority. Just when the white race made up its mind that it was the master race is lost in the dim historic past. But the assertion, either implicit of explicit, of white supremacy is written all over the record of the western world at least since the age of the great discoveries in the late 15th century and thereafter.

In the Western Hemisphere, notably in the northern half, the white supremacy fallacy got its most vicious expression with the beginning of the slave trade in the early 17th century. By colonial days, slavery had become an established institution especially on southern plantations. And when from the Revolutionary War we emerged as a new Nation, it had been built into the very structure of our political economic, and cultural life. Almost 90 years and the fighting of one of the bloodiest civil wars in history were to elapse before slavery as an accepted American practice would get knocked out.

Then came the tragic era in the South—the reconstruction—from 1865 to 1877. What happened in those crucial years we will not discuss here except to observe that for any adequate understanding of the nature of the current crisis in the South, it is necessary to know something especially of the psychological wounds then inflicted, and which the passage of 79 years since the Reconstruction has only partially healed. This is certainly not to condone, far less to justify the defiance of legitimate authority, ecclesiastical and civil, which lends such ominous undertones to the crisis. But the still vivid recollection of reconstruction days is a principal factor to be reckoned with in any realistic appraisal of Southern intransigence.

In 1877, the last Federal troops were pulled out of the South. This ended the formal stage of reconstruction. The several decades that followed were fateful ones indeed. In reviewing this period I lean heavily on the scholarly work of Arkansas-born C. Vann Woodward, the Strange Career of Jim Crow (Oxford University Press. New York., 1955), a volume which I strongly recommend for your reading. The author proves that prior to 1877, the better classes among white southerners were opposed to isolating and proscribing the Negro. This attitude, however, underwent gradual change because of several factors. First, during the last decade of the 19th century, there was a general surge of racist feeling in the United States. This was "expressed by imperialistic adventures and aggressions against colored peoples in distant lands" (p. 64). "These adventures in the Pacific and Carribean suddenly brought under the jurisdiction of the United States some 8 million people of the colored races, 'a varied assortment of inferior races,' as the nation described them, 'which, of course, should not be allowed to vote.' As Americans shouldered the white man's burden she took up at the same time many Southern attitudes on the subject of race. 'If the stronger and clever race,' said the editor of the Atlantic Monthly, 'is free to impose its will upon "new-caught, sullen peoples" on the other side of the globe, why not in South Carolina and Mississippi?'" (pp. 54–55). "These 'permissions-to-hate,'" observes Professor Woodward, "came from sources that had formerly denied such permission. They came from the Federal courts in numerous opinions, from Northern liberals eager to conciliate the South, from Southern conservatives who had abandoned their race policy of moderation in their struggle against the populists, from the populists in their mood of disillusionment with their former Negro allies" (p. 64).

Actually it was not until the 1890's that disenfranchisement laws were enacted. And it was not until the early part of this century that the segregation pattern became fixed in southern laws and customs. Thus it is historically false to maintain that segregation is rooted in long-standing traditions.

But of all the influences at work during this period none was more effective than the Supreme Court in giving segregation a facade of respectability and a status of permanence in American life. There are many actions of the Court that could be cited to underscore this point. But we confine ourselves to special consideration of only one, namely, the *Plessy* v. *Ferguson* decision of 1896. This decision was concerned with the question of whether a State (in this case, Louisiana) could segregate Negro train passengers from white without violating the constitutional rights of its citizens. The Court said "Yes," provided the service was equal. This decision became one of the most famous ever handed down by the Supreme Court. By it was written into American law the much-praised, much-condemned "separate but equal" doctrine. A precedent was thus set which was intimately to affect practically every aspect of Negro-white relations in the United States from that time on. For this doctrine served as the nucleus around which has been woven an intricate web of law and custom to give American democracy a violent undemocratic twist.

Oddly enough, the lone dissent in *Plessy* v. *Ferguson* of Justice John Marshall Harlan, whose grandson is a Justice on the present Supreme Court, is more widely quoted than the majority opinion. Let us examine this dissent, for it has important lessons for us even today. In part the dissent reads:

"But in view of the Constitution, in the eye of the law, there is in this country no superior, dominant, ruling class of citizens. There is no caste here. Our Constitution is color-blind, and neither knows nor tolerates classes among citizens. In respect of civil rights, all citizens are equal before the law. The humblest is the peer of the most powerful. The law regards man as man, and takes no account of his surroundings or of his color when his civil rights as guaranteed by the supreme law of the land are involved. It is, therefore, to be regretted that this high tribunal, the final expositor of the fundamental law of the land, has reached the conclusion that it is competent for a State to regulate the enjoyment by citizens of their civil rights solely upon the basis of race."

And he continues, "The destinies of the two races in this country are indissolubly linked together, and the interests of both require that the common government of all shall not permit the seeds of race hate to be planted under the sanction of law. What can more certainly arouse hate, what more certainly create and perpetuate a feeling of distrust between these races than the enactments which in fact proceed on the ground that colored citizens are so inferior and degraded that they cannot be allowed to sit in public coaches occupied by white citizens? • • • If evils will result from the commingling of the two races upon public highways established for the benefit of all, they will be infinitely less than those that will surely come from State legislation regulating the enjoyment of civil rights upon the basis of race. • • • "In my opinion," concludes Justice Harlan, "the judgment this day rendered will in time prove to be quite as pernicious as the decision made by this tribunal in the Dred Scott case. • • • The thin disguise of equal accommodations for passengers in railroad coaches will not mislead anyone, nor at one for the wrong this day done."

I believe that this analysis by Justice Harlan is the only valid interpretation that can be placed on the American Constitution. I believe that the hour in which the *Plessy* v. *Ferguson* decision was handed down was a dark hour indeed for America. I believe further that if the dissent of Justice Harlan had been adopted as the majority opinion, the subsequent history of race relations in this country would not have been such as now to imperil the future of democracy in the eyes of the two-thirds of the world population who belong to nonwhite races and who are not interested in "white" democracy. In 1896 had the Court accepted the view of Justice Harlan, in 1956 our eyes would not be flowing with tears over outraged justice, and our hearts would not be aching with frustration over the ever-worsening threat of atheistic communism. Truly what Justice Harlan's dissent so tragically forecast as the course race relations would take in the succeeding 5½ decades has become "America's greatest and most conspicuous scandal."

Through the years since 1896, the harshness of *Plessy* v. *Ferguson* was softened in certain important aspects. As early as 1917 the Supreme Court outlawed zoning laws which enforced segregated housing. Also, in subsequent years, were ruled all forms of segregation in interstate travel. And within the last 10 years, the Court has required many State universities to accept qualified Negro applicants. In none of these cases, however, was the issue joined as to the constitutionality of the "separate but equal" provision of the 1896 decision.

But in the years between 1948 and 1954, the Supreme Court, in a series of important civil-rights cases, gave clear warning that not for much longer would it tolerate separate but equal as a constitutionally acceptable practice.

We have traced in barest outline the sorry picture of race relations up to the eve of one of the great events in American history. As we look back over those centuries, little comfort indeed can the white man find in his dismal record of inhumanity, injustice, and uncharitableness toward the Negro. On this record the white race stands convicted of grave moral guilt. In the South this guilt may be greater in degree, but in kind it must be borne by other sections of the United States and by the nations of Western Europe.

It has been observed that God can and does punish individuals in eternity. But He can punish nations and society only in time. May it not be that the Communist threat to the Western World is, in part at least, a mysterious expression of divine wrath in punishment for the white man's arrogance in subjugating the colored man in order to give specious plausibility to the assumption of racial superiority?

But there have been stirrings in the American conscience. Despite vigorous opposition in certain areas, there can be no doubt about the tremendous progress, especially within the last decade, in applying genuine democratic principles to our race problem. It is equally certain that the Federal judiciary is the agency largely responsible. The several levels of the Federal judicial system have with increasing regularity struck down the legal barriers blocking the Negro's participation in democracy.

But legal cases do not originate in the courts. They are initiated by those seeking redress through the due process of law. And to one man in particular must go the major credit for having prepared and presented most of the now famous civil-rights cases upon which the Federal courts have passed favorable judgment. This man is Thurgood Marshall, the chief counsel, as you know, of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People. By spectacular victories before the courts he has emphatically demonstrated that American democracy is still a vital force which has within itself the motivation for honest self-appraisement and the courage for sincere self-discipline. It is my conviction that in the light of a calmer day, say, 10 years hence when the history of this period is written, Thurgood Marshall and the NAACP will be duly recognized as having made a vast contribution to the cause of human rights and human decency not alone in America but wherever freedom is still a cherished goal.

A moment ago we referred to one of the great events in American history. That event occurred on May 17, 1954. This truly was a great day for Americans and for freedom-loving people everywhere. For it was on this day that America stood before the world and by way of a unanimous Supreme Court decision repudiated the "separate but equal" doctrine for the travesty on truth and justice which it has always been. Thus did America eloquently affirm that the dictates of the moral law and the ideals of democracy would define its official policy in relationship to its colored citizens. Henceforth Americans with repentant consciences could proclaim truthfully to the shackled millions under communism and to the other millions of as yet free people that the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution of the United States do in fact as in word reflect the spirit of a Government, equal participation in whose democratic liberties is the right of all its citizens, irrespective of creed, race, color, or national origin.

On that memorable May 17, the Supreme Court declared that "separate educational facilities are inherently unequal" and in violation of the equal protection of the laws provision of the 14th amendment and the due process of law provision of the 5th amendment. By so doing the Court did not tell the several States in question how to run their respective school systems. But it did tell them that they could not run their schools so as to do violence to the fundamental law of the land.

Exactly 54 weeks later on May 31, 1955, the Court ordered that its May 17, 1954, decree be put into effect in a manner "consistent with good faith compliance at the earliest practicable date."

These in briefest review are the two Court actions around which has raged a battle of vast and fateful dimensions. The battleground is confirmed almost exclusively to the South. Resistance to these decisions has precipitated our most serious internal crisis since the Civil War. For an unpredictable period it will continue to be fierce and articulate. Unless the as-of-now entirely unforeseen happens, there will be no early end to this crisis. Nor is any easy formula to end it in sight.

The fact is that Governors of States, Members of Congress, and of State legislatures, prominent civic, professional, business, and even labor leaders do not hesitate to attack openly not only the decisions of the Court, but the character and loyalty of the Justices themselves. This is not to speak of the tactics of the White Citizens' Councils and other like-purpose organizations which have large and influential membership throughout the southern States. Through these rebellious groups political, economic, and even physical reprisals have been threatened and in many instances visited upon those who agree with the Court and loyally urge that its mandates be carried out with good faith compliance.

I am not, to be sure, telling a pretty story. It hurts deeply, believe me, to tell it. But I am convinced that only harm can come from concealing the truth. This is an age of harsh realities. And we serve democracy neither at home nor abroad by refusing to face up to the ugly facts of our own failures.

Let us examine some of these facts in greater detail. The typical southern attitude holds that only in a rigidly segregated society can "the southern way of life be preserved." It is the claim of most southerners, then, that in resisting the Supreme Court, they are defending "the sacred traditions of the South." In reply to that claim let me here repeat what I have said on many southern platforms: "I am a southerner. I was born and raised in what is popularly known as the Deep South. I believe I know this region, its problems, its strength, its weaknesses. In the light of that knowledge I yield to no other in my loyalty and devotion to the things that are genuinely southern. But as a southerner I assert with all the emphasis at my command that no traditions of the South are worthy of respect, much less of un-Christian, undemocratic defense, which violate the elementary demands of human decency. Such traditions must not any longer be allowed to defile the fair name of a region that needs no practices of racism and inhumanity to sustain it as one of the most blessed of God's creatures. Yes, I am a southerner, intensely proud of my southern heritage. But I am before all else a Christian and an American, and I will never recognize that any demand of my southern loyalty can come between me and my loyalty to God and to America."

I need not tell you that America, if it is to survive, must gain the allegiance of the 800 million people, one-third of the earth's population, who as of now are uncommitted either to communism or to democracy. In other words these hundreds of millions with their human and material resources constitute the balance of power in the world today. And of this vast number, the overwhelming majority are colored people.

It was with these facts in mind that Secretary of State John Foster Dulles told the American people in December, 1952: "Let our people intensify their determination to respect human rights and fundamental freedom. Our discrimination at home and abroad are not only a moral blot on our so-called Christian civilization, but they are a major international hazard. • • • Throughout the world, there are myriad souls that suffer humiliation and bitterness because of the white man's assumption of racial superiority." And with like purpose, Vice President RICHARD NIXON, in December, 1953, declared in a nationwide radio-television address: "Every act of racial discrimination or prejudice is blown up by the Communists abroad and it hurts America as much as an espionage agent who turns over a weapon to a foreign enemy."

In view of all this how can we explain what is happening in the South? Frankly, I know no satisfying answer to that question. But this I do know. Southerners by and large are good people. They are warmhearted, hospitable, and gracious. They are kind, generous, and God-fearing. On the other hand, most southerners for generations have taken for granted the political, economic, and social patterns which assigned the Negro to a second-class status. Many of them until quite recently did not give a second thought to what were objectively grave violations of human rights. In a true sense they are now victims of uncritical conformism to a system the basic evil of which they never challenged. They have grown up instinctively accepting segregation as an integral part of southern living. By an involved process of rationalization they argue that the injustices and uncharitableness of the present racial system are only accidentally associated with segregation. They do not condone these distortions of right order. But they will not admit that racial segregation as such is immoral. They claim that greater and greater effort must be made to bring equality of educational and economic opportunity to the Negro. But they insist that though this is their objective, it must be realized within the traditional framework of separation, enforced both by law and custom.

But there is another side, the brighter side. It is certainly not my intention to minimize the grim seriousness of the racial crisis in the South. Nevertheless, there is solid ground for hope. Sooner rather than later the wave of emotionalism will spend itself. Then conformity to the dictates of morality and law will become the rule of the times.

What evidence is there for this optimism? In the first place, the southern conscience, despite all appearances, is profoundly disturbed. And the man chiefly responsible is the great archbishop of New Orleans, the Most Reverend Joseph Francis Rummel. For years he had proved himself the champion of justice and charity for the Negro. In the face of certain and spirited opposition, he placed himself and the Catholic Church within his jurisdiction solidly behind the Supreme Court. But his most telling display of courageous leadership came in the form of his now famous pastoral letter of February 11, 1956. In this letter, the archbishop invoked his authority as a successor of the Apostles and solemnly declared: "Racial segregation as such is morally wrong and sinful." This declaration has caused innumerable southerners, Catholic and non-Catholic, to look into their consciences as they have never done before. From such soul-searching is coming a deeper understanding of what justice and charity demand. And this new insight will be the basis upon which a true sense of brotherhood between Negro and white can be fostered.

It is too early adequately to appraise the leadership of Archbishop Rummel. But it may well be that historians of the next generation will hail him as the focal center from which came the direction and inspiration for a new and greater South.

Another sign of happier times to come is the intensive educational process now in progress. It is taking place around cracker barrels in country stores, in the setting of professional organizations and fashionable social clubs, on street corners, at the family dinner table, in formal lectures, from the pulpit, in the classroom, through the newspapers, over the TV and the radio, and even in citizens' council meetings. No other topic so engrosses the attention of high and low, rich and poor, literate and illiterate, segregationist and integrationist, as does the question of race relations. Hitherto if mentioned at all, it was by way of casual reference.

In the process great are the sorrow and suffering, the disillusionment and frustration, the misunderstanding and suspicion, the broken friendships and wounded hearts.

A third and final chapter in the foreshadowing of happier future is now being compiled quietly but ever so effectively on college and university campuses all over the South, and in the thought and action, the minds and hearts of ever growing thousands of true southerners who know that segregation and all it implies is an affront to the God-given dignity of both Negro and white, and a betrayal of the basic truths of democracy. They are thoroughly out of patience with the transparent ruse of striving to construct around the perfectly legitimate principle of State rights a facade behind which to tear down human rights. They are unwilling any longer to profess one set of norms for human behavior and act according to another. Hence they want the South to accept graciously the decision of the Supreme Court and to work earnestly toward transplanting its letter and spirit not only into our educational system but into our religious, political, economic, and cultural institutions as well. They want all this because they love the South and because they long for, with all their being, that the South may measure up to its historic mission of proving to a skeptical world that democracy is what we claim it to be.

In the beginning of my address, I observed that the race problem is not strictly a southern problem, but one of acute concern for all Americans. It is easy enough to be critical of the South, and I readily admit that it is not beyond criticism. But it is also much easier to examine the other fellow's conduct than to look into our own. You should be fully aware that regions outside the South have their own serious problems in human relations. These problems do have different external expressions than in the South, but they stem from the same basic prejudices. In the South we have laws to force the Negro into an underprivileged position. You have more subtle ways of discriminating. If you would know what I mean, go to Washington, Philadelphia, New York, Cleveland, Detroit, Chicago, St. Louis and even Los Angeles—These are cities in which I have fairly wide acquaintance—I can't speak for Worcester. In these areas you will find, not in quantity I grant, but in quality, if I may use that word, as glaring examples of man's inhumanity to man as you will find anywhere in the South. Please believe me, I do not say this in any querulous mood. For I have never believed that it makes the Southern pot any cleaner to call the Northern Kettle black. My whole point is to emphasize the critical importance of human relations not so much as a southern problem or as a northern problem, but as a world problem. Whenever we indulge our prejudices against the Negro or the Catholic, or the Jew, or the Irish, or the Italian or the Hottentot, we are playing the enemy's game. Communism has frightening unity and it is forged on the anvil of hatred. When we hate (and prejudice is a form of hatred) any man or group of men, we delight the hearts of Khrushchev, Bulganin, Mikoyan and their whole wretched crew. The only ultimate answer to the diabolic force which is communism is love, not the sickly, syrupy stuff that flows out of Hollywood, but the love of God above all things and the love of our neighbor, whoever he be, as ourselves. And this not in some ethereal reaches but in the practical day-to-day relationships we form at home, at work and at play.

It is time, therefore, that we took with deadly seriousness those great eternal truths which teach us that there is a God above us, the Creator and Ruler of the world; that man, every man, is made in the image and likeness of God and, consequently, he is not a mere animal, but a rational being with an immortal destiny. They teach us that man, every man, is endowed with the dignity, the supreme value, the sanctity of the human nature born of God, and that he is vested with a pattern of rights which no one can dare violate with impunity. They teach us that man, every man, is a sacred being, more precious than the material world and all the riches thereof, and that he cannot be made a cog in the collective machinery of an all-powerful state, or a prop to support the white man's pride of race. They teach us that political society is the instrument in the hands of a free people not alone to preserve law and order but also to take positive means to insure a reign of justice for all its citizens, regardless of religion, race, or national origin. They teach us that America, for all its serious faults, has given her people the most equitable form of government in world history.

Fellow Americans, we are passing through one of the great turning points of history. Whether men are to be free or slave depends almost entirely on America. It depends upon you and me and all the other men and women in the North, East, South, and West of this marvelous land. Do we have the dedication, the courage to think and to live in the spirit of America's Declaration of Independence that "all men are created equal and endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights"? If so, then we will steady the faltering footsteps, we will quicken the fainting hearts of the millions now writhing under Communist despotism and of the even more millions menaced by the same tyranny. We will prove that democracy is not an illusion and that America will spare no sacrifice that the lights of Divine love and human decency may go on again all the world over.

This is freedom in its finest flower. Thank God, whatever the price, this freedom is worth fighting for.

Orderly Scientific Research Approach Necessary in Nuclear Power Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT C. BYRD
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 22, 1956

Mr. BYRD. Mr. Speaker, I desire to direct to the attention of our colleagues two articles which appeared in the New York Times for June 17, 1956, in regard to the report issued earlier in the month by the National Academy of Sciences on the biological effects of radiation.

The report of the National Academy alerts us to the manifest fact that radiation, unless carefully controlled, presents a grave threat to the generation exposed to it, as well as to future generations. The report gives support to the testimony which the coal industry, in hearings before the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, presented in opposition to S. 2725 and similar proposals to adopt a crash-program approach to the atomic generation of electricity. In this regard, I also wish to direct the attention of the House to the resolution adopted on November 1, 1955, by the National Coal Association.

The New York Times articles follow:

SCIENCE IN REVIEW—NATIONAL ACADEMY REPORT ON RADIATION POSES PROBLEMS FACED BY HUMANITY

(By Waldemar Kaempffert)

The report of the National Academy of Sciences on the biological effects of radiation is one of the most important public documents that have been issued since the atomic bomb startled mankind into realizing that the world of tomorrow is here. There is no doubt that mankind must make up its mind whether a world movement for the control of atomic energy is to be organized or whether the human race must be slowly extinguished centuries hence.

We have heard and read much about the possibility of destroying civilization in a ruthless atomic war. The National Academy's scientific committees pay proper attention to that dreadful possibility, but much more to the dangers that lurk in the peaceful uses of atomic energy—to X-rays that are mercifully applied in diagnosing and curing disease, to the little X-ray machines that enable a dentist to look inside a painful tooth, to the nuclear reactors that are to produce much of the world's power, to the wastes which must be removed from power reactors and which will ultimately be more dangerous than tons of radium.

GENETIC DANGERS

The dangers that especially alarm the authors of the academy's report are genetic. We are beginning to interfere with the processes of heredity. Nature has always interfered with them. It interferes when it sends cosmic rays through everybody on earth. Even if there were no cosmic rays there would still be interference because the earth's uranium and radium are sending forth rays that affect us. All this is what is called "background radiation." We are adding to it rays from our cyclotrons, our X-ray machines, the radium and radioactive isotopes that we need to deal with disease and to find out more about life processes.

What happens when X-rays, gamma rays and other rays strike the reproductive organs? The genes are jolted. The genes are to life what atoms are to matter. They determine whether we shall be blue-eyed blonds or brown Polynesians, tall and lean or squat and fat, roundheaded or flatheaded. We are what our genes makes us.

When genes are jolted and rearranged mutations are the result—departures from the parental type. The departures breed true generation after generation. A 4-leafed clover is a mutation. So is a 2-headed calf. If they are to survive mutations cannot be too marked. A legless animal has no chance of survival in the wilderness. Every living organism mutates. Without mutation evolution would be impossible.

A great light was thrown on this whole subject by Nobel Laureate Prof. H. J. Muller, who served on the genetics committee of the National Academy of Sciences. Years ago he turned the X-rays on fruit flies and got hundreds of mutations—many of them monstrosities. Since then mutations have been produced by heat, ultraviolet rays and chemicals. What stands out in these experiments is both the stability and the instability of species.

FREAKS DOUBTED

It is pure bosh to believe that unless we control the rays given off by atoms we shall produce human monstrosities and freaks, and the report of the academy says as much. Monstrosities and freaks are sometimes born to apparently normal parents. What the geneticists on the committee of the National Academy predict is a slow, almost imperceptible deterioration of the human race, a deterioration that may take centuries. It is a deterioration marked by a higher death rate, a lower birth rate, a lowered resistance to disease, a proneness to leukemia. Unless this deterioration is halted or controlled the end is just as certain as if atomic bombs were to destroy every community on earth.

There are enormous gaps in our knowledge of radiation and its biological effect. Or, as the report puts it, "man has been dealing with an enormous new force whose potential effects he has only dimly understood." This does not mean that man should cease his efforts to apply atomic energy. Radiation problems are not insoluble. With intelligence and vigilance and the exercise of caution there is no reason why humanity should not exploit the most potent force ever placed in its hands.

It is the effect on the reproductive cells that is most important in this consideration of man's possible fate. The amount of radiation received by the cells is usually infinitesimal. But it adds up in a lifetime, and it is the cumulative effect that is to be feared.

AMOUNT OF RADIATION

How much radiation can the reproductive cells stand? Radiation is measured in roentgens, which are units of radiation. When a dentist makes an X-ray picture of your jaw you get 5 roentgens, a negligible dose. Of these 5 roentgens only five-thousandths of a roentgen reaches the reproductive cells. The report states that the 30-year dose to the reproductive organs received by the average person is about the following:

1. Background radiation: about 4.3 roentgens.

2. X-rays and fluoroscopic examination: about 3 roentgens. At present the average citizen is getting in his sex glands about 3 roentgens in medical and dental examinations that extend over a lifetime or 30 percent of the limit set by the National Academy's report.

(3) Weapons tests: If continued at the rate of the past 5 years there would be a probable 30-year dose or about 0.1 roentgen, with a possible range of 0.02 to 0.5 roentgens.

So far, atomic explosions have not raised worldwide radiation to anything like the danger point. Nor are they likely to do so if continued at the same rate as in the past. What would happen in a war waged with atomic bombs is another matter.

Next to fallout, the chief problem is the disposal of radioactive atomic wastes which must be removed from nuclear reactors from time to time, just as we have to remove ashes from a furnace. The British dump the wastes into the sea, which may be a dangerous method because nothing is known about the way the oceans mix or what happens to fish.

RADIOACTIVE WASTE

The committee of the National Academy estimates that by 1965 reactors in this country will be producing more than 20 pounds of radioactive wastes a day, the equivalent of tens of tons of radium. By 1980 accumulated wastes in solutions may amount to 200 million gallons; by 1990 to 600 million; by 2000 to 2.4 billion. The report points out that when a worldwide power industry is fully developed the accumulated wastes would send out more deadly rays than bombs in an atomic war.

No one can lay down the report or the National Academy without being impressed by the information presented or the conclusions drawn. It is a social document that is bound to make its impression on statesmen. But what has been undertaken with the financial aid of the Rockefeller Foundation is only a beginning.

Other studies are being made in Europe. That of the British Medical Research Council ("The Hazards to Man of Nuclear and Allied Radiations") has just been published. It is more technical than that of the National Academy of Sciences. Its discussion of the genetic aspects is not as sensational as that of the Academy; it paints no alarming pic-

ture of the future of the human race if we do not use X-ray and other machines with more discretion.

In the end the various investigating bodies will have to unite, perhaps under the auspices of the United Nations, to arrive at an understanding which will be acceptable and enforceable by the nations of the world. That understanding will have to embrace the perils that attend the peaceful uses of atomic energy.

MAN AND RADIATION

When a person speaks, energy radiates in sound waves to a listener's ear. When the sun shines, it radiates light and heat waves to the earth. And when atoms are "excited"—artificially through bombardment in an atom bomb or power plant or X-ray machine, or naturally in radioactive substances such as radium—the atoms send off energy in the form of radiations.

Unlike sound or light waves, however, atomic radiations penetrate human tissues and produce biological changes in the human body. For that reason the National Academy of Sciences, with financial help from the Rockefeller Foundation, last year appointed a number of high-ranking scientists to investigate the potential effects of atomic radiation on man.

Last week the National Academy released a report of the scientists' findings. The burden of the report was that radiation, unless carefully controlled, presents a grave threat to the generation exposed to it and to future generations as well. These were some of the scientists' findings:

With regard to the effect of radiation on living persons: "There is considerable evidence * * * that exposure to moderate levels of radiation shortens life expectancy. Radiologists die 5 years earlier on the average than physicians having no known contact with radiation." Continued exposure "at a relatively low level" can cause "cancer and leukemia * * * lowered immunity, damage to connective tissues, or premature aging." Human beings can safely take more radiation than they are now receiving—but the scientists cannot say precisely how much more.

GENETIC EFFECT SERIOUS

With regard to the effect of radiation on future generations: Any radiation dose, however small, is harmful from the viewpoint of genetics. This is because radiations which reach the reproductive cells cause mutations, or harmful changes in the material governing heredity, that are passed on to succeeding generations. "If the whole population of the United States received small doses of extra radiation * * * there is good reason to think that among the next hundred million children to be born, several thousand would be definitely handicapped."

The problem, especially acute in view of the development and use of atomic power in the near future, is how to prevent more and more atomic radiation. The National Academy report recommends the keeping of records for every individual showing his accumulated exposure to radiation including X-rays and fluoroscopy; restraint in the use of X-rays, and continued research and investigation—especially in the fields of atomic fallout, food contamination and disposal of radioactive waste products.

The following is the resolution of the National Coal Association:

Be it resolved by the directors of the National Coal Association, That the following facts and principles should be considered by the executive branch of the Federal Government, the Members of Congress, the Atomic Energy Commission, and the American people, in determining the role of the Federal Government in the development of atomic energy:

I. In the progression of humanity, in furthering world trade, in advancing the cause of peace and in maintaining the world leadership of the United States, there is a need to continue Government sponsorship of the development of nuclear energy. To this end, the National Coal Association recognizes the need for the Government to support the national laboratories and to carry out the basic as well as applied research in the field of atomic energy.

II. Future development of economically feasible nuclear power is necessary to provide power for underdeveloped areas of the world, to assist nations which have power shortages, and to protect the future of the United States in the power field. The National Coal Association therefore recognizes the need for the Government to continue the power demonstration program to optimize the conditions under which atomic power is generated.

III. The public interest requires that atomic energy be utilized principally in whatever ways or processes it will contribute efficiently to the energy requirements of the United States and the world. The conversion of solid fuels to gas and to liquid fuels through the utilization of atomic energy promises great benefits to the people of the United States. The national laboratory effort should be directed toward minimizing atomic-energy fuel-processing costs, increasing the safety of reactor systems against the public hazards, and developing high temperature materials of construction to the end that all sources of energy will receive their fair share of the total effort to achieve progress.

IV. The United States is one of the few nations of the world blessed with sufficient reserves of fossil fuels to meet the Nation's power requirements at low cost for centuries to come. In the United States the most economic source of steam-generated electric power in the foreseeable future will be plants fueled by coal, oil, or natural gas. Under the competitive stimulus of our free-enterprise system, the ingenuity of the American people will bring about the most beneficial results that can be obtained from all energy sources, including coal, oil, natural gas, and atomic energy.

V. The public interest demands dissemination of actual cost information with respect to nuclear fuels to the greatest extent compatible with national security. To the extent that Government subsidies are necessary in the development stages of the nuclear program, the public should be informed as to the magnitude thereof. There can be no reliable forecast of the comparative costs of power generation until nuclear fuel costs, and the cost of the safe disposal of radioactive wastes, are established.

VI. The Nation's best interests are not served by unwarranted optimism about the early availability of low-cost nuclear power.

Address by Former Senator Strom Thurmond Before South Carolina Automobile Dealers' Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. S. MIKE MONRONEY

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, June 22, 1956

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an outstanding address delivered by former Senator Strom Thurmond, of South Carolina, who is the Democratic nominee for the United States Senate from South Carolina before the South Carolina Automobile Dealers' Association, at Myrtle Beach, S. C., on May 28, 1956.

As we know, Senator Thurmond was a member of the Automobile Marketing Subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Mr. President, I have been informed by the Public Printer that the address will require approximately three pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, at a cost of $240. Notwithstanding that estimate, I ask unanimous consent that the address be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, in order that the Senate and the country may have the benefit of the advice of former Senator Thurmond, as a result of his work on our subcommittee.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY STROM THURMOND AT THE ANNUAL CONVENTION OF THE SOUTH CAROLINA AUTOMOBILE DEALERS ASSOCIATION, THE OCEAN FOREST HOTEL, MYRTLE BEACH, S. C., MAY 28, 1956

President Rose, distinguished guests, members of the South Carolina Automobile Dealers Association, and other friends, it is certainly a pleasure to have this opportunity to speak to you. Certainly during the past year I have come into close personal contact with your problems, and I welcome this chance to discuss them with you.

First, however, permit me to commend Mrs. Ella W. Ford, your capable and efficient executive secretary, who has truly done an outstanding job for your organization, and who, I might add, has always been most kind and considerate, and has won many friends for your group. In addition, I would like to say that while in Washington it was my privilege to work with Ambrose Easterby, your able national director for NADA in South Carolina. He, too, has done a fine job on your behalf during this past year in which the auto business has been dragged back and forth across the front pages of the Nation. Your president and all your other officers deserve to be highly commended for their splendid service.

Looking back at 1955, we find it was a year of warning to the automobile business. These warnings were unheeded by the industrialists of Detroit, and 1956 has become a year of decision. This year may go down in automotive history as a turning point in the battle of independent small businessmen—the cornerstone of our American free enterprise economy—for the right to run their own businesses in the manner they see fit. It may mark a turning point in the right of the American automobile dealer to resist the efforts of a few men in Detroit to regiment, standardize, document, and re-educate them, to suit the whim of some factory road man to get a gold star on his monthly report card.

America owes a great debt of gratitude to the men who make, and to the men who sell, automobiles. Julius Caesar, George Washington, Thomas Jefferson, and Teddy Roosevelt all used the same basic mode of transportation—a one- or two-horsepower convertible. Every chief executive in history from before Julius Caesar until 1921 used this type of conveyance in the inaugural parade. The first President to use an automobile to ride up Pennsylvania Avenue in an inaugural parade was Warren G. Harding.

And now in the year of our Lord A. D. 1956 we are driving about in shiny 200-horsepower models with power steering, power brakes, power seats, power windows, power glide, and every other conceivable aid to safety and

comfort. Nearly everybody has a car. The people who make and sell cars have done the most amazing job of effective manufacture and distribution of a product that the world has ever seen.

You will notice that I did not limit the credit for this job to the manufacturers or to the merchants who sell the cars. The job could not have been done without both segments of the automobile industry. They are as inseparable as Siamese twins. If one dies, the other will also. When one goes hungry, even though the other may be temporarily gorging on the food at the same time, both will be anemic before long.

I think perhaps this fact has finally dawned on the men who make the cars in Detroit. With factory sales down as much as 40 percent and dealer sales correspondingly low, and with an 800,000 to a million car backlog of unsold new units, it should be occurring to someone, somewhere, in a responsible position in the automobile business, that the feast which the factories have spread before themselves for the last few years—marked by profits on investment up to 66 percent before taxes and 33 percent after taxes—could not long last if the other half was in a period of famine.

And the amazing thing is this. As close as the connections between these Siamese twins of the industry were, the one couldn't hear the other.

The ivory tower of Detroit, with its fantastic array of research and talent and with its very walls supported by file cases containing dealer reports and reports on dealers—and you know what I mean—was too well insulated and soundproofed to hear the problems of the dealers.

It was natural that if the manufacturers could not hear the problems of the dealers, then Congress could. Senator WARREN MAGNUSON, of Washington, chairman of the Senate Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, appointed Senator MIKE MONRONEY of Oklahoma, Senator FREDERICK PAYNE of Maine and myself as a special subcommittee to study these problems. This was in March of 1955.

Because of the magnitude of our assignment, we started out to thoroughly acquaint ourselves with all the information we could get about automobile marketing. One of the most complete and thorough studies of all phases of automobile marketing ever made was undertaken by the members of our committee and by its staff.

I cannot overemphasize how much help the dealer organizations, principally NADA and Admiral Bell, and James C. Moore, NADA's General Counsel, gave us during this period of our study. Without their fine cooperation, I doubt if we could have had tasks so well advanced

It became readily apparent in the course of this background study, that certain danger signs were appearing in the automobile marketing picture. Automobile installment paper was seriously and threateningly being overextended, both in volume and in length of terms. Unsold new cars were backing up in dealer showrooms to the point of nearly 800,000 units. Dealer profits were down to as low as six-tenths of 1 percent. Dealer mortality had increased by more than 200 percent. Frantic advertising was screaming from the back pages of every newspaper. All this was happening while automobile manufacturers were selling cars at a full profit, and at a record rate to dealers, feasting on 6 million units and licking their chops over an 8-million-car year for dessert.

The subcommittee pointed this situation out in a report in July of 1955. But this report was hailed by the manufacturing segment of the industry as so much poppycock. We were advised that amateurs shouldn't attempt to second-guess professionals, and that 1956 production and market would be even better.

Partially because of this conflict of opinion and principally because we wanted to establish direct contact with dealers—who, after all, are the real experts about their own businesses—we prepared questionnaires to go to the 42,000 dealers of America, and to provide for them a sounding board for their views. About 20,000 dealers answered these questionnaires in detail. Thousands with added comment on their business problems. I am told that this is the greatest return on a voluntary questionnaire ever set out by Congress or by any executive agency.

The number of returns which we received proved beyond a reasonable doubt that dissension in the industry was widespread, and that all dealers of all makes felt the destructive effects of the wild race for percentage of price class supremacy.

While these were being tabulated, our committee and staff determined to implement the questionnaire with field checks. I met with dealers in South Carolina and other southern areas. The other members of the committee checked their own and representative areas. In these spot checks, we found mainly the same types of dealer trouble throughout the Nation.

To me, to other members of the subcommittee, and to the staff, the problems we found indicated a dangerous malignancy in America's No. 1 industry.

It appears to me, and I believe to the others, that if the drift continues as it has been going in the past 2 or 3 years, the basic pattern of automobile distribution through independent dealers will undergo a revolutionary change. This change will, I feel, in the long run, destroy the benefits of the most successful distribution system of a high-price consumer product ever known in the world's history. It will wipe out a system of locally owned and locally managed small business—in many cases now in the hands of the third generation of the same family. It will destroy the reliability, the responsibility and the respectability of dealerships, on which the sale of a three or four thousand dollar product must rest, if consumers and the buying public are to buy with confidence. And along with this change, the ethical standards that marked the growth of manufacturing and retailing in past years, will sink to the business mortality of a county fair shell game.

So far, you have only the used-car dealer, or a few ex-franchised dealers, to contend with, but when these leaders of your industry feel compelled, by economic circumstances, to quit the traditional system to protect their investment, then you are going to see supermarket operation with real high-power leadership.

Just one more year like the past several, and I am convinced that the big change will come to supermarket operation by these experienced dealers, unless the entire industry—and I mean dealers and factories—act now.

Supermarkets won't stay. These abortive sales efforts—the cut price, the phony trade-ins, the 4-year terms—finally will exhaust themselves; then salesmanship, service, and responsibility will again be required to sell cars and to maintain factory investments, employment, and reputations. But this will be too late for the experienced dealers, because they will have liquidated, gone bankrupt, or gone out of business. So the third stage will be the chain-store type of merchandising or the factory-owned distributorship. But the consumer, the town, the dealers, and the factories will lose by this transition. Also, of major importance to the public, is that greater economic power will be concentrated in the hands of fewer and fewer financial giants.

Our study has shown that this malignancy, which, in effect, affects our No. 1 industry, has 5 major symptoms in this order: 1, automobile bootlegging; 2, phantom freight; 3, bad factory-dealer relationships and one-sided contracts; 4, unsound credit terms; and 5, irresponsible, phony advertising. Like many ills, the germs of each 1 of the 5 infect and aggravate the other 4. They are interrelated and self-acclerating.

The only note of cheer is that they are so easy to cure by men of good will if they are anxious and willing to find the cure. But these were the things that we saw when we lifted the hood.

The subcommittee's report was published with the compiled answers to the questionnaire showing how dealers felt about these things. Not until we announced our intentions to hold hearings on these matters—then and only then—did the people in the Detroit ivory tower begin to stop, look, and listen. The drawbridge banged down, the advance scouts rushed to Washington to the subcommittee hearing room to find out how the privates in the front ranks—the dealers—felt about them and about these problems. And, believe me, they got an earful. So did the committee.

And let me pay proper tribute to the dealers and ex-dealers who came before our committee to testify under oath. Most of them were men who had been automobile dealers long before World War II. None of them were weaklings or ingrates. They were examples of the fact that in this great democracy of ours, the spirit of '76 still burns brightly in the hearts of American citizens, and cries out against any attempt to dominate or intimidate the American small-business free-enterprise system.

But what did the factories hear regarding bootlegging? They heard sworn testimony of incidents in which factory representatives actually encouraged dealers to bootleg, in their mad race to put their zone first in sales every month. They heard of discrimination against dealers who refused to bootleg or engage in other unfair destructive, unethical, and irresponsible practices. They heard instances of capricious, arbitrary factory treatment of dealers that are almost unbelievable; instances of dealers with 20 and 30 years as loyal, faithful servants of the factory, who once would have fought anyone who said a bad word about their particular company, being canceled by brief, curt, one-paragraph letters, with no explanation except that their performance was considered unsatisfactory. We have sworn dealer testimony in the record showing that dealers were canceled for failure to get price class when they couldn't get delivery of cars to sell. One dealer attributed the death of his brother to the pressure of seeing his life's savings swept down the drain by factory cancellation because of the dealer's refusal to change his location. He wanted to stay in the center of town rather than to build a monument for the factory on the outskirts. The obvious sincerity of this man, as tears welled up in his eyes, wrung the hearts of every member of the subcommittee. The factory scouts and the subcommittee heard the testimony of a dealer from Beaumont, Tex., who was canceled after he failed to get the percentage of price class which his factory thought he should have. By how much did he fail? By one car. This particular dealer has written his factory many, many times regarding bootleg cars being sold in his area. He sent them the serial numbers and all necessary information so that the bootlegger could be identified by the factory. He received no reply. The subcommittee heard testimony that dealers in the low freight rate areas of Chicago and Detroit boasted of the cars they were bootlegging in distant areas, while other dealers in the same areas couldn't get deliveries. We heard of dealers being franchised in towns of 25—I repeat 25—population, so that they could sell in nearby metropolitan

territories. These stimulator dealers sold from superservice gas stations and sheet-iron barns with no service department, leaving the loss on warranty work to be assumed by old-time, conscientious dealers who had spent thousands of dollars in securing equipment to do such work.

What did we hear about phantom freight? We heard freight experts, employed by the National Automobile Dealers Association, estimate that the American public and automobile dealers were being charged more than $200 million a year in excess of freight costs by Ford Motor Co. and General Motors Corp. To be specific, General Motors Corp. admitted a profit of $151 million a year from freight alone. Ford Motor Co. admitted $50 to $60 million a year. Also, they admitted that the freight differential between the Detroit area and outlying sections of the country, which in some cases were just as close as assembly plants, was a factor in bootlegging.

What did the subcommittee hear about the third point of our study—Bad factory relations and bad contracts? Just like bootlegging and phantom freight go hand in hand, so do factory relations and contracts. I've already told you of some of the testimony the subcommittee received regarding cancellation pressure the factory is able to put on the dealer so that the dealer bootlegs cars. But more serious than that perhaps was the testimony about how the dealer was unable to sell his business at a fair price, even if he had bona fide offers from good faith purchasers.

Factories maintained that their dealers are independent businessmen with their own individual investments. The dealers have their own individual investments all right. But what kind of an independent businessman is it that can't sell his own investment on the open market?

Franchises in most towns mean economic life or death to the owner of the business. The constant threat of cancellation or competition from newly enfranchised dealers in the same community, or the humiliation of a once free and independent businessman, is a powerful weapon in the hands of the manufacturer, and fear crept into the hearts of these thousands of free-born American small-business men. The fact that over one-fourth—and I think this is important—of the 20,000 dealers who answered our questionnaires failed to sign their names was sufficient evidence that this fear of economic retaliation existed, even without the testimony which we received confirming the fact.

We heard that dealers were requested to make gifts of diamond rings and palomino ponies to zone and factory personnel—the men on whose whims the economic life of the dealers depended. The striking thing about this testimony was that these were not isolated cases, by any means.

What did the subcommittee hear of the fourth subject—that of finance and credit? We heard that the tremendous skyrocketing of automobile credit—its increase by 40 percent in the year 1955—from 10 billion to 14 billion, came at the same time that the sales race did. We heard that with the highly respectable, responsible General Motors Acceptance Corp. at the lead, finance companies had expanded their terms from 2 to 3 years, and now to 4 years. We have a perfect example of the effect of last year's wild credit jag on which the automobile industry embarked. Right now customers are so heavily in debt with new cars, bought last year, that the car market all over the United States has dropped by 20 to 50 percent. Certainly automobile credit has helped greatly in the matter of distributing cars. Without it we could not reach the market. But the destructive credit practices which have been growing up for the last year or two—with 3- or 4-year terms, and in some cases those are based on phony balloon payments at the end—can ruin the future prosperity of the industry. Crazy credit terms during the year 1955, brought about by the mad race for first place, oversold the market in that year by a million cars, and now dealers are having to pay the piper with nearly a million unsold new cars in inventory. In the credit race the factories have nothing to lose. They have their money before the car is even delivered to the dealer. As a matter of fact, the finance companies have very little to lose. The president of GMAC told us that only on 15 percent of its paper was that company responsible in case of default. Actually, it is your money. If the owner of that car goes to Mexico, you are there with a half a million or more in capital assets to pick up on the tab on whatever is due. Your name is on the back of those notes. They are playing poker with the dealer's money.

This skyrocketing expansion of 40 percent from 10 billion to 14 billion outstanding automobile installment credit in the year 1955, goes hand in hand with the fifth problem which the subcommittee considered, that is, the problem of false advertising. Dealers told us they had to engage in it as a matter of self-protection. You are familiar with the ad giving a thousand dollars for anyone's prewar car; giving three or four hundred dollars cash away with each purchase; trips to Paris; shares of stock, etc. You are familiar with the packing of prices on automobiles. One Pontiac dealer of 25 years' standing told us that his zone manager had insisted that dealers pack the price of new cars by exactly $225. He also told us the factories expected dealers to make their money from finance packs and insurance packs, and all the other antipublic practices which go on with false advertising.

George Romney, President of American Motors, and a real industrial statesman, described these methods as just like taking narcotics. One shot might be sufficient for this year, but next year it will take 2, and so on until the customer and the dealer are fully committed to more and more dope.

These, then, were the things that the factories saw and heard in the subcommittee's hearings. They also heard nearly 50 Members of Congress come forth to testify about the sentiment of dealers in their areas, urging the subcommittee to pass legislation to correct these abuses. We heard many other problems. I wish I had time to discuss them. We heard the problems of accessories, the problems of seat covers, the problems of special tools, the problems of unfinished cars coming from the assembly line in Detroit—incidentally, one dealer called cars nowadays do-it-yourself kits. I wish I had time to discuss them all, but I do not. We did discuss them all, however, in our 6 weeks of hearings, and the factories heard these things, perhaps for the first time. Not only did they hear these things, they promised to do something about them. Now, let's talk for a minute about what the factories have promised to do since our committee began its study.

First of all, all automobile manufacturing corporations have reduced freight charges to areas distant from Detroit. These charges were passed on to the dealer and to the car buyer, put into the finance of the car so that the customer had to pay interest on it and the dealer had to pick up the tab if the note went bad on repossession. Now they said they have cut this freight profit out. Of course, at the same time all factories raised the basic price of their cars. The committee is still interested in finding out whether the revenue gained by the increase in the list prices more than offsets the revenues lost by the freight decreases.

Actually, between the companies this has been of great benefit in the competitive picture. No longer will the smaller manufacturers, who have no outlying assembly plants and thus make no profit on freight, be at a freight profit disadvantage in the competitive market because of freight. So long as Ford and General Motors made an extra $200 million a year on freight to spend on advertising and other things they had a competitive edge over Chrysler, American Motors, and Studebaker-Packard.

Next, all automobile manufacturers have condemned the practice of bootlegging. Ford and General Motors Corp. have publicly announced that they will take positive steps to eliminate bootlegging of their products. Heretofore they have always hidden behind the antitrust laws and said they could not. It is very significant that they now tell us they will take action.

Presidents of both Ford and General Motors have made strong, positive statements condemning false and misleading advertising and the Committee is informed that positive steps have been taken by both companies to monitor advertising which reflects on the goodwill of their product. It is significant that finally, after all these years, they have seen fit to step in.

On the problem of price packing, both Ford and General Motors have condemned its use, as well as the smaller manufacturers. If price packing is controlled and stopped, or even slowed down, this one thing will justify the existence of the subcommittee.

These corporations have also announced that they are opposed to gifts, which might influence the business decisions of the factory representatives.

Perhaps the most significant announcement of all is the formation of top management dealer relations positions. General Motors Corp. has announced its appointment of Ivan Wiles as vice president in charge of dealer relations. Henry Ford II announced that he has appointed a dealer policy board consisting of his brother, Benson Ford, as chairman, Walker Williams and Arthus S. Hatch. In both of these arrangements the assignments will be full-time responsibilities, and I hope that no Ford or General Motors dealer will be reluctant to call upon these men who have been appointed as your representatives at top management. I understand that Chrysler has recently made a similar appointment. Studebaker-Packard and American Motors have also promised to hold meetings between top management and dealers to work out closer liaison.

In the finance area, General Motors has announced its new Release From Liability Plan, under which a dealer may maintain a reserve with the company of 3 percent minimum and 6 percent maximum—of outstandings—and be relieved of any further liability. Any excess is given back to the dealer. Ford Motor Co. has announced its intention to study ways of helping its dealers with finance, both retail and wholesale—this for the first time in nearly 20 years.

False registrations have been condemned by all companies.

A major announcement by the Ford Motor Co. is in its method of billing. Insofar as possible, payment will be due on the day vehicles are scheduled to reach dealerships, rather than on the day of shipment from assembly plants. I hope other manufacturers take this step, too.

Direct mail costs are to be assumed by General Motors, instead of requiring that these costs be borne by the dealer.

General Motors has announced that it will set up no new dealer points this year. We assume that this means that the so-called stimulator dealer, with a gravel lot and a sheet iron building, will not be placed in competition with dealers of long standing and downtown overhead.

General Motors has announced the appointment of an umpire rumored to be an ex-Federal judge, to supersede the dealer-

relations board in cancellation cases, which previously acted as prosecutor, judge, and jury.

Possibly in order to soften the blow of immediate cancellation of franchise upon the death of a dealer, General Motors has instituted a billion-dollar group life insurance plan, which would allow dealers under 65 to be able to obtain $100,000 worth of life insurance without medical examination. Part of the cost of the policy will be shared by General Motors.

Also, General Motors has announced a program under which it may allow the widow to participate in the dealership for a 5-year period.

Ford Motors has also announced that it is studying such a plan, including health and hospitalization and pension plans.

Henry Ford, II, is in the process at the present time of holding meetings with dealers all over the United States. Perhaps some of you have attended one of these meetings. I urge every Ford dealer to speak with all candor and frankness with Mr. Ford and his top assistants in helping to forge a factory-dealer plan which will return the basic element of fair play to the business.

Both Ford and General Motors have announced they are giving dealers a 5-year contract, to be terminated by the company only for cause.

With regard to the new General Motors contract, we are assured that the company is: 1. Assuming the full cost for warranty adjustment. This means that on warranty work done by the dealer, he could charge 100 percent of the flat rate on labor and costs, plus 10 percent on materials. Ford also has adopted such a plan, I understand. 2. Granting of a larger allowance on new cars of the preceding model year, remaining in stock, when a new model is announced. The allowance will now apply to all new cars in stock at that time. Previously, it applied only to a given percentage of cars sold 3. Doubling the allowance under the GM obsolescense plan. Dealers may return 4 percent of the parts ordered in the previous 2 years. 4. Increasing from 30 to 90 days the period within which purchased parts may be returned to the factory. 5. Assistance in protection for the dealer, with respect to disposal of his premises and leasehold, in the event of termination. 6. Extending the policy and the agreement under which a son or son-in-law may succeed the dealership in the event of the death or incapacity of the dealer, to include any qualified person active in the business who is nominated by the dealer to succeed him. 7. Making it possible for a dealer to provide that his widow has a financial interest in the dealership for a period up to 5 years after the death of her husband. 8. Including a detailed provision in the contract for evaluating dealer sales performance, based on all factors, including local conditions affecting his dealership operation, either favorably or adversely. 9. Increasing the factory contribution to cooperative advertising funds used in national media. 10. Incorporating in the contract a clause providing for maintenance of a high standard of ethics in local dealer advertising. 11. Broadening provisions for repurchase of parts and special tools, upon termination of an agreement. 12. Improving the language of the contract in the interest of simplification. 13. Making many other changes in the contract, including the elimination of many clauses, all designed to improve the document as a whole.

Now these are the changes which have come about since the subcommittee instituted its study more than a year ago. These are the changes that have come about since the factories told us that we were seeing ghosts in the dark, that there was really no reason for concern, that the only dealers who were disturbed were those who were unable to brook the free tide of competition.

In all fairness to the factories and in all sincerity, I want to say this: It takes an even bigger man to do something about it, when he sees that he has been mistaken. I fundamentally believe that the lines of communication between the ivory tower in Detroit and the shock troops, the dealers in the field, were in sad need of repair, and that these men had to be convinced that there was even a problem. I think they are big enough men and sincere enough men to do something about it. They have already stated that they would. I believe that they will.

But in closing, I would like to quote the words of the president of the National Automobile Dealers Association in his testimony before the subcommittee. This is what Carl E. Fribley, president of the NADA, told us about the new climate of factory dealer relations:

"If the management of this corporation could decide one Wednesday or Thursday afternoon to operate that way, certainly another management a few years from now on the same Wednesday or Thursday afternoon * * * could turn around and change the course 180 degrees, and that is what I referred to in my football analogy of possibly (passing) ground rules, so that each side will continue to have 4 downs to make 10 yards—so that there will not be a change once it is established."

I must admit that I am tempted to agree with Mr. Fribley. If these companies have, in fact, learned their lesson and decided to play by rules which are fair and square, what can be their objection to allowing a dealer to submit the question of cause to the courts? If they are serious in their promise not to force dealers to take too many cars and not to discriminate against a dealer because he fails in their judgment to take enough cars, what objection can there be to such legislation? If they intend to no longer make morally indefensible profits in the guise of phantom freight charges, what can be their objection to legislation preventing them from making such profits?

These are the problems that I will leave with you. I sincerely hope that you will let the Congress know what you think of them, and what you think the Congress ought to do, and above all, I would urge you to keep solidarity in your ranks, and resist any attempt to divide the dealer organizations among themselves, for this is the principal method by which dealers can lose all. If you disagree on some matters, such as territorial security, I suggest you pass that by and come up with programs on which you can agree. If you do this, I feel sure the Congress will give great weight to the views of you people who represent the cornerstone of the American small business free enterprise system.

Organization for Trade Cooperation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD M. SIMPSON
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 27, 1956

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include an analysis of the constitutionality of Organization for Trade Cooperation—OTC, and General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade—GATT, by our former and distinguished colleague, Hon. Samuel B. Pettengill.

The article is as follows:

My objection to GATT is not that I am a Smoot-Hawley high protection man. I am not. I voted for the Reciprocal Trade Act of 1934. In my book, Jefferson, the Forgotten Man, written in 1938, I stated my belief that the higher tariff walls erected during the 1920's were a contributing cause of the worldwide collapse of 1929.

I am against GATT for a larger reason than protection or free trade, high tariffs or low. I am against GATT because it is part and parcel of international socialism, one-worldism, and the slow surrender of American sovereignty to aliens whom we can neither elect nor defeat.

Whether any tariff on foreign goods should be lowered or raised, that decision should be kept in the hands of officials elected by and responsible to the American people. If our industrialists, workmen, or farmers think any tariff is too low, they ought not to be required to argue their case before foreigners in a foreign city. They should need go no farther than to the Capitol of their own country and submit their case to a jury of their peers. If a mistake is made there, it can be corrected there and by officials responsible to those who claim to be hurt. If a mistake is made elsewhere, it may be permanent.

Article 1 of the Bill of Rights guarantees the American people the right to petition their own "Government for the redress of grievances," not a foreign government nor an international governmental body on which our country will have only 1 vote in 35 or more votes.

Ours is a representative form of government in which the representatives are American citizens.

We were once governed from London. We got rid of that government. Are we to be governed again from London, or from Paris, Rome, Geneva, or Moscow? I am for making the Declaration of Independence permanent. Have the results of 2½ world wars proved so beneficial to us as to justify the abandonment of American independence and sovereignty?

Sovereignty is the supreme and independent power or authority to govern a nation. It is the power to decide the policies and execute the laws that govern a people and their affairs. Sovereignty must always be in some hands and the question is whether any part of American sovereignty should be placed in any other than American hands.

Abraham Lincoln spoke to this question in 1854. He said: "I insist that if there is anything which it is the duty of the whole people to never entrust to any hands but their own, that thing is the preservation and perpetuity of their own liberties and institutions."

Has anything happened in our lifetime to warrant our disregarding Lincoln's advice?

The Constitution says that "all legislative powers" which are granted the Federal Government are vested in Congress. Congress can delegate none of its legislative powers. After laying down the policy, and after erecting a clear standard to which the executive must conform, Congress can of course delegate administrative powers. In fact it must of necessity do so, else it would itself be usurping executive power. But Congress can delegate nothing which involves a discretion as to what the law shall be.

Be it noted that a tariff, whether it be prescribed unilaterally by an act of Congress, or is arrived at by an executive reciprocal agreement of the President with the agents of a foreign power, is a law. It is something which people must obey. A tariff is an exercise of legislative power which under the Constitution is vested in Congress alone. Congress alone has power "to regulate commerce with foreign nations." Article 1, section 8 of the Constitution.

The constitutional aspects of tariff making in general and GATT in particular have been

powerfully presented by Mr. Lennox P. McLendon, Esq. in a brief filed before the Ways and Means Committee of the House of Representatives entitled "The Legal Sweep of H. R. 5550." I shall not repeat his arguments nor attempt to enlarge on them. I confine my thought to the historic developments of our free institutions since 1776 and the divergence therefrom of GATT, and of those who favor GATT.

George Washington asked in his Farewell Address, "Why quit our own to stand on foreign ground? Why, by interweaving our destiny with that of any part of Europe, entangle our peace and prosperity in the toils of European ambition, rivalship, interest, humor, or caprice?" Why, indeed?

GATT embraces not Europe alone, but entangles our peace and prosperity in the ambitions, rivalship, and interests of 34 other nations all over the world, all of whom have their own axes to grind.

The State Department has said that "GATT is the most comprehensive international agreement ever negotiated for the reduction of barriers to and hence for the expansion of world trade." Note that it says "world trade," not our own part of world trade. The old-time philosophy of Washington and Lincoln, stated in the Preamble of the Constitution, was that it is the business of the American Government to promote the interests of the American people. If that rule were still followed, one might view the present question in a different light.

But that is no longer true. The mass hallucination is now dominant in Government circles that the United States is a charitable organization for the benefit of 2½ billion people. This mental derangement is now of epidemic proportions, and its contagion infects leaders of both parties. The State Department is on record that "There is no longer any real distinction between domestic and foreign affairs." That is the tipoff, the warning bell.

It is in this murky and alien atmosphere that we must judge what the proponents of GATT and OTC intend to do, if Congress gives them its blessing.

There is nothing in the above quotations from Lincoln and Washington that derogates from Jefferson's words: "Peace, friendship, and commerce with all nations." Jefferson believed in international commerce. Look at all the stuff he brought over from France. Since 1789, the American people, both with their old-time clipper ships and in many other ways, expanded American commerce with all the world's people, and on a tremendous scale.

But they did so as the Constitution intended and without interweaving our destiny with any form of world government, or surrendering any part of American sovereignty to foreign hands.

No one objects to private enterprisers or public officials negotiating with foreigners about international trade. This we have done for a century and a half, but always subject to the constitutional power of Congress to approve, reject, or modify. Has our Constitution been such a failure as to now excuse the use of devious ways to sidetrack it?

GATT and the OTC, if once legalized, can, however, make rules, binding as law on its members on matters not only directly controlling the flow of world trade, but on domestic matters which affect world trade. Note this well. In short, GATT and OTC can affect the jobs of every worker and farmer in America. Moreover, GATT has the power of self-amendment—that is, it could, if once legalized, enlarge its powers without an action or approval by Congress.

Do we want to get ourselves in this bear-trap?

It is time for the American people to stop, look, and listen. GATT is proposed in a far different prevailing political atmosphere and philosophy of government than the Reciprocal Tariff Act of 1934. That act went to the extreme limit of the power of Congress with respect to its responsibility to act as the governing body of the American people on matters of foreign trade. Its constitutionality has never been passed on judicially. Assuming that it is constitutional, as I thought it was when I voted for it, it has certain advantages over the logrolling procedures under which tariff laws were formerly written on the floor of the House and Senate.

However, in 1934 no one in high office was arguing for the surrender of any part of American sovereignty to foreign governments. The law then passed contemplated bilateral negotiations only, our Nation with one other nation at a time. In such negotiations there was no possibility of being outvoted. The power to say "Yes" or "No" remained securely in American hands.

GATT, however, calls for a vast complex of multilateral negotiations with many nations in a sort of world superlegislature where we have 1 vote in 35 or more votes. This is a horse of a different color, a Trojan horse. Once wrapped up in this spider web, it will be difficult indeed to recapture any independence of action.

But more important is the difference in the political climate now prevailing as against the philosophy that then prevailed. It is necessary to understand how far and how foreign our leaders have gone in their thinking since 1934, I refer, of course, to such men as President Eisenhower, Secretary Dulles, and Mr. Harold Stassen on the Republican side, and Messrs. Stevenson, Kefauver, and Harriman on the Democratic side. Everyone of them is for some sort of world government, limited though it may be. They would all limit American sovereignty to a greater or less extent. The $55 billion of foreign aid since 1945 and the effort to continue it, perhaps forever, shows the sort of thinking that will dominate GATT.

In his book, Crusade for Europe, President Eisenhower, after reviewing the operation of the joint military forces in Europe which he commanded, has this to say on page 477: "A firm agreement (is required) that in disputes between nations a central and joint agency, after examination of the facts, shall decide the justice of the case by majority vote and thereafter shall have the power and the means to enforce its decisions." Note those words "majority vote."

The Reciprocal Trade Act of 1934 was to promote American imports and exports. GATT goes far beyond these objectives. It plans to insure full employment worldwide; insure equal access to resources; develop undeveloped countries; raise standards of living and create effective demand for the world's goods by redistributing the world's wealth.

Contrary to protecting American interests, GATT would consider and decide what share of a country's market of a given product belongs to other countries; which other countries are entitled to supply that share; what is a country's fair share of the world's raw materials or other products in short supply. Under GATT foreigners will ask: "What is our fair share of what you have?"

It is international planning and governing on a grandiose scale, and will be largely at our expense. It calls for the worldwide socialization, in greater or less degree, of all trade, resources, and wealth. If approved, it will be another spike in the coffin, now under construction, of American constitutional government.

April 12: National Health Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. IRWIN D. DAVIDSON
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 8, 1956

Mr. DAVIDSON. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a joint resolution calling for the establishment of the 12th day of April of each year as National Health Day. We have witnessed in the past few decades the increasing interest of the Federal Government in the improvement of the health of all of our citizens and in the elimination of disease. The war which is constantly being waged against the destructive diseases which afflict both the mind and the body is, I am sure, the only war, be it hot or cold, which honestly commends itself to the hearts, souls, and minds not only of the people of this Nation but of the peoples of the world. The continual struggle to conquer the many dire illnesses and diseases to which man is still subject is the greatest battle remaining for man against nature.

We have, not only in the United States but elsewhere in the world, vast resources of people skilled and trained in scientific research, investigation and analysis and the utilization of those resources is still required to aid in the conquest of disease. In addition, vast sums of money together with nationwide and worldwide correlation of experimental data and progress are needed to supply the weapons for the successful conquest of disease.

The resolution which I have today introduced, for appropriate reference in the House, would set aside the 12th day of April of each year for the purpose of a public dedication in the never-ending struggle for improvement in our Nation's health. It would invite the medical profession, the press, and all agencies and individuals interested in the national program to unite together in a concerted effort to impress upon the people the necessity and the value of our Federal Government's interest in national health.

The reasons for the designation of the 12th day of April are rather simple. In the first place, that day is the birthdate of our late President, Franklin Delano Roosevelt, who, perhaps more than any other President in our Nation's history, oriented our thinking and our efforts to the need for a national health program. The crippling paralysis from which he suffered was well known to everyone in the world. His personal interest and his efforts to eliminate the dread disease, infantile paralysis, caused him to found the National Foundation for Infantile Paralysis. The annual March of Dimes is not only a yearly drive to aid the foundation, but acts also as a memorial to his memory and to his ability to lead a useful and dedicated public life despite his affliction.

In the second place, the 12th day of April became the day on which the entire world was informed of the results

of a study made on the effect of the use of the Salk vaccine in the reduction, and perhaps eventually the elimination, of paralytic polio. The contribution which Dr. Salk has made to our Nation's health cannot be measured—each of us knows that countless children have been saved from a crippling disease. The discovery of the Salk vaccine is perhaps the outstanding health contribution of our lifetime, and the day upon which the Francis report was issued will serve as a constant reminder of the great strides that can be made by scientific research to eliminate the as yet unconquered illnesses of man.

These two reasons, then, would indicate that the 12th day of April is, indeed, the proper day for the observance of a National Health Day.

I respectfully request the support of each Member of the House for the resolution which I have introduced.

The President's Plan for Medical Insurance for Federal Employees Is a Flagrant Act of Favoritism Toward Big Insurance Companies and Tends Toward Monopoly in the Health Insurance Field

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 25, 1956

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, on May 29, 1956, I commented on a report of a Federal interagency committee relating to the health services to Federal employees. I said at that time that the report showed that although adequate employee health services are available in many Federal establishments, inadequate services or no service at all are available to a substantial number of employees. It is believed that some heads of agencies neither fully realize the value of such health programs nor realize the extent to which they exist in private employment.

Recently, the administration has recommended to the Congress a very limited proposal to help provide for a part of major medical expenses for the employees as an amendment to the Federal Employees Group Life Insurance Act of 1954. It is my belief that this proposal is entirely inadequate. What is needed, I believe, is legislation which would provide basic protection against routine medical expenses. In such a plan, the costs should be borne equally by the Federal Government and by the employees. Medical, surgical, and hospital care should be provided with a payroll deduction for the employee portion of the cost. In addition, the use of nonprofit medical service plans, where they are available, should be encouraged.

In this connection I would like to take this occasion to point out that the policy resolution adopted at the AFL–CIO merger convention relating to Federal employees called for a—

> Hospital and medical insurance program for Federal employees with employee representation in administration of plan and Federal Government to underwrite at least 50 percent of the total cost, and with administrative principles consistent with those approved by the AFL–CIO for administration of health and welfare funds negotiated with employers in private industry.

I would like to say that my reasons for opposing the administration's medical insurance plan are as follows:

First. The proposal is a flagrant act of favoritism toward private commercial insurance carriers and tends toward monopoly in the health insurance field.

Second. The major medical expense plan proposed by the administration discriminates against the lower paid Federal employees. The great majority of Federal employees receive less than $5,000 per year. Many of these employees have no basic health services and many others have only the very minimum coverage.

Third. Few if any of these low income employees would receive any return from such a major medical insurance plan as the administration proposes because they cannot afford the expense of medical, surgical, and hospital care to the extent of the deductibles proposed: namely, $100 medical, $250 surgical, and $500 hospital for each individual.

Fourth. The medical insurance plan put forward by the present administration does not encourage preventive medical care which is so desirable. Rather, it discourages such care by providing for large deductions of charges as mentioned previously. The provision that benefits start only after other insurance or services are fully met is discriminatory and it discourages comprehensive basic health care and penalizes those who are already providing themselves with comprehensive medical care.

Fifth. The administration plan, even after the large deductibles, provides only partial indemnity for medical and hospital expenses of exceptional or severe illness.

Sixth. The coverage provided in the administration plan for retired employees is even more limited in that they are required to pay the first $200 of medical care and are given no reimbursement for hospitalization.

For these reasons, Mr. Speaker, I believe this proposal for major medical insurance put forward by the administration puts the cart before the horse or, as someone said the other day, it finishes the roof before the foundations have even been laid.

On the other hand, if a program such as I propose is adopted, namely, 50-percent participation by the Federal Government plus payroll deduction for the employee's share of the cost for basic medical, surgical, and hospital care, the cost of a major medical program to supplement the basic program would be drastically reduced.

No layman can estimate the cost of the President's program because it is so entwined with the reserves in the life-insurance program.

Let me make myself perfectly clear. I am not opposed to a major medical-insurance program but it is quite clear that a basic health program of the type I propose should come first.

I believe that my position parallels that of the representatives of the Blue Cross hospital service plan, the Blue Shield medical service plan, Group Health Association, the International Association of Machinists AFL–CIO, and perhaps other organizations.

For these reasons, I am introducing a bill to provide the kind of basic program which I feel should be enacted into law before the administration program is adopted by the Congress.

This legislation, I might add, was largely developed by the International Association of Machinists AFL–CIO and I want to commend William H. Ryan, president and legislative representative of district No. 44, International Association of Machinists AFL–CIO, for his leadership in this matter.

United Nations Failure in Korea

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 25, 1956

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am inserting an editorial from the New York Times under date of June 25 entitled "Six Years in Korea." It points out that it was just 6 years ago on last Monday that the Communist invasion of South Korea began. Since that time the United States has poured American life and treasure into a venture that is still greatly in doubt.

After 6 years while the United Nations carries the responsibility to establish a free and unified Korea, it has failed to move in that direction. Its incompetency under present conditions is cause for great regret among those people who feel that the United Nations is a force for peace in the world.

The editorial follows:

> SIX YEARS IN KOREA
>
> On June 25, 1950, 6 years ago today, the Communists from the north struck at the Republic of Korea. It was a powerful invasion in force designed to put an end, once and for all, to Korean liberty and to the young Government that had been set up under the sponsorship of the United Nations.
>
> Led by the United States, the United Nations took prompt action and rallied to meet the assault. In that connection it is worth noting that the official history of the Soviet Union no longer charges that the United States launched the Korean attack, but states merely that the United States intervened in a Korean civil war. The fact was that the Republic's forces were little more than a constabulary and that the United Nations forces were largely an improvisation to meet an assault that had been long planned and skillfully prepared.
>
> At that stage, however, the most important single factor was moral rather than military. The United Nations had actually taken a forceful action to resist an aggression. All of us felt that we had gained something in self-respect and the United Nations gained a new lease on life.
>
> Fighting in the field went on for about 3 years. The Communist attack was repelled, but because of a variety of factors, most of them political within the United Nations it-

self, the eventual result was a stalemate. In July of 1953 an armistice was signed.

Three years of frustration have followed. The armistice terms have been consistently violated by the Communists. Indeed, the United States Congress has had testimony that the violations began on the very day the armistice was signed. The machinery for supposedly neutral inspection of the north and south to assure the carrying out of the truce terms has now broken down and the United Nations has been obliged to insist that spurious neutrals, such as Poles and Czechs, withdraw from the free Republic.

Meanwhile, the attempt to unify the peninsula by peaceful means has also failed. A conference was held in Geneva 2 years ago, which was supposed to explore this possibility. There was not the slightest indication that the Communists had any intention of permitting a free election in Korea, and the conference reached no conclusion.

After 6 such years the United Nations is still committed to the establishment of a free, unified, and democratic Korea. There can be no compromise with such a commitment. Free government exists in the Republic in the south. The north is still the puppet of the Soviet Union—Stalin's death did not change that—and of the Red Chinese. It is inconceivable that members of the United Nations can forsake their ideals to the extent that they would permit the free nation to disappear, or that they can make a mockery of their own protestation by abandoning the idea that Korea must be united and that Korea must be free.

Address of Hon. John J. Rooney, Member of Congress, at Commencement Exercises of Bay Ridge High School Held at Brooklyn Technical High School Auditorium, Brooklyn, N. Y., June 25, 1956

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH

OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 27, 1956

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, last night at the 84th commencement exercises of Bay Ridge High School, held at the auditorium of Brooklyn Technical High School, Brooklyn, N. Y., our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY], had the great privilege of delivering the address to the graduates.

Under the permission heretofore granted me by unanimous consent of the House, I include Mr. ROONEY's address on this occasion as well as the program of the ceremonies, the names of the graduating class of June 1956, and the names of those who received highest scholastic honors, scholarships, and awards:

ADDRESS BY HON. JOHN J. ROONEY, OF NEW YORK

Miss Fitzpatrick, Reverend Mouland, distinguished guests, members of the faculty, the class of June 1956, ladies and gentlemen, it is always a pleasant occasion for a Member of Congress to be asked to give a speech, but I feel particularly good when I am asked in behalf of a high-school group. It proves that the virtue of courage is still one of the prime qualities of youth. It has ever been to the discredt of men that as they grow older, they tend to lose some of that youthful courage, enthusiasm, and optimism, for it is then, more than ever, that they need those very qualities. But youth, too, has a lack of some of the things that are of importance in adult society—experience, self-discipline, and a sense of dedication. These can only be acquired with the passage of time. You can be sure, though, that you will gain these attributes if you will keep the goal ever in sight.

Now, we are not all endowed with the same potentialities. It has always been so. Some of you are destined to become professional women and professional men; others, statesmen or states women; more of you, housewives; and still others, businesswomen and artisans. It is not important into what field you turn your endeavors as long as you exert yourselves to do the best possible in the job that you have chosen. It's similar to the story of the judge who was hearing the case against an elderly man who had been convicted of robbery for the seventh or eighth time. The judge, knowing that the man was an habitual criminal, and as such would be a threat to society, sentenced him to a total of 20 years in State's prison.

"But, judge," said the thief, "I'm 65 years old. I can't possibly serve out a sentence of 20 years."

"That may be true," said the judge, understandingly, "but do the best you can."

Those are sound words for all of us to heed. Do the best you can. Our great country is made up of people from all walks of life, from all income levels, from all intelligence levels. The tremendous advantage we have over many other countries of the world is that each one of us has equal power at the polls and equal justice before the law. You may think it a little early to start thinking about the responsibilities of citizenship, but the best time to prepare for any future job is now. It takes practice and perseverance to gain the experience needed to do any task well. In fact, the only job I can think of offhand where you must be perfect from the very first try is parachute jumping. Preserving democratic principles, fortunately, is not quite this demanding, but the results of not learning how to keep them can be just as fatal. We, all of us Americans, have a tremendous responsibility not only to ourselves and our families, but to the rest of the world that still lingers in chains, and to future generations yet unborn. We have received the inheritance of freedom from our forefathers who fought and died to preserve it for us. It is only right that we pass it on intact.

What then can you do to fulfill your role as good citizens? You can do much. You can start right now. As you go out the doors of this auditorium tonight, you will be leaving one phase of your life behind you forever. The next will have already begun, and it is up to you whether it shall lead to the peaceful world that man has not known to this time, or whether it shall stagger blindly along in the well-worn paths of the past. There is not one good reason, in this world under God, for believeing that wars are inevitable; that depressions will visit us periodically; or that crime is a necessary evil. True, throughout history there have been periods of two or three hundreds of years when the world seemed to stagnate, or seemed bent on self-destruction. However, there have also been times when mankind seemed kildled with the spirit of enlightenment; the Golden Age of Greece, the Renaissance, the Elizabethan Age, and the period of the American Revolution are but a few examples. These are the eras that make use take pride in our membership in the human race, sweeping aside with the grandeur of their purpose the shameful memories of other ages. Shall we pessimistically say that their likes will never be seen again? Better we should turn in our membership cards and take our places with the dumb, unthinking beasts, for progress of civilization can only come with optimism born of hope for better things.

You have probably heard it said that the frontiers have all been conquered; that there is no longer room for the pioneering spirit; that opportunities have lessened in scope since your grandfathers were young. Don't you believe it. Your ancestors and mine had only to conquer natural obstacles. No one will deny that that takes courage, nor will anyone deny them the fame they justly deserve. At the present time, even though the frontiers have no longer a geographic location, the challenge is all the more exciting. These new wastelands that must be conquered so that they will be productive are the wastlands of men's and women's minds. The cudgels must be taken up in the fight against intolerance, against bigotry, against those who would pervert our democracy to their own selfish ends. Although men have been exploring the fringe areas of these frontiers for hundreds of years, they are far from conquered. Here is where you can do much. Examine your own thoughts and attitudes. Keep those that you now have that are fine and noble. Keep those which you know are right for you and for others as well. This is a matter between you and your conscience—and I will not attempt to tell you what should be weeded out. This I will say. Examine all things in the clear light of reason, knowledge and morality. Don't be swept into following emotionally each new ism or belief that people will try to force on you. Think for yourselves.

Once you have determined the values that are worth fighting for, stick with them unswervingly, just as long as they represent truth. This does not mean that you should close your ears to arguments that present the other side, for without knowing the opposition's claims, you can never be sure that you are right * * * and not just being stubborn. You probably will not grow rich by following such a course; you very possibly will not be popular with everyone; you undoubtedly will be very heartily disliked by some. Taking the long-term view, these things simply do not matter. The reward of a clear conscience is beyond price. Just remember this: when your conscience starts bothering you because of the beliefs that you hold, then it is time to start reexamining—for we are only human beings, and, as such, are not infallible. It is keeping this in mind that will make us tolerant of those who hold opinions that differ from ours. Only if we ourselves are understanding can we expect to guide others toward this virtue.

The paths that lead to the attainment of the better qualities of man are not easy. They are not for those who believe that the world owes them a living merely because they didn't ask to be born into it. They are not for those who become discouraged when presented with failure. They are, however, for the group that has ever become the leaders; those who have determination, who have the courage to see things through to the end, and those who have become mature through the exercise of self-discipline.

Discipline, perhaps one of the most important learned qualities, has more to do with the molding of our character than any other factor. It can be said that more thoughtless, unethical, and criminal acts are committed because of lack of discipline than through lack of any other single quality. Discipline is not the imposition of one's will on another just because he or she can get away with it. Rather, it develops one so that he can take his proper place among his fellowmen. I know that many of you have balked at some of the disciplines imposed on you during your school career. I know this because we all have done so. This is a natural reaction among men whose animal instincts encourage freedom of action. It has resulted, at time, from a misinterpretation of the word "democracy." We must recognize, though, that even in a

democracy, all must give up something of their natural inclinations in order to give the whole of society a deeper feeling of security. When we are young and inexperienced, discipline must of necessity be imposed upon us, but as soon as we learn to have mastery of ourselves, it becomes self-discipline. At that point, an imposed discipline is no longer necessary. This is what we all hope and feel you have received at Bay Ridge High School.

I have no fears about your knowledge of the subject matter that has been presented to you. It is to the credit of faculty members everywhere, who have been working under the handicaps of crowded classrooms that include a wider range of intelligence levels than at any time in the past, who in many areas have been working under the added handicap of inadequate pay schedules—it is to their credit that high school students graduating today have a much wider background in world affairs, and place higher on achievement tests than the same groups who graduated a generation ago.

I mentioned earlier three of the qualities that you yourselves will have to develop now that you are going into the world as adults: experience, self-discipline, and a sense of dedication. Experience you will gain as you join the ranks of working men and women, the armed services, or the institutions of higher learning. Self-discipline should be the natural result of the restrictions that have been imposed on you through your school career. What of dedication? Does this mean that you must choose one phase of life that you think needs changing, and fight forevermore to see that it is changed? Not at all. A sense of dedication can be merely a belief in something bigger than yourself, something to which you are willing to devote time and effort without thought of monetary gains. It can be in the field of religion, or in opposing communism and ideas which you believe to be evil, or it can be in striving to raise the conditions of your fellow man all over the world. It can be found in your parents who raised you with love, although at times you were anything but lovable; it can be found in your teachers who taught you in spite of your occasional unwillingness to learn; and it can be found, in its early stages, in each one of you tonight who harbors the hope for a better world to come.

When you receive your diplomas tonight, your quest for knowledge has not ended. This is your commencement. Your search is just beginning. Keep looking for truth until, when you're sure in your own mind that you have it, you can look anyone in the eye and say, "On these principles will I stake my life." And though I fervently pray that no one here will be called upon to sacrifice his or her life, it is better to die nobly free than live a slave to the whims of dictators or tyrants.

God bless you all, and may you and He working together bring this world to its rightful heritage of peace and prosperity.

PROGRAM

Music: Bay Ridge High School Orchestra, Miss Marie G. Petrullo, director.

Processional: America—Our Heritage, Steele.

Salute to the flag: Led by Theresa A. DePompa, president of grade; Marion Masefield, president of GO; Barbara A. Olesak, grade service leader.

Invocation. Rev. Cyril Mouland, pastor, Christian Soldiers Church.

The Lord's Prayer, Malotte: Senior chorus.

Greetings from the principal: Miss Elizabeth T. Fitzpatrick.

Hymn of Praise, Mozart: Senior class, Miss Lilian Chianta, director.

Salutatorian: Marion Masefield.

Young and Foolish (Plain and Fancy), Hague-Horwitt: Senior class, Miss Marie Petrullo, director.

Address to the graduates: Hon. JOHN J. ROONEY, Member of the House of Representatives, 14th Congressional District.

Valedictorian: Katherine Sgouros.

It's a Grand Night for Singing (State Fair), Rodgers and Hammerstein: Vocal solo, Harriet Rosenblum; accompanist, Dorothy Pellechia.

Presentation of honors and awards: Miss Rose R. Restaino, administrative assistant; Mr. Charles E. O'Neill, administrative assistant.

Parent-Teachers Association, Mr. William Kostecki, president: Scholarship awarded to Rita Hagman.

Class of June 1956, Bay Ridge High School: Mrs. Ethel N. Sarafian, dean of senior class.

Conferring of diplomas: Miss Elizabeth T. Fitzpatrick, Hon. John J. Rooney.

Presentation of Arista Keys: Mary A. Uravic.

Presentation of class gift: Theresa A. DePompa.

Valedictorian of Bay Ridge Evening High School: William H. Truax.

Presentation of honors and awards: Mr. William P. Mannix, dean of senior class, evening session.

Class of June 1956, Bay Ridge Evening High School: Mr. Leopold J. DeMaio, teacher in charge of evening session.

Conferring of diplomas: Miss Elizabeth T. Fitzpatrick.

Recessional—School Song: Morris.

GRADUATING CLASS OF JUNE 1956

Rae Acquiviva, Joan D. Adeeb, Carmela Aiello, Carol Aievoli, Phyllis Alamia, Isolina Alicea, Carole Alioto, Rosemarie T. Allegretta, Eleanor C. Aloi, Annarose M. Alvaro, Marie T. Amante, Louise Amendola, Doris Andersen, Elizabeth Andersen, Esther Andersen, Anita Andresen, Anne Angelo, Frances Antino, Christine Apreda, Nina Arcuri, Molly Arizzo, Carmen Arrieta, Benedetta Arrigo, Rosemarie Ascrizzi, Mary Auletta, Marie Auteri, Arleen Avena, Barbara Babich, Lorraine Baloy, Laura Bandiera, Mary Ann Barletta, Anna Barone, Marilyn Barra, Jennie Barraco, Mary E. Barry, Frances Basile, Anna Bassolino, Dolores Batanjany, Phyllis Battiloro, Dorothy Battista, Gloria Bayard, Patricia Becker, Joan Beinert, Lucretia Beltrone, Rosanne Bencivenga, Alba Beneforte, Shirley Bensen, Mary Ann Bentivegna, Catherine Bergersen, Gladys Bernius, Greta Berntson, Linnea Berntson, Christina Beshara, Penelope Biriidis, Geraldine Bitetto, Michelina Biunno, Virginia Biwer, Lucy Bianco, Rosalie Biasko, Rena Bloom, Louise Bocchicchio, Irene Bogdan, Frances Bonilla, Phyllis Botte, Ramona Bowen, Beryl Boyle, Carol Bredal, Anna Brett, Caroline Brockway, Nancy Brunner, Rosemarie Bruzzese, Elizabeth Buononato, Veronica Burulcich, Angela Burzi, Norma M. Byrne.

Annamae Cacace, Alice Caccavo, Florence L. Cafaro, Johanna Calacanis, Joyce Calderone, Helen Calla, Rose Marie Calvanico, Diane H. Campbell, Theresa Capalbo, Helen Cappadona, Irene Caputo, Joan K. Carey, Nancy Carlsen, Edith Carlson, Janet Carlson, Joan Carroll, Agnes Carrozza, Frances Carta, Patricia Caruso, Madeline Casanova, Marlene Cascio, Rosemarie Casciola, Antoinette Cassata, Sophie Castagna, Cynthia Castellano, Angelina Castelli, Josephine Castore, Dolores Cataffo, Caroline Cavalli, Elizabeth L. Cavallo, Phyllis Celifarco, Josephine Cervasio, Rae Cervino, Caroline Cherdron, Rachel Chierchio, Janet Christensen, Helen Christopher, Louise Ciccone, Gloria Ciminieri, Barbara Cioffi, Josephine Cioffi, Gertrude Clark, Joan Clauberg, Geraldine Colabella, Helen Connolly, Barbara Conte, Mary Conti, Barbara A. Corbett, Mary Ann Corliss, Anna R. Cotolo, Catherine Coughlan, Gertrude Crane, Geraldine Crecco, Catherine Crisera, Camille Cristiano, Georgia N. Cuomo, Jeannette Cuomo, Ann Curry, Kathleen Cusack, Dorothy E. Cushing.

Mary D'Agostino, Helen Dalessio, Rosalie D'Ambra, Joan D'Amico, Marlene D'Andrea, Marilyn J. Dangelo, Carole D'Antonio, Angela D'Antuono, Rosemary Davis, Jeanette DeCarlo, Grace DeCaro, Joan DeCaro, Wanda DeJesus, Rita Del Gatto, Rosalie Dello Russo, Dolores Delmonico, Rose Delosa, Norma Del Rosso, Alice del Valle, Catherine DeMarco, Katherine DeMarco, Rosanne DeMichele, Louise DeOliveira, Theresa DePompa, Martha DeSantis, Joan C. Dethlefs, Loretta Devino, Marilyn DeVita, Theresa Diano, Frances DiBitetto, Gloria DiDonato, Jennie DeGiacomo, Clara Dilorenzo, Pauline DeMartino, Rita DiMauro, Frances Diomede, Valerie R. Dorman, Lillian Driller, Dorothy Dudeck, Patricia Dunne, Mona Ecks, Rose Elia, Margo Ellis, Arlita Ericksen, Helen Ericksen, Marie Etrasco, Marietta Facchino, Barbara Fager, Evelyn Fannin, Florence Fauci, Rita Ferraiulo, Concetta Ferrante, Joy Ferranto, Louise Ferraro, Rasalie Ferraro, Rose Fioriello, Patricia Louise Fioto, Barbara Fischer, Marion Forte, Emily Fortunato, Fina Frangella, Joan Frasca, Frances J. Freddoso, Shiela Freund, Eleanor Frias, Nina Friscia, Margherita Fusco.

Barbara Gabrielsen, Antoinette Gagliardi, Marilyn Gagliardo, Aldona Galas, Josephine Galdieri, Mary Jane Gambale, Joan Ganim, Blanche M. Garcia, Elizabeth Garcia, Lucretia Gatto, Concetta Genovese, Margaret Gentile, Rose Gentile, Barbara Gerrity, Roberta P. Giacalone, Lillian Giacone, Rosalie Giammanco, Phyllis Gigante, Barbara Sue Ginn, Patricia Giordano, Joan Giovannone, Patricia Giuliano, Loretta Gobeil, Mary Jane Goebel, Constance Gold, Anna Gonzalez, Olympia Gonzalez, Rita Governale, Hilda Graff, Pauline Graffeo, Rosalie Graziano, Carmela Griffo, Lucile Guarnaccio, Ann Guggino, Angela M. Guido, Mary Guinan, Rita Hagman, Diane Hansen, Barbara A. Hanson, Jeanette Hanson, Carol Harrington, Linda Hartford, Dorothy Hayes, May Helen Hedland, Ruth B. Hernandez, Juliana Hild, Elaine Hoffman, Evelyn Holt, Ann Hom, Linda Fay Hom, Signy Hoyvik, Joan Hunter, Marie Iacobelli, Antoinette Iacovano, Bridget D. Imperato, Rosemarie Inganamorte, Alice Isaksen, Irene C. Ischia, Rose Marie Janicke, Barbara Jerembinsky, Edith Jensen, Katherine Johannesen, Elaine John, Antoinette Kanakry, Linda Karpa, Joan Kasold, Noreen Kearns, Margaret Kelly, Mary Kenny, Elizabeth Kerr, Margaret Kolz, Barbara Kostecki, Corinne Koster, Mary Kriskiewicz, Barbara Krooss, Gladys Kvinge.

Anita Lacerra, Nora J. LaCorte, Arline B. Ladanyi, Judith Laface, Marie F. Lantieri, Elaine Larnaitis, Rosalie LaRosa, Diane Larsen, Doris Larsen, Margaret Larsen, Judith Lashway, Janet LeBlanc, Naida M. Lebron, Lucille Lecompte, Carmela Lembo, Lynda Lembo, Angela Lentino, Viola R. Leone, Rose Leonini, Marianne LePore, Elenore Leschier, Ingrid Lindfors, Immaculata Linguiti, Josephine Lociento, Theresa LoFiego, JoAnn LoFrisco, Alice Loland, Julia Lombardo, Theresa C. Lombardo, Mary Lou Lonardo, Joan Long, Barbara Longo, Ann Lozito, Maureen Lucey, Barbara Luciano, Carol Maffucci, Louise Magnussen, Gloria Magone, Virginia Main, Rosemarie Maiolo, Adrienne Majewski, Louise Majka, Catherine Mainolfi, Rae L. Maiorino, Rosalie Maiorino, Alice Malinowski, Geraldine R. Malvicini, Ann Marie Mancini, Laura Mangano, Louise V. Mangia, Adele V. Manni, Lillian Marino, Marilyn Marino, Patricia A. Marino, Virginia Marino, Jeanette Margiotta, Geraldine Markianus, Marion Masefield, Angela Mastrianni, Carolyn Materdomini, Betsy Mauro, Gloria Mavrikis, Rose Mayo, Roberta McCann, Patricia McCarthy, Bridget McCormack, Kathleen McFall, Mary Ann McGowan, Cecceilia McKee, Sarah McNally, Florence A. Medaglia, Mildred Meinsen, Carol Melamedorf, Mary Ann Menichini, Rose Marie Mercurio, Edith Merendino, Joyce Messadi, Rose Messina, Theresa Michalski, Elvira Miglino, Dolores J. Miller, Theo-

dora K. Milonis, Mary Mingolla, Margaret Mistretta, Ronnette Mitchell, Anna Moa, Rosemarie B. Mokarry, Elba Monroig, Barbara Montemarano, Virginia Moon, Lillian Morabito, Patricia Morabito, Angela Morgante, Joan Morris, Lila Morterud, Louise Mottes, Gertrude G. Mouland, Julianna M. Mount, Barbara Mullio, Elizabeth Multari, Eileen Murray, Mary Murray, Theresa Muscarello, Anna Rose Muscolo.

Paula Napoli, Grace Napolitano, Norma Nasso, Clara Nastasi, Pola Nancy Navarro, Ruth Neilson, Jeannette A. Neiro, Julie A. Ness, Marion Niceforo, Loretta Nicols, Lorraine Nicols, Barbara A. Nilsen, Lillian Nilsen, Arlene Nixon, Barbara Nobiletti, Ann Nocito, Anna Noia, Irene Notwicz, Patricia A. Nystrom, Eileen O'Donnell, Julia O'Donnell, Yolanda A. Odstrcil, Carolyn O'Keefe, Barbara A. Oleksak, Virginia Oliva, Anne Olsen, Lorraine Olsen, Mary O'Mahoney, Rita O'Malley, Mary Oswald, Barbara Ann O'Toole, Myra Owens, Jeanette Pace, Marilyn Palm, Vivian Palmeri, Ida Palmieri, Gladys Panisse, Loretta Papa, Victoria Pappas, Shirley Parris, Angela Pasqualicchio, Constance Passante, Carmela Patti, Frances Patti, Marie Patti, Mary Anne Patti, Elizabeth Pearce, Marilyn Pedersen, Ruth Pedersen, Deanna Pehowich, Mary Louise Pehowich, Jean Pekara, Irene Pellecchia, Dorothy Pellecchia, Camille Peluso, Carmen Perez, Marian Pergolizzi, Marie A. Pergolizzi, Rose Marie Perillo, Santa Perone, Kathleen Perrotto, Josephine Perticone, Louise Pettine, Marie Picarelli, Kathleen Piccarelli, Loretta Pilch, Patricia Pinto, Theresa Pinto, Anna Piro, Rose Mary Piscopo, Anne Platis, Theresa Polanish, Theresa Ponziano, Jean Potter, Rita Pozza, Irene Prelewicz, Barbara Prevete, Menica Proscia, Marie Pucci, Marian Pulco.

Julia Quagliano, Dorothy Quina, Frances Quinn, Gladys Quintana, Dorothy Radolinski, Patricia T. Raffaele, Juanita Ramos, Judith Ann Randazzo, Catherine Raucci, Caroline Reese, Jean Reffelt, Eileen Regan, Sallie A. Rhyne, Dolores J. Ribertelli, Carol Ricci, Dulcie A. Ridd, Aida Rivera, Carmen A. Rivera, Maddalen Rivera, Norma Rivera, Matilda Robusto, Rose Rojnikoff, Eva Romagnano, Rose Marie Romano, Sylvia Rosanelli, Rita Rosen, Harriett Rosenblum, Norma Rubinich, Rosalie Rubino, Irene Russo, Carole Rutkowski, Lillian M. Ryan, Patricia Ryan, Catherine Sabo, Angela Sacco, Irene Saier, Lynn Sandstrom, Valerie Sandstrom, Rachel San Flice, Reina Santiago, Josephine T. Santore, Josephine E. Santoro, Roseann Santulli, Diana Santus, Pauline Saraceno, Josephine Sarnicola, Lucy Savastano, Carole Savettiere, Angela Scalogna, Phyllis A. Schaudel, Ann Schifferdecker, Rosemary Schulz, Rose Sciusco, Theresa Scognamillo, Annette Scotto, Isidora Scotto, Joan Scotto, Barbara Seigle, Laura L. Senatore, Eleanor Sgarlato, Katherine Sgouros, Mary Shannon, Rosanne Silvestri, Helen Simonsen, Marie Siriletti, Helen Skiba, Ronda Skoblow, Barbara Small, Joan Smigel, Marion F. Snyder, Christine Somma, Mary Anne Sorrentino, Carmela Spada, Iva Spallino, Anita Spatola, Florence Spinelli, Virginia Spinello, Dorothy E. Stafford, Arlene Steinbuch, Jean Stene, Patricia Stevens, Dolores Stigle, Viola Stucchio, Marie Sturiale, Joan Sylvester.

Anne Talluto, Barbara Tamer, Marian Terranova, Violet Terzano, Iris Tessitore, Mildred Testa, Lorrain Thorgersen, Emily I. Thorson, Jennie Todisco, Elaine Tomasetti, Carmen Torres, Rosann Trumbull, Frances Tufano, Barbara Tuffy, Joan Twigg, Mary Uravic, Ann Valente, Yvonne Van Oppre, Marie Vele, Marie Vetere, Anita Vina, Grace Vindigni, Josephine Visconti, Yolanda Vitale, Renate Volkhardt, Sonia Marie Wahl, Dorothy C. Ward, Faith Warrington, Margaret Watson, Ellen Weidmyer, Elfriede E. Weinreich, Joan Weller, Sarah Ann Wilson, Mary Jane Wink, Janet Wojcison, Carol Ann Woodman, Irene Woods, Marilyn Yarzab, Josephine Yodice, Joan Zablocki, Josephine Zach, Anna Zapulla, Rosina Zavaglia, Mary Zervoudakes, Marie Zosimo.

Evening session: William J. Anderson, Barbara A. Belmont, William H. Blake, Donald J. Byrnes, Carlo Campagnuolo, Arlene T. Caravella, Josephine B. Corso, John C. Cunningham, Richard M. Carrique, Chris Demetriades, Joanne Garry, David J. Gilmartin, John R. Ginty, Arne H. Hansen, Helen A. Iwaniuk, Helen Kenan, Kennedy A. Kilroy, Richard D. Lalor, Marion C. Lawrence, Norah M. Lonne, Margaret M. McDonnell, Idalia Merced, William J. Morton, Salvatore A. Petrolino, Patsy D. Rizzo, Racel Roman, William H. Truax, Herbert L. White.

Highest scholastic honors: English, Norah M. Lonne; mathematics, Christos Demetriades; social studies, Richard M. Carrique.

Awards: Elizabeth T. Fitzpatrick award, William H. Truax; Theodore Roosevelt medal, Joanne Garry; Bausch & Lomb award in science, Christos Demetriades.

Highest scholastic honors: Accounting, Katherine Sgouros; art, Barbara A. Kostecki; biology, Rita Ferraiulo; chemistry, Sallie A. Rhyne; economics, Louise R. DeOliveira; english, Louise R. DeOliveira; French, Rita Hagman; health education, Katherine Johannesen; history, Rita Ferraiulo; home economics, foods, Ellen Weidmyer; home economics, clothing, Caroline Cherdron; Italian, Alba Beneforti; Latin, Sylvia Rosanelli; mathematics, Louise Magnussen; music, vocal, Harriet Rosenblum; music, instrumental, Ann Marie Mancini; Norwegian, Margaret Larsen; physics, Victoria Pappas; secretarial studies, Alice Malinowski; Spanish, Katherine Sgouros; stenography, Angela Mastrianni.

SCHOLARSHIPS

Admission to Cooper Union for the Advancement of Art and Science: Mona H. Ecks.

Eastern School for Physicians' Aides, Inc.: Jean H. Pekara.

Fashion Institute of Technology scholarships: Irene A. Bogdan, Helen D. Connolly, Mona H. Ecks, Iris C. Tessitore.

Generoso Pope memorial scholarship: Theresa A. DePompa.

Grand Street Boys' Foundation scholarship: Ingrid M. Lindfors.

New York State regents college scholarships: Mona H. Ecks, Rita L. Ferraiuolo, Anna Stavrand (January class).

New York State regents science scholarship: Ingrid M. Lindfors.

New York regents scholarships for nursing education: Linda Hartford, Joan Hunter, Nora J. LaCorte, Dorothy C. Ward.

School Art League scholarships: Mona H. Ecks, Carmela F. Lembo.

AWARDS

Alexander Medal for Merit in Art: Carmela F. Lembo.

Youth's Friends Association medal for outstanding contributions in art: Mona Ecks.

Belding memorial award for excellence in accounting: Katherine Sgouros.

Belding memorial award for excellence in secretarial studies: Katherine Sgouros.

St. Gaudens medal for fine draughtsmanship: Marilyn Barra.

New York Classical Club medal for excellence in Latin, Victoria Pappas.

Alliance Francaise membership award for interest in French culture: Rose Rojnikoff.

American Association of Teachers of French, Spiers memorial medal for excellence in French: Marie Iacobelli.

Pan American medal for creative work in Spanish: Barbara Mullio.

Italian Teachers' Association medal for excellence in Italian: Marion Niceforo.

American Association of Teachers of Spanish medal for excellence in Spanish: Angela D'Antuono.

Steuben Society of America—Gen. Theodore Schwann, Unit No. 316, award for interest shown in American history: Ingrid M. Lindfors.

Louise Wingate Underhill memorial certificate: Rosemarie B. Mokarry.

Public School Athletic League medals: Patricia Louise Fioto, Mary Jane Goebel, Diane Hansen, Louise Majka.

Bausch & Lomb medal for exceptional progress in science: Victoria Pappas.

Cooperation in Government medal award: Theresa A. DePompa.

Cooperation in Government diplomas: Christine Apreda, Marilyn Barra, Alba N. Beneforti, Louise R. DeOliveira, Rita Hagman, Barbara Kostecki, Carmela F. Lembo, Eleanor J. Leschier, Ingrd M. Lindfors, Marion Masefield, Barbara A. Oleksak, Sallie A. Rhyne, Mary A. Uravic.

Medals awarded by the mayor's committee on scholastic achievement: Theresa A. DePompa, Ingrid M. Lindfors, Rita Hagman, Marion Masefield, Mary A. Uravic, Dorothy C. Ward.

Perfect attendance pins: Carmela Aiello, Phyllis Alamia, Marie Auteri, Marilyn Barra, Mary E. Barry, Greta Berntson, Michelina Biunno, Elizabeth Buononato, Joan Carey, Edith Carlson, Madeline Casanova, Elizabeth Cavallo, Angela D'Antuono, Louise DeOliveira, Theresa DePompa, Rita Hagman, Ann Hom, Marie Iacobelli, Antoinette Iacovano, Barbara Jarembinsky, Barbara Kostecki, Louise Majka, Adele V. Manni, Anna Moa, Carolyn O'Keefe, Barbara A. Oleksak, Mary O'Mahoney, Vivian Palmeri, Victoria Pappas, Angela Pasqualicchio, Marie Patti, Carmen Perez, Sylvia Rosanelli, Carole Rutkowski, Irene Saier, Joan Smigel, Christine Somma, Dorothy Stafford, Joan Twigg, Mary Uravic, Margaret Watson, Ellen Weidmyer, Mary Jane Wink, Janet Wojcison.

Publications awards: Senior book editor in chief, Louise R. DeOliveira; senior publication art editor, Eleanor J. Leschief; assistant editor, Elizabeth Pearce; Literary art publication, Marilyn Barra, Carmela F. Lembo.

Ridge Echo: Coeditors, Barbara Kostecki, Barbara A. Oleksak.

Gold medal for highest average for 4 years, Katherine Sgouros.

The AMA and FDA: A Story of Cooperation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LISTER HILL

OF ALABAMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, June 27, 1956

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, this morning I attended a historic national meeting to commemorate the 50th anniversary of basic national pure food, drug, cosmetic, and meat inspection laws in the United States. Dr. Dwight H. Murray addressed the meeting, and his address was most interesting and most enlightening. I ask unanimous consent that the address may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE AMA AND FDA: A STORY OF COOPERATION

(By Dwight H. Murray)

The American Medical Association is proud to have had a hand in the great progress made for wholesome and pure foods, drugs, and cosmetics in this Nation.

It is proud to have cooperated with the backers of the 1906 Food and Drug Act and the Meat Inspection Act. It is proud to have worked with the supporters of the 1938 Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act which strengthened the 1906 law. It is proud to

have had a close working arrangement with the FDA these past 50 years, and it certainly hopes to continue this association.

Because the medical profession has the responsibility of seeking the best medical care for every man, woman, and child in the United States, and because the FDA has the responsibility of protecting every man, woman, and child from impure, injurious, adulterated, or misbranded foods, drugs, and cosmetics, the two should, and must, cooperate.

A review of AMA history shows that doctors were interested in, and fought for, Federal laws governing the production and marketing of foods and drugs long before 1906.

As many as 25 years before the signing of the 1906 Pure Food and Drug Act, Dr. F. E. Stewart urged the AMA to recommend the establishment of a national bureau of medicines and foods. And in 1892 the AMA made its first proposals for food and drug legislation to prevent adulteration.

The AMA Journal in that same year also recommended the establishment of a Department of Health and the placement of a Food and Drug Administration under it. As you know, this is now the existing setup, with the FDA under the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

The agitation for the establishment of a national department of health continued within the AMA, and in 1893 AMA president, Dr. Hunter McGuire, concluded his address in Milwaukee by urging again a national setup.

Just after the turn of the century a California physician, Dr. Ellis, proposed that a national organization be formed with representatives of the AMA and the American Pharmaceutical Association examining and analyzing new remedies and making certain that labels were truthful and claims warranted.

A committee was formed and reported at the next annual meeting of the AMA. Although the establishment of a national bureau failed after extended discussion in the AMA's house of delegates, the effects of the pressure—brought about by the discussion—were sufficient to cause the AMA's board of trustees to take action later which resulted in the establishment of the AMA's own council on pharmacy and chemistry.

In February of 1905, 1 year before the signing of the Pure Food and Drug Act, the council on pharmacy and chemistry of the AMA held its first meeting. Dr. Harvey Wiley, the individual primarily responsible for the enactment of the Pure Food and Drug Act, was a charter member. He was a doctor of medicine as well as a chemist.

In the spring of 1905 Secretary of Agriculture James Wilson told the AMA that he had established a laboratory in his Department's Bureau of Chemistry for the investigation of adulteration of drugs and medicines. He went on to say:

"It seems to me that the collaboration with the great body of American physicians who form the AMA affords a splendid opportunity to carry out the work which Congress intended to be done.

"It gives me pleasure, therefore, to inform you that I have authorized the Chief of the Bureau of Chemistry to cooperate with the council on pharmacy and chemistry of the AMA."

So began the close cooperation between the American Medical Association and the FDA. That cooperation has continued through the last 50 years. It continues today.

The bureau of investigation of the AMA also has worked in harmony with the FDA for half a century. Also set up in 1906, the bureau was among the first organized groups in this country to investigate quackery. And for 50 years now its primary object has been the collection and dissemination of information on nostrums, quacks, medical fads, and various other phases of pseudomedicine.

Long before the Pure Food and Drug Act was changed requiring that labels must list the active ingredients and also carry warnings against misuse, the AMA bureau of investigation was exposing the nostrums, or phony cure-alls.

The bureau continues to provide information on over-the-counter medicines and such related matters as devices, food faddists, cultists, and quacks.

A third scientific AMA group cooperating with the FDA is the council on foods and nutrition organized in 1929 to evaluate nutritional claims of food processors and to discourage unwarranted, incorrect, and false promotional claims.

As FDA activities increased after the 1938 law, the AMA council on foods and nutrition swung into a more positive phrase—encouraging good practices in food advertising and labeling and improving the nutritional aspects of food.

The AMA council on medical physics is concerned with the evaluation of medical devices and the publication of authoritative reports on the established uses and limitations of such machines and equipment.

Finally, a fifth and relatively new AMA group, the committee on cosmetics, established in 1948, promotes a better understanding of the usefulness, limitations, and health problems of cosmetic preparations.

So today the AMA has five groups—the council on pharmacy and chemistry, the bureau of investigation, the council on foods and nutrition, the council on medical physics, and the committee on cosmetics—working for the profession and the public to supplement the activities of the FDA in the vital matters of foods, drugs, cosmetics, and medical devices.

In addition to these functions of the AMA, I am happy to say that the AMA has been among the first ones to advocate and support needed changes in food and drug legislation.

For example, in 1933—5 years before the new Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetics Act became law—the board of trustees of the AMA adopted a resolution again protesting against the inadequacy of the National Food and Drugs Act of 1906, and stated:

"That the AMA pledges its support toward procuring the formulation and enactment of effective national food and drug legislation adequate for the protection of the people."

After this resolution the AMA worked diligently with those sponsoring the new Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to obtain the bill as written, adopted, and signed.

And so the medical profession is happy to be counted among the many groups in the Nation helping the FDA to protect the Nation's health by safeguarding food and drug supplies.

As responsible doctor-citizens, we are happy to cooperate with the FDA, with the thousands of commercial establishments distributing products and with other citizen groups in keeping the standards of America's foods, medicines, and cosmetics as high as possible—today, tomorrow, and always.

Missile Progress Exceeds Estimate

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 27, 1956

Mr. WILSON of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the San Diego Evening Tribune of June 22, 1956:

SPEED ON ATLAS JOB GAINING, SAYS "CZAR"—MISSILE PROGRESS EXCEEDS ESTIMATE

(By Frank Macomber)

WASHINGTON.—The Government's missile chief said today Convair's Atlas program in San Diego is moving "considerably faster" than predicted in previous estimates.

Eger V. Murphree, special assistant for missiles to Defense Secretary Charles E. Wilson, chose his words carefully in an interview with the Evening Tribune's Washington Bureau.

He did not refer to any particular previous estimate of the Atlas timetable.

The Atlas is an intercontinental ballistic missile sometimes described as "the ultimate weapon"—a giant rocket which is capable of spanning oceans in 30 minutes and which is virtually unstoppable by present air defenses.

PROCEEDS RAPIDLY

Murphree did not refer specifically to the previous estimate of Air Secretary Donald Quarles, who told Congress in February, and reaffirmed the statement in April, that the piloted bomber would continue to be the preferred means of bomb delivery for at least 5 years.

This left the inference that the intercontinental ballistic missile might become the preferred means after that time.

Murphree said the Atlas "development program is proceeding rapidly and substantial progress is being made."

FIRE OFF FLORIDA

He added:

"I would be disappointed if we really haven't gotten very far along in the development in less than a 5-year period."

Murphree said security would prevent him from disclosing how soon Convair would put to use its launching equipment for the first Atlas test firing off the coast of Florida.

Murphree, often nicknamed "Mister Missile" of the Defense Department, answered a series of questions submitted by the Washington bureau.

Participating in the half-hour questioning was Rear Adm. John H. Sides, USN, a missile expert and Murphree's assistant.

Convair and the Air Force are to build a $40 million plant on a Montgomery airport site at San Diego for production of the Atlas. The plant is to open late next year.

The missile czar was asked if the big Atlas test stand at Convair will be moved to the plant when it is completed.

Admiral Sides expressed doubt the towering stand, now a sort of landmark for motorists and pedestrians on Pacific Highway, would be shifted to Montgomery Field. He pointed out the new plant would have its own test facilities and that such a move likely would be very costly.

Murphree was asked if work is progressing on launching equipment for the Atlas at the Air Force's Cape Canaveral, Fla., missile test range which extends 5,000 miles into the South Atlantic.

"Facilities to test fire the Atlas either are in being or will be in time to meet test needs," he replied.

The Air Force already has awarded a series of contracts to erect Atlas test firing facilities at Cape Canaveral, near Patrick Air Force Base. Some have been published in the Commerce Department's synopsis of Government contract awards.

Murphree said some missile test firing equipment already is operational at Cape Canaveral, but he was not speaking of Atlas facilities.

Asked if he believes sufficient funds have been appropriated to push the Atlas program at the greatest possible speed, Murphree replied:

"I have questioned every contractor on the project to see if any are limited by lack

of funds. All said no. I am convinced money in no sense is limiting progress on the project."

Congressional critics of the missile program have charged a lack of funds is hampering the program.

Questioned about the Navy's Convair-built surface-to-air missile, the Terrier, Murphee said "an improved" version of the weapon is on the way but he would not say when it would become operational with the fleet.

EVALUATE MISSILES

The earlier Terrier already is operating in the fleet and has been fired at public demonstrations to show how its electronic guidance system or "brain" will seek out a maneuvering aerial target and destroy it. The Terrier is produced at Convair's Pomona plant.

Murphree observed in connection with the improved Terrier that "all our missiles constantly are being improved."

Asked if he subscribed to congressional demands for a "duel" or competitive "shoot" between the Army's antiaircraft missile Nike and the Air Force's Navy-developed missile Talos, Murphree had this to say:

AVOID FIRE

"Studies are going forward to evaluate the Nike and Talos missiles. Certainly any additional test data required will be obtained."

Mut Murphree indicated the suggestion of a "shoot" between competing missiles was oversimplifying the problem.

The Nike which must be compared to the Talos, the missile chief emphasized, is an improved and more efficient version of the earlier antiaircraft weapon being used to protect many American cities against the threat of any enemy attack.

The Navy's air-to-surface or subsurface missile, the Petrel, is operational now, Murphree said and the Air Force's version of the same type of weapon, the Rascal soon will be ready, he added.

These missiles delivered on sea or land targets, have ranges sufficient to allow bombers to fire them from a position many miles short of the immediate target area, thus allowing the bombers to avoid enemy antiaircraft fire in the target vicinity, Murphree pointed out.

Three More Seats at the Table

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN A. BLATNIK

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 27, 1956

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend remarks, I would like to insert an article by Capt. Stephen E. Jones, United States Naval Reserve, entitled "Three More Seats at the Table." In this article Captain Jones, who is a graduate of the University of Michigan and the University of Michigan Law School, and who currently is Assistant Director of Naval Intelligence (Security) in the Office of the Chief of Naval Operations, discusses the very serious problem of the recent decline in service reenlistment. The situation with respect to the number of high grade men leaving the Armed Forces for civilian pursuits after many thousands of dollars and a great deal of time has been spent in their training is rapidly becoming critical. The problem and its solution deserves the immediate attention of all concerned with the strength and well-being of this Nation.

The article follows:

THREE MORE SEATS AT THE TABLE

(By Capt. Stephen E. Jones, U. S. Naval Reserve)

In reporting on the then prospective military pay raise, the editors of U. S. News & World Report noted that Navy reenlistments had fallen off from 46 percent to 8.1 percent. In so doing they echoed the concern expressed by Secretary of the Navy Charles Thomas in an address to the Navy League at Detroit, in which he had produced the shocking figures that even among career people the reenlistment figure had dropped in 1 year from 90 percent to 48 percent. In the most optimistic terminology of the marketplace, this might be classified as an unhealthy recession. As to noncareer people, there is no concealing the "crash": here less than 3 percent are signing up for another tour.

"That is really too bad." I can hear you saying—"If they don't want to reenlist in this most exclusive of services, then let's get some others who do."

That, too, is quite a problem, and as Secretary Thomas pointed out, on a monthly 1954 input requirement of 12,500, the Navy recruiters fell short by 1,700 in September, and by 4,000 in October of that year.

The really critical part of this situation is the cost of training replacements. When we say, in effect, "O. K., son, if you don't like the way we play, pick up your battleship and go on home." That's a fine independent spirit—but it costs money—and time.

We can't very well order Reserves to active duty in peacetime, and space limitations afloat create versatility requirements of a standard seldom found except among volunteers or enlistees. What then are we to do?

It seems that every effort is being made on the material side to make more attractive the lot of service personnel. Some of the so-called fringe benefits are being retained against opposition—or are even being recaptured.

Certainly the new military pay raise is a nice fresh carrot to have dangling around.

But man does not live by carrots alone. Nor does a sailor respond to such a lure by itself, even given the benefit of however many pretty trimmings about the fringes. This all helps. But, as the Secretary pointed out, something of the spirit must be added. There has to be the ingredient of individual motivation of service to the country, and there has to be recognition by the public.

Mr. Thomas, in his address at Detroit, put it in the form of a challenge to the Navy League members all over the country—that they strive to create an atmosphere of renewed public pride in peacetime military service. He suggested that, if there were more appreciation and esteem by the American public for military service, more of our young people would understand our country's need of their services and would choose it as a cereer. In such a light, the Secretary feels, the virtues of service and devotion to country may be seen in clearer definition, and may be expected to result in enabling us to keep—and to keep up—a first-class Navy.

Anyone who has at heart the interests of the Navy can voice an unqualified "Amen" to these sentiments. But now comes the cold clear light of the next day and, with it, the practical problem of translating these aspirations into eager, alert, trained, responsive, live young American bodies who are willing and proud members of the Naval Establishment.

To speak of individual motivation for, and public recognition of, the service is to talk of the two sides of the coin. Indeed, the first follows the second. If something is highly thought of, people want to belong to it. If the services in general and the Navy in particular enjoy their proper place in popular esteem, the size and shape of the carrot, while interesting, won't be controlling. How can this popular esteem be created or induced?

I come now to the delicate part of this little treatise, and I had better be careful what I say and how I say it. The line at this point becomes very fine between helpful suggestions, which I intend, and implied criticism, which I do not.

It seems to me that the answer, in reality and inescapably, is tied up with the word "prestige"—the prestige of the Armed Forces—the prestige of the Navy. From the figures referred to above and cited by the Secretary of the Navy, no Gallup poll is required to point up the conclusion that this is at or near an all-time low.

For the Navy League—or for any of us for that matter—to say to the body politic, "Tarry a moment, think ye well of the Navy" is essentially a bootstrap operation. The impetus must come from outside and higher up. If a bank is wobbly, the tide may be turned and a disastrous run averted by nothing more complicated than some courageous citizen coming up publicly with a big cash deposit. By this one act of faith, confidence is restored. The idea that one well-known leaders thinks an institution is good—and sound—and important—and gives public demonstration of this conclusion, touches off a chain reaction of renewed faith. It is the sign for which the people scan the skies.

What I am about to suggest may not perform the miracle, but I believe it can. I believe it can because it will be a symbol of the reversal of a trend which has been nearly disastrous to the prestige of the Armed Forces. This trend—or movement—has been going on now for several years. It operates in the name of economy, elimination of duplication, and civilian control. It has resulted in subjugation of career military men to a new and expensive hierarchy of civilians, the dissipation of their energies and experience in endless and often needless, or wastefully duplicatory, conferences called to reach coordinated positions. It has resulted in the effective infiltration of the Armed Forces at all levels—and in the invasion of their planning chambers and innermost secret places by a great number of well-meaners with authority to make continuing demands for information, but with no responsibility for the time and effort wasted, nor for work left undone, that their queries may be answered within the usual deadlines. By this insistent and continuing cancerous process, the Armed Forces have been, in effect, infiltrated and their security jeopardized, a sense of futility engendered, and in the language of the Pennsylvania divorce statute, they have arrived at a posture in which "their condition has become intolerable and life a burden." Is it any wonder, then, that many of the Navy's finest have preferred quietly to bow out? And that those who remain are confronted with a growing crisis? Or that they lift up their eyes to the hills and look for a sign of hope or relief?

In this situation the suggestion is respectfully tendered that the first sign must come from the First Citizen. The first thing that is needed in the restoration of the prestige of the Armed Forces is three more seats at the table. The Armed Forces deserve to be represented personally—by their respective service secretaries—in the President's official family. To state the matter more bluntly—if our Commander in Chief—the President of the United States, does not believe that his people in the Army, Navy, and Air Force need—and rate—the prestige of having their respective secretaries at his right hand in his councils, why should the good people of the Navy League concern

themselves with the matter? or more broadly, why should the good people?

It does not do to say, "Oh—they are all represented by the Secretary of Defense." The secretary of Defense is in effect assistant president for defense. He is too far removed from the grassroots of the services for the purposes of which I speak. He represents rather a ponderous, impersonal, monolith—without tradition and without a soul—actual or potential. We need in addition, a personal, service representative at the President's table, one who can say, "Mr. President, I'm sorry, but I don't think my man-o-warsmen would go for this," or, "My people would certainly like that," or "Mr. President, my people and their dependents have to have enough doctors—and we've got to keep good doctors!"

The current status of the service secretaries is not one calculated to inspire prestige, service-wise. They fit in somewhere in the defense hierarchy along with some 10 or 30 deputy or assistant secretaries of defense.

There are no legal obstacles to the President's appointing to his official family whomsoever he will. In fact a new one—the Secretary of Peace—may soon be added. A consideration of the interests being served by this appointment is not within the scope of this paper. It provides a basis, however, for a fortiori reasoning. Many considerations support this proposed rerecognition of the Armed Forces. Budgetwise, each is responsible for the proper and efficient administration of a sum which far exceeds that subject to the control of other nondefense Departments or agencies of the Government combined. It is not intended to suggest that a large money bag—by itself—should qualify any department for Cabinet representation. The size of the fund, however, supplies some measure of the area of interest, or, more properly, the segment of the American public which has to do—in one way or another—with the department concerned. When the Secretary of the Navy once again sits and speaks at the President's Cabinet meetings, he will be representing the young lieutenant standing the mid watch on his destroyer in the faraway Pescadores, the wet-nosed seaman in boot school at Great Lakes, an antisubmarine lookout in the North Atlantic, or the marine sergeant on maneuvers in South Korea; in addition to those on active duty, he will also be representing the host of Reserve and retired naval officers and men throughout the country, the bookkeeper in the naval supply depot at Bayonne, the electronic engineer of Grumman Aircraft Co. at Bethpage—all of whom, and to varying degrees, love the Navy they have served so well over the years. It seems to me that these are all entitled to participate—through the Secretary of the Navy—with their Commander in Chief as he takes his council with the elders.

This is one of the few really fine things that can be accomplished at no expense to the taxpayer. From such a simple sign, people beyond counting will take heart. It will lead the way in reestablishing and revitalizing the interest and popular esteem in which the services are held throughout the land. And it can be accomplished with so little discomfort—just three more seats at the table.

Western Hospitality and Enthusiasm

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS CASE
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, June 27, 1956

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from the Bennett County Booster, Martin, S. Dak., the issue of June 14, 1956, entitled "Let's Invite Them Again." Here the editors, Mr. and Mrs. Wendell Long, reflect on how members of the United States Army Field Band marveled at the hospitality and enthusiastic treatment they received while recently playing a concert at Martin.

I believe the editorial does a good job of pointing up briskly that South Dakota hospitality is unequaled and also tells of the pleasure and enjoyment experienced by the more than 4,000 persons who heard the concert.

I should like to add my comments to those of the editors, that anyone who visits South Dakota, and more particularly Martin, S. Dak., can always be assured of an enthusiastic and warm western welcome. As has been stated, more than 4,000 persons attended the concert. This number is 4 times more than the population of Martin according to the 1950 census.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LET'S INVITE THEM AGAIN

The tremendous "hit" made here by the United States Army Field band with more than 4,000 people that attended both concerts, gives the programs the unquestionable title of the best entertainment feature ever brought to Martin.

Although there were a few vacant seats still available at each performance, the directors and band members alike were a little astonished at the tremendous crowds that began filling the Legion Auditorium as much as 1½ hours before starting time of each program.

"Where do all these people come from," was one of the first questions asked by Maj. Chester E. Whiting, commanding officer and conductor, at the conclusion of the evening concert.

Detected in conversation with some of the Army's traveling salesmen earlier in the day were skepticisms about how many people would be available to hear the programs.

Before the day was over, however, band members and officers alike, were high in their praise of the wonderful reception the people of this community had given them and that when they next made a tour through the midwest States, Martin would most definitely be on the list for another scheduled appearance.

This, of course, cannot be expected for at least 2 years because the band's itinerary already is tentatively made out for more than a year in advance. Next summer at this time the musical group will be traveling in Europe.

Individual band members also were quick to point out that treatment of the band members when off stage was most enjoyable at Martin. They said they were not accustomed to the friendly, homey hospitality shown them here. Most of their engagements are played in larger cities, the soldiers said, where individual hospitality is apparently a forgotten attribute.

But the most important thing for everyone to remember who heard and enjoyed the concert here, is that the purpose of these concerts is to build good will for the Army. And the officers in charge of scheduling these tours feel that the purpose is served if the band is well received.

And if the band is well received, the chances are extremely good that more concerts will be scheduled.

A dozen editorials in this column saying how wonderful the band was and how much it was enjoyed by everyone would not be nearly as effective as a few letters spontaneously written from individuals who attended the concerts, expressing the same thoughts.

Red Capitals Retain Oppressive Atmosphere

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 27, 1956

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

RED CAPITALS RETAIN OPPRESSIVE ATMOSPHERE

(By Edgar Ansel Mowrer)

What is life really like under communism's New Look? Many foreigners are now being permitted to peep behind the Iron Curtain, some of them for the first time. The latter obviously have no standard of comparison.

In my view, the best brief descriptions I have read are those of an experienced businessman, Norris McWhirter, which I take the liberty of republishing with slight omissions:

"'Interesting but not enjoyable' would be my verdict on my recent business visit to Moscow and Prague. These two countries are the 30th and 31st I have visited so I have some grounds for making comparisons.

"Moscow—my first sight of Moscow, having arrived from the airport, was of three drunken men (vodka?) lurching past the hotel entrance holding one another up. The hotel seemed like a 1928 film set, and the wait for food in the restaurant seemed interminable by western standards. My first real shock was the extraordinary fact that Moscow has no current telephone directory, and that street maps are not merely unobtainable, but do not exist. Whether this crazy state of affairs is part of oriental mysticism or whether there is some deeper significance I was unable to divine.

"CONDUCTED TOURS

"For the western visitor with only a few words of the language, life consists of conducted tours of the five show places: (1) the university, (2) the wide streets, (3) the G. U. M. Stores, (4) the Metro, and (5) the outside of the Kremlin. The university is an impressive monstrosity with 40,000 rooms and compulsory lectures, and it is stuffed with Chinese and Indians. The streets are up to 120 meters wide, but without pedestrian refuges. Some basic statistics are not published, but then Muscovites do not know the population of their own city—it's secret.

"The GUM stores, claimed to be the biggest in the world, are very much smaller than Macy's in New York. At the farcical exchange rate of 11.20 roubles to the pound sterling, an orange costs 5 shillings, and a medium bar of rather ordinary chocolate 32 shillings. The Metro ,which does not serve the suburbs as does London's network, is lavishly tunneled but seems very stark, without advertisements. The center of attraction, of course, is the squat, ugly mausoleum in Red Square where Lenin and Stalin (irreverently known to the United States Embassy as the gruesome twosome) lie preserved.

"Russian claims that their airline Aeroflot is the largest in the world are comical, since the departure board at Moscow aerodrome showed only 42 departures in the day. This compares with a daily average of over 100 a day at London Airport and over 400 a day at Chicago's Midway Airport.

"ONE ACCIDENT

"Owing to the absence of deicing equipment, the Aeroflot planes fly very low. Some people less generously attribute this to the absence of navigational aids. In a rough-and-ready way these rather crude planes move all the mass of delegations and missions around the vast country, though there is a saying among English-speaking people, 'fly Aeroflot and you've had your lot.' By the simple expedient of admitting only one accident since the war, U. S. S. R. can point to its unrivaled safety record. The accident which was admitted was the wiping out of a Norwegian delegation, which could hardly be explained in any other way.

"Prague—what a contrast there is between Moscow and Prague. It is the switch from a brash oriental city to an ancient western capital. Prague is the capital of a country which is Communist by imposition. Correspondingly, one felt less oppressed, but far more depressed. There were abundant signs of the long arm of occupation—the screaming dullness of the bookshops full of shoddy Marx-Engels-Lenin-Stalin paperbacks, the tawdy slogans about the advance of socialism, a vast statue of Stalin which cost the man-hours for 40,000 flats, the men in raincoats who loiter outside the United States Embassy on a sunny day. Worse than the outward and visible is the inward and spiritual—the lack of gaiety and passports, and the fear.

"The situation in Czechoslovakia is intolerable, but how little the free countries understand it. Free elections would be useless, since the totalitarian Communists are so deeply embedded that they would still win in an election of fear. It would require a nonpolitical caretaker government of at least 18 months' duration before sufficient confidence could be restored to enable an unfettered expression of the peoples desires. Every month the present oppression lasts so will the transition period have to be lengthened."

Last Month It Was a Greek Ship—Will It Be an American Ship This Month?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 7, 1956

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the following item from the June 1, 1956, edition of the Israel Digest sounds an ominous warning. As I have previously pointed out, Egypt and its Prime Minister, Mr. Nasser, have no respect for treaty obligations. The Suez Canal is supposed to be open to ships of all nations. The United Nations and our own country have sat idly by while Egypt has prohibited Israeli ships from moving through the canal. As pointed out in this item, in May 1956, Egypt prohibited passage to a Greek ship. Will American ships be barred next?

The item follows:

SUEZ CANAL BLOCKADE SCORED—GREEK SHIP DETAINED IN PORT SAID

UNITED NATIONS, N. Y.—The detention in Port Said of a Greek vessel, carrying a cargo of cement from Haifa to Elath, was protested in a letter submitted to the President of the Security Council by Mr. Mordecai R. Kildron, Deputy Permanent Representative of Israel to the United Nations, this week. The letter stressed the special gravity of the incident at a time when the Security Council has just reaffirmed, once again, the need for the reestablishment of full compliance with the General Armistice Agreement.

Following is the full text of the letter:

"I have the honor to request that the following information relating to the General Armistice Agreement between Egypt and Israel be brought to the notice of the members of the Security Council.

"The Greek vessel *Panngia* which arrived at Port Said from Haifa on May 25, 1956, with a cargo of cement for discharge at Elath, is still being held up at Port Said. It is unable to continue passage through the Suez Canal because Egyptian authorities have prevented and continue to prevent the local shipping agents from making the necessary arrangements for the continuation of the voyage. At the same time, these authorities refuse to allow the ship's master to leave the vessel and to make these arrangements ashore. It is evident that these obstructive measures are designed to harass the owners of the vessel and to cause them financial losses by inducing the master to discontinue the voyage and to return to Haifa, without, however, being able to claim that his ship was denied the right of passage through the Suez Canal.

"Similar delaying tactics have been exercised in several past instances by Egyptian authorities, as in the case of the Greek vessel *Konitsa* in February of this year; the Greek vessel *Parnon* in September 1953; and the Italian vessel *Francamari* in December 1953. Two of these incidents were the subject of communications to the Security Council (S/3093 and S/3153).

"The interference with the steamship *Panngia* constitutes a violation of article I, paragraph 2 of the General Armistice Agreement between Egypt and Israel. The action of the Egyptian authorities also constitutes a further flagrant breach by Egypt of other international obligations and in particular of the resolution of the Security Council of September 1, 1951 (S/2322).

"The Government of Israel, in registering its protest against the Egyptian action in respect of steamship *Panngia*, wishes to draw attention to the increase of tension to which such a policy must inevitably give rise. This appears to be of especial gravity at a time when the Security Council has just reaffirmed once again the need for the reestablishment of full compliance with the General Armistice Agreement."

If Anyone Should Ask if There Is a Difference in the Republican and Democratic Parties, the Answer Is "Yes; and in Many Very Important Ways"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LESTER HOLTZMAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 27, 1956

Mr. HOLTZMAN. Mr. Speaker, the April issue of the Democratic Digest contains an excellent and scholarly summation of the fundamental differences which exist between the Democratic and Republican Parties. In order that we have no doubt in this poltical year about these differences, I include this summation in the Appendix of the RECORD:

THE DIFFERENCE BETWEEN THE DEMOCRATIC PARTY AND THE REPUBLICAN PARTY

Is there any real difference between the Democratic and Republican Parties? Many people ask this question, and the answer is "Yes." They differ on how to achieve prosperity for all the people. They differ on how to achieve and maintain peace. They differ on providing for and improving the welfare of the people. They differ on the role of Government.

WHERE THE PARTIES DIFFER ON HOW TO SECURE PROSPERITY FOR EVERYBODY

The Democratic Party believes that the key to prosperity is to increase mass purchasing power by keeping the farmer, laborer, small-business man, and consumer prosperous, and protecting the people against the evils of unfair taxation and monopoly, through:

The Republican Party believes that prosperity can be secured by increasing big business profits, which will eventually trickle down to the people, and that this program can best be put into effect through:

Tax cuts for everybody

Eighty-eight percent of House Democrats voted to raise the personal exemption by $200, thereby exempting 10 million low-income taxpayers from taxation February 2, 1948).

Seventy-seven percent of Senate Democrats voted to kill a special tax cut for corporation shareholders and for a $20 tax cut for everybody (July 1, 1954).

Ninety-six percent of House Democrats voted to kill the special cut for corporation shareholders and raise the personal exemption by $100 (March 18, 1954).

Tax cuts for the rich

One hundred percent of House Republicans voted against increasing the personal exemption (February 2, 1948), and 99 percent of House Republicans voted for GOP tax-reduction bill which gave 37 percent of the tax relief to the wealthiest 4 percent of the taxpayers (March 2, 1948).

Ninety-five percent of Senate Republicans voted against killing the special tax cut for shareholders and against the $20 tax cut for all (July 1, 1954).

Ninety-five percent of House Republicans voted against killing the special tax cut for corporation shareholders and against raising the personal exemption by $100 (March 18, 1954).

Full employment

Ninety percent of House Democrats voted for the Full Employment Act when it passed the House (December 14, 1945).

Opposing jobs for all

Sixty-four percent of House Republicans voted against the Full Employment Act on House passage (December 14, 1945).

Assuring good wages

In 1935, President Roosevelt recommended and a Democratic Congress enacted the Wagner Act, which made it a matter of right for working men to organize into trade unions and to bargain collectively.

In 1938, President Roosevelt recommended and a Democratic Congress enacted the Fair Labor Standards Act, establishing minimum wages and maximum hours to be observed by all interstate manufacturers.

86 percent of House Democrats voted for the minimum wage law when it passed the House (May 24, 1938).

In 1949, as soon as the Democrats regained control of Congress, they raised the minimum wage from 40 cents to 75 cents an hour.

In 1955, as soon as the Democrats regained control of Congress a second time, they raised the minimum wage to $1 per hour.

Opposing good wages

"It (the Wagner Act) is a bad bill and a serious menace to the 76 percent of labor that does not belong to unions." (Representative JOHN TABER, Republican, of New York, June 19, 1935.)

"You are paving the way for the absolute enslavement of labor by the fixing of the

wages of labor from the top of the Government." (Representative JOHN TABER, Republican, of New York, December 14, 1937.)

Sixty-one percent of House Republicans voted against the minimum wage law on House passage (May 24, 1938).

During their first 2 years in power (1953 and 1954), the GOP did nothing about raising the minimum wage.

In 1955, the Eisenhower administration recommended raising the minimum wage to only 90 cents an hour, 10 cents less than the Democrats favored.

Providing social security

Under the leadership of Franklin D. Roosevelt, the first social security law was enacted in 1935.

Eighty-six percent of House Democrats voted against a Republican effort to kill the social security bill by sending it back to committee (April 19, 1935).

The Democratic 81st Congress increased social security benefits and brought 10 million more Americans under the social security system.

"We want to advance, to improve, to carry forward our efforts to provide * * * better security. These are not 'vestiges' of the New Deal that we mark for destruction. They are part of the fabric of our life." (Adlai E. Stevenson, October 3, 1952.)

Opposing social security

"To call it 'social security' is a fraud on the workingman. * * * The saving it forces on our workers is a cruel hoax." (Gov. Alf M. Landon, G. O. P. nominee for President, September 26, 1936.)

Ninety-nine percent of House Republicans voted to kill the social security bill by sending it back to committee (April 19, 1935).

The Republican 80th Congress not only failed to expand social security, it actually denied social security coverage of 500,000 workers.

"If all that Americans want is security, they can go to prison. They'll have enough to eat, a bed, and a roof over their heads." (Dwight D. Eisenhower, December 8, 1949.)

Helping farmers

Under Franklin Roosevelt and a Democratic Congress, the first major legislation designed to assure farm prosperity was passed, in the belief that (a) the farmer's prosperity is vital to the Nation's prosperity; and (b) the farmer, unlike others, is totally at the mercy of the free market, hence needs some help if he is to stay prosperous.

Eighty-two percent of the House Democrats and 76 percent of Senate Democrats voted for the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, which established our farm-price support system (February 9 to 14, 1938).

Democrats have supported the REA program. For example, during the GOP 80th Congress, 79 percent of House Democrats voted to provide $300 million for REA loans (February 24, 1948).

Democrats have favored soil conservation. For example, on July 18, 1947, 97 percent of House Democrats voted to continue the soil-conservation program and to defeat a GOP attempt to kill the program.

Democrats favor adequate farm-price supports; 78 percent of House Democrats and 77 percent of Senate Democrats voted for 90-percent price supports, instead of GOP sliding-scale price supports (July 2, 1954 and August 9, 1954).

Opposing help to farmers

The Republican philosophy of the 1920's was best expressed by President Coolidge when he said: "Farmers have never made money. I don't believe we can do much about it."

Result (in 1932): 30-cent wheat; 3-cent hogs; 15-cent corn; farm prices 42 percent below parity; over 65,000 farm foreclosures in 1932.

Eight-four percent of House Republicans and 85 percent of Senate Republicans voted against the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 (February 9, 1938, and February 14, 1938).

Republicans have opposed the REA program. For example, during the GOP 80th Congress, 79 percent of House Republicans voted against providing $300 million for REA loans and favored providing no REA loan funds at all.

Republicans have opposed soil conservation. For example, on July 18, 1947, 88 percent of House Republicans voted to kill the soil-conservation program by denying funds to carry out the program.

Republicans oppose adequate farm price supports; 89 percent of House Republicans and 80 percent of Senate Republicans voted for "sliding scale" supports, despite falling farm income (July 2, 1954, and August 9, 1954).

Results of Democratic farm policies

	1932	1952
Parity ratio	58 percent	100 percent.
Net farm income	$1.9 billion	$14.1 billion.
Farm mortgage debt	$9.1 billion	$6.6 billion.

Results of Republican farm policies

	1952	1955
Parity ratio	100 percent	80 percent (decrease).
Net farm income	$14.1 billion	$10.6 billion.
Farm mortgage debt	$6.6 billion	$9.0 billion.

Aiding small business

From 1948 to 1952 (the last 4 years under the Democrats) the number of businesses grew at the rate of 52,000 a year.

During the last 10 years under the Democrats, the rate of small-business failures was only 20 per 10,000 businesses.

Examples of Democratic efforts to give special attention to the problems of small business during wartime were the establishment of the Smaller War Plants Corporation during World War II and the Small Defense Plants Administration during the Korean emergency to help small businesses get defense contracts.

Injuring small business

From 1953 through 1955 (the first 3 years under the Republicans) the number of business grew at the rate of only 6,500 a year.

During 1955, under the Republicans, the rate of small-business failures was 42 per 10,000 businesses—twice what it was under the Democrats.

Moreover, between 1952 and 1955 small-business profits went down 66 percent; small-business investors' returns went down 57 percent.

Although the Republicans in 1953 continued the Small Business Administration, they put in charge of it a man (William Mitchell) who said, "Let's face it. Big business is going to get bigger and small business is going to get smaller, and there is nothing we can do about it. Why get excited?"

Curbing monopoly

Three of the cornerstones of the antitrust laws designed to help small business against the encroachments of monopoly were passed under Democrats: The Federal Trade Commission Act (1914), and Clayton Antitrust Act (1914), and the Robinson-Patman Act (1936).

In 33 months under the Democrats, the Federal Trade Commission brought actions against companies whose assets totaled $256,200,000.

Fostering monopoly

When the Republicans came to power in 1953, they put the Federal Trade Commission under the chairmanship of Edward Howrey, a lawyer who had defended antitrust violators against charges brought by the Federal Trade Commission.

In 33 months under the Republicans, the FTC brought actions against companies whose assets totaled only $32,500,000.

Youth's Plans for the Future

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 27, 1956

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, Orin Lee Dahl, a senior at Washburn High School, in Minneapolis, has won the first-place scholarship in the national Thom McAn Success Awards program, in competition with selected students from high schools across the country. He is receiving a $1,000 scholarship to the college of his choice and a trip to Washington and New York.

Young Dahl was nominated by his high-school faculty as the school's candidate. He wrote a paper on My Plans for the Future, which was submitted with a record of his widely varied school activities and his excellent scholastic grades, to the sponsors, Thom McAn Shoe Co. and Scholastic Roto, a high-school paper supplement.

Field judging of the entries was done by a distinguished board of judges representing the fields of education, business, religion, government, and youth activities.

The scholarship winner plans to follow in the footsteps of his parents who have been college teachers. His father, Dr. Orville Dahl, is at present executive director of higher education for the Evangelical Lutheran Church, whose national headquarters is in Minneapolis.

Naturally we are proud of Orin Dahl's fine record and are happy to have him visiting with us in the Congress today. I am sure he will have a most successful and useful career in his chosen field of service.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the winning essay:

MY PLANS FOR THE FUTURE
(By Orin Lee Dahl)

The past and the present are a part of my plans for the future. The future is a hope, a hope that I may someday be on the faculty of a good college or university. The past is a challenge, a challenge because history, literature, art, religion, and philosophy are the areas of knowledge that I seek to understand. The present is a problem, a problem because it brings me face to face with the question of how to accomplish my objectives.

I believe that I have reached a carefully evaluated solution to this problem. Both my father and my mother have been college teachers. I have increasingly admired their profession because I have seen the contributions they have made to the lives of students. I have listened to endless discus-

sions on great social, political, and religious issues of the past and present. I would like to discuss, in my turn, the great issues of the future. In short, I desire to help young people get, as I have been given, a sense of meaning, purpose, and direction in life. Such help can come from many sources, but this is the objective of higher education, and I would like to share in it.

American education has a great obligation. It must help preserve our free society by teaching its meaning to our citizens. It must help our Nation fulfill its responsibility for world leadership by educating responsible leaders. It must help mankind by making available the benefits of scientific advancement. These are but some of the responsibilities of the profession I have chosen. As I am able, they will someday be met in the classroom where I hope to teach.

If I can train and educate myself to achieve these objectives, I will serve the future, and my future will serve others.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is located in Statuary Hall, House wing, where Mr. Frank Brodie is in attendance during the sessions of Congress to receive orders for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month, and where single copies may also be purchased. Orders are also accepted for the printing of speeches in pamphlet form.

LAWS AND RULES FOR PUBLICATION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

CODE OF LAWS OF THE UNITED STATES

TITLE 44, SECTION 181. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; ARRANGEMENT, STYLE, CONTENTS, AND INDEXES.—The Joint Committee on Printing shall have control of the arrangement and style of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and while providing that it shall be substantially a verbatim report of proceedings shall take all needed action for the reduction of unnecessary bulk, and shall provide for the publication of an index of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD semimonthly during the sessions of Congress and at the close thereof. (Jan. 12, 1895, c. 23, § 13, 28 Stat. 603.)

TITLE 44, SECTION 182b. SAME; ILLUSTRATIONS, MAPS, DIAGRAMS.—No maps, diagrams, or illustrations may be inserted in the RECORD without the approval of the Joint Committee on Printing. (June 20, 1936, c. 630, § 2, 49 Stat. 1546.)

Pursuant to the foregoing statute and in order to provide for the prompt publication and delivery of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the Joint Committee on Printing has adopted the following rules, to which the attention of Senators, Representatives, and Delegates is respectfully invited:

1. *Arrangement of the daily Record.*—The Public Printer will arrange the contents of the daily RECORD as follows: First, the Senate proceedings; second, the House proceedings; third, the Appendix: *Provided*, That when the proceedings of the Senate are not received in time to follow this arrangement, the Public Printer may begin the RECORD with the House proceedings. The proceedings of each House and the Appendix shall each begin a new page, with appropriate headings centered thereon.

2. *Type and style.*—The Public Printer shall print the report of the proceedings and debates of the Senate and House of Representatives, as furnished by the Official Reporters of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, in 7½-point type; and all matter included in the remarks or speeches of Members of Congress, other than their own words, and all reports, documents, and other matter authorized to be inserted in the RECORD shall be printed in 6½-point type; and all rollcalls shall be printed in 6-point type. No italic or black type nor words in capitals or small capitals shall be used for emphasis or prominence; nor will unusual indentions be permitted. These restrictions do not apply to the printing of or quotations from historical, official, or legal documents or papers of which a literal reproduction is necessary.

3. *Return of manuscript.*—When manuscript is submitted to Members for revision it should be returned to the Government Printing Office not later than 9 o'clock p. m. in order to insure publication in the RECORD issued on the following morning; and if all of said manuscript is not furnished at the time specified, the Public Printer is authorized to withhold it from the RECORD for 1 day. In no case will a speech be printed in the RECORD of the day of its delivery if the manuscript is furnished later than 12 o'clock midnight.

4. *Tabular matter.*—The manuscript of speeches containing tabular statements to be published in the RECORD shall be in the hands of the Public Printer not later than 7 o'clock p. m., to insure publication the following morning.

5. *Proof furnished.*—Proofs of "leave to print" and advance speeches will not be furnished the day the manuscript is received but will be submitted the following day, whenever possible to do so without causing delay in the publication of the regular proceedings of Congress. Advance speeches shall be set in the RECORD style of type, and not more than six sets of proofs may be furnished to Members without charge.

6. *Notation of withheld remarks.*—If manuscript or proofs have not been returned in time for publication in the proceedings, the Public Printer will insert the words "Mr. ——— addressed the Senate (House or Committee). His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix," and proceed with the printing of the RECORD.

7. *Thirty-day limit.*—The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD any speech or extension of remarks which has been withheld for a period exceeding 30 calendar days from the date when its printing was authorized: *Provided*, That at the expiration of each session of Congress the time limit herein fixed shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee.

8. *Corrections.*—The permanent RECORD is made up for printing and binding 30 days after each daily publication is issued; therefore all corrections must be sent to the Public Printer within that time: *Provided*, That upon the final adjournment of each session of Congress the time limit shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee: *Provided further*, That no Member of Congress shall be entitled to make more than one revision. Any revision shall consist only of corrections of the original copy and shall not include deletions of correct material, substitutions for correct material, or additions of new subject matter.

9. The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the full report or print of any committee or subcommittee when said report or print has been previously printed. This rule shall not be construed to apply to conference reports.

10. *Appendix to daily Record.*—When either House has granted leave to print (1) a speech not delivered in either House, (2) a newspaper or magazine article, or (3) any other matter not germane to the proceedings, the same shall be published in the Appendix except in cases of duplication. In such cases only the first item received in the Government Printing Office will be printed. This rule shall not apply to quotations which form part of a speech of a Member, or to an authorized extension of his own remarks: *Provided*, That no address, speech, or article delivered or released subsequently to the final adjournment of a session of Congress may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

11. *Estimate of cost.*—No extraneous matter in excess of two pages in any one instance may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by a Member under leave to print or to extend his remarks unless the manuscript is accompanied by an estimate in writing from the Public Printer of the probable cost of publishing the same, which estimate of cost must be announced by the Member when such leave is requested; but this rule shall not apply to excerpts from letters, telegrams, or articles presented in connection with a speech delivered in the course of debate or to communications from State legislatures, addresses or articles by the President and the members of his Cabinet, the Vice President, or a Member of Congress. For the purposes of this regulation, any one article printed in two or more parts, with or without individual headings, shall be considered as a single extension and the two-page rule shall apply. The Public Printer or the Official Reporters of the House or Senate shall return to the Member of the respective House any matter submitted for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which is in contravention of this paragraph.

12. *Official Reporters.*—The Official Reporters of each House shall indicate on the manuscript and prepare headings for all matter to be printed in the Appendix, and shall make suitable reference thereto at the proper place in the proceedings.

Appendix

Rev. Dominic J. Del Monte Selected Outstanding Catholic of the Year

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ALFRED D. SIEMINSKI

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 28, 1956

Mr. SIEMINSKI. Mr. Speaker, a lovable, kindly man was again singularly honored by our people in the 13th Congressional District of New Jersey:

The Star of the Sea Assembly, Fourth Degree, Knights of Columbus, Bayonne, whose faithful navigator is Eddie Ruggirello, has for the fifth consecutive time selected the outstanding Catholic of the year. Our pastor, Father Dominic Del Monte, is this year's choice. The committee which makes the selection is made up of 9 members, representing the 9 Catholic parishes of Bayonne. At least 6 of the 9 must agree on 1 man for him to be designated "Outstanding Catholic of the Year." From this we clearly see the nature of the honor which has come to Father Del Monte, and the entire parish rejoices with him.

Michael J. O'Brien, the general chairman of the committee, expressed the sentiments of his group in this wise: "We are proud (to pay tribute to the Assumption pastor) because we believe that the achievements of Father Del Monte stand as splendid monuments of faith, as a noble inspiration in the progress of our community life." Then Mr. O'Brien outlined in his citation the accomplishments of Father Del Monte. "The burning of the $95,000 church mortgage. The improvement of the church property. The renovation of the various buildings. The addition to the parochial school now under construction. A superb record in itself which would be sufficient to earn for him a place of honor among the people."

In particular the Knights of Columbus citer Father Del Monte for something vastly more important. These accomplishments could have been done by any good layman, but the work of Jesus the Priest only Father Del Monte the priest could do. Mr. O'Brien summed it up well enough for mere words when he wrote: "His interest on behalf of the youth, his warm personality, his humble ways, his sacrifices, and his sincere interest in people and an inspiration toward a more tolerant way of life."

Human honors are pleasant in their place; they lighten somewhat the burden of responsibility, and lift a bit the drooping shoulders of a man bent under his work, but the real honors for the year, and indeed for all his priestly years still await our Father Del Monte. They are stored up in his heavenly mother's treasure house for safe keeping, and in the day he steps into eternity God will do the honors. It is for them Father works; they alone are sufficient for him.

I include an article that appeared in the Bayonne Times, Bayonne, N. J., on Monday, April 23, 1956, regarding Father Del Monte.

CITED AS CATHOLIC OF THE YEAR IN CEREMONIES UNDER AUSPICIES OF LOCAL KNIGHTS OF COLUMBUS

For service to his parish, community and the United States, for outstanding success as a priest, citizen, and administrator, the Reverend Dominic J. Del Monte last night was acclaimed as the outstanding Catholic of 1955.

Church bells tolled 10 times every hour as the Fourth Degree, Star of Sea Assembly, K. of C., honored the Assumption Church pastor with a banquet and testimonial that attracted a capacity crowd headed by Gov. Robert B. Meyner, church dignitaries, international figures, educational and civic leaders, and persons from every parish and every part of Bayonne.

CHAPLIN CHEERED

Governor Meyner set the pace for a battery of speakers when he described Father Del Monte's devotion to the welfare of his fellow man. The Governor noted that the Bayonne Knights were the largest in the State, and he congratulated the K. of C. for its choice of Father Del Monte.

From the Reverend David James Pathe, chaplain of the Villa Marie Claire, who shared speaking honors with the Governor, came highest praise. Said Father Pathe:

"When the great army of men, women and children someday gather in the halls of Heaven and learn again of Jesus Christ, they will turn to each other with simple truthfulness and say, "Why, He's just like Father Del Monte'."

About 600 persons, the capacity of the Victory Memorial Auditorium, applauded with enthusiasm.

Earlier, Charles F. Fiumefreddo, the toastmaster, outlined some of the reasons why Father Del Monte was selected for the honors. "He is not only my pastor," said Fiumefreddo, "but my friend. He is a humble priest with a warm personality who has the love and respect of the entire community regardless of color, creed, or religion. He is Father Del Monte."

WORD FROM ARCHBISHOP

Fiumefreddo was deluged with telegrams from a host of well wishers who sounded like a who's who. The telegrams were topped by warm notes from President Eisenhower and Archbishop Thomas A. Boland. The archbishop, noting that a heavy schedule prevented him from attending last night's event, wrote:

"My cordial congratulations on this evidence of the deep esteem and affection Father Del Monte enjoys in the community he serves. I am particularly happy, because the citation details with praise Father Del Monte's accomplishments as an administrator of his parish and emphasis is placed on his Christlike pastoral solicitude, which has made him a real shepherd of the flock committed to his care."

Among those present to hear the tributes was Miss Elvira Del Monte, a sister of the pastor, who sang two numbers, Bless This House, and You Alone. Miss Del Monte formerly appeared with the Boston Opera Co.

She was presented with a large bouquet of roses by faithful Capt. John Rudnicki.

The main presentation, the award itself, symbolized by a gold plaque, was made by faithful navigator Edward J. Ruggirello. It left Father Del Monte visibly touched.

This was no time to make prepared speeches, even if he remembered it, said the priest. Referring to the expansion of his church and the school addition now under construction, Father Del Monte said, "We must look to the future. We're going to do it. With God's help, God willing, we're going to get there."

Modestly the priest drew from the fount of St. Paul to minimize the long list of accomplishments cited by the speakers. "In the words of St. Paul, I can do all things from Him who strengthens me," said the honor guest.

A presentation on behalf of the Hudson County Press Club was made by its vice president, Barry Factor, of the Bayonne Times. He gave the priest a cope and biretta as the personal contribution of all the press club members. The club itself donated $50 to Father Del Monte's education fund.

Another presentation was by Mrs. William Migliaccio, representing St. Ann's Society and the United Societies of the Assumption Church.

Superior court Judge Peter P. Artaserse opened the speechmaking portion of the program and underlined Father Del Monte's life of hard work for the church and the community. Other speakers were Michael J. O'Brien, general chairman; Dr. Luigi Vittorio Ferraris, Italian Vice Consul of Newark; and Philip O'Donnell, grand knight of Star of Sea Council, K. of C.

Congratulatory wires were read from the Sisters of the Assumption; Bishop Fulton Sheen; NBC president Robert Sarnoff; Rabbi Rubin Bendelstein; Faithful Friar Msgr. Joseph F. Dolan; Auxiliary Bishop Justin McCarthy; Judge Vincent R. Impellitteri; Amvets Bayonne Post 32; Jewish War Veterans Bayonne Post 18; Alberico Casardi, Italian ambassador to the U. N.; Jersey City Mayor Bernard J. Berry; Newark Mayor Leo P. Carlin; Bayonne Section, National Council of Jewish Women; County Clerk Edward Barrone; Clare Booth Luce, Ambassador to Italy; Representative T. James Tumulty; Judge Alexander Ormsby, State commander of the Catholic War Veterans; Harrison Knights of Columbus; former Supreme Court Chief Justice Thomas J. Brogan; and Civil Air Patrol of New Jersey, of which Father Del Monte is State chaplain.

Mayor Thomas Domenico and Commissioner Edward F. Clark, both present, also sent telegrams.

I also include an article written by an outstanding newspaperman in our area, Mr. Alfred Ciaburri, a reporter for the Jersey Journal of Jersey City, N. J. Mr. Ciaburri writes an excellent article which describes the great feeling and honor that was done to this wonderful man.

BAYONNE'S OUTSTANDING CATHOLIC—BELLS CHIME AS TRIBUTE IS PAID FATHER DEL MONTE

(By Al Ciaburri)

The sound of church bells echoed its joyous call through the crowded auditorium.

It was like a benediction.

It was like a tremendous chorus blending toward a final hymn of praise in tribute to a humble parish priest.

The Reverend Dominic J. Del Monte, the kind of a priest whom we all love and admire, acknowledged the award of "Outstanding

Catholic of 1955 in Bayonne" with "the deepest gratitude and thanks."

The bells—for him—held a personal magic, special significance, as they chimed from his church of Our Lady of the Assumption for 3 hours—as the testimonial dinner in his honor took place, last night.

It seemed to "this faithful servant of God" that they tolled the various events in a "life dedicated to the service of God."

They tolled in remembrance:

Immigrant parents. Childhood days in a modest Newark home. High school. Seminary studies. Ordination to the priesthood in 1932. Curate. Chaplain. Pastor of the Assumption, August 1, 1946.

They tolled in glory:

The spiritual awakening in the parish. The work on behalf of the youth. The forming of new church societies. The burning of the mortgage. The addition to the school building.

They tolled in hope:

"We must continue to grow—the work is not finished. The dream of a new "more beautiful church, a more splendid edifice for the glory of our Lord."

Tfiey tolled in honor:

The Fourth Degree Assembly, the Star of the Sea Council 371, Knights of Columbus, Bayonne, selected "this wonderful priest" as the top Catholic of the year—and the entire community was quick to join in tribute.

This tribute came also from many parts of the State and the country.

It was in the message of Gov. Robert B. Meyner, who presented Father Del Monte with a copy of a resolution introduced in Trenton by Assemblyman Thomas Hughes and Senator James Murray.

The Governor said the work of men like Father Del Monte makes it possible for each of us to enjoy equal opportunities through existing institutions such as the schools, the churches and civic and fraternal organizations.

I know of Father Del Monte's personal work on behalf of his parishioners in Bayonne and his friends throughout Hudson County. He is a man of compassion and great understanding. When he calls upon me or writes to me, it is always in the interest of some person who has a difficult problem and he asks for assistance—always helping others. I hope that God will bless him in his many fruitful years ahead in the service of his parishioners.

Safety Devices for Household Refrigerators

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH A. ROBERTS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 25, 1956

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the letter which I received from the Admiral Corp. indicating their willingness to license their Admiral lifeguard release for other manufacturers' use to help save children's lives, a news clipping from Electric Appliance Service News regarding the House committee hearing on my bill requiring safety devices on all refrigerators manufactured for shipment in interstate commerce, and a numerical list of the children and their ages, who have become trapped in refrigerators:

ADMIRAL CORP.,
Chicago, June 18, 1956.

Hon. KENNETH A. ROBERTS,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. ROBERTS: We wish to thank you on behalf of Admiral Corp., for the recent opportunity to appear before your subcommittee to testify in connection with the refrigeration industry's efforts to develop a mechanism which will permit the door of a refrigerator to be easily opened by a child from the inside.

You, of course, are aware of the mechanism introduced by our company—the Admiral lifeguard release—an exclusive feature developed by Admiral engineers to protect children from unnecessary loss of life. While in this highly competitive industry we normally seek to retain exclusive features, human life, particularly that of defenseless children, is more important than any competitive advantage. Therefore Admiral Corp. is prepared and willing to license the industry to utilize its patents or those patents which may be issued covering its lifeguard release.

Admiral engineers are also continuing to offer their full cooperation to the Bureau of Standards personnel in connection with their studies of this problem. In fact, our Mr. William R. Moll was in Washington last week with Dr. McPherson, of the Bureau of Standards on this very question.

Very sincerely yours,

JAMES R. OBERLY.

[From the Electric Appliance Service News of June 1956]

HOUSE GROUP WARNS INDUSTRY TO SOLVE ICEBOX DEATHTRAPS

(By Stanley Cohen)

WASHINGTON.—Members of a House subcommittee concerned with safety devices for household refrigerators displayed impatience with industry members for delays in agreeing on safeguards to deal with the deathtrap problem.

Pointing out that almost a full year has passed since the industry agreed to try to develop a solution to the problem, Representative KENNETH A. ROBERTS, Democrat, of Alabama warned that the public is not impressed with the explanations the industry has been offering.

"If the public feels you have been dragging your feet," he told industry members, "we will be under pressure to pass legislation dealing with the problem; and there will be a lot more support for this legislation than you may think."

Representative ROBERTS presided at a 1-day hearing of the subcommittee held May 28 for a progress report on the efforts of the National Bureau of Standards and the industry to agree on safety mechanisms.

DISAGREEMENT ON FORCE

Spokesmen for the Bureau of Standards and the National Electrical Manufacturers Association said efforts to adopt safety mechanisms have bogged down because of disagreement over the amount of force which children of various ages may exert to open a door from inside, as against the minimum force which is required to produce and retain the essential refrigeration efficiency to preserve food.

Dr. A. T. McPherson, associate director of the National Bureau of Standards praised cooperation he has received from NEMA, pointing out that industry members went all-out in arranging conferences, and even included manufacturers of gas refrigerators, who are not members of the association.

He said conferences have led to agreement on most criteria. But in considering the effectiveness of criteria, "both NEMA and the Bureau have been increasingly impressed with the importance of taking child behavior into consideration in designing and testing safety mechanisms."

TELLS OF TESTS

He said tests conducted last December indictated that small children under certain circumstances did not exert forces in excess of 10 pounds. The manufacturers, however, regard a force of at least 22 pounds as the minimum required to secure the closure of a refrigerator door necessary to prevent food spoilage.

Marian Faegre of the Children's Bureau, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare reported tests showed that some small children make no effort to escape when trapped. She said her agency expects to conduct tests this summer in an effort to provide the Bureau of Standards and NEMA with useful information about the way a child behaves in a "deathtrap."

EFFORTS PRAISED

Committee members praised GE and Admiral for their efforts to install safety devices in refrigerators, but Roy Buchanan, manager of advanced engineering, for refrigerators and freezers of Westinghouse, cautioned that pomotion of safety devices at this time might "provide a false sense of security" and lead children to engage in experimentation in refrigerators which lack escape mechanisms.

"There are a great many mechanical things that could be done for escape mechanisms if you or I were trapped," he told committee members. "But we have to wonder what can be done for a child."

Leslie D. Price, manager, Engineering and Safety Regulations Department of NEMA said the problem has two stages. One stage is the abandoned box.

He expressed a belief that escape mechanisms could be developed to eliminate the hazard caused by boxes still in use. But he expressed doubt that any reliable mechanisms could be developed which would be useful 10 or 15 years, and would provide escape from abandoned boxes. The best remedy for the danger caused by abandoned boxes is to remove the door or latch, he said.

Price said NEMA is prepared to finance research programs planned by the children's bureau. In the meanwhile it is vigorously promoting and financing a program of the National Safety Council to make the public aware of the problem.

"It is obvious," he said, "that while a solution to the problem has not yet been reached, definite progress has been made. Individual manufacturers have placed on the market, refrigerators designed to meet a reasonable solution. Others are sure to follow. NEMA, therefore, still believes that this problem will be solved by industry-Government cooperation, and that no Federal legislation is needed."

TELLS OF PROGRESS

Marshal Bartlet, manager of product planning for the refrigerator and freezer division of General Electric said GE's "Child Safe" magnetic door is engineered to require only a 10 to 20 pound force. He said this is achieved by using a specially developed "soft gasket," to provide a seal. The magnet is 4" x ½" x ½" and the entire installation costs GE only $1.

The committee also saw a demonstration of Admiral's Lifeguard release by James R. Oberly, Admiral veep, and William R. Moll, chief of the applications section of Admiral's refrigerating engineering staff.

Silas A. Morehouse, president of SiLok, Inc., charged that "a sense or urgency seems to be lacking" in the industry, and that legislation is needed to assure that safety locks are used.

He said his company has magnetic and mechanical devices which are opened easily from the inside, and will provide safety at low cost.

The committee also heard Col. G. B. Kidwell who proposes "a device to provide ventilation in refrigerators temporarily or permanently out of use."

Children suffocated in household refrigerators, January 1954–June 1956, 33 incidents, involving 54 children, of whom 39 died and 15 survived

Month and day	1		2		3	
	Sex	Age	Sex	Age	Sex	Age
Jan. 6	Boy	7 years				
Feb. 17	Girl [1]	19 months [2]	Girl	3 years	Boy [3]	6 years.
Mar. 11	Boy	4 years	do	6 years		
30	do	6 years	do	8 years		
Apr. 1	Girl [3]	4 years	Girl [3]	7 years		
15	do	5 years	do	6 years		
16	Boy	3 years	Boy	8 years		
25	do	5 years				
May 1	do	4 years				
4	Girl	5 years	Girl	6 years		
16	Boy	6 (and dog)				
17	do	5 years				
18	Girl	3 years	Boy	3 years		
19	do [3]	5 years	Girl [3]	7 years		
—	do [4]	2 years [4]	do [3]	5 years		
June 2	Boy	3 years	Boy	4 years		
10	do	5 years	do	5 years		
15	do [3]	4 years				
29	do [3]	do				
July 12	do	5 years	do	5 years		
Aug. 1	do	4 years	Girl	10 years		
—	do	7 years				
7	do [3]	3 years				
18	do [1]	2 years [5]	Boy	5 years		
19	do [1]	19 months [6]	Girl [3]	6 years	Girl [3]	10 years.
26	do [3]	4 years				
Sept. 3	do	3 years	Boy	4 years		
16	do	do	do	3 years		
23	do	4 years	do	4 years		
25	Girl	5 years				
Oct. 17	Boy [3]	3 years				
18	do [3]	do				
Dec. —	do	5 years				

	Died	Survived	Remarks
Under 2 years	2	0	See footnote 2 and footnote 6.
Age 2	1	1	See footnote 4 and footnote 5.
Age 3	8	3	
Age 4	7	4	
Age 5	11	2	
Age 6	5	2	
Age 7	2	2	
Age 8	2	0	
Age 9	0	0	
Age 10	1	1	
Total	39	15	

[1] 2 years of age or less.
[2] Girl, 19 months (died), accompanied by sister (3 years, died) and boy (6 years, lived).
[3] Survived.
[4] Girl, 2 years (lived), accompanied by sister (5 years, lived).
[5] Boy, 2 years (died), accompanied by brother (5 years, died).
[6] Boy, 19 months (died), accompanied by 2 sisters (6 years, lived; 10 years, lived).

President Eisenhower Backs and Fills Despite Campaign Promise of Consistency

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DON HAYWORTH
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 28, 1956

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, when a candidate for political office makes a pledge, voters expect that he will stand up to that pledge and not hedge. During his campaign of 1952, Candidate Eisenhower promised many things, one of which was the promise to be consistent and not to back and fill.

I desire that a record of some of Mr. Eisenhower's inconsistencies—or backing and filling, as he would call it—be included in the Appendix of the RECORD. This compilation is from the April issue of the Democratic Digest:

BACKING AND FILLING WITH IKE AND EZRA

I add another pledge: We shall be consistent. Having made and worked out with the farmers a program that seems best to fit the situation, we will not back and fill. (Candidate Eisenhower, Albert Lea, Minn., September 16, 1952.)

SUPPORTS FOR PERISHABLE COMMODITIES

We must find methods of obtaining greater protection for our diversified farms, our producers of perishable foods * * * We can and will find a sound way to do the job. (Candidate Eisenhower, Kasson, Minn. (July 6, 1952.)

Question. I wonder if you could give us your viewpoint on the use of price supports on hogs during the present farm emergency?

Answer. I would believe that to go in this whole perishable field and begin the business of price supports would be dangerous. I would want to study it more. (Eisenhower press conference, January 19, 1956.)

KEEP POLITICS OUT OF AGRICULTURE

All of our broad farm programs should be lifted out of politics. (Eisenhower, Brookings, S. D.)

Our national farm policy * * * must not become a field for political warfare. (Eisenhower, state of the Union message, January 5, 1956.)

GOP promoting its farm policy. Hires public relations firm to sell program with eye on next year's election. (New York Times, December 13, 1955.)

Eisenhower makes bid for farm vote; blames low income on rivals. (Baltimore Sun, October 16, 1954.)

ASSISTANT SECRETARY BUTZ AND THE SOIL BANK

Dr. Earl Butz * * * was critical of the soil-bank program which has been advanced as a solution to the farm problem. (Washington Star, December 4, 1955.)

Earl L. Butz * * * praised President Eisenhower's exceptional courage in proposing the soil-bank farm program in an election year. (United Press, January 13, 1956.)

THE PLOW THAT BROKE THE PROMISE

We will not plow under every third row of cotton or sentence the little pigs to execution. (Secretary Benson, New Orleans, September 20, 1955.)

It should be practical to include in the soil bank wheat already seeded if it is incorporated in the soil, i. e. plowed under, as green manure or by other accepted practices. (Eisenhower, January 9, 1956.)

IT WON'T WORK, SO LET'S TRY IT

The Agriculture Department recommends against the enactment of this soil bank bill sponsored by Senator HUMPHREY (Democrat, of Minnesota). (Agriculture Department letter to Senator ELLENDER, September 30, 1955.)

I shall urge authorization of a soil bank program. (Eisenhower, State of the Union Message, January 5, 1956.) Ike, Benson speed plan to establish soil bank. (Washington Post & Times Herald, January 7, 1956.)

FREEDOM FROM HANDOUTS

All I know of farmers convinces me that they would rather earn their fair share than to have it as a Government handout. (Eisenhower, Kasson, Minn., September 6, 1952.)

It is doubtful if any man can be politically free who depends upon the state for sustenance. (Secretary Benson, February 5, 1953.)

Eisenhower asks soil-bank to pay for cut in crops. President Eisenhower called today for a $1 billion soil-bank to pay farmers for growing smaller crops and improving soil fertility. (New York Times, January 10, 1956.)

TAKING THE EMPHASIS OFF WASHINGTON

The first thing we intend to do is to take the emphasis off of Washington. * * * Our goal will be sound, farmer-run programs that safeguard agriculture—but do not regiment you, do not put the Federal Government in charge of your farms. (Eisenhower, Kasson, Minn., September 6, 1952.)

The administration presented to Congress today a bill that would make the Secretary of Agriculture the absolute boss of the farm aid soil bank. (New York Times, January 18, 1956.)

Neighborly Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD C. OSTERTAG
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 28, 1956

Mr. OSTERTAG. Mr. Speaker, the spirit of neighborliness still abides and abounds in our country, as witness the

following incident described in the Buffalo Evening News:

FARMERS WORK FAR INTO NIGHT TO HELP OUT SICK NEIGHBOR

WARSAW, June 18.—Fourteen men with tractors have solved a serious situation for Edward Sheehan, 43, of Dale Road, Warsaw.

Mr. Sheehan has taken ill with pneumonia a week ago. None of his crops were planted on his farm, a few miles northwest of Warsaw. He was taken to Wyoming Community Hospital in Warsaw Friday. On Saturday, however, the picture turned brighter for Mr. and Mrs. Sheehan and their seven children, ranging in age from 10 years to 3 months.

The 14 neighbors of the family devoted Saturday to preparing and planting the Sheehan fields with corn and oats. They had rushed their own work during the week to enable them to aid their friend and neighbor.

The cold, wet spring delayed planting until about 10 days ago. Mr. Sheehan missed out on the good weather and the lateness of the season made the problem acute. At best his day in the field is short because he drives a school bus for Warsaw Central School.

The helpful neighbors worked far into the night on Saturday, using lights on their tractors to complete work on the Sheehan farm. Mrs. Sheehan served noon dinner to the men with the aid of two women friends.

The neighbors who helped are Ernest Cousins, Charles Thompson and Charles Thompson Jr., Robert Christ, Donald Newhland, Paul and Richard Kaczmarek, Clifford Cofield, Wesley Bathrick, John Keough, Gerald and Michael Coveny, Burdette Galton and Norman Raupp.

Mr. Sheehan was reported by a hospital spokesman as "much better" today.

My War With the Mob

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PETER FRELINGHUYSEN, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 28, 1956

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I should like to include the second in a series of articles by Victor Riesel which appeared in the Washington Evening Star of June 27, 1956, entitled "My War With the Mob":

MY WAR WITH THE MOB—HOODLUMS USE UNION POWER TO FORCE WAY INTO BUSINESS, SHAKE DOWN CONTRACTORS

(By Victor Riesel)

You can fight today's manicured mob better with a sharp accountant than with sharpshooting police.

The crime cartel inside labor stretches from lush wall-to-wall carpeted offices in midtown Manhattan to ultramodern, neonlit executive suites on the west coast.

To unpeel a series of Mr. Bigs, it has taken some Federal agents years to go through as many as 80 fronts—for just a handful of polished mobsters worth millions of dollars.

These men have infiltrated some of the best clubs. They have purchased country clubs of their own. They control skyscrapers, construction and insurance companies, restaurants, nightclubs, banks, textile and steel mills, garment firms, trucking companies, transit lines, construction-supplies distributors, hotels, jukebox companies, stevedoring outfits—even barbershops and luncheonettes. All this the local and Federal police have recorded in intricate records.

THEY LOVE RESPECTABILITY

But little can be unraveled in the courts—because, unlike the old Capone muscle days and the bloody gun and icepick wars of Lepke and Gurrah, all this is legal. It may be unethical, immoral, and contrary to the quasipublic trust a labor official should pledge himself to when he goes to work for the proletariat, but it is legal—and the boys do love the aura of respectability with which it cloaks them.

The key word among today's mobsters is "respectability"—the standing they've gained in their communities while they operate their criminal cartel behind the scenes. Their dominating fear is neither the police nor the Federal investigators nor even the Internal Revenue Service.

They fear most the spotlight of exposure in the press which goes into their communities, their homes and among their families and neighbors.

FORCED PARTNERSHIPS

To amass their fortunes in cash, real estate, and other investments, they've used the power of the unions they've seized—often in the same business fields in which they operate. They have become businessmen's partners by simply threatening to withhold workers from employers whose projects were racing for deadlines set by contracts with the Federal Government, big cities and private concerns.

Let's step past the men whose notoriety has hit the press so regularly. They're as familiar to the public as Marilyn Monroe's curves.

Let's look at some current incidents cut from the same old pattern.

Let's consider the gimmick used by George J. Walters, former president of the Pittsburgh Building Trades Council and an official of a bricklayers local there. So prominent a citizen was Walters that he served as chairman of the Pittsburgh Housing Authority and as a member of the city's board of education.

FAILED TO REPORT $35,000

Walters, who went to jail, had connections with pipe and building supply firms. If you wanted skilled bricklayers for your construction job, you had to buy blocks from the company which paid him part of its profits. During his trial, it was shown that in 2 instances he picked up $13,000 and later $14,000. Walters was jailed for 15 months and fined $5,000 for failure to report $35,099 in income which he got on the side from building contractors over a 5-year period.

Just a few weeks ago, two bricklayer officials in Pennsylvania were indicted by a Scranton grand jury on charges of demanding $4,200 before they unloaded bricks for a contractor building a Signal Corps depot.

I report these two incidents out of many others because they are typical of the disrespect for decency displayed by this crowd. Walters, trusted by his neighbors, gave all labor a black eye by forcing money out of businessmen although he was labor's representative on important municipal bodies. The Scranton men are penny-ante operators, but this case shows that no even vital Government projects are immune from shakedowns.

MILLION DOLLAR SHAKEDOWN

The pressure by some union officials on contractors building swiftly needed Federal projects doesn't always come from the penny-ante crowd. There is a hulking fellow now slimming down in the Federal pen for another decade or so because he tried, among other inspirations, to extort a million dollars from the Ebasco Corp., then building tremendous power projects for our atomic and thermonuclear defense program. This shakedown artist is Evan Dale, chief of the Hodcarriers and Common Laborers in East St. Louis.

Not quite as imaginative as the pirate in the atomic fields was a set of crooks who were lifted out of the St. Louis construction trades unions by a Federal grand jury. There it was shown that businessmen who wanted to bid on Government contracts first consulted certain union officials. The contractors had to find out exactly how much the union men's shakedown would be before the bid was put in—otherwise that cost could run as much as $200,000 on a project. This could easily be the difference between profit and bankruptcy.

In fact it was the margin for one heating contractor who dared to bid on Government work without the union bosses' permission. This contractor was forced out of business and another firm, in which the labor leaders had a financial interest, was able to get choice contracts without difficulty.

$50,000 OR ELSE

In St. Louis, there were such specialists in extortion as Larry Callahan and Paul Hulahan. The first was the boss of the steamters local and he wielded terrific political power. The latter was known as the heavy-fisted business agent of a hod carriers local. Their price was a mere $50,000 each to permit two projects to get underway.

The judge, in sentencing Hulahan to 12 years for violation of the Federal anti-racketeering laws, summed it up for all areas plagued by rasketeers and extortionists when he said: "You are a menance to this community and the people will sleep better with you away."

These are but a few of hundreds of such cases. Attorney General Brownell's Justice Department reports that since it began prosecution, right after the inauguration in 1953, on to March 31, 1956, a total of 102 convictions on racket charges were secured. All were labor people.

Scores more were indicted but were able to slip through the loopholes of the law. A corny phrase indeed, but through these loopholes pass some of the toughest officials, right across the threshold to "respectability."

MASS PROJECTS LUCRATIVE

There is a belief across the land that racketeers are restricted solely to the trucking and garment industries and the waterfront. The time has come to go further inland where a handful of goons have simply worded union charters into immense personal fortunes because those charters gave them the right to assign workers to mass projects.

Once the mobsters, such as Evan Dale, have the power to hand out jobs, they control the lives of tens of thousands of men who swarm in on such construction projects as the Joppa power works. Control of so many workers gives the Evan Dales the influence needed to set up bars, bawdy houses, and gambling joints—and the power to order men to patronize their joints. The muscle men see to it that no one gets out of line and patronizes competitors.

The take is enormous.

When you travel inland, away from the much biographed eastern rackets, you run into such brazen techniques as union officials charging a nickel a foot to provide labor for digging trenches and laying pipes. There is another group of goons which forced contractors to pay 5 cents a square foot for permission to excavate land.

BASEMENT TRIBUTE

An operating engineers union leader forced building contractors to pay $8 each time they dug a cellar under a new home—and there were some 40,000 homes put up in this particular area.

Contractors in Missouri were forced to pay rent for nonexistent equipment supposedly furnished by certain union leaders or companies controlled by them. In some cases the companies were as nonexistent as the equipment. If a contractor wanted a receipt for his payoff, the union leaders obliged with fictitious invoices.

In one case, a legitimate concern was forced by a union official to set up a company for the labor leader to use as a coverup for his extortion racket. The legitimate firm was threatened with financial loss if it didn't go along.

Not even food escapes the rackets. Other extortionists operating as union officials charged businessmen in the poultry field 2 cents a pound for the right to buy and sell chickens.

CASH FOR CANDIDATES

In a score of communities, these union officials are powerful in the local political organizations. Why not? They always have cash ready for quick donations to needy candidates. So they buy political protection. They move among mayors, police officials, judges, prosecutors, playboys seeking thrills, and others who think them fascinating.

It becomes tougher to find and expose the mob. And still tougher to elude their respectable friends who are always saying: "Why pick on those poor persecuted labor men?"—some of whom are their own suburban neighbors by night and move with the toughest criminals by day.

The Responsibility of a Citizen in a Democracy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 25, 1956

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, over the past few weeks I have been conducting a contest among students in the 11th grade of all the high schools in my district. The winner of the contest is to be my guest in Washington for 4 weeks. Among other requirements in that contest was one which required all entrants to submit an essay under the general title of "My Responsibility as a Citizen in a Democracy."

The results of that contest were most encouraging to me as they indicated what a splendid job the schools are doing to teach our students both the rights and the duties which are theirs because they are American citizens. Much is said currently about the failure of our educational system. The essays I received from students in the Fourth Congressional District of New Jersey point to a different conclusion. As an example of what I feel to be a real understanding of democracy, I should like to submit for the consideration of my colleagues the following essay which was written by the winner of this contest, David C. Guy, of Moorestown, N. J. The essay follows:

MY RESPONSIBILITY AS A CITIZEN IN OUR DEMOCRACY

(By David C. Guy)

Living in America entitles us to many rights and privileges not enjoyed by others in the world. Some of these rights are most precious to me. As an American citizen I have the right to worship as I please, to attend a church of my own choice and to receive the benefit of religious training. It is my right to think and believe as I please, to have my own opinion and to make known my thoughts whenever I desire. It is my privilege to participate in the Government by voting whatever way I please and by serving in public office. I have the right to justice in the courts, to a trial by jury of my peers, to state my case expecting fairness. The right to a free education is mine, to learn as much as I can and to make use of the knowledge gained. It is my right to live my own life, to make of it what I choose.

I have the right to—but wait a minute. Can I exercise these cherished rights, and the many more not mentioned and receive the benefits they bestow, and not return anything for them? Are there not certain responsibilities I have to this democracy which gives me these rights? Or can I say, "These rights are given to me, no one can take them away, so why should I have to do anything for them?" The answer is: For every right or freedom we receive in this country, there is a corresponding responsibility or obligation. What, then, are some of my responsibilities as a citizen of this country?

First, I must be well informed. This means making use of the privilege of free education, a privilege unknown to millions, by attending school and conscientiously putting forth my best effort in my studies. Then, if at all possible, I should obtain higher education, so that I can have as much knowledge as possible at hand. In addition, I must keep posted on current events by habitually reading newspapers, magazines, periodicals, etc. Another part of being well informed is to know as much as possible about the candidates, issues, and questions at hand when I go to the polls, so that I can vote wisely with full confidence in my choice.

It is my duty to make use of the privilege of participating in the government. In many places today the government is in the hands of a very few, with the people having little or no say in the government, where voting, if there is any, is a farce. We in America have a government of, by, and for the people. Being one of the people, I must make my part in the government active and useful. I can do this by voting in every election, not just haphazardly, but, as stated before, after careful consideration of the issues involved. I must be ready at all times to accept the responsibility of public office and to remember that "a public office is a public trust."

Being an active citizen of America, enjoying our way of life, I must be ready at all times to bear arms in the defense of our precious heritage even as many have done before. Peacetime also offers opportunities to defend our country. When others criticize it, I can quickly come to the fore and speak out for it. In addition, I must see that those who criticize our way of life are not provided with added ammunition in the form of any injudicious acts on the part of America or her inhabitants. This means, among other things, that I recognize the worth of each individual and the equality of all men under God, their Creator. Keeping this in mind, I will try to stamp out bigotry and prejudice wherever and whenever I find them, and to see that in this land of equality all have equal opportunities to live according to their own desires.

Another responsibility I have is that of recognizing that our society and our government are built around law. Thus, I will obey and respect the law and its enforcement agencies, report any suspicion or knowledge of unlawful acts to the proper agency, and uphold the court system by testifying, when I am called to do so, honestly and clearly, by willingly performing jury service, and by abiding by the decisions of the court.

An additional responsibility deals with my personal life. That is, in my home I will do my best to make my family a responsible and cooperative unit of democracy. I will see that my family has a complete understanding of the principles of democracy and its responsibilities. I will also see that religion plays a vital part in the life of my family as I realize its importance in our democracy. In other words, I will be a responsible family man. In addition, I will do my part in maintaining the best standards in my community by an interest in civic and community affairs.

I have the responsibility also to make any contribution I can to the scientific knowledge or the cultural storehouse of America, to aid, if I can, the advancement of American "know-how" in all fields.

How fortunate I am to live in America where I have so many rights and privileges unknown to millions in the world today, millions who have never known what it is to be free, free as we are, or who have had but a taste of freedom, only to have it taken away from them. What, then, must I do in return for this blessing of the greatest freedom the world has ever known? It can all be summed up by saying, "I must exercise these rights and make use of these privileges, rights and privileges won with blood, sweat, and tears, rights and privileges which others today do not have, rights and privileges which we must keep at all costs." This is my responsibility as a citizen of our democracy, and as long as this responsibility is shared by every citizen, the United States of America will continue to be a shining example of freedom in today's world.

Replies to Questionnaire From 15th District on Major Issues

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 7, 1956

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, I have requested the people of my district once again to share with me their opinions on some of the most vital and important issues before Congress. This questionnaire was circulated throughout the entire 15th District to assure that all who were interested would have an opportunity to express their views on these issues.

The replies which I have received reflects the keen interest of the people on these issues and the thoughtful consideration given in stating their opinions. In many instances the replies included observations and comments not only on the issues which I had included in the questionnaire, but on other important problems of government.

The following is a summary of the replies I received to my questionnaire:

1. Should the Constitution be amended to provide direct election by the people of the President and Vice President? Yes, 79.5 percent; no, 20.5 percent.

2. Should the United States withdraw from the United Nations if Red China is admitted over our objections? Yes, 51.6 percent; no, 48.4 percent.

3. Should the death penalty be applied to convicted narcotics peddlers? Yes, 72.3 percent; no, 27.7 percent.

4. Should postal rates be increased to balance the Post Office Department deficit of $350 million? Yes, 55.2 percent; no 44.8 percent.

5. Should the Constitution be amended to prevent treaties and international agreements with foreign nations from becoming the supreme law of the land? Yes, 73.6 percent; no, 26.4 percent.

6. Should the price of natural gas be controlled by Federal Government or by State governments? Federal, 39 percent; State, 61 percent.

I am confident that this review of the results from my latest questionnaire will be of great interest to the Members of the House of Representatives.

Foreign Aid Needs More Study

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. SPARKMAN
OF ALABAMA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, June 28, 1956

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Foreign Aid Needs More Study," published in the Birmingham News of June 7, 1956.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FOREIGN AID NEEDS MORE STUDY

President Eisenhower in a press conference yesterday strongly emphasized his desire for the Congress to pass a foreign-aid bill without any substantial cut. He correctly said that it is cheaper to maintain an aid program than to fight wars, but the question is not that simple—it is not a case of aid or war. The issue involves how much aid, what kind, and which countries truly need it. These are matters of increasing concern to close students who think that we are in a period of transition, that our overseas program needs careful study.

All thoughtful persons will agree with the President that help is still needed abroad. To have reservations about parts of the projected mutual-security program should not be equated with general opposition to foreign aid, or excessive zealousness in behalf of saving dollars today, whatever may come tomorrow. We would therefore submit that, with due respect for the presidential concern, a critical survey of the projected program is in order and should be pressed.

When the issue is pinpointed there is room for debate. The administration has asked for a total of $4,860,000,000 for its mutual-security program. This is broken down into $3 billion for military aid, $1,131,000,000 for defense support, and the rest for a scattering of different types of assistance—technical help, packaging and shipping of materials, training programs, funds for Asian and African development, and so on.

Now tables showing this breakdown readily show why some Members of the House, including Democrats and Republicans—men not customarily antiforeign aid, either—are of the opinion that this overall program can be trimmed. The administration says it cannot without crippling the program. The paramount interest right now is in direct military aid—supply of arms and military equipment. This takes, alone, $1,999,000,000, or almost half the total requested. That aid goes to NATO countries, to Indochina, to Korea, Formosa, Turkey, Denmark, Netherlands, Spain, and a lot of other countries. But a mutual-security program brochure does not show the amounts contemplated for each country. This information, it is said, is in process of classification, and by this we may assume that some of the facts will be termed "secret," and cannot be given out.

Yet it is precisely at that point that questions arise. Exactly what is the correlation of, say, $5 million in rifles or cannon or aircraft to Formosa, or to Iraq, or Iran, to western or Asian freedom's defense? Do all these many countries need our support for divisions and squadrons? Such questions, in our view, necessarily lead to an examination of the degree of danger in each of internal subversion, of attack from an agressor who might turn the country over to communism, and so on. But they cannot be considered publicly without the actual figures. Presumably in closed sessions, House committee members can get such figures. We are led to conclude that statistics have indicated to some of them that trimming is feasible, without endangering western defense.

Of course, everything gets back, ultimately, to the question, What kind of attack on the West is likely? When this question is raised, then, the number of divisions for Indochina or Iraq, for example, may be seen in a different light. Further, the Soviet Union is offering countries principally economic aid, as against military supplies and guidance—though there is, of course, some of this, too. But the bulk of our program is for armies, planes, and in the form of commodity shipments which in turn are sold in the respective countries, the money being used largely for financial support of military arms. In this general bracket, supplies and support, are to be spent some $3,131,000,000.

We do not question the need of funds to help build strong economies abroad. But with almost three-fourths of projected aid to go to military support, it seems to us the nature of western freedom's defense must be reconsidered and evaluated, particularly in the light of the current directions of Soviet policy in dealing with other countries. It has accurately been said that NATO today is in need of reevaluaiton. This may be said about our total mutual-security program.

In Memoriam: To a Great Man, and a Great Patriot, Ignace Jan Paderewski

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALFRED D. SIEMINSKI
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 28, 1956

Mr. SIEMINSKI. Mr. Speaker, June 30, 1956, marks the 15th anniversary of the death of Ignace Jan Paderewski, world renowned composer and pianist, who became the first Premier of the Polish Republic in 1919 after the people of Poland asserted their independence according to the principle of national self-determination embodied in the famous 14 points of President Woodrow Wilson.

The inspiration Paderewski gave the Polish people is still nurtured in their hearts.

At home and abroad, on both sides of the Iron Curtain, Paderewski left a sublime understanding of freedom with a humility that strove to walk in the footsteps of God.

The anniversary today of the passing of this great man, of this great patriot, more fully serves to remind me that freedom is indeed worth living for and, if need be, worth dying for. May God ever bless and keep green the memory of Ignace Jan Paderewski. He lives in the hearts of all who love freedom and its thrilling song.

Brainwashed Soldiers Need Scientific Aid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, June 28, 1956

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, in an age when we talk of a war for the minds of men, and when homefront no longer means a noncombatant area, we search for new answers to new problems.

A few months ago, we heard a great deal about brainwashing and the treatment administered to GI's in Red prison camps. For a few months, the subject was forgotten. Recently, in newspapers and on the air, it has again been a subject of serious consideration. Editorial writers, commentators, and columnists render considered opinions on all phases of the subject. An editorial written by a professional psychologist should be of major interest at this time. Such an article appeared in the August 11, 1955, issue of the Portland, Oreg., Journal, when Dr. Harold S. Tuttle, professor of psychology at Lewis and Clarke College, discussed these problems in an informative guest editorial. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BRAINWASHED SOLDIERS NEED SCIENTIFIC AID

(By Harold S. Tuttle)

Only a few centuries ago our ancestors treated their emotionally disturbed fellow citizens as witches, condemning them to the stake or the gallows. A little later they abandoned the witch epithet, but still seeing in them dangerous creatures, they chained them in prison cells. More recently (if the cause of their emotion came within certain categories), we began sending them to hospitals, treating them as patients, and providing the services of mental specialists. If they could be cured and restored to society, good. If not, after the best efforts of science to effect a cure, they were given care under as humane conditions as possible.

Meanwhile we began to learn a lot more about the causes of emotion. The word "conditioning" emerged in our vocabulary; and we began to explain the abnormal, disruptive "learning" which confused the mind and sapped the will, not as magic, but as the operation of certain laws of mental life.

Once we recognized emotional learning as an intelligible process we began to apply the laws of science to its treatment. Being humane, civilized people, we preferred to help the victim rather than to burn him at the stake or chain him in a prison cell. And so we now "treat" victims of emotional "conditioning" with a view to their cure, or at least their relief—provided their illness springs from, say, lack of parental affection in childhood, or alcoholism, or one of a score of other "approved" causes.

But now we have in our social order a few individuals whose "conditioning" came about through an unusual channel. We sent them

as boys, half educated, to fight and, if need be, give their lives for the protection of democracy. We sent them to fight a foe not only highly skilled in military combat, but still more highly versed in the art of "conditioning" emotional complexes.

It is significant that our knowledge of conditioning, and from that, our effectiveness in reconditioning, came from Russia. Pavlov made it his life study, and gave it as a highly developed science to his country. How easily we overlook the fact that Russia and her satellites are masters of the art of conditioning emotions. We have attached a name to it: Brainwashing we have come to call it.

Let us face an imaginary situation, in a different environment from that of our brainwashed prisoners of war. If, in their training camps, some of our boys were abducted by sadists who found glee in mental tourture, and were brainwashed into repudiation of all their cultural standards, and if these boys were then freed from their captors, we would make haste to get them to psychiatric clinics and give them the best treatment science knows in order to restore them to normal appreciation of the values which we count dear in our culture.

Few Americans today are aware of the devastating effects of brainwashing, thanks to popular accounts by highly educated men who survived the torture. When we better understand conditioning we shall recognize that the less firmly one is conditioned to a wholesome set of ideals the more easily he can be reconditioned to conflicting standards. Once reconditioned, his will simply does not function.

Before many years the psychologists of the country will rise in force and demand that we move out of the Dark Ages in the treatment of our boys who have been victims of brainwashing, and provide professional care and reconditioning, rather than punishment for being made tragically ill through the tortures of our enemies.

It ought not to be necessary to await so tardy a reform. Few Presidential acts would prove more epochal in the course of history than the suspension of all punitive sentences of our pitiable victims of brainwashing, with a directive that they be given every care and the best treatment science can provide to restore them to a normal love of democracy.

Congress Makes Money Talk

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DENNIS CHAVEZ
OF NEW MEXICO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, June 28, 1956

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Congress Makes Money Talk," written by David Lawrence, and published in the Washington Evening Star.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CONGRESS MAKES MONEY TALK—DRIVE TO CUT AID AND BOOST AIR FUNDS VIEWED AS SIGN UNITED STATES HASN'T GONE SOFT

(By David Lawrence)

Whether it to be the will of the people or the confused thinking of their conscientious Representatives here in trying to determine what to do in a distraught world, the Congress of the United States is saying some pertinent things these days which ought not to escape the notice of foreign offices everywhere, domestic and foreign propagandists, and prominent Americans returning from their travels abroad.

For the Congress is striving to cut down foreign aid by a billion dollars and at the same time is increasing appropriations for airpower by a billion.

"Money talks," and, in this instance, it says a great deal. It tells the folks who have been shouting loudly that America is putting too much emphasis on "military alliances" that the Congress of the United States hasn't gone soft despite the criticisms from the socalled liberal sources and from those Democrats who have beeen carping about how this country is throwing its weight around in a military sense.

It tells the folks who have been transparently seeking to drive a wedge between President Eisenhower and Secretary of State Dulles that their troubles in getting more money out of America do not happen to be concentrated in the executive branch of the United States Government, but in the Congress.

It tells the wobbling and wavering countries abroad, including certain allies and also certain so-called neutral countries, that maybe they have persuaded the Congress that it is unwise to rely on overseas bases. Whatever propaganda victories Communist Russia gets out of the "Yankee go home" slogans in Iceland's election campaign or in Egypt or in Tunisia or elsewhere, the Congress of the United States is beginning to believe that the best way to protect this country is by intercontinental bombers, a strong naval air force with carriers fully equipped to carry all kinds of bombs, and a mobile force of ground troops.

Members of Congress cannot in the very nature of things become military experts, but they are swayed by events in the world that take on special significance to them. For weeks a few Democrats, with some traces of partisan motivation, have been regularly picking flaws in the foreign policy of the United States with a series of speeches. Whenever the Kremlin makes an effective move of infiltration somewhere, it is promptly blamed on Dulles, or on Eisenhower's illness or on his lack of pressure on Congress. It is immediately urged, moreover, that there be a re-examination of our policies.

Unless, of course, the Democrats who are articulate on this subject really want the United States to get into a war in order to force the Communists to behave, there isn't much point in blaming the State Department for the aggressive acts of the Kremlin.

But the critics who must really be disappointed over the attitude of Congress this week are those who have been extolling Nehru and praising his virtues as a "neutralist." They have been arguing that America should give more and more money to "win men's minds" in the "neutralist" countries. They have been complaining that the Southeast Asia treaties are actually sinister—as they do no doubt look to Nehru and the Communists—but they forget that these pacts were meant to be a warning against further aggression when the Indochina truce was signed and a means of discouraging any more Korean wars.

It is remarkable how soon those Americans who are thinking so much about the objectives of foreign countries can so readily forget the objectives of their own country. It seems to be fashionable to find fault with the American policies—the foreigners are pictured as always right.

But the Congress, irrespective of party, has spoken this week—somewhat awkwardly, to be sure, and without a clear-cut explanation of what's back of it all, yet plainly on one point. For the legislators here in Washington are beginning to think a little more about the interests of the American people and not so much about the numerous petitioners abroad who have been demanding more and more money as the price of their cooperation with us.

It's not an encouraging thing to see dissension in the ranks here on foreign policy, but it's in Congress and not in the executive branch where the "isolationism" has cropped up. And, of all things, it has emerged in the Democratic Party, whose votes have gone to big money for defense of America instead of for defense of American military alliances abroad.

Letter Carrier Finds He's Public Relations Man for Post Office

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROY W. WIER
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 28, 1956

Mr. WIER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I should like to include an article from the Minneapolis Star-Tribune by Peg Johnson, a staff writer, entitled "Letter Carrier Finds He's Public Relations Man for Post Office."

The article follows:

LETTER CARRIER FINDS HE'S PUBLIC RELATIONS MAN FOR POST OFFICE

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—Reporter Peg Johnson looked into opportunities and problems of a dozen possible careers, seeking information to guide June graduates and others hunting a new job. This is the seventh of her 12 articles.)

(By Peg Johnson)

Letter Carrier Archie Mohn enjoys delivering mail that he knows someone is waiting for.

It's a good thing he does, for giving service—and giving it cheerfully and well—is what Uncle Sam's 2,400,000 civil servants are paid to do.

Of the total number of Federal employees, more than half a million are in the Post Office Department (nearly 1,100 in Minneapolis), as letter carriers, clerks, mail handlers, or in other jobs.

To get a Federal job, you must pass a civil-service examination. Applicants must be between 18 and 45, although the age limit is waived if you're a veteran.

Veterans also get 10 points extra when test scores are computed, giving them a big advantage in landing jobs.

Women may apply for clerks and other jobs, but may not be mail carriers.

After applicant's test scores are determined, the person to get the job is picked from among the top three qualifiers. Almost invariably the No. 1 man gets it, according to Mohn, a letter carrier more than 20 years.

Even after being selected, however, you don't start right out as a full-fledged mailman. First you have to put in time, often as much as several years, as a substitute, which often is a "rugged life to begin with," Mohn said.

New employees are given orientation and training classes, then make rounds with regular employees. They must report for work each day just as the regulars do, but there may or may not be a job for them.

Substitutes are paid $1.82 an hour and in busy seasons often make more than the regulars do by working 10 or 12 hours a day.

Once you become a regular, your chances to get better jobs improve with seniority.

When a man retires or leaves, bids are opened for his run. The employee with the

most seniority among those bidding gets it.

Mohn, who lives at 2322 Northeast Taft Street, got his present run that way. It includes the main post office and Federal Office Building, and is better than most runs, Mohn says, because it does not involve the long route and long exposure to inclement weather.

These two factors are two of the biggest disadvantages of a mailman's job. Mohn believes. Another one, the picture of the mailman fending off vicious dogs every day, is not often applicable; residents are required to keep unfriendly dogs away from mailmen or have their mail deliveries stopped.

Advantages? You've a chance to give service, Mohn said, and you're protected by civil service job security provisions, which prohibit dismissal without just cause.

Letter carriers start their 8-hour days between 6 and 7:30 a. m., while mail collectors may come at 1 p. m.

Mohn starts at 6, spends the first 2 hours sorting mail for his route into pigeonholes—one for each stop.

Since his is a short-business route, he makes these three trips a day, and can come back to the post office for lunch, unlike some residential carriers.

Around the route Mohn takes time to greet his customers, pick up letters for mailing, and perform any other services he can.

"After all," he said, "letter carriers are, so to speak, the public relations men of the post office. We're the ones who meet the public, so it's important to be courteous and agreeable, for to them we represent the United States Government."

Carriers are inspected on their routes and their efficiency rated annually, but outside of that "there's no one hanging over you every day," Mohn said.

Regular post office employees are paid about $70 for a 40-hour week to start, with raises periodically until the maximum of $4,710 is reached after 22 years.

On retirement at the age of 60 and after 30 years' service, you draw a pension of about $2,170 a year, toward which each employee contributes a set percentage of his income each year.

Low-cost Government insurance also is available (about $2.50 per $5,000 worth), and mailmen get $100 uniform allowances each year. Mailmen in cold climates use all of it or more, Mohn said.

Vacations are figured at 13 working days a year the first 3 years; 20 days after 3 years, and 26 days after 15 years.

Employees are allowed 13 days' sick leave each year, and the time is cumulative. Mohn thus has 1,300 hours coming should he ever need it.

All these provisions are decided by Congress, Mohn pointed out, so Government employees take special interest in what each session does. They are subject to the Hatch Act, which prohibits Federal employees from taking part in political activities, but are permitted to write or talk to Congressmen individually or through their National Association of Letter Carriers.

Mrs. Cleo Maletis, of Oregon, Mrs. America of 1956

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, June 28, 1956

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I speak both for my distinguished senior colleague [Mr. MORSE] and myself when I announce that all the people of the State of Oregon are proud of Cleo Maletis, of Portland, who is the 1956 selection as Mrs. America. Mrs. Maletis, now attending the American Home Economics Association meeting in Washington, is an outstanding homemaker, wife, and mother.

I think it is happily symbolic of this great land of ours that Mrs. Maletis, born in the Canadian Province of Saskatchewan, north of the international border, is a naturalized citizen of the United States whose citizenship followed marriage to her college sweetheart, Chris Maletis, of Portland.

As one of the Senators from the State of Oregon, I congratulate Mrs. Maletis and her entire family for the great honor which she has attained. I ask unanimous consent that an excellent interview with Mrs. Maletis, which was published in the Washington Post and Times Herald of June 28, 1956, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the interview was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THIS CONTEST WINNER COOKS IT—MRS. AMERICA IS CHEESECAKE SPECIALIST

(By Millicent Benner)

When New York photographers asked Cleo Maletis, this year's Mrs. America, to strike a cheesecake pose, she snapped back, "I don't pose for it, but I make it."

Truer words were never spoken. In fact, they best sum up this sweet brown-eyed brunette contest winner, who is first and foremost a homemaker for a wonderful husband and their three healthy sons.

She is presently in Washington to attend the American Home Economics Association, of which she is a member and undeniably one of the most outstanding.

Although she's happy to be here, today is Cleo's ninth wedding anniversary and the first one she has missed celebrating with her husband, Chris.

But she'll be back in Portland, Oreg., Sunday, and she's not letting the family forget it. One of the first things she did after boarding the plane for her Washington flight was write her hubby and children a postcard filled with plans for a family picnic to take place the day she returns.

A vivacious 31 years' young, Mrs. Maletis was the first Mrs. America in the contest's 18-year history to win five homemaking events in a row. The winner, incidentally, is selected for her homemaking talents, not the way she fills a bathing suit. However, attractiveness is a deciding factor.

In her clean sweep of homemaking honors, Cleo won awards for her lamb rice pilaff dish, meal-planning ability, an original fruit cocktail pie, outstanding civil-defense work (an award "which pleased me"), and a black-walnut chiffon cake.

Cleo says she entered the contest at the suggestion of some Home Economic Club friends that was enthusiastically endorsed by her husband. "He feels as strongly about the importance of homemakers as I do," Cleo explains.

A graduate of the University of Washington, with a degree in home economics, Cleo was born in Saskatchewan, Canada, and became a citizen of the United States after marrying her college sweetheart.

Cleo says she's a great believer in maintaining a loving home, because everything begins in the home.

Her children, she says, are no emotional problem. They're just good normal, healthy children. Chris and I spend all our spare time with them. It's more fun for us that way, too.

They had each of the boys in swimming trunks and in the water by the time he was one. Now Chris and Cleo are teaching them to ski. "This way they learn to take things in their stride," she says of her son's early training.

Here is one of Cleo's favorite cooling recipes, that also won over the Mrs. America judges. "It only costs 17 or 18 cents to make," she says.

MRS. AMERICA'S REFRIGERATED DESSERT

¾ cup crushed graham crackers
2 eggs
5 tablespoons lemon juice
2 tablespoons lemon rind
¼ tablespoon salt
⅓ cup sugar
½ cup cold water
½ cup instant nonfat dry milk solids

Put one-half cup crushed graham crackers in bottom of refrigerator tray. Beat egg yolks in top of double boiler; add lemon juice (3 tablespoons), lemon rind, salt, and sugar. Mix well and cook over hot water until it thickens. Stir constantly—about 7 to 10 minutes. Remove from heat and cool thoroughly. Beat the egg whites. Pour water into mixing bowl and add instant nonfat dry milk solids and whip until soft peaks form (for 2 or 3 minutes). Add 2 tablespoons lemon juice and whip very stiff (about 2 minutes). Fold the beaten egg whites and whipped topping into lemon mixture. Put into refrigerator tray and top with remaining crumbs. Freeze until firm (2 to 3 hours). Cut in wedges.

Guidhim Rath Mor Ort

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES A. BOYLE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 28, 1956

Mr. BOYLE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I herewith include an editorial appearing on June 28, 1956, in the Chicago Sun-Times, of Chicago:

GUIDHIM RATH MOR ORT

The new lord mayor of Dublin is a Jew. And why not?

The Irish and the Jews have much in common. What Ireland is to the Irish, Israel is to the Jews. Their struggles and their tribulations have run parallel in time and in circumstance. They are loyal to their traditions and their institutions, constant in their causes, and determined in their battles. They make good American citizens. An Irishman would make a good citizen of Israel, and a Jew has obviously made a good citizen of Ireland.

The parallels are admirably summarized by the career of Lord Mayor Robert Briscoe; he has been both an ardent Sinn Feiner and an ardent Zionist.

As part of the Irish struggle for independence, he made several secret missions to the United States to raise money and arms for the rebels. As a Zionist he headed a delegation which in 1939 sought international support for the settlement of Jews in Palestine.

And obviously it was the Catholic vote that put him into the several offices he has held. Ninety-five percent of his constituency is Catholic, and in all of Dublin there are only 5,000 Jews.

We join Mayor Daley in his expression of good wishes to the new lord mayor of Dublin. As the Chicago mayor messaged in both Irish and Hebrew, "Guidhim rath mor ort, and mahzel tov."

Federal Aid to Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRUCE ALGER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 12, 1956

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, concerning my views on Federal aid to education generally, and the Kelly bill specifically, I feel that Federal aid to education is entirely unnecessary. Do we need the schools? Yes; of course, we do, and we're building them locally at a rate that will solve this so-called national crisis we face in shortage of classroom facilities. Further, the money that goes into school construction comes out of the pockets of our citizens whether this is done under the jurisdiction of the local and State agencies or whether the Federal Government masterminds the operation.

Therefore, let us not be deluded into thinking that through Federal aid we are securing somebody else's money to do the job. Nobody else is paying for our schools, but rather the local citizens, and in sending our money to Washington before returning it to local school construction a sizable deduction must be made by the Federal bureaucracy which is a total unproductive loss of money and certainly does not go into school construction.

In sober reflection no one can deny that Federal money put into construction of schools means Federal control since the Government must be careful in the expenditure of taxpayers' money.

As to the Kelly bill in particular, briefly let us examine it. On page 1 we find this under section 2:

> The Congress finds that despite sustained and vigorous efforts by the States and local communities, which have increased current school construction to an unprecedented level, there is still a serious national shortage of classrooms requiring emergency action on the part of the Federal Government.

Is this an emergency? If it is, why cannot we meet this in the time-honored American way by putting our shoulders to the wheel locally rather than appealing to the far distant Federal Government? How many times in the name of emergency we Americans have called on Uncle Sam for help and the emergency apparently never passed but rather more and more Government control was imposed and the original cause for Government help was forgotten. The end is always bureaucrat control. Quoting again from page 2:

> The limited financial resources available to a number of communities are not adequate to support construction programs of sufficient size to eliminate their classroom shortages. Other communities, in their efforts to apply their potential resources to their needs, are confronted with restrictive debt and tax limits, an inability to borrow the necessary funds at reasonable rates, and other obstacles.

Why are there limited financial resources at the community level? The reasons best known to local residents probably stem from some very sound financial considerations and should not be overrun roughshod by the Federal Government offering Federal aid without regard to the cost, which perhaps was the motivating factor in the community's hesitancy to incur additional debt.

Further on page 2, the first provisos are mentioned for payment to the State on a current basis. Thereafter, for 29 pages there are rules and regulations spelling out the Federal controls imposed on the States in return for Federal money. These bureaucratic tactics only point out that the end result will be another American bureaucracy contrary to the founding principles of our Government. Twenty-nine pages of rules and regulations culminate in labor standards to be imposed in construction known as the Davis-Bacon Act. This act prescribes working conditions and wages to be dictated by the Secretary of Labor rather than by State and local custom and usage, commensurate with local economy. And we should not forget that in case of error and dispute during construction the Secretary of Labor is prosecutor, judge, and jury. In fact, there is no recourse from his decision—no right for an American to have his day in court.

This bureaucratic labor dictation is but another of the provisions specified in the Kelly bill for Federal aid to education. In the Davis-Bacon Act or any one of the 29 other pages of regulations there is further ample proof to the fact that Federal aid to education means Federal control. We American citizens do not want Government dictating when it comes to the education of our children and this danger is certainly now upon us.

Dispersal of Industrial Facilities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES A. WOLVERTON
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 6, 1956

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, the conference report on extension of Defense Production Act of 1950, accompanying H. R. 9852, contains an amendment to the House bill that is a new provision. It declares that it is the policy of Congress to encourage geographical dispersal of industrial facilities and to provide that the Government in certain instances shall give recognition to this new principle. While I am of the opinion that there may be instances where such a principle could properly operate, yet, it is doubtful whether in the administration of the act there can always be assurance that the location of new industries will be entirely controlled alone by the best interest of national defense. I have too often seen other considerations of a political character enter into such decisions. Furthermore, there has been no hearings held in the House Committee on the subject and no real opportunity, other than by the limited means of this report, to consider the subject with the care that there should be prior to the adoption of such a far reaching amendment. For the reasons I have expressed, I am opposed to the adoption of the conference report with such an amendment to the basic law contained in it.

Textile Imports

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH A. ROBERTS
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 25, 1956

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I include the following letter addressed to Gov. Sherman Adams, Assistant to the President, written by Mr. Donald Comer, chairman of the executive committee of Avondale Mills, Inc. Mr. Comer, in his letter, points out the economic deprivation being suffered in the textile industry caused by the heavy, uncontrolled import of textiles from Japan. To further injure our own textile industry, the United States sells cotton abroad for a much cheaper price than charged American mills. This is a very serious situation, yet the administration has refused to invoke any of the statutory provisions and act in behalf of the American textile industry. As a Member of Congress I do not intend to stand by idly and watch the State Department and the Tariff Commission sacrifice the American textile industry upon the altar of internationalism. If action is not taken to erect some floodgates against the tremendous influx of foreign textiles, I intend to ask Congress to enact a reasonable import quota for textiles, applicable to all countries.

APRIL 24, 1956.

GOV. SHERMAN ADAMS,
White House,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR GOVERNOR ADAMS: The President's reference to the value of Japanese trade in his speech of Saturday night is responsible for this letter. This reference, I construe as an unresponsive attitude on his part to the increasing threat to the American textile industry from Asian looms, from Japan at the moment, but with the uncounted millions of Chinese, Indian, and other Asians.

My sister, Mrs. H. C. Ryding, wrote to the President in April 1955 because the Comers are cotton textile people and what hurts textile hurts us. Mr. Hague replied to her letter on April 23, 1955, and comforted her by enclosing a copy of a letter which the President wrote Congress JOE MARTIN on February 17, 1955. I quote a paragraph of this letter:

"This program, therefore, must be and will be administered to the benefit of the Nation's economic strength and not to its detriment. No American industry will be placed in jeopardy by the administration of this measure. Were we to do so, we would undermine the ideal for which we have made so many sacrifices and are doing so much throughout the world to preserve. This plain truth has dictated the retention of existing peril point and escape clause safeguards in the legislation."

This guaranteed protection promised by the President has been left in the hands of Secretary Dulles. I am quoting from a copy

of a letter that the State Department wrote to Mr. Marion Heiss, of Cone Mills Co., on April 5, 1956. In this letter Mr. Prochnow said:

"With reference to your concern regarding the trend of Japanese imports, existing legislation provides means by which the United States may take action to prevent excessive imports due to trade agreement concessions from threatening serious injury to a domestic industry. * * * The escape clause procedure prescribed by the Congress provides an equitable way by which to determine whether or not there is need for such action. It involves a thorough investigation and public hearings by the Tariff Commission, an independent agency.

"It is hoped the foregoing comments will explain why this Department has concluded that the negotiation of a quota agreement is not a desirable course of action."

I am giving you some figures to show the tremendous percentage of increase of shipments of textiles from Japan. In 1955 Japan shipped 5,754,000 square yards of velveteens against a total United States production of 7,308,000 yards. The velveteen industry, now practically closed down, took their case before the Tariff Commission in January; the hearing is set for June.

In 1954 Japan shipped 1,322,000 units of pillow cases and in 1955, 11,725,953 units were shipped. They applied to the Tariff Commission for a hearing in March and the date for hearing has been set for September.

During 1954, Japan shipped blouses and shirts, 189,000 dozen, and in 1955, 4,234,000 dozen, which is over one-third of our domestic production. Application to the Tariff Commission was made in February; hearing set for August.

In 1955 Japan shipped 46,699,000 square yards of gingham and during December alone she shipped 10,767,000 square yards; that was 20 percent of our home production. Our company makes ginghams, and one-third of our looms are today shut down and considerable of the balance of our production is going into the warehouse. The gingham industry, to date, has made no requests for a hearing.

A news item from the Daily News Record dated April 19, 1956, quotes Mr. Sidney S. Korzenik, executive director and counsel of the National Knitted Outerwear Association: "Japanese sweater imports, which whizzed up 450 percent in 1955, are the most 'ominous' problem facing the knitted outerwear industry here." He asserted that Japanese competition menaces the knit goods industry of every other country in the world. To prove his point, he asserted that British sweater manufacturers, "who can undersell American," are being squeezed out of the American market by Japanese competition.

The president of the American Cotton Manufacturers Institute, in discussing this procedure and these delays, said that by the time the hearing dates arrived, instead of it being a hearing it will be an inquest. Recently Alabama, South Carolina, and Mississippi Legislatures passed laws requiring merchants to post notices that would identify Japanese goods in their stores. These actions, according to newspaper reports, "alarm Mr. Dulles."

Another store of the Belk chain didn't wait for such a law but posted notices that Japanese goods were not sold in their store because they considered it not to the best interest of the community or the area. Whether such laws are wise or not is not the primary concern. My first concern is that Mr. Dulles quickly shows a concern for Japanese workers while continuing over the months to refuse an equal concern for American textile workers or investments. This action by the several States is just a natural act in self-defense of local workers and local industry, that, for the time being, are denied protection by the Federal Government.

Let me quote a few headlines in our local papers: From the Cotton Trade Journal—"Alabama Millmen Ask Stores To Boycott Japanese Textiles" under date of April 20, 1955. In a resolution adopted at the closing session of the Alabama Cotton Manufacturers Association Convention, the industry said it urgently requested "of all retail and wholesale establishments in Alabama that would normally handle textile fibers, fabrics, and garments, that they refrain from adding to this type of competition that cannot be met under the American standard of living, that is undermining operations in United States textiles and promises to become depressing and disastrous unless checked in time."

From the April 21, 1956, Southern Textile News, under heading of "Jap Import Flood Gets Ervin Ire," Senator SAM ERVIN, Democrat, North Carolina, said: "The reciprocal trade agreement concept was based on the proposition that the United States would export to foreign countries things which we produce in surplus quantities and would import from foreign countries things not available in our own country."

Also, on the same date the Southern Textile News carried an editorial headed "Tut, Tut, Mr. Dulles." The South Carolina and Alabama laws might be termed "pressure" legislation, but failing to obtain protective relief from Washington, this was a logical and sound move on the part of solons in the two States. Groups which have attacked the advisability of the legislation, including the United States State Department, leave little doubt as to their interest in the American textile industry.

In the New York World Telegram dated April 18, 1956, Mr. Roger Milliken's statement is headlined: "Textile Imports Held Menace."

Mr. John M. Ward, executive president of the State, Chamber of Commerce of Alabama, is quoted from Daily News Record of April 17, 1956: "The State Chamber recognizes the increased import of Japanese textiles could hold a serious economic threat to the American textile business, a vital part of Alabama economy."

Another headline from Daily News Record of the same date: "Japan-United States Talks on Exports Urged." This letter from American Farm Bureau Federation to the Department of Agriculture in which Mr. Lynn stated "this would be the best approach toward solving the conflict of interest involved in Japanese competition with the United States textile industry." Mr. Lynn said there is "every reason to believe" that the increased exports of textiles from Japan within the last 12 months will continue "at a very much accelerated rate" if not action is taken.

From the Daily News Record of April 9, 1956: "Two-Party House Group Sends Ike Quota Plea."

A statement, by Mr. A. K. Winget, president, American Cotton Manufacturers Institute, on April 6, 1956 headlined "Warns Inertia by Government May Destroy United States Mills." Failure to act on imports may see Japan capture textile industry, with consequent widespread havoc here. Mr. Winget then referred to the fact that the Quartermaster General of the United States Army once said that the textile industry was second only to steel for defense needs.

Cotton Trade Journal of April 13, 1956 quotes Mr. L. G. Hardman, Jr. of Georgia: "Imports held as threat to entire cotton economy."

The New York Times, Friday, April 20, 1956 said if the whole problem is approached with cool-headedness on both sides an equitable agreement can be reached. There can be other "gentlemen's agreements" and there can be additional safeguards to see that they are carried out in good faith.

From a letter written by Mr. Lawton S. Brayton, President, Northern Textile Association, April 10, 1956: "I talked with Ellison McKissek in Hollywood and he remarked to me that it was very peculiar that an industry as large as the textile industry is, especially on the employment end of it, and also because it is a vital industry for the welfare of the country, that we do not have more friends * * * in the administrative side of the Government."

Southern Textile News of April 21, 1956, there is a news item headed "North Carolina's Textile Industry said endangered by Jap Imports." The report further said "This danger and the importance of the textile industry to the overall economy of North Carolina are spotlighted in a report released by Governor Hodges."

To all of this evidence of growing concern and resentment, the only friendly word that our industry has had from Washington is in the Daily News Record, April 17, 1956, under an article headlined "United States Seeks To Tactfully Halt Cheap Japan Imports: Weeks."

Governor, when Asiatics had their hands and we had the machines we were safe, but today they have the same machines we have and there is no way in the world that home markets can be safe to their home manufacturers except by some restriction. We haven't asked for the entire American market. We have expressed a willingness to shut down some of our looms in order to take some Japanese goods. We don't need a single yard of these goods. They have nothing to offer to our market except low prices just because of their low wages. Japan itself has been realistic about this, and I think in a friendly attitude have offered a restricted quota. All we are asking Washington to do is to make this a bilateral agreement, otherwise the uncertainly in the case would continue. It is the unknown that is destructive to our production schedule and to our price structure.

My only approach to the President is through you, and I am writing you because it is going to take the President to tell Mr. Dulles to accept this friendly hand that Japan is holding out and give our industry the protection that we are going to have to have.

I am closing this letter with a listing of earnings of a dozen American industries. These figures are quoted from the Cotton Trade Journal, an article by Harry Defore titled "Textile Mills Lag Behind Other United States Industries." Figures quoted are for the first three quarters of 1955:

	Percent
Petroleum refining	10.7
Stone, clay, glass	8.97
Chemical and allied products	8.10
Nonferrous industries	8.07
Primary iron and steel	6.93
Motor vehicles and parts	6.87
Paper and allied products	6.23
Lumber and wood products	5.97
Photographic, watches, and instruments other than clocks	5.07
Textiles	2.50

You can see from this list that textile is at the bottom and even with these continuing low earnings our industry has continued to keep itself up to date and modern. There are over 1,000 separate units. We are sharply competitive. There are 2½ million employed and at this very moment we feel that our interests are very much neglected by our Government.

Yours very truly,

DONALD COMER,

Member of Murchison Committee to Japan in 1937; Member of the MacArthur Committee to Japan in 1948; Chairman, Executive Committee, Avondale Mills, Inc.

Domestic Politics and Foreign Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. B. CARROLL REECE
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 28, 1956

Mr. REECE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, all the Members of this House on both sides of the aisle wish to further a system of free competitive enterprise. None of us advocates monopoly. We attempt to use the powers of Government to create a climate where anyone can establish a new business. The success of such a business should be limited only by the ability of those associated with it. Regardless of party, we are opposed to any artificial restraints on the freedom of enterprise.

Let me remind the House that the Sherman Act was passed in 1890 when Benjamin Harrison, a Republican, was sitting in the White House. It has been supported by both parties ever since. Our fundamental anti-monopoly law is now 66 years old.

I have been personally concerned with the problem of preserving our competitive economy for many years. It was my privilege to serve on the Temporary National Economic Committee. The distinguished junior Senator from Wyoming [JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY], and myself are the only Members of the Present Congress who served on that committee.

My colleagues know my interest in this problem is not a new one. While I am determined to do everything in my power to prevent monopolies, I am equally concerned when the term is used loosely to merely attack bigness and success.

Mr. Speaker, just about a year ago on Wednesday, June 29, 1955, I brought to the attention of the House some statements which had been made within the United Nations Economic and Social Council by supporters of the Russians to embarrass this Government. The statements in each case were based on material originating within the United States. I cited specifically remarks by Elinor Kahn, who represents the World Federation of Trade Unions, an organization which has been repudiated by the American Federation of Labor-Congress of Industrial Organizations as a Communist-dominated group. Miss Kahn addressed the United Nations Economic and Social Council at length on the evils of big business. She implied that our economy was controlled by monopolies.

I also showed how the Democratic Digest, which is distributed all over the world, has continually attacked large corporations and attempted to give the impression that they were in some way alined with the Republican Party.

Mr. Speaker, I am as fearful today as I was a year ago that unless we exercise great care and self-discipline in the forthcoming political campaign, loose statements and campaign oratory will be used by our enemies in the United Nations to embarrass us in the future as they have in the past.

Let me cite the most recent example which has come to my attention. The Washington Post and Times Herald on Sunday, June 17, carried a story on its front page with this heading: "Shepilov Opens Cairo Visit With Attack on United States, Britain as Oil Monopolists." The article said:

CAIRO, June 16.—New Soviet Foreign Minister Dmitri Shepilov arrived in Egypt today for a second wooing of the Arab States and promptly took a slap at the United States and Britain as oil monopolists.

In a speech to Egyptian and other officials who welcomed him at Cairo Airport Shepilov described the Soviet Union as "a country whose economic structure has no place for oil monopolies or any kind of imperialistic monopolies which suck the vitality of less-developed nations."

He said Russia bases its relations with other states, large or small, on mutual respect for sovereignty and noninterference in their internal affairs.

This was an obvious blast at the Western allies, particularly Britain, which have vast oil holdings in Saudi Arabia, Iraq, and other Arab States.

Mr. Speaker, it is incumbent upon us to conduct our debates so that Mr. Shepilov and his allies cannot twist anything which we say into something which will benefit the devious foreign policy of the Soviet Union.

Raymond Moley, the distinguished columnist, in the Newsweek issues of June 11 and June 18 discusses the political and foreign relations aspects arising from the confusion of bigness with monopoly. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that these two articles may be included as an extension of my remarks. They are a further development of the theme which I discussed a year ago:

[From Newsweek of June 11, 1956]

PERSPECTIVE

(By Raymond Moley)

In a recent speech, Senator JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY, perennial scourge of big business and exponent of Federal incorporation, made a surprising confession. His testimony to the efficiency of the villain in his tale, General Motors, was, he said, expressed in his personal ownership of a Cadillac. Since Senator MORSE and others have contemptuously called this a Cadillac administration, this might seem to be a dangerous admission by a Democrat. But in politics there is often advantage in giving evidence of some unusual attainment. Perhaps the Senator had been reading Edwin O'Connor's wonderful story of the Senator's native State, Massachusetts. In that novel, The Last Hurrah, Frank Skeffington, like the Senator, a passionate friend of the common man, had a habit of reading and quoting poetry. That trait Skeffington's humble followers regarded "as an awesome and barely attainable ideal, like celibacy or telling the truth."

Nevertheless, this seems to be a poor time for a Fair Dealer to reveal any taint of affluence. Chairman Butler says that his party is broke. The Reuther war chest is probably down to its last few millions. Moreover, according to the Senator, his ranchers and small-business men are in a mire of distress. Perhaps, indeed, the Senator's Cadillac is 5 or 6 years old and is cherished as a reminder to his perishing constituents of pre-Eisenhower prosperity.

Even so, a liberal who can afford such a symbol is revealing something that his political discourse denies. He is admitting that if a toiler in the barren vineyard of politics can enjoy such a standard of living, there must be something of magic in the economic system which he deplores.

INTERLOCKING

But the Senator's purpose in rising was not to praise GM but to dismember it. His approach was an old one dating back at least as far as Frank Walsh's monopoly investigation 40 years ago. His proof of GM's monopoly power was an inventory of the 81 outside directorships of 16 GM directors. The companies represented have aggregate assets of $44,111 million. This, concluded the Senator, "means such a concentration that neither the cities nor the States can stand up against it." The nostrum would be Federal incorporation plus dismemberment.

If this logic be true, the Senator should look to some of our higher institutions of learning. Twelve members of the Harvard Board of Overseers hold directorships in corporations with assets of $32,018,000,000. Eight members of Yale Corp. "interlock" to the extent of $36,616 million. Fourteen Columbia trustees "control" $40,883,000,000, while the Massachusetts Institute of Technology has directors whose outside affiliations are $102,098,000,000.

But trustees are there mostly to raise money, and to vote for things (like the Senator's honorary degrees) that are recommended by the president and the faculty. They toil little and neither do they spin—an effective web of control over their immense institutions.

ABSURD PROOF

The real facts show the absurdity of the Senator's method of "proving" monopoly power. Company directors have certain functions which really come down to giving advice out of their experience in the business world generally. To a large degree they only approve the actions and recommendations of management. Only in a crisis do they make management changes. Management, on the other hand, is at the mercy of customers demanding lower prices, workers wanting higher pay, and stockholders asking for some return on investment.

I have often wished that some professional director would set down in writing just how much influence he could exercise if he tried. The picture would be far from the sinister vision of domination which is conjured up by critics like the Senator.

But since politics is governed not by what is true, but by what politicians can make people believe, the Senator's twice-told tale will be broadcast from countless forums this year. His statistics may even make the Democratic platform.

The people who listen meanwhile, like the Senator, will feed the behemoth by buying its cars.

[From Newsweek of June 18, 1956]

PERSPECTIVE

(By Raymond Moley)

BIG-BUSINESS MYTHS

Since big business will once more be an issue this year, let us note the ripe—perhaps overripe—reflections on the subject by a major Democratic seer. For JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY has made a career of two ideas—the evils of bigness and the need for Federal incorporation. As cochairman of the Temporary National Economic Committee 17 years ago, he toiled prodigiously and gave birth to a set of Government volumes which have been the happy hunting ground of professors in search of antibusiness data. In anticipation of the campaign, the Senator

and a staff have toiled again, with General Motors as a case study.

THE GAME

The Senator's discourses on his favorite subject suggest what someone said of a fugue: A composition in which a theme keeps coming in and the audience keeps going out. His most notable recent speech reported on his General Motors researches. He found that 70 corporations have total assets of $201 billion. "If every man, woman, and child each had assets of $1,100 they would not have assets equal to those of the 70 corporations." Since the game here is to pull your own multiplier out of the air, let us suppose that every Senator has assets of $200,000 (including the O'Mahoney Cadillac). The corporations would then seem to own more than 10,000 times the assets of the Senators: This is no more true than the Senator's statement, because Senators, like some millions of other Americans, must own some of the stock of the 70 corporations. Thus the use of the multiplication table, even on the Senate floor, does not necessarily make a statement true.

The influence of these corporations, according to the Senator, is bad. They have caused the farm income to go down. How this happened, the Senator neglects to explain.

The Senator deplores the fact that GM and Ford can go abroad and charter subsidiaries under the laws of other countries. The Senator would have them get permits from Congress for that purpose. Thus Congress would sit in judgment on company policies, and considering the wisdom with which Congress has dealt with its Washington streetcar and bus affairs, the result would be deplorable. Moreover, to license or permit companies operating abroad would certainly embroil our Government as well as the companies in endless entanglements with foreign governments.

At this point in the Senator's speech the omniscient Senator MORSE broke in: "We must get away from the policy of the flag following the dollar, to one in which the dollar follows the flag. That means that we must exercise Federal jurisdiction over international commerce so far as American corporations are concerned." This is strange stuff from an exponent of free trade.

Among the other evils of American corporations abroad, O'MAHONEY finds a lag in enlistments in our Armed Forces. This is because "our people do not want to go to war to sustain business enterprises which are operating under European law."

At this point the Senator's wrath moved on to American oil companies operating in the Middle East. "Why," he said, "are we so concerned about the tensions there, and why is it that very little, if anything, is done? It is because the great oil companies * * * are more interested in holding onto the oil they have secured by their negotiations with the governments of foreign nations than in anything else."

At this point Senator MORSE expressed his fear "that the politics of oil has become bigger than American foreign policy."

NONSENSE

This is more nonsense. The United States is interested in the oil of the Middle East because it does not want to have that strategic treasure fall into Communist hands and thus mortally endanger the Western nations who are dependent upon it.

This reviling of American corporations and the collateral attack on the integrity of our Government provide wonderful ammunition for our enemies abroad. In the discussions of the U. N. and its subsidiary councils there is plenty of evidence of irresponsible and untrue statements by Americans about American business, out of the mouths of our Communist critics.

The Senator has provided them with new material.

Housing for the Elderly

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD D. DONOHUE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 28, 1956

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, I should like to include the speech I delivered in Worcester, Mass., on June 22, 1956, on the occasion of the public dedication of the George F. Booth Memorial Apartments for the Elderly.

This housing project is the first of its kind in the Worcester County area and, indeed, one of the first in the Nation.

The project name honors the memory of the late George F. Booth, former publisher and editor of the Worcester (Mass.) Telegram and Evening Gazette newspapers, and is intended as a lasting indication of the genuine interest and concern in the problems of the elderly Mr. Booth consistently expressed and perseveringly worked to solve.

The memory of Mr. Booth is revered for multitudinous public benefactions, but this housing project is a particularly fitting memorial as a prime example of the Christian humaneness which characterized his whole life.

The address follows:

It is a high honor and deep pleasure for me to take part in the public dedication of this most attractive housing project as the George F. Booth Memorial Apartments for the Elderly.

It is doubly gratifying to be present with you today because of the vital importance of the problem to which the erection of these buildings gives recognition—Christian concern for our older citizens—and because of the genuine tribute this project bestows upon one of the greatest men and benefactors with whom any community was ever blessed.

No person of any religious training, and particularly no American legislator, can help being more and more concerned about the proper solution of the many and varied problems plaguing the increasing numbers of our older people in the sunset of their fruitful lives.

According to authorities, our ancestors of 2,000 years ago had a life expectancy of only 20 to 30 years, as compared with an average life span of nearly 70 years in the United States today. Realizing the great modern strides in preventive medicine and disease control resulting from medical research in all fields, we can appreciate vividly that the life expectancy of every American will become longer and longer, which means, of course, that we will continuously have greater and greater numbers of older citizens who must be reasonably assisted in their later years.

Let us realize that our American economy is largely industrial. Its frightening materiality is geared to maximum production of the unit and the individual, with exaggerated emphasis upon the robust energy of youth to the unhappy neglect of the wisdom and prudence of the aged. Too many competent American workers over 45 are being too often denied suitable employment opportunities by more and more industries, thereby visiting financial catastrophe upon increasing numbers of our people in the upper age brackets.

It is a startling story to hear that among the some 14 millions of people in this country over 65 years of age today, the average income for a man and his wife is about $1,500 and their average savings are less than $1,000. The unfortunate significance of these figures is that in spite of our great economic gains over the past quarter of a century, old age in America still remains for the majority a time of insecurity, fear, and dependence upon charity. In other words, in the richest and most blessed land in the world, those who have worked the longest and given the most can look forward only to the least.

I don't think that anyone here or any other decent person in the country is willing to accept the continuation of this un-American picture of abandonment of and distress for our older people.

Rather, I think you will agree that all segments of our society at the local, State, and Federal levels should humanely cooperate in sensibly doing whatever is necessary to make old age in America a dignified period of usefulness and satisfaction that can be approached without discouragement and fear.

That is why a great many of us who are charged with national legislative responsibility have consistently urged over the past several years that the executive agencies of our Government devote greater attention to the complex problems of the aged before it becomes a disgrace to our American principles and traditions.

Our Federal Government includes about 2 million persons with a budget of some $65 billion a year. Among that vast personnel, there are perhaps less than 50 people, with a budget less than $100,000, engaged in seeking ways to help our elders comfortably through their threshold years. Such a situation certainly is not wholesome.

Through the great resources of our Government departments, we have the duty of expanding our efforts to discover opportunities for our senior citizens to continue to be active, useful, and satisfied. We must, for instance, find ways to encourage our older persons to work, if they can and if they want to. We must try to convince industry that there are substantial advantages in the employment of older people. We ought to attempt to develop a program for training our older people to learn to do other things when they have retired from their regular work.

On the legislative level, we must constantly and conscientiously investigate the need for new laws and the proper revision of existing laws, to adequately meet the desperate needs of our old folks in the critical fields of social security, housing, medical care, and gainful employment.

Assisting the aged is a truly American action, and as in all nationwide problems, much can and should be done on the initiative of communities themselves. That is why I am, as you are, today so proud of my own city where the problem has been recognized and as a result, these clean, healthy, livable housing accommodations have been provided. Viewing these beautiful structures, we should be mindful of the substantial civic merit they reflect upon all our city officials, and we are impelled to recognize the unselfish sacrifices of so many private citizens like Raymond Harold and Samuel Donnelly, their staffs and associates. The unity in action of all their good hearts and their good wills in bringing this project to reality is an inspiring example for the people of other communities and cities to follow.

To perpetuate the memory of beloved citizens, it is often customary and appropriate to erect personal images of stone or steel. It has frequently seemed to me that while such monuments are acceptable, too often they fall short of the real objective. Somehow they fail to convey any living impression of the nature and the spirit of the person we desire to revere. To my mind, the dedication of these most livable homes for the most needy of our citizens in the memory of George F. Booth happily hits the mark.

To those who had the honor of personally knowing him, nothing is necessary for them to remember him. George Booth was a man

who worked hard and lived fully through his entire life. He worked untiringly to give good example; he was highly ambitious, but strictly ethical; he was stern, as all strong men must be, but he was essentially kind, as all great men are. He was a driving leader in his profession, but a respected and beloved employer. He was a devoted family man with genuine concern for his fellow man. He respected God and he generated respect for himself. The height of his character was integrity of word and action. The genius of his talent was wise prophecy. The courage of his heart was tempered with sympathy. The depth of his mind was illuminated by gentle humor. The self-discipline of his own life was persevering work, and the substance of his nature was unselfish service to his fellow men, to his community, and to his country.

These are some of the things we mean whenever we talk about a man and the way he lived. The outstanding attribute of George Booth was his remarkable and extraordinary vision, recognized by everyone who ever had any contact with him. He could see into the future and advise upon its coming. This unique quality was strikingly placed upon him at the immature age of 30, at which age the affectionate and endearing term of "the old man" was attached to him forever by his friends and associates.

It is, therefore, particularly fitting that the living character and nature of George Booth be carried on by naming this haven for the old folks after him and in his memory. It was he who first saw the need for these homes and who originally recognized the suitability of this area for their development.

George Booth knew better than most men that taking care of the aged is a clear moral obligation upon any Nation claiming to live under God and a duty distinctly placed upon us by His command to "Honor Thy Father and Thy Mother." He also well understood that so long as the American system retains its premium on personal initiative while making reasonable provision for the economic security of the young and the old, we need have no doubt of our triumph over the Communist challenge.

May the memory of George F. Booth ever inspire others to carry on similar humanitarian programs.

Pressure on Emigrés

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FREDERIC R. COUDERT, JR.
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 11, 1956

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include, at the request of a constituent, an interesting editorial in one of the country's leading newspapers, the New York Herald Tribune, dated June 22:

PRESSURE ON EMIGRÉS

The charges brought by Michael Shatov, former Soviet Army captain who fled to this country in 1952, throw a still darker shadow on the current activities of the Soviet United Nations personnel in this country. Mr. Shatov, an archivist at Columbia University, is leader of an emigré group dedicated to the liberation of the peoples of Russia. At a press conference sponsored by the American Committee for Liberation from Bolshevism, he accused two Soviet U. N. officials of exerting improper pressure to persuade him to return to Russia or to enlist as a Red spy in the United States. He indicated his belief that Arkady A. Sobolev, head of the Soviet mission to the U. N., was aware of the pressure and approved it.

These charges, which Mr. Shatov has already brought before the Senate Internal Security subcommittee in executive session, should be thoroughly investigated. The circumstances surrounding the redefection of five Russian sailors in April were sufficiently disturbing to bring a protest from the State Department. Two of Ambassador Sobolev's aids were asked to leave the country, and the Ambassador and his staff were warned "henceforth to adhere to their recognized functions." Meanwhile, the Senate subcommittee continued its study of the case and on May 25 concluded that Ambassador Sobolev and his First Secretary had abused the hospitality of the United States and should be recalled.

The Soviet campaign of cozenage and intimidation against defectors in the United States is proof, no doubt, against the ousting of a few officials here and there. The best defense against it must be the defector's assurance that in this country threats to their personal safety are idle, and this assurance they received in a White House statement on May 24. "The United States," it declared, "has already taken steps which make clear its determination to extend the full protection of American laws to all aliens residing here." Let this be remembered by the objectors of Soviet agents' unwelcome attentions, and they can break the dark web of threats and lies no matter how cunningly woven.

Resolution Commending REA Aid In Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. T. A. THOMPSON
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 17, 1956

Mr. THOMPSON of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I have been pleased to devote much of my time in Congress to matters in behalf of the rural electrification program which is vital to the comfort, progress, and general welfare of so many of our American citizens and I greatly appreciate the following resolution adopted at a meeting of the board of directors of the Southwest Louisiana Electric Membership Corp., the world's largest rural electric association:

Whereas, the board of directors of Southwest Louisiana Electric Membership Corp. recognizes and acknowledges with deep appreciation, the very able work and wonderful support received from Hon. ALLEN J. ELLENDER, Hon. RUSSELL B. LONG, Hon. T. A. THOMPSON, and Hon. EDWIN E. WILLIS, for the rural electrification program which reflected in direct benefits to the rural people of Louisiana; and

Whereas, this board also recognizes and acknowledged the hard work and wonderful support received by our United States congressional delegataion on appropriations for McGee Bend Dam, a multipurpose dam which will be of great benefit to the rural electric systems in stabilizing wholesale power rate in Louisiana: Now, therefore, be is

Resolved, That this board of directors go on record as expressing their heartfelt thanks and appreciation to our Congressional Delegation for their sincere and complete support throughout their service in Congress; be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be forwarded to Senator ELLENDER, Senator LONG, Congressman THOMPSON, and Congressman WILLIS and that copies be spread upon the minutes of this meeting.

Status of Forces Agreements

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK T. BOW
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 25, 1956

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I wish to call to the attention of the House a letter to the editor of the Evening Sun, of Baltimore, Md., which was published on June 22, 1956, as follows:

TREATY QUESTIONS

To the EDITOR OF THE EVENING SUN:

SIR: Your June 14 editorial in defense of the status-of-forces treaties suggests a number of questions.

Suppose, for illustrative example, that two Americans, stationed in a foreign country with which one of these treaties is in force, are on an off-duty basis. Suppose that they drink too much liquor, get into an argument with a native of that foreign country, and kill him in the course of a resulting fight.

Suppose that one of them is in the American diplomatic service and is in that foreign country because he went there of his own free choice and prefers to be stationed there rather than at home. Suppose that the other is in the American military service and was sent to that foreign country against his will as a result of being drafted into the Army. Suppose that he would much prefer to be back in the United States defending his country on his native soil.

Would both these American partners in the same crime have exactly the same status? Would the courts of that foreign country have exactly the same primary jurisdiction over both of them, and have it for exactly the same reasons, and be able to exercise it in exactly the same ways?

Have these status-of-forces agreements been negotiated for the United States by persons in the American diplomatic services? If so, have the agreements conformed to the old Army rule to the effect that the cooks should be required to eat the same food they serve up to the soldiers?

Your June 14 editorial indicates that these status-of-forces agreements have been worked out on some sort of discriminatory basis, whereby the United States gives some foreign countries relatively much more primary jurisdiction over Americans than it gives to others.

Can you tell us who decided upon these discriminations between various countries to which we are bound by agreements? And can you tell us the criteria upon which these discriminations are based?

Any factual information you may choose to give in response to these questions will be appreciated by the undersigned. And possibly also by other Evening Sun readers who, like myself, have not had opportunities to analyze the status-of-forces agreements, and whose information about them has been derived from arguments for or against made by partisan advocates or opponents.

JOHN J. IAGO.

Baltimore, June 15.

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—All our correspondent's questions apparently revolve around two

points: Why shouldn't servicemen be treated in exactly the same manner as members of diplomatic missions? Why shouldn't the various agreements with different countries on jurisdiction over servicemen be uniform?

(The relative handful of diplomatic mission members make their case a highly special one, which has traditionally been dealt with by the device of diplomatic immunity. The hundreds of thousands of servicemen stationed abroad obviously present a wholly different problem. To insist that the two problems should be dealt with in precisely the same fashion seems to us to ignore the quantitative difference as well as the differing functions of the two groups.

(The lack of uniformity in agreements with various countries was designed to provide exactly the protection which the opponents of the arrangements are so worried about. Foreign countries are granted primary jurisdiction over American servicemen only to the extent that we are convinced the foreign legal and penal system will not work an undue hardship on delinquent American servicemen.)

This letter poses several questions to which every Members of the House should give serious thought. Even the State Department could not answer the questions completely without considerable embarassment. It is not surprising that the editor of the Sun failed in his note to justify this discrimination between diplomatic and military personnel.

The different functions exercised by diplomats and the Armed Forces do not extend to either group when off duty. A diplomat can operate a motor vehicle as recklessly as a serviceman. If he should commit a serious crime such as homicide on his own time as it were, his diplomatic connections do not make the crime more palatable to foreign nationals than a like offense by a serviceman.

"Quantitative difference" is a fancy way of saying there are fewer persons in doplomatic service than in military service. Is this a valid reason for relieving the smaller group of any responsibility to foreign courts, but subjecting the larger number to all the vagaries of foreign justice?

There is no great lack of uniformity in our agreements which surrender criminal jurisdiction over our servicemen to foreign countries. The NATO Status of Forces Agreement covers 14 countries, the agreement with Japan is practically identical, other Executive agreements which surrender jurisdiction do so in similar terms. The real lack of uniformity is in the laws of the various countries. This subjects our men to different forms of justice and varying degrees of punishment for the same offense in different countries.

The editor is sadly misinformed if he believes that "Foreign countries are granted primary jurisdiction over American servicemen only to the extent that we are convinced the foreign legal and penal system will not work an undue hardship on delinquent American service men." The facts are that the State Department and the Defense Department had made no effort to inform themsalves concerning foreign laws or penal conditions before these agreements were made. The Defense Department for example did not complete a study of the laws of Japan until 2 years after the agreement went into effect and after 49 or more of our men had been tried and imprisoned there.

Through belated studies of foreign laws, ordered by the Senate, the Judge Advocate General of the Army has found that it is impossible for an accused to receive a fair trial by our standards in any foreign court, if you consider that the accused automatically loses certain rights granted by our Constitution, such as a presumption of innocence, burden of proof on the prosecution to establish guilt beyond a reasonable doubt, protection against self-incrimination and against use of involuntary confessions.

Congress has now provided counsel for the accused because the Defense Departmen admitted that this was necessary in order to try to protect United States personnel against the disadvantages of these agreements . Such counsel however cannot restore to an accused the constitutional rights which he loses through these agreements. Neither can counsel protect the accused who prosecutes an appeal against the tendency of foreign appellate courts to punish him for so doing by increasing the penalty imposed.

It is regrettable that editors who seek to mold public opinion or to advise their readers as to issues of the day do not always secure all the available facts before taking their persuasive pens in hand.

The Republican Press on Ike's Health

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 28, 1956

Mr. MULTER. Mr. President, the following is an interesting summary of newspaper comment on the President's health as it appeared in Drew Pearson's column of June 28, 1956:

GOP PRESS ON IKE

This newspaperman's mail has increased as a result of the President's illness. Most of my readers seem to be most sympathetic toward Mr. Eisenhower, but want all the facts about his health. Some of them, Republicans, believe GOP leaders are taking advantage of the President, imposing on him, risking his life further by demanding that he run again. A few editors have criticized my columns on Ike's health.

On the other hand, some of the outstanding Republican publishers in the Nation have been extremely frank, much franker regarding the second illness than regarding the first.

Wrote John S. Knight of the Detroit Free Press, Miami Herald, Akron Beacon-Journal, and associated newspapers:

"The seriousness of the President's illness has been minimized by friendly editorialists who point to Adlai Stevenson's operation for kidney stones; Harry Truman's gall bladder operation; the recent surgery on Gov. Averell Harriman's prostate gland; Senator LYNDON JOHNSON's heart attack; and Senator STUART SYMINGTON's sympathectomy for high-blood pressure in 1947.

"How idle and misleading it is to pretend that the President, a former heart case and chronic sufferer from gastric disturbances, can fully regain his old vigor. But in their anxiety over the future, the Republican strategists and the big guns in the business world are determined to have Ike run, even though he may not last through a second term under the pressures of the job."

MORE FRANKNESS

Here are other quotes from Republican or conservative newspapers showing a much more forthright approach this time to the problem of the President's health:

Toledo Blade: "A great many doctors must have said to themselves that they never before heard a doctor speak with such optimism about a patient right after he had undergone major surgery." Richmond, Va., News Leader, Democratic but strongly pro-Eisenhower: "Surgery is nothing to laugh off. It means a strain on an already weakened heart. Twice within a 9-month period his body has given way. What might happen in the future is anybody's guess." Hal Burton in Newsday: "The complex of the indispensable man is growing up again in Washington. The last time we suffered that complex was when Franklin Roosevelt was President. He was a great man, but not indispensable. Nobody is. The moment we hit this point in the United States we shall have substituted an elected dictator for an elected President."

Pleasure Boating

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM K. VAN PELT
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 28, 1956

Mr. VAN PELT. Mr. Speaker, pleasure boating is rapidly becoming one of the Nation's most popular recreational activities. From this sport stems a substantial boat and motor industry, a number of important units of which are located in the Sixth District of Wisconsin, which I have the honor to represent.

A leader in the industry is Mr. Ralph Klieforth, president of Universal Motors, Inc., located at Oshkosh, Wis. He is also president of the National Association of Engine and Boat Manufacturers, Inc.

This association has pointed up the advisability of adopting new Federal regulations to provide additional safety for the growing pleasure-boating fraternity.

Attesting to his keen interest in all matters pertaining to boating and shipping, our distinguished colleague, Hon. HERBERT C. BONNER, chairman of the House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, has scheduled hearings starting July 2 to explore the need for such regulations. It will be an extremely interesting hearing.

Mr. Speaker, at this point in my remarks I include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a news release issued by Chairman BONNER describing these hearings.

The item follows:

Representative HERBERT C. BONNER, Democrat, of North Carolina, chairman of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fish-

eries of the House of Representatives, announced today that his committee would begin public hearings July 2, 1956, to determine the necessity or desirability of additional Federal legislation to regulate pleasure boating in the United States.

This will mark the opening of a study which the committee is undertaking, in advance of any specific legislation being introduced, to examine the problems which have been raised on the navigable waters of the United States by the phenomenal growth of pleasure boating and attempt to arrive at conclusions and recommendations for legislation, if such is found to be necessary.

Mr. BONNER said: "With the wholehearted support of the Coast Guard, the industry involved and the States themselves, where similar problems exist, I feel that constructive results can be achieved which, though regulating, will not restrict the growth and popularity of this healthy recreational sport which today is such a unifying family activity in our country."

Mr. BONNER stated that Vice Adm. Alfred C. Richmond, commandant of the United States Coast Guard, would be the witness on July 2 and that he would outline the problems faced by the Coast Guard in their efforts to keep pleasure boating safe for the approximately 25 million citizens of this country who go afloat each year.

On July 10 to 13 of the following week the committee will hear various industry and yachting groups at further hearings in Washington. Later in the year it is expected that hearings will be held by the committee in boating centers of the United States in order that both the interested State officials and other interested groups and individuals may conveniently be heard.

The Unity Achieved by Coal Producers, the United Mine Workers of America, Exporters, and the Railroads Merits Special Attention of Congress Regarding Government Policy and Its Effect on the Coal Industry of the Nation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 28, 1956

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, among the many interesting sessions incident to the National Coal Association's Convention in Washington on June 12 to 14 was the luncheon of the Coal Exporters Association at which Mr. Walter J. Tuohy, president, Chesapeake & Ohio Railroad, announced formation of a new corporation to be known as American Coal Shipping, Inc. After his announcement of this unprecedented action, Mr. Tuohy concluded his address to the convention with this statement:

This is an historic moment in the coal industry. We stand as a cohesive group—the coal producers, the miners' union, the exporters, and the railroads. Our unity is the assurance to the free nations that coal, America's greatest and most abundant resource, will find its vital role in world prosperity and peace.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that this development in the coal and railroad industries merits the special attention of the Congress. Heretofore coal has been a neglected—yes, an abused—industry as far as Government policies are concerned.

For almost a decade after the conclusion of World War II, foreign oil was encouraged to flow into our great fuel markets of the east coast in ever-increasing volume, thus harassing the coal industry to the point where many mines were forced to close, thousands of mineworkers were thrown out of employment, and selling prices were so depressed as to prevent coal companies from making investments in conformity with anticipated demands of the years ahead. Other Government policies—including TVA's fuel-buying program—were equally reprehensible.

Some adjustments have been made in the past year with the realization of coal's importance to the Nation. We who are more cognizant of the role which coal must assume in the national economy and security will continue to demand further action toward removal of the inequalities inflicted upon the coal industry.

With the announcement of the new shipping corporation, Americans are becoming more aware of the contributions of the United States coal industry toward stabilizing the economies of other countries throughout the free world. I question whether the outstanding job performed by coal industry management and labor in the past 10 years is generally recognized.

Europe's coal industry was hit hard by the long war of 1939–1945. Some mines were knocked out by enemy attack. Transportation facilities were disrupted. Labor forces were depleted by the call to arms, and many experienced miners were never to return.

To assist in the rebuilding of Western Europe and the United Kingdom, American mines sent more than 16 million tons of bituminous coal across the Atlantic in 1946 and in excess of 36 million tons in 1947. As mines abroad were reactivated, the need for our coal gradually decreased until by 1950 Europe required less than a million tons.

The following year, with very short notice, United States mines were called upon to send abroad more than 30 times the tonnage that had been required in the preceding 12 months. The sudden upsurge was the result of an extremely cold winter and of an industrial reactivation resulting from the outbreak of hostilities in Korea. Had adequate shipping facilities been available, there would have been even more than the 28 million tons of bituminous coal leaving our eastern seaboard in 1951.

By 1952, Europe's own mines had made substantial gains in productive capacity, so that only 20½ million tons of American coal were needed that year. In 1953 the figure declined to 8 million tons, with a slight recovery—10½ million tons—for 1954.

Last year it became obvious that American coal would have a permanent place in the energy picture of Western Europe—at least in the foreseeable future. We sent 28½ million tons across the Atlantic in 1955, and present indications are that these exports will reach 38 to 40 million tons this year. In other words, 1956 will mark a record tonnage moving from the United States to Europe. Thus the American coal industry, having been beset by extreme fluctuations in Europe's markets over the past decade, may at last look forward to a stabilized demand. To a mining industry, the violent ups and downs of the European market have a most upsetting impact. Mines cannot be expected to remain open through periods of depressed demand in anticipation of a future change in market conditions, nor can miners be expected to remain out of work in their home communities on the theory that the outlets for their productive efforts will be placing orders a year or two hence. Despite these inconsistencies, however, the United States bituminous-coal industry did not fail to respond to any situation; I believe the present outlook for a sustained demand on the part of European consumers is only a fitting reward to this industry. A stabilization of shipping facilities will also be appreciated, as in the past it has been most difficult for both coal producers and railroads to find necessary shipping bottoms at tidewater when needed.

There is still a lot of coal in the ground in Western Europe, but the difficulty in getting it out is the principal factor involved in the expected rise in demand for American coal. Reserves in Great Britain are estimated at more than 185 billion tons, and the continental territory west of the Iron Curtain is believed to contain more than 150 billion tons. Recoverable reserves in the United States are estimated at approximately three times the combined total of Great Britain and this portion of the continent; what is more, in America they are largely more accessible, and of course our industry is so modernized as to be able to extract this valuable fuel at far less expense than their contemporaries across the sea.

In past years Great Britain always showed a surplus of output over demand. She has been a traditional exporter for centuries. Probably the first instance of coal exportation took place in 1362 when a ship from France brought a cargo of corn to Newcastle and returned with a load of coal. As the importance of this fuel became recognized over the years, the British Isles began to engage more actively in its exportation, most of the coal coming from the mines of Wales.

A monopoly in the coal export trade was eventually established by the British, and at one time—in 1923—the United Kingdom's shipments to other countries amounted to 90 million tons. With Germany also able to produce more coal than was required for her own consumption, Europe never faced a coal shortage except in periods of work stoppages or as a result of the ravages of war.

Under her socialistic mining industry, England has had great difficulty in meeting her own domestic demands, much less being able to continue to serve other countries. Added to this problem is the fact that the most easily recoverable coals have already been taken from the ground and the British have been forced to dig deeper and into less desirable veins.

Germany's coal fields were split by diplomatic and military negotiations after the conclusion of World War II, and now about 20 percent of her potential production is within the Soviet perimeter of influence. Western Germany's mines have indeed made great progress, but neither their production nor that of France, Belgium, The Netherlands, and other coal-producing nations of free Europe are going to be able to meet the energy demands of the foreseeable future. America's coal will consequently be required in great quantities to supplement domestic supply.

I commend the action of Mr. Tuohy, Mr. John L. Lewis, of the Mine Workers, and his vice president, the former Lieutenant Governor of Pennsylvania. I congratulate all the coal producers who have had a hand in forming the new shipping corporation, and I trust that it will lead to a solution of the overseas coal-shipping problems. American coal is needed in South America in ever-increasing quantities ,and it must continue to be shipped wherever else it is needed by friendly peoples.

The National Coal Association's convention was held in an atmosphere of enthusiasm and determination on the part of the coal operators. They have had the foresight and have been willing to invest in mechanization to such an extent as to be far and away the world's leaders from the standpoint of output per man-day. I had the pleasure of talking with a number of the mine owners—large and small—during the NCA convention, and I was pleased to find that they are extremely optimistic about business conditions in the years immediately ahead as well as in the long-range future. It is incumbent upon the United States Government to remove any unfair restraints against this great industry so that it will be able to continue to progress and thus fulfill the energy needs of our Nation as well as those which are depending upon us across the seven seas.

Dulles Indifferent to Indignities Heaped Upon American Citizens

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMANUEL CELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 12, 1956

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, the Syrian Consulate at New York, when asked to visa a passport of a United States citizen of Jewish faith, will brazenly state, "I am very sorry, but we have instructions not to grant visas to members of the Hebrew faith."

The Lebanese Consulate is more polite, but just as firm in its refusal.

The Iraq Consulate will say that the Arab League Constitution forbids a visa to any Jew, and Iraq is a member of the League.

Submissively, our passport division of the Dulles State Department warns that American Jews will be denied the right to visit Arabian countries. The American Export Lines warns that not only American citizens of Jewish faith, but anyone with a Jewish name—Jew or gentile—will be excluded from their cruises that touch Arab ports.

Airlines warn that American Jewish passengers will not be allowed to disembark at Beirut and other Arab ports of entry.

Even United States Government civilians and military personnel must suffer indignities and violations of their rights as citizens.

Mr. Dulles accepts with complacency the refusal of Saudi Arabia to allow religious services by Christians and non-Moslems at the Dhahran base. Chaplains cannot display crosses except during services at the base.

Dulles offers lame excuses when complaints are voiced against such assaults upon our citizen rights.

Dulles, with the undoubted approval of the President, on February 24, last, testified before a Senate Committee on Saudi Arabian aid. He was asked whether the terms of our Mutual Security Agreement with Saudi Arabia actually disqualified Jewish servicemen from being stationed at the Dhahran base, replied:

It may be.

Thus he accepts without remonstrance the right of a foreign state—this time Saudi Arabia—to pass upon the religious qualifications of our American citizens abroad.

A New York company advertises for welders to work in foreign parts. Those applying were told that Jewish welders would be barred. This proscription violated New York State law. The company excused its conduct by pointing to prohibitions contained in its contract with the Arabian Government.

Army contractors engaged in defense projects—the cost of which is paid by all of us—Jews and Gentiles alike—has encouraged this ostracism of American Jews. Maj. Gen. G. J. Nold, Deputy Chief of Engineers, stated that Army contractors were warned not to recruit workers for Arab military bases in New York City because many of the applicants were likely to be Jews. He suggests that the Midwest would be a better recruiting point.

Such bland approval of discrimination permeates the Departments of Government having jurisdiction, and Mr. Dulles does not protest.

American firms are boycotted by Arab Governments where they have had any relation with Israeli firms.

We ask Mr. Dulles: "What do you intend to do about these deprivations of the rights of our citizens?"

Is it not time for the great United States to assert itself?

Shall we spinelessly continue to permit our rights to be trampled upon?

Our weakness only begets more flagrant and defiant Arabian truculence.

Even a Secretary of State must at times act with courage—even at the expense of the black gold, called oil.

Russia cannot be offered as an excuse. Through past mistakes Russia is already in the Middle East—knee-deep. Cut off Saudi Arabian aid and diplomatic relations would neither help nor hurt Russia.

But at least our honor as a nation would be served. We would not obsequiously accept insults from an oil-soaked potentate.

More astonishing was the attitude of President Eisenhower. He was questioned at a recent press conference whether we were making any effort to persuade Saudi Arabia to abandon its policy of barring American Jews from military service with American Armed Forces in that country. He astounded his audience by saying he had not heard of the matter, but nevertheless he offered the excuse that a sovereign state has "the right to determine if an American is persona non grata and cannot enter." What a humiliating concession to King Saud. Our President apparently sanctions discrimination against our citizenry on a religious basis. Shades of past Presidents. Washington proclaimed that our Government would "give to bigotry no sanction." Presidents Wilson, Taft, Cleveland, Teddy Roosevelt, demonstrated that the principle of religious liberty was applicable in our foreign relations as well as in our domestic affairs.

Let us have a policy based not on weakness but on strength.

In a comparable situation President Wilson argued that the price—of yielding—was too great. He said that "America is not a mere body of traders; it is a body of freedom" and that the greatness of America "is moral not material" and that we must "square our politics with our principles."

Dulles should do no less.

John W. Foster, grandfather of the present Secretary of State, when American Minister to St. Petersburg, made this point unmistakably clear in writing to the acting Russian Minister of Foreign Affairs:

The Secretary of State instructs me to state to Your Excellency that in the presence of the fact that an American citizen has been ordered to leave Russia on no other ground than that he is the professor of a particular creed or the holder of certain religious views, it becomes the duty of the Government of the United States, which impartially seeks to protect all of its citizens of whatever origin or faith * * * to protest * * * insofar as the regulations for the expulsion of foreign Jews from Russia affects American citizens, it is an unjust reflection upon American Jews as a class and a discrimination which cannot be acquiesced in by my Government.

I suggest Mr. Dulles take a leaf out of his grandpa's book.

It is not difficult to find precedent in American history which upheld the principle of opposition against discrimination based on race or creed. In 1879, when Czarist Russia would not honor passports of Americans of Jewish faith, the House of Representatives passed a resolution, declaring:

Rights of citizens of the United States should not be impaired, at home or abroad, because of religious beliefs; and that if the existing treaties between the United States and Russia be found, as is alleged, to discriminate in this or in any other particular, as to any classes of our citizens, the President be requested to take immediate action to have the treaty so amended as to remove the grievance.

In 1885, Secretary of State Thomas F. Bayard declared that the United States was entitled to "ask and expect that no race or class distinction shall be made as regards American citizens abroad." And in 1911, when Russia continued its discrimination against American Jews, the then Secretary of State, Philander Knox, let it be known that the United States was abrogating the 1832 treaty between the two countries.

Abandonment of principles wins no friends. Self-respect is lost and the respect of other nations for the United States is diminished. No man and no nation can afford to be tagged as a "paper moralist." The refusal of the United States Department of State to assert itself in behalf of the rights of American citizens puts us in the position of beggars and we are only embracing the shabby concept that the end justifies the means.

The Supreme Court Under Fire

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WATKINS M. ABBITT
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 28, 1956

Mr. ABBITT. Mr. Speaker, it is apparent to me that people generally are becoming aroused over the way the present so-called Supreme Court of the United States of America is usurping powers and prerogatives which have never been delegated to them by the people, the States, or the Congress.

There appeared in the Richmond Times-Dispatch of Thursday, June 28, 1956, a very strong editorial which points out very cogently the trend of the Court and the awakening of the people to what is happening to them.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I desire to include herewith the editorial above referred to, which is as follows:

THE SUPREME COURT UNDER FIRE

The United States Supreme Court is "under its heaviest fire in a decade," according to an article in the June 25 issue of Time. The magazine notes that "resentment of southern lawyers and laymen over the desegregation decision" is behind much of the criticism, but that "all the concern is not southern," since—

"Many thoughtful observers who are devoutly on the side of desegregation are nagged by a feeling that the decision, as written by (Chief Justice) Warren smacked more of a sociological treatise than a legal document. They believe they see the same signs in other principal Supreme Court opinions of the last term."

For such statements to be made in Time, which is as integrationist as they come, is truly significant. It indicates that the Supreme Court is weaker in public esteem than it has been in a long time, and that many objective observers in the North are strongly questioning various recent findings of that tribunal, under Chief Justice Warren's increasingly liberal leadership.

Over against Time's desegregationist views of the Court let us place those of John Temple Graves, the prosegregationist conservative southern columnist, writing in the July American Mercury. Under the title "The South Won't Surrender," Mr. Graves says in his arresting article:

"The Court's (desegregation) decision having tortured the Constitution, the South is torturing the decision. If any cry shame, the South says the Court has tortured the Constitution's welfare clause, its interstate commerce clause, its 10th amendment, its forgotten 9th, its separation of Federal powers, its fundamental original promise that sovereignties (like education) not granted to Washington should remain in the sovereigns that form the Union."

All this leads to a lessening of confidence in the courts, and for it the courts are primarily to blame. The process had begun before the Supreme Court handed down its 1954 desegregation decision. For example, the late H. L. Mencken says in his just-published book, Minority Report, written perhaps as much as a decade ago:

"The only guaranty of the Bill of Rights which continues to have any force and effect is the one prohibiting quartering troops on citizens in time of peace. All the rest have been disposed of by judicial interpretation and legislative whittling. Probably the worst thing that has happened in America in my time is the decay of confidence in the courts. No one can be sure any more that in a given case they will uphold the plainest mandate of the Constitution. On the contrary, everyone begins to be more or less convinced in advance that they won't. Judges are chosen not because they know the Constitution and are in favor of it, but precisely because they appear to be against it."

And to sum up these observations concerning our courts, and the constant danger that they will undermine the Constitution, instead of upholding it, let us go back to Woodrow Wilson, who once wrote on this subject:

"Every government is a government of men, not of laws, and, of course, the courts of the United States are no wiser or better than the judges who constitute them. A series of bad appointments might easily make them inferior to every other branch of the government in their comprehension of constitutional principles, their perception of constitutional values. But that would be because the government had fallen into wrong hands, and would not invalidate the principle upon which our courts are constituted and empowered."

Is the time approaching, as Wilson feared it might, when our Federal courts are becoming "inferior to every other branch of the Government in their comprehension of constitutional principles"? Recent trends, especially on the highest bench in the land, make the question by no means an idle one.

Medical Aspects of Automobile Crash Injuries and Deaths

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH A. ROBERTS
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 25, 1956

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I include a speech delivered by Dr. Fletcher D. Woodward, of the University of Virginia Hospital, and chairman of the committee on medical aspects of automobile crash injuries and deaths of the American Medical Association. This statement was presented as part of a symposium on the medical aspects of automobile crash injuries and deaths held by the American Medical Association in Chicago, Ill., June 15, 1956. I would also like to have inserted in the RECORD a copy of the resolution adopted at this symposium calling for the establishment of a national foundation for the prevention of crash injuries and deaths. This resolution is now pending before the board of trustees of the house of delegates of the American Medical Association.

There is much valuable information contained in Dr. Woodward's statement regarding action which can be taken to increase the safety features in the manufacture of automobiles—such as safety belts, padded dashboards, and collapsible steering wheels.

As chairman of the special Subcommittee on Traffic Safety, I was pleased to learn of the excellent work being done by the American Medical Association to help stop the waste of 38,000 lives a year on our Nation's highways.

The speech follows:

THE GENERAL MEDICAL ASPECTS OF AUTOMOBILE CRASH INJURIES AND DEATHS

(By Fletcher D. Woodward, M. D., Charlottsville, Va.)

In 1925 there were 20 million automobiles and a death rate of 19 per 100 million miles. In 1956 there were 60 million automobiles but the death rate had been reduced to 6.4—a most gratifying improvement—for otherwise the deaths last year would have been over 100,000 instead of 38,000. The credit for this result is due to the automobile manufacturers, the police, and the many national, State, and local safety organizations whose indefatigable work over the years made this improvement possible.

However, the fact that concerns the doctors who are called upon to pronounce death or to treat these unfortunate victims night and day is that there is also a slow but steady increase in the total number of deaths and injuries each year. In 1946 there were 34,000 deaths; in 1954, 36,000; in 1955, 38,000. These deaths were associated with a comparable increase in injuries which last year numbered well over 1¼ million. If this trend is continued, the National Safety Council estimates that in 1966 there will be 53,000 deaths from 83 million cars and a corresponding increase in injuries.

In a search for the causes of this tragic toll each year, two factors stand out above all the rest—speed and drunken driving—so our energies should be directed to curb these two outstanding killing factors if we are to halt our barbarous progress.

I first became interested in this problem some 8 years ago because my department in the University of Virginia Hospital was responsible for the care of facio-maxillary and jaw injuries which were increasing at an alarming rate. In questioning several hundred patients who were able to give a reason for their injuries, we found that the great majority of those in the front right seat attributed their injury to the head and face to impact against the windshield and dash, those who had injury to the pelvis and legs to impact against the dash, and among the drivers, the majority of serious injuries were to the chest from impact against the steering wheel and post.

These results were impressive enough for me to choose them as a subject for a chairman's address before the section of Laryngology, Rhinology and Otology of the American Medical Association under the title, "A Medical Criticism of Modern Automotive Engineering."[1] The suggestions made in this address, in an effort to reduce the number of casualties regardless of the cause, were well

[1] Medical Criticism of Modern Automotive Engineering. Journal American Medical Association, October 30, 1948, volume 138, pages 627–631.

received by the public and especially by the doctors. Since this article was reprinted in many other journals in this country, Canada, England, and New Zealand, many favorable letters were received which further convinced me that my criticism was fundamentally sound, and I am happy to say that the continuing careful and extensive research done by Mr. John Moore of Cornell and other agencies corroborates these early observations. The physician's first interest in any medical problem is, of course, prevention, and there is no question but that alteration in design will prevent many injuries and deaths. By study of how, where and why these injuries occurred it soon became apparent that prevention was possible in many instances and that research should be directed to that end. A slow but methodical compilation of statistics by individual psysicians, universities and by public and governmental agencies made it apparent that redesign of the machine itself was important. The use of safety belts and body harnesses would also help to prevent the high percentage of injuries to the head, face and legs of the passenger; also, the use of crash paddings on the dash, collapsible steering wheels, safety locks on doors, the eradication of projecting knobs and buttons, the firm anchorage of seats, perhaps higher backs to prevent whiplash neck injury, and many other simple and sensible suggestions have been offered.

I am happy to report that now many of the manufacturers, led by Ford, are studying this problem and installing safety devices on their cars and if the installation of such safety devices can be made competitive instead of size, horsepower, acceleration, and speed, then the many people and agencies responsible for this happy event can sit back and applaud. Otherwise, a Federal agency will be sought to establish and require all manufacturers to meet certain minimum safety requirements. Two bills to this end have been introduced in this session of Congress and many State legislatures are considering similar legislaton.

At present the automobile remains a lethal and crippling agent and since there appears to be little likelihood of accomplishing radical changes in human nature in general and exuberant youth in particular, it would seem the part of wisdom to work for desirable alterations in the machine itself rather than to place all attempts to bludgeon "old Adam" into safer driving practices.

Among the things which we now can employ to reduce this carnage in addition to safety features in the car itself is the control and punishment of the drinking driver. In the State of Virginia last year he was involved in 25 percent of the fatal accidents. To combat this tragic situation apathy on the part of the public, State legislators and judges must be overcome.

My county medical society and others in our State have appealed to the Governor and our legislature to provide that in any criminal prosecution for driving while under the influence of intoxicating liquor the accused or the Commonwealth shall have the right to a determination of the amount of alcohol in the blood of the accused at the time of the alleged offense as shown by a chemical analysis of blood, breath or other bodily substance. Such determinations shall be admissible in evidence together with any competent evidence bearing upon the question of whether or not the defendant was under the influence of intoxicating liquor.

We also requested that they provide for a mandatory jail sentence of at least 24 hours in all cases of conviction of driving while under the influence of intoxicating liquor. However, I am sorry to say that because of a few little men in responsible positions, we were only partially successful in securing the enactment.

The first duty of the physician in the care of those injured is to see that adequate first aid is rendered and that proper transportation is provided. To this end he, in collaboration with the American Red Cross, has developed through the years manuals for the education and guidance of his fellow physicians as well as the layman and the trained lay worker. This phase of medical care along with definitive treatment of the wounded is probably the only good that came out of our recent wars.

The physician's second duty is in the definitive care of the injured and of these results he is justifiably proud. His results in World War II were much better than those in World War I. There was a further improvement during the Korean conflict. Prompt and efficient first aid, better and prompt transportation, the treatment of shock, more blood transfusions, better anesthesia, the use of antibotics to control infection, along with improved surgical techniques, were responsible for this gratifying improvement.

The medical profession, although not self-satisfied with its present-day accomplishments in the care of the wounded, is highly gratified with its results. But, as previously stated, the physicians must also study the medical aspects of automobile crashes in an effort to prevent them and further reduce these increasing injuries. There are no statistics yet available as to the number of crashes caused by medical conditions—if sleep and fatigue are included, perhaps 8 to 10 percent, otherwise perhaps 2 to 3 percent. Still, even 2 percent of a million is 20,000 injuries.

To this end, the American Medical Association is directing a study of the medical aspects of automobile crashes, driver licensure and for the examination of repeat offenders. This study includes a review of the visual, hearing and physical requirements, the incidence of Meniere's disease, petit and grand mal, as well as other diseases of the nervous, cardiovascular and musculo-skeletal systems, physical conditions, drugs, insulin shock and alcohol.

When 1 car in 12 is involved in a serious crash each year, when speed is a factor in approximately one-third of our fatal accidents, when the drinking driver is involved in approximately one-fourth of our fatal accidents, when the automobile death rate as figured in man-years of life lost ranks next to our main killers of cardiovascular disease and cancer, it is indeed time to answer Cain's query and say, "Yes, I am my brother's keeper."

To fulfill this promise, we must first overcome the apathy of the public, our legislators and traffic court judges by education. Second, adequate and stricter laws must be enacted, laws far more severe than any we now have. The speeding and drinking driver can then be curbed by their prompt and impartial administration. Third, safer automobiles must be provided to protect us in crashes which seem to be inevitable. Fourth, a national automotive safety foundation should be set up to study all phases of automobile crashes. This foundation should be financed by funds from governmental agencies, insurance companies and from the automobile and its many allied companies. Crash injuries and deaths would then be studied from many angles such as education, automobile and highway engineering, enforcement, legal, legislative, judicial, and medical aspects. Necessary research could be ordered and financed and duplication of effort avoided. The foundation would serve as a library or repository for all pertinent information and finally as a result of its studies, safety on the highway would become a reality.

A PROPOSAL: A NATIONAL FOUNDATION FOR THE PREVENTION OF CRASH INJURIES AND DEATHS

The purpose of this nonprofit organization would be to receive money and grants from individuals, charitable foundations, governmental services, automobile and allied companies, insurance companies and others. These funds would be utilized for research. It would serve to prevent duplication of effort to underwrite worthy projects. It would also serve to stimulate and guide research in needed channels.

The foundation would also serve as a central repository and clearinghouse for information of all types.

To administer such an organization, it should have a president and one or more vice presidents. These men should be men of national importance and prominence serving without pay; perhaps retired business executives and service officers could be induced to serve.

The treasurer should be a representative from one of the well-known banking institutions for it may well be that our research found could be considerable.

There should be an executive secretary, on salary, for he would bear the burden of the foundation's work. Of course, paid assistants would be necessary.

A board of directors would necessarily include a rather large list of names of men prominent in both national and international affairs.

I next believe we should have an executive committee made up of the officers and the chairmen of the various subcommittees which I will list tentatively:

1. Education aspects: To consider child and adult driving schools, public and private, along with safety education.

2. Legal aspects: To correlate the many State and national laws, insurance requirements, litigation procedures, etc.

3. Legislative: To correlate and modernize the many State and Federal laws which apply.

4. Law enforcement: For uniform punishment, for the administration of chemical tests to establish drunkenness and acceptance of these determinations as evidence.

5. Medical aspects: The AMA to be responsible for all medical aspects of licensure and renewals.

6. Automotive engineering and design: This committee should include medical men.

7. Highway engineering: To correlate highway markings, paints, reflectors, size and shapes of signs, road surfacing, etc.

8. Commercial aspects: Size and shape and illumination of trucks, piggybacking and motor exhaust fumes as examples.

As a result of the work of these committees, certain basic standards of design could be established and all manufacturers would be required to meet these minimum requirements.

Other committees will come to mind, and the work to be done by these groups is vast.

If these ideas appeal to you then steps could be taken to underwrite the exploratory investigation and, if feasible, an organization meeting could be held in Chicago sometime in the near future.

Antarctic Population Boom Predicted

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STUYVESANT WAINWRIGHT
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 27, 1956

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, the enclosed article in a recent issue of the Washington Evening Star concerns the work of the Director of the Brookhaven Laboratory of the Atomic Energy

Commission. This research development center is located in the heart of the First Congressional District of New York on Long Island. Here is an operation, dealing in the field of nuclear physics, which is designed to improve man's status rather than destroy it.

The article follows:

VISTAS IN SCIENCE

(By Thomas R. Henry)

ANTARCTIC POPULATION BOOM PREDICTED

A hitherto uninhabited, and considered uninhabitable, 6 million square miles of the earth's surface will have a population of at least 10,000 during the next 2 years.

This is the prediction of Dr. Lloyd V. Berkner, director of the Brookhaven Laboratory of the Atomic Energy Commission and vice president of the National Research Council's special committee on the International Geophysical Year.

Some of this population of the Antarctic continent probably will be at least semipermanent, forerunning the day when the ice-covered wastes of both polar regions may be rather thickly inhabited.

Up to now the population of the Antarctic never has exceeded more than a few score explorers and scientists at any one time, and these seldom have remained more than a few months. Only 2 or 3 women ever have been there. No child ever has been born there.

The geophysical year settlements in the far South, Dr. Berkner says, will be "the very beginnings of the movement of man into the polar regions on a large scale." Modern engineering and, to some extent medicine, he stressed, have gone far to make possible what would have seemed fantastic a few years ago but many problems remain in the adjustment of man to polar environments.

ASSOCIATE OF BYRD

Dr. Berkner himself is a former Antarctic explorer, an associate of Adm. Richard E. Byrd, who will be in overall charge of the geophysical year program of this country.

"The Antarctic," he recently told the New York Academy of Medicine, "is not nearly as inhospitable as you might suppose. One can live in relative comfort provided preparations are so complete that no accident occurs. But such an environment requires great ingenuity to exist until the land becomes more populous."

Much may be learned from studying the ways of life of the penguin, the only higher animal that has been able to establish itself in the Antarctic wastes. This has involved establishment of a rather highly developed animal society and voluntary personal sacrifice on the part of individuals.

He cited a case when 20 penguins were captured and placed in a wire enclosure to be brought back to the United States. The next morning there was only one penguin in the pen. Others were captured and placed in the enclosure. Again the next morning only one was left—but the wire was much too high for any of the birds to jump over. Again the pen was filled with penguins and watched all night. It was found that one bird was climbing on another's back to escape. But the last one always had to remain—presumably a volunteer.

"Only within our lifetimes," Dr. Berkner said, have the polar regions of the earth had an impact on man's consciousness. Within the next century, under the force of population pressures, both the Arctic and Antarctic most certainly will be populated, probably quite heavily."

The Antarctic population predicted by Dr. Berkner during the next 2 years will be international—American, British, French, Russian, and Norwegian—and will occupy the numerous observation stations. Americans will constitute the majority.

A Commendable Action

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALT HORAN

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 28, 1956

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, under the privilege granted me to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I am pleased to include a release by the Department of Interior. I feel it is commendable.

COMPETITIVE BIDDING BRINGS INDIAN PROPERTY OWNERS FOURFOLD BONUS FOR URANIUM MINING LEASE

Because of competitive interest in their property, two Indians of the Spokane Reservation in Washington have recently been offered a $317,000 bonus for a 15-year mining lease on their 120-acre tract in comparison with an offer of about one-fourth this amount which they wanted to accept several months ago, Commissioner of Indian Affairs Glenn L. Emmons pointed out today.

The case, he added, emphasizes the significance of the trustee role performed by the Bureau of Indian Affairs and the importance of considering the competitive factor before completing lease arrangements on Indian properties.

Commissioner Emmons' comment was prompted by a bid opening made June 11 at the Colville Indian Agency, Nespelem, Wash. The bids were for mining leases on four allotments of the Spokane Reservation owned by various members of the Boyd family of Indians.

Interest in all of these allotments, especially the one drawing the high bonus offer, has been unusually keen since uranium was discovered on nearby property in the fall of 1954.

All four of the allotments were advertised for bids in June 1955, at the request of the Indian owners. At that time the high bid on the outstanding tract, which is identified as allotment No. 156, was $167,850. The Indian owners, however, refused to sign a lease with the high bidder and insisted that they be permitted to negotiate with the second high bidder who had offered a bonus of $87,100. This negotiation proposal was presented to the Bureau last January and was rejected in favor of further advertising.

"Because of the competitive interest in the property," Commissioner Emmons explained, "the Bureau of Indian Affairs did not accede to the wishes of the owners in this case. As administrators of the Federal trusteeship for Indian property of this kind, we had a clear obligation to act in the best interests of the Indian owners regardless of their own feelings in the matter. We believed strongly that competitive bidding would produce the best results for the Indians and our judgment has obviously been borne out by the results of the recent opening."

Since the Bureau refused to approve a negotiated lease, and the Indians refused to sign with the high bidder, all bids received in June 1955, were eventually rejected and the recent offering was made only after the Indian owners had given the local Indian Bureau superintendent powers of attorney to sign a lease on their behalf with the high bidder.

The high bidder on all four allotments was Dawn Mining Co., of Portland, Oreg., which also holds leasing rights on the adjoining tribal property where the Midnite Mine is located. Bonuses offered on two of the other allotments were $2,500 each and on the third $17,500.

In addition to the bonuses, the Indian property owners will receive annual rentals of $1 per acre and royalties on a sliding scale ranging from 10 to 20 percent of the mine value dry ton of the ore received.

The Congress of the United States Has Made a Most Worthy Contribution in Race Relations by Authorizing the Coinage of Booker T. Washington Commemorative Half Dollars—They Received the Greatest Public Acceptance in the History of Commemorative Coins, Therefore Continued Legislation Is Justified

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH SCOTT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 26, 1956

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, in endorsing the provisions of H. R. 9677 and other identical bills recently introduced to authorize the coinage of 50-cent pieces in connection with the celebration of the centennial anniversary of the birth of Booker T. Washington, as continued legislation, I have in mind the great service rendered by Booker T. Washington to his own people and to the Nation as a whole.

For the past 10 years a group of people devoted to building good will and headed by Sidney J. Phillips, president of the Booker T. Washington Centennial Commission, has worked very effectively to perpetuate the ideals and teachings of Booker T. Washington—particularly those dealing with understanding and harmony among Americans of different races.

Since May 1954 there have been tensions in our land among the peoples, and between the races—tensions that definitely indicate the need for a program or programs, specifically designed to promote greater good will among our people.

I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD a memorandum from Mr. Sidney J. Phillips, president, Booker T. Washington Centennial Commission, telling why a Booker T. Washington centennal half dollar should be reminted by melting down 100,000 Booker T. Washington half dollars, through continued legislation under the authority of the act of August 7, 1946—Sixtieth United States Statutes at Large, page 863, Public Law 610, 69th Congress—and enacted into law by July 4, 1956, the 75th anniversary of commencement of his work, and which would provide funds for carrying out a nationwide good will building program as a part of the 100th anniversary celebration of the birth of Booker T. Washington.

The Congress of the United States has made a most worthy contribution in race relations by authorizing the coinage of Booker T. Washington commemorative

half dollars—they received the greatest public acceptance in the history of commemorative coins; therefore, continued legislation is justified.

WHY A BOOKER T. WASHINGTON CENTENNIAL HALF DOLLAR SHOULD BE REMINTED BY MELTING DOWN 100,000 BOOKER T. WASHINGTON HALF DOLLARS, THROUGH CONTINUED LEGISLATION UNDER THE AUTHORITY OF THE ACT OF AUGUST 7, 1946 (60 STAT. 863, PUBLIC LAW 610, 69TH CONGRESS), AND ENACTED INTO LAW BY JULY 4, 1956, THE 75TH ANNIVERSARY OF COMMENCEMENT OF HIS WORK, AND WHICH WOULD PROVIDE FUNDS FOR CARRYING OUT A NATIONWIDE GOODWILL BUILDING PROGRAM AS A PART OF THE 100TH ANNIVERSARY CELEBRATION OF THE BIRTH OF BOOKER T. WASHINGTON

1. The Federal Government has issued 52 commemorative coins. The last of these under authority of Public Law 610, was issued in tribute to the character of Booker T. Washington and in recognition of his services not only to the people of his race but to the Nation as a whole.

2. In this, the centennial year of his birth, the Government has issued a Booker T. Washington centennial 3-cent postage stamp, and has also authorized the creation of a national monument out of the plantation on which he was born in Virginia, for the inspiration of all American youth and as a symbol of freedom and opportunity for all, of which America is the outstanding example in all the world.

3. Through legislation continuing the provisions of Public Law 610, a redesign of the Booker T. Washington commemorative half dollar was authorized in 1951 to bear the likeness of George Washington Carver, famed Negro scientist and associate of Booker T. Washington, in connection with the creation of a national monument out of the plantation in Missouri on which George Washington Carver was born.

4. These coins by public sale laid the foundation for the program to preserve that site and perpetuate the ideals and teachings of Booker T. Washington, as demonstrated in a life-time of service devoted to the progress of his own people and the building of cooperation and goodwill between the races in all parts of the country.

5. The public distribution of the Booker T. Washington commemorative half dollars made possible the most successful operation of its kind in history of commemorative coins. The 2,885,271 Booker T. Washington coins outsold by nearly 400,000 the sales of the Great Columbian Exposition issue with all of its vast publicity, unparalleled Federal backing, and the added influence of a world fair (2,498,300 Columbian Exposition coins sold). The Booker T. Washington issue surpassed in sales by nearly 50,000 pieces the next 11 highest issues (combined sales, 2,837,006); and doubled by more than 400,000 the combined sales of the other 39 commemorative coin issues. (Total of the 39 issues, 1,293,000.)

6. The net profit to the Treasury Department from issues of the Booker T. Washington commemorative coins has been nearly one million dollars. But more than any financial yield to the Government is the significant service to the American people of all races and to the cause of democracy the world over in thus paying tribute to a humble slave-born American who set in operation a great program of social and economic advancement for underprivileged peoples throughout the world. This result alone justifies whatever departure is involved in administrative or operating policies of the Government.

7. As a capstone to these activities extending now over a period of more than 10 years the Federal Government is now asked to extend the original legislation of 1946 (Public Law 610) to authorize the reminting of 100,000 coins of the Carver-Washington issue now in reserve in the form of a centennial half dollar to mark the 100th anniversary of the birth of Booker T. Washington. This would finance a continuing program throughout the centennial year, sponsored by the Booker T. Washington Centennial Commission that will revive in the minds of all Americans the program, policies, procedures, and philosophies of Booker T. Washington, both for the continued progress of his people, who represent one-tenth of the population of our country, and for advocating his policies and philosophy of race relations at this critical time in the history of our own country and in the history of the nations of the world.

8. At a time when almost incalculable sums are being spent for the maintenance of peace and the promotion of understanding and goodwill among the nations and peoples of the world, it would be wise statesmanship to encourage here in our country a monument which has demonstrated over a period of 75 years its effectiveness in reducing conflicts between the races here at home and its soundness in promoting the advancement of that segment of our population that has had the longest and hardest road to travel toward the goal of American citizenship.

9. For this purpose the Government is not called upon to appropriate any funds, to set up any organization, nor to pass any new legislation. The Congress is requested only to further extend the original law that there may continue a program whose value has been proven and to which the country has given a support unequaled by any similar movement.

10. To authorize the reminting of these 100,000 coins, the premium proceeds from which shall be used in observing the centennial of Booker T. Washington, will bring to a climax a movement which honors a great American and helps to perpetuate through the media of radio, television, press, and informative literature the aims and ideals to which he dedicated his life.

11. July 4, 1956, will mark the 75th year since the commencement of Booker T. Washington's work, for on this date in 1881 he organized the Tuskegee Normal Institute which was to become the center of his activity. The favorable report by the committee and the enactment and approval of the legislation before July 4, therefore, would be an appropriate tribute on this significant anniversary.

As a feature of the year-long celebration in observing the 100th anniversary of the birth of Booker T. Washington, the Booker T. Washington Centennial Commission will sponsor, July 4, a mammoth picnic and celebration on the United States land use project near Tuskegee which more than 10,000 are expected to attend. We should like then to announce the enactment of law providing for this Booker T. Washington centennial half dollar, the premiums from the sale of which will make funds available to carry on a nationwide good will building program to assist in reducing racial tension based on the philosophy of Booker T. Washington.

Plea for Consideration of Cyprus Issue

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MARGUERITE STITT CHURCH
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 28, 1956

Mrs. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I would like to include the enclosed strong plea for consideration of the Cyprus issue by the United Nations from the recent grand president of the Daughters of Penelope, Miss Adeline J. Geo-Karis. Miss Geo-Karis is a distinguished attorney and outstanding American in the 13th Congressional District of Illinois, which I have the honor to represent.

The letter follows:

JUNE 14, 1956.

MRS. MARGUERITE STITT CHURCH,
Thirteenth District, Illinois,
Congress of the United States,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MRS. CHURCH: On March 26, 1955, I went to Europe as commander of the Daughters of Penelope section of the AHEPA (American Hellenic Educational Progressive Association) annual excursion to Greece. At that time I was grand president of the Daughters of Penelope, which is the senior auxiliary of AHEPA, and has had about 15,000 women initiated into its order, with almost 300 chapters in the United States, Alaska, Nassau, Bahamas, Brisbane (Australia), Canada, and Athens (Greece).

One of my purposes on this trip was to visit the Island of Cyprus. Cyprus is an island midway between Greece and Turkey and contains a population of approximately 500,000 people, 80 percent of whom are of Greek descent. The people of Cyprus by great majorities in the past have voted to be permitted self-rule free from the British yoke which has been enforced upon them since 1878. I met with the State Department of America on March 9, 1955, before I sailed for Europe to ascertain the position our State Department wished us to have on this item, inasmuch as I did not feel we should take any further stand on the question without proper guidance from our American State Department. The State Department told me that it appreciated my interest in complying with the desires of our United States in the matter, and further, that the United States had no intention to hurt the people of Cyprus, but unfortunately, conditions at this time were not favorable to an active assertion for or against Cyprus in view of the Atlantic Treaty. I mentioned then that I planned to visit Cyprus and asertain whether or not the people were as well off as British sources had stated to me. I did visit Cyprus and investigated things on my own. In the meantime, Great Britain made a strong statement to the press in May 1955, that Cyprus had desired, but would never be permitted self-rule or union with Grooce, as Cyprus had desired, through the overwhelming majority of its people. I can truthfully say that conditions in Cyprus today, from my observations, are not the type that will permit the people of Cyprus to wait much longer for a chance to be heard for self-rule or union with Greece before the United Nations. I am afraid that if this matter is not heard soon in the United Nations, and if Great Britain is not curbed in her autocratic rule of Cyprus, there will be much bloodshed, which can easily be averted by a proper hearing before the United Nations. Communist Russia is too sympathetic toward the plight of the Cyprians, which might militate against our interest, if America and her allies do not encourage an expeditious and fair hearing on the Cyprus question before the United Nations. I could not help but feel the tremendous undercurrent existing in the minds of the people of Cyprus. As one Cyprian put it to me when I reminded him that if the British were to leave Cyprus, they would be leaving with their capital assets which might be a detriment to Cyprians, he said: "It is better for us to live 10 years

in deprivation with the rule with which we choose to live rather than 1 year with luxury and under a rule which we do not desire." American prestige has been high in Greece, because the United States has long been considered as being the only country to help destitute European countries without ulterior motive. It hurts me to think that this prestige is endangered by the autocratic tactics of the British Government in re Cyprus.

I do feel that Cyprus is entitled to a fair hearing before the United Nations in order to preserve and maintain our high American standards of fair play and democratic action, irrespective of the size or formidability of the nation asking for such a hearing, and your consideration for such a hearing would be greatly appreciated.

Thank you for your attention in this matter.

Sincerely,

A. J. GEO-KARIS.

Rising Parity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD C. OSTERTAG
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 28, 1956

Mr. OSTERTAG. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include in the RECORD an editorial from the New York Times of June 26, 1956, with respect to farm prices. The editorial calls attention to the fact that the decline in farm prices, which began during the Truman administration, and continued, though at a far slower rate, under this administration, has at last been reversed. In the period between last December and mid-May, the price index for farm products rose 20 points. While farm costs have also risen, the income rise has been greater, with the result that the parity ratio stands today at 85, 5 points above last November's ratio.

It is a source of satisfaction to the entire country that this beneficial trend has begun. As the soil bank becomes a reality, we may look forward, I believe, to the progressive reduction of surpluses and the progressive improvement of our farm economy.

The editorial from the Times follows:

RISING FARM PARITY RATIO

When, just about a year ago, anti-Administration forces began to concentrate their attention and their political activity on the plight of American agriculture they placed particular stress on the "price squeeze" to which the farmer was being subjected. The things the farmer had for sale, it was pointed out, had been steadily declining under the present administration, while he was compelled to pay increasingly higher prices for the things he bought.

It was true enough that, at the time this campaign was launched, farm prices were declining. But as persons who took the trouble to consult the figures frequently pointed out, the decline of farm prices wasn't ushered in with the election of Mr. Eisenhower. It had been in progress for nearly 2 years when the latter took office, and in those 2 years (following the inflation that accompanied the fighting in Korea) had been decidedly more severe than anything since that time.

As for the argument that a year ago at this time the farmer was being squeezed between declining prices for his products and mounting prices of nonfarm commodities: It is true that throughout the latter half of 1955 so-called industrial wholesale prices were advancing while wholesale farm prices were declining. But when we turn to the Department of Agriculture's figures designed specifically to show how prices paid by farmers compare with the prices he receives we find that it was not until December that this upturn in wholesale industrial prices was reflected in the farmer's cost of living. But in December farm prices themselves turned up correspondingly. The result was that the parity ratio (that is, the ratio of farm prices to nonfarm prices), which had stood at 80 percent in November, was still 80 percent in December.

Since that time, however, the farmer has not only held his own, as measured in terms of the parity ratio, but has improved his position measurably. The parity index (which is a measure of the prices he pays, weighted for such elements as taxes, interest and wage rates) rose from 278 in mid-December to 286 in mid-May, or by 8 points. But in the same period the index of prices for his own products rose from 222 to 242, or by 20 points, or 9 percent. In consequence, the farmer's parity ratio has now climbed back to 85.

Eighty-five percent of parity is not, of course, 100 percent. But when one considers that this improvement has now been in progress for 6 months, and that May was the first month in almost 4 years when farm prices weren't lower than a year earlier, one would seem to be justified in the belief that the worst of this postinflationary readjustment may at last be behind us.

Sir Oliver Franks Appraises Mr. Truman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STEWART L. UDALL
OF ARIZONA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 25, 1956

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, too often we are so close to our national leaders that we cannot view them in true perspective. The mellowing process of time is the most essential adjunct of the historian, but in the short run the best substitute available is detachment. Therefore, when we try to appraise the worth of men in political life, it is particularly valuable to have the views of observers who were aloof from the political currents of the time.

Such an observer is the former British Ambassador, Sir Oliver Franks, who recently wrote an article about former President Harry S. Truman for a British magazine, the Listener.

I think the judgment of history will be that Mr. Truman was a great President of the United States—

Sir Oliver wrote. I commend this article—in which he explains the reasons which informed his judgment—to our colleagues:

[From the Washington Post and Times Herald of June 24, 1956]

SIR OLIVER SALUTES A "GREAT" TRUMAN

What sort of man is Harry S Truman? Mr. Truman was President of the United States for more than 7½ years. Was he a great President, or average, or an indifferent one?

Do you remember when Mr. Truman ceased to be President in January 1953, and went home to Independence, Mo. A reporter asked him what he did on his first day at home. He replied: "I took the suitcases up to the attic." One gets an impression of simplicity of manner, directness of speech, a practical man who when he has finished one thing gets on with the next.

I saw Mr. Truman from time to time while I was in America and I do not think this is a mistaken impression. At first sight he seems an ordinary man, an ordinary American, an ordinary American from the river valley of the Mississippi and Missouri.

I think the judgment of history will be that Mr. Truman was a great President of the United States. When I say this, I am not thinking of Mr. Truman's domestic policies: I am not competent to judge these. As President and Chief Executive of the Nation, he was also the leader of the Democratic Party. And the Americans take their party politics strenuously; many millions of them were strongly for Mr. Truman and many millions were equally strongly against him.

But I am talking about something different—Mr. Truman as the leader of the American people in world affairs.

So there is a puzzle. If I am right, Mr. Truman must be an extraordinary as well as an ordinary man. What are the qualities of character and mind which mark him out from most of us? We get little guidance from the way in which he came to be President. He was suddenly picked, to his own surprise, as vice presidential candidate by Mr. Roosevelt in the 1944 campaign.

The news of it reached Mr. Truman from the national chairman of the Democratic Party, Bob Hannegan. He was shown a note from Mr. Roosevelt on a page torn out of a scribbling pad: "Bob, it's Truman, F. D. R." And no one then considered the candidate for Vice President as a man likely in less than a year to become President of the United States."

In the last few months, Mr. Truman has published two volumes of memoirs covering the years in which he was President. The first volume, called "Year of Decision," deals with 1945, the ending of the war in Europe and Asia, the birth of the United Nations, the dropping of the atomic bomb, and the Potsdam Conference. Volume II takes in the years 1946 to 1952, "The Years of Trial and Hope," Mr. Truman calls them.

It seemed to me as I read this account of his stewardship that I became clearer about the answer to the puzzle; I began to have a fairly definite idea about the qualities Mr. Truman brought to the office of President. I got it more from the second volume than from the first, perhaps because it was only after 1945, with all its thronging problems, that the President had a chance to develop his positive policies about the postwar world.

I feel, too, that the office brought out the man and that the President grew in stature by living with and facing the responsibilities of that solitary position. Perhaps I have a better recollection of the years of my tour of duty in the United States. At all events, the impression I want to convey to you about Mr. Truman derives from the period of volume II.

It is no good approaching the American system of Government with our own traditional ideas of the collective responsibility of the Cabinet or of the position of the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs. The American Constitution places on one man, the President, the authority and the responsibility for charting the course of the United States in its complex relations with other countries.

The President must lead and decide. No doubt he is limited in the exercise of these

powers. He is the elected Chief Executive of a democracy, and the Constitution provides plenty of checks and balances. He must lead so that he will be followed, if he is to be effective. In many things he must seek and find the support of the Congress. He must command his policies to the American people. But the fact remains: leadership and positive decision rests with the President.

Mr. Truman, as President, had extraordinary powers of decision. This is not a common gift. The capacity to decide is rare.

The temptation is always to fight the difficult decisions, to fight them off. So often all the possible courses seem risky and unpleasant. It is not easy to get the facts clear to foresee what the consequences of particular decisions will be. Making decisions on foreign affairs in times of crisis is hard work for men of great courage. Mr. Truman has this capacity to decide, with all the endowment of moral courage and sheer hard work that it implies.

Think back for one moment to the decision that lay behind General Marshall's speech at Harvard in June, 1947, Ernest Bevin was an early riser: he heard a report of that speech before breakfast in Carlton House Gardens. He was able to give the Foreign Office the news.

As he listened, the first thought that came into his mind was not that this gave a prospect of American economic help for Europe. He saw that, and grasped the chance with both hands: but first came the realization that his chief fear had been banished for good. The Americans were not going to do as they had done after the first World War and retreated into their hemisphere. They had enlarged their horizon and their understanding of the interests of the United States to take in the Atlantic and several hundred millions of Europeans who lived beyond it. The keystone of Bevin's foreign policy had swung into place.

Bevin was right. All this, and more, lay behind the decision: a view about the Soviet Union and the future course of Soviet policy; a political and strategic judgment on the importance of Europe to the United States; a strong practical desire to help friends who had suffered more, and more directly, from the war than the Americans; a judgment on the extent to which the American people would be ready to tax themselves to give reality to this new American foreign policy in times of peace.

But there were other major decisions, some of which included a judgment on the risks of general war. There was the momentous one in the spring of 1947 about Greece and Turkey, called the Truman Doctrine. "It must," said the President, "be the policy of the United States to support free peoples who are resisting attempted subjugation by armed minorities or by outside pressures."

Then there was, jointly with us, the decision on the Berlin airlift. It was Mr. Truman who took the decision on the American side to negotiate and enter into the Atlantic Pact. He also decided, under the authority of the United Nations, to take the lead in meeting aggression in Korea in June 1950. Later on came the decision to relieve Gen. MacArthur of his command.

As we look back, we can see that Mr. Truman led the United States in these years to an entirely new view of its interests and responsibilities in the world. By now we are accustomed to it all and rather take it for granted. In fact, this astonishing change came about in a series of conscious and deliberate decisions on policy. The President made them. They were then debated and often hotly contested. But the American people followed him. Just imagine anyone in the twenties or thirties telling us that American foreign policy would change and develop like this by mid-century. We should have laughed at him.

What other qualities did Mr. Truman possess as President? I will name three.

First, a broad historical sense. Mr. Truman has read and reflected on a great deal of history, foreign and domestic. "Reading history," he says in his memoirs, "to me was far more than a romantic adventure. It was solid instruction and wise teaching which I somehow felt I wanted and needed. * * * It seemed to me that if I could understand the true facts about the growth and development of the United States Government and could know the details of the lives of its Presidents and political leaders, I would be getting for myself a valuable part of the total education which I hoped to have some day." History, I am sure, gave depth and strength to Mr. Truman's decisions.

Next I put his practical knowledge of American public and political life. He knew, far better than most Presidents, what had to be done to win acceptance for a policy, what steps had to be taken to translate a decision on policy into effective action. This knowledge came largely out of his own experience. He administered Jackson County in Missouri for 12 years, for 10 years he was a Senator in Washington. All this came to his aid when he set about changing the course of the United States in foreign affairs.

Lastly, he inspired loyalty and respect among his advisers. During almost the whole of the time of which I am speaking, President Truman had as his principal advisers on foreign policy, as successive Secretaries of State, General Marshall and Dean Acheson. Both are men of great distinction. They have adorned the public life of their country.

General Marshall and Dean Acheson are very different in type, training, and temperament from Mr. Truman. Yet they were glad to give him wholehearted service. The quality of his decisions owes a great deal to their skilled help.

These, I think, are the qualities which enabled Mr. Truman to lead the United States in this revolution in foreign policy which we now take for granted. Because of them he was able, when the call so unexpectedly came, to become a great President. They do not contradict the first impression.

In the memoirs, when he tells how he made his decisions, he remains simple in manner, direct of speech, a man who likes his fellows and is glad to meet them. It is one of the merits of democracy that it can train ordinary men to develop uncommon quality when called upon to rule.

Address by Edward G. Bern, Vice Presiden, Traffic and Sales, of Panagra (Pan American-Grace Airways) to the World Trade Club of Denver on May 22, 1956

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. DODD

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 23, 1956

Mr. DODD. Mr. Speaker, inter-American relationships, both cultural and economic, are becoming increasingly important largely because of the expansion of civil aviation after the last world war. The neighboring countries to the south are no longer remote and relatively inaccessible to Americans; Latin America is now only a few short hours from the United States by air, and the growing volume of commerce between the Americas is impressive.

Many of the Latin-American countries are underdeveloped economically and are now entering an era of tremendous growth and development that is important to the United States. American investment capital and technical know-how will be a vital factor in this expansion, and will be offered in a spirit of friendliness and mutual cooperation. In these days of world tension and conflict, our fine relationship with Latin-America stands out in bold relief, and the prospect for the future is bright.

Under leave granted, I insert a recent address by Mr. Edward G. Bern, vice president of Pan American-Grace Airways:

Mr. President, distinguished guests, ladies, and gentlemen, it is always a pleasure to be here in Denver. But tonight it is not only a pleasure but a great honor to be here at the annual dinner of the World Trade Club of Denver and asked to speak to such a distinguished audience. I have been coming to Denver now for as long as I can remember, and I still enjoy the fresh mountain air, the beautiful scenery, and I like the people.

As I look back now, I remember the first time I came to this lovely city back in 1926. It was to pick up an Eagle Rock airplane which was made right here in Denver. Now, 30 years later, I'm back in Denver and still in the flying business. But this time I'm not buying planes. As a matter of fact, I'm not even buying. I'm trying to sell an idea. And the idea which I would like to get across to you tonight is that we've got to look south—to Latin America.

I have just come back from a tour of practically all of the Latin American countries. I make several of these tours each year. And I can tell you in all sincerity that this continent is on the threshold of one of the greatest industrial and economic booms of our time. It is a new frontier for American enterprise, one that holds as much promise for United States businessmen as the Golden West did for our pioneering forefathers.

No other area in the world holds greater promise for economic development and profitable venture than Latin America. It is a continent bursting with opportunities. Everywhere you look there are new buildings going up, roads being built, mines being dug, jungles and forests giving way to farms and industry.

Latin America is the fastest growing continent in the world. Since the end of the last world war its general economic activity has been expanding at the rate of almost 5½ percent a year.

Almost three times larger than the United States in area, Latin America is growing at such a fantastic pace that its population of 174 million is expected to reach 275 million by 1975. In other 50 years it will hit the 500 million mark. Let's have them as friends instead of enemies.

As most of you here know, we buy and sell more to Latin America than to any other area in the world. We do over $7 billion worth of trade with these countries each year and by 1975 this business will be up to $14 billion.

While these statistics are impressive, the growth and development in agriculture and mining in some of these countries has been just as impressive.

Everywhere industry is on the rise. More of our machinery is finding its way to these countries, much of it is being made right here in Colorado—by the Denver Equipment Co., the Gardner-Denver Co., the Mine &

Smelter Supply Co., and others. And more of her young graduates from your mining colleges are finding their way and their future in Latin America. And we hope that more of them will.

Our own experience in Latin America goes back a long time. The Grace Co., which has a 50-percent interest in Panagra, has been doing business there for over 100 years. Pan American Airways, our other half, was the first United States airline to start scheduled continued service to Latin America. So I think we can speak about this area with some measure of authority.

To give you some idea of the development taking place in Latin America today and the part American industry is playing in it, let me cite a few for instances. Last year, Glenn McCarthy brought in a successful oil well in Bolivia, and the Williams Brothers of Tulsa are building a pipeline from the interior of this landlocked country to the Chilean coast several hundreds of miles away. The Gulf Oil Co. has signed a 40-year contract for the exploration, development, and transportation of oil from Bolivia. United States Steel is mining iron ore in Venezuela. Floyd Odlum is planning to develop Argentina's oil and uranium resources. The LeTourneau Corporation of Texas is building an all-weather highway into the interior of Peru that will open up this area to colonization.

Let me give you some idea of the money being invested by United States firms in Latin America. American & Foreign Power plans to spend more than $500 million on new plants in Latin America within the next 5 years and also install 3 atomic powerplants. The Anaconda Copper Co. and the Braden Copper Co. have announced they will invest about $94 million in mining installations in Chile. W. R. Grace & Co. has already invested $24 million and plans to invest another $40 million in the construction of new chemical and industrial plants in Brazil within the next 5 years. Sears Roebuck has already invested over $33 million in new stores throughout Latin America and is showing these countries how to make local products for their stores that are up to United States standards and can be merchandised in their stores.

These are but a few of the ripples in this tremendous wave of industrialization which is now sweeping Latin America. And while it is true that there are only about half as many workers in industry in this vast area as there are in the United States, and that greater capital investment, more machinery, and improved techniques are generally needed to raise the level of production efficiency, I can't help feeling optimistic about the future.

The Latin American market is changing so rapidly that within the next 20 years these countries will be producing their own automobiles and farm machinery as well as other manufactured goods which they now must import.

Today, there are about 2,000 United States companies doing business in Latin America. And thousands of different United States products are being imported by these countries. Yet, for every American manufacturer who is now exporting to Latin America there are hundreds in the same fields who are not.

On the other hand, foreign competition is getting keener all the time. The British, the Germans, the French, the Swiss, and the Japanese—to mention but a few of the more active nations—are now moving into Latin America with cheaper prices, easier credit terms and immediate delivery. Even the Russians are getting into the act. Only last week, low-priced Soviet-made automobiles and trucks were put on display in Buenos Aires.

The Russian move, of course, is in line with the new Soviet policy of trying to win friends and influence people by suspending the cold war in favor of engaging the United States in an economic and political contest on various fronts. Their motive is propaganda instead of profit so we can expect that they will try to extend their campaign throughout Latin America no matter what the cost. But the competition we are now getting from other friendlier nations doing business in Latin America, while not as dangerous, may be just as serious. As their trade missions roam Latin America spreading good will and picking up orders, United States goods are being replaced by products from these countries with distressing consistency. Yet, in spite of it all, Latin Americans are still buying from us because they have come to prefer American products.

Usually when we think of Latin America we think in terms of what is produced there—coffee, cocoa, sugar, tin, bananas—rather than in terms of what this growing hemisphere needs—machinery, manufactured goods, technical advice and know-how and capital.

You begin to get a better idea of the importance of Latin America as a market for our goods when you realize that some of these countries buy more from us than do our traditional European customers. Last year our exports to Colombia were greater than our sales to either France or Italy. So were our exports to Mexico, Cuba, Brazil, and Venezuela. Mexico and the Central American countries together purchased more United States goods than were imported by Great Britain and all the Scandinavian countries.

I believe that within the next quarter century, the Latin American nations will become one of the most prominent and prosperous areas in the world. God gave them everything. All we have to do is show them how to use it.

Looking not too far ahead, I believe that by 1960 a resident of Denver will be able to drive down the Inter-American highway to Panama, Colombia, Chile, Ecuador, Peru, Argentina, Brazil, and the other South American countries on their vacation. Or if he is in a hurry, he will be able to fly in a 120-passenger jet transport that will enable him to have breakfast in Denver, lunch in Lima, and dinner in Buenos Aires that same evening.

Back in 1924 I made a speech in Kansas City, where I said we would soon be flying planes that would carry as many as 50 people at 30,000 feet. The next day the Kansas City Star said it thought the heat had affected Mr. Bern.

If you think that maybe the altitude is affecting me now or that I'm just daydreaming, just think back 25 years ago and compare then and now. Denver then was several days away from New York, and a trip between Colorado and Peru was practically unheard of. Denver is now the hub of an aerial network of routes that places it within short hours of any key city in this country, and a trip to South America is not so out of the ordinary. It used to take us 11 days to fly from the United States to Argentina back in 1928 when Panagra started operations. We make the trip from New York to Buenos Aires today in only 22 hours.

By 1960, when we get our jets, flying time between these two points will be cut in half, and a flight from Denver to the Argentine capital will be less than 12 hours. Imagine what atomic powered supersonic planes or whatever we will be flying in another 10 or 20 years will be able to do to this distance or to this rapidly shrinking world. It's something to think about.

You begin to wonder if the airplane with its disdain for distances and natural boundaries is not really the instrument of peace that it was intended to be. For in a sense the airlines of the free world, flying peoples of all races and creeds to the four corners of the globe, are bringing us closer to that common goal of a world brotherhood of nations living in peace and harmony. Mass air travel may prove more significant to the destiny of the world than all the atomic explosions put together.

In the brief span of half a century since the Wright brothers invented the airplane at Kitty Hawk, we have seen a development without parallel in the transportation history of the world. In this hemisphere, we have the finest air transportation system anywhere. To continue to serve the American people in the coming jet age, the scheduled airlines of the United States have already committed themselves to buy one and a half billion dollars' worth of new aircraft equipment. Our airports are also being rapidly improved and expanded all over the Nation in anticipation of the expected increase in traffic. The new Stapleton airport which you have here is a magnificent example of this, a credit to your city and a tribute to your foresight. It may someday become an important midwest link with Latin America.

The Latin American countries are today surging ahead rapidly to economic prosperity. As far as we Americans are concerned not only are these countries important to us but the truth is that the United States and Latin America have a mutual interdependence, geographically, historically, and economically, which should be clearly obvious to all of us.

We all know that the dollar shortage in some of these countries have made it necessary for them to impose restrictions which curtail our trade with them. And that this shortage exists because Latin America does not sell enough goods for dollars. What can we do about it?

The answer is obvious. We must buy more goods and services from them. We must help them to find new sources of products for which there is today an unsatisfied demand in the United States, and new markets for products that are not now being imported. We must channel new development capital there. And, above all, we must try to increase the volume of our travel to these countries. We must export more tourist dollars.

Tourism could be Latin America's greatest source of dollars which they need to purchase our goods and machinery. It already is a principal industry in Mexico, Cuba, and some of the islands in the Caribbean area. But only a small percentage of the more than two million Americans who will travel abroad this year know of the many attractions in the rest of the Central and South American nations and the ease with which you can travel there. That's why I took the liberty of bringing copies of our booklet How to Get the Most Out of Your Trip to South America, and had them placed at your table.

In all the years I have been in the aviation industry, I have never received a complaint from a tourist expressing a dislike for the people or the countries. Some of my closest acquaintances are people who have traveled to South America on our tours. And I would also like to add that in all my travels in these countries I have never met a man I didn't like. I know that they feel the same way about us. The junior ambassadors that we brought here to Denver on a goodwill tour of the United States about 3 years ago, have become this city's best boosters in their respective countries. I want to thank you for the courtesy that your city and State extended to these boys.

Most people think of South America as a place to go for oddities and Indians if they have the time and money to afford it and usually take off for some more expensive and crowded retreat in Florida or the Caribbean, when actually there are just as good places in South America to spend a restful vacation for a lot less money.

For instance, very few people know that you can ski high in the Andes in the middle of our summer, or that some of the finest fresh-water and deep-sea fishing can be found in the lakes and coastal waters of

Chile and Peru, practically the year around. And, while we're talking about fishing, let me tell you that 20-pound rainbow trout are not uncommon down there. Senator HICKENLOOPER of Iowa landed a 34½-pound rainbow trout in Lake Titicaca a couple of years ago, and there are reports of even bigger ones. As for deep-sea fishing, the biggest fish ever caught on rod and reel, a black marlin weighing 1,560 pounds, was taken off Cabo Blanco, Peru, in 1953, and practically every gamefish record has been broken in these waters off the coast of Chile and Peru.

It is a known fact that living can be less expensive in most of these countries than in the United States. The airplane has shortened distances in this hemisphere to a matter of hours and made possible 2-week vacations. I would even go so far as to say that outstanding tourist attractions, scenic wonders, an ideal climate, fine hotels, good food, and low prices make most of these countries the best travel buy dollar for dollar anywhere in the world.

We recently introduced year-around excursion fares, which reduce by 30 percent the cost of a round-trip airplane ticket to the so-called far-away lands on the southern continent and puts these countries within the reach of a greater number of American tourists. These low fares bring the price of a complete 28-day package tour around South America to less than $900. They make South America competitive with Europe for the lucrative United States travel dollar. A trip from Denver to Lima now costs less than a trip to Paris and a trip to Buenos Aires is less than a trip to Rome, although the distance to the Argentine capital is much farther.

Our company records show that more people travel to South America for business than for pleasure. It seems that a greater number of our businessmen are touring these countries to investigate the possibilities for overseas expansion of their own interests. To accommodate these groups, we recently devised a Panagra trade tour which gives them an opportunity to look into business possibilities and prospects in Latin America and explore new fields for American enterprise. These trade tours are a practical example of what United States businessmen can do to implement our Government's "good partner" trade policy with Latin America and, in most cases, are considered a legitimate tax deduction. Naturally, they are becoming very popular.

So much so that the trend to mix business with pleasure is catching on and trade groups aboard our planes are now as common as schoolteachers and missionaries used to be. Last year, the chambers of commerce of Detroit, Portland, and Fort Worth, as well as the International House of New Orleans conducted business-development tours of the continent. And such groups as the American farmers tour, the Kansas City Chamber of Commerce, the Miami Trade Mission, and the Canadian businessmen's tour have traveled to South America so far this year, and many more are scheduled to go. I hope we may even be able to get a group from Colorado to make such a trip some day—perhaps even the World Trade Club of Denver.

The fact that more American businessmen are at last becoming aware of the many opportunities for growth and profit which exist in Latin America for the man or woman with vision, imagination, and daring is one of the most encouraging signs in the future development of our trade with this area.

I only hope that more Americans will come to realize that our future economic well-being and political security lies in this hemisphere, and that we must work together with the friendly nations of Latin America if we are to seize upon these opportunities and build a strong foundation for mutual progress and understanding between the Americas.

Brooklyn Navy Yard Builds New "Saratoga"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 28, 1956

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, the workers employed at the New York Naval Shipyard in Brooklyn, located in my congressional district, have once again shown their great skill in building one of the finest fighting ships ever to be added to our Navy. I refer to the huge aircraft carrier *Saratoga*, which was recently completed at the Brooklyn Navy Yard and which is described as "the largest and most powerful fighting ship in the world."

The people employed at the naval shipyard in Brooklyn have every reason to feel proud of this achievement. Theirs is a very proud record of achievements in skill, and this is only the latest example of it. I want to extend my warmest greetings and congratulations to all those in the shipyard who had anything to do with the construction of the *Saratoga*. As usual, it is a job well done.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to insert a brief article on the subject which is published in the July 1956 issue of the AFL–CIO American Federationist. The article is as follows:

SKILLED LABOR BUILDS THE NEW "SARATOGA," LARGEST AND MOST POWERFUL FIGHTING SHIP IN THE WORLD

American labor and the Navy have been partners for the promotion of the Nation's security from the earliest days of our country. Skilled workers have built thousands of vessels of many different kinds for the United States Navy in the 180 years since the proclamation of the Declaration of Independence. These ships have played a vital role in the preservation of our freedom, and in the atomic age America still must have a powerful Navy, equipped with the finest of warships, to keep our land and the free world safe.

The latest contribution of American labor to the strength of the Navy is the new *Saratoga*, the largest and most powerful fighting ship in the world. The giant aircraft carrier has just begun a series of sea trials, after which will come its shakedown cruise.

A great multitude of skills went into the construction of this super-super-carrier. All the trades represented in the AFL–CIO Metal Trades Department made their contributions. The *Saratoga* was built at the New York Naval Shipyard in Brooklyn. In recognition of labor's vital role in the construction of the world's largest fighting ship, the Navy invited AFL–CIO Secretary-Treasurer William F. Schnitzler to the carrier's commissioning. He was present for the colorful ceremonies, as were B. A. Gritta, secretary-treasurer of the metal trades department, and other leaders of trade unionism.

The new *Saratoga*, longest and largest carrier in the world, would reach, if turned end to end, to the 80th story of the Empire State Building. It is 3 feet longer than the *Forrestal*. It has 4 acres on its flight deck. The *Saratoga's* powerplant embraces enough propulsion equipment to drive more than 100 passenger locomotives.

An especially thrilling aspect of the commissioning program witnessed by AFL–CIO Secretary Schnitzler was a fly-past by 46 Navy jets which will be stationed on the *Saratoga*. The new carrier has a 100-plane capacity and the mobility to make it one of the free world's most versatile bastions of security.

This tremendous fighting ship, built by skilled and efficient American workers, is the new pride of the Nation. Once again labor has made a great contribution to the strengthening of our country's defenses.

Exchange Programs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD J. THYE
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, June 28, 1956

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial that appeared in the Minneapolis Morning Tribune of June 26, 1956. It is a very timely editorial.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THOSE EXCHANGE PROGRAMS

Foreigners often have strange ideas about American institutions, thought, action and people. We, too, have misconceptions about many foreign lands.

One of the very best ways to correct these erroneous impressions is to have more foreigners travel and study in this country, and to have more Americans go abroad for the same purpose.

That is why we applaud the report of Dr. J. L. Morrill, president of the University of Minnesota, who calls for an "upgrading of United States exchange activity in governmental, congressional, American public and foreign consciousness."

He wants to raise cultural and technical exchange to the level of "a major instrument of American influence and assistance in international affairs."

After his study of the problem, he also recommended better coordination between the programs currently sponsored by two agencies of the Federal Government: The International Educational Exchange Service (IES) which is under the State Department, and the International Cooperation Administration (ICA), an independent agency.

The two agencies are responsible for an impressive number of exchanges. This year more than 14,000 persons will be exchanged, while next year's plans call for participation of almost 20,000. It should be noted that more than twice this number, more than 40,000 a year, take part in private exchanges and those financed by foreign governments.

As Dr. Morrill points out, a government can augment private exchanges, provide exchangees that meet the needs of other countries, and give foreign nations the sense of helping the United States.

With all this we agree. Yet we want to issue a word of caution in raising the exchange activity to a new eminence. We must not come to regard it as a method of propagating democracy. The moment we tell students and scholars and technicians we send abroad that they are expected to sell democracy, we will be stooping to the level of the Communists.

Instead, we must put our faith in free men who are interested in the pursuit of knowledge, if only for its own sake. We're confident that democracy has much to gain and nothing to lose from such a policy.

Increasing Rates of, and Liberalizing the Basis for Payment of, Non-Service-Connected Pension and Service-Connected Compensation

SPEECH
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 27, 1956

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H. R. 7886) to amend part III of Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a) to liberalize the basis for, and increase the monthly rates of, disability pension awards.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, I certainly favor more adequate compensation for disabled veterans, their widows, and dependents. The bill sponsored by the Disabled American Veterans, H. R. 11310, was such a bill and I long ago urged that it be reported out favorably. That bill would have been passed promptly by the House and the Senate, signed by the President, and the benefits made available months ago to those who everyone agrees are the first responsibility of a grateful Nation.

But, unfortunately, action on H. R. 11310 was delayed and its provisions in substance were incorporated into H. R. 7886, a bill which then provided increases in pensions or increased compensation for veterans with total and permanent disability, but which, in addition, introduced a wholly new concept into veterans' legislation, namely, that every veteran upon reaching the age of 65 years shall be deemed to be permanently and totally disabled, and therefore eligible for a pension, provided his annual income is less than $1,400 if he is unmarried, or is less than $2,700 if he is married or has minor children.

All the provisions granting increases in the compensation to veterans with service-connected disability, and their widows, have been stricken from the bill. Remaining before us is only the shell of H. R. 7886 as reported by the House committee. As it now stands, it contains the worst feature of the original bill and none of its best features.

Mr. Chairman, I do not believe it is sound legislation or fair to our neediest veterans to make such a departure from the principles and practices long followed in veterans' legislation, as the remnant of a bill makes.

The assertion in it that every war veteran upon reaching the age of 65 shall be deemed to be totally and permanently disabled is plainly contrary to fact. Furthermore, it is unfair to veterans who actually are disabled. If we believe we ought to give special help to every needy citizen of 65 who is a veteran, let us say so directly and not adopt the fiction that he is totally and permanently disabled.

Mr. Chairman, the only real issue left before us today is whether we are to follow a concept that any person who served 90 days or more during a war, and who sustained no injury or disability as a result of this service, should nevertheless, when he reaches the age of 65 years, even though hale and hearty, be treated differently from other citizens of equal age and equal or greater need.

It has always been my own philosophy that veterans' benefits are a means of trying to equalize, as much as possible, the sacrifices that result from wartime military service. We should always give service-connected disabilities the highest priority among programs for veterans and the rehabilitation of disabled veterans and their reintegration into useful economic and social life should be our primary objective. Successful readjustment generally places the veteran on a postwar footing equal to or better than that of persons who were not in the service. There is then no need to treat him throughout the rest of his life as a citizen with either special handicaps or special privileges.

So, Mr. Chairman, I must vote against this mutilated bill, not because I don't want to provide more suitably for all veterans in need, but because this bill simply will not do what is needed.

It would be a cruel deception if any veteran needing more assistance from his Government, were led to believe passage of this bill today will provide it. The Bureau of the Budget has plainly stated the bill is not in accord with the views of the President. Can anyone believe the President will sign a bill that provides new pensions for veterans not disabled at all, and larger pensions for veterans not disabled in war, and no increase at all in compensation for veterans with disabilities which were sustained in war?

For all these reasons I sincerely believe that the bill should go back to the committee for a re-do and be brought back in a form that can be passed, not only by the House, but also by the Senate and signed by the President. Our veterans who have sacrificed so much for our country's welfare deserve this special effort to give them a fair bill. I am sure the distinguished chairman of this committee, Mr. TEAGUE of Texas, as true a friend as the veterans can ever have, will try again to get his committee to bring out a bill that will be adequate and sensible and can become law. I could not look the veterans in my district in the face if I were to vote for the remnants of H. R. 7886, which helps only those who did not suffer any disabling injury or illness in war.

Top Dairy Scientist

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD J. THYE
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, June 28, 1956

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial that appeared in the Minneapolis Star of June 1956, paying tribute to Dr. William G. Petersen, a dairy scientist, of the University of Minnesota.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TOP DAIRY SCIENTIST

When dairymen the world over want advice about the care, feeding, or understanding of milk cows they usually try to contact Dr. William G. Petersen, University of Minnesota professor of dairy husbandry.

Chances are he visited their country at least once since he joined the Minnesota staff in 1921. And if he did he left behind a lasting impression and a batch of new ideas for them to try. In most cases they either reduced workloads and/or added to profits.

Dr. Petersen is both a colorful teacher and an unorthodox researcher. He once constructed a mechanical cow that gave real milk and helped perfect techniques for transplanting unborn calves to the wombs of foster mothers. Last fall, he and Dr. Berry G. Campbell of the university's medical school announced their principle of "protective milk" which holds that humans may gain immunity to certain diseases by drinking milk from vaccinated cows.

It is not surprising, therefore, to learn that Dr. Petersen has been named the Nation's outstanding dairy science teacher of the year by the Milk Industry Foundation. The designation is richly deserved.

We Cannot Buy Friendship

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. L. MILLER
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 28, 1956

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I ask permission to revise and extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include an editorial from the Omaha World-Herald dated June 24, 1956. The Omaha World-Herald is one of the leading newspapers in the Midwest and I find this editorial timely and sobering at a time when the Congress is considering the appropriation of approximately $5 billion for foreign aid. I commend it to my colleagues for reading.

The text is as follows:

WHY THEY HATE AMERICA

Ten years ago the United States was the most powerful nation in the world, and also the most admired.

It had shown unparalleled generosity to its conquered enemies as well as to its allies. It had embarked on a program of rehabilitation the like of which the world had never seen.

Insistent upon ending colonialism, America had virtually forced the British out of India, Burma, and Ceylon and blasted the Dutch out of Indonesia.

Great, good, kind Uncle Sam.

He wanted nothing for himself except a peaceful world. For others he wanted freedom, justice, and prosperity.

And he was prepared to give away vast amounts of America's substance to achieve these noble goals.

That was 10 years ago. Now look.

The United States has followed the program faithfully. It has flung its armies and airbases around the world to protect the peace. It has given away upward of $50 billion to the deserving and the undeserving.

And what is the result?

The best-phrased answer we've seen comes from a Frenchman, Raymond Cartier, whose article translated from the magazine, Paris-Match, is making quite a stir in Washington and wherever else its contents have been made known. The title of his piece is, "Why Does the World Hate America?"

Mr. Cartier shows that the hatred is universal and comes from the people.

America is vastly more unpopular in India than is the once-hated Britain, says Mr. Cartier, and he quotes Nasser of Egypt as having told him so personally. When Mr. Cartier asked Mr. Nasser what he thought of Americans, the Egyptian strong man replied with outthrust chin that he liked American movies.

Country by country this Frenchman goes down the list of nations that hate America. Indonesia. Japan. Even South Vietnam, Korea, and Formosa. South Africa, where the whites curse America for its anticolonialism and the blacks blame it for its segregation. The Near East, where the Arabs abominate it and the Jews accuse it of meanness and egotism. Latin America, which has not a single country where the anti-Yankee spirit does not predominate. Even Canada—and, of course, Europe.

"It is hard to say whether anti-American sentiment is stronger in England or in France," says this French writer. "In France it is aggravated by Communist influences and at present overexcited by the events in north Africa; but in England it is fed by the intense frustration of a nation recently supplanted in its world role."

And what do American officials think of this universal anti-Americanism? Publicly they dismiss it, says the French writer. They argue that America's wealth makes unpopularity inevitable. Privately, says he, American officials know that America is despised the world around.

"Three idelible facts," says Mr. Cartier, prejudice America before a majority of the world's people:

"Americans are white. They are rich. They are the richest of the white peoples."

Mr. Cartier lists these results of America's postwar policies:

"The decline of every liberated country into communism or neutralism; the dizzy growth of anti-Americanism in decolonized Asia; the fact that liberated north Africa will join an Arab League that is practically Moscow-oriented; the further fact that the loss of north Africa will push France itself—humiliated and desperate—into the Soviet system."

The writer concludes:

"There would be less anti-Americanism in the world if America abandoned its philanthropic aspirations, its vocation of Santa Claus, its transcendental morality, all its missionary trappings, all its Boy Scout gear, and if, at last, it followed openly and intelligently the policy of its own interest."

Mr. Cartier might be surprised to know how many Americans agree with him.

LAWS AND RULES FOR PUBLICATION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

CODE OF LAWS OF THE UNITED STATES

TITLE 44, SECTION 181. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; ARRANGEMENT, STYLE, CONTENTS, AND INDEXES.—The Joint Committee on Printing shall have control of the arrangement and style of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and while providing that it shall be substantially a verbatim report of proceedings shall take all needed action for the reduction of unnecessary bulk, and shall provide for the publication of an index of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD semimonthly during the sessions of Congress and at the close thereof. (Jan. 12, 1895, c. 23, § 13, 28 Stat. 603.)

TITLE 44, SECTION 182b. SAME; ILLUSTRATIONS, MAPS, DIAGRAMS.—No maps, diagrams, or illustrations may be inserted in the RECORD without the approval of the Joint Committee on Printing. (June 20, 1936, c. 630, § 2, 49 Stat. 1546.)

Pursuant to the foregoing statute and in order to provide for the prompt publication and delivery of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the Joint Committee on Printing has adopted the following rules, to which the attention of Senators, Representatives, and Delegates is respectfully invited:

1. *Arrangement of the daily Record.*—The Public Printer will arrange the contents of the daily RECORD as follows: First, the Senate proceedings; second, the House proceedings; third, the Appendix: *Provided*, That when the proceedings of the Senate are not received in time to follow this arrangement, the Public Printer may begin the RECORD with the House proceedings. The proceedings of each House and the Appendix shall each begin a new page, with appropriate headings centered thereon.

2. *Type and style.*—The Public Printer shall print the report of the proceedings and debates of the Senate and House of Representatives, as furnished by the Official Reporters of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, in 7½-point type; and all matter included in the remarks or speeches of Members of Congress, other than their own words, and all reports, documents, and other matter authorized to be inserted in the RECORD shall be printed in 6½-point type; and all rollcalls shall be printed in 6-point type. No italic or black type nor words in capitals or small capitals shall be used for emphasis or prominence; nor will unusual indentions be permitted. These restrictions do not apply to the printing of or quotations from historical, official, or legal documents or papers of which a literal reproduction is necessary.

3. *Return of manuscript.*—When manuscript is submitted to Members for revision it should be returned to the Government Printing Office not later than 9 o'clock p. m. in order to insure publication in the RECORD issued on the following morning; and if all of said manuscript is not furnished at the time specified, the Public Printer is authorized to withhold it from the RECORD for 1 day. In no case will a speech be printed in the RECORD of the day of its delivery if the manuscript is furnished later than 12 o'clock midnight.

4. *Tabular matter.*—The manuscript of speeches containing tabular statements to be published in the RECORD shall be in the hands of the Public Printer not later than 7 o'clock p. m., to insure publication the following morning.

5. *Proof furnished.*—Proofs of "leave to print" and advance speeches will not be furnished the day the manuscript is received but will be submitted the following day, whenever possible to do so without causing delay in the publication of the regular proceedings of Congress. Advance speeches shall be set in the RECORD style of type, and not more than six sets of proofs may be furnished to Members without charge.

6. *Notation of withheld remarks.*—If manuscript or proofs have not been returned in time for publication in the proceedings, the Public Printer will insert the words "Mr. ——— addressed the Senate (House or Committee). His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix," and proceed with the printing of the RECORD.

7. *Thirty-day limit.*—The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD any speech or extension of remarks which has been withheld for a period exceeding 30 calendar days from the date when its printing was authorized: *Provided*, That at the expiration of each session of Congress the time limit herein fixed shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee.

8. *Corrections.*—The permanent RECORD is made up for printing and binding 30 days after each daily publication is issued; therefore all corrections must be sent to the Public Printer within that time: *Provided*, That upon the final adjournment of each session of Congress the time limit shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee: *Provided further*, That no Member of Congress shall be entitled to make more than one revision. Any revision shall consist only of corrections of the original copy and shall not include deletions of correct material, substitutions for correct material, or additions of new subject matter.

9. The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the full report or print of any committee or subcommittee when said report or print has been previously printed. This rule shall not be construed to apply to conference reports.

10. *Appendix to daily Record.*—When either House has granted leave to print (1) a speech not delivered in either House, (2) a newspaper or magazine article, or (3) any other matter not germane to the proceedings, the same shall be published in the Appendix except in cases of duplication. In such cases only the first item received in the Government Printing Office will be printed. This rule shall not apply to quotations which form part of a speech of a Member, or to an authorized extension of his own remarks: *Provided*, That no address, speech, or article delivered or released subsequently to the final adjournment of a session of Congress may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

11. *Estimate of cost.*—No extraneous matter in excess of two pages in any one instance may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by a Member under leave to print or to extend his remarks unless the manuscript is accompanied by an estimate in writing from the Public Printer of the probable cost of publishing the same, which estimate of cost must be announced by the Member when such leave is requested; but this rule shall not apply to excerpts from letters, telegrams, or articles presented in connection with a speech delivered in the course of debate or to communications from State legislatures, addresses or articles by the President and the members of his Cabinet, the Vice President, or a Member of Congress. For the purposes of this regulation, any one article printed in two or more parts, with or without individual headings, shall be considered as a single extension and the two-page rule shall apply. The Public Printer or the Official Reporters of the House or Senate shall return to the Member of the respective House any matter submitted for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which is in contravention of this paragraph.

12. *Official Reporters.*—The Official Reporters of each House shall indicate on the manuscript and prepare headings for all matter to be printed in the Appendix, and shall make suitable reference thereto at the proper place in the proceedings.

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

SENATORS WITH RESIDENCES IN WASHINGTON

OFFICE ADDRESS: Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

[Streets northwest unless otherwise stated]

Vice President, Richard Nixon

Aiken, George D., *Vt*.....Carroll Arms.
Allott, Gordon, *Colo*.....
Anderson, Clinton P., *N. Mex.*.....6 Wesley Circle.
Barrett, Frank A., *Wyo*.....The Woodner.
Beall, J. Glenn, *Md*.....
Bender, George H., *Ohio*.....120 Schotts Court NE.
Bennett, Wallace F., *Utah*.....
Bible, Alan, *Nev*.....
Bricker, John W., *Ohio*.....The Mayflower.
Bridges, Styles, *N. H*.....
Bush, Prescott, *Conn*.....
Butler, John Marshall, *Md*.....
Byrd, Harry Flood, *Va*.....The Shoreham.
Capehart, Homer E., *Ind*.....The Westchester.
Carlson, Frank, *Kans*.....Sheraton-Park
Case, Clifford P., *N. J*.....
Case, Francis, *S. Dak*.....4635 Mass. Ave.
Chavez, Dennis, *N. Mex*.....3327 Cleveland Ave.
Clements, Earle C., *Ky*.....The Congressional
Cotton, Norris, *N. H*.....
Curtis, Carl T., *Nebr*.....
Daniel, Price, *Tex*.....
Dirksen, Everett M., *Ill*.....
Douglas, Paul H., *Ill*.....
Duff, James H., *Pa*.....
Dworshak, Henry C., *Idaho*.....
Eastland, James O., *Miss*.....5101 Macomb St.
Ellender, Allen J., *La*.....
Ervin, Samuel J., Jr., *N. C*.....
Flanders, Ralph E., *Vt*.....
Frear, J. Allen, Jr., *Del*.....
Fulbright, J. William, *Ark*.....
George, Walter F., *Ga*.....The Mayflower.
Goldwater, Barry M., *Ariz*.....
Gore, Albert, *Tenn*.....
Green, Theodore Francis, *R. I.*.....University Club.
Hayden, Carl, *Ariz*.....
Hennings, Thomas C., Jr., *Mo.*.....
Hickenlooper, Bourke B., *Iowa.*.....5511 Cedar Parkway, Chevy Chase, Md.
Hill, Lister, *Ala*.....
Holland, Spessard L., *Fla*.....Sheraton-Park
Hruska, Roman L., *Nebr*.....
Humphrey, Hubert H., *Minn.*.....
Humphreys, Robert, *Ky*.....
Ives, Irving M., *N. Y*.....
Jackson, Henry M., *Wash*.....
Jenner, William E., *Ind*.....
Johnson, Lyndon B., *Tex*.....
Johnston, Olin D., *S. C*.....
Kefauver, Estes, *Tenn*.....4848 Upton St.
Kennedy, John F., *Mass*.....
Kerr, Robert S., *Okla*.....
Knowland, William F., *Calif.*.....
Kuchel, Thomas H., *Calif*.....
Laird, William R. III, *W. Va*.....
Langer, William, *N. Dak*.....2101 Conn. Ave.
Lehman, Herbert H., *N. Y*.....Sheraton-Park
Long, Russell B., *La*.....
McCarthy, Joseph R., *Wis*.....
McClellan, John L., *Ark*.....
McNamara, Pat, *Mich*.....
Magnuson, Warren G., *Wash.*.....The Shoreham.
Malone, George W., *Nev*.....The Mayflower.
Mansfield, Mike, *Mont*.....
Martin, Edward, *Pa*.....
Martin, Thos. E., *Iowa*.....4545 Conn. Ave.
Millikin, Eugene D., *Colo*.....
Monroney, A. S. Mike, *Okla.*.....
Morse, Wayne, *Oreg*.....5020 Lowell St.
Mundt, Karl E., *S. Dak*.....122 Schotts Court NE.
Murray, James E., *Mont*.....The Shoreham.
Neely, Matthew M., *W. Va*.....
Neuberger, Richard L., *Oreg.*.....
O'Mahoney, Joseph C., *Wyo.*.....Sheraton-Park
Pastore, John O., *R. I*.....
Payne, Frederick G., *Maine*.....
Potter, Charles E., *Mich*.....
Purtell, William A., *Conn*.....
Robertson, A. Willis, *Va*.....
Russell, Richard B., *Ga*.....
Saltonstall, Leverett, *Mass*.....2320 Tracy Pl.
Schoeppel, Andrew F., *Kans.*.....
Scott, W. Kerr, *N. C*.....
Smathers, George A., *Fla*.....
Smith, H. Alexander, *N. J*.....Sheraton-Park
Smith, Margaret Chase, (Mrs.), *Maine.*.....
Sparkman, John J., *Ala*.....4928 Indian Lane
Stennis, John, *Miss*.....
Symington, Stuart, *Mo*.....
Thye, Edward J., *Minn*.....
Watkins, Arthur V., *Utah*.....
Welker, Herman, *Idaho*.....4823 Tilden St.
Wiley, Alexander, *Wis*.....2122 Mass. Ave.
Williams, John J., *Del*.....
Wofford, Thomas A., *S. C*.....
Young, Milton R., *N. Dak*.....Quebec House So.

OFFICERS OF THE SENATE

Secretary—Felton M. Johnston.
Chief Clerk—Emery L. Frazier.
Sergeant at Arms—Joseph C. Duke.
Secretary for the Majority—Robert G. Baker.
Secretary for the Minority—J. Mark Trice.
Chaplain—Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D.

STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE SENATE

Committee on Agriculture and Forestry

Messrs. Ellender (chairman), Johnston of South Carolina, Holland, Eastland, Clements, Humphrey, Scott, Symington, Aiken, Young, Thye, Hickenlooper, Mundt, Williams, and Schoeppel.

Committee on Appropriations

Messrs. Hayden (chairman), Russell, Chavez, Ellender, Hill, McClellan, Robertson, Magnuson, Holland, Stennis, Clements, Johnson of Texas, Bridges, Saltonstall, Young, Knowland, Thye, McCarthy, Mundt, Mrs. Smith of Maine, Messrs. Dworshak, Dirksen, and Potter.

Committee on Armed Services

Messrs. Russell (chairman), Byrd, Johnson of Texas, Kefauver, Stennis, Symington, Jackson, Ervin, Saltonstall, Bridges, Flanders, Mrs. Smith of Maine, Messrs. Case of South Dakota, Duff, and Welker.

Committee on Banking and Currency

Messrs. Fulbright (chairman), Robertson, Sparkman, Frear, Douglas, Lehman, Monroney, Morse, Capehart, Bricker, Ives, Bennett, Bush, Beall, and Payne.

Committee on the District of Columbia

Messrs. Neely (chairman), Bible, McNamara, Morse, Frear, Beall, Hruska, Case of New Jersey, and Allott.

Committee on Finance

Messrs. Byrd (chairman), George, Kerr, Frear, Long, Smathers, Anderson, Douglas, Millikin, Martin of Pennsylvania, Williams, Flanders, Malone, Carlson, and Bennett.

Committee on Foreign Relations

Messrs. George (chairman), Green, Fulbright, Sparkman, Humphrey, Mansfield, Morse, Long, Wiley, Smith of New Jersey, Hickenlooper, Langer, Knowland, Aiken, and Capehart.

Committee on Government Operations

Messrs. McClellan (chairman), Jackson, Kennedy, Symington, Ervin, Humphrey, Wofford, McCarthy, Mundt, Mrs. Smith of Maine, Messrs. Cotton, Bender, and Martin of Iowa.

Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs

Messrs. Murray (chairman), Anderson, Jackson, O'Mahoney, Bible, Neuberger, Laird, Scott, Millikin, Malone, Watkins, Dworshak, Kuchel, Barrett, and Goldwater.

Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce

Messrs. Magnuson (chairman), Pastore, Monroney, Smathers, Daniel, Ervin, Bible, Wofford, Bricker, Schoeppel, Butler, Potter, Duff, Purtell, and Payne.

Committee on the Judiciary

Messrs. Eastland (chairman), Kefauver, Johnston of South Carolina, Hennings, McClellan, Daniel, O'Mahoney, Neely, Wiley, Langer, Jenner, Watkins, Dirksen, Welker, and Butler.

Committee on Labor and Public Welfare

Messrs. Hill (chairman), Murray, Neely, Lehman, Kennedy, McNamara, ———, Smith of New Jersey, Ives, Purtell, Goldwater, Bender, and Allott.

Committee on Post Office and Civil Service

Messrs. Johnston of South Carolina (chairman), Pastore, Monroney, Hennings, Scott, Neuberger, Laird, Carlson, Jenner, Langer, Curtis, Martin of Iowa, and Case of New Jersey.

Committee on Public Works

Messrs. Chavez (chairman), Kerr, Gore, McNamara, Neuberger, Wofford, ———, Martin of Pennsylvania, Case of South Dakota, Bush, Kuchel, Cotton, and Hruska.

Committee on Rules and Administration

Messrs. Green (chairman), Hayden, Hennings, Gore, Mansfield, Jenner, Barrett, McCarthy, and Curtis.

UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT

Mr. Chief Justice Warren, of California, Hotel Sheraton-Park, Washington, D. C.
Mr. Justice Black, of Alabama, 619 S. Lee St., Alexandria, Va.
Mr. Justice Reed, of Kentucky, the Mayflower.
Mr. Justice Frankfurter, of Massachusetts, 3018 Dumbarton Ave.
Mr. Justice Douglas, of Washington, 3701 Connecticut Ave.
Mr. Justice Burton, of Ohio, the Dodge.
Mr. Justice Clark, of Texas, 2101 Connecticut Ave.
Mr. Justice Minton, of Indiana, the Methodist Building.
Mr. Justice Harlan, of New York, 1677 31st St.

OFFICERS OF THE SUPREME COURT

Clerk—Harold B. Willey, 3214 N. Wakefield St., Arlington, Va.
Deputy Clerk—Reginald C. Dilli, 1329 Hemlock St.
Deputy Clerk—Hugh W. Barr, 4701 Connecticut Ave.
Marshal—T. Perry Lippitt, 6004 Corbin Road.
Reporter—Walter Wyatt, 1702 Kalmia Rd.
Librarian—Helen Newman, 126 3d St. SE.

UNITED STATES JUDICIAL CIRCUITS

JUSTICES ASSIGNED
TERRITORY EMBRACED

District of Columbia: Mr. Chief Justice Warren. District of Columbia.

First judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Frankfurter. Maine, New Hampshire, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Puerto Rico.

Second judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Harlan. Vermont, Connecticut, New York.

Third judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Burton, Pennsylvania, New Jersey, Delaware, Virgin Islands.

Fourth judicial circuit: Mr. Chief Justice Warren. Maryland, Virginia, West Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina.

Fifth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Black. Georgia, Florida, Alabama, Mississippi, Louisiana, Texas, Canal Zone.

Sixth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Reed. Ohio, Michigan, Kentucky, Tennessee.

Seventh judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Minton. Indiana, Illinois, Wisconsin.

Eighth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Clark. Minnesota, North Dakota, South Dakota, Iowa, Nebraska, Missouri, Arkansas.

Ninth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Douglas. Washington, Oregon, Montana, Idaho, California, Nevada, Arizona, Alaska, Hawaii.

Tenth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Clark. Colorado, Wyoming, Utah, Kansas, Oklahoma, New Mexico.

Appendix

The American Dilemma

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER F. GEORGE
OF GEORGIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, June 29, 1956

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address by Hon. Louis Johnson, prepared for delivery at Clarksburg, W. Va., on Tuesday next. I have asked permission of Mr. Johnson, former Secretary of Defense, to have his address entered in the RECORD at this time, because it is a singularly strong statement, both on our national-defense program and our foreign-aid program. It is an exceedingly able presentation with reference to the Defense Act, as well as the Mutual Security Act.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE AMERICAN DILEMMA

(Speech of Louis Johnson at luncheon meeting of Rotary and Kiwanis Clubs, Clarksburg, W. Va., July 3, 1956)

It is good to be here at this Independence Day celebration speaking in the house of my friends, Rotary and Kiwanis, in my hometown, Clarksburg, W. Va.

One hundred and eighty years ago tomorrow the battle for American freedom and independence began in earnest with the signing of the Declaration of Independence and its adoption that day by the Continental Congress. Based on the Declaration of Independence, our forefathers created "a design for freedom and better living." We have come a long way in this 180 years since July 4, 1776.

I could give you today a wonderful picture of the American economy, but instead I want to talk to you about the most serious dilemma of our time, not the American economy particularly. There are some bad spots in the total picture of our economy. Nevertheless, the outlook for the next 10 years is full of great promise. In the economic picture there are three particular things that disturb me:

1. There is, of course, no excuse for a chronic depression in agriculture.

2. Nobody can justify the fact that several million American families continue to live in conditions of poverty.

3. I am convinced that something must be done to strengthen the economic position of the small private enterpriser—the individual businessman—whose independence and hard work have done so much for the character of our country.

But the overall picture indicates that we ought to be able to handle these three major problems. With a continually growing population, with a continually expanding capital investment, with a continually increasing industrial productivity and a purchasing power that grows greater year by year, our national economic system ought to be and is able to solve these problems.

Our rate of growth is almost bewildering. Last year our total national product was approximately $390 billion. By 1957 we ought to have a gross national product of $600 billion. This means a total output of goods and services 50 percent greater than this booming economy that we have today.

If our economy is able to distribute this great prosperity fairly so that every man, woman and child shares in it, we should have a standard of living in this country beyond anything that man—even here—has ever imagined for himself.

Yet this great vision of the future is overshadowed by an enormous question mark. American business will not decide for itself whether it will go ahead toward its dazzling future. Neither will American labor nor American agriculture. The deciding factor lies not in our economic efforts here at home but in something else—something beyond our borders.

It is the international situation which will determine whether or not the American economy reaches the heights of which it is capable. Our future depends upon what men say and do in London, in the Kremlin, in the sandy wastes of Arabia, and in the rice fields of the Far East.

This is a difficult fact to master.

We are conscious, of course, that international wars in recent years have had their effects on the American economy. We have seen our national production stepped up by the forced draft of the Second World War. We have seen the tremendous effect on our economy of the defense program necessitated by the Korean conflict and the cold war. We have seen our price levels and our production levels changed by these upheavals.

And on the other hand, we have seen the flourishing economies of other countries laid waste by the effects of war. Fortunately, we have been able to escape the devastation of our industrial plants and the disruption of our economic system, but we know that such things are a possibility in the world as it is today.

Obviously, if there should be a war—and this time it would be an atomic war—all projections and predictions about the growth of the American economy would have to be suspended.

Furthermore, we must realize that even if we do not have another war, large or small, the international power struggle can still be a controlling influence on our domestic economy.

I think this is rather difficult for the man in the street to understand. There seems to be a growing opinion that if the Russians do not use the atom bomb we have nothing much to worry about. We have looked so long and with such dread at the prospect of atomic conflict that when this vision fades we begin to think all our troubles are over.

But it is quite possible that our fanatical adversaries could strangle the growth of our economy without dropping a single bomb.

Sir Winston Churchill has pointed out that there may be a kind of security in the balancing of atomic armament. With both sides possessed of weapons capable of total destruction, he argues, neither side will dare to use them. If there were one weapon of atomic destruction and one way of using it, this might be true, but the world of atomic armaments is not a simple one nor a static one. The world of atomic armaments is a terrifying whirlpool of abstract science, advancing technology and mass production. It is continually generating new possibilities of its own. The arms of last year become obsolete before they have been tested—perhaps even before they have been taken off the drawing boards. Under the impact of untried new weapons strategic plans are shuffled and changed, discarded and drawn up afresh. Basic concepts concerning the organization of our Defense Establishment suddenly appear to be outdated. Under the pressure of defense needs scientists develop new weapons, new measures of defense for a counterattack, new ways of delivering explosives to the enemy. What will come out of this turmoil no one can say. But it is safe to predict that we have not seen the end of these developments. It is safe to say that new, more terrible and more totally destructive possibilities still lie within the womb of science.

And from this we can conclude that the nation which reaches these possibilities first may be able to impose its will on other nations which lag behind in the race.

The atomic stalemate is an illusion or at least only a temporary stage of development.

This does not mean that either side will necessarily have to use these weapons. It does mean that the nation which has the newest and most effective of these devices will have a diplomatic, a political, and a psychological advantage over the nation that does not have them.

To descend to a simple metaphor, the modern weapons which a nation possesses are something like a corporate balance sheet. They show the relative standing in the competitive race. If my competitor reveals substantial liquid assets and a generally strong position in his balance sheet, I will be less likely to undertake a price war with him or seek to invade his territory. So it is with nations. If the enemy has weapons that will wipe us out at a moment's notice, we are not likely to undertake a course of policy that will lead us to a showdown with him. Similarly, the smaller nations for whom survival is a prime consideration, will not wish to sign with the side that may lose. The small nations will not wish to be under the protection of a great power which at the moment of armed collision might not be able to protect them successfully.

In short, even if atomic weapons are not used, their existence will influence the diplomatic and political conduct both of the nations which possess them and the nations which do not possess them.

I am convinced that we can look back over the history of the past 10 years and interpret it in the light of the armaments possessed by the United States and the Soviet Union respectively. At the conclusion of World War II when we dissolved our wartime coalition and dismantled our own forces so rapidly and so imprudently, the Russians adopted an attitude of truculence and a policy of diplomatic pressure on all our allies. They had the ground armies then and our side had none. And they used every kind of pressure short of outright aggression. They were restrained from outright conflict by the fear of our supremacy in the atomic field. But at the end of 1949 the Russians set off their first atomic explosion and it was little more than 6 months after that when a Communist nation flung down the gauntlet of aggression. Then began the tremendous new arms race in which we re-

dressed, somewhat, the balance of conventional arms and managed to keep our lead in atomic power. As a result, Russia began to lose in the competitive struggle, and devised a change in tactics. Today Russia is using more conciliatory tactics, but at the same time it has begun to pull ahead in the atomic race, making up rapidly for its inferiority in past years. This combination of conciliatory tactics and new and undeniable atomic power is causing a great change in our diplomatic position today.

If we become manifestly inferior in effective military power to the Soviet Union, our situation will be precarious and our economic future will be in mortal peril. By a combination of coercion and cajolement, the Soviet Union could bring more and more nations into its orbit and impose upon them the anti-American policies which it already imposes on its satellites. We in turn, with inferior power, would be forced to watch helplessly as our friends and allies were drawn away from us. With each defection from the Western alliance the Soviet Union would grow stronger, and it would have more tempting benefits to hold out to our remaining allies. Already, the Soviet Union holds out the trading area of the Communist countries—geographically a sizable market—as bait to bring neutral nations into its trap.

Under such pressure, military, economic and diplomatic, our circle of friends would get small and smaller and eventually, we might be driven into that fortress America, which some of our people, unfortunately, seem to be longing to experience. This would not be a situation which we brought on ourselves by accepting the concepts of isolationism. It would be a situation in which we were isolated—isolated by the skillful maneuvering of the Soviet Union.

I do not say that all these consequences would flow from a change in the balance of arms, but I do say that a marked change in the balance of arms to our disadvantage could set such a train of events in motion.

The economic effects of such isolation could be most serious. We might find many of our exports curtailed or shut off. We would probably find it impossible to carry on the import of those raw materials and strategic items which are essential to our prosperity and our defense. In all probability, if we were driven into such an isolated position, we would be unable to maintain our rate of uninterrupted economic growth.

But worst of all, worse than any economic consequences, would be the shattering impact of such a catastrophe on our moral values. We would stand alone believing in freedom, against a world overcome by communism. The pressures on us to sacrifice our basic values and to go over to the Communist way of thought would be intense. Throughout the world, Communist persecution would be raging, and we would be powerless to step in and stop it. Soon the tentacles or Soviet power and pressure would try to reach into our own society to stifle criticism, corrupt and coerce our political freedoms, and undermine the citadel of freemen.

The prospect is a horrible one, and at the present time it seems so distant as to be almost ludicrous. This is the reason perhaps why it is so difficult to arouse people from their complacency and to make them realize that we are facing a double-barreled danger in the growth of the Soviet atomic power and the success of the new Soviet diplomatic offensive.

If we are to avoid these calamities, we will have to keep on with our own development of atomic weapons and countermeasures, and with the maintenance of multiple-purpose Armed Forces. We will have to keep on—not in a halfhearted way—but at the peak of our energy and resources—pressing scientific possibilities to the utmost.

This will be expensive. It will make it necessary to continue Government spending at a rate of scores of billions of dollars annually. However, this is not all that we will have to spend if we are to keep the Soviet threat from overcoming us. We will have to continue to give technical assistance and economic aid to the undeveloped and uncommitted nations. If we do not do this successfully, the Soviet Union will. And the aid they give may very well draw the millions of Asia and Africa into the Communist orbit.

We need not think that every dollar of our economic aid will bring a corresponding dollar's worth of political advantage to us. Neither can we be sure that it will all be well spent. We can only be sure that if we do not spend it—if we do not add this effort to our military efforts—the Soviets will forestall us here too, and turn these people into our enemies. In all probability over the decade ahead, we will have to increase our foreign nonmilitary spending. I believe we will have to develop a new philosophy for it and new instruments for dispensing it, but I do not think that we can diminish the quantity of it.

Some people I know feel that we cannot sustain the present levels of military spending and foreign-aid spending without grave damage to our national economy. It is true that these items make up the largest part of our national budget. It is true that they are expenditures which we do not like to make. It is true that if we did not have to make them, our taxes would not be so high. Nevertheless, these expenditures are not injuring our national economic system. So long as we keep growing—so long as we keep increasing our national output by 3 to 5 percent a year, we need not fear that the expenditures for armament or for economic aid will injure us.

If, however, we should so mismanage our domestic affairs that we had another depression, then these expenditures might become a serious burden.

I think it is safe to say that for an indefinite time we can continue to keep pace with the Russians in the arms race, and to win new allies for the cause of freedom, without injuring our own national prosperity.

The prospect of an arms race reaching indefinitely into the future is not, however, a happy one. It is in fact most frightening. The world cannot be safe so long as the power to cause instantaneous intercontinental destruction lies at the fingertips of a group of dictators.

We have no reason to assume that the leaders of Russia are the best judges of their own national interests. Hitler was a madman and preferred to destroy his own country rather than surrender. Stalin, by the admission of his own intimates, was a paranoiac, in whose presence no one felt safe. Are Khrushchev and Bulganin likely to prove, over the years, wiser and more reliable? What about the men who replace them? Once such men have the power of push-button destruction, the world is not safe.

How long can this great world civilization of ours exist, if its existence is at the mercy of such men? How long can the welfare of mankind hang by the thin thread of sanity of a few power-hungry tyrants?

Certainly this is the basic question. This is the question human society must answer. There must be disarmament ultimately. There must be international regulation and control of this terrible menace ultimately.

How we can achieve this I do not profess to know. Perhaps it can come about only through the creation, ultimately, of international organizations of a power and effectiveness which we have never beheld before. Time may hold some of the answers. Time with its eroding effects may be able to bring about such changes in the Soviet system that mankind can achieve a lessening of the threat which now overshadows it. But time alone will not accomplish these things. We must have men and policies—we must use our resources and our brains—to achieve freedom from the overshadowing danger of destruction.

If we can bring that about, or perhaps I should say when we bring it about, for I have confidence that this can be achieved—then we shall really be able to see what the American economic system can do. Then our total resources and our total capabilities could be released for the welfare of mankind and for building up of the spiritual and intellectual life of men everywhere. That is a vision so wonderful, so full of possibilities for good, that it stuns the imagination. I will leave its articulation to prophets who are more gifted than I. But it is the great incentive to spur us on. It is the bright picture, more real than any of the Utopias of the past, that can inspire us to shoulder our tasks, and with faith, guided by hope, make our way through the dangers of this troubled present time.

Atomic Power Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLINTON P. ANDERSON
OF NEW MEXICO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, June 28, 1956

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, Mr. Robert McKinney, editor and publisher of the Santa Fe New Mexican recently delivered three addresses, the first before the Overseas Press Club, New York City, on May 17, 1956; the second, before the National Conference on Uranium and the Atomic Industry of the Atomic Industrial Forum and Denver Research Institute, on June 25, 1956, in Denver, Colo., and the third, on June 27, 1956, at a roundtable discussion on the civilian use of atomic energy, at the National Governors Conference.

I ask unanimous consent that the first address which I have mentioned be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

I am advised by the Public Printer that the manuscript is estimated to make approximately 2⅔ pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, at a cost of $214. I ask unanimous consent that the text of the address be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, notwithstanding the fact that it overruns the limit.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PEACEFUL USES OF ATOMIC ENERGY AS AN INSTRUMENT OF INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS

(Address to Overseas Press Club, May 17, 1956, New York City, by Robert McKinney, editor and publisher, Santa Fe New Mexican, chairman, citizens' panel, which reported to the Joint Congressional Committee on Atomic Energy on the impact of the peaceful uses of atomic energy)

When I first sat down to outline what to say to you today, I began by wondering whether I dared stand before a captive audience of hard-bitten newspapermen to say what anyone could read in a 100-page report on sale at the Government Printing Office.

While still wondering, I found myself a few days later also in a captive audience of newspapermen. In Washington, the American Society of Newspaper Editors heard the

President of the United States propose the establishment of a nonpartisan citizens' commission to review our international policies and to recommend additional ways and means of meeting the Soviet threat. The President also made specific point of the fact that any person who sees or believes he sees some of the basic factors in the problems facing the Nation, and who has some little ability or opportunity to explain them to others, has the responsibility to do so.

A few hours earlier on the same day, the editors' convention had an example of some of the confused thinking on the use of atomic energy as an instrument in international relations which the country is getting from men to whom we look for leadership. Adlai E. Stevenson said to us, and I quote, "We should give prompt and earnest consideration to stopping further tests of the hydrogen bomb."

Now, my own newspaper, the Santa Fe New Mexican, supported Governor Stevenson in 1952. I even campaigned for him myself. But I was struck by the fact that proposals such as this are not responsive to our need for new ways and means to meet the Soviet threat. This particular proposal comes from the illogical assumption that, because the testing of nuclear weapons may be related to a warlike use of atomic energy, the cancellation of nuclear weapons tests is a peaceful use of atomic energy and, therefore, a fitting instrument of international policy.

The facts of life are different. Our present narrow margin of nuclear weapon superiority—which shields the free world against Communist world conquest—is entirely due to our vigorous atomic energy research and development program. This program includes, as a necessary ingredient, design and test of weapons. Tests, like all research, do expand the basic body of nuclear knowledge from which flow both peaceful and military applications. Statements like this from Governor Stevenson and others, while well intentioned, are a misuse of atomic energy—a misuse for the manufacture of headlines and the consumption of newsprint.

These two experiences crystalized for me the idea that my purpose here today should not be to tell you the method and findings of our whole study on the impact of the peaceful uses of atomic energy. My purpose should be, I decided, to tell you how some of the conclusions we reached in the international section of our report can help provide important ways and means for dealing with those problems which the President mentioned and with which you overseas reporters are so particularly concerned.

MOST DECISIVE PROBLEM

So for a few moments I am going to discuss atomic energy in the light of what is the most fundamentally decisive problem now facing the United States. Simply stated, the problem is this:

How can we put a stop to deterioration of America's position of leadership abroad? And how can we restore the faith that the rest of the world only recently placed in the United States as a symbol, not only of material but also of moral progress?

I believe that this deterioration can be stopped, this faith restored through the peaceful uses of atomic energy. I firmly believe this for one simple but fundamental reason. The reason is that the peaceful uses of atomic energy have completely captured the imaginations of the peoples of the world.

And this fact leads to two fundamental propositions:

The first proposition is this: That the peaceful development of atomic energy gives the United States an opportunity such as we never had before to win respect, good will, and friendship throughout the world.

The second proposition is: That we must grasp this opportunity now—and by now I mean immediately—because we will never have it again.

These are pretty broad statements. You may feel that they represent an extreme point of view. But to me they are the only conclusions which can logically flow from the demonstrable facts.

For the first of these demonstrable facts, let us look at where the United States stands today in relation to the uncommitted nations of the world.

In Ceylon an election is held and it is assumed that the government earnestly friendly to the United States will be reelected. But this government is soundly beaten by an opposition which says that, because it is anticolonial, it must therefore be anti-American. Coming elections in Iceland, Nepal, and elsewhere seem to be shaping up the same way.

In the Middle East we painfully build a structure of military alliances shored up with conventional economic aid, along the so-called northern tier, feeling sure that the Arab region to the south is safe. Suddenly we find the Arab nations turning against us, and the balance of power in the area tipping toward Russia.

You, here, are reporting other new and unexpected examples every day. We are learning the hard way that the expensively and painfully won good will of governments lasts no longer than the governments themselves last. Only rarely does it carry over to the people.

That is true not only of former colonial countries now going through the growth pains of national political and economic independence. It is true also of many established, industrialized nations.

It is true of countries with which we have formed defensive alliances and to which we have given billions in military aid. It is true of nations to which we have given billions in economic aid. It is a fact which has become increasingly clear in just the last few months since the Russians made a scapegoat instead of a saint out of Stalin, turned the guillotine into a maypole, and put on the market their new tactic of service with a smile.

A NEW ELEMENT

So the first demonstrable fact to which I would like to call your attention is this: We need some other element—something besides defense alliances and military aid, something besides conventional technical and economic assistance. We need it to convince the peoples of the world, as well as their leaders, of what we have been trying for the last decade, but so far have failed to convince them of—that the United States is truly their friend and deserves their respect and trust.

To me, the second demonstrable fact is that the peaceful uses of atomic energy can provide the new element, the new ways and means we need. But the whole subject of atomic energy is one which to most Americans is a kind of hazy, indistinct land of pie in the sky and wishful thinking.

Permit me to tell you why I think the peaceful uses of atomic energy have such a great potential as an instrument in international relations.

A year ago I had a call from my neighbor, Senator CLINTON P. ANDERSON, chairman of the Joint Congressional Committee on Atomic Energy. He asked me to take the chairmanship of a nonpartisan, nine-man citizens' panel which was to look into the progress being made in peaceful atomic uses and was to measure their impact on the Nation and world.

Although I did not realize it at the time, when I took this job I was getting the opportunity for an education so broad, so intense, that it has amounted almost to a revelation.

Now I am not trying to set up as an atomic authority after a 9 months' course. I am only a country newspaper publisher. But the work of the panel brought to bear the cumulative thinking of several hundred authoritative individuals and organizations in close to a hundred special studies.

From our research study group, led by Nobel prize winner, Dr. I. I. Rabi; to our medical study led by the eminent authority on atomic medicine, Dr. Shields Warren; to our agricultural study led by the Under Secretary of Agriculture, True D. Morse; to our power study composed of 40 outstanding authorities in all forms of energy; we tried to bring to bear the collective knowledge of the whole Nation on the probable impact of the peaceful uses of atomic energy at home and abroad.

Here are just a few of the highlights of peaceful atomic uses that these experts brought out:

Atomic electric power is here. But it will not be until the second or third generation of atomic powerplants is built that they will be broadly competitive in the United States.

In agriculture, new plant strains have already been developed through atomic radiation—barley, oats, wheat, corn, and peanuts—to name just a few. These new strains yield more, are better adapted to mechanical harvesting, and better able to resist drought, bad soil, pests, and diseases. One of the most damaging pests to cattle raisers—the screwworm fly—has been eradicated from an entire Caribbean island in a test of a new atomic radiation technique.

QUIET REVOLUTIONS

Hundreds of atomic applications are working quiet revolutions in almost every phase of American industry.

In medicine, 2 radioactive isotopes are now accepted pharmaceuticals—50,000 patients have already been treated with radio isotopes—and half a million others have been given atomic medical diagnosis.

Atomic food preservation has been brought to the point where irradiated foods are being tested on human beings.

Although there are many other examples, these early accomplishments only scratch the surface.

Agricultural researchers foresee the day when we can tailor-make plants for specific growing conditions in specific regions; when we can breed color and taste and shape into our food products to suit consumer preferences; when we may understand the mysterious process of photosynthesis by which plants make proteins and carbohydrates.

Within 1 or 2 decades, a large part of our oceangoing tanker and ore carrier fleets may be running on atomic power.

Within 25 years we may be producing more electricity in this country in atomic powerplants than we produce today from coal, oil, and falling water.

These predictions may sound fantastic but they do not come from Sunday supplement writers. They are conservative forecasts by hardheaded men. And I have been careful in relaying these things to you not to inject into them the coloring of my own enthusiasm.

As the panel's study progressed, I came to recognize a tremendously important facet of this complex subject of atomic energy which so far has received little attention.

This facet is that it is precisely those countries which have the most need for peaceful atomic uses now that have the least chance of getting them by themselves anytime soon.

Let me be specific. Atomic techniques can make farming productive in many areas where today it is either impossible or, at best, marginal. In the United States farm surpluses are serious problems. Atomic techniques which would add to these surpluses are certainly not essential. But in many other countries, in North Africa, Egypt, India, and the Far East—hunger—the stomach instead of the head—is the only influence which motivates hundreds of millions of people.

A NEW HUNGER

There is another kind of hunger—the hunger of nations for fuel and power, the hunger which comes from not having enough energy resources. We in America have never felt that hunger. Even without atomic energy, we will not run out of coal or oil in our lifetimes. In the energy-short economies of the rest of the world, however, atomic energy can make the difference between healthy growth and arrested development.

Right here is the crux of what I want to get across to you today. It is in this imbalance that I see our challenge and our opportunity. We in this country are indifferent, sometimes hostile, to the promise that atomic energy holds. But to the rest of the world, atomic energy is the only real chance for a good life in this generation.

Whenever the United States drops some hint that we are ready to give atomic aid, the world response has surprised even those few Americans who fully appreciate the power and scope of peaceful atomic uses.

There was initially such a response to President Eisenhower's atoms-for-peace plan, announced over 2 years ago. There was such a wave of enthusiasm when the United States pulled back the curtain of atomic secrecy a little bit at last summer's Geneva Atomic Conference. And yet what concrete steps have we taken?

These waves of enthusiasm show a basic fact about atomic energy. It is not just one more medium of economic aid or technical assistance; we can keep on giving conventional aid at the cost of billions, without lasting effect.

Today the United States is the most advanced nation in the development of peaceful atomic uses. But we have learned once before, to our regret, that any lead in the atomic race can be a transient thing. There is no law that the nations of the world must always come to us for atomic knowledge and equipment. On the contrary, there is an inexorable law of human nature that if men want something badly enough, they will go get it wherever they can. And we can be certain, with the new Soviet tactic of service with a smile, that it will not be too long before the whole range of peaceful atomic applications will be made available by Russia, even if not by us.

This leaves us with only one course of intelligent action—we must make a broad atomic-assistance program an integral part of our international relations.

Why, then, when we have been spending billions in economic aid abroad, have we been so backward with the most advanced, the most dramatic, even perhaps the cheapest, form of foreign aid?

The reason is one word, "security." We have been afraid that other nations might misuse the information and the materials we would give them. As a result of this fear, we have tied the hands of our Government and our private businessmen with secrecy restrictions.

We cannot quote abroad the actual prices of atomic fuels. We are afraid that these prices might reveal our rate of weapons material production. Yet, without knowing these prices, no nation can come to its own conclusions as to its own economics of atomic power.

Some reactor technology we can disclose to foreign nations, but we cannot tell them whether it is the latest available. Thus, a foreign nation cannot tell whether atomic equipment it might get from us has been obsolete for years.

Under our secrecy restrictions foreign scientists and engineers, studying in our atomic facilities, can have access only to information which has been thoroughly declassified. Our newspapers are not able to give the real picture of the state of our atomic technology. All down the line, secrecy restrictions prevent us from dealing frankly and openly with foreign nations in peaceful atomic uses.

"SECRECY" AND "SECURITY"

But is "secrecy" reall "security"? To me the only answer is "No." The time has come to stop thinking solely about what atomic energy can do to the world. We must think also about what it can do for the world.

At the present stage of world atomic development, the degree of risk involved is small—particularly because I do not call for any total disclosure in all categories of atomic information. I ask only that atomic electric power technology be share with other nations. Specific military applications of this technology we should continue to keep secret.

Whatever risk we might run by bringing this information to bear for peaceful uses throughout the world would be infinitely smaller than the risk involved in our losing world leadership. On letting down these bars of secrecy, the word is clear for making the peaceful uses of atomic energy an important instrument in our international relations.

The nine members of our citizens' panel all felt that one of our most important conclusions was the need for immediate affirmative action in the field of peaceful atomic developments abroad. We recommended that the United States furnish nuclear fuels, give technological assistance, and permit contracts for the installation of at least 1 million kilowatts of atomic electric generating capacity outside the United States as soon as possible—we hoped by 1960. We called the attention of the world to the fact that such a program would parallel and possibly exceed the atomic power capacity installed at home during this same period.

These recommendations we presented to the Joint Congressional Committee on Atomic Energy January 30. On February 23, President Eisenhower set aside 20,000 kilograms of nuclear fuel for use abroad. My own rough calculations, based on assumptions including material, grade and reactor type, indicate some measure of equivalence between the President's 20,000 kilograms and the panel's 1 million kilowatt goal.

But just making fissionable material available does not build reactors. Two years ago, the United States set aside 200 kilograms of nuclear fuel for research reactors to be built abroad. Yet today only one research reactor fueled with American nuclear fuel is in operation on foreign soil—the one we built for the Geneva Atomic Conference and later sold to Switzerland.

HERE'S HOW

I would like to propose a way for us to go about getting atomic power reactors built abroad. To make my proposal clear, let us first look at how we are doing it at home.

We now have underway in this country what we call a power reactor demonstration program, being financed jointly by business and Government. As part of this program, 7 plants totaling between 800,000 and 1 million kilowatts of electric-power capacity will probably be finished by 1962. The total cost to the Government and participating private business groups—will be in the neighborhood of $300 to $350 million.

Now there are some who say this program is lagging and that a crash program involving heavy Government spending is required lest the United States lose the atomic power race. In fact, hearings on this subject are going on in Washington this week. But I believe that if there is any need for real urgency it does not arise from any present domestic shortage of conventional fuels or electric power, or from any need at home to have a lot of atomic powerplants simply to look at, brag about, and subsidize. If there is any paramount urgency for pressing forward with an enlarged atomic-power demonstration program, it can only stem from the need for the United States to lead in bringing atomic power to the fuel-short, energy-short regions of the world—regions in which the whole issue of our world leadership will be decided.

These regions abroad are the places where atomic power is most likely to pay its own way now, and where atomic plants should be built now.

Specifically, the United States, together with those countries needing atomic power now, should move forward at once with an international atomic-power demonstration program for the construction abroad of one atomic plant of each major type and size to be demonstrated in the United States, as well as other designs particularly adaptable to the needs of specific foreign regions.

THE COST

Let's look at the cost of such an international atomic-power demonstration program.

Our domestic-demonstration program will cost $300 to $350 million. An international program of the same magnitude—that is, close to 1 million kilowatts by 1960—will probably cost about the same. This may sound like a lot of money. But our military and economic credits to Yugoslavia alone in the past 8 years total $1 billion.

The administration has asked for a foreign aid appropriation of $4,900,000,000 for the coming fiscal year. Compared to this, the cost of an International Atomic Power Demonstration program over 5 years would be small—even in the unlikely event that the United States would bear the whole cost. Yet this program could salvage, it would make dynamic and productive our $50 billion investment in foreign aid programs, military, economic, and technical. It could serve as the keystone for a new and effective structure of international policy.

An International Power Demonstration program, as I propose, would give us as useful technical and economic information as we would get from an enlarged demonstration program at home. But, more important, it would prove to the world that we are vigorously moving forward to help those in need; that we are giving them our latest developments, not our cast-off designs; and that worldwide application of peaceful uses of atomic energy are not being held back because our own needs for fuel, energy, and food are not as pressing as in other nations.

This program could dramatically demonstrate that there are more constructive relations possible between neighboring countries than uneasy coexistence or armed truce.

For example, a power demonstration reactor located near where several of the Middle East countries border, would do more good than any number of cease fire agreements. Electric power from this atomic plant, crossing and recrossing frontiers in a regional grid, could harness underground water for irrigation, light homes, and drive machines—all contributing to stability in these troubled countries.

Wherever located, a 10,000 kilowatt atomic powerplant, staffed by local people, would be a far more dramatic focus for local pride, respect, and gratitude than a 100,000 kilowatt conventional powerplant. This is true because atomic energy is not simply a way of selling American store clothes to replace native burnooses. The distinctive garb of the atomic technician can capture the imagination of people abroad out of all proportion to the cost involved. That is a basic point to remember. With atomic energy, cost is not the criterion by which gratitude is measured. The measure is the pride it breeds in the minds of men for the present, and the hope it breeds for the future.

SPECIFIC STEPS

Now, I would like to conclude by suggesting some remaining specific steps to be taken to bring a 1 million kilowatt international atomic power demonstration program into being by 1960.

First, I would recommend that the United States call a series of regional technical meetings, to be held as soon as possible, on the peaceful uses of atomic energy.

These would not be "talk" meetings for the presentation of formal papers. Their agendas should be designed to cut through the fog of generalizations that so often prevents concrete accomplishment. Their purpose would be to get down to the brass tacks of the who, what, when, where and how of applying atomic energy to the specific countries and regions involved.

Secondly, I would recommend that these regional meetings establish definite goals for research, development, and practical application of atomic energy in three fields: electrical generation, medicine and agriculture. Other fields of atomic promise can wait, for the present.

Third, information now classified by the United States—such as, for example, reactor technology and fuel prices—should be made available to participating countries.

Fourth, I would recommend that the entire program be conducted under the auspices of the Atomic Energy Commission, which is best equipped to handle so technical an undertaking.

By giving the job to our engineers and scientists, backed by our industrial strength, we would convince the world that we are not using these humanitarian and economic tools cynically, as poker chips of power diplomacy, as does Russia.

THE GOAL

Our goal should be to bring other nations to the point where they can make sound decisions for themselves on the use of the new resource of atomic energy for social and economic progress. At the same time, we must help them acquire the physical means for carrying out these decisions. We must encourage in every way development of local scientific and technical talent, so that eventually their research reactors, power reactors, hospital, farm and university atomic laboratories will be operated by their own people. The local self-respect and self-sufficiency which will come from harnessing this new resource may end the present state of ferment and unrest in many parts of the world where hopeless poverty and frustration now force national leaders into irresponsible positions against their own and the world's best interests.

It was in the United States that the first controlled nuclear chain reaction was achieved. It is in the United Ctates that the greatest progress has been made toward harnessing this fundamental discovery. After having come so far in our development of the peaceful uses, we cannot now abdicate—and let others bring them to mankind.

The Atomic Energy Commission must be given vigorous support in the steps it is already taking and in the new steps it should take to carry out the augmented program I have outlined here today. Otherwise, all this administration's fine promises since it first used the phrase "Atoms-for-peace," will have gone only to make headlines and consume newsprint.

We must not forget, nor let the world forget, that every kilogram of nuclear fuel we send abroad for peaceful purposes can be one less kilogram available for war. If we move forward immediately on an international atomic power demonstration program, we place before the world our challenge to the Communists to practice, not just preach, atomic disarmament.

Jose DeSoto

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, June 29, 1956

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an excellent and informative article by Gerry Pratt from the Northwest magazine of the Portland Sunday Oregonian for June 24, 1956, describing the great achievement and talent of Jose DeSoto in the Biblical murals he is painting at the famous and historic Sanctuary of our Sorrowful Mother in the city of Portland, Ore.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE MAN WHO SEES INSIDE HEAVEN

(By Gerry Pratt)

Quietly, inch by inch and unnoticed by the people of the city, a man working in the calm confines of the chapel in Portland's Sanctuary of Our Sorrowful Mother is busily brushing back the curtain on heaven.

It is the heaven of the dreams of Jose DeSoto, complete with exciting color, drama, and life. It is the coronation of Mary by the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost.

This is heaven as it appears in the visions of the stocky Spanish artist. For 23 years he has been trying to capture that vision with his paints on the walls and domes of churches in Chicago, Detroit, St. Louis, Los Angeles, Minneapolis, Boston, and now Portland.

"Always, you can see the vision better in your mind than it appears from your brush," said the little man of his work. "My dreams are much nicer than the reality of my art," he added and laughed.

DeSoto admits he has often painted heaven and the things he imagines to be of heaven. But, he will also admit with a light in his eye: "Never before has it been just like this."

The painting, which is fast covering the vast dome above the altar of the new $750,000 chapel at the Sanctuary of Our Sorrowful Mother, first came to life in a downtown hotel room. That was in the summer of 1954, a matter of days after DeSoto had first been invited to bid for the commission of painting the works that would appear in the church.

The vision which the painting portrays was born many years ago in the mind of DeSoto the art student.

A solemn man who is slow to warm to conversation, DeSoto can be drawn out with the mention of the works in the chapel.

"I was in Portland in the summer of 1954 with the Fox theater people, when I was approached by the architect to submit a drawing for the work," he said in his clipped, Spanish-accented English. "They told me 3 or 4 other men from different parts of the world had also bid and that my proposals would also be welcomed.

"The building was just open beams and piles of cement then," he said indicating the exquisite church with a wave of his hand. "But I came out to see for myself. Then I went back to my hotel and sketched in pencil what I would do in this chapel in this setting.

"Then I waited," he added plunging his hands into his faded blue trousers pockets and shrugging his shoulders to give the impression that he hadn't expected to get the job. But he had. The sketches had strength, life and beauty and they instantly impressed the Servite fathers who operate the sanctuary.

DeSoto was asked to consult with the priests.

His drawings showed the seven sorrows of Mary. These would cover the wall panels. Then, the major work above the altar, would be the coronation, complete with angels and DeSoto's vision of heaven. It was only a matter of short time and the commission was his.

The 59-year-old artist moved to Portland in April 1955 and began work. His square hands, which had first mastered the brushing of pictures in the Royal Academy in Madrid while he was still a boy, worked swiftly. They had the talent and the training of years of study at the Spanish conservatory in Rome. They had the experience of 23 years of doing important work in churches throughout the country. And they had the vision in the artist's mind to guide them.

By mid-summer much had been done. Working day in and day out, 8 hours or more each day, much of the intricate work had been finished. The rought charcoal sketch lines of the wall had been filled out with the rich colors of his paints.

Jose DeSoto, though he is reluctant to admit any admiration for the work, became excited. He moved his bachelor belongings into a priest's cell in a lower section of the chapel to be close to his work. Now he is nearly finished.

"I am not satisfied," he said with a tight-lipped expression of appraisal when asked to judge his work. "There are times up there," he said indicating the 30-foot-high scaffolding which holds him close to his work, "when I would like to erase everything and start over. But then there are times, too, when it isn't so bad," he added and you could see the pride and interest this work has brought out in the man.

"It is lonely sometimes. And when you work so close to a piece so large you can't really tell until you get down and see it. When you move away, things change. I am working without a model, and without a model it is hard. No matter how much you know of anatomy, there is always a shadow or a curve that must be seen in finished form before you can be sure.

"No artist is satisfied," he added as if to explain his attitude toward the work. "To be satisfied is to say you can go no farther."

The man puffed nervously on a cigarette while he talked. "This is now a consecrated church, and I do not smoke while working," he explained again. "You see the work is really very hard and not too good," he added and laughed so that it was easy to see that isn't what he meant.

Perhaps a thousand or two thousands years from now when historians probe into the ruins of our civilization they will find this work of DeSoto's. There is a chance they may look on it as something extraordinary, something precious like an El Greco or a Michelangelo. They may not think it great.

Regardless of who sees this art or how they judge it, few will see it without conceding it is very beautiful.

And if you watch this son of a Spanish music professor at work you realize that in the painting of his dream he may well win a place in the history of art.

Quiet trails of 60-acre Sanctuary of Our Sorrowful Mother are open to the public 8 a. m. to 10:30 p. m. daily during summer months.

A memorial to Mary, hewn from rocks and trees on bluffs at Northeast Sandy Boulevard at 85th Avenue in Portland, the grotto is built around the new chapel and a giant altar set in a cave in the side of the cliff.

On 40-acre upper level resting among trees is collection of sanctuaries and Italian carving in memory of Christ and His works.

American Farm Bureau Federation Statement Regarding Hells Canyon Power Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ARTHUR V. WATKINS
OF UTAH
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, June 29, 1956

Mr. WATKINS. Mr President, in action yesterday, here in Washington, the board of directors of the American Farm Bureau Federation unequivocally stated that it "favors the development of the power resources of the Hells Canyon reaches of the Snake River as approved by the Federal Power Commission."

We have before us S. 1333, a proposal which would abrogate, by special legislation such development on the Snake River by the Federal Power Commission. That bill would overturn a national water policy developed over a period of decades and embodied for a quarter of a century in the Federal Power Act.

I am heartily pleased to see that a body of men so vitally interested in the development of our water resources as is the American Farm Bureau Federation, has recognized this basic contradiction.

I believe the entire Farm Bureau statement should be placed before the Congress and therefore I request unanimous consent that it may be printed in the appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WASHINGTON, June 28.—The board of directors of the American Farm Bureau Federation in their quarterly session at Chicago, Ill., today issued the following statement on the controversial Hells Canyon power project:

"The American Farm Bureau Federation favors the development of the power resources of the Hells Canyon reaches of the Snake River as approved by the Federal Power Commission.

"We believe that the production and transmission of power should be primarily a function of private enterprise. The entry of the Federal Government into the commercial production and distribution of power should be restricted to those instances where adequate development cannot be had otherwise.

"In the case of Hells Canyon a private company has sought to develop this resource. Their application to do so has, after comprehensive engineering study and long hearings before the Federal Power Commission, been recommended by the staff of the Commission and the hearing officer, and unanimously approved by the five members of the Commission. The Commission concluded that the 'proposed project is best adapted to a comprehensive plan for improving or developing a waterway for the use or benefit of interstate commerce, for the improvement and utilization of waterpower development, and for other beneficial public uses, including recreation purposes.'

"The flood control, navigational, and recreational benefits of the proposed private development are not significantly different from those of the proposed Federal project and such public benefits would, in the case of private development of the resource, be provided without cost to the taxpayer.

"The Federal project would result in higher production of firm power than the private development—but the cost of the additional power would be at least equal to and possibly in excess of its value.

"Additional power is needed in the area now. Initial power production will be provided within 2 years under the proposed private development as approved by the Federal Power Commission. To stop this development by the intervention of authorization for a Federal project would delay for an indefinite period the availability of additional power in the area.

"The private development, during the 50-year license period, will return to local and Federal Government tax revenues more than double the total cost of the project. Such tax revenues will not be available in the event of Federal construction.

"It is our conviction that the public interest will be best served in this instance by the proposed private development."

The American Farm Bureau Federation represents 1,623,222 farm families in the 48 States and Puerto Rico. It is the Nation's largest general farm organization.

Members of the board of directors are AFBF President Charles B. Shuman, Sullivan, Ill.; AFBF Vice President Walter L. Randolph, Montgomery, Ala.; Herbert W. Voorhees, Trenton, N. J.; Don J. Wickham, Hector, N. Y.; George C. Dudley, Litchfield, Conn.; Wilson M. Heaps, Street, Md.; Lorenzo D. Lambson, Southwick, Mass.; Hassil E. Schenck, Indianapolis, Ind.; Charles Marshall, Lincoln, Nebr.; W. I. Boone, Manhattan, Kans.; Curtis Hatch, Madison, Wis.; E. Howard Hill, Des Moines, Iowa; George H. Wilson, Clarksburg, Calif.; Delmar Roberts, Anthony, N. Mex.; Reuben V. Anderson, Pine Bluffs, Wyo.; Ray V. Swanson, Pocatello, Idaho; Arthur L. Andersen, Ault, Colo.; R. Flake Shaw, Greensboro, N. C.; Boswell Stevens, Jackson, Miss.; H. L. Wingate, Macon, Ga.; B. S. St. Clair, Falls of Rough, Ky.; J. Walter Hammond, Tye, Tex.; and Mrs. Haven Smith, Chappell, Nebr., chairman of the American Farm Bureau women's committee.

Twentieth Anniversary of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOR C. TOLLEFSON
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 14, 1956

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Speaker, today marks the 20th anniversary of the passage by Congress of the 1936 Merchant Marine Act. It was enacted only after strenuous debate, but a majority of the Members of Congress were convinced that the act was in the best interests of the Nation from the standpoint of national defense and economy. The succeeding years have proved most convincingly that their views were correct. An excellent article appearing in today's issue of the Journal of Commerce bears out that fact. I insert it herewith in the RECORD:

[From the Journal of Commerce and Commercial of June 29, 1956]

SHIPPING OUTLOOK

(By Edward P. Tastrom)

MERCHANT MARINE ACT ANNIVERSARY

Today marks the 20th anniversary of the enactment by Congress of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, a piece of legislation that has come to be regarded as the Magna Carta of the shipping industry.

This law is particularly noteworthy for having set for the first time a long-range formula for the development of our overseas commercial shipping. It did this by establishing the parity formula for both construction and operation, required the lines which proposed to benefit by this arrangement to build up and earmark for new construction certain reserves and to confine their operating activities to certain specific trade routes which were designed to promote the commerce of the United States.

It recognized the need of an adequate merchant fleet, but it also made certain that its development would be along the lines which would most adequately serve the common good both in time of crisis and in development of trade.

How has the act worked? A look at some statistics shows that the lines holding subsidy contracts have virtually doubled the size of their fleets. Today this fleet consists of 294 vessels of 3.2 million tons deadweight. compared with the prewar fleet of 171 ships aggregating 1.7 million tons.

More striking is the threefold increase in yearly carrying capacity of this fleet due to the creation of larger and faster ships. Today, estimated cargo capacity lift is placed at more than 14 million tons deadweight, compared with 4.6 million 20 years earlier.

Capital reserves of these lines also have been built up to high levels and are estimated to aggregate about $500 million. This has permitted several of the contract lines to announce new long-range construction plans recently ranging from $175 million to over $300 million.

Thus, this legislation can be said to have achieved its purpose and, according to the Committee of American Steamship Lines which represents the subsidized group, at a modest cost to the taxpayer. The committee estimates that the net operating subsidy cost from 1947 through 1954 (payments were discontinued during the war period) totaled $68.3 million, or an average of $8.5 million a year. This is after Federal income taxes and repayments under subsidy contracts as called for by law.

The 1936 act has been amended several times to meet changing economic and political conditions so that it continues today as the living instrument of our national maritime policy.

Looking into the future it is evident that still further changes will be in order over the years ahead if this law is to continue as a dynamic force.

New problems are constantly arising and new trends having a vital influence on business continue to come to light. Shipping, with its heavy capital investment, is a long-range planning proposition so that, while the securing of cargo is always an immediate concern, the steamship executive, like the master on the bridge of one of his ships, must always look to the horizon.

If one were to peer into the crystal ball today and try to divine what might be in store for us during the next 20 years it is possible to engage in some intriguing speculation, assuming of course, that we are spared a third world war.

Some interesting trends are developing and they all will affect shipping and our maritime policy.

There is, for example, the utilization of atomic power by the merchant marine. This is coming without question, and on a commercially practical scale. The submarine *Nautilus* can be likened to the *Clermont* which first successfully and profitably utilized steam propulsion. During the decade following that initial 1807 trip to Albany, tremendous strides were made and we have never stopped expanding in this direction, as the performance of the superliner *United*

States demonstrates. Look or the same thing to happen with atomic power.

With this will come new problems in ship design, cost and handling; the need for new types of safeguards afloat and in port; revisions in cost and capital accounting, to mention a few possibilities.

We shall continue to import more and more of our raw materials to feed the giant industrial machine that we call these United States. It may be necessary to insure this flow of products by extending the benefits of our maritime laws to specific types of bulk carriers.

We are engaged in what promises to be a great struggle with the Communist bloc for adoption by the backward countries of Africa, the Middle East, and the Orient of our basic philosophy as opposed to that of the Reds. Its origins must be in economic aid to lift living standards and prove visually that our way of emerging from the dark ages is the more preferable.

This struggle is just beginning, if we read correctly the new change in Russian attitude to one of apparent friendliness.

Actually, the new Moscow attitude is more dangerous than the old truculence because it is more insidious and may lull us into a false sense of security.

Again the steamship industry is in the position of playing a major role. Our flag penetrates every major port of the world and with it brings a segment of our national attitude and way of life. It can be utilized forcefully and effectively in this great struggle which is shaping up for the loyalty of key areas of the world.

We are fortunate in having a strong merchant fleet today. We must be ever alert to keep it strong and to expand it with the needs of our economy and our position as the world's leading trading nation.

The States and Atomic Power

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLINTON P. ANDERSON
OF NEW MEXICO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, June 28, 1956

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, in connection with the two addresses on the subject of the atomic power program, delivered by Mr. Robert McKinney, editor and publisher of the Santa Fe New Mexican, which I have had printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix the last two paragraphs of a third address which was delivered by him at a round table discussion on the civilian use of atomic energy at the National Governors' Conference.

There being no objection, the two paragraphs were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE STATES AND ATOMIC POWER

Under the system which America has evolved, State governors have two roles: Primarily, you are the chief executives of your States. But you are also traditionally the heads of your particular political parties in your individual States. In the latter role, you play important parts in shaping the policies and platforms of our two great political parties. Twenty-eight of you will go to one national convention this summer, 20 to the other. But whether you go to Chicago or San Francisco, you can do much toward raising our national foreign policy into the bipartisan realm on which all Americans can and should agree. Therefore, I hope you would not consider it presumptuous if I were to outline a possible bipartisan national atomic policy for you to think about in the next 2 months. In one paragraph, the outline is this:

The speed with which the United States acts to bring benefits of the peaceful uses of atomic energy to all peoples will hasten the achievement of lasting peace through helping to eliminate some of the causes of war. Therefore, we must move forward, on a priority second only to our national defense, in applying atomic techniques to the problems that face the free world, especially in the fields of medicine, agriculture, and electric power. We must embark forthwith on a program generally directed toward these objectives, and particularly toward demonstrating by specific types of plants in specific places the present economic feasibility of atomic power in energy-short and underdeveloped regions of the world. We must hasten to apply the experience thus gained to bringing down the cost of power to levels on which the United States and other free nations can build economic strength, prosperity, and security.

University of Americas Proposed to Offset Reds in Latin America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRUCE ALGER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 12, 1956

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD I would like to include an editorial by Ray Kay of the Dallas Times Herald Washington Bureau.

President Dwight D. Eisenhower delivered a powerful appeal for worldwide education and understanding on the occasion of addressing the graduating class of Baylor University at Waco. His remarks were most provocative, and I would like to call my colleagues' attention to this article of Ray Kay's for their further consideration.

The article follows:

UNIVERSITY OF AMERICAS PROPOSED TO OFFSET REDS IN LATIN AMERICA

(By Ray Kay)

Establishment of a University of the Americas at some focal point such as Puerto Rico is seriously being considered here as a logical step to counteract Communist smiles toward Latin America.

Such a university, operating under the Organization of American States, and supported by OAS members, would offer values far beyond that of throwing an economic monkey wrench into Soviet attempts to expand in this hemisphere, supporters feel.

They say it could translate the Eisenhower administration's good partner policy into increased cultural exchanges in the field of art, literature, and the sciences, and further result in shared technical knowledge and mutual understanding of hemispheric problems.

IKE'S PROPOSAL

In a commencement address at Baylor University, Waco, May 25, President Eisenhower proposed that American universities, with the support of private foundations, establish schools around the globe in a new person-to-person partnership. The partnership, he said, would be designed to enhance "the prospects for a peaceful and prosperous world."

Though he used a different approach, Democratic Senator MIKE MANSFIELD, of Montana, a member of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, had beaten the President to the punch, with the idea of using universities as creators of good will.

MANSFIELD PLAN

On May 16 the western Senator introduced a joint resolution in the Senate which would provide for a study of the possibility and desirability of establishing a University of the Americas.

Existence of such a university, according to MANSFIELD, would "afford superior opportunities for students and professors to expand the interchange of ideas, skills, and culture."

MANSFIELD called attention of the Senate to "the dissatisfaction which has been spreading throughout our neighbors to the south, both with respect to the policies followed toward them and with the degree of interest we have manifested toward the pressing problems which they have."

He added that an alarming drift toward disunity and misunderstanding has, seemingly, acquired impetus in the past 3 or 4 years.

OFFSET TO REDS

Earlier, the Senator had pointed to "the shift in attitudes toward the Soviet Union, in the Latin-American countries," and warned the Senate. A few years ago a Russian diplomatic and economic offensive directed at Latin America might have been dismissed with ridicule. Today, it is no longer a laughing matter."

Senator MANSFIELD said the proposed university could provide "a focal point for deepening understanding of the shared values of the civilizations of the Americas and for enlarging the interchange of ideas, skills, knowledge and achievements among the American Republics."

The Mansfield resolution would provide for the establishment of an eight-member commission to study the idea. Four would come from Congress and four would be appointed by the President, from university presidents representing this country's principal geographical areas.

Other Members of Congress have evidenced interest in the idea.

Representative JOE L. EVINS (Democrat) of Tennessee, who represents the congressional district once represented by the late Secretary of State Cordell Hull, father of the good-neighbor policy, is one. He plans to take the matter up with the President of Puerto Rico and with officials of International House in New Orleans, which has fostered the Cordell Hull Foundation.

OAS VIEW

Dr. Jose Mora, former Uruguayan Ambassador to this country, who is now secretary-general of the OAS, termed the idea a good item for discussion by an inter-American conference. He said the OAS, under its present charter, does not have authority to set up a university. Its function, he added, is to promote, to encourage and cooperate in the cultural exchange.

He pointed out that one of the problems faced by such a school would be the setting up of some method of academic credit equivalence.

Although finding the idea of a University of the Americas interesting, the secretary-general said he does not want to discourage the universities in this country already doing a wonderful job for Latin-American students. These, he said, include Tulane University in New Orleans, the University of Houston, and the University of Florida.

Atomic Power Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CLINTON P. ANDERSON

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, June 28, 1956

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, with further reference to the addresses delivered by Mr. Robert McKinney, editor and publisher of the Santa Fe New Mexican, on the subject of the atomic power program, I ask unanimous consent that the address delivered by him before the National Conference on Uranium and the Atomic Industry of the Atomic Industrial Forum and Denver Research Institute, on June 25, 1956, in Denver, Colo., be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, as follows:

I have been advised by the Public Printer that the manuscript is estimated to make approximately 3⅓ pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, at a cost of $267. I ask unanimous consent that the address be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD regardless of the fact that it overruns the limit.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AMERICAN INDUSTRY'S STAKE IN AN INTERNATIONAL ATOMIC POWER PROGRAM

(Address to National Conference on Uranium and the atomic industry of the Atomic Industrial Forum and Denver Research Institute, June 25, 1956, Denver, Colo., by Robert McKinney, editor and publisher, Santa Fe New Mexican, chairman, Citizens' Panel which reported to the Joint Congressional Committee on Atomic Energy on the impact of the peaceful uses of atomic energy)

This is an era of departmentalization. In my particular business most well-run newspapers have special editors-in-charge-of-being-horsewhipped. Publishers used to throw letters from irate readers in the wastebasket. These readers, receiving no reply, usually canceled their subscriptions. An editor-in-charge-of-being-horsewhipped bridges the gap. After the readers have taken out their wrath on him, fewer subscriptions are canceled.

My experience as my own editor-in-charge-of-being-horsewhipped has been priceless to me in other fields. On looking over the distinguished titles—each different—listed after the names of you all attending this meeting, I am convinced that the atomic energy industry has grown up enough to become fully departmentalized. So I am going to suggest a new atomic job title—Vice president-in-charge-of-being-horse-whipped.

My own qualifications are for a less distinguished title, atomic-observer-in-charge-of-being-horsewhipped. During the past 14 months, as many of you know, my activities have taken me close to the heart of some of the problems of the atomic industry. With eight other laymen, I served on the Citizens Panel which reported to Congress on the impact of the peaceful uses of atomic energy.

Principally, we studied the effect of atomic developments on our economy, industry, natural resources, and employment here in the United States. Within the terms of reference established by the Congressional Joint Committee, our study of international aspects of the peaceful uses of atomic energy was directed mainly to the effect which atomic developments abroad might have on the United States.

The other side of the coin—that is, the effect peaceful atomic developments in the United States might have on other countries—was not specifically included in our terms of reference, because of our limited time and resources. In our studies, however, our panel was struck by the fact that it is precisely this other side of the coin which is of paramount importance. We therefore felt ourselves bound to report that—

"Atomic power may be the most tangible symbol of America's will to peace through the peaceful atom. Our domestic needs cannot be our only motivation. Otherwise, we leave without effective rebuttal the argument that America is so rich, so prosperous, that a revolutionary new energy resource can emerge without any urgent need on our part to put it to man's use. This must seem a strange position indeed to peoples possessing neither conventional fuels nor technical capabilities to put the atom to work.

"If we fail to act to bring atomic power to the free world, other countries will do so ahead of us, or progress will proceed at a slower pace.

"Peaceful uses of atomic energy will inevitably be developed throughout the world. The United States must lead."

In the few months that have passed since our panel report was published, I have given much thought to another phrase we used, "the challenge to the United States world leadership." I felt that, in looking at the shape of things to come, the international aspect must be considered, not only in evaluating the atomic industrial potential for America; I felt also that we must examine the international aspects of atomic energy for clues to the solution of the problems of world leadership—even survival—which face us.

Having thought about this reverse side of the coin, I ventured to put some of my preliminary conclusions up for public view, and so qualified as atomic-observer-in-charge-of-being-horse-whipped. In a talk before the Overseas Press Club in New York last month, I took as my subject "Peaceful Uses of Atomic Energy as an Instrument in International Relations." I tried to tell why the international aspects of atomic energy seemed to me of crucial importance, and suggested a few concrete steps which I believe we should take. I mentioned several countries as possible places for demonstration of atomic power reactors, among them Liberia.

My efforts of that day inspired some to take the old horsewhip down from the harness locker. The Augusta (Ga.) Chronicle—which by Georgia measurement is located 12,500 miles from Liberia and which, accordingly, may have forgotten that Liberia was founded by settlers from Georgia—had this to say:

"There just seem to be no limitations on the unrealistically generous impulses of certain people when it comes to spending American taxpayers' money in foreign countries. Now a Santa Fe publisher, Robert McKinney who is described as an authority on atomic energy, has suggested that the United States help to build at least seven atomic-power plants in countries where fuel is scarce. Well, he may be an authority on atomic energy, although the rank and file of the American people have no knowledge of him and his accomplishments, but he is certainly no authority on what is best for the American people and the American Nation."

America's largest newspaper, the New York Daily News, asked this trenchant question:

"Is anybody sure, for instance, that the natives of West Slobovia really want an atomic reactor? Even if we American taxpayers gave them shiploads of electric toasters, too, how about if Slobovians turn out to be toast-haters? And so on * * *. Any way, no matter what the side-arguments, a challenging atom age is with us, and the United States had better develop and use this new wonder-power to the best of its technological ability."

In spite of the horsewhippings, my morale continued high, because there were many who agreed with my premises and my conclusions, and who took time to write. They said that I had provoked them into thinking about the specific action proposed, and put to me the questions to which their own thinking had given rise.

Some of these questions really go to the heart of the problem of what an atomic power demonstration program abroad can mean in our international relations. But more important to you here in this audience, these same questions go to the heart of what such a program can mean to American industry.

Before looking at some of the specific questions, let me make a brief observation which I think might help the Augusta Chronicle and its readers understand the issues.

We are engaged with the Russians in a battle of ideas. Our victory in this battle—our world leadership—can only be achieved, if all Americans are sure of the principles for which they stand. We are not in an international footrace of statistics. Our leadership cannot stand on the number of kilowatts of atomic-power capacity we might install at home by any given date. It cannot be based on the number of papers our scientists might read before learned societies. In this battle of ideas we need a new weapon.

We need a new element in our foreign policy to convince the peoples of the world of what we have been trying for the last decade, but so far have failed to convince them of—that the United States is truly their friend and deserves their respect and trust.

An international atomic power demonstration program can provide this new element. It can prove to the world that we are vigorously moving forward to help those in need; that we are giving them our latest developments, not our castoff designs. Atomic powerplants built abroad can, for many countries, spell new hope for economic growth.

But we must also remember that construction of atomic powerplants abroad can mean much more. It can mean new markets to help bridge the gap which might otherwise exist in the volume of business of reactor designers, fabricators, and contractors of uranium miners and processors, of fuel element manufacturers.

Against this background, let us look at some of the questions thoughtful people are asking.

ARE WE LAGGING?

Precedent to the question of whether we should expand our present atomic program is the question of whether this program is lagging. This question has two facets:

First, are we moving ahead fast enough in our present atomic power activities and are we moving in the right direction? The Atomic Energy Commission has powerful capabilities of its own in manpower and facilities; it is able to draw by contract on all American industry. Has the Commission made the wisest use of these capabilities?

The second facet of any inquiry as to whether our present program is lagging is this: Can private enterprise play a greater part than it is now playing in the development of civilian atomic power?

In a nutshell, are Government and industry each moving with the right momentum in the right direction, to serve the best interests of the Nation?

In the course of our panel study we looked into these questions. In recent hearings before the joint congressional committee, the pros and cons were again examined. Our panel report clearly recognized that the growth of atomic power can come only from sound technological knowledge and thorough engineering and operating experience. That

these all can be brought about only in an orderly, time-consuming way we are learning from the well-rounded atomic power demonstration program for large-size plants now being pressed by the Atomic Energy Commission.

We stated, however, that the importance of small- and medium-sized atomic powerplants on the international scene, and the opportunity which they afford for a bold demonstration of United States technological leadership, give their development a high sense of urgency.

We concluded, therefore, that the present program is deficient to the extent that appropriate demonstrations of small- and medium-size plants are not now underway.

Although the recent congressional hearings did not seem to be conclusive as to whether our present program was lagging, they did bring out several specific types of reactors which were considered promising so-called second choices for power demonstration purposes. It was interesting to me that these second choices are types which have advantages of the first order, in the context of construction and operation abroad.

It is easy to criticize. It is easy to dismiss criticism as Monday-morning quarterbacking. But I know we meant the remarks of our panel to be constructive in setting the basis for a reappraisal which we felt was needed. I know, too, that what was brought out at the recent hearings—by such objective expert witnesses as Zinn, McCune, Smyth, Fairman, Sporn, LeClair, and others—was intended in the most constructive way. Those of us who have lived closely with the Atomic Energy Commission—some in studying its activities, some in negotiating power demonstrations or similar projects—are keenly aware of the difficult and complex problems the Commission faces in bringing to reality the dream of civilian atomic power. We know that the Commission has given great thought and effort to establishing an evaluating process. Through this process, its scientific and technical programs must pass muster before some of the best minds in the country. Many other minds of the same high caliber are available in our atomic industry, and I am confident that the Commission must draw upon their evaluating skill on an ever-increasing scale.

In this light then, answers begin to emerge.

The Atomic Energy Commission's power demonstration program represents a direct frontal attack on the problem of low-cost atomic power in the context of the American economy. Presently proposed investments by American industry, while not large, are at least earnest money. Efforts of American industry to sell atomic power reactors abroad would also be serious, if existing barriers can be removed. All this does not look like lagging.

But I must hasten to point out that no mere recapitulation of programs intended approved or sought, no listing of treaties and compacts desired can be considered as real evidence for any sound judgment as to whether our efforts are equal to the urgency, or whether our efforts are lagging.

There must be concrete action. Reactors must be solid, funds committed, materials fabricated, ground broken, construction started.

If our atomic power development program is to be dynamic, there must be continuing examination and reexamination of all promising reactor concepts—studies in the context of where each type and size is most likely to be economically competitive. Such a reappraisal at the present time can only lead to the conclusion that demonstrations should be undertaken abroad, where even present concepts can be economically competitive.

Let me say that, while the need for the construction of atomic power plants abroad is urgent, I do not believe that we should undertake reactor construction—either at home or abroad—on a crash basis. We cannot, as a nation, be diverted by economic or a political expediency from the path of orderly atomic development. We cannot waste our capabilities or throw scientific and economic caution to the winds.

A GIVEAWAY?

And this leads us to the next question: Is what I propose a give-away program? As I understand the colloquial term "give-away," it means a gift with no hope of any return. I have already mentioned the intangible returns which we can expect to receive from the construction of atomic power demonstration plants abroad. In addition to these intangible returns, I believe there can be tangible returns on the investment.

Organizations represented in this audience will be among those called upon to sell and build these reactors in foreign countries. Part of the job of selling is the job of finding where the money will come from. American manufacturers may not think enough of the credit standing of some foreign countries to undertake the sales, without financial guarantees. Yet there are clearly several financing sources: Local investment capital, normal international financing channels and, lastly, the United States foreign-aid program.

It would be my recommendation that the first two of these sources support the required capital outlay, or at least a very substantial part of it. I would consider the use of foreign-aid funds a last resort and use it only to cover those cases in which the intangible benefits are considered to be of surpassing importance.

Even if foreign-aid funds are used, I see no reason why these funds should be gifts—repayment should be required. The plants which would be built should, as I have said, preferably be located where they can be economically competitive; therefore they should yield a return on the investment.

Furthermore, I think it is important to recognize that the formula used at the Shippingport, Pa., atomic power demonstration plant can be as useful and realistic abroad as at home. Under this formula, the unconventional—the atomic—portion of the plant is charged off against development expense. This should be done in all cases, wherever demonstration plants are built. By such an approach only the cost of research and development of benefit to the United States remains in the realm of the giveaway. This approach converts the program into a practical way to bring down the cost of nuclear power wherever generated, in Augusta, Ga. or in Monrovia, Liberia.

The giveaway charge can be answered in another way particularly interesting to American industry. This answer has both tangible and intangible values. The American atomic energy industy needs dynamic impetus now. Yet even doubling the present domestic demonstration program cannot provide that impetus—it only would double the amount of present and continuing subsidy.

It is important, however, to recognize that, because of high power costs abroad, the growth of atomic generating capacity there can begin immediately since atomic power can now be competitive in some areas. This growth could reach or exceed 100 million kilowatts of atomic power capacity by 1980.

Significant growth of nuclear power in the United States is not likely to start before 1960—probably not until after 1965—reaching by 1980 possibly as much as approximately 140 million kilowatts of atomic power capacity. As I see it then, the construction by American firms of 1 million or more kilowatts of atomic power capacity abroad, during the next 5 years, would give our manufacturers a market in these near term years which otherwise could be very lean.

POWER IN INDUSTRIALIZATION

Before passing from the subject of the economics of atomic power abroad, we should consider questions raised by those who are concerned lest we delude ourselves into believing that atomic power, by itself, can mean healthy economic growth for underdeveloped areas. This concern, although sincere, is, I feel, misplaced.

If underdeveloped regions are to become industrialized, two things are needed: electric power and industrial facilities to use that power. Large investments in industrial facilities are required, whether the electricity which drives the machine tools is generated by fossil fuels or atomic reactors. If they are to move toward industrialization everyone must recognize that the needs of these foreign areas will not be limited to power generation, to power distribution or consumption, or even to the manufacturing segment of the economy.

DEPENDABLE POWER

Another economic question is raised by those who ask whether, in the present state of the art, atomic powerplants are dependable enough to be useful in meeting the needs of power-short countries.

I see achievement of economic nuclear power as a stepwise process. One step is to establish technical feasibility through experiment. In this step the main interest is whether the reactor will even operate. The second step—the demonstration phase—cannot take place until after determination of technical feasibility. The goal of this later phase is to give a concrete example of the economics of operation of a particular sign, under particular conditions, in a particular place.

Based upon this distinction, when I use the term "demonstration" as applied to an atomic powerplant, I mean a plant which is capable of proving economic where it is located by bearing its required portion of the load. Abroad, the load factor for such a demonstration plan may be 80 percent or better. In the United States, in the midst of integrated power systems, the load factors for such plants can be materially lower. Thus, while in the United States we may be inclined to carry over some of the activities of the experimental phase into the demonstration phase, practices which result in low, firm power capabilities cannot be tolerated abroad.

I think for such a well-posted audience I need only note that designs for plants which can provide firm power, with load factors of 80 percent or better, exist. One example is the *Nautilus* powerplant. It has operated safely and for long periods under continuous loads and under extremely difficult conditions—conditions far more exacting than encountered in land-based plants.

SAFE POWER

And this raises another concern which is usually expressed in the form of this question. What would be the effect on United States world leadership, in case an accident occurred during operation of an atomic powerplant constructed abroad under United States auspices? Such an incident, some people say, would have disastrous international complications, on which Russian propagandists would capitalize. The best reply is another question: Would the Russians fail to make as much or more propaganda capital out of an accident involving an atomic powerplant here in the United States?

I do not believe that we must limit our reactor exports only to obsolete designs having a long history of accident-free operation. We must not lose sight of the fact that decisions to build atomic powerplants abroad must be made, in the first instance, by the countries involved. The safety of a particular design should be a matter of frank and open disclosure. We are not forcing these

countries to build reactors. We are giving them the opportunity, if they want it, to build their choice of the reactors we are willing to operate at home. Perhaps the concern thus expressed is more indicative of a desire to keep atomic energy information buttoned up in our secret files than a real concern with possible accidents abroad.

SCIENTISTS, ENGINEERS, TECHNICIANS

I have been asked whether the construction of atomic powerplants abroad would not constitute an added, perhaps unbearable, drain on our already critically short manpower capabilities. This question seems to come from the premise that, here in the United States, all available scientific, engineering, and technical manpower, capable of working on atomic programs, is already fully employed on projects now underway; and that the ever-growing American atomic industry can continue to use fully all of its scientific, engineering, and technical capabilities, whether or not a foreign market ever develops.

Let me say at the outset that I have no intention of minimizing our Nation's problems in all fields of trained manpower. Shortages are serious in all professional skills. Urgent remedial action must be taken, or the situation will soon become critical. The hunt for scientific and engineering manpower, with special experience and training in atomic energy, has become almost frantic. Perhaps competition for atomic personnel, however, may be a necessary prelude to competition in selling atomic products.

Yet, even the number of people with professional skills, required for such a large program as that now being carried out by the Atomic Energy Commission, are actually not in themselves alarming. For example, the AEC estimates that it is currently employing through contractors about 3,600 scientists and 2,500 engineers, primarily or partly engaged in peaceful applications of atomic energy. These numbers are small, when compared to the scientific and engineering manpower reservoirs of the Nation. And certainly these numbers are not alarming, when one finds that only 1,200 of these scientists and 450 of these engineers spend the greater part of their time on peaceful uses.

To understand the true dimensions of the manpower problem, let us look at some figures on manpower demand which may be created by an international atomic power demonstration program having a total capacity of 1 million kilowatts by 1960. Here an estimate prepared by the Atomic Energy Commission for a domestic program twice this size might be useful. For 2 million kilowatts of power capacity, generated in 150,000-kilowatt plants, each operated on a 4-shift basis, the Commission estimated that a total of 500 people would be needed to operate the nuclear portion of the 13 or 14 plants involved. This sum includes reactor operators, supervisors, radiation technicians, monitors, instrument technicians, maintenance and service personnel, and engineers. This total of 500 people for a 2 million kilowatt program by 1960 can be broken down. It is made up of 4 reactor operators per shift per plant, 1 supervisor per shift per plant, 2 engineers per plant, 3 radiation technicians on each shift, and a few maintenance personnel. These figures I have just given dealt with operating personnel.

Another interesting estimate by the Atomic Energy Commission, dealing with manufacturing personnel, indicates that—for the same total capacity of 2 million kilowatts installed by 1960—development, design, and construction of reactor systems would require a total of 8,000 people employed at one time or another during the period 1956–60. This includes 6,000 laborers, mechanics, technicians, draftsmen, fabricators, etc. It includes another 2,000 scientific and engineering personnel. These too, are not large or alarming numbers and if anything, are probably conservatively computed. These figures, I repeat are for a 2-million kilowatt domestic program; 1 million kilowatts—even abroad—would certainly require less.

If the premise is true that all personnel in the American atomic industry are now fully and profitably employed, I can only ask why many, if not all of you here today are aggressively hunting new business.

The Atomic Industrial Forum Memo last month noted that the Babcock and Wilcox Co.—with support from Union Carbide Nuclear Co.—was selected to design, fabricate, and operate the first liquid metal fueled reactor, expected to begin operation in about 3 years. The forum memo goes on to say: "The Babcock and Wilcox proposal won out over nine others. These were submitted by: ACF Industries, Inc.; American Radiator & Standard Sanitary Corp.; Dow Chemical Co.; Koppers Co.; Glenn L. Martin Co.; Mine Safety Appliances Co.; Nuclear Development Corp.; Nuclear Science & Engineering Corp.; and Robershaw Fulton Controls Co. in combination with the Consolidated Western Steel Division of the United States Steel Corp."

The Atomic Energy Commission could accept only one of the 10 bids for this one plant. Would not several of the nine unsuccessful bidders be ready, able, and willing to undertake, now, the design and construction of atomic power plants abroad—drawing only on their own present manpower? And remember these 10 bidders represent only a small part of the atomic industry.

I grant that we may need all of the people employed by these other manufacturers for some future—some still undefined—reactor projects. But we have already noted that, if there is any urgency in moving forward with atomic power in this country, it does not stem from any present or near term shortage of conventional fuels; but that the real urgency can only stem from the need to make atomic power available now to other nations which desperately need it. The critical problem that faces us is the international problem—not any present domestic deficit of electric energy, either civilian or military.

Obviously, we could not fully man and operate all of the atomic power reactors which could conceivably be constructed abroad. Yet you will recall the numbers of people needed per reactor. They are so small they are worth repeating: 4 reactor operators per shift; 3 radiation technicians per shift; 1 operations supervisor per shift, a few maintenance people, and 2 engineers per plant. These numbers—which you will note do not call for mathematicians, physicists, chemists, metallurgists, or other categories of scientific manpower—are surely within the manpower capabilities of all but the most underdeveloped nations. In the 3- or 4-year period required for plant construction, specialized training for all but the 2 engineers required per plant, could be carried out under the training programs conceived with great foresight and now being conducted by the Atomic Energy Commission.

Surely what I have done here today cannot be considered to be a rigorous analysis of the manpower problems which could arise from an international atomic power demonstration program. I think we have, however, a reasonable first approximation, and I cannot find the results disturbing. The job looks feasible. I do not think we can afford to lightly dismiss a program of such importance by merely mentioning the words, manpower shortage, any more than I believe that we should support such a program merely because someone says that we have to keep ahead of the Russians.

NATIONAL SECURITY

The last group of questions, which we need to touch on only briefly, stems from defense considerations. They relate to protection of our national security through secrecy controls on information, and through assuring that nuclear materials, involved in atomic powerplants abroad, do not turn up in weapons which might be used against us.

Since President Eisenhower proposed his atoms for peace plan 3 years ago, the world has had still greater evidence that the Russions have no intention whatsover of playing ball. Their bullheaded attitude was not unexpected. It has characterized all Russion dealings, both within and outside the United Nations, on the whole subject of atomic control since the end of World War II. Yet our representatives have patiently, sometimes brilliantly, tried to bring about the necessary first steps for international controls on a multilateral basis. But these efforts on our side have met barrier after barrier built by the Russians. The United States has, therefore, taken the route of bilateral agreements with friendly nations. Thus far, with only few exceptions, these bilateral agreements are limited to research reactors and to scientific information in nonsensitive categories. Haltingly we have moved toward bilateral agreements concerning exchange of information on civilian atomic power.

True, bilaterals for research reactors are necessary first steps. True also, that those countries with which we have bilateral agreements for research reactors should indeed be grateful. Yet, unfortunately, these measures can be made to appear to many only crumbs from America's bountiful table.

Questions naturally arise in the minds of people abroad who have neither conventional energy sources, nor any real chance to develop atomic power on their own. Why, they ask, is the United States—with all its reserves of conventional fuels—so niggardly in making atomic power available to the rest of the world? Such questions undermine the concept we are so painfully trying to build of the United States as a helping friend. Perhaps the problem of controlling nuclear fuels on a multilateral basis is an impossible task, so long as the Soviet Union must be party to the agreement. When handled on a bilaterial basis, however, the material control problem can be shrunk to dimensions which are within our capacity to handle expeditiously.

Turning from material control to secrecy, we find another seemingly large problem which can be reduced to workable dimensions. I think we are agreed that if atomic energy is to be an effective instrument in international relations, people in other countries must decide for themselves whether they want civilian atomic power and, if so, what installations would best fit their needs. Such decisions require specific, factual information, some parts of which continue to be held secret under our present classification concepts.

I am not preaching disclosures of how we apply atomic energy for military purposes, but because of the present advanced state of development of atomic energy throughout the world, particularly in Russia, any feeling of national security based upon secrecy is false. The costs to atomic progress on peaceful uses in dollars, in speed of development, and in manpower as a result of overemphasis on secrecy is probably enormous. And these costs may be overshadowed by the incalculably greater costs arising from the conversion or neutralization of important areas of the world by communism.

BREAKING THE LOGJAM

To some your presence here today may seem a complete answer to many of the questions I have placed before you. This crowded room could be offered as evidence of the prosperous state of the American atomic industry.

But, at this point, I would like to ask some questions.

Is what we have represented here today really industry in the American tradition?

Is it private, is it enterprise?

If so, what concrete steps can you point to?

The commitment of 20,000 kilograms of nuclear fuel for atomic power stations abroad was made by Government, not by industry. Even this can be termed only a diplomatic gesture, if not followed soon by steps to bring about the constuction of reactors in which to burn the earmarked fuel.

Our atomic equipment manufacturers may well feel the pressure of hard times, if left to exploit only the domestic atomic power program which cannot start real growth until around 1965. Our uranium miners and processors may suddenly find themselves with a depressed market, should military requirements be curtailed.

An international atomic power demonstration program involving construction of 1 million kilowatts of plant capacity abroad by 1960 can be an important instrument in international relations—yet still only partially relieve the hardships of slow times in our atomic industry.

An international program can, however, bring about those legislative and policy changes by Government which would permit our domestic atomic industry to develop the maximum market potential abroad—far above this very modest goal of 1 million kilowatts.

Atomic power will inevitably take its place in the front ranks of the economic forces of the world. It will take this place much sooner, if our American atomic industry tackles the job vigorously and without restraint. To instill vigor, to minimize restraint by Government, we must avoid subsidy.

The questions that have been put to me are indeed questions for you here, and the whole atomic industry, to answer.

And remember that neither the American public nor the world at large will tolerate superficial answers which have no basis in fact or action.

Increasing Rates of, and Liberalizing the Basis for Payment of, Non-Service-Connected Pension and Service-Connected Compensation

SPEECH

OF

HON. WINFIELD K. DENTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 27, 1956

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H. R. 7886) to amend part III of Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a) to liberalize the basis for, and increase the monthly rates of, disability pension awards.

Mr. DENTON. Mr. Chairman, I hope that no points of order will be raised against H. R. 7886 or any of its provisions, for I would like to see adequate benefits provided for both non-service-disabled veterans and service-disabled veterans. After lengthy deliberation, the Veterans' Affairs Committee has seen fit to report to the House a single bill carrying both types of benefits. If we are now obliged to put aside the provisions for compensation of service-disabled veterans and wait for a new bill containing those provisions, we will be risking delay at a critical stage of this session. But, if that should be the case, I hope that a second bill can be brought to the House with all possible speed. I think that practically all are agreed that an increase in compensation benefits is warranted, and I certainly hope that we can take timely action and be sure of getting such an increase this year.

However, as to title I of the bill, providing for non-service-connected pensions, I think that is the place and this is the time to begin to make some distinction between veterans of World War I and those of later wars in considering such benefits. So long as that distinction is not made, we are going to continue to hear argument against these pensions in terms of cost and national policy and many other factors which might be debated endlessly.

These arguments against such pensions tend more and more to be based on estimates as to what effect the coverage of World War II and Korea veterans will have on the pension program. But I say there will be time and opportunity enough in another Congress to go into that matter. Let us not cloud the issue of World War I veterans pensions any longer. Their case is urgent. Time will not wait for them.

I believe that pensions to veterans of World War I are long overdue, and it was for that reason I introduced H. R. 656, which provides for the same pensions to be granted to World War I veterans as are granted to the veterans of the Spanish-American War. Nearly 40 years have passed since the close of World War I and no general pension legislation has been passed for veterans of World War I. No veteran of four previous wars in our history had to wait as much as 40 years to see Congress enact a pension for him.

Pensions were granted to the Revolutionary War veterans 35 years after the close of that war; to the Mexican War veterans 39 years after the close of that war; to the Civil War veterans 24 years after the close of that war, and to the Spanish-American War veterans 18 years after that war.

I am a veteran of both World Wars I and II, but I cannot help contrasting the differences in the way the veterans of the two wars were treated, after the close of each conflict. Those who enter military service in wartime must give up their positions or jobs, and when that service ends there generally follws a period of hardship during which they must find employment and readjust to civilian life. The Government did very little to help the veterans of World War I tide themselves over this period of adjustment.

When they were discharged they were given only $60 mustering-out pay. After a long struggle, an attempt was made to adjust this injustice by giving the veterans so-called "adjusted service certificates." The Government ascertained the amount of mustering-out pay that should have been paid to the veterans at the time of their discharge. An increment was added to make up for delay in payment, and it was determined how much paid-up insurance, due in 20 years, could be bought with each veteran's "adjusted service credit." Each veteran was given a certificate for that amount of paid-up insurance. The total amount paid under these certificates was $3.8 billion, but the expenditure would only have been about $1.5 billion if the veterans of World War I had been paid this money due them 18 years before when they were mustered out of service, as were the veterans of World War II.

Contrast the difference in the benefits given the veterans of World War II. They were given mustering-out pay, without question, of from $200 to $300 to each veteran, which cost the Government $4 billion. In addition, they were given terminal-leave pay, which cost the Government $3.1 billion, and unemployment compensation which cost the Government $3.8 billion. They were also given social security credits for the time they spent in service. Complete figures for the cost of this are not available, but it will amount to something over $600 million.

The veterans of World War II were also given the GI bill of rights. Under this program, they were given education benefits which have cost the Government to date $15 billion, and these veterans were also given guaranteed loans to purchase homes or to go into business or start farming. Such loans totaling $30 billion have already been made, and $16 billion of this sum is guaranteed by the Government. Similar benefits have been granted to Korean war veterans, although in some cases they are not as great as those granted to the veterans of World War II.

Excluding disability compensation, which is available to the veterans of all wars, and aside from the home-loan program which so far has cost comparatively little, the benefits paid to the veterans of World War II and the Korean war now total $26.5 billion, and this figure will certainly exceed $30 billion within 10 years from now. This sum is 20 times the amount paid to veterans of World War I, and per person, the benefits paid to the veterans of World War II and Korea are 4 times those paid to the veterans of World War I. The benefits were paid World War II and Korea veterans when they left the service, and so were much more beneficial to them than if paid to them years later.

It seems that when it is proposed to do anything for the veterans of World War I, someone always says the cost will be prohibitive. I do not know why there is this feeling about World War I veterans, and why people feel that these veterans should be treated so differently from the veterans of any other war.

I have made a rather intensive study of the financial and budget aspects of this question, and tried to get to the real essentials of it without reference to the elaborate presentations which the Veterans' Administration makes in its usual line of opposition. My conclusions were given in detail to the Veterans' Affairs Committee in my testimony there on February 27. I will mention the substance of it briefly here.

Forty-five years after the close of the Civil War, when pension costs of that conflict probably were at their peak, Civil War veterans' pensions took up 15.2 percent of the total budget of the

Federal Government. But if every veteran of World War I living today were paid a pension of $101 a month at age 62—as I proposed in H. R. 656—the cost would be less than 3 percent of the Federal budget. The Civil War pension of 15 percent of the budget did not break up the Treasury then, and I hardly see how a World War I pension of 3 percent of the budget could bankrupt us now.

Those Civil War pensions at peak cost amounted to one-half of 1 percent of the national income. And the World War I pensions which I proposed would amount to less than one-half of 1 percent of the current national income.

We were paying those Civil War pensions in 1910 at the same time as pensions to veterans of three other conflicts. Veterans benefits of all types then took 23 percent of the Federal budget. Today, we use only 7.4 percent of the budget to pay for veterans' benefits of every description.

All these figures I have presented are based on granting World War I pensions of $101 a month at age 62, without a means test of any kind. But, if we follow the idea of H. R. 7886, and set the eligible age at 65, and continue the limitation on outside income so that fewer would qualify, the cost of such a program would be much lower than the one of which I spoke. And, certainly, if any pension less than $101 a month were provided, the program's cost would be far lower than my figures—and I think I have shown the cost of my own proposal to be reasonable. In short, as to World War I pensions, the cost argument is no argument at all when we look at budget history.

There can be no question about the sacrifice that World War I veterans gave in their service. More of the population remained at home in their civilian pursuits during that war than in any of the five other major conflicts in which this country has fought. During the Revolutionary War, 14.2 percent of the population saw military service; 7.4 percent served in the War of 1812; 9.7 percent of the available population performed Federal service during the Civil War; 11 percent served in World War II; 4.4 percent served in the Korean conflict. But only 4 percent of the population was called up for service in World War I. Those who served in World War I were but a few selected from among the many.

For the veterans of World War I, the sands in the hourglass of time are running low. Today, their average life expectancy is only 15 years. Of the 4.6 million who came home when the fighting in France was done, barely 3 million remain. "Taps" has already sounded for more than one third of the "Doughboys" of 1918. Every passing day, 235 of them die. Tomorrow, 235 of them whom we could have pensioned today will be dead. A year from now, 90,000 more of the boys who faced shot, shell and gas in the trenches will have gone to Eternity—unpensioned and very nearly forgotten.

I think the arguments of those who oppose pensions for World War I veterans dwindle down to admitting that these pensions would be only just and proper, "but for the cost."

Surely no one would want to say that, while these veterans in all fairness are deserving of these benefits, we had better wait until death has thinned their numbers still more, and start paying them pensions when it can be done more cheaply. Surely no one would want to play such a cold-blooded waiting game as that.

I prefer to believe that all of us will recognize now the justice in the proposal to pension those veterans, and that we will take steps now to do now what ought to be done.

Let the veterans of World War I be treated with the same consideration as those of the other wars in which our Nation has fought. Let there be no generation of forgotten men among America's veterans.

Senator John F. Kennedy for Vice President

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 29, 1956

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, may I call to the attention of my colleagues an editorial from the Springfield Daily News on June 27 headlined "KENNEDY Boom Grows," which points up several of the recent compliments paid to our esteemed junior Senator from the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, as the possible Democratic nominee for the Vice Presidency.

One of the tributes came from the Republican Governor of Massachusetts, the Honorable Christian Herter, who, while at the annual Governors' Conference at Atlantic City, said that Senator KENNEDY might carry the State for the Democratic ticket in November if he were the vice presidential candidate.

The editorial follows:

KENNEDY BOOM GROWS

Gov. Abraham Ribicoff of Connecticut, who told the Democratic State convention in Worcester earlier this month that the party should nominate Senator JOHN F. KENNEDY of this State for Vice President, disclosed yesterday that he is still working for that objective.

At the annual governors' conference in Atlantic City, Governor Ribicoff said that he had written to Adlai Stevenson, leading Democratic presidential candidate, on the subject, and had discussed it with James A. Finnegan, campaign manager for Mr. Stevenson.

Gov. Dennis J. Roberts of Rhode Island gave his endorsement to the Connecticut governor's proposal, and also said that he considered Mr. Stevenson as "the best qualified man in either party for the presidency."

Many newspapers have commented favorably on this proposal to put Senator KENNEDY on the Democratic ticket, and the Chicago Daily Sun-Times this week joined that group by presenting a strong, favorable case for the Massachusetts Senator. Representative EDWARD P. BOLAND, Democrat, of Springfield, remarked that the editorial reflects the feelings of the majority of the citizens of Massachusetts, regardless of political part, and he had it reprinted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

However, the highest compliment paid this week to Senator KENNEDY came from the Republican governor of his State, Christian A. Herter. He told an Associated Press representative at the governors' conference yesterday that Senator KENNEDY "might possibly carry the State" for the Democratic ticket if he were the vice presidential candidate.

Governor Herter has made it clear that he assumes that President Eisenhower will run for reelection, and that the President's popularity in this State is as great as it was in 1952. At that time, the Republican national ticket received 1,292,325 votes to carry the State by a margin of more than 200,000. At the same time, Senator KENNEDY was defeating Mr. Eisenhower's right-hand man, Senator Henry Cabot Lodge, by 70,000 votes.

However, Mr. Eisenhower received 80,000 more votes than did Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Herter now believes that Mr. KENNEDY might be able to draw enough votes as a vice presidential candidate to swing the State. To do that Seantor KENNEDY would have to switch tents of thousands of votes from the popular President to the Democratic presidential candidate.

There are many in this State who believe that the confidence which the people of Massachusetts showed in Mr. KENNEDY 4 years ago has been increased by the service he has given in the Senate. Governor Herter apparently shares that belief, for he now says that Senator KENNEDY "might possibly carry the State" for the Democratic ticket in 1956. The governor also believes that Senator KENNEDY's candidacy would strengthen the ticket in Rhode Island, where voters gave Eisenhower a slim 8,000-vote edge in 1952. The governor says that Senator KENNEDY "would not have the same strength" in other New England States.

Two Democratic governors in New England have strongly endorsed Senator KENNEDY, and one Republican governor concedes that the Senator's name on the ticket might possibly switch the tens of thousands of Massachusetts votes necessary to carry the ticket in this State.

Where he is best known, Senator KENNEDY is most strongly supported. As his reputation grows throughout the Nation, he becomes the man who would bring strength to the ticket, dignity to the office, and service to the country.

Amend Section 165 (b) of the Internal Revenue Code

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN E. MOSS, JR.
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 29, 1956

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing legislation to amend section 165 (b) of the Internal Revenue Code relating to the amount deductible for income tax purposes in the case of losses of commercial fruit and nut trees in a major disaster.

As a direct result of widespread floods in December 1955 and January 1956 in northern California and elsewhere in the Nation, hundreds of commercial fruit and nut growers were virtually rendered destitute by the destruction of their fruit and nut trees.

The problem of the orchardist who suffers a loss to his trees is more serious than that of the farmer losing a crop as a result of flood. The orchardist who loses his trees must wait a minimum of 4 or 5 years in order to grow new ones during which time his source of income is destroyed; the farmer may produce a bumper crop in the next growing season.

The method of planting orchards, and growing and cultivating the trees does not lend itself to a practical solution of capitalizing costs, as the Bureau of Internal Revenue terms it. Most nut or fruit growers are single operators. Orchards are planted periodically in small blocks, with the grower doing his own work, and naturally there are very few costs to capitalize even if it were practical to do so. For this simple but cogent reason, it is far more equitable and sound to measure the grower's loss by fair market values, rather than by the Bureau of Internal Revenue's "cost approach" method.

In other words, the fair market approach measures the real loss suffered. Current provisions of the Revenue Code are such that with this real loss provided, the grower could get some relief of his taxes when it is most sorely needed.

As things are today, we have the paradoxical situation of growers being completely wiped out of homes, and livelihoods, although still faced with a staggering tax burden. This situation cries out for remedy in major flood disaster areas of the Nation.

Foreign Aid Does Not Pay Off

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OTTO KRUEGER
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 29, 1956

Mr. KRUEGER. Mr. Speaker, while the Senate Foreign Affairs Committee proceeds to restore the foreign aid funds cut by the House, there is a growing feeling over the Nation that we should tighten up on this aid to the whole world. If this sentiment thrives there may be trouble when the appropriation bill for this so-called mutual security comes up.

It is likely that the Senate will follow the recommendation of the committee and restore $715 million of the $1.1 billion cut that the House made when that body considered the mutual security authorization. The Senate has always been rather generous where the State Department was concerned.

There has been no change in the foreign aid situation. It looks like the same silly business that we have indulged in for years, this attempt to buy friends. We look ridiculous when we have to be so careful how we beg some of these nations to accept our cash. They will take our money and then tell us that we should drop all barriers against Red China and recognize the international outlaws that still hold our citizens as prisoners.

This is the type of cooperation that our billions have bought. The American taxpayer is asked to dig up more billions to continue the deal. In the House last week, before passing it, we debated and argued on a pension bill for our veterans. The costs of the measure were brought up time and again, and there were some touching words about the expense that the country would have to face.

We should spend what is proper to care for those veterans who suffer from service-connected disability, or those veterans who are past their productive years. If we have so much money that we can spend it overseas, I would like to cut that out and put some of it into circulation here at home. Certainly our veterans should merit as much consideration as Tito or Nehru.

These spending plans, once they are started, never seem to end. Back in 1945 we were to have the Marshall plan in operation for 4½ years and it was to cost only $11 billion. We still have the foreign aid going in 1956, and the authorizations from July 1, 1945 to June 30, 1957, if the Senate committee figures are retained, will amount to $72,154,816,750.

We are told that this is smart spending; that it has halted the spread of communism. From 1945, when this program began, Soviet Russia has brought 5 million square miles of territory under its control, and more than 700 million free people suffer oppression and slavery that come with the red flag. I would say that such a program has failed dismally. The idea sounded good, but it did not make friends. You have to earn their respect and cooperation.

We know that these billions have not checked communism. Congress cannot find out how the money is being spent. We are told much of it goes for military purposes and that is a secret. The General Accounting Office is supposed to be the watchdog, but it makes little progress in running down the way the money goes. GAO says that the foreign-aid program suffers from "poor planning, lack of accountability, poor coordination, overestimating the capabilities of recipient countries, and overambitious programing."

If it should come to pass that Congress would refuse to appropriate the money which has been authorized for this year, the foreign aid could go rolling right along for quite a while with the money still on hand. The request was for $4.9 billion for this year. During the recent debate on the bill, Congress did find out that there was $6.8 billion still on hand. This was money that had been appropriated and was not spent. The spenders got the money faster than the countries could spend it.

Many people seem concerned about the growing idea that our Government can provide money for all of us in any circumstance or any condition; that all we have to do is ask for it. When we review the billions that have been spent abroad on these questionable programs, then I cannot see how anyone can take issue with Government spending here at home.

Jan Paderewski

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. DODD
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 12, 1956

Mr. DODD. Mr. Speaker, today, June 29, is the 15th anniversary of the death of one of the world's truly great figures—Jan Paderewski, statesman, musician, and patriot. It is also the centennial year of the birth of Woodrow Wilson, who did so much to further the cause of a free Poland. The lives of these two leaders touched at many points; both were passionate advocates of the principle of national self-determination, and both dedicated their lives to their respective countries.

It is ironic to read in today's headlines of the revolt against Red troops in the Polish city of Poznam. For it was in this historic city that Jan Paderewski dedicated a statute to Woodrow Wilson after the end of World War I. Paderewski wished to commemorate America's friendship to the new Polish Republic by honoring our wartime President. Perhaps this one incident illustrates the difference between the United States and the Soviet Union. The Poles honor a statute of one of America's greatest leaders in Poznam, while for Communist Russia they have nothing but hatred and armed resistance to her troops.

It has been said that all humanity pays tribute to genius, and the genius of Jan Paderewski brought esthetic pleasure to millions. But his career has an even greater significance. He was an outstanding leader in world affairs, and an articulate spokesman for his homeland.

Paderewski was born in the Province of Podolia, then a part of Czarist Russia, in 1860. From relatively obscure origin, he rose to become the Premier of Poland and an almost legendary figure in the world of music. Paderewski's father played an important role in the uprising against Russia in 1863. For his struggle against Russian tyranny the elder Paderewski was banished to Siberia when his son was less than 3 years old. The great musician probably inherited his life-long hatred of oppression from his father, who was an active leader in the cause of liberty.

Jan Paderewski was a man of deep and sincere humility. On his 75th birthday, in 1935, he asked the people of Poland not to be "bothered" to commerate the occasion, but nevertheless hundreds of thousands of people throughout the world sent their grateful thoughts to him, even if they were not always recorded. For this man had contributed not only his talent, but his fortune, to the cause of freedom. It was his lifelong wish to see a free and happy Poland before he died.

The signing of the armistice after the first World War gave Paderewski the opportunity to return to his homeland. Czarist Russia had fallen, Germany defeated, and all Europe was in a state of chaos. The time had come to press

Poland's claim to freedom from foreign domination. On June 26, 1919, Paderewski accepted the task of forming a coalition government, in which he held the dual posts of Premier and Foreign Minister. His genius as a statesman became apparent when, with freedom in sight, Poland was torn with internal strife. There were numerous factions, each fighting for political control of Poland, and it was his duty to bring a measure of peace to his homeland.

Paderewski became a world figure at the Versailles Peace Conference, where he ably represented his country. He argued for Polish territorial claims on the basis of the principles set forth in President Wilson's 14 points. The result of his negotiations was the establishment of the Polish Corridor, with Danzig as a free city of Europe. Paderewski obtained German and Austrian recognition of the new Poland and achieved a friendly relationship with Czechoslovakia, Latvia, and other European nations born of the war. Paderewski eventually resigned as Premier of Poland and came to the United States, where he began a series of concerts that added to his world fame.

Paderewski's generosity, almost to the point of folly, has become well known throughout the world. He gave vast sums of money to help relieve the suffering of the people of Europe during World War I, and turned over his great estate on Lake Geneva, in Switzerland, to victims of the war. It has been said that before leaving Europe for the United States in 1930, he had given away most of his fortune. The true extent of his generosity, both in spirit and money, will never be known.

Americans, and indeed all the people of the free world, will never forget the contribution to the cause of freedom made by this musician, patriot and statesman. The prayers of millions for world peace will someday be realized, largely because of the groundwork laid by such giants as an Paderewski.

Polish Workers' Courage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE M. RHODES
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 25, 1956

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, the spontaneous uprising of Polish workers in the city of Poznan on the eve of the 15th anniversary of the death of the great Polish patriot, Ignace Jan Paderewski. is an inspiring example of the courage and determination of the Polish people to regain their birthright of freedom.

Eyewitness reports from western observers attending the industrial fair in Poznan confirmed the heroic demonstrations protesting working conditions, lack of food, and poor living standards. The revolting Polish workers attacked Communist headquarters and government buildings and clashed with tanks and troops, according to these reports.

The Polish uprising comes 3 years after the revolt of German workers in East Berlin and again shows the willingness of these patriots to lay down their lives for freedom. It is dramatic proof that the people behind the Iron Curtain have not succumbed to the evil forces of totalitarianism and tyranny.

Mr. Speaker, by their courage and daring, these Polish patriots have again shown the world that the spirit of freedom never dies in the hearts and minds of the Polish people. As so many times in their history, the Poles have once more proved that the spark of human freedom can never be extinguished. They have given hope to the world that the day will come when that spark will burst into a flame and Poland will again take its place in the front ranks of the free nations of the world.

Do We Trade or Do We Stop Trade?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 13, 1956

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, there have been many words spoken and written on the subject of our foreign trade policy. The issue of protection versus growing trade has occupied the attention of Congress and the public since the founding of the Republic. We do not approach the subject today with much that is new or original. But old truths are durable ones and, what is more, they are constantly illuminated by events. One such truism, as the New York Journal of Commerce points out, is that "protectionism generates protectionism." In an editorial on June 13 entitled "Home To Roost," the Journal of Commerce addresses itself to the administration's negative policy on watch imports from Switzerland. Pointing out that the July 1954 decision to raise the tariff on Swiss watch movements by 50 percent has only served to complicate an already complicated situation, the editorial notes that the pressures for protection against imports have only increased. "We stand by our earlier prediction that the troubles the administration set for itself in raising the watch tariff 2 years ago have only just begun," the editorial observes. This is undoubtedly the case and the better course—in the interest of our national trade policy, our foreign relations, and the American consumer—would be to recognize the 1954 decision as a mistake and rescind that action. Fortunately, the 1954 decision is now under review by the Tariff Commission and the Office of Defense Mobilization. These agencies will, in due course, make their recommendations to the President. We can only hope that the wisdom of the Journal of Commerce editorial will be compelling to the policymakers and that they will have the courage to recognize the mistake made in 1954 and will urge that the watch duties be restored to their previous level. The complete editorial is as follows:

HOME TO ROOST

Although the administration is preparing to institute a new round of tariff cuts, following the negotiations in Geneva, it is still faced with difficulties in holding the line on cuts already made, especially where protectionists have succeeded in making a break in that line via the issue of defense essentiality.

This was made plain last week by Albert L. Reeves, general counsel of the Clock and Watch Manufacturers Association of America. Mr. Reeves told the Congressional Joint Economic Committee a plea for higher tariff rates on nonjeweled watches is imminent.

He says it has been made inevitable by a heavy increase in imports "in the O–1 jewel clasification," an increase which, in turn, is in good part the product of President Eisenhower's decision to raise tariffs on the more expensive jeweled watches by 50 percent in July 1954. By making it more difficult to market multiple-jeweled watches in the United States of America, this action naturally encouraged overseas producers to concentrate on types against which the higher tariff rates were not applicable. The makers of pin-lever watches are now feeling the squeeze and want help. The chickens are coming home to roost.

This is a perfectly logical development. As we have pointed out repeatedly in these columns, there is only one way in which protection can be given to domestic producers via higher tariffs and import quotas. It can only be given at the expense of other groups of producers.

The watch case illustrates plainly enough that United States manufacturers of pin-lever watches have had to pay some of the cost of the protection given jeweled watch manufacturers 2 years ago. But that is only a small part of the story. What is equally true, but more difficult to demonstrate in specific cases, is that the cost falls most heavily on other groups of United States producers who are alert enough and efficient enough to compete not only in their home markets without excessive protection, but in foreign markets where they must slug it out toe to toe with their overseas competitors.

Every time the Government sets up artificial trade barriers to "protect" a group of domestic producers unable to meet foreign competition in their home markets, these efficient producers are obliged to foot the bill. Because their overseas markets cannot sell as much here, they cannot buy as much. The efficient are thus penalized to protect those who are less so.

How is the Government to handle the new turn the watch case is taking? It is facing something of a dilemma.

Like the complainants in the United States jeweled watch industry (consisting mainly of four companies), the manufacturers of pin-lever watches appear to be paving the way for an appeal for protection based not so much on the Tariff Act's escape clause as on the issue of defense essentiality, which is what turned the trick for the jeweled watch industry in 1954, after all else had failed.

The jeweled watch industry's claim to defense essentiality was a debatable claim at best, and we do not know whether the Clock and Watch Manufacturers Association will be able to come up with anything more convincing. But suppose it does. What then?

A higher tariff on O–1 jewel watches and/or clocks can be made to sound reasonable, inasmuch as it is something the jeweled watch industry already enjoys. Perhaps it is not altogether fair that one section of the industry should have it and another should not.

But, all other things being equal, is it not highly probable that the effect of a sharp tariff increase on the less expensive time-

pieces would be to reverse the trend of the past 2 years and tend to shift the main import pressure back on the jeweled watch industry? Will not this, in turn, spur more demands for protection in that sector?

Interestingly enough, the jeweled watch industry has already indicated that it is far from satisfied with the protection it is now accorded, despite the big tariff increase of 1954. It wants more protection, and a good deal more.

So there is still another point to be considered. If both the jeweled and nonjeweled sectors of the watch and clock industry are given more protection, the reverberations will merely spread further. If the protection is great enough to block imports of timepieces in large measure, foreign manufacturers will have two choices. Either they will have to spread out into other fields—in which case other groups of United States producers will want more protection—or failing to earn dollars here, they will cut their United States buying proportionately, throwing the whole burden back on the efficient producers of this country.

There is a moral to all this. It is that protectionism generates protectionism. It is something more easily started than controlled, once it gets underway.

This was the real danger in the President's decision to raise the watch tariff, not the size of the increase in the going rate. And this was, and is, the real danger in the resort to the doctrine of defense essentiality as an excuse for a tariff increase in circumstances in which the pertinent facts were something less than convincing.

But having granted the increase to the jeweled watch industry, the administration may not find it easy to deny the same right to the nonjeweled sector. If this is the case, where, then, will it be able to stop at all? We stand by our earlier prediction that the troubles the administration set for itself in raising the watch tariff 2 years ago have only just begun.

The 15th Anniversary of the Death of Ignace Jan Paderewski

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERMAN P. EBERHARTER
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 29, 1956

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow, June 30, will mark the 15th anniversary of the death of Ignace Jan Paderewski, Polish composer and pianist, statesman and a foremost champion of freedom and democratic ideals. This is a most appropriate occasion to remember not only the profound works of the immortal Paderewski, but also to extend our sympathy to the millions of Polish Americans in the United States and the Poles throughout the world who have been persecuted for their belief in the same ideals for which Paderewski fought so hard.

Paderewski was born in Poland in the year 1860, and at a very early age made manifest his great talents in music. As he continued his career as an artist and composer, he received increasing acclaim throughout the world, and in 1891 made his first American appearance at a recital in New York City. This, of course, was only the beginning of a career in this country that was to bring him closer to the heart of every American.

But Paderewski's contributions in the field of music were not his only ones—not by any means. He received innumerable honors for his statesmanship and to thousands of people he is still a symbol of liberty. It is significant to note in this centennial year of the birth of Woodrow Wilson, that it was largely due to Paderewski that the 13th of Wilson's 14 points was devoted to the restoration of a free and independent Poland. After the people of Poland asserted their independence according to the principle of national self-determination, Paderewski was the first Premier of the Polish Republic in 1919.

We all remember with sadness that the freedom gained by Poland after the First World War was short lived and the land of Poland was again take over by a totalitarian aggressor. But the independent spirit of the Poles still prevails today and I am sure that none of the Polish people will ever forget the last words of Paderewski, which were "Poland will rise again."

This could not be manifest more clearly than by the protest of the Polish workers yesterday against the dominating rule of the Communist when thousands of Polish workers revolted against their undemocratic rulers.

Effects of United States Foreign Aid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALVIN M. BENTLEY
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 29, 1956

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I wish to insert the following article from the June 27 edition of the Washington Evening Star by Dorothy Thompson entitled "Effects of United States Foreign Aid":

EFFECTS OF UNITED STATES FOREIGN AID—MONETARY GIFTS SEEN SOCIALIZING EARNINGS OF PRIVATE ENTERPRISE

(By Dorothy Thompson)

The forthcoming election would be more interesting if any issues of substance were involved. If there were a real opposition party, for instance, it would attack the program of foreign aid, both in theory and practice. But although the Democrats are denouncing obvious failures in the foreign field, they never get to grips with what is fundamentally wrong with policies that, in fact, they initiated.

Governor Harriman recently accused the Eisenhower administration's foreign-aid program of being "inept, bullying, and regardless of the interests of other countries." But he did not analyze the reasons, nor advocate retrenchment, nor suggest that it might be well for the American Government to consider the interests of the American people.

On the contrary, under a Democratic administration they can expect more of the same thing.

In the past 10 years the American people have put up $55 billion for aid to all and sundry, while our own national debt still equals the combined national debts of all the other nations of the world. Spruille Braden, in the last human events, estimated that $55 billion is equal to the total assessed valuation of all the property of America's 13 largest cities.

Today the biggest single item in nearly every family's budget is for direct and indirect taxes. In addition to the Federal debt, every American, it has been estimated, is personally indebted for some $3,000. He can't pay his private debts because the Government takes a minimum of 20 percent of every net dollar.

This program of universal giveaway is accomplishing the following things:

It is socializing on an international scale a large proportion of American earnings from private enterprise, and thus promoting world socialism.

By encouraging the idea of getting something for nothing, it is undermining the voluntary export of private American capital for long-range investment in expectation of fair earnings.

Since the Russians have begun competing, it is argued that we must outbid them, thus issuing a universal invitation to blackmail.

Premier Nasser of Egypt, having received a rather vague offer to build the Aswan Dam from Russian Foreign Minister Shepilov on his recent visit to Cairo, promptly approaches the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development for the total capital. If we are out to top every Soviet bid, we offer the Soviets a means of promoting American bankruptcy.

The foreign-aid program with no strings attached violates every principle of contract and, therefore, of mutual honor and respect.

It binds us to foreign personalities and parties in power and alienates those who seek to succeed them. That is the real background of our troubles in Iceland; and sometimes we have put money into the pockets of knaves—Peron, of Argentina, for example.

By speeding up the industrial revolution in backward countries, we are creating new social strains for the Communists to exploit.

The underlying theory is contrary to all experience.

It is that one can buy friendship and respect. These are never for sale by the self-respecting, and nations, like individuals, don't stay bought. They continuously raise the price.

Another false theory is that communism is "the result of misery, hunger, and disease," and that if living standards are raised, people become good "democrats," and affectionate to their beneficiaries. What nonsense.

Among primitive peoples, radical movements result from exaggerated hopes insufficiently fulfilled. If improved living standards were the criterion, the Indonesians should adore the Dutch, and the north Africans the French. Instead the revolts against the imperialists are usually led by the men educated by the imperialists.

The example of America herself is what has hitherto attracted the world, not the huge bureaucracy of experts who now have a vested interest in billion-dollar giveaways.

Nothing is pleasanter, of course, than to spend other people's money.

Let Us Keep Up the Crusade for Freedom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 25, 1956

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, wherever American citizens are in peril through no

fault of their own it is the duty of our Government to rescue them.

I ask, what has our Secretary of State done to cause the release by Red China of the 13 Americans held prisoner these many years?

Their release was promised by Red China last September 1955. They are businessmen and Protestant and Catholic missionaries. It is high time our Government did something about them.

The "Victory" of Dulles

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 29, 1956

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the New York Times of June 28, 1956:

THE "VICTORY" OF DULLES—A CRITIQUE ON HIS VIEW THAT WEST SPURRED REDS' WOES AND HIS GLOATING OVER DISCORD

(By James Reston)

WASHINGTON, June 27.—Secretary of State Dulles came into his news conference today full of bounce and confidence. The State Department theatre was wired for sound; TV cameras and lights, Voice of America microphones and wire recorders were all over the place, and it was clear something special was going on.

The Secretary of State was, in effect, celebrating a victory. He had taken a chance on making public the text of the anti-Stalin speech by Nikita E. Khrushchev. The gamble had paid off in howls of protest against Mr. Khrushchev by Communist Party leaders all over the world, and Mr. Dulles was now clearly "seizing the initiative."

The Secretary was like a military commander suddenly perceiving a crack in the enemy's line. He identified it with a whoop and ordered a general offensive.

On the field of battle, this would have been standard practice, but whether it was good diplomacy, propaganda, and psychological warfare is another matter. And by this evening it was being widely debated in the capital.

Mr. Dulles' objective was perfectly clear. He saw Palmiro Togliatti and Pietro Nenni, the Moscow stooges in Italy, criticizing Mr. Khrushchev and identifying the Soviet Communist leader with Stalin's crimes. He saw the same thing going on among the Communist parties in France, Britain, East Germany, and New York, and he wished to encourage these centrifugal forces within the Communist world.

DULLES SEEKS COMMUNIST RIFT

His aim was to get the Communist parties outside the Soviet Union to break away, to demand more and more freedom of expression and action. And he wants these same things to happen in the Communist satellites and in the Soviet Union itself.

Whether Mr. Dulles encourages these developments by gloating over them, however, is the point at issue. And he was visibly gloating today. He announced, in a formal statement, that "international communism is in a state of perplexity." He called the anti-Khrushchev criticisms of Signor Togliatti, M. Thorez, and the other Communists a "revolt." He taunted the Communists for not having had any "recent victories," and he contended that this was due to the "unity and combined strength" of the free world.

PART PLAYED BY DULLES

All this is fairly true. The Communists are clearly in a state of disarray over the inner relationships of the national Communist parties to Moscow. It also is true that Mr. Dulles personally helped spark this present Communist controversy by taking the unusual action of releasing the private speech of the political head of another government.

Nevertheless, it is difficult for well-informed Soviet experts here to see how Mr. Dulles expects to deepen and widen the breach in the Communist world by proclaiming publicly that these divisions jeopardize the unity and success of the whole Communist movement.

He is opposed to "the iron discipline and brutal terrorism Stalin employed," but said today communism had great difficulty in being an effective instrument of cold war without such discipline.

He wants Signor Togliatti, M. Thorez, and the other national Communist leaders to go on defying Mr. Khrushchev, but advertised these gestures of defiance as a victory for the West.

Thus, there was strong feeling here tonight that the Secretary of State was unconsciously discouraging the very objectives he sought, and inadvertently handling Mr. Khrushchev a powerful argument for restoring discipline among the Communist leaders in Rome, London, Paris, and New York.

Mr. Dulles was more adroit today in his handling of Marshal Tito of Yugoslavia. He didn't say that Marshal Tito's defiance of Stalin had weakened the Communist structure, nor did he condemn the Yugoslav President for going to Moscow and making up with Mr. Khrushchev. He praised the courage of Marshal Tito and thus encouraged the development of Titoism, which is now a main objective of State Department policy.

GAIN FOR DULLES IS SEEN

On balance, too, he probably made domestic political gains with his line today—and this may explain his eagerness to take credit for the difficulties of the Communist parties.

It is a long time since Mr. Dulles has had any victories to claim. He has been under constant attack on Capitol Hill for weeks. Consequently, he chose today to let the TV cameras into his news conference for the first time, and he took full advantage of the publicity opportunities provided by his dramatic statement.

Maybe he was right in this, as he proved to be right, despite the contrary views of his critics, about publishing the Khrushchev speech as a State Department document. But many observers here do not think so.

"This is, above all, a time for the free world to remain strong in their unity," he said. "It is a moment of particular importance."

Everybody agrees with this, but many here believe it also is a moment when the deep divisions within the Communist Party are more likely to be encouraged by silence than by jubilant pronouncements in the State Department.

My War With the Mob

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PETER FRELINGHUYSEN, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 29, 1956

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I should like to include the third in a series of articles by Victor Riesel which appeared in the Washington Evening Star of June 28, 1956, entitled "My War With the Mob":

MY WAR WITH THE MOB—RACKETS "TAKE" ESTIMATED AT $1 BILLION FROM UNIONISTS TERRORIZED BY GOONS

(By Victor Riesel)

From Maine to California, from the suburbs of Detroit to the Everglades outside Miami, at least 200 union officials have been murdered in the past 20 years by the crime cartel operating inside labor.

It is literally impossible to calculate the number of bombings, beatings, knifings, dynamitings, feet burnings, chain floggings and shotgunnings of union men by the troops of the mob.

Arms and legs have been broken. Boiling water has scalded men. Stench bombs have emptied theaters and restaurants and ruined food and dress shipments.

The most prominent labor men attacked were the Reuther brothers, Walter and Victor. Each was shotgunned. Walter's life was saved only because a ringing telephone caused him to turn sideways at the very split second that the two-barreled gun went off. His right hand is still semiparalyzed as a result of that attack. The other Reuther brother survived a shotgun blast in the face but lost one eye. Both are still under constant bodyguard.

FEW CASES SOLVED

Despite the fact that these cases of murder and violence have been so numerous and different that it would take a Univac to assort them, few have been solved.

The thugs who shot or killed 56 union officials in St. Louis over the past 20 years are still free if they haven't died of natural causes.

No one has ever been taken in for the murder of such union officials as Norman Redwood of the Sandhogs, Tommy Lewis of the Building Service Employees, Johnny Acropolis of the Teamsters, Will Lurye of the International Ladies Garment Workers Union and a string of others.

THIRTY-FIVE SLAIN ON WATERFRONT

Some 35 men have been killed on the New York waterfront alone. There have been few solutions, arrests or convictions.

This isn't confined just to the Northeast. A Negro official of the laundry workers union was taken out in the Florida Everglades. He was shot and rocks were bounced on his head.

Joe De Sylva of the Los Angeles retail clerks had a brick and steel reinforced front on his union headquarters as a guard against dynamiting. Los Angeels detectives have told me of liquor stores being hit by heavy cans hurled by union men.

In Hermosa Beach, Calif., a business agent for the Reinforced Iron Workers Union, Bruce Dexter Parkhurst, was shot in the back by Chicago-type mobsters who escaped in a fast car.

Cross country in Hialeah, Fla., a late aide of the late Al Capone, Max Caldwell, brutally beat a member of the carpenters union because the carpenters were taking the lead in driving Caldwell out of the Central Labor Union. Caldwell earned his star in the underworld by stealing $900,000 from a retail clerks union and kicking women down the stairs when they complained.

PAID ASSASSIN SEIZED

A brazen murder attempt was made against crusading Paul Hall, leader of the Seafarers' International Union. The police accidentally picked up a suspicious looking car nearing Hall's New Jersey home. In it was a man with a shotgun. He confessed he had been paid to knock off Hall because of

the union leader's fight to clean the goons off the waterfront.

But even this horrendous record does not reflect the terror which rides the shoulders of hundreds of thousands of union members. On the waterfront, for example, the longshoremen have had to buy tickets for functions which never took place and for boat rides on nonexistent vessels. They've had to borrow money whether they neded it or not—at usurious rates from union officials.

On Long Island, members of the operating engineers had to buy up to $20 worth of liquor a month from the bar owned by union owner William De Koning, Sr. No drinks, on jobs. De Koning was finally jailed for extorting hundreds of thousands of dollars.

Union officials have taken out bank loans and job seekers have had to pay the installments in cash before they got on the job list. Employers—and members—have been forced to donate heavily for testimonial "gifts" for union officials—sometimes totaling up to $50,000.

OFF-HOUR WORK "DONATIONS"

Thousands of skilled workers have had to go out to the suburban estates of their union chiefs to contribute off-hour and weekend work building annexes, repairing homes, putting up stables for thoroughbreds and waiting personally on the big boss—if they wanted to work the next week.

Literally millions of workers went through the war breaking their backs at high speed skilled work to turn out weapons for our country—and yet were never permitted real rights in the union to which they paid dues. These were, and still are, known as permit men. They paid upward of a dollar a day to get a card. Even today, there are hundreds of thousands of class B union members who pay dues but can't vote or sit in on meetings or even address their union officials.

These are no petty rackets. They bring the mob upwards of a billion dollars—a figure I get just by totalling data put together by various investigating committees.

What these racketeers fear most is the spotlight of publicity. It is bitter to realize that all the glare into the snakepit has not yet moved the public.

Spirit of Independence Inspired by Paderewski Burns Anew in Poland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 29, 1956

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, on the eve of the 15th anniversary of the death of the great Polish patriot, Ignace Jan Paderewski—so well known in America that we considered him one of us—it is encouraging and gratifying to witness the rekindling of the fire of liberty and freedom so well fed by him through his lifetime.

The inspiration Paderewski gave the Polish people is still nurtured in their hearts and the smoldering embers of their national patriotism today are bursting into full flame—threatening to engulf the Communist tyrants who have enslaved their Christian land for the past decade. In these efforts the Polish people have the sincere support of the entire free world. Here in the United States the prayers of millions are with them in their struggle.

Paderewski, world renowned composer and pianist, became the first Premier of the Polish Republic in 1919 after the people of Poland asserted their independence according to the principle of national self-determination embodied in the famous 14 points promulgated by President Woodrow Wilson. It was most fitting that this new blow for liberty being struck by Polish patriots should come on the 15th anniversary of Paderewski's death.

Cyprus: A Job for NATO?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STEWART L. UDALL
OF ARIZONA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 25, 1956

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, many of us have been distressed by the tragic failure of British policy on Cyprus. Not only have our feelings for the rights of the Cypriots been offended, but it has produced unnecessary strife between the members of NATO alliance—Greece, Turkey, and Britain.

This week the Honorable Denis Healey, a leading foreign affairs spokesman for the British Labor Party, had an article published in this country in which he voiced the conviction that the best hope now for a solution of this knotty problem rests with the NATO council. This is a hopeful idea. It might well serve as a point of departure for the "three wise men" who, we are told, are now searching for the appropriate role for a new, enlarged NATO organization.

Mr. Healey's challenging article is printed below:

WHY NATO MUST END THE CYPRUS DILEMMA

(By Dennis Healey)

British policy on Cyprus faces total collapse. And, as things are, the West as a whole will be deeply involved in the tragic consequences of Prime Minister Eden's blunders. Failing a dramatic reversal in British policy, the situation can be saved only if the western alliance takes a collective initiative in the near future.

At present, Field Marshal Sir John Harding is making an all-out effort to kill terrorism on the island by force. Twenty thousand British troops—the majority young national service draftees—are trying to catch a hard core of EOKA terrorists who may number no more than 100. In the last 12 months, only a handful of this hard core have been put out of action. But the repressive measures by which Harding has tried to match the EOKA's intimidation of the Greek Cypriote population have provided many times that number of recruits for terrorism.

The military authorities complain that their task will be impossible unless the Cypriotes themselves collaborate. However, the policy of collective punishment, curfew and forcible searches has reduced even once-friendly Cypriotes to mutinous silence. By exiling Archbishop Makarios, Eden removed the only Cypriote through whom he could seek a political solution; worse still, he put Makarios in a position where he could be a martyr without personal suffering and could recommend intransigence without personal risk.

It is now admitted even by official circles that, unless EOKA can be stamped out by next fall, the cost of continuing operations on the island will be out of proportion to the latter's military value as a base. Moreover, if once the Greek and Turkish populations come to blows and the British troops have to assume police duties as well as hunting the terrorists, another 20,000 soldiers will be required and the operation will lose all military sense. Thus, at any moment Eden's Chiefs of Staff may rebel against his policy.

This is, if he has a policy. For both the officials and the journalists who have been on Cyprus during the last 12 months agree that the political problem centers on the one issue Eden still absolutely refuses to discuss: sovereignty. Proposals for constitutional reform or economic development are totally irrelevant to a political solution. Unless Britain can satisfy the 400,000 Greek Cypriotes of his readiness to consider Enosis or union with Greece, the causes of the present disorders will remain, whatever happens to the EOKA.

Until recently, Eden's excuse for rejecting Enosis out of hand was Turkish opposition. Indeed, he has done nearly everything possible to encourage and exacerbate Turkey's intransigence. Yet, although Turkey now presents a far more difficult obstacle than she did 3 years ago, neither her interests nor her feelings are yet so deeply engaged as to make compromise impossible. Apart from natural reluctance to see what was for centuries a Turkish possession pass into the hands of a traditional rival, Turkey's opposition to Enosis spring from fears for the future of the 100,000 Turkish Cypriotes if Britain is no longer in a position to protect their minority rights. But this is an issue on which negotiations could certainly produce solutions.

It is often argued in Britain that Turkey also fears for her security if this island, 40 miles off her southern coast, falls into unfriendly hands. Yet, the fact is that since Turkey surrendered her other offshore islands to Greece after World War I, Greek-Turkish relations have been better than ever before in history. Allied to Turkey in both NATO and the Balkan Pact, Greece could not have been conceived as a potential enemy until her relations with Turkey were poisoned by Britain's refusal to consider Enosis.

Indeed, one of the most dangerous products of Eden's Cyprus policy has been the conversion of Greece from a stalwart ally of Britain into something like an angry neutral. Just when it looked as if Greek democracy was firmly established after the long agony of the civil war, Cyprus gave the extremists of both left and right an ideal issue on which to combine. Not only the Communists, but also the wartime collaborators, are now making a comeback.

All this presents terrifying dangers if Britain continues her present policy until it finally breaks down. The collapse of Eden's Cyprus policy is bound to produce a major crisis in the British Government. In such a situation, it is easy to see the Prime Minister imitating Ernest Bevin's behavior in Palestine. He might well order the evacuation of British troops and leave the 2 communities to fight it out. If communal fighting begins on the island, Greece and Turkey are likely to be drawn in directly and full-scale war between them becomes a possibility. It will then be far too late for anyone else to intervene successfully.

There are some signs that Eden, aware at last of the catastrophe toward which he is racing, is having second thoughts. After refusing for nearly 3 years to permit discussion of Cyprus with any foreign government, on the ground that it was a matter of British domestic concern, he made a speech at Norwich on June 3 in which he at last admitted that Cyprus was not a colonial question or one between Britain and Greece alone, but was international. Unfortunately, in the next breath he said that Britain must have Cyprus as a national base in order to protect her oil supplies in the Middle East.

Yet, he has now conceded the essential point. Cyprus is a question for the entire western alliance. Indeed, Eden's insistence

on Britain's oil interests reinforces this point. For every member of NATO depends no less than Britain on Middle Eastern oil—some, like Italy, even more. The United States, Holland, and France also have the same financial interest in the oil as does Britain. Thus, if military force is needed to protect Middle Eastern oil, the other members of NATO have the same interest and obligation as Britain to provide it.

Moreover, it is difficult to conceive of circumstances in which Britain could use force to protect her interests in the Middle East except as part of an alliance. She did not use force in Iran in 1951, in Egypt in 1952, or in Jordan in 1956. It has become obvious that she will not use force to implement the Tripartite Declaration on Palestine unless her cosignatories, America and France, agree to join her. Of all issues, Middle Eastern oil is the one on which Britain could least afford to use military force without support from her allies. In any case, it has become obvious that, unless Britain can obtain local consent for keeping a base on Cyprus, the cost of keeping it by force will exceed its military value. There is now no way of winning that consent except through NATO.

All parties to the Cyprus dispute are members of NATO. All have in the last month asserted their belief that the alliance should deal with political disputes among its members. Unless NATO addresses itself to the Cyprus problem, Lester Pearson might as well abandon his search for new fields of NATO activity. In fact, NATO's future depends as much on a solution of the Cyprus problem as a Cyprus solution depends on NATO.

The great advantage of NATO over any ad hoc framework for a Cyprus settlement is that, representing a wider community of nations with broader interests, it can help all the governments concerned to save face when they have to compromise. This is as important for Britain as it is for Greece and Turkey. Moreover, NATO is ideally suited to find a satisfactory formula for the strategic interests of both Britain and Turkey on the island. Whether the base which emerged from negotiation was a British-leased base or a collective NATO base, the treaty which established it could define the conditions of its use in war so as to satisfy the needs of Middle Eastern strategy.

With Western strategic interests guaranteed by NATO, the remaining problem would be to find a compromise between the political demands of Greece and Turkey. Though this is becoming more difficult every day, it is doubtful that the problem even now is as formidable as that which faced Western diplomacy in persuading Yugoslavia and Italy to agree about Trieste. And in this case, provided all the NATO powers cooperate, compensation might well be found to ease the smart of the less fortunate party.

The longer NATO waits, the more difficult its ultimate intervention will become. Few in Britain believe that the collapse of Eden's policy can be postponed for more than a few months. Yet, his subservience to the Tory dinosaurs is now so complete that he will not find the courage to change course unless he is under effective outside counterpressure.

Dr. Samuel Paul Capen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDMUND P. RADWAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 29, 1956

Mr. RADWAN. Mr. Speaker, with the passing of Dr. Samuel P. Capen, former chancellor of the University of Buffalo, a great record has been indelibly written.

It was my distinct honor and pleasure to attend the University of Buffalo under Dr. Capen's leadership.

Dr. Capen's record is one that should have the attention of this body, and it is best expressed in an article by Mildred Spencer which appeared in the Buffalo Evening News, Buffalo, N. Y. The article follows:

FIGHTER FOR DEMOCRACY: DR. CAPEN STANCH CHAMPION OF AMERICAN FREEDOMS

(By Mildred Spencer)

"Mankind has a right to be free—and a concomitant obligation to protect that freedom, whatever the personal cost."

So Dr. Samuel Paul Capen believed, and so he lived. He stated his passionate convictions to students and faculty on many occasions, and before distinguished educational bodies. His firm stand made the University of Buffalo a beacon of academic freedom in troublous times when forces were at large which threatened to destroy some of this country's basic freedoms.

The chancellor sensed the threat to intellectual freedom as early as 1935. Then, in Easton, Pa., he told a conference of trustees of colleges and universities how he felt about repressive tactics by which some would check the utterances of unorthodox or unpopular beliefs by faculty or students.

Academic freedom, he pointed out, implies that "teachers are free to investigate any subject, no matter how much it may be hedged by taboos; to make known their findings in classrooms or elsewhere, to differ with their colleagues and present the grounds of their difference; to take part as citizens in any public controversy; to be sure that no repressive measures, direct or indirect, will be applied to them, no matter how unpopular they may become through opposing powerful interests or jostling established prejudices, and no matter how mistaken they may appear to be in the eyes of members and friends of the institution."

In June 1938, with the world hovering on the brink of war, Dr. Capen urged the graduating class to "fight for the preservation of democracy" by watching and thinking and talking "when our talk may be unpopular," by writing and by voting.

A year later, he referred to the conflict of ideologies between the dictatorships and the democracies as "a test of whether or not there are such things as human rights."

"Men want more than order," he added. "They also want freedom. They will pay a high price for order, but they will not long pay for it with their freedom. The policy of the totalitarian states denies the unconquerable impulse to freedom that is in men. It destroys the most valuable capital of the people, the power that resides in the unhampered play of the mind."

Again in 1940, the chancellor attested his belief in the dignity of the individual. Addressing the senior class he stated:

"I suppose that I represent an almost extinct species. I am an individualist and not ashamed of it. It is not now in style. I do not expect the members of this class either to be individualists or to approve of them. Nevertheless, I would like to have you think for a moment of all the trouble that regimentation seems now to be causing in the world."

Predicting, 6 months before Pearl Harbor, the probability that the United States would have to enter the world conflict, Dr. Capen asserted:

"There is no possible way for us to play safe. * * * No more than for the European nations, which asked only to go their peaceful way unmolested, can there be safety for us until the conflict is ended. All signs indicate that the struggle will be long. Inevitably your generation faces shocks and hardships and losses."

In the spring and fall of 1941, and again immediately after Pearl Harbor, Dr. Capen stressed the fact that bearing arms is not always the greatest contribution that college students can make to the cause of freedom.

"The country now needs highly trained men," he declared. "We demand of you stability, the ability to keep your heads, to resist hysteria, to use horse sense." And he stated firmly that "the most patriotic thing any young person can do who is on his way to completion of an important specialty is to go on with his education until he is called."

His understanding of young people was highlighted when he added:

"Perhaps some of you cannot wait. Perhaps the urge to participate is too strong to resist. If so, I say go and God bless you."

"Now more than ever," America is the hope of the world, Dr. Capen affirmed in 1942 after this country had entered the war.

"Between us and the Axis, the conflict is irreconcilable," he continued. "No compromise is possible. The end must be our absolute triumph, or no American would hold life worth living."

Dr. Capen admitted the necessity, during a war, of forfeiting freedoms and rights, but he warned students in May 1943 to be "inexorably determined to reclaim them completely, once the emergency is past."

"We must prepare for the challenge of the day of victory," he said in 1944.

"Many people, still overexcited and unsettled, will expect a brave new world to be born ready-made on the heels of war," he declared. "When it does not at once appear, they will be disillusioned and resentful. They will have been conditioned to violence and to quick action. They will be disposed to seek scapegoats whom they can blame for situations which dissatisfy them. They will be ready to listen to anyone who offers some absolute scheme for reforming society and making everybody happy, prosperous and safe. The demagogue with a panacea will have an enthusiastic following."

The charge that the United States "has flagrantly mismanaged its affairs in the first year of peace" was leveled by Dr. Capen in June 1946. "This democracy is being murdered in its bed by members of its own household," he affirmed, striking out at selfish chieftains of industry and labor, "racial and religious intolerance," and "lawmakers who lack the courage to enact laws to protect the general interest."

"Freedom is never won, never stays put," the chancellor said in November 1947. "If we mean to keep our heritage, we have to keep on guard so the wrong people don't upset it."

The same year he expressed his faith in youth and his belief that "there is little chance of communism gaining hold in our colleges and universities."

"I know that some skillful emissaries of the Communist Party can establish cells in some universities," he said. "The American Youth for Democracy is a thing of that sort. The AYD makes no impression at all if it is aired and not suppressed. If it is suppressed, the immediate reaction of young people is to come to its defense."

At his final baccalaureate service in June 1950, Dr. Capen once again affirmed his belief that academic freedom is a cornerstone of American democracy.

"Those who believe universities are hotbeds of Red radicalism are completely mistaken and misinformed," he asserted. "No university can protect a member who has been proved to be disloyal, but it must defend any loyal and honest teacher or student who may be attacked because his findings or opinions displease some people."

Fifteenth Anniversary of Death of Ignace Paderewski

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 29, 1956

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, June 29, 1956, is the 15th anniversary of the death of Ignace Paderewski, the internationally renowned Polish composer, pianist, and patriot who in 1919 became the first Premier of the Polish Republic.

A great portion of the credit for the formation of this Republic has to be attributed to the efforts of Paderewski. Although he had already won world fame with his incomparable piano concerts, this Polish patriot considered the freedom and independence of Poland more important than his musical career. Early in life he said, "The vision of a strong and independent Poland has always been the lodestar of my existence. Its realization is still the great aim of my life."

No one was more aware than Paderewski that the establishment of an independent Poland would be a difficult task. Poland had been partitioned for nearly 150 years by her aggressive neighbors Austria, Prussia, and Russia. There seemed to be little chance that the Polish people could ever be united. However, the outbreak of World War I was to give them that chance.

Paderewski quickly took advantage of this opportunity that arose during the war. He came to the United States to arouse the sympathy of the American people for Polish freedom. He had previously in concert tours in this country won their hearts with his peerless music; he now came to open their hearts for the Polish people in their struggle for independence. In a short period of time he accomplished much. He was successful, through a series of lecture and concert tours, in raising funds for his war-ravaged homeland; he was instrumental in the recruitment of Polish-American volunteers to serve in the Polish Army already fighting with the Allies in Europe—and perhaps his greatest achievement—he obtained the sympathy of President Wilson for the Polish cause.

President Wilson was always a stanch supporter of the rights of small nations. Through Colonel House, a close friend of Paderewski, consultations were arranged in which this champion of Polish freedom expressed to the President his pleas for his beloved homeland. These meetings formed the foundation upon which the Polish Republic was to be constructed at the Paris Peace Conference. President Wilson was impressed with the devotion of Paderewski to his cause, and assured him that he was confident that one day Poland would be free and united. The famous 14 points that were published soon after these conversations and in which the Chief Executive stated that an independent Poland should be erected, was tangible evidence that Paderewski had succeeded in gaining the support of President Wilson. Paderewski's vision of an independent Poland was almost realized.

This dream became a reality at the Paris Peace Conference. After the war Paderewski returned to Poland and succeeded in uniting the various political factions and in forming a coalition government so that a unified country could formulate plans for the legalization of Polish freedom at Paris. He became premier of the new government and was chosen as chief delegate to the Conence. At Paris he took an active part in the delimitation of Poland's frontiers along much the same borders as discussed with President Wilson during the war. Finally, Paderewski's supreme confidence in a resurrected Poland became an established fact when he signed the Versailles Treaty.

Paderewski had contributed his time, energy, talents, and resources to aid in the establishment of the Polish Republic. Having accomplished the chief aim of his life, in 1921 he retired from public life and returned to his music. In 1939 ill health forced him to abandon his piano concerts.

It was while he was in retirement in Switzerland that his beloved country was once more invaded by Russia and Germany. Quickly, this heroic Polish patriot emerged from his retirement and although aged and fatigued he returned to America to solicit aid for his subjugated country. On January 11, 1940, he accepted the presidency of the exiled Polish Parliament in France.

He died on June 29, 1941, fighting to his last breath for the freedom of his native land.

I would like to take this opportunity on the anniversary of Paderewski's death to again express my concern for Poland and all other enslaved nations which are suffering under Communist tyranny. I am confident that the Polish desire for freedom expressed so nobly by her patriot Paderewski will never be extinguished despite the brutality of the Soviets. May the memory of Paderewski serve to encourage the Poles who are today oppressed by the ruthless Kremlin.

Boys' Clubs of America Commend CBS-TV Comics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LESTER HOLTZMAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 29, 1956

Mr. HOLTZMAN. Mr. Speaker, it has come to my attention that a leading youth organization, Boys' Clubs of America, whose chairman of the board is a former President of the United States, Hon. Herbert Hoover, has commended a New York publisher for providing outstanding comic magazines to our youth. This is a matter of vital national significance which should be brought to the attention of all Americans who are vitally concerned with the moral and spiritual welfare of our children.

Mr. Ned L. Pines, president of Pines Publications, Inc., New York City, has been presented with the golden anniversary gold medallion and certificate of award of Boys' Clubs of America for his distinguished service to American youth by publishing exceptionally fine and wholesome comic magazines. This honor is most significant because of the considerable criticism that has been heaped upon this segment of the publishing industry in recent years.

This recognition accorded to Mr. Pines merits our attention because it focuses the spotlight of public opinion upon a publisher who believes in our youth and believes in providing them with wholesome entertainment. Mr. Pines, who has been a publisher for nearly 30 years, provides millions of our Nation's young folk wtih fine, wholesome comics such as Dennis the Menace, CBS-Television's Terrytoon comics and Mighty Mouse comics. I am indeed happy to see that he is getting this well-deserved recognition from one of the country's most respected organizations, devoted to the highest ideals of building the character of American boys.

I only hope that this award will spur other comic magazine publishers throughout the country to follow Mr. Pines' lead in publishing comics which we can, in good conscience, encourage our children to read and enjoy.

I want to read into the RECORD the text of the certificate of award and that of the presentation letter to Mr. Ned Pines from former President of the United States, Hon. Herbert Hoover, chairman of the board of Boys' Clubs of America:

BOYS' CLUBS OF AMERICA,
New York, N. Y., April 26, 1956.

Mr. NED L. PINES,
President, Pines Publications, Inc.,
New York, N. Y.

DEAR MR. PINES: It gives me great pleasure to inform you that Boys' Clubs of America has selected you to receive a special award in recognition of your distinguished service to American youth and your outstanding contributions to the Boys' Clubs movement.

I should like, therefore, to present to you this golden anniversary medallion and certificate of award.

Please accept my personal congratulations along with those of the other members of the board of directors.

Sincerely,

HERBERT HOOVER,
Chairman of the Board.

BOYS' CLUBS OF AMERICA—GOLDEN ANNIVERSARY AWARD PRESENTED TO NED L. PINES, PRESIDENT, PINES PUBLICATIONS, INC.

For distinguished service to American youth by publishing comic magazines whose outstanding wholesomeness, interest, and entertainment value exemplify the highest publishing standards.

A. L. COLE,
President.
DAVID W. ARMSTRONG,
National Director.
HERBERT HOOVER,
Chairman of the Board.
WILLIAM S. HALL,
Honorary President.

MAY 1956.

St. Mary's Diamond Jubilee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. RHODES
OF ARIZONA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 29, 1956

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, under leave previously granted, I would like to bring to the attention of the House the diamond jubilee of the establishment of St. Mary's Church in Phoenix. This was the first Catholic Church established in Maricopa County. From the nucleus of this parish there have been established 24 other parishes. On last Sunday, June 24, there was a communitywide celebration commemorating this event. Under unanimous consent, I include in the RECORD editorials from the Arizona Republic and the Phoenix Gazette of June 23, 1956:

[From the Arizona Republic of June 23, 1956]

BUILDERS

The copper-colored twin steeples of St. Mary's have long been a downtown Phoenix landmark. At this same site, on Monroe between Third and Fourth Streets, the original St. Mary's Church was dedicated exactly 75 years ago tomorrow. The original mass was said in Spanish and the Phoenix Brass Band was on hand to enliven the ceremonies.

It wasn't the first religious service, or even the first church, in Phoenix. The Presbyterians had held services in their original grass-thatched church 2 years earlier. And Father Kino had celebrated mass in the vicinity of what is now Phoenix some two centuries before the church was founded.

But St. Mary's was definitely the first Roman Catholic Church in Maricopa County, and the diamond jubilee of its founding will be observed by Christians of many races and creeds at the Thunderbird Room in the Westward Ho Hotel Sunday evening.

The spirit of the old Spanish missions broods over the Southwest. Everyone living in Arizona owes something to the Spanish priests who entered what must have appeared a foreboding and sterile land with sword in one hand and Bible in the other, determined on converting the heathen and honoring God. Their successors, at St. Mary's and elsewhere, have played a mighty part in creating this desert empire. Phoenix salutes them, proud of the churches and schools they have built, but even prouder of the fine citizens they have contributed to the city, to the State, and to the Nation.

[From the Phoenix Gazette of June 23, 1956]

MILESTONE FOR WORSHIP

Few community diamond-jubilee observances have so many "firsts" to mark as does this year in Phoenix. But 1956 is not only the 75th anniversary of the city of Phoenix, the Phoenix Gazette, and the First National Bank of Arizona; it is also the diamond jubilee of the founding of the first Catholic church in Maricopa County.

Tomorrow afternoon a memorial mass will mark the occasion at the present St. Mary's Church on Monroe betweeen Third and Fourth Streets—almost the exact site of the original church dedicated on June 24, 1881. The present pastor, the Reverend Victor Bucher, OFM, says that formal religious activity as an outgrowth of missionary work by Fathers Kino and Marcos de Niza began in this part of the State with dedication of the original St. Mary's.

The mass, at which the diocesan bishop, the Most Reverend Daniel J. Gercke, will preside, will be followed by unveiling of a historical plaque, and a commemorative banquet. All of the events are open to the public, as befits an occasion symbolizing this community's 75-year progress in the role of its churches, alongside material gains.

Record of Hon. A. L. Miller on Public Power and Reclamation: The Truth of the Story

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. L. MILLER
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 29, 1956

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, a misstatement, if repeated often enough and by persons in authoritative positions, can inevitably acquire the appearance of fact. How many times have we heard the remark "It must be true, so and so said it and he ought to know"; "it must be true, I read it in the paper."

Misappropriations of the truth can come about quite innocently, or false impressions can be created deliberately. In either case, it becomes necessary to set the record straight, and I feel this compulsion now with respect to my record in Congress as it applies to Federal power projects.

The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KIRWAN], Chairman of the Democratic Congressional Campaign Committee, by his May 22, 1956, attack upon my voting record and my motives, precipitated a campaign that has been taken up by segments of the New Deal press and Federal power zealots throughout the country. The fact that his intemperate remarks had no foundation in truth does not lessen the vigor of battle, and I suspect that his remark that "DOC MILLER would not vote for the second coming of Christ" may have brought smiles to the faces of the few who follow his line.

There is truth in his statement that I am interested in power and reclamation development for Nebraska. I want my State to progress. I have authorized legislation that created the Ainsworth project, the Sargent project, the Farwell project, the Mirage Flats project, the Lavaca Flats, O'Neill and Mirage Flats extension units; I have actively supported the Salt-Wahoo, the Frenchman-Cambridge, the Bostwick, and other irrigation and flood control developments in our State. I have also supported projects adjacent to Nebraska that have enhanced the growth of irrigation and electrical power for the people of these neighboring States as well as my own, such as Kendrick, Alcova and Glendo in Wyoming, and all of the outstanding projects in the seven-State Missouri River Basin.

During the 14 years I have been a Member of Congress I have supported at least 371 reclamation, hydroelectric, and flood-control projects that have passed the House. These acts authorized construction of works throughout the United States; the Chief Joseph project in Washington, Trinity, Ventura, and the Central Valley in California, the Washita in Oklahoma, Weber Basin in Utah, and the upper Colorado. I have voted for steam plants in the Tennessee Valley Authority, irrigation and power in Bonneville, dams and transmission facilities in the Southwestern Power Authority, and many others. My interest is not confined to Nebraska alone. Quite obviously, it is nationwide.

In 1952, President Truman declared a moratorium on new reclamation and power projects starts and when this order went into effect, I addressed the House as follows:

> It comes to my attention that no new starts have been before the Congress and the administration for some time; and if this program continues, the present irrigation projects will have been finished and we will be without a new start for irrigation. I earnestly hope that the policy of the Government and the Committee on Appropriations will be changed so that we can proceed with the orderly development of feasible irrigation and electric-power projects.

This, you will recall, was a Democratic administration and a Democratic Congress.

In 1955, it was my amendment, offered on the floor of the House, that increased the appropriations bill $32 million so there would be money for 8 new irrigation and power projects that had been deleted by the Democrat-controlled House Appropriations Committee.

Now, if my critics who have branded me as being anti-public-power had examined the record I am sure they honestly could not have issued these statements. I have supported the REA's and the rural telephone in Nebraska, and in the Nation at large.

At the same time, I have been concerned about economy in Government, and it was for this reason that I voted, with the majority of the Democratic 82d Congress, to trim the appropriations for power and reclamation projects for 1 year when we were experiencing adverse fortunes in the Korean war. The Government's current operating budget at that time was in the red by $14 billion, and the 5-percent cut I supported was certainly in order. The Democratic Party, described by some as the patron saint of public power, must not have felt that this action was intended to destroy public power because the majority vote was with the Nebraska delegation.

In recent days I have been told that I cannot qualify as a public-power supporter because I did not vote to build a high Federal dam in Hells Canyon when this bill was before the House Interior Committee. However, the issue is not that simple. It can be understood by a sketch of the factual background of this legislation. The Hells Canyon bill has been introduced in at least four different Congresses—the Democratic 81st, the Democratic 82d, the Republican 83d, and the Democratic 84th. In 1950 it died silently in the Senate. On June 18, 1952, it was killed by unanimous vote in the House Interior Committee, when the Democratic members controlled the committee by a 15-to-13 majority. It was again introduced and referred to the

committee of which I was chairman in the 83d Congress, but the sponsor of the bill did not request a hearing, and no attempt was made to press the bill forward. When Hells Canyon legislation was before the subcommittee of the House Interior Committee last year the Democrats walked out of the committee room to defeat a quorum call on a motion to indefinitely postpone action on the bill; but they did not again bring up the bill until Paul Butler, chairman of their national committee, ordered that it be done because of its importance to the reelection of the senior Member of the other body from Oregon, and Congresswoman EDITH GREEN, from the same State.

This, considered together with the fact that Idaho Power Co.'s three-dam proposal will cost less than half and produce 98 percent as much power as the Federal high dam, makes it obvious that the Hells Canyon issue is intensely political and nothing more.

I am sure that you, in fair-mindedness, will understand that there are two sides to this looking-glass. I could easily accuse Mr. KIRWAN of being against public power, because he admittedly killed the Fort Randall-Grand Island 230-kilovolt line. No better opportunity to prove his advocacy of public power could be presented to him, and the excuse he made to explain his opposition was indeed flimsy.

It is my hope that these decisions will be considered in the light of the welfare of our country, with intellectual honesty, and in the spirit of fairness toward the people upon whom these responsibilities rest.

Fleet Admiral Ernest J. King

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. D. BAUMHART, JR.
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 29, 1956

Mr. BAUMHART. Mr. Speaker, the man who commanded the greatest naval armada in the history of the world will be laid to rest today. Fleet Admiral Ernest J. King, a native of my Congressional District, who died on Monday, June 25, will be buried—as he wished—in the Naval Academy Cemetery at Annapolis, Md., following funeral services today at Washington Cathedral.

Admiral King was responsible in great measure for the tremendous comeback of the United States Navy after it was so badly disrupted by the infamous attack on Pearl Harbor. A man who wanted to be judged by his performance rather than by his personal popularity, he set the pace for the Navy during World War II in his dual role as Commander in Chief of the United States Fleet and Chief of Naval Operations.

President Eisenhower and the many other wartime leaders who knew, worked with and respected Ernest King have already expressed their deep personal sorrow at his passing. But the people outside his immediate family who perhaps feel the Admiral's death most profoundly are the citizens of Lorain, Ohio, his birthplace. Lorain has had a long and close attachment to the man whose boyhood dream was to go to sea and who later commanded a giant navy of 1,800 ships, 23,000 planes, and 4 million men. Led by their mayor, 56 citizens representing Lorain are in Washington today to pay a final tribute to their community's most illustrious son.

Out of personal respect to Admiral King, I wish to include in today's CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the texts of editorials which appear in the Lorain Journal and the New York Times on Tuesday, June 26. They constitute an appropriate epitaph to the career of a man whose rise from lowly beginnings to a place of preeminence in naval history is in the finest American tradition.

[From the Lorain Journal of June 26, 1956]

ERNEST JOSEPH KING

In 1946—just 10 years ago this very month—a former Lorain railroad shopworker was in England to receive one of the world's highest academic honors. The chancellor of Oxford University, in conferring the doctorate of civil law upon Ernest Joseph King, remarked in Latin:

"You have invaded alike the realms of Glaucus, of Neptune, and of Jove the Thunderer."

Thus did the chancellor, Lord Halifax, turn to the myths of the ancients for a summing up of one of the great naval careers of modern history. Glaucus, least well known of the pagan deities involved in the figure of speech, reputedly presided over the fortunes of sailors and fishermen. Neptune ruled the depths of the sea, as many a student can testify, while Jove hurled his bolts from the skies.

Lord Halifax's little foray into the classics was singularly appropriate. In the course of becoming an admiral, the former railroad shopworker, a mechanic's son, had mastered the arts of war on water, under water, and in the air.

Yes, at the age of 47, after notable services in submarine as well as the surface operations of the United States Navy, Ernest King learned to fly. In naval aviation, he demonstrated the same competence he had previously shown with submarines, destroyers, and cruisers.

A man who had so much to do with the merging of the natural elements—with the practical application of scientific knowledge to naval uses—would merit a place in military annals on that basis alone. In Admiral King's case, there was much more, for he was fated to become the chief commander of the largest naval operation in the history of mankind.

If our interpretation of the man is correct, the secret of Ernest King's success is to be found in our Navy's own motto, Semper Paratus—always ready. If ever there was a man who took those words to heart and lived by them, it was the Lorain High School graduate who left for Annapolis in the summer of 1897.

Even in high school, Ernest showed that he knew what he was about, for he graduated as the valedictorian of his class. His oration was on Uses of Adversity, a subject not exactly remote from the lives of railroad shopworkers in that day.

Whether from ambition or a sense of destiny, the entire career of Ernest Joseph King up to World War II was a masterful preparation for the responsibilities he was to assume. Colleagues in the naval service can testify that he never really lived the life of a junior officer, for—as ensign, as lieutenant, and on up the ladder—his constant preoccupation was with the life of the future admiral.

For this, his country owes him a great debt. In keeping himself ahead of his times, professionally and technically, he had a great deal to do with forcing the Navy to keep up with technological progress.

As one of the foremost exponents of postgraduate schooling for Navy officers, King frequently incurred the displeasure or positive wrath of superiors whose heads as well as their hats were of brass. One such used caustically to address him as "Professor." And, while King was heading and building up the Postgraduate School at Annapolis, the man who then commanded the Atlantic fleet was passing the word that attendance at the school would be a detriment to any officer's career.

Ironically, then, some of King's greatest services to the United States were performed, far from the battle lines, in outwitting and circumventing the doughty numbskulls who insisted that they would fight the next war with the last war's weapons and methods.

Whether Ernest King could have roared like a Farragut or a John Paul Jones, had occasion required, need not be an issue for historians and biographers. The big point is that he did keep up with science and technology, that he was prepared when called to command more ships and sailors than any man had ever commanded before.

The lesson of his career is of vital importance at this very hour, when the Nation's security depends more than ever upon scientific objectivity. In an atomic era, indeed, diehard military thinking can threaten our very existence.

Lorain will ever be proud of this native son.

Lord Halifax didn't mention our railroad shops. It's many a mile and knot from them to the halls of Oxford—or to the command of history's biggest naval operation—but of such stuff is America made.

[From the New York Times of June 26, 1956]

ADMIRAL KING

History must reserve a place for Ernest Joseph King. An Ohio railway machinist's son who never saw blue water until he was appointed to Annapolis, Fleet Admiral King commanded in the world's greatest war the mightiest navy ever assembled under one flag and commanded it superbly. General Marshall, his opposite number on the Joint Chiefs of Staff, said once of Admiral King that the Navy leader was one of the finest strategists with whom he ever had been associated.

A strict disciplinarian, intolerant of criticism, contemptuous of public opinion, he was, nevertheless, exactly the type of leader that was needed when the Japanese attack on Pearl Harbor plunged the United States Navy into the toughest war it has ever had to fight. President Roosevelt lost little time in calling him back to Washington from his command of the Atlantic Fleet and making him Commander in Chief, United States Navy, and Chief of Naval Operations. He was the first Navy man ever to hold both posts.

Behind Ernest King, when he went to Annapolis in 1897, was no naval tradition, no high social position, no wealthy parents to make his days as a poorly paid young officer easier. He did have the driving ambition to be some day the boss of the United States Navy. He had the eager intelligence to make attainment of that goal possible. Realizing the importance of the airplane, he went to Pensacola Naval Air Training Station as a captain, 49 years old, to learn to fly, so that he would know the art as well as the science of aerial warfare. He was an expert submarine skipper.

Close friends of Admiral King know that behind the tautness of his official bearing

there was a kindly man, loyal to his friends, a gracious host and enjoyable companion. If few people ever saw that side, it will not detract from his place in history. The important fact is that when his country needed most a driving leader, intolerant of weakness, demanding perfection, Admiral King was there. It was fortunate for the United States that he was.

Island of Cyprus

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. DODD
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 12, 1956

Mr. DODD. Mr. Speaker, there is clear indication that the strife-ridden situation on the Island of Cyprus has become far more than the internal matter the British claim it to be. The persistent uprisings by the Greek population on this strategic Mediterranean Island, and the heavy handed manner that the uprisings have been put down by the British have become the focusing point of a most effective Communist propaganda attack on what the Kremlin terms "western colonialism."

We all know that the Communists are always on the lookout for some means of driving a wedge between the Western allies. Cyprus has become another Communist wedge that is rapidly weakening the solidarity between the United States and three of its most important allies: Greece, Britain, and Turkey.

The announcement that Soviet Foreign Minister Demitri Shepilov will confer with Greek Foreign Minister Evangelos Averoff should add to our concern. The United States has spent billions of dollars in Greece to insure that this valued ally would not fall prey to Communist domination.

However, the Greeks from ancient times have been a proud people, and our support for their cause in Cyprus means more to them than our money. Shepilov is an expert propagandist and knows full well the implications of the Cyprus situation. There is no doubt that he will attempt to capitalize on the vacillating policy with regard to Cyprus.

On March 20, I wrote to President Eisenhower suggesting that representatives of the divergent interests in Cyprus meet with him in Washington to attempt to settle this menacing rift between vital allies of the United States.

The letter follows:

MARCH 20, 1956.

The Honorable DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER,
The White House,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Together with most other Americans, I have become increasingly concerned about the critical situation involving the island of Cyprus. The forcing into exile of Archbishop Makarios by the British with the attendant civil disturbances on Cyprus and in Greece have added to the gravity of what was already a very difficult problem in a part of the world that is vital to the security of the United States and the rest of the free world.

I have noted with great interest that our Department of State has urged Great Britain and Greece to press for a peaceful solution of the Cyprus crisis and to establish a truly representative government on this Mediterranean island.

This is all good, however, I feel that the importance of the Cyprus situation calls for a more dynamic approach if we are to find a solution.

Therefore, I respectfully suggest that you invite representatives of the divergent interests in the Cyprus problem to Washington to confer with you in an effort to reach a solution.

It is my conviction that if such a meeting were to be held in Washington with you acting as mediator and as friend to all parties, the likelihood of finding a solution for this great problem would be materially enhanced.

I suggest that the most appropriate representatives at such a meeting would be Archbishop Makarios for the Cypriots and the British Governor of Cyprus, who exiled the Archbishop, for Great Britain.

Mr. President, I feel that if you were to make such an offer to mediate this strife between two of our closest allies it would be in keeping with our best traditions and would receive the approval of good people all over the world.

As an example of what can be accomplished by mediation of this type, I refer you to the accomplishments of President Theodore Roosevelt who in 1906 was awarded the Nobel peace prize for his success in settling the Russo-Japanese War which ended with the signing of the Treaty of Portsmouth, N. H., in 1905.

I respectfully offer these suggestions to you because I feel that the hour is late and that conditions on Cyprus and in Greece call for strong action of this kind.

Mr. President, I feel that if this suggestion should be promptly implemented, it would demonstrate in a dramatic and practical way that the United States of America and its friends are really dedicated to and devoted to the cause of peace and of justice in the world.

With all good wishes.

Sincerely yours,

THOMAS J. DODD,
Member of Congress.

Mr. Speaker, this recommendation as we know has not been carried out, and it now appears that there is little likelihood that it will be put into effect in the future. I do not feel that it is important that my recommendation be implemented, but I do feel strongly that the United States must promptly take positive action to amicably settle the dispute in Cyprus.

The British interest in Cyprus is to preserve its control over this small Crown colony which has an overwhelming Greek population. I maintain that the United States as the leader in the North Atlantic Treaty Organization has a far greater interest. In our position of leadership, and having assumed a major part of the responsibility of defending the West from Communist attack, it is our duty to take positive action.

The United States is neglecting the responsibility that goes with leadership if it sits idly by while strife in Cyprus destroys the unity of the NATO countries, and supplies the Soviet Union with potent propaganda ammunition.

Baker County Chamber of Commerce Opposes Hells Canyon Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SAM COON
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 25, 1956

Mr. COON. Mr. Speaker, the Baker County chamber of commerce has sent me a resolution with their stand on legislation now pending in Congress on authorizing the construction of the high Federal dam at Hells Canyon. They urge the Oregon delegation to vote against this bill.

I wish to place this resolution in the RECORD so that the Members will know the stand of a representative group in Baker County, Oreg., on this legislation.

The resolution follows:

RESOLUTION OF BAKER COUNTY, OREG., CHAMBER OF COMMERCE

Whereas the Federal Power Commission which was established by an act of Congress, after a thorough and complete study following a hearing which extended for almost 2 years, has decided that the three-dam plan of the Idaho Power Co. is in the public interst for the purpose of improving and developing that particular stretch of the Snake River for the use and benefit of interstate and foreign commerce, and that public purposes such as flood control, navigation, recreation and power production could be effectuated to about the same extent with private construction, as with Federal construction, of the same developments in the Hells Canyon reach of Snake River; and

Whereas this area is confronted with a serious power shortage which will become critical within the next few years; and

Whereas the Congress of the United States did not see fit, during the time that the Federal Power Commission was conducting its studies to take any action toward authorizing the construction of any dam on this particular stretch of the river, and the only hope for a quick supply of electricity for this area is through the construction of the dams which have been started by the Idaho Power Co.; and

Whereas the Idaho Power Co., acting and relying upon the license of the Federal Power Commission, has already expended millions of dollars and is employing hundreds of men in compliance with the provisions of said license; and

Whereas Congress is now considering the enactment of legislation which would nullify and destroy all that has been done in the way of construction on the present projects and would override and set for naught the license of a duly constituted Federal board, and such action would result in the loss of millions of dollars and the confidence of people generally and of investors particularly in undertaking to construct any project on any river under Federal jurisdiction with private funds; and

Whereas if Congress does take the action contemplated, it will be years before a high Federal dam will be constructed, and the threatened power shortage will become a reality; and

Whereas we believe the order of the Federal Power Commission, founded upon all the engineering testimony introduced before it, is more likely to result in promoting the public interest than would action by the Congress founded upon political motives; and

Whereas we firmly believe that private enterprise, all things being equal, should be encouraged to develop the natural resources of this country:

Now, therefore, we, the board of directors of the chamber of commerce, which has 300 members and a total paid-up membership of 1,195, do hereby register our protest against the legislation now pending in Congress for the authorization of the high Federal Hells Canyon Dam and to urge the Oregon delegation to vote against said bill.

Ignace Jan Paderewski—The 15th Anniversary of the Death of Ignace Jan Paderewski

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN D. DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 29, 1956

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, today we celebrate the 15th anniversary of the death of Ignace Jan Paderewski, famed Polish musician, humanitarian, and statesman. Paderewski certainly deserves the laudation being accorded him for his untiring efforts and devotion to duty in helping restore the integrity and liberty of the great nation of Poland. Poland, long torn apart by internal insurrections and by external aggression of powerful neighbors, was given a new chance for national survival largely by the courage and energy of this one man, Ignace Jan Paderewski. He felt that an independent Poland, which had once played a major role in central Europe, was still needed there. Paderewski himself said:

The need of Poland is an integral part of the need of the world. Totalitarianism must be defeated and liberty and self-government restored. Until that is accomplished the rest is idle talk.

The history of Poland is familiar to us all. This history, often one of national frustration, defeat, and international strife, also has had many glorious chapters. The greatest opportunity, however, for Polish patriots to realize the restoration of Poland as an independent country came with World War I. Many Poles carried their dream for national revival to various parts of the world. Ignace Paderewski was chosen to go to America for this purpose. The reason for choosing him doubtless was that he was better known in the United States—through his musical career—than any other Pole, and he could speak and write English. The selection was a good one, too, for he not only won the sympathy of the American people but also that of President Woodrow Wilson. When Woodrow Wilson went before Congress to deliver his annual message, he mentioned Poland and stressed it should be independent, united, and autonomous. Twelve months later he listed an independent Poland as the 13th point of his famous 14 points. The creation of a free and united Poland by the World War I statesmen at Paris was largely due to the great prophet for the movement of Polish freedom, Ignace Paderewski.

The commemoration of the death of Paderewski this year coincidentally comes during the centenary celebration of the birth of Woodrow Wilson. These two men, more than many others of the past generation, held fast to a vision of the kind of healthy international atmosphere, based on faith in justice, righteousness, belief in the common cause of liberty and democracy, that would make the world a better place in which to live. We of this generation could do no better than to follow in the course they laid out.

Slighted Story

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD J. THYE
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, June 29, 1956

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an excellent article by Alfred D. Stedman, entitled "Slighted Story," which appeared in the St. Paul Pioneer Press of June 24.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SLIGHTED STORY

(By Alfred D. Stedman)

Five years have seen a remarkable drop, not only in the number of farms, but also in the total area being farmed in northeastern Minnesota. In crop land, the declines have ranged from 6 percent in Mille Lacs County to 47 percent in Cook County.

For a very particular reason, this change seems worth looking into. It sheds light on an off-the-farm movement that has become widespread from the less productive or marginal lands areas of the United States. The Minnesota facts present the migration in a brighter, more accurate light than usual.

The usual presentation to Congress and the public is in terms of disaster. The departing farmers are described as having been "driven off the farms," by a dreadful combination of low production, low prices, and low income.

But that is only one side of the story. A better and often overlooked side is unfolding, particularly upstate.

This is the story behind the story of the off-the-farm movement wherever it is marked. It reflects not just the push of low farm income but the pull of job openings in nonfarm industry.

In northeastern Minnesota, this side of the story emphasizes the effects of a foundation of permanence that is being built under the iron-ore industry by the great taconite development, with its use of the area's peat resource as a future prospect. Taconite augments the paper, pulp and other iindustrial activities of the northeast.

Lake and Cook Counties, where the off-the-farm trend has been pronounced, are now scenes of the main taconite development. The Minnesota Department of Health reports population gains of 70 percent in Lake and 40 percent in Cook County in 5 years. The past decade has seen the great industrial expansion in the Twin Cities and other centers, reflected in population increases of 58 percent in Anoka, 31 percent in Washington, 24 percent in Dakota, and big gains in several other counties of this State.

All of this has augmented the chances of farming people for part-time or full-time jobs off the farm. The story as to part-time work is beautifully analyzed by Prof. W. H. Dankers and F. L. Olson, of the St. Paul Farm Campus.

They show that in 1954 (a poor ore year) two-thirds of the farm operators in northeastern Minnesota were supplementing their farm incomes with nonfarm work. Half the farm families were getting the most cash from off-the-farm jobs. Where farm incomes under $2,500 a year are the rule and farming offers not 1 boy in 10 a prospect of substantial betterment, such off-the-farm opportunities are a godsend.

The truly dark side of the United States farm picture was timed, not with such off-the-farm movement but with depression that drove city jobless to the farm. Then the on-farm population and the heartbreak of trying to wring a living from inadequate farms reached the peak.

Now the population current is reversed and is strongly cityward. In the past 5 years people have been moving off the land at a million-a-year rate. The main flow isn't here, but is from the South's poor, overcrowded lands. Wherever the flow it raises problems, including those of concentrating landownership and of providing schools for bigger and bigger urban populations.

But Minnesota's experience does drive home an important point. This is that the present off-the-farm flow is not accurately labeled in terms of farm distress alone. It is a migration away from distress of past depression. It is generated by opportunities of farming people to help themselves by finding better jobs in industry. It is a move for betterment and for higher standards of living.

Congratulations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEON H. GAVIN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 25, 1956

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, I want to say that I heartily concur in an editorial which appeared in the New York News about our very good and able friend, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON] and the position he has taken on the billion dollar increase included in the defense appropriation bill.

Also I want to take this opportunity to comment on the work of the Secretary of Defense, Mr. Wilson. I think he is a great American who has been conscientious in the performance of his duty and who has turned in an outstanding record.

Any man who handles the spending of $35 billion a year as he has done for the past few years, with the tremendous responsibilities that go with it, has earned and deserves our hearty commendations.

The editorial follows:

[From the New York Daily News of June 28, 1956]

CONGRATULATIONS

Congratulations are due this morning, we feel, to Representative GEORGE MAHON, Democrat, of Texas. Mr. MAHON is chairman of the Appropriations Subcommittee which handled the big defense bill in the House. To this bill, the Senate day before yesterday tacked an extra $960 million for the Air Force—largely as a slap at Defense Secretary Charles E. Wilson for having called the talk of such an increase phony.

MAHON says he wants to know whether the Pentagon can or will use the money before he

advises the House to endorse the Senate's action. Thus, he refuses to go along with the more or less hysterical desire in both Houses to make some sort of monkey out of Wilson. Such calmness and broadmindedness are truly commendable, and we could wish there were more of same in Congress at this moment.

Marjorie Mitchell, American Pianist

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, June 29, 1956

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD a series of comments, in the press of various foreign countries, about an outstanding young musician from Virginia.

Miss Marjorie Mitchell is from Charlottesville, and had an exchange scholarship under the Government-sponsored program. She made an outstanding success. Miss Mitchell has been assisted in her career by Mrs. Watson, of Charlottesville, the widow of Pa Watson, whom most of us knew when he served President Roosevelt.

She is further confirmation of the soundness and effectiveness of the exchange of student program.

There being no objection, the comments were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PRESS COMMENTS FROM EUROPE, 1954–56

Unfailing technique and great bravura—a genius. (Vienna, Wiener Zeitung.)

The pianist, Marjorie Mitchell, enchants us with her natural unaffected execution. Her playing was admirably clear and spontaneous. (Munich, Munchner, Merkur.)

Brilliant technique, fabulous accuracy, and great spirit. (Berlin, Spandauer Volksblatt.)

Beethoven's C Major Sonata masterfully performed. (Berlin, Togesspiegel.)

Her playing of Barber's Sonata tore the listeners from their seats. (Hamburg, Abendblatt.)

Tremendous musical impulse. Imaginative and exuberant use of virtuoso technique. (London, the Times.)

The power with which this attractive young artist mastered her exacting program is only to be found in few pianists. (Linz, Tagblatt.)

Brilliant—a palette enriched by many colors. (Geneva, La Suisse.)

A great talent—a clear vision in which temperament is controlled by intellect. (Amsterdam, Algemen Handelsblad.)

Thunderous applause followed a beautiful recital. Magnificent talent. (Athens, Franco, Hellinque League.)

Marjorie Mitchell's concert was absolutely outstanding and enthralling. (Stockholm, Tidningen.)

A virtuoso's technique coupled with incredible musical understanding, striking the audience with the force of lightning-arousing ovations. (Oslo, Dagbladet.)

Her playing was sparkling and her vital personality triumphed once more. (Oslo, Morgenbladet.)

A great experience—meeting such a versatile musical talent. (Copenhagen, Berlingske Tidende.)

Marjorie Mitchell's performance of Prokofieff's third Piano Concerto was brilliant, fascinating, and sparkling clear. (Helsinki, Nya Pressen.)

President's Illness Has Tragic Results

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 26, 1956

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker. I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following article from the Washington Post of June 26, 1956:

PRESIDENT'S ILLNESS HAS TRAGIC RESULTS
(By Marquis Childs)

The full force of the effect of President Eisenhower's second major illness on the main goal of the administration, which is peace in the world, is now painfully evident.

The cancellation of Prime Minister Nehru's visit is a tragedy. The hope that it may merely have been postponed is dubious since Nehru's schedule of international visits is a close one and he must return to New Delhi for an important session of the Indian Parliament.

No one believed that in three days of talks the President and the Prime Minister would have resolved differences that have set the two countries apart. But through the informal, man-to-man kind of conversations that had been planned they would surely have come closer to an understanding.

This was the prospect carefully nurtured by the American Ambassador in New Delhi, John Sherman Cooper, and by the Indian Ambassador in Washington, G. L. Mehta. Both had worked painstakingly to bring about what they hoped would be a new start in the troubled relations between the two powers.

The disappointment that will be felt is particularly acute against the background of the exaggerated optimism of the bulletins issued in the first days after the President's emergency operation for ileitis. With due allowance made for the desire to reassure the public, it seems extraordinary to think that Press Secretary James C. Hagerty declined to say that the President's visit to the conference of Latin-American States in Panama would be canceled.

In a number of talks between the White House and the State Department the possibility was explored of curtailing the schedule of Nehru's 4-day visit. It was believed that if the dinner at the White House, tentatively set for the date of the Prime Minister's arrival, were eliminated, with Vice President NIXON substituting as host, and with a luncheon also cut out, the talks might be held.

But it was finally decided the tension of 5 or 6 hours of discussion was in itself too much for the President in the convalescent stage. There are differences in the outlook of the two governments, notably over Communist China, with Nehru arguing for a settlement with the Reds which would eventually mean the end of Chiang Kai-shek's stronghold on Formosa. To have explored such differences frankly and freely would have put the President under a considerable strain.

It has always been made clear that the real purpose of the visit was a frank and, it was hoped, friendly exchange between Eisenhower and Nehru. The original plan, set before the President's attack of ileitis, had been to go to the quiet and seclusion of the Presidential retreat at Camp David. There the two men, so dissimilar in background and outlook, could have come to know each other better.

Nehru did not want to take the time to come to Washington for conversations with Secretary Dulles, whom he had seen in the course of Dulles' quick swing through southeast Asia earlier this year. That feeling may well have been accentuated by Dulles' recent speech calling neutrality, as between Communist and non-Communist nations, "immoral."

Eisenhower's performance at the summit conference in Geneva last July convinced Nehru that the President wanted to reach a peace settlement with the Communists not only in Europe but in Asia. He wrote an admiring letter to the President inviting him to come to India.

Eisenhower replied by pointing to the difficulties of any long absence from the country for him as Chief of State under the Constitution and urging Nehru to come to this country.

Whether justified or unjustified, Nehru has had the conviction of a marked difference between the Eisenhower foreign policy and the Dulles foreign policy. It was in direct negotiation with the President that he had hoped to advance toward the peaceful coexistence that has always been the goal of India's foreign policy.

For those in this country, and among them are highly placed officials in the administration, opposing any form of coexistence and wanting the cold war continued as before, cancellation of the Nehru visit will be good news. But to those who have continued to believe that Eisenhower could achieve a peace with honor and in doing so build a bridge to the great uncommitted nations of Asia the news will be saddening, indeed.

Arms Control: 11th Hour

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, June 29, 1956

Mr. HUMPHREY of Minnesota. Mr. President, in the Washington Post on Sunday, June 17, 1956, a major editorial was devoted to the disarmament problem. The editorial was entitled "Arms Control: 11th Hour," and it concluded by issuing an "imperative call for Mr. Stassen and his colleagues to make a far more incisive and imaginative attempt than anything yet tried to move world arms control off dead center."

I ask unanimous consent that this editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ARMS CONTROL: 11TH HOUR

Prime Minister Bulganin's latest letter to President Eisenhower serves as another reminder that time is running out on arms control. There is, to be sure, a thick coating of propaganda on the Soviet note. The appeal to the United States, Britain, and France to parallel the Russian reductions in military manpower ignores the fact that the Western Powers have long since cut their forces substantially but without making a propaganda virtue of it. The Soviet suggestion of military withdrawals from Germany was timed neatly to embarrass Chancellor Adenauer at home during his visit here.

Yet it is impossible not to have some sympathy with the Soviet observation that the meetings of the United Nation's Disarmament Subcommittee in London have been largely academic. The Soviet attempt to compare a mere verbal ban on the use of nuclear weapons with the ban on chemical warfare after World War I is patently misleading. But from the Russian standpoint

the shifts in the Western position—from insistence on international atomic control to insistence on reductions in conventional forces to insistence on inspection safeguards against surprise nuclear attack as a mandatory prerequisite—may well seem confusing. Direct Russo-American negotiations, which are the suggestion implicit in the Bulganin letter, may not be the answer, but the urgency for some new initiative on nuclear control ought to be self-evident. Despite some serious individual efforts the disarmament meetings so far have produced no more than a sort of debate on the edge of disaster, whereas some supreme effort is required to pull the world back from catastrophe.

The stark fact is that development of the intercontinental ballistic missile is proceeding apace in both Russia and the United States. Indeed, there is a bitter irony in the contradiction between the insistence on safeguards against surprise attack and the race to develop a missile which will make such safeguards impossible. Sooner or later, and probably sooner, the ICBM is sure to be perfected. Then the last apparent possibility of effective safeguard will be gone. For any potential enemy will have it within his power to launch weapons with nuclear warheads that can reach any point on earth within a matter of minutes. There is no known defense against such weapons.

Each country goes blithely ahead testing large nuclear weapons, even though each has a stockpile sufficient to annihilate the other. Soon Britain also is to test megaton-size thermonuclear weapons. The Russians cluck their propaganda tongues at the American tests in the Pacific, saying nothing of their own recent experiments in Asia; each time the Russians explode a new weapon there is pressure in the United States for additional tests. And every such explosion adds to the level of radioactivity in the atmosphere and advances the possibility that the contamination by radiostrontium will become lethal. The many unanswered questions raised by the report of the National Academy of Sciences ought to strike a chill in the heart of every government.

Is there no way in which vision and courage can break this vicious circle? The one lasting result of the Geneva Conference last summer is the political acknowledgment of a scientific fact: that civilization could not withstand an all-out nuclear war. Possibly the Soviet Union, along with Britain and the United States, may be awed into responsibility by this fearsome knowledge. But there are no real scientific secrets, and basic nuclear materials are so plentiful and widespread as to raise the real possibility that any despot like Peron may soon have the capacity to blow the world to bits. This danger surely is as apparent in Moscow as it is in Washington and London. Yet no country has attacked the problem at its roots.

The Federation of American Scientists is the latest group to call for a worldwide ban on further testing of nuclear weapons, to be enforced through an international long-range monitoring system. The practicability of such monitoring had already been demonstrated by the American detection system. The federation goes further to advance a proposal already discussed on this page: A ban on the testing of intercontinental ballistic missiles, provided that competent authorities verify the feasibility of monitoring such tests. There is scientific reason to think that it is possible to devise a workable system for monitoring large missile tests. In the case of both nuclear weapons and the missiles for delivery, a moratorium on tests would act to retard further development.

There are always arguments against such bans, and not all of them can be discarded lightly. For example, unless the intermediate-range missile also somehow could be controlled, it could wreak havoc just as frightful as the ICBM. It also is said that the United States needs to conduct additional experiments with "small" nuclear weapons to prepare for defensive use (though why this requires explosions of megaton-size weapons has not been explained). There is the contention that you can't afford to halt scientific experimentation. A more powerful consideration is the possibility that if a potential enemy violated a test ban with a successful missile, the United States might test its own missile only to find that it was a failure.

Yet when all the objections are counted up, they amount to an argument for doing nothing. Meanwhile the clock moves inexorably closer to the time when these fiendish instruments of annihilation will be beyond any known means of control. No amount of money will then buy security. It is undoubtedly true that in today's context of world relations present stockpiles of nuclear weapons and efforts to develop the intercontinental missile are necessary to deter an aggressor; and no one would advocate destruction of these stockpiles or abandonment of the efforts until there was some foolproof system of control.. But the existence of and additions to these stockpiles ought not to delude us into what the London Times calls "the ultimate fallacy"—"the belief that it is possible to win a thermonuclear war."

Is there not an imperative call for Mr. Stassen and his colleagues, using President Eisenhower's world renown as a man of peace, to make a far more incisive and imaginative attempt than anything yet tried to move world arms control off dead center? Is it not time to make available to the people of the world all the present information about the effects of nuclear weapons, including radioactivity, possibly the most potent force of all for effective international agreement?

It may be that despite the most serious and sincere efforts the people of the world will have to steel themselves to living on the edge of a precipice over which they may be pushed at any moment. But the question that men of good will everywhere must continually ask themselves is: Will it be easier to reach agreement before half the world is reduced to ashes—or after?

Brain Trusters Still at Work—Industry Dispersal Plan Wins by Narrow Margin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARL HINSHAW
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 29, 1956

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, the Victor Roterus who is said to direct area development activities for the Department of Commerce, and in fact, the entire office which he directs, should be removed and abolished, if the following report of his speech at Atlantic City is correct.

This speech should have been available to Members of the House yesterday, June 28, 1956, when, by the narrowest of margins, 200 to 197, the House approved a conference report containing amendments to the Defense Production Act, one of which, in effect, approved order No. I–19 of the Office of Defense Management. I have been approached by a number of the Members of the House, who voted "aye" on that vote, who said if they had been fully aware of the implications, they would have voted "no."

Mr. Speaker, that conference report was brought to the floor of the House, with only one-half hour's notice to its opponents and those opponents, including myself, had expected it not to come up for at least another day.

Mr. Speaker, the basic reason why I oppose, with all the vigor I possess, this planned dispersal of industry, is that as has been stated many times, and as everyone knows, the next war, if it comes, will be fought with the weapons and materials in being at the moment that war commences. After it commences, there will be no further war production. Hence, it is vital that the defense efforts of today be confined to the building of weapons, and the stockpiling of materials of war in safe places, without waste of time and funds of the Armed Forces in building new factories in remote places, with complete communities to surround these factories. The plans outlined by the Office of Defense Mobilization and the author of that speech at Atlantic City, Mr. Roterus would foist upon us an immense change in our economy, and expense at a time when we are struggling to arm ourselves against attack.

The article follows:

[From the Washington Post and Times Herald of June 29, 1956]

UNITED STATES TO DENY CONTRACTS IN TARGET AREAS—COMMERCE OFFICIAL SAYS MANY PLANTS ARE SITTING DUCKS

(By Laurence Stern)

OCEAN CITY, MD., June 28.—New industries locating within 18 miles of Washington and other prime nuclear bomb targets throughout the Nation will be denied Federal contracts, a Department of Commerce official disclosed here today.

Victor Roterus, who directs area-development activities for the Department's agency which handles defense matters, said industries now located within the 50 major hydrogen bomb target areas are sitting ducks for an aerial bomb attack.

He made the statement in a panel discussion at a meeting here of the Maryland Municipal League.

The newly announced policy runs counter to efforts by the Washington Board of Trade and numerous suburban Maryland and Virginia communities to attract new industry as a means of lightening the tax load on local residents.

In Washington, Arthur S. Flemming, Director of the Office of Defense Mobilization, said his agency's policy toward industry dispersal was contained in a directive published January 13 in the Federal Register.

He said he would be very much surprised if that directive resulted in a ban such as that described by Roterus.

The ODM order said it is the Nation's policy "to encourage and, when appropriate, to require that new facilities and major expansions of existing facilities important to national security be located insofar as practicable, so as to reduce the risk of damage in the event of attack."

It said the "distance of a facility from the probable area of destruction is the controlling factor in reducing the risk of damage.

Roteurs emphasized that existing industries within target areas are not affected by the ban. "Only newly constituted or relocated plants would be affected," he declared.

Roterus, Director of the Office of Area Development of the Business and Defense

Services Administration of the Commerce Department, declared:

"It is not the intention of the Government to force industry into the desert."

He said, however, that Federal authorities are applying a concept of defense through space in screening sites for newly located industries handling essential Government contracts.

Questioned later about his comments, Roterus said the actual distance of danger from nuclear attacks may be 25 to 30 miles from a city, not 18 miles as he had declared earlier. The Washington area is one in which a larger radius of danger area exists, he said.

It is within this area, he said, that the Government may withhold defense contracts or refuse to grant a speed-up in tax amortization allowances.

Roterus said this policy stems from an ODM pronouncement, presumably the one issued by Fleming in January.

His earlier statement came in reply to Mayor Dickran Y. Hovsepian, of Rockville, who said municipal officials are concerned about the effects of the new Federal requirements on four large industries now considering relocation there.

Rockville, Montgomery County seat, is within the 18-mile zone.

"This policy is complete news to the board," a spokesman for the Washington Board of Trade said last night. "If it is found that this policy is to be continued," he added, "the board of trade will make every effort to have the policy changed."

I. Alvin Pasarew, director of the Maryland State Planning Commission said Federal authorities are constantly switching the rules on us. He urged city officials attending the panel to plan for industrial development and not tie themselves to current Federal defense specifications.

Roterus told the group that a new joint site in Montgomery County for the Weather Bureau and Geological Survey is still not far enough out from the nuclear bomb danger zone.

Some 250 mayors, councilmen, and commissioners from 65 Maryland municipalities are attending the meeting.

They were told by State Senator Louis Goldstein, Democrat, of Calvert, president of the State senate, that a compulsory automobile insurance bill stands a good chance of passing in next year's general assembly.

Similar measures, opposed by rural representatives, have died in previous sessions. "We feel," said Goldstein, "the motorist who carries insurance should have protection from the uninsured."

Ignace Jan Paderewski

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 29, 1956

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow, June 30, 1956, marks the 15th anniversary of the death of Ignace Jan Paderewski.

The world of culture knows him as a renowned composer and pianist. Freedom-loving people everywhere remember him as the first Premier of the Polish Republic. It was in 1919 that he was elevated to that post by the people of Poland, after they asserted their independence in accordance with the principles of national self-determination as contained in the famous 14 points of President Woodrow Wilson.

Paderewski was born in 1860 in a Polish province which was then under the domination of Russia. Much of his love of freedom was instilled in him by his father, who was imprisoned in Siberia.

Having attained world success in terms of both fame and money, he could easily have turned to an easy way of life. Instead, he returned to his homeland and his people where he devoted himself to furthering the true concepts of democratic freedom.

We hope some day to see the spirit of Paderewski revived not only in enslaved Poland but in every part of the world where liberty is presently suppressed.

Remarks on H. R. 12022, A Bill To Provide Relief for the Sponge-Fishing Industry by Making Special Nonquota Immigrant Visas Available to Certain Skilled Alien Spongedivers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM C. CRAMER
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 29, 1956

Mr. CRAMER. I yesterday introduced H. R. 12022, being a bill for providing relief for the sponge-fishing industry by making special nonquota immigrant visas available to certain skilled alien spongedivers.

At Tarpon Springs on the west coast of Florida is located the only sponge-fishing community and industry in the United States. This community was established in 1905 when the Greeks brought to Tarpon Springs the first sponge boat equipped for sponge diving with a completely Greek crew. Prior to that date sponge fishing was entirely dependent upon "sponge hooking" or fishing from the surface with various size poles to bring the sponges from the bottom. Currently, sponge fishing is conducted in the beds off the Florida coast in maximum depths up to 26 and 27 fathoms. The industry continued to prosper until during the Second World War. Tarpon Springs provided 65 percent of the sponges, valued in millions of dollars used by our military forces and allies. The sponge fishing community near the end of the war numbered hundreds of active Greek-American sponge fishermen, and at least 200 vessels were manned and active. For one-half century the sponge industry constituted and kept open the economic life of the large Greek-American community of Tarpon Springs, Fla. As a community it is one of the outstanding Greek centers of the United States with a record of self-sustenance and great pride in all civic matters.

Approximately 8 years ago a mysterious disease struck at and ruined the entire sponge fishing grounds on the gulf coast, limiting the source of supply of what was generally stated to be the world's finest sponges. Many of the young descendants of those Greek fishing founders and those capable of working in the industry left for opportunities in the north. Frankly, there was much suffering in the community because of the loss of its one great source of income. I am proud to point out, however, that this Greek community has taken care of its own, and has fought through the years to provide a living for its people.

The sponge fields today have been by nature ridded of the blight and restored to their full productive ability. During the past year we have been successful in efforts with the Department of Interior, Bureau of Wild Life and Fisheries, Florida State University, University of Miami, Small Business Administration, Department of Commerce, and other Government agencies in organizing through the Sponge Industrial Committee of Tarpon Springs, Florida, a research of the potential of the industry and its rightful participation in the commercial market of the country. This has been a point of great effort on the part of the many individuals, organizations, and agencies.

In the further redevelopment of the industry an impasse has been reached through lack of experienced and capable spongedivers, skilled in the art of gathering this most useful and vital product of the sea. In Tarpon Springs there are ready and outfitted sponge fishing boats only awaiting skilled divers to put out for the sponge beds. Through the Florida State Employment Service determination has been made that nowhere in the United States are these skilled craftsmen available. Sponge-diving is an extremely skilled industry, one in which the Greeks have excelled for generations.

I have just introduced a bill, H. R. 12022, which would permit the entry to the United States of 50 skilled spongedivers for the relief of this industry, and to be employed therein; the same to be granted entrance to this country under this special bill not to be charged against the quota of the country from which they will come. It is anticipated these divers will come as Greek nationals for it is well known that the best sponge fishermen in the world are from the Dodecanese Islands of Greece, and particularly from the islands of Kalymnos, Halki, and Symi, where, from ancient times, sponge fishing has been the principal means of livelihood of these people. It is appropriate that such immigration should be permitted from these particular areas, because 90 percent of the original Greek population of Tarpon Springs originated from these same islands and these emigrees would find themselves among their friends and relatives. I would quote from a letter addressed to me by Archbishop Michael of the Greek Orthodox Church in North and South America in which he urged such action in the economic relief of Tarpon Springs, saying:

Granting permission to this type of highly specialized labor will certainly be a credit to the industry and will not be a burden to the community, but rather will safeguard an industry that has contributed much

economically to Tarpon Springs, to the State, and to our country as a whole.

Under the present immigration quotas and preferences established, this favorable action upon my bill is the only means available to save the economic life of one of America's most unique and proud communities.

As a member of the Judiciary Committee of the House of Representatives it is my intent to vigorously bring this matter to the attention of the committee seeking favorable report to the House of Represenatives during this session of Congress, or otherwise to seek passage of this needed legislation.

St. John's College

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, June 29, 1956

Mr. HUMPHREY of Minnesota. Mr. President, recently there has come off the press a great documentary of the history of St. John's Abbey. It is written by Father Colman Barry of St. John's College in Collegeville, Minn. St. John's this year is celebrating its 100th birthday anniversary.

I call to the attention of my colleagues a letter written to me by Rev. Roderic Albers, of St. Benedict's Convent and College, at St. Joseph, Minn., in which he briefly describes St. John's, the oldest institution of higher learning with a continuous history in the State of Minnesota.

I ask unanimous consent that this letter be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

Father Barry, the author of Worship and Work, has dedicated his life to the education of our youth and his intimate knowledge of the institution and of the era about which he writes. The motto of St. John's, "Pray and Work," is, indeed, the motto of Father Barry.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CHAPLAINS' HOUSE, SAINT BENEDICT'S CONVENT AND COLLEGE,
Saint Joseph, Minn., May 31, 1956.

DEAR SENATOR HUMPHREY: Today I sent you a copy of Worship and Work, by Father Colman Barry, O. S. B., the centenary history of St. John's Abbey. Dr. George N. Shuster of Hunter College in New York, speaking of Father Colman's book, says: "This book makes the story of St. John's an unforgetable part of the spiritual romance of America." And Dr. August C. Krey, Minnesota University historian, says of the same work: "This book presents an intimate story by a member of the community, recounting in full detail both its internal and external activities during a century."

As early as 1857 the Territorial Legislature granted the St. John's Seminary charter, making St. John's the oldest institution of higher learning with a continuous history in the State of Minnesota. In 1883 this charter was amended to give the school the name "St. John's University."

Besides conducting a school at Collegeville today for some 13 hundred high school, college and seminary students, the 360 members of the St. John's community are working in parishes, missions and schools in Minnesota, New York City, Bahama Islands, Kentucky, Mexico, Puerto Rico, and Tokyo, Japan.

The first Benedictines came to Minnesota from the Abbey of Metten in Bavaria, via St. Vincent's Archabbey in Pennsylvania. These men were mostly Bavarians. Today the membership includes almost every European nationality, several orientals, and a large number of Negro. Without a lot of fanfare St. John's has become interracial—and has made it work. The Negro who is ordained at St. John's, after his years of training, does not feel particularly conscious of his color or race. He attends the chapter meetings and votes as one of the family.

St. John's is an American institution. Its hundred years represent the best America has given to the solving the Old World antagonisms. It is typical of the hundreds of institutions that make America the land of the free. It is the center of the so-called liturgical movement in America—a reform representing more dignified and understandable worship of God. But the men of St. John's are proud of their ROTC, of their football team and so forth.

In its hundred years St. John's has tried to make good Christians, and good Americans. Its motto is: Pray and Work. At its centennial St. John's dedicates itself anew to the honor of God and the welfare of civil society.

Sincerely yours,
RODERIC ALBERS, O. S. B.

Adventures in International Friendship

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, June 29, 1956

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD the contents of a brochure issued by the Rotary Club of Little Rock, Ark. This brochure describes in some detail the program of the club, by which the club members sponsor annually visits by two young men from abroad.

It is such a successful undertaking that I believe the Members of this body will be interested in it, and I hope it may inspire other clubs to follow the example of the Little Rock Club.

There being no objection, the brochure was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADVENTURES IN INTERNATIONAL FRIENDSHIP

THE BACKGROUND OF OUR IDEA

In a world of conflicting political ideologies—democracy and communism—what can the Little Rock Rotary Club do in the field of international service to help clarify this confused state of affairs? That was the question put to our club assembly several years ago.

From that question evolved the "Little Rock Adventure in International Friendship"—a program to bring foreign visitors to the United States as guests of our Rotary Club. They would stay here 60 days—live as we live, see what we see, hear what we hear, do what we do. It would give them the opportunity to return to their respective countries and tell their own countrymen the truth about democracy under a capitalistic setup such as we have here in America.

Millions in Europe do not know what to believe about the United States. Firsthand statements, however, from their own countrymen have greater weight by far than statements made by outsiders, statements which are largely discounted.

PROCEDURE

Early in the Rotary year our membership ballots upon the continuation of the project, and also ballots upon the country from which they would prefer that the two students come for the coming year. This gives ample time for committees and contacts and selections, and authorizes the billing of the membership for their pro rata cost of the project. The committee then contacts the district governors in the country and an explanation of the plan and idea stating that we are ready to pay the expenses for two young men from their country to visit Little Rock for 60 days. We ask their cooperation in conducting the selection of a group of candidates for this adventure. The boys must be college students aged 18–25, they must be able to understand and speak the English language, and must be the caliber of young men who could return and express their experiences in an acceptable manner.

These young men need not necessarily be, or be related to, Rotarians, but each of them must be sponsored by some Rotary Club.

We ask the district governors to require of each candidate a 2- or 3-page presentation of his background, biography, educational, and business experience, and an essay on why he would like to visit America. We also require a recent photograph of the candidate to be attached. We ask the district governors to make eliminations from the candidates down to not more then 10, and then to send us the completed applications and essays on each of these 10 candidates.

Our own Rotary International student-project committee makes the final determination after studying the files on each of the 10 candidates. The two winning candidates are notified of their selections. We make reservations for transocean travel by plane with arrangements to give them $50 each upon their arrival in New York. (We give weekly spending cash later.) However, they fly directly to Little Rock for the beginning of their visit.

After the 60-day visit, they begin their return trip by train from Little Rock usually through Chicago with 2 days stopover there, with entertainment through contacts with Rotary International. From there they go to Washington for another 2- or 3-day stopover where they are the guests of Arkansas congressional Representatives, who show them around in Washington. From Washington they go to New York with a brief layover prior to their departure to their home country.

COST

The cost of the project varies depending upon the country selected. The principal item of expense is, of course, the air transportation. We have a club membership of around 290 members, and originally it was supported by a $10 voluntary contribution, which was paid by 180 to 200 members. The last 2 years the club has voted to sponsor the project on an assessment basis, and it has cost $9.50 per capita and $8 per capita for the past 2 years. The total cost of the French project was $2,500. The total cost of the Italian project was $2,271. The total cost for the German project was $1,840, and the total cost of the Finnish project was $2,250.

We recommend the assessment approach as it lessens the burden on all, and gives every Rotarian a participation.

WHAT THEY DO IN LITTLE ROCK

The visitors are met at the airport upon their arrival in Little Rock, and their usual

first evening is spent with the committee only, with a small get-acquainted dinner. Prior to their arrival, the 60-day visit has been allocated in weekly segments to 9 Rotarians, 1 for each week. This Rotarian is responsible for the appointments and activities of the two visitors during the week of his assignment, and all invitations for that period must be cleared with the Rotarian sponsor for that week. From the very beginning we have always had more invitations for entertainment in the home and various trips and experiences than we have been able to schedule in the allotted time, so this does not leave the boys very many idle moments.

We give them permanent residence at the YMCA. They are given planned tours through our courts, governmental agencies, our schools from the grade level up to a visit to the State University at Fayetteville. They attend church services each Sunday and Sunday schools of many denominations. They appear as guests and speakers at civic clubs and school gatherings in Little Rock and over the State. They go to the offices and factories of our Rotarians to see how business is conducted. They visit our agricultural areas to see cotton plantations, rice farms, timber reservations, bauxite and other mining activities. Rotarians vie with each other to have the boys as their guests, to take them on these tours, and to entertain them in their homes, for one of the things we especially want them to observe is the way in which Americans live at home. No attempt is made to propagandize the boys. We try to be natural and let them form their own impressions of our democratic processes; the workings of our free enterprise system, the independence of religious worship, the freedom of the press and speech; and the inalienable right of an American citizen to live and prosper according to his efforts and circumstances.

THE FINAL CHAPTER

When these young men return to their native land, they prepare reports of their visit which they present before the Rotary Clubs in the area in which they live, and the demand for these boys as speakers seems to exceed their ability to fulfill them. Transcripts of these reports which are forwarded to us have convinced us that our efforts and our money was more than well spent; and that these young men who have had only a picture show and textbook conception of America and American living, have developed an understanding and an appreciation of the real America which is an invaluable asset in our great problem of having nations understand one another. Each year we are more convinced than ever that the individual influences of these two boys each year will make a more than casual contribution as they report their impressions to their fellow countrymen.

We do not offer this project as a substitute for international scholarships or the student-exchange program, but rather it is a supplementary activity because we are bringing young men who would otherwise never come to this country. Even the student who studies in a country for a year is rarely accorded the privilege of visitation in the home and intimate participation in American daily activities such as is accorded the members of our student project.

From the speech delivered by Jacobacci to the Turin, Italy, Rotary Club after his return: "I am very thankful to the Turin Rotary Club, to the Italian district, and to the Little Rock Rotary Club for the splendid opportunity they offered me to visit the United States, to have known so many different persons who have done what was in their power in order to give me a total, complete vision of American life, to tie again those friendly links between two countries and their people so different and so far away."

From a letter received 6 years after his visit: "I have an incommensurable debt toward you. Little Rock Rotarians and all the people in your town—firemen, policemen, post-office clerks, nice girls at the record shop * * * those 6 weeks in Little Rock mean more to me than 1 year of my whole life. For this reason I was happy to hear that you are carrying further your foreign students program. Though some of you may feel sometimes that it is a hopeless task to convert to good ideals millions of people who have no opportunity of seeing your way of life at work, I believe that your contribution thereto will bear its fruits, by the example it gives to others and by the spreading of knowledge through those who had the privilege of being chosen as I was."

From Peter Kuhne, one of our German students:

"I know a young fellow in Germany, who was once over there in America. He had a big time in the United States of America, making speeches from time to time, in which he always used to speak about the angel of a foreigner, instead of the angle of a foreigner. It was not the only mistake he made, as far as I can remember, but nevertheless he had many good friends over there. When he returned to Germany everybody said, 'Peter has become a Yankee,' as he tried to disturb the outdated view of the United States of America which people still have in our country.

"* * * So often people ask me to show my United States of America picture album to them and on these occasions Arkansas and the most wonderful hours I was able to spend down there in the South turn up before my mind all of a sudden.

"Our problem child in West Germany is Mr. Ollenhauer, the leader of the Social-Democratic Party. That fellow ought to visit the United States of America in order to learn how real opposition works. I think the essential difference between American and German political opposition in government is this: When in your country the rough time which precedes the day of general election is over and the new-elected President enters White House, fights between the parties remain in the past and prolific cooperation between opposition and leading party with the goal of social and economical improvement is the common aim in the future.

"Give kindest regards to my Rotary friends. It might interest them that the idea of the program of international friendship was taken up by the Hamburg Rotary Club which invited last summer 10 boys of 5 European countries."

After his return, Asko Karttunen wrote as follows:

"I have been thinking of the fact that you fellows in the Club may decide not to bring anybody over during next spring, and if so happens I'm certainly going to feel sorry, not only for the guys who might have come over, but also for the men who have been given jobs in our foreign relations projects.

"I know the value of it—the value for myself, for Rotary and its members, for United States, and for the free world and democracy. Maybe the value is not something all the world sees and hears of, but it is the work of common men, wanting peace and freedom, something that in its humble way will strengthen understanding and friendship among nations, something that should not be given up, but made more widespread.

"So continuing the project would be a fine thing; I have had the honor to be part of it once, so I have every reason to promote its future life. It is worth the money—to you and to us. Like they sing in the 'South Pacific' there's 'nuttin' like a dame,' there is nothing like the Little Rock project.

"Life has been pretty busy with all the reading to be done. The summer is at its peak, and it's just dog-hot, even by your standards.

"My best wishes to the new President Dick and Secretary Bob as well as to the 'old guard'."

Peter Boyer from Paris had this to say after his return home: "I have had the opportunity to talk with many students—even Communists—and many of these middle class people who really make the majority in France appreciate very much my information coming first hand, and not through the lies of the newspapers."

EXCERPT FROM SEPTEMBER 1949 THE ROTARY MAGAZINE

Little Rock Rotarians are rightfully proud of this Fourth Object project, typifying as it does the active role Rotary Clubs everywhere are playing in broadening the understanding of world youth. And as for Pierguido and Guido now back in Italy—they expect to be better civil engineers and lawyers for it all * * * and better citizens of Italy and the world, too. It seems a reasonable expectation.

Great Accomplishment of Democratic 84th Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BARRATT O'HARA
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 29, 1956

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, the record of the Democratic 84th Congress for constructive accomplishment is unsurpassed. There has been an absence of fanfare and of sensationalism but not of industry and of wise planning. Outstanding on that record is the $33 billion Federal roads bill, which will make a reality of the dream which this country has envisioned these many years.

What this measure will mean to the country has been expressed in terms of its significance to my own city of Chicago in an article appearing in the Chicago Daily News of Wednesday, June 27, as follows:

WHAT ROADS BILL MEANS TO AREA—STATE, LOCAL CASH FREED FOR NEW PROJECTS HERE

What does the $33 billion Federal roads bill mean to Chicago and Cook County?

It's a lot like striking oil at State and Madison, local highway engineers agree.

"It will make a reality out of projects that until now were little more than pipe dreams," said William J. Mortimer, county highway superintendent.

"It will cut completion of the Interstate Highway System here from 30 to 13 or 15 years," predicts R. H. Harrison, division engineer of the Federal Bureau of Public Roads."

It will free tens of millions of city, county, and State money—now earmarked for expressways—for additional highway projects, offers George L. DeMent, Chicago commissioner of public works.

Uncle Sam now picks up the tab for 50 percent of the Congress expressway, the Northwest, South, Southwest, and Edens expressways, plus the Wacker Drive extension.

The other 50 percent was divided among the city, county, and State.

Under the new bill, Uncle Sam will pay 90 percent of the freight—if such new construction qualifies as part of an Interstate Highway System.

And in Cook County nearly all of it does qualify, the experts say.

Here's how the county government would benefit, for example:

It issued $245 million in bonds last year to pay its part of the expressway system in the county, says Mortimer.

If the United States puts in 90 percent of the money for the expressways instead of 50 percent, Mortimer says the county could use most of the bond issue for projects like these:

Making Stony Island an expressway between 79th and 107th Streets to connect South Shore Drive with the Calumet expressway.

Build an east-west route near 55th Street to link Stony Island with Cicero or Harlem.

Construct an inland route through Chicago, possibly linking Midway Airport with O'Hare Field.

Participate with the city and park district in overhauling the outer drive between Oak and Cermak Road, flattening out the right angle curves between the river and Randolph.

Push through a crosstown route near California to link the southwest expressway with the Congress and northwest expressway.

Mortimer gave no estimates on how much these multimillion dollar projects would cost—and pointed out that it will be up to the State to split up the Federal fund more.

G. DeMent estimates there are $440 million in present and future road projects around metropolitan Chicago that qualify for the 90 percent United States grants.

He says the new United States bill will free county, State and city money for other road projects "that aren't eligible for Federal funds but that are still regarded as needed."

Governor Stratton has said he believes that half the United States funds given Illinois for an Interstate System during the first 1½ years of the program will be spent in the Chicago area.

Illinois is expected to get $8,100,000 this year and another $129,600,000 in the next 2 years. The whole building program is to take 13 years.

Stratton, Mayor Daley, and County Board President Dan Ryan already have ordered their engineers to submit reports on how the money can best be spent.

Capt. Chester McPherson Anderson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 29, 1956

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, it has been my privilege, as a result of my affiliation with the United States Coast Guard, to have become acquainted with one of its unsung heroes.

Capt. Chester M. Anderson retires from the United States Coast Guard service tomorrow, June 30, 1956, after 32 years of loyal, efficient, and distinguished service.

Captain Anderson was born in Seattle, Wash., in 1894. He received his primary education in that city's schools and later attended the DeKoven Military School and the Navigation School of the University of Washington.

During World War I he served on active duty as a lieutenant, junior grade, with the United States Naval Reserve. He entered that service in October 1918 and was honorably discharged therefrom in September 1921. He continued to follow the sea until 1924 when he was commissioned as an ensign in the United States Coast Guard.

During World War II he was the commanding officer of the cutter *Algonquin*, assigned to the North Atlantic. His fine service is only partly recognized by the awards from our Government to him which consist of, among others, the Navy Commendation Ribbon for convoy escort operations in the North Atlantic during World War II, the American Defense Service Ribbon with Sea Clasp, the American Area Ribbon, the European-African-Middle Eastern Area Ribbon, the Asiastic-Pacific Ribbon, and the World War I and World War II Victory Medals.

During the last 4 years he has served as Director of the United States Coast Guard Auxiliary where he has done an exceptionally outstanding job. He systematized their procedures, he minimized and standardized the forms they use, he assisted with their new manuals, encouraged the enrollment of new men, and aided considerably in increasing the present roster of the northern area to well over 2,000 men and women.

He is loved and respected by all, particularly because of the way he extended himself beyond the call of regular duty.

I know that every Auxiliarist joins me in saluting him and wishing him well in all that he undertakes in the years ahead.

The Presidency

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, June 29, 1956

Mr. HUMPHREY of Minnesota. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the final column in Mr. James Reston's series on the Presidency, which have appeared in the New York Times, be inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE PRESIDENCY, V—EVALUATION OF NEW INSTITUTIONS THAT HELP PRESIDENT KEEP UP WITH PACE OF HISTORY

(By James Reston)

WASHINGTON, June 21.—The American Presidency, like most other national institutions, is in a race with the pace of American history.

So swift is that pace and so vast the growth of the American Republic and its responsibilities, that all national institutions—and the habits of the men who run them—inevitably lag behind.

This is true in a special sense of all political institutions. It is true, regardless of the party in power, not only of the Presidency but of the Congress with its multiplicity of overlapping committees and its cult of seniority.

It is true not only of the machinery for electing Presidents but also of the methods of selecting powerful assistants to the President. And the problem of change in Washington is especially different. For change depends most of the time on the men who have benefited by the political habits and machinery of the past.

In this series of articles, of which this is the last, an effort has been made to draw a distinction between the President and the Presidency, and to report on some of the men and institutions that carry on the burdens of the office during the President's illness.

All these men are caught in this race with the fierce transition of the time. They are all conscious of the need of change. And while they do not change as fast as events, it does not follow that progress has not been made.

CABINET MEETING DAY

This, for example, was Cabinet meeting day in Washington (it is usually on Fridays). The only resemblance it bore to Cabinet meetings of Franklin D. Roosevelt's time was that it was held in the White House Cabinet Room.

The Cabinet under FDR was a story-telling bee—informal, unprepared, and unrecorded. When, after the war, officials and historians wanted to know what happened in these Cabinet meetings, they had to go to the late Henry L. Stimson's personal diaries. For no official record was kept, no agenda was prepared, no catalog of decisions was preserved. And the only consolation for the historians was that it probably didn't matter, for the Cabinet was not the place where the main business was conducted.

Today, the Cabinet (minus John Foster Dulles, Secretary of State, who was off in California scalding Nikita S. Khrushchev, his favorite target) arrived at the White House, each with his black Cabinet diary.

The secretary to the Cabinet, Maxwell M. Rabb, of Boston, had prepared an agenda. For each item on the agenda there was a background memorandum, setting out the points at issue, and a financial statement, indicating what the various proposals would cost, if adopted.

When Vice President RICHARD M. NIXON, pinch-hitting for the President, called the meeting to order, the Cabinet members did not have to be told the background of the problem (this took up most of the time in the Roosevelt meetings). The problems had been defined and the papers circulated to the members by the Cabinet secretariat earlier in the week.

Furthermore, a record of the meeting was kept by Mr. Rabb. And as soon as Mr. NIXON ended the meeting to go to Quantico, Va., for a survey of problems with the lords of the Pentagon, representatives of all the Cabinet members met at the White House. They recorded whatever decisions had been taken so that they could follow up on the action promised.

DIFFERENT FROM BRITISH

This is not to say that the Cabinet is now an agency of the Presidency comparable, say, to the British Cabinet. It does not have the power of decision, as the British do under the system of Cabinet responsibility. Nor does it deal with national security matters.

Its responsibility is to report and recommend policy on home matters—agriculture, natural resources, justice, etc. National security questions are dealt with in the National Security Council. The Council is now the most powerful agency of the Government under the President, and the most important arm of the Presidency.

This came into being under President Harry S. Truman on the basis of the experience of the war. It was the result of many years of anguish over the burdens of the White House, and was finally given statutory authority in the National Security Act of 1947, as amended in 1949.

This act did four things:

1. Established the Department of Defense (instead of separate departments of Army, Navy, and Air Force).

2. Created the Central Intelligence Agency for the collection and appraisal, at a central

point, of world intelligence relating to national security.

3. Set up the National Security Resources Board (now the Office of Defense Mobilization).

4. Established the National Security Council.

The purpose of the NSC was to advise the President on the integration of domestic, foreign, and military policies relating to national security; to assess and appraise the objectives, commitments, and risks of the United States in relation to our actual and potential military power; to consider policies on matters of common interest to the departments and agencies of the Government; and to make recommendations to the President in connection therewith.

ANTIFREEWHEELING DEVICE

This was intended to keep the separate departments dealing with security matters from running off in all directions—sort of an antifreewheeling device. And while nobody can ever hope to coordinate as many people as now work in the security field, it has done extremely well.

The statutory members of the NSC are the President, who normally chairs the weekly meetings on Thursday mornings; Vice President Nixon; the Secretaries of State (Mr. Dulles) and Defense (Charles E. Wilson); and the Director of the Office of Defense Mobilization, Arthur S. Flemming.

Others who attend are the Director of the Central Intelligence Agency, Allen W. Dulles, who opens each meeting with a world intelligence report; the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, Adm. Arthur W. Radford; the Secretary of the Treasury, George M. Humphrey; the Assistants to the President for Disarmament (Harold E. Stassen) and Foreign Affairs (William H. Jackson); the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, Percival F. Brundage; and such other officials as the President wishes to invite.

The difference between the NSC and the Cabinet, other than that one deals with home affairs and the other with security affairs, is that the NSC is far more formal. It does everything on the basis of carefully prepared staff work, and almost always deals with questions that require a specific recommendation to the President for policy action.

If the President has something he wants studied, he refers it to his Special Assistant for Security Affairs, Dillon Anderson. Mr. Anderson is a conservative lawyer from Texas who has a gift for wry verse, which he does not use on NSC papers.

Mr. Anderson may then refer the question to the department concerned, or to several departments for their observations. And when the papers are then taken by the NSC permanent staff (most of whose top members have been there from the start of the agency), the staff prepares them for the consideration of the National Security Council's planning board.

POWER OF PLANNING BOARD

Much has been written, though little is known, about the NSC. What is more important is that even less is known about the council's planning board, which does most of the pick-and-shovel work for the NSC and a great deal of its thinking.

It is, therefore, the principal planning and coordinating interdepartment committee in the issues of war and peace and one of immense power. This, of course, is flatly denied by all its members, who are not only anonymous but practically invisible.

The planning board met this afternoon in room 382 of the Old State Department Building—nine men whose names are almost unknown beyond the top level of official Washington.

Mr. Anderson, the aforementioned writer who normally is chairman of the planning board, was not present this afternoon. He was away on Kwajalein Atoll with Lewis L. Strauss, the atomic energy chief, presumably listening to bangs. His place was taken by the man who has been staff secretary of the NSG from the beginning, James S. Lay, Jr.

The other members on hand today were Robert R. Bowie, the Harvard teacher who is Assistant Secretary of State and head of that department's policy planning staff; Robert Amory, Jr., of the Central Intelligence Agency; Maj. Gen. Francis W. Farrell, representing the Joint Chiefs of Staff; Jarold A. Kieffer of the President's Advisory Committee on Government Organization; C. Dillon Glendenning of the Treasury; Robert E. Mattison of the White House Disarmament Staff; Ralph W. E. Reid, Assistant Director of the Bureau of the Budget, and Karl Harr of the Department of Defense.

BASED ON PAPERWORK

The famous men who sit on the NSC base their discussions like the Cabinet, on carefully prepared papers, and they are not restrained in their criticisms. But the men in big government who prepare the papers for Cabinet members, who have a thousand other things to do each week, are in the key spot, regardless of how much they may deny their authority.

These instruments of departmental cooperation—the NSC, the NSC planning board, and the Operations Coordinating Board, which sees that the NSC policies are carried out by all concerned—provide the President with solid staff services, but they cannot substitute for the President.

As Sidney W. Souers, the first executive secretary of the NSC, wrote about interdepartmental committees of the past:

"[They] suffered for lack of a definite mission * * * and most of all, from authoritative direction."

This is true to a certain extent today in the NSC. The council and its planning board can recommend, but the constitutional responsibility of the President is still the duty to decide.

When he is available he works hard at the NSC papers. And even now he is beginning to send his observations to the staff from the hospital. But he is not able, and has not been able during his two illnesses, to go through the long hard task of arguing out the NSC problems and hammering them into the policy he wants.

"The powers and duties" of the Presidency, mentioned in article II, section 1, paragraph 6 of the Constitution, do not refer only to those simple acts of signing papers that have to be signed so that the public business can go on.

They refer not only to the President but to the whole of the Presidency: to the direction of these staffs, to the hard decisive business of choosing between dangerous courses.

This is why there is apprehension in Washington about the illness of President Eisenhower. There are institutions behind him that carry on better than his political opponents would have the public believe, but these institutions do not work so well without him as his political supporters pretend.

A Tribute to Ignace Jan Paderewski

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY S. REUSS
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 12, 1956

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, 15 years have passed since the death of Ignace Jan Paderewski and nearly 100 since his birth. Each year his contribution to mankind's welfare shines more brilliantly in the pages of history.

It is appropriate to recall that this year also is the centennial of the birth of another great champion of human liberty, Woodrow Wilson. Wilson and Paderewski worked together in the common effort for the self-determination and independence of Poland which was achieved after the First World War.

The 20 years of Polish freedom—from 1919 to 1939—were glorious ones. Paderewski was the first Premier of the Polish Republic and his name is inextricably tied to the cause of Polish liberty.

Providence is rarely as generous in her endowments as with Ignace Jan Paderewski. He would have won immortal fame as a composer and artist alone. But linked with his brilliant musical achievements was his dedication to a free Poland. When he died on June 29, 1941, he left a record of which all Poles and all Americans of whatever national origin will find inspiration for generations to come.

Farm Newspaper Polls Kansas Farmers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ESTES KEFAUVER
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, June 29, 1956

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article from the Tiller and Toiler, a newspaper in the Kansas farm belt, which shows the feelings of farmers polled in that section of the West.

I believe this trend will attain full force by November.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEMOCRATS REVERSE 1952 IN STUNNING VICTORY—EISENHOWER, HALL, BENSON DEFEATED IN POLL

With the Democratic candidates for the presidency and the governorship of Kansas smashing to overwhelming victory over President Eisenhower and other Republican candidates, the Tiller and Toiler today closes its second postcard poll of rural voters after 10 straight days of balloting of all farmers in Hodgeman and Edwards Counties. Final victory margin for the Democrats on the presidency stands at 156–131, or 54 percent of total votes cast.

Added to the vote in the Tiller and Toiler's April Pawnee County farm poll—both polls are the first newspaper polls in Kansas this election year—the grand total of cumulative votes on the presidency in the three counties adds up to 591 for the Democrats against 377 for the Republicans. This means that 61 percent of the voters in the three central Kansas counties will apparently vote for Senator Kefauver, Adlai Stevenson, or Governor Harriman against only 39 percent for President Eisenhower, Senator Knowland, or Vice President Richard Nixon.

Each day the count of the ballots returned in the mail on the 3-county poll has been attested by prominent local Democrats and Republicans from outside the Tiller and

Toller officer, and the qeustion asked on the ballots were rigidly nonpartisan. The question on the possible Democratic presidential candidates, for example, read: "If the presidential election were held tomorrow, would you vote for a Democrat—whether the candidate was Senator Kefauver, Adlai Stevenson, Governor Harriman, or some other?" Similarly, the question on possible Republican candidates read "If the presidential election were held tomorrow, would you vote for a Republican—whether the candidate was Dwight Eisenhower, Richard Nixon, Senator Knowland, or some other?"

The significance of the undeniable rebuke extended to President Eisenhower, it is believed, makes not only Kansas likely to go Democratic this November, but all other wheat States—perhaps all farm States—as well. Pawnee, Hodgeman, and Edwards Counties are typical Kansas wheat counties. Moreover, they voted for Eisenhower in 1952 by fantastic majorities, 2½ to 1 in Pawnee County, 4 to 1 in Hodgeman County, and nearly 3 to 1 in Edwards County. The stunning reversal of opinion demonstrated by the poll can be traced to dissatisfaction and even hatred of administration farm policies. This is clearly shown in the 179 to 97 vote to fire Secretary of Agriculture Benson in Hodgeman and Edwards Counties, and the 473 to 162 vote to fire him in Pawnee County. Adding Pawnee County, this makes a total of 652 votes to fire Benson against only 265 to retain him, or a margin of better than 2 to 1.

The enormous Democratic sweep is further demonstrated by the vote on the governorship. Here Democrat George Docking, of Lawrence, only Democratic candidate to file for the office so far this year and the candidate defeated by Gov. Fred Hall in 1954, moved to a 164 to 110 victory over Governor Hall or Warren Shaw, Hall's primary opponent in Hodgeman and Edwards Counties. Including the Pawnee County vote, Docking rolled up a 617 to 333 victory for 63 percent of the total vote. This makes Docking look like a sure victor over any Republican candidate this fall.

Even the Tiller and Toller staff, admittedly partisan, has been amazed by the Democratic landslide. But day after day, as farmers, after voting Democratic straight down the line, marked their ballots with the recurring refrain: "I was a Republican in 1952 but not any more," and drew gallows beside the fire Benson box, sometimes adding, "And Eisenhower, too," it became clear that hundreds upon hundreds of formerly Republican farmers had turned Democratic.

Acreage allotments, lower prices, and relatively poor crops, of course, have undoubtedly influenced farmers to go Democratic. But it must be remembered that both Edwards and Pawnee Counties are well east of the 100th meridian, traditional demarcation line for dust bowls and poor wheat country, and that part of Hodgeman County is also east of this line. Moreover, Edwards and Pawnee Counties are now harvesting wheat crops which on the harvested acreage will not be far below the long-term average for these counties. However, President Eisenhower's unfulfilled 1952 promise of 100 percent of parity for farmers has undoubtedly stuck in many farm craws, as this promise was mentioned frequently, too, in writing in the ballots. On only 3 of the 10 days of polling were the Republicans able to chalk up a majority for their candidates.

The fact that the Tiller and Toller polled only farmers in Hodgeman and Edwards Counties, while polling all towns but Larned in the Pawnee County poll, has been cited by a few Republicans as evidence that the town vote might upset the country vote. But this did not prove true in Pawnee County towns, and in the last Presidential election there was not 1 percent difference proportionately between the way Larned as a city and Pawnee County rural voters cast their ballots. Town prosperity in Kansas is so inextricably tied in with farm prosperity that there is little, if any, difference in totals piled up in town versus country.

The Tiller and Toller wishes to thank its subscribers and friends for their intense interest in the 2 polls, which brought an average 18 percent return from the 3 counties—more than triple the return received in the ordinary postcard poll, and evidence of burning interest in candidates and issues this election year.

Altogether, 977 voters expressed their opinions in the 3 polls. As usual, weekend votes and yesterday's votes were counted by local attorneys. James Boyd, prominent local Republican and present county attorney, and Maurice Wildgen, prominent local Democratic attorney, counted the weekend and yesterday's ballots.

Final results in Tiller and Toller Poll (Hodgeman and Edwards Counties)

For a Democratic President:	
Monday	15
Tuesday	39
Wednesday	30
Thursday	34
Friday	17
Weekend	17
Tuesday	4
Pawnee County	435
Grand total	591
For a Republican President:	
Monday	26
Tuesday	37
Wednesday	13
Thursday	14
Friday	24
Weekend	8
Tuesday	9
Pawnee County	246
Grand total	377
For a Democratic Governor:	
Monday	15
Tuesday	38
Wednesday	30
Thursday	34
Friday	20
Weekend	21
Tuesday	6
Pawnee County	453
Grand total	617
For a Republican Governor:	
Monday	23
Tuesday	36
Wednesday	11
Thursday	14
Friday	15
Weekend	4
Tuesday	7
Pawnee County	223
Grand total	333
Retain Benson:	
Monday	24
Tuesday	27
Wednesday	9
Thursday	10
Friday	16
Weekend	2
Tuesday	9
Pawnee County	172
Grand total	273
Fire Benson:	
Monday	16
Tuesday	42
Wednesday	30
Thursday	38
Friday	24
Weekend	27
Tuesday	2
Pawnee County	473
Grand total	652

Percent of total vote

For President:	
Democrat	61.0
Republican	39.0
For Governor:	
Democrat	64.0
Republican	36.0

Robert Dinwiddie: Grandfather of the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. PORTER HARDY, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 29, 1956

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Speaker, in an extention of my remarks in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of August 20, 1954, under the title "Robert Dinwiddie: Grandfather of the United States," I included an article on this subject by Philip Bergan, published in the Phoenix, a student's magazine of the Archbishop Stepinac High School, of White Plains, N. Y.

The ensuing publicity in both Virginia and New York was gratifying, for it served to focus attention on this celebrated colonial Governor of Virginia and his part in discovering George Washington.

On June 22, 1956, the mayor of Portsmouth, Va., Hon. Fred A. Duke, proclaimed July 6, 1956, as Dinwiddie Day in his honor. This will be observed with appropriate celebrations including the renaming of the principal hotel in Portsmouth as the Governor Dinwiddie. This is a fitting prelude to Virginia's 1957 commemoration of the settlement of Jamestown.

On June 24, 1956, the Virginian-Pilot and the Portsmouth Star carried an editorial which provides additional historical highlights, which I am sure will be of interest to my colleagues. The editorial follows:

DINWIDDIE AND WASHINGTON AND THE PORTSMOUTH STORY

Dinwiddie and Washington streets run along parallel courses in Portsmouth. There is a parallelism between the history of the city and the career of a colonial administrator for whom a hotel is to be named. Frank D. Lawrence, president of the Hotel Portsmouth, has announced that the name of the hotel will be changed to the Hotel Governor Dinwiddie on July 6, its 10 anniversary.

Robert Dinwiddie was Governor of Virginia when Portsmouth was established in 1752. Technically his title was lieutenant governor during the period from 1751 to 1758 when he was the colonial administrator of the colony under the Crown. Colonial Virginia's administration is divided into three periods.

The Virginia Company of London governed the colony under a charter from the Crown from 1607 to 1624. The colony was directly administered by governors and lieutenant governors appointed by the Crown in two periods. The first period lasted from 1624 to 1652. From 1652 to 1660 Cromwell's Roundheads held the power in England, and the colony also was under the Commonwealth. After that, Virginia was again under the Crown until 1776 and the Revolution,

after which she was a free and independent State.

Virginia's colonial administrators had various titles during the three periods that preceded statehood. They were presidents of councils, deputy governors, and governors. The last two under the company had the simple title of governor. They were Sir George Yeardley and Sir Francis Wyatt. Both these governors later held the same office, with the same title, under the first period of administration under the Crown. There were 11 administrations during this period and only seven of the administrators held the full title of governor.

The three governors under the Commonwealth all held the unqualified title. When the Restoration came, and Virginia and England were again under the Crown, Sir William Berkeley became the first Governor of Virginia. Between 1660 and 1704 there were governors and lieutenant governors and presidents of council as the chief administrators of the colony. Between 1704 and 1768 (the Dinwiddie period) the office of Governor of Virginia was a sinecure held by Crown appointees in England who did little more than enjoy the title. A president of council served after that, and John Murray, Earl of Dunmore, was governor in chief from 1775 to 1776, when he was overtaken by the American Revolution.

Dinwiddie and Washington—these are storied names like Portsmouth's. Dinwiddie, the governor-in-fact, sent a young surveyor named George Washington to drive the French out of the Ohio region and later named him commander of the Virginia militia. Virginians had a chance to judge the character of Washington when he had to defend 300 miles of mountainous frontier with about 300 men.

Virginia's judgment of Washington lasted beyond Dinwiddie's time. Washington was the military leader of the American Revolution, who won American independence as much by the force of his character as by the force of arms. When a traveler pulls up in front of the Hotel Dinwiddie, he can tell himself he is making a stop along the highway of history. The governor for whom the hotel is named is the one who named Washington to his first major commission. He played a grandfatherly role to the man who has been called the Father of His Country and Portsmouth give him honor that is his due.

Judge Burns on Manhattanville, 1956

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 29, 1956

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, in the present state of world affairs, intelligent advice, based on ripened experience and proven sound judgment, is of inestimable worth, especially to well-educated graduates who will be in a position to assist in the formulation of programs to meet the changing need of this progressive age. Such worthwhile counsel is contained in the excellent commencement address recently delivered by Judge John J. Burns to the graduating class of Manhattanville.

Judge Burns, of New York and Boston, is an acknowledged leader of the legal profession. His preeminence in the art of jurisprudence, his enviable record as an educator, jurist, and director of far-flung business enterprises entitle him to recognition as a scholar whose analysis of governmental philosophies is of commanding interest.

Citizens throughout our Nation will be better informed by reading the well-chosen address of Judge Burns, and I therefore ask unanimous consent that the text be inserted in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

It is a great honor for me to be asked to speak on this occasion, which marks such an important milestone in the lives of these young ladies.

All of us friends of Manhattanville should be particularly happy that His Eminence, Cardinal Spellman, has honored us with his presence. It is no exaggeration to say that this great new Manhattanville College with its unrivaled scenic splendor, its outstanding architecture, its novel engineering, with its great promise for future growth and service, would hardly have been possible had it not been for the drive, the sympathy, the energy, and the great intelligence contributed by His Eminence to a cause that lies very near to his heart. I can testify to this from personal knowledge, and I am sure, as the years move on and class after class of young ladies leave these sheltered halls to take their part in carrying to the world God's pattern for society, Your Eminence will be much comforted by the realization that you have played such a decisive part in the inauguration and development of the new and glorious Manhattanville.

I suppose Mother O'Byrne is by this time so used to compliments that she has developed a tolerance for them. One of the most gracious and felicitous paragraphs was used by New York University last year in awarding her an honorary degree. She was particularly praised for her great skill as a teacher and as an administrator.

Some years ago I was asked to address an alumni group in Boston. I made a study of the metropolitan press for a week in September 1921, the year of our commencement, and for a similar week 25 years later. The thought behind this survey was that in our day-to-day existence people little by little become inured to social changes. They lose their faculty for indignation. They come to ignore downward trends in morality, the integrity of the family, the mores of the community, and the like. Even though I had expected to be startled, I was unprepared for the shocking disclosures.

Take homicide, for example. In the earlier period, a murder case was a causé celebré. They were infrequent and treatment by the press and the public reflected the novelty of the occasion. In the later period homicides had come to be regarded as almost an inevitable part of the scene of daily life.

In the earlier period divorces were not uncommon, but it was clear that great social stigma was attached to persons who had been parties to a divorce. In the later period the courts and the press were filled with news about divorce libels and marital misconduct, and the marriage bonds were broken for such frivolous causes that society had stopped just a little short of institutionalizing divorce by consent.

In the field of juvenile delinquency the earlier period showed concern for minor acts of youthful indiscretion, but there was hardly any showing of that strange anarchy that now goes under the name of juvenile delinquency.

In like fashion could be found the contrasts in such items as organized gangsterism, abandonment of children, sales of pornographic literature, dope addiction, public corruption, and political subversion. The study showed that there were in effect forces of evil leading to the gradual erosion of the individual and the national character.

If you young ladies, who I am sure have lived a happy existence in these holy surroundings, were to cast your minds back in memory to the days of your entrance, and reflect upon the pace at which our modern world is changing, you could not but be impressed that the change is for the worse.

Experts tell us that crime is increasing four times as fast as the national birth rate.

Insanity has multiplied, and suicide is a growing concern to the well-being of the Nation. I might at this point state that of all the nations in the world, the suicide rate is lowest in Ireland and Spain, two countries still boasting of a sound family life and a true devotion to our blessed mother.

This is not the time or occasion to do more than note in passing that the deep sleep of the American people has been hardly disturbed, and the so-called spirit of Geneva and the New Look of the Russian tyrants seem to have become a huge success. God help America! Having abandoned principles, having adopted expediency, our motto being to scrap ideals and to seek friendship in the international field by getting the best money can buy, we are proving to the hilt the truth of the aphorism that, "If you stand for nothing, you will fall for anything."

All these manifestations may be summed up in one phrase—we are a secular society. What then is this disease of secularism in a nation that boasts of its huge Sunday church attendance? It means that, so far as a guiding principle of action, so far as a hallmark of culture is concerned, America and a good part of western civilization have decided to do without God in their daily lives. Thus secularism becomes a hypocritical form of paganism. It is correctly described as neo-paganism.

Michael de la Bodoyere, the prominent Catholic publicist, has recently speculated about what would happen if communism should actually be abandoned by its leaders and the Kremlin should restore religious and political freedom. Of course, we must be on our guard and never lose sight of the fact that Khrushchev, the new boss of the Kremlin, was in large measure responsible for the unspeakable betrayal at Warsaw when the Polish patriots were lured to a certain death at the hands of the Germans while the Russians stood at ease at the entrance to the city within hearing distance of the cries of the dying. We must, as Pope Pius XII has said, "be wise in the ways of these terrorists," unbeguiled by their new slogans and unconvinced until new deeds and new attitudes proclaim their contrition and amendment. But perhaps we are wrong, perhaps a combination of internal pressures and external propaganda has made dialectic materialism unpopular with the present Russian leadership.

The principal point of De la Bodoyere's conception of what is likely to happen should communism end in Russia is that while there would undoubtedly be great dancing in the streets, relief from tension, reduction of armaments—a much-to-be-desired goal—western civilization would still be left plagued by seculiarism. Undoubtedly the materialism which from the start dominated the Communist world would continue, even if the philosophy of communism were abandoned. Here in the Western World it is doubtful if the alarming trends I have described would in any way be eliminated or corrected by the disappearance of the world Communist threat. After all, much as we dislike to admit it, our much-vaunted American way of life is frankly secularistic, and the probabilities of change seem dim, indeed.

There are on this great day, my dear young ladies, many reasons why you should be congratulated, but none more important than that you have received a training here in Manhattanville that is avowedly based on fighting the evil of secularism with every weapon at the command of the good nuns and Holy Mother Church. It is because your training has been inspired by the age-old

conviction of the great society of nuns—first things first—that you were taught by a teaching process that conforms to God's divine plan for ordering human society.

A few months ago I had a conversation with Father Barnola, rector of the Jesuit University in Caracas, Venezuela. We discussed the contrasts in the deaths within the last few years of the two most famous Spanish exiles—George Santayana and Ortega y Gasset.

George Santayana, philosopher, poet, critic, essayist, and novelist, was born in Madrid in 1863, and baptized a Catholic.

In 1872 he came with his family and settled in Boston. His faith did not survive the cold front of the Back Bay. He had a brilliant record at Harvard, where later on he headed the philisophy department, from the turn of the century until 1912. At that date he quit Harvard to lecture at the Sorbonne in Paris. Some years ago he took up permanent residence in seclusion in a convent in Rome, where he died on September 29, 1952.

He was during his lifetime Harvard's proudest boast. Difficult to class in terms of a school of philosophy, he is probably most accurately termed a skeptic. We must remember that Harvard and practically all the secular universities of this country have no system of philosophy like Manhattanville and other Catholic schools, which truly regard philosophy as the queen of sciences, and acknowledge that when God created the human mind it was for the purpose of making rational and to God's purposes the whole scheme of education.

It is very difficult to place Santayana in a conventional category of philosophical schools. It was not the ideas he generated so much as his skill as a teacher and writer that made him famous. All through his life, as appears from his autobiography, he admired the Catholic Church and was particularly familiar with the great Catholic architecture here and abroad. He spoke very frequently of his admiration for the Catholic Church and yet remained unreconciled even in death, despite the fact that in his later years he was the object of the tender solicitude of a convent of nuns in Rome.

Ortega, philosopher, critic, essayist, and publicist, was born also in Madrid and, like Santayana, became a voluntary exile from Spain. He was educated by the Jesuits and later studied at several German universities where he became famous throughout Europe as a skillful exponent of the German culture against the Latin culture. Somewhere in the course of his studies he abandoned the Catholic faith. He turned out to be the church's most bitter critic. Because of the tremendous influence he had upon European youth, there are undoubtedly today throughout Europe literally thousands of anticlericals who owe their slant to the brilliant if heretical teachings of Ortega.

And, yet, despite a mature life of skepticism and violent diatribes against the church, when his final hour came in Buenos Aires not very long ago he sent for a priest and very unostentatiously was received back into the religion of his fathers.

I asked Father Barnola what explained this difference in two great men. He said very simply, "The grace of God." And that explanation, my dear friends, cannot be broken down by the most talented of minds, the most brilliant of philosophers. It is valid for the mighty and the humble, for the king and for the peasant.

One last thought and I shall conclude. I propose a toast to you young ladies—a pagan toast, upon which is superimposed a Christian motto with which you are all familiar. Here, then, to the Manhattanville class of 1956: Ad multos annos, ad majorem Dei gloriam.

LAWS AND RULES FOR PUBLICATION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

CODE OF LAWS OF THE UNITED STATES

TITLE 44, SECTION 181. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; ARRANGEMENT, STYLE, CONTENTS, AND INDEXES.—The Joint Committee on Printing shall have control of the arrangement and style of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and while providing that it shall be substantially a verbatim report of proceedings shall take all needed action for the reduction of unnecessary bulk, and shall provide for the publication of an index of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD semimonthly during the sessions of Congress and at the close thereof. (Jan. 12, 1895, c. 23, § 13, 28 Stat. 603.)

TITLE 44, SECTION 182b. SAME; ILLUSTRATIONS, MAPS, DIAGRAMS.—No maps, diagrams, or illustrations may be inserted in the RECORD without the approval of the Joint Committee on Printing. (June 20, 1936, c. 630, § 2, 49 Stat. 1546.)

Pursuant to the foregoing statute and in order to provide for the prompt publication and delivery of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the Joint Committee on Printing has adopted the following rules, to which the attention of Senators, Representatives, and Delegates is respectfully invited:

1. *Arrangement of the daily Record.*—The Public Printer will arrange the contents of the daily RECORD as follows: First, the Senate proceedings; second, the House proceedings; third, the Appendix: *Provided*, That when the proceedings of the Senate are not received in time to follow this arrangement, the Public Printer may begin the RECORD with the House proceedings. The proceedings of each House and the Appendix shall each begin a new page, with appropriate headings centered thereon.

2. *Type and style.*—The Public Printer shall print the report of the proceedings and debates of the Senate and House of Representatives, as furnished by the Official Reporters of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, in 7½-point type; and all matter included in the remarks or speeches of Members of Congress, other than their own words, and all reports, documents, and other matter authorized to be inserted in the RECORD shall be printed in 6½-point type; and all rollcalls shall be printed in 6-point type. No italic or black type nor words in capitals or small capitals shall be used for emphasis or prominence; nor will unusual indentions be permitted. These restrictions do not apply to the printing of or quotations from historical, official, or legal documents or papers of which a literal reproduction is necessary.

3. *Return of manuscript.*—When manuscript is submitted to Members for revision it should be returned to the Government Printing Office not later than 9 o'clock p. m. in order to insure publication in the RECORD issued on the following morning; and if all of said manuscript is not furnished at the time specified, the Public Printer is authorized to withhold it from the RECORD for 1 day. In no case will a speech be printed in the RECORD of the day of its delivery if the manuscript is furnished later than 12 o'clock midnight.

4. *Tabular matter.*—The manuscript of speeches containing tabular statements to be published in the RECORD shall be in the hands of the Public Printer not later than 7 o'clock p. m., to insure publication the following morning.

5. *Proof furnished.*—Proofs of "leave to print" and advance speeches will not be furnished the day the manuscript is received but will be submitted the following day, whenever possible to do so without causing delay in the publication of the regular proceedings of Congress. Advance speeches shall be set in the RECORD style of type, and not more than six sets of proofs may be furnished to Members without charge.

6. *Notation of withheld remarks.*—If manuscript or proofs have not been returned in time for publication in the proceedings, the Public Printer will insert the words "Mr. ——— addressed the Senate (House or Committee). His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix," and proceed with the printing of the RECORD.

7. *Thirty-day limit.*—The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD any speech or extension of remarks which has been withheld for a period exceeding 30 calendar days from the date when its printing was authorized: *Provided*, That at the expiration of each session of Congress the time limit herein fixed shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee.

8. *Corrections.*—The permanent RECORD is made up for printing and binding 30 days after each daily publication is issued; therefore all corrections must be sent to the Public Printer within that time: *Provided*, That upon the final adjournment of each session of Congress the time limit shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee: *Provided further*, That no Member of Congress shall be entitled to make more than one revision. Any revision shall consist only of corrections of the original copy and shall not include deletions of correct material, substitutions for correct material, or additions of new subject matter.

9. The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the full report or print of any committee or subcommittee when said report or print has been previously printed. This rule shall not be construed to apply to conference reports.

10. *Appendix to daily Record.*—When either House has granted leave to print (1) a speech not delivered in either House, (2) a newspaper or magazine article, or (3) any other matter not germane to the proceedings, the same shall be published in the Appendix except in cases of duplication. In such cases only the first item received in the Government Printing Office will be printed. This rule shall not apply to quotations which form part of a speech of a Member, or to an authorized extension of his own remarks: *Provided*, That no address, speech, or article delivered or released subsequently to the final adjournment of a session of Congress may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

11. *Estimate of cost.*—No extraneous matter in excess of two pages in any one instance may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by a Member under leave to print or to extend his remarks unless the manuscript is accompanied by an estimate in writing from the Public Printer of the probable cost of publishing the same, which estimate of cost must be announced by the Member when such leave is requested; but this rule shall not apply to excerpts from letters, telegrams, or articles presented in connection with a speech delivered in the course of debate or to communications from State legislatures, addresses or articles by the President and the members of his Cabinet, the Vice President, or a Member of Congress. For the purposes of this regulation, any one article printed in two or more parts, with or without individual headings, shall be considered as a single extension and the two-page rule shall apply. The Public Printer or the Official Reporters of the House or Senate shall return to the Member of the respective House any matter submitted for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which is in contravention of this paragraph.

12. *Official Reporters.*—The Official Reporters of each House shall indicate on the manuscript and prepare headings for all matter to be printed in the Appendix, and shall make suitable reference thereto at the proper place in the proceedings.

Appendix

Address by the Vice President at Annual Convention of the Lions International

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD J. THYE
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, July 2, 1956

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by the Vice President of the United States before the 39th annual convention of the Lions International.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TEXT OF ADDRESS OF THE VICE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES BEFORE THE 39TH ANNUAL CONVENTION OF LIONS INTERNATIONAL, MIAMI, FLA., JUNE 30, 1956

I have selected a subject today which I believe is the most important and vital issue of our time. I should like to state it in the form of a question. What United States policy is best designed to reach the goal we desire for ourselves and for others—freedom in a world of peace?

Let me first make three basic propositions clear.

This subject is one which is completely devoid of partisanship. No political party has a monopoly on patriotism or on devotion to the basic objective all Americans share, of keeping our country strong, our people free, and the world at peace.

There is understandable and honest disagreement among equally well-intentioned men as to what our policy should be during this period. Some say we spend too much for defense, and some, too little. Some say we should increase foreign aid, others that we should reduce it. Some say that in view of recent events we are being too tough on the Communist world, others that we are too soft.

The third proposition that I wish to make clear is that I claim no infallibility or omniscience in this field. I bring you no secret information—no magic formula. What I would like to do is to present to you as objective a picture as possible of the problems which confront the policymakers in Washington, and some suggestions as to how we can deal with those problems.

THE AMERICAN POSITION

Let us first examine the position of the United States on this great issue.

The yearning for peace is deep in the heart of every American. It is rooted in every page of our history. The waves of immigrants who made this Nation great came here to escape the strife and turmoil of older lands, hoping here to find the sanctuary of freedom, a land of peace.

But we are not alone in this pursuit of peace. In nation after nation, on both sides of the Iron Curtain, the voice of countless millions is heard asking for an end to war and bloodshed.

War has never been glamorous to those who took part in it. The thrill and excitement of battle, the joy of triumph, are feelings which sometimes come to the spectator who sees war at a distance. Novels and dramas often portray war as a path to glory. But this is not the reaction of those who are in the midst of the struggle. The weary soldier, the bereaved mother, the widow, the orphan—they find no glamor, no thrill, in the harsh reality of destruction and death.

This response to the demands of elemental human decency has been reflected in the foreign policy of the United States. We have been forced into war, but we went with reluctance. When we fought, it was not because we considered peace as a lesser value, but only that we felt that freedom was more important. It is no accident that America's great leaders who have known war at first hand, from our first President, George Washington, to President Eisenhower today, have desperately fought to save mankind from useless slaughter.

The United States of America covets nothing that belongs to other peoples. We do not seek to dominate other lands. We seek a world in which the immense energies of the atom, and the other great discoveries of modern science, will be used to build, not to destroy. The only enemies we want to attack are poverty, disease, ignorance, and fear. We hope that the entire world, including the people now under Communist rule, may one day share the prosperity and freedom we count among our blessings. This quest for peace and world prosperity is the official policy of the United States. It has been stated time after time by President Eisenhower and Secretary of State Dulles.

But the battle for peace will not be won simply by being for peace. No panaceas, no cliches, no slogans will win this battle. Only hard, tedious, exacting, and dedicated work will achieve our goal. That is why I believe that we are so fortunate to have had during this critical period the wise, experienced, inspirational leadership of a man who knows war, and is a symbol of peace throughout all the world, President Eisenhower.

The problem of achieving our peaceful goals is difficult even when we know what we are faced with. It is infinitely more difficult when there is disagreement on the nature and magnitude of the threat to peace. We find ourselves in such a predicament today as we try to determine the answer to this question: What are the real policies of the Soviet Union and the related Communist states at this time?

COMMUNIST LINE CHANGES

The Soviet leaders have proclaimed the possibility of peaceful coexistence between Communist nations and the rest of the world. They have denounced some of the policies of Stalin. They have toured the world seeking alliances with neutral nations. They have offered the hand of friendship to Socialist parties throughout the world, claiming that now they can work together for the same goals.

What is even more surprising is that there are signs of changes in the internal administrations of Communist countries. It may be too much to say that the first signs of freedom have appeared. But the stark terror or earlier years has been partially lifted at least for a time.

What do these moves mean? The Soviet leaders talk peace. But are their actions in harmony with their words? We should ask this question without cynicism, and without bitterness. If we could be sure that the Soviet leaders were willing to promote peace, justice, and freedom throughout the world, we should be willing to forget the nightmare of the past 40 years and thank God that now we can work together for the good of all.

We face a painful dilemma. If we reject Soviet so-called peace moves, many nations may consider us as warmongers. If we accept these offers uncritically, we may weaken our alliances and thus invite the very war we seek to avoid.

How do we escape this dilemma? I think that the simplest and most honest way is this—to proclaim to the entire world, as we have, that we are always ready to listen to words of peace, but that we will act only when these words are followed by deeds. Some complain that such a policy is too firm, too rigid. But a firm policy will not discourage the Kremlin if it really seeks peace. The leaders of Russia are realists. They know that in the light of past history the burden of proof is on them. For nearly 40 years we have had various changes and twists in Soviet policy. But events have always proved that these changes were deceptive. They were aimed to mislead the free world and too often they succeeded.

Surely we cannot be charged with being calloused and indifferent to the cause of peace if we bear these facts in mind. I am sure that the very Communist leaders who proclaim peace and coexistence would despise us as weak-minded if we did not demand the most rigorous proof that conditions had really changed in the Communist world.

THE SOVIET RECORD

Let us for the moment look at the record in this respect. In the last 35 years, there have been 8 complete about-faces in Soviet policy.

In 1920, the Soviet Union gave independence to the Baltic States, Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania, and in 1940, annexed them.

In 1921, shortly after the Soviet Union was formed, Lenin backtracted on his announced program of communizing Russia in a short time. Instead he encouraged private enterprise at home, and even invited foreign engineers and technical experts to help build Soviet industry.

In 1929, Stalin reversed the field, wiped out private enterprise, and forced farmers into collective farms, starving or imprisoning millions who refused to cooperate.

Six years later, Stalin, terrorized by fear of Hitler, ordered all Communist parties throughout the world to adopt a new line. They were to become respectable and cooperate with all non-Communists in a united front against Fascism.

Yet, in 1939, the bloody hands of the two cruel dictators, Stalin and Hitler, were clasped in a fast pact of friendship. This protected Hitler's eastern front and started the Second World War.

When Hitler turned on his partner in 1941, Stalin once again proclaimed devotion to freedom and democracy. In fact, under the influence of this line, Earl Browder said, in 1943, that capitalism and communism could coexist after the war.

Two years later, Browder was purged when the iron first was unveiled and Soviet troops moved out to conquer defenseless peoples in Europe and Asia.

Today the Communist line has shifted back to that of Earl Browder in 1943.

History is a greater teacher. Certainly in this case it should teach us caution.

As Secretary Dulles said just 9 days ago, the fact is that it is possible for a dictatorship to have one policy for public consumption, and a different or even opposite policy as its real program. It is perfectly equipped to deceive the unwary, since it can clamp an Iron Curtain of censorship over all its actions. It is accountable to no one for its policies. In dealing with the outside world, it can reveal or conceal, as it pleases. Until this Iron Curtain is lifted, we can not be sure of the realities behind honeyed words.

TESTS OF SOVIET INTENTIONS

Is there anything, then, that we know for sure about the Communist world and its tactics and strategy for the future? Let us examine what is publicly known about the present military, political, economic and subversive policies of the Soviet Union. In these four fields let us contrast Communist words with Communist deeds. This will help all of us to understand the foreign policy of our Nation in these confusing times.

MILITARY STRENGTH

In the military field, the Soviet leaders have announced a reduction of 1,200,000 men in its armed forces, the scrapping of some naval units, and other actions which would seem to indicate less emphasis on military preparedness.

This is what the Soviet leaders say. Now let's see what it means. Assuming that the announced reduction in Soviet armed forces has actually been made, it will not affect the core of its military strength. The Soviet Union is one of the most powerful military nations in the world. To quote Secretary Dulles, "Soviet industries are working at top speed to develop ever more potent atomic and nuclear weapons." It has excellent aircraft in abundance, a large and powerful army, and a navy that includes hundreds of the latest and best submarines. Its research in the use of guided missiles apparently is beginning to pay off.

A real disarmament program must cut deeply in three areas of offensive weapons—atomic weapons, bombers and guided missiles, and long-range submarines. Until concrete action is taken in these areas—action which can be corroborated by an adequate inspection system—we cannot say that deeds have been added to words in this phase of the Soviet peace campaign.

DIPLOMACY AND POLITICAL ACTION

In the sphere of diplomacy and political action, the leaders of the Soviet Union have been intensely active in building up alliances and seeking to win friendship. Within the Communist orbit, relations with Yugoslavia have been improved and for the first time the political independence of a Communist nation has been acquiesced in by the Kremlin. So-called neutral nations have been cultivated with all the arts of salesmanship. There have been friendly gestures directed toward many countries now united in defensive alliances against Communist aggression. Premier Bulganin and Mr. Khrushchev have gone to great trouble to convince many nations that the Soviet desires peaceful coexistence.

But on the other side of the picture we find disturbing deeds which contrast with peaceful words. The shipment of arms to the Middle East increases the chances of war in that critical area. The Soviet leaders have been adamant in refusing to end the artificial division of Germany. They have also refused to help France establish peace in North Africa. While Foreign Minister Shepilov proclaims in Egypt that the Soviet opposed all colonialism, it has not yet surrendered an inch of territory which it took by force during the last 15 years, with the exception of a small part of Finland, and the badly plundered state of Austria. As trate, no torrent of words will drown out the cries of the millions of captive peoples who are suffering under this modern type of colonial imperialism which the Communists have imposed.

In other words, there are two styles of Soviet diplomacy today. There is the soft line that is being used to woo nations that have recently been freed from colonial status. This line is also used to foster trade relations when this is to the advantage of the Soviet Union. But there is also a hard, almost ruthless line which is used for Germany, France, or any other nation that is trying to get concrete, workable assurances of peace. In view of this record, are we unfair in asking if the Soviet is really seeking peaceful coexistence, or if it is merely using this as a means for gaining allies and friendly neutrals?

ECONOMIC POLICY

A third area of conduct involves international trade. Determined efforts are being made to expand the exchange of goods with other countries, particularly with nations that are beginning to develop their natural resources. Loans, both of money and of technicians and engineers, are offered to many peoples so that they can go ahead with economic expansion.

If this were a peaceful world, we would rejoice at this expansion of trade. We would be particularly happy that assistance is being rendered to nations whose standards of living are so low in comparison with our own.

But past Soviet trade programs have not been beneficial to the parties involved in them. They have been far too political in their motivation. At times they sought to tie a nation's economy to that of the Soviet Union so that it would ultimately lose its political independence. At other times they sought cover for agitators and political agents who stirred up internal subversion in the host nation.

In other words, these were not really legitimate patterns of world trade. Rather we had here a dressed-up version of the economic imperialism that caused such merited resentment in the last century. We cannot but ask the question, Is this trade designed to help other nations, or to make them economic satellites of the Soviet Union?

INTERNAL SUBVERSION

A final test of Soviet peaceful intentions is found in the area of internal subversion within free nations. Communist agents, Moscow controlled, have long been active in almost every nation in the world. They are a serious threat today in large areas of Africa, Asia, and Latin America. Less than 2 weeks ago our press carried stories about difficulties caused by Communist activity in Brazil. Burma and Malaya are troubled with Communist-led civil wars. We know the story of China, Korea, and Indochina.

Once again, when we seek to check the line of peaceful coexistence with actual Communist practice, we find relatively little evidence of substantial change. It is true, as Secretary Dulles pointed out earlier this week, that the large Communist Parties of France and Italy have been critical of Soviet leadership. Beyond doubt, the denunciation of Stalin has created great internal strains and caused much soul searching in their midst.

Yet, with all these difficulties, they remain true to the principles of Marx and Lenin. They are quarreling over their own relations with each other, rather than over basic beliefs, which continue to be materialistic and godless. So, while we should welcome these signs of dissension in the Communist world, we dare not assume that Communist subversion will lessen. Even if these parties were to shake off an an extent the uprisings in Poland which were reported in the press yesterday so eloquently illustrate the old pattern of complete Moscow control, their principles and aims and would still run counter to those of the free world.

In these four areas then—the military, political, economic, and subversive programs of the Soviet Union—we have a checklist of actual performance under the new line of Communist policy. On the basis of this checklist, we have no guaranties that will allow us to relax our defensive preparations. Those who demand that we junk our present programs and adopt a so-called bold, new foreign policy forget that Soviet capabilities for evil have not disappeared, and their intentions are not purified. If the situation is changing in that liberalizing forces are at work, it is largely because of the policies the free world has followed.

Does this mean, then, that we ignore completely the new policies of the Soviet leaders? Not at all. But it does mean that we do not abandon a program which has proved to be successful in checking Communist expansion and which has forced the Kremlin leaders to adopt new tactics.

A POLICY FOR AMERICA

Our course of action then becomes clear.

Militarily we must maintain our strength and continue to assist our free world allies to maintain theirs until we get more concrete proof that the Soviet leaders are reducing their strength.

Economically we must recognize that the men in the Kremlin have opened a new front. This is in reality a tribute to the success, not only of the programs which have shored up the military strength of the free world, but also of our Marshall plan, our point 4, and other economic aid programs. We have not moved over to challenge the Soviet leaders through aggression and subversion. They have moved over to challenge us and to challenge us right in our own backyard in terms of our own economic system, in terms of the relative abilities of communism and free enterprise to meet and satisfy human needs.

It would be foolhardy for us to ignore this challenge. We must constantly explore ways and means to make our economic program more effective in meeting the new Soviet tactics. I know the impatient arguments well-intentioned people throughout the country make against these programs. They say they don't like giveaways, that the recipients of our aid don't appreciate it, and that often they fail to support our diplomatic policies in world councils.

PURPOSE OF ECONOMIC AID

Let us recognize at this point the objective of our economic assistance programs abroad. They are not aimed at buying the friendship of other peoples. This would be a foolish and unobtainable goal. They are not aimed at creating subservient economic satellites throughout the world, as are the Soviet economic programs.

What are we trying to do then? We know that a people who are economically strong enough to retain their independence and freedom can resist the imposition of tyranny of any type, including Communist tyranny. And a program which helps any country keep its independence helps all countries who want to keep theirs.

We must deal with Communist subversion in our own country in a fair, sane, and effective manner. The naive idea that there is such a thing as an American Communist Party should be exploded once and for all. What we face is a foreign-controlled, conspiratorial Communist organization in the United States. Its members and supporters do not owe their allegiance to the United States and, as such, they should be dealt with accordingly under the laws of the land.

Our program for information must be strengthened and, as I stated just a few weeks ago at Lafayette College, it is particularly important that we greatly expand our program for exchange of students and leaders from other countries. I can speak from experience when I say that our guests of today are ambassadors of goodwill tomor-

row. They see at firsthand the fruits of freedom and democracy. They know that we are a peaceful people and that we harbor ill will toward the people of no other nation in the world.

EXCHANGE WITH COMMUNIST NATIONS

It is particularly important that we not overlook any opportunity to expand the exchange of persons between the United States and countries behind the Iron Curtain. We should accept the challenge of honest interchange of views. We should do this, not with the naive idea that everything is changed, that all will be better overnight, but rather as earnest apostles of peace.

We can be friendly without receding one iota from our principles of freedom and justice. We can deal on a person-to-person basis with the Russian people, and those of other Communist lands, but we will not compromise on the system of communism itself. It is true that, in the past, such visits have often deluded naive and unprepared persons. But the program I envisage would not be wild-eyed visits of the 1930's. Rather I believe that informed and competent Americans, who know and understand the Communist system, could take advantage of these new opportunities to talk frankly and honestly with their counterparts behind the Iron Curtain. Thus we could plant ideas of freedom and justice which, in the long run, would bear real fruit.

As far as citizens of Communist nations visiting the United States are concerned we should recognize that such forms of information as radio broadcasts, pamphlets, news releases, and the like, may now have less effect than previously on the people behind the Iron Curtain. They have just been told by their own leaders that virtually everything they heard or read during the 29 years of Stalin's rule was at its best inaccurate, and at its worst unmitigated falsehood. Consequently, people behind the Iron Curtain may be affected now primarily by what they see, and not by what they read or hear. That is why exchange of persons is so vitally important in this area.

By this approach we can cut through the confusion and uncertainty that the Soviet "new look" has caused in many circles. Our approach will be simple and positive. Where Soviet deeds do not harmonize with peaceful words, we shall keep up the military, economic and political strength that is the only sure deterrent to war. And whenever the opportunity arises to tell of the virtues of freedom, we shall proclaim the faith that has made America great.

Freedom is a priceless right cherished by every man, no matter how poor he may be or how lowly his position in life. It is cherished by the people of the Soviet Union and in the satellites. It is honored in India and Indonesia. It has spread like fire through the colonial world of Africa. We believe in freedom. We practice freedom. We want it for ourselves and for others throughout the world.

With this as our message, we can never lose in a struggle with the slave philosophy of communism.

Fluoridation of Drinking Water

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BYRON G. ROGERS
OF COLORADO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 2, 1956

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter that I received from a constituent who is opposed to artificial fluoridation of public drinking water.

The letter is as follows:

This artificial fluoridation of public drinking water is really endangering peoples lives. If these people that are at the head of these chemical associations would only stop and realize what harm they are doing to the people of this Nation, instead of helping them. Believe me they should stop and think twice before doing these things.

I realize you are very busy, but this matter is vitally important now.

Sincerely,

Mrs. EDWARD BARWINSKI,
Denver, Colo.

Income Taxes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL G. ROGERS
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 2, 1956

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, most of us regard a family as a single economic unit producing income for the common benefit of all members of the family. However, for income tax purposes the unit has traditionally been the individual, and not the family. Since our personal income tax has always been a graduated tax, the higher the income of the individual, the higher the tax rate which applies to it. In most families the husband is the income-earner and the tax rates are applied to his income. But if the husband and wife are regarded as the tax unit of the family and the income can be divided between them, the total family tax will be less in most cases than if the family income is taxed only to the husband. This follows because more of the family income will then be taxed at lower rates. The tax on two $4,000 incomes is much less than the tax on one $8,000 income.

Prior to 1948, residents of community property States were in a particularly advantageous tax position because under the property laws of those States the income of husband and wife was regarded as belonging one-half to each of them, even though all of it was earned by the husband. In common law States, such as Florida, income could be split between the husband and wife only in special cases where property could be held jointly, or where property could be conveyed from one spouse to another to attain a division of income. Income items, such as salaries, could not be divided in any way in common law States. As between couples residing in California this resulted in a much higher tax for the Florida couple and offered a real inducement to retired people to move to California to gain a tax advantage, even though they may have preferred to come to Florida.

In 1948, Congress acted to place the common law States on a parity with community property States and allowed, for the first time, income splitting on a joint return. Income splitting means that after the total income for both husband and wife has been determined it is divided and the tax computed on one-half. This tax is multiplied by two. The effect is about the same as though all income of the husband and wife were community income reported on separate returns.

From 1948 to 1954 the community property States and common law States occuppied the same position for tax purposes, and the residents of community property States had no tax advantages not enjoyed by residents of common law States. This is as it should be. But in 1954, when the new Internal Revenue Code was enacted, new discriminations were produced against residents of common law States in favor of residents of community property States.

The 1954 code changed the tax on dividend income by permitting the taxpayer to exclude from gross income up to $50 of dividends received from a domestic corporation. In addition, the 1954 code permits the taxpayer who is 65 years of age or over a credit against his tax liability, known as the retirement income credit. This credit can operate to reduce the retired income-taxpayer's tax liability by a maximum of $240 per year. This credit is equivalent to the tax at the first bracket rate of 20 percent on amounts of retirement income up to $1,200.

A Floridian whose gross taxable income includes $100 in dividends and $2,400 of retirement income derived from a pension can take only $1,200 of his retirement income into account for purposes of the $240 credit, and only $50 of his dividends into account for purposes of dividends exclusion. Since he purchased the stocks from which his dividends are derived from his earnings and performed the services for which the pension is paid, he may not take a retirement credit for his wife, nor may he take an additional $50 dividends exclusion for her.

Yet a Californian in the same circumstances is permitted two $50 dividend exclusions and two retirement income credits. This discrimination results because the Internal Revenue Service has ruled that the community property laws of our Western States must be taken into account in applying sections 37 and 116 of the Internal Revenue Code.

In the official explanation sent out with the 1955 tax returns the Internal Revenue Service took the position that married residents of community property States were entitled to two $50 dividend exclusions, even though the stocks owned by the husband and wife were paid for completely by the earnings of the husband. To the same effect in revenue ruling 55–597 the service has ruled that a husband and wife domiciled in a community property State are entitled to two retirement income credits, even though all of the retirement income of the couple may have been earned by the husband.

The resulting discrimination against residents of Florida and other common law States can best be pointed up by an example. Assume that we have two taxpayers, both are married, have no dependents, both are over 65 years of age, and that their wives are over 65, but that

one lives in Florida and the other in California, and that income tax is computed on the basis of the same income:

	California community property State	Florida common law State
Gross income:		
Rents	$1,500	$1,500
Interest	1,500	1,500
Dividends	1,600	1,600
Pension	2,400	2,400
Total	7,000	7,000
Dividends exclusion	100	50
Adjusted gross income	6,900	6,950
Less:		
Standard deduction	690	695
Personal exemptions	2,400	2,400
Taxable income	3,810	3,855
Tentative tax	762	771
Retirement income credit	480	240
Dividends credit	60	62
Tax payable	222	469

The double retirement income credit and the double dividends exclusion enjoyed by the couple residing in California results in a tax bill which is $247 lower than that paid by the couple residing in Florida. $247 is a lot of money to a retired couple. It can mean the difference between comfort and want.

The general purpose of the bill H. R. 11920 which I have introduced is to equalize, with respect to the items covered by the bill, the income-tax treatment of husbands and wives in States which do not have community property laws with the treatment of husbands and wives in community property States. There are eight States which have community property laws. This bill will give like benefits to the 40 States which have been discriminated against.

The first section of the bill relates to the retirement income credit provided by section 37 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954.

Under existing law, if an individual has received earned income before the taxable year he is allowed a credit against tax for amounts received by him as retirement income. Under community property laws this means that both the husband and wife are entitled to the credit on the basis of the income each is considered as receiving under such laws.

The effect of the first section of the bill is to permit a husband and wife who made a joint return to treat one-half of the earned income and and one-half of retirement income as received by one spouse and one-half by the other. These provisions do not apply unless it is to the advantage of the taxpayers. Section 2 of the bill relates to the partial exclusion from gross income of dividends received by individuals.

Existing law permits an individual to exclude dividends from gross income to the extent the dividends do not exceed $50. Thus, if the dividends constitute community income a husband and wife may exclude a total of not to exceed $100 whether they file separate or joint returns. Under section 2 of the bill the total exclusion is $100 if the husband and wife file a joint return. Section 3 of the bill relates to limitation on capital losses. Existing law provides: "In the case of a taxpayer other than a corporation, losses from sales or exchanges of capital assets shall be allowed only to the extent of the gains from such sales or exchanges, plus the taxable income of the taxpayer or $1,000, whichever is smaller." In the case of a joint return the limitation is computed with respect to the combined capital gains and losses of the spouses. If separate returns are filed by a husband and wife the limitation applies separately to each but the advantage of splitting income under the joint return system is lost.

Subsection (a) of section 3 of the bill increases the $1,000 limitation to $2,000 if a joint return is filed. Subsection (b) makes a technical conforming change in the definition of "net capital gain."

The Administration's Medicinal Insurance Plan for Federal Employees Is a Makeshift and Ramshackled Affair, According to John Cramer of the Washington Daily News

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 25, 1956

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this occasion to point out that a policy resolution adopted at the AFL–CIO merger convention relating to Federal employees called for a:

Hospital and medical insurance program for Federal employees with employee representation in administration of plan and Federal Government to underwrite at least 50 percent of the total cost, and with administrative principles consistent with those approved by the AFL–CIO for administration of health and welfare funds negotiated with employers in private industry.

In support of the administration's medical insurance plan for Federal employees the Civil Service Commission claims, among other things, that most Federal employees carry basic hospital and surgical insurance to take care of the first need. The Civil Service Commission also maintains that those Federal employees who do not have such insurance can get it at the local level for a modest cost. In August 1954, however, Nelson Rockefeller testified in favor of a radically different plan which would have provided basic coverage just as does a bill I have introduced, H. R. 12005, to provide for Government contribution toward personal health service benefits for civilian employees in the Federal service. Mr. Rockefeller said at that time that:

I think the interesting factor is that here with families having incomes between $2,000 and $4,000 only 51 percent have some coverage, and that is the group in which the bulk of the Government employees are. We can consider they are typical of the United States average that only about 51 percent of the Federal employees in this wage group would have any hospitalization insurance and that is the most common area for them to take coverage in.

In a statement I submitted to the Post Office and Civil Service Committee of the House of Representatives on June 29, 1956, in support of my bill, I said, in part:

If a program such as I propose in a bill, H. R. 12005, I introduced on June 27, 1956, is adopted, namely, 50-percent participation by the Federal Government plus payroll deduction for the employees' share of the cost for basic medical, surgical, and hospital care, the cost of a major medical program to supplement the basic program would be drastically reduced. * * * Let me make myself perfectly clear. I am not opposed to a major medical-insurance program, but it is quite clear, or so it seems to me and to others, that a basic health program of the type put forth in my H. R. 12005 must come first. I believe that my position roughly parallels that of the representatives of the Blue Cross hospital service plan, the Blue Shield medical service plan, Group Health Association, the International Association of Machinists, AFL–CIO, and perhaps other organizations who have testified, or will testify, before your committee on the administration's 1956 plan for medical insurance.

I was very interested, Mr. Speaker, to read in the Washington Daily News of July 2 a really excellent article by John Cramer, one of the outstanding reporters in the Nation's Capital, entitled, "Why Free Medical Insurance Plan Is Opposed."

Mr. Cramer writes that:

On the surface, the administration's major medical proposal is pretty, indeed. It would protect employees against most expenses of catastrophic-type illness or injury. And it carries the alluring tag: This is free. It will cost your nothing. Search beneath the surface, however, and you'll find the plan a ramshackled affair—and, above all, a makeshift affair.

It was painfully assembled over many months after the administration found it too difficult to keep its original 1954 promise of a basic health-hospital insurance plan for Federal employees—as distinct from major medical.

Because the President publicly was committed to a health program of some sort, his aids had to come up with something.

What the President's aids came up with should, and must, be painstakingly examined. So far, it looks like a goldbrick. John Cramer has carefully examined it in his article of July 2, an article so important that I include it here for the information of my colleagues.

WHY FREE MEDICAL INSURANCE PLAN IS OPPOSED

(By John Cramer)

This is for the many Federal employees who can't understand why there should be opposition to the administration plan to grant free major medical insurance to United States workers and their families.

Here is why:

The plan would hurt many employees—and actually increase their out-of-pocket medical expenses.

It very possibly would hurt as many as it would help.

It especially would hurt thousands of married women who now provide health insurance for their families.

It clearly would discriminate against organizations such as Blue Cross, offering prepaid hospital services, and Blue Shield, offering prepaid surgical services.

On the surface, the administration's major medical proposal is pretty, indeed. It would protect employees against most expenses of catastrophic-type illness or injury. And it carries the alluring tag: "This is free. It will cost you nothing."

MAKESHIFT

Search beneath the surface, however, and you'll find the plan a ramshackle affair—and, above all, a makeshift affair.

It was painfully assembled over many months after the administration found it too difficult to keep its original 1954 promise of a basic health-hospital insurance plan for Federal employees—as distinct from major medical.

Because the President publicly was committed to a health program of some sort, his aides had to come up with something.

So they came up with major medical.

But let's look beneath the surface. Let's look first at what the plan would do to organizations such as Blue Cross and Blue Shield.

There are two basic types of health-hospital protection. They compete against each other.

1. The insurance company or indemnity-type offers specific dollar amounts for specific illnesses, injuries, or periods of hospitalizations.

2. The service type Blue Cross and Blue Shield plans deal only indirectly in dollars. Instead, they offer prepaid days of hospitalization, or prepaid surgical services.

The administration proposal would discriminate against Blue Cross and Blue Shield because:

They would be frozen completely out of the Federal employee major medical field—even though they already operate to a large extent in that area and plan to expand into it further. Under the administration proposal, major medical protection would be handled exclusively by insurance companies, and by Federal employee unions with their own insurance-type plans.

Blue Cross and Blue Shield not only would be frozen out of major medical. They actually would be forced to trim back the protection plans they now offer—in order to mesh them into the insurance company-controlled major medical program.

Under the administration plan, employees and the dependents would be protected against 75 percent of all major medical expenses after the first $500 of hospital expense, first $250 of surgical expense, and first $100 to $200 of medical-care expense (depending on the employee's income).

BEYOND

Blue Cross and Blue Shield offer plans whose benefits usutlly go well beyond these dollar limits.

And about half of all Federal employees—here and elsewhere—have Blue Cross and Blue Shield coverage.

Once the administration major medical proposal went into effect, however, Blue Cross and Blue Shield say they would be forced to repackage and downgrade their own basic-coverage plans for United States workers.

Blue Cross would offer hospital protection only up to the $500 limit in the major medical plan. Blue Shield would offer surgical and medical-care protection only up to the $200 and $100–$200 limits.

And, as a result, many employees would find themselves with less real protection than they now have.

Instead of near 100 percent protection against certain brackets of health cost, they would have only the 75-percent protection of the major medical plan.

In recent testimony before a House committee, Washington's Dr. Donald Stubbs, speaking for Blue Shield plans, cited an actual case to illustrate how the administration plan would increase out-of-pocket medical expenses for many employees.

FILES

His case came from the files of Medical Science of the District of Columbia, of which he's president of trustees.

It involves a male employee who had both Blue Cross (group hospitalization) and Blue Shield (medical service) coverage.

He incurred $1,301 in hospital expenses and $500 in surgeon's fee—a total of $1,801, which Blue Cross-Blue Shield paid in full.

But had the major medical plan been in effect, and had this same employee been covered by downgraded Blue Cross and Blue Shield plans (up to $500 hospital protection and $250 surgical) the situation would have been far different.

His downgraded Blue Cross-Blue Shield coverage would have paid $750.

His major medical coverage would have paid three-fourths of the remainder—$788.

And the employee himself would have had to pay $363, all out-of-pocket loss, traceable policy to the major medical plan.

Here are three other cases which illustrate how the major medical plan would hurt many employees—cases from the files of Group Hospitalization.

BILL

Case 1: Involved an employee who incurred a $542.85 hospital bill, and $500 surgical bill, a total of $1,042.85 of which Blue Cross and Blue Shield paid all but $6.10. Had the administration plan been in effect, his downgraded Blue Cross-Blue Shield coverage would have paid the first $750, major medical would have paid 75 percent of the remaining $292.85, and the employee would have wound up paying $73.46.

And the employee's out-of-pocket loss, as a result of major medical, would have been $73.62.

Case 2: Involved an employee with Blue Cross coverage only who incurred a bill (hospitalization plus $39 for pathology) of which Blue Cross paid all but $39.30. Had the Administration plan been in effect, downgraded Blue Cross coverage would have paid $500, major medical would have paid 75 percent of the remainder—and the employee would have paid $447.64.

In this case, the employee's out-of-pocket loss would have been $408.34.

Case 3: Involved an employee with Blue Cross and Blue Shield coverage who incurred hospital bills for $946.23, and a surgeon's fee for $500 which is coverage paid in full. Had the Administration plan been in effect, his downgraded Blue Cross-Blue Shield coverage would have paid $750, major medical would have paid 75 percent of the rest, and the employee would have paid $236.56—all of it out-of-pocket loss.

HOW

Here is how the Administration plan would hurt married women in Government.

Thousands of these women now are enrolled in Blue Cross or Blue Shield plans which provide the only medical protection for their families. In many cases, the woman is the one who buys the protection because group coverage is not available to her husband.

If the major medical plan went into effect, her Blue Cross-Blue Shield coverage would be downgraded to major medical levels like that of other employees.

But that's only part of the story.

Under the Administration plan, families of married women would not be covered by major-medical protection unless the husband was physically or mentally unable to work.

Thus, the married woman would lose much of the coverage she now has—and be barred from the extra coverage extended other employees.

Review and Reappraisal of Military and Economic Foreign Aid Programs Absolutely Necessary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 2, 1956

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, all Members of the House were circulated last week with a statement signed by members of the Hoover Commission task force on overseas economic operations headed by the former Secretary of Commerce, the Honorable Charles Sawyer.

These outstanding Americans insist that the time has come to immediately review and apprase our foreign aid programs and they support that such a review could best be accomplished by adoption of the resolutions now pending in the House and Senate and introduced by our colleagues, HARRISON, of Virginia, and CHURCH, of Illinois, and on the Senate side by Senator MARTIN, of Pennsylvania.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am inserting at this point the statement hereinbefore referred to:

To the Senators and Representatives of the 84th Congress:

The undersigned have been concerned with the problem of foreign aid since its inception. All of us were members of the Hoover Commission Task Force on Overseas Economic Operations. We hold varying opinions regarding the nature, merits, and size of foreign aid but we are united in believing that the time has come for an immediate review and reappraisal of both our military and economic programs.

While there are obviously many ways of conducting such a review and reappraisal, we urge the Congress to approve the resolutions introduced in the Senate by Senator MARTIN, Republican, of Pennsylvania, and in the House by Representatives HARRISON, Democrat, of Viriginia, and CHURCH, Republican, of Illinois, which propose an inquiry by a joint congressional committee.

The reasons for our position may be summarized:

1. A review of foreign aid encompasses the planning and management of a Government-operated business that is spending billions of taxpayers dollars every year in providing military equipment, capital goods, consumer commodities, and personal services to over 60 countries and their dependencies.

2. The operation of this program over the years has raised questions bearing upon the adequacy of the planning, the efficiency of management and the waste of appropriated funds.

3. It has become increasingly difficult to distinguish between economic aid and military assistance.

4. There is an apparent need for comprehensive end-use checks in the field.

5. Any reappraisal to be useful should, in our opinions, be founded upon thorough factfinding designed to trace foreign aid dollars from their appropriation to final use. The real need is to determine the actual costs of selected programs and projects and then to relate the costs to the impact upon both the recipient countries and the United States.

6. A review of all these matters appears to us to be the sole responsibility of the

Congress which appropriates the necessary funds.

7. The review and reappraisal should be a bipartisan undertaking. It should be conducted without participation, direct or indirect, by the executive agencies whose operations are involved.

8. A congressional review should not conflict with the activities of any civilian advisory board that might be conducted by the President. Any such Presidential board or commission would presumably be preoccupied with matters of policy whereas a congressional committee would be primarily concerned with the use of appropriated funds. In our opinion both studies are essential but should be carried out independently in their respective fields to avoid any suggestion of self-examination by the executive agencies in respect of their operations.

Respectfully submitted.

CHARLES SAWYER.
FERDINAND EBERSTADT.
JULIUS KLEIN.
HENNING PRENTIS, Jr.
HARRY A. BULLIS.
FRED CRAWFORD.
ARTHUR FOYE.

Courageous Poles

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN C. KLUCZYNSKI
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 2, 1956

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the June 30 issue of the Chicago Daily Tribune:

COURAGEOUS POLES

Free men the world over are watching Poland where courageous men and women are risking their lives to protest against bolshevik oppression.

As yet there is no evidence to suggest that this uprising will overthrow the regime in a day, a week, or a month; all that is almost too much to hope for at the moment. But faith breeds faith and courage breeds courage. The spirit which asserted itself on the streets of Poznan will be strengthened, not weakened, by any acts taken by the Communist government to suppress the revolt. The protest will grow and one day it will succeed.

The Communist regime in East Germany has never been the same since June 17, 3 years ago, when German men and boys, having no other weapons, threw rocks at Russian tanks; and the Russian soldiery, to their everlasting credit, were reluctant to shoot down the demonstrators. The end may still be far off, but in East Germany that was the beginning of the end of bolshevism.

Now—and not for the first time—there has been a similar demonstration in Poland. Sooner or later communism will be driven from Poland unless men prefer slavery to freedom and national degradation to national independence.

It has become the fashion in recent years among those who fancied themselves liberal and cosmopolitan in their outlook to decry and deplore nationalism as if it were something retrograde and unworthy. True, many sins can be charged to nationalist excesses but so can many of the great achievements of the mind and spirit. The men and women who participated in the revolt in Poznan were reacting as Poles—nationalist Poles—to an alien oppression.

Within a few days we shall celebrate our own successful uprising against a foreign oppressor. Our own liberty is the first and finest fruit of our own nationalism.

Congressman Lester Holtzman Reports to the People—Fourth Annual Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LESTER HOLTZMAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 2, 1956

Mr. HOLTZMAN. Mr. Speaker, each year, after the work of the Senate and House of Representatives is done, it has been my practice to send a report to the folks back home.

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

Since my last report to the people, the passing months have witnessed far-reaching developments all over the world. Abroad, there have been changes in the faces and tactics of the Russian leadership as it wages a life-and-death struggle with the free world for the souls of men everywhere. In Europe, our friends and allies continue to develop new answers to the ancient questions of security from attack and from want. In the Near East, little Israel once again looks into the guns of a rearmed and vastly strengthened Arab world. In Asia, countries that for centuries had not known freedom forge ahead in the quest for a stable economy and a secure democracy. In Africa, new forces are emerging and pressing problems of varied kinds clamor for solution. Our Latin-American neighbors have seen the removal of one of those despots who now and then gain a temporary foothold in some part of the world only to be booted out when their excess becomes too much to bear.

DOMESTIC AFFAIRS

And here at home, events and problems of equally great importance crowd each other in rapid succession. In the area of civil rights, the historic Supreme Court devision on school desegregation has opened a period of progress and readjustment in many States of the Nation. The merger of the two major labor organizations into one union gives a more dynamic voice to the aspirations of millions of our citizens. The continued stresses of competition between big and small business call for imaginative and constructive solutions to safeguard a stable economy. Our farmers are still confronted by falling income while our consumers face rising prices. From our nation's laboratories come reports of scientific advances in the fashioning of destructive weapons and, at the same time, in the fight against polio and other diseases. The preservation of our natural resources, threatened lately by the big giveaways arranged by a businessman's administration, requires the attention and ingenuity of our best minds. The optimum size of our armed forces, the wisest arrangements for aid to our allies, the protection of the rights of the individual against the occasional transgressions of government bureaucracy, the safeguarding of adequate earning power of our wage earners and of the economic security of our elder citizens, the building of housing, schools, highways, dams, and waterways to serve our expanding Nation—all these and many other problems must be tackled by your Congressman and his colleagues.

A CONGRESSMAN'S RESPONSIBILITY

Of course on most of these issues, a Representative's main job is to inform himself thoroughly enough to be able to cast his vote in the best interests of his constituents and of the country as a whole. On others, he must participate in committee hearings and deliberations which must come before proper legislation can be framed. And yet on others of particular interest to him, he may formulate and sponsor bills which embody his thoughts and recommendations.

I should like to invite the comments of my neighbors in the Sixth Congressional District to legislation I have introduced:

BILL NUMBER AND PURPOSE

H. R. 10072, strengthen our civil-rights laws so that all Americans may enjoy equal opportunity.

H. R. 6509, H. R. 6510, H. R. 6511, grant tax relief to the average man and woman by increasing the allowance for dependents from $600 to $1,000.

H. R. 9687, H. R. 5277, increase the minimum wage to $1.25 per hour and reduce the workweek to 35 hours.

H. R. 9844, provide $100 per month pension to veterans of World War I at age 60.

H. R. 4443, assist cooperative housing owners by reducing FHA insurance premiums.

H. R. 6828, H. R. 4805, amend and revise the McCarran-Walter Act.

H. R. 2108, curb low-flying planes by making airlines and pilots criminally responsible for violations of law.

H. R. 3842, H. R. 3227, prohibit the importation of souvenir firearms by returning servicemen and their dependents.

House Concurrent Resolution 74, condemn religious persecutions behind the Iron Curtain.

H. R. 3479, control inflation by giving the President authority to freeze the the economy of the United States.

H. R. 7390, expand benefits under the civil-service retirement system.

H. R. 8667, relieve victims of disaster from the forces of nature.

H. R. 11624, give bargaining recognition to civil-service employees.

House Concurrent Resolution 43, safeguard consumer interests by keeping down the cost of living.

H. R. 9430, increase unemployment compensation benefits.

H. R. 6543, repeal the unfair provisions of section 14B of the Taft-Hartley Act.

In addition, I have voted in favor of the following legislation: The Mutual Security Act; extension and liberalization of the Social Security Act; reduction of individual income tax and excise taxes; admission of 200,000 refugee immigrants; Housing Act, providing for additional public-housing units; Federal

aid for highway construction; Federal aid for school construction; increased benefits for veterans; broadening of unemployment compensation program; pay increases for postal workers and other Federal employees; increase in minimum wage; statehood for Hawaii and Alaska; St. Lawrence seaway development; reciprocal trade agreement extension.

I would also welcome the feelings and attitude of my constituents on legislation that I have opposed and voted against: The tidelands oil bill; the Dixon-Yates contract; the natural-gas bill; the shipment of arms to the Arab States; the reduction of the Air Force budget; the curtailment in building veterans' hospitals; the increase in first-class mail rates; the disposal of Government-owned synthetic rubber plants.

BACK HOME

In addition to these legislative endeavors, a Congressman's job affords many opportunities to take a hand in solving some of the local problems back home. I am fortunate to live in an area within easy commuting distance to the Nation's Capital, so that it has been possible for me to take an active part in the civic work which is so integral a part of the communities that have sent me to Washington to represent them. In any rapidly expanding area such as my district, there is an urgent need for additional schools and traffic lights and police protection, and I hope my constituents will continue to call upon me to take part in their drives for these vital community services.

Mr. Speaker, during the last 4 years, my greatest pleasure and privilege has been the chance to meet with so many of my neighbors, to profit from their thoughts and recommendations, and to try to serve their personal and civic needs. Their friendship and sincere interest will always be this Congressman's most lasting compensation.

Washington Lowdown Book Said Not Distributed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. USHER L. BURDICK
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 2, 1956

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, about June 2, 1956, a book entitled "The Washington Lowdown" was offered for sale. The book was written by Larston D. Farrar who is a writer here in the city of Washington. It is reported that newsstands order the book, the publishers ship out the books, but they do not get to the newsstands. In other parts of the country the books are selling by the thousands. Just what is the trouble here? The book does not boost either party but attempts to give some pertinent facts about the leaders of both.

There is no legal action pending for the purpose of suppressing the book; no injunction has been served on either the author or publisher, but still the books cannot be obtained in Washington. I am curious to know what is the reason for this surreptitious ban on these books. If the people of the District want to read it, what is preventing them from getting the book? It cannot be the exorbitant price asked for the book, because the retail price is 25 cents per copy. The publishers have a good supply of these books and the news dealers want to handle them as they sell them as fast as they can be had. In spite of this the newsstands cannot get the books.

Can it be that the higher ups who may or may not have been criticized have influence enough, with legal action, to stop the flow of these books to the public? If there is some force squelching the sale of these books, surreptiously, I am sure those who believe in free speech and a free press want to know what it is.

Respect for Supreme Court Going Fast

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. B. W. (PAT) KEARNEY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 2, 1956

Mr. KEARNEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following editorial entitled "Respect for Supreme Court Going Fast," which appeared in the Texarkana Gazette for June 12:

RESPECT FOR SUPREME COURT GOING FAST

One needs only to read the newspapers to conclude that never have so many people held the Supreme Court in such low regard as they do at this time.

Here are a few examples picked at random from local and big-city newspapers:

James F. Byrnes, a former Associate Justice of the Supreme Court, says the Court "must be curbed."

"Power intoxicates men," Byrnes said in a copyrighted article in the U. S. News & World Report. "It is never voluntarily surrendered, it must be taken from them, the Supreme Court most be curbed." With strong southern support the National Association of Attorneys General wants Congress to limit the United States Supreme Court's power to determine whether Federal laws supersede State statutes. The national association also adopted a resolution favoring nullification of a Supreme Court decision holding that the Federal Smith Act supersedes the Pennsylvania sedition laws. The decision prevents the State from prosecuting subversives under its own laws.

Senator STENNIS, Democrat, of Mississippi, urges that Congress revalidate State sedition laws which were virtually nullified by a recent Supreme Court decision.

STENNIS said the decision was the latest in a series of cases in which the Supreme Court has disregarded established precedent to achieve further centralization of government.

A Waxahachie district judge says that political decisions by the United States Supreme Court likely is one reason the public generally has lost a lot of respect for courts and lawyers.

Criticism of the High Court came from District Judge A. R. Stout of Waxahachie in a talk before the Dallas Criminal Bar Association.

Judge Stout denounced recent decisions by the High Court as warning clouds of an end to free government.

He referred to the High Court's decision as being made by men more distinguished in politics than they ever were in law. He said that judges should be fearless and able—not political experts.

These stories may reflect the feeling of lawyers generally over the country.

Not even the Supreme Court of the United States can function efficiently with so much ill will.

More Opposition to H. R. 4090

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS M. PELLY
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 2, 1956

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, two important newspapers on the Pacific coast have had editorials recently opposed to H. R. 4090, a bill on which hearings were held last week by the subcommittee of the Senate Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee.

I hope the logic of these two editorials will not go unheeded by the appropriate members of that subcommittee:

[From the San Francisco Call-Bulletin of June 11, 1956]

USELESS EXPENSE

Legislation whose effect would be to saddle the operators of American cargo ships with extra and useless expenses running into thousands of dollars is due for debate on the floor of the House in Washington tomorrow.

The bill (H. R. 4090) would amend the 1934 Communications Act to require all United States cargo vessels to install a gadget known as an automatic radiotelegraph call selector. For those vessels which did not install the device another radio operator would be required.

What the selector does is to pick up any given ship's signal and ring an alarm bell. Thus an individual vessel can be contacted without rousing the radiomen of all the other vessels in the vicinity.

However, several Government agencies, steamship operators, and some maritime unions have opposed this bill on the valid grounds that the device is not yet perfected, that its compulsory installation would be a needless and costly complication, and that it contributes nothing to safety at sea.

Government agencies which take a dim view of this legislation include the Federal Communications Commission, the Coast Guard, and the Department of Commerce.

Their views should be heeded. It doesn't make sense to force upon American ships a superfluous device, which may well be obsolete in a few years, at extra cost which, incidentally, their foreign competitors would not be required to bear.

[From the San Francisco Examiner of June 23, 1956]

UNWANTED GADGET

Any device that increases the safety of ships at sea is desirable. But it is axiomatic that every such device must first withstand testing and receive the approval of qualified experts.

Despite this sound axiom the House of Representatives has just passed H. R. 4090, a measure compelling all American cargo vessels with less than two radio operators to in-

stall an unproven radio alarm gadget largely duplicating one all vessels have carried for 30 years.

The Federal Communications Commission, the Coast Guard and the Commerce Department all oppose the device as untested and unnecessary. The Radio Officers' Union declares it would help little in emergency. The American Merchant Marine Institute and the Pacific American Steamship Association say it has been tried and found wanting; they further assert it would run up costs by requiring a second radio operator and needless overtime payments.

The Senate should recognize it is measures like these that drive American ships to foreign registry, and should kill the bill.

1956 Platform of the Democratic Party of Massachusetts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 2, 1956

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under the chairmanship and leadership of State Senator JOHN E. POWERS, the Democratic leader in the Massachusetts State Senate, the committee on platform of the Democratic State convention recently held in Worcester, Mass., adopted a forward-looking platform in the best interests of the people of Massachusetts, and one consistent with the progressive policies of the Democratic Party of Massachusetts.

In my extension of remarks, I include the "1956 Platform of the Democratic Party of Massachusetts" upon which platform and pledges the Democratic Party of Massachusetts can go forward confident of victory and success next November in the State and national tickets:

1956 PLATFORM OF THE DEMOCRATIC PARTY OF MASSACHUSETTS

We, the Democrats of Massachusetts, in convention assembled, do proclaim and adopt this platform as a prelude to victory in November.

STATE GOVERNMENT

We pledge an administration of government which will reflect the ideals, the dignity and the compassion of the citizenry.

1. We renew our opposition to a sales tax.

2. We promise a revision of the tax structure to alleviate the present unwarranted burden on real estate.

3. We favor an adequate salary increase for all State employees, and not for the select few.

INDUSTRY

We pledge a reestablishment of an economic climate within the Commonwealth, which will restore the confidence of industry and business in the administration of government.

1. We record our opposition to existing freight differentials which hamper and impede profitable participation in interstate commerce by business concerns in Massachusetts and the entire New England area.

2. We promise the establishment of a program which will assist existing industries to expand and attract new industries to the Commonwealth.

3. The Democratic party looks with alarm at the diminishing profit margins of small business concerns, leading to many business failures, and the increasing growth of mergers leading to giant corporations. We urge appropriate studies and legislation in this field, leading to an opportunity for small business to keep sufficient invested capital to enable it to exist, expand and remain the bulwark of our free competitive system.

LABOR

We believe in the dignity of labor and the right of individuals to join labor unions for collective bargaining, free from interference, restraint or coercion from the employer. We believe in free collective bargaining. We believe that a free labor movement is ssential to democracy and the free enterprise system.

We favor:

1. Repeal of the Taft-Hartley Law.

2. A $1.00 minimum wage for all persons with time and one half in excess of 40 hours per week and 8 hours per day.

3. Compulsory sickness disability insurance with a State fund.

4. An increase from $25 to $35 per week in unemployment compensation benefits.

5. Re-employment rights for injured workers.

6. Workmen's compensation benefits equal to two-thirds of the injured worker's average wages; and subsistence payments adjusted to the fluctuations in living costs to injured workers and their families. Same to be integrated under a State operated program of workmen's compensation.

7. Increases in salaries for schoolteachers with a $3,500 minimum.

8. A Labor representative in the Department of Commerce versed in labor relations and industrial matters.

9. A Labor representative in the Department of Public Utilities trained in labor relations and consumer problems.

10. Strengthening and better policing of minimum wage and of the child labor laws including the school-attendance law and correction of abuses under the industrial homework laws.

EDUCATION

We pledge a return to the program which was inaugurated under a prior Democratic administration whereby school-construction aid will be provided to the cities and towns of the Commonwealth.

1. We favor the establishment of a medical and dental school to be affiliated with the University of Massachusetts.

2. We favor expansion of the facilities of the teachers colleges to provide trained teachers for all schools of the Commonwealth.

3. We favor expanded facilities at the University of Massachusetts to provide educational opportunities for the youth of the Commonwealth.

4. We favor expansion of the programs for the benefit of retarded children and for vocational training for the physically handicapped.

HEALTH

We, as Democrats, express our conviction that the health of the citizenry is the prime concern and the foremost obligation of government.

Accordingly, we favor:

1. Every practicable governmental effort to attract and retain in State service, able, competent, sympathetic personnel for the care of our less fortunate citizens.

2. An integrated administration of the State health agencies.

3. The full use of existing facilities for the care and custody of those afflicted, and the erection of new modern facilities for their increased protection.

4. Under the Republican administration, the department of public health has utterly failed to administer the Salk polio vaccine program. The Democratic Party deplores this lack of concern for family health and security. It is the humane realization of the Democratic Party that our children and expectant mothers must never again be exposed to the dread disease of poliomyelitis.

HOUSING

The objective of our free democratic society of a decent home for every family is still far from attainment. Assistance from the Commonwealth is necessary. The first approach should be through private enterprise and individual homeownership. For those families which cannot be housed by this method, assistance through public housing must be provided.

CIVIL RIGHTS AND CIVIL LIBERTIES

In respect to civil rights, both nationally and in Massachusetts, the Democratic Party has made equality of opportunity not an ideal to be sought, but a reality to be practiced.

We wholeheartedly support the decisions of the Supreme Court in outlawing segregation in the public schools. We favor the elimination of segregation in housing. We abhor second-rate citizenship. We recognize no race, color, or creed as a minority group.

We revere the memory of the late Maurice J. Tobin, pioneer in the fair employment practices field.

We affirm our belief in the cardinal precept of our constitutional system that the Supreme Court is the final arbiter of the laws of the land. Accordingly, we express our deep concern and manifest indignation of any effort, by any group, anywhere in the land, whereby the Constitution, as interpreted by the Supreme Court, is flaunted for the base reason of maintaining a decadent way of life which from its inception was alien to the American ideal.

In the struggle for freedom and security we must be careful we do not sacrifice our individual liberities guaranteed us by the Constitution.

VETERANS

We, as Democrats, recognize and acknowledge our veterans of all wars. In gratitude and respect, we pledge to defend, and retain, and increase the benefits granted to them and their families. We are ever mindful of our obligation to the veteran in the fields of public housing, civil service, pensions, hospital and medical care, and in all other endeavors of government.

COST OF LIVING

As Democrats, members of the political party ever sensitive to the needs of our citizens, we view with alarm the increased cost of living with which the people of Massachusetts have been burdened by the callousness of the present Republican administration.

Accordingly, we favor:

1. Greater control to be lodged in the division of necessaries of life.

2. The establishment of a division within the department of public utilities charged with the responsibility of representing the public at rate hearings.

STATE FINANCES

As Democrats, and as citizens of the Commonwealth, we view with justifiable alarm the present financial condition of our Commonwealth. We deplore the extravagant practices of the present Republican administration which has deprived the Commonwealth of the enviable credit position it enjoyed under the predecessor Democratic administration.

ELECTION LAWS

Democracy begins with the registration of the voter. Every avenue of convenience should be left open to the unregistered and prospective voter to perform this civic duty. Our election laws need considerable revision in order to make them uniform.

We favor:

1. Bipartisan boards of registrars for all cities and towns.
2. Bipartisan count of ballots in all cities and towns at State elections.
3. Preventing the counting of votes in towns in State elections during voting hours.
4. A complete count of ballots used or unused in elections and recounts.
5. The restoration to city councils of the right to revise or change the ward lines of their cities.
6. To have all voters designated on the street lists of our cities and towns.
7. To provide for the initiation of partisan municipal elections in our cities.
8. The local registrar of voters shall, at least 2 months before every gubernatorial election, notify every unregistered citizen that he is unregistered and specify the times and places for registration.
9. The required number of evening sessions for registration be increased.
10. The elimination of the vicious "gerrymander."

SMALL LOANS AND USURY

We favor strengthening of the Small Loans Act by increasing the regulated statutory limit, and the adoption of an effective usury law.

CONCLUSION

As Democrats, familiar with the glorious attainments of past Democratic administratitons, and proud participants in, and copossessors of the surging spirit of the Democratic Party, we express our unbounded confidence in the integrity of our fellow Democrats throughout the Nation, and in their ability to express in the platform to be adopted at the national convention our views, our convictions, and our ideals in the fields of national and foreign affairs.

As Democrats we conclude this our platform of the Massachusetts Democratic Convention of 1956, by giving expression to our esteem, affection, and continued confidence in the Honorable JOHN F. KENNEDY, our distinguished United States Senator from Massachusetts, and our equal unbounded respect in the Honorable JOHN W. MCCORMACK, the majority leader of the House of Representatives in Washington, and other distinguished Democratic members of the Massachusetts congressional delegation.

Northeast Deserves Support

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FREDERICK G. PAYNE
OF MAINE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, July 2, 1956

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an editorial entitled "Northeast Deserves Support," which was published in the Bangor (Maine) Commercial of June 27, 1956, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NORTHEAST DESERVES SUPPORT

New England's congressional delegation has decided to line up in support of the Northeast Airlines application for a southern route.

Most Maine residents with the economic welfare of their State at heart had wondered why such a decision hadn't been reached previously.

This is no reflection on Maine's congressional delegation which worked hard to bring about the final result. We are fortunate in having an excellent representation in the Congress. Men and women who take their responsibilities seriously.

The importance of Northeast Airlines can not be minimized. It is one of Maine's most important transportation links. Air transport today has assumed an equal importance with rails and highways, without such transport we cannot keep pace with the rest of the Nation * * * and not keeping pace can be fatal to our economy.

Northeast is a New England airline, it is a concern that originated in New England and is dedicated to providing the best possible service to the area. It has officials who understand the problems of the region.

We can remember during World War II when Northeast was forced to cut back on its transport planes, yet had the determination to keep going. Smaller planes had to be substituted, yet Northeast flew its routes, it made its scheduled stops * * * and this at a sacrifice.

We talked with Northeast officials in those early days of World War II and they were consistent in placing the national defense above and beyond any financial aspect of operation. At the same time they expressed the hopes that in the days following World War II there would be an opportunity to expand and to provide the service which they believed was essential to the region.

Now, it seems, such service is forgotten, instead the Federal Government, which regulates the airways of the Nation, trends toward promotion of airlines originating outside New England.

Northeast has a just case, a right to expand, and deserves the full and active support of each and every individual in New England.

The Revolt in Poland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN C. KLUCZYNSKI
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 2, 1956

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the July 1 edition of the Chicago Sun-Times:

THE REVOLT IN POLAND

If the world needed proof that there has been no change in the plight of satellite captives of the Kremlin since the death of Stalin, it came Thursday in Poznan, Poland.

Polish workers who are bitterly unhappy over low wages and bad food marched on public buildings in protest. They were cut down by guns and tanks. At least 38 were killed and 270 wounded in a blood-letting that was greater than the 1953 riot against the Red masters in East Berlin.

The revolt is a reminder that the spark of freedom still burns in the hearts of those who have been trapped behind the Iron Curtain. The news of the revolt, and the reasons for it, ought to be broadcast by the United States to every corner of the world to demonstrate what communism does to those it rules.

Under the bourgeois imperialists—that is, the people themselves—who formerly ran Poland, a worker earned $315 a month. Today he earns $95—which in Poland is the price of a pair of shoes.

Moreover, the revolt is tangible evidence that shows how wrong was George F. Kennan, former United States Ambassador to Russia, when he recently advised Americans that there is a finality, for better or worse, about what has happened in Eastern Europe. He believes the Poles, Chechs, and others should not be encouraged to believe they can pick up again where they left off 10 or 20 years ago. This is a counsel of despair for such as those who faced the Communist guns last Thursday.

Instead, the United States ought to seize the opportunity to get over to the Iron Curtain captives that we have not forsaken them. The United States can do this by protesting again and again that the Reds have not lived up to the guaranty of the Yalta agreement that the Poles should have the right to run their own affairs. The United States should press for these rights in the United Nations and in the forum of world opinion—even to the extent, perhaps, of threatening to break off relations with Poland.

It is true that the Communists have been easing their grip on Poland. In the last few weeks, the internal-security organization has been cutback 22 percent, the penal code has been overhauled, and amnesty or reduction of sentences promised to 70,000 prisoners. Perhaps the loosening of the chains gave the people heart to revolt.

The outbreaks in Poland and in other sections behind the Iron Curtain recently indicate all goes not well with Bulganin and Khrushchev. Despotism cannot work except through the iron discipline of a Stalin.

We have now seen, by the manner in which the Communists handled the Polish revolters, that they have not abandoned Stalin's methods. They denounce Stalin but they still rule the satellites with his methods.

Honoring the Heroes of Korea

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 2, 1956

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, in my extension of remarks, I include the text of remarks by Hon. Henry Cabot Lodge, Jr., United States Representative to the United Nations, at the dedication of the United Nations memorial plaque in remembrance of the men of the armed forces of member states who died in Korea in the service of the United Nations. The occasion is the dedication of this plaque at 10 a. m., Thursday, June 21, in the United Nations Headquarters Building. Mr. Lodge speaks as representative of the country which, at the request of the United Nations Security Council, acted as the unified command of all United Nations forces in Korea, and of the forces of the Republic of Korea:

Mr. Secretary General, Mr. President, Excellencies, ladies and gentlemen, the United States of America was the unified command during the fighting in Korea and it is accordingly my privilege to speak on behalf of the 16 member states who contributed troops, that is, Australia, Belgium, Canada, Colombia, Ethiopia, France, Greece, Luxembourg, the Netherlands, New Zealand, the Philippines, Thailand, Turkey, the Union of South Africa, the United Kingdom and the United States of America. With the men of the Republic of Korea, who carried such a large part of the load, these men carried on the fighting, sustained the losses and won the victory.

The passage of time since these men died has made it all the clearer that this victory was worth winning. At stake was the very existence of this organization, the United

Nations. At stake was the question of whether peace-loving nations could band themselves together to repel a ruthless and unprincipled aggression—or whether the doctrine that might makes right would triumph and, having triumphed in Korea, would then, without much doubt, spread to the rest of the world. Stated in the simplest terms, such was the issue.

The men whom we remember here today faced this issue. They proved their capacity to endure and to conquer. They won their war—and they preserved for us the chance to go forward. Their sacrifice reminds us that we do not measure man's life by its length but by its height. Indeed, the English poet, Ben Jonson, saw this long ago when he said:

"It is not growing like a tree,
In bulk, doth make man better be;
Or standing long an Oak, three hundred year,
To fall a log at last, dry, bald and sere:
A Lily of a day
Is fairer far in May,
Although it fall and die that night;
It was the plant and flower of light.
In small proportions we just beauties see;
And in short measures life may perfect be."

For the future let the memories of our United Nations dead inspire us with the thought that the very existence of the United Nations must always depend on the willingness of the members to back up words by deeds—and in some cases by the blood of our sons.

It is fitting indeed that we here, in the presence of the highest ranking officials of the United Nations, should bow our heads in prayer, as we have just done, and that we should for these great ends dedicate this plaque.

Mr. Speaker, I also include herein remarks made on this same occasion by Hon. Dag Hammarskjold, Secretary General of the United Nations, and by Hon. E. Ronald Walker, Ambassador and Permanent Representative of Australia to the United Nations and President of the Security Council:

REMARKS BY MR. DAG HAMMARSKJOLD, SECRETARY GENERAL OF THE UNITED NATIONS

Mr. President and excellencies, we meet here to dedicate this plaque inscribed "In grateful remembrance of the men of the armed forces of member states who died in Korea in the service of the United Nations, 1950–53."

"In grateful remembrance of the men"—it is the individuals we honor with this plaque. But it is fitting that the organization in whose service they gave their lives, is here represented first by the President of the Security Council which assumed the main responsibility. Those who gave their lives came from many countries. Ambassador Lodge is on this occasion representing not only those from his own country—as we know they were the great majority—but all who made their personal sacrifice, irrespective of their nationality.

An occasion such as this one is a poignant reminder that behind every historic action, national or international, is the individual human being, each giving of his courage and his devotion. Those whom we honor today were called upon by their governments to fight, as loyal citizens of their own countries, for a common cause. In devoted service they made the supreme sacrifice.

To their memory it is fitting that we should pay simple and humble tribute. We cannot recall the lives they gave, and only in a small and imperfect measure can we share the grief of those they loved and left behind. But in paying them honor, we can resolve to remember always their example of selfless sacrifice. In the memory of their devotion was can find cause to renew our own. In the memory of their service, we can seek to be worthy in our lives to the building of a peace that will endure.

REMARKS BY AMBASSADOR RONALD WALKER, PERMANENT REPRESENTATIVE OF AUSTRALIA TO THE UNITED NATIONS AND PRESIDENT OF THE SECURITY COUNCIL

Mr. Secretary General, Excellencies, ladies, and gentlemen, we are about to unveil a memorial to the men of the United Nations forces who died in Korea. As President of the Security Council, I consider it a privilege to pay tribute to those brave men who, at the call of the United Nations, took up arms to resist aggression and gave their own lives so that others might live in freedom.

The countries that contributed forces to the United Nations effort and suffered losses in Korea can, of course, never forget the extremely heavy sacrifices which were borne by the people of the United States, nor the leadership and generous cooperation which the United States gave to all who rallied to this United Nations cause. I consider it is particularly fitting therefore that the permanent representative of the United States should also speak to us in today's ceremony on behalf of all the countries which gave the men in whose memory we dedicate this plaque.

This occasion recalls many vivid memories for me personally. As Australian representative on UNCURK last year and as Ambassador to Japan for some years, it has been my privilege to know many of the men of the various components of the United Nations forces—in Korea, in bases, and hospitals in Japan, and in the United Nations headquarters in Tokyo. These men shared a noble comradeship that transcended all differences in nationality, in tongue, and in race, and will long be an inspiration to those who observed it or experienced it.

Not long ago I stood in the beautiful United Nations cemetery on the outskirts of Pusan, where the hills look down on the fields in silent graves. Some countries, such as the United States, have brought their dead home, while the men of other countries have found their last resting place in the land for whose freedom they have fought. Beneath the flag of the United Nations, beneath their own national flags and the flags of their comrades in arms flown in honor of all the fallen, for me as an Australian it was especially impressive when visiting the graves of my own countrymen, and our kinsmen of the Commonwealth, to lift my eyes to the neighboring rows of Turkish graves and the other United Nations graves beyond.

Today in the headquarters of the United Nations we honor the memory of all these men and we share the grief of those who mourn them, whether here or in distant lands. The fallen belong to their own people but they belong also to us all. Their lives and their sacrifice were dedicated not only to their own countries but also to that wider loyalty which in time to come will unite all men and women into one peaceful family. We shall not forget them.

America Needs Full-Time Patriots

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 2, 1956

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am including a statement made by Mr. J. Edgar Hoover, Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation. Mr. Hoover knows what he is talking about. His statement follows:

WORDS TO LIVE BY—AMERICA NEEDS FULL-TIME PATRIOTS

(By J. Edgar Hoover)

"God grants liberty only to those who love it, and are always ready to guard and defend it."—DANIEL WEBSTER.

There is no place in America for part-time patriots. If our Nation is to live, if we are to continue to enjoy the fruits of liberty, we can do no less than follow the example of the men who won that freedom for us. Freedom, while a heritage, must be rewon for each generation.

With complete selflessness and with blazing intensity of spirit, our forefathers dedicated their lives first to securing and then to maintaining, freedom. They know at first hand that life without freedom is intolerable. And so they dreamed of freedom, fought for freedom, lived for freedom, breathed it and spoke of it, prayerfully and without self-consciousness.

Benjamin Franklin could say simply and eloquently, "Where liberty dwells, there is my country." And when the salute of cannon in celebration of the Fourth of July reached his ears, a dying John Adams could arouse himself long enough to murmur, "Independence forever."

Independence, freedom, liberty—are words that ring like exulting bells. Today we need such bells to be rung. This Nation is face to face with the gravest danger ever to confront it. The menace of communism is no simple, forthright threat. It is a sinister and deadly conspiracy which can be conquered only by an alert, informed citizenry dedicated to the preservation of the principles on which America was founded.

If our Nation is to retain its liberty in the future, now, as never before, its citizens must understand that the inescapable price of freedom is eternal vigilance. And eternal vigilance, with dedication to its cause, brings unity and strength in time of crisis.

Low Second-Class Postal Rates Have Provided Best Informed Citizenry of the World

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. USHER L. BURDICK
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 2, 1956

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, I am alarmed when I hear these distinguished gentlemen stand up and argue seriously that some publishers—not many, they admit that, but some—are still making a little money to cover their taxes, and that we ought to take it away from them before they manage to hide it.

Publishing is one of the lowest-profit industries in the country, and personally I wish they made a lot more. There wouldn't be any United States as we know it today if it weren't for newspapers and magazines. And without newspapers and magazines this free and informed United States we do know today would not be here tomorrow.

I learned my ABC's from a magazine. It was called Farm Home and Fireside, and it cost the whopping price or 25 cents a year. That was pretty high for us farmers out in Dakota, so we had a

rotation system. Our folks were the second on the list that got it. When we were through it it we passed it on.

I do not know if Farm, Home, and Fireside was any great shakes as an intellectual magazine. I remember it carried a lot of stories about detectives and fights with Indians. That was not escape literature, either—in those days we had Sioux Indians all around the ranch. They used to knock on the kitchen door to bum coffee. But that little magazine also brought the whole community information about farming methods that there was no other way of getting. It told about new farm machinery and better livestock. And it reminded us that there was a great big world beyond Graham's Island, N. Dak.—that maybe the world did not even end at Minnesota.

If I were going to name the elements that have rendered this country great, I would put reading very near the top of the list. And if I were going to name the things that have made reading possible, I would put down first of all the public-school system and the great institution of second-class mail. It it were not for second-class mail we never would have gotten that magazine out in Graham's Island. If it were not for low second-class rates a lot of families could not get magazines and newspapers today.

No other country in the world can match our hunger for information or our techniques for getting that hunger satisfied. We Americans are learning more and more as the years go by. I just wish some foreign countries, and I do not need to name them, could say as much.

In my opinion, it is just as absurd to call the net costs of the postal service a deficit as it would be to call the net costs of the Agriculture Department a deficit. The Post Office is an essential avenue of communication. The information it disseminates through newspapers and magazines not only sharpens our minds—it gives people a look at the products of our industry. It keeps the heart of business pumping. Certainly, we need a Post Office that is efficient and well run, but once that is taken care of we ought to throw this ridiculous talk about deficits right out the window. What we are getting as a result of low second-class rates is the best-informed citizenry of the world, and even if the Postmaster General is right when he claims it is costing the taxpayers money it is cheap, in my opinion, at the price. The proposal to as much as double the price we are charging to carry newspapers and magazines through the mails is an affront to commonsense and a disservice to the people of this country.

GOP Must Face It: Take or Dump Nixon?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE H. BENDER

OF OHIO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, July 2, 1956

Mr. BENDER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial published in the Akron Beacon Journal of July 1, 1956, entitled, "GOP Must Face It: Take or Dump NIXON?" written by John S. Knight.

I think the editorial makes good reading, not only for Members of this body, but for all Americans. There has been much talk about our great Vice President, and there has also been much unfounded criticism directed at him. I think Mr. Knight, in his editorial, lays it on the line.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GOP MUST FACE IT: TAKE OR DUMP NIXON?

(By John S. Knight)

At the recent conference of governors in Atlantic City, the 21 Republican heads of States signed a petition asking President Eisenhower to run for reelection but pointedly left out any reference to Vice President NIXON.

The official explanation, which nobody believed, was that it just hadn't occurred to them to include NIXON.

The truth is that NIXON's name was omitted by design. Gov. Fred Hall, of Kansas, author of the Eisenhower petition, has quoted one of the GOP governors—quite possibly himself—as saying, "For God's sake, keep NIXON's name off of it."

So NIXON was ignored because the Nation's Republican governors, with ears close to the ground and moist fingers testing the winds of public opinion, consider the young but experienced Vice President something of a political liability.

But the question may be appropriately asked: Why are the Republicans so self-conscious over DICK NIXON?

What is there about this affable, contemplative young man which makes him such a controversial figure?

Why do so many people say "I just don't like NIXON," without, in most instances, being able to offer valid reasons for their dislike?

These are interesting questions worthy of consideration because the much discussed and often cussed No. 2 man in our Government is only a heartbeat removed from the Presidency.

ABLE YOUNG MAN MADE FAST PROGRESS

RICHARD MILHOUSE NIXON is a success in the American tradition. He was born to parents of moderate circumstances, worked as a boy in the family's general store, and became an excellent student with a flair for debating.

After young NIXON was graduated from Whittier College with second highest honors in his class, he won a scholarship to Duke University where he achieved further distinction in the study of law.

Following service as a naval officer in the Pacific during the war, he ran for Congress and defeated the veteran Jerry Voorhis, a five-term Representative who was usually found in bed with the leftwingers.

In 1950, NIXON was elected to the United States Senate by defeating Helen Gahagan Douglas, a known lefty who had won some fame and fortune on the legitimate stage.

NIXON's most notable accomplishment in the House was his relentless digging into the case of the traitorous Alger Hiss. The result was Hiss' conviction for perjury and subsequent imprisonment.

Before Eisenhower's nomination in 1952, I predicted several days in advance that NIXON would be the Vice Presidential candidate. Upon reading the story, NIXON was so surprised that he bought a number of copies of the Chicago Daily News because as he told his wife, "This may be the only time I will ever be mentioned for that high office."

Ike, being new to politics, didn't realize at first that he could, if he wished, dictate the choice of a running mate. At the request of his intimate advisers, Eisenhower submitted a short list of acceptable names and from this list NIXON was selected.

DIFFICULT CHORES PERFORMED FOR IKE

As Vice President, DICK NIXON has been a trusted and faithful aid to the President.

No Vice President in modern times has been as diligent in the pursuit of his duties, nor as well informed in the science of government.

NIXON's good-will trips to the Far East and Central America, undertaken at the President's request, have been notable successes.

In the political field, NIXON has borne the brunt of the battle. He is an aggressive and resourceful campaigner who cheerfully accepts the tough political chores which are so displeasing to the President.

From the hour of Eisenhower's first illness, NIXON has conducted himself with admirable dignity and restraint.

There have been no foot-in-the-mouth statements, nor any attempts at self-glorification.

WIDESPREAD DOUBTS VAGUELY EXPRESSED

In view of this record, and it appears to be substantial, why do the Republican governors and other segments of the party believe DICK NIXON has political "B. O."?

They will tell you privately, as several have told me, that they like him but DICK NIXON is "just not popular with the people."

Some folks, they say, think he is too young. Others don't like his looks, or remark that he can't be trusted.

Reference is frequently made to the California campaign fund and NIXON's "corny show on television."

The women like Ike but NIXON leaves them cold. When pressed for a good reason, you get this typically feminine retort: "I just don't know what it is, but I don't like that man."

And of course, DICK NIXON is extremely unpopular with Democratic leaders who resent his hard-hitting campaign speeches and the alleged aspersions on their patriotism.

I venture the opinion, however, that inherent in the thinking of those who don't like NIXON, for whatever frivolous reason may be expressed, is a solid doubt that he would make a good President.

And this, I submit, is the only question worthy of consideration.

Not all of DICK NIXON's career has been marked by the best judgment.

I found myself in violent disagreement several years ago with his statement before the American Society of Newspaper Editors that American troops should, if the French pulled out, be sent to Indochina.

It seemed to me that NIXON was naive and uninformed when he told Rotary International in Chicago that "Geneva was the last hope for peace."

He has had some questionable associates such as Murray Chotiner, who is presently under investigation for attempting to influence Government contracts in behalf of clients.

But on the whole, he has made fewer mistakes than most young men suddenly elevated to such a high office, and his record of accomplishment is one of which he and the country can well be proud.

GOP HURTING SELF BY INDECISION

My own view is that the Republicans are doing DICK NIXON a great injustice.

Either he is a man of presidential caliber, or he is not.

Because the Republicans have staked everything on a second term for Eisenhower, this question becomes tremendously important.

If the tergiversating Republicans, who are shying away from NIXON, feel he lacks the

proper qualifications, why don't they stand up in the meeting and say so?

Do they have a better candidate?

If not, the silent treatment they are giving NIXON is hurting the man who may be nominated for President if Ike doesn't run.

No one is being fooled by the present Republican strategy except the strategists who say every day that Ike is better in every way.

It is idle to pretend, and dishonest as well, to act as if NIXON did not exist.

It is incomparably stupid to brush him off, or wish that he might go away.

It is grossly unfair to NIXON, who has given such yeoman service to his country and to his chief, to backbite the Vice President without having the courage to speak out against him in public.

For the NIXON problem, if that it can be called, is on their doorstep and the Republican leadership should come out of their dream house and face up to it.

Interest Charges of the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD MARTIN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, July 2, 1956

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, in the Pittsburgh Sun-Telegraph of Friday, June 29, Sylvia Porter had a very interesting comment relative to the interest charges of the United States.

We now pay annually, in interest on the public debt, total of $7 billion a year. This is the amount of total Government spending only 20 years ago. We should all rejoice that we are cutting the debt in the fiscal year just ended.

I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SEVEN BILLION DOLLAR INTEREST
(By Sylvia Porter)

You cash in a United States saving bond you bought in 1946 for $75 and get back $100. The difference of $25 represents the interest the Treasury pays you on this, your tiny slice of the public debt.

The bank on your corner turns in for $1 million a block of New United States securities it bought from the Treasury 90 days ago at $993,600. The $6,400 difference represents interest the Treasury pays the bank on its slice of the public debt.

The manager of your corporation's pension fund clips the June 15 coupon on the $5 million of United States Treasury 3-percent bonds the pension fund bought for investment a year ago. The $75,000 he adds to your fund's resources represents the interest the Treasury pays for one-half year on this amount of its 3-percent bonds.

TWO HUNDRED AND SEVENTY-THREE BILLION DOLLARS

All over the Nation, tens of millions of individuals, tens of thousands of banks and corporations own the two-hundred-and-seventy-three-billion-dollars-plus of United States securities on which the Treasury pays interest.

Each of these individuals and institutions gets interest from the Treasury at periodic intervals or on the due date of a security.

Yet few who get the interest bother to think what the individual payments mount to over the weeks, months, year. You think of your $25, the bank thinks of its $6,400, etc., etc.

They add up to the staggering total of $7 billion. That's the total of interest the Treasury will pay to the individuals and institutions holding its securities in the 12 months beginning this Sunday.

This week, the Nation's public debt is in the headlines, for this is the end of the Government's fiscal year and Congress has just voted a new bill that will allow Treasury Secretary Humphrey to borrow enough in the next 12 months to raise the debt temporarily to $278 billion.

SOLID LOAD

So this is a timely day to dig into what that debt means. And one thing it signifies is an annual interest burden approximating total Government spending in the fiscal year of 1937—only 20 years ago.

No matter what the effort to hide it, the central fact is that $7 billion of the taxes we'll be handing over to the Treasury in these months will go to cover just interest on the debt.

Need for Calm Appraisal in Budget Considerations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ARTHUR V. WATKINS
OF UTAH
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, July 2, 1956

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, I am quite concerned about the way in which critical judgment in the Senate is often too easily swayed by personal antipathy for certain administration figures and need—at any cost—to make provision for what is called a political issue."

I believe a case in point is the recent Senate action in which the majority decided, what I regard as very meager study to increase the Air Force budget by some $960 million over the amount requested by the Department and by the administration.

I am not alone in this concern, and certain newspapers have seen fit to comment editorially on the need for more calm and judicial thinking, before we so casually add another near-billion to our mounting tax burdens and foist upon a Department, with an obvious lessening in congressional controls, such a huge sum.

I cite an editorial and which I believe is somewhat typical of such editorial reaction. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

POLITICAL PIQUE VERSUS NATIONAL DEFENSE

The Senate should not be proud of its action in voting to give the Air Force nearly a billion dollars more than President Eisenhower had requested.

Politics and pique were strong factors in the action—politics because the Democrats hope to use the airpower issue in the campaign; pique because a number of Senators were offended by Secretary Wilson's bumbling remarks about the issue. The feeling regarding Wilson was clearly shown in the oratory preceding the vote. He was attacked as inept, vain, arrogant, and contemptuous of Congress. That, however, was beside the point, for a Cabinet member's personality or actions can hardly be cited as a valid reason for upsetting a carefully planned defense budget.

Some of the backers of the Air Force increase were, of course, sincere. That applies especially to Senator SYMINGTON who is an earnest advocate of air power. But the sincerity of many others is subject to reservations.

The Senate's action is an invitation to extravagance. As Senator BYRD pointed out the Air Force already has 20 billion dollars in unspent funds and such unexpended balances lessen congressional controls. When the Senate says, in effect, "Here, have another unasked-for billion," the effect on those who spend the taxpayer's money can easily be anticipated.

This is not the first time, though, that Presidents have had trouble with overly generous Congresses. It happened during the previous administration, but President Truman exerted his prerogative and impounded additional funds granted the Air Force. The same course is open to President Eisenhower if the House, which gave the Air Force a billion dollars less than the Senate, goes along with the increase.

Mr. Eisenhower's military reputation certainly should have carried weight in the Senate. That it did not is only another sign—if one is needed—that this is a Presidential election year. The vote split was generally along party lines, with 43 Democrats and 5 Republicans voting in favor of the increase and 37 Republicans and 3 Democrats voting against it. We are pleased to note that Senators WATKINS and BENNETT stood by the President on the issue, for we are convinced that the President is right.

Problems of Small Business

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD J. THYE
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, July 2, 1956

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a copy of a letter which was addressed to the Honorable Arthur F. Burns, Chairman of the President's Committee on Small Business, by Mr. John C. Davis, executive director of the National Small Businessmen's Association.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JUNE 26, 1956.

The Honorable ARTHUR F. BURNS,
Chairman, President's Committee on Small Business, Executive Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR DR. BURNS: I appreciate your letter of the 22d inviting me to meet with you or your associates to discuss the problem of small business as seen by my association, and relating to the possible activities of the President's Cabinet Committee, of which you are chairman. I will be happy to accommodate myself to any date you set.

Perhaps we could facilitate our meeting if I set forth some of our feeling.

We recognize the need for amendment of the present tax formula to accommodate the need of small business productive enter-

prise for the accumulation of equity capital. We also feel that the present tendency toward mergers might be checked if the inheritance tax law were overhauled in such a way as to encourage the descent of business either through family enterprise or corporate association. In this connection, I am enclosing a copy of a letter which was read into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of June 20, 1956, page A4912 by Congressman JAMES ROOSEVELT, of California. This is typical of many such in our files.

Our feeling on the need for tax revisions is directed most strongly toward the field of productive enterprise rather than that of the retail or wholesale businesses. Our feeling is that these may be well covered under the present law, but a brief review reveals that, under the present tax structure, it is no longer possible for a small productive enterprise to grow by the accumulation of capital out of earnings. Our feeling is that this segment of our economy, so vital to the preservation of our enterprise system, must be given special consideration.

You are perfectly aware that this source of equity capital was a major factor in the growth of most of our successful corporations, a majority of which began their service as small businesses.

While we feel strongly about this need for tax review we also know that appropriate adjustment of administrative and regulatory policies under the existing law could accomplish a great deal. On the basis of individual cases brought to our attention there is evidence that small business is frequently subjected to overzealous collection efforts which are both harassing and oppressive. It has become a common practice to assert a tax claim without consideration of its adverse effect upon the growth of the business.

It is also evidenced in our records that overzealous collection efforts result in undue interference with management policy without having any real significance as far as the overall tax revenue is concerned.

There is also a suspicion that these tactics result in making the collection branch of the Treasury an arm to exert undue union coercion.

Since the small-business man has neither the tax experts, the money nor the time to cope with these methods we believe that substantial results can be achieved by a close scrutiny of collection methods on the part of the administration.

We recognize that the anti-trust law enforcement is necessary to the protection of small business. However, on the basis of our information we believe that anti-trust violation has been somewhat exaggerated as a small-business problem. Our feeling is that action under this law should be limited to cases in which violations are clearly oppressive and damaging to healthy competition rather than to petty cases of little or no significance to the public or to the business community.

With regard to Government contracts and procurement as these affect small business, it is our feeling that they should be continually reviewed in order to offset the known tendency to follow the easy course and place the major part of procurement contracts with large companies, even though the items involved can be produced by small business.

We feel that small business should be accorded a larger place in Government-financed research and development programs. After all, there is no monopoly of individual ideas and there is some evidence that disregard of this fact has resulted in loss of vital development in technology.

As regards the availability of financing for small business, we feel that loans by private banks take adequate care of short-term financing. Long-term equity loans by the Government is a question of dubious policy. Private investment companies aiming at this market are appearing, and their progress indicates that this form of financing may be adequate to meet any reasonable need. We would suggest a thorough exploration of this avenue of credit approach before supporting any Federal program that might lead to the indiscriminate placing of loans without proper local supervision.

To conclude, we feel that adjustment of the tax rate by legislation, or present collection practices by administrative action, is the most pressing need of small business.

I realize that these comments are necessarily incomplete in view of the scope of the subject, but hope that they can establish a discussion area for our meeting. I will look forward to our meeting, and again want to assure you of the willingness of our association to cooperate.

Sincerely,

JOHN C. DAVIS,
Executive Director.

B-N-G Mung Bean Sprout Balm

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VICTOR WICKERSHAM
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 2, 1956

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, on last Thursday, the 28th of June, a press conference was held at the Willard Hotel at which wonderful news was announced both for the people of the United States and Oklahoma. It was disclosed that after many years of research, the sensational burn remedy known as B–N–G Mung Bean Sprout Balm will finally be made available to the American public.

The announcement, made by Mr. Ben E. Zaremba, president, and Mr. Roy Lindburg, general manager of manufacturing Worth Pharmacal Co., is of special interest to the people of Oklahoma since over 90 percent of United States production of mung bean sprouts is grown in our State. For this reason, Mr. Speaker, I have followed the development of this wonderful medicine during the past 6 years, and I would like to express my appreciation to Mr. William Vaughan, east coast regional distributor of B–N–G for bringing the mung bean sprout balm to my attention.

Mr. Speaker, due to the interest expressed in this medicine both in Oklahoma and other parts of the United States, I ask unanimous consent that the release made last Thursday be printed in the RECORD at this point, and also consent that one of the congratulatory telegrams which the Worth Pharmacal Co. received from many of the great industries of this country, which reads as follows:

FLUSHING, N. Y., *June 27, 1956.*

Mr. BEN E. ZAREMBA,
President, and
WILLIAM W. VAUGHAN,
Care Washington Hotel,
Washington, D. C.:

Congratulations for putting on the market B–N–G. A fine product which should have great success.

ARDE BULOVA,
President, Bulova Watch Co.

NEW DRUG ANNOUNCED—VEGETABLE ENZYME STABILIZED; RESEARCH FOR BURN TREATMENT ASSURED

WASHINGTON, D. C.—Market and research plans for a new burn and dermatitis drug treatment were announced here today by the Worth Pharmacal Corp., of Oak Lawn, Ill.

Although B–N–G, an aqueous extract of mung bean sprouts, has been the subject of public discussion as a healing agent for major burns throughout the last 6 years and has been in use in many hospitals and first-aid clinics for emergency treatment, the product has not been released to the public until today. The announcement by Ben E. Zaremba, president of Worth Pharmacal Corp., today, revealed the following developments:

First, release of B–N–G for public use in the treatment of minor burns and dermatitis;

Second, a program of long-range research into the benefits and uses for the stabilized enzyme of the mung bean sprout in the treatment of major burns and for other purposes of the drug and chemical fields will be established; and

Third, a program for the study of improved methods for the treatment of industrial and disaster burns will be expanded in cooperation with principal safety organizations and numerous industrial companies.

STATEMENT BY BEN E. ZAREMBA, PRESIDENT, WORTH PHARMACAL CORP., OAK LAWN, ILL.

WASHINGTON, D. C.—For the past 6 years, many people in public life, in the field of medicine, in industrial chemistry, and in the press have shown keen interest in the development of a new treatment for burns and dermatitis which we have named B–N–G. We deeply appreciate this humanitarian interest and I wish to thank all of these people again today.

Many people who have had loved ones or friends who have been treated with B–N–G for what otherwise would have been painful burns or disfiguring dermatitis conditions have been urging us to make it available for public use and treatment.

It is now possible for me to announce that B–N–G is to be made available to the public, to drugstores, to doctors, and to all industrial establishments where burn injuries are possible or prevalent. In addition, I am happy to announce that the Worth Pharmacal Corp. will undertake to insure that a program of long-range research will be undertaken to determine the major benefits to be derived from B–N–G for severe burns and for additional uses in the chemical industry. To support this program, the Worth Pharmacal Corp. will set aside a fixed percentage of revenue from gross sales for research and development.

We wish to make it clear that B–N–G has not been willfully or callously withheld from the market. Although we have had thousands of letters urging us to place B–N–G on the market, we have not felt that the time was right until a series of tests had been made. It was not enough that we knew that the product was safe. It was not enough that we have seen scores of people wonderfully treated for burns and for dematitis and poison oak. It was necessary to prove through research and testing that B–N–G was absolutely safe.

In addition to the testing work undertaken in 1947, we have recently completed a research project which has been under the direction of Dr. Lawrence Rosner, president of the Laboratory of Vitamin Technology, Inc., Chicago, Ill., which establishes the fact that B–N–G is nontoxic and nonirritating and indicates that B–N–G, as a treatment for scalds, has the same effectiveness that many of us have observed in other severe burns. Although Dr. Rosner was forced to cancel his

trip to Washington for this meeting, he will be available at any time for consultation or press interviews by telephone. His report, a copy of which we have here, clearly justifies our plans for additional research in the field of severe burns and scalds. Although no public agency has yet volunteered to join in this research program, it is our hope and belief that, in the future, the agencies most concerned with burn problems—military services, civil-defense authorities, etc.—will join us in seeking the answer to the problem of saving human life and the avoidance of painful disfigurement from burns.

Some of you know that B–N–G, like the sulpha drugs and penicillin, resulted from development following an accidental discovery. An explosion in one of our plants resulted in the serious scalding of several workmen. Immediate action was necessary. For first-aid, the only liquid, or aqueous, treatment available was a compress of mung bean sprouts which we applied, freshly cut and ground. When the doctors at the hospital saw that the scalded areas treated were free from serious damage and scars, they urged us to develop the extract which eventually has been named B–N–G. In the ensuing years, many severely burned individuals have been treated with B–N–G, either by their own request or by doctors, and have avoided serious consequences—scars, pain, and subsequent plastic surgery. These are the people who have been most insistent that we place the product on the market.

Today, we announce that B–N–G will be made available under the label which describes it as a treatment for minor burns, sunburn, poison ivy, poison oak, and dermatitis.

In addition, we announce our own program for further research activities. Foremost in this field, of course, is the need to secure more and more information concerning the effect of B–N–G treatment for severe burns. For several years, industrial first-aid emergency rooms have been using B–N–G solution on an informal basis and doctors in numerous hospitals and first-aid clinics have been applying the solution in emergency burn cases. The histories of these treatments are valuable, but we will seek more information.

Of most interest to industry is the real secret of B–N–G, and that is the stabilization of the enzyme of the mung bean sprout extract. Although the use of mung bean sprouts in the treatment of burns is not new, our chemists have achieved a dramatic and startling development: They have successfully stabilized a vegetable enzyme. This is an accomplishment which challenges the entire chemical and drug world with the tantalizing possibility of new drugs, new solutions making use of the vegetable enzymes which have heretofore been elusive or unmanageable.

These problems, and many others, will be probed through the Worth Pharmacal Corp. research program. In the meantime, we derive great satisfaction, today, in announcing the release of this great service to humanity, B–N–G, for public use.

Dr. Eric A. Walker Named To Succeed Dr. Milton S. Eisenhower as President of the Pennsylvania State University

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 2, 1956

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, by unanimous vote of the Board of Trustees of the Pennsylvania State University, University Park, Pa., Dr. Eric A. Walker, now vice president and dean of the College of Engineering, was named as the 12th president of the 101-year-old university to succeed Dr. Milton S. Eisenhower, retiring president.

Knowing Dr. Walker personally and in behalf of his many friends throughought the Nation, I am inserting in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the following articles incident to his election which appeared in the June 30, 1956, issue of the Centre Daily Times, State College, Pa.:

COLLEGE DEAN ADVANCED TO SUCCEED DR. EISENHOWER AS 12TH PRESIDENT

Dr. Eric A. Walker, who had yet to assume the vice presidency officially, today was hailed as the 12th president of the 101-year-old university.

The 46-year-old Walker was named to succeed Dr. Milton S. Eisenhower by unanimous vote of the Board of Trustees at a special meeting on the campus yesterday afternoon.

His selection came close on the heels of the acceptance by the Board with utmost regret of Dr. Eisenhower's resignation. Dr. Eisenhower had submitted his resignation June 8.

Dr. Walker and Dr. Eisenhower plan to determine at an early date when the changeover will be made. Dr Eisenhower, in his letter of resignation, had asked to be relieved no later than December 31.

The new president was chosen vice president last October and was to take over that position tomorrow. He came to the campus in 1945 and has been dean of the College of Engineering and Architecture since 1951.

He said he was gratified by the confidence expressed in him by the board and was fully cognizant of the heavy responsibility it will impose.

"It will not be easy to follow in the footsteps of a man like Milton Eisenhower," Dr. Walker declared, "but I trust that I shall prove equal to the task."

He added he looked upon the assignment as one of opportunity and challenge.

Dr. Eisenhower pointed out to the board why for purely personal reasons his decision to resign was irrevocable, and expressed the belief that Penn State is destined to become one of the most distinguished State universities in the Nation.

Dr. Walker, a member of Borough Council, was born in Long Eaton, England, attended high school at Wrightsville in York County. He earned his bachelor, master, and doctor of science degrees at Harvard University.

He first came to the university in 1945 from the Harvard Underwater Sound Laboratory at Cambridge, Mass. The family, including two children, Gail, 13 and Brian, 9, resides on West Park Avenue.

In the 3 years preceding his move to Penn State, Dr. Walker was research associate, assistant director, associate director of the laboratory, and was in charge of the development of ordnance weapons. For his work there, he was awarded the Naval Ordnance development award and also a Presidential certificate of merit.

With his predecessor, the late Harry P. Hammond, Dr. Walker completed arrangement with the Bureau of Ordnance in the Navy Department whereby the Ordnance Research Laboratory was established at the university.

He served as its director and also as professor and head of the department of electrical engineering from 1945 to 1951.

Upon becoming dean of the College of Engineering and Architecture, he was credited with expanding its work to include the research reactor facility; the computation center in the department of electrical engineering; and development of the 2-year curricula in electrical technology and drafting and design technology.

He also was influential in stimulating research programs among the small industries of the State.

Earlier this year, Dean Walker was named by President Dwight D. Eisenhower to a new national committee for the development of scientists and engineers and serves as vice president of this group. He also serves on an Army scientific advisory panel and is a member of the Naval Research Advisory Committee, which advises the Chief of Naval Research on research and development programs for the Navy.

The American Society for Engineering Education earlier this week selected Dr. Walker to direct a comprehensive study of the Nation's needs for research in engineering.

From 1931 to 1940 he taught mathematics and electrical engineering at Tufts College and at the same time conducted research for Doble Engineering Co. in Medford Hillside, Mass.

In 1940 he was employed by the General Electric Co., Pittsfield, Mass., on a special project and later that year joined the faculty of the University of Connecticut, where he remained until 1942. From 1941 to 1943, he also served as a consulting engineer for Colt's Patent Fire Arms Co., Hartford, Conn.

Dr. Walker has served as a vice president of the American Society for Engineering Education which held its national meetings on campus last year and in 1952 was named chairman of the Engineering College Research Council.

He is a member of the American Institute of Electrical Engineers, the American Physical Society, a fellow of the Acoustical Society of America, a member of Tau Beta Pi, engineering honor society, and a registered professional engineer in the States of Pennsylvania and Connecticut.

DECISION ON CHANGE-OVER UNDECIDED AS PRESIDENT SEES DISTINGUISHED FUTURE

Neither President Milton S. Eisenhower nor President-elect Eric A. Walker was prepared today to say when the latter would officially assume his new position.

The board of trustees left this decision in the hands of the two men, indicating meanwhile that Dr. Eisenhower had expressed a willingness to serve until the end of the year.

Dr. Eisenhower, in pointing out to the board yesterday why he would not reconsider and stay on as the university's 11th president, had this to say:

"It is with a heavy heart and the deepest regret that I shall leave Penn State. I have treasured the wholehearted cooperation and friendly association I have had with the trustees, the alumni, the faculty, and the students.

"I wish to say a special word about the Board. It is truly remarkable that a group of 32 could so consistently agree on the major outlines of Penn State's development. Both quantitatively and qualitatively, and so vigorously work together for the benefit of all the people of the commonwealth.

"I am immensely proud of the fact that in my 6 years at Penn State the board and I have never had a disagreement on a single major issue.

"I know that my successor will have the same kind of cooperation. Believe me, no matter where I shall be in the future, a part of my heart will always be here and I wish for Penn State the full realization of its true destiny, which is to become one of the most distinguished universities in the Nation."

PRESIDENT OF WHAT—SON OF NEW PRESIDENT FINALLY GETS THE NEWS

Brian Walker, 9-year old son of president-elect Eric A. Walker, was the last to learn that his father had achieved a new station at the university.

Young Walker was at the Little League ball park helping the VFW "B" team beat

Metzger's, 9–0 when it as announced that his father had been elected president of the university.

His father, meanwhile, had made an appointment to assemble the family for an official photograph at 6 p. m. Brian was late, but jubilant when he approached the Walker home proclaiming that his team had won.

His mother quickly urged him to change his clothes and join the family for the photograph.

The photographer, placing the family for his picture-taking, asked the youngster to stand in front of "the new president."

"President of what?" young Walker asked, the last to learn that his father only a few hours before had been named to succeed Dr. Milton S. Eisenhower as president of the university.

Naming New Bridge

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD H. VELDE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 28, 1956

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to place in the RECORD a resolution which has been passed by the city council of East Peoria, Ill., suggesting that the fine new bridge which is now being built across the Illinois River between Peoria and East Peoria be named the Murray M. Baker Bridge. A similar resolution has been passed by the city council of Peoria, Ill.

I am personally acquainted with Murray M. Baker and know that he is one of the leading citizens residing in Peoria, has been a civic-minded leader in both business and social circles, and is probably more responsible than anyone else for getting the movement started to build this new bridge.

The resolution follows:

RESOLUTION

Whereas for more than the past half century Murray M. Baker, of Peoria, Ill., has contributed tremendously toward the progress, growth, and the general welfare of this community, the Peoria area, the State of Illinois, and the Nation; and

Whereas he was primarily responsible for the location of the Caterpillar Tractor Co. in this community as one of its founders and played a most important part in the location of R. G. LeTourneau, Inc., in Peoria, Ill.; that as a result of his efforts in bringing these two large industries to the Peoria area, he has made this area the earthmoving capital of the world; and

Whereas as chairman of the War Defense Council for the State of Illinois during World War II, he was the first to recognize the imperative need for a new bridge in the Peoria area across the Illinois River to relieve the congestion in East Peoria and Peoria, and for many years he has guided this project; and

Whereas by reason of his support and planning which he has done over a long period of time, he has contributed immeasurably toward this new bridge, which is now under construction, becoming a reality, which connects the city of East Peoria and Peoria, Ill., between Fayette and Jackson Streets, in Peoria, Ill.; and

Whereas during the lifetime of Murray M. Baker, the number of employees of Caterpillar Tractor Co. have increased from about 40 employees to in excess of 26,000 employees, during all of which time he has been a director of Caterpillar Tractor Co., or its predecessors; and

Whereas Murray M. Baker is a well known industrialist, an outstanding civic leader, a pillar in his church, a great optimist, and a great American; and

Whereas his energy, leadership, and backing have contributed most materially and substantially to the industrial, civic, educational, philanthropic, and social life in this community: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the city council of the city of East Peoria, in recognition of and in honor of the noble and great public service rendered by Murray M. Baker, of Peoria, Ill., to our community, the Peoria area, our State and Nation, hereby joins in the naming and hereby names the new bridge now under construction across the Illinois River between Fayette and Jackson Streets, Peoria, Ill., and connecting with the city of East Peoria, Ill., the Murray M. Baker Bridge, and in and by this resolution all necessary authority is granted to the proper officers of this council to do all necessary acts in connection with carrying out the purposes of this resolution, and it is further directed that certified copies of this resolution be sent to the Honorable Murray M. Baker, 1222 Moss Avenue, Peoria, Ill., and the Honorable Edwin A. Rosenstone, director of public works and buildings, Springfield, Ill., and to the Bureau of Public Roads, Washington, D. C.

Benefits From the Purchase of Alaska

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. L. BARTLETT
DELEGATE FROM ALASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 2, 1956

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Speaker, the Wenatchee Daily World in an editorial on June 20, 1956, reminded its readers in a most comprehensive way of the values derived from the purchase by the United States of Alaska in 1867. Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, that editorial from the Washington State paper is included here:

IF WE HADN'T BOUGHT ALASKA

Have you ever stopped to think what might have happened if we hadn't bought Alaska? Don't do it unless you want cold chills creeping up and down your back, for if we hadn't done it, Russia would probably still own it.

It was just 89 years ago today, on June 20, 1867, that this second-best real estate deal we ever made was completed.

The treaty with Russia for the purchase was ratified.

For a mere $7,200,000 we got an area of 375,296,000 acres, one-third larger than all the Atlantic States from Maine to Florida.

It figures out less than 2 cents an acre.

It wasn't as good a land deal as we made when we bought the Louisiana territory from France 64 years earlier for $15 million. We paid a little more per acre—roughly 3 cents for this—but we got better land.

We are spending billions today for defense and other billions for foreign aid, much of it for military aid to countries that might be able to help keep world peace.

Just figured purely as a defense investment, the $7.2 million we paid out for Alaska was a mere pittance.

The defense angle wasn't too much of a consideration 80 years ago. It has become important since.

But suppose we just glance briefly at the economic value of both Alaska and the Louisiana Territory.

Consider the income we have received from this area in the years since.

Alaska, with its fur-bearing seals, fish, gold, copper, tin, and forests has repaid its cost hundreds of times over.

But looking back at the country in 1867, it is no wonder many called the purchase "Seward's Folly," and "Seward's Ice Box." Charles Seward was our Secretary of State when the purchase was made, and was one of the foremost proponents for the transaction.

There were only a handful of people there. In fact when the first census was made in 1880, there were only 33,426 inhabitants, and 10 years later the figure had dropped to 32,052.

In 1950 there were 128,643 and 2 years later it had grown to an estimated 191,000.

When we bought the Louisiana tract from France in 1803, we extended our borders westward from the Mississippi River to the Rockies and from the Gulf of Mexico to the Lake of the Woods north of Minnesota.

Our States of Louisiana, west of the Mississippi, Arkansas, Missouri, Nebraska, Iowa, South Dakota, North Dakota, except for a small tract in the northeast corner held by Britain until the treaty of 1891, Minnesota west of the Mississippi, Kansas, Oklahoma, and parts of Montana and Colorado.

It is a good thing to look back on some of these early deals and realize that we weren't always as free and liberal in handing out our money as we are today.

We had some pretty shrewd bargainers who sat around the council table a hundred and fifty years ago when we bought Louisiana, and 89 years ago when we bought Alaska.

We can be thankful today that they were.

Not only did we get our money's worth many times over in an economic way, but our survival as a Nation might have been different without Alaska.

If you want a good shudder, contemplate what the last 10 years would have been with Russia looking down our neck from Alaska.

And we wonder too, if our neighbor to the north, Canada doesn't sometimes ponder the same thing, from her own point of view.

They may feel sometimes that they have some grievances with us, and they have, but at least they have no electrified fenses, patrolled no-man's land and iron curtain restrictions along the borderland.

We don't like to appear boastful, but we honestly believe we are better back-yard neighbors than Russia would be.

The American Fishing Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN F. KENNEDY
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, July 2, 1956

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the remarks of Thomas Fulham at the 123d quarterly meeting of the New England Council at Poland Springs, Maine, on June 15, 1956. They are a very clear summary of the current status of the American fishing industry.

There being no objection, the remarks were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PROBING THE DEEP SEA

Thanks to Miss Rachel Carson and her delightful book, The Sea Around Us, it is now possible to talk to a group of people about the ocean and some aspects of the fishing industry without explaining that the Grand Banks of Newfoundland do not start one mile from Boston lightship and that Spencer Tracey is not still at sea with Freddie Bartholemew on a sailing vessel as depicted in Captains Courageous. As a matter of fact, fishing is no longer a romantic adventure, but a very serious industrial enterprise aided by scientific instruments such as loran, radar, radio telephones and the underwater radar devices called Fischlupe or fish finder that actually scans the ocean floor as the diesel-powered vessel roams the surface These are the facts than anyone can see.

Not so apparent, but equally as factual, is the life and death struggle for survival that is being waged currently by the fishing industry. The opponents in these struggles are many, some economic, some scientific, and some just manufactured from the perverseness of the individualistic characters who go to make up the people of the industry.

It was not always this way, for the early settlers in the New England area settled in a veritable paradise of marine life. One Francis Higginson, a settler in the Bay State Colony, reported in 1630, "The abundance of seafish are almost beyond believing," and a contemporary, Thomas Morton, wrote "Multitudes of cod, in addition to sturgeon, salmon, herring, eels, smelts, shad, halibut, flounder, and bass, as well as lobsters are there, infinite in store in all parts of the land, and a great store of oysters in the entrance of all rivers." He speaks of mussels, clams, razorfish, cockles, and scallops. I'm sure that Mr. Higginson and Mr. Morton never dreamed that the people who would occupy the land adjacent to these vast natural resources would one day be faced with the problem of foreseeable depletion and be contemplating a program of planned harvesting, lest there be nothing left for future generations.

It is most unfortunate that the average person who relies on the daily press for information usually sees nothing more about fishing than a beautiful picture of an ice-encrusted trawler on a winter's morning or the annual reporting of the hearings before the Tariff Commission which are usually filled with dire predictions about the loss of the New England fishing industry to Canada and the great masses of unemployed that will soon be walking the streets of Boston, Gloucester, Portland, and New Bedford. This has been going on since 1944 and, although there have been some dislocations, the industry is far from dead. But the effect of this adverse publicity has not been good. The public refuses to believe that New England has anything left but a decayed industry. The banks and other financial institutions have assumed that at best anything associated with fishing is a dubious risk. Governmental bodies occupied with considerations of agriculture, mining, electronics, and the implements of war have until very recently seen no future in wasting time with the feeble pleadings of fishing people. So, we have been left to our own devices.

What kind of an industry am I talking about? How important is it to the economy of New England? According to the latest figures of the Fish and Wildlife Service, the fishery resources of New England support an industry employing over 50,000 men in $80 million worth of boats, plants, and equipment, handling over 900 million pounds of fish annually at a value in excess of $53,300,000.

I'm certain that if a major corporation in the country announced plans to establish such an activity in the New England area, that between chambers of commerce, governors, mayors, and representatives of the New England council knocking at their door, that they would have little time for anything but interviews.

What is in store for our fishery resources and the industry that exploits it? We have been most fortunate over the past years to have in our Fish and Wildlife Service and the various State agencies who are charged with the care of our deepwater and shore fisheries men whose sole occupation has been a devotion to the cause of conservation and improvement. To this end, they have explored, researched, and studied the populations, habits, growth cycles, and natural enemies of the fish and shellfish on which we exist. It was apparent to them that either we regulate our destructive fishing practices or we would destroy our resource. At first, they tried explanation, but once the futility of this course was established, an international convention of 11 nations was called to be held in Washington in 1949. From this meeting emerged a treaty which established the International Commission for the Northwest Atlantic Fisheries. The vast area covered by this regulatory body extends from the southern tip of Greenland to the back of Cape Cod, and was divided up into five principal areas. The area which concerns us the most, area 5, encompasses the Gulf of Main and Georges Bank. After much deliberation, it was determined that, by increasing the size of the mesh in the trawl nets to 4½ inches, that there would be enough room for haddock of immature size to escape being caught or destroyed. It was predicted also that over a period of 13 years, allowing for variances in natural factors, that the availability of haddock on Georges Bank would be increased one-third or 90 million pounds per year. That regulation has now been in effect about 3 years. The landings at the Boston Fish Pier for the first 5 months of 1955 were 63 million pounds. The landings for the first 5 months of 1956 were 68 million pounds, an increase of 5 million pounds. Of course, it is almost presumptuous to ascribe the total increase to this conservation measure, but there are strong indications that it may be so.

The industry has always been fortunate in its congressional representation from this area. In 1952 Senators SALTONSTALL and KENNEDY from Massachusetts, joined by a majority of the other Senators and Congressmen from New England, introduced a bill which bears both of their names which asked that $5 million be set aside annually from the approximately $14 million collected by tariffs on fishery imports, which now goes to the Department of Agriculture. These funds were to be used over the entire United States for research, exploration, and marketing service as allocated by the Fish and Wildlife Service assisted by an industry advisory council. After due hearings were held and committee reports made, it was voted into law as a 3 year appropriation of $3 million per year. At first glance, this does not appear to be much money, but the $500,000 allotted to New England was a vast increase. It meant that now we could operate 2 research vessels 12 months of a year, rather than 1 vessel for 12 months every other year. Laboratories which had skeleton forces and no equipment could open staffed and equipped to provide valuable technological services which would otherwise be impossible to obtain.

We have now operated under the provisions of this bill for over 2 years. The results have been startling and of great importance. Two discoveries which have received considerable publicity have been the extensive deposits of huge deep water lobsters and the existence of large schools of ocean perch in depths of water which have never been fished. Of even greater importance, but not as newsworthy to the general public, has been the compilation of vast data on salinity, temperature, and movement of water masses, as well as many thousands of miles of continuous plankton tows which reveal the movements of eggs and larvae of both the commercial species and the other fish on which they feed. The economic importance of this research is that it can be translated accurately into predictions of just how much fish of any given species will be available to be caught in those areas 3 and 4 years from now.

Another very significant legislative development has been the introduction of the Payne and Magnuson bills. The Payne bill, which soon will be enacted, calls for $550,000 annually to provide for the training of personnel for the fishing industry. This excellent bill provides further that the funds be matched 100 percent by the States, colleges, universities and technical schools using the program. It will be apportioned by the Fish and Wildlife Service on an equitable basis among the several States and Territories having special interest in fisheries. A particular feature which should prove to be of great value to the widely scattered small port fishermen is an extension service which should provide information on the latest developments to the individuals in those areas.

The Magnuson bill is much more far-reaching because it provides for a reorganization of the entire Federal system for fisheries. There will probably be many changes before it becomes law, but in brief summary, it separates the fishing function from the wildlife function in the Fish and Wildlife Service and places this administration directly under the Secretary of the Interior. It will have its operating functions under an autonomous commission of five men. There has been another bill introduced by Congressman BONNER which would provide for an Under Secretary of the Interior whose duty would be fish and wildlife. Then, the two divisions would be separated and each would have a director and two assistant directors. The authority provided in the Magnuson bill would be approximately the same under the Bonner bill. In effect, regardless of what bill eventually passes, the fishery function of the Federal Government will have its own administration, budget, and determination and will be in a much stronger position. These are very favorable developments.

Last week, startling news was released by the White House which contained three provisions: (1) That the Saltonstall-Kennedy Act be placed on a permanent basis without the $3 million limitation; (2) that a Bureau of Fisheries be created with sole responsibility for Federal programs related to Fisheries; and (3) that Congress create a special $10 million revolving fund which would set up 10-year loans at not less than 3 percent for the maintenance, repair, and equipment of fishing vessels. Of these three provisions, the Bureau can be set up by administrative procedures already established by law, but the other two will require legislation.

With this very sketchy background, let us examine the conditions of the New England Fisheries today. Actually, is it in a healthy condition?

If the industry will follow the advice and guidance of the marine biologists, it is conservative to predict between haddock and ocean perch alone an increase in yearly availability of over 100 million pounds from nearby sources.

What the deposits of offshore lobsters will mean to New England is problematical, and much study will have to be made, but there they are, and when the smoke clears somebody will be using them.

The attitude of the Federal Government is more favorable than at any time in recent history as evidenced by the legislation under consideration.

The large company-owned trawler fleet is shrinking, but developing rapidly is a new class of medium trawlers which are individu-

ally owned and operated. This development will need financial aid and technical assistance.

The acceptance of new convenience seafood products, such as fishsticks, is opening an entirely new market concept to the processors and marketers. The wealth of products which can be prepared from the multitude of various seafoods staggers the imagination. They will provide a new dimension to menu variety.

There is new confidence in the industry. New facilities costing over $1 million were dedicated recently in Gloucester, $150,000 was spent in Portland, investment in new plant and equipment has increased in New Bedford, and Boston, which is supposed to be dying, will shortly announce a $2 million expansion project. This is hardly an indication of defeat.

The stage is set for a dramatic revival in New England fishery fortunes.

It will not be stopped by imports or stifled by blind adherence to traditional methods.

The marine biologists, oceanographers, and related scientists have shown that the raw material is there.

The country's appetite for sea products is hardly sampled.

The various governmental bodies are interested and sympathetic.

Private as well as public capital will be available.

I do hope that we may have all of you along for this voyage.

Reaction of Foreign-Aid Funds Upon United States Economy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ARTHUR V. WATKINS
OF UTAH
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, July 2, 1956

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, in the debate last week on the mutual-security program, I was again disturbed by the apparent lack of understanding of exactly how our so-called foreign-aid funds react upon our own economy.

Also, I believe that many persons think that these funds—much like a Government check—are simply put into the hands of some foreign ruler or government, which thereupon deposits them to its own local bank account and uses them much as our people use the funds deposited in their own checking accounts; that is, for whatever pleases them.

Actually, of course, much of our foreign aid consists of goods and services, produced in this country, and which then go abroad. I am sure that the impetus to the American economy of the mutual-security program, if it were suddenly and conclusively removed, would have reverberations up and down our land of far-reaching import.

In this connection, I call attention to an article written by James M. Haswell, a Chicago Daily News writer, which was syndicated to other newspapers and was published in the Salt Lake Tribune of June 19.

By pondering the statements made in the article I think many of us will be reminded that foreign aid is not so completely foreign as we may be led to believe.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COSTLY FOREIGN AID FUNDS FEED UNITED STATES INDUSTRY FIRST

(By James M. Haswell)

WASHINGTON, June 18.—Congressional talk about foreign aid sounds as though it were all going out and none coming in.

Some people speak of it as taking dollars away from Americans to give to Europeans and Asiatics.

Such talk overlooks the fact that foreign-aid dollars make business in this country before they ever leave these shores.

Harry W. Arnold, president of the Ohio Chamber of Commerce recently circulated in Congress a statement that President Dwight D. Eisenhower's 1956–57 foreign-aid request would cost Ohio taxpayers $292 million.

Figures from the International Cooperation Administration and the Census Bureau indicate this same foreign-aid request would bring $408 million worth of business into Ohio.

Using the same premises:

Michigan taxpayers would pay $368 million and Michigan farmers and manufacturers would get $393.5 million business.

Illinois taxpayers would pay $81 million and Illinois would get $345,600,000 business.

People talk about foreign aid in terms of dollars but foreign aid actually is goods and services.

Some of the goods and services are produced in the countries to which the foreign aid goes.

But the great bulk is produced in this country.

The International Cooperation Administration reports that 91 percent of the foreign-aid funds spent on agricultural commodities last year was spent right in this country for American farm products.

Seventy-one percent of the money spent on industrial goods went to American manufacturers, and 88 percent of the money spent on military goods furnished wages for American workers and profits for American corporations.

Ohio is one of the great centers of American industry. Ohio accounts for 9 percent of the value added by American manufacturing. Ohio also furnishes 3.1 percent of the Nation's farm products.

Michigan does 12.2 percent of defense-type manufacturing, 8 percent of general manufacturing, and raises 2.1 percent of the farm goods.

Working out all these percentages, it appears that postwar foreign-aid spending already has brought Ohio about $2,900,000,000 business. Michigan $2,300,000,000 and Illinois $3,100,000,000.

Report on the Situation of the Czechs and the Sudeten Germans in Exile

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. USHER L. BURDICK
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 2, 1956

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, the following article by Mr. Franz Gaksch of Munich, member of the Bavarian Landtag and editor of the Volksbote, is one in which all proponents of right and justice will be interested. The courage and persistence of these people who are fighting for political and economic freedom deserve the admiration of the free world:

ELEVEN YEARS SINCE THE BEGINNING OF CZECHOSLOVAKIA'S COMMUNIZATION

Eleven years elapsed since the time of the takeover in Czechoslovakia by the Communist-led National Front in 1945, since the time of liquidation and suppression of all Czech non-Communists and anti-Communists by the regime and system of Dr. Benes, Dr. Zenkl, Dr. Lettrich, Dr. Stransky, Juraj Slavik, and Ferdinand Peroutka, since the time of suppression and liquidation of all political parties of the center and the right, which opposed communism, since the time of the erection of the "people's courts" which sentenced to death thousands of political adversaries and sent hundreds of thousands into prison and concentration camps, since the time of forced nationalization of industries, trade and property, since the time of abolishment of freedom of election and speech, since the time of the introduction of a uniformed Communist and pro-Communist press, licensed by the National Front, since the time of introduction of "Soviets" in Czechoslovakia, the time of the beginning of building up kolkhozes and since the time of the bloody expulsion of 3.3 millions of Sudeten-Germans and Hungarians from their centuries-old homeland in Czechoslovakia by the very same National Front regime, during which nearly 300,000 Sudeten Germans lost their lives.

Three years later, in 1948, the National Front completed sucessfully the communization of Czechoslovakia and handed over the full power to an exclusively Communist regime. Eight years elapsed since that time, since February 1948, when the Communists took over full power and let their National Front comrades go west in order to continue their work there.

I. THE NATIONAL FRONTERS

The National Front Communist collaborators, who, in 1945, were chosen and selected for cooperation by the Communists (the Communists e. g. also enforced new leaders to other parties of the National Front, until that time politically meaningless, but who suited them) who fully communized Czechoslovakia from within, either by their procommunism or unintelligence, and who, in 1948, were permitted to go west by the Communists, were also chosen and selected as the only and exclusive representatives of the Czechs and Slovaks at home and in exile by an American private society, the Free Europe Committee, Inc., financed by the Crusade for Freedom, and planted in leading position in Radio Free Europe and in the Council of Free Czechoslovakia.

The so-called Czechoslovak desk of Radio Free Europe is led by men like its editor in chief, Ferdinand Peroutka, a prominent journalist of the National Front, who used to write that the Bolshevist revolution is as great a historical impulse as Christianity, and who even today maintains in his weekly commentaries over the same Radio Free Europe that, due to the Communist movement, we are standing on the threshold of a new era and that, re political and economic freedom, no return to the time before the Communist take over is possible.

Peroutka's deputy in Radio Free Europe is one Dr. Jan Stransky, who, as a member of the National Front Parliament, propagated Soviet Russia and the cession of a great part of Czechoslovakia to the Soviet Union. Weekly commentator is also Dr. Jaroslav Stransky, Jan Stransky's father, who was Minister of Justice of the Nationalist Front Government, who elaborated and signed the

expropriation decrees and the decrees constituting the people's courts and who therefore carries the principal responsibility for the bloody justice and suppression of all adversaries by the National Front.

The Czechoslovak desk in Munch is headed by Julius Fuerth (Firt), who was one of the leading men of the National Front press, and is known be have signed as member of the National Front Parliament, together with Peroutka and other cooperators of Radio Free Europe, the declarations for true brotherhood with Soviet Russia. His deputy is one Dr. Martin Kvetko, former regional minister of the National Front in Slovakia, who is responsible for the agricultural expropriations there, coresponsible for the erection of concentration camps for the adversaries of the Communists in Slovakia, and who, even after the full Communist takeover in Czechoslovakia in February 1948, voted in the Parliament for the new Communist Gottwald government, thus giving it, together with other National Front pals, the full legality.

Other leading editors and festival speakers over Radio Free Europe include the former Communist Milos Vanek, responsible during the National Front regime for the nationalization of many, even small enterprises, and who, however, is now leading the economic department of RFE's Czechoslovak desk; furthermore Karol Belak-Berger, who was one of the National Front journalists; Jiri Pistorius, the former Minister of the National Front; Marxist Vaclav Majer, who signed the same decrees as Stransky; the former chairman of the foreign relations committee of the National Front Parliament, Dr. Ivo Ducacek, who pushed energetically the friendship with the U. S. S. R.; the leader of the Nationalist Front in Slovakia, Dr. Jozef Lettrich, who insisted that Czechoslovakia be a people's democracy, and that all nonleftist parties be prohibited because of being, as he called it, outmoded; Dr. Petr Zenkl, who was Deputy Prime Minister of the National Front under the Communist Gottwald, and who was a great promoter of the friendship to the U. S. S. R.; Dr. Miloslav Kohak, Dr. Vratislav Busek, Frantisek Listopad-Synek, Otto Graf, the friend of men, who turned out to be Communist agents; Ivan Herben, Ing Filo, Dr. Matej Josko, Samuel Bellus, Professor Macek, and other former pro-Communists, Communist collaborators, and fellow travelers. The Radio Free Europe cooperator staff included also several direct Communist agents like Vladimir Kucera, Marie Dvorakova, Jiri Kalas, and others, who have already returned to Communist Prague.

The Council of Free Czechoslovakia, which is the continuation of the National Front in Exile, financed too by the Free Europe Committee, is again led by the same former Communist collaborator, Ferdinand Peroutka, who is president of its committee, by Dr. Juraj Slavik, former Ambassador of the National Front regime to Washington, by Dr. Petr Zenkl, Dr. Jozef Lettrich, Vaclav Majer, and other National Fronters and collaborators of the Communist Party line quoted above.

The Council of Free Czechoslovakia and the men of Radio Free Europe both working with American money, make today reproaches to their former comrades in Czechoslovakia. In official programs and broadcasts the councilmen propagate the renewal of the National Front, the upholding of the nationalization of Czechoslovakia, of many of the Communist measures, the upholding of the abolishment of the nonleftist political parties there, and the upholding of all the achievements of the National Front, including the perpetuation of the expulsion of the Sudeten Germans and Hungarians, and of the subjection of the Slovak people. As far as the fight against communism is directly concerned, these men have never repented and rejected their pro-Communist attitude—on the contrary, they have been developing programs which on principle clearly suit the Communist line. They propagate socialism, lowered down an Iron Curtain on everything which was changed in America since the Roosevelt era, and fully protect eastern and international communism by the following lines:

They give a false interpretation of communism as being a mere Soviet imperialism, a danger only from those visible Communist parties, a danger only from without, and fully suppress every word about the true character of this international Communist conspiracy, about the danger from within, about the infiltration of the free world, universities, press, etc.—they never mention anything about the causes of the loss of China, about the Harry Dexter White case, about the true causes of the Communist successes in the past (including Czechoslovakia, where they conceal their true activities).

They uphold the Yalta agreement, the Kosice program, the National Front.

They never broadcast names of American Communists and spies, the fifth amendment Communists, etc., and they fully suppress every word about the congressional committees fighting communism in the United States of America. Thanks to the former Communist collaborators in Radio Free Europe, the East knows absolutely nothing about the existence of men like JENNER, EASTLAND, MUNDT, WALTER, VELDE, REECE, DIES, and other great men. The National Front men in FRE do completely suppress any mention of Senator MCCARTHY.

They attack, in substance, petty and known Communists and do not stress adequately the existence of a system of officers of the secret police in the East and of that "Invisible Government" behind the scenes there; they warn the people insufficiently of the sly methods of the men behind the Secret Police, etc., in the countries behind the Iron Curtain. In this way, while superficially shouting against communism and calling it names, they are misinforming East and West, and blinding the eyes of the people in the East.

On the occasion of the Sudeten-German Day in Munich on Whitsuntide 1954 Senator JENNER stated in his letter to Dr. Rudolf Lodgman von Auen:

The Communists also needed non-Russian allies, whose pro-Communist nationals could be sent to Western Europe and the United States to infiltrate our anti-Communist agencies here and abroad and reduce American psychological warfare to impotence."

And this is exactly what certain National Front men of the Council of Free Czechoslovakia are doing today.

II. THE ANTI-NATIONAL FRONT CZECHS AND SLOVAKS

The leaders of the Czech and Slovak political parties, which were suppressed and liquidated by the National Front and which, before World War II, used to represent the majority of the Czechs and Slovaks (their majority was about 2:1 in the last free election in 1935), were either executed or imprisoned by the Communists and the justice of the National Front, in 1948, 3 years later, still kept in prisons—unable to escape to the West as the National Front men could do. It was the clear policy line of the Communists: only the soft-heads were permitted to escape, while all real Czech statesmen and politicians were kept in Czechoslovakia by force.

Despite this fact, many members and some leaders of these parties are, however, in exile. Ninety percent of the exile Slovaks, and still more at home, stand against the Council of Free Czechoslovakia and have their great organizations, such as the Slovak National Council Abroad, whose leading man in Germany, Matus Cermak, fell victim to an explosive assassination in Munich, the Slovak Liberation Committee, the Slovak League of America, the Democratic Bloc of Slovaks, and the National Committee for the Liberation of Slovakia, including names such as Philip A. Hrobak, Ferdinand Durcansky, Dr. Frano Tiso, Dr. Boehm, Petr Pridavok, Dr. Hrusovsky, Dr. Krajcovic, Dr. Stefan Lukats, Dr. Michael Zibrin and others. They are all for a free Slovakia.

As far as the Czechs are concerned the rank-and-file members of the Agrarian Party, the greatest party in pre-war Czechoslovakia, which was suppressed by the National Front, opposed the Council of Free Czechoslovakia for the same reasons for which they once opposed the National Front, which had robbed them and started the collectivization of Czech agriculture. The Agrarian Party has among its leaders the former prewar Minister Dr. Josef Cerny (the only non-National Front Minister), who had been persecuted and imprisoned by the National Front. He does never speak over Radio Free Europe. Other leaders of the Agrarian Party such as Prof. Dr. Frantisek Kral are strong enemies of the National Front.

The Artisan Party (Trade Party) was also forbidden and liquidated by the National Front. Its members are against the National Front and against the Council. Its leaders include e. g. Karel F. Stekr, who is also secretary general of the Union of Czech Industrialists in exile, whose president is Dr. h. c. Jan A. Bata, cofounder of the greatest shoe manufacturing trust in the world.

The National Democratic Party, once prohibited by the National Front, now opposes sharply the Council of Free Czechoslovakia, including the RFE personnel. Mr. Jiri Havelka, the young son of a former Czech minister, is president of this party. This party has already made intelligent and energetic actions in participating in the American political life.

The People's Party was a member of the National Front. In exile, it divided itself into three parts: the first one is cooperating with the Council of Free Czechoslovakia e. g. the former National Front Minister Dr. Adolf Prochazka, who has the same pro-Communist past and activities as his colleagues Stransky, Majer, Ripka, Zenkl, and Lausman; the second one opposes in one way or another the Council and the RFE-lines, but adheres to Czecholsovakism, and finally the third and strongest part the name "Czech Christian Democratic Movement," its organizations being under the leadership of the former member of parliament, Dr. Bohdan Chudoba, of Ladislav Lobkowitz, Josef Kalvoda, Simeon Ghelfand, etc. This movement quit the forced Czechoslovak conception, giving the Slovaks the right for full self-determination and thus absolutely opposing the Council.

A further Czech group is the "Czech Democratic Federalists" around Vladimir Pekelsky, who cooperates with Ghelfand and Lobkowitz.

Surmounting all other men, however, the Czech general of the army, Lev Prchala. General Prchala was supreme commander of the Czechoslovak armies and minister plenipoteniary in Eastern Czechoslovakia. He fought Hitler and, in 1939, went, via Poland and France; to Great Britain. In England, he opposed the pro-Soviet policies of the Czechoslovak exile government of Dr. Benes and especially the Czechoslovak-Soviet Treaty of Friendship of 1943. In 1945, meanwhile becoming chairman of the Czech National Committee in London, General Prchala refused to return home, to the Czechoslovakia of the National Front and declared the Kosice-Government program and the nationalization and expulsion decrees as not binding for the Czech people. His predictions and his firm opposition against the U. S. S. R. proved true, when in 1948, Czechoslovakia, due to the activities of Benes, Peroutka, Slavik, Zenkl, Ripka, and Lettrich as well as others fell into absolutely Communist hands.

General Prchala, together with his associates, first of all Dr. Karel Locher, personifies the moral and sound line of Czech policy since the time before Hitler and Benes, and his movement started active work for the liberation of the Czech countries. In 1950, the Czech National Committee signed an agreement with the democratic representatives of the Sudeten-German expellees, providing for the return of the Sudeten Germans, for the right for self-determination of all nations of former Czechoslovakia, i e. the Czechs, the Sudeten-Germans, the Slovaks, the Hungarians, the Subcarpathian Ruthenians and the Poles. In 1955, the Czech National Committee under the presidency of General Prchala, was joined by the Czech Christian Movement under the presidency of Dr. Bohdan Chudoba. In radiobroadcasts to the Czech countries behind the Iron Curtain, started in December 1955, General Prchala proclaimed as the aim of the liberation fight also the restoration of private property and free enterprise in the Czech countries.

III. THE SUDETEN GERMANS

The National Front regime of Czechoslovakia, led by the Communists Benes, Peroutka, Zenkl, Slavik, and others, expelled in 1945 nearly all of the 3,300,000 Sudeten Germans from their centuries-old homeland, since these Sudeten Germans represented the hard core of anticommunism in former Czechoslovakia. About 2 million of the Sudeten Germans are now living in Western Germany. They are organized in the Sudeten German Landsmannschaft and have their foreign representation in the Sudeten German Council, led by Dr. Rudolf Lodgman, of Auen, the members of the German Bundestag—Hans Schütz, Richard Reitzner, and Johannes Strosche, as well as the member of the Bavarian Landtag, Dr. Walter Becher. The Sudeten Germans have also a number of men in the German Federal Parliament and Government as well as in all state parliaments and governments.

The Sudeten Germans notice with astonishment that the Free Europe Committee supports and encourages the nonrepenting National Front men, who once suited the eastern Communists so well, while rejecting all non-National Front men, or using them only in very subordinate positions, and while rejecting also all repenting National Fronters. The elimination of the non-National Front Czechs as well as all repenting National Fronters, and the support for the nonrepenting former Communist collaborators deprives the Sudeten Germans of real possibilities of understanding with the Czech nation; it, moreover, hinders in America anti-Communist statesmen, preaching the policy of liberation and a true anti-Communist fight. It cripples fully the anti-Communist combat and efforts for liberation of the Czechs and Slovaks, and it aids invaluably the Communists in the East.

IV. THE FUTURE POLICY

Viewing realistically the situation, I come to the conclusion that there is only one moral and political program for the future for the exiles and the refugees from former Czechoslovakia, which can and will unite all decent men of all nations of the former Czech state. In my opinion, it has two points:

1. The full and absolute restoration of conditions within the former Czechoslovak territory as they existed before the Nazi and the Communist interference, i. e., the full return to the situation of 1938. This means the return to private property, free enterprise, and trade, which once made Czechoslovakia great; this means the return of the nationalized industries and agriculture into the hands of the Czech, Slovak, etc., proprietors. This means also the return of the Sudeten Germans and Hungarians to their homeland, and the return of their properties to them. This means restoration of all political and economic freedom, the full restoration of all political parties suppressed by the criminal National Front, the return of free press, free elections, justice, administration, and of a free government. Only this program can unite all of them, except the Communists and their pals. In other words, the full freedom, justice, and order must be restored. The return to freedom must be all or nothing.

2. Under these restored conditions, the full right for self-determination for all nations must be applied. If the Slovaks want their own state, they must have it. Every Czech politician wishing a common state, including the Slovaks, must realize that he cannot force them against their will. And a political insight would show him that only a magnanimity in granting the Slovaks full right for independence could possibly win them over for a common federation. The same concerns all other nationalities of former Czechoslovakia. The right for self-determination so grossly neglected in the first Czechoslovak Republic after 1918, must be applied to all nations within the territory of Czechoslovakia.

On the basis of a program concerning the restoration of the conditions before the illegal Nazi and Communist interventions—and only on this basis—will it be possible to unite all of the anti-Communist Czechs, the Sudeten Germans, the Slovaks, the Hungarians, and all other nations. Let us not think egotistically: if the Sudeten Germans will demand only their return to their centuries-old homeland, the Czech non-Socialists only the return of free enterprise and their property, and the Slovaks their independence—no unification can come. The years of exile have taught us that we must develop a program on a basis on which all freedom-loving forces can unite.

As long as this program is not being preached by the West, in radio broadcasts to the East, as long as, on the contrary, the national fronters continue to preach Titoism and the restoration of the national front, attacking decent Czechs and Slovaks, so long the enslaved peoples in the East can clearly understand that the liberation is many years remote.

The years still ahead of us before any liberation would come will contribute to the clarification of the program of many of the Czechs to the unification of all well-meaning men among them, and will also be the time of the struggle between the two basic programs:

The one program of the national fronters who wish to restore this national front and who show nothing but their present fruitless activities in Radio Free Europe on the one hand; and

The other program, advocated by the Sudeten Germans, which asks for the restoration of full political and economic freedom for all—the Czechs and the Slovaks as well as the Sudeten Germans.

As Dr. Walter Becher, secretary general of the Sudeten German Council, stated already in his CONGRESSIONAL RECORD insertion of April 25, 1955, in view of the present international situation as well as of the future one, the final judge on these two programs will be the American people. I do not doubt for a moment which program will win.

Vitamin E Said Effective in Treatment of Heart Disease

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. USHER L. BURDICK
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 2, 1956

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Otis J. Bouma who is president of Mature Americans, Inc., has some information on vitamin E which has been indicated to be very effective in the treatment of heart disease. Under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to include the following material Mr. Bouma sent me on the subject:

[From the Canadian Medical Association Journal]

THE USE OF ALPHA TOCOPHEROL IN ACUTE AND SUBACUTE THROMBOPHLEBITIS

(By Priscilla Suffel, M. D., London, Ontario)

The increasing incidence in recent years of thromboembolic disease, particularly coronary thrombosis, emphasizes the urgency of the problem of maintaining blood fluidity within the vascular system of so-called normal people, and the need for administering anticoagulants as a prophylatic measure after operation and childbirth.

The literature on blood coagulation has become voluminous, signifying the complexity of the subject. The discovery of vitamin K, factor V (plasma Ac-globulin), factor VII (SPCA), antithemophilic globulin and Christmas factor has cleared up much of this mystery, but the mechanisms related to the "antithrombin" phenomenon are not yet clearly understood. Indeed, there is a surprising lack of unanimity about this.

In the normal blood there is an effective mechanism for suppressing coagulation. Formation of plasma thromboplastin takes an appreciable time and depends upon contact of the blood with a foreign, nonendothelial surface to develop an essential activator. This, therefore, is a very important factor in preventing intravascular clotting. In addition, the naturally occurring inhibitors, such as antithrombin, heparin, antithromboplastin, and other circulating anticoagulants in the globulin fraction of plasma, are factors tending to maintain the fluidity of intravascular blood.

The discovery of heparin and dicoumarol has provided the clinician with two powerful anticoagulants for thromboembolic disease, but in coronary thrombosis there is a wide difference of opinion as to the advisability of using anticoagulants for both the seriously ill and ambulant patients. As more and more complicating hemorrhages are reported, a swing toward the conservative side appears to be developing. There has been less controversy, however, about the place of anticoagulants in the treatment of peripheral venous thrombosis and pulmonary embolism. For in spite of intensive prophylactic and therapeutic measures designed to prevent such thrombosis and embolism, measures such as early ambulation of the postoperative patient, leg exercises for the bedridden, or elastic bandages and stockings for patients with varicosities, the incidence of venous clotting and pulmonary embolism does not seem to decrease. As the use of heparin or a dicoumarol compound is too hazardous and cumbersome for routine use, physicians must diligently search for a safer and at the same time a simple method both to prevent and to treat all types of thrombosis.

The clinical use of alpha tocopherol in peripheral thrombosis was first reported by Shute et al. Subsequent reports of its application in preventing and treating phlebothrombosis and thrombophlebitis have been very encouraging.

OUR OBSERVATIONS

At the Shute Institute we have treated 327 cases of thrombophlebitis from 1946 through June 1955, 24 of which were acute and 45 subacute. For purposes of discussion we have defined an acute case as one showing considerable local swelling, tenderness, and redness, with or without constitutional manifestation of fever, leukocytosis, and tachycardia. The subacute case is one showing only slight swelling, pain, or discoloration, usually without constitutional symp-

toms. The chronic case is one showing neither heat nor redness but with a good deal of linear tenderness or a positive Homans test or definite tenderness on lateral compression of the calf, and sometimes swelling. All these cases were treated with alpha tocopherol alone. Calcium has never been used concomitantly. Not once have the usual anticoagulants been used. This in itself is a significant observation. Moreover, even in acute cases no antibotics were given, and no bed rest has been advised during the last 6 years. Hospitalization has not been necessary. No elaborate quick test is involved in controlling these cases. Therapy is oral only, and cheap. There has not been one hemorrhagic complication encountered in our series, or in any other series in the literature. Embolism has not occurred, despite activity, in any patient on tocopherol treatment in this series. All these points set this treatment apart and render it unique. Others have been convinced of its value in preventing embolism in postoperative cases.

The results of the treatment of patients with acute thrombophlebitis and subacute thrombophlebitis are summarized below. It should be remembered that this study was done on consecutive, unslected private patients. Obviously such a series cannot be investigated with parallel controls. It must be compared with similar series in the literature.

Of the 24 acute cases, all were clinically cured within 3 weeks, the majority of them showing obvious improvement within 3 days. Of the 45 subacute cases, 25 showed a good result, that is, marked clinical improvement within 3 weeks; 19 could be classified as fair, that is improvement within 3 months, while 1 showed no improvement.

The chronic phlebitis cases were not included here, for one rarely expects much benefit from any form of treatment. Remarkable improvement has been observed in occasional cases, however.

The effect of alpha tocopherol on acute peripheral thrombosis is dramatic. Within 5 days there is usually definite evidence of subsidence of inflammation, provided an adequate dose has been given from the onset. To be effective one should use massive doses of dependable preparations of alpha tocopherol—500 to 800 international units daily. In Canada a Federal regulation requires that alpha tocopherol preparations be labeled in terms of the League of Nations international unit, and that the contents accurately correspond with the claim on the label. In some other countries there is very inadequate supervision of both labeling and content. Hence our stress on the term "dependable."

If progress is slow, the dose of alpha tocopherol should be increased promptly until evidence of substituting phlebitis is indubitable.

DISCUSSION

The first suggestion of any relation between alpha tocopherol and blood coagulation was made by Adamstone, who described obstruction of the blood vessels in the yolk sac in chicks fed a vitamin E-deficient diet. Early intravascular thrombosis was seen. This resulted in local ischæmia, vascular stasis in the blood channels, and finally hemorrhages. Mason reported that the classical fetal resorption in vitamin E-deficient pregnant rats was due to such vascular abnormalities in the uterine wall as stasis, distension and thrombosis (notably venous). Faust observed a hyaline leukocytic thrombus attached to the wall of the ventricle in one of his vitamin E-deficient rabbits. In histological studies of that myocardium evidence was found of a small break in the continuity of the endothelium of the vasa vasorum, and platelets had conglutinated there.

On account of its chemical structure, vitamin E is a potential antagonist to vitamin K, as first suggested by Zierler et al. For example, vitamin K deficiency has followed the administration of alpha tocopherol quinone, an early tocopherol oxidation product. Both in vitro and in vivo these workers found alpha tocopherol vigorously antithrombic. Indeed, they suggested it was antithrombic in its n r mal concentration in human blood; therefore it may normally prevent intravascular clotting.

Another set of studies on alpha tocopherol as an antithrombin was carried out by Ochsner and his associates at Tulane University. They were in search of a safe anticoagulant for post operative thromboembolic patients. They found by in vitro experiment that disodium alpha tocopherol added to thrombin prevented clot formation when fibrinogen was added to the thrombin. Further study indicated that alpha tocopherol was present in the accelerator globulin which showed antithrombic activity when precipitation with calcium was carried out. In their discussion they suggested that phlebothrombosis is the result of a relative disproportion between the prothrombin and the antithrombin levels of the blood. The thrombin released as a result of injury following surgery is inactivated by circulating antithrombin. When the antithrombin titre is low, phlebothrombosis develops. Because of the in vitro effect of disodium alpha tocopherol on thrombin and the finding of tocopherol-like compounds in the accelerator globulin, it was assumed that alpha tocopherol might be the antithrombin.

Enria and Ferrero in Italy did a very convincing experimental study on the relation of alpha tocopherol to thrombosis. They produced thrombosis in an isolated segment of the femoral vein in a controlled series of dogs. Dogs given alpha tocopherol alone showed a tremendous increase in collateral circulation about the site of obstruction and an absence of inflamatory reaction in the wall of the thrombosed vessel. Some canalization of the clot was also noted. However, canalization occurred more rapidly and more effectively in animals given Tromexan (ethyl biscoumacetate) together with alpha tocopherol. Puente Dominguez and Dominguez in Spain in their turn performed very interesting experimental studies on the effect of alpha tocopherol on collateral circulation after arterial obstruction in rabbits. They produced femoral artery obstruction by double ligation and by enveloping the vessel at the femoral ring in folds of cellophane. No medication was given in the control group. Intramuscular alpha tocopherol, 10 milligrams per day, was given to the experimental group. Arteriographic studies were made on all animals, living and dead. Histological investigations were also carried out at the sites of obstruction. Arteriography as well as disection showed no collateral circulation in the control group. The vitamin E-treated group developed a great arterial arborization about the site of the obstruction, both in the superficial and deep femoral systems. The caliber of these collaterals throughout their course was sometimes equal to that of the normal femoral trunk.

All these experiments would indicate that alpha tocopherol may be a majar antithrombin, circulating normally in the blood stream and so preventing intravascular coagulation. Theoretically, therefore, it should be superior to other anticoagulants as it does not suppress prothrombin or other such factors; therefore it cannot produce the hemorrhagic tendency so common with heparin, dicoumarol and the newer Tromexan.

The effect of alpha tocopherol on collateral circulation is another important factor in improving local circulation, minimizing local inflammatory reaction and preventing thrombosis from sludged blood.

Further research should be pursued to explain the role of alpha tocopherol in intravascular thrombosis. In the meantime, alpha tocopherol should be widely used in the prevention and treatment of thrombosis, whether coronary or peripheral, in the light of the evidence reported in the literature and our own encouraging experiences.

SUMMARY

Alpha tocopherol is uniquely valuable in the treatment of acute and subacute thrombosis of peripheral veins. It is very safe, permitting ambulant management without fear of either embolism or hemorrhagic complications.

Foreign Policy Descends Into the Valley of the Shadow of Death, Says William C. Bullitt

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 2, 1956

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, two of our former Ambassadors to Russia are at swords' points as to what we should do about Russia. The Honorable William C. Bullitt, who served as United States Ambassador to Russia from 1933 to 1935, in a slashing article in U. S. News & World Report for June 29, says that since the Second World War our foreign policy has led us from a pinnacle of power and security into the valley of the shadow of death. He charges that former Ambassador to Russia George F. Kennan played a part in our descent from safety to danger.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am including Mr. Bullitt's statement:

Since the Second World War our foreign policy has led us from a pinnacle of power and security into the valley of the shadow of death. Mr. George F. Kennan played a part in our descent from safety to danger, and it is not unreasonable to hope that he may be able to suggest a path of escape from the pit into which he helped to lead us. Even a discredited guide is apt to know some landmarks.

It is a pleasure to find in the latter part of Mr. Kennan's address a bit of good advice. He rightly attacks those American politicians who grovel before unfriendly governments and try to buy friendship by offerings of the American taxpayers' money. Our gifts to Nehru (Prime Minister Nehru of India) and his neutralist disciples, who act as advance agents for our enemies, have brought us nothing but contempt. Mr. Kennan is wise to urge our politicans to try to earn respect for the United States and to abandon efforts to purchase popularity.

Strangely enough, he suggests that we should channel such aid as we may give in future "through some international agency." He seems to have forgotten the manner in which UNRRA (United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration) spent a considerable amount of our money in accordance with the advice of Communist sympathizers and dupes. Fortunately, no American Congress is likely to be bitten twice by that dog. In any event, Mr. Kennan's "international agency" aberration does not diminish the merit of his contempt for American grovelers.

To praise this comment of Mr. Kennan's is to exhaust all the approval that can be

accorded to his address. The rest of it is softness, self-satisfaction, and defeatism.

What does Mr. Kennan advise us to do to survive as an independent nation?

1. He believes that the changes which have recently occurred in Russia represent "the beginning of that mellowing process which overtakes sooner or later all militant movements," and that they point the way "to the restoration of a more normal and hopeful relationship of the Russian people to their world environment and to us in particular."

He goes on to say: "I can see no reason why a satisfactory and hopeful relationship should not be established between the United States and Russia, even though the respective social systems and political philosophies remain theoretically in conflict."

How agreeable it would be if that were true! But there is no evidence that it is true. Khrushchev has attacked Stalin but he has never attacked a single article of the Communist faith. The political philosophy and the social system of the Soviet Union are still based, as always, on the godless Communist creed which teaches that the duty of every Communist is to destroy every capitalist country like the United States.

There is nothing theoretical about the conflict. In the past 11 years the Soviet Union and its agents have forcibly seized control of countries containing more than 700 million persons. The Communists will not stop their attacks—they can only be slowed. Stalin and Beria are dead, but the rest of the old gang of criminals, which is guilty of more murders and tortures of men, women, and children than any other gang that has ever existed in any country, including the Hitler gang, is still running the Soviet Union and the countries it has enslaved.

These Kremlin gangsters, by denouncing Stalin, are merely trying to kill 2 birds with 1 stone: to shift the blame for the unhappiness of life in the Soviet Union from their own shoulders to those of the dead Stalin, and to slow down the rearmament of the free countries of the world by convincing them that it is useless to go on spending money on armaments since the Soviet Union will never attack.

Meanwhile the Soviet Government is pushing its production of intercontinental bombers and nuclear bombs and ballistic missiles so intensely that our chief expert on this problem, Gen. Curtis E. LeMay, has testified that by 1959 the Soviet Union may be strong enough to destroy the United States by sneak attack.

"MELLOWING PROCESS" IN KREMLIN?

Mr. Kennan's desire to trust the Russians is so powerful, however, that he finds a "mellowing process" in this crude Kremlin maneuver. This is the same sort of wishful thinking that led Harry Hopkins to convince the ailing Roosevelt that he could and should trust Stalin.

2. Mr. Kennan then turns to Communist China and says: "I must say that up to this time I have been able to observe in the conduct and outlook of the Chinese Communist leaders nothing that could give justification for any immediate hope of better relations between ourselves and them—nothing, in fact, but the most profound arrogance, inhumanity and obstinate error in the understanding of the Western world."

Four paragraphs later he writes: "I feel that the present Chinese leaders have given to this country the deepest and most unjustified sort of offense, which they should not be permitted to forget at any early date. I see nothing to be gained by entry into any direct diplomatic relations with them. Let us rather keep our distance, defend our own interests with whatever ruthlessness the situation requires."

These paragraphs are sensible and logical but between them Mr. Kennan has inserted a paragraph in which he advocates that we should now permit these same Chinese Communists to have a seat in the United Nations. He knows that this would mean the presence of large numbers of Chinese Communist agents in New York, and, indeed, throughout our country. He knows that the admirable, loyal, law-abiding Chinese communities which are scattered throughout the United States would then be under enormous pressure to swing to the Communist side.

He knows that the Nationalist Chinese, our friends in Formosa and throughout the world, would rightly feel betrayed. He knows that gradually almost all the 11 million overseas Chinese—whether in Singapore, Indonesia, Vietnam, the Philippines or elsewhere, would go over to the Communists. He knows that every Communist state in the United Nations is another enemy in a seat of power. He knows that admission to a seat in the U. N. would be a steppingstone for the Chinese Communists to an embassy in Washington, and for desertion by our Government of the Chinese Nationalists in Formosa.

He inserts the knife with diplomatic delicacy. In Washington, "No! No!" he says; in New York, "Yes." He advocates that against the Chinese Communists we should "defend our own interests with whatever ruthlessness the situation requires," but his ruthless action with regard to their admission to the U. N. turns out to be to "abstain from voting on this particular question."

At times, Mr. Kennan seems to understand that to grovel is not the way for a nation to win respect and friends; but he seems not to understand that, throughout the world, disrespect for the United States would be multiplied many fold if we should permit the Chinese Communists to have a seat in the United Nations. That would be the ultimate grovel. The truth seems to be that, in Mr. Kennan's emotional constellation, to grovel is not to grovel if you grovel to the Soviet Government or its satellites.

3. Mr. Kennan's other suggestions are equally queer. He thinks we should abandon all effort to free the people of the satellite states from Soviet slavery. He writes: "What we must recognize today, in the case of the satellites, is that evil, like good, produces its own vested interests. Where regimes of this nature have been in power for more than a decade, there can be no question of putting Humpty Dumpty together again and restoring the status quo ante * * * there is a finality, for better or for worse, about what has now occurred in Eastern Europe."

These are as peculiar words as have ever been written by an American who pretends to know something about history; for they are flatly untrue. The vested interests of evil do not become permanent or respectable or sacrosanct at the end of a 10-year period or any other period. Most of the history of the past 180 years consists of the successful struggles of oppressed peoples to destroy the vested interests of their oppressors.

If Mr. Kennan's statement were true, there would never have been a United States. The vested interests of England in its American colonies had existed for more than 150 years when our forefathers destroyed them and won our independence. The vested interests of the Hapsburg monarchy in Bohemia had been so absolute from 1620 to 1848 that the Czechs scarcely remembered that they had been a nation; but, in 1918, the Czechs won complete independence and ended every vestige of Austrian vested interest in their country.

For centuries, Italy was nothing more than a geographical expression divided between the vested interests of Germans, Austrians, Spaniards, Normans, French, and a gaggle of local tyrants. Yet the Italians, in the Nineteenth century, destroyed those vested interests and became a united nation.

HOW OTHERS WON FREEDOM

Poland, transformed by the third partition in 1795 into a mere conglomerate of vested interests of Russia, Prussia, and Austria, won her absolute independence in 1918. In my childhood the Cubans, with our help, ended the old vested interest of Spain in their country. In my youth the antique vested interests of Turkey in Syria, Iraq, Lebanon, Palestine, Jordan, and Saudi Arabia were destroyed.

Examples from the past could be multiplied, but let us look merely at what has happened since the close of the Second World War.

Great Britain has been pushed out of its vested interests in India, Pakistan, Ceylon, Burma, Jordan, Israel, and the Sudan.

France has been driven out of its vested interests in Laos, Cambodia, Vietnam, Morocco, and Tunisia. The Netherlands has given up its vested interest in Indonesia.

The Soviet Union, to be sure, since the Second World War, has established vested interests in 11 satellite states containing more than 700 million souls. But to assert that these Kremlin conquests are permanent is to drop to the level of an adolescent schoolboy, ignorant of history, attempting to pose as a worldly wise cynic while he smokes his first cigarette.

The fact is that every vested interest of evil succumbs in the end to man's will to be free. Since Mr. Kennan aspires to be taken seriously, his perversion of historic fact is as shocking as his readiness permanently to abandon the enslaved peoples of Eastern Europe to the Kremlin criminals.

4. Mr. Kennan then advocates that large neutral zones should be set up between the United States and the Soviet Union—not by neutralization of the Soviet satellites in Eastern Europe and the Balkans, not by the neutralization of Communist China, North Korea, and North Vietnam, but by the neutralization of our allies, Germany and Japan, and "the surrounding areas as well."

PLAYING INTO SOVIETS' HANDS

Nothing could better suit the Soviet Government's purpose to weaken the Western World. The physical strength of our side in the struggle for survival would be vastly reduced if Germany and Japan should be neutralized. Respect for the United States would be diminished to the vanishing point. Nearly everyone in the world would be convinced that the Soviet Union had us on the run, and most human beings—who are not heroes—would feel inclined to mount the Soviet bandwagon.

With regard to Germany, Mr. Kennan writes: "I have always doubted the wisdom of the decision to rearm Western Germany and to bring her into the Atlantic Pact. It seems to me that American policy should be aimed at the reunification of Germany and the earliest possible establishment of that country as a neutral factor that can blunt the sharp edge of military bipolarity in Europe and help, eventually, to mitigate the intensity of conflict between East and West.

"I am aware of the memories and inhibitions that cause the French and many other Europeans to contemplate such a prospect with unmitigated horror. * * * If our European allies insist that we must try to solve the European problem of today on the basis of the conditions that prevailed 20 years ago, then I am bound to say I see no solution of that problem at all, and no very good reason, therefore, why the United States should continue to commit resources to the vain hope of its solution. This, as I do not need to stress, is a very serious conclusion."

Thus Mr. Kennan advises us to cut off aid to our European allies unless they will accept the reunification of Germany at the price of her disarmament and neutralization. That would, indeed, be "a very serious conclusion" if it had been reached by the Government of the United States instead of

by Mr. Kennan. Fortunately, the two are not the same.

With regard to Japan, Mr. Kennan makes even more grotesque remarks. He regrets our conclusion of a peace treaty with Japan "which settled nothing with respect to the adjacent areas and provided for an indefinite stationing of American forces on Japanese territory." Then he states: "I suspect that this may have had more to do than we suppose with the outbreak of the Korean war." The Korean war started on June 24, 1950, more than 15 months before the peace treaty with Japan was signed on September 8, 1951. This is possibly the first time in history that a later event has been suspected to be a cause of an earlier event. Perhaps Mr. Kennan will now prove to us how the election of President Eisenhower in 1952 helped to produce the election of President Truman in 1948.

"I think," writes Mr. Kennan, "American policy ought to be pointed toward a solution in which the Japanese Archipelago, like Central Europe, could eventually come to constitute a bridge, and an area of reconciliation, rather than a bone of contention, between the two great world systems."

Here is wishful thinking of the type that is based on ignorance. The fact is that Japan's respect for the United States received a dagger thrust when Harry Truman dismissed General MacArthur, whom the Japanese revered. The death blow to Japan's respect for the United States was delivered when Truman's policy of acceptance of defeat by the Chinese Communists and the conclusion of an armistice at the 38th parallel, instead of at the Yalu River, was carried to the bitter end by President Eisenhower. Since then the Japanese have regarded us as a new-rich nation which has no idea how to use its money or its strength to insure its own survival or the survival of its friends.

Mr. Kennan says that he has "confidence in the maturity and enlightened self-interest of the Japanese people." That is more confidence than any Japanese has today in the political system of his country. A neutralized Japan would drift rapidly into the Communist orbit. In defense of Mr. Kennan it should be said that he probably does not understand the consequence of the measures he advocates since he knows almost nothing about the Far East.

Mr. Kennan knows the Soviet Union well. He was named after his great uncle who had written a best seller on the sufferings of the exiles in the prison camps of the Tsar. All his life Russia has been his romance.

He learned to speak Russian fluently and acquired an extensive acquaintance with Russian history and literature. In 1933, when I chose the secretaries for the first it has such destructive nuclear weapons that it can reduce our power of retaliation to negligible proportions by a sneak attack.

We are only now entering the period of supreme peril. Some Americans believe that American Embassy in Moscow, I selected Mr. Kennan as a junior member of my staff. An admirable subordinate, passionately interested in his work, he carried out my orders efficiently. He was, to be sure, inclined to give the Russians the benefit of every doubt—not because they were Communists, but because they were Russians—and he was apt to flee from harsh reality.

He had a book which he reread every year, and he imitated its balanced sentences in his writing. It was the Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire, by Edward Gibbon. Mr. Kennan's devotiton to that book gave him a pessimistic bent of mind for one so young. He was more captivated by declines and falls than by rises and achievements.

His views were stimulating but he found it almost unbearable to have a beautiful theory slain by a refractory fact. It was, therefore, entertaining to listen to him but unwise to take his notions seriously and, in spite of my liking for him, I acquired gradually a distrust of his judgment.

EMOTIONAL INVOLVEMENT IN RUSSIA

Mr. Kennan's appointment as Director of the Policy Planning Staff of the Department of State in 1947 aroused in me, therefore, lively apprehensions—which, unfortunately, turned out to be justified. His emotional involvement in Russia was so great that he could not bear the idea of standing up to the Communists with force, even in China.

In 1952, Mr. Kennan achieved one of his great ambitions: He was appointed Ambassador to Moscow. A few months later the Russians demanded his recall because of his indiscreet statements. He was astounded. He was so fond of the Russians that he had talked to them, and about them, as if he were reproving an elder brother, and he had not realized that they did not love him nearly so much as he loved them.

Since then he has spent most of his time at the Institute for Advanced Study at Princeton, N. J. That institute has nothing to do with Princeton University; and its inmates, from Dr. Robert Oppenheimer to Mr. Kennan, live in the higher atmosphere of nuclear physics and international morals.

The American foreign policy there evolved by Mr. Kennan is based on 4 main proposals:

1. Trust the Kremlin criminals.
2. Admit the Chinese Communists to the U. N.
3. Abandon permanently the enslaved peoples of the Soviet satellite states.
4. Encourage Germany and Japan to cease to be our allies and to become neutrals.

This is defeatism.

Mr. Kennan seems to have transferred his interest from the "Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire" to the "Decline and Fall of the United States." His advice, if accepted, would hasten the day when he would have the material to write that book.

But we are not defeated. If we were to have war with the Soviet Union tomorrow, we would probably win. We are not yet in as great peril as Great Britain after Dunkirk. To be sure, we have no United States standing behind us. We have no one standing behind us. In this fight we ourselves are the last reserve. And we know that within a few years the Soviet Union may feel that it has such destructive nuclear weapons that it can reduce our power of retaliation to negligible proportions by a sneak attack.

We are only now entering the period of supreme peril. Some Americans believe that we can cringe our way to safety; but most Americans have enough commonsense and physical and moral courage to face the fact that to try to appease the unappeasable is folly. We cannot turn a tiger into a cat by stroking it. We can shoot it. We can keep it ringed with fire until it loses its nerve and runs.

The essential, indispensable factor for our survival is the maintenance of our power to deliver, at any moment, on the Soviet Union a weight of nuclear explosive far heavier than the Soviet Union can deliver on us. That is the ring of fire.

If we maintain that ring long enough, the Soviet Union will, I hope, lose its nerve and turn and run. Khrushchev's admission that Stalin was a low and brutal criminal may gain for the living criminals of the Kremlin a slightly improved standing with their own people, and it may cause soft dupes and easymarks outside the Soviet Union to relax their vigilance and their defense against the tiger.

Yet, at the same time, the official revelation that Stalin was loathsome must have dealt an almost fatal blow to the Communist faith. Since 1918 the deepest source of strength of the world Communist movement has been the quasi-religious fanaticism of the believers in the gospel according to Marx, Lenin, and Stalin. Without sacrilege, it is possible to ask what would have been the disillusionment of the early Christians if a church council, 38 years years after the Crucifixion, had proved that St. Peter was a brutal criminal and that St. John was a torturer.

I have known something about Russians since 1914 when I was in Moscow at the outbreak of the first World War. I cannot imagine that the spirit of the Communist movement will survive unshaken the impact of the official admission of the truth about Stalin. I hope that the spirit of the tiger has received such a blow that he will slink away if we maintain our ring of fire.

I believe that, if we face the Soviet Union with an absolute determination not to cringe or appease or submit, and a happy will to face whatever the Lord God may bestow, be it honor or death, we shall win.

American Prisoners in Red China

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. T. JAMES TUMULTY

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 20, 1956

Mr. TUMULTY. Mr. Speaker, after the stirring speech my distinguished colleague, THOMAS J. DODD, of Connecticut, made here in the House recently on behalf of the American prisoners held by Red China, a crusade has started to rescue these forgotten Americans. In New Jersey intensive activity is taking place under the leadership of the Right Reverend Monsignor Cornelius J. Boyle, an energetic and devoted priest himself. I am sure all of us desire to do our share in ransoming these captives. The following letter and information sent to me by Mr. Allen C. Bradley, who is aiding Monsignor Boyle in this great cause, follows:

THE ADVOCATE,
Newark, N. J., June 29, 1956.

Hon. T. JAMES TUMULTY,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. TUMULTY: A short while ago Mr. THOMAS J. DODD, of Connecticut, made a speech on behalf of the American prisoners still in Red China. In that speech he asked other Members of the House to take up the fight in their own States.

With that thought in mind, I submit to you the enclosed articles. You will notice that something is being done for these Americans. Monsignor Boyle has appointed me to get the campaign under way. I might add at this time that it will be put on an archdiocesan level very soon, with Monsignor Boyle as director.

I was very fortunate to meet and talk to Father Harold Rigney while I was in Dallas, Tex., attending the Catholic press convention. The stories he told made me determined to see that no stone is left unturned until these Americans are set free.

You can feel free to tell the other Members of the House that we in New Jersey have not forgotten these men and are now ready to do something about their freedom.

Thank you very much for your cooperation. If there is any more information that you may need, please call on me. You may use the enclosed articles and this letter for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD if you wish.

With best regards and personal thanks, I remain,

ALLEN C. BRADLEY,
The Advocate.

[From the Newark (N. J.) Advocate of June 16, 1956]

ESSEX COUNTY FEDERATION

A resolution to participate in the Freedom Crusade recently instituted by Rev. Harold Rigney, S. V. D., a recent prisoner of the Chinese Reds, was voted at the June 6 meeting.

Since his arrival home, Father Rigney has urged that American citizens deluge Mao Tse-tung, head of China's Communist government, with polite letters petitioning for release of 13 Americans still held prisoner. Eight of them are priests. Father Rigney suggested that letters be addressed to Chairman Mao Tse-tung, Peiping, China. He also recommended use of a 25-cent airmail stamp since this amount would equal the pay received by a carpenter in Red China for several hours work.

Msgr. Cornelius J. Boyle, spiritual director, announced this week that he would send letters to the parish organizations outlining the plan and urging cooperation of all members. He said he hoped the result would amount to many thousands of China-bound letters.

[From the Newark (N. J.) Advocate of June 30, 1956]

AMERICANS HELD IN RED CHINA

EDITOR: On September 10, 1955, Communist leader Mao Tse-tung promised release of all 13 Americans imprisoned in China.

Father Harold W. Rigney, a recently released China missionary, proposes a startlingly logical proposal which I heartily endorse.

Father Rigney urges a compaign of letter writing to Chairman Tao Tse-tung, Peking, China, advising him that you are a citizen of the United States of America, and the nature of your employment, who is greatly disturbed by the continued imprisonment of 13 Americans in China whom he, Mao Tse-tung, on September 10, 1955, promised to release.

The approximate pay for 1 day of a Chinese carpenter is 25 cents, therefore airmail postage costing 25 cents would be the most effective.

Communism is amazingly sensitive to public opinion, therefore positive action as suggested by Father Rigney is necessary.

Please remember these men in your prayers.

RT. REV. MSGR. CORNELIUS J. BOYLE,
Spiritual Director, Essex County Holy Name Federation, Newark.

Federal Aid to Classroom Construction

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH W. GWINN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 2, 1956

Mr. GWINN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following memorandum:

Federal aid to classroom construction; a memorandum for the Members, dealing with the Kelley bill and the proposed amendment based upon the Scrivner plan of Federal aid, prepared by RALPH GWINN, dated July 2, 1956

State	Kelley bill States will pay in	Kelley bill States will get back	Income tax collections fiscal 1954	Under Scrivner plan a sum equal to 1 percent of tax collections will be returned to the States
Alabama	$2,172,000	$8,968,658	$365,904,000	$3,359,010
Arizona	928,000	2,537,686	153,119,000	1,531,190
Arkansas	904,000	5,313,957	148,110,000	1,481,100
California	30,480,000	27,545,819	4,671,633,000	46,716,330
Colorado	3,588,000	3,611,322	553,265,000	5,532,650
Connecticut	7,364,000	4,782,562	1,168,589,000	11,685,800
Delaware	5,152,000	835,050	869,525,000	8,695,250
Florida	3,868,000	7,623,902	599,990,000	5,999,900
Georgia	4,008,000	10,237,501	581,573,000	5,815,730
Idaho	612,090	1,691,790	100,902,000	1,009,020
Illinois	32,912,000	20,247,262	4,926,633,000	49,266,330
Indiana	9,148,000	10,226,657	1,205,079,000	12,050,790
Iowa	3,020,000	6,420,128	494,575,000	4,945,750
Kansas	2,876,000	4,750,027	437,870,000	4,378,700
Kentucky	7,600,000	8,317,970	441,333,000	4,413,330
Louisiana	3,096,000	8,090,229	459,357,000	4,593,570
Maine	976,000	2,244,876	159,030,000	1,590,300
Maryland [1]	[1] 10,904,000	[1] 16,202,148	851,777,000	8,517,770
Massachusetts	10,876,000	10,573,691	1,708,884,000	17,088,840
Michigan	34,844,000	17,058,887	4,857,146,000	48,571,460
Minnesota	6,064,000	7,699,816	917,255,000	9,172,550
Mississippi	800,000	6,506,886	129,336,000	1,293,360
Missouri	10,128,000	9,174,710	1,472,722,000	14,727,220
Montana	668,000	1,594,187	109,285,000	1,092,850
Nebraska	2,340,000	3,220,909	320,620,000	3,206,200
Nevada	484,000	466,327	70,308,000	703,080
New Hampshire	712,000	1,279,688	118,150,000	1,181,500
New Jersey	11,776,000	11,343,672	1,745,232,000	17,452,320
New Mexico	$808,000	$2,320,790	$99,351,000	$993,510
New York	74,996,000	32,794,708	11,626,091,000	116,260,910
North Carolina	8,824,000	12,178,549	673,436,000	6,734,360
North Dakota	364,000	1,724,325	60,929,000	609,290
Ohio	26,936,000	20,236,416	4,147,301,000	41,473,010
Oklahoma	3,576,000	5,715,215	504,416,000	5,044,160
Oregon	2,444,000	3,893,287	403,821,000	4,038,210
Pennsylvania	30,448,000	25,105,737	4,531,795,000	45,317,950
Rhode Island	1,696,000	1,778,549	271,663,000	2,716,630
South Carolina	1,444,000	7,005,748	239,806,000	2,398,060
South Dakota	408,000	1,724,325	67,056,000	670,560
Tennessee	2,916,000	9,174,710	463,856,000	4,638,560
Texas	12,480,000	21,982,431	1,969,318,000	19,693,180
Utah	1,696,000	2,168,962	135,924,000	1,359,240
Vermont	432,000	965,188	70,790,000	707,900
Virginia	6,156,000	9,207,244	641,430,000	6,414,300
Washington	4,736,000	6,355,059	711,456,000	7,114,560
West Virginia	1,676,000	5,747,750	270,198,000	2,701,980
Wisconsin	7,428,000	8,740,918	1,121,973,000	11,219,730
Wyoming	324,000	780,826	51,764,000	517,640
Hawaii	776,000	1,409,825	126,170,000	1,261,700
Possessions		422,000		
Alaska			45,843,000	458,430
District of Columbia			707,455,000	7,074,550
Puerto Rico			(9,571,000)	(95,710)
Total	398,664,000	400,000,000	58,578,533,000	585,785,330

[1] Figures for Maryland include those for District of Columbia and Puerto Rico.

NOTE.—Income tax includes collections for old-age insurance. Actual benefits would be somewhat less than shown in Scrivner plan after adjustment for that factor, an average of 7.2 percent.

Increasing Rates of, and Liberalizing the Basis for Payment of, Non-Service-Connected Pension and Service-Connected Compensation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN E. HENDERSON
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 27, 1956

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Speaker, some months ago a veteran from Zanesville wrote to me on the subject of the forgotten man, pointing out in great detail that the veteran of World War I had not been afforded the consideration from his Nation that the veterans of other wars had received and are receiving. It was pointed out that the veteran of World War I who had faced the enemy with as grim determination as the veteran of any other war had not received the benefits of a GI bill of rights or adjustment to civilian life such as have been afforded to the veterans of the more recent conflicts. In addition, this letter pointed out that the veterans of World War I have now reached the place in life where a great number of them are no longer employable.

We know, Mr. Speaker, that it is one of the tragedies of our American way of life that when a man has reached an age of 50, or 55, or 60, that it becomes increasingly difficult for him to find suitable employment to meet the necessities of life. Indeed, it is a sad commentary upon America and its tremendous resources and opportunities that those opportunities show themselves less readily to those persons of the advanced years. The problem has become more acute in America because of the fact that we are living longer and that a greater number of our citizens attain advanced age.

It has been the thought of many of the veterans of World War I that some assistance from a grateful Government whom they served so faithfully and well should be forthcoming. In many of the

communities throughout the United States organizations have been established by veterans of World War I to discuss and advocate legislation beneficial to them. There is one such organization in Zanesville, Ohio, which is the largest city in my district, and I have heard from the members of that organization on numerous occasions urging that Congress do something to benefit the veterans of World War I, for they have now reached the point in life which was reached by the veterans of the Civil War and the Spanish-American War for whom congressional action was forthcoming.

Specifically they have asked for consideration of a pension of $100 upon attaining the age of 60. It is pointed out that the average life of the veteran of World War I is now age 62 and that his years of life expectancy are not great. This bill does not go that far, but it is a step in that direction. This bill as amended will provide for a presumption of disability and a non-service-connected pension of $90 for veterans of World War I who have attained age 65. In voting in favor of this legislation I will have voted in behalf of the veterans of World War I, remembering "the forgotten man."

Address by Paul G. Blazer, Chairman of the Board of the Ashland Oil & Refining Co.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARL D. PERKINS
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 25, 1956

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, as an illustration of the economic opportunities of our time, I ask unanimous consent to include in the RECORD the speech of Mr. Paul G. Blazer, chairman of the board of the Ashland Oil & Refining Co.:

My fellow members of Newcomen, speaking for the personnel of Ashland Oil & Refining Co., I take pleasure in expressing our appreciation of the honor conferred on our company on this occasion by the Newcomen Society in North America and the members of the Kentucky committee.

I hope, Mr. Chairman, that my presentation this evening of an account of the organization of a small oil refining company and its growth over a period of years, may interest you and call attention to a method of industrial development which is susceptible of wide application.

The roots of the organization which you are honoring extend back through many mergers and property acquisitions to the earliest days of the oil refining industry. Many personalities have contributed their business philosophies, as well as their energies and skills, to the various business undertakings which have been consolidated into the present Ashland Oil & Refining Co. and its subsidiary companies.

The present parent corporation was formed on October 31, 1936, when Swiss Oil Corp. and its subsidiary, Ashland Refining Co., were consolidated. But that is a comparatively recent date in the histories of the many loyal and proud organizations which have been joined and expanded to comprise the Ashland group of companies.

Swiss Oil Corp., a producer of Kentucky crude oil, was organized here in Lexington by J. Fred Miles in 1918. Mr. Miles, a capable and resourceful oil producer from Oklahoma, who had been attracted by oil discoveries in Kentucky, interested important Chicago and Cleveland capital in his Kentucky ventures and brought prominent Kentuckians into his organization. E. L. McDonald had resigned from his position as counsel of the Louisville Title Co. to take an executive position with Swiss Oil, and Thomas A. Combs, one of the most prominent and highly regarded business leaders of central Kentucky, became president of the company, but Miles, as vice president and general manager, continued for some years as the dominant factor in the company.

Union Gas & Oil Co. had discovered, in extreme eastern Kentucky, a large oilfield which Mr. Miles was most anxious to acquire. Having learned that the owners of that company were interested in getting into the business of oil refining, in order to refine the crude oil produced from their properties, he decided to purchase a suitably located small refinery, hoping thereby to facilitate the acquisition of the important Union Gas & Oil Co. properties. He outlined his plans and made a proposal to me when he learned, in October 1923, that I was planning to resign from my position with Great Southern Refining Co., which had its principal offices in Lexington and operated refineries there and at Pryse, Ky.

I had been thinking along similar lines and had in mind the transportation advantages of 2 small refineries which had been established a few years earlier adjacent to the Ohio River, 1 near Ashland and Catlettsburg, Ky., and 1 at Latonia, Ky. Also I desired a larger ownership participation in a refinery, since I had only a 3-percent interest in the Great Southern Refining Co., which had been organized in 1919 by my school classmate J. E. Shatford, with the financial support of Messrs. Desha Breckinridge, Leonard Cox, George Graves, Charles Manning, Frank Justice, Jim Combs, and other prominent Lexington businessmen.

Backed by funds supplied by Swiss Oil, I arranged to buy, at a price of $212,500, the little 1,000 barrel per day refinery of Great Eastern Refining Co., which had been promoted and built near Ashland by a chemist who previously had been associated with us at Great Southern. Messrs. Jack Dalton and John Kelly, coal operators of Huntington, W. Va., were the owners of the refining company, and John Grossenbach, whose business experience was limited to the coal industry, was the general manager. It was not surprising that the venture of these coal people into oil refining had proved unprofitable and they were glad to sell their refinery, including a small towboat and oil barge.

On February 2, 1924, Messrs. Combs, Miles, McDonald, and I were the incorporators of Ashland Refining Co., with a paid in capital of $250,000. We took over the operation of the refinery which had 25 employees who were working 7 days per week and 12 hours per day. I moved to Ashland. Since Swiss Oil had supplied the capital for the new venture, it is understandable that William Wapples, the only member of the Swiss Oil organization to come to Ashland, was our first treasurer.

Our refinery operations were successful from the very first month. We increased wages and reduced the hours of work. Within a few years, Ashland Refining Co., the small subsidiary formed solely to facilitate the purchase of some oil producing properties, began showing larger earnings than the parent company. Mr. Miles, who had not been active in the operations of Ashland Refining, became so impressed by the financial success of our venture that he left Swiss Oil and acquired personal control of an idle refinery at Louisville.

Each year we increased our refinery capacity, our sales volume, and our financial strength. Our large competitors were frankly puzzled; they continued to predict that we would go bankrupt like most independent refiners.

One afternoon in 1930, I received a telephone call from the owner of the Tri-State Refining Co., which a few years earlier had built a new refinery of modern design across the Big Sandy River at Kenova, W. Va., within sight of our refinery. He and I were close friends and keen competitors. He was inexperienced, however, in the business of oil refining and marketing. He told me that his plant recently had been losing almost $1,000 per day and that he would turn it over to us if we would assume and promptly pay off the accumulated indebtedness which he personally had guaranteed. He named an approximate figure of around $300,000 and we closed the deal over the telephone. I learned later that he had been trying to sell his refinery to one of the larger oil companies.

We operated that plant long enough to return our investment. We might have made it our principal refinery, except that it lacked room for expansion. Within two or three years, we moved its principal operating equipment across the river to our Catlettsburg plant. The purchase of the Tri-State Refinery, with its associated marketing facilities, was our first important expansion by acquisition.

The Ashland and Tri-State refineries received Eastern Kentucky crude oil through the facilities of the Cumberland Pipe Line Co., which, before the dissolution, had been one of the Standard Oil companies. It was a common-carrier line serving at first only refineries of the Standard Oil group, which included the Louisville refinery of Standard Oil of Kentucky, the Parkersburg, West Virginia plant of Standard of New Jersey, and the three refineries of Atlantic Refining Company at Philadelphia, Pittsburgh, and Franklin, Pennsylvania.

Because of our more favorable location in relation to the oil fields of Eastern Kentucky, we could afford to pay a higher price for that oil than our larger competitors. We paid our bills promptly, and each year more of the oil producers had begun selling their oil to us; by 1931, we had become the principal refiner of Eastern Kentucky oil. Also, we were taking practically all of the oil gathered by the 750-mile pipeline system of the Cumberland Pipe Line, which served more than 5,000 small oil wells.

In September 1931, we purchased the Cumberland Pipe Line system. It was the most significant acquisition we ever have made.

The Cumberland Pipe Line Co. owned and operated the Kentucky pipelines of the Southern group of pipeline companies, which had a network of thousands of miles of gathering and trunklines extending from the oil fields of Kentucky, West Virginia, and western Pennsylvania, to the large refineries located along the Delaware River. They were headed by Forrest M. Towl, located at 26 Broadway, in New York City, who as a young engineering graduate from Cornell University, had gone with Mr. Rockefeller in 1885, and had become chief engineer of the original Standard Oil Co. I thoroughly enjoyed my negotiations with Mr. Towl in connection with the purchase of the pipeline properties. He was truly a gentleman of the old school.

To provide a better perspective of the transaction between Ashland Refining and Cumberland Pipe Line Co., it is necessary to point out that the physical properties of Cumberland Pipe Line Co. represented an investment of more than $3 million constructed at a time when building costs were low. The depreciated value of the properties as carried on the books of Cumberland,

at the time of our purchase, was close to a million dollars, which was almost two-thirds as much as Ashland's total net worth. The principal stockholder in Cumberland was the Rockefeller Foundation, which owned approximately 25 percent. The balance of the stock was publicly owned, since it was traded on the New York Curb Exchange. Some of my friends and associates thought we were taking on more than we would be able to handle.

The Kentucky pipelines were reported as showing an operating loss of about $15,000 per month, and Mr. Towl, obviously, wanted to make a sale. We were anxious to buy the properties because ownership would assure our supply of eastern Kentucky crude oil. A purchase price of $420,000 was agreed upon, of which $60,000 was to be in cash and the balance in 4 installments of $90,000 each, payable every 6 months. It was one of the very few times that we have ever paid for properties in installaments. In addition to the pipelines, rights-of-way, pumps, tanks, and buildings, we were to receive such excess oil as might be in the "over and short account." Apparently no one knew—and certainly we didn't—the amount of oil in that account, as it did not show on the books of Cumberland. It turned out to be worth in excess of $100,000.

Within a few weeks, we had put into effect many economies which turned the previous operating loss of Cumberland into a profit of more than $15,000 per month, thereby providing the installment payments as they came due. Our economies did not involve any reductions in wages; Mr. Towl had agreed that Cumberland would take care of any employees we might not require. One girl in our office, with a comptometer, took over the work which was reported to have required much of the time of 15 men at Oil City, Pa., who had been receiving the crude oil runs by telegraph daily from each Kentucky lease and had been computing the number of barrels by hand. That was 25 years ago. Today, a large electronic computer could do the same work in a few minutes each day.

I ask your indulgence for having reminisced at such length concerning the details of the acquisition of our first refineries and of the Cumberland Pipe Line properties. Unquestionably, these transactions determined the future of our company by setting a pattern for the subsequent expansion which, without unusual risk, has enabled our small initial venture to grow into the organization which you of the Newcomen Society, and so many guests, are honoring tonight.

Our favorable purchases and successful operation of properties, which had shown losses for their previous owners, encouraged us to believe there must be many similar opportunities. Much of our expansion occurred during the early thirties when so many recently established companies, such as ours, were thinking in terms of retrenchment. Capital was not readily available; earnings tended to be meager, yet Ashland Refining was looking constantly for profitable expansion, and some of its most important acquisitions came during the depth of the depression.

We were especially interested in finding ventures connected with the refining, transportation, or marketing of oil products, which had failed to meet with success because of unfavorable situations which would be corrected. If they fitted into our overall objectives and we thought we could convert them into profitable operations, we were willing to invest our available funds, even though we knew there would be problems of the kind most people would prefer to avoid. In more recent years, however, our most favorable mergers and acquisitions have been facilitated by tax considerations or other personal reasons of the owners.

Ours is a highly competitive, rapidly growing industry which calls for constantly increasing capital expenditures. It is not surprising that the individual owners of some of the most successful independent oil companies have been unwilling to continue to reinvest all of their earnings, and frequently increase their indebtedness, in order to provide the new facilities required by an industry which becomes more technical and more complicated each year. Often a tax-free exchange of the stock of their privately-owned company for the stock of our publicly-owned company has offered them a satisfactory solution.

In a few instances we have taken over businesses which otherwise might have been obliged to liquidate. Occasionally, we have paid relatively high prices for properties which had a special value to us. We have not hesitated, on occasion, to purchase obsolete manufacturing equipment in order to acquire the associated sales volume. It is much easier to construct new equipment than to build sales. We have greatly expanded and modernized the most of the operations we have acquired. In fact, we have spent $41,500,000 for improvements to the plans and facilities we have purchased from other companies. Usually we have been able to help earnings by increasing production without increasing the number of employees. Almost invariably we have been able to raise wages.

Each of the many companies in the Ashland group has contributed not only physical properties, business experience, customer relations, and financial strength, but collectively they have developed a corporate personality which is as truly the composite of all its forebears as is the personality of a person the product of his heredity and environment. Of course, every business organization has its own distinctive personality; few corporations, however, so comparatively young as ours, have been privileged to draw upon the resources of so many predecessors and profit from such a remarkable business heritage.

The name of "Ashland" was adopted in 1936 for the new parent corporation because Ashland Refining Co., through its refining and marketing operations over a period of 12 years, had become better known than its parent, Swiss Oil; and the officers of Ashland, upon the death of Senator Thomas A. Combs, president of Swiss, had been elected to the management of that company. The original officers of Ashland Refining have provided, for the past 32 years, much of the management of the operations of the Ashland group of companies.

Looking through the roster of people who have contributed importantly to the success of the Ashland group, we find among them those who were associated with Swiss Oil, Union Gas & Oil, Great Southern Pipe Line, Great Eastern Refining, Tri-State Refining, Cumberland Pipe Line, Minamax Oil, Western Reserve Refining, Allied Oil, Central Pipe Line, Canton Refining, Cleveland Tankers, Lakeland Tankers, Aetna Oil, Freedom Oil, Valvoline Oil, Galena, Frontier Oil, National Refining, and many others.

Valvoline, Freedom, and Galena date back to the earliest days of the oil industry, when crude oil was refined to make lubricants and coal oil—25 years before the gasoline engine. Those names and their supporting organizations have retained their identities through the years, and now are an important part of the Ashland group. National Refining was a lusty, strong, independent oil company before the turn of the century. Their White Rose and Enarco brands were known to thousands. Cumberland began laying, in 1902, its pipelines, which continue to serve the oil fields of eastern Kentucky.

The Aetna Refinery was one of the first in Kentucky and was operating successfully when Swiss was organized to drill for oil, in 1918. Great Southern, which provided the initial refining experience for the management of Ashland Oil, built the first independent pipeline into Lee County, giving competition to the older, Standard Oil affiliated, Cumberland Pipe Line. Great Southern supplied crude oil to dozens of independent refiners, including 5 plants which now, more than 30 years later, are in the Ashland group.

Swiss Oil furnished the financing and was responsible for the organization of Ashland Refining in 1924, acquiring, in 1925, Union Gas & Oil, which then was the most important producer of Kentucky crude oil. Meantime, Ashland Refining had purchased the refinery and towboat and barge of Great Eastern Refining Co. as well as the associated marketing properties of Minamax. Tri-State Refining Co. then was building a competing refinery at Kenova, W. Va., to be followed by a river terminal at Covington, Ky., near Cincinnati, and then by their purchase of the extensive West Virginia marketing properties of Hi-Grade Oil & Gas Co. That same year, Allied Oil was organized in Cleveland to market fuel oil to the steel companies, receiving much of its supply from Ashland Refining. Allied was responsible for the organization of Cleveland Tankers, Lakeland Tankers, Canton Refining, and Central Pipe Line. Shortly thereafter, Frontier entered the scene as a fuel oil marketer in Buffalo, and later built a successful refinery.

Ashland built its first modern towboat and barges in 1936, and soon augmented its crude oil supply with purchases of oil from the Illinois Pipe Line at Owensboro, Ky., making its first movement of crude oil by water. Later, the extensive western Kentucky gathering system of the Illinois Pipe Line Co. was purchased by Ashland and combined into a joint operation with the Fordsville gathering system of another company, thereby further increasing Ashland's crude oil supply. In 1945, Ashland purchased from a major oil company more than 400 producing wells in Lee County, Ky., along with the affiliated refinery at Pryse and pipeline system formerly owned by Great Southern. Thus, those properties and the management of Ashland Oil became associated again after more than 20 years' separation. This acquisition permitted the consolidation of the Cumberland and Great Southern pipelines, which for so many years, had duplicated service to the same oil fields, their lines often lying only a few inches apart in the same creek bottom.

The merger into Ashland Oil in 1948, of Allied Oil and its affiliated companies added 50 percent to the size of the Ashland group. Ashland thereby secured a foothold on the Great Lakes, to be further strengthened by the important merger, in 1950, with Frontier Oil Refining Corp. at Buffalo. The Frontier acquisition included a well-located small refinery, a number of valuable gasoline service stations, 12,000 domestic heating oil customers, and an extensive industrial fuel oil business. A few months later, Ashland purchased the Findlay, Ohio, refinery of the National Refining Co. and gained, also, another fine sales organization. The linking of that plant by pipeline with the terminal at Toledo, acquired through Allied Oil, and thence by pipeline with a new terminal constructed at Detroit, put Ashland products into those great industrial areas.

Ashland also was strengthening its position in Kentucky by merging with Aetna Oil, thereby acquiring a refinery at Louisville and extensive marketing facilities in central and western Kentucky and along the lower Ohio River. About the same time, Freedom-Valvoline Oil Co. came into the Ashland family, giving the group a national advertised brand name—Valvoline—known throughout the world; and with a refinery equipped to manufacture premium quality motor oils and lubricants. Valvoline, which this year is celebrating its 90th birthday, is reported to be

the oldest trade name in the oil industry. It was awarded the gold medal for lubrication at the Paris Exposition, in 1875.

Kellogg petroleum products, a more recent acquisition, obtained through an exchange of stock, added more than 100 service station outlets in Buffalo and vicinity, and 5,000 fuel-oil customers—also, a fine sales organization to support the frontier refinery. Scores of other local marketing operations have been added to provide better distribution of our refined products in our principal marketing area, extending from Tennessee on the south to Wisconsin and Michigan on the north, and from Illinois to western Pennsylvania and New York State. Similarly, acquisition of important crude-oil-producing properties, in Texas, Louisiana, Oklahoma, Montana, and the Illinois Basin, added to our crude-oil supply.

Almost every month additional properties or companies are acquired by the Ashland group. Although the most of these additions are comparatively small, yet their acquisition is of vital importance, of course, to the personnel associated with the properties, and every acquisition makes it distinctive contribution; otherwise, there would be no justification for the addition, since increased size, alone, has no merit.

There are many problems inherent in the methods of expansion which we have used so extensively. Questions pertaining to personnel must be put at the top of the list. We consider the morale of an organization the most important single factor contributing to business success or failure. The feeling of personal insecurity, often associated with mergers, must be overcome. It must be replaced with the confidence that there will be greater opportunities and that every employee will be advanced without favoritism. Mergers must not result in stepchildren.

Every organization has in it much that is good and desirable, but each organization also has its weaknesses and peculiarities. A merger of two companies is far more than a financial transaction. Sometimes there are financial complications, but financial problems, because of their very nature, have a common denominator; in the case of our company their solution always has been simple, as compared with problems pertaining to people. Unquestionably, problems pertaining to personnel require more careful attention when large cohesive groups of people are added through mergers than when organizations expand through the selection and employment of individuals such as is characteristic of the usual industrial growth.

Mergers frequently require the reconciling of different philosophies of business. Planning and patience are necessary in order to avoid inequities to individuals and to protect personal pride. It is not easy to bring two groups of people, who have been trained differently, into a smoothly functioning team under a consolidated leadership. The acceptance of a certain amount of entrenched inefficiency may be necessary; likewise new talent must be recognized and rewarded. A period of months may be required in which to relocate people into positions where their abilities may be better utilized and their shortcomings minimized.

In connection with every merger or important acquisition there usually will be differing policies as regards employee relations, wage scales, pensions, insurance, retirement, the selection and training of supervisors, delegation of authority, the type of executive organization, communications between individuals and departments, and dozens of varying customs which can become a source of dissatisfaction. All of these, and many other factors, some of which are quite intangible, directly influence the morale of an organization.

A critical analysis of the basic business policies and philosophies of the Ashland group of companies, which I believe is appropriate for this occasion, is difficult for me to present, since I have been so closely associated with their development.

To provide a more objective appraisal, I shall take the liberty of quoting excerpts from a dissertation submitted by Joseph L. Massie to the faculty of the School of Business of the University of Chicago, in connection with his candidacy for the degree of doctor of philosophy. The subject of his thesis was Management of a Growing Company: Ashland Oil & Refining Co.

Dr. Massie, a student of business management, who formerly taught that subject at the University of Kentucky, and now is assistant professor of business administration at the University of Chicago, spent the greater part of 3 years studying the history and management of our group of companies. The records of the company since the organization of Swiss Oil and Ashland Refining, including personal correspondence and my hundreds of reports to the directors over a period of more than 30 years, came under his careful scrutiny. He interviewed scores of people, including our competitors.

Under the heading of Objectives of the Management, Dr. Massie states:

"Survival was the primary objective of the management in the early period. Although large profits were made in the first few years, the management refrained from expanding at too great a rate. The conservative credit policy, the retention of earnings, and the continued use of relatively old equipment were reactions of the Blazer management to the earlier policy of the Swiss Oil Corp. Probably Blazer reasoned that first he must build security within the structure of the Ashland Refining Co. His early success in the development of a good credit rating for the subsidiary and the ability of the subsidiary to obtain funds on its own credit, illustrate the result of this drive for security first.

"After survival seemed assured, the primary objective changed to gaining greater security of the company's competitive position. In this connection growth became important. While growth itself never appeared to be an objective, numerous comments pertained to expansion as a means of 'insurance' * * *; in the later years he appeared to fear that the company might become too large.

"A third objective of the management related to management's responsibility to employees and to the public. The development of the Ashland family illustrates a means by which the management sought to gain its goal. Location of the firm in a small community caused the management to identify its goals with those of the locality. This objective which involved treating each employee on a personal basis, had definite effects upon techniques of management.

"The family goal of the management established an atmosphere that permitted the development of strong informal organizations. While these spontaneous groups often were evident only upon close study of the operations, they formed a most important aspect of the total organizational picture.

"This objective extended to all those with whom contacts were made, e. g., the community, business suppliers, and customers, etc. The chief executive felt that good public relations could best be achieved by every operating employee without formalization of functions. As a result, no executive held the title of public relations specialist. It was felt that an atmosphere of informal action rather than formal planning would result in more sincere, and therefore more effective, public relations.

"As the company became larger the management initiated several actions in an effor to maintain high morale by means of the family concept. In line with the theory held by the chief executive that it would be advantageous for the employees to own the stock of their company, the company offered several stock purchase plans to employees, beginning in 1938. A type of profit-sharing plan was initiated in 1947 in which 'employee dividends' were paid quarterly to employees and declared by the board of directors in the same manner that the board declared dividends on stock.

"A fourth objective of the management was to promote competition in the industry through positive actions. Although the chief executive managed a small company, which was the type that the Government sought to help, he consistently fought efforts to freeze a formal pattern by regulation of the industry. This attitude first became clear during the days of the NRA codes in the 1930's when Blazer was an important industry leader on Government committees. This experience with Government administration had a lasting effect upon his ideas of management. Many of the formal techniques employed in government did not fit administrative experiences in the small company. In December 1933 he first indicated his thinking to the board of directors: 'Our company * * * has less to gain and more to fear than others from this regimentation of the industry.' It was his belief that Ashland's advantages were based upon a unique group of factors which would be neutralized in any governmental effort to 'stabilize' or 'regulate' the industry; a small growing company should not seek to freeze a pattern in which it has a small share.

"Throughout the 30-year period, Blazer took and aggressive part in the fight of the independents against the majors; yet he preferred to emphasize direct competitive means rather than appeals to Congress or to the courts. In fact Blazer gave testimony before congressional committees which had the effect of supporting the interests of the major companies. Several times this action was taken to show the majors the importance of the support of independents—a part of the larger picture of bargainging power with the larger companies. Such moral suasion to get an even break from the large companies, e. g., through admittance into pipelines, through exchanges of gasoline, etc., were in Blazer's opinion much more effective than appeals to legislative or judicial power.

"Underlying the concepts of management which evolved in this company, the idea of flexibility has been pervasive and fundamental. The emphasis that the Chief Executive placed upon this single idea was fundamental to most of his managerial techniques. Flexibility in this context refers to the quality of adaptability to external changes, susceptibility to modification of actions, resiliency of policies, and responsiveness of the entire organization to meet new problems; it is the antonym of rigidity, unchangeability, inflexibility, and inelasticity.

"The recognition of this concept of flexibility is by no means new; many writers have referred to certain aspects of the idea. None, however, appear to have placed as great an emphasis upon its application to a growing firm as did the chief executive of the Ashland Oil & Refining Co.

"A major part of the concepts of management that proved useful to this management can be classified under 5 distinct types of flexibility: (1) technological flexibility, (2) marketing flexibility, (3) financial flexibility, (4) personnel flexibility, and (5) organizational flexibility."

In his comments on personnel flexibility, Dr. Massie states:

"A fourth aspect of flexibility relates to dependence upon executives who are 'generalists' in lieu of specialists. Blazer felt that this phase of flexibility resulted in high morale and good cooperation and was, therefore, essential to other aspects of his philos-

ophy. He outlined this idea in a commencement speech, in 1950:

"'The demand for trained men to fill the best jobs in large companies exceeds the supply. There are more vacancies near the top than down the line. I don't know why that should be, unless it is because large business is inclined to make specialists out of its key people, thereby precluding breadth of experience. Possibly a contributing factor is the necessity for the various levels of authority in big business to make decisions and assume responsibility for those under them. Or it may be because so much emphasis has been placed on technical training and not enough on those qualities which make for leadership. In that connection, we must never forget that essentially we shall always live in a world of people—rather than in a world of things. Others can do for us more than we can do for ourselves.'"

I am most appreciative of Dr. Massie's permission to quote so extensively from his analysis of the objectives of our company and of his appraisal of the philosophies of our management—particularly as regards our attitudes and relations with employees, with the United States Government, and with the public.

These fields of human relations are deserving of, and are receiving, greatly increased attention from all corporate managements. As a company grows, the complexity and the importance of these relationships increase. In an expanding industry, however, continued corporate growth, and skill in the solution of related problems appear to be necessary for competitive survival. The degree of success of management in meeting these interesting challenges appears to me to be of even greater significance than the growth of the business.

As Ashland Oil has continued to grow, so we have struggled to retain the informal, friendly organization of a small company. We have endeavored to inject into our relations with the public, our employees, customers, and stockholders, what I like to think of as a small-town, large-family attitude. That becomes increasingly difficult now that we are owned by 30,000 stockholders, and operate in hundreds of communities through a number of thousand employees, with sales of $250 million per year.

We hope, however, that we have engendered throughout our entire organization a loyal, friendly, cooperative spirit, which will leave its imprint for many years. If we have accomplished that, we need have no fears concerning the future.

Tribute to Representative Clifford R. Hope

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES B. HOEVEN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 2, 1956

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, Clinton Davidson, author of This Week in Washington, has paid a fine tribute to our colleague, Representative CLIFFORD R. HOPE, who is soon to retire from Congress. Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the article as follows:

In a few days Representative CLIFFORD R. HOPE will close his office in Room 1111, New House Office Building, and go home to Garden City, Kans., a retired Congressman.

It will be a voluntary retirement after 30 years in Congress, years in which he has played a leading role in the development of farm legislation. Few men have served in Congress with greater distinction, or more unselfish devotion to the cause of agriculture.

CLIFF, as almost everyone knows him, has been more than an outstanding legislator. He is one of the finest men, in every sense, that we have known in more than 25 years in Washington.

CLIFF is listed as a Republican, but he always has placed the interest of agriculture above that of the party. In the past 4 years, 2 of which he served as chairman of the House Agriculture Committee, he has differed frequently and sharply with the farm policies of Agricultural Secretary Ezra Taft Benson.

No farmer or representative of farmers has ever been turned away from CLIFF'S office. He has made hundreds of speeches to farm groups in every part of the Nation. Few men in Congress, if any, have a more sympathetic understanding of farmers and farm problems than CLIFF HOPE.

He very probably has had a major part in the writing of more farm legislation than any other man who ever served in Congress. His knowledge of an interest in agriculture includes every phase of it in every part of the country.

He is a quiet, thoughtful man who seldom loses his temper. His reputation for fairness has won and held the friendship and respect of both Republicans and Democrats in Congress, as well as that of farm spokesmen who appear before the Agriculture Committee.

CLIFF came to Congress from the Fifth District of Kansas in 1926, and was one of the few Republicans to survive the 1932 Roosevelt landslide. He became a member of the House Agriculture Committee his first term in Washington, and the ranking minority member in 1933. He served as chairman in 1949 and 1950, and again in 1953 and 1954.

One day last month a portrait of CLIFF HOPE was unveiled to hang permanently in the House Agriculture Committee hearing room, one of the four great farm representatives so honored in over 150 years. Chairman HAROLD COOLEY, a North Carolina Democrat, in paying tribute to CLIFF, said:

"No man in either House of Congress has made a greater contribution to the farmers of America than CLIFF HOPE. His life has been a blessing and a benediction not only to farmers but to all people of this great country."

The Fallbrook Case

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES B. UTT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 2, 1956

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I wish to include the following article which appeared in the June 1956 issue of Western Water News. Mr. Phil D. Swing, who wrote the report which the article summarizes, is a former Member of Congress from southern California:

THE FALLBROOK CASE—ANALYSIS OF APPELLATE COURT REVERSAL OF YANKWICH DECISION

In view of the continuing interest in the Fallbrook case and the fundamentals of Federal-State relations which were brought into focus by the recent decision of the United States circuit court of appeals, a summary of the decision is presented in this issue of Western Water News. The summary comes from a report which was made to the directors of the Fallbrook Public Utility District by their attorney, Phil D. Swing, who participated in the case as a friend of the court.

BACKGROUND OF THE CASE

Early in 1951, the United States Government filed a complaint against the Fallbrook Public Utility District, the Santa Margarita Mutual Water Co., the Pratt Mutual Water Co., and some 3,000 individual farmers in the Fallbrook area. The Government accused the water users of taking water from the Santa Margarita River in direct violation of the rights of the United States of America as it was involved in the marine base development at Camp Pendleton in San Diego County.

BROAD INTEREST IN THE CASE

The first case to come to trial before United States Judge Leon Yankwich was against the Santa Margarita Mutual Water Co. On July 1, 1953, after a protracted trial, Judge Yankwich decided in favor of the Government and the case was appealed to the Ninth United States Circuit Court. The Attorney General of California, Edmund G. Brown, entered the case and actively participated. The Santa Margarita Mutual Water Co. was represented by William B. Dennis.

The Yankwich decision was reversed by the appeal court, and the case has been remanded to the United States District Court in Los Angeles. Possibility of appeal to the United States Supreme Court by the Federal Government has been recognized, but no definite decision has been made as to disposition of the case. No disposition has been made of the cases against the Fallbrook Public Utility District and the several thousand farmers.

POSITION UPHELD

In summarizing the case, counsel Swing said that: "An analysis of the formal opinion of the court shows that the position and contentions of Fallbrook have been fully upheld and sustained. This can be said without in anywise minimizing the credit due the attorney general and the attorneys for the State division of water resources for the splendid briefs prepared and filed by them in the case."

Enumerating the points brought out in the decision of the court of appeals, Swing reported to the Board: "'The admitted 'sovereignty' of the United States over the lands within Camp Pendleton, did not give the Federal Government any greater rights against upper riparians and appropriators to the waters of the Santa Margarita River than a private landowner would have had. The exclusive jurisdiction of the United States stopped at the boundary lines of Camp Pendleton and while after it got the 'physical possession of the corpus of the water' it could then use it for whatever purposes and wherever on Camp Pendleton it chose, this was not evidence ever of enforcible 'property rights in the flow against upper riparians and appropriators.'

"The judgment was reversed because it declared there was no surplus water subject to appropriation. The opinion declared that the trial court's findings, that there was no surplus water, 'are not well founded in the present record'."

PROCEDURE ABUSED DISCRETION

Swing reported that the decision held back to the end its most conclusive reason for reversing the judgment, to wit: separate trials of separate defendants. Fallbrook had from the very beginning protested this method of trial but the Government's attorneys insisted upon it. Now the appellate court declares that procedure was unwarranted and constituted an abuse of discretion.

The decision said: "The only proper method of adjudicating the rights on a stream, whether riparian or appropriative or mixed, is to have all owners of lands on the watershed and all appropriators who use water from the stream involved in another watershed in court at the same time.

"The trial court violated this principle by issuing a declaratory judgment as to the right of the United States as against one claimant whose rights were junior, which had the effect of preventing a trial of the other water rights involved without giving a hearing as to the individual owners."

MILITARY NECESSARY VERSUS CITIZENS' RIGHTS

In analyzing the decision, Swing said: "The judgment was reversed because it recognized and approved military uses out of the watershed as a substitute use for the Government's riparian water right.

"The appellate court said: 'The Government brief blares out like a trumpet the military necessity in the use of Pendleton against the aggressors. It was on the postulate that the United States of America could utilize water in the State of California successfully to wage war that the case was tried. This reasoning seems to have had effect on the findings of the trial court.'

" 'The theory of the Government agents seems to be that, if a military post be established upon the mouth of a stream and the State voluntarily cedes sovereignty of the area, on the ground of military purposes and future military necessities, the Government obtains the right to use all of the water which in the state of nature flowed there.

" 'The steady beating of the war drums in the Government's brief by references to military necessity tends to deflect full consideration from the property rights of ordinary citizens'."

SANTA MARGARITA'S RIGHTS

Swing reported that "the rights of the Santa Margarita Mutual Water Co. were lightly considered by the appellate court. The decision in discussing the rights of Santa Margareta Mutual Water Co. said:

" 'The trial court found that Santa Margarita had not made any diversion and the State had issued no permits for diversion or storage. In other words, here was a paper application.

" 'If the partial judgment in this case had only gone to the extent of declaring under the laws of California one who has filed an application for appropriation of water, which had not been acted upon by the State authorities and under which no diversion had been made, acquired no privileges which should conflict with the vested real property rights of riparian owners and established appropriators, no appeal would probably have been taken.'

" 'The Government apparently desired to try Santa Margarita because it was obviously in the weakest position of any prospective user on the stream'."

Labor Racketeering

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 2, 1956

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, the Daily Mirror last Friday finished an exposé on labor racketeering written by that crusading reporter, Victor Riesel, who was blinded a short time ago because of his previous exposés of labor racketeering.

Mr. Riesel has submitted shocking evidence that mobsters, hoodlums, and cheap labor racketeers have:

First, interfered with our national security "by withholding workers from employers whose projects were racing for deadlines set by contracts with the Federal Government." Some of these contracts pertained to our atomic energy research program.

Second, compelled businessmen who wanted to bid on Government contracts to first consult certain union officials to determine the take of these crooked union officials on the contract. If one dared to bid on a Government contract without the union bosses' permission he would be forced out of business.

Third, threatened and bribed public officials, judges, and prosecutors.

Fourth, murdered at least 200 other union officials throughout the United States who dared to interfere with their rackets.

Fifth, created a super second government run by an army of thugs operating under the laws of the underworld.

Mr. Riesel's daily column in the Daily Mirror has for years blazed away at labor racketeers. Until the foul acid attack on him he felt himself immune because of his status as a reporter. He pathetically stated this observation in his exposé:

It is bitter to realize that all the glare into the snakepit did not move the public.

He concluded by challenging the Congress of the United States to take proper action. Speaking of congressional probes, he says:

There must be congressional probes. Otherwise the ball falls between two outfielders. The Government finds that it can't handle clever criminals on any charges except income-tax evasion. So, some of the worst hoods get away with sentences as short as 8 months on tax raps. There just are no laws to deal with the subtleties of the crime cartel and to jug men like Frank Costello.

Mr. Riesel also told the millions of Mirror readers that previous congressional probes have been allowed to die when they hit pay dirt. Referring to our own 84th Congress, he made this blistering accusation:

Why, after Illinois Senator PAUL DOUGLAS found a score of union officials using welfare and pension funds as their own money, was his investigation permitted to die?

Mr. Speaker, it is my considered opinion, and I have spent a restless weekend thinking about this matter, that we cannot let this defiance of law and order to go unchallenged. We cannot permit a second government within the United States. Congress, and only Congress, has the power to write the laws that would put an end to this sort of racketeering.

I am reminded, Mr. Speaker, that the union officials involved are only a small fragment of the large body of union leaders who have battled, and continue to battle, the crooks, that the millions of men and women of organized labor are pleading with us that we drive the crooks and hoods out of their unions.

Without the power of the Government many union officials have risked their lives to clean their own houses. Most outstanding are:

First. Samuel Gompers, the father of the labor movement himself.

Second. George Meany, president of the AFL–CIO.

Third. Walter and Victor Reuther, of the Automobile Workers Union.

Fourth. Mr. Alex Rose, president of the Hatters Union.

Fifth. Mr. David Dubinsky, president of the International Ladies Garment Workers Union.

Sixth. Mr. Joe Curran, president, National Maritime Union.

Seventh. Mr. Jacob Potofsky, president of the Amalgamated Clothing Workers Union.

Eighth. Mr. Paul Hall of the Seafarers International Union.

Ninth. Mr. Luigi Antonini, vice president of the International Ladies Garment Workers Union.

Tenth. Mr. Edward Mollisani, member, general executive board of the International Ladies Garment Workers Union.

Eleventh. Mr. August Bellanca, vice president, Amalgamated Clothing Workers Union of America.

There are many other unsung heroes in the labor movement who are daily battling the crooks.

Mr. Speaker, I am this day introducing a resolution calling for a full-scale investigation of labor racketeering and all other interference with the proper conduct of labor unions; that this investigation be made by a select committee of the House who are after all the true representatives of the people; and that this committee have all the necessary powers to subpena and the right to call on any agency of our Federal Government to assist in this investigation.

Let us have a complete and full study. Let us call on Victor Riesel and the public to present such facts as they have at their disposal. Let us call on the honest labor leaders with a record of defying the hoods to present their suggestions.

In the end we should be able to write legislation that would clean up the labor movement and keep it clean.

Crimes of the Communist Conspiracy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. DODD
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 2, 1956

Mr. DODD. Mr. Speaker, for many years leaders in the United States and elsewhere in the free world have been charging the Communist conspiracy with a wide range of crimes against humanity. Many of these charges involved crimes which, by their magnitude and cold cruelty, almost defied belief. Eye witnesses to these crimes who later escaped to freedom have added their testimony to support the charges made against the elite class of communism. Still others, who themselves were once Communists, have come forward to add more evidence to a record of crimes against humanity which knows no equal in history.

In our lifetime we have witnessed the rise and fall of the Nazi tyranny with a black record of crimes against humanity which shocked all recent people. Following World War II the criminal leaders of the Nazi conspiracy were brought to

justice in the international war crimes trials at Nuremberg. As executive trial counsel at the trial of the top Nazi leaders, I came to know the details of those terrible crimes. In the many months devoted to the preparation for and trial of those international criminals, we pieced together one of the greatest human tragedies ever to be recorded in the dismal record of man's inhumanity to man.

The 83d Congress created the Select Committee To Investigate Communist Aggression. It was my privilege to serve as a member of that committee. In that capacity, we examined hundreds of witnesses under oath and made a careful examination of thousands of affidavits attesting to the criminal nature of communism and the many crimes committed in its name.

This intensive inquiry lasted for 2 years and was climaxed with the submission to Congress of 27 official reports which have since been universally hailed as among the most authoritative works on the conspiracy of communism available anywhere in the world. But with all this work, which includes voluminous information on some of the most extensive crimes of communism, the job of completely documenting all such crimes and identifying all the persons implicated in them is far from complete. To accomplish this task will require a full-time body, officially authorized and operating under rules and procedures, which will assure the orderly collection and verification of all facts and evidence as well as individuals implicated in the crimes.

The urgency for going ahead with this project is emphasized by one of the speeches of Communist Party Boss Khrushchev at the 20th Congress of the Communist Party in which he charged Stalin with many terrible crimes. Khrushchev by no means included all the crimes against humanity committed by the Communist leaders, but he performed a real service when he testified that Stalin had both directed and participated in crimes of mass violence, genocide, and political murder. But Communist Party Boss Khrushchev neglected to fill in a number of essentials which are important both for the record and for the judgment of all mankind. Here is some idea of what I mean by details:

First. What part did Khrushchev, Bulganin, Molotov, Zhukov, Mikoyan, Kaganovich, Voroshilov, and other Communist leaders play in the decision to carry out these crimes against humanity and the actual carrying out of the Stalin order?

Second. Did not these same leaders of communism praise Stalin for his inhumanities and cloak them with deceptive phrases so as to keep the truth from the people of the world?

Third. What acts of opposition, if any, to these crimes were engaged in by the Communist elite who now attempt to place all the blame for these terrible crimes upon Stalin and Beria?

Fourth. Could Stalin and Beria alone have carried out this long list of crimes? If not, what action has been taken to punish all those who played the cruel game of tyranny with Stalin and Beria?

Besides, Khrushchev neglected to even mention some of the worst crimes committed against humanity during the Stalin reign. Here are but a few of them:

First. The deportation of 100,000 patriots from Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania to Russian Siberia in the course of 48 hours during the tragic days of June 13 to 14, 1941. It is an established fact that General Serov, now chief of Internal Security of the U. S. S. R., issued NKVD Order No. 001223 which set in motion the mass arrests and deportation in the dead of night of these good people. But who were the higher-ups authorizing this action and who were all the people who carried out its evil ends? For example, what part did Molotov, Vishinsky, or Malenkov play in these crimes?

Second. The false arrest and forced deportation to the U. S. S. R. of over 100,000 Hungarians from their homelands in 1945–46, and the studied effort to liquidate all Hungarian leadership, such as that symbolized by Cardinal Mendzestz.

Third. The slaughter in the Polish Home Army of patriots, which occurred when Moscow encouraged these patriots to rise up against the Nazis as the Red Army approached Warsaw, and when the battle was at fever pitch the Red Army halted across the river from Warsaw. What part did Zhukov, as marshal of the Red Army and actual field commander in that area, have in this cruel plot to destroy the Polish Home Army?

Fourth. The manmade famine in the Ukraine during 1932–33 which caused the death by starvation of 5 million Ukrainians at a time when the crops in that country were better than average. Molotov was then first secretary of the Communist Party in Kiev, a position that controls all that happens in Ukraine. Khrushchev was then a party functionary in the Ukraine, and a very zealous one. How could either of these men possibly escape responsibility for this terrible crime against humanity?

Fifth. The calculated plan carried out in Slovakia to destroy all the leadership elements in the population and to replace them with foreign Communists who are engaged in an effort to break the spirit of the Slovak nation which for 1,000 years has struggled against foreign occupation and for national independence. Who are the Communist elite responsible for this crime?

Sixth. The slave-labor system of the Communist empire takes its manpower from every one of the nations under the heel of the Kremlin. Are not the present leaders of communism responsible for the enslavement and death of millions of people by permitting this system to persist?

Seventh. Armed aggression against non-Communist nations, causing death, maiming, and tragedy for millions of innocent people. Korea and Vietnam are the most recent examples of this type of crime against humanity. What part did Zhukov, as the leading military strategist of the Red army, play in mapping out the plans for these ruthless aggressions and for putting them in motion? Thousands of American mothers and fathers, whose sons died or were wounded in the defense of human freedom in these countries are entitled to the answer to this question.

Again, Mr. Speaker, these are but a few of the major crimes committed by the Communist conspirators which should be fully recorded and documented by an international agency.

There is a tendency these days to forget the true nature of communism. The Russians are engaged in an all-out campaign to confuse and dim the memory of free people on the real facts about life under communism. There are dangerous signs of a softening up process among free nations as the illusion of peace is advanced by the Communists. Our basic free world alliance, the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, has shown signs of weakening as the false belief spreads that the danger of another war of aggression by the Communists has passed. Many nations which up until recently have sought a neutral course in world affairs are now drifting into the Communist orbit. These are all danger signs for those who work and pray for peace because they can lead nowhere but to war—under conditions which would be favorable to the Communist conspiracy.

It is for these reasons, Mr. Speaker, that I have introduced in the House today, House Joint Resolution 668, because I feel this resolution represents positive action we can take in the cause of a just and lasting peace.

I include the text of that resolution at this point in my remarks:

House Joint Resolution 668

Joint resolution to urge the creation of an International Juridical Commission within the framework of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization in order to document the crimes against humanity committed by the international Communist conspiracy and to reduce the dangers of world war III

Whereas there is an abundance of evidence now available to support the charge that the leaders of the international Communist movement are guilty of a long list of crimes against humanity; and

Whereas there are many persons in the free world able to give eyewitness testimony to the crimes against humanity committed by the leaders of communism and to identify official documents, directives, records, and other written evidence necessary to support the essential details of such crimes; and

Whereas the orderly collection and safekeeping of such evidence and testimony is essential in order that a just and truthful account of Communist crimes be made a part of history; and

Whereas the leaders of the international Communist movement are now engaged in an intensive campaign to place sole guilt and responsibility for these crimes against humanity upon the deceased Dictator Stalin thus relieving themselves of complicity in such crimes; and

Whereas the effort of the present rulers of the Kremlin to absolve themselves from complicity in a long list of crimes against humanity is aimed at covering the conspiracy of communism with a deceptive cloak of respectability which can only lull free people into a false sense of security, divide the free world alliances, and rapidly increase the danger of world war III;

Whereas the experience gained at the International War Crimes Trials at Nuremberg following World War II demonstrated that the scarcity of authentic records, sworn tes-

timony of eyewitnesses, and other documented evidence made difficult and in some cases impossible the prosecution of persons who were participants in a wide range of crimes against humanity; and

Whereas the North Atlantic Treaty Organization is a grouping of free nations dedicated to the defense of human freedom and the safeguarding of such nations against Communist aggression: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That it is the sense of Congress that the establishment of an International Juridical Commission, within the framework of North Atlantic Treaty Organization, is both necessary and timely in order to document all available evidence on the crimes against humanity committed by the leaders of the international Communist conspiracy; to prevent those individuals implicated in such crimes from purging themselves of guilt by passing all responsibility to former leaders of the conspiracy now deceased; to prevent the conspiracy of communism from cloaking itself with unwarranted respectability and to reduce the dangers of a world war III.

The President and Secretary of State are respectfully urged to take immediate steps to cause the establishment of such an International Juridical Commission within the framework of North Atlantic Treaty Organization.

Bars Up for Out-of-State Students

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM H. NATCHER
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 2, 1956

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith an editorial entitled "Bars Up for Out-of-State Students" which appeared in the June 28, 1956 issue of the Messenger, of Madisonville, Ky.

The editorial is as follows:

BARS UP FOR OUT-OF-STATE STUDENTS

The New York Times, in conducting a survey among 48 State universities, including our own university at Lexington, finds that all of them—under the pressure of ever-growing enrollment—are finding it necessary to make admission of out-of-State students more difficult and more expensive.

The trend in this direction, which educators told the Times investigators isn't due to sectional antipathies, but is the result of a realization that the first duty of a State is to provide an education for its own residents, is gathering speed. Less and less room exists for nonresidents from year to year, so the story goes, and the universities can't see much improvement in this regard ahead.

The usual role to hold nonresidents to a reasonable minimum is to require that they have higher grades than resident students, and that the nonresidents be required to pay a higher tuition rate. Ohio State University, for instance, insists that nonresidents have grades in the upper 10 percent, while most others require that they be in the upper 50 percent.

As for relying on high uition fees to discourage nonresidents, Vermont sets the fastest pace, the study shows. Vermont's tuition for nonresidents is $720 a year, compared with $360 for Vermont, for instance. North Dakota has the lowest out-of-State tuition—$189—with the fee for North Dakotans $129.

On a national average basis, the fee for nonresidents is $413 and for residents $180.

Admissions directors interviewed in the survey predicted that the trend toward limiting nonresidents even more strictly is going to spread instead of narrow, since the enrollment in schools of higher education is growing all the time. At present it is 3 million, a figure which is twice what it was 15 years ago.

By 1970, they predict in a glimpse into the future, it will be up to 6 million.

When 1970 rolls around, unless the States can provide additional facilities, it is forecast that nonresident students on a public campus will be a novelty, as they were many decades ago. That is because no State is going to turn away its own residents to make room for those from other States who want to attend out-of-State schools.

Nor can they be expected to do so.

Excerpts From Addresses Made on the Floor of Congress Relative to Farm Problems by Hon. J. Harry McGregor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. HARRY McGREGOR
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 2, 1956

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, I feel that the people whom I represent in Congress would like to know of my activities and my position on various issues. I recognize that time and space make it impossible to cover all subjects. However, knowing the interest of the farm group in legislation directly affecting them, I would like to review a portion of my activities on this subject.

MAY 4, 1955—CONTROLS AND PRICE SUPPORTS

Mr. Speaker, as one who is sincerely endeavoring to seek a solution to some of our farm difficulties, I took a poll of the 17th Ohio District trying to learn just what our farmers and our people are recommending. The following were the questions and the replies received:

Which is your choice on the farm program relative to price support and crop control?

One hundred percent price support and right crop control. Yes, 8 percent; no, 92 percent.

Flexible price support and medium crop control. Yes, 64 percent; no, 36 percent.

No price support and no crop control. Yes, 30 percent; no, 70 percent.

This clearly demonstrates to me, Mr. Speaker, that my constituents are thoroughly familiar with the fact that the 90 percent parity program has been the cause of tremendous farm surpluses which is now costing us approximately $1 million per day for storage and maintenance services. My farmers are also of the definite opinion they want a minimum of Federal controls and are looking forward to the time when they can live as free citizens without Government interference. If the New Dealers are going to continue to force rigid controls upon the farmers under the guise that they, the farmers desire it, then they should be reasonable and allow all farmers to vote on the referendum. It is unfair that all farmers should be forced to abide by the decision of a referendum vote when all farmers are not given the right and opportunity to voice their views by ballot.

Why not establish a program that will ultimately allow us to get rid of controls, Mr. Speaker, so that the farmers of today will be able to make an honest living and not be dictated to by some bureaucrat who, in many instances, knows nothing about farm problems.

JANUARY 23, 1956—PERMIT ALL FARMERS TO VOTE ON WHEAT REFERENDUM

Mr. Speaker, I think we have become a great Nation because of the many freedoms it is our privilege to enjoy. That freedom has been protected at the ballot box by an expression of the views of the majority. With this thought in mind, I have introduced a bill, H. R. 8697, to permit wheat farmers, including those who plant less than 15 acres of wheat, to vote in any wheat marketing referendum conducted by the Secretary of Agriculture.

The records will show that in Ohio, only 57,000 of nearly 152,000 wheat producers have the right to vote. This certainly is unfair. If this bill is passed, Mr. Speaker, I am sure that we will be carrying on the majority views of the people and that is what we want. Regardless of the "pros" and "cons" of a marketing program, the majority of the people should determine whether it should be in effect or not in effect.

JANUARY 23, 1956—PERMIT FARMERS TO GROW WHAT THEY NEED

Mr. Speaker, I find a great deal of hardship is prevailing among my farm group because of certain portions of an agricultural program which was passed several years ago and is now in effect. Many of my farmers find themselves in a position of not being able to grow enough grain to feed even their livestock and to give them an adequate supply of straw.

I have introduced a bill, H. R. 8698, which will exempt from marketing quotas farmers who raise grain entirely for their own use on their farms either as feed or seed. I feel this legislation will give freedom from a program to that group of farmers who now do not derive benefit. Certainly in this great Republic responsible farmers should have the right to grow the crops that are necessary to sustain their own farms without Federal control or interference.

JANUARY 26, 1956—GIVE RURAL MAIL SERVICE TO ALL

Mr. Speaker, I have introduced a bill, H. R. 8845, which gives authority to the Postmaster General, subject to the postal laws and regulations, the right to extend rural mail routes. This bill, if it becomes a law, would give rural mail delivery, as nearly as practicable, to the entire rural population of the United States.

I previously had introduced a bill similar to this making it mandatory that all be given rural mail service. It has been proven to me, Mr. Speaker, that my previous mandatory bill would not be equitable or workable as in some areas of our country it would be nearly impossible to be in compliance with that mandatory clause.

I am reintroducing the bill and I have been assured by those in control that

everything would be done wherever at all possible to see that the intent of the law be carried out. This legislation, Mr. Speaker, will probably require realinements of routes but when this is done, I feel certain that practically all will have rural mail service to their property, and it will cost our Federal Government only a small amount. After all, Mr. Speaker, we are all citizens and we are entitled to equitable service and treatment regardless of where we live.

JANUARY 30, 1956—M'GREGOR SUPPORTS GASOLINE REFUND TO FARMERS

Mr. Speaker, I am most happy to add my support and vote to H. R. 8780, which relieves farmers from excise taxes in the case of gasoline and special fuels used on the farm for farming purposes. I was most happy when President Eisenhower, in his state-of-the-Union message, insisted that the Congress pass this legislation immediately and bring some semblance of relief to the farmers.

I sincerely hope that the Agriculture Committee will start hearings immediately on the other portions of the President's recommendations to give relief to agriculture groups. I hope that the committee will forget politics and recognize that the farmers need immediate help. I feel certain that this Congress is in accord with most of the President's recommendations to give immediate relief to the agriculture people.

MAKING SURPLUS FOODS AVAILABLE TO WESTERN EUROPE—FEBRUARY 22, 1956

Mr. Speaker, I am most happy to see that President Eisenhower is making our surplus food available to western Europe, which has suffered from blizzards and floods in one of the worst winters in 20 or 30 years. I am particularly pleased with his statement, and I quote:

The United States stands ready to make surpluses of agricultural commodities, which we have in abundance, available for relieving the distress of the people in these areas.

Mr. Speaker, to me this is a great humanitarian deed, and I am one who has always felt that it was ridiculous for us to have surplus food when people in other parts of the world are hungry. I congratulate the President on his immediate action to relieve the distressed.

AGRICULTURAL SURPLUSES—MAY 29, 1956

Mr. Speaker, on January 17, 1956, I introduced H. R. 8549, a bill to prohibit the use of real property owned by the United States for the production of agricultural commodities which are to be disposed of by sale. It seems ridiculous to me that we have had a policy of renting farmland that is owned by our Federal Government to people who, in turn, produce the very crops that are in surplus.

The Federal Government had been following a policy of buying this property, constructing the needed projects and then leasing thousands of acres, in many instances, back to the previous owner who puts the land into production of crops we now consider surplus and for which we are now paying the farmers for not growing. To me this is a silly procedure. After many conferences with the Defense Department, a decision was reached whereby this program could be put on a sound and logical basis simply by a Presidential directive. I am happy to advise the President made a public release, and I quote from that release:

The President today by memorandum requested the heads of all executive departments and agencies to place in effect specified policies designed to limit the leasing of federally owned farmlands for the production of price-supported crops in surplus supply. The President's action was taken to make the leasing of farmlands owned by the Federal Government consistent with the administration's program to reduce price-depressing surpluses and to bring agricultural production into line with markets.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I would like to quote from the President's Executive Memorandum to all executive departments and agencies:

1. Except as provided in paragraphs 2 and 4 hereof, leases of farmlands made by the Federal Government on or after the effective date of this memorandum shall prohibit the cultivation of price-supported crops in surplus supply.

2. In the case of acquisition of farmlands by the Federal Government on or after the effective date of this memorandum, if price-supported crops in surplus supply are growing on such lands at the time of acquisition, the harvesting of such crops may be permitted.

This directive, Mr. Speaker, by the President establishes a policy that is in accord with the administration's program to reduce depressing surpluses and would bring agricultural production into line with market demands. I am highly pleased that this policy, that has been adopted, will accomplish the objective of the bill I introduced, H. R. 8549, and will assure fair and equitable treatment to the farmers that are leasing Government-owned real property for agricultural purposes.

HIGHWAY BILL, 1956, FARM-TO-MARKET ROADS, AND REA

Mr. Speaker, it has been my privilege to be a member of the Public Works Committee ever since I came to Congress. These years of service on that committee has placed me as senior minority member of the Subcommittee of Roads, which position carries with it possible additional responsibilities, as well as privileges. As senior member of the Subcommittee of Roads it was my duty to assume my proportionate share of responsibility for the highway legislation recently passed by this Congress, H. R. 10660. The records will show that I was especially active and took the initiative in provisions that will give additional Federal assistance to the farm-to-market roads. This legislation gives permission to the State highway department and local authorities to use Federal funds on county and township roads. The specifications covering these roads can be drawn by local county engineers, with the approval of the highway department, and need only to meet the requirements of the local communities. This means that Federal highway funds can be used on farm-to-market roads without rigid adherence to Federal specifications which often in the past, because of the exhorbitant cost, have prevented the construction of needed roads in many sections of rural areas.

The record will also show, Mr. Speaker, that I was very active in having a provision included in the new highway bill which grants permission to use Federal funds to pay for the cost of relocating both public and private utility facilities necessitated by construction of highway projects. This means that all utilities, including either storm sewers or sanitary sewers in a village or city, or telephone poles and facilities, including REA, which have to be moved due to the relocation of a roadway, will have proportionate share of that cost borne by the Federal Government. This certainly will mean a great saving to the REA users and small telephone companies which, in the past, have been forced to bear the cost of all relocations when compelled to do so by new road alinements.

Mr. Speaker, the new highway bill has many fine provisions which, in my opinion, will give us a better system of highways, both on farm-to-market, primary, urban and interstate. It is cheaper to drive a car or a truck over a good road than it is over a bad one. We had approximately 38,000 highway fatalities last year and about 110,000 highway accidents. Let us hope and pray that this vast expenditure of money that we are putting into highways will make our travel more pleasant, less expensive, and without accident.

Mr. Speaker, it certainly is my hope that my constituents will keep me advised of their opinions and interests because only by this contact am I, as their Congressman, able to know their views and express them by my actions and votes on the floor of Congress. Their suggestions are always welcome.

Technical Assistance: Instrument of National Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BROOKS HAYS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 2, 1956

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, recently the World Alliance Newsletter published an extract of a speech that I made at the Conference on University Contracts Abroad sponsored by American Council of Education, and under leave to extend my remarks I include my statement as follows:

TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE: INSTRUMENT OF NATIONAL POLICY

(By BROOKS HAYS)

Many of the independent nations of the world cherish their independence, but do not fully appreciate the nature of the East-West conflict. Most of them, I am sure, would recognize in case of armed aggression that they do have a stake in the issue that divides the Communist and the free world.

Without neglecting the importance of a strong military defense, we must share our productiveness with the less favored peoples of the world. Even if we were not thinking in terms of global strategy against communism, we should be busy convincing the

"neutral" third of the world's population that we are gravely concerned with assistance programs that are only remotely related to our own narrow national interests. This involves our ideals. It involves the philosophy upon which we have built our Nation.

UNITED STATES POLITICS AND WORLD PROGRAMS

There are political implications in these world programs. The businessman fears that the cost may be too much, although the U. N. proper, with all organizational activities, takes only 8 cents per year from the United States taxpayer, and when we add the activities of the specialized agencies, the total cost is still only 67 cents per United States citizen per year. Some of our people fear that energies are diverted that could be used at home. It is difficult to establish that in promoting world progress we promote our own self-interest. But it is true, and we must try to be convincing on that point. There are also considerations outside the appeal of our national self-interest. Underneath the surface of mental skepticism is a potential nobility in the heart of the American voter, and he has springs of generosity and intelligence that can be channeled in constructive directions.

U. N. TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE

Some of the most interesting things that were talked over in United Nations meetings this year concerned the U. N. technical assistance programs. One of the expanded technical assistance program's functions is to coordinate the work of such specialized agencies as the World Health Organization, the U. N. Children's Fund, the Food and Agricultural Organization, and the International Postal Union. These multilateral operations are extremely important for the underdeveloped countries. Multilateral programs spread the burden, and other nations are eager to assume some of the responsibilities for them.

Every person recovering from a dread disease through miracle drugs feels grateful to find that some of them were discovered in foreign laboratories. The farmers who are aware of the benefits of research abroad, and of the help in their fight against crop diseases, feel a new sense of internationalism. The interdependence of our modern world is, of course, something that I do not need to labor. But perhaps we talk too much of what we have done for other people and too little of our debt to them. We should impress our own people with the fact of interdependence, and certainly we should avoid every appearance of trying to impose our own culture on other peoples.

There is an impression among those who have not probed deeply the question of political sentiment that we should retreat from responsibilities for leadership in education and health and material progress throughout the world. While we cannot read the Russians' minds or appraise their decisions, it is evident that they are transferring some of their energies away from the military into the economic and propaganda fields. We must not let them out-run us. We must be in there fighting for the kind of bold, effective technical assistance program that convinces the people of the world that we are concerned about living standards, and that the people of the United States want to share our incredible productivity with them. If we move into blighted areas and neglected places with imagination and leadership, we will win in this global struggle with the Communists, and nothing can obstruct us. I fear that if we follow a pinch-penny policy for technical assistance and foreign aid, we may lose this race to those who believe altogether differently about man, about human society, and about the processes of government by which order and justice are sought.

UNITED STATES PUBLIC IS FOR TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE

We are making headway. The technical assistance program is being accepted, and I think it is because of the fine admixture of practical values with our historic ideal of service. Every poll I have seen supports this. Only 6 percent of the college-educated people are opposed; 94 percent are for it. The percentage in favor goes down a little, according to the polls, if specific sums are mentioned. They always look too big, whatever the figure, but the principle is embedded in the thinking of the American people, and even in the group of the lowest educational level—the grammar school level—50 percent know about technical assistance and are generally for it.

The technical assistance program should not be greatly affected by changes in the administration or control of Congress. We must have the total resources of both parties to prevail in this great human service. There is too much suffering abroad, and there are too many expectations of us, to leave unutilized our tremendous moral and intellectual resources.

Address of Dr. Ezequiel Padilla of Mexico

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 2, 1956

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, several weeks ago Dr. Ezequiel Padilla, the former Minister of Foreign Affairs of Mexico, delivered a most interesting and thought-provoking address at a luncheon of the Pan American Society of the United States, which was given in honor of the Latin American consular corps in New York City.

Dr. Padilla is without a doubt one of the leading statesmen of the Western Hemisphere and one of the greatest friends of the United States. He served as Foreign Minister of Mexico during the World War II period and was one of our most ardent supporters and defenders. During those trying years, and also in subsequent years, he has urged strong collaboration and cooperation between the 21 American Republics to form a solid and cohesive front of the American nations.

Prior to becoming Foreign Minister, Dr. Padilla served three times as a Congressman, twice as a Senator, then was Attorney General, Secretary of Education, and later Ambassador. He has always shown complete dedication to the principles of freedom and constitutional government.

Mr. Speaker, Dr. Padilla's address is entitled "One Single Continental Destiny." I am pleased to insert it into the RECORD and commend it to the attention of all my colleagues:

ONE SINGLE CONTINENTAL DESTINY

(By Ezequiel Padilla)

Mr. President of the Pan American Society of the United States, ladies, and gentlemen, my presence in this splendid hall makes me think how correct the observation is that an orator would not cross the street to listen to a speech but that he would cross a continent to deliver one.

Exactly 14 years ago on this very spot, when I was Minister of Foreign Affairs of my country, I delivered a speech on Pan-American Solidarity. Mr. Hasler, who was then president of this society, was kind enough to enable me to listen across a great distance to the first babblings of one of my sons who had recently been born in Mexico City. And yet, what the child said to me has remained an impenetrable mystery to me. I felt myself carried away by emotion, because that weak little voice made me think of the moral grandeur of the undertaking which the free countries were carrying out in order to leave behind for our children, after that era of catastrophes, a world of security and of justice.

On that day in April 1942, we were all moved by the grave war news. Nevertheless, there were neither worries nor doubts in our hearts; our thoughts were filled with confidence in the final victory. In our America, the spectacle was magnificent; from New York's Fifth Avenue to the humblest villages of South America could be seen our 21 flags interwoven, forming the rainbow of continental solidarity. Of course we were in danger, but at the Rio de Janeiro Conference our nations had sealed one sole destiny and had dictated wise measures for defense. It was the romantic year of American fraternity. We all felt proud of defending a common cause with bravery.

Fourteen years have passed and the hopes for the permanent peace of the world have been frustrated. The threats which surround our America today are much more serious. And yet, the means of collective defense, and above all the conviction that we are manning the same ship lack the force and the decision of that time? Why? Our continent has been protected by extraordinary privileges: we have lived far from the zones of disaster. Thanks in great part to the formidable forces of this American Nation, our skies, our territories, our seas have not suffered from the horrible days of the war. Our peoples, unharmed, grew and prospered while other regions of the earth were covered with desolation and ruins. Was it not natural then that the men of America should have purified their devotion for the redeeming doctrine which, in this era of anguish, has kept us safe within the confines of fraternity and peace? What then is the cause for the crisis which has unquestionably begun to undermine the cordial union of our poeples these last 10 years? There are two fundamental causes: one is the immense Soviet propaganda; the other the economic anarchy in which our continent lives.

It is very frequently said that the frightful powers of destruction of atomic weapons have made a new war impossible. Without accepting this conclusion which is not supported by the tragic history of man—but which fits admirably into Communist doctrine and tactics, which is why the Soviets have unleashed their fabulous peace propaganda—the evident result is that this struggle for the domination of the World has been removed from the field of armed war to the field of peaceful conquest. This strategy grows more spectacular every day. And it is here, in the field of peaceful conquest, that communism seeks to fulfill Lenin's prophecy that, once the peoples of Europe and Asia are conquered, America will fall like a ripe fruit. In this peaceful conquest, Soviet propaganda is a formidable weapon. Through it, the Soviet Union, invaded and in flames in 1942, has transformed itself into the Communist empire of 1956, with a billion slaves. And propaganda is not only an ideological war, as is often said: it is a war of subversion, of penetration, of sabotage which, without firing a gun, undermines the strength of a nation until it crushes it. For this end, Russia spends $3 billion per year on propaganda, while the United States, to combat it, has a budget of 3 percent of that sum. The prodigious feats of Communist propaganda are too well known to attempt to enumerate them. Its work in Europe and in Asia is inscribed in the tragic contemporary history of nations once sovereign and now reduced to slavery. Its mission in

America is the same as unfolded in all parts of the world: infiltrate, subvert institutions, open the doors to the enemy in order to surrender the fate of our people to police terror and to a philosophy without God and without liberties. It is imperative, then, to organize a more effective continental defense. Not only are the laboratories of the United Stats and of England working but the Russian's behind the Iron Curtain as well, in territories that lack time limitations for work and whose laborers do not declare themselves on strike. Each day, nuclear weapons are more manageable and the fifth column with its bacteriological armaments can constitute a combination that would signify the possibility for a fatal blow of destruction.

I have referred to operations which conspire against security. But there is another activity intensely directed against the economic integration of the continent. The defense against this propaganda which tries to profit by the dislocation of our markets in order to spread distrust and create profound animosities, accusing the United States of exploiting our Latin American countries, is not only a job of vigilance, of repression or of ideological programs; above all it must be a job of construction.

Permit me to recall the time when my illustrious friend, Mr. Sumner Welles, presented me to President Roosevelt in 1942. After the introductory words he said: "I wish that you would listen to the pan-American ideas of Mexico, represented by Dr. Padilla." Then I unfolded before President Roosevelt the ideas which I had expounded at the Rio de Janeiro Conference in the name of my country: The construction of a continent as a harmonious whole, not with the aim of establishing national or international privileges, but of building the well-being of the American masses, affirming at the same time the dignity of the free spirit.

History teaches us that those generations that live through the decisive hours of the great changes in the destiny of mankind do not have an immediate realization of the presence of a new epoch; I believe that is the case of our modern times. Not everyone is aware that we are already in the new atomic era; that is to say, in the greatest revolution in history. The technological forces which man has conquered already have the capacity of creating abundance. And the grave danger into which we may fall is to reason with yesterday's ideas about the problems of today's revolution. Today's peoples, unlike those of yesterday, are aware that their liberation is already within the reach of man. Some entrust its realization in the midst of liberties to the paths of democracy, to free enterprise; but others, influenced by Soviet propaganda, feel that it is surer and more rapid to achieve this liberation by means of what they call the system of compulsory economy, submitting themselves to the terror of totalitarian tyranny, that is to say, sacrificing present generations to attain through forced marches the well-being of future generations. Time does not allow me to analyze this imposture; but that is the thesis of Communist China in the Orient; that is the thesis of communism in the whole world. In any case, the impatience of peoples rent by privations and misery demands a solution. In our America the solution is to reach an accord between all our peoples in order to use the new creative powers of human well-being, conquering the great valleys and the great rivers, the riches of the oceans and beneath the earth, the application of nuclear power and the use of the space of the continent to create an American civilization which will be an advance view of what humanity dreams and hopes.

The statesmen of the United States declare rightly that the first bastion of defense is a healthy and vigorous economy. This principle ought to be extended to all of America. The fabulous prosperity of the United States lacks persuasive force before the heart-rending poverty of Latin America. Let us bear in mind that our enemy is not communism, since our peoples believe in liberty. The Orient, it is often repeated, supports tyranny because it has known no other form of government throughout the ages; but this is not the case of our America. Among us, all the nations have free constitutions, and even in the darkest hours of dictatorships—where they existed—the people fought for the conquest of its liberties. This gathering can hardly imagine what it costs to dream and fight for liberty in the midst of dictatorships. For another thing, all of America is profoundly religious and therefore rejects a system which, like communism, denies men the right of worshipping God in their conscience. For this reason, not even doctrines of third positions or of neutrality have made any impression in our America, because they are considered morally cowardly and abject forms of deserting the fortress of duty. No. Communism is not the enemy; the enemy is economic anarchy in which our American peoples struggle. Cotton, sugar, some metals, coffee, wool, and other fundamental products for the well-being of the Latin American masses constitute present problems which, instead of bringing our peoples together, separate them. We should not accept the bankruptcy of intelligence and the technique of our governments for not finding in inter-American commerce channels of security in production, prices of primary materials and manufactured products. It is comforting to observe in our governments the resurgence and the preoccupation with the authentic operation of the Pan-American doctrine. To abandon these grave realities to anarchy can expose us—in this era when the markets of the world are in dispute, and when Russia openly tries to capture the Latin American markets—to suffer a worldwide economic defeat as dangerous as a military defeat. It must not be forgotten that Latin America is the principal purchaser from the United States, that it has a rapidly increasing population of 150 million inhabitants, and that it possesses a great number of strategic materials for the hours of danger. We must create a powerful inter-American market. But how can we obtain it if our nations do not unite to deliberate and resolve the multiple problems which arise in an undertaking of such great magnitude? The creation of a climate propitious to foreign investments, the setting aside of zones exclusively for national investments; the reply to a growing, active youth with legitimate ambitions which wants financing for the projects of its economic undertakings and wants thus to be able to maintain its independent homes, an inter-American bank which frees it from the usury that frustrates all its hopes; the financing and construction of tens of millions of lodgings for men who live in hovels unworthy of human dignity; hundreds of thousands of kilometers of modern highways and new conveyances; the application of the formidable conquest of science and of nuclear energy which is already unfolding the magic of its force; in other words, all the marvelous power of modern men and even the unsuspected technological powers which are to come, urgently demand a continental economic convention which should deal with plans for the creation of prosperity for the Americas. There is certainly a school of thought in our Latin America which dreams of anarchy self-sufficiency; but it is sterile arrogance, contrary to the true interests of the people, to think with the meager savings of our incipient Latin American production we can erect the gigantic creation of the new forces of the world.

In our Latin America, cooperation among the governments is enormously important in order to materialize these redeeming programs. In other matters they must assume the construction of undertakings which private enterprise cannot carry out. Besides the joint planning of a Pan-American economy, which must be made under the sign of free enterprise, initiative and generous action by the governments is also needed.

The philosophy of profit and of free enterprise—as my friend Spruille Braden has demonstrated so eloquently in a recent speech—has been the constructive force of the economic greatness of the United States. Until now, no economic system has been invented which guarantees prosperity while at the same time guaranteeing human liberties; but this philosophy of competition and profit cannot by itself have the same result as an international system. This has also been understood by the United States which has spent fantastic sums throughout the world—tens of billions of dollars—without any profit motive. Why, when it is a question of organizing a continental economy, could the cold calculations of speculation and of profit not be overcome? Friendship and solidarity have their roots in the human heart.

The 18th century was the Age of Reason; the 19th century was the Age of National Selfishness; the present century is the Age of Human Emotion. A few months ago the Tampico region was struck by tremendous floods; the United States quickly sent boats, helicopters, food, medicine and the most valuable of its contributions, a team of men who, in those anguished hours, showed not only goodwill in their behavior, but also devotion and heroism. The change which took place in our Mexican souls in those days of nobility of deeds and of true solidarity, is incalculable and indelible. Its influence can be noticed in the cordiality of the recent meeting of our Presidents Eisenhower and Ruiz Cortines. No cold and calculated diplomatic step has ever achieved such profound results.

Allow me to terminate by recalling this beautiful sentence from Lincoln: "If you wish to convert men to your cause, persuade them that you are their true friend."

Soviet Airpower

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. DODD
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 2, 1956

Mr. DODD. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call the attention of my colleagues to an excellent article in the New York Times of today. This article is written by Mr. Hanson W. Baldwin, military editor of the Times.

Mr. Baldwin has properly analyzed the disadvantages accruing to the United States from the visit of General Twining and other Air Force officers to Russia.

Nothing will come of these visits except a great and more powerful propaganda weapon for the Russians to use against the United States. This is a fact that the administration does not seem to recognize.

I hope that every Member of the House will read this article, which is as follows:

SOVIET AIRPOWER: I—A REPORT OF UNITED STATES OFFICERS' FINDINGS DURING VISIT TO MOSCOW AERIAL SHOW

(By Hanson W. Baldwin)

Moscow, July 1.—The United States delegation to last Sunday's Soviet Aviation Day

was en route home today with only slightly more technical knowledge about the Soviet Air Force than it had when it arrived. Most of the facilities shown to the Americans represented, in the words of one officer, "seventh-grade stuff."

But the visits of 28 foreign air force delegations to the Soviet Union were deliberately used by the Communists as the basis for a forum to preach peaceful coexistence and disarmament.

The political and psychological importance of the visits, in the Soviet Union, in the United States and in the rest of the world, particularly in the neutral nations, in Western Europe and in the Communist satellites, was certain to be major.

The Communists have emphasized the "comradeship" between Russian and United States airmen, and photos showing Gen. Nathan F. Twining, who headed the United States delegation, clinking glasses with the Russians are being widely distributed.

The voice of the United States Air Force Chief of Staff, recorded on tape, has been broadcast repeatedly over the Moscow radio and it is evident that this Communist capital of the world is doing all it can to foster the impression of a tete-a-tete between United States and Soviet leaders.

SOVIET MIGHT WAS STRESSED

The visits, of course, cannot be fully evaluated yet, but it is possible the Russians have left the impression they wished to implant despite the paucity of technical information they released. In a nutshell this impression might be described as: "We are too strong to be licked; therefore you have got to get along with us."

Moscow also wants for its air force leaders reciprocal return invitations from the countries it invited here. Former Foreign Minister Vyacheslav M. Molotov said so in so many words to Gen. Paul Bailly, Chief of Staff of the French Air Force, who leaves here tomorrow.

But there are some obvious risks and dangers to communism, particularly in the satellites, in permitting such contacts as that represented by General Twining's visit. Freedom is a heady wine, and even a slight easing of internal restrictions and resumed contacts with the West might encourage a greater degree of independence in the satellites. At least that is the clear hope of the West.

UNITED STATES SUPERIORITY IS CITED

It was clear that, like many other experts who came to the Soviet Union, members of the United States delegation were confused by the contrasts and contradictions they encountered on every hand. The Americans were divided in their technical evaluations. Some stressed it would be dangerous to draw any conclusions on the basis of what we have seen. But there probably were three salient and overwhelming impressions:

1. The United States is still clearly superior to the Soviet Union in airpower today.

2. The rate of the Soviet developmental progress in airpower since World War II, and particularly since 1947 when the Soviet Union purchased 55 Rolls-Royce jet engines from the British, has been very rapid.

United States research and development funds, along with the military budget, were severely curtailed from the end of the war until the start of the Korean war, and the Nation is still paying today for the failure in those years to exploit all possible research leads. The rate of development of the two powers, in other words, will be an index to who will win the airpower race tomorrow.

3. Research and development and technical education must be stressed in the United States at all costs. Strong operating forces must be maintained, of course, for United States strength has been, and will be, a primary deterrent to aggression. It may be responsible for the present trend toward "sweetness and light" in Soviet tactics. But it would be a mistake to put too much money into the production of the big B–52 long-range jet bombers, which cost about $8 million each, since overstressing these planes might force a curtailment in research funds. In any case, in a few years the B–52 may be technically obsolescent.

OLD TRANSPORTS STILL USED

In addition to these general impressions, other conclusions that appear valid to this correspondent have been drawn here by other foreign observers.

All the foreign visitors were impressed by the contrasts and contradictions in Soviet airpower—the most modern right alongside the most obsolescent. The IL–12 and IL–14 twin-engine, propeller-driven transports with speeds of less than 200 miles an hour, and with a passenger capacity of 18 to 24, still are the mainstays of the Soviet airlines and of military air transportation.

The IL–14 still is being built in quantity despite the development of the TU–104 twin-jet transport. There do not appear to be any radar ground-control approach systems to guide planes to Soviet airfields in low visibility. Many Soviet pilots do not appear to be trained in instrument flying. There do not appear to be any rocket mountings on Soviet all-weather fighters although all United States air-defense fighters now are equipped with rockets or missiles instead of guns.

INCONSISTENCIES ARE NOTED

The Russians say they have air-refueling systems, but no evidence of them ever has been seen, except an unidentified protuberance on the nose of a twin-jet medium bomber. Soviet pilots at the field at the Monino Air Force Academy visited by General Twining yesterday said they were required to fly a minimum of 300 hours annually compared with the 100-hour minimum required of United States Air Force pilots to maintain their flight pay. Yet it is not believed that the Russians have enough aviation fuel to permit such requirements.

There are many other apparent deficiencies and inconsistencies. On the other hand there is the undeniable fact that the Russians have some good new jet bombers and fighters and they know how to fly them.

Another salient conclusion that can be drawn from even a brief look at Soviet air power is that the Soviet Union has profited greatly from the United States, Germany, and Britain. Many silhouettes of Soviet aircraft closely resemble United States planes and General Twining remarked yesterday upon the exact "Chinese copy" of the four-engine, propeller-driven B–29 bomber he saw at a Soviet airfield. The B–29, manufactured in the Soviet Union as the TU–4, is a World War II bomber with a range of about 2,606 miles and a speed of about 300 miles an hour. It is obsolescent now except for special tasks, but the Russians have hundreds of them that they use for training and other jobs.

A CAPACITY FOR COPYING

The moral is that they have a capacity as copyists and an ability to adapt and modify to their needs the best developments of other nations. In addition, they have excellent designers of their own.

Another obvious fact about Soviet aviation is that the Soviet Union's military education system is emphasizing a thorough blend of theory and practice. The schools inspected by General Twining appear to combine many features of United States technical or training schools, with classroom and laboratory instruction of the college or university type. The equipment is modern and the courses are long and complete.

The Soviet Union is strong in the air. But it probably is not so strong as it would like to make the world think, and definitely not so strong as some press reports would seem to indicate. Some observers, for instance, do not believe the Soviet Union has as many heavy jet bombers as past reports have indicated; no more than 12 to 15 Bisons have been seen at any one time.

Protest in Poland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 2, 1956

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial in the New York Times of Saturday, June 30, 1956, which discusses the recent uprising of the steel workers in Poznan, Poland, against their Communist rulers:

PROTEST IN POLAND

The long and honorable history of Poland has many chapters that tell of brave resistance to oppression and struggle for freedom. Now a new chapter has been added to that history by the steel workers of Poznan. They have defied the Communist dictatorship to demand bread and freedom. The answer they received was the same brutal one given to the East German workers in 1953, to the Soviet slave laborers who demanded freedom after Beria's purge and to the people of Tiflis last March. The answer was bullets from the guns and tanks of the Communist soldiers and police. Thirty-eight dead and 270 wounded are the grim statistics admitted even by the Warsaw regime.

The first barrage of Communist bullets stripped off the mask from those who claim that the Communists represent and rule for the working class. It was the proletarians of Poznan who took to the streets to voice their demands and it was the proletarians whose lives were taken by the bullets. There are no "capitalists" in Poland today. The Polish Government's talk of imperialist agents is simply nonsense, a device to justify its brutal policy. The facts could not be plainer. As we of the free world speak out in protest and sorrow, we have the right to demand that all who claim to have humanity and sympathy for the oppressed speak out with us. Will the Communists outside the Iron Curtain speak out against the latest crime of those who succeed Stalin?

Reports from Poznan indicate that the workers who tried to voice their grievances there were misled by the supposed new atmosphere in Poland. They thought that now, when past crimes are being admitted, they could freely exercise the basic rights of petition and of public assembly. The dead and wounded testify eloquently to the error of those expectations. Rights which our workers regard as elementary are still forbidden in the Communist workers' paradise.

For the moment the unrest in Poznan has been drowned in blood. But it would be a mistake to think that the basic causes of these events have been removed, or that there is no likelihood of repetition elsewhere in the Communist world. Ever since World War II the vital interests of the workers under Communist rule have been sacrificed to the pitiless drive to build up military power. Instead of bread and decent housing the workers have been offered displays of the military might their sacrifices made possible. But one cannot eat guns or live in a tank, and the workers want to enjoy the fruits of their labor just as do workers everywhere.

The Poznan events demonstrate the moral and political bankruptcy of Polish communism in two ways. First, when the workers'

original peaceful demonstration was turned to anger, it was against the Polish United Workers (Communist) Party and the Polish secret police that their wrath was turned. These are our enemies, the workers said in effect. Thus an initial act of economic protest was turned into a political demonstration of the highest significance. Second, the Polish Government had no better answer to the workers than bullets and tanks. Could there be a clearer demonstration of bankruptcy by any government?

In a democratic country this could well bring down the government in power. But Poland is a dictatorship and its Communist rulers have no intention of being dethroned. Yet they cannot escape their responsibility before the Polish people. The police and soldiers fired at the workers in Poznan. Will they do so again if similar events erupt elsewhere? Already we have reports that some of the police and army men in Poznan showed sympathy for the demonstrators. As the full implication of these events sinks in, will not the sympathy of the Polish people for the victims rise higher, and will not the demands for an accounting rise until ultimately it becomes unanswerable?

The Polish Government claims that it recognizes that economic conditions are bad and that it is trying to do something to improve them. It has said that before with imperceptible results. It still accepts Khrushchev's thesis that heavy industry must have higher priority than consumer goods and the standard of living. The Poznan demonstrations may force new concessions. But the workers' demands for freedom and the fury at the Communists and the Communist secret police show that the steel workers of Poznan recognize the fundamental truth that freedom and Communist dictatorship are incompatible. That is the lesson of Poland.

Japan and United States Textiles

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. FLYNT, JR.
OF GEORGIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 2, 1956

Mr. FLYNT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a copy of a letter which appears in the letters-to-the-editor section of the Washington Post and Times Herald of today, July 2, 1956.

This letter, which was written by Mr. O. R. Strackbein, of Washington, D. C., is the latest in a series of the letters to the editor on the present conditions of the American textile industry, due to rapidly increasing imports from Japan.

It is my understanding that the figures which are quoted in the letter which follows are taken from Government sources, carefully documented and accurate.

This letter clearly shows the adverse effects which these rapidly increasing imports are having upon the American textile industry:

JAPAN AND UNITED STATES TEXTILES

In your issue of June 16, Mr. Nelson A. Stitt replied to Mr. W. Ray Bell, president of the Association of Cotton Textile Merchants of New York, whose letter appeared on a previous day.

Mr. Stitt chides Mr. Bell for using the year 1947 as his anchorage for measuring the trend of cotton textile exports. Actually Mr. Bell did not have to use 1947, a record year, to establish the downward trend.

However, after drawing so fine a bead in challenging Mr. Bell, Mr. Stitt turns around and uses "the more realistic prewar period of 1936–38" as his own base for measuring the trend of such exports. Why not go back to the landing of the Pilgrim Fathers?

The present economy of the United States is of an entirely different order from our prewar economy. Why then try to hitch the textile, or any other industry to such an obsolete standard?

The textile industry is an important industry. It employs over a million workers; and in this respect outranks the great automobile industry. Yet everyone is aware of the importance of the automobile industry to our economy. When the industry sickens suffering spreads rapidly to other industries. Concern is expressed far and wide.

Now, I would not have the cotton-textile industry attain the barometric and psychological position of the automobile industry. One such is enough. The fact is, however, that the cotton industry as a whole, from the raw fiber to the product of the spindles, is badly beset; and that bodes ill for the whole southeastern section of the country and for a great part of New England.

The trade-agreements program has long been advertised as a prime disposer of our farm surplus products. That was avowedly one of its key virtues; and, of course, raw cotton stood No. 1 among such exports. Let us see what has happened.

In 1931–35, that is, at the beginning of the trade-agreements program, the average annual exports of our raw cotton (excluding linters) were 7,244,000 bales. Even this was well below the 1926–30 figure. In 1954 these exports had fallen to 4,321,000 bales and in 1955 nose-dived to 2,590,000 bales. What a proud GATT record.

Now, says Mr. Stitt as have others, imports of textiles from Japan are only a very small percentage of our total market even though they do amount to more than 150 million square yards. Presumably that is a healthy condition. Reducing the imports to an over-all average is like saying that a flood in one area of the country if spread over the whole country would have amounted only to a drizzle.

Mr. Stitt says Japan has imposed an export limitation on herself. She will export only so much cotton goods to us. In 1952 Japan placed a limitation of 12,000 tons on the exports of frozen tuna to the United States. That was after a bill proposing a tariff of three cents a pound on such tuna had passed the House. Later the Senate defeated the bill. Today that self-imposed limitation is over 50,000 tons.

Yet the State Department finds such self-imposed export quotas acceptable.

Mr. Stitt calls attention to Japan's greater purchase from us than the other way around. We sell more raw cotton to Japan than is contained in the textiles she sends us. On that theory we should insist that Brazil buy as much coffee from us as we do from her. Actually, Japan is buying less raw cotton from us than prewar and yet has become the world's No. 1 textile exporter while we are fourth.

The proper remedy for this import situation would be import quotas imposed by us rather than self-imposed bans controlled by Japan. The import quotas could be made sufficiently liberal to assure Japan a generous share of our market but we should hold the controls in our own hands. Otherwise uncertaintly would undermine their value.

O. R. STRACKBEIN.

WASHINGTON.

Micronesians Gaining Under United States Direction

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN P. SAYLOR
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 2, 1956

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, so often we hear criticism of various activities and decisions of the Interior Department which are, for the most part, inspired by partisan political purposes.

It is therefore most gratifying and refreshing to note an article in the New York Daily News of July 1 which draws attention to the splendid performance of the Department in the administration of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands.

This article, authored by Peter Wallenberg, points up significant social and political progress which has taken place in this remote island area and I commend it to the Members of the House:

MICRONESIANS GAINING UNDER UNITED STATES DIRECTION

(By Peter Wallenberg)

More social and political progress has been made in the Pacific Island Trust Territory during the few years of American administration than in the almost 50 years of German and Japanese rule, a Micronesian educator said yesterday.

Alfonso Oiterong, 32, superintendent of schools in the Palau district of the Caroline Islands, came here as a special representative of the islanders to the U. N. Trusteeship Council which is discussing United States administration of the U. N. trust territory.

Oiterong who speaks English and Japanese fluently, is well qualified to talk about Micronesia. Born in the Palaus, he graduated from the secondary school there and was given teacher training in Japan, where he spent 3 years. When the United States occupied the Palaus during World War II he was singled out for further training and ultimately attended the University of Hawaii before taking up his job as school superintendent.

GREAT PROGRESS

Under United States administration—since 1947—he said, "education in the trust territory as a whole has been unbelievably progressive."

The people, he said, have become so interested in education that they now build schools and pay teachers' salaries out of locally collected taxes. The three R's are taught both in English and Micronesian. Vocational studies, citizenship, health, and sanitation are particularly stressed, Oiterong said.

SLOW MOVEMENT

"We, the people in the trust territory," he asserted, "owe a great deal of respect and appreciation to the United States Government and the U. N. for the student scholarships and fellowships that are granted every year." Elementary education is mandatory for all Micronesian children between the ages of 8 and 16.

Political progress, he said, must be slow because the islands were never a political entity. Some 2,000 islands in 72 clusters containing only 525 square miles of land, are spread out over more than 1 million square miles of ocean. Only 64,000 Micronesians inhabit this vast area comprising the 3 large island groups of the Marshalls, the Marianas, and the Carolines.

The three groups were originally taken over by Spain, then sold to Germany. Japan took them over during World War I, and the United States finally occupied them during World War II and now administers them under a U. N. trusteeship setup.

LOCAL ADMINISTRATION

In spite of great difficulties, Oiterong said, municipalities of from 100 to 2,000 inhabitants are now under native administration. Each has a Micronesian magistrate and judge who work with the traditional chief. Most districts, taking in a number of municipalities, have congresses which legislate on taxes and education.

The United States administration is headed by Acting High Commissioner Delmas H. Nucker, who has had wide experience as a Territorial administrator for the United States Department of the Interior.

Statement of National Federation of Post Office Clerks on Civil-Service Retirement Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT C. BYRD
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 27, 1956

Mr. BYRD. Mr. Speaker, in the course of the hearings being conducted by the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service on the subject of civil-service retirement legislation, the National Federation of Post Office Clerks on June 19, 1956, testified in support of S. 2875, the bill which passed the Senate on April 18, 1956. I believe the federation's statement, which was presented by Mr. E. C. Hallbeck, its legislative director, is of interest to our colleagues.

Legislation has long been needed to correct the inequities and deficiencies in our present civil-service retirement system. It is a distressing fact that the annuities being paid to retired employees average only $1,600 a year. According to recent actuarial figures submitted by the Civil Service Commission, 29,206 employees earn under $2,500. There are 983,259 employees whose salary is $4,000 or less. It is no wonder, then, that the separation rate of career Government employees is so abnormally high, and this failure on the part of the Government to meet the progress of industry in retirement matters is one of the very reasons why it is so difficult to attract men and women into the Federal service.

Ever since the original enactment of the civil-service retirement system, in 1920, it is apparent that the Congress intended that the Government should share equally in the cost of the program. While employees have met their share of the cost through regular payroll deductions, the Government, in practice, has failed to meet its share. For example, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955, through deductions from salaries and voluntary contributions, employees paid into the system $440,284,878.46, while the Government's contribution was only $33,678,729.94. The legislative proposals now under consideration would, for the first time since the enactment of the retirement program, provide machinery to require both the employer and the employee to share equally on a current basis the future service costs. There is no reason why the deferred compensation which ultimately becomes payable in the form of retirement benefits should not be accounted for as part of the cost of continuing Government operations.

The statement submitted by the National Federation of Post Office Clerks makes a number of worthy recommendations that should be taken into consideration in enacting the many long justified and sorely needed liberalized and expanded retirement, survivorship, and disability benefits in our retirement system. Through the legislative proposals now under consideration, the Congress holds in its hands the future security and living standards of millions of Americans who are giving their working years to the public service, and it behooves us to adopt the necessary and proper adjustments in the retirement system before the Congress adjourns.

Mr. Hallbeck's statement follows:

STATEMENT OF E. C. HALLBECK, LEGISLATIVE DIRECTOR, NATIONAL FEDERATION OF POST OFFICE CLERKS, TO THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON POST OFFICE AND CIVIL SERVICE ON PENDING AMENDMENTS TO THE CIVIL SERVICE RETIREMENT ACT, JUNE 19, 1956

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, in order to identify myself for the record, I am E. C. Hallbeck, legislative director of the National Federation of Post Office Clerks, with offices at 711 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

We are highly pleased and gratified at the prompt action this committee is taking on the retirement question. It is one of the most important questions before the 84th Congress.

A surprisingly large number of bills to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act have been introduced and the Senate passed the bill S. 2875, which would provide many needed improvements in the retirement structure, including a new and more logical formula for the computation of annuities; an improved optional retirement procedure; much needed liberalization of the widow and dependent benefit features; improved disability retirement benefits with a much needed minimum benefit provision; a sound mandatory retirement feature, and several administrative improvements, is in our opinion, sound and desirable legislation. I am appearing in support of that measure.

I am aware that there are bills before this committee which, if enacted, would provide for joint coverage of postal and Federal employees under both social security and the Civil Service Retirement Act. The theory behind this sort of legislation is that since the dependents' benefits under social security are so much more liberal than those provided under civil-service retirement, that the extension of such social-security coverage to postal and Federal employees would provide these added benefits without appreciable increase in cost. I do not think that is true. There is no magic formula in social security which makes greater benefits possible at a lesser cost. The ultimate cost of benefits are the same under any system and any seeming difference in favor of social security results from the fact that social security does not at the present time truly reflect the costs of these benefits.

Employees desire a modern retirement system, within the framework of the present act, which will provide a reasonable annuity after 30 years of loyal and faithful service, with adequate provisions for the widows and dependents of employees or annuitants, as well as protection against the hazards that make disability retirement necessary before a normal retirement age, at a price which the employee can afford to pay. These benefits can be provided under the Civil Service Retirement Act, and the bill S. 2875 most nearly approaches that objective.

Because some pay acts define "basic salary" to exclude longevity pay and since there is no desire to exclude longevity pay from "average salary" for purposes of computing annuities, we suggest an amendment to section 1 (e), adding, after the words "basic salary" on line 13, the words "including longevity or meritorious pay."

Under the Railroad Retirement Act, officers of the railroad employee organizations are covered for the purposes of that act while so engaged. We believe similar consideration should be extended to officers of the Federal employee organizations and suggest that this purpose can be accomplished by amending section 3 (c) to add the words, "while serving as an officer of an employee organization, or" after the word "or" in line 2, page 9. We are particularly pleased with some of the optional features of section 6 of S. 2875. Certainly this section is a considerable improvement over present law. It will provide for what amounts to optional retirement after 30 years of service, with a reduction in annuity based on the age of the employee. Frankly, we take the position that there should be no reduction in annuity, regardless of the age of the employee, after he has performed 30 years of service. We know that there are some who will claim that the cost of such a program would be prohibitive. However, experience with optional retirement to date indicates that only a relatively small minority of employees elect to retire at an early age unless there is some all-compelling reason for such action. The principal reason is the health of the employee or his family. The number of employees who would actually retire at an early age is necessarily limited by the laws of economics. The man of 50 to 55, for example, ordinarily has family responsibilities, such as children in school or college, a home only partly paid for, and things of that sort, which make it virtually impossible for him to even think of anything which would have the effect of reducing his take-home pay. The jobs which people of that age could obtain in private industry usually pay a wage so low that the combination of that wage with an annuity is actually less than the employee receives in Government work. For that reason, we feel that optional retirement at an early age would be limited to those for whom there was a compelling necessity and that the ultimate cost to the retirement system would be much less than is commonly estimated.

Section 7 deals with retirements caused by disability of the employee. In this field, there is a notable need for improvement. The provisions of present law, particularly in cases where the employee has only limited service, are woefully inadequate. By providing for a minimum annuity of 40 percent of average salary in cases of disability retirement in section 9 of the bill, S. 2875 goes a long way in the right direction. My own view is that it would be entirely just and equitable to retire an employee on a minimum of half pay whenever permanent disability makes retirement necessary.

Section 9 (a) of S. 2875 provides that in the computation of annuities, the annuity "shall be (1) the larger of (A) one and a half percent of the average salary, multiplied by so much of the total service as does not exceed 5 years, or (B) 1 percent of the average salary, plus $25, multiplied by so much of the total service as does not exceed 5 years, plus (2) the larger of (A) 2 percent of the average salary multiplied by so much of the total service as exceeds 5 years, or (B) 1 percent of the average salary,

plus $25, multiplied by so much of the total service as exceeds 5 years: *Provided*, That the annuity shall not exceed 80 percent of the average salary: *Provided further*, That the annuity of an employee retiring under section 7 shall be at least (1) 40 percent of the average salary or (2) the sum obtained under this subsection after increasing his total service by the period elapsing between the date of separation and the date he attains the age of 60 years, whichever is the lesser, but this proviso shall not increase the annuity of any survivor."

I suggest that it would be completely equitable if the formula for the computation of annuities of employees were based on 2½ per centum of the average salary as defined in this bill. Such an amendment would have the practical effect of providing the same formula for the computation of employees' annuities as that provided for the Members of Congress.

Section 9 (g) of the bill provides for the designation by unmarried employees of a beneficiary having an insurable interest to receive an annuity after the death of an annuitant. In order to establish such a joint annuity, it is necessary that the employee be in good health at time of retirement and that he take a 10 percent reduction in annuity, plus an additional 5 percent reduction for each full 5 years the person designated is younger than the retiring employee.

In most instances that have come to my attention, the people who would take advantage of this provision are those who have dependent parents. That is particularly true of women employees. Under the circumstances, it appears to be unjust and inequitable to require an employee to take a reduction of 10 percent in order to protect people who are older than he and whose normal life expectancy is considerably less than that of the employee.

We suggest, therefore, that this section be amended to provide that a parent or parents may be designated by an unmarried employee to receive an annuity after death of an annuitant under the same conditions as those applicable to a wife or husband in section 9 (f).

The survivor benefits provided by section 10 of S. 2875 are highly desirable. In addition to providing a form of automatic coverage for the widow of the annuitant, increased benefits for the surviving widow and children of an employee who dies before becoming eligible for retirement are provided.

I believe, however, that there is one field not covered in the bill as it passed the Senate which should be given serious consideration. I refer to the case of an unmarried employee who is supporting a dependent parent or parents. In most instances, I believe the social need is as great in such cases as the need of surviving widows and children. I suggest that the committee consider amending section 10 (c) to read as follows:

"(c) If an employee dies after completing at least 5 years of civilian service, or a Member dies after completing at least 5 years of Member service, the widow or dependent widower of such employee or Member, or the dependent parent or parents of such employee or Member shall be paid an annuity equal to 50 percent of an annuity computed as provided in subsections (a) (b), (c), and (e) of section 9 as may apply with respect to the employee or Member: *Provided*, That if more than 1 dependent parent survives the employee or Member, the total annuity to both dependent parents shall not exceed the amount of annuity payable to a single parent: *Provided further*, That in the computation of annuities under this subsection such deceased employee or Member shall be considered as having not less than 15 years of civilian service prior to his or her death. The annuity of such widow or dependent widower or dependent parent or parents shall begin on the first day of the month after the employee or Member dies, such annuity or any right thereto shall terminate upon death or remarriage of the widow or widower or dependent parent, or upon the widower or dependent parents becoming capable of self-support."

This amendment in addition to providing coverage for dependent parents would also provide that the annuity in such cases be computed on the basis of at least 15 years of civilian service. In view of the fact that unmarried employees or Members make the same contribution as married employees, I think it is only just that some provision be made for their dependents just as provision is made for the dependents of married employees.

Section 15 of the bill deals with exemption from legal processes. We feel that this section should be amended to provide an exemption from Federal income taxes in the same manner and to the same extent as exemptions are granted to beneficiaries of the Railroad Retirement and Social Security Acts.

One very important feature of the bill is the method of financing. In addition to insuring stable contributions on the part of the Federal Government, the bill, S. 2875, as it passed the Senate, would increase employee salary deductions from 6 percent to 7 percent and I am confident that this increase will not meet serious objection from employees if the improvements to the retirement structure provided in the bill as it passed the Senate are retained. However, if the bill is amended so as to eliminate provisions for 30-year optional retirement or to decrease the amount of annuity resulting from changes in the formula for computation of annuities or if there is any serious depreciation in survivorship or dependent benefits, I am confident that any increase in the employees' contributions would be vigorously opposed and objected to.

With the amendments I have suggested, we feel that the enactment of S. 2875 would be welcomed by employees and that its enactment would make the career service of our Federal Government much more desirable.

In closing, I want to thank the chairman and members of the committee for the time and attention being given to this very important subject and to express the hope that the bill, S. 2875, will be reported to the House at an early date and that it will be enacted during the current session of the Congress.

Thank you.

Need for Federal Responsibility for Relief of Migratory Families

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES A. VANIK
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 2, 1956

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, a few weeks ago a statement was made in this House attacking the city of Cleveland for violating the civil rights of an Alabama woman who was offered the alternative by the juvenile court of Cuyahoga County, Ohio, of either placing her adjudged neglected children in a county receiving home where they could get food, shelter, and supervision or returning to their home in Alabama. The woman in question had been adjudged guilty of contributing to the neglect of the children and the family had a legal residence in Alabama. The Alabama welfare agencies had acknowledged their responsibility for the family and had indicated their willingness to provide relief upon their return to their legal residence.

The judge in the Ohio court had no other alternative for this family for the reason that the family was not qualified for permanent relief in Ohio because of the 1-year residence requirement.

In the attack upon my city it was charged that section 2 of article IV of the United States Constitution which guarantees the right of every citizen to live anywhere in the United States was violated. This was certainly not the case. The right of any citizen to live anywhere in the United States does not include the right to receive relief, pensions, and other privileges for which each of the States have established some necessary residence requirements. This case certainly points up the need for some Federal supervision and Federal responsibility for the relief of migratory families in America. The citizens of one State should not be compelled to assume the full cost of providing for the relief and welfare of migratory citizens who enter that State frequently because their home State fails to provide adequately for their welfare. The interstate movement of families in despair is a national problem. The tragic fact is that this Nation professes more concern for the problem of the migratory bird than it does for the migratory family.

It is incumbent upon Congress to recognize the fact that the migration of families in America will be a constant problem and that those communities which are generous to their responsibility, to the destitute, the homeless, and the disabled, should be reimbursed for whatever expenditures they make to take care of this interstate problem. The migration of the destitute and the homeless to the more friendly and more generous attitude of northern cities should in some measure be compensated by the Federal Government. In no other way can the unquestioned constitutional right of every citizen to live anywhere in the United States be given meaning.

The family in question came to Ohio because Alabama apparently failed in its obligation to care for a needy case.

The civil rights of this family were not violated by Ohio—the State of temporary refuge.

In order to clear the record, I am submitting herewith a letter which I have today received from Mr. Bernard C. Wachtel, president of the Cuyahoga County Bar Association, which completely describes the case, along with the Cleveland Press editorial of Saturday, June 23, 1956, entitled "This Effort to Smear Ohio Is Absurd and Meaningless," and the editorial of the Cleveland Plain Dealer of Saturday, June 23, 1956, entitled "The Martha Winston Case"; also a copy of a letter dated June 15, 1956, addressed to the editor of the Cleveland Plain Dealer by the Honorable Albert A. Woldman, Judge of the Juvenile Court.

THE CUYAHOGA COUNTY BAR ASSOCIATION,
Cleveland, Ohio, June 29, 1956.

Hon. CHARLES A. VANIK,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN VANIK: Our attention has been called to the requests of two Southern Congressmen calling for a Federal probe of the Martha Winston case which was

tried before Judge Albert A. Woldman of the juvenile court of Cuyahoga County the early part of this month.

Because we have reason to believe that their requests are based upon distorted newspaper accounts which erroneously referred to the Winston family's leaving Cleveland for their native Alabama as court imposed "exile," the trustees of the Cuyahoga County Bar Association feel very strongly that any action predicated upon these incorrect newspaper accounts constitute an unwarranted and unjustified attack upon the juvenile court of Cuyahoga County, Judge Woldman, the Cuyahoga County Welfare Division which held the Winston family ineligible for public relief in Ohio, and upon the people of greater Cleveland generally.

The trustees of the Cuyahoga County Bar Association have caused an investigation to be made of the entire matter and have concluded that there is no basis for criticism in the handling of the case. We believe that you should be given the facts so that you may help set the record straight in Congress and uphold both the fine reputation of Judge Woldman and this community's nationally known position for a fair and intelligent attitude in racial matters.

We enclose herewith a certified copy of the court entries in this case which reflect the only authentic account of what actually occurred. We enclose also copies of editorials which appeared in the Cleveland Plain Dealer and the Cleveland Press commenting upon this case, and a copy of Judge Woldman's letter which was published in the Cleveland Plain Dealer on Sunday, June 17, 1956.

Our investigation reveals that the matter came before Judge Woldman in the Juvenile Court on a complaint filed by a representative of the Cleveland Board of Education charging that the children were neglected and that the mother had contributed to their neglect; that the evidence before Judge Woldman disclosed that the family was destitute and unable to qualify for public relief; that the children were neglected and that one, a girl 17 years of age, had recently given birth to an illegitimate child; that the children had not been in school since February; that the family lived in a condemned house in Area B which was soon to be demolished; that the family had legal residence in Alabama where the husband and father resided and operated a farm; and that the Alabama welfare agencies had acknowledged their responsibility for the family and had indicated their readiness to provide relief upon their return to their legal residence.

The court entries indicate that the children were adjudged neglected and ordered placed in a temporary county receiving home where they could yet food, shelter and supervision; and that the mother was adjudged guilty of contributing to their neglect. However, no disposition had ever been made of her case when it was reported to the court that she had left with her family for Alabama.

We agree with the conclusion of the Cleveland Press editorial which states, "The woman in question wasn't forced to leave * * * rather, she left (with traveling expenses paid by Cuyahoga County) after she was told the alternative was to place her children in foster homes."

We also agree with the conclusion of the Cleveland Plain Dealer editorial which states: "Judge Woldman handled the case wisely and humanely. He could have sent Mrs. Winston to jail for neglecting her children, while committing the children to an institution. Instead, he found a way of keeping the family together which was what the woman wanted."

We trust with this information at hand you will be able to present the truth of this matter to the House of Representatives and thereby remove the erroneous conclusions which so unjustifiably reflect to the discredit of Judge Woldman and this community.

Further, we are convinced that the relief problem created by our citizens who move from one State to another in an attempt to better their living conditions should receive the attention of Congress, to the end that the citizens of the United States may, within reason, establish themselves in communities where they deem it in their best interests to do so.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely yours,

BERNARD C. WACHTEL,
President, Cuyahoga County Bar Association.

[From the Cleveland Press of June 23, 1956]

THIS EFFORT TO SMEAR OHIO IS ABSURD AND MEANINGLESS

Efforts of an Alabama judge and a Georgia congressman to make the relief troubles of a former Cleveland resident a civil rights case are ridiculous.

The woman in question wasn't forced to leave Cleveland, as these men are trying to make people believe.

Rather, she left (with traveling expenses paid by Cuyahoga County) after she was told the alternative was to place her children in foster homes.

The family was eligible for relief in Alabama, but not in Ohio, because the children didn't qualify under residence requirements here. So relief officials paid the expenses for getting the family home, which is the standard way of handling these cases on both sides of the Mason-Dixon line.

It would be well if Ohio's laws were flexible enough so the county could be more helpful in cases like this one.

But unless other States also relaxed their laws, or the Federal Government stepped in, it would be impossible.

Easier residence laws would simply encourage prospective relief clients to shop around for "easy" States, which would impose too heavy a burden on States that were trying to do the best job.

[From the Cleveland Plain Dealer of June 23, 1956]

THE MARTHA WINSTON CASE

The case of Martha Winston and her 7 children, and 1 grandchild has attracted national attention because the news stories incorrectly said she had been "exiled" from Ohio to her native Alabama. Such was not the case. The family was destitute, but not eligible for relief under Ohio law because Mrs. Winston had not been a resident of the State for 1 year. Accordingly, when she was brought before juvenile court on a charge of neglecting the children, Judge Albert A. Woldman gave her a choice of having the children committed to a home where they would be cared for, or of returning voluntarily to Alabama where the family was legally entitled to relief. Mrs. Winston chose the latter.

Now an Alabama judge has gotten into the act, in an obvious effort to make it appear that a Northern State discriminates against Negroes. He has charged that Mrs. Winston was deprived of her legal rights by being "forcibly sent to Alabama," and he wants an investigation.

* * * * *

It was because of such cases as Mrs. Winston and her family that the Ohio Legislature a number of years ago enacted the law requiring 1 year's residence before a person became eligible for relief. Before that requirement, indigent people were coming to Ohio from other States for the purpose of drawing relief, which always has been dispensed more generously here than in some other parts of the country.

Judge Woldman handled the case wisely and humanely. He could have sent Mrs. Winston to jail for neglecting her children, while committing the children to an institution. Instead, he found a way of keeping the family together, which was what the woman wanted.

Anyone who tries to make political capital out of this case is either ignorant of the facts or is deliberately trying to incite racial animosity.

JUNE 15, 1956.

EDITOR, THE CLEVELAND PLAIN DEALER,
Cleveland, Ohio.

DEAR SIR: The unfortunate use of the word "exile" in describing the action of my court in the case of Mrs. Martha Winston, her 7 children and an 11-day-old grandchild, who voluntarily returned to Alabama where they were eligible for relief, is a complete distortion of the actual decision.

A complaint was filed by the Cleveland Board of Education charging the mother with contributing to the neglect of her children because she had kept them out of school since February. In addition, it was reported to the court that a 17-year-old daughter had given birth to an illegitimate child 11 days before this hearing; that the welfare agencies of Cuyahoga County had given the family emergency relief for 3 months from the children's arrival from Alamaba in October 1955, and had cut off all further relief in December because the family was not eligible under the Ohio law requiring residence of at least 1 year; that the family was living in a Cleveland city-owned house in area B which had been ordered razed, and that the family would soon be without shelter; that there was no food in the house, no milk for the 11-day infant, and no income whatever; that the husband and father of the seven children was a legal resident of Alabama, was operating a farm there and stood ready to accept the return of his family to the farm. (Not being divorced from her husband, Mrs. Winson's legal residence and that of the children is the residence of the husband.) That the welfare agencies of Alabama had been contacted, had acknowledged legal responsibility for the family and stood ready to give them relief on their arrival in Alabama.

I advised Mrs. Winston I had no right to tell her where she should reside and that it was her privilege to live wherever she wanted to. However, I pointed out to her that since she admitted that she could not support her family, or get relief in Ohio, or return to her legal residence in Alabama where relief was forthcoming, I had no alternative but to take immediate measures provided by law to protect the 11-day infant and the other children who were reportedly without food.

In accordance with the testimony given by the school and welfare representatives and by our probation officers, I adjudged the children to be neglected children, and the mother guilty to contributing to their neglect. The welfare division was instructed to give the family immediate temporary relief; the children were ordered placed in a county receiving home where they would be given food, shelter, and supervision.

Despite the fact that the children were without food, the mother objected to their placement in the receiving home because she did not want to be separated from them. I told her that the emergency situation left only two courses of action: Either the children must go to the receiving home in Cleveland, or she could go back with them to Alabama where they were legally entitled to relief. I withheld disposing of the mother's case to give her time to make her choice.

Two days later she decided to return to Alabama with her children. In fact, I was in the midst of a series of telephone conferences with some leaders of the local community, including representatives of the Urban League, the NAACP and the Call &

Post, to ascertain if some private help could be obtained for the family, when I was advised that Mrs. Winston had decided against having her children placed in a receiving home and preferred to return with them to Alabama.

The local Travelers' Aid furnished the family with transportation and food and contacted the Alabama welfare agency to receive them. There was no exile order by the court but only a voluntary choice by Mrs. Winston to escape a possible sentence for her neglect of the children, and to prevent them from being placed in a receiving home. No court could compel Mrs. Winston to return to Alabama had she preferred to remain in Cleveland under the above circumstances.

As chairman of the Unemployment Compensation Board of Review of Ohio, I had fought for the granting of unemployment compensation to workers who moved from one State to another for the purpose of finding employment. I believe nothing should be done to hinder American citizens from migrating to localities where they might improve their economic conditions. Today a mass migration is going on in our country. Families are on the move from one State to another. It is inevitable that problems like those of the Winston family should arise.

It is noteworthy that 45 of the 48 States have residence restriction like those of Ohio against granting relief to persons unable to qualify under residence requirements. The plight of the Winston family is typical of many other cases. The hands of courts and relief agencies are tied against granting long range help to nonresidents. Involved is a broad human problem which transcends the borders of any single State. It is a national problem. The rights and human dignity of unfortunate people will continue to be adversely affected until public relief is put on a national basis as in the case of relief for farmers for many years. Consideration must be given to the enactment of Federal legislation to help families who must migrate from one State to another in search of better living conditions. The hands of local welfare agencies and courts should not be tied so as to prevent granting aid and relief in worthy cases.

Sincerely yours,

ALBERT A. WOLDMAN,
Associate Judge, Juvenile Court of Cuyahoga County.

New England Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JAMES T. PATTERSON

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 2, 1956

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Speaker, recently I read an excellent pamphlet entitled "Salute to New England," published by Pan American Airlines. It is a report on the growing ties of New England industry with the markets and resources of Latin America. Since this directly concerns the future of New England industry, and particularly the people of the Naugatuck Valley, whose welfare is of the utmost concern to me, the pamphlet prompts me to make some urgent remarks.

As we all know, New England, long the center of America's industrial activity, recently found itself confronted with serious problems caused by conditions beyond its control. Manufacturers and laborers had to face ruinous competition from other areas whose labor and power were cheaper and where fuel and resources were more accessible. This was particularly true, for example, in our great textile industries, where only 1 of 9 New England workers is now employed, compared to 1 of 4 in 1920.

New England was in trouble. Unemployment was chilling the lives of many of our great one and one-half million labor force. Valuable plants active in strengthening the national defense were cutting down production.

This is why New England's great surge since the war has been so exciting to me. As a result of this surge our industry has both a new look and a new direction. Its new look is its new industries—plastics, aircraft, electronics, and nuclear power, to name just a few. Native New England ingenuity has rechanneled some of its great potential into these new fields and has nearly succeeded in solving the problems caused by cheap southern power and labor.

I do not mean to say by this that New England has a completely new look. This is not so. Connecticut's great metal factories, for example, alone employ over 300,000 workers, many in the Naugatuck Valley. Almost 150,000 more of our great labor force earn their livings producing such essential materials as furniture and paper, and rubber, leather and textile goods. All these long-established great industries are still the core of Connecticut's industrial life, yet the expanding new ones, such as nuclear power and plastics, have made New England even more the heart of American industry.

Yet even more important than the New Look of New England industry is its new direction—Latin America. Here is a vast land area, startlingly near New England, and superbly wealthy in natural resources, which is rapidly solving our crucial problems of costly domestic transportation and lack of native resources. The two areas are made for each other.

I am proud to say that our manufacturers in New England have been very quick to see the potentialities of this developing area. More and more, the great resources of Latin America—cheaply transported to such nearby ports as New York, Boston, Bridgeport, and New Haven—have been used by New England manufacturers in making their products. More and more, our finished goods are finding their way to the rapidly expanding Latin American markets. The combination is an unbeatable one. For example, already, 40 percent of New England investment is in Latin America; 40.5 percent of its waterborne imports are from Latin America. This represents more than $200 million worth of imports.

And since more than one-third of New England industry depends very heavily upon foreign imports, of which 40 percent are from Latin America, it follows that at least 200,000 of New England's working force totaling 1,500,000 people depend directly upon these imports for their livelihoods. About 450,000 depend upon them to a great extent. In our Naugatuck Valley this is particularly true, since Latin American imports are essential to these great factories.

Furthermore, Latin America provides New England industry with a $400 million export market yearly. This is 6 percent of the Nation's total to Latin America, and 2 percent of the nationwide trade to the whole world.

The most exciting thing about these statistics is that they grow by leaps and bounds every year. Both New England and Latin America are expanding quickly, and in expanding, become even more closely tied. Latin America's population is the most rapidly growing in the world. Its 175,000,000 people are increasing at the rate of 2½ percent a year. This means that by 2006 there will be 500 million people in Latin America in need of New England's finished goods. Furthermore, as they grow, they are becoming much more expert at harvesting their inexhaustible supplies of crude petroleum, fibers, hides, foods, and all kinds of ores for machinery, machine parts, transportation and electrical equipment, precision instruments, metal products, and finished goods of all kinds. These, needless to say, are just the raw materials New England needs—and they can be transported here more cheaply than similar materials found anywhere else in the world. The east coast of South America, for example, is only 200 miles farther from Bridgeport than it is from Miami. This fact of distance is clearly shown when we realize that the ties with Latin America are much stronger in New England than in the rest of the Nation. The more New England manufacturers turn to Latin America, the better the future of New England industry, and I am proud to say that New England manufacturers have been the first to realize this.

I want to stress this point with regard to the industries in the Naugatuck Valley. Not only will fine and inexpensive raw materials from Latin America make it possible for these fine industries to compete favorably with any area in the world, but Latin America offers unlimited possibilities as a market. The more we invest in their development, the faster this market will grow. Furthermore, Latin America can be tremendously beneficial to transportation facilities in the valley. Ports such as Bridgeport, New Haven and others nearby would benefit by concentrating upon this trade. Railroads would find their business booming even more if they acted as feeder lines from these ports to the factories in the area. And all transportation facilities, and consumers in general, would benefit by the cheaper goods produced as a result of less expensive raw materials and expansion of production.

So the most important thing of all about the New Look and the new direction of New England industry is not just that there are new industries or that they are turned in a new direction. The most important thing is that New Englanders keep up this trend. Ingenuity and resourcefulness have keep New England's place as America's industrial leader. The way to stay in the lead is to increase our ties with Latin America. We must invest even more in their undeveloped resources so that they may be-

come greater. In the process so will New England.

Pan American Airlines deserves praise for its continued keen interest in New England industry, especially Connecticut industry. This great, forward-looking airline has long been a great service to businessmen in New England, and its continued interest will be a tremendously important factor in our future. A regular and direct Pan American flight schedule operating out of Boston, New York, Hartford, and other convenient cities in the area could do as much for our industrial future as any other single innovation. Such a service would make Latin America much more accessible to New England businessmen and investors, and thereby increase the economic ties with Latin America many times over. We of New England thank Pan American for its "salute," and return it with hope for the future.

Western Borders of Poland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS S. GORDON
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 2, 1956

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Speaker, by request of the Polish Western Association of America, Chicago, Ill., and under unanimous consent, I insert in the RECORD the position taken by this association with reference to the Polish western borders. A copy of this article was delivered to the German Chancellor, Dr. Konrad Adenauer, through the German Embassy in Washington, earlier this month, when he visited here:

POSITION OF THE POLISH WESTERN ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA WITH REFERENCE TO POLISH WESTERN BORDERS

The Polish Western Association of America is an organization of men and women interested in and largely descended from Polish western territories.

Aim of the Polish Western Association of America is to safeguard and strengthen the ties binding the western lands restored to Poland after the First and Second World Wars to the organic parts of Poland, as well as to correct misleading information coloring American opinion.

On the occasion of Chancellor Adenauer's visit to the United States, the association takes the liberty of calling attention to the fact that these western lands are the cradle of the Polish people and nation, and for thousands of years were the dwelling place of Poles and their Slavonic ancestors.

A thousand years ago when Poland entered upon the stage of recorded history as a lawfully ruled state established several hundred years earlier, these lands were governed by native Polish princes of the Piast family. One of them, Mieszko, for the sake of delineating on record the separateness of Poland from its German neighbors, rejects their offer, and, through the instrument of her Slavonic brother Czechs, enters the family of Western European culture.

Polish defense of these lands began when the Slavs along the Elbe and the western shores of the Oder succumbed, overcome by the German forces of annihilation or assimilation. The only Slavonic people remaining within the German realm were the Lausitzer Serbs, who today are demanding their freedom. In their struggle against the eastern German margraves, the Poles were repeatedly allied with the most illustrious Roman emperors of the German nation.

Polish arms, often victorious, permitted Polish knights to stake out the Saale River as a frontier, and were sufficiently effective to prevent the German "Drang nach Osten" from succeeding in conquering Polish lands in one fell swoop. The process, or the gradual tearing away of parts of Poland, took the Germans over 800 years. Last of the principal or biggest cities in the West, namely, Szezecin (Stettin), Wroclaw (Breslau), and Gdansk (Danzig), did not become Prussian until the 18th century.

The population of the western lands, and this until after 1945, was predominantly Polish. Their attachment to Poland, Polish origin and character, was affirmed and enscribed in blood alike in the armed resistance to Prussian occupation of Szezeclin (Stettin) and Gdansk (Danzig), and in the Polish uprisings in the 19th and 20th centuries. They further affirmed their ties with their outstanding contribution to the spread and development of Polish culture.

It is unjustly, therefore, that the German Government and German public opinion alike call this region Eastern Germany. They continue to regard this territory as only temporarily under Polish administration and stubbornly cling to geographic place names, Germanized for the most part in the 1900's. During the Second World War after Hitler's attack on Poland, all remaining semblance to their Polish origin was completely eradicated in thousands of instances.

During the time they belonged to Germany, these lands were deficit territories. They always ate up a large percent of the German national income. Learned men and journalists in Germany constantly called attention to the continuous exodus of Germans from these lands. This historic process reached a peak in 1945, when all of the German immigrants abandoned the territory. Only the native-born—that is the Poles—remained on the land.

Relatively few Germans were displaced, and then they were not compelled to do so in a later period.

One and the other, those who abandoned and those who departed Poland, were absorbed into the German economy. At the same time, the young, and so the most productive element does not want to even think of returning. German economists emphasize that without them the revival of Western German economy would not be possible.

Lands restored to Poland were wholly repossessed by the Poles and administered as their own. Today the majority of people on these lands are Poles, born there; and it is a question of only months before the population reaches and exceeds that which existed before the war.

There is only one problem and that is how do the Germans picture themselves taking over these lands again? There is talk of this not only by the man on the street and second-rate journalists, but also very frequently by ministers in Chancellor Adenauer's government.

This is nothing else but a hidden menace of a new war caused by Germany, inasmuch as the Poles will never give up these lands.

Objective German voices belong to a rare few, so it is that the declaration of West German Minister of Foreign Affairs Heinrich von Brentano was greeted with esteem when he declared that renunciation by the German people of questionable border expansion cannot be rejected.

Likewise, a proven friend of the Germans, former longtime United States Commissioner in Germany McCloy, came forth with the request that West Germany renounce expansion of its borders beyond the Oder and the Lausitzer Neisse, and thus pave the way to the unification of Germany. In this, he acknowledged the Polish point of view.

The Polish Western Association of America, numbering within its ranks Americans of Polish ancestry, regards the present Polish-German boundary along the Oder and Lausitzer Neisse Rivers as historically fair and as final. Further, it holds that the recognition of this boundary can end a thousand years of Polish-German border misunderstandings. Concurrently, it can mark the beginning of a new era of Polish-German cooperation, in which both Christian nations could stand as an effective bulwark against the eastern wave of barbarity threatening western culture and civilization.

Time and again, Poland performed such deeds in history, for example: defending Europe on the fields of Liegnitz in 1241, lifting the siege of Vienna in 1683, and through victory over the Bolsheviks in 1920, repelling Soviet imperialism already then tending toward the conquest of all Europe.

Rock Island (Ill.) Centennial Bridge Improvement

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT B. CHIPERFIELD
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 2, 1956

Mr. CHIPERFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted S. 2091, a bill authorizing the reconstruction, enlargement and extension of the bridge across the Mississippi at Rock Island, Ill., passed the House today.

This bill was sponsored by Senator DIRKSEN and had previously passed the Senate. I introduced a similar bill in the House.

The real purpose of the bill is to reconstruct, enlarge and extend the approaches to such bridge. This construction does not require any Federal appropriation and will not cost the Federal Government one dime but will be paid for by toll revenue collected from those who use the bridge.

The following statement from the House report concisely states the reasons why improvements are necessary:

GENERAL STATEMENT

The Rock Island bridge was completed in 1940 and since that time the average daily traffic over the bridge has increased from 4,000 to 12,000 vehicles per day. The bridge is a 4-lane roadway and can accommodate a large volume of traffic, but it is estimated that its present approaches nave only one-third to one-fourth the capacity of the bridge. Approximately 10 percent of the vehicles using the bridge are large trucks which are channeled through the business areas.

The metropolitan areas of Rock Island and Moline, Ill., Davenport, Iowa, and adjacent cities, has a total population of about 200,000. The area is highly industrialized, with an estimated 126 industries with 29,000 employees on the Illinois side, 179 industries with 15,000 employees on the Iowa side, and 6,000 employees at the Rock Island Arsenal located on an island in the river. Being one metropolitan area, the traffic across the river produced by this employment is extremely heavy on the available bridges.

Approximately eight blocks east of the Rock Island bridge is a free Government

bridge connecting Rock Island and Davenport by way of the Rock Island Arsenal. Practically all of the employees at the arsenal travel to and from their homes by motor vehicles over the free bridge. The present average flow over this bridge is 15,000 to 18,000 vehicles per day. This traffic is impeded by the opening of the bridge to permit boats to pass, which averages about 125 openings monthly.

Based on present revenue, the Rock Island bridge is expected to be toll free in 1959. The committee has been advised that city authorities believe that refinancing and extending the small toll of 10 cents per passenger vehicle is a practicable, equitable, and feasible method of improving the approaches to the bridge. They estimate that under this procedure the proposed improvements will be completely paid for and the bridge made toll free by about 1970.

The committee believes that S. 2091 should be enacted so that proper steps can be taken to permit the Rock Island bridge to be utilized to its designed capacity to relieve the existing and anticipated traffic conditions. The approaches to the bridge appear to be the key to the problem, and unless corrected to permit a free flow of traffic across the river, the economy of the area will be adversely affected and the movement of highway traffic will be impaired. Adequate approaches to the bridge, with attendant improvement of access roads and streets, will afford safe and rapid approach to the bridge and increase its utility; prevent congestion and overflow of traffic and trucks in the downtown city area; and handle the heavy increase in traffic expected from the nearby terminus of the Illinois toll road East-West Highway and the construction of a new bridge over Rock River.

The committee has been informed that the Secretary of the Army, the Secretary of Commerce, and the Director of the Bureau of the Budget have offered no objection to the enactment of this legislation.

Resolution Passed by New York Army and Navy Union

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL A. FINO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 2, 1956

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I include a resolution passed at the recent State convention of the Department of New York Army and Navy Union, U. S. A.

The Army and Navy Union, U. S. A., the oldest veteran organization in this country, is to be commended for its important work in promoting, fostering, and encouraging perpetual fraternal comradeship. It lists among its members such personalities as Presidents William McKinley, Theodore Roosevelt, Harry Truman, and Dwight D. Eisenhower; Douglas MacArthur, Edward V. Rickenbacker, and many other famous persons.

The resolution, which follows, was unanimously adopted and expresses the appreciation of this fine organization for the efforts of Members of Congress who have been sympathetic to the problems and affairs of our veterans and servicemen:

At the 41st annual convention of the Department of New York Army and Navy Union, U. S. A., Troy, N. Y., June 21 to June 23, 1956, a resolution was unanimously adopted praising and extolling the Congressmen and two United States Senators, LEHMAN and IVES, all from the State of New York, who have sympathetically indicated and demonstrated sincere effort and activity to veterans and servicemen, and their families, and to the families of the men who sacrificed their lives in the defense of their country.

To you New York State Congressmen and Senators LEHMAN and IVES, please accept our most humble thanks for your unending and thoughtful consideration in enacting veterans' legislation for the benefit of all who served and are serving their country in peace and war. Our sincere hope that you will continue to serve your country prudently and unselfishly.

Value of Foreign Aid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM H. NATCHER
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 2, 1956

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith an editorial entitled "Foreign Aid Also Improves Foreign Relations," which appears in the June 21, 1956, issue of the Leitchfield Gazette, of Leitchfield, Ky.

The editorial is as follows:

FOREIGN AID ALSO IMPROVES FOREIGN RELATIONS

Attempts by the national administration to restore cuts made in appropriations for foreign aid apparently are in for tough sledding created mostly by a line of thought which, although not justified by facts, is prevalent and not without logic. Objections to foreign aid by Congressmen are reflections of the objections made by private citizens toward paying tax money to foreign countries and people, regardless of the purpose. Reports of how Uncle Sam is being duped through foreign aid are rife, and the most far-feteched rumors find easy belief in the minds of those already prejudiced.

Oddly enough, some of the persons who oppose foreign aid also ask why the Russians are so successful in their efforts to mold thinking in satellite nations, implying that this country should use their methods. What these critics overlook is that the Russians are spending much more to force their way of life on subject nations than we spend to help keep our allies strong and friendly. If we were to adopt the Communist methods of winning friends the cost would be considerably more and the results probably less effective.

Foreign aid represents only a small part of our total budget, even through $5 billion is an astronomical figure that is too great for the average person to comprehend. Cutting over a billion dollars off what was supposed to be an adequate amount might make sense to harassed Congressmen who are faced with a constant barrage of questions about the need for foreign aid at all. However, weakening this country's position to assist friendly nations could be a bad policy in the end.

The often-heard statement that friends who must be bought are useless may be countered with the fact that we are not buying friends with the money. Friends are made or lost as a result of our actions rather than the amount of our aid because all the money in the world will not help a churlish giver. With so much debate over the value of foreign assistance as a policy, friendly nations naturally may be led to believe that our finances are being used to exploit rather than aid them. To avoid the likelihood of more than a minority holding this view, it would be advisable for all concerned to decide upon an amount to devote to foreign aid and strengthen arguments for continuing the aid to counteract claims of the poorly informed.

The Poznan Revolt

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 2, 1956

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, today's reports indicate that the 3-day revolt of workers in Poznan has been brutally crushed by the Communist security police and armored divisions.

On the heels of this announcement came the reports of the beginning of a bloody purge of the people of Poznan who rebelled against the unbearable situation created by the Communist aggression, economic exploitation and miserable living conditions under the Red rule.

Our prayers and deepest sympathy are extended to the courageous people of Poznan in these days of trial when they are exposed to the ruthless revenge of the Communist dictatorship which recognizes only the force of terror and police oppression.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to commend to the attention of the membership of this body a statement issued by President George Meany, of the AFL–CIO, hailing the courage of the workers of Poznan and assuring them of American labor movement's full moral support:

Yesterday's uprising of Polish workers in Poznan demonstrates to the entire world on both sides of the Iron Curtain that the torch of freedom lit by the workers in East Berlin 3 years ago has not been extinguished.

Once again active leadership in the fight against Communist totalitarianism has been seized by heroic workers. This uprising is not the action of people who have deliberately measured the consequences of their acts. It stems from the irrepressible human desire for freedom which has burst forth in a symbolic chant, "We want bread". This cry will not fall upon deaf ears, because workers will recognize it as the echo of the demands of free trade unionists everywhere for "bread, peace, and freedom".

The Polish uprising once again provides evidence that the workers of the world are united in heart and mind despite different governmental regimes. They are united in their yearning for freedom and in their determination to break the chains of Communist enslavement.

We of the AFL–CIO are, indeed, proud of this memorable day of July 28, 1956. The free workers of America hail the courage of the workers of Poland. While we cannot extend a helping hand to them in their imprisonment behind the Iron Curtain, we want to assure them of our full moral support.

At the same time, I also wish to include in the RECORD an editorial which appeared in the Milwaukee Journal of June 30. The editorial aptly points out that "no amount of force can extinguish love of liberty among those who have experienced liberty." Even though the Poznan uprising has been crushed by tanks and guns of the Communists, the spirit of the Polish people will continue to fight for liberty and true independence for their nation.

The editorial follows:

THE CHILL WIND FROM POZNAN

The Polish uprising, like the East Berlin revolt of June 16, 1953, shows anew that people who have known national independence and democratic freedoms will not supinely accept Communist tyranny.

Soldiers may maintain Red control over them. Puppets may govern them from guarded headquarters. Police may silence their unrest. But the moment there is the slightest relaxation of force and terror, hatred of communism comes into the open and the spirit of revolt is in the air.

Tanks and guns quell uprisings, of course. Unarmed men are helpless against modern weapons. The day is past when revolutions can be made by men with muskets or Paris can be taken by a mob armed with scythes and pitchforks.

No amount of force, however, can extinguish love of liberty among those who have experienced liberty. It is Communists' belief that, given time, they can sell their doctrine to a people or can insure its permanence by force. The belief has never proved justified outside of Russia, where citizens have never known freedom. Even in Russia today there seems to be a stirring that troubles the men in the Kremlin.

It is in Poland that the world would expect the first signs of trouble for the Red oppressor. The Poles have experienced many occupations and suffered many repressions. They have died in many courageous revolts. They do not like Russains; they cherish independence; they are not fooled by puppets in their midst.

The chill wind from Poznan is blowing today through the government buildings in Warsaw. It must bring sympathetic trembles of uncertainty and fear in East Berlin, Prague, Budapest, Bucharest, and Sofia. Yes; even in Moscow.

Unreasonableness of Steel Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ELMER J. HOLLAND
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 2, 1956

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include an editorial from the Washington Post and Times Herald of Monday, July 2, on the unreasonableness of the steel industry:

THE STEEL STRIKE

Officials on both sides are predicting that, now the major steel mills are closed, the strike will last for at least a month. If so, losses on both sides will be enormous. It is said that losses in wages and steel production will run to more than $40 million a day. As the mills had planned a reduction in output to 80 to 85 percent of capacity during the summer months, a short strike might not have any serious repercussions on the economy. But prolonged idleness in this basic industry could not fail to slow down construction and manufacturing over wide areas and to spread a havoc of unemployment.

Where the chief responsibility lies is difficult to determine. As in most controversies of this kind, fault may be found on both sides. The sharpest conflict appears to have arisen over the length of the proposed contract. Because of the vast outlays for plant expansion contemplated for the next 3 years, the industry sought a 5-year contract so as to eliminate the danger of frequent strikes and thus increase stability and make it easier to attract capital. The union refused to be bound for so long a period, although it is said to have been willing to negotiate a 3-year contract. No satisfactory middle ground could be found. Undoubtedly long contracts have many advantages, but the steel executives now have to ask themselves whether the present strike will not inflict precisely the sort of damage they sought to avoid by demanding a long contract to prevent strikes.

One other action that is difficult to explain is the industry's rejection of the union's proposal to extend the old contract for 15 days in the hope of averting a strike. The union's condition was that any wage gains finally agreed upon be made retroactive to the date on which the contract expired. That practice is widely followed in labor-management negotiations. Certainly it is not unreasonable. The unfortunate rejection of this offer cannot now be rectified, but the steel management can bid strongly for a short strike by initiating new negotiations, and both sides ought to be formulating new offers, for a compromise is the only feasible solution of controveries of this sort, whether the punishment the parties inflict on one another is long or short.

Criticism of Foreign Aid Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM H. NATCHER
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 2, 1956

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith an editorial entitled "Uncle Sam's Nephews and Nieces Grow Critical of Vast Handouts Abroad," which appears in the June 19, 1956, issue of the Messenger, of Madisonville, Ky.

The editorial is as follows:

UNCLE SAM'S NEPHEWS AND NIECES GROW CRITICAL OF VAST HANDOUTS ABROAD

Scribblers for the Big Prints and commentators who generally are found in the camp of the give-away boys are shedding a lot of tears over the drubbing which has been given lately to the President's foreign aid program.

In Sunday's papers some of the scribblers forecast a break-up of the bipartisan foreign policy which has guided our relations with the rest of the world for some years, but these writers, it seems to us, ignore a simple fundamental principle which is behind the foreign-aid fund cuts. It is this:

The American people, who have given away to the rest of the world the tremendous and unbelievable sum of $115,000,000,000, are getting tired of the handouts.

This attitude on the part of the Great American Taxpayer and some of his representatives in Congress should not surprise anyone. It seems to us that the American people, to whom tax-paying has grown to be a critical levy upon income, have simply dropped their starry-eyed attitude toward the so-called downtrodden or unfortunate nations of the world and are beginning to count the cost and wonder what our $115,000,000,000 have produced either in improvement in the lot of downtrodden or in good will toward Uncle Sam.

The good will is desired by the sincere not as a matter of building up our national self-esteem, but as a means of putting across to the rest of the world our peaceful intentions, our free way of life, and our desire for world progress as well as American progress.

In this intent of ours, sad to say, we see little to indicate that we have scored anything like reasonable success. We haven't bought security with our money, even, a project in which we have invested $55 billion in foreign aid since World War II ended and the present great contest with the Russians began. Who will say today that we have gained lasting friends by our vast outpouring of good American dollars, or that communism has been contained in its original places as a result of our generosity?

The plain fact is that communism hasn't been contained, and everybody knows it. Communism, despite its smiles, is waging the same cold but deadly war, and it has chalked up gains in the East and Middle East which are startling and menacing in their extent.

Tito, who has received a lot of American dollars, is professing anew his love for the Russians. Our citizens don't like what is going on in Saudi Arabia. They don't like the attitude of Iceland, and they know that our big air bases in Morocco are in peril. And even the Greeks are turning against us.

The fact is, a lot of Americans and some of their representatives in Washington are asking themselves seriously whether we have any real friends in the world. This is causing them to take a hard look at this whole giveaway business. The average citizen doesn't have the slightest idea what $115 billion is, but he can figure out that it is one hundred and fifteen million thousands of dollars. And the administration wanted to kick up the giveaway, rather than pare it down.

No wonder Congress acted up. Members, we feel sure, have been talking with the folks back home.

Air Transport in Action

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARL HINSHAW
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 29, 1956

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Milton W. Arnold, vice president, Air Transport Association, from the June, 1956 issue of Air Force magazine, entitled "Aerial Lifeline in Reserve":

AERIAL LIFELINE IN RESERVE

(By Milton W. Arnold)

Come an all-out war, the Government has contracted to purchase an airlift package from the airline industry. The package is called CRAF, Civil Reserve Air Fleet.

CRAF is made up of a fleet of airliners capable of moving men, machines, and materiel to the four far corners in a civilian-operated airlift, the like of which the world

has never known before. Operationally, it it a plan worked out jointly by the Department of Defense, the Department of Commerce, and the operators of our civilian air transportation system.

The plan calls for integrating commercial airliners and the know-how of the air transport industry into the Military Air Transport Service's aerial supply line whenever it is necessary to support an emergency action. At the same time, a war air service pattern for the remaining civil airliner fleet is being worked out, designed to insure essential priority air traffic over the 80,000 miles of domestic airline routes and the 112,000 miles of our international system.

In short, the CRAF plan calls for taking the experience, manpower, and facilities of the commercial airlines and using them to augment the military airlift capacity (MATS), which would be taxed in the early stages of another war.

In the words of Lt. Gen. Joseph Smith, the Commander of MATS, who is charged with implementing the entire CRAF program, "CRAF is a mobilization of civil airlines capability. It is not a militarization of the airlines."

The plan provides for:

Orderly, yet rapid, transition of the civil airlines from normal schedules to contractual military support operations.

Limited modification of selected four-engine civil aircraft so that equipment for long-range, over-ocean operation could be installed quickly.

Assignment of actual routes and destinations to the civilian operators so that each airline can plan for the routes over which its aircraft will be flying.

Deferment for essential airline-operating personnel, as much as possible, from active military service.

Already certain phases of the CRAF program are in motion. There are still many things to be worked out, but the basic formula is off the runway and heading in the right direction. If needed, CRAF could be put into operation this minute.

Many of its planes, for example, have been tagged by N–number for the job. More than 80 percent of these planes have been modified to provide for a different kind of operation than their normal duties require. New planes have the necessary modifications built in, engineered, as a matter of fact, from their blueprint stages. The Lockheed Super G Constellations, for example, were designed with quick conversion interiors. In a matter of hours it could go from a 65-passenger capacity to more than 100.

CRAF planes aren't "mothballed. It is not a standby operation. These planes are busy day and night flying mail, passengers, air express, and freight. They constitute more than 45 percent of the civilian air industry's 4-engined fleet. CRAF planes every day are flying routes which at the moment might become vital new war supply lines.

Likewise, ground personnel, flight crews, station facilities, and maintenance operations have been keyed to the CRAF plan. Rendezvous points, hopping-off points, loading points, maintenance bases, and other operational tasks have been assigned specific carriers. As rapidly as possible, needed equipment and materials for the operation of the reserve air fleet are being stockpiled. Although flight crews have not been classified by name, pilots, copilots, flight engineers, navigators, and all flight personnel have been alerted and know they might be called on overnight.

The CRAF package, incidentally, has an estimated value of $400 million in aircraft equipment alone—on an initial equipment investment basis. To maintain and operate such a fleet on a standby basis would cost the Government another $300 million annually. Under CRAF, the cost is much less per year.

To understand CRAF we have to go back to an act of Congress in 1938. This law put the adolescent United States air-transport industry into long pants. Up to 1938 airline operations were in a state of confusion with cutthroat competition, a bad case of crash fever, and financial instability threatening our whole system of airlines. Passage of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938 helped a critical situation.

The act gave purpose and mission to the airlines under a system of regulated competition and rigid safety requirements. Its ultimate aim was, and is, that the industry will become self-sufficient while serving the commerce, the postal system, and the national defense of the Uinted States. Congress spelled out definite obligations that the air transport industry must perform as a defense partner.

Before it was 3 years old—still in the kindergarten of regulated competition under the Civil Aeronautics Act—air transport went to war. Six months after Pearl Harbor, more than half our commercial fleet—193 planes out of 359—was either sold outright or leased to the Government. One-third of the airline personnel, top executives, pilots, radio operators, flight superintendents, meteorologists, and maitenance crews went into uniform. Their know-how formed the nucleus of the Air Transport Command (ATC) and the Naval Air Transport Service (NATS), predecessors of today's worldwide MATS operations. Airline experience pioneered new air routes across the top of the world and around its hot, equatorial middle. It developed new techniques of flying, navigation, maintenance, at home and abroad, and helped write the bible for a global network of air transport.

By war's end, on Army and Navy errands, the airlines had flown the equivalent of 26,000 times around the world. They flew 8 billion passenger miles and 850 million ton-miles of cargo. They moved anything and everything that would fit into a plane's fuselage. World War II was the proving ground for a whole new concept of logistics.

It proved, beyond any doubt, the value of an air transport industry in being and showed how it could be used in time of national emergency.

On the strength of this a number of Government agencies and the airline industry itself began studying how to prepare the airlines for a future emergency.

The big concern was to eliminate the obvious mistakes of World War II. As somebody put it, "Then the airlines weren't drafted—they were atomized."

Too many planes were taken away from civilian war jobs too quickly. There was no worldwide route pattern in the beginning because there were only 1 or 2 overocean routes. Planes and crews got to places in a hurry, only to sit around and sweat out loading, maintenance, and uncalled-for operational delays. There was no system of air priorities worked out until months later. Airline know-how was scattered in a thousand directions before it could be collected to a single purpose.

In any future war, there would be no time to get organized. Needed air transport must be ready, on the shelf. This was proved in Korea. Using civil air transport for the Korean airlift was a sample of how ready-made and ready-for-action airlift could be used by contracting with the carriers.

This is the crux of the CRAF plan which came into being officially in 1951 after many discussions and surveys by the Department of Defense, Department of Commerce, and the civilian air transport industry. The result, CRAF, is a many-sided operation, organically. It is directed and supervised by the MATS Commander acting as an operating agency for the Department of Defense. Its operational control is under MATS. However, it is maintained and operated by the civilian air transport companies, using their personnel, planes, facilities, and experience on a contract basis. All activities are coordinated with a civilian agency, the Defense Air Transport Administration (DATA), acting for the Department of Commerce. Another agency to handle necessary air priorities is being established under jurisdiction of the CAB—to implement and run the war air service pattern.

The physical requirements of CRAF are continuously changing. Based on 1956 figures, however, the CRAF fleet will consist of more than 360 four-engined, overseas aircraft with a contingency reserve of 35 additional aircraft to replace losses. These include Douglas DC–4's and DC–6's, Lockheed Constellations, Boeing Stratocruisers, and the newer and larger DC–7's and Super Constellations.

Their airlift capacity has been estimated at 566,000 available ton-miles per hour. But the figure is being revised upward to around 797,000 available ton miles per hour on the basis of the proposed 1956–57 CRAF program that will include more of the bigger and faster planes.

Revised estimates indicate the numerical size of the fleet may be increased to at least 358 planes, but its airlift capacity will go up 39 percent while the number of planes increases by only 13 percent. "We are trying to keep virtually the same number of coins in our emergency fund," a DATA spokesman explained, "but we are putting in quarters instead of dimes."

Jet transports will eventually again double the capacity without substantially increasing the number. And CRAF planners are already counting on using jets in the reserve fleet.

It has been estimated that the 1956–57 fleet could move an infantry division (17,500 men) across the Atlantic in about 72 hours. This, of course, if everything was to be thrown into the breach at one time.

The CRAF planes have also been earmarked for specific pobs. DC–4's will be used for heavy cargo shipments. The other types will be used to haul personnel, plus, of course, normal cargo hold capacity.

Modification of the planes for CRAF has been in progress for more than 3 years, by the airlines under government contract at airline maintenance and overhaul bases. This program involves installation of necessary wiring and brackets so that the peacetime airliners can accept military equipment. Such equipment includes new electronic systems, navigational aids, and sea-rescue gear necessary for over-ocean operations.

Initial pre-D-day modification—brackets and wiring—adds about 50 pounds extra weight to the airliner. But the equipment itself will weigh almost half a ton. The fact that the planes are equipped to accept the extra black boxes, however, puts the reserve fleet that much closer to active readiness. It means planes unequipped to fly the ocean today can be fitted to fly anywhere in 48 hours.

CRAF is a 2-ocean operation, with an Atlantic division and a Pacific division. The routes for each division have already been designated. In addition to normal airline routes, several auxiliary routes have been selected exclusively for CRAF use. The airlines responsible for operating their planes over all the respective routes have their assignments. Likewise various airlines have been assigned as senior lodgers for each division—responsible for upkeep of CRAF bases which will become maintenance and refueling stops and necessary equipment stockpile centers for the operation.

Sixteen different airlines have been assigned to the Atlantic division and eight other companies have been assigned to the Pacific Division. Some operators provide services for both areas. Altogether, 24 different airlines participate in the CRAF

program. The majority are scheduled airline operators with the remainder coming from the nonscheduled and contract haulers. Each has its specific assignment.

American Airlines, Seaboard & Western Airlines, Pan American World Airways, and Trans World Airlines, for example, are the senior lodgers for the Atlantic division. They will maintain and supply CRAF requirements at bases like Idlewild in New York; Santa Maria Airport in the Azores; Gander Airport, Newfoundland; Wheelus Airport in North Africa. Other carriers like United Air Lines, Northwest Airlines, and Transocean Air Lines will be senior lodgers for the Pacific area at places like Honolulu, Wake Island, Elmendorf AFB, Alaska, and Travis AFB, Calif.

Equipment and supplies are being stockpiled at the various bases around the globe. Likewise, stockpiling of the necessary equipment for modification of the planes at the airlines' major overhaul bases has also been in effect. Under the contract arrangement the Government pays for this equipment, the stockpiling, the necessary modification work. But the civilian operators provide the planes and crews and put it to use.

One of the biggest problems facing CRAF today is getting enough personnel. It is estimated that it takes about 3.5 crews per airplane to keep the fleet operating at maximum capacity. That means something like 1,400 pilots, and a like number each of copilots, navigators, flight engineers, alone—a total of more than 5,000 flight personnel.

The personnel problems have recently been clarified to some extent. All airline pilots, other than those serving in a supervisory capacity, are definitely earmarked for duty with the CRAF program. No longer are personnel in this category "counted twice," i. e., they may no longer fill positions as mobilization designees within the Air Force structure while being counted as a CRAF crew member. Several plans are under consideration to further resolve the draft and reserve status of airline personnel other than air crew members.

Suffice it to say, everything possible is being done to keep essential personnel of the airlines for the CRAF operation in their jobs which can give maximum efficiency to the program. The whole theory of CRAF is based on the principle of utilizing experience and know-how to the highest degree.

The man who would actually trigger CRAF is the commander of MATS. But he will not set the program into motion without an Executive order passed on to him through the Department of Defense.

A full-scale war is the real test. Here's how CRAF would work for the first 48 hours:

(1) All CRAF planes, wherever they might be, would return to or head toward designated modification points (the respective airline maintenance centers) where necessary equipment for overseas operation would be installed.

(2) All CRAF crews would be alerted and flown to already designated flyaway points.

(3) Senior lodgers at the various overseas bases would be alerted and ready to receive the flow of CRAF traffic.

(4) As soon as the modification program was completed on each aircraft it would be flown to designated rendezvous points or assigned to a specific mission.

Simultaneously the war air service pattern for the remaining civilian fleet would go into effect under a priorities system.

This is the plan. This is CRAF. It is being revised and revitalized every day. How well it will work can only be learned when and if—God forbid—we ever have to use it.

Rebellion Within Poland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RAY J. MADDEN
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 2, 1956

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I am herewith submitting for the information of the Members of Congress a copy of a telegram I received from the Indiana Department of the Polish American Congress. The same speaks for itself.

I am also submitting a copy of the letter which I have mailed to the Honorable John Foster Dulles, Secretary of State. This letter requests that our Government immediately instruct our representatives to the United Nations to resolve that the United Nations Organization make a complete investigation of the Poznan uprising and all internal and governmental conditions which incite rebellion on the part of the Polish people against communistic tyranny.

The telegram and letter follow:

JUNE 30, 1956.

Hon. RAY J. MADDEN,
House of Representatives:

The Polish American Congress of Indiana Department demands your appeal to the Department of State to immediately bring the Polish uprising at Poznan to the attention of the United Nations as a proof that Poland is still enslaved under the sharp communistic oppression. It is imperative that the State Department demand free election in Poland under the international control as per the Potsdam Agreement. A clear and determined position of the State Department in the defense of the Polish anti-communist heroes must be taken up immediately.

POLISH-AMERICAN CONGRESS
INDIANA DEPARTMENT,
ALOISE M. WOZNIAK, *President.*
THADDEUS WACHEL, *Secretary.*
T. S. KUBIAK, *Director.*
JOSEPH WIEWIORA,
Public Relations.

JULY 2, 1956.

The Honorable JOHN FOSTER DULLES,
Secretary of State,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: Enclosed you will find telegram which I have this day received from officers of the Polish American Congress, Department of Indiana, in regard to the uprising of the Polish citizens at Poznan. The request set out in the same should be given every consideration by our Government. The uprisings in Poland as well as the rebellion that took place in Germany 2 years ago, is an added testimonial of the unbearable enslavement of all captive countries under the Kremlin.

Judging from the propaganda machinery of the Commist tyrants, we can easily imagine the actions of the Kremlin if similar uprisings took place in any of the democratic nations of the world. The Communists would indeed carry on an endless propaganda if these conditions existed in any country outside of the Iron Curtain. Our Government has already overlooked and failed to take advantage of numerous opportunities to expose Soviet operation, enslavement, and tyranny over captive countries. One outstanding example was the failure of the State Department to allow the evidence and findings of the congressional Katyn Forest Massacre Committee to be sent to the United Nations. Another mistake was the opposition of the State Department to the sending of the findings and reports in the 83rd Congress of the Committee Investigating Communist Aggression. If we are to gain the confidence of the people of the world who love freedom, we must expose the truth about communism.

I believe that it is the duty of the State Department to immediately submit to our representatives in the United Nations, a demand for a complete and exhaustive investigation of the Poznan uprising, conditions and economic enslavement of the Polish people. History reveals that when tyranny and slavery exist in any part of the world, it is a threat to freedom everywhere.

Sincerely yours,

RAY J. MADDEN,
Member of Congress.

Hundred Billions and What Do We Get?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM H. NATCHER
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 2, 1956

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith an editorial entitled "Hundred Billions and What Do We Get?" which appeared in the June 27 issue of the Messenger, of Madisonville, Ky.

The editorial is as follows:

HUNDRED BILLIONS AND WHAT DO WE GET?

We in America are slow to learn, or maybe never learn, that efforts to maintain honest relations with dictators and mass murderers of the type of Stalin and Tito have never resulted in anything but sorrow and setbacks for the people of high ideals and integrity. It was ever thus, we thought the other day, while reading the first volume of Winston Churchill's History of the English Speaking Peoples, with its accounts of mass slayers of the early days.

Anyway, there is no more striking example of present-day international political stupidity, based on wishful thinking and good intentions, than the events which have happened between the great burden bearer of the world and international philanthropist, Uncle Sam, and the schemer Tito. It all began when Tito stabbed the patriot general, Draja Mihailovich, in the back after a phony trial in a phony people's court, and then turned upon and slaughtered several thousands of loyal Yugoslavians.

General Mihailovich, it is remembered, had the support of Winston Churchill and the government in London, plus the support of the United States and of France. Also, he was favored by the leaders of Greece and Turkey. However, Uncle Sam executed what amounted to a tailspin or an aboutface, and began pushing good American dollars into Tito's lap.

Now that Tito is in Russia's lap, it causes a lot of people to wonder how we expected to gain anything from Tito in the first place—Tito who now professes undying love

for the Russian people and rulers and undying faith in the eventual triumph of communism over the whole world?

The man in the street, the guy who pays all the bills and furnishes all the soldiers, wonders how we can hope to survive, even, when we persist in an effort to be the world's biggest big shot, moneywise, while at the same time dissipating our own resources in a suicidal effort to make our potential enemies stronger and stronger.

Now that Tito has made it crystal clear that he is a true Communist and an ally of Russia, the few legislators in Washington who saw through the Tito fraud from the start and who have opposed aid to him all along could, with good reason, cry from the Capitol dome "we told you so." And those who rallied to the give-away-American-dollars cry are bound to wonder how bitter crow can be, now that they are given a good chance to taste it.

It is too late to do anything about the Tito blunder now, of course, but it certainly is not too late to look carefully over our aid of the future—especially aid of a military nature—lest we repeat, in our dealing with other questionable regimes and dictators, our great mistakes of the past.

A hundred and fifteen billions and what do we get? Not even secure bases in Iceland, it now appears, and not even the friendship of the Greeks.

Liberalism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN F. KENNEDY

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, July 2, 1956

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an illuminating speech delivered by the Honorable Adlai E. Stevenson at the town hall luncheon, Biltmore Hotel, Los Angeles, Calif., on May 31, 1956.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXCERPTS OF REMARKS BY ADLAI E. STEVENSON AT THE TOWN HALL LUNCHEON, BILTMORE HOTEL, LOS ANGELES, CALIF., MAY 31, 1956

I'd like to talk particularly about the continuing, yes, I think the increasing importance of what has been of the deepest of democracy's taproots. I mean the idea, the concept, the attitude we have called "liberalism." Great and proper concern is expressed in these political campaigns about conserving our natural resources, about developing water and air and atomic power. I venture the belief that the natural resource we should today be most concerned about, the source of our most essential and infinite power, is a militant, effective and responsible liberalism.

What do we mean by "liberalism"?

Perhaps you recall that a few years ago a national magazine had great fun when it posed the question: "What is a liberal?" Its letters columns were filled with a rich variety of answers: Answers from reactionaries saying that liberals were people who had formed a blood pact with the devil; answers from the liberals also, each one choosing his own terms of definition. This filled the editors with great glee, and they drew the conclusion that a modern liberal didn't know who he was, or what he was, and hence was a vague, confused and ineffectual zombie wandering from point to point in a world he never made, and couldn't run.

Now I had always thought that variety of opinion was supposed to be the great hallmark of the American way—the unafraid and unfettered freedom to possess one's own political thoughts; not dictated by a party line, not cast in bronze, not chiseled in marble, not demanded from some obergruppenfeuhrer or commissar. But no, this magazine seemed to think the variety of voices with which liberals spoke made liberalism a mockery, and that a variety of opinion was somehow either funny, or silly.

If anyone had thought to ask the editors, "What is a reactionary?" there would, of course, have been no such variety of opinion. The voice that answered would have said in a hoarse monotone: "See what the boys in the back room will have."

I have my own feeling about what is a liberal in today's protean world. I offer them to persuade, not to coerce. If someone else has different views, well, we might both be right.

First, he believes in the existence of the future, and believes that it can be made a good future. If he is my age he may often think of the past, and he may think of it with affection and nostalgia. But he rejects the idea that it was either better or simpler than what we face now. In answer to the conservative's classic question, "Whither are we drifting?" the liberal says: "We cannot drift, we must go." Although he respects the past, he has no desire to tinker with the clock or turn it back. He does not try to force it ahead. But he does wind the clock.

He has never seen from on high any slightest indication that heaven itself wishes to return to the good old days—and so he walks ahead, in courage and steadfastness, and with a minimum of backward glances, into the perpetually obscure, the perpetually dangerous, the perpetually unknown future. No wonder he cannot always tell where he is going. In contrast to this, the reactionary can always tell you where he has been, so he has an air of authority. What he doesn't know is that the political house of his fathers, which he perpetually talks about but hasn't seen for 40 years, has now been condemned or torn down.

A second major belief of the liberal today is that people are all that is important and that all people are equally important, and that such ideas as property and corporate business are only means, not ends.

You will recall that John Locke listed the inalienable rights of man as "life, liberty, and property," and he went so far as to state that "Government has no other end than the preservation of property." But when the Founding Fathers were at their desks drafting our Constitution they amended Locke's classical formula to read "life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness"; and Jefferson wrote that "the care of human life and happiness is the first and only legitimate object of good government."

I think of a third element that gives the liberal faith, its integrity, and sets it apart. It requires no commitment to particular conclusions, but it demands of its adherents that they bring courage to their convictions. I am sure there are liberal Republicans as well as liberal Democrats. I am sure that true liberals can be in complete disagreement on any given point, that liberalism is a process for approaching answers rather than any given set of answers, that it never indulges itself the soft luxury of being absolutely sure the other fellow is wrong, that it is marked by tolerance, yes, and that its besetting sin is intolerance of tolerance.

But I am sure at the same time that the effective liberal is essentially characterized too by a commitment, something within him, which makes his restless and unsatisfied unless he can be doing something to advance that cause.

Woodrow Wilson spoke of a "fighting ardor for mankind." HERBERT LEHMAN was talking about the same quality when he spoke in Washington last month not just for freedom, but, as he put it, of a "passion for full freedom." There is no connection at all between extremism and liberalism. But every really effective liberal I know is a dedicated person—who can be convinced, even converted, but who won't ever admit he's licked and therefore never is.

I'm sure there's much more than these superficial reflections to the anatomy of modern liberalism. But this is enough to let us ask now what these elements of the liberal faith mean in terms of today's more immediate political issues.

There is time to touch only one aspect, in this conection, of the infinitely important and central manner of the conduct of our foreign affairs.

I realize that a great many liberals, like a great many others who would disclaim this label, hold firmly to the simple belief that the heart of a better, wiser foreign policy would be simply a new address for John Foster Dulles.

There is, of course, much more to it than this. I have said that it is a part of the liberal tradition that conviction be coupled with courage. I think the most significant fact in world affairs today is that the administration of the Nation which should be exercising leadership in those affairs is inherently unable to bring courage and consistency to the support of its convictions.

Why is this? What lies behind this aimless, erratic drift—which now disturbs every thoughful American as much as it has disturbed America's allies for years?

Why, the explanation is simply that this administration has failed in its effort to unite behind it the two wings of the political party upon which it must depend for its support. America's drfit is the inevitable consequence of a basic conflict, actual, factual, and philosophic, that has divided the Republican Party probably for half a century, since the tariff struggles, and certainly for 35 years since the League of Nations struggle.

Even this week perhaps you noticed stories about the President's so far unexplained decision not to put his support politically behind Republican Senator WILEY, of Wisconsin, who has "based his political future on support of the administration's foreign policy." Why? The stories suggest some connection with Vice President NIXON's reports of the unpopularity in the Middle West of the foreign aid program—the one policy, incidentally, upon which the President has appeared to show the greatest determination.

But this is only this week's illustration of the internal contradictions within the party and the administration and the course of the past years is strewn with the wreckage of the efforts to reconcile the irreconciliable, too often at a painful price in allied unity and mutual understanding.

When Mr. Eisenhower appeared on the scene in 1952, it was hoped that the isolationists' old guard wing of the Republican Party could disappear once and for all as a major political influence. At the Republican Convention of 1952, the more modern-minded forces behind the General seemed to have won a clear victory for control. Yet the old guard remained strong in the councils of the party. Political realism dictated a compromise and the price of that compromise was congressional domination by Senator Taft. The international-minded President was forced to trim his sails to the obsolete foreign policy concepts of the majority leaders of the Republican Party in Congress.

The political power of Mr. Taft as majortiy leader was great. And before his death, his authority was sufficient to pass the mantle of party leadership to Senator KNOWLAND, so the internal struggle has continued. And now, since the President's illness last Sep-

tember, there have been recurring signs that their influence is ascending.

The result is profoundly serious and it must be bluntly faced. At this critical juncture in our history, when the Soviet Union is employing its most formidable tactics in ideological, economic and political warfare, the United States Government remains frozen on dead center. There it sits, mired in the negative and the uncreative. There it sits, incapacitated by internal divisions. There it sits, unable to seize the international initiative.

And this inability is due to one single, overpowering reason: a positive program adequate to cope with the new Soviet tactics would split the Republican Party wide open.

* * * * * * *

Today there is general agreement that while security is obviously essential it can be achieved without resort to those unfortunate extremes. And yet there is all too much evidence that the administration cares little whether this wound on democracy's face is closed or not.

I shall not review the "numbers game" and all the abuses of the innocent. But just this month a member of the Subversive Activities Control Board, a Republican and an appointee of the President, has called public attention to the continuing injustices in the Government's personnel-security program and has condemned the political distortion by the administration of the actual facts regarding the hiring and dismissal of Government personnel. He has called for the very honesty in Government and the regard for human values which the President has repeatedly extolled. Yet the newspapers now predict that the response will be to get rid of board member Cain.

And the President, when he was asked about the most recent case of abuse in the name of security, said he was not familiar with it because, as he puts it, "they bring before me what has been going on, usually not in terms of names but in terms of numbers." I shall resist the temptation to comment on that—to you "numbers."

I suspect that perhaps one of the most serious affronts to the liberal tradition today is in the suggestion of the Republican leadership that we have just about arrived at where we want to go as a people, and in the almost complete lack of realization—certainly of any enthusiasm—about the frontiers of human betterment this Nation now faces. To really believe in the future and to have an ardor for mankind is to be driven by the feeling that we are wasting precious time as a nation in not doing the things which are possible now for the first time in our history.

Why aren't we fighting cancer and arthitis and diseases of the heart and the mind the way we fight our enemies?

Why aren't we going after the slums which weaken our whole social structure the way we go after anything that threatens our economy?

Why aren't we attacking the problems of making atomic energy and these new electronic machines the servants of men instead of their masters?

Why aren't we doing something to develop the programs which we need and which we will eventually have to have to meet the problems of our old age?

I suggest that the only reason for this lassitude is that there is all too little today, in the administration of this Nation's affairs, of the ardor for mankind Woodrow Wilson spoke of.

Surely, no one can suppose that even in our blessed land we have reached the limits of human welfare, or harnessed our abundance. Nor can we in a world undergoing revolutionary change hope to prosper by standing still. The most urgent need for new thinking springs from the fact that we are constantly by our science, our techniques and our inventions, altering out of recognition the contours of the human scene. The old landmarks are going. We need new roadmaps in a world that is, whether we like it or not, being remade every day.

In America today the quantity of goods and services available to ordinary families has banished, for the great majority, the oldest, grimmest specters of human misery. The ancient struggle for just food and raiment and shelter is about over, in this fortunate section of the world at least.

But free society cannot be content with a goal of mere life without want. It has always had within it a visionary spark, a dream that man, liberated from crushing work, aching hunger and constant insecurity, would discover wider interests and nobler aims. If quantity comes first so that men may eat, quality comes next so that they may not live by bread alone. Free society in the West has brought most of its citizens to that great divide. The next frontier is the quality, the moral, intellectual and aesthetic standards of the free way of life.

Of all the challenges faced by our new society of leisure, none equals that of education. It strikes at the central problem. In a community where at last we have time to ourselves, and where the social order is designed to give us a free range of choice, what sort of people do we want to be? What aims do we seek to fulfill ourselves, what ideals do we set before our children? We have come to the point at which, as a nation, we are beginning to recognize the inadequacy of our physical apparatus of education. Both political parties are agreed that, while State authorities shall bear the main responsibility for expanding our schools, Federal aid can and must supplement the program. This is a great gain but does it touch more than the fringe? The great questions of education are not only answered in the public mind, they are hardly even formulated.

Given new and better classrooms and lunchrooms and playgrounds—an ample educational environment in physical terms—what will we teach in the new schools? Above all, who and how many can we persuade to do the teaching? We are only on the outer margins of educational quality if all we can agree on is physical plant.

In these two great fields—the content of education and the recruiting of teachers—we urgently need a new sense of direction. We have to realize that the kind of technological and scientific society that lies ahead demands hard early training in the grasp of facts and the use of reason. Acquiring social skills or achieving group adjustment will not give us tomorrow's mathematicians and nuclear physicists. The Russians are outpacing us in tough basic training. We cannot afford to lag. But, unlike the Russians, we cannot be content with technological skill. Ours is a humane society and the disciplines of science need to be balanced by that profound respect for human values which can come only from history, literature, and thought.

But nothing can be taught without teachers. The best in education has always come from the ability of great and gifted men and women to communicate their love of learn- and love of truth. In absolute terms, we lack over 150,000 teachers. But in relative terms, do we give those who volunteer the respect, the status, the opportunity and the reward in any measure equal to their vast responsibility? What must be said of our priorities in a society in which the latest movie starlet can earn in a week more than a devoted teacher can earn in a year dedicated to training tomorrow's citizens?

I see so many new tasks for this free, powerful, rich society of ours. It seems to me we sometimes get so concerned about our problems that we miss our opportunities. The shaping of a new society is not the function of Government. And yet Government is at the same time our only instrument for carrying out some of our common purposes, for realizing some of our common hopes, for reaping, if you will, some of the fruits of our abundance in this period of unparalleled plenty. And I suggest that it calls for the faith of the liberal, a faith in the future, a consuming passion for the interests of people, if these opportunities are to be seized.

I have talked too long and I'm afraid I may have imposed upon you. My days recently have been very long and very crowded, and there has been too little opportunity for the thought about my remarks here today which would have permitted more precise utterance. I can testify to the accuracy of a line in Froude's life of Bunyan to the effect that the exercise of perpetual speaking is not conducive to the highest thought.

It is hard, frankly, for a politician to concentrate, in the last week of 4 months' campaigning, on a nonpolitical speech. And perhaps you will in this connection permit me to add one note. I have leaned heavily today on a phrase of Woodrow Wilson. Its broader frame, which I now quote, is this: "You will observe that whenever the Government loses its ardor for mankind it is time to elect a Democratic President.

Can't Anyone Tell Us What Our Foreign Policy Is?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 29, 1956

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the following article by Joseph Alsop which appeared in the New York Herald Tribune of June 29, 1956, is most illuminating:

MATTER OF FACT

(By Joseph Alsop)

LETTING THE DUST SETTLE

WASHINGTON.—The most important single fact revealed by a long Middle Eastern journey is the simple fact that the United States of America has not the shadow, or even the beginning of a shadow of a Middle Eastern policy.

The Middle East has considerably greater strategic and economic significance than the Far East. A Middle Eastern convulsion now looms ahead, on the scale of the Far Eastern convulsion that began with the loss of China.

If this Middle Eastern convulsion is not averted or controlled, the effects on the Western Alliance can make the after-effects of the Far Eastern convulsion seem downright coy.

But in their dealings with the Middle East, the American policymakers are now imitating the unfortunate example of Dean G. Acheson, in the famous period when he was "letting the dust settle" in the Far East.

To be sure, this administration is always very conscious of its public relations. All sorts of meaningless activities and purely temporary expedients are made to look like parts of a larger policy-design, that does not in fact exist.

For example, the Middle Eastern mission of U. N. Secretary General Dag Hammerskjold had no visible result whatever except the momentary prevention of an actual outbreak of war between the Arabs and Israel. Yet this was grandiosely portrayed as a brilliant triumph of American policy.

It was like claiming every successful foray of the fire brigade as a triumph for the municipal housing program, on the ground that even although houses are not getting built, at least they are not being burned down.

Meanwhile, the vacuum of American Middle Eastern policy approaches the point of being ludicrous. We have able diplomatic representatives in the area, but when you ask them what our policy is, they throw up their hands in amusement or despair.

Almost every American Embassy in the Middle East sees the problem utterly differently from all the other embassies, so that you wonder if they all belong to the same country. The Operations Coordinating Board, that mysterious adjunct of the National Security Council, has even sent an able young staff member to the Middle East to rush about from embassy to embassy in order to synthesize viewpoints. But this has little visible effect.

This utter vacuum of American policy cannot be too strongly stressed, because it is the least understood of the four cardinal factors in the ugly and dangerous Middle Eastern crisis. The other three factors are:

First, the rise of Arab nationalism, with its threat to all Western positions in the area including the oil interests that provide the lifeblood of most of the Western Allies.

Second, the unceasing and increasing Arab-Israel tension, with its constant threat of renewed fighting.

Third, the Soviet intrusion in the area, which has greatly encouraged the Arab nationalists both in their anti-Westernism and in their determination to wreak vengeance upon Israel.

These three forces are immensely powerful. They have combined to produce a rancid, rising ferment of a really frightening kind. The British, the people most directly threatened by this ferment, no longer have either the prestige or the power to control it effectively. They can talk of moving troops to the head of the Persian Gulf, if this is needful to safeguard their most important oil sources. But this is really about the best they can do; and it is a very poor best.

Therefore, the utter vacuum of American policy in the Middle East means that the only power, the only influence that might be used to pacify and control the situation is not being used for any purpose whatever. We do not wish to take the risk, or accept the commitments, or even make the distasteful choices that are essential for a serious Middle Eastern policy. So we are just letting things rip.

They have ripped pretty far already. Action on many fronts, from London to Bagdad and from Moscow to Ryadh, is urgently demanded. Much of this action must initially take the form of the most secret kind of secret diplomacy.

None but the administration policymakers, with their access to all the complex nuances of the intelligence, can tell just which policy choices are most likely to lessen the Arab-Israeli tension and prevent the Arab nationalists from attempting a final onslaught upon really vital Western interests.

But in Cairo and in Bagdad, in Damascus and Jerusalem, one always heard the same weary, desperate, pleading refrain—"Any American policy, even a bad policy, is better than none at all. You must at least try to prevent catastrophe, even although you cannot be absolutely sure of success."

The true criticism of the Truman administration's handling of the rise of Chinese communism was not that they did not prevent the Communist success. No one could guarantee the defeat of the Chinese Communists. The true criticism was that the Truman administration did not even try. The same can be said of the Eisenhower administration's dealings with the Middle Eastern crisis to date.

Resolution Opposing Federal Aid to Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BEN F. JENSEN
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 2, 1956

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, the annual convention of the American Legion held at Miami, Fla., in October 1955, adopted a resolution opposing Federal aid to education such as is proposed in the bill H. R. 7535 now under consideration by this House of Congress. The education of the youth of the United States has been a matter of deep interest and continuous study by the American Legion since its organization in 1919. The American Legion keeps close contact with our public and private schools through its 17,000 posts in all our 48 States, our Territories and in the District of Columbia. No organization in America has taken a keener interest or is better qualified to speak out on this important question than is the American Legion and they have spoken out in no uncertain terms; here is what they say:

The American Legion is of the opinion that sound judgment indicates that the only effective solution to our educational shortages is prompt and incisive action by the States and the local school districts.

What are the reasons for the policy stand of the American Legion? In summary outline they are set forth as follows:

1. The respective States have the financial capacity to meet their educational requirements if they wish to do so.

2. Federal aid is not the way to get good schools; under any moderate program of aid, the amount going to individual States would not be large enough to count effectively. And Federal aid in an amount sufficient to mitigate the problem significantly could result in such undermining of the State and local responsibility as to seriously endanger the kind of educational system that has served us so well since the founding of our country.

3. If substantial financial support is provided to local public schools by the Federal Government, local community interest and responsibility will diminish.

4. The wealth of the Nation is to be found in the States. In most instances, this wealth is as available to the States as to the National Government. Generally speaking, all taxes come from the same pocket. Sending tax dollars to Washington, which are intended for local use merely increases overhead and administrative costs and adds to the size of the Federal bureaucracy.

5. If a reappraisal of tax values on taxable property in the various communities and States is conducted in order to equalize tax responsibility on all types of property and education given its proper recognition in the reappraisal, there would be no need for Federal aid to general education.

6. There are serious dangers in creating a powerful centralized authority. It could lead to attempts at thought control and might invite infiltration by the Communist conspiracy.

7. It would seem impossible to have Federal aid to general education without the minimum of Federal control. Education certainly should be left up to the communities and the States and not to the Federal Government.

8. Local and State ability and willingness to deal with school problems is impaired by injecting a third level of government. The task of school administration will become even more difficult and complicated. Administrative differences with respect to controls or agreements as to division of funds will make for delays and inequities.

9. If you have Federal aid to education and a minimum of Federal control over this Federal aid, then there is great danger that the Federal Government will want to prescribe the curricula, textbooks, and other instructional materials. All of this should be left up to the community and State.

10. Federal aid whether by grants-in-aid or other forms cannot be provided without Congress imposing legal and accounting safeguards or formula or criteria of distribution. Some type of control or supervision, whether large or small, direct or indirect, is an essential ingredient of Federal action. The mere fact that Congress could discontinue the funds in future appropriations is a potent factor in itself.

11. History indicates that once Federal appropriations are made for any purpose the tendency is for the affected groups to lobby for their continuation and enlargement.

12. Approximately 12 percent of the schoolchildren in the United States are educated in private or religious schools. The exclusion of these schools raises difficult problems. Their inclusion would raise even more difficult legal questions and policy issues.

13. There are about 62,000 separate public school districts or systems in the United States. If the National Government dealt directly with these local school organizations, it would seriously conflict with State educational responsibility and control. If the National Government dealt with only the States, it could not achieve the objectives sought by Federal grants or funds without imposing important and unwanted conditions.

14. The general public already feels that Federal taxes are too high. There is great pressure for reduction of Federal taxes. Certainly sound national policy should require that serious consideration should be given to the balancing of the Federal budget and a planned and consistent reduction of the Federal debt before the National Government embarks upon a new and tremendous program of Federal expenditures for general public education in our elementary and secondary schools.

15. The usual purpose of Federal grant-in-aid is to stimulate State and local activities. There is no need for this in the field of public education since expenditures by States and local governments for education are already the largest and most expensive of any of their activities.

16. There is no need for Federal leadership in setting minimum educational standards. These are already well defined and administered. There is a strong desire on all sides to avoid Federal control or supervision or the imposition of Federal standards or conditions. There is a widespread feeling that any degree of Federal control over education would be dangerous. No one has ever enunciated any practical method of providing Federal funds without some scintilla of authority or administration.

17. There are other well-defined responsibilities and activities of the Federal Government, such as national defense, the Post Office Department, and the Immigration and Naturalization Service, to name but a few which require all of the foreseeable Federal funds that are likely to be available.

18. If Federal aid is predicated on the determination of necessity of local school districts or systems, who will establish the criteria of need and formulas of distribution? What agency will determine which are needy and who gets what? What weight will be

given to the relationship between those districts which have for years taxed themselves to the bone to meet their requirements and those which have the resources but do not choose to impose the local taxes? What equalization assistance will be required of the respective States before the Federal Government lends a hand?

19. Federal funds could place in the hands of those in political authority the power to transform our whole way of life. The opportunity which would be opened up for the imposition of requirements as to what would be taught is frightening.

20. The creation of a system of Federal educational assistance, nationwide in scope, would destroy the traditional role of the State and local governments in the field of educational activity and would represent an unnecessary and radical expansion of the functions of the National Government beyond anything envisioned by Thomas Jefferson and the other architects of our Federal system.

21. This is not the kind of governmental functions which has to be done by the National Government or which it can do best. In fact, efficiency, economy, forthrightness, cultural experimentation, opportunity for differences of approach and educational pioneering and programs will be sacrificed if the Congress should embark the National Government upon a program of Federal aid to education.

To prevent any confusion or misconceptions about the extent of the position of the American Legion on this subject, it should be stated that the policy as set forth herein is confined to the matter of across-the-board, general Federal financial aid to public education in the primary and secondary schools (first grade through high school) and should be strictly construed.

Atomic Roadblock

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN P. SAYLOR
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 2, 1956

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include in the RECORD an editorial from the Boswell (Pa.) News entitled "Atomic Roadblock."

Articles such as this one will go a long way toward alerting the American people to the impracticability and economic danger in some of the proposals regarding peacetime application of atomic energy. Although metropolitan newspapers have become accessible to practically every town in the Nation through the medium of improved transportation facilities, and although television has now replaced or supplanted the radio in most homes in the populated areas, rural America looks also to the smalltown press for factual and interpretive information on all issues—national and local. The printed word of the sincere smalltime editor remains one of the most effective devices for forging individual curiosity into public opinion.

Recognizing as ludicrous the proposed reactor program to set up an atomic powerplant in practically every area where there is a Good Humor truck is only to be expected of the smalltown editor. He has never been taken in by the profligates who persist in planning to invest money that we do not have in projects that we do not need. Such exposes as the Boswell News' report are going to defeat the atomic TVA program. My hope is that the intrinsic fallacies of the reactor program will be given sufficient publicity in the coming weeks as to forestall any appropriations of this nature that advocates of the program may attempt to force through Congress in the closing days of this session. A delay of any kind will be beneficial. It will give Members of Congress and the general public time to make a rational analysis of the plans of the atomic bureaucrats, thus making the legislation more difficult—if not impossible—to get through in ensuing sessions.

I am particularly pleased to know that publishers in coal areas are taking an active part in the crusade to prevent the irresponsible crash reactor program from going into effect. Those behind the reactor program are following the usual procedure; that is, first it is recommended that these reactors be built in areas where power generated by nuclear materials will not compete with coal-fired steam plants. That theory is in itself misleading and dishonest. Every coal-burning electric power plant in the country—regardless of its location—is at this very moment capable of generating electricity at costs far below the most optimistic estimates for atomic plants. If, however, the United States Government provides the funds for construction of the plants, buys the fuel, and, finally, underwrites the risks involved in the operation of the plant, then it may be possible to produce electricity cheaper than it can come through coal. The same standard would apply in the heart of coal regions.

The National Coal Association Convention for 1956 got under way yesterday and is continuing through today. One of the reasons for the optimism prevailing at the convention is the expected increase in coal demand by electric power companies. During hearings of the Coal Research Subcommittee, of which I am a member, witnesses invariably emphasized the projected rise in consumption of coal by the electric utilities as a premise on which long-range plans can be formulated.

Assuming that the principal dangers involved in the operation of an atomic power plant can ultimately be minimized and the disposal problems settled, Government-built and subsidized electric facilities would be directly responsible for the loss of thousands of jobs in the coal industry, and among railroaders as well. Residents of coal-producing States cannot afford to permit such an eventuality to take place. Now is the time for opposition to be made known. The editor of the Boswell News is to be congratulated for his efforts in this direction and I hope that an increasing number of voices will be heard in this regard. The editorial follows:

ATOMIC ROADBLOCK

Washington is accustomed to words—especially in an election year. But Elmer Lindseth, president of the Cleveland Electric Illuminating Co., has said a few that not only make uncommon good sense but contain worthwhile news for the American people.

The Joint Congressional Committee on Atomic Energy was told by Mr. Lindseth that the United States now has 89 atomic reactors completed, planned, or applied for, compared with 63 for all the other nations of the world combined and five times as many as Communist Russia. This is atomic leadership with a capital L.

Mr. Lindseth was speaking for the Edison Electric Institute, the industry's statistical authority, in apposition to a bill by Senator GORE, of Tennessee, which would put the Atomic Energy Commission in the electric business by ordering it, against its will, to build six large-scale atomic power reactors.

This atomic TVA program would cost taxpayers an estimated $2 billion on top of the $10 billion which the Federal Government has either spent or is planning to spend on power facilities in competition with United States electric companies. The point is, there is just no need for Federal spending in this field. America already is head and shoulders above the rest of the world in atomic power progress. Private industry is moving forward rapidly with its own program to build nine atomic powerplants. The proposed program would do nothing but duplicate projects underway, wasting manpower, materials, and tax dollars in the process.

With taxes as high as they are today, it makes no sense to waste taxpayers' money simply to produce a carbon copy of a job already being done by private enterprise in cooperation with AEC. We suggest that Senator Gore voluntarily remove his roadblock to progress and let the AEC get on with its job.

Secretary Wilson and the Veterinary Corps

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT C. BYRD
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 27, 1956

Mr. BYRD. Mr. Speaker, Secretary of Defense Wilson on May 15, 1956, directed the Secretaries of the Army, Navy, and Air Force jointly to develop and submit for his consideration appropriate plans to implement his little personal venture to eliminate the Veterinary Corps in the armed services. In this regard, permit me to direct the attention of our colleagues to the letter which I addressed to Secretary of Defense Wilson on June 18 and the reply thereto, forwarded to me on June 29 by Assistant Secretary of Defense Robert Tripp Ross.

The correspondence follows:

JUNE 18, 1956.

The Honorable CHARLES E. WILSON,
Secretary of Defense,
Department of Defense,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. WILSON: My attention has been directed to the memorandum issued by you on May 15, 1956, addressed to the Secretaries of the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force, on the subject of Utilization of Veterinary Personnel in the Armed Services. I have also read your recent testimony in hearings before the Subcommittee on Department of Defense Appropriations of the House Committee on Appropriations. At that time you made the following remarks, among others, concerning the position of the Veterinary Corps in the Army and in the Air Force:

"I have a couple of little personal ventures where I think ultimately we are going to save some money.

"I think it is about time we eliminated the Veterinary Corps in the Army and in the Air Force. I think that is a holdover from the old cavalry days.

"I know they have a nice lobby down here, and they are trying to bring themselves up with the doctors and dentists, but it is time that one is finally washed out although there is not a great deal of money left in it.

* * * * *

That is just one of my projects which is used as an example of how hard it is to get people out of the old rut, and to face the new. In other words, there are people with fixed interests in what is going on and they do not want to step up to the new programs."

The printed record of the same hearings contains a statement classifying the functions and responsibilities of the Veterinary Corps, which include the inspection of food products of animal origin and the sources thereof, the investigation and control of diseases common to man and animals, the care and treatment of military animals, and research and development in chemical and biological warfare and in radiation hazards.

If the above statement presented a proper description of the Veterinary Corps, then an injustice has been committed in not bringing these facts to your attention during the long period over which you have nursed this little personal venture. After reading an article that appeared in the May 21, 1956, issue of the New York Times, one wonders if there exists on your part a prejudice against accepting such facts. Over and above all this, I am distressed by the contumelious treatment you have shown toward the individuals who make up the strength of our Veterinary Corps. It is evident that your remarks could have a demoralizing effect on the vital role which the Veterinary Corps performs in protecting the health of our military personnel here and abroad, as well as that of American service families scattered abroad.

Mr. Secretary, I am not taking this occasion to bring a formal expression of my views to your attention simply to point up what might have been an unhappy choice of words or action resulting from a lack of information. What I am interested in, however, is the fact that throughout World War II, and since then, the health of our troops has been peerless—credit therefor going to the Veterinary Corps. In substantiating my position, permit me to cite the Army milk program on the continent which has not only benefited our military personnel abroad, but has also been helpful to foreign countries themselves. The Army Times (Europe) for June 21, 1955, delineated the worthy activities of the Army veterinarians in Denmark, Holland, Yugoslavia, Belgium, Norway, and Sweden. Veterinarian units in those countries check all food products purchased by the forces for sale to Americans in commissaries, post and base exchanges, clubs, and messes throughout Europe and North Africa. In this regard, the article states "they test animals before and after they are slaughtered; candle eggs by the millions; and run all tests known to man before letting milk and its by-products flow into Army and Air Force run facilities." It is a known fact that the Veterinary Corps in the Armed Forces performs an admirable research task in comparative pathology and in exotic diseases. The fact that the military operates anywhere in the world enables veterinary personnel to carry on research programs in foreign areas when appropriate and necessary. It should be noted that, should an emergency arise, it is unlikely that civilian technicians would be available for assignment in any part of the world.

I sincerely trust that the important functions of the Veterinary Corps and the position of such technicians in our Armed Forces will be given full and serious consideration before any decision is reached to transfer, reassign, or abolish this group which is so vital in safeguarding the health of our military personnel.

Sincerely yours,

ROBERT C. BYRD,
Member of Congress.

Hon. ROBERT C. BYRD,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. BYRD: Secretary Wilson has asked me to reply to your recent letter concerning changes contemplated by the Department of Defense with respect to the utilization of veterinarians in the Armed Services.

The Secretary long has had the greatest respect personally for the veterinarians in tihs country. He fully recognizes and is most appreciative of the considerable contribution which these personnel have made to our defense effort over a period of many years.

He is of the opinion, however, that a further unification of these functions among the agencies of the Federal Government is desirable in the interest of effecting increased economy and efficiency. With this objective in mind, on May 15, 1956, following detailed study of the problem and personal consultation with these officials, he directed the Secretaries of the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force jointly to develop and submit for his consideration appropriate plans which would generally provide for the following:

1. Further utilization, where possible, of facilities and services available within the Department of Agriculture for the inspection and grading of subsistence items required for the Department of Defense as well as for such research as may be required on food-borne diseases and animal disease control.

2. The utilization of civilian veterinarians to provide medical care for public animals wherever possible.

3. The discontinuance of the current practice of providing, at Government expense, veterinary care for the private pets of military personnel except in emergencies.

4. Equitable disposition to be made of all veterinary personnel presently performing functions to be reassigned, discontinued, and/or obtained by contractual arrangements in accordance with the above.

Future action to be taken by the Secretary of Defense, upon submission of these plans, will be based on the needs and best interests of the Department of Defense as a whole, with due regard to the rights and equities of all personnel involved. Matters of significant interest to the Congress and particularly requirements for legislation will be promptly referred for their consideration.

Sincerely yours,

ROBERT TRIPP ROSS.

Who Scuttled the Merchant Marine Naval Reserve?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 7, 1956

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial from the July 1956 issue of Marine News is startling, to say the least:

NATIONAL DEFENSE—WHO SCUTTLED THE MERCHANT MARINE NAVAL RESERVE?

Now that the United States Merchant Marine Academy at Kings Point has been made permanent by act of Congress, it has been discovered that not only its own cadets but also those of the four Federal-aided State maritime academies at New York, Massachusetts, Maine, and California can be inducted into the Army at any time due to the action of the Department of Defense. To add insult to injury, it has also been learned that the Department of Defense has prevented the graduates of these Federal and State maritime academies from being granted commissions as ensigns as heretofore.

Congress may well inquire into the acts of the Department of Defense in these matters. Congress should, at the same time, inquire into and expose the individual or clique in the Department of Defense who slipped in a repealer of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936 and previous acts of Congress whereby the Merchant Marine Naval Reserve and the status of cadet midshipmen at the Federal and State academies was scuttled or sabotaged by the Armed Forces Reserve Act of 1952 which was drawn up by the Department of Defense in a large measure. In fact, this slick repealing clause was not even noticed until the Department of Defense prevented the Navy from commissioning these graduates. The repealing clause was apparently kept under wraps until wholesale damage could be inflicted. Thus, the Naval Reserve is deprived of a hard core of well-trained, loyal, patriotic Americans.

We know that frantic efforts are being made to recruit officers and men for the Reserve forces of the United States, yet it appears that the Department of Defense is preventing success of the recruitment campaign by overt discrimination against the American merchant marine, its officers and men.

The Armed Forces Committee of the House of Representatives has recently conducted hearings to reestablish the status of cadet midshipman and Naval Reserve commissions for graduates of the Federal and State academies, but again the Department of Defense has been negative. Congress should smoke out the ill-advised or subversive elements who are thwarting the Naval Reserve. It is now only too obvious that something is rotten in the Defense Department.

On May 22, 1956, the Honorable Charles S. Thomas, Secretary of the Navy, delivered a stirring address as the keynote speaker at the National Maritime Day ceremonies at New York's Rockefeller Plaza. To quote his excellent remarks in part: "Twice in our memory we have been unprepared. Twice our failure to have a strong merchant marine has brought our country to the brink of disaster. A third failure could be fatal."

The graduates of the Federal and State Maritime academies are trained in naval science by Regular Navy officers. They are licensed as officers by the United States Coast Guard after examination. Yet we find that the Department of Defense prefers to let them be drafted as foot soldiers in the Army. Again we ask, "What goes on in the Department of Defense?" In this connection the Senate of the United States has previously passed enabling legislation in behalf of the Naval Reserve, but the Department of Defense seems to be staging a last-ditch campaign to "scuttle the ship." In so doing it is scuttling our merchant marine in time of national emergency and our national defense. It is impairing the Navy.

The circumstances which necessitate the prompt passage of S. 1748, which concerns the restoration of Naval Reserve status to the cadets and graduates of Kings Point and the State maritime academy, warrants a full and immediate congressional investigation both from the standpoint of possible ill-considered and unpatriotic actions of a few individuals in the Armed Forces, and also what might be tantamount to an act of subversion which threatens to dissipate and demoralize a Regular corps of officers.

For the naval reservist: "Individual preparedness is national preparedness."

Labor Racketeering

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 2, 1956

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, in connection with my statement in today's RECORD and the resolution I have introduced for a full-scale investigation of labor racketeering, I wish to insert an article by Victor Riesel "None So Blind as Those Who Blink at Rackets," published in the New York Daily Mirror, Friday, June 29, 1956:

NONE SO BLIND AS THOSE WHO BLINK AT RACKETS

(By Victor Riesel)

I have been blinded by a thug who stalked for a moment out of the underworld shadows—but I can still see more clearly than those who so fantastically champion labor that they denounce automatically all crusades against the mob inside labor.

It is these decent but overzealous defenders of labor who are blind. It is they who identify all labor with the mob. It is the public crusader who carefully etches the sharp line between the underworld invaders and the honest union leaders.

What the disturbed champions of labor don't see is the danger of their outcries. Unwittingly, these men become, in effect, the secret weapon of the mob. By blasting all outside forces which fight the labor underworld, they frighten off public officials, Senators, Congressmen, and even governors in some States. For no ambitious political figure is willing to jeopardize his career by pushing for an investigation only to find himself later smeared as "antilabor."

Just look at the record of State and Federal probes. I charge that at least four major congressional investigations have been dropped like hot coals because of political pressure. I have been told by investigators that they had been directed not to get too tough or bring in evidence which would force indictments.

Look at this Congress. How many probes into any cobwebbed corner of the underworld has it launched?

Why, after Illinois Senator PAUL DOUGLAS found a score of union officials using welfare and pension funds as "their own moneys," was his investigation permitted to die? It had one of America's top investigators, Frank Plant, a former FBI agent. Its chief counsel, Paul Cotter, was raring to dig deeper. They turned out a searing 365-page indictmen of the crime cartel inside labor. The AFL-CIO executive counsel went through it. AFL-CIO chief George Meany sent it on to the Ethical Practices Committee for action.

Yet nowhere in the Government was there $100,000 to keep the Douglas committee alive. Why?

There must be congressional probes. Otherwise the ball falls between two outfielders. The Government finds that it can't handle clever criminals on any charges except income-tax evasion. So some of the worst hoods get away with sentences as short as 8 months on tax raps. There just are no laws to deal with the subtleties of the crime cartel and to jug men like Frank Costello.

And we find district attorneys with no power to prosecute because they are hamstrung by local laws. Only the spotlight of a properly conducted congressional investigation can light up the murky corners.

But an even greater obstacle than ineffective laws is local political pressure. Here is where the honest union leaders can move boldly. They can make it known that they would not regard an honest investigation into labor rackets as an attack on all labor.

They can say publicly that they welcome such a probe. Then, perhaps, the automatic deplorers of probes might agree that there are honest men outside labor as well as inside.

The fault is not all on the conditional reflex champions of labor. The fault lies, too, on the shoulders of the public defenders, the law-and-order forces of State, county, and municipal governments—and in Washington, as well.

If they have been listening as carefully as did the President of the United States before he became ill they would have heard stentorian voices shouting out a call for Government help.

Violence, corruption, and betrayal of trust by labor officials have been loudly denounced by David Dubinsky and George Meany at the recent International Ladies' Garment Workers Union convention in Atlantic City. Walter Reuther struck out at the hoods before the Textile Workers Union's sessions in Washington.

Scores of unions have passed resolutions on my behalf, offering help, deploring mob action, and even increasing the reward for apprehension of the ghoul-for-hire who wiped out my sight with a concentration of acid so strong it bleached the sidewalk.

Furthermore, at the most recent session of the AFL–CIO executive council, labor's high command, George Meany brought in a resolution giving real police power to its ethical practices committee.

O. K., let's go. The committee, led by the truly crusading Al Hayes, of the Machinists, and manned by equally courageous and honest men—Dave Dubinsky, Jack Potofsky (Amalgamated Clothing Workers), Joe Curran (National Maritime Union), and George Harrison (Railway Clerks)—now has the power to hire a staff and become labor's FBI. And it has President Eisenhower's personal promise that it can utilize every Government facility to help it.

It can look into the 15 national unions and scores of local unions which have been muscled. The committee can hire lawyers, investigators, and researchers. It can go to any police force. It can recommend that a union be thrown out of the AFL–CIO.

It can stand up and fight. It can right the wrongs of a thousand martyrs. It can prove what so many of us believe—that regardless of our agreement or disagreement with such men as George Meany and Walter Reuther—there are honest men atop the labor movement ready to apply the same fervor and genius they use in collective bargaining, strikes and organizing drives to clean up that part of the underworld which is making a patsy out of sections of labor.

This Ethical Practices Committee has the power to work out a code of ethics for all labor. It can demand that all union leaders maintain honor and decency in their unions.

To draw up this code so that it can be hammered into philosophical shape, the committee has the Bernard Baruch of American labor, Washington attorney Arthur Goldberg, who believes that labor should conduct itself so ethically that it can live in a giant fish bowl. This isn't guaranteed to win him popularity in certain circles. But what price popularity? What price votes? What price compromise?

This is no fight on juvenile delinquents. This is no fight on other labor men who simply want to live by their own code. This is a fight on men who are really not of labor, who buy and sell unions just as real estate men unload parcels of land.

This is a fight on terror. Let no one think I wanted to be blinded for life. Let no one think I did not know the risk involved in this kind of fight I've been making. But how could it have been otherwise? Men don't live by bread alone—or cake, or lush apartments or gourmet's food in $12-a-steak restaurants. After all, how many more rolls can one eat at breakfast? How many more suits can one wear?

How could I have done otherwise then a woman and her daughterd came to me, weeping, to say a squad of goons from a union had just ripped up their little shop? How could I have done otherwise when the owner of a small chain of stores came to me, gun in pocket, saying he was ready to shoot it out with muscle men who had harassed him for months—though he really didn't know the gun butt from the barrel.

How could it have been different when strong men, ex-GI's and former prisoners of war, who fought fascism and nazism and communism, came to me and told me how they were caught in a union headquarters and surrounded by a strong-arm squad, which attempted to provoke the two reformers into swinging at them by calling them and their mothers foul names of an unprintable nature.

If these two men had swung out in defense of the honor of their mothers, they would have been beaten to a pulp. They had to stand there, weeping with frustration, so they'd be able to walk out unharmed and earn a living for their people. In their own union, they were told that day they'd never get work. They were told never to come back. Can you stand by unmoved by such men and women who cry out—literally—for help? I couldn't. So the crime cartel hurled its acid.

I'm not important. You are. The people are. Labor's decent traditions are. The memory of Samuel Gompers, at the top, and of my father, the little fellow away down on labor's line of command, is important.

Crusade, anybody?

Hoover Commission Recommendations on Budget and Accounting Should Be Enacted by the Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GLENARD P. LIPSCOMB
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 2, 1956

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Speaker, during June 1955 the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government—Hoover Commission—transmitted to the Congress its report on budget and accounting in the Federal Government. This report recommended many long-overdue reforms in our Federal budgeting and accounting systems which could lead to significant savings for the taxpayers by making possible the more efficient and economical conduct of the Federal Government's many vast operations involving annual expenditures of billions of dollars.

On May 10, 1956, President Eisenhower, in a special message to the Congress—House Document No. 401—urged that the Congress seek the early enactment of appropriate legislative provisions to support the major objectives of the Hoover Commission's recommendations on budget and accounting. In this message the President reviewed briefly the administrative action already taken partially implementing the Hoover Com-

mission's recommendations on budget and accounting, and said:

The actions being taken by the executive branch to put many of the Commission's proposals into effect will require close coordination with the legislative branch and merit the support which the Congress should and can provide. I urge that the Congress seek the early enactment of appropriate legislative provisions to support the main objectives of the Commission's recommendations.

The Senate has already passed a bill which would put into effect the majority of the recommendations of the Hoover Commission on budget and accounting.

The House Committee on Government Operations has concluded hearings on bills which would likewise put into effect the majority of the recommendations of the Hoover Commission on budget and accounting, including a bill, H. R. 9402, which I introduced on February 20, 1956.

I sincerely hope and urge that the House take timely steps to consider seriously and approve before adjournment legislation of this type in order that these most important Hoover Commission recommendations can be enacted into law during the 84th Congress.

I would commend to the attention of the members the following article entitled "Ledger Legerdemain?—Congress Mulls Hoover Commission's Plan To Save Billions Through Bulget Reforms," by John Chamberlain, which appeared in the Wall Street Journal on Tuesday, June 19, 1956:

LEDGER LEGERDEMAIN?—CONGRESS MULLS HOOVER COMMISSION'S PLAN TO SAVE BILLIONS THROUGH BUDGET REFORMS

(By John Chamberlain)

WASHINGTON.—Can $4 billion in savings on the annual cost of Government be conjured out of a different way of entering figures in ledgers?

Since men do not eat, drink, or wear black (or red) ink, or feed it into airplane engines or the firing chambers of big guns, the question smacks of legerdemain. Yet it is being seriously asked these days by Members of Senate and House subcommittees who are considering legislation to put Hoover Commission budgetary and accounting reforms into operation. According to friends of the Commission, there is a 50–50 chance of the reforms becoming law before Congress adjourns this summer.

The $4 billion figure is based on the informed opinion of J. Harold Stewart, former head of the American Institute of Accountants who bossed the Hoover Commission task force on budget studies. Magical though the sum may seem, a comparable magic has been worked in private industries which have applied close accrual accounting to the so-called controllable items of expense. Accrual accounting has saved as much as 8 percent or 10 percent on costs in private industry.

There is nothing mysterious about an accrued expenditure system of budgeting—it simply consists of keeping an accurate record of the charges for goods and services received in a given year and using that record as the basis for budgeting for the year ahead. Industry is used to doing this; Government is not.

In the old days, when Government expenditures went largely into salaries and routine purchases that could be easily prophesied on an annual basis, accounting and budgeting methods did not matter very much. But with the introduction of long lead time appropriations by Government for big bombers, big generators, big atomic installations and big foreign programs, vast sums accumulated from year to year.

Thus when President Eisenhower asked for new obligational authority of $66.3 billion in appropriations for the 1957 fiscal year beginning July 1, he was, in effect, asking for money that might not be spent in its entirety for some time to come. Similarly, his budgetary figure of $65.9 billion for actual fiscal 1957 spending included money left over from previous periods. When obligated sums outpace actual annual disbursements for goods and services, the pipelines of future spending become clogged. The figure for unexpended appropriations this June 30, the end of fiscal 1956, has been estimated at $53.9 billion.

THE SPORT OF SQUIRRELING

With such a carryover, Congress has little control over the amount of money spent in any given year. Nor does it get any informed review of how Government agencies run their businesses. The agencies merely tell Congress how much of their past funds have been obligated, and how much is needed for obligations in the fulture. Obligational budgeting does not keep Congress abreast of the state of Government-owned inventories, or declining or increasing costs, or the condition of capital equipment, or the "squirreling"—i. e., hiding away—of funds already received.

To take an example that is not in the least hypothetical: In June 1952, the Army had $9.8 billion available for the purchase of guided missiles, tanks, and ammunition. Since this money represented obligated sums—money the Army had already been authorized to spend—the Army felt no compunctions about going to Congress for $2.7 billion more, making a total of some $12.5 billion available for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953.

During that fiscal period, however, the Army actually paid out only $600 million for guided missiles, ammunition, and such. Almost $12 billion was thus carried over into fiscal 1954. Even with Korea lapsing into quiescence, the Army got $3 billion more for 1954, which upped the grand total to some $15 billion. At the end of the year it still had $11 billion in the kitty for guided missiles, tanks, and ammunition.

Since the carry-over could hardly be hidden even by the most antiquated methods of accounting Congress eventually stopped granting new funds for ammunition. And the Army, no longer faced with the problem of shooting at Red Chinese, canceled a number of the contracts it had placed when the Korean war was on. The funds saved by the cancellation, however, still remained with the Army, a prime example of agency "squirreling."

Plainly, under the "obligation" system of budgeting, lax practices and large wastes could creep in. A sample of "obligation" accounting of aid to Pakistan, for example, would show $20.3 million "obligated" in 1954. Actually, only $2.6 million of this had been spent by June 30 of that year. Yet the accounting records of the Foreign Operations Administration (as it was known then) listed the difference of $17.7 million in unspent funds as "costs."

A system of "accrued expenditure" budgeting would change the system of counting unspent money as "costs" and, in the estimation of the Hoover budget experts, account for half of the projected annual Hoover Commission savings of $8 billion in one fell swoop.

MORE THAN ENOUGH

Under "accrued expenditure" budgeting, the Army would have gone to Congress in June of 1953 with a detailed statement of what it had spent for tanks, ammunition and guided missiles during the past year. Congress would have seen that expenses had suddenly dropped from Korean war heights to a mere $600 million. It would also have seen that $12 billion remained in Army coffers to be spent on tanks, missiles and so on. At this point it could have said to the Army: "Stop. You've got more than you can spend on missiles and tanks this next year. If you think you need more a year from now, come back to us then."

Since subsequent "accrued expenditure" reports to Congress would have disclosed that $1.5 billion in 1954 and $1.1 billion in 1955 had reverted to the Army because of contract cancellations, the Pentagon would have had to work hard to justify future claims for funds. Instances like this, when multiplied over the whole area of Government, would naturally increase the skepticism of Congress—and it is quite probable that substantial savings would result.

The proposed accrued expenditure system of budgeting, concentrating on "accrued" costs for the year just past and accrued expectations for the year ahead, would result in a close-meshed relationship between appropriations and spending. Since only enough would be appropriated at a time to cover a single fiscal year, and since all unexpended funds would revert automatically to Congress for reallocation every June 30, carryovers would disappear.

Enemies of the accrued expenditure system argue that it does not reckon adequately with items such as big bombers—things that need a long lead-time period for the placing of contracts. But even though this may be true in theory, the Hoover Commission people argue that Congress would never be so irresponsible as to leave a battleship or a big dam in a half-completed state. They point to the fact that the Bureau of Reclamation is already budgeting on the accrued expenditure system. The Bureau of Reclamation lists its requirements on a year-to-year basis, even when it is planning for such long-lead-time things as the Palisades Dam project in Idaho.

A SHAKY ANALOGY

Meanwhile, the Bureau of Reclamation books show when it spends less in a given year on a generator than it has originally expected to spend. Congress can see this, and take it into account when appropriating for the following year.

Whether $4 billion could be trimmed from the annual cost of Government by accrual budgeting is anybody's guess. Government, after all, is not entirely analogous to private industry, which has the whip if competition to force it to save once accrual methods have indicated a way. But even if only half of the $4 billion were to become a reality the taxpayer would obviously be well ahead of the game.

And regardless of savings it also seems obvious to many that Congress should be supplied with better tools for keeping close tabs on the biggest annual business in the world.

As We Prepare To Celebrate Independence Day, What Would Be More Fitting Than To Make the Capitol Dome an All-Night Beacon of Freedom's Light?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 2, 1956

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, the project for which I rise to speak is minor in and of itself for the

agenda of the Congress of the United States in this crowded hour of crisis and the concentrated pressure of the public business. Yet it has a symbolic value that in my judgment can be said to have intense meaning for America and considerable global significance, particularly as we prepare to celebrate Independence Day this year. Without being either too boastful or too obtrusive, I like to think of the Capitol of the United States as a kind of beacon of freedom for all mankind—a light that should never be permitted to go out—both figuratively and actually. It is symbolic of that meaning that I recommend this House take steps, through official channels, to provide that this Capitol's exterior be illuminated, not only up to the hour of midnight, but all night long.

What I ask this House to remember is that the Capitol of the United States has come to be a magnet for the 166 million people who own it, as well as for visitors from all corners of the earth. We must begin to think of it not only as the workshop of the greatest democracy in the annals of free government, but also as a monument to freedom for all peoples. This calls for exhausting every avenue of appeal, of propaganda—in the best sense of the term—of acceptability, to intensify the patriotic feelings of our own people, and win the mind of mankind. Thus it seems to me almost rude in a Capitol representative of so much magnificence in the rise of man, that, promptly at midnight, as if life and freedom ceased at that hour, the lights over the Capitol go out and a deadly pall hangs over the area, as if freedom had fallen victim to its enemies and was now become a corpse.

Eyes that are not used to the light of freedom are disturbed and uncomfortable in its harsh, merciless light. The hundreds of millions of human beings dominated by communism today are like those pitiful creatures in Plato's cave, looking at shadows and listening to echoes all of their lives.

> At first, when any of them is liberated and compelled suddenly to stand up and turn his neck round and walk and look toward the light, he will suffer sharp pains—

Socrates said, and added that—

> the glare will distress him, and he will be unable to see the realities of which in his former state he had seen the shadows.

The background story of the illumination of the Capitol may be told in a word: There was no exterior illumination of the Capitol at night even as recently as the first Woodrow Wilson administration. It was during the second Woodrow Wilson inaugural that the lights were turned on—how appropriate when we think of the history of that hour—and our people began to see a significance in the lights that transcended in the imagination and mere measurement of candlepower and kilowatts and wattage. Consequently, the lighting that had been intended merely for the inaugural ceremonies was continued. It was then decided that the lights should be on every night of the year up to midnight.

That is the status as of now, except for one additional item: In 1922, at the request of the Department of Commerce and as a safety factor for aviation, which was then rising to prominence, it was decided to keep lighted all night the figure of Freedom, which tops the Capitol dome. Thus 4 searchlights, 1 at each point of the compass, illuminate this sculptural mass all through the night. These are synchronized to the timing of the city's street lights, depending upon the length of the night. Of course, this is indispensable and, of course, this is all to the good. But I cannot forebear the observation that it is rather a pity we should think of the statute of Freedom not for its immense cultural and psychological meaning for ourselves and all the world, but only as a traffic light in the night to keep our aviators from peril. My proposition for the full illumination after midnight of the Capitol as it is now illuminated only up to that hour, amplifies this element of safety for aviation and combines with it the much broader and more profound task of serving as a sort of eternal pillar of fire to the passion for freedom that stirs men's hearts everywhere.

In assigning myself to the responsibility for suggesting this project I had a cursory investigation instituted to determine the cost. For we are all conscious of Government waste and we are all determined to avoid expense where the fruits fail to justify it. I find that—roughly speaking—the cost of illuminating the Capitol of the United States for a few additional hours from midnight to dawn would come to something between five and ten dollars an hour. This would provide bathing the Capitol in light by the warm illumination of 100 1,000-watt floodlamps and eight 1,000-watt searchlights. The cost therefore would be—say for 4 hours—$40 per night, or something like $14,200 annually.

Judged by the advertising rates, shall we say, of the enthusiastic and enterprising entrepeneurs of New York's Madison Avenue, this annual outlay for this form of displaying the American dream, is a price so cheap for a cause so magnificant that it would be extravagance in its stupidest form not to seize the bargain. Oh, yes, I am aware, as we all are, that the period from midnight to dawn is not as rich in audience attraction as the earlier period. But my studies show that 10,000 people visit the Capitol of the United States every day—2 million a year. It is inconceivable to me, that this vast motoring and traveling and sightseeing public, to say nothing of the permanent population, hungry for a vision of their living Government, all drop off to slumber promptly on the stroke of midnight. It is inconceivable to me that we should deny to travelers after midnight—whether Americans or visitors from far countries—the inspiration of the sight of the Capitol from the air.

It is a vision that we should not deny ourselves.

Nor does it sound reasonable to me that a Nation with a gross national product of upward of $400 billion, with an annual budget running into the sixty billions and more, a nation which has given out billions in foreign aid, should start counting petty pennies when it comes to dressing up its own Capitol in the light that should by that much help win the affectionate patriotism of its own people and the heart-warming respect of the foreign visitor. Other capitols of the world—perhaps with the help of money we give them in the form of foreign aid, directly or indirectly—show their pride in their nationhood by all-night illumination of their capitols.

The greatest Nation since the Roman Empire, the greatest Nation in the world and in all time, certainly owes itself that much self-regard. I hope the Congress of the United States will join me in saying: "Let there be light." I hope we shall have it soon, a signal to the world and a symbol of man's success at last that where this light burns there is the heartbeat of free government and a happy people.

Record Proves Ike's Need for a Republican 85th Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CRAIG HOSMER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 26, 1956

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, if a person likes President Eisenhower, trust and respect for the man are part and parcel of it. Also part and parcel of it is an approval of what he does as President. For like and trust alone could never account for the consistently high popularity the President has enjoyed throughout his service in this White House. If the people also did not like what he has done as President, he would never have enjoyed this popularity.

It thus follows as night after day, that those who like Ike and will vote him a second term in the White House, to be consistent and logical, must give him a Republican 85th Congress to enable him to do those things the people approve his doing.

Raymond Moley, one of ex-President Franklin D. Roosevelt's braintrusters, in a recent column strikingly shows the necessity of a Republican 85th Congress to support President Eisenhower by comparing the number of times the ranking Democrat and Republican Members of Senate and House Committees supported the President with their votes on issues. On the record, Democrats in this important group cast 126 votes supporting the President, while Republicans were casting 570 votes supporting him.

Mr. Moley's column details this comparison as follows:

> There are already appearing expressions of the opinion, presumably inspired by Democratic sources, that it will be just as helpful to President Eisenhower, if elected, to have a Democratic majority as a Republican majority in the 85th Congress. A study of the voting records of Members, together with a consideration of who will be chairmen of the committees in the 85th Congress, completely disproves this contention.
>
> Whatever wishful thinking there may be to the contrary, party government prevails in Congress. Democrats, with very, very few exceptions, are anxious to help their

own party. On the other side, President Eisenhower is a Republican, and Republicans will for many reasons give him support.

In proving this point, let us first note the many changes among the ranking members of committees that will be seen in 1957. Senator GEORGE and Representative RICHARDS, top Democrats in Foreign Relations and Foreign Affairs, respectively, are retiring. So are Representative DONDERO, ranking Republican on the Public Works Committee, and Representatives WOLCOTT and GAMBLE, top Republicans on Banking and Currency. Representative REED, ranking Republican on Judiciary, died recently. TOLLEFSON, ranking Republican on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, is leaving Congress to run for the Washington Governorship. Representative VELDE, ranking Republican on the Un-American Affairs Committee, is retiring, and so is Representative HOPE, ranking Republican on Agriculture.

Taking these retirements into consideration, let us see how President Eisenhower might fare with either of the two prospective ranking members of the committees in the new Congress. Twenty-four issues in the 84th Congress on which the Democratic and Republican leadership were on opposite sides were used in compiling the following tabulation of Senate committees. Twenty-three isues were used in the House tabulations.

The figure following each name is the number of times that the member voted in support of Republican measures, which in practically all cases meant support of President Eisenhower.

SENATE

Agriculture: ELLENDER, Democrat, 9; AIKEN, Republican, 18.

Appropriations: HAYDEN, Democrat, 1; BRIDGES, Republican, 19.

Armed Services: RUSSELL, Democrat, 4; SALTONSTALL, Republican, 23.

Banking and Currency: FULBRIGHT, Democrat, 1; CAPEHART, Republican, 19.

District of Columbia: NEELY, Democrat, 2; BEALL, Republican, 19.

Finance: BYRD, Democrat, 15; MILLIKIN, Republican, 21.

Foreign Relations: MCCLELLAN, Democrat, 4; MCCARTHY, Republican, 15.

Interior and Insular Affairs: MURRAY, Democrat, 4; MALONE, Republican, 16.

Interstate and Foreign Commerce: MAGNUSON, Democrat, 2; BRICKER, Republican, 21.

Judiciary: EASTLAND, Democrat, 6; LANGER, Republican, 3.

Labor and Public Welfare: HILL, Democrat, 1; SMITH of New Jersey, Republican, 24.

PostOffice and Civil Service: JOHNSTON of South Carolina, Democrat, 1; CARLSON, Republican, 22.

Public Works: CHAVEZ, Democrat, 2; MARTIN of Pennsylvania, Republican, 22.

Rules and Administration: HENNINGS, Democrat, 1; JENNER, Republican, 15.

HOUSE

Agriculture: COOLEY, Democrat, 4; ANDRESEN, Republican, 17.

Appropriations: CANNON, Democrat, 1; TABER, Republican, 23.

Armed Services: VINSON, Democrat, 5; SHORT, Republican, 16.

Banking and Currency: SPENCE, Democrat, 1; TALLE, Republican, 17.

District of Columbia: MCMILLAN, Democrat, 8; SIMPSON of Illinois, Republican, 15.

Education and Labor: BARDEN, Democrat, 7; MCCONNELL, Republican, 20.

Foreign Affairs: GORDON, Democrat, 0; CHIPERFIELD, Republican, 16.

Government Operations: DAWSON of Illinois, Democrat, 1; HOFFMAN of Michigan, Republican, 22.

House Administration: BURLESON, Democrat, 7; LECOMPTE, Republican, 18.

Interior and Insular Affairs: ENGLE, Democrat, 3; MILLER of Nebraska, Republican, 20.

Interstate and Foreign Commerce: PRIEST, Democrat, 2; WOLVERTON, Republican, 13.

Judiciary: CELLER, Democrat, 0; KEATING, Republican, 18.

Merchant Marine and Fisheries: BONNER, Democrat, 9; ALLEN of California, Republican, 16.

Public Works: BUCKLEY, Democrat, 0; MCGREGOR, Republican, 20.

Rules: SMITH of Virginia, Democrat, 13; ALLEN of Illinois, Republican, 23.

Un-American Activities: WALTER, Democrat, 3; KEARNEY, Republican, 14.

Veterans' Affairs: TEAGUE of Texas, Democrat, 6; ROGERS of Massachusetts, Republican, 9.

Ways and Means: COOPER, Democrat, 3; REED of New York, Republican, 14.

Party control of the committees is very important. Chairmen decide when hearings are held and select committee majority staffs. Those staff members for the most part draft the reports and to a large degree select witnesses. On some deplorable cases they also leak information to sympathetic newspapermen. The chairman also has great power with his party colleagues on the committees.

The record of the Members shown above should indicate why a voter, if he prefers President Eisenhower, should also prefer candidates for Congress on the Republican side, and if he prefers the Democratic candidate for President he should support Democratic candidates for Congress.

Liberalize Railroad Retirement Benefits Now

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN A. BLATNIK
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 2, 1956

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, the employees of the rail industry and retired railroad employees are looking for some relief from this Congress on the many inequities and inadequacies existing under the existing Railroad Retirement System.

The Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce has reported out a bill, H. R. 9065, which is designed to liberalize the existing Railroad Retirement System by increasing pensions and annuities by 15 percent. As originally introduced the bill contained a tax-exempt feature which provided that railroad employees would pay withholding taxes on their take-home pay only and not on their gross earnings. This provision, contained in section 5 of the bill, was eliminated in committee and as reported H. R. 9065 contains no comparable provision today. In other words, the bill due to come to the floor of the House increases the employees' taxes by 1 percent without any corresponding relief. As a result railroad employees will be forced to pay 7¼ percent of their earnings up to $350 a month which makes this the highest pension rate in the country. Fortunately, the Committee on Ways and Means has decided to hold hearings on legislation similar to the provisions of section 5 of the original bill.

Now railroad employees do not mind paying additional taxes if they can obtain additional benefits. The question is whether H. R. 9065 actually provides for a more liberal and equitable pension program for the Nation's railroad employees who number over 1 million today. Of course, H. R. 9065 does provide for a 15-percent increase in benefits, with extensive limitations. In the first place, the 15-percent increase in no way increases benefits for those in the lower paid brackets who are today operating under the social-security guaranty and are actually receiving social-security benefits although at no time did they pay less than 3 times more in taxes than did their counterpart under social security.

For instance, 65 percent of the aged widows and widowers presently under railroad retirement would receive no additional benefits under H. R. 9065. Only a very limited number of spouses would receive any additional benefits. Combining all types of beneficiaries under the present system, we find that 27 percent of them would receive no additional benefits whatsoever. The inequity of such a bill is apparent on its face. It should be amended to provide increased benefits to all retired railroad employees and their families across the board.

I firmly believe, Mr. Speaker, that we take a long, close look at this bill which is soon due to come before the House in an effort to write into law amendments truly designed to benefit the hard-working and loyal railroad employees throughout the Nation.

A number of amendments are badly needed to modernize and improve the existing railroad retirement system. For instance, the test period, 1924–31, should be eliminated and the 5 highest years substituted in lieu thereof. This would bring the Railroad Retirement Act up to the standards now enjoyed by the postal people, the civil servants, and even the social-security beneficiaries. Why discriminate against railroad workers, Mr. Speaker? Why must their retirement system be based on an obsolete and antique formula not used by any other pension system in the country and, at the same time, ask these people to pay a higher contribution than any of the other systems? This striking inequity in the law should be repealed and a new test period comprising the 5 highest years substituted in its stead.

Another very necessary change is the elimination of the so-called dual restriction insofar as spouses are concerned. Under existing law, spouses who help the family budget by working find now that the social security they qualify for in their own right is deducted from their spouse benefit check under railroad retirement. This application is so harsh that many spouse benefits are wiped out entirely because the social security produces higher benefits. Spouses today are the only group to which this dual restriction applies.

In 1954 Public Law 398 was enacted removing the dual restriction insofar as employees were concerned. Again in 1955 Public Law 383 was approved which eliminated the dual restriction insofar as survivors were concerned. Under Public Law 383 widows who had social security benefits in their own right would receive such benefits in addition to sur-

vivor benefits under railroad retirement. This provision applied mostly to widows, widowers, and parents, but the railroad worker's spouse still suffers from this restriction and any benefit awarded to her under social security is deducted from her spouse benefit check under railroad retirement. We are actually penalizing these wives of railroad workers who find it necessary to go out and work to help the family budget. We are discouraging thrift and the desire of people to better their station in life. We are discriminating against women who work. This is especially unfair when many railroad employees find themselves working a short week with no overtime to supplement earnings. In short, Mr. Speaker, the dual restriction on spouses should in justice be eliminated if we are to have a truly effective and beneficial railroad retirement system.

Another important improvement that can be made in existing law is the elimination of the "last employer" clause. At the present time, a large number of employees, while they work for the railroads, have side jobs in building and loan associations, fraternal organizations, and so on, where they receive a little additional income. Most of these jobs pay only very small wages, yet the individuals must resign from these positions before they can qualify for railroad retirement benefits. This restriction should be removed so that it will not be mandatory to resign from other than a railroad to qualify for retirement benefits under the act.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I urge all the Members of the House to give serious thought and consideration to the question of railroad retirement improvements. While H. R. 9065, which has been reported out of committee, is an improvement, it does not go far enough toward correcting the inequities in existing law. So while we have this very serious problem of so great importance under consideration we should exert every effort to work out a sound, yet adequate bill. There is no question but that this is a deep, involved and complex problem, but I do hope we will be able to make some basic and fundamental improvements in the railroad retirement system. I believe we should act now. Any further delay would be an injustice to hundreds of thousands of railroad workers and their dependents.

Notable Career of Attorney William P. Brewster

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 2, 1956

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial which appeared in the Wilkes-Barre Times Leader Evening News on Saturday, June 30, 1956, calling attention to the fact that attorney William P. Brewster has tendered his resignation as solicitor of the Kingston (Pa.) School District after more than a half century of outstanding service:

When a man has been on the job for 54 years, he writes his own valedictory. Such is the case with Attorney William P. Brewster, who has resigned as solicitor for Kingston School District after a half century. He also was on the board of education 4 years, making his a remarkable career of public service and a notable contribution to education.

Attorney Brewster, known as a scholar and historian, as well as a lawyer, has seen the public schools of Kingston grow from a small beginning into one of the finest systems in the Commonwealth. Moreover, he has been a part of the development. School directors, principals, and teachers have come and gone, but he continued until his decision to sever official ties was announced yesterday.

Such a career must afford tremendous satisfaction, for this is the principal reward of long and distinguished service in a field like education. Attorney Brewster, in his letter of resignation, had many nice things to say about colleagues and they were in a position to return the compliment. The west side borough was singularly fortunate to have the services of a man of his caliber at its disposal so long.

Crime: Racial, North, South

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ADAM C. POWELL, JR.
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 2, 1956

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from Journal and Guide of June 30, 1956:

[From the Journal and Guide of June 30, 1956]

CRIME: RACIAL, NORTH, SOUTH

On our editorial page we are reprinting an editorial from the Richmond Times-Dispatch, which supports a statement by Representative JOHN BELL WILLIAMS, of Mississippi, purporting to show that States in which there is school integration "show a substantially higher incidence of Negro crime in proportion to Negro population than in segregated States."

We do not know the source of Mr. WILLIAMS' statistics, and would say that the source would be very important in their bearing upon the truth.

Furthermore, when statistics are used to prove one side of a case, one is led to take a look at statistics which have an important bearing on the other side of the case.

ORIGIN OF POPULATION STUDIED

We would grant, on the basis of Representative WILLIAMS' claims, that a great many half-educated, unadjusted former southern Negroes now in the North fall into the toils of the law. The North has only partially assimilated these millions of ignorant migrants in the economic fabric of the section.

It must be remembered—according to United States census reports—that more than 2 million Negroes from the farms of the Deep South have migrated to the North during the past decade and a half.

It must also be remembered that any student of sociology or penology knows that the detection and prosecution of crimes committed by Negroes in the South depend largely upon whether these crimes affect the property or persons of white people. Another way of stating it is to say what is common knowledge: That crimes committed by Negroes against Negroes in the South are frequently not apprehended and punished, but in a general way are taken for granted, unless they are serious crimes, or unless they occur in an urban community with an adequate police department.

DIFFERENT IN THE NORTH

In the North, both the law and public opinion treat crime as crime, whether the offense is by Negroes against Negroes, or by Negroes against white people. There are also many offenses, which in the South would be tacitly excused or disposed of by very light punishment if committed by Negroes, but which would be crime in the North and treated as such. In the South many of the offenders never reach the State prisons. In the North they do.

It is well known to all students of crime and delinquency, that in many areas in the South—and it happens in Norfolk and Richmond—a Negro may locate in a good Negro residential area, and from that point he may engage in the sale of alcoholic beverages, numbers writing, prostitution, partnerships with bootleggers of untaxed liquor, receiving and disposing of stolen good plus nightly affrays, without fear of being molested by the police—until white persons beging to frequent his establishment. This statement can be supported by an array of reputable witnesses, who have complained to the police in efforts to break up this kind of thing which brings into good Negro neighborhoods criminal traffic from the outside.

OBJECT OF THE STATISTICS

Statistics are usually brought forward and manipulated in these days of slander of Negroes by large staffs of propagandists employed by the numerous political underground organizations in the South, which are engaged in whipping up hate against Negroes by any means possible, and against anybody who is disposed to hold that Negroes should enjoy civil rights in the South. The matter does not have to be pinned down to school desegregation. The issue has now been resolved into a campaign of hate against all minorities. It has also been resolved into a campaign of hate against the North to confuse the whole issue, to the end that the Congress will enact laws limiting the powers of the United States Supreme Court; making the limitations retroactive to January 1954, so as to nullify the High Court's ruling in the school cases, and to amend the 14th and 15th amendments to the United States Constitution. There is no secret about that.

THE WHITE CRIME RATE

Congressman WILLIAMS and the editors of the Richmond Times-Dispatch could find some interesting facts about crime among Southern white people if they took time to do a little research.

It is a fact that if Negroes living in the North are more criminal than those living in the South, white people living in the South are more criminal than those of the same race living in the North. That phenomenon probably never occurred to many in the South.

We find no pleasure in pointing this out. Neither do we find any pleasure in pointing a finger at Virginia. We believe that white Virginians are more law-abiding than white Mississippians, or Alabamians, or South Carolinians. But we do not have immediately at hand any statistics on the latter deep Southern States. So, we will cite an instance in which white commitments to State prison in Virginia were compared with white commitments in Wisconsin.

THE UNDISPUTED RECORD

Mr. Rice M. Youell, former commissioner, Virginia Department of Corrections, is the author of a crime study which was published May 7, 1947, in the University of Virginia News Letter.

Mr. Youell found that 108 persons out of every 100,000 in Virginia were committed to the State prison as compared with 35 of every 100,000 committed in Wisconsin.

He found also, that only eight States and the District of Columbia had a higher crime rate than Virginia. As if anticipating the usual answer (presence of Negroes) Mr. Youell said:

"Lest someone should attempt to blame the increase of commitments in Virginia, over Wisconsin, on the colored population, it might be well to point out that the white commitments in Virginia were almost three times greater than the white commitment rate in Wisconsin."

FIGURES IN 1953

On the same question the results of a crime study in Virginia made by Dr. R. Wayne Kernodle, chairman, and Dr. John F. Kantnor, of the department of sociology and anthropology, College of William and Mary, and published in the University News Letter, March 15, 1953, contained the following comment:

"Generally speaking, a high incidence of crime would indicate the lack of moral order or integration of a community. That is, positively stated, the more people of a community are knit together in a real moral order, the less they will violate one another's persons or property. It will be seen from the foregoing data (a table of statistics) if taken per se, that Virginians tend to violate each other's persons and property more frequently than persons in most of the other States of our Nation. It would further indicate a low degree of integration and suggest that the Commonwealth is seriously threatened with moral disintegration."

Granting that although Virginia is in the low forties among the States, in the matter of education, we are higher than Georgia and Mississippi, and some other Deep Southern States. It would appear that the Times-Dispatch would look homeward, rather than joining a southern Congressman in trying to show that Negroes in the North—most of whom went there from the South in recent years—have a higher incidence of criminality than those who remain in the South.

By expert testimony of southerners who are competent sociologists and penologists, the incidence of crime among white people in the South is much higher—almost three times higher—than the incidence of crime among white people in the North.

It does no good to the South, especially the white South, to recite this, but to do so is pertinent to the facts of life when an unfair relation to criminality is fastened upon Negroes for political propaganda purposes by southern Congressmen and certain southern newspapers.

[From the Richmond Times-Dispatch]

THAT DIXIE REIGN OF TERROR

The "reign of terror" in the South against southern Negroes is often described by our "liberal" northern and western friends. It is interesting, therefore, to note some extremely interesting figures concerning the number of Negroes in the penitentiaries of the two sections.

Representative JOHN BELL WILLIAMS, of Mississippi, using official record of the Federal and State Governments, compares the 13 non-Southern States with over 100,000 Negro population (except Michigan) with the 10 Southern States (except Georgia, there being no 1950 statistics for Georgia and Michigan). He finds the following:

The integrated States show a substantially higher incidence of Negro crime in proportion to Negro population than the segregated States. In fact, the per capita crime rate among Negroes in the integrated States is 199 percent or double the rate—in the segregated States. The cases enumerated are convicted felony cases, and the figures do not reflect arrests or misdemeanor convictions.

Representative WILLIAMS goes on to note that these figures prove "either that Negroes are more law abiding in a segregated society or Southern courts are far more lenient with Negro defendants." He inquires, with much justice, where a reign of terror is to be found in all this.

The tables in question show that integrated Ohio sent more Negroes to prison in 1950 than the segregated States of Arkansas, Tennessee, and South Carolina combined, although their total Negro population is 1,266,247 greater than that of Ohio.

Similarly, New York courts in 1950 sent more Negroes to the penitentiary than the courts of Arkansas, Mississippi, and South Carolina combined, although the total Negro population of those three States exceeds that of New York by 1,317,019.

Many of the most pointed sermons directed at the benighted South come from New York. Yet New York has five times more Negroes per capita in prison than Mississippi.

Just what explanation does the Reverend ADAM CLAYTON POWELL, of Harlem, have for this phenomenon? If New York Negroes, living under the blessings of integration, are five times as felonious as Mississippi Negroes, it's a bit difficult to find that much talked about reign of terror in Dixie, or to see wherein the lot of New York Negroes is so much better than that of their fellows in the deep South.

Ignace Jan Paderewski: The 15th Anniversary of His Death, June 30, 1956

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 2, 1956

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, in 1860 there was born in Poland a man destined to become one of her greatest artists and statesmen. This man was Ignace Jan Paderewski. We are proud today to commemorate the anniversary of his death and to review briefly some of his inspiring and noble achievements.

Ignace Jan Paderewski had a long musical career filled with satisfying experiences and stimulating work. A true genius in the field of music he finally channeled his great talents and energies into the fight for Polish freedom, thus advancing the cause of liberty and democracy everywhere in the world. Someone once said: "The Polish race breeds patriot artists; their patriotism is not enervated by their art, neither is their art vulgarized by their patriotism." This can certainly be applied to Paderewski. He gladly put aside his music in order to contribute his time for Polish independence and freedom. Although it is not uncommon for great creative artists to offer their services when their nation's liberty is imperiled, it is unusual for them to play the outstanding political role that Paderewski did in reviving the independence of his native land.

During the First World War Ignace Paderewski became aware of the need for championing the restoration of Poland to the European community. Many Poles were enlisted in the campaign to help regain their former liberties and national integrity, and the task of alerting America to the Polish cause fell to Ignace Paderewski. Being well known in the United States as a pianist and very highly regarded as both an artist and a humanitarian, he was an excellent choice for an unofficial ambassador to America. He particularly gained the confidence of Col. Edward M. House, personal adviser to President Woodrow Wilson, and later Wilson himself acknowledged that he had been won over to the Polish cause by Paderewski. There were also countless other statesmen and leaders in the United States who shared Wilson's esteem for Paderewski. Charles Evans Hughes remarked about Paderewski that "creative power has rarely had such an opportunity, and rarely has opportunity been so nobly used." Robert Lansing, in his writings on world war leadership, stated that Paderewski:

Was an able and tactful leader of his countrymen and a sagacious diplomat, and that his emotional temperament, while it intensified his patriotic zeal and his spirit of self-sacrifice, never controlled or adversely affected the soundness of his judgment or his practical point of view.

It is a fact that Paderewski gave his whole life over to benefit and improve his fellowmen.

The steady and untiring efforts by Paderewski for a free Poland still are clear in the minds and hearts of Poles today. And as the vision of an independent Poland was the lodestar of his existence, so must the liberation and revival of Poland become a goal for the democratic world. We gladly commemorate the anniversary of this noble and dedicated Polish statesman and artist.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

REPRESENTATIVES WITH RESIDENCES IN WASHINGTON

OFFICE ADDRESS: House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

[Streets northwest unless otherwise stated]

Speaker, Sam Rayburn

Abbitt, Watkins M., *Va*____
Abernethy, Thos. G., *Miss*__6278 29th St.
Adair, E. Ross, *Ind*_____4200 Cathedral Ave.
Addonizio, Hugh J., *N. J*___
Albert, Carl, *Okla*_____
Alexander, Hugh Q., *N. C*__
Alger, Bruce, *Tex*_____
Allen, John J., Jr., *Calif*___
Allen, Leo E., *Ill*_____University Club
Andersen, H. Carl, *Minn*___4545 Conn. Ave.
Andresen, August H., *Minn*_
Andrews, George W., *Ala*___3108 Cathedral Ave.
Anfuso, Victor L., *N. Y*____
Arends, Leslie C., *Ill*_____4815 Dexter St.
Ashley, Thomas L., *Ohio*___
Ashmore, Robert T., *S. C*___
Aspinall, Wayne N., *Colo*__Arlington Towers, Arlington, Va.
Auchincloss, James C., *N. J*_113 S. Lee St., Alexandria, Va.
Avery, William H., *Kans*___
Ayres, William H., *Ohio*___

Bailey, Cleveland M., *W. Va*_
Baker, Howard H., *Tenn*___
Baldwin, John F., Jr., *Calif*_
Barden, Graham A., *N. C*__2601 Woodley Pl.
Barrett, William A., *Pa*____
Bass, Perkins, *N. H*_____
Bass, Ross, *Tenn*_____
Bates, William H., *Mass*____
Baumhart, A. D., Jr., *Ohio*_
Beamer, John V., *Ind*_____110 Maryland Ave. NE.
Becker, Frank J., *N. Y*_____
Belcher, Page, *Okla*_____
Bell, John J., *Tex*_____
Bennett, Charles E., *Fla*___1530 38th St. SE.
Bennett, John B., *Mich*____5804 Bradley Blvd., Bethesda, Md.
Bentley, Alvin M., *Mich*___
Berry, E. Y., *S. Dak*_____2720 Terrace Road SE.
Betts, Jackson E., *Ohio*____
Blatnik, John A., *Minn*____
Blitch, Iris Faircloth, *Ga*__
Boggs, Hale, *La*_____
Boland, Edward P., *Mass*___
Bolling, Richard, *Mo*_____3409 Lowell St.
Bolton, Frances P., *Ohio*___2301 Wyo. Ave.
Bolton, Oliver P., *Ohio*____
Bonner, Herbert C., *N. C*__The Dorchester
Bosch, Albert H., *N. Y*_____
Bow, Frank T., *Ohio*_____4301 Mass. Ave.
Bowler, James B., *Ill*_____
Boykin, Frank W., *Ala*_____The Washington
Boyle, Charles A., *Ill*_____
Bray, William G., *Ind*_____
Brooks, Jack B., *Tex*_____
Brooks, Overton, *La*_____4413 46th St.
Brown, Clarence J., *Ohio*__Alban Towers
Brown, Paul, *Ga*_____Boston House
Brownson, Charles B., *Ind*_
Broyhill, Joel T., *Va*_____
Buckley, Charles A., *N. Y*__
Budge, Hamer H., *Idaho*___
Burdick, Usher L., *N. Dak*__
Burleson, Omar, *Tex*_____2737 Devonshire Pl.
Burnside, M. G., *W. Va*____
Bush, Alvin R., *Pa*_____
Byrd, Robert C., *W. Va*____
Byrne, James A., *Pa*_____
Byrnes, John W., *Wis*_____1215 25th St. So., Arlington, Va.

Canfield, Gordon, *N. J*_____
Cannon, Clarence, *Mo*_____
Carlyle, F. Ertel, *N. C*_____The Washington
Carnahan, A. S. J., *Mo*____
Carrigg, Joseph L., *Pa*_____
Cederberg, Elford A., *Mich*_
Celler, Emanuel, *N. Y*_____The Mayflower
Chase, Jackson B., *Nebr*___Sheraton-Park
Chatham, Thurmond, *N. C*_
Chelf, Frank, *Ky*_____
Chenoweth, J. Edgar, *Colo*_
Chiperfield, Robert B., *Ill*__1713 House Office Building
Christopher, George H., *Mo.*
Chudoff, Earl, *Pa*_____
Church, Marguerite Stitt, *Ill.* 2122 Mass. Ave.
Clark, Frank M., *Pa*_____3735 Gunston Rd., Alexandria, Va.
Clevenger, Cliff, *Ohio*_____The Jefferson
Cole, W. Sterling, *N. Y*____1610 44th St.
Colmer, William M., *Miss*__
Cooley, Harold D., *N. C*____2480 16th St.
Coon, Sam, *Oreg*_____
Cooper, Jere, *Tenn*_____The Washington
Corbett, Robert J., *Pa*_____
Coudert, F. R., Jr., *N. Y*____
Cramer, William C., *Fla*___Hunting Towers, Alexandria, Va.
Cretella, Albert W., *Conn*__
Crumpacker, Shepard J., Jr., *Ind.*
Cunningham, Paul, *Iowa*__
Curtis, Laurence, *Mass*____3314 O St.
Curtis, Thomas B., *Mo*_____

Dague, Paul B., *Pa*_____
Davidson, Irwin D., *N. Y*___
Davis, Clifford, *Tenn*_____4611 Butterworth Pl.
Davis, Glenn R., *Wis*_____2550 South Joyce, Arlington, Va.
Davis, James C., *Ga*_____
Dawson, William A., *Utah*__
Dawson, William L., *Ill*___
Deane, Charles B., *N. C*____
Delaney, James J., *N. Y*____
Dempsey, John J., *N. Mex*__2500 Q St.
Denton, Winfield K., *Ind*__
Derounian, Steven B., *N. Y*_
Devereux, James P. S., *Md*_
Dies, Martin, *Tex*_____
Diggs, Charles C., Jr., *Mich*_2705 13th St. NE.
Dingell, John D., *Mich*_____
Dixon, Henry Aldous, *Utah*_
Dodd, Thomas J., *Conn*____
Dollinger, Isidore, *N. Y*____
Dolliver, James I., *Iowa*____3752 Jocelyn St.
Dondero, George A., *Mich*__The Continental
Donohue, Harold D., *Mass*_
Donovan, James G., *N. Y*__
Dorn, Francis E., *N. Y*_____
Dorn, W. J. Bryan, *S. C*____
Dowdy, John, *Tex*_____
Doyle, Clyde, *Calif*_____3877 30th St. N., Arlington, Va.
Durham, Carl T., *N. C*_____The Lee House
Eberharter, Herman P., *Pa*_3101 4th St. N., Arlington, Va.
Edmondson, Ed, *Okla*_____
Elliott, Carl, *Ala*_____
Ellsworth, Harris, *Oreg*____4301 Mass. Ave.
Engle, Clair, *Calif*_____3840 Lorcom Lane Arlington, Va.
Evins, Joe L., *Tenn*_____5044 Klingle St.
Fallon, George H., *Md*_____
Fascell, Dante B., *Fla*_____
Feighan, Michael A., *Ohio*_
Fenton, Ivor D., *Pa*_____3725 Macomb St.
Fernandez, A. M., *N. Mex*__200 C St. SE.
Fino, Paul A., *N. Y*_____
Fisher, O. C., *Tex*_____Calvert-Woodley
Fjare, Orvin B., *Mont*_____
Flood, Daniel J., *Pa*_____The Congressional
Flynt, John J., Jr., *Ga*_____
Fogarty, John E., *R. I*_____3627 Chesapeake St.
Forand, Aime J., *R. I*_____4108 Dresden St., Kensington, Md.
Ford, Gerald R., Jr., *Mich*__514 Crown View Dr., Alexandria, Va.
Forrester, E. L., *Ga*_____
Fountain, L. H., *N. C*_____The Westchester
Frazier, Jas. B., Jr., *Tenn*__Fairfax Hotel
Frelinghuysen, Peter, Jr., *N. J.* 3014 N St.
Friedel, Samuel N., *Md*____
Fulton, James G., *Pa*_____

Gamble, Ralph A., *N. Y*___
Garmatz, Edward A., *Md*___
Gary, J. Vaughan, *Va*_____
Gathings, E. C., *Ark*_____6377 31st Pl.
Gavin, Leon H., *Pa*_____
Gentry, Brady, *Tex*_____
George, Myron V., *Kans*___3801 Rodman St.
Gordon, Thomas S., *Ill*____
Grant, George M., *Ala*_____4801 Conn. Ave.
Gray, Kenneth J., *Ill*_____
Green, Edith, *Oreg*_____
Green, William J., Jr., *Pa*__
Gregory, Noble J., *Ky*_____2401 Calvert St.
Griffiths, Martha W., *Mich*_
Gross, H. R., *Iowa*_____
Gubser, Charles S., *Calif*___
Gwinn, Ralph W., *N. Y*____

Hagen, Harlan, *Calif*_____
Hale, Robert, *Maine*_____2722 N St.
Haley, James A., *Fla*_____
Halleck, Charles A., *Ind*___4926 Upton St.
Hand, T. Millet, *N. J*_____
Harden, Cecil M., *Ind*_____The Congressional
Hardy, Porter, Jr., *Va*_____
Harris, Oren, *Ark*_____1627 Myrtle St.
Harrison, Burr P., *Va*_____4519 So. 34th St., Arlington, Va.
Harrison, Robert D., *Nebr*__
Harvey, Ralph, *Ind*_____110 Maryland Ave. NE.
Hays, Brooks, *Ark*_____314 2d St. SE.
Hays, Wayne L., *Ohio*_____Arlington Towers, Arlington, Va.
Hayworth, Don, *Mich*_____
Healey, James C., *N. Y*_____
Hébert, F. Edward, *La*_____104 Cockrell St., Alexandria, Va.
Henderson, John E., *Ohio*__
Herlong, A. S., Jr., *Fla*_____
Heselton, John W., *Mass*___
Hess, William E., *Ohio*_____
Hiestand, Edgar W., *Calif*__
Hill, William S., *Colo*_____110 Maryland Ave. NE.
Hillings, Patrick J., *Calif*__
Hinshaw, Carl, *Calif*_____
Hoeven, Charles B., *Iowa*__100 Maryland Ave NE.
Hoffman, Clare E., *Mich*___Methodist Bldg.
Hoffman, Richard W., *Ill*___
Holifield, Chet, *Calif*_____
Holland, Elmer J., *Pa*_____
Holmes, Hal, *Wash*_____
Holt, Joe, *Calif*_____
Holtzman, Lester, *N. Y*____
Hope, Clifford R., *Kans*____3541 Brandywine St.
Horan, Walt, *Wash*_____
Hosmer, Craig, *Calif*_____
Huddleston, George, Jr., *Ala.*
Hull, W. R., Jr., *Mo*_____
Hyde, DeWitt S., *Md*_____

Ikard, Frank, *Tex*_____

Jackson, Donald L., *Calif*__
James, Benjamin F., *Pa*____200 C St. SE.
Jarman, John, *Okla*_____
Jenkins, Thomas A., *Ohio*__The Mayflower
Jennings, W. Pat, *Va*_____
Jensen, Ben F., *Iowa*_____2120 16th St.
Johansen, August E., *Mich*_
Johnson, Leroy, *Calif*_____630 North Carolina Ave. SE.
Johnson, Lester R., *Wis*____3816 Pope St. SE.
Jonas, Charles Raper, *N. C*_
Jones, Paul C., *Mo*_____3613 Greenway Pl., Alexandria, Va.
Jones, Robert E., Jr., *Ala*___
Jones, Woodrow W., *N. C*__
Judd, Walter H., *Minn*____3083 Ordway St.

Karsten, Frank M., *Mo*____
Kean, Robert W., *N. J*_____2435 Kalorama Road
Kearney, B. W. (Pat), *N. Y*_
Kearns, Carroll D., *Pa*_____Sheraton-Park
Keating, Kenneth B., *N. Y*_1612 34th St.
Kee, Elizabeth, *W. Va*_____
Kelley, Augustine B., *Pa*___
Kelly, Edna F., *N. Y*_____
Keogh, Eugene J., *N. Y*____The Mayflower
Kilburn, Clarence E., *N. Y*_The Gen. Scott
Kilday, Paul J., *Tex*_____3507 Albemarle St.
Kilgore, Joe M., *Tex*_____
King, Cecil R., *Calif*_____
King, Karl C., *Pa*_____
Kirwan, Michael J., *Ohio*__
Klein, Arthur G., *N. Y*_____
Kluczynski, John C., *Ill*___
Knox, Victor A., *Mich*_____
Knutson, Coya, *Minn*_____
Krueger, Otto, *N. Dak*_____112 Schotts Court NE.

Laird, Melvin R., *Wis*.
Landrum, Phil M., *Ga*.
Lane, Thomas J., *Mass*.
Lanham, Henderson, *Ga*.
Lankford, Richard E., *Md*.
Latham, Henry J., *N. Y*.
LeCompte, Karl M., *Iowa*—Sheraton-Park
Lesinski, John, Jr., *Mich*.
Lipscomb, Glenard P., *Calif*.
Long, George S., *La*.—2136 31st St. SE.
Lovre, Harold O., *S. Dak*.—1605 Sherwood Road, Silver Spring, Md.
McCarthy, Eugene J., *Minn*.—419 Raymond St., Chevy Chase, Md.
McConnell, Samuel K., Jr., *Pa*.
McCormack, John W., *Mass*.—The Washington
McCulloch, Wm. M., *Ohio*—Westchester Apts.
McDonough, G. L., *Calif*.
McDowell, Harris B., Jr., *Del*.
McGregor, J. Harry, *Ohio*—The Westchester
McIntire, Clifford G., *Maine*—220 2d St. SE.
McMillan, John L., *S. C*.—1201 S. Barton St., Arlington, Va.
McVey, William E., *Ill*.—The Coronet
Macdonald, Torbert H., *Mass*.
Machrowicz, Thaddeus M., *Mich*.—812 Park Ave., Falls Church, Va.
Mack, Peter F., Jr., *Ill*.
Mack, Russell V., *Wash*.
Madden, Ray J., *Ind*.
Magnuson, Don, *Wash*.
Mahon, George H., *Tex*.—Alban Towers
Mailliard, William S., *Calif*.
Marshall, Fred, *Minn*.
Martin, Jos. W., Jr., *Mass*.—The Hay-Adams
Mason, Noah M., *Ill*.—The Baronet
Matthews, D. R. (Billy), *Fla*.
Meader, George, *Mich*.—3360 Tennyson St.
Merrow, Chester E., *N. H*.
Metcalf, Lee, *Mont*.
Miller, A. L., *Nebr*.—2801 East-West Highway, Chevy Chase, Md.
Miller, Edward T., *Md*.—2901 Conn. Ave.
Miller, George P., *Calif*.
Miller, William E., *N. Y*.—3708 Calvend Lane, Kensington, Md.
Mills, Wilbur D., *Ark*.—2701 Conn. Ave.
Minshall, William E., *Ohio*.
Mollohan, Robert H., *W. Va*.
Morano, Albert P., *Conn*.
Morgan, Thomas E., *Pa*.
Morrison, James H., *La*.—4301 Mass. Ave.
Moss, John E., Jr., *Calif*.—204 Jefferson St., Alexandria, Va.
Moulder, Morgan M., *Mo*.
Multer, Abraham J., *N. Y*.
Mumma, Walter M., *Pa*.—The Coronet
Murray, James C., *Ill*.
Murray, Tom, *Tenn*.
Natcher, William H., *Ky*.—5108 Bradley Blvd., Bethesda, Md.
Nelson, Charles P., *Maine*.
Nicholson, D. W., *Mass*.
Norblad, Walter, *Oreg*.
Norrell, W. F., *Ark*.—2301 Conn. Ave.
O'Brien, Leo W., *N. Y*.
O'Brien, Thomas J., *Ill*.—The Hamilton
O'Hara, Barratt, *Ill*.—The Congressional
O'Hara, Joseph P., *Minn*.—2813 31st St.
O'Konski, Alvin E., *Wis*.—4000 Mass. Ave.
O'Neill, Thomas P., Jr., *Mass*.
Osmers, Frank C., Jr., *N. J*.
Ostertag, Harold C., *N. Y*.—100 Maryland Ave. NE.
Passman, Otto E., *La*.
Patman, Wright, *Tex*.—117 Carroll St. SE.
Patterson, James T., *Conn*.
Pelly, Thomas M., *Wash*.
Perkins, Carl D., *Ky*.
Pfost, Gracie, *Idaho*.
Philbin, Philip J., *Mass*.
Phillips, John, *Calif*.
Pilcher, J. L., *Ga*.
Pillion, John R., *N. Y*.
Poage, W. R., *Tex*.—2309 Skyland Pl. SE.
Poff, Richard H., *Va*.
Polk, James G., *Ohio*.
Powell, Adam C., Jr., *N. Y*.
Preston, Prince H., Jr., *Ga*.
Price, Melvin, *Ill*.
Priest, J. Percy, *Tenn*.—The Berkshire
Prouty, Winston L., *Vt*.
Quigley, James M., *Pa*.
Rabaut, Louis C., *Mich*.
Radwan, Edmund P., *N. Y*.
Rains, Albert, *Ala*.
Ray, John H., *N. Y*.
Rayburn, Sam, *Tex*.
Reece, B. Carroll, *Tenn*.
Reed, Daniel A., *N. Y*.—The Woodner
Rees, Edward H., *Kans*.—1801 16th St.
Reuss, Henry S., *Wis*.—1650 30th St.
Rhodes, George M., *Pa*.—1809 Franklin St. NE.
Rhodes, John J., *Ariz*.
Richards, James P., *S. C*.
Riehlman, R. Walter, *N. Y*.—3210 Wis. Ave.
Riley, John J., *S. C*.
Rivers, L. Mendel, *S. C*.
Roberts, Kenneth A., *Ala*.—6102 Cromwell Dr.
Robeson, Edward J., Jr., *Va*.
Robsion, John M., Jr., *Ky*.—1500 Delafield Pl.
Rodino, Peter W., Jr., *N. J*.
Rogers, Byron G., *Colo*.
Rogers, Edith Nourse, *Mass*.—The Shoreham
Rogers, Paul G., *Fla*.—Sheraton-Park
Rogers, Walter, *Tex*.
Rooney, John J., *N. Y*.
Roosevelt, James, *Calif*.
Rutherford, J. T., *Tex*.
Sadlak, Antoni N., *Conn*.
St. George, Katharine, *N. Y*.
Saylor, John P., *Pa*.
Schenck, Paul F., *Ohio*.—3801 Conn. Ave., Apt. 307
Scherer, Gordon H., *Ohio*—The Mayflower
Schwengel, Fred, *Iowa*.
Scott, Hugh, *Pa*.
Scrivner, Errett P., *Kans*.—2331 Cathedral Ave.
Scudder, Hubert B., *Calif*.—4545 Conn. Ave.
Seely-Brown, Horace, Jr., *Conn*.
Selden, Armistead I., Jr., *Ala*.—4625 B 36th St. So., Arlington, Va.
Sheehan, Timothy P., *Ill*.
Shelley, John F., *Calif*.
Sheppard, Harry R., *Calif*.
Short, Dewey, *Mo*.
Shuford, George A., *N. C*.—Sheraton-Park
Sieminski, Alfred D., *N. J*.
Sikes, Robert L. F., *Fla*.
Siler, Eugene, *Ky*.
Simpson, Richard M., *Pa*.—5205 Lawn May, Chevy Chase, Md.
Simpson, Sid, *Ill*.—2100 Mass. Ave.
Sisk, B. F., *Calif*.
Smith, Frank E., *Miss*.
Smith, Howard W., *Va*.—204 W. Walnut St. Alexandria, Va.
Smith, Lawrence H., *Wis*.—2480 16th St.
Smith, Wint, *Kans*.
Spence, Brent, *Ky*.—Sheraton-Park
Springer, William L., *Ill*.
Staggers, Harley O., *W. Va*.
Steed, Tom, *Okla*.
Sullivan, Leonor K., *Mo*.
Taber, John, *N. Y*.
Talle, Henry O., *Iowa*.—4613 Harrison St.
Taylor, Dean P., *N. Y*.
Teague, Charles M., *Calif*.
Teague, Olin E., *Tex*.—6015 Mass. Ave.
Thomas, Albert, *Tex*.—2901 34th St.
Thompson, Clark W., *Tex*.—Sheraton-Park
Thompson, Frank, Jr., *N. J*.
Thompson, Ruth, *Mich*.
Thompson, T. A., *La*.—1600 Kenwood Av., Alexandria, Va.
Thomson, E. Keith, *Wyo*.
Thornberry, Homer, *Tex*.
Tollefson, Thor C., *Wash*.
Trimble, James W., *Ark*.
Tuck, William M., *Va*.
Tumulty, T. James, *N. J*.
Udall, Stewart L., *Ariz*.
Utt, James B., *Calif*.
Vanik, Charles A., *Ohio*.
Van Pelt, William K., *Wis*.
Van Zandt, James E., *Pa*.—Arlington Towers, Arlington, Va.
Velde, Harold H., *Ill*.
Vinson, Carl, *Ga*.—4 Primrose St., Chevy Chase, Md.
Vorys, John M., *Ohio*.—2032 Belmont Rd.
Vursell, Charles W., *Ill*.—The Congressional
Wainwright, Stuyvesant, *N. Y*.
Walter, Francis E., *Pa*.
Watts, John C., *Ky*.
Weaver, Phil, *Nebr*.—9408 Crosby Rd., Silver Spring, Md.
Westland, Jack, *Wash*.
Wharton, J. Ernest, *N. Y*.
Whitten, Jamie L., *Miss*.—5804 Nebraska Ave.
Wickersham, Victor, *Okla*.
Widnall, William B., *N. J*.
Wier, Roy W., *Minn*.
Wigglesworth, R. B., *Mass*.—3257 N. St.
Williams, Harrison A., Jr., *N. J*.
Williams, John Bell, *Miss*.—1001 26th Road S., Arlington, Va.
Williams, William R., *N. Y*.—1241 Pa. Ave. SE.
Willis, Edwin E., *La*.
Wilson, Earl, *Ind*.
Wilson, Robert C. (Bob), *Calif*.
Winstead, Arthur, *Miss*.
Withrow, Gardner R., *Wis*.
Wolcott, Jesse P., *Mich*.—3707 Thornapple St., Chevy Chase
Wolverton, Charles A., *N. J*.—1336 HOB
Wright, Jim, *Tex*.
Yates, Sidney R., *Ill*.
Young, Clifton (Cliff), *Nev*.—2705 Westminister Pl., Alexandria, Va.
Younger, J. Arthur, *Calif*.—4545 Conn. Ave.
Zablocki, Clement J., *Wis*.
Zelenko, Herbert, *N. Y*.

DELEGATES

Bartlett, E. L. (Bob), 1718 33d Pl. SE. *Alaska*.
Farrington, Mrs. Joseph R., *Hawaii*.

RESIDENT COMMISSIONER

Fernós-Isern, A., *P. R*.—2210 R St.

OFFICERS OF THE HOUSE

Clerk—Ralph R. Roberts.
Sergeant at Arms—Zeake W. Johnson, Jr.
Doorkeeper—William M. Miller, 1732 S St. SE.
Chaplain—Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., 1421 Montague St.
Postmaster—H. H. Morris.

OFFICIAL REPORTERS OF DEBATE

SENATE

James W. Murphy, 7 Primrose St., Chevy Chase, Md.
John D. Rhodes, 3535 Williamsburg Lane.
Gregor Macpherson, 3111 44th St.
Herbert N. Budlong, Kurtz Rd., McLean, Va.
J. Chester Wilfong, 4408 Fourth Road North, Arlington, Va.
Charles J. Drescher, 3738 North 4th St., Arlington, Va.
Francis J. Attig, 3919 Livingston St.
Nicholas J. Cinciotta, 400 Williamsburg Dr., Silver Spring, Md.
Elmer L. Koons (assistant), 826 Aspen St.
Willard W. Pruett (clerk), 1200 North Stuart St., Arlington, Va.
Placidino Zagami (clerk), 5805 10th Place, Chillum, Md.

HOUSE

W. L. Fenstermacher, 2929 Connecticut Ave.
Roy L. Whitman, 4820 Linnean Ave.
F. S. Milberg, 5032 Massachusetts Ave.
E. B. Clark, 604 Bennington Dr., Silver Spring, Md.
Frank E. Battaglia, 957 East-West Highway.
Claude S. Scheckel, 6 East Blackthorne St., Chevy Chase, Md.
Albert Schneider, 7516 14th St.
Paul L. Miller (clerk), Shadyside, Md.
Sidney W. Williston (assistant clerk), 1830 Longford Drive, Hyattsville, Md.
Bjarne J. Sigurdsen (assistant clerk), 1921 You Place, SE.

Appendix

Atomic Power for Profit

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. IRVING M. IVES
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, July 3, 1956

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, these days all of us are vitally interested in the peaceful uses of atomic energy. Recently, Gen. Walter Bedell Smith delivered an excellent address before the Brooklyn Chamber of Commerce dealing with atomic power as a source of industrial energy.

I ask unanimous consent to have the text of this speech printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ATOMIC POWER FOR PROFIT

(Address by Gen. Walter Bedell Smith, vice chairman of the board of directors, American Machine & Foundry Co., before the Brooklyn Chamber of Commerce, Brooklyn, N. Y., May 28, 1956)

Mr. President, members, and guests of the Brooklyn Chamber of Commerce, here in this city, which has taken the lead in making so much business and industrial history, the immediate and future prospects for the atomic powerplant seems to me to be a very appropriate subject for our consideration.

Today every businessman in Brooklyn has a personal stake in this new form of industrial energy. Its implications are so vast, its potentials are of such interest to our free economy, that no enterprise can afford to ignore them.

Yet only a decade ago it would have been impossible for a group such as this even to discuss the subject of atomic power in its application to industry. The reason has nothing to do with national security; the atomic powerplant simply did not exist as far back as 10 years ago.

A little over two decades ago, in fact, the mere idea of extracting useful energy from the atom was publicly scorned by a great nuclear physicist in Britain. "Anyone who expects a source of power from the transformation of these atoms," said Lord Rutherford as late as 1933, "is talking moonshine."

It happens that—as I glanced through a recent magazine article quoting this remembered remark—there lay on the desk before me the design for an atomic powerplant by AMF Atomics, a subsidiary of our firm, which will build the reactor for it.

This particular atomic powerplant is planned to produce electric current at a cost of less than 8 mills per kilowatt for the area around Elk River, Minn., where present cost of generating current due to the high price of coal is about 9 mills per kilowatt.

All of you know, I am sure, that West Milton, N. Y., is to be electrified from General Electric's power reactor. You read the announcement this month that Consolidated Edison is building a $55 million atomic powerplant at Indian Point, N. Y., about 40 miles north of here, which will supply 236,000 kilowatts—enough to service the home electric needs of 1 million New Yorkers—and will be in full production by 1960.

I could go on at length, but these examples alone are enough to make one smile now at the pessimistic predictions of only a few years ago and justify the predictions of today's experts, who do not hesitate to say that atomic powerplants will eventually produce power below the cost of even our most efficient conventionally fueled plants.

However, as Hugh Walpole once wrote to his brother, "Prognostics do not always prove to be prophecies." And, he added cautiously, "At least the wisest prophets make sure of the event first." With Walpole's words in mind, I hesitate to play the role of prophet. It is enough to say that even today the atom is a source of industrial power that, under certain conditions, is competitive with fossil fuels and that there is no doubt that engineering ingenuity will rapidly broaden the field of this competition.

I think it might be interesting to review today some of the growing pains and accomplishments of this new source of industrial energy. You will then be free to draw your own conclusions as to the outlook for its profitable development.

To begin with, there is nothing different or distinctive about the electricity produced by an atomic powerplant. A nuclear reactor merely replaces the conventional firebox and boiler used to generate steam. The combustion of coal or oil is suppplanted by heat produced in a fission chain reaction. The resulting steam then drives a generator to produce electricity, as in the more familiar power complexes.

The principal advantage of atomic fuel, as compared with conventional fuels, is the large amount of heat which can be derived from it in relation to its weight. The fission of 1 pound of uranium-235 in an atomic reactor will produce the same amount of energy as the burning of 1,300 tons of coal, or 6,000 barrels of fuel oil.

The TVA's new Kingston steam plant to serve Oak Ridge requires 15,000 tons of coal a day for its normal operation. The equivalent amount of uranium-235 required to produce the same amount of energy would be about 10 pounds. Theoretically, the entire world's energy demands for a whole year could be supplied by a single 8-foot cube of nuclear fuel weighing only 300 tons.

However, as every manufacturer knows, power is being consumed at an ever-rising rate by our industrial economy. Projections of electric power demand in the United States indicate that we will be using 1,400 billion kilowatt-hours a year by 1975—an increase of neary 150 percent above present levels.

At the same time our known reserves of conventional fuels are being depleted rather rapidly. Dr. Palmer C. Putnam, an authority on the subject, characterize our burnup rate as unbelievable. In the United States, for example, one-half of all the coal ever consumed has been burned since 1920. Nearly one-half of all the coal and gas ever consumed has been burned since 1940. The burnup rate is 10 times faster now than it was a century ago.

By 1975 the largest sources of conventional fuels may be depleted to the point where the recovery of lower grade reserves or less easily available reserves, may up their cost. Or, the miracles of the modern test tube may create new markets for fossil-fuel products, increasing their value. It is easy to foresee a day when we may want to save our coal and other below-ground fuels for the manufacture of synthetic organic chemicals.

In any case the fossil fuels are characterized by extreme bulk and weight. In places where these fuels must be hauled long distances for conversion to power, their costs rise sharply. We are all aware of the tremendous quantities of conventional fuels that must be transported by rail, barge, truck or pipeline to supply our domestic powerplants from sources close at hand and we are more fortunate than most other nations. Elsewhere, these supplies either are not available or are prohibitive in price. I was astonished a few weeks ago when the managing director of our British associate told me of the amount of railroad coal that South Africa imports from the United States. There are many areas where industrialization cannot go forward without nuclear powerplants.

On the basis of these considerations, the case for atomic power would seem to be an open-and-shut one. Nuclear fuels are compact and readily portable. They generate tremendous amounts of energy in proportion to their weight. They can be made available at points where conventional fuels are all but unobtainable. They have a longer productive life in comparison with other fuels, which are rapidly consumed in the generation of power and must be replaced with equal rapidity. Their price is stable and will be decreased as new skills are applied to their recovery; wheraes, new uses and demands for the available supply of other fuels threaten to increase their cost.

Finally, our known reserves of nuclear fuels, which are steadily growing, are not in danger of exhaustion in the foreseeable future. In fact, it is estimated that they already contain 25 times as much usable energy as do our established sources of coal, oil, or gas—which are diminishing and can never be replaced.

On the other hand, a highly competitive and cost-conscious power industry cannot be expected to switch over to the use of nuclear fuels just to be different. There is a tremendous investment in the production of power through the use of conventional fuels, and an equally enormous facility for recovering them from the earth, shipping them, and handling them. Our American skills in all those directions are the marvel of industrialists everywhere, and rightly so.

The cost of nuclear fuel is still high by comparison (usually about twice the current figure for other sources of power). Potentially it is a cheap form of energy, weight for weight, but a great many things must be done to it first. It must be discovered, it must be mined, it must be transported, it must be refined to a very high degree of purity, and sometimes it must be enriched with uranium 235. Then your fissionable material must be fabricated and assembled very carefully into fuel elements for the reactors.

As these elements undergo fission, they produce highly radioactive waste products and must eventually be replaced. The used elements are then reprocessed to rid them of undesirable substances, and to recover the unburned uranium. They can then be reenriched and refabricated into fuel elements, ready to be used again. In addition to the expense of refining and fabrication, there is the quite serious problem of waste disposal.

Obviously, these technical problems and many others must be dealt with—or at least reduced—before atomic power can make its way everywhere on equal terms with power-producing systems that are generations old. All this was forecast in the first Report on the International Control of Atomic Energy, dated March 16, 1946—only 10 years ago. This report declared, in what I consider something of an understatement, "Anything constructive in relation to atomic energy must inevitably be novel and immensely difficult."

You will be interested in some of the steps our Government has taken to help resolve these difficulties. For one thing, a 5-year program of power-reactor development, on which $200 million will be spent, has been launched by the Atomic Energy Commission.

By 1960, the most promising of several possible approaches to the economical uses of nuclear fuels should be fairly well established. This is by no means the first effort by the Atomic Energy Commission to advance the peacetime uses of atomic energy, of course. The Commission's scientists must already be credited with much of the basic development of reactor techniques during the past 5 years.

The Atomic Energy Commission's contributions to this field are perhaps all the more remarkable for having been made in a period when much time and attention necessarily had to be devoted to other uses for the atom. In what President Eisenhower once called "this age of peril," many top physicists who were engaged in defense work had to pass up, for the time being, very attractive avenues of scientific approach that had enormous peacetime possibilities. In addition, of course, there was and continues to be a chronic shortage of professional talent capable of doing exploratory and follow-up work in these directions.

These handicaps are now being eased; first by drawing the research facilities of the great research institutes and universities into the atomic development picture; and, second by enlisting the scientific resources of private industry. As a result there has been a very marked increase in both academic and business interest in the atom during recent months, though the former remains a great national problem that must be overcome.

As designers and builders of nuclear reactors and related equipment, my firm has played its part in the encouragement of these interests. For instance, we are constructing a research reactor for Battelle Memorial Institute in Columbus, Ohio. Two research institutes have completed such reactors, or nearly so, and four others that I know of are actively interested in similar projects.

We have been retained by the University of Buffalo to assist in its plans to build a research reactor on the campus, and we know of other universities with similar plans. Two, North Carolina and Pennsylvania State, already have reactors in operation. A third, at the University of Michigan, is nearing completion.

All this, of course, is immensely important to the future development of atomic energy for peacetime. Without opportunities for training, we cannot hope for the continuous enlistment of young technical brains, skill, and know-how that are necessary for its expansion. There is no other way in which this Nation can hope to keep pace with new atomic discoveries, much less put them to work for us.

Nor has industry been remiss in this respect. My firm (and I refer to it because I know what it is doing) is preparing to design and construct at Plainsboro, N. J., the first nuclear reactor to be owned and operated for mutual benefit by a group of large private companies. The Industrial Reactor Laboratories, as they will be called, will be used to conduct atomic research in industrial and humanitarian fields. Our own organization will be among the participating companies, incidentally, and all of the other member companies are well known here in Brooklyn.

Altogether, there are now some 29 nuclear reactors operating in the United States, plus 3 national laboratories in full production. One of these last, the laboratory at Oak Ridge, uses about one and one-half times as much electricity as all the rest of the State of Tennessee put together. In fact, it consumes about three times as much power as is used by all of the highly industrialized city of Detroit.

This power demand, which literally did not exist before 1943, is an example of the stepped-up energy needs which must be met in this country, and soon. After 1960, when the 5-year reactor research program will be completed, this Nation, will have only 15 years in which to build something like $8 billion worth of nuclear powerplants to meet the 1975 demand.

These will produce about 45 million kilowatts of electric power, in places and at prices where atomic power is competitive. This would represent only about 15 percent of the total United States power demand at that time—about a billion dollars worth per year. The industrial and technological advancement thus represented, however, would be a major contribution to our American standard of living.

It is hardly necessary to mention to this audience the overriding importance of national prestige in this field; of economic well-being; and of continued peace, progress and prosperity. Those are the things we live by in the Western world—they are the very embodiments of our way of life.

The same things are true of our great neighbor to the north, where vast resources await industrial development that can come only from atomic power. Canada is fortunate in more ways than one; in addition to her other natural wealth she has at least five times more proven reserves of nuclear fuel than we have. I need not tell you what her prospects are, in the atomic development of the future, and the Canadians are very alert to these prospects. There, as in our own country, remote regions beyond reach of conventional fuel supplies—and regions too rough or distant for the easy transmittal of existing power—can now be opened to industrialization through "packaged" atomic powerplants.

As we range over the map of the British Commonwealth, as over the maps of our own Territories and possessions, we find countless places that fit this description. The same is true of friendly lands in South America, and in other parts of the world.

Therefore, if I were asked to sum up the possibilities of atomic power for profit, my appraisal would run something like this: I would say that in the present state of the art, no man can declare as yet, dogmatically, that one form of its application is more efficient under every given circumstance than another form; or that his is the only and infallible solution to every problem to be faced.

The principle of "breeding" fuel, for example, has been pretty well established. One type of breeding reactor converts nonfissionable U–238 to fissionable plutonium at a rate faster than its U–235 is consumed. Another converts nonfissionable thorium to fissionable U–233. In both cases the reactor ends up with more fuel than it started with, which promises a vast increase in our potential nuclear reserves. But no one knows as yet which is the better.

Chemical processing methods are constantly being improved. This is important because, with the prospect of breeding new fuels and thus keeping the cost down, the separation and purifying of waste and contamination becomes vital to efficiency. No one knows as yet whether running a chemical plant in connection with a power producer will be an asset or a liability. As in the case of some of the other questions I have raised, there simply has not been time to find out.

Of one thing we can be sure. Atomic reactors, which once were inherently dangerous to operate or be around, are now inherently safe. They can be and are being set up close to large centers of population. This one point alone makes a great difference in transmission costs.

We can be sure of another thing, too. No organization, public or private, industrial or academic, can help but enrich its own prospects by its research in the nuclear field. Never has it been more true today that, as President Eisenhower told the Parliament at Ottawa 3 years ago, "Beyond the shadow of the atomic cloud the horizon is bright with promise."

There has been a tendency of late to compare American scientific achievements in this field somewhat unfavorably with those of a lesser social and economic order and by that I mean the Soviet Union. I am not one of those who would be inclined to sell our native genius short but we must deal with realities. Our technical training systems need to be enlarged and improved to supply greater numbers of scientists. They must certainly be enlarged and improved though there is nothing wrong with the quality of our American performance in the atomic arena. It is and has been superb from the beginning. As far as I know today, our position is dominant. Further improvements will come at the hands of industry, the universities, the great research centers and the Government, working together in the traditional American way.

I am confident that in the future, as in the past, our national genius will meet every challenge from without, and that our industrial achievements, which have always been the symbols of American strength, will continue to react effectively to what Mr. Jay Hopkins has described so accurately as "the dynamics of the market place." The job will not be easy, but it must be done.

Appreciation Banquet for Senator Warren G. Magnuson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY M. JACKSON

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, July 3, 1956

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, some time ago, leaders and advocates of intensive Pacific Northwest developments held an appreciation banquet honoring the senior Senator from Washington, WARREN G. MAGNUSON, in recognition of the work he has done in this regard.

The main speaker for the occasion was our colleague, Senator ROBERT KERR, of Oklahoma.

I ask unanimous consent that the address by Senator KERR, as of the broadcast from the banquet, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY SENATOR KERR

It is wonderful to be in the State of Washington. When Oklahoma came into the Sovereign Union of States she did so with

a constitution that had been drafted by a constitutional convention of many of her greatest sons.

It is a well-known fact that she took more points and more provisions from the constitution of what was then the young State of Washington than from any other source. And we have always been grateful that this great and sovereign State of Washington had produced such a progressive and worth while constitution that could serve as so much of a pattern for our own constitutional convention.

There's a lot in common between Washington State and Oklahoma.

I'm very happy to participate in this occasion honoring my Senate colleague.

There is nothing that a politician appreciates as much as appreciation. In fact, an ounce of appreciation is worth a pound of criticism.

It has been said that a statesman is a dead politician. I don't subscribe to that statement. I resent it.

A statesman is an appreciated politician. And politicians go where invited and stay where appreciated. You know, appreciation at home, MAGGY, is wonderful.

When I first went to Washington and became acquainted with Senator WARREN G. MAGNUSON, and when I learned of his stature and reputation so justly earned, I heard them calling him "MAGGY," and I wondered how that started. Then it became apparent as I became acquainted with him that it was because of his having such a magnetic personality.

You know, WARREN, appreciation at home is wonderful. A man just can't stay in office without it. But, also, I want to say to you that appreciation of his colleagues in the United States Senate, and their respect for him, is also a wonderful thing for your Senator WARREN MAGNUSON.

You know, a man can't stay in Washington as a Senator unless he has the appreciation of the folks at home.

And he'd just as well not be there, so far as the folks at home are concerned, unless he has the appreciation of his colleagues. Because, great as your State is, and outstanding as your Senators are, there are just 2 of them in the 96 down there, and it takes teamwork there, just as it does here, to be effective.

A Senator's effectiveness for his constituents at home is in direct proportion to the respect and appreciation in which he is held by his colleagues.

I'm happy to tell you tonight that no man in the United States Senate (notice I didn't say "no woman" because there is a great lady in the United States Senate and I want you to know I'm excepting her from this statement) that no man in the United States Senate is more accepted and more appreciated by Senators than is WARREN MAGNUSON, of Washington.

A fellow in public office is greatly desirous of living up to the responsibility and opportunity of the office he occupies.

I was impressed by the invocation that we heard a little while ago from the fine voice of the Christian leader who spoke those words of reverence in the invocation. I listened as he asked for guidance from the Deity who has that place in the heart and mind of the American people, that on every coin now minted by the Government of the United States, you find inscribed these words, "In God we trust."

I'm glad that I live in a country where that sentiment is evident not alone on the coin in the pocket, but also in the hearts of the people. And I'm grateful for the fact that He who founded the Christian religion, gave not only to the disciples about Him and to His day and generation but also to us, the exact recipe whereby man can be appreciated and respected by his fellow men.

It was He who said, "Let him who would be first among you, be the servant of all."

Therein is the priceless secret of His own omnipotent personality, Grace and power. In those words He laid down the only formula whereby we who proclaim His name and prescribe His faith, can walk in His footsteps.

"Let him who would be first among you, be the servant of all."

The great thing about WARREN MAGNUSON is that in his public life he has exemplified that great admonition in seeking to be the servant of his people.

He has more position in the United States Senate and more seniority than any other man of his age in the Senate of the United States.

Under his leadership, and by reason of the sum total of effort which he and those who work with him—and certainly he's made the greatest contribution to that effort—the most extensive program of Federal development of the natural resources of any State in the Union has taken place here in the State of Washington.

It's wonderful to fly over this great State; it's wonderful to fly over our country with its magnificient forests, broad streams, fertile valleys, and glorious mountains. We get the picture of the abundance with which Providence has blessed up, and no State has been more richly blessed than yours. Nor have the resources of any State been further brought along in development than yours, with you great reservoirs for the conservation and the storage of that priceless resource, water.

For the creation of power.

For the development of navigation.

For the building of recreational facilities.

For industrial and municipal water supply.

For use in bringing the breath of life to your fertile soil through irrigation.

WARREN MAGNUSON has walked in the front ranks of those who have brought the development of the Nation's resources to such an advanced stage.

No State has fared better than yours.

Not only have these projects contributed to the security and prosperity of the State of Washington—made the Nation more prosperous in peace and stronger in war—brought your State to such a high degree of development; but every single one of them either has brought revenue which has reimbursed the Federal Government for its cost, or is in the process of doing so.

Long after the Government has received back every dollar invested in them through decades, yes, through centuries of future progress, they will serve to reinforce the economy and strength of your State and the security of your country.

When I think about Grand Coulee—the greatest engineering accomplishment man has brought about upon the face of the earth, Ice Harbor Dam, Chief Joseph Dam, the McNary Dam, Kennewick Irrigation project, Roza powerplant, development of the great Bonneville power grid, I am aware that each is in part and some of them in toto—a monument to the genius, the service, and the labors of your great senior Senator, WARREN MAGNUSON.

By his service, this year and hereafter, he will play a prominent part in the development of that, yet another, tremendous hydroelectric power—water conservation project—Hells Canyon.

One of the things that I have respected Senator MAGNUSON for the most, has been his stanch service to agriculture. He shares with me the conviction that a nation which has developed the most outstanding industrial economy on the earth despite only 7 percent of the earth's surface, and 7 percent of the earth's population, yet produced an industrial structure that produces half of the manufactured products in the world—can still say our greatest national industry is agriculture.

The second largest industry in our country is the public utility.

The third largest industry is the oil and gas industry.

The fourth largest industry is our railroads.

Yet, the total investment in all three of those—the second, third, and fourth industries in our country—their combined investment is less than is the total investment in agriculture.

So there can be no doubt but what it is our greatest industry. MAGNUSON has recognized these facts in being a stanch friend and champion of agriculture, of the farm people of his State and our country.

He has fought to prevent increases in freight rates on his cattle producers.

He has fought for market for the fruit, the wheat, the livestock producers, and those who produce other agricultural commodities.

Today he's recognized by his colleagues in the Senate as one of the outstanding champions of agriculture in the Congress of the United States.

MAGNUSON has always been a stanch friend of the common man. He has championed social legislation—social security—laws that guarantee better wages and working conditions for labor, and he has devoted himself in a high degree to programs that have been devoted to improving the health of all the people.

There are many people in Washington, D. C., who regard WARREN MAGNUSON as the greatest authority in the Nation's Capitol, on the development of adequate research to prevent and bring about control of cancer and of heart disease.

Programs of your government to which he has made as great a contribution as any, and much greater than most in the field of research against these killers of humanity, has resulted, so I am told by health authorities, in increasing the life-span of the average citizen, a minimum of 12 years, in the last 15 years of the history of these great programs.

I don't see any women here tonight old enough to be concerned about getting twelve more years of life yet, but I see a lot of men here who are in my shape and to whom the comforting though of 12 more years than had previously been the average life span, is a matter of no little comfort.

MAGGY, I want to pay my contribution and tribute to you for your great work in that field of public service.

Yes, I'm happy to pay tribute to WARREN MAGNUSON.

He has built many monuments to himself in his unselfish public service.

The evidence at this meeting tonight reminds me that the greatest monument that he has built to himself is in the affection and love of the people of the State he loves.

It has been said by the great order in whose hall we meet tonight: "The faults of our friends we write upon the sands; their virtues we carve in the stone of love and memory."

Therein is man's greatest monument—therein is man's greatest achievement.

The few halting words that I have spoken and the matters to which I have referred, significant and as important as they are, will all sink into relative insignificance when compared with the tremendous reservoir of good will, affection, esteem, respect, and appreciation in the hearts and minds of the people of the great State of Washington, for this, her distinguished son and public servant.

It gives me great pleasure tonight to be here with you and him.

Appraisal of American Foreign Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. IRVING M. IVES
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, July 3, 1956

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address by Daniel J. Riesner, Esq., of New York, president of the National Republican Club. Mr. Riesner's address, appraising American foreign policy in recent years, was delivered by him at a meeting of the National Council of Business and Professional Men, Inc., in New York City.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I am proud indeed to have been invited to speak before the membership of the National Council of Business and Professional Men, Inc., which means so much in the field of civic and philanthropic endeavor and which is so representative of progress and private thinking in business and professional endeavors. It is a very great personal pleasure for me to meet this evening with the members and friends of this organization, particularly your president, the Honorable Chauncey H. Levy, who is a member of my fraternity, a graduate of Columbia with me many years ago and we have been close personal friends for over 35 years; the Honorable Frank Zuckerbrot, chairman of the immigration committee, executive member of the Central Queens Republican Club of Kew Garden Hills, Long Island, Borough of Queens, N. Y., and my very efficient political colleague from that area whose career and political background has been similar to my own for the last 25 years.

I know of your work and your purpose and I am very grateful for this opportunity to exchange views with one of the most alert and civic-conscious groups in our community.

I will attempt to give tonight an impartial appraisal of American foreign policy based on events which took place from 1953 to 1956.

When President Eisenhower took office on January 20, 1953, the Korean stalemate was sapping the nerves and energy of the country and threatening once more to throw the shroud of war over the shoulders of our Nation. There was nothing but bitter frustration resulting from our efforts to secure peace. The Iranian war bubble was ready to burst and the Communists were threatening to engulf all of Indochina. Trieste was boiling over and all efforts to get Soviet Russia to live up to her commitments and get out of Austria were unavailing. These were just a few of the trouble spots in the world engulfed by the despairing gloom attendant upon a so-called cold war which kept erupting in volcano fashion with grim threats to light the fuse to a worldwide war of annihiliation.

Between 1945 and 1952, the Communists, propelled by the seven-league boots of totalitarian authority, built up by ruthless force and underwritten by the broken bodies of beaten and betrayed peoples, acquired more millions of square miles of territory and more millions of people under their sway than was ever taken by any conquering horde in any period of time since the beginning of recorded history.

Thus was the stage of foreign policy set when the Eisenhower administration took office in 1953. Let me make this clear. My present appraisal of the foreign policy accomplishments of the present administration is based on its affirmative acts rather than on a criticism of the acts of the previous administration. Suffice it to say that tremendous world problems faced the Nation from 1945 to 1953. International crises arose in rapid succession and continued to exist when President Eisenhower took office. Let us consider what has happened since, as American accomplishments in the field of foreign policy, rather than as partisan achievements.

The first accomplishment of our President was to set the wheels in motion which resulted in a real truce and settlement of the Korean war. In rapid succession came the settlement of the Iranian oil dispute—with the aftermath of Mossadegh's fall from power—the truce in Indochina which prevented that Nation from being swallowed up entirely by the militarily successful Communist armies—and left half the country to fight against further encroachments of communism; the making of a formal peace treaty with Russia and the withdrawal of Communist troops from Austria, and the Paris agreements which resulted in West German consent to rearm and participate actively in NATO. There also followed the implementation of SEATO and the Formosa resolution, which put the entire Congress and country squarely behind the President in his countering of Chinese Communist threats to invade Formosa.

And let us not forget that after the death of Stalin—the cause of which event is still the subject of much international speculation—and the accession of Malenkov, neither soft words failed to swerve this Nation from its resolve to arm to the limit of practicality, nor did angry words weaken our purpose to go forward with strengthening NATO and our resolve not to yield one iota in any other phase of our mutual security program. Criticism did not alter our program to continue to help militarily and economically those countries of the world which needed our help and might be relied on to stop the spread of communism.

Then came the shelving of Malenkov and the accession of the present clique headed by Khrushchev and Bulganin. For a time the smiling Russian faces at Geneva gave some hope to the world that a formula for coexistence might be found. President Eisenhower, though thoroughly wary of Russian duplicity, nevertheless gave the world every chance for a lasting peace by his expressed willingness to cooperate with Russian leaders and by making his famous open-skies proposal. Obviously this threw the Russians off balance, because it took weeks after the Geneva Conference for the Russians to give their equivocal answer.

The events of history are clear. The overall direction of our Nation's foreign policy under the Eisenhower administration has been strong and firm and steady. The change of pace has come from Russia and has had to be countered by us. It is easy for a dictatorship to switch its policies from day to day because there is no accountability to the people for its actions. But a democracy, accountable almost on a daily basis to the pressures of an alert public opinion, has greater difficulties, Russian leaders, recognizing the strength of the American position, have changed rapidly from a smiling to a threatening diplomacy and back again as the occasion warranted.

Of course, great tensions exist in the world today—notably unrest in colonial Africa—and among the Arab nations of the Near East and in Israel. As in all previous crises, the United States has thrown its power and strength and prestige behind the United Nations in the attempt to quiet these situations, here again we see the hop-scotch tactics of Russia, so clearly intended to throw the United States off balance, and to create added confusion and uncertainty. While previously severely critizinging the United States for allegedly attempting to influence smaller nations by offering economic and military aid, Russia is now in major competition with the United States in this same field, and is offering to outbid us for the friendship of the Near East Arab nations. Russia has already sent arms and munitions to some of these nations, thus creating graver tensions. The Soviet is also wooing India with kid gloves and soft voices.

These problems are indeed delicate and critical. But our administration is handling them. We're learning how to live with the peoples of the Far East, to have a greater responsiveness to their ideas and their need, to realize that they don't react to Russian tactics with the same alacrity as the people of this nation. And we have come to understand that this doesn't necessarily mean that they will fall prey to the beguilements of communism. As to the Near East, the administration evidently doesn't think that sending arms to Israel at this moment will clarify the tensions in that area, but believes the reverse might be true. Meanwhile, the United Nations as well as this country has made it abundantly clear that it will not tolerate aggression in the Near East from any source. That assurance, publicly expressed, means much more than the shipment of any amount of arms.

In appraising effects of our foreign policy over a period of years, it is more important to examine the overall effect of that policy, rather than a day by day account of tensions. The incontrovertible facts are apparent that since 1953 no American boy has been shot at by an enemy, that the Communists have not added 1 inch of territory as a result of any aggression started after January 1, 1953. Likewise, Ex-President Truman, in accounts published in yesterday's newspapers during the last leg of his European travels, said he found the prestige of the United States abroad to be "very, very good indeed." It is notable that the American people today, along with that prestige, are enjoying an overall prosperity which is unprecedented in our peacetime history.

Yes; tensions will exist in the world for a long time to come. When they're solved in the present trouble spots they'll crop up in others. The strategy that our nation as the leader of the free world will employ will be a continuation of its present course, with a smart mobile diplomatic defense and a position of military strength second to none in the world. Let us hope this policy will enable us to avoid the pitfalls of war and will maintain the peace.

Woodrow Wilson—Address by Governor of Maryland, Preceding Preview of Motion Picture, Woodrow Wilson: Spokesman for Democracy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. GLENN BEALL
OF MARYLAND
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, July 3, 1956

Mr. BEALL. Mr. President, on June 28, Gov. Theodore R. McKeldin, of Maryland, delivered an address in the Coolidge Auditorium of the Library of Congress. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of today's RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS OF THEODORE R. MCKELDIN, GOVERNOR OF MARYLAND, PRECEDING PREVIEW OF MOTION PICTURE, WOODROW WILSON: SPOKESMAN FOR DEMOCRACY, WOODROW WILSON CENTENNIAL CELEBRATION COMMISSION, COOLIDGE AUDITORIUM, LIBRARY OF CONGRESS, WASHINGTON, D. C.

The Prince of Wales bears on his coat of arms the German words, Ich diem which, rendered into English, mean I serve. It seems to me that the State of Maryland could well adopt Wales' motto with reference to the Presidents of the United States. It is a proud and happy motto, expressive of a proud and happy service. When the President can snatch a moment from the duties of his office to drive out into the country, or to cruise down the Potomac, it gives us pleasure and pride to remember that it is Maryland waters and the green hills of Maryland that are privileged to give some refreshment to his tired eye.

But with reference to one President it has been our good fortune to serve him twice. Twenty years before Woodrow Wilson came to the White House he received the last of his formal schooling at the Johns Hopkins University, in Maryland. There his mind, like a fine swordblade, received its forging and tempering. Obviously, it was an extraordinary mind to begin with; but in Maryland we like to believe that under the hammering of such powerful teachers as Adams and Ely and through close association with such scholars as Gilman and Gildersleeve, it acquired a polish and keenness that it had not had before.

On account of this double association Maryland has a peculiar interest in this particular President; and I do not deny that we take a quiet pride in the fact that the President whom we served twice was a very great President. To be associated with greatness is, to be sure, not a virtue, it is merely a privilege; but it is a privilege in which one may rejoice with reason.

The greater the man the longer it takes for the world to pass anything like a final judgment on his true place in history. Thirty-two years after his death we are still trying to determine exactly where Wilson stands in the list of the Presidents; two new books on him have been published within the last month. But if his place is still undetermined after thirty-two years we may rest assured that it is a very high one. Small men are disposed of in much less time than a whole generation.

There is no doubt in my mind, however, that we know the essential Wilson better today than we knew him when he died in 1924. In the dust and smoke of battle it is impossible to obtain a true perspective on anything. In the murky atmosphere of conflict a ditch-bank may look like Mount Atlas, while on the other hand, an immense but gradual elevation may be mistaken for a flat surface. Only distance and clear air enable us to take measurements that are relatively true.

After the lapse of thirty-two years we can see that much to which men attached the utmost importance at the time was really trivial, while other things, that passed almost unnoticed, were of tremendous import.

The domestic policies of Woodrow Wilson are commonly associated with the series of reforms he effected in our political and economic system. It is not to be denied that the Federal Reserve System, the reduction of tariff barriers, antimonopoly legislation and the establishment of the eight-hour day for labor do constitute an admirable record. The soundness of the legislation is proved by the fact that no serious attempt has been made to reverse it.

But that same fact is evidence that all these things were, so to speak, in the cards. They had to come, if not under one leadership, then under some other. Wilson's credit in connection with them is rather that he hastened the arrival of the inevitable than that he introduced any genuine novelty into the American system of Government. Please do not assume that I am denying the credit; any political leader who can perceive the trend of events and aline his policy with it is due credit, but for foresight rather than for innovation.

I suggest that the essential Wilson, the Wilson long to be remembered, is less evident in any of his legislative reforms than in one move that was not legislative at all, but took the form of a mere obiter dictum that at the moment aroused no more than a mild and rather perfunctory interest. It was his proclamation on assuming office that he proposed to be not only the constitutional President of the United States, but also the extra-constitutional leader of his own party, that is to say, an unofficial prime minister.

There was some comment, but not much. Whether critical or approving it took the line that since he was the leader anyhow, his saying so did not make much difference. After all, Theodore Roosevelt had acted as party leader without saying anything about it; what else could you expect?

But in putting the statement on record Wilson regularized what Roosevelt did; and in regularizing it he established a precedent that has grown steadily more binding as the years have passed.

Wilson's enemies instantly saw that it was a grasp of power, and denounced it accordingly; but even his friends were slow to perceive the other side of it, that it was a centering of responsibility that enormously enhanced the importance of the presidential office, whether for good or for ill. It was a practical application of the political maxim that he announced later: "Put all your eggs in one basket—and watch the basket".

If you wish to take the measure of the change this has effected in American politics, consider this one fact: today, a President's enemies are delighted if they can bring against him the charge that he is not leading his party. It is true that every strong President has in fact led his party, but as late as Grover Cleveland's day few of them admitted it publicly, and none felt obligated to apologize for not doing so. In making a virtue of party leadership Wilson introduced what lawyers call "a change in procedure" that may be longer lasting and more significant than any of his legislative enactments. At the moment, I am not interested in discussing its quality, whether good or bad; I am merely pointing out that, although it has been largely ignored, it was tremendously important.

Nevertheless it is true that the essential Wilson, the man that the world will remember whenever the name is mentioned, did not begin to appear until August 4, 1914. That was the day on which England declared war and the European conflict became world-wide. Even then the quality of the man was not clearly apparent.

There is a curious parallel between Wilson, from August 1914 to April 1917, and Lincoln, from November 1860 to April 1861. Both men were denied the right to assume that war was inevitable and both had to exhaust every resource to shore up a peace that obviously was crumbling. As a result both were charged with duplicity, cowardice and hopeless incompetence; and both made mistakes that became plain enough after the fact.

The difference is that Lincoln's ordeal lasted less than 6 months, Wilson's more than 2 years. But today the name of Lincoln brings to no mind, the harried, uncertain, desperately anxious man of the weeks before the firing on Sumter. So the name of Wilson reminds ever fewer people of the overwhelmed President crying "Peace" when there was no peace. In each case the war President, as most of us believe, is to be judged by his conduct of the war, and not by what went before.

The final, irreversible judgment of Wilson as a war leader can be summed up in two words: he won. Everything else is subject to argument, but not this. You can say that if he had done this, or not done that, he might have won earlier, or might not have won at all; yet whatever you say about details, there will always be someone to take the opposite view, and the debate is endless. But there is no denying the fact that he won, and a war leader who wins is a success, as a war leader.

Yet it has been repeated so often that it has become a sort of axiom, that Woodrow Wilson failed. If you stop to give it a moment's thought, this is remarkable. Here is the man who won the greatest war in which the United States had ever engaged up to that time, yet some people account him a failure. This alone is enough to mark him as an extraordinary man, for it implies that he had undertaken a task more tremendous than a war that convulsed the world, that he played a game in which the stakes were so enormous that the destiny of the United States constituted only a part of them.

To defeat and destroy three great empires, and to bring his country to a position of such dominance that for 20 years none would be so rash as to challenge it, is a record of achievement matched by few of the world's statesmen and they among the greatest. Yet in the estimation of millions all that was mere failure for Woodrow Wilson. What a tribute to the man it is when we account a record that was the everlasting glory of Bismarck to be only a minor credit to Wilson. Consciously or unconsciously, we do not judge him by ordinary standards; our logic holds that what would be a magnificent feat of strength for a man is but a small success for a Titan, and we are persuaded that Wilson was among the Titans.

As a matter of fact, he himself persuaded us. In the old Greek myths, you remember, the Titans were giants who made war against the gods and who heaped up the mountains, piling Pelion upon Ossa, to scale the heights of heaven. Wilson imitated them. From the very beginning he insisted that not the German people, nor even the imperial German Government constituted the real foe. He was making war upon the great god Mars. He called it a "war to end war" and set as its goal not victory, not conquest, but nothing less than a world safe for democracy, which is to say, peace on earth and good will to men. He himself counted the triumphs he did achieve as of no importance except as preliminaries to the victory over war itself and he neither expected nor desired tribute until that victory should be won.

Well, as men are accustomed to judge success, he failed, but not until his assault had shaken the very foundations of the war god's throne. He did not cast down the old idol, but he did bring it into such disrepute that since his time only madmen, the Hitlers and Mussolinis, have had the termerity to praise war for its own sake. Today, even the Communist imperialism is obliged to pay lip-service to the ideal of peace. Its protests may be utterly insincere, but at least they are an acknowledgment that the world will no longer tolerate open and unblushing worship of Mars.

So who dare assert with assurance that Woodrow Wilson really failed? In my State one of our proud traditions is the stand of the Maryland line at Guilford Courthouse in the Revolutionary War. That battle was a technical defeat for Gen. Nathanael Greene, because he was forced back and the enemy held the field; but the British Army was so terribly mauled that Lord Cornwallis acknowledged that it could not stand another

such action and from that point began the slow retreat that ended at Yorktown.

It was General Greene's destiny to serve as the pivot on which the whole war turned but far from calling him a failure, we have enshrined him among our national heroes. I see Woodrow Wilson in a similar light. It was not for him to receive the submission of the enemy. Indeed, that enemy has not submitted yet. But I have faith to believe that his technical defeat was the beginning of a long, slow retreat that is destined to culminate in a greater Yorktown that will signalize the end of tyranny, not merely on this continent, but everywhere in the world.

For Wilson's great battle was not fought with fire and steel against the German army; it was fought with weapons of the mind and spirit against the old and powerfully entrenched idolatry of the strong arm. To destroy the German empire was in his mind merely an unfortunate necessity incidental to the destruction of a far more dangerous and a far more evil thing, namely, men's faith in the doctrine that might makes right.

He did not kill that dragon outright, but he dealt it a blow that we believe in God's good time will prove mortal. Though it may writhe until sundown, yet never again will it ravage the hearts and souls of men as it did before the Crusader's terrible sword fell upon it.

All that was mortal of Woodrow Wilson was consigned to the tomb 32 years ago. I submit that the time is at hand when we may well afford to dispose of all the rest that mattered only for the moment if at all. All that may have been weak, all that may have been mistaken, all that may have been unsound or unwise may well be buried in the shades of oblivion, but the immortal part we must preserve—

"Let his ashes rest
At home, afar, or in the wave,
But keep his great heart with us, lest
Our Nation's greatness find its grave."

The only visible remains of the war that Wilson won are its scars and its monuments; but the greater war that he did not win still rages and the heirs of Wilson are committed to its prosecution to a triumphant end. The ancient evils still survive, the false gods are still enthroned; but the evils survive furtively and in disguise, the pedestals on which the idols stand are battered and weakened. Hope for the establishment of the reign of justice throughout the earth was never brighter, provided the successors to Wilson prove worthy to come after him.

His memory is a call to battle, but not to the hateful service of the War Lord. It is the age-old struggle for the minds of men, the incessant combat against falsehood and evil, the only service in which a manful man may find, not death, but the more abundant life. It is the one form of warfare to which an intelligent man may march out exultantly, for it is the one form in which victory is not only possible but, once attained, will endure from generation to generation.

It is also the form of warfare in which America must take the lead for the simple reason that there is none to replace her. Wilson say this clearly and it is the essence of his greatness that he saw it more clearly than any other leader of his generation. It was the vision that nerved him for the struggle of blood and iron, which he hated with his whole soul, but which he accepted because it was the unavoidable prelude to the other. We, at this moment, are faced with no such bitter necessity. It is our good fortune to be already on the field of the larger warfare, and we should therefore be able to march blithely, not as men dragooned into arduous and probably futile combat, but as happy men who see the radiant hope of victory, not against the world, but for the world.

In this spirit let us accept the challenge of our times, counting ourselves as privileged to be in the ranks. That word "privileged" is one that Wilson used at a great moment, when he was facing a war that he know would be long and stern. If the contest that faces us also bids fair to be long and stern, let us accept it, not lamenting, but, as he did, "with the pride of those who know that the day has come when America is privileged to spend her blood and her might for the principles that gave her birth and happiness and the peace which she has treasured."

Malheur, Oreg., Soil Conservation District Essay and Speech Contest

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, July 3, 1956

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, it is always a pleasure to be able to call attention to the good work being done throughout the country by our many soil conservation districts. The Malheur Soil Conservation District with headquarters at Vale, Oreg., has done at extremely able job of informing the public about its program, accomplishments, and objectives. This district makes consistent use of the press, radio, and farm organizations to educate the public on the importance of its program.

One of the district's excellent projects, of an educational nature, features an annual essay contest and an annual speech contest.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appnedix of the RECORD the winning essay, entitled "The Job Ahead in My Soil Conservation District," written by eighth-grader Holly Thorstad, route 1, box 86–A, Vale, Oreg., and also the winning speech entitled "Conservation Is Everybody's Problem," delivered by Norman Murray, of Ontario, Oreg.

There being no objection, the essay and speech were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE JOB AHEAD IN MY SOIL CONSERVATION DISTRICT

(By Holly Thorstad)

When the Pilgrims came to America, they thought the natural resources would never be exhausted, so they cut and burned the trees just to get rid of them. We now see that they made a mistake which had far-reaching results.

Through education by conservation experts, people are at last realizing that their very existence depends upon using the natural resouces wisely. They are beginning to understand that everyone has to do his job to conserve the soil, but the job isn't over yet. Some people don't realize that conservation is everyone's job. They destroy for their own use and profit the natural resources that belong to everyone. The lumber company that chops down trees and doesn't replant; the industrial plant that poisons the rivers with its waste, and the careless farmer are all part of this thoughtless group. They don't realize what a serious act they are committing.

If we keep letting soil erosion take such a large bite of our usable farmland, our high standard of living will drop. Some people just don't realize that under certain conditions soil is extremely unstable and not something to last until the end of time.

As you can see by a critical look, we have no more soil to lose. We are too close to the danger line as matters stand. Actually we need more good land for crops. Too many farmers are working land that should be turned back to woodland or pasture land. More waste of good land would amount to a national crime on the part of those who are responsible—meaning ourselves.

We are letting 500,000 acres of good farmland go to ruin every year. The Corn Belt is one of the areas which is being very rapidly eroded. Throughout our country 110 million acres of farmland are now being damaged at a critically severe rate. This means that yields from about a fourth of the land now used for crops will be considerably lower within 10 or 12 years if present farming methods are continued, but prompt action can prevent most of this potential damage.

Most people are either unaware or heedless of these facts. The soil conservation district works very hard to make people realize this situation.

Soil conservation is generally defined as proper use and care of the land. Many ways of cultivating the land are known as conservation. Terraces, contour farming, and strip cropping are means of soil conservation.

There are many things we can do to conserve soil. We can try to use suitable erosion control practices, but not all control practices are suitable. The district has the job of fitting methods of conservation to the types of the soil in their region.

The soil conservation district must first make a study to show what the land is fitted for. They tell the farmer what is the best means of conserving the soil they have and what land should go back into woodlands or grazing lands.

Most conservation districts have both long- and short-time plans. Some soil problems are so acute they can't wait. Work on the critical areas must be done now. Other problems can wait a few years without much danger. These serious problems are what the district works so hard to combat.

Our conservation districts are working hard to fight this foe of our land. They need more cooperation from the public to do their job effectively.

If we were invaded by a foreign nation, everyone would rise to the defense of the country we love. Yet we have just as dangerous a foe right here that is being allowed to weaken our country more every minute of every day. This foe is erosion. Let's take up arms against it.

Our soil is a base for everything we do. All we share, even whatever we amount to as a great nation begins and rests on the condition of our land and its production. Let's not leave soil erosion to be a menacing evil for the next generation to face because of our carelessness. Let's fight it now.

CONSERVATION IS EVERYBODY'S PROBLEM

(By Norman Murray)

To the American businessman, as well as the farmer, conservation is important. They may not realize it, but the prosperity of the Nation depends upon the prosperity of the farmer. A nation can survive without glass in its windows, but it cannot survive without food on its tables. And we can't grow food without soil and water.

When you buy a farm, you are actually buying a few inches of soil and a little water. The soil is too easily washed away, and the water is too easily polluted. We must take care of these two important resources on which the foundation of our Nation rests.

A nation cannot maintain a position as a world power on wornout soil and polluted

water. It is said that history repeats itself and we find in history that the downfall of Rome was brought about by its wornout soil. This could happen to us if we are not careful, for all around us we find our soil in many stages of deterioration. And it is rapidly growing worse.

Of course, there are many reasons for soil erosion. The farmer's lack of knowledge of the fact that his soil is deteriorating, or the neglect of renters and landlords on leased land are common reasons. A farmer may feel that he cannot afford conservation practices, while it can be shown that such practices can mean almost immediate money in his pocket.

A farmer realizes that his income depends upon the fertility of his soil, but many times, when he finds his soil is deteriorating, he doesn't have the money needed to practice conservation. He may then do anything to try to get himself out of a tight spot. A common thing done is that he will try to get as much produce as possible in as short a time as possible, to get money for conservation. This never helps and will bring about faster destruction of his soil.

We are learning, as the Romans learned before us, that a small family-operated farm is best from the standpoint of conservation as well as economics. The United States has the highest standard of living ever known, but our standard of living can fall into poverty if we allow our soil to go to wreck and ruin. No nation can be prosperous if it has to import its food.

But there is an even closer threat. Our city water supplies are becoming polluted, and we can't import water. Not only that, but badly polluted water is nearly impossible to purify. Any purifying that may be done would cost large amounts of money, and our national economy might not be able to stand the extra burden.

Some people may say that our water cannot get that bad, but if they would only open their eyes and look around them, they would see that that is exactly what is happening. This is shown by the decrease of gamefish and the increase of trash fish in our rivers and streams. They may say that this is brought about by too much fishing, and some of it is. But for the most part it is caused by too much silt in the water. The gamefish cannot continue to live and multiply in the silt while the trash fish can. But even the trash fish are getting fewer, and this is a definite danger sign.

We must do something to stop this. But what? Conservation is the answer, but this covers a large field. We must keep the soil from washing off our fields by better farming methods and we must keep the soil from washing off the timberland and rangeland areas by better management. We must also prevent forest and grass fires. Then with the help of our cities in sanitary sewage disposal we can halt this pollution. We may even be able to bring back the lost gamefish of yesterday.

But how are we going to encourage and promote soil and water conservation? One very good answer seems to be the soil conservation districts that are springing up all over the country.

The work of a soil conservation district can be very valuable because under the laws under which they operate, it is nearly impossible for them to injure anyone. Their purpose is to help stricken areas, halt erosion, and restore soil fertility.

Most conservation methods would cost one farmer too much money and in some cases would do little noticeable good. But with combined effort the cost would be reduced and the benefits would be much greater. What one cannot do, a community or district can accomplish. The district can buy machinery for ditching, leveling, and terracing, and its members can then get their work done at reduced cost. Cities and towns should cooperate with the districts to improve their watersheds, keep their streams clean, and educate the citizens.

The process of organizing and operating a district is simple. Everything must be passed by a majority of the people affected.

First 25 land owners must petition the State soil conservation committee for a district. Then a hearing is held to determine the need for one. If a need is shown, the committee lays out the boundaries of the district and the people vote it in or out. If passed, the committee appoints 2 supervisors who apply for a certificate of organization with the Secretary of State. When the certificate is issued, the district then elects 3 more supervisors and they begin operation under the 5-man board. Any time, after 5 years, the district may be dissolved by a majority vote of its people.

In most cases, the board of supervisors will only have to help plan a program, but in some cases it may be necessary to adopt land usage laws. If these are passed, a board must be set up to decide when these laws are to be enforced so no one can be done an injustice.

This shows how the soil conservation districts can help solve the conservation problem. As yet we do not have one in Ontario. Do we need one? We do, and as the years pass it will become more and more important and evident. Why not start a district now and avoid the problems that accumulate after years of erosion? This must be answered by the farmers, but it is of great and vital interest to everyone.

A Vast, But Vital, Road Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD MARTIN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, July 3, 1956

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, in Sunday's Philadelphia Inquirer, there was a very well-written editorial on the subject A Vast, But Vital, Road Program.

The American people should give constant consideration to our road-building program. It is the greatest peacetime undertaking in the history of our Nation.

In order that its completion may be in conformity with the vision of those who have worked for the enactment of the legislation, every American must take an interest in it.

I ask unanimous consent that this editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A VAST, BUT VITAL, ROAD PROGRAM

Impressive though it is in size and scope, the new Federal road program which goes into effect today will strike many Americans as no more than an appropriate answer to the challenge presented by the dizzy growth of the age of the automobile.

The bare outlines of the program as passed by Congress and signed by President Eisenhower tell part of the story.

Over a period of 13 years, $33,480,000,000 in Federal funds will be spent to bring up to date both through highways and secondary roads in every State of the Union. This sum will be augmented considerably, since matching State funds will be required in many cases. In all, it is the biggest peacetime spending program ever undertaken by the Federal Government.

But considered in relation to the need, it can be argued that the huge sums involved are not too great. For rapidly, in recent decades, and with increasing swiftness since the end of the Second World War, the United States has become a nation on wheels.

Most Americans do not need figures on the record-breaking output of automoblie companies, or statistics showing that there is 1 automobile for every 3 persons of the country's 167 million population, to tell them that this is an era when plenty of good, safe highways are essential.

The story is evident in dozens of ways every days as millions of persons drive to and from work and other millions use cars for trips to the store and other errands.

It is plain, too, in the grim figures on accidents, which show that every year the toll of those killed on the highways exceeds the number of Americans killed in the Korean war. The staggering cost in injury and property damage, of course, is piled on top of the death toll.

Narrow, worn-out, and poorly engineered highways are not the only cause of the shameful accident rate. But they are a big factor and the part they play in contributing to accidents has been growing bigger as the Nation fell further and further behind in meeting the needs of its citizens for decent roads.

Under the program enacted by Congress, about 41,000 miles of interstate highways will be modernized or completely rerouted. Over all but 7,000 miles of these up-to-date four-lane highways with limited access and crossroads will be built, linking 90 percent of the largest cities and the capitals of 42 States.

Of special interest to residents of metropolitan areas is the provision for improvements of through roads in and around cities. Expressways and belt routes will be constructed, not only to save time for the through traveler, but to decrease congestion.

Pennsylvania will share heavily in this new program. In the first 3 years it is estimated that this State will receive a total of $1,865,000,000 in Federal funds. After that time, the progress of the program, and the future needs will be reviewed.

Manifestly, this mammoth project does not relieve the States and cities from their responsibility for roads. It should spur action by local agencies to make sure that their street and highway systems are in keeping wtih the demands of the times.

In financing the unprecedented undertaking, Congress has acted wisely, we believe, in sticking to a pay-as-you-go basis, rather than mortgaging the future with more indebtedness. The added 1-cent-a-gallon Federal tax on gasoline and the additional taxes on tires will cost the average motorist about $10 a year. In return, we who depend more and more on automobiles will get smoother, more modern—and safer—roads.

Apostle of Friendship—Biographical Sketch of the Reverend Dr. Joseph F. Thorning

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. GLENN BEALL
OF MARYLAND
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, July 3, 1956

Mr. BEALL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in

the Appendix of the RECORD a biographical sketch of my good friend, the Reverend Dr. —Father—Joseph F. Thorning, associate editor of World Affairs and pastor of three churches in Maryland: St. Joseph's-on-Carrollton Manor; St. Ignatius Loyola, Urbana; and St. James, Point of Rocks. This priest-scholar, who has served as an official member of several United States special diplomatic missions, has often been described in the Congress of the United States as "the padre of the Americas." He is known as an apostle of the good neighbor policy and is a personal friend of many Members of the United States Senate. I believe that my colleagues will welcome the opportunity of having the facts about Father Thorning in permanent form.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REV. JOSEPH F. THORNING, PH. D., S. T. D.

Joseph F. Thorning is the son of a New England mother and a Viking father. The mother came from Springfield, Mass., while the father, now hale and hearty at the age of 95, worked as a shipbuilder on the shores of Lake Michigan.

Born at Whitefish Bay, Wis., on April 25, 1896, Joseph Francis Thorning received his early education at Marquette Academy, Holy Cross College, and St. Louis University. While at St. Louis, he was invited to prepare a series of articles on international friendship for the national review, America.

This series led to his election as chairman of the Europe Committee of the Catholic Association for International Peace. His first monograph, "National Security and International Peace," was published under the auspices of this association.

In 1931, Joseph F. Thorning, now ordained to the priesthood in the Jesuit Order, was awarded a doctorate in sociology, economics, and political science by the Catholic University of America. His doctoral dissertation, Religious Liberty in Transition, is still regarded as a classic on the subject, according to Carlton J. H. Hayes, one-time Seth Low professor of history in Columbia University and wartime Ambassador to Spain.

In late 1931, Dr. Thorning, now associate editor of the quarterly, Thought, was asked to serve as European correspondent of America and special correspondent of NCWC News Service.

These assignments took Dr. Thorning to the United Kingdom, where he developed his interest in international studies under the direction of Sir Alfred Zimmern. Another of his friends at Oxford was Francis de Zulueta, regius professor of civil law. He also exchanged views with Father Martin C. D'Arcy, S. J., celebrated Thomistic scholar at the University.

Oxford University furnished a splendid headquarters for research and writing with the opportunity of making frequent excursions to European centers of learning. Among the universities which Dr. Thorning visited were the Sorbonne, the University of Salamanca, the University of Fribourg (Switzerland), Munich, Bonn, and Heidleberg. At Geneva Dr. Thorning was invited by officials of the National Broadcasting Co. to give a transatlantic address, a novelty at that time, on the so-called Disarmament Conference. In this period, Dr. Thorning also wrote articles and reviews for the Commonweal.

Returning to the United States, Dr. Thorning was appointed Special Lecturer on Sociology and acting dean of the graduate school in Georgetown University by the Very Reverend W. Coleman Nevils, S. J., one of the most famous presidents of that institution.

It was at Georgetown that Dr. Thorning began his series of conferences with Father Edmund A. Walsh, regent of the School of Foreign Service. As a result, these two intellectuals were often described as the two leaders who, for 30 years, best understood the nature of the Soviet Union and the mentality of the Soviet hierarchy.

When Father Walsh was asked by the general of the Jesuits to prepare a volume on the cause and cure of Marxism, he entrusted the pivotal first chapter of the positive phase of this scholarly study to Dr. Thorning. In this chapter Joseph F. Thorning explained, in practical terms, the celebrated Labor Encyclical, Forty Years After, by His Holiness, Pius XI.

While at Georgetown, Dr. Thorning formed his friendships with Ambassador J. H. Jefferson Caffery (first career diplomat to hold the blue-ribbon post at Paris, France); with Ambassador Walter J. Donnelly, who has had brilliant service in Colombia, Cuba, Brazil, Peru, Panama, Costa Rica, Venezuela, Austria, and Germany; and with the Honorable H. Freeman Matthews, now United States Ambassador to the Netherlands.

In 1937, by appointment from His Excellency, the Most Reverend Michael J. Curley, archbishop of Baltimore and Washington, Dr. Thorning became chairman of the Department of Social Science in Mount St. Mary's College, Maryland, and professor of ethics and church history in Mount St. Mary's Major Seminary. At this post, he wrote the monograph on Social reconstruction, a Primer of Social Justice, with a preface by Archbishop Curley.

In May 1938 at Budapest, Hungary, it was reported in the New York Times that Dr. Thorning established a world record by broadcasting, over the facilities of the National Broadcasting Co., the story of the International Eucharistic Congress, in seven languages.

Then, as in 1937, he visited all the battlefields in the Spanish civil war, interviewing leaders on both sides. When he returned to the United States, Dr. Thorning was described by Archbishop Curley as one of the greatest authorities in the Nation on Spanish affairs.

Once more in Europe in the summer of 1939, the Maryland educator traveled throughout the Balkans. World War II broke out while Dr. Thorning was a guest of the Bishop of Nice on the French Riviera. Upon his return to America, he predicted the fall of Adolf Hitler. Years previously, in a notable series of articles in America, Dr. Thorning had furnished the first systematic, scientific expose of Hitler and nazism (1931). Indeed, his piece on Five Years of Hitlerism had been featured by the Religious News Service of the National Conference of Christians and Jews in 1938. Dr. Thorning, in the early thirties, had also written the longest series ever to be published in America on the program of Soviet collectivism for the United States.

Upon the conclusion of the Spanish civil war in 1939, Dr. Thorning was awarded the rank of knight commander in the Order of Isabella the Catholic. His articles on Spain and about other European countries had been publicized from Bombay, India, to Brisbane, Australia. One result was that the Historical and Geographic Institute of Brazil, upon the death of Prof. Percy Alvin Martin, of Stanford University, unanimously elected Dr. Thorning as its one honorary fellow in the United States. At the same time, he was nominated as a director of the American Peace Society, associate editor of World Affairs, and a fellow of the American Geographic Society.

Throughout the summer of 1941, Dr. Thorning served as Director of the first Inter-America Seminar to South America, with headquarters at the University of San Marcos, Lima, Peru. The next year, he established inter-American seminars at the National University of Mexico and the University of Habana, Cuba. One result was a unique distinction: Dr. Thorning was awarded the degree, doctor of divinity, honoris causa, by the Catholic University of Chile, a pontifical institution. It was the first award of this dignity to a North American. Simultaneously, the Republic of Ecuador conferred its national decoration, the Order of Merit. This decoration was given at the hands of His Excellency Don Galo Plaza, then Ambassador and subsequently President of the Republic.

In February 1948, Dr. Thorning was a guest of the Venezuelan Republic for the inauguration of Don Romulo Gallegos in Caracas. While in Venezuela on this visit and on other occasions, he explored the archives of the National Academy of History.

In the summer of 1949, Dr. Thorning made the midshipman cruise to Europe, as a guest of the United States Secretary of the Navy, on the battleship U. S. S. *Missouri*, flagship of Task Force 61. In this capacity he was invited by Rear Adm. Allen E. Smith, commander of the task force, to preside as chairman at the daily 2-hour seminar on conditions in France, the United Kingdom, Belgium, the Netherlands, Italy, and the Iberian Peninsula.

In February 1950, as a guest of the Republic of Haiti, Dr. Thorning attended the International Exposition celebrating the 200th anniversary of the founding of the Haitian capital, Port-au-Prince. Subsequently, he was awarded the national decoration of the Republic, the Order of Honor and Merit.

In 1951, Dr. Thorning was appointed to serve as an official member of two United States special diplomatic missions: The first for the inauguration of President Getulio Vargas in Rio de Janeiro, Brazil; and the second for the inauguration of President Anastasio Somoza in Nicaragua.

Nineteen fifty-two was signalized by the publication of Dr. Thorning's most recent book, the biography of Don Francisco de Miranda, precursor of South American freedom and independence. Miranda: World Citizen had a preface by Sumner Welles and the introduction by Galo Plaza, President of Ecuador. In his preface, Sumner Welles wrote as follows:

"I regard this biography of Francisco de Miranda by Dr. Joseph F. Thorning as an immensely valuable contribution to the cause of inter-American understanding."

Twice in 1952, the editors of the New York Times Book Review described Miranda: World Citizen as one of the outstanding books of the year. This life of the fabulous Miranda, published by the University of Florida Press, is now in its second printing.

On June 19, 1950, at colorful ceremonies on Constitution Avenue, Washington, D. C., Dr. Thorning gave the invocation, dedicating the beautiful bronze figure of Jose Gervasio Artigas, champion of Uruguayan independence. This program, heard on the Voice of America, included speeches by Ambassador Jose Antonio Mora, now Secretary General of the Organization of American States, Dr. Alberto Lleras Camargo, now rector of the University of the Andes, Bogota, Colombia, and the then United States Secretary of State Dean Acheson.

In 1953, Dr. Thorning was a guest in Europe of Congressman THURMOND CHATHAM of North Carolina, a distinguished member of the Foreign Affairs Committee of the United States House of Representatives. Together they visited Spain.

In 1954, at the 10th Pan American Conference, Caracas, Venezuela, Dr. Thorning acted as special adviser to the chairman of the United States Senate Subcommittee on the American Republics, the Honorable BOURKE B. HICKENLOOPER of Iowa.

Because of the manifold services to the cause of inter-American amity, Dr. Thorning, in March 1954, was proclaimed a doctor of laws, honoris causa, by the oldest institu-

tion of learning in the Western Hemisphere, the University of Santo Domingo, founded in 1538. The entire Diplomatic Corps, including the Ambassador of the United States, William L. Pheiffer, assisted at these ceremonies.

In 1955, at the request of several leaders of both parties in the United States Congress, Dr. Thorning made a survey of social and economic conditions in all the Republics of Central America: Panama, Costa Rica, Nicaragua, Honduras, El Salvador, and Guatemala. In the meantime, he had been awarded several more high national decorations: the Order of Francisco de Miranda (Venezuela); the National Order of the Southern Cross (Brazil); the Cross of Boyaca (Colombia); and the Order of Carlos Manuel de Cespedes (Cuba).

Upon the reestablishment of full diplomatic relations between the United States and Spain, the Spanish Government awarded to Dr. Thorning two of its most coveted decorations for his "outstandingly brilliant leadership in the cause of friendship"; the Grand Cross of the Order of Isabella the Catholic and the Grand Cross of the Order of Alfonso the Wise (Spain's highest award for cultural achievement).

In 1956, with White House approval, Dr. Thorning served as an official member of the United States delegation, headed by Vice President RICHARD M. NIXON, at the inauguration of the new president of Brazil, Juscelino Kubitschek.

Two months later, Dr. Thorning was invited by His Excellency, the Most Reverend Octavio A. Beras, Archbishop Coadjutor of Santo Domingo, to be a delegate and spokesman for North America at the closing session of the International Congress on Christian Culture for the Peace of the World.

For 12 consecutive years, Dr. Thorning has been invited by the United States Congress to deliver the invocation to start Pan American Day in the Capitol. On these occasions, he has been hailed by United States Senators and Representatives as "a great American and a man of God." It was Senator MIKE MANSFIELD, one of the youngest and most respected Members of the United States Senate Foreign Relations Committee, who characterized Dr. Thorning with the title which has now become popular, "The Padre of the Americas." Few inter-American functions in Washington are complete without his presence.

United States Cold War Status

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WAYNE MORSE
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, July 3, 1956

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have published in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Banker Blames President For United States Cold War Status," written by Wilma Morrison, staff writer of the Oregonian, and published in the June 19, 1956, issue of that newspaper.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BANKER BLAMES PRESIDENT FOR UNITED STATES COLD WAR STATUS

(By Wilma Morrison)

It is the judgment of practically all competent observers—including many of Eisenhower's staunchest admirers—that the United States is losing the cold war, and that the major responsibility for inept international performance lies with the President.

This was the conclusion of John Nuveen, Chicago investment banker and experienced executive in the foreign field, in a Monday speech in which he said, "It is unbelievable, but it is true, that our foreign policy is being largely run by isolationists."

Nuveen, who was head of the Economic Cooperation Administration mission to Greece and Belgium at end of World War II, is a speaker at this week's Institute of International Relations in Portland. He appeared Monday noon before a businessmen's luncheon at the Aero Club.

HARRIMAN ALSO SCORED

Nuveen's documented criticism of President Eisenhower for lack of leadership and of Secretary of State John Foster Dulles for lack of administrative gumption, carried with it no retroactive bouquets for the Democratic Administration. He scored Averell Harriman for aimless nonadministration that drove nearly all the leaders of ECA missions into quitting, and compared his performance with that of General Eisenhower when he was sent over to set up NATO, and "sized up the problem in just a few months."

He found little to praise, however, in Eisenhower's administration of foreign policy since his inaugural, except his principles, which, Nuveen said, the President laid down and "left the implementation to leaders of the Republican Party."

"Today foreign policy is being run by Herbert Hoover, Jr., and Taft's law partner, John B. Hillister," Nuveen declared.

Dulles has an unusual knowledge of international relations, he said, and would be an able adviser. But running the State Department, the biggest administrative job in the world, is beyond him.

"Even if we had a President who knew how to operate politically, and a Secretary of State who was administratively efficient," he said, "improvement would be difficult without a major reorganization of the State Department."

LOYALTY FOR IKE CITED

Nuveen said there is no doubt of the deep loyalty the American people feel for the President and their support of his international goals and principles.

"If there were any hope that Eisenhower would put his hand to the plow instead of merely touching the plow, we could be very happy," he said.

Dr. Graham H. Stuart of Stanford, in his morning talk at Reed College, also said the United States has not met the Soviet challenge in foreign policy.

A Portland teacher, Ruth Widmayer, assistant professor of political science at Portland State College who took her doctorate at the Harvard Russian Research Center, shared the platform Monday morning with Dr. Stuart and Nuveen.

While Stalin is being criticized in Russia now, she said, many of the institutions that he started are not only being continued, but are being strengthened.

Sermon by Rev. Martin Luther King, Jr., of Montgomery, Ala.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. IRVING M. IVES
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, July 3, 1956

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, on May 17 a group of ministers in New York City, organized as the Greater New York Committee for a National Day of Prayer and Thanksgiving, sponsored a special service in the Cathedral of St. John the Divine. On that occasion, the Reverend Martin Luther King, Jr., D. D., Ph. D., of Montgomery, Ala., delivered an inspiring sermon on brotherhood.

I ask unanimous consent to have the text of the sermon printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the sermon was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE DEATH OF EVIL UPON THE SEASHORE

"And Israel saw the Egyptians dead upon the seashore." (Exodus 14: 30.)

There is hardly anything more obvious than the fact that evil is present in the universe. It projects its nagging, prehensile tentacles into every level of human existence. We may debate over the origin of evil, but only the person victimized with an extreme superficial optimism will debate over its reality. Evil is with us as a stark, grim, and colossal reality.

The Bible affirms the reality of evil in glaring terms. It pictures it symbolically in the work of a serpent which comes to inject a discord into the beautiful, harmonious symphony of life in a garden. It sees it in nagging tares disrupting the harmonious growth of stately wheat. It sees it in a ruthless mob hanging the world's most precious character on a cross between two thieves. The Bible is crystal clear in its perception of evil.

But we need not stop with the glaring examples of the Bible to establish the reality of evil; we need only to look out into the wide arena of everyday life. We have seen evil in tragic lust and inordinate selfishness. We have seen it in high places where men are willing to sacrifice truth on the altars of their self-interest. We have seen it in imperialistic nations trampling over other nations with the iron feet of oppression. We have seen it clothed in the garments of calamitous wars which left battlefields painted with blood, filled nations with widows and orphans, and sent men home physically handicapped and psychologically wrecked. We have seen evil in all of its tragic dimensions.

So in a sense, the whole history of life is the history of a struggle between good and evil. There seems to be a tension at the very core of the universe. All the great religions have so pictured life in terms of conflict. Hinduism called it a conflict between illusion and reality; Zoroastrianism looked upon it as a a tension between the god of light and the god of darkness; Platonism called it a conflict between spirit and matter; traditional Judaism and Christianity called it a conflict between God an Satan. In the midst of the upward climb of goodness there is the down pull of evil. The Hebraic-Christian tradition is clear, however, in affirming that in the long struggle between good and evil, good eventually emerges as the victor. Evil is ultimately doomed by the powerful, insurgent forces of good. Good Friday may occupy the throne for a day, but ultimately it must give way to the triumphant beat of the drums of Easter. A mythical Satan, through the work of a conniving serpent, might gain the allegiance of man for a period, but ultimately he must give away to the magnetic redemptive power of a humble servant on an uplifted cross.

Evil may so shape events that Caesar will occupy a palace and Christ a cross, but one day that same Christ will rise up and split history into A. D. and B. C., so that even the life of Caesar must be dated by his name. Biblical religion recognized long ago what William Cullen Bryant came to see in the modern world: "Truth crushed to earth will rise again." And what Carlyle came to see: "No lie can live forever."

A graphic example of this truth is found in an incident in the early history of the Hebrew people. You will remember that at a very early stage in her history, the children of Israel were reduced to the bondage of physical slavery under the gripping yoke of Egyptian rule. Egypt was the symbol of evil in the form of humiliating oppression, ungodly exploitation and crushing domination. The Israelites symbolized goodness in the form of devotion and dedication to the God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob. These two forces were in a continual struggle against each other, Egypt struggling to maintain her oppressive yoke and Israel struggling to gain freedom from this yoke. Finally, however, these Israelites, through the providence of God, were able to cross the Red Sea, and thereby get out of the hands of Egyptian rule. The Egyptians, in a desperate attempt to prevent the Israelites from escaping, had their armies to go in the Red Sea behind them. But as soon as the Egyptians got into the Red Sea the parted waves swept back upon them, and the rushing waters of the sea soon drowned all of them. As the Israelites looked back all they could see was here and there a poor drowned body beaten up upon the seashore. For the Israelites, this was a great moment. It was the end of a frightful period in their history. It was a joyous daybreak that had come to end the long night of their captivity.

This story symbolizes something basic about the universe. It symbolizes something much deeper than the drowning of a few men, for no one can rejoice at the death or the defeat of a human person. This story, at bottom, symbolizes the death of evil. It was the death of inhuman oppression and ungodly exploitation.

The death of the Egyptians upon the seashore is a glaring symbol of the ultimate doom of evil in its struggle with good. There is something in the very nature of the universe which is on the side of Israel in its struggle with every Egypt. There is something in the very nature of the universe which ultimately comes to the aid of goodness in its perennial struggle with evil. There is something in this universe which justifies James Russell Lowell in saying:

"Truth forever on the scaffold,
Wrong forever on the throne,
Yet that scaffold sways the future
And behind the dim unknown
Stands God within the shadow
Keeping watch above His own."

Notice how we have seen the truth of this text revealed in the contemporary struggle between good, in the form of freedom and justice, and evil, in the form of oppression and colonialism. Gradually we have seen the forces of freedom and justice emerge victoriously out of some Red Sea, only to look back and see the forces of oppression and colonialism dead upon the seashore. There are approximately 2,400,000,000 people in the world today. The vast majority of these people are found in Africa and Asia. More than 1,400,000,000 of the peoples of the world are found on these two continents. Fifty years ago most of these people were dominated politically, exploited economically, segregated and humiliated by some foreign power. There were 400 million in India and Pakistan under the iron feet of British rule. There were in China 600 million persons under the gripping yoke of British, Dutch, and French rule. There were 100 million persons in Indonesia under the oppressive hands of Dutch rule. There were 200 million in Africa dominated and exploited by the British, the French, and the Dutch. The great struggle of the 20th century has been between these exploited masses questing for freedom and the colonial powers seeking to maintain their domination.

What we are seeing now in this struggle is the gradual victory of the forces of freedom and justice. The Red Sea has opened, and so today most of these exploited masses have won their freedom from the Egypt of colonialism and are now free to move toward the promised land of economic security and cultural development. As they look back they clearly see the evils of colonialism and imperialism dead upon the seashore.

In our own struggle for freedom and justice in this country we have gradually seen the death of evil. Many years ago the Negro was thrown into the Egypt of segregation, and his great struggle has been to free himself from the crippling restrictions and paralyzing effects of this vicious system. For years it looked like he would never get out of this Egypt. The closed Red Sea always stood before him with discouraging dimensions. There were always those Pharoahs with hardened hearts, who, despite the cries of many a Moses, refused to let these people go. But one day through a world-shaking decree by the nine Justices of the Supreme Court of America and an awakened moral conscience of many white persons of good will, backed up by the Providence of God, the Red Sea was opened, and the forces of justice marched through to the other side. As we look back we see segregation caught in the rushing waters of historical necessity. Evil in the form of injustice and exploitation cannot survive. There is a Red Sea in history that ultimately comes to carry the forces of goodness to victory, and that same Red Sea closes in to bring doom and destruction to the forces of evil.

This is our hope. This is the hope and conviction that all men of good will live by. It is at bottom the conviction that all reality hinges on moral foundations and that the whole cosmic universe has spiritual control. It is therefore fitting and proper that we assemble here, just 2 years after the Supreme Court's momentous decision on desegregation, and praise God for His power and the greatness of His purpose, and pray that we gain the vision and the will to be His coworkers in this struggle.

Let us not despair. Let us not lose faith in man and certainly not in God. We must believe that a prejudiced mind can be changed, and that man, by the grace of God, can be lifted from the valley of hate to the high mountain of love.

Let us remember that as we struggle against Egypt, we must have love, compassion and understanding good will for those against whom we struggle, helping them to realize that as we seek to defeat the evils of Egypt we are not seeking to defeat them but to help them, as well as ourselves.

God has a great plan for this world. His purpose is to achieve a world where all men will live together as brothers, and where every man recognizes the dignity and worth of all human personality. He is seeking at every moment of His existence to lift men from the bondage of some evil Egypt, carrying them through the wilderness of discipline, and finally to the promised land of personal and social integration. May it not be that this is entirely within the realm of possibility? I prefer to live by the faith that the kingdom of this world shall become the kingdom of our Lord and of His Christ, and He shall reign for ever and ever,

Hallelujah. Hallelujah.

Revival of Fisheries

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN F. KENNEDY

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, July 3, 1956

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Fisheries Due for Revival?" which was published in the Gloucester (Mass.) Times of June 26, 1956.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FISHERIES DUE FOR REVIVAL

An optimistic question-and-answer interview with Thomas A. Fulham, of Fulham Bros., Inc., Boston fish firm, is headed by the Boston Herald, "Fulham Sees Fish Industry Bound for Dramatic Revival."

It makes good reading. But it's not all convincing, in the face of hard facts concerning financial troubles of Gloucester fishing boat owners, decreased earnings of fishermen, and unemployment ashore.

Mr. Fulham is quoted as saying:

The landings at the Boston Fish Pier for the first 5 months of 1955 were 63,000,000 pounds (of haddock). The landings for the first 5 months of 1956 were 68,000,000 pounds, an increase of 5,000,000 pounds. Of course, it is almost presumptuous to ascribe the total increase to this conservation measure, but there are strong indications that it may be so. (He refers to the increase in size of haddock trawl nets mesh to four and a half inches, arranged by the International Commission for the Northwest Atlantic Fisheries, in effect for 3 years.)

Asked about the Saltonstall-Kennedy Act providing for fisheries marketing and research help from the Federal Government, Mr. Fulham says:

The results have been startling and of great importance. Two discoveries which have received considerable publicity have been the extensive deposits of huge deepwater lobsters and the existence of large schools of ocean perch in depths of water which have never been fished. Of even greater importance, but not as newsworthy to the general public, has been the compilation of vast data on salinity, temperature and movement of water masses, as well as many thousands of miles of continuous plankton tows which reveal the movements of eggs and larvae of both the commercial species and the other fish on which they feed.

What is the economic importance of this research?

That it can be translated accurately into predictions of just how much fish of any given species will be available to be caught in those areas 3 and 4 years from now.

It's interesting to see how Mr. Fulham answered the big-money question, "But actually, are New England fisheries in a healthy condition?"

If the industry will follow the advice and guidance of the marine biologists, it is conservative to predict between haddock and ocean perch alone an increase in yearly availability of over 100 million pounds from nearby sources.

He goes on to remark:

The large company-owned trawler fleet is shrinking but developing rapidly is a new class of medium trawlers which are individually owned and operated. This development will need financial aid and technical assistance.

He concludes:

The marine biologists, oceanographers and related scientists have shown that the raw material is there; the country's appetite for sea products is hardly sampled; the various governmental bodies are interested and sympathetic; private as well as public capital will be available.

Mr. Fulham makes a promising case. Now if this optimism is tempered with the gloom of the Gloucester boat owners and the city of Gloucester Fisheries Commission, the Federal Government officials who have been asked for assistance might arrive at a good course. We believe in optimism, but we think the men who have to meet payrolls of Gloucester workers know what they're talking about when they say that a helping hand is needed, but quick.

State Department Needs Defenders

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MIKE MANSFIELD
OF MONTANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, July 3, 1956

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "State Department Needs Defenders," which was published in the Montana Standard of June 27, 1956.

In this connection I should like to call to the attention of the Senate a statement made by President Henry M. Wriston, of Brown University, at commencement exercises at Williams College. On that occasion he told his audience: "In fact, I believe it"—the Foreign Service—"to be the very best."

Dr. Wriston made that statement on the basis of having conducted a survey of the State Department, following which he made some very worthwhile recommendations regarding how both the administration and the personnel could be improved.

The editorial published in the Montana Standard states that one of the difficulties in the State Department is that "it is timid," in that—

When some publicity-seeking Congressman displays at once his ignorance and his voice by denouncing the State Department or some of its achievements, too often the Department fails to answer back.

The editorial continues as follows:

This is understandable, considering that Congress holds the purse-strings. But the State Department ought to have many defenders in the ranks of citizens who understand and appreciate the devoted work of our foreign service.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATE DEPARTMENT NEEDS DEFENDERS

The rule that Americans think all their institutions the best in the world has one notable exception. It is the fashion to speak ill of the State Department. To hear some comments, it would be supposed that that Department is populated by striped-pants cookie pushers and guzzlers of tea, who are hopelessly outmatched whenever they encounter a practical man. They are, according to this theory, meat for the sly and hard-boiled diplomats of other countries.

This makes a good story, but is far from the truth. President Emeritus Henry M. Wriston of Brown University told a Williams College commencement audience that the United States Foreign Service is as good as any in the world. "In fact," said Dr. Wriston, "I believe it to be in the very best."

One criticism of the State Department is legitimate. It is timid. When some publicity-seeking Congressman displays at once his ignorance and his voice by denouncing the State Department or some of its achievements, too often the Department fails to answer back.

This is understandable, considering that Congress holds the purse-strings. But the State Department ought to have many defenders in the ranks of citizens who understand and appreciate the devoted work of our Foreign Service.

Mass Desegregation in Public School System of District of Columbia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SAMUEL J. ERVIN, JR.
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, July 3, 1956

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Washington's Showcase," which appeared in the Greensboro Daily News, of Greensboro, N. C., of June 30, 1956. This editorial discusses with candor and sanity what the experiment in mass desegregation has done to the public school system of the District of Columbia.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WASHINGTON'S SHOWCASE

The full impact of public school desegregation in Washington, D. C., was a long time being acknowledged, but at last the truth is out.

School Superintendent Hobard M. Corning told a Senate Appropriations Subcommittee recently that the merger of the city's white and Negro schools, begun 2 years ago, has brought teaching, disciplinary, and social problems that have put an unprecedented burden on the city's 3,700 teachers.

An exodus of white pupils from the city's interior to the suburbs continues, and while actual cases of violence and open conflict have not been widespread, the caliber of teaching in the schools is in real jeopardy. Superintendent Corning has called on Congress for more teachers in order to provide more individual attention for students (i. e., smaller classes). The main problem lies in realization that Negro students are not adequately prepared for work required of them, and cannot keep up with their white classmates.

Whether his disparity is due to the Negro's intellectual caliber or inequality of public education under separation is a question which will be widely debated; but whatever the cause, the Washington, D. C., experiment in mass desegregation substantiated grave fears in the South about carrying out the United States Supreme Court decision.

In Washington, as in many parts of the South, there are more Negro than white students, and the intensity of the crisis produced by desegregation varies largely with this ratio.

Washington's experiment occurred under mostly ideal circumstances. Most of the school officials favored an effort to make the Nation's Capital a showcase experiment for the Court decision. School appropriations in the District of Columbia come not directly from a vote of the citizens but rather through congressional committees; the hazards of strangulation of school funds (possible and highly probable in most of the South if integration moved rapidly) were not present in Washington.

Even with these favorable factors the experiment has produced a crisis of real proportions in the Washington schools. Fortunately, the crisis occurred on the level of academics rather than emotions, but it is no less a crisis thereby.

Washington desegregation has been both a scholastic failure and a human-relations nightmare, said Representative JAMES C. DAVIS, Democrat, of Georgia. Representative DAVIS is right.

The Supreme Court and the rest of the Nation should awake to the fact that the South will not willingly open the floodgates of racial emotionalism and school disintegration through forced desegregation. Where barriers of racial discrimination can be lowered voluntarily and cooperatively, they will be eliminated; elsewhere the South will set its own timetable for a grievously complex dilemma which is its 20th century double-edged sword.

The Truman Responsibility

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. WILLIAMS
OF DELAWARE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, July 3, 1956

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial which appeared in the Boston Herald of Thursday, June 21, 1956, entitled "The Truman Responsbility."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE TRUMAN RESPONSIBILITY

President Truman's appointment secretary and his Assistant Attorney General in charge of the Tax Division were convicted the other day of conspiracy to fix an income-tax evasion case. In comment, the Washington Post said:

"There is no suggestion that former President Truman had anything to do with the improprieties or even knew of them at the time. Yet this is precisely the sort of petty corruption that dogged the administration and tended to diminish respect for its big accomplishments. * * * The duty to make constant checks to insure that a strict code of official morality is enforced at all levels is in the last analysis a responsibility of the President himself."

How petty a corruption it is for a Presidential secretary and an Assistant Attorney General to conspire to help a taxpayer escape the consequences of a $128,721 tax evasion can be debated. In our judgment it is not very petty.

But if this were the only case, or merely one of a few that dogged the Truman administration, it could be dismissed as an accident unavoidable in so big an institution as the Federal Government.

But there were more than a few in the tax field alone. Senator WILLIAMS, of Delaware, set off the exposure of tax scandals in 1951. Since then, he said last week, there have been 214 indictments and 101 convictions. A Commissioner and an Assistant Commissioner of Internal Revenue have been convicted. Five out of sixty-four directors of tax offices throughout the country have been convicted.

And, Senator WILLIAMS added, these scandals had to be exposed over the opposition of the Truman administration rather than through its cooperation.

These are not petty cases, for they deeply concerned the integrity of that exceedingly important operation of Government, the collection of taxes. And to say that they "dogged" Mr. Truman, implying that he was the unfortunate victim of a lot of bad luck, hardly describes the situation.

But there were also the Reconstruction Finance Commission scandals, the sales of influence, the Kansas City ballot frauds—the whole extraordinary record that has been brought together for the first time by Jules

Abels in a new book (Henry Regnery Co.) called the Truman Scandals.

Which is more charitable, to say that Mr. Truman defended his own name and that of the Democratic Party by refusing to admit the scandals, or to say that he was unaware of them and remains so, despite the mounting evidence? Yet, as the Post says, in the last analysis, the responsibility is his.

Milk Shakedown in Oregon

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WAYNE MORSE
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, July 3, 1956

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, my attention has been called to an article entitled "Milk Shakedown in Oregon," written by James Daniel, veteran Washington correspondent for Scripps-Howard newspapers, and published in the Reader's Digest for October 1955. This article refers to a campaign being conducted by Mr. Elmer Deetz, a well-known dairy farmer and legislator, and a recent candidate in the May primaries on the Republican ticket for the United States Senate.

It is with pleasure that I submit this article for the RECORD. I think it deserves the attention of my colleagues in the Senate. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MILK SHAKEDOWN IN OREGON

(By James Daniel)

Elmer Deetz sells less than 40 gallons of milk a day from his tiny dairy farm near Canby, Oreg. But because of this middle-aged man with calloused hands, Oregon has thrown off an archaic milk-control system and is saving the State's families $8 million a year in their milk bills. Oregon and Elmer Deetz have thus shown the Nation a way for people to get better milk for less money, instead of piling it up as surplus butter and cheese for the Government to buy.

Elmer did not start out to reform the dairy business. His only thought was to make a living on 24 acres of scrub land in his native Clackamas County, where he settled in 1948 after a disastrous flood wrecked a big cattle operation that he had been managing on the Columbia River. Two years later he was breeding prize-winning Jersey cows. These he sold to commercial dairy farmers who operated under State quotas permitting them to sell assigned amounts of milk to the big retail distributors.

But when Elmer asked a State official to give him a quota so he could share in this profitable business, he was told he would have to wait 3 years. In the meantime, it was suggested, he could sell to the cheese factory in his area.

Elmer knew all about the cheese factory. It is a sore subject with dairy farmers. Under the quota system—practiced in many parts of the Nation in order to limit the supply of drinking milk and thus create higher prices for it—all milk produced above the allotted quota has to be sold for other purposes for anything it will bring. Most of it goes to manufacturers who turn it into milk by-products. In Oregon, cheese-factory trucks plied the back roads, paying farmers 5 cents a quart—a price that would not cover Elmer's feed costs, much less make him a profit. But the cheese factory had no financial worries. Like the makers of butter and dried skim milk, it had an unlimited market in Uncle Sam.

One night, the Deetzes were discussing this situation with some neighbors. They agreed the milk-control system was a mess. For example, since the end of World War II the State milk-control board had jumped retail milk prices 7 times—from 14 cents to 22 cents a quart—and was soon to order another raise, to 23 cents. The board told consumers that they had to pay more, or farmers would not produce enough milk. At the same time the same board told hundreds of small farmers like Elmer that they could not sell milk to the commercial dairy distributors because this would create a surplus. The story in most other States was the same.

Carl Joehnk, a former county extension agent, commented, "To me the real tragedy is that the milk you buy these days has no taste. When you compare the rich milk you used to get with the stuff they sell today, it's small wonder many people have stopped drinking it."

"Well," said Elmer, "you haven't tasted my milk." And Mrs. Deetz fetched a plate of cookies and a pitcher of milk.

From then on, Elmer, without having planned it, was in the milk business. The visitors liked the milk so much they each asked to be allowed to buy a quart a day. Others sampled the rich, creamy milk and Elmer had new customers.

He didn't deliver. People served themselves, listing their names and purchases on a pad and making change from a cigar box of bills and silver. Elmer had no idea that his unique method of selling would disturb the State milk-control board. But in time a big retail dairy missed a customer. Tracking him to the Deetz farm, it learned that Elmer was charging only 70 cents for a gallon of milk, the top fourth of which was whipping cream. Under the State price-fixing formula, the minimum a gallon of such milk could sell for was $1.05. But of course no commercial dairy was offering consumers milk of this quality. The dairy indignantly reported that Elmer was guilty of unfair competitive practice.

One morning as he was doing chores, Elmer was visited by two State milk-control officials. Already barred from selling his milk through commercial channels, Elmer was now told he could not even let his friends and neighbors buy it unless he took out a license, agreed to be bound by the State minimum prices and installed thousands of dollars' worthy of costly automatic equipment used only by big commercial dairies. Elmer told the officials that he would not comply.

On Thanksgiving Day, 1953, as the Deetzes were having dinner, the radio blared that the State board had announced it would sue Elmer. There was a reason for the crackdown. The board had secretly determined on another statewide milk-price increase and even one independent farmer-distributor like Elmer could set an example that others might copy. Elmer had to be put out of business. The news hit the Deetzes hard.

"We may lose the farm," Elmer said. "But this thing is wrong, and it's wrong to give in to it."

Thus, the Deetz family reached a decision that was to cost them much more than a year's income, thousands of hours of anxiety, and have consequencies far beyond Oregon's borders.

The milk-control board filed suit against Elmer and, simultaneously, State sanitation agents swooped down on his farm to take samples of the milk. They swore out warrants charging him with selling dirty milk. In court they could not produce any laboratory reports to back them up. Elmer, however, had employed private laboratories to make exhaustive tests immediately after each State visit. The certified reports of these laboratories, which the State did not challenge, proved that Elmer's milk was much purer than the State's requirements.

Instead of admitting that they were wrong, the State milk-control bosses redoubled their efforts to compel Elmer to accept their authority. Frustrated and financially strapped, Elmer went to his lawyers, Norman Easley and Stewart Whipple of Portland, in January 1954, and told them he had taken just about all he could. They told him not to worry about their fee. "If you can hold out 2 years longer," they said, "we can appeal this all the way up to the State supreme court."

Elmer knew he would be broke by that time. "If the people only knew what this system was like," he said, "they'd get rid of it. By golly, let's repeal the whole milk-control law."

In Oregon, the people can change laws by direct vote during their regular elections. The next election was to be held in November 1954. To get the question of milk-control repeal on the ballot a minimum of 37,000 voters had to sign a petition.

Elmer had no funds, no organization, merely a conviction, which his lawyers shared, that the people of Oregon would do the right thing if they were shown how. Tom Gerber, editor of the weekly Canby Herald, long convinced that the small business people of his State were being strangled by bureaucracy, took up Elmer's cause and made such exciting reading of it in his paper that the press of the whole State was pulled into reporting the controversy. The press was also reporting the additional news that Elmer Deetz would be a candidate for the State legislature. Advised that this was the best way to keep milk-price repeal on the front pages, Elmer had agreed to run.

Several better-government leagues stepped forward and offered to help take over the circulation of the repeal petition. Then, with 2½ weeks to go before the deadline, it was learned that through inexperience the petition circulators had forgotten to get addresses for thousands of the names. And signatures without addresses could not be counted. Suddenly, what had been just a rollicking good news story—a fight between a citizen and the law—became a crusade. Hundreds of letters from all over the State flooded in supporting Elmer. Strangers telephoned, "Send us your petition. We'll get every name in town."

Mornings, Elmer would be up at 3 a. m. to catch the change of shifts at some distant paper mill or be down at the Portland docks to sign up stevedores. The Deetz telephone never stopped ringing. On the last day on which the State would accept petition signatures, the required total still had not been achieved. Then 5 minutes before the deadline the necessary names arrived at the statehouse by helicopter from Portland.

Now the State milk board moved into high gear. Unleashing an attack against Elmer unmatched in Oregon political history, it accused him of a sinister plot to undermine State milk-sanitation laws, although these laws remain intact and never were an issue. One hundred thousand dollars was lavished on radio, television, newspapers and billboards reiterating that a vote for Elmer was a vote for contaminated milk. Financially exhausted by the drive to circulate the petition, Elmer had only $1,100 left to fight back with.

Then, from an unexpected source came a letter which calmly and clearly set before the public the fact that not milk sanitation but milk price-fixing controls was the only issue involved. This statement was from E. G. Harlan, who had been Oregon's first

State milk-market administrator 20 years before. He wrote that the bulk of milk controls were enacted in the depression years as a temporary measure to raise the retail price of milk which had fallen as low as 5 cents a quart. Nobody expected them to last 2 years, much less 20. Harlan reproached his successors in office, telling them they should have supported Elmer's efforts to give the public high-quality milk at a moderate price.

Reason and right pointed to a victory for Elmer personally, and for the repeal of the milk-price control. But the politicians regarded Elmer as little more than an interesting gadfly. Until election night. Then as the returns piled up, it was seen that both Elmer and repeal were victorious in what Oregon papers the next day wrote up as the most surprising election upset in Oregon history.

The Portland Oregonian reported: "A little-known Canby dairyman playing the role of the underdog against the milk monopoly has accomplished in a low-pressure campaign what organized consumer groups and disaffected segments of the dairy industry, despite great expenditure of money and effort, long have tried and failed to do."

With repeal, Oregan milk prices began to fall, although nationally, milk prices have increased. The United States Department of Agriculture's survey of home-delivered milk prices for June 1955 averaged 22.7 cents a quart—a fraction higher than June 1954. Oregon prices, however, are 21½ cents for home-delivered milk, 19½ to 20 cents in stores, and down to 16 cents in some small towns and villages. United States official surveys show that Oregon's milk today has more cream in it than any other milk sold on the west coast.

For 20 years, except for a period during the war, Oregon milk consumption had been going down, while Oregon dairy surpluses went up. Now the people of Oregon are drinking their milk once again. Safeway stores alone report their sales have jumped 23 percent above 1953, and the Oregon Milk Producers Association reports that spot checks of 6 key towns and cities show consumption per capita is up from 7 to 17 percent since Elmer's victory.

Many dairy farmers found that the lower price for milk didn't hurt them, because they could sell all their milk for drinking purposes and throw none on the wasteful surplus market. Some dairy farmers report the highest incomes in their history. Federal dairy purchases in Oregon, amounting to $6 million in 2 previous years, have slacked off toward the vanishing point.

Elmer is still trying to pay off a $9,000 mortgage on his farm and that much more in other costs as the result of his repeal campaign. Would he do it all over again?

"I think so," he says slowly. "It's worth a lot to a man to know he has done what he could to make things better."

The Failing Crusade—Eisenhower Commends Crusaders Who Became Liabilities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 3, 1956

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, some aspects of the great moral crusade inaugurated in 1953 have always puzzled many of us. One of the puzzles has been the unwillingness of the crusaders, including the chief crusader, to acknowledge frankly that a few of their appointments might have been bad.

Under leave to revise and extend my remarks, I offer the following editorial from the St. Louis Post-Dispatch:

PRESIDENTIAL POSIES

One of the most gracious aspects of Washington life these days is the kindly way in which officials who have become liabilities are eased out. Take Robert B. McLeaish, for example. He resigned as Farmers' Home Administrator amid charges of gross inebriation and participating in gay parties with emphasis on kissing. Yet Mr. McLeaish can display a letter from the President commending him on his "valuable assistance."

This is in a well-established pattern. After Harold E. Talbott got his post as Secretary of the Air Force mixed up with the private concerns of his business and resigned while the shot and shell were falling, he received a letter from the White House. It contained such presidential encomiums as "tireless energy," "leadership," "diligence," and "fine accomplishments."

Mrs. Oveta Culp Hobby resigned as Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare close on the heels of her fiasco in the handling of the Salk vaccine. President Eisenhower told her: "Oveta, this is a sad day" and then praised her "calm competence in the face of every kind of difficulty."

Another who had to pack his bags was Edmund F. Mansure. He came in with the new broom as General Services Administrator. His many difficulties included the Nicaro nickel insurance deal. The President thanked him for "savings" and "improvements" and wished him "success in your future undertaking."

Peter A. Strobel resigned as Commissioner of Public Buildings after a House committee pointed out a conflict between his official post and his interest in a firm of consulting engineers. His letter of thanks came from Mr. Mansure rather than the President, but it was couched in typical White House compliments including "your fine attitude," "considerations of loyalty" and "high professional competence."

There is much to commend this fraternal spirit and the era of good feeling which it expresses. And that only makes it the more pointed that no one around the White House or in the Cabinet has found time to say so much as one good word for Senator WILEY, of Wisconsin. He deserves and really could use a presidential posy.

Needs of the Indian People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. Y. BERRY
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 2, 1956

Mr. BERRY. Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am inserting an address delivered by W. A. Riegert, of Kyle, S. Dak., at a meeting in that city on June 2, 1956, which I had the privilege of attending.

In his remarks, Mr. Riegert outlines some of the problems of the Indian people. He brings us up-to-date by pointing out the need for industry on the reservation now to provide employment, and thus improve the standard of living. His closing comments describe a philosophy of life we could all do well to follow.

The address by Mr. Riegert follows:

Mr. Chairman, friends, and your honor, sir, Mr. Berry, I have met most all of you individually but am now honored for the permission of speaking to you all in audience.

There are many daily examples in our lives of perfect cooperation that nature provides. Our existence and all our senses—that we awake and can walk on two legs with perfect balance, the universe and its mysterious operations, nature in its growth and blooming, that human nature multiplies, passes away, and multiplies again, and so forth.

I want to relate an example of perfect cooperation that impressed me just recently. Last Wednesday afternoon a boy on his bike, followed or led by his two rat terriers, stopped suddenly at the challenge of a rattlesnake in the way. The dogs, mother and son, had been challenged before, so that they immediately went into battle formation. The son prompting and tempting in front, the mother ducking in and out, nipping. Their strategy worked perfectly for on the third charge and fling by the mother the rattler was ducksoup for the next job, tearing the snake apart. The boy and the son dog went their way, but the mother lingered to make sure the job was complete. To me, this scene was a master performance of cooperation. This example of working together, side by side, and, hand in hand, we can and must use daily if we are interested in success.

Allow me briefly to go back into history, especially at this time, to picture progress and its justice or injustices along the way. The pilgrims coming to our shores, looking for freedom from a long demoralizing yoke of autocracy. The events that followed are most distasteful in the injustices to the American Indians. Forgetting their past, the pilgrims and those that followed, transferred the yoke of autocracy to a yoke of autocral limitations to the people they found as natives who befriended them when they really needed help, the American Indians.

Progress was inevitable, it came, it saw, and under the guise of progress it conquered. Progress was and is inevitable in all phases of human endurance and existence. Nevertheless, it should leave in its wake, justice, freedom, and peace. When those vital measures pertaining to man's welfare are missing, then, progress is irreparable aggression to the human souls and bodies trampled under. Only the generations to follow can demand reparation, that is, you and I.

Today Uncle Sam, our Government, is the greatest assembly instituted by man for the freedom of mankind the world has ever known. It is of the people, by the people, and for the people under God. Nature's boundless covenant, yet, in the preamble to our Constitution, the American Indian was classified as savages, and as such, are not entitled to full rights of the proposed Constitution, so following these vital words, to the Articles of our Constitution, I quote:

"We the people of the United States, in order to form a more perfect union, establish justice, insure domestic tranquillity, provide for the common defense, promote the general welfare, and secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity, do ordain and establish the Constitution for the United States of America."

Remember the above quotation, for it overflows with justice and welfare to qualified citizens under the Constitution. I emphasize qualified citizens for under amendment 14 (adopted July 28, 1868) under section 2, I quote in part: "Representatives shall be apportioned among the several States according to their respective numbers. Among the whole number of persons, in each State excluding Indians not taxed."

There has been some changes made, but I cannot at this time give you reference, for Indians not taxed, are voting their choice of State and congressional representatives. Regardless, there has been no change in our

Constitution, freeing the American Indian from the alleged savagery.

The contention for adverse circumstances that exist among us Indians is that our Constitution in the above quotation, holds a controlling leverage over us in the form of special legislation adopted from time to time that regulates our welfare and tranquility. You are all well aware of the controls that exist through the Bureau of Indian Affairs, a bureau set up by Congress.

Let's be mindful of the things that lead to our present predicament. Let's get down to good old reservation earth problems and circumstances we are facing each day of our lives. Don't forget my relation of the scene of the rattler and the dogs, cooperation. There are large reservations in about seven of our States. Some have oil, gas, and other minerals, and timber resources, from which they derive some or all of their livelihood. The Dakotas have millions of acres of the finest grazing land in the United States. Those acres are our motherland and precious beyond measures of dollars and cents—they are our only homes and have been for generations, especially since the aftereffects of the battle of the Little Big Horn. I firmly believe that all Indians especially the Oglala Sioux have forgotten why that battle was fought. With their backs to the wall, Crazy Horse, Sitting Bull, Red Cloud, and every Sioux warrior with the backing of their wives and children fought a memorable battle for their homes, their families, and everything they owned under God. They were the bravest of the brave and knew they were fighting for not only the present but for generations to come. For them, they knew, there may not be a tomorrow, nevertheless, they were willing to sacrifice the last drop of their willing blood. The shedding of both the white and Indian blood could very easily have been avoided. By treaty, the Sioux were to be protected against trespassing.

A delegation of Sioux chiefs, one from each of the 9 bands of the Sioux Nation went to Washington to confer with President Grant, the Secretary of the Interior, Commissioners of Indian Affairs, and assistants, especially to request promised protection against trespassers. Briefly, the request was refused on the grounds that such trespassing was progress and could not be stopped. The Sioux delegation returned home emptyhanded and to the scorn of those waiting at home for good news. Following came the Custer battle. The events of time, since then, each and every man, woman, and child of the Sioux Nation knows by heart, by want and by sacrifice. Today, we are lost in the maze of misunderstandings, questionable interpretation of laws governing Indian welfare.

The fact that Uncle Sam has let us down, should not result in us letting ourselves down. We have too much at stake, our future. I think Uncle Sam appreciates in the other fellow, a good honest and just scrap and will concede for justice's sake. Surely he can't forget that his wards "nieces and nephews" fought in 2½ world wars to help keep and make people free of autocracy.

The battle of the Little Big Horn should not be a thorn in his side; rather, it should tend to strengthen his confidence in a great people that they should be made full-fledged citizens by constitutional amendment.

The Wounded Knee Sacrifice by the Sioux people needs Uncle Sam's fullest responsible consideration and restitution. So, with the right approach and a well-tempered hammering of circumstantial facts, Uncle Sam should give us a well-balanced rehabilitation program without any further congressional delay.

Let's survey our present circumstances and where do we go from here. The Sioux people have millions of acres of land held in trust, most of it is grazing land but much of it rich farming land. We are surrounded by successful outside operators either on deeded or leased land tracts. Slowly but surely, at the present rate of land sales, the Oglala Sioux people will either be living on tribal lands or out in the cold. The money derived from sales is not going back into more land or improved homes, but cars, liquor and many unpaid credit obligations.

Lease money from either grazing or farmland, plus welfare assistance, either Federal or State, is insufficient for an ordinary livelihood. Our homes and social circumstances speaks volumes of adversity. Why these deplorable conditions? Programs of rehabilitation have failed for two definite reasons, insufficient funds and follow through administration and, the lack of an all out fight by the Indians. The latter, the lack of education and discipline. Law and order on the reservation is at its lowest ebb and delinquency runs rampant. Higher education is limited to a select few high-school graduates. We need more Haskells and more funds to send our children to other colleges. We need a welfare program that takes workers more often into the homes—we need a health program that covers each district more consistently so that the Indian is not forced to go many many miles to the Pine Ridge Hospital. The Indian family does not have the money or transportation to make timely trips to Pine Ridge. Furthermore, Pine Ridge Hospital is not large enough by far to accommodate those that should be hospitalized.

We desperately need industry on the reservation for both common and skilled labor. The relocation program is not the solution to reservation labor or social problems. We have got to make a firm determination to get our heads, hands, heart, and soul into our problems and resolve now, to personally take the bull by the horns, as the saying goes, and work out our own problems. Our children demand it, and so does God. God helps those that help themselves, otherwise, we are left to the mercy of the man with the big stick, progress. Opportunity was conceived and created by God, for man, with open doors. Entering is all in the free will of man, I will, or, I will not. Henry Kaiser, Sr., puts it this way: "Opportunity is a problem in work clothes."

All success begins with work and the Indians have the tools to work with; a good mind, a strong heart and body, the spirit of God in his soul and, his native land to live and toil on. Millions are without some of these tools and are longing for the freedom to exercise their God-given rights. Men, through their communistic principles, have deprived them. Millions are coming to our shores annually and more land is needed for their and our welfare. Beware, hang onto your precious lands and make the most of it.

Elect and keep good, progressive, hard-fighting men in your council and in Congress. Fight hard and justly for your rights, stick together, old and new dealers alike.

Sleep on your petty grievances and forget them. Take your family to church regular and often, keep your children in school until they can properly care for themselves, pay your just debts, and you will live a fine, upstanding life in the grace of God and the friendship of men.

Small Flood-Control Projects

SPEECH
OF
HON. ANTONI N. SADLAK
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 2, 1956

Mr. SADLAK. Mr. Speaker, I heartily endorse H. R. 9555, amending section 205 of the Flood Control Act of 1948 to increase and make certain revisions in the general authorization for small flood-control projects because it is most worthy legislation, not only for the New England areas that were so seriously devastated by the recent hurricane floods but because it will provide rapid assistance in all areas of our country without geographical restrictions and expedite the construction of small flood-control projects not specifically authorized by Congress. Similar legislation has already been approved in the other body where a herculean effort was put forth by the senior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BUSH]. This companion measure by the distinguished majority leader of the House, Mr. MCCORMACK, will, when accepted by the House today, not only increase much-needed funds which will be used wisely by our Army engineers, but will provide for the immediate construction of flood-protective works which might otherwise be unduly delayed awaiting the usual survey and authorization process. This legislation will bring hope, relief, and a feeling of security to large segments of our people throughout the United States. I urge the suspension of the rules and approval of this bill.

A New Foreign Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
CLARE E. HOFFMAN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 15, 1956

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, it has been impossible for me to see the efficacy of a foreign policy which called, year after year, for the giving, the loaning, or the expenditure of billions of dollars to foreign nations on the theory that, if war with Russia came, they would be our effective allies.

It has never worked out that way. History will bear out the assertion that in every war, local or worldwide, in which a nation is involved, of necessity she makes her own objectives her first concern.

Our contributions of billions, whether in dollars, munitions of war, or economic aid, have failed, except as their own national interests indicated, to obtain for us overall, long-time allies.

Not only have our sacrifices and generosity failed to give us staunch, permanent friends abroad, but in some instances they have created a feeling of animosity against us. Well do I recall the report of a grandson who, some years ago, serving in the Navy, twice with his shipmates having shore leave in Italy, were greeted with shouts of "Go home, Yanks".

Recently the press, reporting on the election in Iceland—a United States base considered necessary for protection against Russia—told us that the Social Democrat and Progressive Parties, who joined forces in a drive-out-the-Americans-but-remain-in-NATO stand, polled 25 seats, 2 short of a workable majority.

The Independents won 19 seats; the Communists 7, giving them the balance of power.

This, notwithstanding the fact that we gave Iceland $35 million between 1948 and 1953. Because our contributions to Iceland caused inflation, raised the cost of living to local people, our activities there are resented.

Iceland's livelihood is derived from its fishing industries. More recently, both the United States and Great Britain, by the imposition of what is considered a high tariff, have made it almost impossible for Iceland to sell its fish in either country. Russia has stepped in, giving the Icelanders a market for the only thing they have to sell.

Iceland has no armed forces, her people have always resented the presence of troops from other countries.

The three factors—the one making it impossible for Iceland to market fish, the only thing she has to sell; another, the presence of American troops; and the other the influx of American dollars which raised the cost of living to every Icelander—all add up to ill will where we anticipated friendship.

We need a reconsideration of our foreign policy.

Rehabilitation of Persons Convicted of Crime

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WAYNE MORSE
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, July 3, 1956

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, it seems to me that very frequently we do not give sufficient attention to the fine work in rehabilitation of persons convicted of crime which goes on day in and day out, by dedicated and devoted public servants, such as Mr. James V. Bennett, director of Federal Prisons, and Sanford Bates, president of Prison Industries.

I wish particularly to commend to the attention of the Senate today the work which is being carried on by Federal Prison Industries, Inc., of which Mr. George Meany, president of the AFL-CIO, is chairman of the board of directors. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a press release issued under date of June 19, 1956, by the Department of Justice, pointing out some of the accomplishments of Federal Prison Industries, Inc.; also an article on the same subject entitled "Here's a Switch, Convicts Give Out with Sizable Check," written by Fred W. Perkins, a well-known newspaper man in Washington, D. C., and published in the Washington Daily News of June 20, 1956.

I believe that the men and women who have designed and developed the rehabilitation program of Federal Prison Industries, Inc., are deserving of the thanks of the American people. I know from my previous experience in the field of criminal law and my association with many of these men and women in the United States Department of Justice some years ago, that the approach which is being made to the problem of rehabilitating criminals by Federal Prison Industries, Inc., is deserving of the thanks of the American people.

There being no objection, the news release and article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Mr. George Meany, president of AFL–CIO and as member of the Board of Directors of Federal Prison Industries, Inc., today presented to Attorney General Herbert Brownell, Jr., a voucher for $1,500,000 for deposit in the Treasury representing earnings of the corporation.

This is the second dividend paid this year from the profits of industrial operations in the Federal prisons. At a previous directors' meeting a payment of $2,500,000 was authorized making a total return of $4 million for the present fiscal year.

Federal Prison Industries, Inc., is a wholly owned Government corporation that provides employment opportunities for inmates of Federal prisons.

A diversified system of some 50 different shops and factories in Federal prisons produces goods for the Government itself. None of the prison products are sold in the open market in competition with private industry and free labor.

The prisoners are paid a wage adjusted to their efficiency and status which averages about $30 per month. Pay jobs in prisons are given on the basis of family need and importance of trade training in the rehabilitation of the prisoner.

The prison industries corporation also finances the entire vocational training program in Federal institutions which enables over 10,000 inmates each year to enroll in 1 or more of the nearly 450 available courses ranging from airplane engine mechanics to poultry husbandry. Many of the courses are acceptable for accreditation under State and union apprenticeship programs.

The corporation is under the administrative supervision of the Attorney General and the Director of the Bureau of Prisons but its policies and program are a responsibility of a Board of Directors representing all interested groups. The present members are: Mr. Sanford Bates, representing the Attorney General; Mr. Emil Schram, representing agriculture; Mr. George Meany, representing labor; Mr. James Lindley Palmer, representing retailers and consumers; Mr. Frank A. Reid, representing the Secretary of Defense; and Mr. Berry N. Beaman, representing industry.

The corporation since its formation in 1934 has paid into the Treasury a total of $32,500,000. The earnings during the fiscal year 1956 have been the largest of any peacetime year. These results have been possible because Government departments and Federal purchasing officers have cooperated wholeheartedly with the corporation in its effort to find useful and stimulating employment for its approximately 20,000 prisoners. Private industry and organized workers have also greatly aided in helping to solve one of the most perplexing questions affecting prison administration. Attorney General Brownell adn Mr. James V. Bennett, Director of Federal Prisons, expressed their appreciation for this cooperation and the generous assistance and helpful counsel of the corporation's Board of Directors.

[From the Washington Daily News of June 20, 1956]

HERE'S A SWITCH, CONVICTS GIVE OUT WITH SIZABLE CHECK

(By Fred W. Perkins)

Smiles all around but no speeches, because a check for $1,500,000 speaks for itself.

That was the situation yesterday when George Meany, president of the AFL–CIO, handed the check to Attorney General Herbert Brownell, Jr., in a simple ceremony at the Justice Department.

Mr. Meany was acting as the labor member of the Board of Directors of Federal Prison Industries, Inc., Government corporation which has delivered $4 million this year for deposit in the United States Treasury. Since its formation in 1934, it has shown a cash profit of $32,500,000.

OTHER DIVIDENDS

But there are other dividends besides money, according to James V. Bennett, Director of Federal prisons, and Sanford Bates, President of Prison Industries. The more massive returns, they say, come from the teaching of useful vocations to prison inmates, helping them to become productive citizens instead of returning to a life of crime.

Mr. Meany's participating in the enterprise is evidence of its backing by organized labor. William Green, late AFL president, cooperated with Mr. Bates and Mr. Bennett in developing the idea of a Government corporation to operate the prison industries under a policymaking board representing the Government, labor, industry, retailers and consumers, and agriculture.

A primary policy is that none of the prison products are sold in the open market in competition with private industry and free labor. The Government itself is the only customer for the goods turned out by about 50 shops and factories in Federal prisons. Prices are kept at commercial levels, and in one respect the Government sells to itself and also makes a profit for itself.

The prisoners are paid for their work, an average of about $30 a month (of course, in addition to the board and lodging furnished by the prison). Wages are adjusted to efficiency and other considerations, and pay jobs are allotted on the basis of family needs and the importance of training in the rehabilitation of prisoners.

EARNINGS

Many men send their earnings to their families, and others save the money to help them through the adjustment period when the prison doors open for them.

The Prison Industries Corporation also finances vocational training which enrolls over 10,000 prisoners each year in nearly 450 courses ranging from airplane engine mechanics to poultry husbandry. Many courses lead into State and union apprenticeship programs.

Change Needed in the Administration's Near East Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. T. JAMES TUMULTY
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 20, 1956

Mr. TUMULTY. Mr. Speaker, during the mutual security bill debate I raised the question why the United States foreign policy was aggressively friendly toward Tito, an enemy, while almost hostile toward our friend Israel. Developments in the Near East during the past few weeks confirm my judgment.

The Russian Foreign Minister has been making a triumphant tour of Arab countries, ready to fill the vacuum brought about by the British withdrawal from the Suez base; the parade of Commu-

nist weapons in Cairo was a frightening spectacle; and Arab leaders, Colonel Nasser, of Egypt, and the new Premier of Jordan, have made new, open, and belligerent threats against Israel. Meanwhile, that little democracy still cannot persuade the Department of State to let her have the jets she needs to defend herself from the Communist planes now in Egypt. The administration continues in a state of paralyzed neutralism—utterly inconsistent with the responsibilities of leadership in the worldwide defense of freedom. There should be a change in the administration's unrealistic policy.

Long Beach-Los Angeles Breakwater Extension Urgently Needed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CRAIG HOSMER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 3, 1956

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, tides and currents, in part due to existing extensions of the Long Beach-Los Angeles Harbor breakwater have caused much damage in the vicinity of Seal Beach and Surfside, communities adjacent to the harbor area. In part to remedy this situation, extension of the breakwater from where it now ends on to Seal Beach has been proposed.

Other advantages of this extension would include protection to entire harbor area from storms and giving it positive protection against submarine torpedoes. During the last war an elaborate and extensive system of antisubmarine nets had to be installed and maintained for the harbor. Today the Navy annually spends a considerable sum to keep nets available for the event of a future emergency. Construction costs of the breakwater extension would soon be recovered from abatement of damage at Seal Beach and Surfside, and from decreased maintenance cost by the Navy to keep nets standing by.

The Long Beach Press Telegram recently commented editorially on the subject as follows:

WHERE PERMANENT PROTECTION IS NEEDED

Residents of Seal Beach and Surfside appear assured of temporary protection against high tides and ground swells which have caused serious damage at times in the past. The protection comes from the depositing of nearly a million cubic yards of sand dredged from the harbor floor of the ammunition and net depot nearby. Citizens of the area are to be congratulated on the success that has crowned their efforts after a long flight.

But the protection may not be permanent, due to erosion. In time, unless ocean currents change their pattern, the new beach may be washed away, and more trouble can be expected. Permanent relief, according to engineers, will only come when the outer breakwater is extended to give lasting protection.

Inasmuch as the Federal Government has an important naval installation at the ammunition and net depot, there is good reason for the Government to extend the offshore rock barrier. It would not only protect the depot harbor from silting, according to engineering studies, but it would protect Seal Beach and adjacent communities against serious erosion. In addition, federally constructed jetties have been blamed as contributing factors to the past erosion.

Efforts should be made now to have the Army engineers recommend the permanent protection necessary, and then Congress should be urged to make funds available for the work.

Effingham, Kans., Bank Performs a Public Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM H. AVERY
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 27, 1956

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to bring to the attention of the Members of Congress an outstanding public service which is being rendered by the Farmers and Merchants State Bank of Effingham, Kans. Mr. Milton C. Cummings, president, instituted the idea of using bank advertising to present information regarding soil conservation and flood control. Mr. Cummings states:

For the past 5 years we have used approximately two-thirds of our bank advertising in generating ideas about land treatment and water control.

While we cannot measure results with the exactitude of bank operations we believe there has been some effects.

We do know that Atchison County is very close to "leading the pack" in the 105 Kansas counties in the matter of conservation.

An integral phase of the overall conservation program is the matter of keeping the urban population informed of the true significance of soil and water conservation work. The farmer knows what it is and what it can do for him. Programs of instruction in our city schools can render much good. No one will deny the great value to be gained by our cities from all phases of soil and water conservation.

Mr. Cummings and the Farmers and Merchants State Bank are setting an outstanding example in promoting an information covering this work.

The following is an ad which appeared in the Effingham New Leaf newspaper. I believe the ad speaks for itself:

CONSERVATION AND FLOOD CONTROL

Harold Engstrom, USDA representative on the Missouri Basin Interagency and a leading conservationist in the United States Soil Conservation Service, has stated the need for a coordinated land treatment and water control program which seems to have a practical ring in the light of northeast Kansas conditions.

Engstrom states that the experience of the past 20 years points to 3 principal types of operations which, if carried forward by farmers in cooperation with the Soil Conservation Service, the Reclamation Service, and the Army engineers, will add value to the farms in the Missouri Basin.

1. Land treatment: These measures control soil erosion, maintain soil fertility, conserve water by storing it in the soil, prevent damage on the farm from the erosive action of rainfall and runoff, and reduce the sediment loads of creeks and rivers. Atchison County is well on the way in this operation.

2. Flood prevention: This work, largely structural, involves work on the tributaries and waterways to control or retard runoff from neighboring farms. These measures alleviate damage to the agriculture of the smaller watersheds above the downstream engineering works. They slow runoff and stabilize sources of sediment in upstream channels.

3. Downstream engineering: This is the work done on the major waterways to control runoff after it has reached the main stream. It alleviates urban damages and damage to agriculture in the flood plains lower down the major rivers.

These are straws in the wind which indicate that the conservationists and the flood-control backers may yet get together, admitting neither side has all the answers to soil protection and water control. Farmers have a big stake in this matter. (Farmers and Merchants State Bank, member of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, Effingham, Kans.)

Gen. George C. Marshall Dedicated Himself to Service to His Country, Forgetting Personal Ambitions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 3, 1956

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith an article written by Roger D. Greene, of the Associated Press, which appeared in the East St. Louis (Ill.) Journal on July 1, 1956. The article, General Marshall Wanted To Lead Invasion, follows:

GEN. MARSHALL WANTED TO LEAD INVASION

(By Roger Greene)

The Democrats wanted Gen. George Catlett Marshall to run for President in 1948.

He wanted to command the Normandy invasion armies in World War II.

Why didn't he?

Now, for the first time, the 75-year-old soldier statesman brings into the open matters that have long been subjects of speculation.

Interviewed at his rambling 18th century home here, Marshall spoke with gruff finality.

"I would never have accepted the Presidency. I saw too much of it from the inside."

With a twinkle, he turned to his wife. "Besides," he said, "Mrs. Marshall wouldn't let me."

Mrs. Marshall explained:

"The Democrats wanted him to run for President. They wrote me in China asking me to urge the general to accept. I told them I would never consent to intercede with him on the subject."

Mrs. Marshall did not say what year it was, but presumably the incident occurred during Marshall's ill-fated mission to China to halt the conflict between Communists and Chiang Kai-Shek's Chinese Nationalists.

Elaborating, Marshall spoke fleetingly of political "rough stuff" and "some things I just wouldn't stand for."

He added: "I felt I had certain qualities, as a soldier, that shouldn't go with the presi-

dency. I have never thought a military man should be President."

Biographers have long puzzled whether Marshall ever regretted the decision that kept him tied to a Pentagon desk in Washington while the appointment to command the Normandy invasion armies went to his subordinate, Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower.

Touching on this, President Eisenhower said at White House news conference August 4, 1954:

PERSONAL DESIRE SECOND

"I am quite certain that he did not want to sit in Washington and be Chief of Staff. I am sure he wanted a field command. But he wouldn't even allow his chief (President Roosevelt) to know what he wanted, because he said, 'I am here to serve, and not to satisfy personal ambition.'"

The British Cabinet reportedly wanted Marshall as supreme allied commander, and at one point arrangements are said to have been made to fly him to London to take command of the cross-channel invasion forces. Roosevelt scotched the plan.

"I feel I could not sleep at night with you out of the country," F. D. R. told Marshall.

I asked if those were the facts. The general nodded.

"Of course I wanted to get out of Washington," he said, with a touch of asperity. "I'm a soldier. I wanted a combat command. But I had no choice. President Roosevelt wanted me to stay in Washington."

A sparkling raconteur, Marshall reminisced about unpublished bits of history for nearly 2 hours as he showed the way, with Mrs. Marshall at his side, through the historic 20-room house and gardens on the 4-acre estate.

The house, shaded by giant oaks and maple trees, was begun in 1768 by George Washington Ball, a nephew of George Washington.

Marshall paused in the dining room to relate how the floor was hurriedly completed so it would be ready for a dance in honor of the French Marquis de Lafayette.

The Question of Fitness

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. TORBERT H. MACDONALD
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 3, 1956

Mr. MACDONALD. Mr. Speaker, I am sure that whatever their political affiliation, the vast majority of the American people are happy over the fact that President Eisenhower's operation for ileitis was a success, and that he is progressing so well in his recovery. The President's doctors agree that his illness need not bar him from a second term. Also, the Republican high command has expressed absolute confidence that the President will run, and that he will so announce shortly. The President, while he recuperates at Gettysburg, must be thinking long and hard whether he can carry on successfully for another term.

Even so, there are many millions of people in this country that are asking the question: "Should a man in the President's condition attempt to carry the crushing burden of the Presidency for 4 more years?" This question can only be decided by careful weighing of the medical factors, and other more intangible but equally more important factors as well. In any event, I feel that it is not only legitimate but right that the matter be frankly and fully debated by the American people.

With these facts in mind I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues a very enlightening editorial written by David Brickman, editor-publisher of the Malden Evening News and the Medford Daily Mercury, two of the outstanding newspapers in my Eighth Congressional District. The editorial entitled, "Question of Fitness" deserves careful study not only by the Members of Congress but by all Americans who are endeavoring to reach a just and fair decision on a most difficult matter. I am confident that the American people will analyze all sides of this issue both impartially and as factually as possible. It is for this reason that I submit this editorial for the RECORD.

THE QUESTION OF FITNESS

A quick poll around the country shows that the second Eisenhower illness may have devastating effects upon his candidacy. The trend of opinion is that the President has tried to do too much since he announced his candidacy.

The majority of persons polled felt that he can't stand another 4 years in the White House. The optimistic reports from the bedside are received with thankfulness, but without political enthusiasm.

A considerable number of people feel that Len Hall and the Republican hierarchy are too aggressive. Despite the expert and folksy treatment by Jim Hagerty of the bedside bulletins, a lot of people feel that the politicians are pushing the President too hard.

No one at the opinion level could be found who felt that the President could do a good job in the next 4 years after his two illnesses. How this will be translated into votes come November, is, of course, another story. Here are some of the quotes from people polled:

"He is in no shape to run again."

"Those Republicans would run him stuffed."

"A man of his age with two close calls within a year should take to the sidelines."

"It is cruel to make him run."

"He might be better than ever as they are saying in Washington, but what if he isn't?"

"Everybody is sorry for the poor guy, but the country comes first."

The Republican high command can possibly overcome this present disadvantage by good luck and a burst of inspired showmanship along in October. Roosevelt campaigned through rain and sleet to give the Nation the assurance of his robustness. It is entirely possible that Ike, after a summer of rest, can dramatically appear before the television cameras, tanned and rested, and will sweep misgivings aside. There is no question that the Republican Party has the experts in public psychology to think out the problems of such a presentation.

It will take a lot of convincing that the President has enough stamina left to carry on the duties of his office. The average person is natively shrewd about health and disability. While Ike has a vast reservoir of good will to draw upon, many people at this stage will hesitate to vote for him. And the more the drums are beaten, the less they will believe. Ike has one enormous advantage, which few men have. He looks young and fit, no matter what. He has a wide, youthful face and the close-cropped look of a boxer. Most men of his age look worn and old before the cameras. If he does not hesitate in his decision to run, he can very well sell the country on his fitness.

But it would be a shame, and a disgrace upon our political system, if efforts to have him carry on resulted in further damage to his health.

Comments on the Poznan Revolt

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS S. GORDON
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 3, 1956

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD, releases made by the Polish National Democratic Committee, in two instances; one comments on the Poznan revolt, and the other, on the events in Poznan.

The alarming and heartbreaking news of the uprising of the Polish workers in Poznan against their Communist oppressors and the gruesome massacre that followed, serves notice on the free world what is happening to Poland, our faithful ally in World War II.

The releases follow:

COMMENTS ON THE POZNAN REVOLT

(By Mr. Stanislaw Mikolajczyk, former Prime Minister of Poland and chairman of the Polish National Democratic Committee)

Once again in the history of Poland, Polish blood has been spilled on the Freedom Square in Poznan. Demonstrating against the Communist dictatorship demanding the release of political prisoners, and crying for bread, the people of Poznan received bullets from the Soviet-controlled security police which killed many innocent people. This revolt shows the unbearable situation created by the Communist oppression, economic exploitation as well as miserable living conditions under the Soviet colonial rule in Poland.

The province of Poznan has always been known for the high standard of its agriculture and large surplus of agricultural products.

The industry of Poznan has been outstanding in the construction of railroad cars and equipment, agricultural and industrial machinery, and in the rubber manufactory. Today, under the Communist rule and Soviet exploitation the railroad passenger cars built in Poznan are shipped to Soviet Russia and China while the workers are underpaid and undernourished.

The collectivization drive in agriculture which has increased in the recent months brought about a great scarcity of food.

Out of 100,000 political prisoners and 300,000 inmates of forced-labor camps in Poland only 26,000 were released under the recent so-called amnesty.

It is therefore not surprising that the people of Poznan went to the historic Freedom Square where the headquarters of the Polish Communist Party and security police are located—the prison being situated on the nearby Mlynska Street—to demand freedom and bread. They were answered with bullets and their innocent blood was spilled.

The Communists say that there was a foreign inspiration behind the revolt. This is nonsense. Today the people in Poland know very well that every premature uprising would bring only a disaster. But the recent political developments have created a special atmosphere.

The Poznan workers have never been Marxist. They have always been very patriotic and very industrious. From the beginning of trade unionism they have always been very well organized in the trade unions. In June 1946 when I returned to Poland they participated in a huge mass anti-Communist demonstration on the same Freedom Square. Later they frequently tried to show their dissatisfaction with political and economic

conditions by organized strikes. But in the end they were suppressed by the brutal force of the police and the Red Army stationed in Poznan.

Recently, the Communists started a false propaganda of more freedom and of right of the people to express their desires.

Nobody needed to destalinize Stalin in Poland, because the Poles know best the murders of Stalin and his collaborators, who today condemn him.

The struggle for power among the followers and collaborators of Stalin, Soviet Russia's economic and international difficulties influenced also the events inside the Communist Party in Poland.

Bierut, the closest collaborator of Stalin, has returned to Warsaw from the last Communist congress in Moscow, but in a coffin. Berman was dismissed because his reports were responsible for Stalin's dissolution of the Polish Communist Party in 1938 and murder of many Polish Communist leaders. Rokossowski and Zawadzki—both Stalin's and Beria's pupils could not succeed Bierut. The cruel and generally hated Ochab chosen by Chruszczew in Warsaw as the new Secretary of the Polish Communist Party is seeking Moscow's help by accusing whole Communist Party groups of disobedience.

The prestige of the Communist Party of Poland has always been low, because of its repeated betrayals of Poland—in 1920 during the Polish-Bolshevik war, in 1932 by the agreement with the German Communists and in 1939 after Molotov-Ribbentrop agreement.

Certainly, the struggle inside the Communist Party and its propaganda of so-called Polish way to socialism and of more freedom influenced the attitude of the Poznan people, who were encouraged by these events and tried to show their feelings. The bloody answer which they received shows how much value have the false Communist promises and propaganda.

Only full freedom and democracy based on the will of the people expressed in free elections under the United Nations supervision can bring a good solution.

The blood of the inocent people in Poznan will not be forgotten by the whole Polish Nation and specially it will not be forgotten by the workers and peasants in all parts of Poland who, praying for the dead, will increasingly oppose the so-called Lenin's principle of the October Revolution aiming to establish communism by all possible methods—parliamentary control, subversion, revolution, or war.

NOTE: In 1918 there was also a revolt in Poznan. It was against the German occupation. In fact, it is known as the only victorious uprising in the Polish history. It coincided with the arrival there of Ignace Paderewski from the United States of America at the end of the World War I. He stayed then in the Hotel Bazar on the same Freedom Square. After this uprising the square was named Freedom Square. This fact lies deeply in the hearts of the Poznan people. The Poznan workers also took a very active part in the uprising of 1918.

THE POLISH NATIONAL DEMOCRATIC COMMITTEE ON THE EVENTS IN POZNAN

The executive board of the Polish National Democratic Committee held in Washington on June 29, 1956, an extraordinary meeting which discussed the situation in Poland in connection with the recent events in Poznan. At this meeting the following resolution was adopted unanimously:

"Deeply shocked with the news of the events which took place in Poznan on June 28, 1956, we pay our homage to the victims of the Communist terror and express our deepest sympathy to their families.

"In spite of the tragedy of these events this blood was not spilled in vain. None of the Poles in Poland or abroad will forget this innocently spilled blood. It will speed up the liberation of Poland.

"We expose the propaganda trick of the Warsaw government which, having brought the Polish population to misery and despair, (Cyrankiewicz himself had to admit it after the events) tries to transfer the responsibility for Poznan events to the alleged 'provocation of the foreign agents' or to the activities of the 'reactionary underground.'

"These reactions of the Communist regime on the Poznan events show in the proper light the whole perfidy of its attitude toward the workingman and shows the falsehood of the policy of liberalization of the system of government, which is being publicly declared by the official representatives of the Warsaw Communist government and the Communist Party.

"The threat of the severe reprisals against the demonstrators proves that the Communist regime, in the same way as during the Stalin era, recognizes only the force of terror and police oppression.

"This confirms the conviction entertained in the public opinion of the West that, in spite of the boisterous promises, nothing has been recently changed in the political and social situation in Poland.

"The announced reprisals will not, however, change the real situation in Poland, but their execution will only exceedingly increase the responsibility of the present rulers of Poland, adding to the long chain of their crimes the new bloody perpetrations.

"Keeping in mind the system of provocation, used by the Communist regimes during the difficult for them periods of time, we appeal to our countrymen in Poland asking them to remain calm and collected and to preserved proper self-control and judgment.

"In view of the recently undertaken, with the aid of the diversion in exile, efforts to weaken the spirit of the nation and to undermine its faith in the West, we wish to assure our countrymen in Poland that the attitude of the governmental circles of the West as well as of the wide public opinion proves irrefutably that the case of Poland neither was nor can be forgotten by the free world."

At the same time the executive board of the Polish National Democratic Committee decided to send to the President of the United States, the Prime Minister of Great Britain, and the Chairman of the Security Council, the following telegrams:

The President of the United States, Dwight D. Eisenhower: "We send you our heartiest thanks for the moral support, given in the yesterday's statement of the United States Department of State, to the Polish people in these days of trial for Poland.

"At the time when the Polish people, instead of enjoying freedom based on free and unfettered elections, are being murdered by the Soviet controlled military units of the so-called Polish security police on the streets of Poznan and are exposed to the ruthless revenge of the Communist dictatorship, we beg you to bring the Polish case to the Security Council of the United Nations, in view of the wartime pledges given to the Polish people jointly by the United States, Great Britain, and the Soviet Union."

The Right Honorable Sir Anthony Eden, Prime Minister of the United Kingdom: "At the time when the Polish people, instead of enjoying freedom based on free and unfettered elections, are being murdered by the Soviet controlled military units of the so-called Polish security police on the streets of Poznan and are exposed to the ruthless revenge of the Communist dictatorship, we beg you to bring the Polish case to the Security Council of the United Nations, in view of the wartime pledges given to the Polish people jointly by the United States, Great Britain, and the Soviet Union."

Chairman of the Security Council of the United Nations, New York: "The events in Poznan, where the oppressed and exploited people, misled by the recent false Communist propaganda of more freedom, while trying to express their desires and demands for bread and freedom are being murdered by the Soviet controlled military units of the so-called Polish security police and exposed to the ruthless revenge of the Communist dictatorship, prove once more that not only all the provisions of the Charter of the United Nations are being violated but also the peace and security of the world are endangered.

"We beg you therefore to put the case of Poland as well as the case of other captive peoples of Central Eastern Europe on the agenda of the Security Council of the United Nations."

All the telegrams were signed by: Stanislaw Mikolajczyk, former Prime Minister of the Wartime Polish Government, chairman of the Polish National Democratic Committee; and by Karol Popiel, former Minister of the Wartime Polish Government, chairman of the executive board of the Polish National Democratic Committee.

Straightening Out the Facts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 3, 1956

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, it is refreshing to have a newspaper clarify historic facts that recently have been distorted for political purposes during the necessary discussion of the illness of the Nation's President.

All of us wish the President full recovery and a happy tour of duty the remainder of his term. All of us recognize that in politics, distortions sometimes creep in. It is well, however, to try to keep the record clear. It is my thought that the following editorial from the St. Louis Post-Dispatch serves this purpose:

AS TO ILL PRESIDENTS

A good deal of bad history about the illnesses of Presidents is being circulated these days. Some newspaper readers are being told, for example, that Franklin D. Roosevelt was a dying man when he ran for reelection in 1944, but that a conspiracy of silence kept this fact from the people.

Mr. Roosevelt died of a cerebral hemorrhage. No evidence whatever has been produced to support the view that this affliction or any anticipatory illness had been either detected or concealed at the time of the election.

It was obvious to everybody in the fall of 1944 that the President was a desperately tired man. So were many men in other war jobs who, like their Commander in Chief, nevertheless had a national duty to perform. But it is unnecessary to create a Roosevelt myth in order to approve heartily of the Eisenhower administration's stated policy of giving the public detailed information on the President's illness.

The public did not get such information on Woodrow Wilson, when he was lying virtually disabled by paralysis for weeks toward the end of his term. Nor was there much reliable news about the illness that struck down President Harding in midsummer, 1923, and soon thereafter took his life.

This was at the very time when the scandals of the Harding administration were breaking around its amiable and easy-going

chief. The first postwar Republican President, he went to Alaska in the hope of getting relief from the betrayals of trust only to have the troubles follow him by telegram. En route to California, he became ill reportedly of ptomaine poisoning. In San Francisco his doctors said he was suffering from utter exhaustion. He was seized with bronchopneumonia and grew worse. Allan Nevins, writing the article on the unfortunate President in the Dictionary of American Biography, says cautiously, "the cause of his death was stated to be embolism."

Anyone who goes back to the newspaper files of the time will find that people were pretty much in the dark as to the true condition of their President and what had brought it on.

Tito and Aid From America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEON H. GAVIN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 3, 1956

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Evening Star, Washington, D. C., of June 20, 1956:

TITO AND AID FROM AMERICA—YOGOSLAVIA LISTED AS SIDING WITH REDS AGAINST UNITED STATES ON MAJOR U. N. ISSUES

(By Constantine Brown)

Marshal Broz—Tito—will be allowed to continue his present game of playing both ends against the middle unless Congress firmly calls a halt.

Tito's statement in Moscow that there will be mere consultation and cooperation between the Soviet and Yugoslav Communist Parties—as if they were two distinct entities—was the result of the dictator's information that if he did not go entirely overboard there would be no drastic cuts in America's support.

Secretary Dulles provided Senators of both parties last week with a brief explaining the administration's policies. He pointed out that the State Department was vigorously opposed to Senate bill 4001 which seeks to cut off all United States assistance to Yugoslavia. The basic thought behind the policies expressed by the State Department can be summed up in these very Christian words: "Be kind to your enemies."

Dulles explained at length the well-known fact that the U. S. S. R. now sits astride the middle of the European Continent and has stifled the sovereignty of a number of once-independent countries in Eastern Europe. Then he went on to say: "Yugoslavia has had both the opportunity and the steadfastness to stake its virtual existence as an independent state on a defiance of Moscow's ambitions to dominate it." This is, of course, a defendant lawyer's argument. Tito was dazed when Stalin kicked him unexpectedly out of the Cominform in 1948. He would have sunk long ago if the American Government had not come immediately to his rescue. This assistance enabled him to adopt a cocky attitude toward his personal enemies, Stalin and Molotov, and survive.

But Tito and his Government have never shown any real gratitude to the United States for saving him and his regime. In all major international matters before the United Nations in which Yugoslavia had a chance to repay our generosity she sided with the anti-Western bloc.

Dulles' briefing paper reaches a conclusion which many Senators describe as strange when he explains the reasons for Tito's visit to Moscow. The Secretary admits, of course, that the Yugoslav regime is a Communist one. "It is understandable," he then adds, "that its leaders now look hopefully to the Kremlin to rescue the U. S. S. R. and the worldwide reputation of communism from the disrepute to which the totalitarian system perfected by Stalin brought it. In that sense, the United States cannot overlook the tendencies in Yugoslavia toward a rapprochement with the Soviet Union, induced both by ideology and the memories of long Communist Party collaboration prior to 1948."

The Secretary of State or those who prepared this remarkable policy paper seem to have forgotten their history. Yugoslavia—not Tito and his cohorts who were raised in Moscow and educated by the MVD long before the outbreak of World War II—got into the Kremlin camp officially only in 1944. Hence, the assistance and support from Moscow—which includes the organization of the present Yugoslav secret police—lasted only about 4 years. Tito and Yugoslavia have received America's unstinting military and economic aid amounting to well over $1 billion for twice as long a time.

Before Tito was designated as the leader of his nation by the Big Three at Teheran at Stalin's request the Communists were regarded as subversive criminals by the Serbian, Croatian, Slovene, Montenegran, and Dalmatian people who form the Yugoslav commonwealth. Even today, if the reports from western observers are accurate, the bulk of these people are kept in subjection to communism by Tito's secret police. There are grave doubts that he and his associates would last long if the Yugoslavs had even a small degree of freedom. These top-secret facts were not given to Congres lest they upset the applecart and provide ammunition for the sponsors of Senate bill 4001.

The Secretary of State points out that Yugoslavia is still economically weak and requires much help from abroad. "She cannot pass up," he says, "the relatively generous offers of trade and credits from the Soviet orbit." All the same we must bear in mind, according to the State Department policy paper, that the Yugoslav Government's policies "are being made in Belgrade and not in Moscow."

Dulles admits that "many of these decisions in the foreign policy field do not correspond to our own." But the salient feature is that "there is no credible evidence that President Tito wishes or is going to enter into a subserveint status vis-a-vis the Soviet Union."

Dulles concludes with his expressed concern that unless military and economic assistance continue to be given to Tito, "dire economic necessity" may force him to turn toward Russia once more. The Yugoslav portion of the present mutual securtiy legislation is designed "to contribute toward preventing that situation from arising."

Democrats Have a Fighting Order for Mankind

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 3, 1956

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, the following are excerpts from a speech in Miami, Fla., May 26, 1956, by Adlai E. Stevenson, former Governor of Illinois, who is seeking the Democratic nomination for President of the United States:

In answer to a question as to what he believed to be the heart of Democratic belief, Adlai E. Stevenson replied:

"I'm a Democrat—and mighty proud of it, incidentally. My father and grandfather before me were Democrats. I often think how much it is a measure of my political prejudice that this inheritance always seems to me a good enough reason for being a Democrat but not a good enough reason for being a Republican.

"But there is a lot more to it than this. I am a Democrat because I believe deeply in what the Democratic Party stands for, and has stood for for almost a century and a half. We sometimes forget that while other political parties have come and gone, we who are Democrats today are members of the party of Thomas Jefferson and Andrew Jackson. And this isn't just history. It is part of the answer to your question. Because the reason we have become the party of centuries now is because we do have a central belief—and time has proved its soundness.

"I can't put it in one word—although if I had to that one word would be 'people.'

"I find the heart of this belief in 3 statements you'll find in the history of the Democratic Party—2 of them, incidentally, by Democrats from the South.

"It was Jefferson who said, 132 years ago, that 'Men * * * are naturally divided into two parties; those who fear and distrust the people, and wish to draw all powers from them into the hands of the higher classes, and those who identify themselves with the people, have confidence in them as the most honest and safe * * * depository of the public interests.'

"Almost a century later, Woodrow Wilson said this: 'You will notice that whenever the United States forgets its fighting ardor for mankind it is necessary that a Democrat should be elected President.'

"And, just last month in Washington, a great Democrat of today, Senator HERBERT LEHMAN, of New York, spoke of what he called 'the passion for the full right of freedom.'

"Here, I think, are the seeds at least of the answer to your question. What is at the heart of democratic policy and principle and faith and belief? Well, we identify ourselves with people, and have confidence in them; we have a fighting ardor for mankind; and we have a passion for the full right of freedom.

"And these aren't just words. It seems to me they offer clear and firm guidance to the most immediate and current problems we face today—yes, and to most of the issues in this election.

"The present administration went into office proclaiming itself a businessman's Government. The President's Cabinet and most of the agencies of Government have been filled with representatives of a single interest. I spoke in Fort Lauderdale last night of the policy of this administration not even to tell the rest of us, the people of this country, the truth about what is going on in our Government and particularly in the handling of the issue of peace and war in the world. I say, with Thomas Jefferson, that this is wrong; that the Government of this democracy cannot be one that distrusts the people and draws all powers from them into the hands of one class; that Government in America must identify itself with people, have confidence in them, recognize all people—and no single group—as the only safe guardians of the public interest.

"We are prosperous today as a Nation. Yet in these last 3½ years the administration in Washington has done nothing—or at least nothing substantial—about the human uses to which most of us want at least some part of this prosperity to be put.

"We want better schools, more teachers, the hospitals we need, removal of the slums

and the urban blight that breeds juvenile delinquency. We want to keep the family farm as an essential part of our society. But these are basically human rather than business concerns—and this administration is utterly lacking, it seems to me, in what Woodrow Wilson called a 'fighting ardor for mankind.'

"We want a program to make our older age a time of meaning, of dignity, of opportunity—but this administration opposes even the modest proposals we have made to bring the Social Security Act up to date. And when unemployment threatens—as it does today in some of the industrial centers of the North, particularly the automobile and farm equipment centers—the President's assistant says, as Mr. Pyle did this week, only that 'the right to suffer is one of the joys of a free economy.'

"We Democrats do have a 'fighting ardor for mankind'—and what this means to us is using the fruits of our prosperity in this land of plenty, in this age of abundance, not to give tax cuts to large corporations but to give us the things we want as people. Yes, and it means a program of dealing with the peoples of Asia and Africa and the Middle East in the realization that it is not war or military pacts that will defeat communism there but a program rather that shows those people too that our ardor for mankind extends to all people.

"Yes; and we Democrats have a passion for the full right of freedom. That's why we spoke out so strongly against the political attacks by Senator McCARTHY and Vice President NIXON on the Bill of Rights. That's why we have championed the idea of free trade unions and free collective bargaining. That's why we have felt so strongly and have been so critical about the failure of the present administration in Washington to recognize that in the Middle East this past year not just one little nation, Israel, but the whole idea of freedom was being threatened by cynical aggravation of old tensions.

"We don't just believe in freedom as an ideal; we've got a passion, as Senator LEHMAN puts it, for full freedom—that means what it's supposed to mean in people's everyday lives—here at home, yes and in the whole world, for liberty knows no boundary lines, and tyranny won't stop at any border.

"Well, you asked me for an answer to a question; and I've made a speech. But you asked me really what I believe in—and this is it, and I believe in it so deeply that I wanted to say it. I'm only sorry there isn't time to spell it out more fully in terms of all the issues we face today.

"And now, because our time is up, and because this brings us almost to the close of this Florida Presidential primary campaign, I want to say, too: Thank you, to you who are delegates, endorsing my candicacy, in next Tuesday's election; thank you, to all of you here in Florida who have worked so selflessly and so faithfully in my behalf; and thank you all for listening tonight, I hope you will vote next Tuesday—not for me or for anyone as an individual, but for what we believe in so strongly.

"Goodnight and God bless you."

Robbery at Hells Canyon

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEON H. GAVIN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 3, 1956

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the New York Daily News of June 28, 1956:

ROBBERY AT HELLS CANYON

The proposed Hells Canyon steal from the taxpayers (including you), previously discussed in this space, is now a longish way toward being committed.

Bills requiring the Federal Government to build a big power dam in that remote Northwestern spot (see map) have cleared the Senate and House Interior Committees in the last few days, and Congress should be voting on them before long.

Meanwhile, a private outfit—the Idaho Power Co.—is already at work on three smaller Snake River dams, under license from the Federal Power Commission.

These dams, if completed, will produce almost as much power as would the one big Federal dam. They will also produce some $10 million a year in taxes and they will be financed by private investors.

If the Government builds the one big dam, the $508 million cost of it will be got up by taxpayers all over the country. That works out to about $76 million from New York State, $19 million from New Jersey, and $10 million from Connecticut.

The Federal dam would pay no taxes. Any deficits it might run up would be charged to the general taxpayer. All this, so that a few people out in Idaho and Oregon could have more and cheaper electric power.

Why any lawmaker from any other part of the country should go for this steal from any but political motives, we can't see. Certainly we hope no New York, New Jersey, or Connecticut Senator or Representative will vote to have his or her constituents bilked in this fashion.

Criticism of Eisenhower Foreign Aid Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 3, 1956

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith an editorial entitled "Time for Shift," which appeared in the July 1, 1956, issue of the East St. Louis (Ill.) Journal:

TIME FOR SHIFT

Of all the criticisms of the Eisenhower foreign-aid program, the one made this week by Publisher John Cowles is probably the most significant. Mr. Cowles, president of the Minneapolis Star and Tribune, is an Eisenhower Republican with a deep interest in international affairs, especially Asian-American relations. He knows the subject he is criticizing, and he has no political ambitions.

He is critical of the administration's foreign-aid program because it still stresses military assistance, almost to the exclusion of economic help. "Only a tiny trickle of the funds of the International Cooperation Administration," said Mr. Cowles in a statement published widely throughout the country this week, "is going to the economic development of such presently uncommitted nations as India, Indonesia, and Burma." He also said:

"What worries me far more than the remote possibility of Russia's launching a surprize attack on us in the near future is the grave possibility that the Communists may be able in the next 5 or 10 years, without open war but through propaganda and economic and political pressures, progressively to absorb into the Communist orbit most of the presently neutral or uncommitted nations. If that should happen the free world would be in dire peril."

There are three principal reasons why the Eisenhower administration has failed to shift its foreign-aid emphasis from military to economic assistance:

1. The belief of many persons in the administration, most notably Secretary of State Dulles, that the changes in the Soviet Union since Stalin's death are only surface differences and that the Soviet threat remains basically a military one.

2. The difficulty both the Eisenhower and Truman administrations has had in getting Congress to approve economic assistance funds and the consequent feeling in the executive branch that the battle for economic funds is not worth the meager victory that will at best be the result.

3. The apparent ability of the Eisenhower administration to shift its bureaucratic gears quickly enough to deal with new situations such as Moscow's obvious attempts to woo neutral nations with rubels rather than rumbles.

However, the difficulties in the way of persuading Congress that economic aid, not military assistance, holds the balance of power in the world today should not deter the administration from trying. The fact is that President Eisenhower is relying on the Truman administration's foreign aid concepts, which were valid 6 years ago when North Korean troops were swarming over the 38th parallel but are hardly valid today when Soviet Foreign Minister Shepilov, every bit as gracious as a 19th century British foreign secretary, is moving from one middle eastern capital to another, with talk of economic assistance on his lips and rubles in his pockets.

President Eisenhower indicated his awareness of the foreign assistance problems when he told a news conference early in May that the administration was conducting its own study of aid policies. Another Presidential commission is expected to be the result. In the last 2 weeks both the Senate Foreign Relations and House Foreign Affairs Committees have voted funds to conduct searching inquiries into foreign aid problems.

These studies are all to the good. The Soviet Union has got the jump on the United States, but all is not lost yet.

Nine years ago at this time a Presidential commission, a special congressional committee and a citizens committee were being organized to look into the feasibility of the suggestion made by then Secretary of State Marshall that the United States help Europe. The remarkably successful Marshall plan was approved by Congress less than a year after General Marshall's speech. The present criticisms of the foreign aid program and the plans to study the whole matter could lead to a program as important to Asia and Africa as the Marshall plan was to Western Europe.

But if such a program is to be drawn up, and is to succeed, the endeavor will need the vigorous leadership of President Eisenhower, the kind of enthusiastic backing which former President Truman gave to the Marshall plan idea.

Civil Rights Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 3, 1956

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, several weeks ago I signed a

discharge petition on H. R. 627, the bill seeking to assure and protect the civil rights of all American citizens. This bill has been favorably reported by the House Judiciary Committee and is pending before the Rules Committee.

It was to assure the Members of the House the opportunity to vote on this vitally important bill, that I signed the petition which now lies on the Speaker's desk.

I say "vitally important" in a very real sense. "Vital" because it affects the very life of the Nation; vital because it carries to the highest functional level, the very life of a free and democratic Nation. To carry this word just one step further: I am here as a Member, devoted to the ideals of America, vitalized by Abraham Lincoln.

It is profoundly significant to me that while Lincoln had the support of one party in his fight to assert and protect the civil rights of all the people, President Eisenhower has the support of members of both parties. I want to than those members of our Judiciary Committee who laid aside party partisan politics and harkened to the appeal of President Eisenhower and reported out the proposed Civil Rights Act of 1956. This bipartisan, thoroughly American attitude is shown in the very first section of the bill which provides for a bipartisan Commission on Civil Rights; truly bipartisan and not merely nominally so. For of the 6 members, not more than 3 may be members of the same party.

The appreciation of the deep meaning of the word "inequality" is wisely recognized. Inequality may assert itself in many ways. Basic, of course, is the right to vote. For there can be no equality unless the free exercise of the right to vote is carefully and continuously safeguarded. Hence, the proposed act would specially protect every citizen's right to vote. But this bill recognizes "inequality" as something which can be reflected in conditions which affect the rights of free citizens. This bill would authorize the Commission "to study and collect information concerning economic, social and legal developments constituting a denial of equal protection of the laws under the Constitution." It further expressly recognizes the gravity of "unwarranted economic pressures" which may be imposed on citizens because of "their color, race, religion, or national origin." This thought, these words, make a deep impression on me. I come from New England. In our very early history our boundaries enclosed men who would abuse our fellow men because of creed—when those who would impose such penalties had themselves come to this land to assure them the right to worship God as they chose. But long before my State, Massachusetts, led in helping found our Nation, we wiped out the denials of freedom of worship. When political slavery was the issue, so magnificently did Massachusetts point the way that Daniel Webster held us up as an example in his famous "Massachusetts, There She Stands." In our early history we led in wiping out the laws which imposed cruel punishments arising from economic inequalities. We wiped out the laws for imprisonment for debt. We pioneered in the enactment of child labor laws. We removed property holding requirements as a qualifying condition for voting.

But, today social and economic pressures assert themselves in a far more complex manner. As the great Lincoln said our Nation cannot be half free, half slave. So, today we realize that our Nation cannot be half free economically and socially and half degraded. Poverty, disease, antisocial conduct of all sorts know no State boundaries. Physical and social ills of one part of the country may and often do, become a problem of grave concern to all of us. Lincoln had the vision to recognize this fact and so it is that today as I plead for action on the proposed Civil Rights Act, I plead for a modern adaptation of the great plea of Lincoln. Today there is no threat of a break from our national unity. But there is a threat to our national spiritual unity if we forget the responsibility of all of us to assure equal protection under the laws for each of us.

I am happy that President Eisenhower has taken such a sound and firm position in assuring all people in all of the States that the resources of the Federal Government shall be used for the protection of each and all. I would close this appeal by telling the House of an incident which occurred shortly after President Eisenhower's inauguration.

It was on February 12 at the Lincoln Memorial here in Washington where annually the Military Order of the Loyal Legion holds its exercises in commemoration of Lincoln and in rededication to the principles which he served. These exercises were conducted under the leadership of our beloved civic leader, Gen. U. S. Grant III. For the first time in many years, the President of the United States personally went up those steps to lay the wreath which his aid carried. As President Eisenhower stood there before this statue, in a moment of prayerful, silent devotion, his eyes welled with tears. He looked at Lincoln and bowed his head; he placed the wreath and again seemed to dedicate himself to the spirit of Lincoln with profound feeling. From that moment on, President Eisenhower has proved his sincerity and his devotion to Lincoln's devotion to the freedom of all men.

It is in this spirit that I plead that an opportunity be given to the House Members to vote on the proposed Civil Rights Act.

The Preservation and Protection of Precious Documents of Our Historic Past

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. DODD

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 2, 1956

Mr. DODD. Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced a bill establishing a commission, similar in form and content to the Hoover Commission, for the purpose of making a critical revaluation of all documents in the possession of the Government. In the 180 years since the founding of our Nation there has been no adequate program developed for the preservation and protection of precious documents of our historic past.

While it is true that the Declaration of Independence is preserved for the ages under glass, there are other documents of almost equal value that are not. The establishment of a commission charged with the task of determining what documents are of historic significance and making recommendations as to their preservation and display, could make a valuable contribution to generations of Americans to come.

The Fourth of July is more than just a pleasant summer holiday to thoughtful Americans. It is a time to pause briefly, forgetting the cares of the day, and reflect on the courage and wisdom of the men who forged America's freedom from tyranny. It is easy to take our heritage of freedom lightly and to forget that men, not unlike ourselves, were inspired to boldly proclaim the practical idealism upon which our Nation was founded. It was a new departure in the philosophy of Government, and for the first time set forth the principle that the State is the servant of man, not his master.

The Nation was born of strife and suffering and the universal urge of mankind for freedom. Our early struggle for independence is documented by the letters and papers, both public and private, of the colonial leaders who had the courage and the spirit to fight for freedom. It is clearly the duty of Congress to take an active interest in these documents and to make sure that they are not allowed to deteriorate.

George Mason, the outstanding patriot from nearby Fairfax County, Va., is the author of what later became the Bill of Rights. The first draft of this precious document, in Mason's handwriting, is the property of the Federal Government and is now in the possession of the Library of Congress. While the Mason papers constitute an important segment of Revolutionary documents, absolutely nothing is done to preserve them, or to make them available to the public in the form of reprints. This is by no means an indication of neglect in the care of these papers. They are well guarded against the possibility of theft or malicious mutilation, but are vulnerable to the attrition of time. In a recent issue of the American Bar Association Journal, Mr. R. Carter Pittman, an authority on Mason, states:

> The original (Mason's Bill of Rights) in Mason's handwriting now lies unrecognized, unhonored and unsung among the Mason papers in the Library of Congress. It too is forgotten history.

Yet this first draft of our Bill of Rights eventually became living law.

My bill will establish a commission to be known as the Commission on Historical Documents that will conduct a comprehensive review of historical documents in the possession of the United States relating to the formative years of our country. It will be the duty of this Commission to determine, after objective evaluation, whether a docu-

ment is of such historical importance that it should be preserved for future generations. There can be little doubt that hitherto neglected portions of America's past will come to light by the establishment of such a Commission. Generations of Americans to come will profit by gaining an accurate, contemporary view of the genesis of our country.

The Commission will be composed of seven members, chosen to insure a balanced representation among individuals equipped to undertake such an evaluation. The Commission members will be:

First. The Archivist of the United States.

Second. The Librarian of Congress.

Third. One Member of the Senate appointed by the President of the Senate.

Fourth. One Member of the House of Representatives appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

Fifth. Three members from private life appointed by the President of the United States.

I feel certain the creation of such a Commission would make an invaluable contribution to a better and more widespread understanding of the principles upon which our Nation was founded.

Survey of Current Business

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HENRY ALDOUS DIXON

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 3, 1956

Mr. DIXON. Mr. Speaker, the June 1956 issue of the Survey of Current Business contains a short article entitled "Concerns in Business and Their Turnover." The article makes these major points:

First. In 1955, the 60,000 increase in the number of operating businesses was slightly in excess of the long-term growth trend.

Second. More new businesses were started last year than in any other year since 1948.

Third. Fewer firms discontinued business last year than in either 1954 or 1953.

Most of the new firms started in 1955 represent small businesses, as well as do the bulk of all our business firms. These facts clearly indicate that the owners of small businesses, therefore, have participated in the economic prosperity which has prevailed under the Eisenhower Republican administration.

The article follows:

CONCERNS IN BUSINESS AND THEIR TURNOVER

The number of business concerns in operation in the United States was 4¼ million at the beginning of 1956, having expanded during 1955 under the impetus of the general advance in economic activity which characterized that year. The increase during 1955 of more than 60,000 concerns was larger than in any other year since 1948, which marked the end of a period of rapid postwar growth after the reduction caused by wartime conditions.

Except for minor seasonal variations, the business population as a whole was at a virtual standstill during 1953 and 1954, a period which witnessed some decline in business and profits from the second quarter 1953 peak. In 1955, the growth in the number of operating businesses was slightly in excess of the long-term growth trend. The increase in the number of operating concerns in 1955 resulted from both a rise in the number of new firms started and a decrease in the number of business discontinuances.

Last year's rise in concerns in business was reflected in each of the major industry divisions except manufacturing, which continued to dip slightly. Manufacturing was the only major division in which the number of operating concerns increased throughout the World War II period. This division also shared in the rapid rise in the earlier postwar years.

Contract construction again last year showed the largest relative increase in operating concerns—6½ percent. The construction division dipped and rose much more sharply than any other major part of the business population in response to war and reconversion influences. This division currently contains nearly 3⅓ times the number of concerns operating in December 1943; the latter period marks the low point since 1935 in the total number of concerns in business. The more stable trade and service divisions gained about 1 percent each last year and now contain about 1½ times as many firms as in 1943.

BUSINESS STARTS UP, CLOSURES DOWN

During 1955, some 374,000 new firms were established, about 311,000 businesses discontinued operations, and 321,000 going concerns were purchased or otherwise acquired by new owners. More new businesses were started last year than in any other year since 1948, when new firms numbered 393,000. Fewer firms discontinued business last year than in either 1954 or 1953; except for these 2 years, however, discontinuances were more numerous last year than in any other since the 337,000 closures in the wartime year 1943.

The number of businesses newly established in 1955 was 12 percent higher than in the previous year and 10 percent higher than in 1953 while the number of concerns discontinued was below the same years by about half these percentages.

This pattern was repeated in each of the major industries except services where both new and discontinued businesses increased in number from 1954 to 1955. The increase in the number of new service firms, 10 percent, was much greater than the 1½-percent increase in discontinued firms.

Business transfers in 1955 were little different from 1954, but 10 percent below 1953. About two-thirds of all firms involved in transfers of ownership are classified in retail trade while this division contains about three-fifths of the operating concerns.

Number of firms in operation, selected dates 1940–55, and number of new, discontinued and transferred businesses, 1953–55 [1]

[Thousands]

	All industries	Contract construction	Manufacturing	Wholesale trade	Retail trade	Service industries	All other
	Firms in operation						
Dec. 31, 1940	3,276.0	194.2	230.4	190.1	1,560.7	614.6	486.2
Dec. 31, 1943	2,839.1	146.9	246.4	169.8	1,291.4	536.0	448.5
Dec. 31, 1948	3,984.2	338.9	322.5	260.1	1,782.7	738.6	541.3
Dec. 31, 1952	4,178.8	417.7	326.9	282.9	1,853.0	738.9	559.4
June 30, 1953	4,205.7	432.3	326.6	285.0	1,859.2	741.9	560.7
Dec. 31, 1953	4,135.3	431.3	321.8	285.6	1,849.9	739.0	557.5
June 30, 1954	4,196.7	441.3	317.6	287.1	1,850.7	742.3	557.7
Dec. 31, 1954 [2]	4,189.0	446.1	312.5	287.5	1,846.1	740.6	556.2
June 30, 1955 [2]	4,232.3	465.6	311.4	289.9	1,857.3	745.0	563.0
Dec. 31, 1955 [3]	4,252.0	475.0	308.0	291.0	1,865.0	746.0	566.0
	New businesses						
January–June 1953	199.3	40.4	16.0	11.9	77.4	29.6	24.0
July–December 1953	141.2	23.9	10.4	8.6	58.1	23.1	17.2
January–June 1954	189.0	35.7	13.1	11.0	75.4	30.3	23.5
July–December 1954	145.2	25.8	9.6	8.9	59.8	22.8	18.2
January–June 1955	210.2	40.9	14.9	11.7	81.8	32.8	28.1
July–December 1955 [3]	164.0	28.0	11.0	9.0	68.0	26.0	21.0
	Discontinued businesses						
January–June 1953	172.4	25.8	16.3	9.8	71.1	26.7	22.7
July–December 1953	161.6	24.9	15.2	8.0	67.3	25.9	20.3
January–June 1954	177.6	25.8	17.3	9.6	74.6	27.0	23.3
July–December 1954 [2]	153.0	21.0	14.8	8.4	64.5	24.6	19.8
January–June 1955 [2]	166.9	21.4	16.0	9.4	70.6	28.3	21.2
July–December 1955 [3]	144.0	19.0	14.0	8.0	61.0	24.0	18.0
	Transferred businesses						
January–June 1953	205.0	8.6	9.8	7.4	135.6	30.5	13.1
July–December 1953	151.2	5.5	6.6	5.4	102.0	21.9	9.9
January–June 1954	181.8	7.3	7.8	6.5	121.5	26.6	12.2
July–December 1954	137.9	5.0	5.5	4.5	94.6	19.7	8.7
January–June 1955	176.3	6.6	7.5	6.0	117.7	26.4	12.0
July–December 1955 [3]	145.0	5.0	6.0	5.0	100.0	21.0	9.0

[1] Business population estimates for earlier years appear on pages 12–16 of the January 1954 issue of the Survey.
[2] Revised estimate.
[3] Based on incomplete data.
Source: U. S. Department of Commerce, Office of Business Economics. Estimates based primarily on data from the U. S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Bureau of Old-Age and Survivors Insurance.

Labor Rackets

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PETER FRELINGHUYSEN, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 3, 1956

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the New York Times of July 3, 1956:

SIX INDICTED HERE IN LABOR RACKETS—HOGAN SAYS THOSE ACCUSED OF EXTORTION ARE OR WERE TEAMSTER OFFICIALS

(By Jack Roth)

District Attorney Frank S. Hogan took another step yesterday in his crackdown on labor racketeers. He announced the indictment of six present or former officials of a local of the International Brotherhood of Teamsters.

And, once again, looming in the background of extortion, conspiracy, and the shakedowns of small businesses, were the figures of John Dioguardi, known as Johnny Dio, and Anthony (Tony Ducks) Corallo, who have been described by Mr. Hogan as the two "most powerful underworld figures in the field of labor."

The six men indicted for shaking down small businesses are now or have been officials of local 875 of the Teamsters Union, a local established in the spring of 1954, according to Mr. Hogan, "principally for the purposes of extortion and under the control of Corallo."

Although the indictments named 13 concerns as having been shaken down, Mr. Hogan said as many as 85 small businesses might have been victimized.

NEW LOCAL FORMED

Mr. Hogan explained that local 875 was the successor to local 512 of the International Association of Cleaning and Dye House Workers Union, AFL. Mr. Hogan said that local 512 was headed by Samuel Zackman, who served as a lieutenant of Johnny Dio when Zackman headed local 102 of the old United Auto Workers, AFL., a Dio-dominated local.

When Zackman and his secretary-treasurer were convicted in 1953 of conspiracy and extortion, local 512 disappeared and a charter was obtained for local 875. Those applying for the charter said they wanted to crusade for the teamsters "honestly and fearlessly." Actually, Mr. Hogan said, the local became the instrument for extortion.

The prosecutor said that, although local 875 would pretend to negotiate with employers, this was just a "sham to cloak the criminal activities" of the union's officers.

Mr. Hogan outlined the method by which the local's officials would shake down businessmen. He said the heads of small-business concerns were approached and threatened with picket lines if they did not sign with local 875, which the prosecutor called a "catch-all union."

Fees were extracted from these small-business men whether they did or did not sign up. In many cases a concern's employees were not even aware their employer had signed a contract with a local, Mr. Hogan said.

According to assistant District Attorneys James J. Fitzpatrick and Vincent Ferrara, the local's officials put forth "elastic price tags" as the price for labor peace and avoidance of picket lines. Demands for $5,000 were settled for $1,500. Demands for $500 were settled for $100 or less.

Mr. Hogan said that although the known extortions amounted to between $6,000 and $7,000, he was sure the figure would be much higher when the "complete picture of these six" was known.

Three of the local's former officers are now officials with another teamsters local—275—said by Mr. Hogan to be "another local under the thumb of Corallo."

Dio was indicted on June 19 for conspiracy and bribery in connection with a plot to exact $30,000 in bribes from an electroplating company as the price for labor peace.

After Dio's indictment the International Brotherhood of Teamsters announced plans to review the charters issued to 7 controversial new locals in this city, 6 of which were originally set up by Dio.

Thomas L. Hickey, international vice president of the teamsters, said yesterday a special investigation would be conducted into the affairs of Locals 275 and 875.

Mr. Hogan said that in recent cases of labor racketeering the names of Dio and Corallo seemed to be continually cropping up, indicating a network.

Those indicted yesterday were:

Jack Berger, 37 years old, of 398 Rockaway Parkway, Queens, president of Local 875.

Nathan Carmel, 39, of 73-51 260th Street, Bellerose, Queens, vice president of the local.

Aaron Kleinman, 33, of 44 Howard Street, Freeport, L. I., secretary-treasurer of the local.

Milton Levine, 40, of 814 St. Ouen Street, the Bronx, former organizer of 875 and now president of Local 275.

Samuel Zebofsky, 39, of 189 East 34th Street, Brooklyn, and Jack Priore of 167 Montauk Avenue, Brooklyn, both former organizers for Local 875, now doing the same work for Local 275.

Highway Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE H. FALLON
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 3, 1956

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the subcommittee on roads, it was my privilege to introduce H. R. 10660, national highway legislation passed by this Congress. This legislation became a reality when President Eisenhower recently signed the measure. It is now known as Public Law 627, 84th Congress, the Highway Act of 1956.

Mr. Speaker, in my opinion, the new Highway Act is an excellent one. It is essentially the bill introduced by me in January and passed by the House by a vote of 388 to 19. I am particularly gratified that the House formula for allocation of funds on the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways was retained for the vital final 10 years of the 13-year program. This will guarantee that each State will receive exactly the amount of money it needs, no more and no less, to complete its section of the Interstate System during the life of the program. This is, I believe, the most important section of the act.

Nothing in my career as a member of the House of Representatives has given me the satisfaction that I have experienced from playing my part in the creation and forwarding of this truly great legislation. Not only will every person in the United States benefit from it, but its favorable impact on our economy already is felt. My colleagues in the House and their counterparts in the Senate I know must feel as I do that the act which we have produced was worth every minute of the many months of effort that went into it.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include a statement by the Bureau of Public Roads, listing benefits expected under the new Highway Act. I think the statement will be of interest to every citizen and car owner of the Nation.

BUREAU OF PUBLIC ROADS LISTS BENEFITS EXPECTED FROM NEW HIGHWAY PROGRAM

FEWER TRAFFIC JAMS

About 80 percent of our citizens drive to work. Considering only the Interstate System, this network will get millions of people out of daily traffic jams as they go to and from the job. How tomorrow's freeways will speed the flow of traffic can be seen on such busy routes as the Hollywood Freeway near Los Angeles, where 290,760 vehicles were counted on its busiest day—the average is 172,000 daily. On Chicago's Lake Shore Drive near Aldine Street, 142,503 vehicles have been counted in a single day. A highway bridge which takes U. S. Route 1 from Washington, D. C., has carried 117,333 vehicles in 24 hours.

BIGGER, LESS-TIRING VACATION TRIPS

To the vast majority of American families, thoughts of a vacation include the family car. Vacationing families must ration both time and distance carefully. When the Interstate System is completed to modern standards, vacation plans will range much further than they do today. Expressways will let motorists lay out daily mileages on a 60-miles-an-hour basis, and those longer runs will take much less out of drivers and passengers alike.

INCREASED SAFETY

Last year the death toll on our streets and highways reached 38,300. About 1,350,000 people were injured, including more than 100,000 persons who were left with permanent physical impairments. Dollarwise, the National Safety Council estimates the annual loss from traffic accidents at nearly $5 billion.

In 1955, on all rural highways, nationwide, trere were 8.4 fatalities per 100 million vehicle-miles, in contrast with 3.2 for the representative rural freeways for which the Bureau of Public Roads has data. The Automotive Safety Foundation has estimated that modernization of the Interstate System will save 3,500 lives a year.

MORE JOBS IN HIGHWAY CONSTRUCTION

Jobs in highway construction will increase as the new program gets under way. In 1955 contractors employed nearly 240,000 persons and it is estimated that each increase of $1 billion in the value of highway construction over the 1955 level will require at least 70,000 additional employees.

The highway construction industry, which has been operating at less than 50 percent of capacity, will step up its operations to near-capacity levels when the program reaches its peak in 1963–64.

MORE JOBS IN SUPPORTING INDUSTRIES

The demand for earth-moving and other road-building machinery will keep manufacturers of such equipment busy for the next 10 or 15 years.

At the end of 1954, the production capacity of the cement industry was 294 million barrels per year. Plans now under way indicate that this will be increased to about 400 million barrels sometime in 1959. Now that an enlarged highway program is assured, such plans for future expansion may be carried out even sooner.

In 1955 the aggregates industries produced 821 million tons of crushed stone, sand and gravel, and slag. Over 400 million tons of this total were used in highway construction. The new highway program will give a sustained lift to production and productive capacity in this widespread industry.

United States total consumption of bituminous materials in 1955 came to about 18.6 million tons. Highway construction used about 6 million tons. It is obvious that a greatly enlarged highway program will provide a much bigger market for petroleum asphalt and other bituminous materials.

Many segments of the steel industry will benefit from an expanded highway program. In 1955 highway construction consumed over 800,000 tons of structural shapes and piling, about 700,000 tons of reinforcing bars, and over 110,000 tons of welded wire fabric. Traffic signs, corrugated pipe, guard rail, and many other items used in road construction and maintenance also require steel.

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT

The indirect impact of expressways on industry and communities is illustrated by recent investigation of Route 128 in the Boston metropolitan area, the New York Thruway and some California studies.

Among the recently completed new plants on Route 128 is that of a publishing plant costing $3,500,000. Under construction is a shoe machinery corporation in Waltham, costing half a million dollars, which will employ 300 persons. It is estimated that the cost of plants which have been started or finished exceeds $100 million. Land that sold for $50 or $100 an acre before Route 128 was built now commands $5,000 to $10,000 an acre.

Although the New York Thruway is not yet completed nor has it been opened to traffic for very long, it is conservatively estimated that already more than $150 million worth of new industrial plants have been erected adjacent to it. These plants are estimated to employ 30,000 persons with an annual payroll in excess of $100 million. Typical examples range from a $4 million television assembly plant at Batavia in western New York to a $30 million shipping center at Yonkers.

In California, a new section of the Eastshore Freeway has stimulated a spectacular growth of industry in the Oakland metropolitan area of Alameda County. The particular area investigated, served by the freeway, constituted only 9 percent of the total industrial area in Alameda County, yet it accounted for 43 percent of the dollars invested in new industries, 30 percent of the number of new industries, and 38 percent of the dollars invested in industrial expansion.

Similar results can be expected nationwide as the highway program is carried out, but these changes will not come overnight. They will develop section by section. Cross-country travel entirely by expressways will not be possible until the Interstate System is nearly completed. So far, only the general locations of the network are fixed. Detailed locations, especially in and around cities, will be proposed by the States for approval by the Bureau of Public Roads and will be acted upon one by one.

MORE FUNDS FOR OTHER HIGHWAYS

Apart from funds for the Interstate System, the 1956 act adds $125 million to the apportionment for other Federal-aid highways—primary, secondary and urban. It also authorizes $850 million for 1958 and $875 million for 1959.

In addition, the assumption by the Federal Government of 90 percent of the cost of constructing the Interstate System will leave many States with more funds to spend on other road systems, including farm-to-market roads.

Having So Little, They Dared So Much

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD C. OSTERTAG
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 3, 1956

Mr. OSTERTAG. Mr. Speaker, as we celebrate Independence Day this year, let us take thought of its true significance. Beyond the baseball games and picnics, beyond the parades and the rhetoric, beyond this wonderful, bounteous land which is America today, let us pause to remember the courage, the devotion, and the dedication of the men who signed the Declaration of Independence, pledging to its realization their lives, their fortunes, and their sacred honor.

The issues and the stakes have seldom been better or more succinctly stated than in the following column by A. B. Genung from the June 30 issue of the Rochester Times Union, which, under leave to extend my remarks, I include in the RECORD:

THE PATRIOTS OF 1776: DARED MUCH WITH LITTLE

(By A. B. Genung)

Four days hence we shall remind ourselves and our children, I hope, of the greatest event in our history.

The Fourth of July didn't originate in baseball games and picnics.

Many people think that the United States never was in greater jeopardy than right now, when we are faced across the oceans by a colossal military power bent on conquest. But there was a time when this land faced greater odds and lived.

In that grim day, 180 years ago, our forefathers had to make a choice. That choice was whether to fight for their freedom or submit to a despot. They choose to fight.

Read your history all the way back to Babylon. You will find few times when men, having so little, dared so much as did those American patriots of 1776.

The Revolution was already more than a year old when our grandsires determined to make themselves completely independent of England. So drastic a step had not been in their minds at all when the trouble began. They merely were resisting intolerable acts of the British King.

George III, master of Europe's finest army and navy, was not one to wink at treason. He had put 12,000 disciplined, well-equipped troops ashore here, backed them up with a powerful fleet, and then began to tighten the noose about his revolting American subjects.

On our side there was no army, no navy, no money, no munitions of war, not even a central government. It was, indeed, a brash little David challenging the Goliath of Europe.

But the Colonies had some assets. They had leaders. Some of the world's greatest leaders. They had devoted patriots. They had the fertile land. Above all, they had courage.

Every person who raised a voice against King George knew he would be branded a traitor. Every man who signed the Declaration of Independence knew it could be his death warrant. They laid their lives and their property unhesitatingly in the scales for liberty.

That epic fight for liberty was won by men prepared to pay the price, no matter how high. For they knew what life was under a despot.

Next Wednesday let us take at least one good look about the world and let it remind us what our heritage is worth, and what it cost.

Let the games and picnics pause for just one moment while we ask Heaven to make us worthy descendants of free men.

Administrative Levy Against Warm Springs Indians Reduced

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EARL CHUDOFF
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 3, 1956

Mr. CHUDOFF. Mr. Speaker, in November 1955 the Public Works and Resources Subcommittee of the House Government Operations Committee and the Legislative Oversight Subcommittee of the Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee jointly held 3 weeks of hearings in northern California, Oregon, and Washington. We were looking into Federal timber policies as carried out by the Forest Service, the Bureau of Land Management and the Bureau of Indian Affairs.

In the course of the hearings, on November 21, 1955, representatives of the Indians of the Warm Springs Reservation in Oregon told the committee that they were being seriously overcharged by the Bureau of Indian Affairs for administrative expenses in connection with the sale of their timber. Under the Bureau's regulations, 10 percent of the income from the sale of Indian timber was being deducted from the amount paid to the Indians to cover the costs of administering the sales. This 10 percent went into the Federal Treasury.

The Indians' representative pointed out that since 1950, the amount deducted has exceeded the actual administrative expenses incurred by the Indian Bureau on the Warm Springs Reservation. In 1955 the Indians were overcharged by over $40,000. In 1956 the overcharge was expected to reach $60,000.

The members of the two subcommittees were quite concerned about the situation. We asked the Bureau of Indian Affairs for a report on the matter. On February 22, 1956, the Bureau supplied figures indicating that between 1951 and the end of 1955, the Warm Springs Indians had been overcharged in excess of $100,000, although if the figures were carried back to 1943 the overcharge was only about $14,000, since between 1943 and 1951 administrative expenses exceeded the deductions.

The subcommittee members made clear their view that the Indian Bureau should reduce the levy against the Warm Springs Indians before the overcharges reach even more serious proportions.

I am very happy to be able to inform the Congress that on June 22, 1956, the Commission of Indian Affairs announced that effective July 1, 1956, the administrative charge against the Warm Springs

Reservation timber would be reduced from 10 percent to 7 percent. I trust that the Bureau will watch the Warm Springs situation closely and make further adjustments promptly if they are warranted.

I am sure that all members of the two subcommittees are gratified that our hearings did work out to help the Warm Springs Indians.

In fact, the Warm Springs overcharge was just a small facet of our many days of hearings. We expect to present to Congress soon a comprehensive report on our studies. I hope the report will prove useful to Congress and to the Federal agencies in meeting some of the difficult problems which they face.

Education of the North Proceeds

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE M. GRANT
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 3, 1956

Mr. GRANT. Mr. Speaker, much has been printed in the northern press about racial conditions in the South. I believe that those interested in fair play and the truth will read with interest the recent editorial in the Richmond Times Dispatch that I have the privilege of inserting in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

EDUCATION OF THE NORTH PROCEEDS

Education of the North in the ways of the South proceeds apace. Among the latest to be awakened to the facts of life in the field of race relations here below are James Wechsler, editor of the liberal New York Post, and Ted Poston, his celebrated Negro reporter.

Wechsler sent Poston to Montgomery to spend a couple of weeks studying and writing about conditions in the capital of Alabama, in connection with the prolonged bus boycott there. Editor Wechsler instructed reporter Poston to call him daily by long distance so Wechsler would know that his colored reporter hadn't been murdered or lynched.

Poston himself revealed this, after he had been in Montgomery for about a week, and had found himself hospitably received on every hand, according to an article in Editor & Publisher, of New York.

Grover C. Hall, Jr., the enterprising editor of the Montgomery Advertiser, is quoted there as saying that he opened his files to the visiting Negro reporter from Gotham, "offered him the services of a staff photographer, and promised to make appointments for him with local 'biggies.'" Furthermore, "City Editor Joe Azbell was assigned to him as guide and chauffeur, just as he had been to other reporters before Poston, and he was off to tour the town."

Editor and Publisher then goes on to say:

"By sundown Poston had been offered and had taken his pick of all the typewriters in the newsroom. He chose one between two women reporters and adjoining the city editor's desk * * * Poston likes fun and laughter, and he hit it off fine with both editor and news staff. After a few days he became bewildered at the absence of race tension in Montgomery."

It was then that Poston revealed to the Montgomery Advertiser staff that he had been told when he left New York to phone his office daily and give proof that mayhem had not been committed upon him. He even revealed that so far from being strung up to a lamppost he had got lost one night in Montgomery and had been "led three blocks to a telephone by two white children."

Here, then, is one more impressive example of the opening of northern eyes to conditions in the South. The stereotyped picture of lantern-jawed southern bigots, drooling tobacco juice and bent on mob action, which seems to have been accepted so widely in the North, is slowly giving way, it would seem, to something approaching reality. Even the New York Post must now be aware that the people of Montgomery and the atmosphere there are far, far different from the caricatures painted in many segments of the northern press.

Secretary Wilson and the Unwanted $1 Billion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CRAIG HOSMER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 3, 1956

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, a man could not count 1 billion dollar bills in a lifetime. Yet following 60 minutes' discussion on a certain conference report last week, this body disposed of not one but many billions of dollars. The course of the measure, the Defense Department appropriations bill, was not unattended by storms, however.

As a consequence, one rather perspicacious observer was moved to paint a word picture of us as others see us at such times. The piece appeared in the Long Beach Independent newspaper and was written by Mr. Larry Collins, Sr.:

WILSON "PHONY" ISSUE

Senators and Congressmen are not always the amiable individuals they appear when in their home districts seeking votes. When they are in Washington they often become prima donnas and assume dignities which do not fit their characters. It is natural because in Washington they are almost completely surrounded by public officeholders and lobbyists. All these people are seeking something from Congress so they flatter the elected officials who can give them beneficial treatment. It takes a strong character to remain modest and understanding under such flattery and in such an atmosphere.

It seems, to this writer, that the tirades against Secretary of Defense Wilson are an example of this attitude by Senators. We certainly agree that Secretary Wilson is not a good politician in that he says things no politician would say. But Wilson is a blunt, successful businessman who came up through industry from the bottom. He reached the highest industrial level in the world as head of General Motors.

When he was asked to take over the branch of government calling for great understanding of mechanical developments as well as direction of our entire defense program, he accepted. To do so he had to sell all his General Motors holdings. Those holdings have increased $2 million since he sold them. In addition he had to pay a large capital gains tax when he sold them. He took those losses because he felt it his duty, because it was a challenge to his ability and because he felt he had enough money anyhow.

Now he is under attack by a group of Senators because he was not diplomatic in referring to those among them who seek to ADD to the spending program under Wilson's direction. We capitalize ADD because it is rarely that any department of Government tells Congress to give it less money. But Wilson referred to the issue as a "phony" when in a discussion with reporters. He did not use the careful words of a politician but rather the common language of workmen or ordinary people who refer to an issue as a phony when they are convinced it is not being presented on a sincere basis.

The issue is not the words Wilson used in discussing it but rather if he is correct in saying we do not need more money for our Air Force. The Democratic Senators who are making a great issue of this have done so only since the start of the campaign. The Defense Department says we have enough money to build all the planes we need to meet any Russian threat. That department under Wilson has more information on the subject than any other source in this Nation. He is under President Eisenhower who knows how to evaluate our military strength. It therefore seems like a petty exhibition of opportunism for Senators to become so eloquent and insulated because Wilson lets slip that he thinks it a "phony" issue. The Senators certainly can find more serious issues to take up their time.

Physician, Heal Thyself

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD H. REES
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 2, 1956

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, under permission approved by the House, I am including a sermon delivered at the National Presbyterian Church in Washington, D. C., by the well-known and outstanding minister, Dr. Louis H. Evans. I commend this sermon for your reading:

PHYSICIAN, HEAL THYSELF

And He said to them, "Doubtless you will quote to me this proverb, 'Physician, heal yourself; what we have heard you did at Capernaum, do here also in your own country.'" (Luke 4: 23.)

That was a fair challenge: "We expect you to do here only what you were supposed to have done in another land. If you cannot do it in your own country, how do you expect us to believe it can be done elsewhere?" This is the attitude of mind which we also meet on every hand today, just as Christ met it in Nazareth.

What, more than anything else, does America symbolize for you? What is your concept of her mission? In what way can she give her greatest service to God and man?

Do you think of her as a great giant, limbed with power, standing like a mighty colossus astride the continents and seas—a Nation armed to the teeth for military warfare?

Is America a gigantic factory with its humming machinery, its whirring wheels, its citizens madly burning incense to the goddess Production?

Is America a great family hearthside, where its people find safety, peace, and plenty?

Or is America, to you, a good Samaritan, stooping over a weak and bleeding world;

making humanity healthier and happier, using its strength in helping to bear the infirmities of the weak?

Possibly America is all these things—military colossus, gigantic factory, peaceful family—but surely its whole development, from its Christian founding to its present position of leadership among the nations—evolves almost inevitably into a clear picture of its mission: to serve mankind with its strength and love.

Can we achieve this objective as a Nation? Surely we can—but not without help.

The Apostle Paul was fortunate in having with him on many of his travels a very close friend whose name was Luke. In the fourth chapter of Paul's second letter to Timothy he wrote, rather pathetically, "Demas * * * has gone to Thessalonica * * * Alexander the coppersmith did me great harm * * * Luke alone is with me. * * * But the Lord stood by me." In trying hours, Paul had two loyalties upon which he could depend: the Lord and Luke, the physician—his God and his friend.

That trio is sufficient for any need. Give a man—or a country—God and a friend, and he can see anything through.

Is it possible for America to aid God in this classic combination; as physician and friend, to bring healing to man in body, mind and soul? Can America be friend and physician to a stricken world in this Pauline day? For this is certainly a Pauline world.

In II Corinthians, 11: 23, Paul describes his own difficulties: "In labors more abundant"—and what a parallel this verse strikes today. This is an age of workshops and toil, of men sweating to rebuild their cities from the rubble of war. It is a day of labor battalions.

"In death oft"—and how often death seems to strike. One writer estimated that in the first 30 years of the 20th century, more people died of war and other violence, of pestilence and famine, than in the previous 800 years.

"In perils by the heathen"—certainly we are threatened by paganism and the heathenism of communism's great atheistic forces, which surround us and sometimes infiltrate us.

"Thrice was I beaten with rods"—the backs of men were never so scarred as by the rods of the dictators, or their souls so bloody with man's brutality to man.

"Thrice was I shipwrecked." We see governments, ideologies, movements of all kinds suffering shipwreck all along the shores of times. Perhaps no other century has recorded the wreckage of so many would be utopias and broken dreams as the one to which we belong.

"In perils by mine own countrymen"—treason in one's own land. Subversives, spies, counterspies, informers, seem to abound these days; it is difficult for man to have faith in his fellows.

"Once was I stoned." The rocks of abuse today are hurled by tyrants and false accusers until men are dizzy and bewildered under their bludgeonings.

"In perils of robbers." There are exorbitant taxes the world around. Eight hundred thousand Arabs have been robbed of their homes. Thieves, singly and in whole armies, steal everything from men's earnings to entire art galleries and church treasurers.

"Bring my cloak." This was a colloquial way of saying, "they have taken my shirt." Paul had nothing left.

"But," he said, "Luke is with me * * * and the Lord stood by me." Can we be Luke, the physician and friend, to an ailing world?

If America is to do this, certain things must prepare the way. Primarily, we must recognize that the spiritual need of the world is very real. The cries of men's hearts today are largely spiritual cries. We have passed from an age dominated purely by reason and science to a day of the religious, the spiritual, and a very real desire for the mystical and personal experience. If we are to meet the needs of the world, we must change our techniques from those of material accomplishment, and the emphasis must be more on spiritual service to mankind. This is the area in which America can offer its greatest gift to the world—in the field of the spiritual.

Secondly, we must meet the challenge first given so long ago in Nazareth: "Physician, heal thyself." Paul said he feared "lest preaching to others, I myself should become a castaway." It is not unusual for the cobbler's children to go without soles on their shoes. Eli, the high priest of Israel, who helped many men, failed to help his own sons; they died in rebellion against God.

America herself is sick—spiritually sick. There are 10,000 communities in this country without a regular minister or church of their own—without a single fort in the spiritual wilderness wherein they may protect their souls. There are 27 million boys and girls in America without religious education. That is spiritual malnutrition—starving for the vitamins of God.

We have chastized other nations for war crimes—but who is there to chastize us? The nation that wins a war is in a more dangerous spiritual position than the nation that loses it. The defeated nation is likely to cry out in humility, "God, why were we defeated? Name our sins; cure us; have mercy upon us." But the conquerors are likely to conceive of themselves as being God's darlings, as being worthy of victory in every phase of their endeavor.

While other nations are punished, who will punish us for our sins? If we merely cry out against the faults of other nations and do not confess and cure our own, we may find ourselves in the position of the woman who was asked, "Why did you fire your maid?"; to which she replied, indignantly, "Well, I caught her stealing my Waldorf-Astoria towels."

It is not enough for America to spend her spiritual power in fighting the sins of other nations; she must first use it to cooperate with God in erasing her own. Such a preliminary cleanup is essential to the success of her mission.

I never knew a physician to go into the operating room without "scrubbing up" beforehand. If America is to assist Christ, the Great Physician, in operating upon the soul of the world and in helping to cure its ills, then America must "scrub up" first.

Some time ago I said to President Eisenhower, "Mr. President, I doubt if any man ever came to the presidential office with more hopes and prayers behind him than you." He replied, "Thank you, Dr. Evans. I believe what we need now is not so much political genius as inner integrity. May God give it to all of us."

It is something like this on which we must take hold. America must cry, "Create in me a clean heart, O God, and renew a right spirit within me." Then we will be on our way.

A great obligation confronts us regarding the spiritual as well as the physical health of our commonwealth children. In Puerto Rico there are approximately 600 people per square mile—that is 10 times as many as in the State of Texas. Until a short time ago, one-third of the people of Puerto Rico lived in some of the worst slums in the world. Now, thank God, we are beginning to mend the situation, but for a long time it did not seem that we cared.

Cuba has been a free country since 1935, and yet, more or less, has continued to lean upon us spiritually. Nearly two-thirds of the religious education of the island is now in our spiritual charge—yet one-tenth of the people there are without any adequate religious instruction.

On one of our western reservations, fewer than six Indians are not addicted to the peyote drug. Alaska has two pressing problems. The first is tuberculosis, the death rate for which is 14 times greater than the rate for the States proper. The second problem is alcoholism. Many of the natives of Alaska spend 3 months of the year fishing, and the remaining 9 months in idleness. Much of this idle time is spent in poolrooms and bars. One ship flying the American flag that entered an Alaskan harbor had whisky as four-fifths of its cargo.

The world is watching America to see whether or not the principles of brotherhood are working here. While in the African jungle with my two sons a few years ago, a native chief said to me, "Dr. Evans, don't bother wasting money on sending missionaries over here to preach the Fatherhood of God if you cannot live the brotherhood of man at home. After all, if you do not love the minority at home, you cannot pretend you love the majority here." I shall never forget that. Africa is watching to see how America treats the black man within her own borders.

The Chinese Communists are suggesting that their people examine the way 28,000 orientals are treated in San Francisco. Our love for the rest of the oriental races will be judged by the way we treat these people in our own country.

This sort of challenge is both subtle and forceful. America, you must heal yourself of the disease of race prejudice.

Again, if America is to aid in ministering to the world spiritually, she must see to it that the spirit captains her technology. We must remember that "out of the heart are the issued of life." This is quite a definite change from some 25 years ago, when the technologist was hailed as our messiah. If we worshiped at all, then, we did so in the laboratory; the smell of chemicals was our incense; the table of valences and mathematical charts were our creeds. We were admonished to "learn all the science we can and have confidence in ourselves, and that will be the only religion a man under 40 years of age will need." We learned all the science we could, and had great confidence in ourselves—and now look at us.

Fortunately, the scientists are now becoming in a sense our spiritual evangelists. Whenever I visit a university I nearly always have a meeting or informal talk with its men of science, and usually it is not very long before one or more of them will get into a sort of sermon on the absolute necessity of our souls catching up with our brains in this material age.

For quite a while our goddess was production. Businessmen in America spent more time before breakfast studying the market reports than they did in reading their Bibles; what they had was becoming far more important to them than what they were.

We are of course thankful for our ability to produce things, but this, after all, simply adds to our spiritual problems. We were grateful for the invention of the cotton gin, but out of this came industrial slavery and many of the problems of labor. We were proud of our production and assembly lines, but with them came endless tenements, and dead-end kids. Millions of people rushed into the cities to answer the call of the factories for production, and gave rise to tremendous problems of secularism. Many a working man said, "Religion is like shoe polish; women and children like it, but it doesn't mean much to a man in boots," and most men wore boots.

Many things can happen to the souls of men, and of their children, in great metropolitan industrial areas. One of our national missions workers reports that in the McKim Community House in Baltimore, a Sunday-school teacher said, "The scope of our opportunity can be judged by the fact that in my teen-age Sunday school class, 2 of the girls have been prostitutes, 3 boys are

on parole from training schools, and 2 others are on probation from juvenile court."

It is not enough that our factories turn out good machines and wares; our Nation must turn out good men and women. We are reminded by our urban religious and industrial leaders alike that we must keep God in the city, and the church on the busy metropolitan corner. As never before we need churches and community houses in our great industrial areas, and the workers in them to touch the soul of labor. We need still more workers to go into the residential districts, the suburbs and the rural areas. Dr. Marshall Scott said, "The future of our church in the next generation depends largely on how effectively we minister to the wage earners in this generation." This is certainly a considerable part of our problem.

One of the things of which we must beware is the comfort of a false optimism, something we might define as the opiate of relativity. This is a dangerous drug; it is a coverup, not a cure for anything. By opiate of relativity I mean the putting of ourselves at ease and imagining the disease is cured, simply by comparing our own yesterdays with our own today.

This danger is particularly great in the field of evangelism. The Presbyterian denomination, a few years ago, was very gratified to discover that as a result of the new live movement of our church the years 1948 and 1949 showed the largest increase in church membership of any 2 years in our history. Also, while the population of the United States has increased 22 percent in the last 20 years, the membership of all churches has increased 44 percent.

This might give us some reason for elation, although it is not the recognized, organized churches that have made the largest of these gains. The sects and cults seemed to have greatly out-passioned us. We must remember, however, that despite these seemingly impressive figures there are more people outside the church, numerically speaking, in America right now, than ever before in our history—even though, percentagewise, a larger number are members of a church.

It is comforting—if only to a degree—that while some years ago it required 28 people a whole year to win one other person to the Kingdom of Christ, it now takes only 20 members to do the same. As I say, that is a somewhat encouraging thing—until we compare ourselves with other movements. One Communist sets himself up as a cell, and singlehandedly wins 25 to his cause—but it takes 20 Christians to win one to the Kingdom of God. You see, here again we are being out-passioned.

By thus comparing the figures of 1 year with those of another, we dream happily under the opiate of relativity, but by comparing ourselve in the same way with the gains of other movements, we see immediately the actual anemia of our efforts.

It has been said that "as long as there remains a gap between what you are and what you aspire to be, you have to press forward. When you cease to advance, you begin to fall back." We may paraphrase this somewhat by saying that as long as there remains a gap between what we aspire to and what the Communists aspire to, we must press forward or be pushed back.

The same thing can be applied in the realm of America's stewardship. This, too, can be a matter of relativity. A few years ago our Board of National Missions registered a 25 percent increase in 1 year's giving as against a 17 percent increase the year before. But when we think of what others—less blessed—do, our progress, relatively, does not seem so vital. In 1 desperate year the people in the West Indies were told our church budget would have to be cut. These poverty-stricken people increased their giving 10 percent. In poor Puerto Rico they increased their giving 26 percent; in Cuba, 37 percent; in the Dominican Republic, 66 percent. In comparison with this, our own "increase" looked pale.

There was a period when the per capita giving in our denomination increased from $39 to $50 per year. This seems startling—but $50 is a tithe of only $500, and our average individual yearly income is certainly more than that. It has been said that the Indians of the Northwest are more impressed by the Mormon system of giving than by the Presbyterian system of asking. In the early days, the Israelites gave to God 10 percent of all they had, and sometimes in the special years of heave and jubilee offerings they gave as much as 30 percent. America is giving less than 2 percent to God.

Statistics, of course, can be frightening enough, but this story frightened me more: A man was standing on a street corner when he was approached by another man, who asked him for some money for a meal. The first man said, "I won't give you money, because I don't know how you would spend it, but I will buy you a meal. Come with me." The second man said, "No; I'm busy and you're busy. Just give me the money, and I'll go my way and you go yours." The first man said, "No, come with me and I'll buy you the meal." After some hesitancy, the beggar went with him, and they ate together. The second man ate avidly; evidently he was half-starved. At the conclusion of the meal the first man said, "Tell me—what were you going to do with that money? You weren't going to spend it on food, were you?" The second man replied, "No, I was not. I'll tell you what I was going to do with it. You have been kind to me, and I'll be honest with you. You see, I'm a Communist. Two blocks down the street we have a printshop. We have type all set up, but we couldn't get paper because we ran out of money. Three of my comrades and I vowed we'd go without eating for 4 days and use the money for our meals to buy paper. We have to get the message out."

Did you hear that? "We have to get the message out!" Have any of my listeners gone without a meal, for one day, in order to "get the message out?" Mussolini was able to bring the women of Italy to such a state of enthusiasm for a new Roman Empire that they stripped the rings from their fingers and the jewels from their necks, and gave them to him for war. How long a time has it been since any woman of the church has done this for the Kingdom Cause?

That is the difficulty; these other movements both "out-passion" and "out-purse" us. Let us remember that any given moment in history, that moment belongs to the passionate and to the dedicated. Sometimes too few of us are either one.

Am I pessimistic? God forbid! An intern once came to his superior and said, "I am sick of human nature; I am fed up with odors and diseases and putrefaction and death. I am so sick of humanity I could destroy it. What do you do, doctor, to keep going?" The older physician replied, "Young man, I always look at humanity from a curative standpoint—there is something we can do about."

No, I am not a pessimist; I am an optimist—because I look at humanity from the curative standpoint, also; there is something we can do about it. Christ is here and He can use us. While others may shout in despair, "See what this world has come to!" you and I can cry out in faith, "See Who has come to this world!"

More people than ever before are now coming to the church—the doctor's office. It is our opportunity to make the prescription clear, and this is no time for stammering. We have the cure for the world's ills, and it is up to us to apply it. We must not be daunted by the world's fears and frustrations; we must have but one fear now, and that is the fear of failing God. John Foster Dulles reminded us that "Faith is as contagious as fear." Let us not forget this.

Let us remember also that while we might not know what tomorrow holds, we do know who holds tomorrow! This is the basis of our faith.

Let us pray: O God, bless America, and use her. May this world see her bending over it like a good Samaritan. May we be feared by all who do evil, and loved by all who do good—but above all, may we be loved. Teach us, in turn, how to love, for if we do not learn this, Thou wilt take the leadership from us and give it to a nation that will love.

Enable us, then, to keep our place in Thy heart, and in the hearts of men, through Christ, our Lord. Amen.

School Encumbrance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PETER FRELINGHUYSEN, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 3, 1956

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, in the Washington Post of July 3, 1956, there appeared the following thoughtful editorial:

SCHOOL ENCUMBRANCE

The school construction bill, now under debate in the House, is expected to encounter one of its crucial tests today when an effort is made to saddle it with the Powell rider. This rider, sponsored by Representative A. C. POWELL, of New York, is an effort to mount desegregation on the program of Federal aid to education. We believe that desegregation must be accomplished with all deliberate speed in conformity with the Supreme Court's mandate. And we believe that Federal aid is necessary to bring about an urgently needed revitalization of the country's public school systems. Nevertheless, there are two compelling considerations which, in our judgment, make a coupling of these aims in a single piece of legislation altogether undesirable. First, there is a pragmatic consideration. The plain fact of the matter is that an anti-segregation rider will give the school-aid bill more weight than it can successfully carry. This rider evokes two forms of bitter opposition to the bill. It invokes opposition from all those who believe that desegregation should not be hurried and from those who insist that Federal aid means Federal intervention in the management of school affairs. If the Powell rider should be adopted by the House, it would be met by a filibuster in the Senate. And it is improbable that the Senate leadership would have the toughness to break that filibuster. Thus neither education nor integration would be advanced.

But beyond this pragmatic consideration, there is, we are convinced, a strong case to be made against the Powell rider on grounds of principle. The Supreme Court wisely decided that the change which is commanded in the pattern of the public schools should be made at a pace in conformity with local needs and circumstances—swiftly where feasible, more slowly where the adjustment would be more difficult. Moreover, the Court provided—again, most wisely, we think—that compliance with its mandate should be judged by Federal district courts familiar with local situations. To make the allocation of Federal funds in aid of education contingent upon a finding of compliance by the Commissioner of Education would be to transfer

judgment from the judicial branch to the executive branch of Government. Thus the Powell rider would serve to thwart rather than to support the Supreme Court.

It is a fact that four States have openly defied the Supreme Court, and it goes deeply against the grain to give them money from the National Treasury which they may use to further that defiance. Nevertheless, it would be the part of wisdom, we believe, to give them the fullest opportunity voluntarily to accept a change which the rest of the Nation is embracing and, if they continue to refuse, to let them stand alone and isolated. Patience will enlist on the side of law and order and progress many who would be alienated by peremptoriness. Aid to education uncomplicated by any irrelevant encumbrances is an immediate imperative. It ought to be adopted by Congress—by itself and on its own merits—for the sake alike of the schools, of civil rights and of national unity.

Federal Giveaway Pays Off in Federal Income

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER NORBLAD
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 3, 1956

Mr. NORBLAD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include herewith a very interesting editorial by Jim MacLean in the Oregon City Enterprise Courier regarding the tidelands legislation:

FEDERAL GIVEAWAY PAYS OFF IN FEDERAL INCOME

Whenever somebody gives away something you can rest assured it isn't just "for free." We've often wondered whether philanthropists were really behind giveaway programs, or that ax grinders were hiding their real motives under the spurious smile of "with the compliments of the house, if you please." What brings this to mind is the bitterest of issues with respect to the control of the United States tidelands which featured so prominently in the 1952 presidential campaign.

One of the first steps taken by the Congress was to pass legislation giving the States control of tidelands out to the historic State boundaries. The Federal Government was given control of the waters beyond these boundaries. The hope was that this dual system of State-Federal control would provide maximum development of these vast oil reserves. Yet, many critics labeled the Tidelands Act a Federal giveaway.

Those who took this viewpoint might be interested in recent figures issued by the Interior Department and compiled by Business Week for June 2. In the 1947–52 period, when the Federal Government claimed sole control over the tidelands, it received less than $10 million in payments. Companies couldn't know whether the States or Federal Government would ultimately control the area, so they stayed out. Since Congress cleared up the confusion in 1953 with the Tidelands Act, the Government has received $260 million for drilling rights.

And this is only a starter. The Government receives a 12½ percent royalty on every barrel of oil produced. As the flow of oil increases—estimated to reach 400,000 barrels a day by 1960—the Government take will fatten proportionately. The inference, of course, is that under the Tidelands Act all of the people of all of the States stand to benefit, whereas under private or State control, only those States possessed of oil-rich tidelands would profit.

The Republic of the Philippines Celebrates Its 10th Anniversary of Independence, July 4, 1956

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ADAM C. POWELL, JR.
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 3, 1956

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, I wish to extend sincere felicitations to the people of the Philippines, President Ramon Magsaysay, and His Excellency Carlos P. Romulo, Ambassador of the Philippines, on the occasion of the celebration of the 10th aniversary of independence of the Republic of the Philippines, July 4, 1956.

After 4 centuries of alien rule, the Philippines emerged as the first free and democratic republic in the world after the Second World War. The Philippines is a nation founded on democratic principles. The Constitution and laws of the United States of America were inspiring, decisive factors in the development of political institutions in the Republic.

The unfortunate occupation of the Philippines during the war interrupted its constructive progress toward nationhood. After the war, the Philippines Government was saddled with crushing problems of rehabilitation and reconstruction. Under the energetic leadership of President Magsaysay, the Filipino people have embarked on a concerted effort to achieve peace and prosperity at home as well as security from external dangers. Although the war wrought havoc to the economy, the nation since that time has displayed amazing recuperative powers. The economy is being rapidly modernized and diversified.

As an independent country, the Republic of the Philippines has pursued a course of friendship and understanding among the free nations of the world. The Republic sums up the cornerstones of its policy in dealing with other nations thusly:

First, loyalty to freedom and democracy and therefore against communism; second, adherence to the principles of the United Nations Charter and active participation in United Nations activities; third, espousal of the cause of non-self-governing peoples and protection of minorities; fourth, friendship toward the United States as the foremost and sincere champion of peace and economic well-being; and fifth, closer cultural, political, and social ties with our Asia neighbors.

President Magsaysay's statement on the Asia foreign policy of the Philippines is significant and merits the attention of all freedom-loving people:

The Philippine Government stands for the right of self-determination and independence of all Asian nations; for closer cultural and economic relations and mutual cooperation with freedom loving Asian countries as a group and within the framework of the Charter of the United Nations; and for the proposition that a return to colonialism, of which the last vestiges are now disappearing from Asia, shall not be tolerated in any form.

The colonialism that threatens Asia today is world communism. Nations which have won their freedom from old-style colonialism now face the danger of losing that freedom. A good defense against this threat is a healthy Asian trend to self-determination. We support this kind of nationalism as a rallying point for all free Asians against the forces of aggression and subversions.

The Filipino people can best serve the cause of freedom and democracy by cooperating actively with other Asian peoples in the achievement and maintenance of political independence, economic stability, and social justice. We cannot contribute to that cause if we isolate ourselves from other freedom-loving Asian States and are suspected by them of ulterior motives of insincerity in our relations with them. Our Asian policy must, therefore, seek to remove all causes of distrust.

To achieve our goals, underdeveloped countries in this region need the assistance of the more advanced economies and that each Asian country should be free to decide for itself whether or not it desires such assistance as well as the conditions it believes compatible with its sovereignty and economic objectives.

I salute the Republic of the Philippines as it embarks upon a new year of national life and pray for its people continued progress.

The Secret Place: A Prayer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE M. GRANT
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 3, 1956

Mr. GRANT. Mr. Speaker, the poem The Secret Place: A Prayer was 1 of 2 lyrics selected by the poet laureate of Alabama and awarded honorable mention at the recent Alabama writers' conclave. This poem was written by Dr. P. Dan Hudson, chief medical officer of the Veterans' Administration regional office, Montgomery, Ala. It is fitting that this poem be published in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, as July 4, Independence Day, reminds us that in the spirit of our Founding Fathers' faith and fortitude America today is great and strong because America is free. And we are free from want and fear because we pray:

THE SECRET PLACE: A PRAYER

"He that dwelleth in the secret place of the most high shall abide under the shadow of the Almighty." (Psalms 91: 1.)

The woodland path of yellowed leaves winds
through the fronded dark.
The sunlight sprinkles from above, like rain
on weathered bark
Of wayside trees, and sunbeams trace bright
patterns through the glade,
And the silent restful pathway where footsteps seldom strayed.

When burdens cast my spirit low, this quiet
path shares peace:
The sylvan temple's muted aisles give solace
and release.
For I have prayed along the way, and the
secret of the glen
Reveals the Lord's peace and good will,
sketched on the hearts of men.

—*P. Dan Hudson, M. D.*

My War With the Mob

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PETER FRELINGHUYSEN, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 3, 1956

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I should like to include the fifth in a series of articles by Victor Riesel which appeared in the Washington Sunday Star of July 1, 1956, entitled "My War With the Mob":

MY WAR WITH THE MOB—BIG AND SMALL LABOR CRUSADERS PROVE THAT HOODLUMS CAN BE GIVEN THE BOUNCE

(By Victor Riesel)

CHAPTER V

The mob can be fought.

Certainly there will be casualties. Men have been killed and wounded in the rolling war on the rackets. But you really are not forced to decide whether you want to be a live slave or a dead hero. Many have stood up and have survived.

Back in the Murder, Inc. days, the men—and women, too—who fought back outlived Dutch Schultz, Arnold Rothstein, Legs Diamond, Lepke and their "troops." It took just a little courage, such as the hatters union leader, Alex Rose, found in several hundred hat workers one day in the thirties.

The hatters were mad—fighting mad. They had heard that the mob was planning to move in on one of their big shops. Word was that the hoods were under orders to take over physically early the next day.

Mr. Rose, a veteran of Allenby's Near Eastern Army, could have hired thugs and shot it out. Instead, he called together 200 hat workers, men and women. They agreed to march on the threatened shop.

Hoods back down

The next morning they deployed on the sidewalk in front of the factory entrance. When the gun-toting hoods arrived, they found the middle-aged hat workers standing solid showing Ghandi-like passive resistance. There was tough talk from the hoods. But the rank-and-file union members stood steady.

The mobsters had two alternatives. They could have mowed down scores of men and women. Or they could walk back to the fleabag hotels in which they were quartered while awaiting calls for $15-a-day sluggings. They walked away. The hatters have not been bothered since.

The mob never pushes its luck. It never goes in for unprofitable business. When the hatters made it look unprofitable, they left them alone. But this did not stop the union's fight on the mobs. Only a few weeks ago, Mr. Rose persuaded his union's annual convention to call for a "labor FBI," a special agency to "get after racketeering elements in organized labor." Mr. Rose's proposal calls for trained investigators and the establishment of a clearinghouse of anticrime information.

The Hatters Union is one of the smallest in the AFL-CIO. Mr. Rose's colleague, David Dubinsky, leader of the powerful, 450,000-member International Ladies Garment Workers Union, had a far tougher problem.

David and Goliath

The Communists had brought the big-time mobs into the needle trades. By the time Mr. Dubinsky took over the presidency of the ILGWU, the hoods held artillery positions in the industry which only a political atomic bomb could shake loose.

Little David took on the Goliath. Back in 1940, Mr. Dubinsky decided to hit the crime cartel head on. He was the first to introduce an antiracket resolution at an AFL convention. Joe Fay, of the operating engineers, took personal insult, and that evening Fay swung at Mr. Dubinsky in the bar of the Roosevelt Hotel in New Orleans.

Fay did not quite connect, and the two men were soon rolling the length of the long lobby. That night bodyguards paced outside Mr. Dubinsky's room, while the late AFL president, William Green, fretted over all this fuss in public. When Mr. Dubinsky got to the convention floor the next morning, the resolution was as watered down as the third drink in a Burbon Street pub in New Orleans.

But that was only the beginning. Mr. Dubinsky has fought the mobs for years. He was the first to urge Government aid and even laws which might be helpful in beating back the mob. Some years ago I suggested he see Joe Kaitz, one of the top anticrime fighters in the land. They talked. Soon afterwards, Mr. Dubinsky set up his own anticrime unit headed by an investigator suggested by Mr. Kaitz.

Funds untouched

As a result, the hundreds of millions of dollars in the many funds of the International Ladies Garment Workers' Union have been untouched, and seven union employees found guilty of unethical practices were heaved out.

At the recent ILGWU convention, Mr. Dubinsky and AFL-CIO President George Meany lashed out at union men who use their locals and positions to set up or cut into profitable businesses.

Mr. Dubinsky's fight is far from over and he is the first to admit it. But he is fighting back. There are others. There is Joe Curran, leader of the National Maritime Union. There is Paul Hall, of the Seafarers International Union, who has stood up against the mobs of the waterfront and against the narcotics smugglers.

For his trouble the mob sent a killer with a shotgun to track Mr. Hall down. But the police moved in first.

Mr. Curran was the first to threaten to resign from the AFL-CIO's ethical practices committee if it didn't move fast against the mob. In this he was backed by Jack Potofsky, leader of the Men's Clothing Workers Union.

REUTHER FOUGHT BOOKIES

Walter Reuther took on a good-sized mob when he began driving the bookies out of the giant auto plants. This mob fought back. Its take ran as high as $20 million a year in the giant factories.

The auto union worked with the employers by telling members that any rank-and-file duespayer or shop steward fired for being one of the gambling ring would not be protected by the United Auto Workers.

As Mr. Reuther put it recently: "The kind of free labor movement that we believe in must make leadership a sacred trust and not an opportunity to feather one's nest and make a fast buck. If these people want to get rich, if they want to make a fast easy buck, that's their business, but we must insist that they do it outside of the American labor movement and not inside the American labor movement."

But these men are the national leaders of labor—the publicized ones. There are many unsung crusaders inside labor who battle the crooks quietly.

COURT HEARS COMPLAINTS

There is a little fellow with tall courage by the name of Sal Hoffman, leader of the Upholsterers Union. Some years ago he set up a special court inside the union to which the rank and filers can come with complaints if anybody moves against their union rights.

This court has on it a panel of outstanding public figures. Any union member who wants to appeal any decision of any official or board of the union can come before the court. On it sit Judge Curtis Bok, of the Philadelphia Common Pleas Court; Paul Herzog, former National Labor Relations Board Chairman and assistant dean of Harvard's School of Public Administration; Prof. Nathan Feinsinger, of the University of Wisconsin; Prof. Archibald Cox, of Harvard; the Reverend Leo C. Brown, of St. Louis University; the Reverend Dennis Comey, of St. Joseph's College; Dr. Joseph D. Lohman, of the Illinois Probation Commission; J. B. Gillingham, of the University of Washington; and Dr. Clark Kerr, chancellor of the University of California.

There are rank and filers such as my good friends Bill Wilkens and Pete Batalias, who were on the air with me the night I was attacked by an acid hurler and who had to have police protection while attending their union's convention in Chicago. They have contacted other rebels in other cities to fight on a national front against the toughs and the fronts for ex-convicts in the Operating Engineers.

Kicked in stomach

This is a union which has this country by the throat. A union whose executive board sat quietly by when an older member came to it for justice and one official kicked him in the stomach. The victim of the kick survived, too. He went back home to fight. He calls me from time to time to report his progress.

Let me not pass without mentioning rank and file longshoremen who risked their lives by rallying to the Rev. John Corridan's fight on the New York docks.

Just as the terror is transcontinental, so is the fight for decency inside labor.

But how many kicks in the stomach will it take before the rank and file of those unions which are like slave centers stand up and roar defiance? When will they demand action from their national leaders in Washington, from the Government, from their local district attorneys and from the police?

The mob can be fought. It takes guts. Like the men and women who stood with arms folded against the hoods in front of the hat company back in the 1930's.

Rank and file must act

But remember this. Certainly labor's national headquarters has responsibility. Certainly the Government, the district attorneys, the police have responsibility. But when all is said and reported, so does the rank and file of American labor. It must make up its mind to stand up like men or crawl before the manicured mob.

Certainly there are decent men leading millions in American labor. But there also are convicted rapists, extortionists, hijackers, loan sharks, bank robbers, cop killers, professional sluggers, gunmen, knifers, narcotic smugglers, alien smugglers, bookies, tax dodgers, muggers and perverts. These are just a few taken from the Nation's police blotters.

And unless the rank and file fights them, the modern mob may some day take over all American labor, just as cancer infiltrates the body.

Support needed

Where are the men willing to give their decent leaders the support needed to return labor to the idealism which motivated the old cigarmaker, Samuel Gompers? Gompers used to go to the AFL headquarters many years ago in a pair of frayed bedroom slippers because he couldn't afford to buy shoes, although he was president of the organization.

The AFL headquarters was not a marble palace across from the White House but an old shack. And the AFL president's desk was an empty wooden box.

That financial poverty isn't necessary today but neither is a poverty of idealism. Leaders of American labor have to fight for decency. And rank-and-file union members must rally behind their decent officials to throw off the yoke of the crime cartel.

Farm Stabilizing Needed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. COYA KNUTSON
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 3, 1956

Mrs. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to have inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the enclosed article from the Minneapolis Star of May 29, published in Minneapolis, Minn. This article quoted one of the outstanding businessmen, and the board of which he is chairman, at a speech given to the St. Paul Kiwanis Club, of St. Paul, Minn. These men in business know that the problems of the farmer are the problems of the entire country.

The article follows:

THOMSON SAYS FARM STABILIZING NEEDED

A Minneapolis banker, J. Cameron Thomson, chairman of the board of Northwest Bancorporation, told St. Paul businessmen Thursday that farmers have a right to expect effective Government action to promote greater income stability for them.

Speaking at the St. Paul Kiwanis Club luncheon, he said that it should be a permanent part of the agricultural policy of this Nation "to promote income stability on the farm."

"There are a lot of ways to do this, but they boil down to Government action to iron out sharp and temporary price variations in key farm products."

Pointing out the key word is "temporary," Thomson said it does no good to support the price of wheat, for example, at a level that encourages production over the long run to increase faster than consumption.

"We'd quickly be back in the old surplus mess again. Over the long run, the market must be the primary guide for farm prices.

"But just as Government, through monetary and fiscal policy, acts to curb extreme swings in the business cycle, so Government should take specific, special action to curb extreme fluctuations in farm prices."

There are two techniques at hand for this job, Thomson said. The Government can buy or give loans on crops in connection with a storage problem.

When there is a temporary drop in demand for an unusually large crop, stocks in Government hands would be increased; when demand or production is back to normal, stocks would be reduced.

Or, he said, the Government can make production payments to farmers representing some part of the difference between the actual market price and the price that would prevail under conditions of high employment and normal yields.

"In theory, while production payments interfere less with market price-making forces, there isn't much to choose between production payments and price supports as tools for promoting income stability."

It all depends on the level chosen to support prices and the crops which are made eligible for support.

"It will be people who will have to make these decisions and the best assurance we can have of fair and effective action is to be found in the caliber of the people chosen to do the deciding."

Obviously, he declared, they should be people close to the farm community and capable of discriminating between long-run benefit and short-run political advantage.

To this end, said Thomson, who is vice chairman of the board for the Committee for Economic Development, "we have recommended the establishment of an agricultural stabilization board."

Members, he said, would be chosen by the President for long terms of service after the fashion of Federal Reserve Board members. The Secretary of Agriculture might serve as chairman, and the Board would report to Congress at least once a year.

One of its main responsibilities would be to determine the support level in time of temporary drops in demand and to give broad supervision to the operation of any Government storage program.

The Board might also designate those crops eligible for support, Thomson said, adding that a nonpartisan, decision-making authority like this is needed to insure that we get effective action to stabilize farm incomes.

Republican Corruption

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 2, 1956

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the following item by Drew Pearson, which appeared in the Washington Post of July 2, 1956, typifies how this administration fails to protect the taxpayers' money. But then, what can we expect from a big business Government run for the benefit of big business?

The article follows:

REFUNDS UNPAID ON CHEESE DEAL

(By Drew Pearson)

Full story can now be told how the Kraft Foods Co. cashed in on Secretary of Agriculture Benson's cheese deal, then tipped off its customers so that they, too, could profit at the taxpayers' expense.

Kraft Vice President A. W. Sigmund was a member of Benson's Dairy Advisory Committee, which recommended that the Agriculture Department buy cheese from processors, then sell it back 3 cents a pound cheaper.

As it turned out, the cheese never left the processors' warehouse, and Uncle Sam simply paid them a generous profit for a paper transaction. The program's stated purpose was to help the dairy farmers, not the cheese companies. But the latter got the benefit.

The same Kraft vice president who acted as adviser for Benson's Dairy Committee and joined in recommending this Government giveaway wasted no time taking advantage of it. Before the regulations were even issued, Sigmund wrote to four of Kraft's biggest customers telling them how they could get in on the windfall.

These were: National Biscuit Co., which collected $108,693 from the Agriculture Department; H. J. Heinz Co., which made $24,865; United Biscuit Co., which made $12,062; and Campbell Soup Co., which tried to sell and buy back 5 million pounds of cheese but never closed the deal.

By this time, Kraft was behaving in a taxpayer-be-hanged, get-in-on-the-gravy manner. The company notified seven small customers in New York, Massachusetts, New Jersey, Maryland, and the District of Columbia how to make a quick profit in cheese. These 7 firms made a total of $18,171 at the expense of the taxpayers.

Kraft also sent letters to 11 retail customers—grocery chains, bakeries, and food companies—which made nearly $164,000 total profit.

Meanwhile, Kraft was happily peddling its own cheese to the Government and buying it back for windfall profits. In fact, the company actually collected $725,797 for 7 cheese deals that were made after the program had officially expired.

The whole cheese scandal was so fantastic that the Justice Department finally ordered the companies to give their windfall profits back to the taxpayers. It took Attorney General Brownell and Secretary of Agriculture Benson 9 months after this column first exposed the amazing cheese story exactly 1 year ago—June 24, 1955—to admit the mistake. So far, however, none of Kraft's customers has returned a dime.

Hells Canyon Frontier Opening Up to Tourists

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAMER H. BUDGE
OF IDAHO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 2, 1956

Mr. BUDGE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I include an article by Mr. Blaine Stubblefield which appeared in the Washington Post and Times Herald newspaper Sunday, July 1, 1956. This is rather a new and enlightening approach to the present controversy raging in Congress and one which I think is refreshing. Mr. Stubblefield is a native of my State and runs the river in the Hells Canyon section. He is one of the best authorities in the Nation on this area.

The article follows:

THANKS TO THOSE DAMS—HELLS CANYON FRONTIER OPENING UP TO TOURISTS

(By Blaine Stubblefield)

WEISER, Idaho.—"For 6 years our politicians have argued about Hells Canyon. Now that the Government has given the go-ahead on power development, maybe the folks who live here could put in a few words."

The quote is from Tom Chamberlin, chamber of commerce president at Weiser, Idaho, at the canyon's upper gate.

"Decision was made by the Federal Power Commission, and Idaho Power Co. is building the dams. Now Mr. and Mrs. United States wants to know if they can see the big canyon that made all the headlines.

"We are qualified to say yes. Since the controversy began, more people have been coming here each year to see the deepest gorge in the Western Hemisphere. Construction of the dams is creating additional rather than less recreation.

"This canyon is just less than 8,000 vertical feet deep from Snake River to the Idaho rim. It is walled on the Idaho side by the Seven Devils Mountains and on the Oregon side by the Wallowa Mountains.

"You have to drive 3 or 4 hours of dirt road to see this natural phenomenon. Most visitors say the inconvenience pays off in thrills 10 to 1.

"The canyon area is 170 miles northwest of Boise, and you drive by way of Weiser and Council, Idaho, or Baker, Oreg. The old mining town of Cuprum, Idaho, near the rim, is headquarters for canyon visitors.

"From Cuprum it is a 30-minute drive (up 3,000 vertical feet) to the 7,000-foot-high overlooks at Kinney Point, Horse Mountain, and Sheep Rock.

"It's 12 miles from Cuprum down the Kleinschmidt grade, one way with turnouts and a head-swimming view, to Homestead on

the river. From Homestead, white-water boats will take you for a few hours or a few days into or through the main Hells Canyon gorge, which can be seen in no other way.

"Five miles upstream from Homestead is the spectacular Oxbow Dam site, and 13 miles farther up is Brownlee Dam, not under construction, among the Nation's biggest dams. High overlooks are provided for visitors to observe the builders in action.

Oxbow and Brownlee Dams are both upstream from the main gorge—17 and 30 miles, respectively, and they offer scenic access in their own right to famous Hells Canyon proper.

"The power company's third licensed project, to be named Hells Canyon, will leave the major part of the main gorge unchanged. The tributary gorges of Hell Creek and Deep Creek, central themes in the rugged scene, both will remain untouched.

"The constant-level reservoirs created by Oxbow and Hells Canyon projects will provide unparalleled road and water access to Hells Canyon splendors. Because the water level of these reservoirs will remain virtually constant, there will be no muddy bathtub rings along the banks.

"Some rapids will be drowned out, but some of the best ones will remain. White-water boats will continue to navigate the entire gorge.

"New and better access roads will be constructed; work has already started. Some will be hard-surface highways. Idaho Power Co. is providing funds for fish and wildlife studies, and for construction of facilities to create better fishing than ever before. Because deep water is cooler, fish that never inhabited the warm Snake River will thrive in the three reservoirs, which will be progressively cooler downstream.

"The company will provide boat-launching facilities, will construct picnic and camping areas and help create a new area of recreation opportunity.

"Hells Canyon is the focal point of a vast frontier country, until recently little known to the public. This includes the wild Idaho primitive area, the Salmon River canyons across central Idaho, the scenic Payette Lakes and Payette Forest, and the Wallowa and Seven Devils Mountains, 10,000 feet high and gemmed with nearly a hundred small glacial lakes, many stocked with trout.

"Paved roads generally reach the portals of these retreats, from which travel is by horseback, jeep, boat, or bush airplane. The chamber of commerce in Weiser, Idaho, sends full information to all who inquire."

Low Blow on Polar Route

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER NORBLAD
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 3, 1956

Mr. NORBLAD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I include herewith an editorial from the Oregonian, of Portland, Oreg., regarding proposals for transpolar service from the Pacific Northwest to Europe:

LOW BLOW ON POLAR ROUTE

The proposed schedules filed by Pan American World Airways and Trans-World Airways in their applications to the Civil Aeronautics Board to fly the polar route from California to Europe, each provide for coterminal status for Portland and Seattle on 1 of 7 weekly flights each way.

United Air Lines, in its appearence at a hearing in San Francisco Tuesday, argued that CAB should eliminate the two Northwest cities from the transpolar schedules.

We do not thank United for its intervention in this regard. If there is to be an American transpolar service from Los Angeles and San Francisco, Portland wants to be in on it—even though it be for only 1 day instead of 7. The Northwest is entitled to the opportunity of showing whether or not it will support coterminal status. The rate of population and business growth in this area gives some assurance that weekly flights to London from the Northwest would have to be increased rather than eliminated.

Pan American's proposed polar schedule shows Saturday departure and Sunday arrival of planes which would bring Portland and London within 19 hours 45 minutes flying time. All flights would originate and terminate either in Los Angeles or San Francisco. Thus, no hardship would accrue to California by Northwest stops.

But should CAB heed United Air Lines, and eliminate Portland and Seattle altogether from polar flights, the chief result would be to push more Northwest-Europe passenger travel to Canadian Pacific Airlines which now is carrying a respectable volume of traffic on the polar route between Vancouver, B. C., and Europe.

Washington State Lawyers Want Social Security Coverage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RUSSELL V. MACK
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 25, 1956

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Speaker, the Washington State Bar Association recently took a post-card poll of its members on whether lawyers favored being included under the Social Security Act coverage.

This poll of Washington attorneys revealed that the lawyers of the State of Washington favor almost 2 to 1 being included under social-security coverage even on a compulsory basis.

Here are the results of the post-card vote among lawyers on social security in Washington State as reported by the Washington State Bar News, official organ of the bar association:

1. Do you favor coverage of self-employed lawyers within the Social Security Act on a voluntary basis? Yes, 1,667; no, 206; 149 not voting.

2. Do you favor coverage of self-employed lawyers within the Social Security Act on a compulsory basis? Yes, 911; no, 855; 315 not voting.

3. Do you favor complete exclusion of self-employed lawyers from the Social Security Act? Yes, 167; no, 1,432; 482 not voting.

4. If your answers above to qusetions 1 and 2 show that you favor voluntary coverage but oppose compulsory coverage, what is your choice if voluntary coverage is not obtainable? In that event do you favor: Compulsory coverage, 1,141; complete exclusion, 542; 398 not voting.

It is hoped that the United States Senate soon will pass the social-security bill which the House of Representatives passed almost 13 months ago. This bill provides social-security coverage for lawyers and for dentists.

The Late Fleet Admiral Ernest J. King, United States Navy

SPEECH
OF
HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 29, 1956

(Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, on Friday afternoon, as I watched the extremely impressive funeral procession for Fleet Admiral King as it passed in front of the United States Capitol, the thought occurred to me that this very great sailor and this distinguished admiral of our Navy was making his last voyage to the Capitol prior to leaving for Annapolis where he will rest and receive the admiration and respect of thousands upon thousands for the rest of time. Many of us remember his official calls at the Capitol during the war.

Fleet Admiral Ernest J. King was, without question, one of the great naval commanders and leaders in all history. He was our great Chief of Naval Operations during World War II and also our great Commander in Chief of the entire United States Fleet during this gigantic struggle. Taking over these two great responsibilities after Pearl Harbor when our Navy and our country suffered from one of the most devastating blows in our history, Admiral King brought a clear mind, steel courage, unshakable determination, and firm decision, not only to the United States Navy but to the Nation as a whole. His force, tremendous ability, and power of decision soon marshalled our Navy into a fighting unit that struck blow after blow after blow for victory. During his leadership he built the United States Navy into the greatest naval fighting force in the world. Throughout his long career of 59 years as a sailor and a leader of men, Admiral King distinguished himself in serving his country as the kind of a commanding officer who rises to the leadership of mankind only once in generations. Fortunate, indeed, was the United States Navy and the United States of America that when the time required a great leader he was there and in position to take command.

As I watched the impressive march of the sailors in white, the precision of the company of marines, and the performance of the great Navy and marine bands, I was deeply impressed with the solemn respect that was being shown to this wartime leader of the Navy. It seemed as if the Navy were saying, "Admiral King, you have led us through many rough and dangerous seas and it is now our great privilege and honor to lead you on your last voyage." The respect rendered by the military services was inspiring and this inspiration was almost as deep as the inspiration Adm. Ernest King gave to America in the dark days of 1941 and 1942. This inspiration will never die, for it will be always a

part of young men who follow in his footsteps as officers of our Navy.

Impressive, too, was the presence there of some of those great officers of the Navy, some of those great fighting leaders in those historic sea struggles of World War II, to pay their respects and to lead their old chief on his last voyage. There was Fleet Admiral Nimitz, Fleet Admiral Halsey, Fleet Admiral Leahy, and many, many other distinguished flag officers. They were all on deck Friday afternoon, for in their hearts they knew one of the greatest of America's fighting men and one of the greatest of our country's leaders was stepping down for all time. Admiral King would be one of the first to say that no leader can accomplish gigantic deeds without great men at his side. These men and many others have earned their place in history and were at the admiral's side to the very end.

With his place in history secure, the deeds and accomplishments of Admiral King will never cease to be important. Always he will be an inspiration to American fighting men. If the time should ever come again when our great Navy must sail into action against an enemy, somewhere ahead of the ships in the sea mist will be the image of Admiral King still leading, still commanding.

To have led the United States Navy in the greatest of human conflicts not only was a tremendous task but it was also a great privilege and a great honor. Admiral King was always proud he was an American and America will be grateful forever as a country and as a people that Admiral King commanded the United States Navy. He steered the course to victory at sea.

America is proud of its great leaders. In the days to come may America never forget the tremendous inspiration of the leadership of Admiral King. Let it be preserved through the ages for all America in the form of a fitting monument in the Nation's Capital. Already enshrined in the hearts of his countrymen, this great monument will stand as a lasting and inspiring tribute to the glory and magnificence of the Nation's wartime naval leader, Fleet Adm. Ernest J. King.

Humane Slaughter Bills

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUGH SCOTT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 26, 1956

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to state my position on several bills which are now pending before the House and Senate. These bills are H. R. 8540, H. R. 9603, and S. 1636, also known as the humane slaughter bills.

While I am sure that the authors of this legislation were prompted by humane considerations, I do not believe that they have taken into account the full significance of what these bills, if enacted into law, would do.

Passage of such legislation would make illegal the ritual slaughtering of beef by members of the Orthodox and Conservative Jewish faith which is now carried on and has been carried on for centuries past. For this reason I am definitely opposed to these measures. I do not think that Congress should pass any laws which would abridge freedom of religion or of religious practices. This legislation would also drive out of business countless numbers of beef and poultry slaughterers.

I intend to continue in my opposition to the passage of these bills so long as they involve these undesirable consequences.

Fitness Guided Washington's Judicial Appointments

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE M. GRANT
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 3, 1956

Mr. GRANT. Mr. Speaker, under date of June 25, Judge Walter B. Jones of Montgomery, Ala., in his weekly column, Off the Bench, published in the Montgomery Advertiser, wrote a most interesting article which I have the pleasure of inserting in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Judge Jones is the son of a distinguished Confederate veteran who was governor of Alamaba and also a United States district judge. Judge Jones has served for many years as a circuit judge of Montgomery County. He is president of the Jones Law School and has always taken a most active interest in social, fraternal, civic, and religious activities. He is a former national archon, or president, of Sigma Alpha Epsilon Fraternity and has held other honors too numerous to mention. He is a deep student of constitutional law, and his column is widely read. He has written many books and articles on the subject of law and also on the Confederacy:

OFF THE BENCH
(By Judge Walter B. Jones)
FITNESS GUIDED WASHINGTON'S JUDICIAL APPOINTMENTS

A few weeks ago in this column I made mention of the fact that during the past 25 years appointments by the President of the United States and confirmations by United States Senate to the Supreme Court of the United States have been made largely on the basis of politics. Political appointments have been made much oftener than have appointments to the Supreme Court been made on the basis of character and ability.

Since that time, in reading among some old books, I have found letters written by George Washington, who is well called the Father of Our Country, to the men selected by him to sit on the Supreme Court of the United States.

Hampton L. Carson, while attorney general of Pennsylvania, in 1891, wrote his history of the Supreme Court of the United States. In it he tells us that "the ink was still wet upon the signature of the President (Washington) to the Judiciary Act, when he sent to the Senate the names of the men he had selected for Chief Justice and the five Associate Justices of the Supreme Court."

Mr. Carson writes also:

"To Madison, a few days later, he expressed the utmost solicitude for drawing the first characters of the Union into the judiciary and his regret that Edmund Pendleton was too old to be appointed to the Supreme Court. For Randolph in the character of Attorney General he declared a preference to any person with whom he was acquainted of not superior abilities, from habits of intimacy with him.

"To the Judges themselves he addressed letters, stating that he considered the judicial system as the chief pillar upon which our National Government must rest; that he had thought it his duty to nominate for the high offices in that department such men as he conceived would give dignity and luster to our national character, and he flattered himself that the love which they had to their country, and a desire to promote the general happiness, would lead them to a ready acceptance of the commissions enclosed, which were accompanied by a copy of the Judiciary Act."

In his letter to the Associate Justices of the Supreme Court, written from New York, September 30, 1789, after his appointees had been confirmed by the United States Senate, President Washington said:

"Sir: I experience peculiar pleasure in giving you notice of your appointment to the office of an Associate Judge in the Supreme Court of the United States.

"Considering the judicial system as the chief pillar upon which our National Government must rest, I have thought it my duty to nominate, for the high offices in that department such men as I conceived would give dignity and luster to our national character; and I flatter myself that the love which you bear to our country, and a desire to promote general happiness, will lead you to a ready acceptance of the enclosed commission, which is accompanied with such laws as have passed relative to your office. I have the honor, etc."

President Washington's selection of John Jay to be the first Chief Justice was a wise one. Jay was rather a statesman and a jurist, than a pleader of causes, and Daniel Webster, in a speech, said that Jay's character was "a jewel in the sacred treasures of national reputation, and when the spotless ermine of the judical robe fell upon him, it touched nothing not as spotless as itself."

George Washington, in a letter written September 29, 1789, to John Rutledge, advising him of his appointment as an Associate Justice of the Supreme Court, said:

"Regarding the due administration of justice as the strongest cement of good government, I have considered the first organization of the judicial department as essential to the happiness of our citizens, and to the stability of our political system. Under this impression it has been an invariable object of anxious solicitude with me to select the fittest characters to expound the laws and dispense justice."

How upright and honorable was this determination on President Washington's part "to select the fittest characters to expound the laws and dispense justice."

And now we turn from these notable letters of the high-minded Washington to the things that were to be taken under consideration when the appointment of a Chief Justice was under consideration in 1953, the final choice being Earl Warren.

An article in the New York Times about that time tells us that even before the late Chief Justice Vinson was buried, President Eisenhower was being urged by leading Republicans to apply all sorts of different tests to the appointment—political, geographical, personal and philosophical. You will note that not one of the leading Republicans of that time urged President Eisenhower to select the "fittest characters to expound the

laws and dispense justice." Instead of taking these things into consideration, the President was urged to look West because there were no representatives of that section of the country on the Supreme Court. He was also urged to appoint Governor Dewey of New York because he was only 51 years old. The President was urged to appoint others because they had "strong personal and political claims" on him.

Many years ago Chief Justice Charles Evans Hughes said that in appointing judges to the Supreme Court of the United States, priority should be given to these considerations: "Strength of character * * * courage of conviction, sound learning, familiarity with precedents, exact knowledge and painstaking study * * *"

How good it would be for the welfare of our country if an Almighty Providence could place George Washington back in the White House a little while today, with power to make the 9 appointments to the Supreme Court. My belief is, in such case, that Washington would remove from that bench the Chief Justice and his 8 Associate Justices who sit with him there today. In their place he would appoint an entire new Court, composed of "the fittest characters to expound the laws and dispense justice."

My War With the Mob

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PETER FRELINGHUYSEN, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 3, 1956

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I should like to include the sixth in a series of articles by Victor Riesel which appeared in the Washington Star of July 2, 1956, entitled "My War With the Mob":

MY WAR WITH THE MOB—AFL–CIO HAS ACTED TO ROUT HOODLUMS, BUT MANY LABOR DEFENDERS FIGHT PROBES

(By Victor Riesel)

CHAPTER VI

I have been blinded by acid—but I can still see more clearly than those who so glandularly champion labor that they denounce automatically all crusades against the mob inside labor.

It is these decent but overzealous defenders of labor who are blind. It is they who identify all labor with the mob. It is the public crusader who carefully etches the sharp line between the underworld invaders and the honest union leaders.

What the disturbed champions of labor don't see is the danger of their outcries. Unwittingly these men become, in effect, the secret weapon of the mob. By blasting all outside forces which fight the labor underworld, they frighten off public officials, Senators, Congressmen and even governors in some States. For no ambitious political figure is willing to jeopardize his career by pushing for an investigation only to find himself later smeared as antilabor.

Congress' probes dropped

Just look at the record of State and Federal probes. I charge that at least four major congressional investigations have been dropped like hot coals because of political pressure. I have been told by investigators that they had been directed not to get too tough or bring in evidence which would force indictments.

Look at this Congress. How many probes into any cobwebbed corner of the underworld has it launched?

Why, after Senator Douglas, Democrat, of Illinois, found a score of union officials using warfare and pension funds as their own money, was his investigation permitted to die? It had one of America's top investigators, Frank Plant, a former FBI agent. Its chief counsel, Paul Cotter, was raring to dig deeper. They turned out a searing 365-page indictment of the crime cartel inside labor. The AFL–CIO executive council went through it. AFL-CIO Chief George Meaney sent it on to the ethical practices committee for action.

Yet nowhere in the Government was there $100,000 to keep the Douglas committee alive. Why?

There must be congressional probes. Otherwise the ball falls between two outfielders. The Government finds it can't handle clever criminals on any charge except income-tax evasion. So some of the worst hoods get away with sentences as short as 8 months on tax raps. There just are no laws to deal with the subtleties of the crime cartel.

Hamstrung by local laws

And we find district attorneys with no power to prosecute because they are hamstrung by local laws. Only the spotlight of a properly conducted congressional investigation can light up the murky corners.

But an even greater obstacle than ineffective laws is local political pressure. Here is where the honest leaders can move boldly. They can make it known that they would not regard an honest investigation into labor rackets as an attack on all labor.

They can say publicly that they welcome such a probe. Then, perhaps, the automatic deplorers of probes might agree that there are honest men outside labor as well as inside.

The fault is not all on the conditioned-reflex champions of labor. The fault lies, too, on the shoulders of the public defenders, the law and order forces of State, county, and municipal governments—and in Washington, as well.

If they have been listening as carefully as did the President of the United States before he became ill, they would have heard stentorian voices calling for Government help.

Three leaders speak out

Violence, corruption, and betrayal of trust by labor officials have been loudly denounced by David Dubinsky and George Meany at the recent International Ladies Garment Workers Union convention in Atlantic City. Walter Reuther struck out at the hoods before the Textile Workers Union's sessions in Washington.

Furthermore, at the most recent session of the AFL–CIO executive council, labor's high command, Mr. Meany brought in a resolution giving real police power to its ethical practices committee.

O. K., let's go. The committee, led by the truly crusading Al Hayes of the Machinists, and manned by equally courageous and honest men—Mr. Dubinsky, Jack Potofsky (Amalgamated Clothing Workers), Joe Curran (National Maritime Union) and George Harrison (Railway Clerks)—now has the power to hire a staff and become labor's FBI. And it has President Eisenhower's personal promise that it can utilize every Government facility to help it.

Can probe "muscled" unions

It can look into the 15 national unions and scores of local unions which have been "muscled." The committee can hire lawyers, investigators and researchers. It can go to any police force. It can recommend that a union be thrown out of the AFL–CIO.

It can stand up and fight. It can right the wrongs of a thousand martyrs. It can prove what so many of us believe—that regardless of our agreement or disagreement with such men as Mr. Meany and Mr. Reuther there are honest leaders in the labor movement ready to apply the same fervor and genius they use in collective bargaining, strikes and organizing drives to clean up that part of the underworld which is making a patsy out of sections of labor.

Power to map ethics code

This Ethical Practices Committee has the power to work out a code of ethics for all labor. It can demand that all union leaders maintain honor and decency in their unions.

To draw up this code so it can be hammered into philosophical shape, the committee has the Bernard Baruch of American Labor, Washington Attorney Arthur Goldberg, who believes that labor should conduct itself so ethically that it can live in a giant fish bowl. This isn't guaranteed to win him popularity in certain circles. But what price popularity? What price votes? What price compromise?

This is no fight on juvenile delinquents. This is no fight on other labor men who simply want to live by their own code. This is a fight on men who are really not of labor, who buy and sell unions just as real estate men unload parcels of land.

This is a fight on terror.

Crusade, anybody?

Community Progress Through Self-Reliance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD C. OSTERTAG
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 3, 1956

Mr. OSTERTAG. Mr. Speaker, all of us recognize the fundamental importance of keeping our country strong at the grassroots, and some of us occasionally talk about it. But until recently there has been no nationally planned and coordinated volunteer effort to do something about it.

In the National Council for Community Improvement, of which Mr. James C. Penney is chairman, this important gap is being filled. The council is dedicated to just those objectives which are essential to our freedom and independence; namely, the encouragement of greater self-reliance and community responsibility in government, and the systematic fostering and coordination of those forces which give vitality and rich meaning to community life.

Recently the council sponsored a conference here in the Nation's Capital, which was ably summed up in a closing address by its chairman, Mr. Penney.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include in the RECORD a copy of that address:

COMMUNITY PROGRESS THROUGH SELF-RELIANCE

(By James C. Penney)

Honored guests, fellow officers and members of the National Council for Community Improvement, officers and members of the other participating organizations, other participants in this National Community Conference; I thank you deeply for the warmth of your applause. (I trust that my

salutation was sufficiently broad as to include all of you.)

I stand before you in a position of dubious desirability. When I think of the many fine speakers who have addressed this conference in the past 3 days, I can well imagine how my remarks may seem in the nature of an anticlimax. However, you can take heart, and hence I will do likewise; for this talk of mine is the last, so-called address on the conference program.

At the outset, let me point out that the essence of my message is this: the soundest kind of community progress is that which results from self-reliant action of the cooperative type on the part of both the individuals and the organizations in each community. From the materialistic standpoint, this is the most efficient and economical way—with its lower costs and fewer demands on Government funds. From the spiritual viewpoint, this manner of proceeding brings about the greatest fulfillment of the creative potential of each individual and organization involved. Those of you who have been able to attend at least some of the earlier meetings of this conference will recognize in the above statement of my theme what might be called a very brief summarization of the conference findings.

This matter of self-reliance is a very interesting and important subject. As a devoted student of American history, I have realized that it is a fundamental feature of the true American way of life, and hence that it has played a major role in the wonderful and amazing development of our great Nation. Yes, self-reliance can certainly be regarded as a typical quality for Americans to have—or to aspire to possess. In fact, through the years I came to feel that the people of other nations very generally did not appreciate the desirability of this trait of character. It is only within this very year that my personal experiences and observations have led me to believe that there is a deep desire to be self-reliant residing within individuals generally regardless of where they live on the earth.

I have just recently returned from a 3 months' trip by airplane around the world. Mrs. Penney accompanied me as far as India, where we have a daughter who is married to an American executive with the United Nations Technical Assistance Mission to India. During the month and a half there, I traveled to various points of interest, spoke to government, business, and agricultural leaders, and gave talks before various native groups on Christian principles in business and the democratic way of life. I then proceeded to such places as Jakarta in Indonesia, Bangkok in Siam, Hong Kong, on the China coast, 10 of the major cities of Japan, and Seoul in Korea—where I had the honor and privilege of a good visit with President Rhee.

On this second part of my tour, I was accompanied by Weyman Huckabee, the secretary of the Laymen's Movement for a Christian World, of which I am the vice president. This organization was a sponsor of my 3 weeks' speaking tour while in Japan, from where I had received several invitations to visit following the translation into Japanese, about 3 years ago, of my autobiography, Fifty Years with the Golden Rule.

It is not my purpose to give here, a detailed account of my journey. I simply want to point out that such trip gave me an opportunity, the like of which I had not had before, to talk frankly with persons of various walks of life in these foreign countries. I visited too with some of their government officials, as well as with many of our own representatives in these lands. I thus have been able to clarify appreciably my own thinking about our international relations. In all of the countries I visited, I found a very friendly feeling toward the United States. My observations led me to conclude that our allies and the neutral nations in the various parts of the world highly value our friendship and our economic aid along technical assistace lines—in which they indicated a willingness to share in the cost. Of course they appreciate the worth of our military aid, but they appear to value learning our economic know-how even more—from the long-term point of view. In discussing this attitude on their part it was brought out again and again that they wanted to achieve a self-reliant status for themselves as individuals, and for their country in the family of nations; and, to do this, they realized that they have to make a go of things economically.

So I have come back from trip around the world with three conclusions:

1. The desire to be self-reliant is such a fundamental longing among individuals generally that we can say that it is a part of what we call human nature itself—even though it does need to be encouraged at times among many people.

2. If our Government can increase our foreign still more, along the practical lines of helping our allies and the so-called neutrals to become more self-reliant, without weakening our own economy too much, of course; then I am confident that communism will lose its worldwide struggle against the things which freedom loving people value most highly.

3. The peoples of the world, at a steadily increasing rate, are developing more similar interests generally, and this will become a very important factor in improving the chances of a permanent world peace. This matter of similar interests is underlined by the information I have just received that the General Federation of Women's Clubs currently has members, federated clubs, in 42 countries.

I now would like to direct your attention to some of the observations brought out during this conference which I consider of special importance.

First, despite the magnitude of our task, we must not lose sight of the fact that we are dealing, in the final analysis, with individual attitudes of our citizens in more than 16,000 American communities. Furthermore, under our democratic form of government, voluntary cooperation is the most potent and effective kind. Although the task of reaching and inspiring our fellow citizens in their communities is a great one, we have in this country outstanding methods of communication which can do the job. No other Nation has the quantity and quality that we have in the way of newspapers, magazines, radio and television facilities. They already are being used in a very extensive way to increase the desire of all Americans for further progress and achievement. Of course, we also have a superior postal system, and the NCCI is relying on it for dependable delivery of the appreciable amount of correspondence and printed material which is necessary to perform our mission. Yes, our needed tools are available and in functioning order.

You have heard and seen this week a demonstration of the activities taking place in numerous States and communities where the better hometown movement has taken hold. The extension of this movement is not automatic. There must be outside stimulation and the spreading of information to assure the permanent growth of even such an important idea. But essentially this is a movement of, by, and for the individual community.

When the people of a community choose their own leaders and determine their own activities, they have something that is their very own. An essential principle is the enlistment of all groups in voluntary teamwork. Such an assembly of citizens is not another organization with specialized objectives; it is in reality an interorganization committee, made up of representatives of all of the important local organizations. It may be called the community improvement council, community development council, citizens' association, coordinating council or the correlating council. The essential idea is that all of the organizations get together and work together for progress and improvement. The fundamental purpose of the National council for Community Improvement is to assist, usually through State councils, the formation and functioning of these local councils.

An impressive feature of this movement is its all-inclusive nature. The national council was originally organized with the cooperation of 60 national associations. This national community conference was arranged by national associations. The conference committees are composed of representatives of national associations and universities.

Most of us today are thinking in terms of national and international developments. We need and want a strong Nation—spiritually, physically, militarily and economically; but we can have a strong Nation only with the active cooperation of the people in their relationships within the States and local communities. This is the way to establish unity, and to get the people to take informed and aggressive action.

During the past several years, since World War II, the National Council for Community Improvement has been conducting a countrywide crusade for community responsibility and self-reliance. This program has been aimed at discouraging centralized power at Washington and, at the same time, at making an important, positive effort to promote and coordinate activity and teamwork in the communities. In this, we have the continuing advice and active cooperation of key national leaders in such major fields as business, industry, agriculture, and education.

The American way of life will not automatically continue to function by itself. Real effort on the part of all will be needed constantly to preserve our system and expand it further. For example, how well are we business leaders doing our part in this great vital movement beyond what we need to do to make our individual business successful and safe? How much are we leaving to others to do, and how well are they doing it?

Washington cannot do the job alone. In fact, many leaders in our Government have said that the work of many throughout the Nation is needed to continue and extend the stimulation of our citizens in the communities to organize, to become more interested in economics, and to cooperate in assuming responsibility for many local projects which they can develop for themselves. This is an especially important time for teamwork, for organization, for helping the move toward decentralization—toward greater community responsibility.

Our own self-interest is ultimately dependent upon an all-out, aggressive movement that encourages individual initiative, citizens; responsibility, and community self-reliance. This is something that may not safely be left to chance. Millions of people are likely to lose their courage and slip back at the first real encounter with unusual difficulty. The tendency then to turn to the Federal Government must be countered by a vigorous effort to help the masses of people at "the grassroots" to see and aprpeciate both the virtue and the immediate need for self-reliance.

Aggressive communities must take the lead. Other communities must be made to see the necessity and advantage of doing for themselves, of building up their own communities and thus becoming a collective tower of strength for the Nation.

The opportunity now presented to the loyal citizens of America is so great as to

stagger the imagination. Yet there are many who will not rise to the occasion. There are those who will turn away with a casual remark that the administration and Congress will, or should, fix things up without help from them.

What is needed is a coordinating organization made up of all major citizen groups working together in the interest of community initiative and community progress.

In this effort, it also is apparent that we need to continue to enlist the so-called genius of American businessmen who possess both insight and foresight and the qualities of sound management and statesmanship.

At this point I would like to pay special tribute to the public-spirited business firms who are sustaining contributors to the National Council for Community Improvement. I want also to acknowledge with deep appreciation the active cooperation of the many educators, and leaders in other fields, who have seen the need for community self-reliance and responsibility and been willing to assist in this work. The splendid organizations currently active in specific fields of community development also have been very helpful to the national council.

As a result, it is generally recognized now that there is a real need in most communities for a coordinating organization—in other words, a community improvement council—to get the people working on their own local projects, to help take care of the many local problems which arise, and to strengthen the individual community as a unit. To the extent that this need is met, the United States will be a stronger Nation, for the country will be made up of healthy, self-reliant communities which will be developing their own local prosperity mainly with their own efforts.

The American people, working together in their local and State organizations can reach great heights of community accomplishment. The fundamental purpose of the National Council for Community Improvement is the securing of this type of teamwork, and I believe that this organization has the background of experience, the plan and the program for such activity on a national basis.

I therefore ask you to give thoughtful consideration to the stated objective of the National Council for Community Improvement. They constitute what we call the 4-point program, and here they are:

1. To encourage greater self-reliance and community responsibility through cooperation of national associations and State councils, working with their local chapters and local leaders.

2. To encourage economy in all levels of Government. To encourage local initiative and less dependence on Federal aid in order to check the tendency toward centralized Federal power.

3. To gather and organize information on ideas and methods of community development, and to maintain a clearinghouse to supply such information to State and community leaders.

4. To encourage the formation of State and local councils which will foster the cooperation of all organizations in the community in furthering self-reliant community improvement.

The council's officers will continue to be pleased to have your ideas and suggestions concerning the furtherance of this program in every way possible.

In closing, I want to extend my deeply sincere appreciation to all of you who have attended and who have participated in this conference, which I understand is the first of its kind ever held. I personally have gained from it valuable information, stimulation, and inspiration. If the rest of you can say the same, then the conference can be termed a success—and is worth the very extensive amount of time and effort put into it by Paul Stark and the many others who have worked along with him on it.

May God bless all of us in our efforts to improve our communities through the exercise of as much self-reliance as possible.

School Aid Now

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PETER FRELINGHUYSEN, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 3, 1956

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I should like to include an editorial which appeared in the New York Times of July 3, 1956, entitled "School Aid Now":

SCHOOL AID NOW

The Federal school-aid bill is now being debated in the House and is expected to reach a vote this week. Although it is very late in the day, the bill still has a fair chance of becoming law providing no antisegregation rider is attached to it. The segregation question is being dealt with separately. This bill is aimed at the improvement of educational opportunity for all the children of our Nation, and it ought to be kept free of punitive, self-defeating, and irrelevant amendments designed for either propagandistic or legislative purposes.

Congress recently approved a far-reaching measure to help the States construct a network of first-class highways. Is the same Congress going to refuse to pass a far-reaching measure to help the States construct a multitude of first-class schools? Is speed of transportation really more essential to our civilization than adequacy of educational facilities? We think not, and we do not see how the Members of Congress will be able to face their constituents unless they can say they have done their level best to remedy the appalling shortage of schoolrooms that is daily growing worse. It takes 2 to 3 years to build a school from the time local bond issues are voted, so that even if the pending bill is pased this session we can hardly expect to reap the physical benefit much before the school year 1959.

The bill actually before the House is a Democratic measure known as the Kelley bill. It differs mainly in degree from the administration's own proposal. One important point of difference lies in the method under which Federal aid would be apportioned among the States. The Kelley bill provides for a flat grant, based on the number of schoolchildren in each State. The administration would distribute Federal funds on the basis of State need (per capita income) and State effort (relative expenditure on schools). Although New York would receive much more under the Kelley formula than under the Eisenhower program, we think the latter is far more equable and should be adopted despite its obviously lesser political appeal.

Representative GWINN, of Westchester, has been making a big point of the fact that New York and a few other of the wealthier States would be paying out under the school-aid proposal more than they would receive for this purpose from the Federal Government. There is nothing novel about such a situation. It is to the interest of New York as well as of Mississippi that Mississippi's children have adequate educational facilities and, we may hope, an adequate education. Though education is and must remain under local control, the opportunity for education is a matter of national concern. We believe the wealthier States are willing as well as able to take on this responsibility.

Keyes Medal Awarded to Dr. Charles C. Higgins, of Cleveland Clinic

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCES P. BOLTON
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 3, 1956

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, it is always a pleasure to call the attention of this House to the high level of medicine practiced in the greater Cleveland area. At the annual meeting of the American Association of Genito-Urinary Surgeons at Oyster Harbors, Osterville, Mass., on June 4, Dr. Charles C. Higgins, head of the department of Urology of the Cleveland Clinic, was awarded the coveted Keyes Memorial Medal.

This medal, about the highest honor this association can award, has been presented to only seven other people since it was first awarded 23 years ago.

Under leave granted me by unanimous consent, I am inserting an article by N. R. Howard, editor of the Cleveland News, about the importance of this citation:

[From the Cleveland News of June 14, 1956]

WHAT DOCTORS THINK OF AS HONOR

To the undersigned, all doctors are impressive; they represent to my imagination an embodiment of exact knowledge, self-discipline, and mental courage I am sure I could never achieve.

What causes doctors to be admired by other doctors has been a vague matter to me until this week when I had the chance to read the citation by which Dr. Charles C. Higgins of Cleveland Clinic was awarded the Keyes memorial medal, only eight of which have been given in 25 years. The award is for provable distinction by the American Association of Genito-Urinary Surgeons.

The citation recites that the award depends on "meritorious work; keen observation; originality; unwavering integrity in the recording of procedures and results; a desire for others to profit from one's experience." Dr. Higgins, with relation to this last qualification, has published (in the medical sense) 165 reports, papers, and treatises about genito-urinary analyses.

"In 1933," the citation acknowledged to Dr. Higgins, "you made your original report on the experimental production of urinary calculi; your subsequent experimental work, with particular reference to vitamin A deficiency, was received with widespread interest.

"In 1933, you originated a technique for aseptic ureterointestinal anastomosis and through the years you have published 24 articles dealing with ureterosigmoidostomy incident to exstrophy of the bladder and cystectomy for carcinoma. * * * In 1934 you were the first to perform on the human a transureteroureterostomy, when a painful refluxing ureter was transplanted to the opposite one, thus conserving the involved kidney by taking advantage of the intact valve on the opposite side.

"The courage of your conviction in performing this operation was justified by the highly satisfactory clinical result."

There were further acknowledgments of Dr. Higgins' recognition in his profession by selection to 10 offices in the medical and surgical organizations, including his present capacity as chairman of the board of governors of the American College of Surgeons. Then the citation also noted his talent at the piano and his collection of the largest known library of Oliver Goldsmith.

Any layman, even while stumbling over the unknowable polysyllabic words behind which the medical profession conceals its exact definitions, thus learns that Dr. Higgins has added to the knowledge of the behaviors of the human plumbing systems, and has had the courage to discover how to divert or simplify them for the benefit of sick or tortured human beings.

Lawyers, bankers, engineers, or journalists seem not to have the obligation which is on doctors and some other scientists to reveal for the benefit of all what they have learned or discovered in applying science to the human mechanisms. This is a very great nobility, in my book, about the medical profession; it conjures up the sense that doctors are constantly at work with whatever brains and imagination they have, to make us all constantly better off physically.

The finest doctors, according to the standards for the Keyes award, have to have imagination and powers to comprehend what they are seeing, and must be wholly, frigidly, honest in setting down all notes of their findings. * * * I think of no other class whose standouts are qualified by such towering demands.

Problems in Introducing a Foreign Product Into the United States of America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 3, 1956

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address made by Maj. Gen. Julius Klein at the 12th annual national conference and the 7th International Public Relations Institute of the American Public Relations Association which was held at the Statler Hotel in Washington, D. C., on April 5, 1956:

PROBLEMS IN INTRODUCING A FOREIGN PRODUCT INTO THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

(Address of Maj. Gen. Julius Klein, ING, retired)

It is a privilege for me to join with you in discussing some of the problems that engage the attention of our profession.

The subject assigned to me is listed on the program as "Problems in Introducing a Foreign Product Into the United States of America."

An audience as sophisticated as this needs little, if any, instruction in the craft of product publicity and public relations. However, I do think it would be useful to share with you some thinking on the role our profession can play in serving the interests of free economic interplay in the world of today.

President Eisenhower, in his message to Congress on the foreign-aid plan last month, emphasized the importance of international trade as a means of cementing the strength and unity of the free world. I should like to take my cue from the President and assume that the foreign products whose introduction to the United States we are talking about are those which emanate from either anti-Communist countries or non-Communist countries.

This is an important distinction. It is important because in the light of current history no new foreign product can be introduced here successfully without taking into account American public opinion about the country whose industries seek a market here.

In one sense, this is all to the benefit of our profession. It leaves less room for stuntmen while increasing the need for skilled practitioners with a grasp of the complex economic and political factors that govern international commercial relations today. It is from responsible, well-rounded people such as this that our profession will have to draw in the future to maintain the high standards set by such great pioneers of our craft as Ivy Lee, the dean of our craft Carl Byoir, and Pulitzer prize recipient Herbert Bayard Swope. Lee was the public relations counsel to old John D. Rockefeller, Carl Byoir advised other greats. And the old sage Swope served Bernard Baruch.

The introduction of foreign products here is a unique test of the public relations profession's ability to keep pace with the main currents of our times. We are in a period of increasing pressures for tariff increases or the establishment of quota systems on foreign imports. In many cases, these pressures are the result of hard economic facts on the American scene. Despite record figures of employment and national income, some segments of the American economy are either in distress or in fear of downward trends. The domectic pottery industry, the coal industry, some of the fashion trades—all these have real cause for concern in the face of foreign competition.

The public relations counselor must therefore take into account all phases of the domestic market, from manufacture to point of sale. He must keep a watchful eye on domestic political implications. He must take account of this country's foreign policy, economic as well as political. It is only after a complete understanding of these factors that he can begin to plan intelligently.

As the economic health of foreign countries continues to improve—and as they seek to utilize such instrumentalities as the Organization for the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade to facilitate their entry into the American market—the public relations counselor is likely to find that the emphasis of his thinking and planning will have to reside more in the areas of Government trade policy and tariff legislation than in the field of product publicity.

Let me stress that product publicity will continue to be important. If anything, it will take on greater significance. But it will also call for fresh imagination and additional techniques.

At the same time, we must recognize that—increasingly—the public relations practitioner will have to deal with the introduction of foreign products in terms of what is good for the foreign economic and political interests of the United States as a whole—as well as what is good for consumers and domestic industry. The greater professional versatility this will require can only work to the benefit of our entire craft.

But if the public relations counselor faces difficult tasks in winning American acceptance of foreign products, he is also confronted with formidable problems of client relations.

Public relations as we know it here is little known or understood in many European countries. In 1940, I had the privilege of compiling for the War Department a combat public relations plan which underlined the differing factors that enter into the shaping of public opinion in foreign countries as against the factors that make for public judgments here in the United States. One of the points made in the plan was that while it might be possible to overcome language barriers in explaining American policy concepts, there still remained very formidable problems in semantics. The term "public relations" is a prize example of what I mean. It defies translation in some European languages. And because this is so, public relations is too often regarded by Europeans as a synonym for advertising. Among some foreign businessmen, public relations is considered to be a device for insuring favorable publicity. Only in the rarest of cases, is public relations understood as an implement of company policy.

To some degree, the inability of many Europeans to grasp our concepts of public relations is due to differences between newspaper practices here and abroad. In many foreign countries, the treatment of news leans heavily on interpretation instead of the straight, factual reporting we know here. There are marked differences in newsgathering techniques. The American newspaperman is unique for his independence of judgment and inquiry. His like is to be found in very few countries overseas.

One of the greatest gaps in European understanding of American public relations is the role our craft can, and does, play in the prevention of adverse publicity. Most European businessmen who venture into American public relations for the first time tend to assume that the employment of public relations counsel here carries with it some kind of built-in guarantee that the American press will adhere faithfully to the texts of all company publicity handouts. The ready distinction that we here find it easy to make between publicity and public relations is not so readily understood in Europe. Hence, it is all the more difficult for our European friends to understand that the prevention of adverse publicity is one of the positive aims of public relations, just as the preventon of illness by the medical profession comes about through positive application of needed safeguards.

Client education in the relationship of public relations to basic company policy is, therefore, one of the first problems that confronts any American practitioner in dealing with a foreign client. At the same time, there is always the problem of communication between client and counselor. Marconi helped to solve the problem of time in client-counselor communications. But differences in language and psychology remain.

Many foreign manufacturers feel insecure in the American market because of questions raised in their countries about American foreign policy. They have trouble in grasping all the factors that go into pressures here for tariff increases. American governmental regulations and American politics are often complete mysteries to them. It is in these areas that a public relations counselor can perform immense service—not only to the foreign client, but in bringing about a more informed climate for the conduct of two-way commercial relations between the United States and her neighbors abroad.

There will, of course, be found a certain degree of resistance to foreign-made merchandise. Some of this resistance will be instinctive; some of it will stem from natural economic factors in this country. Foreign products will often have to run a gauntlet of competitive opposition that will raise such bogeys as cheap labor and inferior technology.

These are attitudes which have to be met with a variety of public-relations implements, among them the point that realistic American hospitality to foreign economic ventures on our shores is a sounder and healthier procedure for helping free countries to resist Communist economic pressure than by forcing them to rely on Uncle Sam's handouts. The creation of a climate of understanding about the need for a free flow of international trade is a first necessity. It is the foundation on which the

techniques and resources of American public relations can proceed to build acceptance of imported products. Nor must we forget that American business and industry has some $26 billion invested in plants and property overseas. Our profession has an obligation to point out that in the world of today no nation is self-sufficient. More than ever, the economy and political stability of the free world demand two-way cooperation.

It is to the credit of Europe, and to the benefit of a stronger and more united free world, that a number of European companies have undertaken pioneering efforts in the use of American public relations in our domestic market. The impact on foreign sales here has been quie healthy. But more important, it has led to marked increases in the exchange of technological information and know-how, and in a greater volume of personal contacts by leading European businessmen with our American people and institutions.

This is a process that needs to be encouraged and expanded. And I believe that our profession can help immensely. European business is beginning to think in public-relations terms, not only as regards foreign trade but as concerns its own domestic structure. Organizations such as the American Public Relations Association can encourage this trend by preparing the groundwork for international conferences of public-relations counsel—just as advertising and other professions have undertaken through the years.

Our profession as a whole stands to gain by a regular exchange of ideas and the establishment of personal associations with Europe's practitioners. We have made great strides here as some of our colleges and universities have introduced courses on public relations in their curricula. We can, I believe, use increased contact with the European public-relations profession to suggest that similar attention be given to our profession in European institutions of higher learning.

The end result can help us to do a better job of serving both our domestic and foreign clients and, in the end, the interests of the free world itself.

Thank you for your hospitality and the privilege of this most important forum.

Increased Appropriations of Watershed Management

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY ALDOUS DIXON
OF UTAH
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 3, 1956

Mr. DIXON. Mr. Speaker, this date I received from the Society of American Foresters, intermountain section, a resolution adopted by the intermountain section at its March 31 convention, relating to the need for increased appropriations for watershed management, research and action programs.

Under unanimous consent I insert this letter containing the resolution in the Appendix of the RECORD:

SOCIETY OF AMERICAN FORESTERS,
INTERMOUNTAIN SECTION,
Boise, Idaho, June 20, 1956.

The Honorable HENRY ALDOUS DIXON,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN DIXON: In a meeting of the intermountain section of the Society of American Foresters held March 31, 1956, a resolution was passed as follows:

"Whereas better watershed management is essential to the solution of serious water problems in the Intermountain and Northern Rocky Mountain West, but watershed management programs are handicapped by incomplete knowledge about basic principles and hydrologic effects and by inadequate funds for action: Therefore be it

"*Resolved*, That the Intermountain Section of the Society of American Foresters urge Congress to increase appropriations for watershed management research and watershed management action programs."

Very truly yours,

ARCHIE D. CRAFT,
Secretary-Treasurer.

Common Knowledge to All the World Except to Our Traveling Secretary of State

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 3, 1956

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the following article which appeared in the Washington Post of July 3, 1956, by by George Sokolsky, is interesting, though distressing, information which everybody seems to know about except our Secretary of State. If he does know about it, his actions show no indication thereof. The item follows:

THESE DAYS
(By George Sokolsky)
SOMEBODY GOOFED

Robert J. Donovan, who has written a pro-Eisenhower book entitled "Eisenhower—The Inside Story," recounts the following with regard to the Nasser-Soviet transaction. Nasser first tried to deal with the United States, desiring to buy $30 million of weapons, paying in cotton. The United States, having a cotton surplus, did not want Egyptian cotton. Did the United States want cash or did it propose a credit? Now I quote Donovan:

"Nasser then suggested buying the arms on credit. Washington was slow in reaching final policy decisions in the matter, and Egypt dropped it.

"In the following month, June (1955), the administration got word that Nasser was having discussions with the Soviet bloc about buying arms. Next—before the 'summit conference' in July—American Ambassador Byroade received word from high sources in the Egyptian Government that the talks with Russia has been discontinued. So Eisenhower did not bring it up at the Geneva conference. But in September, the Soviet-Egyptian arms deal was sealed."

The significance of Donovan's report is that the White House did not have what is called "intelligence" on this subject. Our ambassador in Egypt, Henry Byroade, apparently permitted himself to be misinformed by the Egyptians as he had been misinformed by the Chinese when he was in that country with Gen. George Marshall.

A nation without information is blind. Surely President Eisenhower at Geneva should have known of the Nasser-Soviet deal; otherwise, the Russians had an advantage over him of enormous value to them. Khrushchev must have been astonished that Eisenhower did not know what Nasser was up to.

In March 1956, Eisenhower said:

"We do not believe that it is possible to assure peace in that area (the Middle East) merely by rushing some arms to a nation (Israel) that can absorb only that amount which 1,700,000 people can absorb; whereas, on the other side, there are some 40,0000,000 people."

The absurdity of that statement is now obvious to everyone. If we sell Israel arms, are we to make sure that the Arabs have 40 times as much? The alliance of Egypt, Saudi Arabia, and Syria, with enormous influences upon Jordan and Yemen and other Arab states, including Morocco and Algeria, gives Soviet Russia a foothold in the Mediterranean which is as important as a tremendous military victory. Already the very important American air base in Morocco is in peril and our enormous investments in Saudi Arabia need to be reviewed.

To Nasser, this situation opens the prospect of building a career that makes him at least of equal importance in international relations to Nehru and Tito, if not of greater importance in due course. Therefore, it is absurd to make a comparison of 1,700,000 people to 40,000,000 people. If that is the basis of our thinking, why not knuckle under to Red China which has a population of 500,000,000 people?

The answer is that whoever briefed the President on the Middle Eastern situation gave him a wrong steer. Whoever put those statistics before the President was using a trick argument to support a private opinion, not the national interest. This has happened so often that it is astonishing that Congress does not investigate.

What is the national interest? The answer must depend upon whether one believes that the expenditure of $500 billion to purchase friendship could ever have succeeded. As of June 1956, this policy shows many signs of having proved to have been a failure. Nevertheless, Congress is voting more money. Certainly this phase of American policy requires re-thinking and review.

Bow to Mrs. Conyngham

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 3, 1956

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Wilkes-Barre (Pa.) Record of June 27, 1956:

BOW TO MRS. CONYNGHAM

Her concern for the welfare of the community has led to many generous deeds by Mrs. William H. Conyngham. Gifts in countless instances have been of lasting value. It has been well said of her that she is a "beloved community personage."

Wyoming Valley Playground and Recreation Association through its board members and their guests took formal note last night of one of the latest of Mrs. Conyngham's benefactions of enduring worth and service—the donation to the city of a modern play center with wading pools on Lincoln Street. The center has been established in memory of her father, the late George W. Guthrie, a leading member of the medical profession and chief surgeon at the General Hospital at the time of his death. His interest in the young people of the community was highlighted by long and distinguished service on the Wilkes-Barre School Board. It is

now many years since that time, but no board member could be remembered more respectfully or affectionately than Dr. Guthrie is to this day.

For many reasons and for that one particularly it is most appropriate for his daughter to contribute in his name a means of advancing the well-being of the city's youth of today. It was also most appropriate that Mrs. Conyngham should be honored for a handsome gift, as she was last night, and by an association of which she has been a valued board member since 1949.

The affair, held at Weissman's Recreation Room, had something of the characteristics of a welcome-home party, for Mrs. Conyngham has just returned from a European tour.

Commodity Highlights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY ALDOUS DIXON
OF UTAH
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 2, 1956

Mr. DIXON. Mr. Speaker, on June 25, 1956, the Department of Agriculture released the Demand and Price Situation. This publication points out that:

First. Prices received by farmers in mid-May averaged 9 percent above the low point of last December.

Second. May 1956 was the first month in almost 4 years that prices have not been below a year earlier.

Third. Farmers' cash receipts have reflected the rise in prices and in May were tentatively estimated at about 1 percent above a year earlier.

Fourth. Prices of both crops and livestock on the average have shown steady improvement since the early part of the year.

Fifth. Since prices paid by farmers on the other hand have increased very slowly during the same period, the parity ratio has risen significantly, increasing 6 percent since mid-December.

The same publication contains an excellent section entitled "Commodity Highlights." I ask unanimous consent that it be printed at the conclusion of these remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

COMMODITY HIGHLIGHTS

Cattle slaughter so far this year has run about 6 percent above last year, mainly because of large supplies of fed cattle. By mid- to late summer, hog slaughter may be down to the rate of a year earlier, and prices may be up to last year's prices.

Cash receipts from sales of dairy products are above 1955 and, for this year as a whole, will approach the record of $4.6 billion reached in 1952.

Egg prices in early June, though at the season's low to date, remained above a year earlier. Prices have since begun to rise seasonally, and probably will continue above last year until late summer or early fall.

Flaxseed prices declined about 12 percent from mid-June, and in midmonth were slightly above the 1956 crop support level. A large increase in foreign supplies is in prospect for 1956–57.

A record carryover of about 43 million tons of feed grains in is prospect for 1956–57, a 10 percent increase over last year. With a near average growing season, this would mean another big supply of feed grains for the 1956–57 feeding year.

Wheat exports in May and June have been very heavy. The total exported in the year ending June 30, 1956, may be 330 million bushels. The carryover on July 1 will probably be about 1,030 million bushels, about the same as a year ago.

Supplies of early season deciduous fruits are large. Growers' prices for the larger supplies of early season peaches are likely to average below the unusually high prices of of 1955.

Prices received by farmers for early summer vegetables are expected to average at least as high as those of a year earlier.

Fewer potatoes are expected to be available for market during the next 2 months, and prices are likely to average substantially higher than a year earlier.

Prices for middling $1\frac{5}{16}$-inch cotton have averaged around 35.50 cents per pound in recent weeks, or almost 2 cents more than a year ago. The higher price results from the large quantity of cotton withheld from the market under the CCC program.

Consumption of wool in 11 major consuming countries in the first quarter of this year is estimated to have been almost 10 percent above a year earlier.

About 15.4 million pounds of 1955 crop Maryland tobacco—43 percent of the crop—was marketed by mid-June. Auction prices averaged well above a year ago.

Senator Kennedy's "Boomlet"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 3, 1956

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I would like to have printed for the benefit of my colleagues to read a timely editorial entitled "Senator KENNEDY'S 'Boomlet' " that appeared in the Youngstown, Ohio, Vindicator on June 29 last:

SENATOR KENNEDY'S "BOOMLET"

Connecticut's Governor Ribicoff's proposal that Senator JOHN KENNEDY, of Massachusetts be the Democratic Vice Presidential nominee has much to recommend it. The Democrats could go further and do much worse.

Mr. KENNEDY is a young man, only 38, but already has made his mark. Millions of Americans have read his best-selling book, Profiles in Courage, which he wrote while recovering from an operation to correct a spinal injury received as a PT-boat commander in World War II. His Senate record is that of a liberal who recognizes the need for moderation in many issues. He has made himself an expert on numerous phases of government, including the lobbying problem.

Senator KENNEDY's father, Joseph P. Kennedy, was chairman of the Securities and Exchange Commission in the early days of the New Deal and served as American Ambassador to Britain from 1937 to 1941. His mother is a daughter of John F. Fitzgerald, a former mayor of Boston. A younger brother, Robert, is chief counsel for the Senate Permanent Investigating Subcommittee.

The Kennedy "boomlet," supported chiefly by New England Democrats, will grow or burst with the fortunes of Adlai E. Stevenson, whom the Senator strongly supports. Mr. KENNEDY's admirers assert that he would attract many youthful voters. They argue also that if the convention chooses a Southerner as Vice Presidential nominee many Americans will interpret the action as a blow to continued progress toward racial integration.

Another aspect is that Mr. KENNEDY is a Roman Catholic. He would give voters a chance to disprove the ugly theory that religious prejudice bars Catholics from the highest offices. As Governor Ribicoff asserts, "The United States has gained in maturity since 1928" when Al Smith, a Catholic, was the victim of smear tactics.

Many political considerations will dictate the Democrats' Vice Presidential choice and Senator KEFAUVER may be a serious contender. However, if Mr. Stevenson is to be the standard bearer, as seems increasingly likely, many party leaders may well consider that Senator KENNEDY would make an attractive running mate.

Resolution of Department of New Jersey Disabled American Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON CANFIELD
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 20, 1956

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a copy of resolutions adopted by the Disabled American Veterans, Department of New Jersey, at their annual convention in Wildwood, N. J., on June 21 to 24, 1956, opposing the so-called Bradley report. These have been sent to me by James F. Patten, commander, and William J. Dodd, adjutant:

DISABLED AMERICAN VETERANS, DEPARTMENT OF NEW JERSEY, CONVENTION RESOLUTION

Whereas the present administration of the Federal Government has ordered a study of veterans programs and benefits, by a commission headed by Gen. Omar Bradley, which commission produced a series of pronouncements and recommendations, known as the Bradley report; and

Whereas a study of said Bradley report discloses that its recommendations are designed to drastically curtail veterans' benefits, including the total elimination of all benefits for millions of veterans; and

Whereas these recommendations, if implemented, would have a disastrous effect on veterans, particularly disabled veterans, their families and dependents, because the Bradley report seeks to reverse the 150-year-old American tradition and policy, in the words of Abraham Lincoln, to "care for him who shall have borne the battle, and for his widow and for his orphan," and seeks to demolish and wreck the system of veterans' benefits built up so laboriously over the years: Now, therefore be it

Resolved by the degelates of the New Jersey Department, Disabled American Veterans, in convention assembled, That this department highly resolve and go on record, as being unalterably opposed to the said Bradley report in its entirety, as being a deadly and direct threat to the welfare of this organization, its members and their families and dependents, and to all veterans, and as being a bald, deliberate, cynical breach of faith with the American veterans; and be it further

Resolved, That this department, its officers, member chapters and membership, do all in their power to oppose its implementation, in any way, legislative or administrative, and that copies of this resolution be forwarded to appropriate officials of the Federal and

State governments, the United States Congress, the New Jersey Legislature, and to the national convention, Disabled American Veterans, 1956, in San Antonio, Tex., for adoption and support.

H. R. 12078 Will Stop Profiteering of Foreign-Flag Ships

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS M. PELLY
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 31, 1956

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, non-United States flag privately owned commercial ocean vessels, with low-wage foreign crews, are charging rates for transporting United States Government-owned or financed cargoes substantially the same as the rates charged by American-flag privately owned commercial ocean vessels.

If, as I understand to be the case, the owners and operators of American flag ships are finding ample cargo available and are able to charge rates which return them substantial profits, then certainly the owners of foreign registered ships must be reaping a harvest from United States Government cargoes at the expense of the American taxpayer, because the rates of a crew on a non-United States flag vessel aggregate approximately $20,000 a month less than the wages of a crew of one of our United States flag vessels.

In effect, an American owner can register his ship under a foreign flag and then by replacing American seamen with a foreign crew he can reduce his cost of operation and increase his profits to the tune of nearly a quarter of a million dollars a year. That situation is deplorable because that profit is at the expense of American seamen and, likewise, is at the expense of our Federal Treasury—and to add insult to injury, it is United States Government cargoes which are making possible such profiteering by foreign-flag ship operators.

I have sought, Mr. Speaker, to correct the situation. Earlier this year I introduced a bill to force our foreign competition, if it accepted our United States Government cargoes, to pay our scale of wages. Unfortunately, there has not been widespread support to date for that type of solution which is patterned after the Davis-Bacon area labor standard provision used in Federal construction and other legislation.

Meanwhile, the problem of foreign steamship profiteering has become more aggravated and, accordingly, I have developed a new legislative approach which offers, I think, a more practical remedy. This new idea is incorporated in H. R. 12078, a bill which I introduced yesterday and to which I call all Members' attention.

As the membership knows, Mr. Speaker, under the United States Cargo Preference Act, or, as it is generally referred to, the 50–50 cargo law, American ships to qualify for any preference must be available and agree to transport the cargo at reasonable rates. My bill provides, in effect, that foreign-flag vessels to qualify must have rates that are in line with the rates charged by American-flag ships so that the margin of profit of the former is not greater proportionately than the margin of profit of our privately owned commercial oceangoing ships for comparable service in comparable geographic areas, such margins of profit being based on determinations of the Secretary of Commerce, taking into account wage differentials.

I submit, Mr. Speaker, that this legislation is fair and would accomplish three desirable objectives: First, American shipowners would be discouraged under such a provision of law from transferring their vessels to foreign registry by reducing their profit incentive; second, the bill would relieve the United States Treasury and the poor long-suffering taxpayers of this country of paying exorbitant transportation and profits to operators of foreign ships; and, third, the measure would expand our active American merchant marine and increase job opportunities for American seamen.

My purpose in introducing H. R. 12078 at this late date in the session is to allow time for study and Department reports, so the House Committee on Merchant Marine could give the bill early attention next year. At the moment there is considerable demand for cargo and passenger space, so that our seafaring personnel may not be too concerned or fully conscious of future unemployment possibilities. But if the American people come to a realization that in a measure they are subsidizing not only our merchant marine but the ships of other nations and ships flying foreign flags and manned by foreign crews, then there is a danger of a popular move to cut off Government assistance of every nature and to all. In effect, our United States ships are being driven off the seas right now and indirectly and in a large measure it is our own Government cargoes transported on foreign ships which are causing this situation.

Let us stop this profiteering before it boomerangs. H. R. 12078 may well hold the answer to the problem.

Dr. Aaron Kottler

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 29, 1956

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, a new honor has come to my congressional district. Dr. Aaron Kottler, who has long resided in my district and practices his profession of medicine throughout the Borough of Brooklyn and the city of New York, has just been elected president of the Kings County Medical Society and the Brooklyn Academy of Medicine.

He is attached to the medical staff of the Coney Island Hospital and has served for many years as chairman of the legislative committees of the Kings County Medical Society and of the Coordinating Council of the Five County Medical Societies of Greater New York.

He has served as a member of the board of censors of the Kings County society, and, more latterly, as its senior censor. He has been a delegate to the State Medical Society since 1948 and is a member of the Board of Directors of the State Academy of General Practice and of the Group Health Insurance, Inc.

Dr. Kottler graduated from the Fordham University School of Medicine and served as an interne at the Williamsburg, Cumberland and Kingston Avenue Hospitals. He is former president of the Physicians Guild and of the Kings County Chapter of the American Academy of General Practice.

It is indeed a pleasure to join his many friends in wishing him well in his new office and many more years of happy service to his community.

Why Does President Eisenhower Command Such Public Confidence?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 27, 1956

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

IKE'S POPULARITY IS UNPARALLELED
(By Edgar Ansel Mowrer)

How many Americans would get all hot and bothered over the illness of any foreign statesman (except perhaps of Sir Winston Churchill—and even then)?

Yet that is exactly what free citizens in all parts of the world have done at the news of President Eisenhower's illness.

Or again, why are the American people so affected by everything that happens to the present incumbent of the White House? What makes Ike so popular?

My colleague, Dorothy Thompson, in a thoughtful appraisal of Mr. Eisenhower's popularity at home, attributed it to the fact that he is a typical American citizen, only more so. He acts and talks just about as Joe Doakes imagines he would act and talk if President of the United States—only better. He enjoys the same relaxations, eats similar food with no foreign frills. He advises citizens to be happy and to let no day pass without some fun. And he does his best to live up to his admonition. Yet at the same time, his administration runs and he managed to win victory in the greatest war the United States has ever fought. So what more do you want? Small wonder that as a candidate for a second term, he seems unbeatable.

But this is only part of the story. Alone it could not account for the President's amazing popularity overseas, even in countries where American stock is none too high. For that we must look further.

REASSURING HONESTY

Another obvious reason, I surmise, is the impression Dwight Eisenhower never fails to make on those who see or hear him—one of high intentions, love of people, and complete candor. As he once said publicly, even those

of his opponents who think him stupid admit his honesty. This is undoubtedly reassuring to citizens suspicious of politicians. Mr. Eisenhower can be candid even when he is being most political.

But most important, in my opinion, is the compelling factor that this particular American President stands for normalcy in a period when people everywhere are sick of crisis and would forget danger.

Psychologically, there seems to be a rhythmic process in history, certainly in the recent history of the United States. From the beginning of this century we have more or less zigzagged between change and disturbance and the search for stability.

After 7 years of strenuous life with Theodore Roosevelt, the people chose a quiet guy, William Howard Taft. After 8 years of Wilson's new freedom and World War I, they flocked to Warren Gamaliel Harding, a candidate so normal as to be a freak. Harding was followed by the equally normal Coolidge. Then when the economy blew up under Hoover, the people flocked to abnormality incarnate in F. D. R. and the New Deal.

SOUGHT PEACE

Depression, World War II, the cold war, the Korean war—these filled the next 20 years. And after this period of unimaginable change and crisis, the people in 1952 elected a quiet man of great distinction, Dwight Eisenhower.

He has not disappointed them. He has sought peace, persistently and quietly even when this meant substituting his own optimism for the reasoned pessimism of his associates. He has taken things on the up and up rather than as they seemed. With the Russians he agreed to let bygones be bygones if only the Kremlin would lay off further aggression. Domestically, he has stayed in the middle of the road.

And he has found support for these attitudes in the aspirations of simple people not only in the United States but in all other free countries.

Here, in my judgment, lies the explanation of a worldwide popularity greater than any other American has had in his lifetime.

Advisory Committee on Weather Control

SPEECH

OF

HON. HENRY ALDOUS DIXON

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 2, 1956

Mr. DIXON. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object and I am not going to object, I wish to make a statement explaining this bill.

The bill, S. 2913, would extend the life of the President's Advisory Committee on Weather Control. One might logically ask, why extend the life of this Committee when it originally was set up to complete the job by June 30, 1956? The answer simply is this: A check of the record shows that the act creating this Committee was approved August 13, 1953, but funds were not appropriated until almost a year later, in July 1954. Because of this fact, the Committee was not able to assemble a qualified scientific staff that could accomplish the work of the Committee until January 1955.

In effect, therefore, this means that the Committee has had only about 1½ years in which to study the problems it was set up to examine. Its published report shows that cloud-seeding operations in the mountainous areas of the Pacific coast States have produced increased precipitation ranging from 9 to 17 percent above the normal expected precipitation. Most important of all, however, there has simply not been time to permit the Committee's technical staff to study the possibility of increasing precipitation in the Mountain States and the Midwest, which do, as you know, have vast sections now labeled drought disaster areas and which are, thereby, eligible for Federal assistance. To a lesser extent, the same is true of certain sections of the East and South. Because of these conditions, it would be regrettable if the life of this Committee is not extended. Water is one of our most basic resources and it is terribly important that every possible means be exhausted to increase its availability. Because of these factors, I urge passage of the bill.

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is located in Statuary Hall, House wing, where Mr. Frank Brodie is in attendance during the sessions of Congress to receive orders for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month, and where single copies may also be purchased. Orders are also accepted for the printing of speeches in pamphlet form.

PRICE OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

The Public Printer is authorized to furnish to subscribers the daily RECORD at $1.50 per month, payable in advance.

Remit by money order payable to Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C.

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

SENATORS WITH RESIDENCES IN WASHINGTON

OFFICE ADDRESS: Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

[Streets northwest unless otherwise stated]

Vice President, Richard Nixon

Aiken, George D., *Vt*——Carroll Arms.
Allott, Gordon, *Colo*——
Anderson, Clinton P., *N. Mex.*—6 Wesley Circle.
Barrett, Frank A., *Wyo*——The Woodner.
Beall, J. Glenn, *Md*——
Bender, George H., *Ohio*——120 Schotts Court NE.
Bennett, Wallace F., *Utah*——
Bible, Alan, *Nev*——
Bricker, John W., *Ohio*——The Mayflower.
Bridges, Styles, *N. H*——
Buch, Prescott, *Conn*——
Butler, John Marshall, *Md*—
Byrd, Harry Flood, *Va*——The Shoreham.
Capehart, Homer E., *Ind*——The Westchester.
Carlson, Frank, *Kans*——Sheraton-Park
Case, Clifford P., *N. J*——
Case, Francis, *S. Dak*——4635 Mass. Ave.
Chavez, Dennis, *N. Mex*——3327 Cleveland Ave.
Clements, Earle C., *Ky*——The Congressional
Cotton, Norris, *N. H*——
Curtis, Carl T., *Nebr*——
Daniel, Price, *Tex*——
Dirksen, Everett M., *Ill*——
Douglas, Paul H., *Ill*——
Duff, James H., *Pa*——
Dworshak, Henry C., *Idaho*—
Eastland, James O., *Miss*——5101 Macomb St.
Ellender, Allen J., *La*——
Ervin, Samuel J., Jr., *N. C*——
Flanders, Ralph E., *Vt*——
Frear, J. Allen, Jr., *Del*——
Fulbright, J. William, *Ark*——
George, Walter F., *Ga*——The Mayflower.
Goldwater, Barry M., *Ariz*——
Gore, Albert, *Tenn*——
Green, Theodore Francis, *R. I.*—University Club.
Hayden, Carl, *Ariz*——
Hennings, Thomas C., Jr., *Mo.*
Hickenlooper, Bourke B., *Iowa.*—5511 Cedar Parkway, Chevy Chase, Md.
Hill, Lister, *Ala*——
Holland, Spessard L., *Fla*—Sheraton-Park
Hruska, Roman L., *Nebr*——
Humphrey, Hubert H., *Minn.*
Humphreys, Robert, *Ky*——
Ives, Irving M., *N. Y*——
Jackson, Henry M., *Wash*—
Jenner, William E., *Ind*——
Johnson, Lyndon B., *Tex*—
Johnston, Olin D., *S. C*——
Kefauver, Estes, *Tenn*——4848 Upton St.
Kennedy, John F., *Mass*——
Kerr, Robert S., *Okla*——
Knowland, William F., *Calif.*
Kuchel, Thomas H., *Calif*—
Laird, William R. III, *W. Va*—
Langer, William, *N. Dak*——2101 Conn. Ave.
Lehman, Herbert H., *N. Y*—Sheraton-Park
Long, Russell B., *La*——
McCarthy, Joseph R., *Wis*—
McClellan, John L., *Ark*——
McNamara, Pat, *Mich*——
Magnuson, Warren G., *Wash.*—The Shoreham.
Malone, George W., *Nev*——The Mayflower.
Mansfield, Mike, *Mont*——
Martin, Edward, *Pa*——
Martin, Thos. E., *Iowa*——4545 Conn. Ave.
Millikin, Eugene D., *Colo*—
Monroney, A. S. Mike, *Okla.*
Morse, Wayne, *Oreg*——5020 Lowell St.
Mundt, Karl E., *S. Dak*——122 Schotts Court NE.
Murray, James E., *Mont*——The Shoreham.
Neely, Matthew M., *W. Va*—
Neuberger, Richard L., *Oreg.*
O'Mahoney, Joseph C., *Wyo.*—Sheraton-Park
Pastore, John O., *R. I*——
Payne, Frederick G., *Maine*—
Potter, Charles E., *Mich*——
Purtell, William A., *Conn*—
Robertson, A. Willis, *Va*——
Russell, Richard B., *Ga*——
Saltonstall, Leverett, *Mass*—2320 Tracy Pl.
Schoeppel, Andrew F., *Kans.*
Scott, W. Kerr, *N. C*——
Smathers, George A., *Fla*——
Smith, H. Alexander, *N. J*—Sheraton-Park
Smith, Margaret Chase, (Mrs.), *Maine.*
Sparkman, John J., *Ala*——4928 Indian Lane
Stennis, John, *Miss*——
Symington, Stuart, *Mo*——
Thye, Edward J., *Minn*——
Watkins, Arthur V., *Utah*—
Welker, Herman, *Idaho*——4823 Tilden St.
Wiley, Alexander, *Wis*——2122 Mass. Ave.
Williams, John J., *Del*——
Wofford, Thomas A., *S. C*——
Young, Milton R., *N. Dak*—Quebec House So.

OFFICERS OF THE SENATE

Secretary—Felton M. Johnston.
Chief Clerk—Emery L. Frazier.
Sergeant at Arms—Joseph C. Duke.
Secretary for the Majority—Robert G. Baker.
Secretary for the Minority—J. Mark Trice.
Chaplain—Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D.

STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE SENATE

Committee on Agriculture and Forestry

Messrs. Ellender (chairman), Johnston of South Carolina, Holland, Eastland, Clements, Humphrey, Scott, Symington, Aiken, Young, Thye, Hickenlooper, Mundt, Williams, and Schoeppel.

Committee on Appropriations

Messrs. Hayden (chairman), Russell, Chavez, Ellender, Hill, McClellan, Robertson, Magnuson, Holland, Stennis, Clements, Johnson of Texas, Bridges, Saltonstall, Young, Knowland, Thye, McCarthy, Mundt, Mrs. Smith of Maine, Messrs. Dworshak, Dirksen, and Potter.

Committee on Armed Services

Messrs. Russell (chairman), Byrd, Johnson of Texas, Kefauver, Stennis, Symington, Jackson, Ervin, Saltonstall, Bridges, Flanders, Mrs. Smith of Maine, Messrs. Case of South Dakota, Duff, and Welker.

Committee on Banking and Currency

Messrs. Fulbright (chairman), Robertson, Sparkman, Frear, Douglas, Lehman, Monroney, Morse, Capehart, Bricker, Ives, Bennett, Bush, Beall, and Payne.

Committee on the District of Columbia

Messrs. Neely (chairman), Bible, McNamara, Morse, Frear, Beall, Hruska, Case of New Jersey, and Allott.

Committee on Finance

Messrs. Byrd (chairman), George, Kerr, Frear, Long, Smathers, Anderson, Douglas, Millikin, Martin of Pennsylvania, Williams, Flanders, Malone, Carlson, and Bennett.

Committee on Foreign Relations

Messrs. George (chairman), Green, Fulbright, Sparkman, Humphrey, Mansfield, Morse, Long, Wiley, Smith of New Jersey, Hickenlooper, Langer, Knowland, Aiken, and Capehart.

Committee on Government Operations

Messrs. McClellan (chairman), Jackson, Kennedy, Symington, Ervin, Humphrey, Wofford, McCarthy, Mundt, Mrs. Smith of Maine, Messrs. Cotton, Bender, and Martin of Iowa.

Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs

Messrs. Murray (chairman), Anderson, Jackson, O'Mahoney, Bible, Neuberger, Laird, Scott, Millikin, Malone, Watkins, Dworshak, Kuchel, Barrett, and Goldwater.

Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce

Messrs. Magnuson (chairman), Pastore, Monroney, Smathers, Daniel, Ervin, Bible, Wofford, Bricker, Schoeppel, Butler, Potter, Duff, Purtell, and Payne.

Committee on the Judiciary

Messrs. Eastland (chairman), Kefauver, Johnston of South Carolina, Hennings, McClellan, Daniel, O'Mahoney, Neely, Wiley, Langer, Jenner, Watkins, Dirksen, Welker, and Butler.

Committee on Labor and Public Welfare

Messrs. Hill (chairman), Murray, Neely, Lehman, Kennedy, McNamara, ———, Smith of New Jersey, Ives, Purtell, Goldwater, Bender, and Allott.

Committee on Post Office and Civil Service

Messrs. Johnston of South Carolina (chairman), Pastore, Monroney, Hennings, Scott, Neuberger, Laird, Carlson, Jenner, Langer, Curtis, Martin of Iowa, and Case of New Jersey.

Committee on Public Works

Messrs. Chavez (chairman), Kerr, Gore, McNamara, Neuberger, Wofford, ———, Martin of Pennsylvania, Case of South Dakota, Bush, Kuchel, Cotton, and Hruska.

Committee on Rules and Administration

Messrs. Green (chairman), Hayden, Hennings, Gore, Mansfield, Jenner, Barrett, McCarthy, and Curtis.

UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT

Mr. Chief Justice Warren, of California, Hotel Sheraton-Park, Washington, D. C.
Mr. Justice Black, of Alabama, 619 S. Lee St., Alexandria, Va.
Mr. Justice Reed, of Kentucky, the Mayflower.
Mr. Justice Frankfurter, of Massachusetts, 3018 Dumbarton Ave.
Mr. Justice Douglas, of Washington, 3701 Connecticut Ave.
Mr. Justice Burton, of Ohio, the Dodge.
Mr. Justice Clark, of Texas, 2101 Connecticut Ave.
Mr. Justice Minton, of Indiana, the Methodist Building.
Mr. Justice Harlan, of New York, 1677 31st St.

OFFICERS OF THE SUPREME COURT

Clerk—Harold B. Willey, 3214 N. Wakefield St., Arlington, Va.
Deputy Clerk—Reginald C. Dilli, 1329 Hemlock St.
Deputy Clerk—Hugh W. Barr, 4701 Connecticut Ave.
Marshal—T. Perry Lippitt, 6004 Corbin Road.
Reporter—Walter Wyatt, 1702 Kalmia Rd.
Librarian—Helen Newman, 126 3d St. SE.

UNITED STATES JUDICIAL CIRCUITS

JUSTICES ASSIGNED
TERRITORY EMBRACED

District of Columbia: Mr. Chief Justice Warren. District of Columbia.

First judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Frankfurter. Maine, New Hampshire, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Puerto Rico.

Second judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Harlan. Vermont, Connecticut, New York.

Third judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Burton, Pennsylvania, New Jersey, Delaware, Virgin Islands.

Fourth judicial circuit: Mr. Chief Justice Warren. Maryland, Virginia, West Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina.

Fifth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Black. Georgia, Florida, Alabama, Mississippi, Louisiana, Texas, Canal Zone.

Sixth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Reed. Ohio, Michigan, Kentucky, Tennessee.

Seventh judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Minton. Indiana, Illinois, Wisconsin.

Eighth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Clark. Minnesota, North Dakota, South Dakota, Iowa, Nebraska, Missouri, Arkansas.

Ninth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Douglas. Washington, Oregon, Montana, Idaho, California, Nevada, Arizona, Alaska, Hawaii.

Tenth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Clark. Colorado, Wyoming, Utah, Kansas, Oklahoma, New Mexico.

Appendix

Address Delivered by Rabbi David Berent at Naturalization Ceremonies at Portland, Maine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FREDERICK G. PAYNE
OF MAINE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, July 5, 1956

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. President, on June 26, 1956, Rabbi David Berent, of the Congregation Zeth Jacob, in Lewiston, Maine, delivered one of the finest addresses it has ever been my privilege to read at naturalization ceremonies at the United States district court in Portland, Maine. This inspiring message, delivered to a group of new citizens, merits far wider circulation than it has yet received. I commend it to the Members of Congress and all Americans for careful and thoughtful reading. I ask unanimous consent that this outstanding address may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY RABBI DAVID BERENT, UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT, PORTLAND, MAINE, JUNE 26, 1956

It is a great privilege which this court has bestowed upon me, and I am mindful and deeply appreciative of the high honor. Much should be said, which I am incapable of saying, and upon a level of eloquence such as this court is accustomed to hearing, which I cannot reach.

My first words are directed in prayer to the Master Architect of the universe, that He send a perfect healing and renewal of strength to the Honorable Justice John Clifford, the judge of this court, that he may soon resume his duties with restored health in body and in spirit.

And now, congratulations are in order. Congratulations to you, new citizens who I am happy to call fellow Americans. It is indeed a pleasure for me to be able to call you fellow Americans and to extend a warm hand of welcome to each of you as you become citizens of the United States of America. You are today joining some one hundred and seventy million Americans in the privileges, rights, and obligations of American citizenship. This occasion will be indelibly inscribed in your memory as one of the most important and thrilling days in your lives, for it means the reaching of a goal—the finding of something long sought.

Today, having pledged allegiance to the United States in these naturalization ceremonies, you are as much a citizen of this Republic as the man or woman who can claim a background of a dozen generations on this soil. After all, every American came from some foreign land, with the exception of the American Indian. That beloved humorist, Will Rogers, was proud of the Indian strain in his ancestry. At one time, he made this comment: "My ancestors did not come over in the *Mayflower*—they met the boat." Of the two classes of citizens—those who claim the right by birth and those who have studied, as some of you have for as long as 3 years in the evening classes of our night schools and striven to become Americans through naturalization—I am often led to believe that the latter very often have the deeper and truer appreciation of what American citizenship really means. Americans by birth all too often accept this blessing as a matter of course.

You come here with varied backgrounds, just as those who have preceded you brought with them the best of their respective cultures. America welcomes you for what you have to offer. You have become aware through the medium of advertising, that it is the blend that counts. That's what makes good tobacco, good coffee, good flour—it's what gives quality and flavor to our Nation as well. That's why the United States stands head and shoulders above other nations—because we are a blend of many different cultures, creeds and races—an unbeatable blend of many peoples. As John Latouche in his stirring Ballad for Americans has the solo voice sing out in answer to the question, "Am I An American?" "I'm just an Irish, Negro, Jewish, Italian, French and English, Spanish, Russian, Chinese, Polish, Scotch, Hungarian, Litvak, Swedish, Finnish, Canadian, Greek and Turk and Czech and double Czeck American!" "And that ain't all—I was baptized Baptist, Methodist, Congregationalist, Lutheran, Atheist, Roman Catholic, Orthodox Jewish, Presbyterian, Seventh-day Adventist, Mormon, Quaker, Christian Scientist and lots more." Yes, my friends, a nation compounded of almost every national stock, of almost every race and color and creed, must be built on the cornerstone of tolerance, of breadth of understanding, of generosity of viewpoint, and largeness of outlook. With insignificant and sporadic exceptions, America and Americans give full tolerance to other viewpoints and are ready to assimilate the best of all groups. Therein lies her strength!

Second, you will find here a high degree of individual freedom. The Colonies were founded by refugees from Old-World restraints and by fearless seekers after individual freedom.

Third. You will find here full equality of opportunity, so that native talent and native capacity may freely rise to the top, irrespective of social or economic station.

It may be stated categorically that our country has given to its citizens more of well being, more purely material and spiritual advantages, and a higher standard of living than any other group of people has ever known for such a long period of time in all the history of mankind. With the light of freedom in their eyes, with dreams of brotherhood in their hearts, oppressed men and women fled to this country and here they became giants in the earth. Liberation from tyranny freed something heroic in their souls. They conquered a continent with civilization. They reared great cities on what had been desolate plains. They covered the good earth with fields of grain and orchards heavy with luscious fruits. They spanned the rivers and the deserts and the mountains with bridges and tunnels and railways. Through the telegraph and telephone, the radio and television they bound together the vast heterogeneous masses who were scattered from the Atlantic to the Pacific, from the Gulf of Mexico to the Great Lakes, into a great community—these great and blessed United States.

Our Nation has not been without its faults, nor have its bounties always been equitably distributed. But in the light of history, and in comparison with what other countries have achieved for their peoples, not in empty words but in bread and freedom, in faith and peace, American democracy has proved to be the most successful experiment in human living together in all the experiences of mankind. But it seems to me that the most precious contribution of democracy is something that cannot be measured by material standards. It has taken the prophetic vision of that time when every man would be able to sit beneath his own vine and fig tree and none would make him afraid. It has taken the saints' dream of a social order founded upon the Golden Rule. It has taken men's deathless aspirations for brotherhood and freedom, and it said, "Here are the materials to make your dreams come true—to realize brotherhood on the foundation of freedom."

I can testify from my own experience to the meaning and power of this American dream, for I happen to be the son of immigrants, who, as young people, fled to this country to escape from tyranny and persecution in Eastern Europe. I know from what is in the hearts of my people what this democracy means to the downtrodden and the disinherited of the earth. To millions it has meant refuge. Only a short time ago while in New York City I visited a family that had recently arrived in this country. The mother cried out of sheer joy when she told me how happy her children were in the public schools. With tears in her eyes she said to me, "You do not know what it means to be one of the very few families to be fortunate enough to survive the Hitler gas chambers. After having searched for my children who were scattered in England, France, and Belgium, finally getting them together with the aid of American relief agencies who arranged for our admittance to this country—you cannot realize what this new-found freedom means to me and my children. You can't imagine what it means to have your children free from abuse and hurt because of their race or creed." Perhaps I do not know with the poignancy of her mother's heart, but I do know what this freedom has meant to those who fled from the Old World because of persecution. The whole history of America, from the arrival of the Pilgrims at Plymouth Rock to the last refugee entering New York or Portland Harbor, is a record of man's response to the challenge of liberty.

Today you enter the golden door of citizenship. It behooves you, therefore, to pause frequently and appraise that citizenship, placing as much emphasis on its duties as its privileges. These two elements of the modern concept of citizenship, rights and duties, are mutually interdependent. The citizen will continue to enjoy his civil rights and liberties to the extent that he continues to perform his civic duties. Being an American means more than just fairmindedness; more than just a willingness to size up the other fellow on his merits, instead of judging by the color of his skin or the way he worships God. Being American means being on your toes, seeing that your neighbors enjoy the privileges of citizenship, protecting their rights as you would your

own. It means working with other Americans of every race, creed, and ancestry to solve the many problems that confront us from day to day. These are not empty phrases; they represent a way of life that has brought us prosperity and power, made us the envy, and the hope, of the world.

Remember, we are not Americans simply because we live in America and call it our country. Nor are we Americans simply because we were born of American parents or of naturalized American citizens, or merely accepted the oath of citizenship as you are doing today. No. We are Americans because we have something in common with the Americans of the past who put the seal of their spirit and the imprint of their hands on this blessed land.

But the innermost meaning of American democracy is something that goes deeper than refuge from tyranny. It is an affirmation of human dignity, as against the contempt for man, which is felt and expressed by those who espouse the political philosophy of communism. It affirms the divine worth of the individual human being. I believe that America rests on a religious conviction concerning the worth of man. Life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness are not blessings men can give, or that a ruler can take away. These are gifts with which we have been endowed by our Creator. They are, therefore, inalienable rights. It is a religious conviction which undergirds our democracy and is its strongest safeguard.

Do you like quiz shows? Here is the $64,000 question for today. On what statue wil you find these stirring words engraved?

"Give me your tired, your poor
Your huddled masses longing to breathe free,
The wretched refuse of your teeming shore,
Send these, the homeless, tempest-tossed, to me;
I lift my lamp beside the golden door."

If your answer is the Statue of Liberty, you're absolutely right. And these words, written by Emma Lazarus, a Jewess, have special meaning today as we salute you new citizens. For more than 300 years, people from all over the world have brought to these shores the energy, the vision, the many different skills that have made our country the greatest nation on earth. You new citizens are the inheritors of this proud tradition. Of all races and all religions, you are now equal partners in this mighty Union.

I am confident that you will fulfill the faith that your country is placing in you. I have faith that you will help your fellow Americans to transmit, unimpaired, the great values of which we of this generation are but trustees. I warmly extend to you my hand and my heart in welcoming you to the brotherhood of America.

Our Lives, Our Fortunes, and Our Sacred Honor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STYLES BRIDGES
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, July 5, 1956

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the appendix of the RECORD an editorial by William Loeb, publisher of the Manchester Union Leader, Manchester, N. H., entitled "Our Lives, Our Fortunes, and Our Sacred Honor."

I consider this an excellent editorial, as is the article to which it refers and which appeared in the American Legion magazine. It is a very timely commentary and I highly recommend it to my colleagues as well as to the American people as a whole.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OUR LIVES, OUR FORTUNES, AND OUR SACRED HONOR

As is customary, tomorrow, the Fourth of July, the entire front page of this newspaper will be devoted to the greatest document in the history of this Nation, the Declaration of Independence.

This editorial today is written to bring to our memory something about the signers. For many of the facts we are indebted to a splendid article, They Signed for Us, by Merle Sinclair in the July issue of the American Legion magazine, of which Manchester's own Jimmy O'Neil is publisher.

At the end of the Declaration is the great phrase: "And for the support of this Declaration, with a firm reliance on the protection of divine providence, we mutually pledge to each other our lives, our fortunes, and our sacred honor." History proves that these were no empty phrases.

Let us take the case of Francis Lewis, whose fight for freedom cost his wife her life. Because he signed the Declaration, his Long Island home was ransacked by the British, his books and papers destroyed, and his family forced to flee. His wife was captured and held in a filthy barracks for months. She refused a release that would have been given her if her husband agreed to desert the Revolution. Finally she was liberated but died 2 years later as a direct result of her mistreatment.

Then there is the case of Thomas Nelson, Jr. He was the wealthy Governor of Virginia when he signed the Declaration. He mortgaged all his property and raised $2 million, virtually overnight, with which to help the fighting in his colony. The day after he signed the Declaration his home in Yorktown was occupied by Cornwallis' personal staff. When rebels tooks the offensive, Nelson visited their firing lines. He watched the patriots' artillery raze all the houses of the neighborhood except his own.

He asked: "Why do you spare mine?" "Out of respect to you, Governor," he was told.

"Give me the cannon," Nelson ordered. Whereupon he fired and destroyed his own house. Thomas Nelson, Jr., gave his entire fortune to his country. He was never paid a penny of it back. Dying penniless, he was buried in a nameless grave.

Then let us take Rev. John Witherspoon, of New Jersey, who had been president of Princeton College for 10 years. Needless to say, this was in the days before Princeton believed in inviting Alger Hisses to the campus. When a southern delegate to Congress opposed ratification because "we are not ripe for revolution," Rev. Mr. Witherspoon rose to his great height and shouted, "Not ripe, sir? We are not only ripe but rotting for want of it."

Oldest signer of the Declaration was Stephen Hopkins, of Rhode Island, who was suffering from palsy so badly that he could hardly hold his hand still when he signed. Said Hopkins: "My hand trembles, but my heart does not."

Hopkins was 10 times Governor of Rhode Island, chief justice of its supreme court, and first chancellor of Brown University. He must be rolling in his grave when you consider the attitude of Barnaby Keeney, present president of Brown University. Keeney, it will be recalled, called J. Edgar Hoover an anti-intellectual.

Then there was Caesar Rodney, of Delaware, suffering from a cancer which had already affected half his face. He was on his deathbed, 80 miles from Philadelphia, when he was told that his vote was necessary for ratification. Rodney rose from his bed, in fever and pain, and rode the 80 miles in a thunderstorm, arriving in the Halls of Congress in Philadelphia as the voting on the ratification of the Declaration of Independence was going on and just as the name "Delaware" was called. "I vote 'yes,'" said Rodney as he sank, exhausted, to his seat.

Carter Braxton, of Virginia, was the richest of all the signers. He died in debt, a broken-hearted man. His fortune had been in ships. All were captured by the British.

John Hart, of New Jersey, another signer, was a farmer. His wife lay dying when Hessians reached his farm, a few months after he signed the Declaration. He was driven from her side. His property was ruined and his 13 children fled, and he never saw his wife alive again. He was almost 70, but he joined Washington's army as a private.

Finally, we come to Lewis Morris, of New York. As he was about to sign he received word that the enemy was at the gates of his Long Island home, but that his property would be spared if he would withhold his vote for liberty. Said Morris: "There are plenty of homes, but only one country."

What do the signers think about today as they view conditions in the present-day United States? What will they think tomorrow if pitifully few American flags are displayed in the State of New Hampshire? Furthermore, what would they think of the craven and cowardly foreign policy of the United States today?

Federal Assistance to States for School Construction

SPEECH
OF
HON. HUGH SCOTT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 3, 1956

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H. R. 7535) to authorize Federal assistance to the States and local communities in financing an expanded program of school construction so as to eliminate the national shortage of classrooms.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT].

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Chairman, difficult problems compel difficult decisions. Under this bill the State of Pennsylvania will be required to contribute about $30½ million and will receive back about $25 million. We are interested in what happens to the $5½ million for which we get no return other than the satisfaction of seeing that it is justly and fairly administered and distributed. If this money were to be distributed by States which had levied taxes for it, those States might well say that we should leave the entire matter to them. But if the money is to be raised by other States and distributed by the Federal Government then I think we should be bound by the Federal law and by the decisions of the Supreme Court.

It was shocking to me to hear the distinguished Vice Chairman of the Democrat National Committee argue against the Powell amendment. The opposition to the Powell amendment of ex-President Truman and the Democrat National Committee exhibits continuing determination to kill civil rights measures. This is not the first time Harry Truman has tried to pull the rug out from under civil rights legislation.

(Mr. SCOTT asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Federal Assistance to States for School Construction

SPEECH
OF
HON. CLEVELAND M. BAILEY
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 3, 1956

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H. R. 7535) to authorize Federal assistance to the States and local communities in financing an expanded program of school construction so as to eliminate the national shortage of classrooms.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, the proposal of the gentleman from New York is a basic one. If adopted it can well mean the death of this legislation, if not in the House most certainly in the other body.

My position is well known, Mr. Chairman. Some years ago I assisted the gentleman from New York in getting a fair employment practices bill out of our Committee on Education and Labor by a 13-to-12 vote. I assisted him in the fight on the floor even though it was a losing fight. I am still sympathetic toward minority groups.

The Supreme Court has ruled on two occasions, once in 1954 and again in 1955, that the group he seeks to aid is no longer a minority group in the field of educational affairs. I must oppose his amendment on the ground that it has no place in this legislation.

He is not satisfied with equality; he wants the Congress to give special treatment to his race. He wants us to pick them up now that they are on a basis of equality, pick them up as a considered group over and above everybody else who is on a basis of equality, and pass legislation to punish somebody.

It is not the purpose of the Congress of the United States, it is not the function of the Congress, to pass punitive legislation; it is the function of the Congress to pass legislation that is for the general welfare and that bears equally on everyone.

It is the function of the courts to administer punishment and the courts are open to him just like they are open to all the rest of our citizens.

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BAILEY. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania. Will the gentleman explain to the committee whether or not the Committee on Education and Labor considered this amendment?

Mr. BAILEY. We did.

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania. What was the result?

Mr. BAILEY. I think the vote was 17 to 10, as I recall it. If I am wrong, I am sure the clerk of the committee can correct me. I think that was the vote in the Committee on Education and Labor.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to submit at this time for inclusion in the RECORD a wire I just received from the National Education Association in session at Portland, Oreg., as follows:

JULY 2, 1956.

Hon. CLEVELAND M. BAILEY,
United States House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.:

The 2,200 delegates representing over 550,000 classroom teachers in these United States meeting today at their annual business meeting in Portland, Oreg., urgently request the defeat of the Powell amendment and the passage of H. R. 7535 to meet the urgent need of classrooms for our Nation's children.

ELIZABETH YANK,
President, Department of Classroom Teachers, National Education Association.

Here is another telegram from West Virginia, as follows:

The executive board of the West Virginia Federation of Women's Clubs representing 20,000 West Virginia women in session in Charleston ask for your support of the school building construction bill without the Powell amendment.

Mrs. PHARES E. REEDER,
President.

DUNBAR, W. VA.

Here is a telegram from the secretary of the National Education Association in session at Portland, Oreg.:

Respectfully urge you be on House floor to oppose and vote against Powell amendment.

WILLIAM G. CARR,
Executive Secretary, National Education Association.
JOHN LESTER BUFORD,
President, National Education Association.

Mr. Chairman, I also have the following letter from James G. Patton, president of the National Farmers Union, as follows:

NATIONAL FARMERS UNION,
Washington, D. C., June 26, 1956.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: National Farmers Union urges you to support the school-construction bill, H. R. 7535. More than ample justification for enactment into law has been given the Labor and Education Committee in lengthy hearings.

Rural farm States in particular are in need of assistance. Since the beginning of the industrial revolution, wealth has flowed from farm to metropolitan-industrial areas. Migration of rural youth, settlement of estates with off-farm residents, and payment of interest and rent to off-farm interests all contribute to the loss of wealth in rural areas. Wealth from farms will continue to move in this manner with an increasing amount flowing across State lines. The only means we as a Nation have to protect the right of our children to equal educational opportunity is to provide through the Congress the taxing of wealth where it is and the use of funds so derived to help children where they live.

The many long-standing programs of federally aided education have operated under universal local control. National Farmers Union strongly supports local control of educational programs at every level. We do not believe approval of federally aided school construction will violate this principle of long standing.

National Farmers Union strongly believes the bill will give greatly needed aid to children both in urban and rural areas. We hope that you will support H. R. 7535, opposing any crippling amendment when it reaches the House floor for debate and vote.

Sincerely,

JAMES G. PATTON,
President.

Then I wish to submit also the following news item from the National Education Association, which includes a speech by Eric Johnston made at the Annual Convention of the National Education Association in Portland, Oreg. This news item is as follows:

ERIC JOHNSTON, FORMER CHAMBER OF COMMERCE PRESIDENT, ENDORSES FEDERAL AID FOR SCHOOL CONSTRUCTION

PORTLAND, OREG., July 2. Eric Johnston, president of the Motion Picture Association of America and former president of the United States Chamber of Commerce, declared here tonight that there is no crisis in education that money won't cure and that some of the money—"perhaps most of it—must come from the Federal Government." Mr. Johnston's endorsement of the use of Federal funds for education and more specifically of passage of the school construction bill now being debated in Congress comprised a major part of the speech delivered at the National Education Association annual convention being held here this week.

"At the outset," he said, "I would like to offer one personal conviction. I am for Federal financial responsibility in American edueation. I say this unequivocally. I know and you know that we cannot buy one new classroom or hire one new teacher with a tax cut. Personally, as a businessman, I would favor postponing any cutting of corporate or income taxes until we deliver adequate funds for restoring our national educational system. * * * I firmly believe that Federal support for education can be supplied without disturbing the autonomy of our Nation's schools in our local communities."

Mr. Johnston pointed to congressional approval of an expenditure for highway construction that could amount to some $3 billion annually for the next decade. "I favor this expenditure. We need the roads," he continued, "but if we can afford $3 billion of Federal funds each year to improve our roads, why can't we afford $3 billion to improve our schools?"

"I know full well," he stated, "that an additional $3 billion for our schools must come from taxes, not tax cuts. Now some people say we must cut taxes to stimulate business. As a businessman, I am sure we can also stimulate business through a Federal school construction program."

"It's not hard to offer new ideas," he concluded, "It's always harder to work them out. One reason for this is that our society is always in motion—and today it is moving at breakneck speed, with the accelerator down to the floorboard. The status-quo people will undoubtedly argue that large-scale Federal support for education is at least upsetting, possibly radical, probably dangerous. But status-quoism is an old-fashioned and fairly common disease. We've cured it before. We can cure it again. And we shall also cure the diseases now besetting education."

AN ADDRESS BY ERIC JOHNSTON BEFORE THE ANNUAL CONVENTION OF THE NATIONAL EDUCATION ASSOCIATION, PORTLAND, OREG., JULY 2, 1956, MULTNOMAH STADIUM

The theme of your convention this week is "Be Proud To Teach." It's a fine theme. But pride is not enough. I have not come before you this evening to talk as a professional in the field of education. I don't pretend to be one. I have come to talk to you as a businessman and taxpayer who is interested in the welfare, growth and prestige of our country.

You have talked and I presume will continue to talk during your entire session on the crisis in education. I want to say to you as a businessman that there is no crisis in education—that money won't cure.

And that is why I say that pride is not enough? To be proud of your profession, your profession must have a proper status in our society. This will cost money.

At the outset, I would like to offer one personal conviction. I am for Federal financial responsibility in American education. I say this unequivocally.

I know and you know that we cannot buy one new classroom or hire one new teacher with a tax cut. Personally, as a businessman, I would favor postponing any cutting of corporate or income taxes until we deliver adequate funds for restoring our national educational system.

At the same time, I would like to add that I am against the Federal Government telling our schools what they should teach, or how they should teach it. I firmly believe that Federal support for education can be supplied without disturbing the autonomy of our Nation's schools in our local communities.

* * * We've heard the nature of our educational crisis recited many times in many ways—inadequate schools for our growing population, inadequate salaries and status for teachers, inadequate recruits for the teaching profession, inadequate recognition of gifted students, inadequate opportunities for students to proceed to the limit of their talents, inadequate opportunities for students to become acquainted with our complex world—both at home and abroad.

Some of these problems have been with us for years, but never have they been more acute. Let me anchor this fact with a statistic. In the 20 years between 1930 and 1950 our school enrollments remained about the same. Today our school enrollments are increasing by 1¼ million students every year. If we weren't prepared for our new students in the 1940's, how well prepared do we think we are in 1956?

With that disturbing question, I hope to put aside the problems and consider some of the solutions. I don't think it will be hard to find workable solutions—if we are willing to pay for them. As we all know, free education is free only to school children. Someone has to pay for it.

At this moment in our history, we're getting our nickel's worth of education—perhaps even a dime's worth for a nickel. But if we want a dollar's worth, we're going to have to spend a dollar. There is no bargain counter price for education in this or any country.

This year our States and communities are spending almost $10½ billion annually for our public elementary and high schools—which amounts to about 3 percent of our gross national income. How do we spend it? According to our public ledgers, we are now paying about $2½ billion annually for new school buildings, about $5 billion for teachers' salaries, and about $3 billion for all additional school costs—books, pencils and paper; heat, light and water; and the salaries of clerks, cooks and janitors.

This amount is simply not enough—neither for our school sytem today nor for the expanded school system we will require tomorrow. How much more do we need and where will it come from? As a rough figure—a kind of target figure to shoot at—we might consider an additional sum of $3 billion a year for education. I don't intend to stand here tonight and tell the Congress of the United States what it should appropriate—as to the final precise amount, even educators will disagree.

Where the increased funds must come from, however, is a rather simpler question. Some of it, perhaps most of it, must come from the Federal Government. In the gaslight era of our recent past, the States and communities collected 75 percent of all tax revenue and the Federal Government collected 25 percent. Today the States and communities collect only 25 percent while the Federal Government collects 75 percent. If our schools need more tax money today, and they do, they have to go where the tax money is.

Our Congress this year has considered an expenditure for highway construction that could amount to some $3 billion annually for the next decade. I favor this expenditure. We need the roads. But if we can afford $3 billion of Federal funds each year to improve our roads, why can't we afford $3 billion to improve our schools?

I know full well that an additional $3 billion for our schools must come from taxes, not tax cuts. Now some people say we must cut taxes to stimulate business. As a businessman, I am sure we can also stimulate business through a Federal school-construction program. I am opposed to cutting taxes generally until we put our schools in order.

How do we arrive at our target figure of an additional $3 billion a year for education? First of all, we must have more classrooms because we have more children to put into them than ever before and because we have neglected to build enough classrooms for the past 20 years. Today more than a million children can't be properly educated—unless you have no objection to such emergency schoolhouses as war-weary barracks and empty garages.

I am no expert in this field, so I called on the experts. The Federal Office of Education, which has more dedication to its work than funds to carry it out, tells me we must build at least 95,000 classrooms a year for the next 5 years to meet our present needs and increasing enrollments. Their experts say we are now building only 67,000 classrooms a year and that unless we expand our construction program, we will have to stretch the very walls of our schoolhouses to crowd in the avalanche of new students.

I asked how much more we needed, at a minimum, for school construction. With their hearts as well as with their slide rules, they set the figure at $1½ billion annually.

It's not hard to offer new ideas. It's always harder to work them out. One reason for this is that our society is always in motion, and today it is moving at breakneck speed, with the accelerator down to the floorboard. The status quo people will undoubtedly argue that large-scale Federal support for education is at least upsetting, possibly radical, probably dangerous. But status quoism is an old-fashioned and fairly common disease. We've cured it before. We can cure it again. And we shall also cure the diseases now besetting education.

No nation on earth is more devoted than we are to a system of universal free education. After all, we invented the idea. But in recent years, we've neglected our responsibility and now we must give more than lipservice, we must dig into our own pockets. That may hurt a bit, but the rewards will be enormous, for ourselves and the generations to come.

With the funds we need we can restore our educational system to the status it deserves; we can relieve the shortage of skilled people in this country; we can provide an adequate school plant for the children we're raising, an adequate staff to instruct them, and a status for the teaching profession to rank among the highest in America. When that day comes, one truly may be proud to teach.

Bridges Warns on Foreign Aid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STYLES BRIDGES
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, July 5, 1956

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article by Bill Cunningham, an outstanding columnist for the Boston Herald and radio and TV commentator, entitled "Bridges Warns on Foreign Aid." This article appeared in the Boston Sunday Herald of July 1, 1956.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BRIDGES WARNS ON FOREIGN AID

(By Bill Cunningham)

"Let us bear in mind that every American compromise, however it may be explained, is multiplied in other countries into surrenders. Our job, to ensure our own security, and to secure the survival of freedom on this earth, is to galvanize the stragglers, the fearful, the intimidated, by examples of moral valor and spiritual dedication. Such is the rule of leadership which, though we never sought it, we can reject only at our peril."

So said New Hampshire's Senator BRIDGES, as he approached the conclusion of a hard-hitting speech on United States foreign policy on the floor of the Senate last Wednesday afternoon. His absolute conclusion went as follows:

"That, my friends, is what I meant when I said that attitudes and basic principles are no less decisive than actions and policies. An attitude of compromise on essentials, phony friendships with gangsters at any price, leads to one set of decisions.

"It is precisely these underlying considerations which must be examined in the debate on foreign policy which will develop in the forthcoming election campaign. We can excuse and make up for failures of particular policies. Those reflect the mistakes of fallible men in a complex situation.

"We dare not excuse a failure of nerve and a failure of principle, for those witness a weakening and threaten a collapse of our whole moral structure. If the present drift to cynical grayness, where once we knew the difference between black and white, is not arrested and reversed, we shall lose our ability to defend ourselves. Indeed, we shall have little left that is worth defending."

This address, entitled "The Moral Crisis in American Foreign Policy," was part of the great debate on foreign aid, although beyond questioning the value of further contributions to Tito and Nehru, it had little to say about foreign aid as such. Rather it was intended to serve as a reminder and a warning of how far we've wandered from the real point of it all, how fuzzy much of our official thinking has become, and how foolish it is to be taken in by the new Russian pose.

SOMETHING OF A REBUKE

Whether it was meant to or not, it came as something of a rebuke to an emotional address previously delivered by the veteran Senator GEORGE, of Georgia, in which he appealed to the Senate to raise "the best

hopes of mankind" by restoring the $700 million to President Eisenhower's foreign-aid program. Senator GEORGE, as chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee is leading the fight for adoption of the $4.5 billion foreign-aid program for the fiscal year that starts today.

"Is there anyone in this body, or in America, who believes we can abandon our world responsibilities without the gravest consequences to humanity?" the veteran southerner asked the Senate in a speech that brought him close to tears at its close. "The danger of war cannot be avoided if we begin in this bill to liquidate the military strength of the free world."

Many Senators moved forward to wring Senator GEORGE's hand when he had finished and the scene was very emotional. Many reporters and commentators gave this the old Billy Sunday, hit-the-sawdust-trail twist and preferred to see it as GEORGE's having converted many former opponents of the full Presidential measure.

Others, less inspired, saw it more in the line of a sentimental farewell to an old friend and a great figure. This was quite possibly the last major speech the 78-year-old, Democratic leader will ever make from the floor of the Senate of which he has been a Member for 34 years.

He was up for reelection in November, and at first declared himself as a candidate.

Later, after surveying the situation as it seems to stand in his home State, he decided he didn't have a chance against Georgia's former Governor and present champion of State's rights and segregation, Herman Talmadge and so he withdrew with the prospect of remaining in the field of foreign affairs as the President's Ambassador to NATO. Thus, as an internationalist, he becomes a casualty along with such figures as Senators Vandenburg and Ferguson, and apparently Wisconsin's Senator WILEY, whose grassroots electorates didn't agree with their assumption of authority as global experts and policy pushers.

NO REFERENCE TO GEORGE

The Bridges address made no reference to Senator GEORGE, nor even to the Presidential policy. In fact, it didn't even knock foreign aid. Instead, it said:

"I have long favored the basis of our foreign-aid program. I was for foreign aid nearly two decades ago, at a time when that position was not entirely popular, because I believed it was essential to the security of the United States and the protection of the free world. I am still for a truly mutual-assistance program, with particular emphasis on aiding those countries who honestly intend to help themselves and the rest of the free world."

But in explaining further he said, "In my view foreign aid should be employed to build and nurture these allies and alliances necessary to protect us and to assure our safety." He had already said, "the purpose of our foreign policy is to promote and protect the true interests of our people," and said this is the basic and original fact that's being lost in such "incredible confusions."

But, to go on with the above, after saying, "in my view foreign aid, military, economic and technical, is an instrument of foreign policy," Senator BRIDGES continued, "We must match with bonds of friendship the enmities our opponents try to create.

"We want to help other nations, to strengthen them spiritually and economically, so that if they are assaulted, or if we are assaulted, we will all be much stronger to resist and to fight. I don't care about buying gratitude, but we ought to buy something.

"Surely we aren't spending $5 billion a year on a huge giveaway charity program. We have no right to tax our people just to give largesse all over the world. If nations tell us they want our economic help but that what side they are on is none of our business, or that they see good in both sides, and some bad in both sides, then how does helping them aid our foreign policy? What kind of global do-gooding is that?

"How can we respect ourselves for giving our money and substance all over the world and asking nothing in return? What has this to do with an effective policy which, in this day and age ought to be pretty hard, and realistic? Our survival, as a people and a Nation may depend upon who our allies are and how firmly they stand with us.

"And, if we don't have any allies, we ought to know that too, and act accordingly. This confusion—this softheadedness—must end. We must realistically reappraise the whole business or in the end we will waste our substance and perish. * * *"

TITO HONEYMOON

Of Tito he said, "What have we got for the billion dollars we gave him? We fed him, bolstered him when Stalin tried to crush him, we supplied and equipped his army. And what have we got for our pains? We get a Tito honeymoon, staged in Moscow. We get a statement from Marshal Zhukov to Tito that, in war, the Kremlin and Tito, will fight shoulder to shoulder. We get an official statement that Tito and the Kremlin will make stubborn efforts to see that Red China is admitted to the U. N.

"We get an official statement that East and West Germany must be reunited, not by plebiscite, nor popular vote but by a negotiated deal. We get an official statement that Formosa must be handed over to Red China. Americans paid $1 billion for this, and if any one can show me why we should provide more money for Tito, I should like to be shown.

"It was a disdain for moral values which maneuvered us into the folly of building up the dictator, Tito of Yugoslavia. And it is the same retreat from moral standards which today creates the confusion over so-called neutralists. * * *"

Then he went on to say that neutrality makes sense where physical war is concerned and some country wants to stay out of it, but cold war, where the contest is a conflict of "human, moral, and spiritual" issues—"the determination of a crusading totalitarianism to extend its pattern of life to the rest of the human race" is definitely something else, and who, here can be neutral?

"Every time a spokesman for the free world speaks of neutrality in the old sense in relation to our present dilemma, he cheapens the issue and betrays the high purpose of the free world. He helps make it seem—as the Kremlin wants it to seem—simply an old style duel for power. On that false assumption the contest loses its true significance, and other countries are fortified in their delusion that the whole thing concerns only the main antagonists: the United States and Russia.

"It is at this point that I lose patience with those nations which are not only neutralist in their military position, but insist upon neutralism in their moral position. I know of no worse offender in this regard than Nehru, who proclaims himself the moralist of Asia.

"I know of no instance where Nehru has openly and sincerely taken the side of freedom and democracy. I know only weasel words and idle pretensions. Nehru has yet to denounce slave labor, torture, trial without jury, political violence, and all the absolute dictatorship that goes with Soviet Russia.

MAY YET COME AROUND

"It is just possible that Nehru may yet come around and denounce Stalin. Everyone else is doing it. It's thoroughly fashionable and quite safe. Dead men can't retaliate. But, on a more specific level, I cannot feel justified in voting large sums of foreign aid to India. * * *

Earlier in the address, Senator BRIDGES had said "It is with the moral and spiritual side of our problem that I am greatly concerned.

"I don't say Americans are morally weak. I do say we are morally confused. Nowhere is this moral confusion worse than among our so-called liberal intellectuals. This confusion tends to paralyze the mind and the will. The more extended the paralysis, the easier the Communist victory.

"There are moral questions on which we cannot be neutral. The recognition of physical torture as a deliberate instrument of government, the employment of secret police, the use of summary trials and executions behind closed doors, the dragooning of forced labor—these and other practices of tyrannical despotisms have been abhorrent to our people. Yet these practiecs are commonplace in Communist states.

"Right now, we are being told that some mysterious and inexorable law of history and economics is remaking the conduct of the Russians. Things are going to be different. How different? In what way? The 'purported' speech of Khrushchev before the 20th Communist Party Congress * * * (said) * * * of the gruesome methods of the Stalin regime, 'When the cases of some of those so-called "spies" and saboteurs were examined, it was found that all their cases were fabricated. Confessions of guilt of many arrested and charged with enemy activity were gained with the help of cruel and inhuman tortures. * * *

"He continued with instance after instance of these horrors. He spoke repeatedly of trials in secret, of what he calls 'illegality,' etc. What does he mean by the word 'secret' and 'illegality'? This man engaged in denouncing Stalin for these crimes, is the prominent member of an oligarchy which, since it came to power, has been doing the very things of which Stalin is now accused.

"Beria, the Chief of Secret Police, was not the only man the present regime has sent to death. We don't know how many, but we do know that a few weeks ago, the news was permitted to leak out that four lieutenants of Beria had been tried in secret and shot. Is this what you call legal? Is this what you call 'an open trial'? I say we have no evidence whatever that the leopard has changed his spots.

"Only a short time ago, Khrushchev and Bulganin paid a visit to Britain. While there, they were entertained at dinner by Labor Members of Parliament. When the dinner was over the time came for questions. One of those present adressed Khrushchev and said there was concern in Britain over the fact of a number of Social Democrats who had been imprisoned and had disappeared in Eastern Europe.

"Would Mr. Khrushchev be so good as to receive a list of the names and, at his convenience, furnish information about these Social Democrats? the man asked. According to the description of the dinner, Khrushchev turned livid with rage. He brushed aside the list of names and said, 'Why should I take such a list when I have no idea whatever of paying any attention to it?' * * *

"Are we going to give away here a little, there a little, to people of this stripe? There was once a British Prime Minister who went to Munich to get what he called 'peace in our time.' You know what happened. Are we to ignore and pass over and rationalize these things? I say we cannot if we have any moral principle left. We cannot if we act on moral principle at all. * * *"

How much good this will do remains to be seen, but it's a straight and needed reaffirmation of basic principles and common sense. At this point, however, its' practically a voice crying in the wilderness. The Russion "New Look" is making a great hit in many places—the recent triumph in Egypt, for example.

"Neutralism" is the new international style, and even President Eisenhower flum-

bumbled into an endorsement of it recently, and did an awkward job of retracting. It's said that even our White House staff is softtening toward the admission of Red China, if it can only be stalled until after the elections. Foreign aid, at the rate of $5 billions a year for friends and foes alike and with no strings, nor any idea of "buying something" is being driven hard, and will probably pass.

The Bridges voice may be crying in the Wilderness, as it has cried there before, once or twice in this column, as he's quoted in that speech, but it's strange how truly and prophetically these lonely voices speak occasionally. One of these Sundays I'm going to show you by quoting from some of the most bitterly attacked speeches of Senator Taft. Reread now, in the light of what's happened, he seems often to have been the only man in Washington whose vision was clear and whose conclusions were right. This address of Senator BRIDGES places him in the same category currently.

Speech of Hon. Sidney R. Yates Before the National Convention of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, San Francisco, Calif., June 29, 1956

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. SIDNEY R. YATES

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 5, 1956

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address:

SPEECH OF HON. SIDNEY R. YATES BEFORE THE NATIONAL CONVENTION OF THE NATIONAL ASSOCIATION FOR THE ADVANCEMENT OF COLORED PEOPLE, SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF., JUNE 29, 1956

Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen, I am grateful for your invitation to speak to you tonight and to participate in this convention. Your kind invitation gives me the opportunity to pay tribute to your fine organization for its devoted fight for freedom for all Americans.

"Freedom is more than a word * * * freedom is a creative spirit that summons the energies of all men to the task of building the kind of community, the kind of nation, the kind of world in which they want to live. It is a dream of a world in which all men, women, and children are encouraged to grow to their fullest—physically, mentally, spiritually—so that they may fulfill the great promise of their inner potential."

It is for this freedom—so aptly stated by President Edward J. Sparling, of Roosevelt University of Chicago—that the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People has been making a great fight, and for which it deserves the thanks of all Americans. I have been in the Congress for 8 years. In that time I have come to know and to appreciate the dedicated work being done by the NAACP. In the courts, working with Congressmen and with officials in the executive branch, the NAACP has indeed served as one of the most active guardians of the conscience of the community. As one of society's good housekeepers, it lifts the rug under which the Nation has swept and tried to forget the difficult problems of human relationships, in order that they may be exposed to the light of decency and cleaned up.

This is an important meeting for both political parties. It is to be expected that I would meet with Mr. SCOTT at this meeting because he is one of the few members of his party who remembers that it is the party of Lincoln. Knowing this, whenever there is a meeting on civil rights, the Republican National Committee appoints Mr. SCOTT as the party spokesman in order to try to convey the impression that the other members of the Republican Party are like him. Every time there is a meeting of the NAACP you will find HUGH SCOTT present as a party spokesman. The Republicans don't have anybody else they can substitute in his place.

And Mr. SCOTT is about as good a spokesman as the Republicans have. Unfortunately for him, he has no product to sell, because the Republican Party's record on civil rights is a blank—a real dud. Regardless of this fact, however, the Republican Party still tries for the votes of those who want civil rights progress.

The NAACP recognized the potency of the ballot as a sword and shield to obtain justice almost a half century ago. In the first issue of the Crisis in November 1910, Dr. W. E. B. DuBois sounded the clarion call to Negroes everywhere to qualify and vote so that they might have a part in shaping their country's destiny and their own. "Let every colored man who can, vote," urged Dr. DuBois, "whether he vote the Republican or Democratic ticket, let him vote it, not because his father did or because he is afraid, but because, after intelligent consideration, he thinks the success of that ticket best for his people and his country."

Negroes are like all other Americans in seeking the blessings of this democracy. They want equal protection of the laws. They want no more, no less than is their just birthright under the Constitution. They want to enjoy the equal opportunity to work in any position for which their training and education qualify them. They want to see an end to discrimination by employers and by unenlightened labor unions.

They want the right to engage in the election of candidates for all offices and to run for office themselves, without fear of becoming the victims of a bigoted, lawless mob. They want the right, too, to be considered for appointive office on all levels, including that of the President's Cabinet itself.

They want the end of separate but equal facilities, with the tag of inferiority which such separation brings. They want the elimination of Jim Crow everywhere—in transportation, in hotel accommodations, in restaurants, in recreation and entertainment. They want the opportunity for their children to obtain the same good education that is offered to the other children of our country, and they want fulfillment of the Supreme Court's decision in the school case.

In short, they want the eradication of second-class citizenship. In this respect, the ballot has been and will continue to be a most potent weapon.

It was the ballot, bringing the Democratic Party into power in 1932, which contributed most toward projecting America's minority peoples closer to their goal of equality than any other influence in our history. Led by Presidents Franklin D. Roosevelt and Harry S. Truman, the New Deal and Fair Deal brought hope and courage to the masses of American people to replace the despair which had been their lot under Republican administrations. The Democrats brought, too, the opportunity to earn a decent living after the Republicans had left deep poverty and depression in their wake.

The New Deal and the Fair Deal brought a social revolution which changed the people's attitude toward their Government. As explained by Republican editor William Allen White, the victory of the Democrats indicated a firm desire on the part of the American people to use government as an agency of human welfare.

Under this concept, the powers of government were used by Democratic administrations to assure the American people of the right to a usful and remunerative job; of the right to earn enough to provide adequate food, clothing, and recreation; of the right of every farmer to raise and sell his products at a return which would give him and his family a decent living; of the right of every businessman to trade in an atmosphere of freedom from unfair competition and domination by monopolies; of the right to a decent home; of the right to adequate medical care and the opportunity to achieve and enjoy good health; of the right to a good education for their children; of the right to adequate protection from the economic fears of old age, sickness, accident, and unemployment.

Taking action to achieve these goals, the Democratic Party initiated legislation for a minimum wage law; for a full employment law; for a Federal aid to education bill; for raising health standards through adequate medical care; for good housing, including public housing; for unemployment compensation and for social security; for a farm bill that would permit farmers to live in decency.

And all this time what were the Republicans doing? They were opposing every single one of the New Deal measures. The record shows that all the social reforms which are recognized today as being an essential part of our democratic way of life were enacted into law in spite of—not because of—the Republican Party.

Why did they oppose such reforms? They said they were socialistic.

Socialistic? Not to all Republicans. The Democratic program wasn't socialistic to Dr. Channing H. Tobias, for example, who at the time was an Independent Republican. He said that he proposed to support President Roosevelt in 1944 "because his philosophy of government and the generally progressive course he has followed for the past 12 years have vested the common man of every race, creed, and color with a dignity and inspired him with a hope that he has never known before."

Dr. W. E. B. DuBois, after looking carefully at the record, was convinced "without the slightest doubt that Franklin D. Roosevelt has done more for the uplift and progress of the American Negro than any president since Abraham Lincoln."

And with respect to President Truman, Mr. Thurgood Marshall, whom I think you know, and is one of the most respected attorneys in Washington, had this to say in a recent radio interview when he was asked about possible presidential candidates: "The candidate that gets nearest to Harry S. Truman will more than likely get the votes of the people who believe in civil rights. That's my belief."

It is to be expected that these outstanding leaders would so express themselves. Mr. SCOTT stated that the New Deal improved the economic condition of Negroes in this country. It certainly did. The rise of the average American under the Roosevelt reforms was amazing. Knowing that there could be no true freedom unless there is freedom from want, the New Deal of the Democratic Party set about first the elimination of the ravaging effects of poverty, and bringing a dignity to the forgotten man that he never before enjoyed. Both the President and Mrs. Roosevelt gave him a recognition and the feeling that he was a necessary part of the community—that he belonged.

And as for Harry Truman, he became the symbol of progress in the field of human rights. It was he who established the famous Commission to study the complex problems of assuring every citizen's constitutional rights. It was he who fathered the greatest all-around legislative program in the

field of civil and constitutional rights this country has ever known.

Yes, and it was Harry Truman who stuck by that program right through the 1948 Democratic Convention and right through the election, even though he knew it might split his own party and cost him the Presidency.

Harry Truman is a man who knows what it is to stand up and fight for what he believes in, no matter what the cost. More important, perhaps, is the fact that his civil-rights program was not just an election-year matter. Year after year, he kept urging his program on the Congress.

Just compare President Truman's actions with those of the present administration. What a difference. Under President Truman the Federal Government stood squarely behind the constitutional rights of all individuals. Shortly before he left office he stated his view of the responsibility of Federal Government in this field. "I am not one of those," he said, "who feel that we can leave these matters up to the States alone, or that we can rely solely upon the efforts of men of good will. * * * The full force and power of the Federal Government must stand behind the protection of rights guaranteed by our Federal Constitution."

No wonder Thurgood Marshall is searching for a candidate that "gets nearest to Harry S. Truman."

I was in the 81st Congress when the civil-rights bills were filed to implement the civil-rights program, as recommended by President Truman's Commission. They might have been passed if the northern Democrats had received the cooperation rather than the opposition of the northern Republicans. But because most of the members of the Republican Party chose to work with reactionary Dixiecrats from the South, the bills were defeated.

For example, I remember very well the fight on an FEPC bill in 1950 because I was right in the middle of it. After months of maneuvering the bill finally came to the floor on Washington's Birthday, February 22. The southern Congressmen who opposed the bill fought it with the only filibuster that the House knows, quorum calls and rollcalls. Even though the bill had been made the legislative business of the day, after completion of the reading of Washington's Address, which is always done on his birthday, Congressman Cox of Georgia got up and moved that the House adjourn out of respect to the memory of George Washington. Time after time that day I watched Republican Members of the House walk off the floor so that a quorum call would be necessary. A quorum call takes 40 minutes. There were about 10 of them.

We got a vote on FEPC at 3 o'clock the next morning. Those of us who favored the strong bill, watched with dismay when a substitute bill which took away all the enforcement powers of FEPC was offered. Was it offered by a southern Democrat? It was not. It was offered by the ranking Republican member of the Committee on Education and Labor, and the Republicans approved it. On that vote, a majority of the Democrats voted against the substitute bill. Sixty-eight percent of the Republicans voted for it.

You have heard, too, that no civil-rights bill can get through the Senate because of the threat of a southern filibuster.

In 1949 the Republicans in the Senate had an opportunity to strike a blow for civil-rights progress. They could have helped by supporting Vice President Barkley in his ruling to close a loophole in the antifilibuster rules. But nearly three-fifths of the Republicans voted against Mr. Barkley. As a result the Senate today is shackled by the infamous rule 22, which makes it virtually impossible to stop a filibuster. Was the author of that rule a southern Democrat? He was not. The author was the late Senator Wherry, of Nebraska, who was then the Republican floor leader of the Senate.

As a matter of fact, when southern Democrats have proposed anti-civil-rights measures, northern Democrats rather than Republicans have been in the forefront to resist them. A few years ago, Congressman WINSTEAD, of Mississippi, offered an amendment to the Selective Service Act which gave the right to every inductee to serve in a segregated outfit, if he chose. That amendment, which was approved by the House Armed Services Committee, was defeated on the floor of the House because of a magnificent speech delivered by Congressman WILLIAM L. DAWSON, of Chicago. Congressman DAWSON, a Democrat, is the first Negro chairman of a major congressional committee in the history of the Nation.

The record shows that the Republican Party has fought public housing; it has fought the minimum-wage law and subsequent increases; it has fought social security and increased coverage and benefits; it has fought unemployment compensation; it has fought appropriations for health measures and hospitals; it has fought FEPC; it has fought Federal aid to education. It has fought all progressive legislation.

But now the Republicans say—forget the past. We have a new Republican Party. We are now the party of Eisenhower. Forget the fact that the Republican Party did little to help the average man when it was in power. Forget that the Republican Party fought all measures for the people. Forget that it is the party of big business. This is a new party, say the Republicans.

Well, let me say this, former President Calvin Coolidge was once asked the question: "Mr. President, do the people where you come from say a hen lays or a hen lies?" Mr. Coolidge replied: "The people where I come from, sir, lift her up to see."

Let's lift up the hen and take a look at the new Republican Party. What has the President done in the field of civil rights? In contrast to the fighting leadership given to the civil-rights program by Harry Truman, President Eisenhower has done little or nothing. During the first 3 years of his administration he presented no civil-rights program at all to the Congress. This was the first year in which he made any recommendations. He came forward with a limited program of civil-rights legislation.

Did President Eisenhower include FEPC in his program? He did not. The President has stated that he is opposed to FEPC. A few years ago when Secretary of Labor Mitchell testified before a Senate committee that he favored a strong FEPC with enforcement provisions, the President declared that Secretary Mitchell was entitled to his opinion. As far as he, the President, was concerned, he did not agree with him.

Nor did President Eisenhower recommend passage of the antilynching bill or the anti-poll tax bill, which have traditionally been recognized as necessary parts of the civil-rights program. Why did he refuse to sponsor these bills?

Last year, Democrats sponsored several measures to advance the progress toward our goal of equal opportunity. Congressman POWELL introduced an omnibus civil-rights measure in January of 1955, providing for all the recommendations called for by President Eisenhower in 1956.

A comparable measure was sponsored by Congressman CELLER last year. Congressman CELLER is chairman of the Judiciary Committee which has charge of civil-rights bills. It is customary to ask the opinion of the Department of Justice on such bills. Did the Republican Attorney General approve such bills? He did not. He didn't even reply. He took notice of the bill only after a House Judiciary Subcommittee had ordered the bill reported.

Literally dozens of similar bills were sponsored by Democrats last year. On all of them the Department of Justice was conspicuously silent.

In February of last year, Congressman DAVIDSON's bill calling for a Civil Rights Division in the Department of Justice under an Assistant Attorney General got the same treatment from Mr. Brownell. Congressman DIGGS' effort was treated the same way.

Why should the Attorney General take this position? Why shouldn't Government help implement the Supreme Court decision rather than leaving that burden to the NAACP?

I think this is the answer. This morning's Washington Post carried a column by Marquis Childs. The heading reads "Brownell Hedges on Security Issue," and this is what the article says: "Although the Senate Committee on Constitutional Rights is about to make a concluding report, that committee has not had the benefit of the views of Attorney General Herbert Brownell Jr., who is the officer of the Government most directly concerned with the Constitution and its interpretation in law enforcement.

"Repeatedly for many months the committee chairman, Senator THOMAS C. HENNINGS, JR., of Missouri, has invited Brownell to testify and repeatedly Brownell has found one reason or another to evade the invitation.

"This is perhaps the most conspicuous example of a trend more and more evident in the administration to avoid taking any stand on issues that might be considered in any way controversial. It is too often the press agent's approach to Government."

Can anyone tell me how you can be for civil rights and be afraid of controversy at the same time. If any organization knows that you can't make progress in the field of civil rights without a fight, it's the NAACP. You can't get freedom by wishing for it or uttering pious phrases. You've got to fight for it like you did in the Supreme Court or like you are doing in Montgomery, Ala.

Marquis Childs is right—much too often this Government is a government by press agents. Their actions are like the cotton candy you get at the circus—all air and no substance.

It is no secret that there exists within the Democratic Party divergent views on the question of civil rights. We have our Dixiecrats it is true. You know what a Dixiecrat is—it's a man who is elected as a Democrat and then spends his time in Congress voting like a Republican. We have our Dixiecrats because the Democratic Party is truly a national party—a party that knows no regional boundaries. Despite this fact, the record shows that every key motion for civil rights in the United States Congress has been supported by a majority of the Democratic Members.

But is there any reason why the Republicans should act like Dixiecrats? The Republican Party has virtually no representation in the South. The Republicans are not bound by the customs and prejudices of the Southern attitudes on civil rights. The Republican Party represents itself as the party of Lincoln, but Lincoln would turn over in his grave if he saw the way the Republican Party was voting against civil-rights matters.

Mr. SCOTT called the roll of Democrats who would be chairmen of congressional committees next year if the Democrats won the Congress again. He also called the roll of Republicans who would be chairmen if their party wins the election. But Mr. SCOTT forgot to mention the fact that Senator MCCARTHY would also be a chairman. Why Mr. SCOTT omitted the name of Senator MCCARTHY, I don't know. It may have been inadvertent, but he cannot deny that Senator MCCARTHY will be a chairman if the Republican Party wins. And you will remember that Mr. MCCARTHY is the man who a few days ago said that Chief Justice Warren was following the Communist line.

Mr. SCOTT also threatens you with the fact that Senator EASTLAND will be a committee chairman if the Democrats win. Well, Mr. SCOTT—who voted against Senator EASTLAND's confirmation as chairman? Two Democrats voted against it; MORSE and LEHMAN. Every Republican voted in favor of his confirmation.

Mr. SCOTT threatens you by saying that a vote for the Democrats is a vote for EASTLAND. He says this to get you to believe that a vote for the Republicans is a vote for civil-rights legislation. But how gullible does he think you are? If what he is saying is true, why didn't the Republicans come out with a program on civil rights in the Republican 83d Congress. They controlled the Congress. They controlled the committees. Senator EASTLAND wasn't chairman then. No Democrat was a chairman during that Congress. And what happened? Not one civil rights bill was voted out.

Why is it that the Republican Party has voted solidly against fair employment practices legislation in State after State? Right here in California, for example—assembly Republicans voted solidly against an FEPC bill in committee, and in the assembly itself—they voted nearly 3 to 2 against forcing the bill out of committee. Democratic assemblymen, I am proud to say, voted 34 to 1 in favor of the bill.

The story is the same in my home State of Illinois. In 1949, when Governor Stevenson recommended an FEPC bill, it passed the Democratically controlled house, but died in the Republican-controlled senate. In 1951 with both houses of the legislature in the hands of the Republicans, it never even got out of the house committee, and was reported unfavorably in the senate.

That's how the "party of Lincoln" behaved in the land of Illinois.

And in Michigan, in 1952, when an FEPC bill finally reached the house floor, 25 Republicans got up and left the house chamber, refusing to listen to one of their Republican colleagues speak on behalf of the bill. And here is what the Republican said:

"My grandfather and my father voted for Abraham Lincoln. I never expected to see the time when Republicans would leave their seats rather than hear a Republican discuss human rights."

So much for the Republican Party and civil rights. It is a field in which the Administration and the administration's party cannot take pride.

What about other legislation? The NAACP is interested not only in civil rights matters—it is interested in all legislation which will help the average American.

In the field of housing, the President has been content to recommend the annual construction of only 35,000 public housing units, an amount that could be absorbed by the New York City itself. The Senate of the United States almost each year passes a bill providing for the construction of 135,000 public housing units. The House always scales it down. The President always accepts the lower figure.

Is this the attitude of a new Republican Party?

Over the President's opposition, the House passed a new social security bill providing benefits to be paid to women at age 62, rather than age 65. The bill also provides for totally and permanently disabled people to obtain social-security benefits at age 50. This is the provision to which the administration is violently opposed.

Is this the attitude of a new Republican Party?

And in the House Committee on Education and Labor a few weeks ago, the bill sponsored by Congressman UDALL of Arizona, which would help solve many of the problems of desegregation by offering additional funds to school districts making the change, was voted down by a vote of 14 to 10. Every single one of the Republicans voted against it.

Is this the attitude of a new Republican Party?

Congressman POWELL has declared that if the Udall bill were approved there would be no need for his amendment to the school bill.

The Eisenhower administration can hardly be called an administration devoted to the interests of the average man. The school bill was forced on the President by outraged mothers of the Nation, who pointed out the enormous educational deficit which had accrued. The Congress has approved appropriations far in excess of the recommendations of the administration for health and welfare measures.

But you don't find the administration reluctant to heed the call of big business. If this is a new Republican Party, how can it justify the Dixon-Yates contract; the Tidelands giveaway; and other giveaways of the people's natural resources?

The administration makes much of the fact that it has given important jobs to Negroes. Yet, for each such job given, it has discharged almost a hundred Negroes under the security order. The greatest number of people who have been fired under the security order have been porters, charwomen, janitors and other custodial employees. They have been dismissed from Government service as security risks because of some minor gambling infraction.

This, then, is the record of the new Republican Party—of a party, which, according to the New York Times, "is going after the votes of Negroes in the large urban areas of the north in an effort to regain control of the Congress." This is the record of a party, which, it seems, is going to try to persuade the voters that everything from Supreme Court decisions to President Truman's Executive orders are official property of the Republican Party. They have even taken over the victories of the NAACP, like the District of Columbia desegregation case. Did Mr. SCOTT ever hear of Mrs. Mary Church Terrill? It was Mrs. Terrill and the NAACP who won that fight.

Take, for example, the statement of Mr. Richard Tobin, public relations director of the National Citizens for Eisenhower. "In the context of Supreme Court decisions under a Chief Justice appointed by the President," said Mr. Tobin, "decisions as historic as the Emancipation Proclamation of Lincoln, we have a wonderful story to tell, and it is my opinion that it has not yet been told sufficiently well to the average Negro voter."

I am sure the Court and I am sure the people of the United States resent this politicalization of the Supreme Court of the United States—this identification as part of the Republican Party. Certainly the Democrats would never claim that the Supreme Court decision was a Democratic decision because 7 of the 9 Justices who voted on the decision were Democrats.

Apparently, the Republicans will tell the people anything to win. The Republicans in the north say one thing. They say the opposite in the south. Just recently, Mr. Charles McWhorter, national chairman of the Young Republicans, journeyed to Mississippi. There he said that Republicans will be campaigning this fall on a States rights platform. He expressed the opinion that the "Republican" record as a conservative party, moderate on civil rights, best suited the interests of Mississippians.

Is this what Republicans have been saying in the north? Is this what Republicans have been saying to minority groups?

The new Republican Party today is a confused party of inaction and political opportunism. The story is told on Capitol Hill of veteran GOP congressmen who are trying to affiliate themselves with the new Eisenhower look and don't know quite how to do it. They used to be isolationists—now they have to vote for foreign aid and mutual security. They used to call public housing socialism—now they have to go along with it. As one observer put it—they're like the Australian bushman who was given a gift of a new boomerang and went crazy trying to throw his old one away.

It takes aggressive national leadership to chalk up new gains in human rights now and in the future. It takes an active role—as this organization so well knows—not a passive one—to record progress.

You've got to believe in the cause of human rights if you expect to get anywhere in overcoming prejudices and bigotry. You've got to have heart and courage to fight for the things you believe in. You've got to have a feeling—a deep emotional feeling—to do away with discrimination and segregation and second-class citizenship. You've got to have the very qualities that this administration does not possess.

Where has this administration shown any disposition to fight on any issue?

The only important legislation the President has vetoed has been the fixed price support program, and the natural gas bill, and he said he vetoed the natural gas bill not because he wanted to protect the consumers. He said he was for the bill in principle, but he just didn't like the way the gas people were lobbying.

The cause of human rights is served best by the Democratic Party. The Democratic Party ask only that you look at the record. Don't be taken in by sweet words and smooth phrases and glib promises of what you may expect in the future. Don't be taken in by an administration that rests on press agents' ideas. Look at the facts. Look at the record and ask yourselves:

Which party consistently fought for progress through national legislation? Which party stands firmly on the side of equality—of human rights?

The questions are important ones. The answers are important, too. There comes to my mind the time a Boston minister visited Abraham Lincoln early in the Civil War. "Let us pray, Mr. President," he declared solemnly, "that in this conflict the Lord is on our side."

Lincoln paused a moment and said:

"Reverend, I'm not concerned about the question whether the Lord is on our side. I know the Lord is always on the side of the right. But it is my fervent prayer that we may be found on the Lord's side."

1956 will be a fateful year. Let us pray, too, that in making our choice we may be found on the Lord's side. For my part, the Democratic side is the Lord's side.

Statement Issued by George J. Burger, Vice President of the National Federation of Independent Business

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MIKE MANSFIELD

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, July 5, 1956

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement recently made by Mr. George J. Burger, vice president, National Federation of Independent Business, before the Subcommittee on Antitrust and Monopoly Legislation of the Judiciary Committee.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF GEORGE J. BURGER, VICE PRESIDENT, NATIONAL FEDERATION OF INDEPENDENT BUSINESS, WASHINGTON, D. C., BEFORE SUBCOMMITTEE ON ANTITRUST AND MONOPOLY LEGISLATION OF THE SENATE JUDICIARY—SUBJECT: S. 11

I am George J. Burger, vice president and Washington representative of the National Federation of Independent Business. I am appearing here solely for the membership of the federation.

We represent independent business and professional people in all vocations from all parts of the country. We have the largest directly supporting membership of any business organization in the country.

Our position on legislation is dictated directly by our membership. We poll our members on all important issues, and are committed by their majority vote.

Our members desire enactment of S. 11. We take this position because of their vote, in mandate No. 193, on S. 1357, 82d Congress. Eighty-two percent of our members who voted on that issue favored it. The bill is substantially the same as S. 11 which you are now considering.

In my complete statement which I am asking to be made a part of the record of the hearings at this point, from which I quote, "Big business interests have consistently fought against this law (Robinson-Patman Act). It is self-evident from their action they realize for the first time efficient small business would be placed on parity with others so they could fairly compete."

In a message to Members of the House of Representatives under date of May 22, when the discharged petition to House Resolution 414 was completed, I said, "With the recent action of the Federal court in the Standard Oil of Indiana case immediate action on H. R. 11 is more important than ever to protect the future of independent business of this Nation. Destroy the effectiveness of the Robinson-Patman Act and small business can close its doors."

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I have gone through the school of hard knocks like many thousands of others who owned and operated independent businesses and irrespective of how efficient an independent business institution may be and no matter how well financed the independent business institution may be, it is impossible to compete with unfair competition that appears to be in violation of Federal laws.

Not alone in my heretofore private business, but in the 10 years or more as an executive officer of the National Federation of Independent Business, which, by the way, comprises all types of independent businesses, to review the correspondence as to unfair competitive conditions faced by the Nation's independent business, I say to you in all sincerity in their behalf, there is need for your committee to report out immediately S. 11.

It is my hope that the Senate will duplicate the action of the House where the vote was practically unanimous on the companion bill.

Foreign Aid to Neutralists

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STYLES BRIDGES
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, July 5, 1956

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial which appeared in the Manchester Union Leader, Manchester, N. H., on July 2, 1956, entitled "Bridges Is Right."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BRIDGES IS RIGHT

The sound judgment of Senator BRIDGES in his warning to the United States Senate that the United States should stop sending large amounts of foreign aid to such neutralists as Tito and Nehru ought to be apparent to everyone.

BRIDGES pointed out that our security is not confined to military preparations alone. It must also be considered in the light of moral and spiritual considerations. Communism is a type of totalitarianism that denies God and tramples on freedom. With such a system there can be no neutrality without disregard of moral and spiritual considerations.

Thus for Nehru to become a neutral in the struggle between communism and freedom is to disregard moral issues such as slave labor, torture, trial without jury, and an absolute ruthless dictatorship, which constitute the framework of communism today.

In other words, Nehru's neutralism is devoid of any moral and spiritual meaning and is simply an empty challenge to communism.

For us to give financial aid to that kind of leader, who refuses to stand for moral and spiritual principles, is a crime against decency. And the same goes for Tito. We backed him up when he defied Stalin and furnished him financial support, only to see him spend a honeymoon at Moscow, where he promised to help Red China get into the United Nations, and where Marshal Zhukov declared that, in case of war, he and Tito would stand shoulder to shoulder.

To give financial backing to Nehru and Tito is, as Senator BRIDGES said in his speech to the Senate, nothing but a desire to pose as do-gooders, without any regard for the deeper interests involved in the fight against communism.

One thing you can be absolutely sure of is that pouring out money in that way will promote only spiritual demoralization and aid the program of Communist aggression.

Kings County, N. Y., Republicans Overwhelmingly Endorse President Eisenhower for Renomination

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS E. DORN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 25, 1956

Mr. DORN of New York. Mr. Speaker, the Republicans in Kings County, N. Y., have overwhelmingly endorsed President Eisenhower for renomination.

The Kings County Republican executive committee at a meeting on June 14, 1956, adopted a resolution offered by Judge Roy M. D. Richardson, and the Kings County Republican county committee at a subsequent meeting on June 21, 1956, on motion of Judge John R. Bartels, adopted identical resolutions. The latter meeting was attended by over 1,200 members of the county committee, at which time Commissioner John R. Crews was reelected chairman, as he had previously been reelected chairman of the executive committee. The statement follows:

Four years ago the Kings County Republican Executive Committee adopted a resolution in advance of the Republican National Convention held in Chicago, urging that the convention nominate Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower for the Office of President of the United States of America. We did so because we believed that his prestige in the Nation and the various capitals of the world, his patience, tolerance, and understanding, and the love and reverence with which he was and is universally regarded, eminently qualified him for the difficult and arduous responsibility of bringing peace to a world in which hot wars were raging in many diverse areas. We felt that the universal respect and admiration as well as love and affection with which he was held here at home made him the one candidate who could preserve the confidence of our citizens in our economic and political system, bring to an end the activities of the subversive elements who had infiltrated into Government, place our domestic economy firmly on the middle rails and preserve our basic American goal of the highest achievable standards of living for all of our people, and the preservation of private enterprise.

The ultimate nomination and election of Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower has completely vindicated in every regard the high hopes then expressed by us. Through his intercession and effectiveness there is, at long last, no hot war raging anywhere on the face of this earth. He brought to an end quickly the indeterminate warfare in Korea and the senseless casualties resulting therefrom. He has succeeded, too, in lessening the tensions of the cold war while ever remaining alert to the continuing menace of the Communist system and the determination of Moscow to dominate all of the capitals of the earth. He has cleaned house of the subversive elements in American government, preserving at the same time all of our basic civil liberties including freedom of speech, freedom of thought, and a right to dissent. Even in the troubled Middle East situation he has achieved the difficult accomplishment of maintaining friendly relations with Arabs and Israelis alike, preserving our prestige and friendship with all of the dissident groups without in any way compromising our basic responsibility for the preservation and maintenance of the political and geographic integrity of the State of Israel as well as all other nations recognized by the United States and by the United Nations. His quiet determination that violence and aggression shall not prevail anywhere in the world is the greatest stabilizing force for peace and security extant today. On the domestic scene he has brought tranquillity to American life. He has effected a transition from a war to a peace economy without the customary accompanying economic disasters which have attended so many prior transitions. Our economy has expanded to the greatest ever known in the history of mankind. The 65 million Americans employed is an achievement which 4 years ago would have been deemed incredible. The standards of living of all Americans have increasingly improved. Newer and broader horizons of social benefits have come into being. Many more millions of Americans have been brought under the protection of our social-security laws and the benefits thereof not only widened but expanded. At the same time the creeping inflation of the prior administration has been brought to a halt; the cost of living stabilized and the increases of earnings and incidental benefits translated into greater purchasing power for our people.

In the field of civil liberties, the Bill of Rights has been made a reality and the equality of all Americans, without regard to race, color, or creed, transmitted at long last into judicial expression and enforcement as a result of the vigorous intercession

before the Supreme Court of the United States of the administration's viewpoint expressed through its Attorney General, appointed by our President.

In the field of education, President Eisenhower has taken the lead to insure adequate educational standards for all Americans in every village and hamlet of the country, however remote. Opportunities for academic education have likewise been broadened and expanded so that the opportunity of full expression and achievement might become truly a reality for every American boy and girl. All of these achievements have been accomplished, not alone without any increased burden of taxes but with accompanying tax reduction already achieved and the certainty that the immediate future will see even greater tax relief for all American citizens who too long have known the burden of tax rates discouraging of enterprise. Even above and beyond and greater than all of these tangible accomplishments is the human factor so important in life, of the personality of this great American to whom all well-intentioned people instinctively turn with love and admiration and reverence. He has won the hearts and the confidence of the American people and citizens of other lands as well, who trust in him, respect him as one who in heart and soul typifies the highest nobility of human character. The American people instinctively place their trust in him and in this trust find a sense of peace and security and confidence in the future of their land and the well-being of their children and posterity.

The Kings County Republican Committee, therefore, in this meeting assembled, by unanimous vote, expresses its wish to the delegates to the Republican National Convention from Kings County, that they cast their unanimous votes for renomination by acclamation of our great and distinguished President, Dwight D. Eisenhower, to succeed himself in his great office.

The American's Creed and the Fourth of July

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT B. CHIPERFIELD
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 5, 1956

Mr. CHIPERFIELD. Mr. Speaker, as Independence Day comes around each year it brings to mind The American's Creed and its connection with the Fourth of July.

One need only to recall the author of The American's Creed, the Honorable William Tyler Page who for many years was Clerk of the House of Representatives. He was accustomed each Independence Day to go into his library and read the great and foundamental documents on which this country was founded. From such study was born his inspiration to write The American's Creed.

He began his life work at the age of 13 as a page boy, and held numerous offices in the House of Representatives. He completed 60 years of service—the longest any individual ever worked on Capitol Hill. He served under 14 Speakers of the House. Every office he ever held he filled with simple dignity and distinction. His personal charm and superior mental ability were known to all.

William Tyler Page carried in his veins the blood of many great Americans, and his philosophy of life and of Government upheld the finest traditions and ideals of his ancestors.

He was born 88 years ago in Frederick, Md., and early in life formed a friendship with a boy named Schley. Later on Schley went to Annapolis while Tyler Page went to the Capitol. This warm friendship between these two boys continued for many years. Finally, in the Spanish-American War, Schley, who had risen to the rank of commodore of the Navy, and who was temporarily in charge of the American Fleet, won a glorious American victory on July 3, 1898. The marvelous news of the victory of his old friend Schley, thrilled Tyler Page and filled him with patriotism.

He made the resolve that instead of celebrating the next day, the Fourth of July, in the usual way, he would shut himself up in his library and read the great and fundamental documents of the beginning of our country, such as the Constitution, Declaration of Independence, and the Farewell Address of Washington. That evening, after reflection on what he had read during the day, he made the further resolve that he would continue this practice of reading the great historical writings upon which our Nation was founded each Fourth of July thereafter, and he kept that promise for forty-odd years.

In the war of 1917 a contest was held to write an American creed. Page submitted his manuscript and won the contest, and the Congress officially recognized it as the American's creed of our country. It would have been strange indeed if William Tyler Page had not eventually written this creed, for unconsciously, from the reading of these great works, he had been formulating in his mind such a creed for many years. It was the welling up from the soul of this man all of the devotion to liberty, all the ideals of his love of country.

Knowing the Apostles' Creed to have been a compilation expressing their doctrines and principles, which they practiced long before the creed was formulated, and the sources of its articles were the books of the Bible, he resolved that his American creed must also come from recognized authoritative and historical writings. He did not want to use his own words, and every word of the American Creed is taken from such documents as the Constitution of the United States, the Declaration of Independence, Lincoln's Gettysburg Address, Washington's Farewell Address, the National Anthem, and other similar references.

I could do no better in paying tribute to William Tyler Page than to quote the American's Creed of exactly 100 words:

I believe in the United States of America as a Government of the people, by the people, for the people; whose just powers are derived from the consent of the governed; a democracy in a republic; a sovereign Nation of many sovereign States; a perfect Union, one and inseparable; established upon those principles of freedom, equality, justice, and humanity for which American patriots sacrificed their lives and fortunes.

I therefore believe it is my duty to my country to love it, to support its Constitution, to obey its laws, to respect its flag, and to defend it against all enemies.

Alarm Gong Against Red Trap

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STYLES BRIDGES
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, July 5, 1956

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article by Constantine Brown, a well-known authority on foreign affairs and columnist for the Washington Star, entitled "Alarm Gong Against Red Trap." This article appeared in the Washington Evening Star, June 28, 1956.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ALARM GONG AGAINST RED TRAP—SENATOR BRIDGES WARNS THAT SOVIET AIMS TO CONQUER BODIES, MINDS, AND SOULS

(By Constantine Brown)

Senator STYLES BRIDGES, of New Hampshire, the senior Republican Member, sounded the alarm gong from the floor of the Senate against our being entrapped by the sweetness-and-light tactics of the Communist dictatorship. A stanch supporter of President Eisenhower, Senator BRIDGES felt, however, in discussing the grave international problems confronting this Nation, that the elected representatives should be "free of party discipline and executive dictation."

We are today in an incredible confusion about the threats to this country. This is due, according to Senator BRIDGES, to the fact that we overlook sometimes the purposes of our foreign policy, which is "to promote and protect the true interests of our people."

Senator BRIDGES pointed out that the threat from Soviet and international communism means not only that of military conquest but also "of spiritual and intellectual conquest." The American people are cognizant of the military dangers confronting the Nation; but they believe far less in the "dangers of the moral and spiritual offensive of our enemies."

"The time has passed when only men's bodies are conquered," Senator BRIDGES said. "We now live in a world where the dictators are as much interested in the conquest of men's souls and minds as that of their bodies and lands. Security now also means defense against spiritual and intellectual demoralization."

For a number of years our neo-liberals have been critical, on the surface, of the policies of the Kremlin. At the same time they have done their utmost to hamper, under the cloak of seeing a direct menace to the Bill of Rights, the sanitation job against the Kremlin's tools by Congress, the FBI, and other agencies.

"The American is not morally weak," said Senator BRIDGES. "But I do say that we are morally confused. Nowhere is the moral confusion worse than among the so-called liberal intellectuals. This confusion tends to paralyze the mind and the will. The more extended the paralysis the greater the Communist victory."

Senator BRIDGES, like many other thinking Americans, does not believe that anything

has changed radically in Moscow now. "At present we are being told that some mysterious and inexorable law of history and economics is remaking the conduct of the Russians and that things are going to be henceforth different," he said.

He then proceeded to take to pieces the historic "phony" speech of Nikita Khrushchev before the 20th Communist Party Congress: "This man, engaged in denouncing Stalin for these crimes, is the most prominent member of an oligarchy which, since it has come to power, has been doing the very things of which Stalin is now accused."

Senator BRIDGES, who because of his position as chairman of the Republican Policy Committee knows the tendency toward "a little softness toward Moscow on the part of a relatively small but influential group in the administration, cautions against it: "Are we going to give way, here a little, there a little, to peoples of this stripe? There was once a British minister who went to Munich to get what he called "peace in our time." You know what happened. Are we going to ignore and pass over and rationalize these things?"

He wonders how any American in his right mind, unless he is a victim of the present intellectual confusion, can want to deal with the Red regimes when the captive peoples from East Germany to North Korea and North Vietnam "were driven into the Kremlin's prison of nations, and are still hermetically sealed against escape.'

It is a known fact that a number of influential star gazers in this country—including some in the administration—are now more than in the past toying with the idea of inviting to Washington the B & K team and President Tito of Yugoslavia.

To this Senator BRIDGES has this to say: "When Comrades Khrushchev, Bulganin, and Mikoyan stage state visits, they pose as merely the heads of one country. This pose unfortunately is accepted at face value. Yet only the most befuddled can be unaware that these despots are at the same time the heads of a world revolutionary movement. So why the new optimism? Why the disastrous letdown of our vigilance? We are today neck-deep in confusions and illusions, as if the 1930's had never been. In order to soothe our nerves and conscience, we are fed with fairy tales about the new looks in the Communist world and the magic of collective leadership. * * * Certainly, this is not the time to dignify the culprits of the Kremlin by accepting them and extending the courtesies of normal statesmen."

Enforce the Dies Bill To Outlaw Communist Organizations in the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MARTIN DIES
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 3, 1956

Mr. DIES. Mr. Speaker, it has been nearly 2 years since my bill to outlaw the Communist Party or its successors, and to define Communist membership or participation in organizations so as to destroy and prohibit Communist organizations, passed the Congress as sections 3, 4, and 5 of the Communist Control Act of 1954.

By enforcing my bill, the Department of Justice can put out of existence for all time every Communist organization in the United States. Prior to the passage of my bill, the Department of Justice brought proceedings to require Communists to register under the Registration Act. However, the Communists appealed to the courts, and the Supreme Court sent the case back for additional evidence. Because of the pendency of this case, the Department of Justice has delayed the enforcement of my bill. Mr. Speaker, it is the duty of the Department of Justice to enforce my bill without further delay.

During its 7 years of existence the Dies committee established beyond any doubt that the Communist Party is a foreign conspiracy masked as a political party and that Communist organizations are controlled and operated by Moscow to undermine our country from within. The Dies committee exposed hundreds of Communist organizations with several million members who were financing Communist propaganda and activities, and 600 periodicals in the United States. We exposed 2,000 Communists on the Federal payroll who later stole hundreds of vital military, industrial, and diplomatic secrets which enabled Russia to build up her formidable war machine to threaten the free world. We exposed a dozen Communist-controlled labor unions in key industries which thereafter instigated scores of strikes to cripple American industry.

Events during the past 15 years have confirmed our findings 100 percent. If our warnings had been heeded promptly, thousands of lives that have been sacrificed, and untold billions of dollars that have been spent to resist Communist aggression, could have been spared.

In the report of the Dies committee filed January 3, 1939, with the Congress and released to the country, we warned the Nation that "Communism is a worldwide revolutionary movement aiming ultimately at the setting up of a world Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. The Communist conquest of the earth will be far less than compiete until it has conquered America and destroyed our free institutions."

In numerous other reports issued by our committee we warned the Government that the chief objective of the Communists was world conquest, and we exposed the techniques and tactics which the Communists intended to use and which they later used in every detail.

Ten years after this exposure, our Government followed our recommendations, but much of the damage had already been done.

From these tragic experiences we should have learned that "an ounce of prevention is worth a pound of cure," and that to govern is to foresee.

While as a result of the exposure by the Dies committee the Communist movement in America was seriously crippled, it will rise again to threaten us unless our Government profits from its past mistakes. It was to keep this from ever happening that the Congress passed my bill. But my bill will not do the job unless the Department of Justice enforces it vigorously without fear or favor and without further delay.

S. 3879

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. DODD
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 7, 1956

Mr. DODD. Mr. Speaker, I believe it is important that this House adopt S. 3879, which reads as follows:

S. 3879

An act to supplement the antitrust laws of the United States, in order to balance the power now heavily weighted in favor of automobile manufacturers, by enabling franchise automobile dealers to bring suit in the district courts of the United States to recover compensatory damages sustained by reason of the failure of automobile manufacturers to act in good faith in complying with the terms of franchises or in terminating or not renewing franchises with their dealers.

Be it enacted, etc.—

SEC. 1. As used in this act—

(a) The term "automobile manufacturer" shall mean any person, partnership, corporation, association, or other form of business enterprise engaged in the manufacturing or assembling of passenger cars, trucks, station wagons, or other automotive vehicles, including any person, partnership, or corporation which acts for such manufacturer or assembler in connection with the distribution of said automotive vehicles.

(b) The term "franchise" shall mean the agreement, contract, understanding, or arrangement between any automobile manufacturer and any automobile dealer which purports to fix the legal rights and liabilities of the parties to such agreement, contract, understanding, or agreement.

(c) The term "automobile dealer" shall mean any person, partnership, corporation, association, or other form of business enterprise operating under the terms of a franchise and engaged in the sale or distribution of passenger cars, trucks, station wagons, or other automotive vehicles.

(d) The term "commerce" shall mean commerce among the several States of the United States or with foreign nations, or in any Territory of the United States or in the District of Columbia, or among the Territories or between any Territory and any State or foreign nation, or between the District of Columbia and any State or Territory or foreign nation.

(e) The term "good faith" shall mean the duty of each party to any franchise, and all officers, employees, or agents to act in a fair, equitable, and nonarbitrary manner so as to guarantee such other party freedom from coercion, intimidation, or threats of coercion or intimidation, so as to preserve all equities of such other party which are inherent in the nature of the relationship between such parties by such franchise.

SEC. 2. An automobile dealer may bring suit against any automobile manufacturer engaged in commerce, in any district court of the United States in the district in which said manufacturer resides, or is found, or has an agent, without respect to the amount in controversy, and shall recover compensatory damages by him sustained and the cost of suit, including a reasonable attorney's fee, by reason of the failure of said automobile manufacturer to act in good faith in performing or complying with any of the terms or provisions of the franchise, or in terminating, canceling, or not renewing the franchise with said dealer: *Provided*, That in any such suit the manufacturer shall not

be barred from asserting in defense of any such action the failure of the dealer to act in good faith.

I have suggested to members of the Judiciary Committee that this legislation be passed, and I urged favorable report on this legislation.

The statement which I submitted to the Judiciary Committee is as follows:

Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the subcommittee, it is my sincere conviction that the enactment of the legislation being considered today, S. 3879, will be a significant step forward in freeing thousands of automobile dealers from what amounts to economic bondage.

An automobile dealership represents a substantial investment, not only in money, but also in effort. It seems obvious to me that these small-business men are entitled to the protection of the law in their relationships with manufacturers, since under the present system they can be forced out of business almost at the whim of the supplier.

S. 3879 represents a fair and equitable attempt to bring at least a measure of security to the thousands of automobile dealers in the country. It is not intended to underwrite poor judgment on the part of the dealer in his business dealings, as has been charged by opponents of the bill. But it will give him his "day in court" if he believes that the manufacturer has treated him unjustly.

Section 1 (e), the so-called good-faith portion of the bill, seems to me an excellent way to insure that all parties in any dealer-manufacturer franchise arrangement will maintain high standards of business ethics. The critics of this legislation have advanced the old argument that Government should not interfere needlessly with the conduct of private business. Unfortunately, however, the automobile industry has made little or no progress in achieving better dealer relationships and, indeed, the abuses have been increasing at an alarming rate.

Many dealers have been forced to the wall by the practice of shipping unwanted cars to them—cars that cannot be absorbed in the market because of the senseless race among some manufacturers for first place in sales volume. The manufacturers have sometimes totally ignored the saturation point where dealer cannot sell the product in legitimate commerce. Consider the plight of a dealer who can sell about 20 new cars a month at a maximum who is forced to accept delivery of 25 or 30 cars. If he refuses to accept the number of cars that the district representative of the manufacturer arbitrarily sets as his quota, his dealership can be canceled on a unilateral basis.

I think, in all fairness, that any businessman is entitled to a far better break than that. Under the provisions of the bill under discussion here today, he would at least have the chance to bring suit and possibly to recover damages.

The pressure that has been brought to bear on the country's independent automobile dealers by some manufacturers to accept more cars than they can reasonably hope to sell has resulted in a grave deterioration in marketing techniques. To avoid bankruptcy, some dealers in desperation have resorted to shoddy service work, deceptive and dishonest advertising, and the "packing" of insurance and finance charges as well as the "packing" of the prices of cars. Automobile overproduction has led unavoidably to the practice of "bootlegging," which undermines public confidence in the entire industry.

Many dealers from my own State of Connecticut have expressed the strongest possible support for the good faith aspect of the bill. They feel that the enactment of this legislation will have a wholesome effect upon the automobile industry, lead to better dealer-manufacturer relationships, and ultimately be of benefit to our entire economy.

I hope that my colleagues will join me in this effort to pass this very necessary legislation.

Wisconsin the Pioneer and Also the Leader in Bringing Education to the People

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEROY JOHNSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 25, 1956

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, several weeks ago I made a trip to Wisconsin, my native State. On this trip I also visited Madison to be present at the commencement exercises and also to attend a class reunion. The Alumni Association had a meeting which was addressed by the president, E. B. Fred. Also present at the Alumni Association meeting was the dean of the university law school, John Ritchie, who delivered a masterful address. He developed and analyzed an idea that had been started during the regime of president Charles Van Hise almost 50 years ago. That idea was that the university should lend its influence, training, and talent to the citizens of the State. Consequently, extension courses were offered to the people; short courses in agriculture were offered to the farmers of Wisconsin who wished to come to the university during the cold winter days when they could do nothing on their farms. All these activities proved to be popular and productive to the people of the State. About this time a well-known national magazine was printing a series of articles about American universities. When writing about Wisconsin University it started the article as follows:

About all that can be said about the University of Wisconsin is that its campus is at Madison but its influence covers every square mile of the State.

Dean Ritchie developed this idea of mass education in such a way as to arouse the thinking of all of us. What pleased me most was that he dwelt heavily on the idea that those who are offered this opportunity for higher education should have sufficient native ability to be able to capitalize on this opportunity. Especially should the bright student be encouraged, as from that group will come the leaders of the future. We have heard the expression that without vision the people perish. We may also say that without leaders the country will perish. Leaders in public life or in private enterprise are the indispensable spark that makes the American system work.

Following is the speech, which I hope may be read by all of the Members of the Congress:

THE UNIVERSITY'S RESPONSIBILITIES

"Human history becomes more and more a race between education and catastrophe." So wrote the great British historian, H. G. Wells, in his "Outline of History." These days of grave international tensions and recurrent crises emphasize the verity of Mr. Wells' observations. In a very real sense our national survival is conditioned upon an educated citizenry. Bear in mind that the effective functioning of our form of government, the oldest republic extant, depends upon an informed and enlightened electorate; that our military strength in relation to that of our potential enemies is conditioned upon our scientific Hegemony and productive might, and that our Nation's economic strength, which gives us the highest standard of living that the world has ever known, is conditioned upon an educated know-how in the production and distribution of wealth. Permit me to develop these thoughts briefly.

As we are all aware, our form of government rests ideologically on faith in the dignity of the individual and his capacity through reason for polical self-government. Implicit in this conviction is the assumption that opportunities for education will be available to all citizens to the end that they may be informed and trained to "sift and winnow," to recognize the relevant and discard the irrelevant, and to reach decisions only after considering all the pertinent factors. Otherwise our priceless heritage of the ballot may become the instrumentality through which we surrender the cherished values of our society either by an hysterical response to demagogic appeal, or by indifference to the corrosive rot of subversion.

In these days of hydrogen bombs, guided missiles, jet planes, and other awesome weapons of mass destruction it is unnecessary for me, I am sure, to labor the critical importance to our Military Establishment of our Nation remaining the vanguard of scientific discovery—a desideratum grounded on a sound educational system.

Also, blest though this country is with natural resources, its relative economic strength far outstrips its relative wealth in natural resources. What then is responsible for the fact that during the past calendar year the United States with 6 percent of the world's total population, accounted for 60 percent of the world's total production? What is the source of this country's great economic strength? Undoubtedly many factors contribute to this happy state of affairs. But I suggest that in final analysis the answer lies in American know-how. This know-how in turn rests upon training and education coupled with native intelligence, initiative, and hard work.

Much of what I have been trying to say is summarized in the report of the University of Wisconsin Policies Committee of the Wisconsin Legislative Council, as follows:

"But probably the most important reason for our strength is this: The United States has made good use of its human resources. This has been no happenstance. It rests on two significant factors:

"1. The basic law of our Nation guarantees to all citizens equal opportunities and provides that they may earn rewards in proportion to their achievements; and

"2. The principle of public education for all—firmly established at many places in the 13 Colonies even before our Nation was born—has been adhered to and expanded as our Nation has grown."

In implementation of this principle the University of Wisconsin was established more than a century ago. All of us are familiar, at least in a general way, with its past record of distinguished achievement. For more than a century it has been a pacesetter in the race between education and catastrophe to which H. G. Wells refers. As the capstone

of the State's educational system it recognizes three basic obligations: To teach, to search for truth, and to serve the public.

Discharging its primary obligation of instruction requires able, devoted teachers, well equipped laboratories, libraries, an adequate physical plant, and perhaps most important of all, an alert, able, and well prepared student body.

In this country the responsibility for preparing students for college is discharged principally by our public primary and secondary schools. Happily we have an excellent public school system in Wisconsin. Elsewhere, however, increasing enrollments and teacher shortages are causing a discernible trend toward mass education in primary and secondary schools. Mass education is characterized by large classes. Instruction typically is on the average-pupil level of capacity. Particular attention is ofttimes paid to the retarded pupil. Little is done to challenge and hold the interest of the bright pupil. There seems to be more concern over the bonehead than the egghead. This is perhaps understandable. Crowded, understaffed schools, battling illiteracy and striving to see that all pupils receive at least minimal training, are inclined to overlook the bright pupil on the theory that he can take care of himself. But I insist that each pupil must be challenged to work at peak capacity. This means that the gifted pupil must be given the opportunity of progressing through the hierarchy of grades at a much faster pace than the less gifted. It means that courses of study must vary according to demonstrated aptitudes. It means that pupils with a flair for the manual trades must be channeled into vocational schools and thus spared the frustration of pursuing a liberal education. It means therefore that there must be a periodic sorting out of pupils according to abilities and aptitudes.

This sorting-out process is imperative if our universities are to discharge their responsibilities. Otherwise their energies are dissipated in providing training that should have been obtained in high school. And they suffer the further drag of offering higher education to those who have no aptitude for or interest in a college education.

This lowering of the level of instruction penalizes the gifted and well-prepared student for the benefit of the ill-prepared and those who aptitudes or interests lie outside the classroom.

I suggest that the principle of public education for all, when applied to universities, means all who are qualified in terms of training, ability, industry, interest, and character to participate in the intellectually exciting and challenging experience that should characterize university training. Quality of training not quantity of students is the touchstone of a great university.

Happily, our university has always emphasized quality. This insistence on high standards is reflected in admission policies and probation and exclusion rules for academic deficiency. Although a large university, the ratio of faculty to students is approximately 1 to 15. Except for survey courses, supplemented by quiz and discussion sections, classes are relatively small in most branches of the university. Many seminars are offered for advanced students. An advisory sytem and counseling program further attest the university's interest in the individual student. Truly on this campus students and faculty are partners in the learning process. Here the philosophy of mass education is emphatically rejected. May that always be true. Let us never forget that the destiny of this country rests with our young people. There is danger that the industrial genius of our Nation for mass production and standardization will blind us to the tragic waste implicit in mass education. The added costs of individualizing education on every level of instruction pays tremendous dividends in the currency of individual achievement. Collective mediocrity, the end product of mass education, is repugnant to the American tradition. If long tolerated it may spell the doom of the America we know.

The advancement of knowledge and the search for truth is of course a central purpose of a university. Indeed our universities are great research centers. Their faculties are constantly wresting the secrets from nature and advancing the frontiers of knowledge in the humanities and the social sciences. The discoveries of their scientists are largely responsible, on the one hand, for the dramatic progress that is being made in the vanquishing of disease and on the other hand for the position of leadership that our Nation maintains in the never-ending race for the development of more efficient and devastating weapons of destruction. Technological advances contributing to the improvement of our living standards trace back to university laboratories. Coming out of universities also is an enriched understanding of man in his relation to his fellows and his environment. Indeed it is not too much to say that the research activities of universities affect directly or indirectly well nigh all aspects of life today.

Throughout its entire history our university has been famous for the research accomplishments of its faculty. I am sure that you require no documentation in support of that observation. To list even a representative sampling of the significant research performed by the faculty for the past year alone would extend these remarks well beyond my allotted time. Of three matters only would I remind you.

First, throughout the entire history of this country only three American universities have awarded more Ph. D. degrees than the University of Wisconsin. Candidates for such degrees are attracted to the universities reputed to offer the best research opportunities and training. Hence it is that the number of Ph. D.'s awarded by a university is a reliable barometer of its research reputation.

Second, the Wisconsin Alumni Research Foundation, now in its 31st year, has given the university more than $14 million. Most of this money was given in support of research in the natural sciences. With assets now totaling about $30 million, it is anticipated that research in the natural sciences will continue to enjoy generous support from WARF in the years ahead. The significance of this support cannot be overemphasized. All who are interested in our university and the progress of natural science owe an eternal debt of gratitude to WARF, an unique and inspiring undertaking in the field of higher education.

Third, contrary to the situation unfortunately obtaining in many other universities, on this campus there are no artificial barriers insulating one discipline from another. Interdisciplinary research flourishes. Thus, for example, the law school now participates in research undertakings with the college of agriculture, the school of commerce, and the department of economics. The absence here of artificial barriers between disciplines is reflected also in the large number of interdisciplinary courses and seminars available to students. Typical is the course on contemporary trends and the seminar to be given for the first time next year on military policy and administration. Each of these offerings is taught by teams of instructors recruited from a number of different departments and schools of the university. Interdisciplinary research and teaching is so obviously sensible that few outside of academic circles realize how unusual it is for them to be as wholeheartedly accepted as at this university.

All universities worthy of the name are dedicated to research and the oncampus instruction of their students. But our university also recognizes an obligation to serve all the people of the State. This concept of public service extending the boundaries of the campus to the boundaries of the State was pioneered by our university and is known throughout the Western World as the Wisconsin idea in education. It is implemented by the adult education programs, correspondence courses, and publications of the university extension division and the Agricultural Extension Service; by the short course conducted for farmers, by the school for workers, by the continuing professional education institutes in medicine, law, engineering, pharmacy, and commerce; by radio station WHA and allied State broadcasting and television stations; by faculty members working with appropriate State officials and committees of professional associations on law revisions and codifications, and by soil testing and other services performed for individual residents of the State. The Wisconsin idea insists that a university is obligated not only to pursue knowledge for its own sake, but also to make more widely servicebale to mankind that which is already known.

The trinity of obligations recognized by our university—teaching, researching, and serving the public—are not mutually exclusive. On the contrary, they are closely integrated. Thus energetically pursued research undertakings create a vital and exciting intellectual climate within the university which challenges students to realize their optimum capacities. Public-service activities apply the discoveries of research to the service of the State, utilize members of the faculty to teach in the adult education programs, and feed back to the classroom, the study, and the laboratory the insights, information, and stimulation derived from members of the faculty serving as counselors to government, business, and agriculturists. Discharging concurrently all three of its basic responsibilities makes our university a particularly dynamic institution of learning.

And now by way of drawing these remarks to a close, I remind you that President Fred describes the basic needs of a great State university as follows:

"First, qualified and deserving students, drawn from all segments of our society;

"Second, distinguished and devoted teachers, dedicated to teaching, research, and service;

"Third, adequate facilities and equipment; and

"Fourth, an intelligent, resourceful, and provident people who fashion, nourish, and sustain it, convinced of its value and confident of its purpose."

No doubt implicit in this magnificent statement is a prerequisite that I venture to make explicit; that is, the tradition of free inquiry in the resolute search for truth. This tradition finds eloquent expression in these well-known words taken from a report of the board of regents of 1894:

"Whatever may be the limitations which trammel inquiry elsewhere, we believe that the great State University of Wisconsin should ever encourage that continual and fearless sifting and winnowing by which alone the truth can be found."

That immortal declaration of principle voices what I think of as the spirit of Wisconsin; a spirit which undergirds and strengthens the university in the discharge of its responsibilities; a spirit which acts as a catalyst unifying alumni, students, and faculty in the service of the university; a spirit which in the war of political ideologies raging throughout the world today, challenges the various "isms" inimical to the basic values of our society; a spirit which assures that education continues to lead in the race with catastrophe. Nurtured by that spirit your university goes forward in service to State and Nation.

Presentation of Career Service Award to Dr. Helen K. Mackintosh

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOS. E. MARTIN
OF IOWA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, July 5, 1956

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. President, on Monday evening, July 2, 1956, Mrs. Martin and I had the great honor to attend the second annual presentation career service awards dinner of the National Civil Service League. We were deeply impressed with the qualifications of the 10 civil-service employees honored with the career service awards; and we were particularly proud of the only woman to win the award this year, Dr. Helen K. Mackintosh, of the United States Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, because Dr. Mackintosh received her bachelor of arts, master of arts, and doctor of philosophy degrees from the State University of Iowa, and she has won outstanding recognition throughout her entire service to community, State, and Nation.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD in connection with my remarks news articles which appeared in the Cedar Rapids (Iowa) Gazette on June 25; the Des Moines (Iowa) Register on June 26; and the Washington Evening Star on July 2. These articles describe quite fully Dr. Mackintosh's record of achievement.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Cedar Rapids Gazette of June 25, 1956]

DR. MACKINTOSH TO BE HONORED AT WASHINGTON

WASHINGTON.—An Iowa woman who devoted her career to the United States Office of Education will be honored by the National Civil Service League in Washington July 2.

She is Dr. Helen K. Mackintosh, of Hopkinton, chief of the elementary schools section.

Dr. Mackintosh joined the Office of Education in 1938 after supervising elementary schools at Grand Rapids, Mich., and teaching at the University of Pittsburgh and Miami University. She is a graduate of the University of Iowa.

In 1947, Dr. Mackintosh worked with English teachers in the American Military Government at Vienna, and recently she flew around the world.

On that trip, she assisted with workshops for elementary school principals in Cambodia under a program sponsored by the Foreign Operations Administration.

She will be the only woman among 10 Federal employees to receive the second annual career-service awards announced by Look magazine.

[From the Des Moines Register of June 26, 1956]

CAREER AWARD TO MISS MACKINTOSH

Helen K. Mackintosh, State University of Iowa graduate, Monday was named a winner of the annual career-service awards given by the National Civil Service League.

Miss Mackintosh, chief of the elementary schools section of the Federal Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, will receive $100 and a scroll at a dinner Monday in Washington, D. C.

She and 9 other career civil-service employees were chosen for the award from 130 nominations submitted by 33 Federal Government department heads.

Miss Mackintosh was born in Hopkinton and received her B. A., M. A., and Ph. D. degrees from the State University of Iowa. She went to work for the Federal Government in 1928. She worked with the American Military Government in Vienna, Austria, in 1947 and assisted in setting up workshops for elementary-school principals in Cambodia in 1954 before becoming head of the elementary schools section.

[From the Washington Evening Star of July 2, 1956]

EDUCATOR BELIEVES TODAY'S CHILDREN BETTER EDUCATED

Children are being better educated than they were a generation ago, chiefly because teachers try to treat each child as an individual.

This is the belief of Dr. Helen K. Mackintosh, whose distinguished leadership in the field of elementary school education will be honored tonight by the National Civil Service League.

Miss Mackintosh, who is chief of the Elementary School Section of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, is 1 of 10 Federal career employees who will receive career service awards from the league.

She is the only woman in the group.

Miss Mackintosh went to work for the Office of Education (now a part of HEW) in 1938. Prior to that she had taught elementary, high school, and college students.

GOOD TEACHERS

Good teachers today concentrate not on pounding facts into a child's head, "but with giving him the tools of learning—teaching him where to go to find out something he wants to know," Miss Mackintosh says.

"The child of today—and the grownup, too, for that matter—can't begin to carry around every bit of this mental baggage, that is all the things he would like to know," she added. "Even in first grade, we try to teach children where to find the answers. We start them using the dictionary—a picture dictionary, of course."

Many parents actually impede their children's ability to absorb learning—particularly the ability to read—by pushing them too fast, the educator believes.

"They read to the children constantly—long, complicated, often quite interesting stories, that make the little tales in the first year reader seem dull by comparison," she said. "They would do better to have their little preschooler concentrate on simple picture books, with perhaps a few words to a page."

Other parents give their children a bad conditioning to reading by never reading anything themselves, she declared.

"A child who never sees anyone pick up a book or magazine isn't likely to want to read much," she explained. "Children are great mimics."

As might be expected, Miss Mackintosh has firm convictions Why Johnny Can't Read, the controversy which has been waxing furiously in educational circles. Like the bulk of educators, she does not agree that Johnny's reading troubles come about because schools are giving less emphasis to the phonetic method of teaching reading.

Essentially, the phonetic method "teaches children how to pronounce words, not what they mean," she says. The method is just one of several we use to help children learn to read, and no one method works with all children.

Miss Mackintosh challenges the thesis that more children now are unable to read than many years ago.

DIFFERENCE

"The difference is that more children are staying on in school," she said. "When they get to high school, their teachers discover that some of them can't read. Those same children wouldn't have been able to read in the past, but they dropped out of school before any teacher made a point of it.

"The teaching of arithmetic has undergone somewhat of a modification since mother was a girl," the HEW official states.

"Long division, which formerly was thrust upon children in the fifth grade, now is spread out over the third through sixth grades," she said. "And arithmetic problems have been brought up to date," she added.

"Children, no longer are given problems having to do with digging a well, or papering a room, which they aren't very likely to do. Their problems today deal with automobile mileage, gas consumption, the buying and selling of merchandise.

"And the memorizing of multiplication tables is discouraged in many schools," she added. "Some combinations are much easier to memorize than others," she explained.

"It is silly to waste time on the easy ones, by reciting the whole table over and over. So now each combination is learned individually. Children often make a game out of this. They write 6 x 6 on a card, with the answer, 36, on the back. Then they see how many they get right. The ones they miss go into one pile, to be tried over again."

Asks Common Justice for Migratory Worker

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN V. BEAMER
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 13, 1956

Mr. BEAMER. Mr. Speaker, on March 8, 1956, I introduced H. R. 9836, a bill to provide for the regulation of the interstate transportation of migrant farm workers.

The Transportation and Communications Subcommittee of the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee has conducted hearings on this legislation and is giving consideration to this worthy legislation. It is designed specifically to provide more comfortable and humane transportation of these migrant farm workers. Many States already have provided regulations for their intrastate transportation and, thus, this bill would serve to provide the same consideration for these workers when they are transported across State lines.

This bill has the approval of the various Federal agencies and of many other groups. Under unanimous consent, I include in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, an approving article in the June 18 edition of the Lampmaker, published by Local No. 663, UAW–CIO, Guide Lamp of Anderson, Ind.:

ASKS COMMON JUSTICE FOR MIGRATORY WORKER

The AFL–CIO called on Congress to "take one small step toward common justice" for the Nation's migratory farm workers by voting immediate enactment of a bill to permit Federal regulation of their transportation.

Testifying before the House Commerce Committee, Walter Mason, AFL–CIO legislative representative, charged that "overcrowding, the use of unsafe vehicles, and driver exhaustion is needlessly killing and maiming uncounted numbers of these un-

protected migrant workers, the victims of insatiable greed."

Mason said that, although much of the transportation of farm workers involves crossing State lines, "those who profiteer from human misery still escape the jurisdiction of the Interstate Commerce Commission" because most of the transportation is done by private carriers. As a consequence, he pointed out, they are now beyond the scope of public control except as it is imposed by inadequate State and local traffic laws.

Reserve Construction

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. OVERTON BROOKS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 5, 1956

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend and revise my remarks, I enclose the Reserve construction programs of the Air Force, Navy, and the Army National Guard for the fiscal year 1957. I am personally glad to realize that the Defense Department is getting in shape with Reserve training facilities for the time when our Reserve begins to reach its maximum legal strength. Detailed construction in these programs is as follows:

Air Force Reserve construction program, fiscal year 1957

Andrews Air Force Base, Md.[8]: Operational facilities	$89,000
Bakalar Air Force Base, Ind.: Airfield pavements, operational, housing and storage facilities, utilities	4,186,000
Barksdale Air Force Base, La.[2] Airfield pavements, liquid fuel storage, maintenance facilities and utilities	1,821,000
Bates Field, Ala.[4]: Airfield pavements, operational, shop, and storage facilities, maintenance and training facilities, liquid fuel storage, housing and messing facilities, utilities	7,809,000
Bradley Field, Conn.[1]: Airfield pavements, shop facilities, and liquid fuel storage	559,000
Brooks Air Force Base, Tex.[3]: Maintenance facilities	815,000
Chico Municipal Airport, Calif.[4]: Airfield pavements, liquid fuel storage, operational and shop facilities, maintenance, medical, and training facilities, housing and messing facilities, utilities	3,771,000
Clinton County Air Force Base, Ohio[2]; Airfield pavements, liquid fuel storage, maintenance facilities, housing and messing facilities, land acquisition, and utilities	5,063,000
Dallas Naval Air Station, Tex.[2]: Training facility	713,000
Davis Field, Okla.[4]: Airfield pavements, liquid fuel storage, operational, storage and shop, facilities, land acquisition and utilities	2,432,000
Donaldson Air Force Base, S. C.[2] Airfield pavements and maintenance facilities	2,200,000
Dress Memorial Airport, Ind.[4] Airfield pavements, liquid storage, operational storage and shop facilities, utilities	1,281,000
General Billy Mitchell Field, Wis.[1] Shop facilities and land acquisition	$635,000
Grandview Air Force Base, Mo.[4] Operational facilities	106,000
Greater Cincinnati Airport, Ohio[4] Airfield pavements, operational maintenance and storage facilities, liquid fuel storage, shop and administrative facilities	2,844,000
Griffis Air Force Base, N. Y.[2] Airfield pavements, liquid fuel storage, maintenance and administrative facilities, utilities	2,013,000
Hill Air Force Base, Utah[2] Airfield pavements, maintenance and shop facilities	1,933,000
McConnell Air Force Base, Kans.[2] Airfield pavements and maintenance facilities	2,015,000
McGuire Air Force Base, N. J.[2] Airfield pavements, maintenance and shop facilities	1,962,000
Memphis Municipal Airport, Tenn.[4] Airfield pavements and operational facilities	113,000
Mitchel Air Force Base, N. Y.[2] Training facilities	750,000
New Castle County Municipal Airport, Del.[7] Airfield pavements, maintenance facilities and utilities	2,149,000
New Orleans Naval Air Station, La.[5] Airfield pavements	297,000
New York Naval Air Station, N. Y.[6] Storage facilities	133,000
Orlando Air Force Base, Fla.[2] Airfield pavements, maintenance facilities, and utilities	1,981,000
Paine Air Force Base, Wash.[2] Airfield pavements	385,000
Pinellas County International Airport, Fla.[4] Airfield pavements, operational and maintenance facilities, shop and storage facilities, liquid fuel storage and utilities	2,419,000
Scott Air Force Base, Ill.[2] Airfield pavements and maintenance facilities	2,074,000
Tinker Air Force Base, Okla.[2] Airfield pavements and maintenance facilities	2,491,000
Toledo Express Airport, Ohio[1] Airfield pavements, liquid fuel storage, operational and storage facilities, shop and maintenance facilities, land acquisition and utilities	3,350,000
Willow Grove Naval Air Station, Pa.[6] Shop facilites	76,000
Youngstown Municipal Airport, Ohio[8] Training facilities	70,000
Total	58,535,000

[1] Civil, Air Force Reserve, and Air National Guard.
[2] Air Force Reserve and Active Military.
[3] Air Force Reserve, Air National Guard, and Active Military.
[4] Civil and Air Force Reserve.
[5] Air Force Reserve, Air National Guard, and other Reserve.
[6] Air Force Reserve and other Reserve.
[7] Civil, Air Force Reserve, Air National Guard, and Active Military.
[8] Civil, Air Force Reserve, and Active Military.

Department of the Navy military construction, Naval Reserve forces, fiscal year 1957

NAVAL RESERVE (AVIATION)

	Estimated cost
Naval Air Station, Columbus, Ga.: Additional fuel storage, installation of sprinkler systems and jet engine test facilities	$402,000
Naval Air Station, Dallas, Tex.: Airfield pavements, land acquisition, and jet engine test facilities	$1,985,000
Naval Air Station, Denver, Colo.: Airfield pavements and jet engine test facilities	3,056,000
Naval Air Station, Lincoln, Nebr.: Land acquisition, ammunition storage, and jet engine test facilities	220,000
Naval Air Station, Los Alamitos, Calif.: Airfield pavements, aviation fuel storage and jet engine test facilities	596,000
Naval Air Station, Miami, Fla.: Alterations to hangar and jet engine test facilities	325,000
Naval Air Station, Minneapolis, Minn.: Jet engine test facilities	170,000
Naval Air Station, New York, N. Y.: Airfields pavements and jet engine test facilities	890,000
Naval Air Station, Niagara Falls, N. Y.: Airfield pavements, reserve hangar, boiler house and transformer station, messing and Navy exchange facilities, jet engine test facilities	1,573,000
Naval Air Station, Oakland, Calif.: Jet engine test facilities	170,000
Naval Air Station, Olathe, Kans.: Airfield pavement, and jet engine test facilities	504,000
Naval Air Station, Seattle, Wash.: Communication facilities	85,000
Naval Air Station South Weymouth, Mass.; Jet engine test facilities	170,000
Naval Air Station, Willow Grove, Pa.: Relocate communication transmitter, training tank, and jet engine test facilities	659,000
Total	10,805,000

NAVAL RESERVE (SURFACE)

Brownwood, Tex.: Electronics facility, including acquisition	$56,000
Clifton, N. J.: Land acquisition	30,000
Crowley, La.: Electronics facility and land acquisition	58,000
Eddystone, Pa.: New N & MCRTC and land acquistion	770,000
Emporia, Kans.: Electronics facility	60,000
Florence, S. C.: Electronics facility and land acquisition	69,000
Great Falls, Mont.: Electronics facility	63,000
Kingsburg, Calif.: Electronics facility	100,000
Malden, Mass.: Electronics facility and land acquisition	88,000
McKeesport, Pa.: Expansion to existing NRTC	80,000
Paducah, Ky.: Electronics facility and land acquisition	66,000
Parsons, Kans.: Electronics facility and land acquisition (no cost)	60,000
Petaluma, Calif.: Electronics facility	61,000
Raleigh, N. C.: New N & MCRTC and land acquisition	633,000
San Pedro, Calif.: Fire protection for NRTC	38,000
Stockton, Calif.: Land acquisition	22,000
Washington, N. C.: Electronics facility and land acquisition	58,000
Wilmington, Del.: New N & MCRTC and land acquisition	790,000
Total	3,102,000

MARINE CORPS RESERVE (GROUND)	
Baltimore, Md.: MCRTC and land acquisition	$522,000
Jacksonville, Fla.: Expansion to existing NRTC	79,000
San Jose, Calif.: Expansion to existing N & MCRTC	99,500
Rochester, N. Y.: Alteration of existing NRTC	$79,000
Forty Fort, Pa.: New MCRTC and land acquisition (no cost)	285,000
Houston, Tex.: New MCRTC and land acquisition	858,500
Lewiston, Maine: Purchase of land and buildings	$81,000
Total	1,504,000
Grand total	15,411,000

Recapitulation of projects, fiscal year 1957 armory construction program, Army National Guard

Type of armory	Number of projects	Total costs	Federal share	State share
1-unit	18	$2,577,500	$1,868,625	$708,875
2-unit	1	200,000	150,000	50,000
2-unit and MVSB	1	398,000	298,500	99,500
3-unit	2	636,000	422,500	212,500
4-unit	1	400,000	300,000	100,000
5-unit	2	765,000	512,250	252,750
1-unit expansion	2	78,500	58,875	19,625
2-unit expansion and MVSB	1	372,000	278,520	93,480
Rehabilitations	3	$28,000	$21,000	$7,000
Purchase and rehabilitations	1	120,000	90,000	30,000
Total	32	5,574,000	4,000,270	1,573,730
Round off			−270	
Total			4,000,000	

Index of projects, fiscal year 1957 armory construction program, Army National Guard

Location, State and city	Type of armory	Estimated total cost	Estimated Federal cost	Estimated State cost
Arizona: Douglas	1-unit expansion	$18,500	$13,875	$4,625
California:				
Victorville	1 unit	165,000	99,000	66,000
Watsonville	do	160,000	96,000	64,000
State total		325,000	195,000	130,000
Colorado: Englewood	1 unit	110,000	82,500	27,500
Connecticut: New London	3 plus unit	485,000	310,000	175,000
Indiana:				
Warsaw	1 unit	190,000	142,500	47,500
Remington	do	190,000	142,500	47,500
State total		380,000	285,000	95,000
Iowa: Sioux City	3-plus unit purchased and rehabilitated.	120,000	90,000	30,000
Louisiana: Sulphur	1 unit	150,000	112,500	37,500
Massachusetts: Fall River	4 unit	400,000	300,000	100,000
Michigan: Lansing	2-plus unit expansion and MVSB.	372,000	278,520	93,480
Minnesota: St. Paul No. 1	5-plus unit	615,000	399,750	215,250
Mississippi: Collins	1-unit	60,000	45,000	15,000
Montana: Hamilton	do	80,000	60,000	20,000
Nebraska: Wahoo	do	160,000	108,000	52,000
New Jersey: Pitman	do	180,000	135,000	45,000
New York:				
Monticello	2-unit and MVSB	398,000	298,500	99,500
Glen Falls	1-unit rehabilitated	6,000	4,500	1,500
Geneva	do	5,000	3,750	1,250
New York—Continued				
Newburg	4-unit rehabilitated	$17,000	$12,750	$4,250
State total		426,000	319,500	106,500
North Carolina: St. Pauls	1 unit	100,000	75,000	25,000
North Dakota: Mandan	1 unit expansion	60,000	45,000	15,000
Oregon: Woodburn	1 unit	144,000	108,000	36,000
South Carolina: Myrtle Beach	do	126,000	94,500	31,500
South Dakota: Watertown	2-unit	200,000	150,000	50,000
Tennessee: Livingston	1-unit	87,500	65,625	21,875
Texas:				
Houston No. 1	5-plus unit	150,000	112,500	37,500
Houston No. 2	3-plus unit	150,000	112,500	37,500
State total		300,000	225,000	75,000
Virginia: Fairfax	1-unit	150,000	112,500	37,500
Wisconsin:				
Mosinee	do	190,000	142,500	47,500
Plymouth	do	190,000	142,500	47,500
State total		380,000	285,000	95,000
Wyoming: Wheatland	1 unit	145,000	105,000	40,000
Grand total		5,574,000	4,000,270	1,573,730
Round off			−270	
Total			4,000,000	

Index of projects, fiscal year 1957 nonarmory construction program—Army National Guard

State	City	Project	Estimated cost
Arizona	Tucson	Range	$7,200
California	Los Angeles (Van Nuys).	Shop hangar	150,000
Colorado	Camp George West	Motor vehicle storage building	55,000
Connecticut	Bradley Field	Warehouse extension	6,000
Hawaii	Island of Molokai	Range	3,000
Idaho	North Bonners Ferry	do	6,125
Louisiana	Alexandria	do	5,000
Massachusetts	Natick	USP and FO office	85,000
Minnesota	St. Paul	Shop-hangar	85,000
Missouri	Cape Girardeau	Motor vehicle storage shed	24,300
	do	Organization maintenance shop.	25,920
State total			50,220
Montana	Culbertson	do	12,000
New Hampshire	Manchester	do	27,000
New Jersey	Orange	do	30,035
New York	Rochester	Motor vehicle storage building.	130,000
North Carolina	Raleigh-Durham Airport.	Shop-hangar	$29,400
Oregon	Clackamas (Camp Withycombe).	Warehouse	130,000
Puerto Rico	Vega Baja	Organization maintenance shop.	11,520
South Dakota	Rapid City	Shop hangar	40,000
Texas	Corpus Christi	Organization maintenance shop.	38,500
Utah	Manti	Range	7,000
Virginia	Richmond	Sandblasting building	20,000
Washington	Yakima	Organization maintenance shop.	32,000
West Virginia	Parkersburg	Shop hangar	40,000
Total			1,000,000

Mutual Security Act of 1956

SPEECH
OF
HON. BROOKS HAYS
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 8, 1956

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H. R. 11356) to amend further the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended, and for other purposes.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. Mr. Chairman, the debate on the pending bill has been an enlightening one and may conceivably be viewed in the future as the beginning of a great debate on the revision of our foreign policy. As I indicated in my remarks in support of my amendment to restore a portion of the cut in title I, I do not believe that a review of our foreign policy would result in any sharp reversal, but I fully concur in the opinions expressed during the debate regarding the need of a resurvey. I am confident that this will be achieved before the 85th Congress convenes. As we conclude the discussions on this measure I wish to express my views regarding some of the more important phases of this legislation.

AMERICA'S ROLE IN THE FREE WORLD

Mr. Chairman, the current Soviet emphasis on "peaceful coexistence" must not lull us into a false sense of security. It is obvious that the Soviets are using every device to gain trade and political advantages in certain parts of the world through a stepped-up economic program that makes use of deception coupled with a propaganda drive to extend Communist influence throughout the world. The so-called lessening of tensions does not mean any lessening of the aims of international communism. As a leader of the free world, the United States must maintain its attitude of defense as well as contribute to the preservation of free countries everywhere. The theme of the 20th Congress of the Communist Party was that "the ideas of communism will triumph without war." Not only do we have to accept this fateful challenge, but we must strive to roll back whatever advances the Communists have already made. The vitality of democracy and national independence is equal to the task, provided we are aware of the challenge and organize our moral, intellectual, and material resources to meet it.

Any discussion of the Mutual Security Act should make it clear that mutual security means exactly what it says. We live in a world where no one nation has the dominant influence and all free countries are mutually interdependent. We did not seek or want the role of leader of western civilization, but this status became something of a fact before we were aware of it. We have, however, become much better conditioned for the interrelationships of the modern world than we were after the close of World War I. This maturity is now being tested in Congress, Mr. Chairman, since we are again being called upon to contribute to the military and economic potential of the free world. Every representative must undertake constantly to balance those interests that are local and regional in character and those that have a national import. And in these times as America proceeds into a crucial period of transition, accepting rather reluctantly her position as the free world's leader, there is, of course, the obligation upon all of us to think of America's greatness in terms of the welfare of other peoples, and never to measure our greatness and our progress exclusively in terms of our own narrow national interests.

It is doubtless apparent from what I have said that I believe we must not retreat. Now we have come to the position of world leadership reluctantly. The Nation is not yet fully prepared, spiritually, for it, for two oceans separate us from the quarrels of other continents, and we still wonder why we are inevitably drawn into their conflicts. Our cultures are so different and so many of our purposes seem to conflict. Still we cannot escape them. Our advocacy of participation in world affairs is not born of an intention to serve other nations at the expense of our own, but a recognition that we are inextricably bound up with their destiny. We must not retreat, whatever the temptation, whatever the cost. We must accept as a physical fact our proximity to aggression and our identification with intended victims closest to it. Almost every Member of Congress, whatever his political preferences, recognizes this condition.

MUTUAL CONTRIBUTIONS TO WESTERN DEFENSE AND PROGRESS

That our assistance to other countries has not been a one-way street may be shown easily. Many of the weapons that now are an integral part of our defense were made available to us by other free nations. The British discovered the radio-locator at the beginning of World War II, which aided the American development of radar. So also was the jetplane invented in England, as well as such other useful weapons of war as the steam catapult for aircraft carriers, antisubmarine sonar weapons and the midget submarine. Just to name a few more, the Belgian automatic rifle was made available to NATO troops, as was the new British Sterling machinegun, the French Mystere plane, and the British Hawker Hunter all-weather fighter. We all know the great contributions made by foreigners in the development of atomic weapons, which now represent our first line of defense. The non-Communist world has become so intimately interrelated that the welfare of each reflects significantly on the welfare of all the rest and no one country can claim self-sufficiency.

Nowhere else is this more evident than in the field of medicine. Antitoxins were discovered by a German and a Japanese in 1890. Insulin was discovered by Frederick Grant Banting and John James Richard MacLeod in England and Canada. The first sulfa drugs were used by Gerhard Domagk on his daughter in Germany early in 1933. In 1928 Alexander Fleming of the University of London discovered penicillin, thus starting an era of "anti-biotics." DDT was synthesized by Dr. Paul Muller in Switzerland in the autumn of 1939. I could go on and on down the pages of medical history to show that the health and welfare of the United States have been advanced by discoveries made in many countries.

THE PERIL IS STILL GREAT

Aggression still threatens. Although great strides have been made since the end of World War II, we are still confronted by totalitarianism. The Mutual Security bill as reported by the Foreign Affairs Committee authorizes $1.925 billion for military assistance to our allies and $1.147 billion for defense support. These are large sums but are a small price to pay when we realize the alternatives. The Communists would not hesitate to employ physical force or other means of undermining independent governments if they thought we had weakened our defenses sufficiently. The loss of any substantial territory in Asia, Africa, Europe, or even South America would lead to catastrophic results for America. Not only would our standard of living sag, but our ability to defend ourselves would be gravely diminished. So also would our liberties be increasingly sacrificed to the harsh demands of a garrison state.

If many peoples are drawn into a closer political and economic relationship with the Soviet Union, then eventually we would be cut off from the essential raw materials we need to keep our economy running. We are already importing 50 percent of the industrial raw materials required by our expanding industrial machine. We have recently become quite aware that 80 percent of all the oil in the non-Communist world is concentrated within 300 miles of the Persian Gulf. A complete survey of our domestic economic needs would reveal that the expenditure of $3.07 billion raised from our traditional revenue source is a small sacrifice indeed compared to the havoc that would be caused by the stoppage of international trade with countries now menaced by the Communists.

Figures presented to the Foreign Affairs Committee reveal that the NATO countries make a great effort to provide military equipment for their own defense. NATO members have contributed of their own resources about 85 percent of the total cost of the European buildup. Funds from the United States sent through the military assistance program have made up the difference of only 15 percent. Our percentage has currently been decreasing. While the defense expenditures of most European countries represent a smaller percentage of their gross national product than does that of the United States (about 10 percent) the per capita incomes of the others are much lower and the sacrifice is somewhat greater. As General Gruenther pointed out, "one NATO country has an average income of $175 per person per year. By the same method of figuring, the average income in the United States is $2,000 per person per year. Should the basis of contribution be $175 to $2,100?" Certainly the United States must not permit itself to

become the leader in reducing expenditures in the face of possible slackening efforts by our allies. We must show our determination to continue our assistance to those who have provided us with strong defensive outposts.

RESPECT FOR NATIONAL SOVEREIGNTY AND FREEDOM

One major problem in providing foreign aid is the tendency of the countries of the free world to arrive at mutually contradictory policies. A hazard of freedom that we cheerfully accept is the strain on free world unity caused by national sovereignty. We all know that such strains can be converted into our greatest asset, but in the short run, we must be patient and understanding. We cannot expect to buy the loyalty of any nation or people with aid dollars, no matter how many we spend, or as Chester Bowles expressed it "It is also folloy to assume that simply by filling people's stomachs we can automatically turn them into believers in liberal democracy, American brand." Assuming that we have provided for the necessary defense potential, the primary purpose of our economic assistance program should be to help new and struggling nations to create societies which offer a steadily expanding measure of justice and opportunity. We must not demand a uniformity of outlook among the recipients of our aid. It is enough to contribute to the growth of stability and security throughout the non-Communist world. While we are obviously spending large sums to support our allies' defenses and economies, we are also aware of the need to win the respect of all the world's free peoples.

The strengthening of military alliances as such is not the only objective of our foreign aid program. We must constantly reappraise our collective security system to determine how effective and reliable it is. Meanwhile, we seek to provide such countries as India and Indonesia with the help they need to improve the standards of living of their peoples. It should not be difficult for us to understand the desire of nations newly independent, free for the first time in modern history from colonial domination, to have a large degree of independence in their foreign policies. We have also learned that the neglect of have-not nations will only create problems for other regions of the world. Mr. J. D. Zellerbach, chairman of the Committee for Economic Development and one of the leading industrialists of the United States, points out that "foreign aid is not a device for rewarding those governments which agree with us and punishing those which do not." As he see it:

> You do not initiate and develop an economic policy to produce shiploads of gratitude. You do so to produce shiploads of food and machinery, our economic policy was never meant to create expressions of appreciation but to serve serious objectives of mutual interest.

A resident of one of the emerging new nations of the Old World indicated this point of view in answer to the question of an American: "What do you expect of us?" "Respect and rice," he said, adding "and in that order."

UNITED STATES MORAL LEADERSHIP

This leads us to a realistic assessment of the role the United States must play in western civilization. I would like to quote from a speech I made some time ago:

> We must not undertake to dominate the world. Now we have the power, of course, to do great things for all the nations of the world, and sometimes when the requirements seem to overwhelm us, we must remember that our capacity industrially is stupendous. Paul Hoffman gave us this charting of progress recently: Just 50 years ago, America had 6 percent of the world's population and was producing 20 percent of its wealth. Today, with 7 percent, just a little more of its population, we are producing not 20 percent but about 50 percent of its goods, and so by reason of our tremendous material and physical strength we are preeminently the world's leader. The important thing, however, is that we match these enormous industrial powers with a moral leadership that is commensurate.

We cannot limit ourselves to proposing a policy of foreign aid solely to prevent Russian aggression. We must seek to assist other countries to achieve common ends by means of fostering common values. There are over 1 billion people living in the so-called neutralist countries who are today fully aware of the opportunities for economic advancement available to them through employment of modern technology. Our economic policy must be designed to win their confidence and prove to them the superiority of our way of life.

Woodrow Wilson said that "America was created to unite mankind." And with this purpose in mind, his urgent advice was for Americans not only to think of America, but in order to be truly American, "always, also, to think first of humanity." He warned us that if we seceded from the emerging world community, "there will come, sometime, in the venegeful providence of God, another struggle in which not a few hundred thousand fine men from America will have to die, but as many millions as are necessary to accomplish the final freedom of the peoples of the world." Now that we are aware of our international responsibility, we find the totalitarian Soviet Union offering a fraudulent but rather persuasive vision to much of the world. We can and must win this ideological struggle by proving to the disadvantaged people of the world that the American way of life means self-determination, human dignity, expanding opportunities, and peace. In this way, whatever material assistance we offer will be recognized as part of a genuine effort to assure the preservation and the ultimate expansion throughout the world of the spirit of liberal democracy with its primary regard for the dignity and integrity of man.

If we put into our world leadership this greater moral concept, the 20th century can be ours, just as the 19th century was Britain's. As one of my good friends said, "I am sure it will either be ours or Russia's." If we claim it, it must be said, too, that it was humanity's century. Just as Great Britain, supplying the leadership that seemed essential to holding the world together, gave it the impress of freedom of international commerce, so America in the 20th century must give it the impress of spiritual greatness. I am sure of that.

I believe that out of new devotions to these common ends—the attainment of justice and liberty; the achievement of the rule of law in our world—there will be the grandest demonstration of faith that a people ever had. The tax burdens that Congress places on our citizens for these purposes are heavy and they pain every sensitive person in the Congress, but we must believe that these sacrifices are the only basis for a hope that there can be a world united—if not in our time, in some future period. International aspirations are consistent with the truest nationalism as America knows it. As Lincoln said, it is here that "we may meanly lose or nobly save the last best hope of earth."

Now that a form of military stalemate can be maintained through a sustained defense effort, the ideological dimensions of the Soviet challenge achieve new importance. The Communists are placing renewed emphasis upon propaganda and economic programs, and the United States must not neglect this aspect of Soviet aggression. The United States delegation to the United Nations Assembly of 1955 prepared a statement urging that our own policies be reassessed in the light of this move. We said at that time:

> We believe that the United States must counter these Soviet efforts. We can succeed not by outbidding communism in sheer amounts of economic aid, but by making newly independent and newly articulate peoples feel that they can best satisfy their wants by becoming and remaining part of the community of free nations.
>
> We welcome more emphasis on economic and educational endeavors, for we have a proven experience in these fields.
>
> We are in a contest in the field of economic development of underdeveloped countries which is bitterly competitive. Defeat in this contest could be as disastrous as defeat in an armaments race.
>
> We could lose this economic contest unless the country as a whole wakes up to all its implications.

With special regard to the problems of Asia, Mr. J. A. Villamor, a native of the Philippines but a naturalized American citizen and a lieutenant colonel in our Air Force Reserve, a man of wide military, political, and diplomatic experience in the Orient, has this to say:

> Many times the failures of our foreign aid have been due to our own unrestrained, let's-go spirit; our we-know-what's-good-for-you-better-than-you-do approach; our heavy dependence on material things to answer needs that are often largely spiritual; and worst of all perhaps, our tendency to forget the human problems—of peoples with hearts, minds, and souls, as well as stomachs, just like the peoples of the West.
>
> In my opinion, our foreign aid ought to be directed more to the needs of the underdeveloped peoples as they see their needs, not as we see them.
>
> The importance of paying attention to the attitudes of the people of Asia cannot be overemphasized. To ignore their attitudes, to interpret them only by western standards, to base policies and programs on one-way percepts—this is just about the fastest and surest way to bankrupt American policy in Asia.

Thus an adequate, long-range program of assistance, intelligently keyed to the political and ideological as well as the economic realities of the underdeveloped continents, is essential to our national objectives.

CONTINUING AID

Mr. Chairman, such a program of economic assistance cannot be considered as a temporary thing, or stop-gap against the advance of communism. I wish I might be convincing on this matter of continuing the responsibility of Congress to provide economic aid. We are not doing this because we are being pressured or are fearful, but because such aid is a fundamental part of our long-term foreign policy. I believe that if we were less favored industrially we would also argue that the productive nations have an obligation to provide economic help. The authorization for development assistance is $243 million. This is relatively small compared with the total MSA authorization and a minute percentage of our defense budget. With these funds we help to advance the standards of living in Asia, Africa, and Latin America so that the current gap is at least held constant and possibly improved.

The Soviet Union is now engaged in an all-out effort to use its diplomatic, propaganda, and economic power to attract new subjects, to weaken and divide the free world, and to isolate the United States. It is obvious that the emphasis on peace and relaxation of tensions is basic to the success of this policy. We must not permit ourselves to be deceived into thinking that this new economic warfare is any less dangerous than the old conventional warfare, and we must therefore apply our unique abilities and our resources to speed up free world economic growth and development. The basic obstacle to that growth is the shortage of investment capital available to underdeveloped countries. While we should do much to encourage private long-term low-interest loans in these countries, we must recognize the tremendous need for "infrastructures," the fundamental building blocks of an economy—transportation, power, other utilities, irrigation, basic agricultural industry, and so forth—which can only be created with public capital provided by the "have" countries.

When the proper political stability and favorable industrial environment are achieved, then private capital should be able to supply the funds necessary for the profitmaking enterprises. Until then the United States Government should accept the obligation to bolster the economies of the have-not countries with the financial assistance they need. Such assistance should not be in response to the challenge of Soviet promises, but rather in terms of a positive policy of foreign aid, based on the consistent development of a long-term program to raise the productive potential of the free world. Only in this way shall we be able to avoid a repetition of the experience of the Afghanistan Helmand Valley irrigation project. An ill-conceived attempt to win the support of this politically strategic area, this project was not carefully thought out and the extravagant expenditures there have succeeded only in causing a major political crisis. With professional planning of a balanced economic-aid program, we will provide for the kind of economic development that includes the close participation and training of the people we wish to benefit. We would then gain friends and lovers of freedom by the manner in which we present our defense and economic development programs.

TECHNICAL COOPERATION

It is not enough to provide economic development assistance to the underdeveloped countries of the free world. One of the most difficult problems that face the underdeveloped countries in their efforts to improve the living conditions of their people is the urgent need for acquisition and dissemination of basic technical knowledge. In the process of economic development, the solution of this problem ranks equally in importance with that of mobilizing the resources necessary to carry out large investment programs. Without such technical knowledge, nations cannot really begin to extract the potential benefits from capital investment. The total authorization for both bilateral and multilateral technical assistance in this bill is $157,500,000. I can think of no money better spent for the purpose of raising the living standards of other nations. While I will consider the problem of whether more money should be channeled through the U. N. in a short while, I should like to point out here that striking contributions to human welfare have been made by our point 4 experts throughout the world. We should all be very proud of the pioneer part the United States has played in the development of the idea of organized exchange of technical knowledge in the international area; we have now reached the stage where this type of assistance can really begin to pay full dividends in terms of free world economic health.

THE MIDDLE EAST

This general discussion of the benefits of our mutual-security program to our freedom-loving friends and world neighbors should not overlook the existence of various "malignancies" around the globe. Grave dangers exist in the Middle East, and the greatest threat to peace arises there. While strategic considerations are obviously of prime importance, we can readily see that the basic cause of the disturbances is economic. We must, of course, do everything in our power to prevent the outbreak of hostilities in the immediate future, but, in the long run, peace in the Middle East is dependent on political and economic stability and security. We are prepared to offer the economic and technical assistance that will aid in gradually raising the living conditions of the area to an adequate level. In the meantime, we shall maintain an attitude of friendship to all the peoples of the region, seeking to arrive at a peaceful and equitable settlement of Arab-Israeli differences through the United Nations. Above all, we will strive to repel the penetration of Communist influences which seek to inflame passions and stir up enmities. There is no other course available to us that will achieve these ends better than contributing to the establishment of strong independent nations, whose peoples are secure, well trained, and well fed.

NATO PROBLEM

We have all recently noticed the increased concern of our allies and our own Government over the effectiveness of NATO. Secretary of State Dulles suggested in Paris at the meeting of the NATO foreign ministers that article II of the treaty be used to give the Organization new life. This would mean employing the NATO machinery to administer economic aid. While there is much to be said for such an expansion of NATO activities, the important thing to realize is that the United States is giving consideration to multilateral means of assisting other nations. That the Atlantic Alliance needs strengthening is possibly true, but we must also give long consideration and though to the problems that would arise if NATO, primarily a military organization, were to be projected into the economic development of unalined countries of Asia and Africa, such as Burma, Egypt, India, and Indonesia.

MULTILATERAL AID

When we talk about the need for multilateral aid for underedeveloped countries, we must always remember that bilateral American aid is not to be contrasted with multilateral U. N. aid. What we are striving for is simply the most effective means of using our foreign-aid money. Both bilateral and multilateral aid should be coordinated to achieve overall economic development in a given region. We need to coordinate our assistance efforts so that they are on a regional and functional basis—that we aid many countries in one area, and that this aid include many operations which transcend border lines. Thus, not only the U. N. but also the Organization for American States is an international device for getting several countries to consider the same problems. In the report on the 10th General Assembly of the U. N. that Mr. Merrow and I filed with the Congress we did point out that:

It is urgently necessary that in the future we make for greater use of the United Nations' system for foreign aid than we have in the past. This would not mean an increased amount of money appropriated for foreign aid but, rather, the channeling of a part of existing appropriations through United Nations machinery.

Some will say that such sponsorship does not give us the advertising and good will that bilateral programs provide. However, we would point out that the basic reason for our program of economic assistance is not to purchase affection but rather to strengthen the free world, eliminating the vacuums of weakness into which the Soviet power is trying to move.

We do not, of course, overlook the factor of good will, but the leaders of the nations, even the so-called underdeveloped ones, know where help is coming from, and even though the goods are not clearly identified as being of American origin, we believe the people of those countries discern and appreciate our help.

U. N. PROPOSALS FOR DEVELOPMENT

The proposal for the creation of a Special United Nations Fund for Economic Development—SUNFED—reflects the increasingly strong world sentiment in favor of some type of multilateral aid. We voted for the resolution at the U. N. which created an ad hoc committee to carry on the orderly exploration of various relevant ideas and suggestions to establish an international development fund. We believe it premature to try at this time to define precisely what should be the organization and operation of the proposed fund. Heretofore our representations as to such aid have been linked to a worldwide system of disarmament, so that we could use some of the savings thus effected, without remaining inflexible about this mutual connection. As I said then, however:

We feel there is an inherent and logical relationship between an effective move to relieve the world of the heavy burden of armaments on the one hand and an effective effort to use large additional resources to promote human well-being on the other.

With regard to the technical assistance aspects of this program, I believe—that no genuine economic development can take place unless the people concerned work it out for themselves. The goal of the technical-assistance program is to bring out latent aptitudes and skills. Sometimes this means teaching completely new skills. At other times it may mean only helping people recapture skills lost or forgotten because of the tragedies of war, economic misfortune, or physical adversities. In either case technical assistance is the most direct way of helping people help themselves to improve their economic lot. For the future of both economic and technical aid, I wrote Secretary Dulles that in my work in the General Assembly I was struck by the extent to which many of the underdeveloped countries about which we are most concerned would prefer to be helped through the United Nations rather than to receive bilateral assistance which they may view as having "strings attached." This feeling is so strong in many cases as to amount almost to an obsession. Whether we agree with it or not, we must recognize that it exists.

Without abandoning the bilateral programs for economic aid and technical assistance by which we contributed much to raising living standards of other nations we should channel an increased percentage of our aid through the United Nations. We can avoid some of the misunderstandings and misinterpretations by taking this course and we will be more effective in working toward economic goals that are essential to world stability. Francis O. Wilcox, Assistant Secretary of State, who by reason of his legislative experience retains a strong influence on Capitol Hill, testified before the Foreign Affairs Committee that he does not subscribe to the belief held by some that the United States does not benefit as much through its contributions to multilateral activities as through its direct bilateral aid. As he put it "our vigorous support of these popular multilateral programs has been well received by all free countries and has gained for this country a good will which I firmly believe could not be developed to as great an extent in any other way. It is an effective answer to Communist propaganda charges that we are seeking to dominate countries in which we have bilateral programs. It is further evidence of our genuine interest in helping to promote the economic development of newly developing countries." In the context of our relations with other governments, the work of United Nations technical assistance has been increasing steadily in significance. It is furnishing a striking demonstration of the potential effectiveness of multilateral action in the economic and social fields. Experts from some 60 nations are working all over the world to bring knowledge of better methods of doing things to people who are eager to learn. These experts are employed by the international organizations of which the newly developing countries are members. This is rather a unique program of organized self-help, certainly the first of its kind to be established on an international organization basis.

FURTHER STUDIES

The difficulties which have arisen in the formation and administration of a consistent foreign-aid policy indicate that there is great need for further studies in this area. One possible method of reassessment would be the establishment of a joint congressional committee on foreign aid "to conduct a thorough factfinding study and investigation of the operation of the foreign aid programs of the United States in the past and present," as proposed by Mr. HARRISON of Virginia and Mrs. CHURCH of Illinois. Independent studies by the Foreign Affairs Committee would also prove to be extremely helpful.

Another means of revamping our foreign economic policy is the examination of professional reports, such as the recent one prepared by Profs. Max Millikan and W. W. Rostow, of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology's Center for International Studies. The proposals that these scholars of foreign affairs have made, such as creating a long-term capital fund, enlarging international flows of private capital, establishing international stocks of agricultural surpluses, and so forth, should be given the closest study, and the Congress should be prepared to adopt significant revisions in our current programs, when the studies reveal better ways of achieving our goal of strengthening the free world.

WHAT WE NEED TO DO NOW

Until we have obtained the revised foreign economic policy we seek, however, we must evaluate the current MSA bill in terms of its relation to what we now recognize as essential. The provisions of this act do enable us to help the newly independent countries of Asia, the Middle East, and Africa with their economic development, as well as contribute to the military defense of the free world. The case for foreign aid is still a very strong one, however imperfect the present mechanisms may be, and the money requested will do much to tip the balance in freedom's favor in the countries assisted.

Putting an Edge on Studies by Buying a Share of Stock

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 5, 1956

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. I should like to include in the RECORD an article which appeared in Business Week about a very interesting classroom experiment which was conducted at the Nyack (N. Y.) High School in my district.

It seems to me that both the teacher of the class, Mr. Edward Schweikardt, and the superintendent of the school, Mr. K. R. MacCalman, deserve high credit for this dramatic and effective way of illustrating the free-enterprise system.

This experiment enlisted the interest of the president of American Zinc Co., Mr. Howard I. Young, who made a trip to Nyack to address the class, wrote a special report on the activities of the class, of which he distributed over 25,000 copies.

Finally, on August 1, the school is putting on a program before the Associated Public School Systems at their national meeting in New York on the teaching of economics and free enterprise.

The article follows:

PUTTING AN EDGE ON STUDIES BY BUYING A SHARE OF STOCK

These 14 high school students, and 70 classmates, are a stockholder in an American corporation. On May 10, the day after their company's annual stockholders' meeting in Portland, Maine, they will have a special meeting of the owners of their one share of stock to hear a report of their company's president.

The students are seniors in the Nyack (N. Y.) High School history classes of Edward Schweikardt, the teacher in whose name their share of stock is registered. The company president who will address them next month is Howard I. Young, head of American Zinc, Lead & Smelting Co.

It's all part of Nyack's senior history course that stresses how the American economy works. And the actual ownership of a share of stock by the students grew out of class discussion last October. It has resulted in an experience more personal and more vivid than most college economics students get, according to Dr. Allen O. Felix, director of education for the New York Stock Exchange.

PLANTING THE IDEA

Originally, Schweikardt used a fairly widespread teaching trick of illustrating his economics unit by imaginary stock deals. Last fall, however, he had an uneasy feeling that, book-perfect as the students' work might be, the lessons on business ownership and financing weren't coming alive. Imaginary stock investments remained abstract and remote, he felt, to teenagers whose sole economic experience, personally, was as consumers. So, he recalls, he began throwing out the bait in his classes until someone asked, "Can't we buy a share of stock and see how it works?"

The disbelief that greeted his "yes" confirmed his opinion that the students needed a personal experience in stock owning.

STUDENT BROKERS

Each of the five classes elected a "student broker," who had the job of collecting 25 cents per pupil and then investing the proceeds. A sixth student who had already written to brokers and corporations for information was added to the committee as a consultant.

At 25 cents a head, the brokers raised $21 among Schweikardt's 125 students. They called on a local resident, Sydney Bradshaw, a member and former Governor of the New York Stock Exchange, for help in explaining terminology and the details of financial statements. Each of the five boys and girls then nominated one stock for consideration.

The class didn't want a stock with any local industrial connection or one with a static price performance. It looked, rather for the

stock of a sound and interesting company but one whose price would swing enough to enliven a wall chart (picture). Nicholas Golosov, a young Russian refugee who has been in the United States only 3 or 4 years, made a winning case for American Zinc on the basis of his weeks of study or financial data. In 1955 American Zinc traded in a range of $24.25 to $14.25 a share.

IT'S A DEAL

Up to this time, Schweikardt learned by calling for a show of hands, no other pupil in all his classes had ever heard of American Zinc. But after listening to their brokers' report, the students ratified the purchase of one share last October.

American Zinc was then selling at $18.50. The buy order was executed by the Wall Street firm of Montgomery Scott & Co. at a cost of another $1.10 or so. The rest of the $21 was kept in a cash balance.

The first exhibit for the classroom bulletin board was Montgomery, Scott's notice of purchase. "The students were amazed that a brokerage firm would give attention to one share," says Schweikardt. "Here in one brief experience the students were freed of the idea that a person has to have a lot of money to hold ownership in a business."

Next came the stock certificate. "Their first look at an actual piece of ownership of productive America," Schweikardt calls it. Teachers and pupils from other classes came in to look at it and talk about it.

FOLLOWING THE MARKET

The wall display included two graphs, one showing daily changes in price of American zinc and the other showing the volume of shares traded daily in this issue.

"The financial page of the New York Times began to rival the sports page in student interest," says Schweikardt. "Now the questions came fast: What made stock go up? What made it go down? The impact of political and economic events as market factors came into student conversations in the cafeteria, gym, and halls."

Then came the first quartely dividend check—for 25 cents. "A 25-cent check isn't a particularly impressive thing," the teacher says, "but when the students figured it out in terms of yield, this was something different. A 5.4 percent annual yield rang a bell with them. Here was the realism of investment."

Since then, another 25-cent dividend check has joined the first one on the bulletin board. "Up to this time," says Schweikardt, "$18.50 challenged a student only to the extent of what it could buy or where he could go on that amount of money. Here now was proof that $18.50 could mean ownership and production." Besides 50 cents in dividends so far, American Zinc has gained around $3 in market price since the time the group purchased it.

STILL MORE LESSONS

The value of the lone American Zinc share in teaching economics to Nyack teen-agers will continue through the school year. On May 1, all 125 senior history students will be taken on the annual trip to New York, 25 miles down the Hudson River, for a day divided between the New York Federal Reserve Bank and the New York Stock Exchange. Nine days later, they will have their "stockholder meeting" with President Young, of American Zinc.

Finally, as graduation time nears, the students will have to decide what to do with their share of stock. Their sale of the stock will complete the cycle that began last fall with the theory of corporate ownership.

LESSON FOR GROWNUPS

Nyack High School's project is becoming a lesson, too, for other teachers, investment people, and businessmen.

When American Zinc heard of the identity of its new holder of one share, President Young asked Schweikardt to describe the project. This month the company printed Schweikardt's report in a pamphlet that was sent to 3,800 stockholders and 2,400 employees in the same mailing with the annual statement. As word got around, requests for copies of the pamphlet piled up. A first printing of 25,000 copies has now been exhausted and more are being printed.

The stock exchange last week took delivery of 11,000 copies, of which 7,000 will be distributed among educators by Dr. Felix.

"This is the most ambitious high-school project in economics that I've heard of," says Dr. Felix. "We want to let other schools know about it, not that many will actually put it into practice. This is part of what we call 'the growing edge' of teaching practice, and it usually takes something like 50 years for such an idea to spread. But it will start high schools thinking about ways to teach economics more effectively."

Economics in secondary schools is being stressed by business leaders, partly because only 2 percent to 4 percent of college students take economics. "I never heard of a share of stock, or knew really what it was," says President Young, "until I was well up in my career."

Young attributes wide interest in the Nyack project to the fact that the school initiated it, rather than having the idea pressed by business. Public-school people are traditionally wary of direct pressure from special interests.

Rounded experience—In their training as stock investors, the Nyack students even found themselves sought after by securities salesmen. One afternoon, Joseph Caruso, one of the broker committee, received a phone call from a penny-stock salesman who urged him to invest in 2,000 shares of uranium stock. Caruso was evasive.

"What do you do for a living?" the caller finally asked.

"I set up pins in a bowling alley after school," Caruso replied. And the sales pitch ended just about there.

Fallacy of Democratic Claim To Be Party of Common Man

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOS. E. MARTIN

OF IOWA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, July 5, 1956

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. President, on April 11, former President Harry S. Truman, at Des Moines, addressed the people of Iowa. He indulged in his usual unsupported charges which have characterized his political speeches.

In discussing foreign policy, he said:

My friends, I have spoken to you tonight mostly about the agricultural situation. However, there is another matter which should never be absent from our thoughts—that is the question of foreign policy and world peace. I have spoken on this subject a number of times recently and I shall not dwell upon it tonight. But we should always remember that this subject is so important it overshadows all our other problems here at home. And in this field, unfortunately, the Eisenhower administration has made the worst mistakes of all.

They have made a mockery of bipartisanship in foreign policy. They have put politics first and the national interest second. The result has been to dismay our friends, comfort our enemies, weaken the position of the free world, and drive other nations closer to the Communist bloc.

One would think from this statement that Harry Truman thought there was really something basically wrong with President Eisenhower's foreign policy. He supplied the refutation for his own statement. In Rome on May 21, he said:

I am for the foreign policy outlined by the President of the United States. I only wish everyone on the other side had done the same for me (New York Times, May 22, 1956).

On April 26 I placed in the RECORD an answer to many of Harry Truman's charges in his speech at Des Moines. His own statement in Rome repudiating his foreign policy charges at Des Moines must now be included as a part of that record.

The entire tenor of his speech at Des Moines followed the familiar Democratic theme that the Democrat Party holds a monopoly in serving the interests of the common man. He said:

Really the only people who haven't been messed up are General Motors, big business, and the stockmarket gamblers.

On April 26, in answer to his attack on this particular point, I said:

From Harry Truman's speech, you would gather the impression that this administration is only interested in the very rich. He said: "Really, the only people who haven't been messed up are General Motors, big business, and stock market gamblers." The distribution of the increase in both personal and national income does not support the repeated Democratic claims that this administration is operating solely in the interests of big business. The repeated attacks by Harry Truman, Adlai Stevenson, and Senator KEFAUVER on the businessmen in Government is a terrible disservice to the American people.

Let me remind you that prior to 1939 President Roosevelt used to indulge in attacks on the leading members of the business community. However, when the chips were down and it became necessary to mobilize our resources to fight the Nazis, to whom did President Roosevelt turn? He asked William S. Knudsen, then president of General Motors; Edward R. Stettinius, then chairman of United States Steel; Donald Nelson, the president of Sears Roebuck; Charles E. Wilson, the president of General Electric; and William H. Harrison, a vice president of the American Telephone & Telegraph Co., along with countless others of similar capacities and abilities, to enter the Government service. What happened? A certain Senator from Missouri, Harry S. Truman, proceeded to impugn the integrity of these people. He questioned the distribution of defense contracts and asserted that undue favoritism had been shown big business. Early in 1941 the Truman committee was established which plummeted Harry Truman into the Vice Presidency, and then the Presidency. A few years later, when confronted with the Korean emergency what did Harry Truman do? He asked Mr. Charles E. Wilson, the president of General Electric, to take over the Office of Defense Mobilization, one of the most important positions in the entire Federal Government.

Do the Democrats imply the people of the United States can only secure the service of competent people in a period of acute emergency—that the rest of the time we must be content with mediocrity, political hacks, and intellectual theorists? As a matter of fact, the Democrats when in power have recruited business leaders for many important posts. Let me remind you that our first Secretary of Defense—an unusually

capable man, James Forrestal, was a Wall Street banker. W. Averell Harriman, President Truman's Secretary of Commerce after he kicked Henry Wallace out, was not exactly a barefoot boy. The Biddles and the Morgenthaus would not qualify as little business men.

It is time that we stopped peddling this kind of nonsense, that we ceased appealing to the basest of human motivations—envy and jealousy of the achievements of others. President Eisenhower is to be commended for having secured the most capable people he could find to operate what is the biggest business in the world, our Federal Government.

The staff of the Senate Republican policy committee has recently completed an extensive study of the record which disposes of the Democratic claim to be the party of the common man. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that excerpts from this study may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

Mr. President, I am advised by the Public Printer that the excerpts I have asked to have printed in the RECORD will exceed by 2½ pages the two pages which may be printed in the Appendix without a statement of cost, and that the entire cost will be $346.50.

There being no objection the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NOTES ON THE DEMOCRATIC PARTY CLAIM TO BE THE PARTY OF THE COMMON MAN

Campaign oratory is usually dissolved in the ballot box. But occasionally some political claims and slogans are made to stick in the public memory and become part of the folklore of political parties.

One of these is the claim that the Democratic Party "is the people's party" while the Republican Party "is the party of special interests." Stated another way, Democrats assert theirs "is the party of the common man" while Republicans favor "the privileged few."

This claim is utterly false, but Democrats have pressed it so boldly, for so long, and in so many forms that they have achieved for it a measure of popular acceptance.

DEMOCRATIC PLAY ON THE THEME OF THE COMMON MAN

The theme has a double-barreled effect (1) to praise the Democratic Party and associate it with the interests of "the common man" and the "average man"; and (2) to condemn the Republican Party and associate it with the interests of the "rich," the "bankers," "big business," and the "privileged few."

SPURIOUS NATURE OF THE DEMOCRATIC CLAIM

The Democratic Party claim to be the "party of the common man" and the corollary that the Republican Party is "the party of the privileged few" is a flagrant sample of the big lie in politics.

No major party could function successfully in a country the size and diversity of the United States if it served only the common man or only the privileged few.

It is one of the virtues of our nationwide two-party system that the voters may switch from one major party to the other and find each one an adequate instrument to serve the Nation as a whole. If this were not true, our political system would soon degenerate into a multiplicity of small special interest parties incapable of governing, as we see in some countries abroad. The very health and vigor of our two-party system—each drawing strength from all four corners of the union, belies the Democratic Party claim.

One reason behind the Democratic Party claim to be the party of the common man is the fact that for years the Democratic Party has followed a philosophy and has labored hard to mold the American people into common men.

Secretary of Labor James P. Mitchell observed this tendency of the Democrats to turn our people into common men in these words:

"The keepers of this doctrine were interested not in individual men but in collective man, massed man. For them social problems were quite simple. One merely had to determine what was good for collective man and then shove it down his throat like castor oil. The government was of the people, for the people, but by the social planners."[1]

And Dr. James B. Conant, former president of Harvard University, put his finger on the source of the doctrine of massed man when he said: "The Soviets seek uniformity and strict adherence to the creed of Marxism-Leninism."[2] In that creed man is nothing as an individual. He exists only as an unidentifiable atom in a collective mass. And men and mass exist only for the state.

Recent history shows the many steps through which the New Deal-Fair Deal Democrats, who were in control of Government, attempted to deprive our people of their individuality. These Democrats strove to centralize government of everyday affairs in Washington, leaving less and less for people to do in their home States and localities. They handed out billions in relief, grants, and aids from Washington, making a large number of people dependent upon the Government at the Nation's Capital. The centralized administration of these activities operated to reduce the individuality of persons to numbers in electronic computing machines. The list of laws, acts, and regulations systematically designed to rob people of their individuality and pile them up in collective masses could be extended a mile long.

No one can deny that the Democrats responsible for these operations intended to do good by them. But it also cannot be denied that an inescapable and most harmful byproduct of such operations has been the weakening of individual personality and self-reliance.

The Democratic Party under New Deal-Fair Deal domination has done its utmost to pour our people into the mold of common men and to deal with them in the mass. This is the basis of their political philosophy and voting appeals. They have had some measure of success, especially where our technical progress has emphasized collective or mass action. But the success has been superficial because deep down our people are proud and jealous of their individuality. They resent being compressed into the mold of the common man. Behind the mass production and the collective this and that our people still have wide diversities and at heart remain individualists. This is clear when we examine some of the deep-seated diversities in American life.

AMERICA HAS NO "COMMON MAN"

Where Democrats are sincere in making the claim to be the party of the common man, as some undoubtedly are, they see the forest and not the trees. They look at the material uniformities in American life—the same trains, hotels, restaurants, cooking, and newspapers—and quickly come to the conclusion that all our people, too, are of a common mold.

What they fail to see is that this conformity is merely an expression of our technical, material progress. They fail to understand or deliberately close their eyes to the fact that underneath the common material veneer is a people still highly individual in talents, aspirations, and with the intense desire of each to fulfill his or her individual personality.

Footnotes at end of speech.

The greatest fallacy in the Democratic Party claim is that in America there is no common man.

Secretary of Labor James P. Mitchell declared: "We were told for some years that government was supposed to minister to the 'common man.' This doctrine of the common man was as singularly unfree a doctrine as we have ever witnessed in this country. The idea that we are all alike, a common mass, the products of some sort of biological punch press, seeking the same end, through the same means, with the same ideas, desires, and needs, is indeed a devastating one."[3]

REAL BASIS FOR THE DEMOCRATIC PARTY CLAIM TO BE THE PARTY OF THE COMMON MAN

Democratic Party leaders who make the claim that theirs is the party of the common man are well aware that ours is a Nation of great diversities, and that there is no such thing as a common man in our midst.

They even play upon these diversities by making demogogic appeals to minority racial, religious, occupational, and class prejudices. They do not hesitate to develop and inflame class distinctions in their aim to separate a few of our people from all the others.

One doesn't have to think hard to find the reasons for such Democratic trickery. One reason, as explained previously, is that the Democrats have been running the Government on the doctrine of the collective man, massed man.

A second reason lies in the field of raw politics.

Political history shows that present-day Democratic Party leaders will make any claim and follow any line which promises them the votes to gain control of the country and remain in power.

They have shrewdly calculated where the bulk of votes lies and they make their appeals accordingly. That is why they label Republicans as the party of the "rich," the "bankers," "big business," and the "privileged few." They know that such labels carry an unpleasant, even sinister implication; and that few votes can be had from those sources.

They label their own party the party of the common man, the average man, and include among these the farmer, the laboring man, the white-collar worker, and the small-business man because such labels sound wholesome and the bulk of votes can be found in those sources.

It does not trouble such Democratic spokesmen in the least that this deliberate inflaming of class distinctions can do great harm to the peace and unity of the Nation.

It does not bother them to malign good men and women among our people.

Their consciences aren't troubled when it is pointed out that their party, too, has its share of millionaires, its quota of advisers from banks and big business, and a much sorrier record of favors to "the privileged few." It doesn't seem to bother them, either, that a great many of the things they have done with professed intentions to help the so-called "little man" have resulted in great harm to the bulk of our people.

In using the inflammatory phrases of class distinction, they have had but one thought in mind—to get in power and stay there.

MILLIONAIRES AND BIG BUSINESSMEN IN DEMOCRATIC PARTY ADMINISTRATIONS

Common observation of political debate readily shows that Democratic Party leaders never leave off criticizing Republicans for having businessmen serve in Government posts. "Eight millionaires and a plumber" is the way Adlai Stevenson expressed it. The same idea is phrased in many other ways.

Since Democrats seem to think it bad for Government to avail itself of the talents, abilities and competence of businessmen, one would think that no Democratic Admin-

Footnotes at end of speech.

istration would touch a millionaire or a businessman with a ten-foot pole.

Let us look at the record on this point. Does the Democratic Party of the "common man" rub shoulders with millionaires? Does it seek the aid of bankers—big bankers and big-business men?

MILLIONAIRES SERVE DEMOCRATS, TOO

A cursory examination of the men in the United States Senate discloses at least a half dozen multimillionaire Democratic Senators, more it seems than can be found on the Republican side of the aisle (BYRD, GREEN, KERR, LEHMAN, MURRAY, SYMINGTON).

It is a matter of common knowledge that John J. Raskob, multimillionaire contributor to the Democratic Party, bailed out Franklin D. Roosevelt (a millionaire in his own right) when Roosevelt was reluctant to run for Governor of New York for fear of losing his investment in Warm Springs, Ga.

Bernard M. Baruch, who got millions out of Wall Street just before the 1929 crash, is well known as an adviser to Democratic Presidents.

Four out of five prominent contenders for the 1956 Democratic Presidential nomination—Adlai Stevenson, Averell Harriman, W. Stuart Symington, and G. Mennen (Soapy) Williams—are men of wealth.

BANKERS ALSO SERVE DEMOCRATS

Big bankers are not neglected in the roster of Democratic Party aides. Former Secretary of Defense Robert A. Lovett is a partner in the influential Wall Street firm of Brown Brothers, Harriman & Co., Averell Harriman, holder of a half dozen top-level posts under Truman, and now Democratic Governor of New York, was associated with the same firm. The late James Forrestal, first Secretary of Defense, was president of Dillon, Read & Co., one of the Nation's largest investment houses.

DEMOCRATS CALL UPON BIG BUSINESS

Nor has big business been neglected by Democratic Presidents in their search for executive talent. W. STUART SYMINGTON, before he was elected to the Senate, served in the Defense Department and several other high Government positions after he was brought to Washington from the presidency of the Emerson Electric Co., St. Louis, Mo.

A mainstay in high level Democratic Administration posts was Charles E. Wilson, president of General Electric Co. Roger L. Putnam, chose to head the Economic Stabilization Agency with virtual power of life and death over American industry, had been connected with the Nation's largest manufacturers of package machinery, a director of a large machine and gear firm, and of a Springfield (Mass.) bank. Putnam's predecessor as Economic Stabilizer was Eric Johnston, former president of the United States Chamber of Commerce, now president of the Motion Picture Association of America, and a director of United Air Lines, the Bank of America, an insurance firm, and several banks. Paul Hoffman, automobile magnate who reportedly made his first million before he was 35, was head of the Economic Cooperation Administration (ECA) in the Truman administration.

Ex-Secretary of State Acheson has been associated between periods of Government employment with a law firm which has drawn huge retainers as representative of foreign governments, some of them seeking large loans from the United States.

In May of 1952, Senator CAPEHART inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a list which provided a quick glance at men of wealth and big business connections who are either prominent Democrats or who served Democratic administrations in recent years.[4] A thorough survey would multiply this record many times, especially if it included the thousands of businessmen participating in Franklin D. Roosevelt's National Recovery Administration (NRA). But the list presented by Senator CAPEHART should be enough to prove the point.

In setting forth the list, it was not the Senator's purpose to direct criticism at any of the men listed. The purpose was to brand as contemptibly false the Democratic Party insinuation that the employment of big business executives in Government is against the interests of the "little man."

Some of the men listed are Republicans, more are Democrats, judged by voting registrations, by intent, or by repeated and substantial contributions to the Democratic Party. But all who are listed are men whose talents, abilities, initiative, and effort have served the American free enterprise system with distinction. If any administration failed to use such men of proven ability, the people would have cause to charge Government with stupidity, or worse, dereliction of duty.

Memory need not be long to recall the early days of the Roosevelt administration in 1933 when a host of crackpot economists, lawyers alert for the main chance, poets, social planers, and intellectual freebooters swarmed to Washington to inaugurate the more abundant life. After having spoon-fed the Nation's ailing economy for 5 years from sundry bottles of elixir bought with billions of taxpayers' money, these assorted buccaneers only succeeded in having the 1937 depression take the country back to 1932 levels.

Then it was that the Democratic Party of the "common man" turned to the businessmen they pretended to despise in every election campaign. Then began the process of replacing the social adventurers with men whose outstanding performance for American business and industry testified to their talent, ability, and competence.

Once the door was opened no field of private industry and enterprise was left unexplored in the scramble for talent. After World War II began, the Democratic administration's appeal to businessmen was intensified and thousands upon thousands came to Washington to help produce the production miracle which insured victory.

In the roster we find representatives from the American Telephone & Telegraph Co., Aluminum Co. of America, Standard Oil, United States Steel, Republic Steel, General Electric, and General Motors.

Roosevelt and Truman obtained officials for Government posts from General Foods Corp., Eastman Kodak, United States Rubber Co., Lever Bros., Merck & Co., the Union Pacific, and several other railroads, half a dozen air and steamship lines, the Greyhound Corp., many insurance companies, the National Broadcasting Co., and other radio chains.

Investment and international financiers were brought to Washington from Dillon, Read & Co.; J. P. Morgan & Co.; Kuhn, Loeb & Co.; and others.

Mention could also be made of John W. Davis, wealthy lawyer and lifelong Democrat; Owen D. Young of General Electric Co.; Melvin A. Traylor, president of the First National Bank of Chicago; Henry Bruere, president of the Bowery Savings Bank, New York; Basil O'Connor, a lawyer with whom President Roosevelt had been associated and who once asked a fee of $200,000 in an RFC loan, according to Jesse Jones, RFC Administrator; Joseph E. Davies, Roosevelt's millionaire Ambassador to Russia; Col. James W. Flanagan, formerly president of the Imperial Oil Company of Canada who went as RFC representative to South America; Louis Johnson, former Secretary of Defense and who also served the Democratic administration as counsel of General Aniline & Film at $50,000 per year; John M. Hancock, industrial banker who worked with Bernard Baruch on Government missions; Walter Dunham, banker and Detroit businessman of RFC notoriety; Kaiser and his sons who received millions in Government loans which interested his large creditors, the Giannini Bank of America and the Mellon National Bank & Trust Co.; and Delos W. Rentzel of American Air Lines whom Truman made head of the Civil Aeronautics Board.

In the appendix of his book, Fifty Billion Dollars, RFC Administrator Jesse Jones presented a list of former employees of RFC (alumni, he called them) with their connections in business, industry, finance, and other associations. All served the RFC with honor and distinction under a Democratic administration whose leaders now denounce businessmen when they serve in a Republican administration.

The use by the Roosevelt and Truman administrations of wealthy bankers and businessmen is not subject to condemnation, Democrats, like Republicans, simply discovered that these men were the best men for the large jobs in which the Government engaged in depression times, war years, and during the postwar transitions.

It does make the case, however, that the Democratic Party has made lavish use of men from the very sectors of American life their leaders constantly denounce. Republicans, even in their most active days in control of the Government, never had such extensive big business connections.

MEASURES OF NATIONAL WELL-BEING UNDER DEMOCRATS AND REPUBLICANS OR WHICH PARTY BENEFITS THE COMMON MAN?

The test of a political administration, Democratic or Republican, does not lie in comparing benefits given to particular groups in our population. It does not lie in making general conclusions from bits and pieces of data. Yet this is the method Democratic politicians repeatedly use to show that Republicans favor big business, or are against the farmer, or hurt the little man. The method is just as phony and just as meaningless as it would be so say that a husband favors his wife when he buys her a dishwasher, is against his daughter because he does not get her a piano, and hurts his children because he denies them candy before supper.

The true test of a political administration must be found in the general effect the administration has on the national interest and the well-being of the people as a whole.

The chief measures of the well-being of a nation are not hard to find. Does the nation enjoy peace? Is the nation secure from external danger? Is individual freedom preserved? Is the nation prosperous? Is there plenty of work at fair wages for all willing and able to work? How burdensome is the level of taxes? Is the government operated economically and free from corruption?

Questions such as these indicate the true measures of well-being in a nation. A political administration can be judged good or bad by how its performance affects these measures of national well-being. If such tests are applied with regard to the people of the Nation as a whole, the Democrats who claim so loudly to be the party of the common man have much to explain.

WAR AND PEACE

Few events are more important to the average man—the people as a whole—than war and peace. When a nation goes to war the rank and file of people pay the heaviest price. Their sons do the fighting and make up the biggest list of dead and wounded. They and their succeeding generations pay the cost in money. They suffer the shortages and privations of wartime economy. The nation suffers a tremendous loss in resources, many irreplaceable forever. The life of the nation generally is deeply upset and its troubles continue long after the last shot is fired.

While no political party can be absolutely charged with blame if the nation becomes

---

Footnotes at end of speech.

involved in war, yet the diplomacy and foreign policy of a political administration has a considerable bearing on whether the natiaon goes to war or not. With a nation as powerful as the United States, the influence of its diplomacy and foreign relations also has a strong bearing on whether the world generally remains at peace or sinks into war.

Each of our major political parties has been in office for approximately half the time since 1900. Their diplomacy and foreign policies worked completely opposite results.

THE DEMOCRATIC PARTY RECORD ON WAR AND PEACE

It is a singular fact of history that the United States has gone to war three times since 1900—each time under Democratic administrbations; not once under Republican administrations.

In World War I, 4¾ million men were engaged in the Armed Forces. The batte deaths numbered 53,407, other deaths 63,156, and 204,002 were wounded.[5]

In World War II, 16 million were engaged. The battle deaths totaled 293,986, other deaths 113,842, with 670,846 wounded.[6]

In the Korean war, which Mr. Truman entered without prior authority from Congress, 5¾ million men were engaged. The battle deaths numbered 33,629, other deaths 20,617 and 103,284 were wounded.[6]

The full money cost of these three wars cannot be computed finally until many generations have passed because the people of our country will be repaying the borrowed money and continued obligations stemming from these wars beyond the year 2000.

Some measure of the immediate cash cost of these wars can be inferred from figures on the national debt. The average gross public debt of the Federal Government for the period 1911–1915 was $1,191,000,000. For the period 1916–1920, under Democratic administrations, which covered World War I, the debt rose to an average of $24,299,000,000. In 1941, just prior to World War II, the debt stood at $42,968,000,000. By 1946, which finally reflected the influence of World War II, the debt stood at $269,422,000,000. Some reduction was thereafter made by cancellations of war contracts and other financial adjustments. So that on the eve of the Korean war the debt stood at $257,357,000,000. When that war was finally over in 1953, the debt had jumped again $266,017,000,000.[7]

The interest charges on the Federal debt at the end of December 1955 totaled $6,913,000,000 and must be paid currently out of taxes.[8] This amount is approximately $2 billion more than it cost to operate the entire Government in President Hoover's last year, just before the Democrats took over in the interest of the common man.

While these figures are astronomical, they do not amount to a fraction of what these three wars will cost by the time the last dollar is paid on the public debt and the last veteran, his dependents, and survivors are paid off in the distant future. Taxes, of course, are also an important part of war financing and will be treated in the section below devoted to that subject.

Woodrow Wilson in 1916 was elected on the slogan, among others, that "He kept us out of war." Some 5 months later the United States was involved in World War I.

Franklin D. Roosevelt was elected on the Democratic Party platform which declared, "We will not participate in foreign wars, and we will not send our Army, naval, or Air Force to fight in foreign lands outside the Americas, except in case of attack." In a speech delivered in Boston, October 31, 1940, Mr. Roosevelt reaffirmed this pledge in emphatic terms. He said: "While I am talking to you mothers and fathers, I give you one more assurance. I have said this before, but I shall say it again and again and again: Your boys are not going to be sent into any foreign wars."

Footnotes at end of speech.

Historians have since shown that at the time this speech was made, Mr. Roosevelt had already taken enough unneutral steps (many of them secretly) to make our involvement in World War II almost inescapable.

Mr. Truman engaged American forces in the Korean war without ever placing the matter before Congress.

One can hear anguished cries from Democrats that it is unfair to label them the war party in American politics. Senator JOHN J. WILLIAMS, Republican, of Delaware, gave the definitive answer to this outcry in the following words:

"If members of the Democratic Party wish to charge the depression to the Republican Party, a depression which was worldwide but which they wish to charge to the Republicans solely because it happened in a Republican administration, then I want the Democratic Party to take full blame for the wars which occurred in the Democratic administrations. If they boast of the artificial prosperity which accompanied those wars let them have full credit for the wars." [9]

That is fair political rejoinder to a purely political charge. Democrats took political credit in 1916 for keeping the country out of war. Democrats campaigned successfully for more than 20 years on the 1929 depression which they charged to Republicans. But they do not find it so amusing to find themselves on the target end of a comparable charge.

But whether they are responsible for the wars or not, it can hardly be said that the war years in their administrations redounded to the benefit of the "common man."

THE REPUBLICAN RECORD ON WAR AND PEACE

While the campaign of 1952 was being waged the United States was still locked in a stalemate war in Korea. President Eisenhower promised that he would make every effort to end that bloodshed. He kept that promise. Furthermore, he kept the Nation out of another war in Indochina. Despite all the menacing ups and downs in world politics, the American Nation is still at peace and enjoying unprecedented prosperity not based on wars.

President Eisenhower, in sharp contrast to his predecessors, declared his attitude in these words: "I will never be guilty of any kind of action that can be interpreted as war until the Congress, which has the constitutional authority, says so." [10]

These are an attitude and a record which pay substantial dividends in well-being to all the people of the Nation, the "common man" included.

DEMOCRATIC PARTY RECORD ON EMPLOYMENT

At the height of the depression some 12 million or more people were out of work. After the 1932 elections, the Democratic Party took control of the Federal Government and remained in office for 20 years.

In the period 1933–37, the Democrats spent tremendous sums of money on relief, public works, and other Federal projects. They tried every economic nostrum in the books. But at the end of that period the national economy slid back to 1932 levels. Never in the entire period did unemployment fall below 7,500,000. By 1939, there were again 9 million persons out of work.

By that time World War II had commenced. The United States was swept into the war atmosphere first, in rebuilding its own defense which had been neglected for many years; second, in helping Great Britain and her associated allies; and finally, by America's entry—at the end of 1941—into the war itself.

That solved the employment problem for the duration of the war.

In the years immediately after the war, employment remained substantially high because of the pent-up demand for civilian goods released by the ending of war in 1945.

By 1949, however, another sharp economic recession set in and unemployment rose to approximately 4 million persons.

In the summer of 1950 the United States became involved in the Korean war. Once again unemployment fell away to negligible proportions. This continued throughout the remainder of the Truman administration.

Now what do we see here in summary?

One fact stands out: Democratic administrations, with full control of the Federal Government and a practically unlimited treasury of 20 years, completely failed to solve the problem of unemployment, except by war.

Democrats failed in a crucial matter touching the well-being of the "common man."

REPUBLICAN RECORD ON EMPLOYMENT

President Eisenhower's first year, 1953, set all-time records for employment, economic activity, and general prosperity. This is all the more remarkable because the Nation was finally at peace, war spending had tapered off, and the difficult transition was begun from a war economy to a peacetime economy.

The high level of prosperity thus begun continued through 1954 and 1955. It is continuing in 1956.

The one dark spot in an otherwise healthy and prosperous economy is the drop in farm income. Net income of farm operators from current operations dropped from $14.9 billion in 1952 to $11 billion in 1955.[11] The index of prices received and paid by farmers (parity ratio) which had dropped 15 points under Truman (from 107 in 1951 to 92 in 1953) fell another 8 points under the Republican administration to 84 by 1955.[12] However, between April and May of 1956 the parity ratio rose to 85.[13] The parity ratio decline reflected two maladjustments in agriculture: The difficulty in cutting production back from wartime levels, and the high price supports which encouraged increased production to the point where huge surpluses of farm products hang over and depress the market. The Eisenhower administration seeks to return agriculture to a healthy condition by flexible price supports aiming at parity income in the market place, by a soil-bank proposal to take a portion of farmlands out of production, and by other measures short of making the farmer a ward of the Government.

By May 1956, employment on farms, in factories, and in other nonagricultural pursuits stood at more than 65 million.

Personal income in the Nation in April 1956 ran at an annual rate of $317 billion, an increase of $18 billion over the same month a year ago and a jump of $51 billion over April 1952, the last year of the Truman administration. Wages and salaries in the same month of 1956 reached an annual rate of $218.7 billion, or $14.1 billion above the April 1955 rate and $98 billion more than the April 1952 rate.[14]

During the 3 years of the Republican administration the compensation of employees averaged 69 percent of the national income compared with 65 percent during the 7 years of the prior Democratic administration.[15]

Corporate profits on the other hand, after taxes, averaged 6 percent of the national income during the first 3 years of the Eisenhower administration, compared to an average of 7.7 percent during the Truman administration.

The highest gross national product reached in prior Democratic administrations was $346 billion in 1952. Under Republicans it reached approximately $365 billion in 1953, rose to $387 billion in 1955, and in the first 3 months of 1956 it reached an annual rate of $398.5 billion.[16] Constantly higher rec-

Footnotes at end of speech.

Footnotes at end of speech.

ords were set during the period in industrial production, construction, wages, and income.

On January 20, 1956, the Labor Department reported that its Consumer Price Index (often called cost-of-living index) during 1955 reflected the greatest period of stability since the index was started 15 years ago. In 1955, the index changed very little, ranging from 114.2 percent of the 1947–49 average to 115 percent. As the year started, the January figure was 114.6, only three-tenths of 1 percent above that for January of a year ago.

The Department also announced that the gross pay of the average factory worker with three dependents in April 1956 reached $78.99 per week, $4.03 a week more than in April 1 year ago and $13.32 more per week than in April 1952.[17] Net take-home pay for the average factory worker with three dependents set a record of $72.42 in April 1956, compared with $69.20 in the same month of 1955 and $61.81 in April 1952. The purchasing power of the average American worker's paycheck at the end of 1955 was more than 6 percent higher than at 1954's end.

Thus, under Republicans, we have more employment and higher wages than were ever achieved under previous Democratic administrations who like to refer to themselves as the party of the common man.

Democrats talk about benefiting the common man, but Republicans deliver.

TAXES AS A MEASURE OF NATIONAL WELL-BEING

Taxes reflect the cost of government. Every cent the Federal Government spends ultimately comes out of the pockets of the American taxpayer. How has the common man fared in the matter of taxes under Democratic and Republican administrations?

DEMOCRATIC PARTY RECORD ON TAXES

The Democratic Party was in office from 1933 to 1953.

When it came into office in 1933, Federal taxes were approximately $3 billion. When it left office in 1953 Federal taxes reached the enormous total of $65 billion.

In 1932 the so-called "little fellow" paid small or no income taxes. Over the years, under Democratic administrations, the real burden of income taxes shifted to the common man. This is best shown by the number of income-tax returns. In 1932 there were only 1,900,000 taxable returns. After 20 years of Democratic administrations the number of returns increased to 46,800,000. The simple meaning of these two figures is that Democratic Government spending and high taxes shifted the main burden of taxes to the common man.

The plain truth of the tax story is that, since 1913, the income tax has changed from a rich man's tax to everyman's tax. It began as a 1 percent levy ranging upward to 6 percent on incomes of half a million or more. Corporations paid a 1 percent income tax in 1913.

Nowadays the basic income tax rate is 20 percent, and it ranges up to 91 percent on incomes in excess of $300,000 for individuals. Corporations pay 52 percent.

The burden on the little man was further increased by reductions in tax exemptions for himself and family. In 1932 a single person had a tax exemption of $1,000 which Democrats progressively reduced to $600 by 1952. A married person's exemption in 1932 was $2,500 which Democrats reduced to $1,200 by 1952.

In 1932 a single person earning $2,000 paid $32 in Federal income taxes; in 1952, he paid $266. A married couple without dependents with the same income in 1932 paid no taxes; but paid $133 in 1952.

A $5,000 income is more realistic in today's circumstances. In 1932 a single person paid only $140 in taxes; but in 1952 he paid $911. A married couple with no dependents and the same income in 1932 paid $80 in taxes as against $733 in 1952. Owing to the reductions in allowances for dependents, the married couple in the $5,000 income bracket with 2 dependents pays a little more than half as much—$48 in 1932 and $466 in 1952.

The per capita burden of Federal income taxes in 1932, the last year of the Hoover administration, was $170. After 20 years of Democratic administrations this burden was increased to $659, according to official Treasury figures.

During the same span of years excise taxes on almost everything the common man has to buy were greatly extended and in some cases set as high as 20 percent of the price of the article.

TAX INCREASES AND TAX REDUCTIONS

Democrats not only passed the first Federal income tax law in 1913, but they also voted 14 out of 15 tax increases since that time.

Republican Congresses voted 7 tax cuts out of the 10 reductions since 1913.

REPUBLICAN RECORD ON TAXATION

The Republican Party has always pressed for reduced Government spending and lower taxes.

The first Republican Congress since 1932 (the 80th Cong., 1947–48) enacted bills to lower income taxes on three occasions. Three times, Democratic President Truman vetoed these bills. On the last occasion, Republicans won the battle to override his veto and the Revenue Act of 1948 became Public Law 471 on April 2, 1948.

Briefly, this law provided tax relief for more than 40 million American taxpayers. It relieved 7,400,000 taxpayers in the lowest income brackets entirely of income taxpayments. Most of the benefits went to persons earning less than $5,000. Individual income tax rates were reduced by 12.6 percent in low income brackets, graduated downward to about 5 percent reduction in higher brackets. Dependent exemptions were increased from $500 to $600. Married couples were allowed to file joint returns, giving them additional tax cuts. The aged and blind were given additional allowances.

Again in 1954, another Republican Congress made possible the largest tax cut ever given in any single year. The total reduction amounted to $7.4 billion and 62 cents of every dollar in tax cuts went to individuals; almost 25 cents to taxpayers with incomes of less than $5,000 a year. The tax cut included reductions in excise taxes on articles in everyday use. A tax cut of this size would have been wholly impossible if a Republican President and a Republican Congress had not sharply cut Government spending by billions of dollars.

INFLATION

From 1932 to 1952 the Democrats did more than just take a bigger chunk of the "little fellow's" paycheck by way of taxes. Democrats fired the engine of inflation, so that whatever the "little fellow" had after taxes bought less groceries, clothes, and shoes in the market place.

When governments spend lavishly and go deeper into debt each year, as did the New Deal and the Fair Deal, the buying power of the dollar goes down inflation sets in.

In March 1933, the end of the Hoover administration, the buying power of the dollar (with 1935–39 as a yardstick) stood at 111. After 20 years of Democratic administrations, the buying power of the dollar fell to 52 cents. That is why prices are practically doubled for everything people buy today.

Few people realize how inflation robs the average family. Like a sneak thief in the night, it is difficult to see. But, according to a survey of the National Committee on Monetary Policy, Americans lost $158 billion in purchasing power because of inflation between 1938 and 1952. Some $97 billion was lost by holders of life insurance policies, $31 billion by holders of bank deposits, $21.5 billion by owners of Government savings bonds, and $8.5 billion in other channels. This is in addition to the losses in the daily buying power of wages and salaries.

When conditions like this set in, it is the little fellow—not the rich or the corporations—who suffers. Yet the Democrats constantly talk of their sympathetic interest in the common man. If they loved him less vocally at election time and remembered him more often as they dipped into his tax purse, John Q. Taxpayer would be a lot better off today.

Immediately upon taking office, Republicans began to reduce Government spending. Looking over the full 3 years of the Eisenhower administration, Assistant Secretary of Agriculture Earl L. Butz declared: "During the first 3 years of the present administration, the Government will spend $36 billion less than it would have, had the spending policies of the preceding administration been continued. That represents a saving of nearly $1,000 for every farm and city family of 4 in the United States."

At the same time not a single element of security in national defense or social welfare of our people has been sacrificed.

Once again, it is clear that the self-styled Democratic Party of the common man has followed courses of action with results completely the opposite and against the interests of the rank and file of citizens.

Footnotes at end of speech.

[1] Address at Flint, Mich., January 20, 1956.
[2] The Citadel of Learning, Yale University Press, 1956.
[3] Address at Flint, Mich., January 20, 1956.
[4] CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, May 20, 1952, vol. 98, pt. 4, pp. 5555–5561.
[5] Statistical Abstract of the United States, 1955, table No. 266, p. 227.
[6] Ibid.
[7] Ibid., table No. 407, p. 349.
[8] Treasury Bulletin, February 1956, table 4, p. 20.
[9] CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, March 10, 1955, p. 2192.
[10] Press conference, April 5, 1956.
[11] Economic Indicators, May 1956, p. 7.
[12] Ibid., p. 25.
[13] USDA Parity Price Index Reports, May 31, 1956.
[14] Office of Business Economics, Department of Commerce, June 5, 1956.
[15] Address of Deputy Assistant Secretary of Commerce Carl F. Oechsle in Baltimore, Md., April 9, 1956.
[16] Office of Business Economics, Department of Commerce, May 10, 1956.
[17] Latest revised Department of Labor figures for monthly report to be published June 30, 1956.

What Do Minneapolis People Think on Major Issues?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 7, 1956

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, some months ago I prepared and sent to each resident of my congressional district whose name was listed in the phone book a questionnaire dealing with the major controversial issues facing us today. The response,

totaling almost 13,000 replies, was very gratifying and informative.

In evaluating the replies to the individual questions it may be helpful to know that the Fifth District of Minnesota lies wholly within the city of Minneapolis. It includes the downtown section and what is generally referred to as South Minneapolis. Like most cities, the people range in economic levels from low to considerably above average, but with the preponderance being wage earners, white-collar workers, and professional persons of moderate means.

The returned questionnaires demonstrate reassuringly that residents of my district are vitally concerned with the problems of government and are anxious to help in finding solutions to them. Nearly half took the trouble to add constructive comments alongside the checked answers, some attaching several handwritten sheets. Many added something like this: "This is the first time any officeholder ever asked my opinion on any subject." Or, "I have often thought of writing you my ideas, but never did. Your questionnaire gives me a chance to do so."

Each person was asked to indicate whether he considered himself a Democrat-Farmer-Labor, a Republican, or an Independent. I was disappointed that a smaller percentage of the Democrat-Farmer-Labor's in the district replied than of the Republicans and Independents. Perhaps that was to be expected when the questionnaire was being sent out by a Congressman who is a member of the Republican Party. Or it may have been caused in part by failure to make clear that the questionnaire was being sent to all members of all parties and that the views of members of other parties than my own, or of no party, are just as welcome and as useful and helpful to me.

Even so, the percentage of returns from DFL's and Independents is sufficiently large to give a representative and reliable view of their general thinking on the issues covered.

Highly significant, it seems to me, is the high proportion of issues on which the residents of the Fifth Minnesota District, irrespective of party, are in fairly close agreement. This is particularly true with respect to foreign policy questions. They differ sharply as to how well the administration is handling our foreign relations, but they agree largely as to the policies that the country ought to follow.

This similarity in thinking is found on most major domestic issues. For example, a large majority of both parties believes that the Taft-Hartley Act is not unfair to the workingman; and that it would be unwise to return to high rigid price supports in our farm programs.

The replies also confirm my long-standing conviction that people are more intelligent and more patriotic than the cynics give them credit for. In issues involving the security and the solvency of our country they put concern for national interest above immediate gains for themselves or their pocketbooks. This is demonstrated by the responsible way in which people of all political faiths overwhelmingly place balancing the Federal budget and debt reduction ahead of tax reduction.

The questionnaires point up a problem that too few have recognized—the financial difficulty facing many of our senior citizens. Modern medical advances give people 10 more years after retirement than they used to have. What are they to do and how are they to live in deserved comfort and freedom from anxiety? We have a long way to go in finding adequate answers for the very persons who have been so instrumental in creating the wealth and strength and greatness our Nation has today. In good faith they thriftly made provision for their retirement, only to find now that inflation has destroyed half of the value of their savings or pensions. To many people, rising wages and prices seemed so beneficial at the time. The end results are so cruel now and so inescapable. There is no easy answer to the problem—but a better solution must somehow be found.

Mr. Speaker, these are just a few of the conclusions to be drawn from the summary of replies to my 1956 questionnaire. The replies are most instructive and deserve careful study:

OPINION SURVEY, FIFTH CONGRESIONAL DISTRICT, MINNEAPOLIS, MINN., 1956

Do you consider yourself:

	Number of replies	Percent of total
Democrat-Farmer-Labor	1,261	10
Republican	7,328	58
Independent	3,660	29
Not indicated	376	3
Total	12,625	100

FOREIGN POLICY

1. In general, do you approve or disapprove the way the administration is handling our foreign relations?

[Percent]

	Approve	Disapprove	No opinion
All	74	19	7
Democrat-Farmer-Labor	42	50	8
Republican	87	8	5
Independent	61	27	12

2. In general, do you approve or disapprove the way the United Nations is handling the problems it has to face?

[Percent]

	Approve	Disapprove	No opinion
All	69	21	10
Democrat-Farmer-Labor	68	24	8
Republican	70	19	11
Independent	67	24	9

3. Do you favor or oppose admission of Communist China to the United Nations?

[Percent

	Favor	Oppose	No opinion
All	13	79	8
Democrat-Farmer-Labor	21	72	7
Republican	9	85	8
Independent	20	72	8

4. In general, do you favor or oppose continued United States assistance to other countries in the free world's struggle against Communist aggression and subversion?

[Percent]

	Favor	Oppose	No opinion
All	83	10	7
Democrat-Farmer-Labor	80	12	8
Republican	84	8	8
Independent	81	13	6

5. Do you favor or oppose continued United States assistance to:

[Percent]

	Favor	Oppose	No opinion
India:			
All	66	22	12
Democrat-Farmer-Labor	69	23	8
Republican	65	22	13
Independent	68	23	9
Korea:			
All	81	10	9
Democrat-Farmer-Labor	79	14	7
Republican	83	8	9
Independent	80	12	8
Nationalist China:			
All	68	21	11
Democrat-Farmer-Labor	61	29	10
Republican	72	16	12
Independent	62	28	10
Spain:			
All	49	35	16
Democrat-Farmer-Labor	49	39	12
Republican	50	32	18
Independent	48	39	13
Yugoslavia:			
All	43	39	18
Democrat-Farmer-Labor	45	42	13
Republican	43	37	20
Independent	40	44	16

6. Do you favor or oppose continuation of the reciprocal-trade program of negotiating with other nations to lower world tariffs as a means of expanding world trade?

[Percent]

	Favor	Oppose	No opinion
All	86	6	8
Democrat-Farmer-Labor	84	10	6
Republican	86	5	9
Independent	86	5	9

7. Do you favor or oppose changing our immigration laws to allow more immigrants to enter the United States?

[Percent]

	Favor	Oppose	No opinion
All	32	60	8
Democrat-Farmer-Labor	28	68	4
Republican	32	60	8
Independent	36	58	6

DOMESTIC POLICIES

Farm policies

1. In general, do you approve or disapprove the way the administration is handling farm problems?

[Percent]

	Approve	Disapprove	No opinion
All	69	24	7
Democrat-Farmer-Labor	18	77	5
Republican	86	9	5
Independent	57	36	7

2. Do you favor or oppose direct Government payments to farmers who take land out of production as a means of soil conservation and reducing surpluses?

[Percent]

	Favor	Oppose	No opinion
All	51	42	7
Democrat-Farmer-Labor	49	46	5
Republican	53	38	9
Independent	47	46	7

3. Do you favor or oppose a return to rigid price supports for the six basic crops (corn, cotton, peanuts, rice, tobacco, and wheat)?

[Percent]

	Favor	Oppose	No opinion
All	16	74	10
Democrat-Farmer-Labor	50	40	10
Republican	8	84	8
Independent	20	72	8

Government finance

1. In general, do you favor or oppose a policy of reducing the national debt during years of prosperity?

[Percent]

	Favor	Oppose	No opinion
All	93	3	4
Democrat-Farmer-Labor	88	7	5
Republican	95	2	3
Independent	93	4	3

2. Do you favor or oppose reducing taxes this year if:

(a) It means failing to balance the budget?

[Percent]

	Favor	Oppose	No opinion
All	13	80	7
Democrat-Farmer-Labor	25	67	8
Republican	10	84	6
Independent	15	79	6

(b) It means failing to make any reduction in the national debt?

[Percent]

	Favor	Oppose	No opinion
All	16	75	9
Democrat-Farmer-Labor	25	63	12
Republican	13	78	8
Independent	18	74	8

LABOR-MANAGEMENT RELATIONS

1. Check the statement which best expresses your view of the National Labor Relations Act (Taft-Hartley law).

(a) It is unfair to the average working man: [1]

	Percent
All	11
Democrat-Farmer-Labor	34
Republican	2
Independent	19

(b) It is not strict enough in preventing monopolistic practices by some unions: [1]

	Percent
All	32
Democrat-Farmer-Labor	17
Republican	38
Independent	27

(c) It may need some changes, but overall is a good law: [1]

	Percent
All	66
Democrat-Farmer-Labor	48
Republican	71
Independent	65

[1] Columns total more than 100 percent as some checked more than one answer.

2. Do you favor or oppose legislation to impose the same restrictions on labor unions with respect to contributions for political campaigns as are imposed on corporations?

[Percent]

	Favor	Oppose	No opinion
All	79	8	13
Democrat-Farmer-Labor	53	32	15
Republican	86	2	12
Independent	76	12	12

GENERAL

1. Please check the six domestic issues which cause you greatest concern today (arranged according to ranking in total number of replies):

[Percent]

	All	Democrat-Farmer-Labor	Republican	Independent
National defense	57	54	58	57
Communist influence in the United States	57	48	63	46
Balancing the Federal budget	44	23	53	36
Corruption in Government	41	47	38	45
Provision for elderly people	39	54	36	39
Reducing the national debt	39	21	45	33
School construction	39	49	35	45
Labor-management relations	38	36	41	31
Low farm prices	37	52	33	40
Civil rights	33	40	30	39
Federal bureaucracy	32	12	36	30
Tax reductions	32	35	32	32
Cost of medical care	31	43	26	37
Highway construction	30	31	29	32
Slum clearance	27	37	23	31
Public housing	10	20	7	13

NOTE.—Figure indicates the percent of replies on which the particular issue was checked. Some checked more than 6 issues; some checked less.

2. Do you favor or oppose Federal grants to States to construct schools?

[Percent]

	Favor	Oppose	No opinion
All	59	34	7
Democrat-Farmer-Labor	79	17	4
Republican	53	39	8
Independent	65	29	6

3. Do you favor or oppose increasing postal rates in order to reduce the annual post office deficit?

[Percent]

	Favor	Oppose	No opinion
All	71	24	5
Democrat-Farmer-Labor	65	32	3
Republican	73	22	5
Independent	72	23	5

4. Do you favor or oppose legislation granting statehood to:

(a) Alaska:

[Percent]

	Favor	Oppose	No opinion
All	81	11	8
Democrat-Farmer-Labor	86	9	5
Republican	78	12	10
Independent	84	10	6

(b) Hawaii:

[Percent]

	Favor	Oppose	No opinion
All	79	12	9
Democrat-Farmer-Labor	81	13	6
Republican	78	12	10
Independent	80	12	8

5. Do you approve or disapprove of an opinion survey of this type as a means of helping a Congressman know the thinking of his constituents?

[Percent]

	Favor	Oppose	No opinion
All	97	0.5	2.5
Democrat-Farmer-Labor	96	.8	3.2
Republican	97	.3	2.7
Independent	97	.7	2.3

Research or Recession

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK E. SMITH
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 14, 1956

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include excerpts from a very able address delivered by W. T. Wynn, chairman of the board of directors of the National Cotton Council:

QUESTION FOR COTTON: RESEARCH OR RECESSION?

Twelve million dollars a year or more is needed to help cotton meet competition, W. T. Wynn, Greenville, Miss., told Texas Cottonseed Crushers' Association at its annual convention, "and I am proposing that cotton farmers begin thinking about paying into an industry fund $1 to $1.50 for each bale produced."

Wynn, who is chairman of the board of the National Cotton Council, stressed that he was speaking as an individual—a cotton-grower and businessman—rather than as a spokesman for the council. Having served as treasurer of the council from its beginning until named president 2 years ago, Wynn is thoroughly familiar with cotton's financial needs for research and promotion. "Cotton's Option—Research of Recession" was the title of his talk.

Excerpts from his address, made at the convention of Texas crushers, follow:

"The future of this industry depends in great part on whether we develop, through some means, a research program adequate to our needs.

The plight of the cotton industry, we all recognize, is serious. Cotton's percentage of the fiber market has steadily declined over the past 35 years, from almost 90 percent of total fiber consumption to its present two-thirds of total fiber consumption. Our surpluses, resulting in large measure from intensified competition both at home and abroad, are at record levels. They have forced steady reductions in acreage. Reduced acreages, coupled with increased prices of items farmers must buy to make a crop, have cotton farmers in a squeeze of serious proportions. When we stop to think that acreage being allotted this year in all the cotton-producing States is smaller than that planted to cotton in the State of Texas alone during 5 of the 6 years, 1924 to 1929, we get

an idea of what we are faced with if we do not take all necessary means to expand our markets. Planted acreage in 1956 is actually smaller than any year since 1882."

LOST: 4.5 MILLION-BALE MARKET

"While wool, silk, and linen have shared cotton's losses to the synthetics, most gains by the man-made fibers have been at cotton's expense. In 1920, the domestic consumption of synthetics amounted to the equivalent of about 20,000 bales of cotton; in 1930 synthetics consumption equaled 280,000 bales; in 1940, over 1 million bales; in 1950, 3.5 million bales; and in 1955, nearly 4.5 million bales.

"The synthetic fiber producers estimate that in 1957 the consumption of man-made fibers will be substantially more. These figures cover only a part of our competition; they do not include markets seized by paper, by jute, by plastic films, or by wood or metal products."

TEXAS CRUSHERS CONCERNED

"As Texas crushers, you have a special stake in the survival of the cotton industry. At one time your whole problem was to get enough seed to crush. Now you have another problem. You not only must get enough seed to crush, you must also be sure that the cottonseed oil and meal you produce are as good or better for the money than soybean oil and meal.

"Last year, Texas planted 6,000 acres to soybeans for all purposes, and harvested only 2,000 acres for a total production of a mere 26,000 bushels. Cottonseed production, by contrast, averaged a 1,400,000 tons over the past 10 years. The Texas crushing industry, therefore, like that of New Mexico, Arizona, and California, is a cottonseed crushing industry—and will be for some years to come.

"Through research, the quality of soybean oil has been improved continuously. Today, some refineries consider soybean oil and cottonseed oil to be almost completely interchangeable. In the vegetable oil market, cottonseed has lost to soybeans much as cotton fiber has lost markets to synthetics. In 1939, cottonseed accounted for just under 40 percent of all vegetable oil consumption in the United States, while soybeans accounted for just over 11 percent. During the 3-year period—1952–54—soybean oil consumption increased to 40 to 45 percent of the market, while cottonseed oil consumption fell to between 23 and 26 percent.

"Soybean oil is not your only competitor. Most of us remember when the standard cooking fat was lard. We remember that lard lost out to hydrogenated cottonseed oil, which had superior flavor and superior keeping quality. In recent years, lard has been making a comeback. Through research, lard of greatly improved flavor and greatly improved stability is on the market. So far, its success in the market has been limited, but the meat packers are putting substantial research effort into quality improvement. With further improvement and lard's low price, there is every likelihood that lard will develop into a strong contender for the market."

MUST GROW OR DIE

"There is no such thing in life, or in business, as standing still. Either we grow or we die. The American cotton industry today has entered a crucial phase of its history. Either we must determine to move forward in efficiency, and to offer greater value to our customer, or we must reconcile ourselves to watching our industry recede into near oblivion. Today, technology calls the turn. Our industry already has lost many millions of bales in markets it could have had, simply because it has been outresearched and out-promoted.

"How much have we been outresearched? The council has estimated that all research on cotton, by all agencies, public and private, amounts to about $14 million. The producers of synthetic fibers, they estimate, spend at least $60 million for research and development, and most of them have announced plans for further enlarging their budgets.

"Perhaps the disparity in research will be more meaningful if we look at the operation of one synthetic-fiber producer. The Chemstrand Corp. has two plants. One, in Decatur, Ala., manufactures one-half its capacity of 30 million pounds of acrilan a year. The other in Pensacola, Fla., produces 88 million pounds of nylon a year. This makes a total of 103 million pounds or approximately 250,000 cotton bale equivalents. This just happens to be almost exactly the quantity of cotton raised in Lubbock County, Tex., in 1952 and 1953. Yet this one company has a fiber research budget for 1955 of $3,750,000 and in 1956 of $4,500,000.

"The disparity in promotion is equally sobering. The promotional budget for the producers of synthetic fibers probably amounts to $12 million, whereas their production represents only 4.5 million bale equivalents of cotton. Eight rayon companies have launched an industrywide cooperative program supported by funds which, in their first year, were 50 percent greater than those of cotton in its 15th year. We cannot long live under conditions of such disparity in research and promotion, and I think we are beginning to realize it.

"The National Cotton Council, in the very beginning of its operation, recognized that little could be accomplished by tackling the problem of increasing consumption on a broad, general front. It recognized that every market is different and has different requirements of performance and cost, and very important, that the amount of cotton consumed in each market, and the amount of a competing fiber consumed in that market, depend basically upon three things: (1) relative price, (2) relative quality, and (3) the relative amount of promotion behind each product.

"Our industry recognizes we must meet our competition price-wise. But there is just one way that we can be competitive in price without reducing farmers' incomes, and that is through increased efficiency and lower costs of production. Research is the only way to get this greater efficiency and lower costs.

"Now take a look at the quality factor. Cotton fiber quality is indisputably high, giving more value in more desirable properties than any other fiber. For particular uses, however, research on man-made fibers has enabled our competitors to excel in a few especially important characteristics—enough to displace cotton from the market in these uses. Quality improvement can come only from research. There is no other way in which we can meet and beat our competition on the quality front.

"And what about promotion? The council's promotional program is based on careful market research studies to show: First, those markets in which promotion is needed most; second, the promotional appeals most likely to influence our customers; and third, the effect obtained from promotion. Salesmen must have something new, something different, something better to promote. They get it from research.

"Apparently there is a direct relationship between the amount of money spent on research and the growth of an industry. A recent study of the National Science Foundation points this up sharply. The industry spending the greatest percentage of gross sales on research is the drugs and pharmaceutical industry, which spends annually about 5 percent. From 1939 to 1953, production of drugs increased 600 percent, the greatest increase for any group. The industrial chemical industry, which spends almost 4 percent for research, has increased its production during the same period by 400 percent. Electrical machinery manufacturers, spending slightly more than 4 percent for research, increased production more than 450 percent.

"By contrast, the lumber and food industries, spending less than one-half of 1 percent of total sales for research, have been able to increase production a mere 30 to 60 percent. The cotton industry, spending about one-third of 1 percent of gross sales of fiber alone, has increased mill consumption of cotton fiber by only 30 percent."

MANY RESEARCH PROBLEMS

"Cotton fiber has some real research needs and a great many research opportunities. We need to increase efficiency toward the direction of lower prices. We need to increase the uniformity of staple length. We need a stronger cotton fiber. We must reduce the tremendous loss through insect damage and plant disease. Our cotton marketing system must be more efficient. We need to learn how to gin and clean cotton without damaging it, to process it more efficiently through the textile mills, and to create yarns of greater uniformity, greater strength, less neppiness and better appearance. We need to explore the whole field of cotton finishing to learn how to impart higher degrees of such important qualities as resilience, resistance to heat, resistance to acid degradation and weathering.

"There is already at hand a backlog of research proposals, more than 200 in number, outlining clearly enough research to use effectively many millions of dollars per year.

"Cottonseed oil, despite its high quality, poses some research problems. At its last meeting in New Orleans on April 19, the research committee of the National Cottonseed Products Association pointed out that the oil color—involving gossypol and other pigments of cottonseed—is the major problem in the utilization of cottonseed oil. The committee urged greatly expanded work on pigment identification and removal, and measurement of color to overcome the most important handicap of cottonseed oil in its competition with soybean oil.

"Some farmers feel that the cotton mills should do more research on cotton and that the oil mills and refineries should do more work on cottonseed. This, however, overlooks the fact that the mill, in neither case, has a primary interest in the research. The textile mills essentially are converters who receive fiber of one kind or another and convert it into yarn or cloth. They will process whichever fiber offers the most opportunity for profit. Oil mills generally are not wedded to cottonseed—they can and do process any oilseed.

"If the cotton farmer wants his industry to grow and prosper, he must take a leaf from the book of his competitors and make possible a research program adequate to offset those of his competitors."

(As only two of many examples of what research can do for the products of the cotton plant, Wynn at this point in the address cited the development of "wash and wear" cottons and the improvement in the quality of margarine since World War II. He also mentioned the improvement in cottonseed meal quality through research, leading to wider use in livestock and poultry rations. He, then, continued by citing examples of wha some other commodities are doing, as follows:)

"The American Dairy Association, through voluntary deductions from milk checks, is collecting 2 cents for each 100 pounds of milk. Since 100 pounds of milk sells for about $3.50, this deduction is comparable to $1 per bale on cotton. This research and promotion fund, amounting to about $6 million annually, is being put to good use in national advertising on radio and television, and in magazines and newspapers.

"Or take wool for example: The sheep growers have a program that nets them well over a million dollars annually. They obtained legislation authorizing the Secretary

of Agriculture to act as their agent in deducting 1 cent per pound of wool from Government payments, provided that two-thirds of the producers, either in terms of number of producers or in terms of volume of wool produced, vote to approve such deductions. This money is turned over to the American Sheep Producers' Council to promote increased consumption of wool and mutton.

"WHAT COTTON IS DOING

"These are examples of what others are doing. Now let's take a good look at our own industry. We all recognize that over the years the National Cotton Council has worked hard for an adequate program of cotton research and promotion. The council has sparkplugged the drive for such a program, and the council's influence has been the principal reason we have gone as far as we have in research and in promotion.

"Leadership by the council in this area was never expressed more forcibly than last January, when the organization's delegate members voted unanimously to expand the council's program. While this expansion will not come to fruition until the crop year beginning August 1, 1957, it is our great immediate hope to more aggressively meet the challenge of our competitors.

"Crushers are a vital factor in the success of this undertaking. The extent of your participation, just as the extent of participation of the other segments of the industry, will determine its success. While your financial contribution is highly important, your influence with ginners and farmers is essential. The expanded program needs the crushers, and the crushers need the hard-hitting research and promotion the expansion of the council's operation will bring into being.

"I have mentioned the expansion of the council's program in order to relate it to a proposal I wish to make, a proposal that needs to be considered seriously by all segments of the industry. I make it knowning that we have made great progress and that fine work is being done in Government and private research laboratories, and in our textile schools and textile mills. I make it, however, knowing too that we must continually plan for the future. We cannot think in terms of today alone, or even tomorrow alone. We must think now and plan now of and for the day after tomorrow.

"If the cotton industry is to meet the threat to its existence that is posed by the growing imbalance with the synthetics in research and promotion, if the cotton industry is to insure its long-range future, it seems to me that it must build a fund large enough to be more nearly adequate to cotton's future as well as its present needs. When it comes into being, the council's expanded program, therefore, will be the base from which we can plan and move intelligently. That program will make possible the guidance and developmental work and effective use of much larger research and promotion funds.

"WHAT COTTON SHOULD DO

"I, therefore, am proposing that cotton farmers begin thinking about paying into an industry fund $1 to $1.50 for each bale produced. With an average 12-million-bale crop this would yield $12 million to $18 million for work on cotton and cottonseed problems. Admittedly, $12 million is but a start toward matching the money that is being spent by producers of man-made fibers; but $12 million is enough to get into a really effective program of research and promotion. With $12 million effectively used, we would see results, and I feel sure that, with the results obtained, the industry would subsequently move to enlarge its self-financed program.

"In no other way can I envision that over the long pull we will be able to give cotton a truly adequate research program. In no other way can I see how we are to hold and expand our markets, to utilize effectively our land and capital investments, and to be assured of a prosperous cotton economy in this Nation.

"It is not a new idea for farmers to invest in their future in this way. In the Mississippi Delta where I live, we must protect our lands from the floods of the Mississippi River. For many, many years, we paid for these levees through deductions apportioned by the size of the farmers' crops. In my levee district, cotton farmers paid $1 per bale each year, and they paid this dollar per bale over a period of 50 years, many of which never saw the price of cotton rise above 10 cents per pound.

"The threat to the cotton industry provided by the Mississippi River was no more real, and of not nearly so permanent a nature as is the threat now facing the cotton farmer—the threat that his means of livelihood will be swept away by the onrushing flood of synthetic fiber production. If Mississippi Delta farmers could pay $1 a bale out of $50 when yields per acre were less than half what they are now, certainly farmers can afford $1 a bale today out of the $160 and more that they receive.

"And how could such a fund be collected? There are several possibilities, of course, all of which must be carefully studied. In this connection, you will recall a resolution adopted in Biloxi by the council delegates as a part of the organization's comprehensive cotton program. This resolution reads as follows, and I qoute, that the council * * * 'seek to develop a long-range program to finance from private sources research and promotion in amounts adeqaute to make cotton fully competitive with synthetic fibers and other competing materials.'

"The purpose of this resolution is to make sure that we find exactly the right answer to the question of financing such a program as I envision, and the industry should pursue it vigorously until the right answer is found.

"As many of you know, a bill recently has been introduced in the Congress which incorporates the idea of a greatly expanded industry fund for research and promotion. This bill, as I understand it, would have the farmers vote a levy on themselves when they vote on production controls each year. This is one method at which the industry will be looking. But whether we come out with this method of financing or some other, we can all agree that the time for half measures is past.

"If this cotton industry of ours is going to survive, we must unite our resources and take positive steps to build a research program far beyond what we now have. We have our choice of research or recession. Without research, we can only look forward to a declining annual cotton production, to 10 million, 8 million, 6 million bales over the course of the next few decades. With an imaginative, intelligently directed research program, we should see our market expand from its present total of 11 million to 12 million bales, on up to 15—yes, to 20 million bales in the course of the next several decades.

"We have an option. What shall it be? Research, or recession?"

Midweek Holidays

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN H. RAY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 5, 1956

Mr. RAY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I should like to insert in the RECORD the following editorial from the Staten Island Advance, of July 3:

MIDWEEK HOLIDAYS

As everybody knows, tomorrow is the grand and glorious 4th of July.

Except for those in essential services, it will be a day off from work, a day to reflect on an inspring period in American history, a day to be with one's family, a day to rest, relax, and rejuvenate.

But as our favorite critic observes, it would be "more better" if the holiday had been yesterday.

For then we would have a 3-day holiday, the equivalent of almost a half week's vacation.

Business wouldn't have had to close down for the weekend, open up for 2 days, close down for another holiday, and then operate for only 2 more days before shutting up for another weekend.

Families could have planned their leisure to better advantage. And youngsters would have felt the summer vacation had begun with a real bang, with dad home for 3 days of celebration.

You see, we're beginning to like the idea of celebrating most holidays on Monday "more better."

Of course there's some opposition, and there may have to be some modification.

Some say 3-day holidays will lead to a greater death toll on the highways. To limit holidays for that reason is to take the most indireot and difficult approach. With such reasoning, we might eliminate weekends, too.

Exceptions to Monday holidays might have to be granted to some religious observances or a patriotic day or two.

Most holidays, though, can easily be tagged on to a weekend.

Congressman JOHN H. RAY is among those campaigning toward that end. His proposal has been in the works for some time. Every now and then he nudges his colleagues with a comment in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Before Congressmen adjourn for their holiday of politicking and relaxing, they should take some action on the Nation's holidays.

Scientist Blames High Schools, Elementary Schools for "Killing Off Interest" of Students in Science, Mathematics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDGAR W. HIESTAND

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 5, 1956

Mr. HIESTAND. Mr. Speaker, if the National Education Association, at its convention and thereafter, would direct its attention to some self-examination and self-criticism of the obvious discouragement of mathematics and science, which has resulted in our falling behind the Soviet in this regard, instead of campaigning for classrooms for courses in dating, dancing, basket weaving and so-called social studies, its energy could contribute much to the national welfare.

I insert the remarks of Dr. Arnold O. Beckman, former professor at Cal. Tech., president of Beckman Instruments, Inc., and also of the Los Angeles Chamber of Commerce. I consider them quite authoritative and timely.

In March the Congressional Joint Committee on Atomic Energy published an authori-

tative and disturbing report on Engineering and Scientific Manpower in the United States, Western Europe, and Soviet Russia. Statistics cited in this report should destroy any complacency concerning the superiority of the United States in science and technology.

In 1954, Russia had more than 540,000 engineers, plus about 160,000 scientists in educational and research institutions, a total of 700,000. In the United States there are between 700,000 and 750,000 actively employed engineers and scientists. At the moment, we are about on a par with Russia.

From 1900 to 1950 engineering and scientific professional graduates in the United States increased almost twice as fast as did the population.

Since 1950, there has been a sharp decline: 52,732 first professional or bachelor's engineering degrees were granted in 1950; in 1954, only 22,236 such degrees.

In 1950, 28,000 engineering degrees were awarded in Russia; in 1954, 53,000.

For 1955, the number is estimated at 63,000—to be compared with only 23,000 similar degrees for the United States.

Allen W. Dulles, Director of Central Intelligence, sums up for the decade 1950–60: The Soviets will graduate 1,200,000 in the sciences, while the United States wil graduate 900,000. "Unless we quickly take new measures to increase our facilities for scientific education, Soviet scientific manpower in key areas may well outnumber ours in the next decade."

Russian university students start out with more intensive mathematical and scientific preparation at the high school level. They study harder and longer in college.

The joint committee report states that because of the emphasis on science and the vigorous scholastic competition in the Soviet educational system, Soviet graduates are professionally as competent as scientific graduates in the United States.

More than half of all Russian university graduates are in science and mathematics; only a fifth of United States graduates are in these fields.

In my opinion, the blame rests squarely on our public-education system, especially at the high school and elementary levels.

Our elementary and high schools suffer from pernicious softening of the curriculum. Over the past 2 or 3 decades there has been a marked decline in the number of students required to take subjects such as mathematics, physics, and chemistry, which demand and develop clear thinking and analytical reasoning.

At the beginning of the century 1 in every 5 high-school students studied physics; today only 1 out of about 25 throughout the Nation.

There is no evidence that university students are denied training in science and engineering because of an insufficient number of university professors or inadequate laboratory or classroom facilities.

The technical manpower problem arises from the fact that too few students enter colleges and universities who are interested in and prepared to follow careers in science and engineering.

In 1950 some graduates in engineering and science in the United States represented 25 percent of the entire graduating class. In 1954 they represented 18 percent, and the forecast is that the class of 1960 will have not more than 15 percent of its graduates in engineering and science.

This situation is the inevitable result of a long history of declining interest at the high-school level in mathematics, chemistry, and physics.

It is amazing that this decline should have occurred at a time when the interest of young students in new scientific developments has been at an all-time high. Even some of the most popular comic strips for children are based on pseudoscientific subjects. How have our teachers managed to kill off this interest?

There are several explanations. One is that many science teachers are not interested in science nor competent to teach science.

A number of years ago when a competitive examination was sponsored by the American Chemical Society, I was amazed by the number of high-school teachers who asked for sets of the correct answers so they could discuss the examination later with their students.

An investigation showed that 30 percent of the high-school chemistry teachers had taken no university courses in chemistry. There is little reason to believe the situation is much different today.

Last November Lewis L. Strauss, Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission, stated, "A survey of 30 States showed that about 1,800 new mathematics teachers were urgently needed, but 700 of the positions had to be filled with unqualified persons, including instructors in music, home economics, and physical culture."

Time magazine reports that of 211 prospective elementary teachers surveyed, 150 admitted a long-standing hatred of arithmetic.

High-school teaching is so bad that 62 percent of colleges surveyed reported a necessity to repeat high-school mathematics in college—5 years ago Annapolis abolished trigonometry as an entrance requirement, began to teach it itself.

"Elementary teachers, for the most part," according to one observer who has taught them, "are ignorant of the mathematical basis of arithmetic; high-school teachers * * * fall in this category also. * * * In the majority of cases, an individual with ambition to teach in an elementary school can matriculate at a teachers' college without showing any high-school mathematics on his record. He can be graduated without studying any college mathematics. And in this condition, he can meet the requirements of most States for a certificate to teach arithmetic. * * * Nearly one-third of the States will license (high-school math) teachers even though they have had no college mathematics at all, and the average requirement for all States is only 10 semester hours."

The whole situation, says the Educational Testing Service, finally boils down to this: "Future teachers pass through the elementary schools learning to detest mathematics. They drop it in high school as early as possible. They avoid it in teachers' college because it is not required. They return to the elementary school to teach a new generation to detest it."

The alarming spread of teacher incompetence throughout our public-school system reflects the powerful influence of teachers' colleges and certain teacher organizations. Rigid restrictions governing teaching credentials, which purportedly guarantee a measure of competence, actually do nothing of the kind, as surveys have shown.

The Committee for the 1955 White House Conference on Education stated, "Teacher preparation programs have the reputation of requiring needless and repetitious courses. This reputation has the effect of deterring brilliant young people from becoming teachers."

Not only are brilliant young people deterred from relieving the shortage of competent teachers, the arbitrary restrictions prohibit many able persons from teaching in our public schools.

Does it not strike you as strange that leading professors in science at famous universities are not qualified to teach their subjects in our high schools, yet a high-school drama or music teacher with no training in science may do so.

If unreasonable restrictions on teacher qualifications were eliminated, hundreds of competent teachers in mathematics, science, and engineering would be available from industry on a part-time basis—teachers of the kind needed now, teachers who can inspire students to enter technical fields because they can speak from firsthand experience of the challenge and opportunities of their profession.

Many able educators have cried out against teachers college overemphasis on methods of teaching versus underemphasis on knowledge of subject.

During the 14 years I was teaching at the California Institute of Technology I had the opportunity to become well acquainted with the product of our high schools and to learn something about our public school system.

The broad socialistic movement shows up in our school system in several ways. One is the attempt to do away with a competitive grading system.

Some schools even attempted to grade pupils upon their performance in relation to their estimated ability. On this standard, a moron who handed in all of his homework, even though it was worthless, would receive a higher grade than a brilliant student somewhat careless in turning in his papers.

In some school districts where indignant parents have demanded that grades be reestablished, the attempt is made to minimize the significance of grades denoting proficiency, by having several other grades for each course. In arithmetic, for example, grades purportedly measure such things as responsibility and self-direction, and relationships with others.

Several years ago the national American Chemical Society took the lead in fighting a move to substitute general science for specific courses in physics, chemistry, and biology. Educators stated that nature embraces all science—however, the courses in general science failed to provide fundamental training in any field of science.

The first step is to interest the student. Inspiration can come only from enthusiastic, competent teachers. Teachers untrained in a subject should not be permitted to teach that subject, regardless of the number of courses he or she may have taken in so-called pedagogy.

To the best of my knowledge, the routine rating of teachers on the basis of actual effectiveness in the classroom is not attempted. Why not?

The tremendous advances in science create vast amounts of new knowledge which must be taught. How can this new information be worked into a curriculum overcrowded today?

Much subject matter of today's elementary and high school curricula could be eliminated advantageously. Many subjects could be taught at an earlier age. Why should foreign languages, for example, be retained for the later years?

Dan Reed's Fight for the American Motorist

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS A. JENKINS
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 26, 1956

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, one of the less well-known aspects of the highway bill which the President recently signed into law was the tremendous fight waged by Representative REED of New York on behalf of the average American motorist. Almost single-handed, Mr.

REED, as ranking Republican member of the House Ways and Means Committee, saw to it that heavy trucks pay a larger share of the tax burden required by the new roads.

In this connection, the Lawyer's Weekly Report of July 2, 1956, published by Prentice-Hall, Inc., had the following to say:

STORY BEHIND A STORY

After a long battle, the $50 billion highway program is finally becoming law. It was a rugged 2-year fight. Nearly everybody was for the proposal creating a 41,000-mile Interstate Highway System. But differences arose on the method of financing and the additional taxes to be borne by the private motorists and the interstate trucking concerns. Pay-as-you-go was the method finally decided on. But one single Member of Congress was the originator and driving force behind the amendment which cost the truckers $390 million more than the truckers thought they ought to pay. That Member is DANIEL A. REED, Republican, of New York.

It happened this way. When the measure was before the House Ways and Means Committee, the committee had agreed on a provision that would have passed more of the tax on to the individual motorist. But the next morning Representative REED, former chairman of Ways and Means in the 83d Congress, offered an amendment to reduce the proposed individual motorist tax and increase the trucker tax. Democrats on the committee smelled a political mouse. They did not want to be placed in the position of voting the Reed substitute down and have G. O. P.'ers charging them with favoring the trucking interests, so they did a complete reversal and overwhelmingly adopted the Reed amendment. In the conference with the Senate, REED again went to the bat after the Senate had reduced the truck tax. Fear of political repercussions again won the day for him. Thus, thanks to DAN REED, over the 13-year span of the program, interstate truckers will pay $866 million instead of the $476 million proposed by the Senate.

In addition, Mr. Speaker, the Washington Daily News carried the following article by Jack Steele in its issue of June 22:

Victories were chalked up for the Nation's motorists and taxpayers as House-Senate conferees reached final agreement yesterday on the highway bill.

The motorists won as the conferees adopted a House-proposed special tax on heavy trucks which will cost truckers an estimated $866 million over the 16-year span of the program.

This tax will assess big trucks for a larger share of the cost of the 41,000-mile Interstate Highway System because of their heavy use and abuse of these roads.

AGREEMENT

The taxpayers won as the conferees agreed on a proposal backed by Treasury Secretary George M. Humphrey to put the highway program on an actual pay-as-you-build basis.

Under this provision, the Federal Government can spend on the highway program in any fiscal year only the money accumulated in a special fund in which revenues from highway-use taxes imposed in the bill will be set aside.

The special tax on heavy trucks was pushed through the House-Senate conference by Representative DANIEL REED of New York, ranking GOP member of the House Ways and Means Committee.

SHIFT

The Senate had tried to shift more of the highway costs to motorists by reducing this special truck tax so it would yield only $476 million.

Thus the action of the conferees will cost truckers $390 million more over the next 16 years.

As agreed upon by the conferees, this section of the bill will impose an annual fee of $1.50 per thousand pounds on all trucks weighing over 26,000 pounds. The fee will apply to the total weight of these huge over-the-road trucks.

The pay-as-you-build provision was strongly backed by Chairman HARRY F. BYRD, Democrat, of Virginia, of the Senate Finance Committee.

OMITTED

The Senate had adopted the Byrd amendment, but it was omitted from the House version of the bill.

House Democrats—although they claimed credit for a pay-as-you-go road bill—strongly opposed this provision.

They objected that it would slow down construction on the Interstate System, which is supposed to be completed in 13 years with taxes to be collected over the next 16 years.

But Senator BYRD refused to sign the conference report without his amendment, so the House conferees capitulated.

The final version of the bill lays out the plans for a highway-building program that eventually will cost over $50 billion.

However, since fund authorizations were limited to 3 years in the bill, the actual price tag on the measure was cut to about $33 billion.

The bill provides that Congress must take a new look at the highway program and reauthorize the funds every 3 years.

The American Idea: Freedom for the Individual

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 5, 1956

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am inserting an article that appeared in the Wall Street Journal for July 3. It is extremely timely during the anniversary of the 180th birthday of our country:

THE AMERICAN IDEA—ONE HUNDRED AND EIGHTY YEARS OF PROGRESS WAS FOUNDED ON A WISE PHILOSOPHY OF FREEDOM FOR THE INDIVIDUAL

(By William Henry Chamberlin)

One hundred and eighty years is a comparatively short term in the life of a nation. But during that span of years the American Republic which came into existence with the Declaration of Independence has been transformed beyond the imagination of its founders. Thirteen sparsely settled agricultural Colonies have become a unified Nation of 48 States, the leading industrial power of the world. Three million people have become 165 million. More than a century ago the United States reached its natural limits, with oceans for its western and eastern boundaries, and has wisely never sought to expand beyond these frontiers.

The immense material expansion of the United States, a process that is continuous, to which no bounds can be set, is partly a product of science and geography. Few peoples have possessed as a heritage a large and rich continental area. But it is also the outward expression of the American idea, which has set free individual energy on a scale matched nowhere in the world.

The American Revolution was fought and won under the banner of liberty. No other word occurs so often in the writings of the Founding Fathers as symbolizing the desirable state of society. But in the France of Mme. Roland, and in a number of countries of our own time, many and shocking crimes have been committed in the name of liberty. Like all abstract nouns, liberty requires thoughtful definition.

FOUNDATION OF LIBERTY

The Declaration of Independence appeals to "the laws of nature and of nature's God." And belief in natural law, in inalienable rights which men posses independently of government and which no government may lawfully withhold, abridge, or deny, and in the existence of a divine providence that guides the affairs of men, these are three foundation stones of the American conception of liberty.

It is noteworthy that nowhere in the classics of American political theory—in the Declaration of Independence, in the Constitution, in the Federalist Papers—is there any support for the conception of an affirmative government that is to give the people who live under it the good things of life. What one does find is a good many specific injunctions as to what government may not do in interfering with the liberty of the citizen.

The philosophy that stems from the American Revolution is that of individualist self-reliance. Alexis de Tocqueville, shrewdest and most penetrating of the many foreign commentators on the American Republic, often reported the effect of this philosophy, in contrast to the dependence on the state which was more characteristic of Europe, as one of his most lasting impressions of the United States.

The idea that the best service which Government can render to its citizens is to leave them alone permeates the thinking of the Founding Fathers. Thomas Jefferson was regarded as a "leftist" by American conservatives of his time. But modern conservatives would heartily endorse these two among many other similar opinions of Jefferson:

"A wise and frugal Government, which shall restrain men from injuring one another, which shall leave them otherwise free to regulate their own pursuits of industry and improvement, and shall not take from the mouth of labor the bread it has earned—this is the sum of good Government. * * *

"If we can prevent the Government from wasting the labors of the people, under the pretense of taking care of them, they must become happy."

The American Revolution was directed against tyranny, against bureaucratic arbitrariness, against artificial class lines based on privilege and snobbishness. It did not aim at universal leveling. The equality which is part of the American dream is equality of opportunity, not equality of possessions.

In the extensive literature of the American Revolution there is no hint of socialism, no demagogic effort to disparage the right lawfully to earn and acquire property in exalting human rights. The Federalist Papers and other publications of the time recognize the right to own property as a very important human right.

As John Adams wrote: "The moment the idea is admitted into society that property is not as sacred as the laws of God, and that there is not a force of law and public justice to protect it, anarchy and tyranny commence."

HUMAN RIGHTS

So the foundations of the American idea may be summarized as follows: Belief in natural law and in inalienable human rights; intense distrust of any concentration of power in Government; firm rejection of tyranny, whether of a monarch, a dictator or a mob; faith in equality of opportunity.

Insofar as these principles have been respected America has prospered and grown great. It is where they have been most eroded and whittled away that some of the clearest danger signals in our national life are flying. One of these danger signals was foreseen with almost uncanny accuracy by De Tocqueville:

"I seek to trace the novel features under which despotism may appear in the world. The first thing that strikes the observation is an innumerable multitude of men, all equal and alike, incessantly endeavoring to procure the petty and paltry pleasures with which they glut their lives. * * * Above this race of men stands an immense and tutelary power, which takes upon itself alone to secure their gratifications and to watch over their fate. The will of man is not shattered, but softened, bent, and guided; men are seldom forced by it to act, but they are constantly restrained from acting; such a power does not destroy, but it prevents existence; it does not tyrannize, but it compresses, enervates, extinguishes, and stupefies a people, till each nation is reduced to nothing better than a flock of timid and industrious animals, of which the government is the shepherd."

This vision is the welfare state in its last phase of development. It is the totalitarian state, minus police and concentration camp brutality.

The dangers to true liberty vary from generation to generation; an all-encompassing statism, even when this is not associated with acts of flagrant and outrageous cruelty and tyranny, is the greatest danger to liberty in our time.

AMERICA ON BALANCE

For other reasons also the 180th anniversary of the Declaration of Independence cannot be an occasion for unmixed self-congratulation for the American people.

American civilization has not produced cultural values to match its amazing wealth in material gadgets. Not all the problems created by modern industrialism and urbanization have been solved. America's crime rate remains disgracefully high; its quantitative gains in education have been to some extent offset by qualitative failures.

But on balance, and with full allowance for defects and failings, the characterization of America as "one hell of a success" still holds true. If immigration is the sincerest form of flattery, America's prestige among people of many lands seeking opportunities still stands high, higher than that of any country in the world. The American Constitution, which Gladstone called "the most remarkable work known to me in modern times to have been produced by the human intellect," has preserved for the United States the inestimable blessing of liberty under law.

America remains the envy of less happy lands. The American people need only dedicate themselves to the ideals which the men of '76 upheld with their arms and with their minds in order to face with confidence whatever challenge may confront them in this second half of the Twentieth Century.

Also I am inserting herewith an editorial which appeared in the Wall Street Journal for the same date entitled "If We Can Keep It":

IF WE CAN KEEP IT

Mr. Schuur, in our letters column today, presents in pretty able fashion the view of those who are unconcerned about a growth of Federal power. The letter is critical of a recent column by our Mr. William Henry Chamberlin who expressed the concern of many other people about Federal assumption of power from the States.

The basic views of these two gentlemen are not new, of course. They represent two differing philosophies of government about which men argued long before the Constitution was written.

Indeed, the Constitution took its form because of the argument over whether concentrated power or diffused power was best for governing a free people. It was conceived and drafted in the view of the less interference people had from a faraway place the better they might govern themselves. Some power, of course, had to be given a central government, or there would have been no nation. But even after the Constitution was written the people demanded even further restraints on the Congress and they were adopted in the Bill of Rights.

We think it not the "sentimentalism" Mr. Schuur speaks of but hard-headed knowledge that led to this short of a Constitution. We think it was the result of experience with the arrogance of a remote power that led the drafters to build the sort of Government they built.

Mr. Schuur says the Constitution is a "living document" whose greatness lies in its capability to meet the "uncontemplated evolution" the Nation has undergone since 1776. This is certainly true. But we do not think the changes were meant to come by Congress or the courts "construing" the Constitution's plain language to mean one thing today and quite a different thing tomorrow. The changes were meant to come about through constitutional amendment, and the process was deliberately designed to be a slow one. The builders knew that hasty change may cost more in individual freedom than the people receive from the promise of collective benefits that caused the change.

Those who support growing Federal power also support a belief that the more government there is the better off the people will be. Those who support State responsibility argue not only for self-government on the lowest local level, but also that the less government people have to answer to the freer people will remain. They believe that the excessive concentration of Federal power Mr. Schuur fails to find and does not fear can lead only to a government not of the people, not by the people, not for the people, but of, by and for an oppressive government.

Mr. Schuur is plain enough in the way he thinks about these things. "The need of our highly centralized society for good and effective government demands a continuing centralization of power in the Federal Government."

Yet the history of governments shows that as power grows in one place, whether a palace or a parliament, that power is asserted. And it is the people who gave up the power who find in the end that they gave up more than they knew. It was in the knowledge of this history that the Constitution was written with its powers separated and diffused.

The story goes that when the Constitution was drafted, a lady approached Mr. Franklin in Philadelphia and asked him what sort of government the Constitutional Convention had given the people.

He replied, "Madam, we have given you a republic, if you can keep it."

National Security Should Be Divorced From Partisan Politics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. HESELTON

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 3, 1956

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Speaker, I believe the vast majority of the people of this country abhor any attempt to inject partisan politics into matters involving the security and, perhaps, the survival of this Nation.

Presidential and Vice Presidential ambitions are legitimate, even though some who cherish them may have demonstrated their complete lack of qualifications except in their own minds. But the overwhelming majority of the American people know full well the preeminent qualifications of President Eisenhower and his complete devotion to the security of this country. And they will find ways to rebuke resoundingly anyone who places partisan, phony political ambitions on the public record.

The following editorial from the Athol (Mass.) News would be excellent material for such pompous and bombastic individuals:

NO GLOOMY FORECAST

Secretary of the Air Force Quarles, in a vigorous and somewhat warlike address at the new Portsmouth (N. H.) Air Force Base drew a much more optimistic picture of America's ability to retaliate for attack on our shores than he and his uniformed aides gave to Congress during their attempt to get more funds for bases and bombers that the administration has said is necessary.

He said at Portsmouth, for example, that B–47 bombers from the Portsmouth base, in conjunction with aerial refueling from the same point could penetrate "any defense existing today and deliver an atomic attack."

This means, of course, that the swift B–47 should be able to break through Russia's strong antiaircraft and fight defenses and drop atomic bombs on primary targets inside the Soviet Union. He also pointed out that Globemaster transports from the New Hampshire base could transport both troops and equipment for overseas bases quickly and copiously, so that within days and perhaps hours after an attack on the United States, retaliatory assaults by air could be made from bases much closer to the Soviet Union.

The impressive thing about Secretary Quarles' talk seemed to us that he was talking, not about weapons and equipment on order or under construction, but about planes, bombs, and ground force equipment already in existence and combat-ready.

We noticed particularly that he made no mention of the B–52 heavy bomber, which the Air Force has said is in short supply, but rather asserted without strings that the B–47 can do the retaliatory job.

This should minimize the fear that must have been engendered by some of the dire predictions made by General LeMay and other prophets of doom in previous assessments of United States air might. In spite of alleged deficiencies, the Air Force apparently is mighty.

The following editorial from the Springfield (Mass.) Union states some blunt truths of which the people of this country are well aware. It, too, would be worth studying prayerfully by certain individuals who fancy themselves as possible candidates for high office:

ENGINE CHARLIE'S SLIP

The last time Engine Charlie Wilson raced his motor and said bluntly that the attempt in Congress to finagle more money from the Air Force was phony, the New York Times stated editorially that "perhaps, Mr. Wilson is right." Others agree, but are rather silent about it.

For if ever there was a phony it was the attempt to add a huge sum to an already topheavy Air Force budget which crowded every available plan and facility now in force. We may be pardoned for suggesting in this election year that the proposal to use more millions on top of adequate billions, which could not be spent anyway, had an overtone of politics. Can anybody imagine General Eisenhower being so callous to the defense needs of this country, or an industrial genius like Secretary Wilson being so stupid, as deliberately to neglect our defenses?

Everybody knows that the three services, plus the airplane, shipbuilding and other industries, are grabbing for their share, plus, of the $35 billion a year that Mr. Wilson has to pass out, and they are not hesitant about pressuring their Congressmen for a few million extra to slice among them through a phony political move. They are pretty short of issues anyway, as shown by the avidity with which the seize upon and distort Mr. Wilson's bird dog and other slips of the tongue.

Now there are honest differences of opinion among high-minded officials as to the kind or size of Air Force this country must have to offset what General Twining, at least, thinks is an overrated Russian superiority. If politicians who know less than the experts disagree, it does not necessarily mean that the President and his Defenses Secretary are negligent or unaware of the full dangers of falling behind, or are not building what they believe to be an adequate defense with the best possible weapons for the kind of war they believe we should have to wage without bankrupting the Nation.

Secretary Wilson may be blunt and outspoken—a refreshing trait in Washington—but he is tough where we need toughness, of high character, or rare administrative genius, a man who isn't after votes, and whose first consideration is the best welfare of the country. It would be nice if a few outstanding businessmen would make known their belief that Engine Charlie had bluntly told the truth, and had not blundered in trying to defend the taxpayers against the grabbers and politicians.

Sale of Alcoholic Beverages on Air Carriers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES W. VURSELL
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 5, 1956

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, I am glad to learn that H. R. 8000 has been approved by the Rules Committee, and I am hopeful that this legislation may be scheduled as early as possible for the consideration of the Members of the House.

This bill provides that no air carrier shall sell to its passengers any alcoholic beverages, including wine and beer, for consumption while in flight between points within the limits of the 48 States, and the District of Columbia.

I have received, as other Members of the House have, communications from the organizations representing the airlines' pilots, who have the responsibility of flying these planes and protecting the safety of the public, urging the enactment of this legislation into law.

I believe this speaks very highly for the men, who better than anyone else realize the necessity of this proposal being enacted into law before the close of this session.

I am sure that the great majority of the American people who use the airlines for transportation also favor such legislation. I sincerely hope that this legislation can be considered and written into the law before the end of this session, and, as we all know, time is growing short before its close.

Constitutional Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 5, 1956

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

[From the New York Times of July 5, 1956]

CONSTITUTIONAL PROBLEM—A REVIEW OF ISSUE SYMINGTON RAISED IN DISPUTE WITH WILSON OVER DEFENSE

(By James Reston)

WASHINGTON, July 4.—The sharp and sometimes personal fight between Secretary of Defense Charles E. Wilson and the Symington subcommittee of the Senate over the Air Force budget has declined into what Senator STUART SYMINGTON, Democrat, of Missouri, calls a grave constitutional problem.

This is whether the executive branch of the Government is obliged to spend the additional $900 million voted by the Congress against the will of the administration to expedite production of heavy bombers (B–52's) * * * to the optimum limit of existing facilities or whether the administration can ignore the appropriation of the extra funds.

"You know," Senator SYMINGTON told Secretary Wilson yesterday, "that you could further increase the production of B–52's beyond present schedules if you so wanted.

"You also know that it is the conviction of the Congress you should do so. Nevertheless, you stated you will put the money in the bank. That is, maybe do nothing * * *.

"In our opinion there is a grave constitutional problem raised by your attitude and conduct—namely, what are the rights and responsibilities of the Congress with respect to raising and supporting the Military Establishment * * *."

Senator SYMINGTON made these comments yesterday when Mr. Wilson gave his closing testimony before the Senate Armed Services Subcommittee on the Air Force. The subcommittee has been inquirying into the relative military strength of the United States and the Soviet Union.

This fight has been going on for a long time between Senate advocates of a more powerful Air Force and the administration. It has involved different interpretations of the rise of Soviet airpower, different concepts of how to wage the new economic and political phase of the cold war, and conflicting ideas about the force levels and missions of the Air Force, the Army, the Navy, and the Marine Corps.

ISSUE IN NEW LIGHT

Only now, however, has the issue been presented in the Senate as a constitutional problem, with the administration asserting its right to reject congresssional advice and funds it does not approve, and powerful Members of the Congress insisting that the Executive is obliged by the Constitution to carry out the intent and decisions of the Congress.

This conflict over the rights of the two separate branches has been a serious point of debate in the United States ever since the days of Jefferson, Hamilton, and Madison. It is an issue subject to many contradictory interpretations and for that reason has usually been avoided if at all possible.

Senator Symington said today, however, that he intended to press the issue, and he has powerful support from Senator RICHARD B. RUSSELL, Democrat, of Georgia, chairman of the Armed Services Committee, which passes on all the Pentagon's defense authorizations, and Senator HENRY M. JACKSON, Democrat, of Washington, who has been making a personal issue of the question in his sharp and often violent attacks on Secretary Wilson in the Symington subcommittee.

Nevertheless, though they have a clear vote by the Congress behind them, it is difficult to see how this issue can be solved except by agreement between the two equal branches of the Government.

The Constitution does not clearly settle the issue. "What the Constitution does, and all that it does," wrote Prof. Edward S. Corwin of Princeton, "is to confer upon the President certain powers capable of affecting our foreign relations, and certain other powers of the same general nature upon the Senate, and still other such powers upon Congress; but which of these organs shall have the decisive and final voice in determining the course of the American Nation is left for events to resolve.

"All of which amounts to saying that the Constitution * * * is an invitation to struggle for the privilege of directing American foreign policy * * *."

That is what is going on here now: "A struggle for the privilege of directing American foreign policy." The administration, exercising the rights of the Executive, has decided on a policy of calculated risk in meeting the new Soviet economic-political phase of the cold war, and the Congress apparently thinks the risk is too great.

The administration has rejected the idea of trying to maintain armies as large as the Soviets. It has rejected the policy of matching the submarine strength of the Soviet Union. It has adopted a policy of what it calls balanced forces, under which it asserts that it is maintaining an overall equality, and in some phases a superiority, over the Soviet air force.

This policy is under attack from two sides, the Symington-Jackson bloc in the Senate disputes the administration's claims of equality with the Soviet Air Force, and argues, not only that the B–36 is obsolete but that the B–47 is losing strength with the weakening position of United States bases overseas. In short, this group advocates a much stronger Air Force, particularly in intercontinental bombers (the B–52), and the Congress has voted the funds to increase B–52 production as fast as possible to the limit of existing manufacturing facilities.

At the same time, the administration's policy is under attack from precisely the opposite direction. That is to say, the Army, and its supporters in Congress, maintain that the administration is preparing for a big atomic war that will never come, but not putting enough money into ground forces and economic foreign aid which, they contend, are vital to the kind of war that is being waged with the Communists right now.

The intensity of feeling on these issues has been demonstrated during the defense appropriation, foreign aid, and Symington subcommittee debates of the last 2 weeks.

In the course of these, Secretary Wilson has been attacked as a vain and inept public servant. Senator JACKSON has invited the Secretary to apologize to the Senate for implying that the efforts to raise the Air Force budget were phony, and Mr. Wilson, in turn, has refused to apologize and suggested that he is the one who is due an apology.

Coincidentally, Senator SYMINGTON has accused either Secretary Wilson or the Joint Chiefs of Staff of "misleading" the American people about the defenses of the country, has implied that the administration was putting economy ahead of security, and finally has charged Mr. Wilson with flouting the intent of the Congress.

While all this has been going on, officers of the Air Force and the Army have been carrying on a running battle behind the scenes over the allocation of funds and military missions, and this fight has been carried privately to influential Members of Congress and the press.

The tendency in the administration has been to say that the motivation for most of the squabbling is political in a presidential election year, and there is undoubtedly something to this. Back of it all, however, is a fundamental cleavage, partly military, and partly philosophical, about how to wage the cold war.

The Symington-Jackson group is convinced that the lull in the aggressive statements out of Moscow and the general prosperity in this country are blinding the administration to the rise in Soviet technical proficiency, the threat of Communist capital development in Europe and Asia, and the relative decline, as they see it, in the overall strength of the North Atlantic Treaty powers.

Thus, they believe that only by the maintenance of superior atomic-air power and a maximum effort in the research and development of new weapons can the Western Powers maintain the capacity to strike a paralyzing retaliatory blow. This, they are convinced, is the best hope of deterring a big war.

The administration's answer to this is that it is now in a position to strike such a blow and will continue to hold that position, even if it does fall behind the Soviet Union in some aspects of air-atomic development.

ATTACKED ON TWO SIDES

Nevertheless, it is being attacked on the one hand for not putting enough stress on airpower and on the other for stressing airpower and atomic power to such an extent that it could not fight a limited war without using atomic weapons and encouraging the all-out atomic war which its whole policy is designed to prevent.

The general feeling here is that these serious questions of judgment can only be made more difficult by raising constitutional questions that have never been settled since the start of the Republic.

The Executive argues that it would be reduced to a rubber stamp if it handed over responsibilities for the development of the armed services to the Congress.

On the other hand, the Congress points out that the Constitution says "the Congress shall have power * * * to provide for the common defense * * * to raise and support armies * * * to provide and maintain a navy" (art. I, sec. 8).

Moreover, while the President is Commander in Chief of the Armed Forces, he has to have the support and confidence of the Congress if he is to get the money to maintain his Military Establishment.

The President has yet to be heard on this subject. The controversy existed before his illness, but it has come to a head during his absence from the White House.

He can stick to his estimate of what is the best way to carry out his constitutional duties to defend the United States, or accept the congressional judgment on the Air Force, or reach a compromise. He is in what for him is a curious position, for his judgment is being challenged in the field of military affairs, where he has heretofore been regarded as unassailable.

The Arab State of Mind Is Understood By Everyone Except Our Secretary of State

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 7, 1956

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the following item from the May 16, 1956, issue of the Christian Century (undenominational) is most enlightening:

THE ARAB STATE OF MIND

(By J. Coert Rylaarsdam)

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—J. Coert Rylaarsdam has been associate professor of Old Testament theology on the University of Chicago federated theological faculty since 1945. Before that, he taught at the American School for Boys in Basra, Iraq, and at the New Brunswick, N. J., Theological Seminary. Ordained a minister of the Reformed Church in America in 1941, Professor Rylaarsdam is a graduate of Hope College and of the New Brunswick seminary.)

The rude dismissal of General Glubb by Jordan serves as a sign that the situation in the Middle East is a crisis for the West. The stalemate between Israel and the Arab countries is only one symptom of this crisis. The policy that inspired the British evacuation of Suez has failed. It has led to the steep decline of the position and prestige of the West in the Middle East. Britain has officially recognized this. Large sections of American public opinion and of the American press, including Life, are aware of it. Officially, Washington has still to admit it.

The American assumption, explicit since 1953, that the situation in the Middle East can be fundamentally accounted for by "colonialism" and the existence of Israel, or the posture it assumes, is perniciously superficial. The actions based upon it have had disastrous results. They have contributed to the breakdown of the British position. They have led to international anarchy on the part of Egypt and her Arab followers, confirming their suspicion that irresponsible opportunism pays. They have produced guerrilla warfare and made Israel the target for terrorism. They have cost us our capacity to maneuver to a degree that threatens our freedom and our honor. They have permitted Russia to become the sponsor of the Arab spirit and had led to misunderstanding between Britain and America as well as between Israel and America. They may have to be interpreted as the documentation for a policy of appeasement.

I

At the heart of the crisis lies an Arab state of mind that has been fairly constant for more than a generation. Britain has always been aware of this Arab psychological problem and has been partly able to protect itself from it, though unable to make it contribute to constructive purposes. Mr. Dulles gives the impression of being ignorant of it or ignoring it. The bearing of Israel, sometimes called rigid, shows that it understands the state of mind of its neighbors very well. Neither British power nor the creation of the State of Israel produced the basic problem in Arab psychology; they have only determined some of the forms of its expression, as have the policies of Mr. Dulles. General Glubb has recently spoken of "intransigence" as a constant in the Arab record; but this too is only one symptom pointing to a state of mind that reflects the long agonizing struggle of the Arab peoples for the possession of their own soul at the level of nationhood.

One of the more comprehensive and public exhibits of the seemingly endless series of cycles, major and minor, in which this struggle expresses itself is set in Iraq in the early thirties. In 1931 the kingdom of Iraq was a British mandate. Agitation was rife for the termination of this mandate. It expressed itself in strikes, boycotts, guerrilla action, and rallies with addresses that appealed to the sympathy of the world. Iraqis, it was said, in all sincerity, wanted to get to work on their own problems: Illiteracy, disease, and hunger; but they could begin to do so only if they were given a free hand in their own affairs.

In 1932 Great Britain bowed to the demand. Iraq was admitted to the League of Nations and its internal affairs came into national hands; through a treaty of alliance the substance of foreign relations remained under British influence. There was high elation, a 3-day celebration. A new era was announced in plans for education, health service, and irrigation. But faced with the stubborn facts of actual conditions and dampened by an age-old lethargy, the spirit of resolution flickered badly. Excuses for delay and failure seemed necessary. They were provided not by a purifying self-appraisal nor by a realistic analysis of the difficulty of the task, but by the reestablishment of Britain as a scapegoat. It was hinted that the program was failing because the political freedom was still not complete. Then graft, corruption, and venality grew, purpose waned, and the sullenness of agitation returned. But thoughtful Iraqis knew that, without valid excuse, they were walking away from an inescapable challenge.

The real tragedy of the situation was not just the failure of a socioeconomic program but the inability of a nation to come into full possession of its own soul. The spirit that could pay the cost—industry, discipline, steady perseverance—for the realization of a sincere ideal was wanting. Thus the government did not achieve true legitimacy; and to this extent its policies and acts were evoked by an empty opportunism, unqualified by a truly national achievement in process of realization. The only salt left in the situation was a guilty conscience. Whatever may have been Britain's selfish reasons, she did not help the Iraqis bury that. It is perhaps still too early to say that Iraq is finally winning the battle for possession of its soul and attainment of national integrity. But that it is apparently beginning to develop the capacity to dismiss old grievances (including Israel), turn with renewed zest to its internal development and undertake a responsible role in the Baghdad Pact are important signs of promise. One hopes that the psychopathic problem of a perennial adolescence is making way for the health of responsible maturity.

II

Now we have another exhibit, on an even broader canvas, of this poignant drama which is the struggle of the Arab soul. This

scene is laid in Egypt and Abdel Nasser is the central figure.

We see first that the Arab struggle for self-affirmation is not dead. The Egyptian dictator began as a sincere reformer, a spokesman for that element—the intelligentsia and the middle class—that was ashamed of the Egypt of Farouk. He was determined to face facts and deal with the real problems of his people—at home. On his return from the front after the ill-fated war against Israel in 1948, he is reported to have introduced his plan to overthrow the monarchy, saying, "Brothers, our war is here at home, the war against ignorance, disease, and poverty." Sincere, and very familiar.

There was a hopeful beginning. With General Naguib as a front man the coup was a success and Farouk was deposed. A program of land reform was announced. Plans were launched for reclamation through wider irrigation. Education was to be extended. After 70 years the British garrisons had left Cairo. It was the dawn of a new day. Nasser seemed determined to forget the past and its grievances, including Israel. But soon the sky was overcast.

Trying to deal with the stubborn facts of a tradition of lethargy and fatalism was frustrating. The results of the reform program could not be quick and dramatic. There were rivalries, and Naguib, born in the Sudan, was ousted. Almost simultaneously it became clear that the Sudan, newly independent, would decide not to unite with Egypt. Nasser may have felt that this undermined his position. At any rate, the old resentment against Britain flared and he decided to press for the British evacuation of Suez.

In this undertaking Nasser had the powerful aid of the United States State Department and Mr. Dulles. Early in 1953 the President had announced his aim to restore the spirit of confidence and trust between Arab nations and the United States. This seemed a good place to begin. Wasn't Nasser a reasonable man and a man of peace? Under heavy pressure the British yielded. Mr. Dulles spoke of the decision as an epoch-making settlement and an achievement for American diplomacy. He seems to have assumed that, as an equal, Nasser's Egypt would join in a Middle East defense agreement. But this sort of thing would have involved responsible commitments. It seems that just about this time Nasser decided that his war was not at home after all, that he could not face facts or undertake responsibilities that limited his freedom. He was moved to a course of adventurous opportunism. For the time being Egypt had again lost the battle for its own soul. And one fears that, quite unwittingly, Mr. Dulles is helping Nasser and Egypt bury that guilty conscience.

Since the Suez settlement Nasser has moved with the speed of Jonah to escape his vocation. On his trip to Bandung the old mirage of Farouk caught his eye: the leadership of the Arab world. With the Sauds he plotted the end of British and Hashemite power in Jordan. From the Communists he obtained arms and the training needed to use them. To compete, Washington pleaded that he accept American-British funds to build the Aswan Dam. The dictator occasionally assures Mr. Dulles that delay in accepting the offer does not imply refusal. The British are troubled that this comforts Mr. Dulles. Meanwhile General Glubb has been ejected. It took $100 million of (American) Saudi oil money and the exploitation of the refugees by the Communist organizers of spontaneous riots to do it. Today Nasser rides high. He is a hero in the bazaars of Damascus and his broadcasts foment chaos in Africa. His commandos terrorize Israel; he claims an adventurer's license—a luxury a responsible householder like Ben-Gurion cannot afford. Egypt and its allies have lost another battle to possess their own soul. And Jonah has not yet been cast overboard; just now he commands the vessel of his flight.

III

The near-pathological Arab state of mind, so constant since 1920, has complex roots in a long and very mixed history. But it always shows itself by a pathetic inability to face facts and enter into commitments. For failure it compensates with wild adventure or sullenness. Sincerely conceived programs languish, corruption flourishes. In all orders of life—political, socioeconomic, and cultural—it voices the age-old excuse of fatalism and lethargy, "What can one do?" This time the failure of spirit has led to international anarchy. America looks more like a suppliant than like a negotiator. Whether in the Armed Forces or in business and commerce, in the Arab world she does not even dare to claim for her citizens the equality she so proudly boasts at home. She appears weak to a state of mind that admires strength. She has become a victim of her own policy—a policy that has also penalized Israel, however unintentionally.

The nub of the contrast between Israel and its Arab neighbors is that Israel possesses in such full measure the integrity they lack. This is much more important that differences in culture and religion or an unevenness in artistic creativity or technological know-how. Unlike the Arabs, the Israelis possess their own soul. They can make a realistic appraisal of their needs and pay the cost in industry, perseverance and discipline to begin to fill them. When in 1948 the Arab nations invaded their new state, still in process of organization, the Israelis coined the phrase "We must make facts." Even those most reluctant to do so stand in amazement before the creative achievements of Israel in every department of its variegated national life. It is ironical that right now, owing to American policy, she should be at a disadvantage vis-a-vis her Arab neighbors just because she is so provident, responsible, and resourceful as a national housekeeper.

At this moment the whole world is relieved that Dag Hammarskjold has revitalized the truce that dates back to 1949. This provides needed breathing space, but it settles nothing. The peace that should have come years ago is still not in sight. The indefinite postponement of peace is bad for the Arab soul, but it is precisely what Nasser and his followers desire. It is not what Israel either wants or deserves. The world owes Sir Winston Churchill a great debt of gratitude for having pointed out in clear phrases the moral obligation the West assumes toward Israel in the postponement of a settlement.

Egypt can well afford to accept the continuance of the truce, especially since she is not yet ready to fight anyway. She can continue unmolested with the campaign of economic warfare. The renewal of the truce does not end the blockade of Israeli shipping in the Gulf of Aqabah. Nor does it open the Suez Canal to Israeli vessels or to other vessels frequenting Israeli ports. Egypt has ignored the prohibition of this blockade by the Security Council in 1951. She was ready to accept the Hammarskjold mission only with the provision that this violation of international law be kept out of the discussion.

Another example of economic warfare that continues unabated while the truce is extended relates to the utilization of the power and water resources of the Jordan. In 1954 Russia vetoed a Security Council permit to Israel to build a power project on the Jordan. The United States, represented by Eric Johnston, attempted a multination plan of water development. But the Arab States, fearing that acceptance of the plan would mean an implict recognition of Israel, have not accepted it. Israel is ready and waiting to use her share of the Jordan waters; her neighbors prefer to perpetuate chaos. There is no equality in the continuance of such a stalemate. Yet in the very context of the present truce discussions Nasser has again underscored the Arab position that any unilateral action on the Jordan by Israel constitutes cause for war. This sort of dog-in-the-manger tactics, abundantly exhibited by several Arab States during World War II, constitutes a species of luxury open only to those who thrive on anarchy and chaos.

IV

The most cruel and reprehensible aspect of the truce that Nasser does not wish to exchange for a settlement is exhibited by the refugees who have become the chief weapon of Arab propaganda in America. Whoever may have been responsible for the fact that 750,000 Palestinian Arabs became refugees as a result of the Arab war on Israel—even General Glubb recognizes that the question admits of no simple answer—their lot is tragic. But there can be no doubt that today, 8 years later, their status remains unchanged because their own kith and kin do not want it otherwise. The Arabs have used the misery and frustration of their own brothers to build a living cordon of hate around Israel's borders. They prolong the story of their suffering to appeal to the sympathy of the world, hoping to create pity for themselves and ill will for Jews in Israel and in the diaspora. Thus their irresponsibility has extended even to a denial of the brotherhood of Islam's sons.

It is now all but forgotten that the Jewish refugees were as numerous as the Arab. Between 1948 and 1951 alone, 750,000 of them were brought home to Israel. About half came from Europe, the tragic battered and branded gleanings of the Jewry of central Europe, of whom 6 million perished in the Nazi fury. Thanks to a Jewish sense of responsibility these maimed and penniless aliases of many passports, whose vessels could dock nowhere, found a haven at last.

But there were also the Jewish refugees from Arab lands, the other half of the 750,000. The Jews of Yemen and of Iraq, the Jews of north Africa and of other Arab centers were uprooted by the same Arab war on Israel that uprooted the Arabs of Palestine. They had lived much, much longer even than these in the lands they were forced to leave. They too left their property behind them; they too suffered indignity, abuse, and death. Their rehabilitation, in contrast to their Arab counterparts, is due to the fact that their own cared for them. Isn't it ironical that this act of responsibility and compassion should have deprived Israel of a propaganda weapon so cleverly used by its neighbors? Should callousness and opportunism pay? Quite unintentionally, and for want of full comprehension, it sometimes works out that way.

For example, in the Christian Century for April 18 in a paragraph dealing with the Arab refugees we read: "All proposals for relocating them elsewhere have come to nothing. Meanwhile Israel has opened her doors to 750,000 Jews who have taken the refugees' houses, lands, orchards, and businesses * * *." Quite apart from the fact that many of the Arab centers evacuated were left in utter ruin, nothing is said about the fact that the Jews who came in came as refugees who had also left behind "houses, lands, orchards, and businesses." We are not told who took those properties or who may now be developing them. Unfortunately, not the refugees from Palestine. I personally knew Jews in Iraq who were not given even the opportunity to become refugees; they were hanged in the public square. And why have "all proposals for relocating them elsewhere" come to nothing? Actually Israel alone has resettled many thousands more Arab refugees than all the Arab lands put together. Why? Because for the latter to resettle refugees would be equivalent to facting the fact that "Israel is here to stay."

The policy that inspired the evacuation of Suez and issued in the wild adventures of Nasser have indeed failed. It overlooked the real character of the deep, long-standing and agonized struggle of the Arab spirit. While it negotiated concessions it did not insist on a realistic facing of facts and so challenge Nasser to reach for maturity. In the name of kindness and fairness we have really hurt the Arabs and been unjust to the Israelis.

Now we have a breathing space. One hopes that it provides us with one more chance. Even though it is perhaps less likely now than before that the Arab nations will attain their maturity under inspiration from the West, we must not abandon that hope in our plans. For Israel we must seek that strength and security that do justice to her stability as a state and to her confidence in us, implicit in her consent to the further extension of a truce that should have ended long ago. The course of the last 4 years has come to an end; a new policy, more realistic and decisive, is called for.

The Middle East

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CHARLES B. BROWNSON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 5, 1956

Mr. BROWNSON. Mr. Speaker, although the situation in the Middle East has become less explosive in the last few weeks, a major contributor to the unrest of that region has received less attention than it merits—the problem of the Arab refugees. There is much to be said for both the Arab and the Israeli views on this matter—and there is much understanding that can be gained by taking them well into mind. For the concern and consideration of my colleagues, under unanimous consent, I ask to reprint two articles, the first, Forgotten People, These, and the second, Israel's Side of Refugee Problem, in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for this date. I have received requests from distinguished constituents of the 11th District of Indiana that both of these commentaries be thus made available.

The two articles follow:

FORGOTTEN PEOPLE, THESE: ARAB REFUGEES STILL HOPEFUL OF RETURNING HOME

(By R. H. Shackford)

Nimer Muhammad Shurbaji was born in Jaffa, Palestine, 36 years ago. Today he is one of the 900,000 homeless, stateless Arab refugees—innocent victims of the creation of the State of Israel.

The Israel-Arab war forced him to flee his home in April 1948. He and his growing family—a wife and six children, the oldest 10—have lived in refugee camps ever since. The last 5 years the family has existed in 2 rooms in Magazi camp on the Gaza Strip with 7,900 other Arab refugees.

Before 1948 Nimer Muhammad Shurbaji was relatively well off. He owned his home in Jaffa and worked for the Palestine Post Office. Now he hasn't worked for 8 years and is wholly dependent on United Nations relief for bare subsistences.

WAITS

He waits and waits and waits with hundreds of thousands of others just outside Israel's frontiers—still hoping to go back to his home which long since has been occupied by Israeli settlers. He feels grievously wronged.

How much longer will Nimer Muhammad Shurbaji suffer patiently in misery? Maybe not very long. U. N. refugee officials report ominous rumblings among the Arab refugees who talk about staging a mass march back home in June.

Such action could present Israel—still seeking Jewish immigrants from all over the world—a more formidable challenge than an Egyptian army attack.

"Who could stop them if they decided to March?" a U. N. official asked. "You can't shoot hundreds of thousands of people."

Of all the obstacles which block peace in the Middle East, none is so great as the Arab refugees from Palestine. They live in idleness and poverty. About 40 percent of the 900,000 are in camps or tents just outside the borders of what was once home but now is hostile Israel.

ROOM

For 8 years they have waited to go home. The Israelis don't want them; they haven't room even for the Jewish immigrants. The Arab States don't want them.

Settlement of this refugee problem would do more than any other single thing to reduce tension and open the door to Arab-Israel peace. But a new generation of Arab refugees—the population increases 25,000 each year—is growing up, fed on bitterness, hatred, and revenge.

These are forgotten people. The United Nations spends only about $27 a year per person to keep these Arabs alive. Ironically, creation of Israel stemmed partly from a desire to provide a refuge for the Jewish victims of Hitler. Solution of that refugee problem only created another.

Many of these wretched people can look across the border to their former lands and villages. They can watch the new Jewish settlers building a homeland on their old farms and in their old cities.

STATISTICS

Some of the statistics are startling:

Within a couple of years, more than 50 percent of the Arab refugees will be under 15 years of age.

There are about 60,000 pregnancies each year and 35,000 deaths.

There are 905,986 registered with the U. N. as refugees. Of these, about 350,000 live in refugee camps, the rest with relatives or friends or in other accommodations.

Last year 831,794 persons were on U. N. ration rolls. Their 1,500-calorie ration is bare subsistence.

The United States and Britain contribute about 90 percent of the U. N. relief costs.

In the Gaza Strip—5 miles wide and 25 miles long—the refugees (214,601) for outnumber the local population (95,000).

Time and again the United Nations has called on Israel to make a move to end this desperate situation. But no action has been taken.

PROPOSAL

A proposed solution was set forth in a 1948 U. N. Assembly resolution—that Israel offer the Arab refugees a chance to return to their homes, or give those who do not want to return financial compensation for their lost properties.

Israel says the return of any substantial numbers of Arabs to Israel is impossible because they would create a security problem. Certainly many Arabs would be unfriendly to the new Israel Zionists.

The Arab nations, on whose land the refugees are now camped, say they don't want them because they will compete for scarce arable fields, food and jobs. The Arabs have used these pitiful people as political pawns in diplomacy.

U. N. officials say relatively few of the refugees would want to return because Israel would insist that they become Israeli citizens. But the refugees feel Israel must make the offer, to recognize the wrong done them and acknowledge their rights. Then Israel must be ready to compensate the refugees for their property.

COMPENSATION

Compensation, if ever started, is an even greater problem. Israel insists the properties of the Arab refugees have a value of only $35 million; the Arabs say their loss is $1,300,000,000; the United Nations estimate the cost of compensation at about $300,000,000. The most optimistic admit it would take about 5 years to identify the properties and pay off—assuming the legal tangles could be unsnarled.

Neutral observers agree not even a start to break the logjam can come until Israel makes the first move. Once Israel is prepared to make concessions, resettlement efforts can begin in earnest. Israel could use limited numbers of Arabs for agriculture since most of the Jews who migrated to Israel are city folks. The Arab nations must concede that they can use many of the refugees, too.

OUTLOOK

The best outlook for starting new lives for the greatest number of Arab refugees depends on such projects as the Jordan River development program—one that would bring untold benefits to both Israel and the Arab nations, as well as the refugees.

The United States has offered, in effect, to finance not only the compensation of Arab refugees but most of the cost of the Jordan plan. If Arab and Jew would only agree to cooperate on this, it would be worth a lot of American dollars to get it going.

But so far hatred and suspicion prevail over common sense.

ISRAEL'S SIDE OF REFUGEE PROBLEM

(By Julian Freeman, past president, National Council of Jewish Federations and Welfare Funds)

The plight of the Arab refugees, deplorable as it may be, is but one tragic facet of our intricate problem. Our concern should not blind us to the basic problems of the Middle East: The need for peace and the need for stimulating the too long delayed economic and social development of this backward corner of the globe. We should see clearly which are the forces of peace and social order and which are the forces of war and suppression.

Let's look at the whole situation, and not just what's in the headlines.

Israel is not just a new state—carved out of old neighbors. Palestine, Syria, Lebanon, Saudi Arabia, Transjordania all were brought into being almost simultaneously since 1919 upon the dismemberment of the Ottoman Empire. The mandate Britain received over Palestine was conditioned upon the establishment there of a Jewish homeland. Their borders were based on the administrative requirements of Britain and France.

All of these states have in varying degree some identification with the ancient Middle East. But they are in their present form all new states—all phenomena of the 20th Century.

The crisis in the Middle East today still stems from the absolute refusal by the Arabs to accept in any way the principle of a Jewish national homeland in Palestine.

On November 29, 1947, the United Nations decided upon the partition of Palestine. The United Nations established an independent Jewish State and an independent Arab State. There were ample precedents for such solutions. The United Nations arrived at the same decision in India and Pakistan; the same solution was arrived at in Ireland.

Flaunting the United Nations decision, the Arab States from without Palestine launched

a full-scale invasion of the newly established Israel—the purpose, as the Arab League's general secretary put it, "to throw the Jews to the bottom of the Mediterranean Sea."

In various announcements the Arab Higher Committee urged all Palestinian Arabs to leave Israel upon the final withdrawal of British troops and clearly intimated that those Arabs who remained and accepted Israeli protection would be regarded as renegades.

Al-Hoda, the Lebanese newspaper published in the United States, described it: "As the time for the British withdrawal grew nearer, the zeal of the Arab League was redoubled. * * * Brotherly advice was given to the Arabs of Palestine, urging them to leave their land, homes, and property. * * * The Palestinian Arabs had no choice but to obey the advice of the league."

At the same time independent and impartial sources point out that the Israeli authorities did all in their power to convince the Arab civilian population to remain.

The London Economist in October, 1948, describing the pressures by the Arab Higher Committee on the Arab populace of Palestine to flee stated, "During the subsequent day the Israeli authorities * * * urged all Arabs to remain * * * and guaranteed them protection and security * * *."

On April 26, 1948, a high-ranking British police officer reported to British headquarters in Jerusalem: "Every effort is being made to persuade the Arab population to stay and carry on with their normal lives * * * and to be assured that their lives and interests will be safe."

Two days later the same officer reported, "The Jews are still making every effort to persuade the Arab population to remain and settle back to their normal lives in the town."

The Arab war against Israel ended in Israel's victory.

If the partition resolution of the United Nations had been accepted without war, the State of Israel would have had an Arab population of 397,000 or 42 percent of its then population of 1,550,000. The 150,000 Arabs who remained in Israel (now grown to 200,000) have been completely integrated as first-class citizens.

Not a single Jew now lives in any part of Palestine that fell under Arab rule. Syria expelled all of its Jewish population and confiscated all of their property. Iraq's pressures on its Jewish population forced their mass exodus to Israel. Their property was largely confiscated by the government.

Today 895,000 refugees stand idle in Arab refugee camps as a tragic aftermath of a war started by the Arab States to destroy Israel. Today, too, nearly one-half million Jewish refugees from Arab lands are active, vital citizens of Israel.

Can the Arab States absorb these refugees who are of the same culture, the same religion, the same traditions, and the same language? Let the facts speak for themselves.

According to Iraq's own experts, Iraq has "immense areas of cultivable land unused because of lack of workers." These experts believe that the full development of Iraq requires more than 3 million additional workers.

Syria, according to the Royal Institute of International Affairs, can absorb well over 200,000 refugees. In 1951 Syrian officials requested from Egypt a half million Egyptian agricultural workers to emigrate to Syria to develop Syrian land which would be transferred to them. Egypt refused because of an agricultural labor shortage.

The Jordan Valley Authority (the Johnston plan), serving both sides of the Jordan, can, according to American agricultural authorities, solve the entire refugee problem.

But Egypt, Lebanon, Syria, Iraq, and Saudi Arabia refuse to allow refugees to become citizens or to find productive jobs. Of the $700 million the Arab States have received from oil resources, not $1 has been used to ameliorate the condition of the refugees. Syria bears the responsibility for holding up the Johnston plan.

As part of an overall peace settlement, Israel has accepted the principle of compensation for the Arab refugees that fled. Israel has agreed to the Johnston plan. Israel has never said that it would not consider absorbing some of the Arab refugees, but it has stated repeatedly that the problem must be considered as part of an overall peace settlement.

However, Israel cannot ignore the intent of the Arab States to use the Arab refugees as a fifth column in Israel. As a former Egyptian Foreign Minister stated, "Let it be known and appreciated that in demanding the restoration of the refugees to Palestine the Arabs intend that they return as masters of the homeland and not as slaves. More explicitly, they intend to annihilate the State of Israel."

As part of an overall peace settlement Israel has offered Jordan the use of free port facilities at Haifa. It has offered to allow the Arab States to establish communications across its territory. Israel has furthermore indicated a willingness to consider minor border adjustments.

Israel has consistently sought peace. Again and again it has offered to sit down at the peace table with the Arabs. Its only stipulation has been that all the problems must be discussed together and resolved at the peace table. The interrelationship of the problems makes them inseparable.

The Arabs refuse to negotiate peace with Israel on any terms. They refuse to recognize the fact of Israel's existence. They maintain a naval blockade and an economic boycott of Israel. They have closed the Suez Canal to Israeli and Israeli-bound shipping.

The chief obstacle in the way of peace is the intransigent refusal of the Arabs to negotiate in any degree with Israel. The plight of the refugees can be directly ascribed to this refusal.

Juvenile Delinquency: Its Cure

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK J. BECKER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 5, 1956

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Speaker, in these days when we hear so much about juvenile delinquency, it comes as a welcome note to find such an outstanding youngster as Joseph Casson of Freeport, Long Island, N. Y., a student at Holy Redeemer School, who appreciates and has evaluated so meaningfully for all of us those responsibilities which rightfully accrue to us all in trying to eliminate this blight of our age. I feel that this prize-winning essay makes worthwhile reading for everyone. I submit the essay as it appeared in the Brooklyn Tablet under the date of June 24, 1956:

The article follows:

JUVENILE DELINQUENCY: ITS CURE

(By Joseph Casson)

All children are born good but yet somewhere between the age of reason and adulthood there has been the necessity of the use of the phrase "juvenile delinquent." Juvenile meaning youth and delinquent bad.

The words don't seem to fit together somehow, yet they constitute the perfect title for many young Americans. In our land of rights and freedoms these words have been able to find their place. This group ranges from the small child who pilfers pennies to the 18-year-old who steals cars. Although it may seem unfair to put these two cases in the same category, it is necessary because the delinquent who stole the car is the result of the boy who pilfered the pennies, unchastised

This condition prevails in every locality, although some refuse to believe this fact. In many places the question "What can we do about it?" has come up.

ANSWER IS IN THE HOME

The answer to this problem may puzzle some, but the solution is clear to most of our citizens. These people know that the real answer lies in proper religious training and fine upbringing in the home. But these two factors alone cannot fully equip a boy or girl to withstand the powerful evil influences that lead to delinquency. Their lives must also be occupied with sports, hobbies, and other after-school activities that will both interest their minds and develop their bodies, thus leaving no time or even the desire for evil activities.

Delinquency involves everyone and therefore should not be fought only by a select few. The saying "in unity there is strength" can be applied not only to wartime tactics but also to combating the forces of evil prevalent in our times. All persons, the home, the school and the community, each doing its part, must cooperate in this fight against delinquency.

But such a victory will not be won easily. It will be a long, slow fight, but if people are willing to take the time and effort to correct the wrongs of our teen-age group, their efforts will not be in vain.

We should endeavor to realize the fact that as there are numerous causes of juvenile delinquency, so, too, we must use many different methods to combat it.

First and foremost, the parents should shoulder their responsibility by exacting obedience in the home and fostering a respect for all authority. They should show affection for their children and thus gain their confidence.

The school, too, must play its part in teaching high standards of conduct. The community in which the child lives can be a source of good by establishing wholesome means of recreation for youth.

Lastly, our strongest weapon against this evil of delinquency should be religion, for it stands to reason that a child who has been taught to obey the Ten Commandments of God will find it much easier to appreciate and obey the laws of his country.

Delinquency: Adult and Juvenile

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 5, 1956

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, a young lady in my congressional district, Lorraine Butler, an eighth-grade student at St. Aidan's School in Williston Park, N. Y., has written such an outstanding essay on juvenile delinquency I ask that it be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for all my colleagues to read.

Lorraine's essay, which appeared in the Brooklyn Tablet of June 24, 1956, won a well-deserved prize in the annual contest conducted by the Cardinal Mercier General Assembly, fourth degree, Knights of Columbus, among all eighth-grade students of parochial schools in Nassau and Suffolk Counties, N. Y.:

(By Lorraine Butler)

Juvenile delinquency is a terrifyng reality. It frightens children, parents, teachers, leaders in our community, State, and even National Governments. Each tends to accuse the other of being more responsible for the desperate situation. Yet, in a way, each is responsible.

What is juvenile delinquency? It is lawlessness, disregard for the rights of others, dishonesty, hatred, and almost everything that is evil in the adult world reduced to juvenile scale.

A child must learn by example. He should be told that standards of right and wrong do not vary.

If it is wrong for a child to lie, why then should he be forced to listen to the "white lies" of his parents? If it is wrong for a child to steal, it is also wrong for politicians to accept bribes. If it is wrong for a child to cheat, how can one explain a dishonest income tax return? If it is wrong for a child to hate, how can an adult explain the gossip and bad will that the child senses in the adult world?

Opposed to evil is love. Bishop Sheen has said, "God is love and love is God." A heart full of love is left without room for hate. Love is found in the Gospels, Epistles, Scriptures, Commandments, and in the corporal and spiritual works of mercy. We can put love to work through the slogan of Father Keller, "You can change the world." We can change it through love.

A parent's love is not shown through extravagant gifts and large allowances. These things do not help in developing the character, happiness, and personality of the child.

A parent will show his love by giving the child his time rather than his money, his example rather than his gifts. To win the love of a child you must first command his respect. When a child loves and respects his parents he will try to please them by good conduct.

Teachers and Government leaders, too, should realize the importance of God in fighting juvenile delinquency. Today there is a tendency to omit God in classrooms and Government. Educators confuse freedom of religion with freedom from religion. This was not the intention of our forefathers. The preamble of the Constitution speaks of "God-given rights." Lincoln said: "This country under God shall have a new birth of freedom," and Washington prayed for guidance at Valley Forge.

There is only one cure for the evils of juvenile delinquency and that is the love synonymous with God. Clubs, youth forums, and youth organizations will be of no avail if they are not based and conducted on Christ's principle "love one another."

In these words lies the cure for all delinquency—national, adult, and juvenile.

The VFW Bill of Rights for Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 5, 1956

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, in view of the great interest displayed recently by so many Members of the House with respect to veterans' compensation and pension, I think they would be interested in hearing about an unusual document printed in the July issue of the VFW magazine, the official publication of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States. The document to which I refer is a bill of rights for veterans. It is unusual in that it asks no special favors or pension benefits for the able-bodied veterans of past wars, and no favors for veterans who are financially independent of the need for Government medical care or hospitalization.

Every policy enunciated in the VFW bill of rights for veterans makes it quite clear that the VFW yields to none in its concern for the obligations of citizenship. In fact, those persons who preach the catch phrase of "citizens first, veterans second" should be the first to endorse this bill of rights—that is, if they are honestly concerned with the Nation's future.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I insert in the Appendix of the RECORD the following VFW bill of rights for veterans:

THE VFW BILL OF RIGHTS FOR VETERANS

We, the members of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, having served honorably in the Armed Forces of the United States on foreign soil or in hostile waters during some war or campaign in which the United States has been engaged, and believing that honorable service in the Armed Forces of the United States constitutes extraordinary service as citizens entitling them to special consideration for special services rendered; in order to strengthen the faith of future generations of Americans in their citizenship obligations, insure continued reverence for the sacrifices of our Nation's honored dead and preserve the people's concern for the welfare of those who have rendered honorable military service; do hereby ordain and establish this bill of rights for America's veterans:

"ARTICLE I

"To provide liberal monthly compensation payments for service-incurred disabilities ranging from 10 percent to 100 percent, and where the disability results from combat the monthly payment shall be increased by 25 percent of the amount otherwise due and payable.

"ARTICLE II

"To provide unlimited and first-class hospitalization or domiciliary care and medical treatment, including outpatient treatment, for those veterans suffering from service-incurred disabilities for which they are in need of treatment; necessary hospitalization or domiciliary care and medical treatment where beds are available, as well as outpatient treatment, for other veterans who are unable to pay for private treatment with a priority of admission extending to (1) veterans with combat service, (2) veterans with overseas service, and (3) to any other otherwise eligible war veteran.

"ARTICLE III

"To provide a liberal system of survivor benefits, including monthly death compensation payments to the widow, orphans, and dependent parents of those servicemen who die in the service, or who later die as a result of service-incurred disabilities.

"ARTICLE IV

"To provide educational aid and assistance to the orphans of those servicemen who die in service, or who later die as the result of wartime service-incurred disabilities.

"ARTICLE V

"To provide a pension program for the disabled and aging veterans of World War I subject to age and/or disability requirements, as well as a modest income limitation.

"ARTICLE VI

"To provide for a liberalization of the pension program payable to World War II and Korean veterans, subject to age, disability, and income limitations; together with a continuation of the existing pension program applicable to Spanish-American War veterans.

"ARTICLE VII

"To provide for a continuation and liberalization of the monthly pension payments applying to the widows and orphans of deceased war veterans, with the same eligibility requirements for the widows and orphans of World War I, World War II, and Korea.

"ARTICLE VIII

"To liberallize the payment of a burial benefit, as well as the issuance of an American flag to drape the casket, in the case of all deceased war veterans who were discharged under conditions other than dishonorable.

"ARTICLE IX

"To continue and strengthen the modest preferences for war veterans, wives of badly disabled war veterans, widows of deceased war veterans and certain mothers of service-deceased war veterans in the Federal classified civil service.

"ARTICLE X

"To provide a system of readjustment benefits, including educational aid and training; business, home and farm loans; and and unemployment compesation for a reasonable period of time to veterans of each war in which the United States becomes engaged."

Thirty-fourth Annual Slovak Day, Wilkes-Barre, Pa., July 4, 1956

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 5, 1956

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address:

ADDRESS BY MR. FLOOD AT 34TH ANNUAL SLOVAK DAY HELD AT SANS SOUCI PARK JULY 4, 1956, WILKES-BARRE, PA.

Reverend chairman, clergy, the route from Washington to Wilkes-Barre and return covers a little over 500 miles. My willingness to travel that distance to address this splendid gathering is in some small way a measure of my esteem for the thousands of Americans of Slovak extraction living in the congressional district which I have the high honor to represent at the seat of our Federal Government. It is a rare privilege for me to be here, and I am grateful to Father Matircho and his committee for extending me this gracious invitation.

This occasion in reality is a quadruple celebration. This day marks the 34th annual Slovak Day in historic Wyoming Valley and it is the 180th anniversary of the signing of the American Declaration of Independence. Moreover, this year also marks the 150th anniversary of the incorporation of Wilkes-Barre, and for a span of over three-fifths of its incorporated life, Slovak immigrants and their descendants have played an outstanding role in the civic and cultural life of the community. You have also gath-

ered here to commemorate that great moment in history, when the intrepid and beloved Sts. Cyril and Methodius left Macedonia to bring the religion of Christ to your forefathers in the shadows of the Tatra Mountains more than 1,100 years ago. Just as the Irish venerate St. Patrick, the Poles cherish St. Stanislaus, and the Welsh revere St. David, so do the Slovaks pay deserved tribute to Methodius, first bishop of their beloved Nitra, and to his scholarly brother Cyril, the inventor of the first Slavic alphabet.

And it is particularly fitting that Slovaks should combine a religious anniversary with a patriotic celebration. Anyone who knows them as well as I do, who has grown up with their descendants, is familiar with their magnificent history and has drunk deeply of their folklore in song and story, could not expect them to do otherwise.

For to a Slovak, religion and freedom are concomitant; love of country and devotion to God go hand in hand. In all of their turbulent and colorful history, Slovaks have held steadfastly to the faith, and no amount of oppression, however long or arduous, has been able to stamp out their yearning for liberty and freedom.

It is now more than 90 years that immigrants from the land of Slovakia began arriving in the United States in large numbers. But this land we now call America has felt the Slovak leaven long before the Civil War. Slovak ingenuity and craftsmenship were highly valued by the redoubtable Capt. John Smith, when on September 25, 1608 the sailing ship "God Speed" sailed into Jamestown harbor with 6 skilled craftsmen on board, 2 of whom, Juraj Mata and Jan Bogdan, were Slovaks. These men, with the 4 Poles, Lowicki, Stefanski, Zrenica, and Sadowski, came in answer to an urgent plea by Captain Smith to his London agents, to "send 30 carpenters, blacksmiths, and bricklayers rather than a thousand of the kind we have here." It was largely due to the skilled efforts of these craftsmen that the Jamestown colony was able to secure a foothold on the American continent.

And in the War of the Revolution, Slovak love of liberty was exemplified in the military exploits of Count Maurice Benovsky who served with Pulaski at Savannah and who was born in storied Nitra, that ancient See of St. Methodius. Shortly after the first shot was fired at Fort Sumter, Slovak immigrants living in Chicago, under the leadership of Gejza Michalovich, petitioned the President of the United States for permission to organize the Lincoln Brigade which served so valiantly on the side of the Union Army. Hundreds of Slovaks served in the United States forces in the Spanish American War, and of course, thousands were doughboys in World War I and more thousands served as GI's in World War II and Korea.

It is clear therefore, that the thread of slovak history in the New World is long and unbroken from earliest colonial times to the present. And nowhere have Slovak immigrants and their descendants taken firmer root than in the mining communities of northeastern Pennsylvania. Here the first Slovak churches were organized. Here were founded the first fraternal societies, and the earliest schools, social groups and cultural organizations. The roots of the Slovaks are deep in the soil of Wyoming Valley, and it is heartening to recognized that the third and fourth generations are carrying on in the footsteps of the early arrivals.

When your Slovak forefathers disembarked at Ellis Island by the thousands in the period between 1860 and 1895, it was not just chance that saw them endowed with solid potentials for American citizenship. For one quality they had in abundance—faith. Religion for them was not an isolated phenomenon; their devotion to God was an integral part of their lives and the more than 300 parishes in America founded by Slovaks and their descendants serve as eloquent testimony to a rich spiritual heritage. And it was this very heritage, coupled with the Slovakian love for liberty that enabled the early pioneer leaders, the Furdeks, the Rovnianeks, the Novomeskys, the Jankolas and their later compatriots like Murgas, Onda, Porubsky, and Mamatej—to integrate themselves so firmly in our American democracy and imbue their followers with the essentials of loyal citizenship. A good Slovak could not help but be a good American because he has always known his true relationship with God. Like the 56 men who prepared and signed our Declaration of Independence, your pioneer Slovak forefathers knew that man is a creation of God and is graced with qualities that are his, at birth, as a special gift from God.

In these days of intellectual and moral confusion, we ought to ponder the illustrious words that comprise the Declaration of Independence. Nations come and go in history, their real strength powered by a spiritual dynamism. Their decay is rarely the product of material deterioration or defeat in armed conflict. These are just results, not causes. A nation really decays when it begins to weaken its spiritual motivation. To exist, a nation must have faith in its traditions if it is to have faith in itself. All lovers of liberty can well emulate those doughty inhabitants of Slovakia today. Notwithstanding the pratings of dictators and the mouthings of Communist bosses, the gallant sons and daughters of Slovakia know there is no substitute for true democracy, even if it is enclosed in an attractive package with a red wrapper on it.

It is indeed heart-rending to contemplate the cruel Communist yoke under which the 3½ million Slovaks in the old country are constrained to live their lives. But knowing the Slovaks as I do, I know that the glory of Slovakia will not long be dimmed, and that the Slovaks unquenchable thirst for liberty, freedom and democracy will prevail. Just as liberty-loving Slovaks have refused to live under enslavement by the Turks, Magyars, and other conquerors, so will they in the end repudiate the hammer and the sickle for the torch of liberty. I proclaim this confidently: The flaming spirit of the Slovaks that nurtured the magnificent Janosik, whose exploits live in song and story, will no more yield to Communist domination than the Janosiks succumbed to thei oppressors. You thousands of Americans of Slovak descent should take heart and have abiding faith, for you have come from ancestors who have rejected enslavement of the spirit even when the flesh was in bondage.

My friends, in these turbulent days of the mid-twentieth century, we Americans can hold our heads high, humbly proud in the knowledge of the heritage that is America. That heritage is in good hands when it is entrusted to the likes of the more than 1½ million Americans of Slovak descent. You can have no nobler destiny as Americans than this, that following in the footsteps of your intrepid pioneer ancestors, and heeding the example of the framers of the Declaration of Independence, you too hold aloft the banner of freedom, love of God and sound Americanism.

Party Rule in Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD M. SIMPSON
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 5, 1956

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, President Eisenhower, in his state of the Union message delivered on January 6, 1955, referred to the fact that the Democrat Party, as a result of the 1954 elections, was responsible for the organization of both Houses of Congress. He said:

Our quest for peace and freedom necessarily presumes that we who hold positions of public trust must rise above self and section—that we must subordinate to the general good our partisan, and our personal pride and prejudice. Tirelessly, with united purpose, we must fortify the material and spiritual foundations of this land of freedom. As never before, there is need for unhesitating cooperation among the branches of our Government.

At this time the executive and legislative branches are under the management of different political parties. This fact places both parties on trial before the American people.

In less perilous days of the past, division of governmental responsibility among our great parties has at times produced indecision approaching futility. We must not let this happen in our time. We must avoid a paralysis of the will for peace and international security.

Now in the traditionally bipartisan areas—military security and foreign relations—I can report to you that I have already, with the present leaders of this Congress, exchanged assurances of unreserved cooperation. Yet, the security of our country requires more than maintenance of military strength and success in foreign affairs; these vital matters are in turn dependent upon concerted and vigorous action in a number of supporting programs.

As the session draws to a close, observers of the congressional scene are examining the record of "both parties on trial before the American people." The record clearly shows that this has been a do-nothing Congress. It has accomplished little toward the advancement of President Eisenhower's comprehensive program.

Mr. Speaker, the July 4 issue of Newsweek contains an article by its distinguished columnist, Raymond Moley, which reviews the support afforded the President's program by the Members of this body on those issues where the party lines were drawn. Mr. Moley divides the issues before the Congress into two groups. The first includes those issues on which the party leaders were united in supporting the President. These issues do not reflect party support for the President's program. The other group of issues are those on which the Republican and Democrat leaders of the House were divided and were attempting to rally their followers either in support or in opposition to the President's program.

On these issues, which included the farm bill, the tax bill, and the atomic energy revision of 1954, the parties were sharply divided. The Republicans did support President Eisenhower, and the Democrats were united in their opposition to him.

A review of the votes on the divided issues clearly shows the necessity for the election of a Republican Congress in November. The President must be given the opportunity to complete his program for peace and prosperity during the next 4 years. This can only be accomplished with a Republican Congress.

Mr. Moley has provided every precinct worker with facts which should assist him in convincing his neighbors that they have a responsibility to go to the polls and elect a Republican Congress in November.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the text of Mr. Moley's article in the July 4 issue of Newsweek may be included in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

The article follows:

PARTY RULE IN CONGRESS

(By Raymond Moley)

Last week I presented in this space a study of voting in the United States Senate in the 83d Congress and in the 1st session of the 84th Congress. This study was concentrated on the votes on issues in which the leadership in the two parties were definitely in opposition to each other—in short, on issues on which the party line was sharply drawn. The record showed that there is genuine two-party government in the Senate. My conclusion from this is that, since President Eisenhower has clearly defined himself as a Republican who believes in party discipline and loyalty, these votes show the degree to which the President if reelected can expect cooperation from Democrats. This disposes of the fallacy that Mr. Eisenhower would do about as well with a Democratic Congress as with a Republican Congress.

This week I shall show that the same situation prevails in the House as in the Senate.

DOWN THE LINE

During the 83d Congress there were 147 yea-and-nay rollcalls, and in 39 of these there was a genuine party division in which Majority Leader HALLECK and Whip ARENDS were opposed by Minority Leader RAYBURN and Whip MCCORMACK. Among those issues were agriculture, atomic energy, and taxes.

The individual positions taken by members who voted on those issues totaled 15,708. Republicans who followed their party leadership accounted for 6,832 of those positions, and Republicans who opposed their leaders accounted for 1,252. Democrats following their leaders accounted for 6,023 positions, and Democrats crossed the party lines on 1,601.

The same pattern was followed in the 1st session of the 84th Congress. Here, since the speakership changed hands, my guides for leadership are the votes of Minority Leader MARTIN, and HALLECK and ARENDS on the Republican side and of Majority Leader MCCORMACK and Whip ALBERT. Members took 9,595 positions on 23 issues on which the party line was drawn. There were 3,499 Republican positions in support of their Republican leadership and 966 Republican positions across the lines. Democratic positions supporting their leadership were 4,361, with 769 deviations.

It is interesting to note that the party in control seemed to have better control of its Members than its opposition had in both Congresses.

In the 1st session of the 84th Congress the Republican Party's leadership received perfect support from Representatives ALLEN of Illinois, BENTLEY, BUDGE, CLEVENGER, COLE, GAMBLE, KILBURN, REED of New York, TABER, WILLIAMS of New York, LAIRD, UTT, and SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. On only one issue did the following deviate: BATES, WIGGLESWORTH, CEDERBERG, DONDERO, FORD, HOFFMAN of Michigan, MEADER, THOMPSON of Michigan, WOLCOTT, DAVIS of Wisconsin, GWINN, DEROUNIAN, ST. GEORGE, JACKSON, YOUNGER, KING of Pennsylvania, MUMMA, MCGREGOR, MASON, VURSELL, REECE of Tennessee, SCRIVNER, and DEVEREUX.

On the Democratic side, the nondeviators were ADDONIZIO, RODINO, TUMULTY, STEED, ANFUSO, BUCKLEY, CELLER, DAVIDSON, DOLLINGER, KLEIN, POWELL, ROONEY, ZELENKO, ASHLEY, VANIK, BAILEY, BURNSIDE, BLATNIK, BOLLING, CARNAHAN, CHRISTOPHER, BOYLE, KARSTEN, GORDON, KLUCZYNSKI, MURRAY of Illinois, PRICE, DIGGS, GRIFFITHS, LESINSKI, MACHROWICZ, RABAUT, DOYLE, KING of California, MILLER of California, MOSS, SHELLEY, ELLIOTT, METCALF, PFOST, PERKINS, and REUSS.

CROSSING THE LINE

The extent to which Republican leadership and the President enjoyed Democratic support is shown by the number of times certain Democrats voted with Republican leadership. But the number of the cases in which those certain Democrats crossed party lines indicates that they were only about as helpful to the President as the Republicans who were most likely to desert their leadership. Among those Democrats who helped the President, most were from Virginia and Texas.

This record of party cohesion should induce both Republicans and Democrats to labor just as hard to elect a Congress of their party as a President. A President is entitled to a sympathetic and responsive Congress. That makes for responsible government.

Numbers Aren't Strength

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD C. OSTERTAG

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 5, 1956

Mr. OSTERTAG. Mr. Speaker, in the current debate over the adequacy of our Armed Forces and programs, the New York Times has ably pinpointed the crux of the matter. Numbers are not strength. We need overall strength in our Military Establishment, and it should be balanced strength. But it is as dangerous and unwise to try to outbuild the Russians in every category of weapons as it is to try to oppose them at every spot on the globe where they instigate disorders. Let us not be talked into a national anxiety neurosis by politicians in or out of uniform.

Under leave to extend my remarks, Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD the aforementioned editorial from today's New York Times, entitled "Numbers Aren't Strength":

NUMBERS AREN'T STRENGTH

Presumably everybody involved in the argument over B–52's agrees that for the security of the free world and the safety of the United States we have to maintain armed forces that, in the large, are inferior to none. The military menace of Communist imperialism is just as great as ever, in some ways made even more dangerous by the progression from a cold into a smiling war. The United States can and must continue to build its strength to preserve a fully balanced armed force ready to meet potential Communist aggression in the form of either a nuclear or a conventional war. The only way to insure against such a development is a well-rounded preparedness that is not based upon anybody's pet theory or any statesman's pet politics or any service's pet propaganda.

The advocates of a speed-up and expansion of B–52 (heavy jet bomber) construction may be right. But if they are, it isn't because the United States must exceed Russia in every category of the entire weapons arsenal. We may need more B–52's (or any other type of arm) than we are getting, in order to bring our whole defense posture into better balance. We don't need them just to prove that we can outbuild the Russians, or just to be able to say that we have more heavy jet bombers than the Russians have.

The cardinal point to remember in the argument over the size of our Air Force (as over the size and relative strength of each of the other services) is that our country doesn't need to prove its superiority in numbers of weapons. With our allies, we do have to have superiority, and to maintain that superiority in total strength and in total readiness for any kind of armed conflict. There is a big difference between numbers and strength; and it is one that some generals and some politicians evidently need to be reminded of again and again.

A Minister Looks at the New Russia, by Rev. David H. Newson, Watchung Presbyterian Church

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 5, 1956

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include a timely and significant article by Rev. David H. Newson which appeared in the Independent Press of Bloomfield, N. J., on June 21, 1956:

A MINISTER LOOKS AT THE NEW RUSSIA

(By Rev. David H. Newson, Watchung Presbyterian Church)

I'm exicted about the new Russia, Krushchev's denunciation of Stalin is a turning point in history if I ever saw one—not that Khrushchev or any of the other leaders in Russia look upon it as such. To them it is just another tactic to dupe their own people and to outwit the world. The Russian bear has not become a lamb, it has simply killed one of its cubs—a cub who was taking more than his share of the honeycomb. Why then am I so excited and why do I think this is a turning point in history? Because this tactic no matter what its objective may be, has recognized the popular appeal for moral structures in society and has condemned the immoral structure of the old regime. I am not saying that the present leaders intend to pursue their objectives now on a moral foundation. I am only saying that they have seen the need to pretend to do so and this is something which to me speaks volumes concerning the state of affairs in the heart of the common people of Russia.

It leads me to believe that there must have been emerging in Russia in the last

few years a powerful universal feeling of nausea for the conduct of government by the Communist Party. I say nausea for the party rather than for Stalin—for Stalin had rather effectively set himself up as a hero and all his crimes were easily identified with lesser men and party committees. Of course with Stalin's death he was more a hero than ever but the party continued to bear the blame for the past and to accumulate it in the present until it felt compelled to seek out a scapegoat and channel off this rising tide of hate into a harmless reservoir. Stalin himself seemed the perfect choice. Choosing him they not only were able to destroy the myth of past heroes but also prevent new ones from emerging. Whether they have actually been able to channel off this rising tide of hatred in the direction of Stalin is a debatable question. At least it has instilled in the common man's heart the hope that things will go differently from now on. This whole action is demoniacally clever and I dare say they have high hopes—that is the party leaders—that their scheme will take care of the present generation and a new scapegoat can be found for the next.

One thing they overlook in their thesis. Granted hatred is an emotion which can be channeled off if given a suitable object but we who live in the moral climate of religion know that a moral structure is something which man hungers for. You may well get rid of his hate in periodic releases but you don't get rid of his hunger for love in the process. Marx taught that religion was the opiate of the people. This was a grave error. It is not an opiate but a food and a food which is essential to all men and they will seek after it desperately no matter who they are or where they live.

For some time communism represented a kind of religion—without the Communists knowing it. It had a creed, even a God—the common man, a discipline—demanding personal sacrifice and courageous action but it made the fatal mistake of presuming that the common man, once given his proper place in the sun would from out of himself produce a morality which would be the Kingdom of God itself. This never happened and never will happen and so communism which began as a kind of religion died as a religion and grew as a machine. This meant that it no longer satisfied, even within its own party membership the desperate need for the food of religion. Although the Communists have tolerated churches in Russia on the basis of an opiate for its people—in this toleration—its people have been fed—not an opiate but food. They have been fed not hatred but love, even although the structure of the Russian Orthodox Church has been drastically changed to conform to party wishes. The same is true of the Russian Baptist Churches. What I am saying is that the Kremlin is dealing with more than the force of hatred—it is dealing with the force of moral need—and they have not found a channel where this can flow off harmlessly.

One other observation. When they destroyed the myth of Stalin as a hero they did something else as well. I remember well a few years back when at Christmas time we heard that the Russian children were given Stalin to worship instead of Jesus Christ. This horrified me at the time but it comforts me now. Stalin did his best to become a God—a God by the way who did not have to be crucified. Now that they have destroyed him in that myth—there is a wonderful chance that our great hero—the Lord Jesus Christ might enter in to fill the dreadful vacuum. This is what excites me, for it is Jesus Christ who as always creates the turning points in history.

Appeasing Soviet Menace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 5, 1956

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I want to call to the attention of the Congress an article appearing in the Newark News on July 1, 1956, entitled "Appraising Soviet Menace." Mr. Arthur Sylvester's analysis of the status of NATO and of the threats posed by the new Soviet tactics is, I believe, excellent and worthy of our attention.

APPRAISING SOVIET MENACE—SECRETARY DULLES' SOMEWHAT ROSY VIEWS CONTRASTED TO THOSE EXPRESSED BY GENERAL GRUENTHER

(By Arthur Sylvester)

WASHINGTON.—How you view the state of the world today depends on where you sit.

If you sat in the State Department auditorium last week and listened to Secretary Dulles' press conference, things sounded great. So far as communism in the Soviet Union, its satellites, and in the world ouside was concerned, it seemed as if all we had to do was sit back and wait for the apple to fall in our lap.

But if you sat with the governors of the 48 States and 5 Territories in Atlantic City, as this correspondent did, and heard Gen. Alfred M. Gruenther, NATO commander, it sounded as if we are in much greater peril than Mr. Dulles suggested. The burden of General Gruenther's remarks was that Soviet "sinister dedication" still confronted the West with most dangerous possibilities despite the new smiles it is wreathed in.

The unusual presence of television cameras at Mr. Dulles' press conference, taken in conjunction with the prepared statement the secretary opened with, left no doubt that the optimistic character of his remarks represented a considered and propaganda viewpoint. The picture presented was one in which the Soviet Union, perplexed and at internal odds, has been suffering lean years so far as victories in the cold war with the West is concerned.

Yet no such rosy view was sketched by General Gruenther. His recital of the strains on the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, whose defense he heads up, stressed the gains being made by the Soviet as a consequence of its new tactic. The general admitted that as of today NATO cannot fulfill its military mission of holding western Europe against a combined Communist attack that no one actually expects, much less exploit its political and economic potentialities.

OTHER DISTURBING FACTORS

But there are other disturbing factors Mr. Dulles chose to omit. The new mild attitude of the Moscow Communists has made their penetration of the world outside the Iron Curtain vastly easier in Asia and the Middle East. In the latter region the Soviet simply leaped over the NATO defense barrier to woo Egypt with an arms deal and economic offers.

Thus in the area most vital to the Atlantic nations the Russians have achieved an advantage they never had before, and one that is obviously being exploited with great danger to the West. The implications of Egypt's arms deal with the Soviet bloc and the growing uncertainty about oil supplies from the Middle East have given the greatest concern to the British, if not to the United States Secretary.

Mr. Dulles minimized the renewed kissing-cousin relationship of Yugoslavia's Marshal Tito with the Kremlin leaders. But it's a factor a NATO commander cannot regard as a gain for the West. The Soviet smiles are making life difficult for General Gruenther in Greece, a NATO partner particularly important from the military standpoint, and in France where relaxation from defense burdens will be hard to resist if communism no longer appears aggressive, as Moscow is working to make it appear.

IN WEST GERMANY

In West Germany, Chancellor Konrad Adenauer's government has run into increasing opposition. General Gruenther emphasized to the governors, as he has done on other occasions, that the heart of the NATO defense against an attack from the east is the employment of atomic or hydrogen bombs against massed land forces.

The theory is to construct a military shield so impregnable that the Soviet Union would have to concentrate its forces to break through. Such concentrations would then become the natural target of atomic weapons. But a German contribution of at least 500,000 soldiers is needed before NATO can present so stout a defense line. It is the raising of forces of such magnitude that is giving Dr. Adenauer difficulty.

Probably it is inevitable that Messrs. Dulles and Gruenther should see the world scene in different lights. The Secretary's job is to create the conditions that allay the fear of war. The general's job is to prepare for the situation that would follow if the Secretary failed in his effort. Every time Mr. Dulles sees the world through rosy glasses it makes it more difficult for General Gruenther and his associates to convince NATO members, including the United States, that the Soviet menace persists and there should be no relaxation in military posture.

THE CASE OF ICELAND

The case of Iceland makes the point. It joined NATO in 1949 on the understanding no foreign troops were to be stationed there. Then came the Korean war with the evidence of Soviet and Red Chinese willingness to resort to violence. In the face of this Iceland consented to the establishment by the United States of NATO bases. These became a vital anchor in General Gruenther's defense system.

Now, with the Communist threat apparently receding and the fears born in 1950 allayed, Iceland wants the bases evacuated. From General Gruenther's standpoint, the loss of the Iceland bases would constitute a grave setback to his defense plans. But Mr. Dulles says, "Certainly, I would say it does not indicate any great victory for communism."

Federal Aid for School Construction

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ADAM C. POWELL, JR.

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 5, 1956

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following telegram from Mr. Clarence Mitchell, director,

Washington Bureau, NAACP, to the editor of the Washington Post and Times Herald, Tuesday, July 3, 1956:

THE EDITOR, THE WASHINGTON POST AND TIMES HERALD,
Washington, D. C.:

Had you attended the 1956 convention of the NAACP which met in San Francisco last week, I doubt that you would have written the second part of your editorial of July 2 entitled "School Encumbrance." At that convention we heard the stories of persons who have been fired from their jobs, personally intimidated and, in some cases, forced to flee to other communities for safety. These people have merely sought to encourage court action to implement the United States Supreme Court decision in the school cases. You would also have been able to talk with citizens from South Carolina, Georgia, and other States who would have told you that they reject the theory that new schools, even if Jim Crow, are better than what their children attend now. They rightly concluded that unless the Powell amendment is approved recalcitrants will use Federal funds to build totally segregated schools. Our delegates also passed a resolution declaring that those who opposed the Powell amendment are, in reality, voting to give money for what they know will be more segregation. When we strip this issue of all the fine words and lofty statements it is found to be this: Some are for the school bill for political reasons; others are for it because they sincerely want to see the children of the Nation go to classrooms in better buildings. In both instances, however, they are willing to sacrifice the civil rights of colored people in order to obtain these ends. No amount of editorial writing or speechmaking will change this dreadful truth.

CLARENCE MITCHELL,
Director, Washington Bureau, NAACP, Washington, D. C.

Questions for an American

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 2, 1956

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the following article by Donna M. Dickinson from the Christian Science Monitor of July 2, 1956, is must reading for every American.

QUESTIONS FOR AN AMERICAN
(By Donna M. Dickinson)

BANDUNG, INDONESIA.—The name of Lucy has a familiar ring to Indonesians, 80 million people whose skin colors range from golden beige to dusky cocoa to black. For any American visitor here there are embarrassing questions to answer.

In an English language class for labor leaders, a distinguished white-haired gentleman asked, "Is it possible to have a longer conversation period today?" Although he asked in a kindly way, I braced myself to face what was coming. "Why is it," he questioned with concern, "that Americans dislike colored people?"

A Javanese mother of four university students and the wife of one of Indonesia's 80 engineers asked, "Are there any brilliant Negroes?"

A third-generation Chinese Indonesian, who with the writing of his thesis will become the second in this country to gain a Ph. D. in nuclear physics queried, "I can't remember but which party is it—the Republican or the Democratic—which stands for segregation?"

The newspapers had been full of reports from Alabama—covering student riots and a faculty decision to oust one Negro girl who wanted an education at her State university. One editorial commented on the furor at Tuscaloosa, "Little do they realize that if there is anything that has disgraced their university finally and forever, it is their behavior."

Unlike most editorials on this theme, this one ends on a cheerful note, "It is well, too, that the hoodlums who started the riots do not have the unanimous backing of their fellow Americans. Indeed, even some of the newspapers in the United States are bitter in their condemnation of the Alabama affair."

From where I sat on the visiting instead of the home team's side, it all began to sound like Armageddon. Like Will Rogers, all I know is what I read in the papers and it seemed as if every street corner in the United States must have a crowd and 2 squaring off, 1 black and 1 white. Of course, it was only a small number of students and a large number of outsiders who rioted when Autherine Lucy tried to attend classes. And I am sure that many newspapers in the South as well as the North condemned the affair.

But Asians do not have this perspective. To those who live on this far island of Java the United States of America was founded on the proposition that all men are created equal. The existence of even a small minority who act like they do not believe this raises doubt in the minds of men whose skin is not white.

It is 2 years since the famous Supreme Court decision to reinterpret the 14th amendment—"nor shall any State * * * deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the law." This interpretation was lauded round the world. But it brought questions too. Why is it necessary for the highest court in the world's most famous democracy to make a statement that "separate but equal" schools are generally unequal? Does America have first- and second-class citizens?

For many months we have watched this daily preoccupation with the Negro question. Miss Lucy is one link in a long, long line. There have been reports that several legislatures will pass laws to protect their sovereign rights from infringement.

An inordinate interest was shown in the wolf-whistle lynching. In the words of one editor, "He is dead because he whistled at a white woman. Mind you—he whistled at her."

An officer of the NAACP was murdered and burned in his car on a lonely road in Texas.

The Indian ambassador to the United States was refused a table in an airport restaurant and ushered to "separate but equal" quarters in the back. "I didn't know he was an ambassador," the hostess explained.

Nat King Cole, whose records are sold in hundreds of Javan shops, was attacked on a Birmingham stage by six white men.

There have been accounts of a revival of daylight Ku Klux Klans, organized to "resist by all legal means, and without violence, any radical change in the southern way of life."

The questions is repeated, "How does the United States Government feel about Negroes?" Our Government is represented in the minds of Asians by the words and actions of all Americans.

A young Indonesian publisher on a State Department grant was waiting between trains in a southern station. He had heard about separate restroom accommodations. "But, still, I was a little surprised to see the signs," he said. "I started in the door of the colored restroom. But a man stopped me. He pointed to my black velvet pitchi hat and asked where I came from." Mr. G's eyes sparkled with amusement. "When I replied, Indonesia, he said, 'You go in the other door.'"

Sensitivity to this unalterable gift, the color of one's skin, has not been acquired recently. It came first with Hinduism and the caste system from ancient India in the first century A. D. and it has remained. The Brahman caste was the whitest and the group outside Hindu society—lower than the lowest—was the outcaste group and it was the darkest.

A beautiful Javanese mother told me, "You know I am too dark to be considered beautiful by own people. The whiteness of the skin is important here."

During colonial times if an Indonesian baby was light-skinned, friends would complicent the parents by saying—seperti belanda—like a Dutch baby.

At the Afro-Asian conference in Bandung in April 1955, one Indonesian newspaperman pointed out that in spite of the fact that this was "the prayer meeting of the colored peoples of the world," there were color lines drawn. The whitest people from the Near East were the most condescending. The very dark from Africa had little to say about the administration of the conference.

These are the sins of our fathers and their mercantile system of empire is plaguing us now to the third and fourth generation.

The American dream is still a vision of glory to the world. All the propaganda and prevarication of the cold war, even glimpses of incidents like Miss Lucy's, cannot change the wonder of it. There is a land of self-evident truth and equal men under God. The Indonesians want to believe and so the questions keep coming: "It is true that Negroes may only live in certain sections of your cities? Does the color of one's skin exclude one from certain jobs? Why do restaurants 'reserve the right to refuse service to anyone'? Is it true that in some States large numbers of Negroes are not allowed to vote? I know some Negroes are wealthy, but that isn't everything. Do they still feel inferior?"

It is a strange experience to stand out because of the color of one's skin. But now I know. I have experienced a poke which could have been intentional. I have experienced a discomfort at finding it necessary to defend and explain my country and an uneasiness at being outnumbered 1,000 to 3 in a crowd neither friendly nor hostile, and heartache when the husband of a friend refused to acknowledge an introduction.

Carlos Romulo has observed, "It is not enough that we have finally risen to the top. We must be mature enough to be nonviolent to the real minority of the world—the white people."

It is indeed a time for maturity and thought—for seeing ourselves as others see us. It is a time to act for right. Dreams cannot be built by men who only stand and wait. And it must be a time for nonviolence and prayer—a prayer taught us by one from a Middle Eastern country. "Forgive us our trespasses as we forgive those who trespass against us."

Inviting Air Collisions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 5, 1956

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I

include the following editorial from the Washington Post of Wednesday, July 4, 1956:

INVITING AIR COLLISIONS

In the aftermath of the air tragedy in the Grand Canyon, it is worth noting that the dillydallying of the administration over a second Washington airport is an invitation to similar accidents here. The hazard of midair plane collisions such as apparently occurred over Arizona had been regarded as negligible (though the danger increases with the amount of traffic, and the accident calls both for new exploration of the feasibility of a nationwide ground radar collision warning system in connection with current airways studies, and for another look at the safety of the Civil Aeronautics Administration practice of clearing planes to fly visually 1,000 feet above the weather roof). The hazard at the Washington National Airport, however, is real, obvious, and imminent.

Considering the restrictions on the traffic pattern, National is probably the most congested of any airport in the country. Good luck has complemented the extraordinarily skillful work of tower crews in preventing accidents. But the string of good luck cannot be expected to last, particularly with the advent of jet transports and the demand to cut down bad weather delays. The sensible way to minimize the chance of accident here is to proceed with construction of the Burke Airport, which has been recognized for more than 5 years as the only practicable solution.

So far the Department of Commerce has not forwarded the CAA's estimates to Congress, presumably out of a wish to avoid further budgetary burdens during fiscal 1957. But the Administration cannot consistently seek to improve the Nation's airways and yet refuse to take the most essential step for relief in Washington. Even if an appropriation were obtained now, it would be months before construction could start and years before there was any reduction of the load at National. Meanwhile congestion—and the accident hazard—will grow. To procrastinate further would be worse than shortsighted; it would be well nigh criminal.

Future Program of the Inter-American Bar Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANTE B. FASCELL
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 5, 1956

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I commend to my colleagues the recent address of William Roy Vallance, assistant legal adviser, Department of State, and Secretary General of the Inter-American Bar Association at the annual meeting of the Florida bar.

It was significantly appropriate that the future program of this inter-American organization was discussed in Florida. Florida has always been in the forefront in fostering and promoting the solidarity of South and North America. We in Florida have long had the realization that solidarity of the Western Hemisphere is the bulwark upon which rests the free world.

I am proud that this organization of the honored law profession has had the active support of my own bar associations of Dade County and Florida. I extend my congratulations and the good wishes of many constituents to Prof. David S. Stern, University of Miami School of Law, and Marshall J. Langer of the Dade and Florida Bar, who have been elected member of the council and Assistant Secretary General, respectively.

I am happy to bring to the attention of my colleagues in the House this report on the Inter-American Bar Association. Its objectives are noteworthy not only for the benefit to the profession but also because of the tremendous potential available for assisting and aiding that understanding and cooperation between North and South America which is so essential to our existence.

The address by Mr. Vallance follows:

FUTURE PROGRAM OF THE INTER-AMERICAN BAR ASSOCIATION

(Address of William Roy Vallance, assistant to the legal adviser, Department of State, and secretary general of the Inter-American Bar Association at the annual meeting of the Florida bar)

Mr. Chairman, distinguished guests, and members of the Florida bar, it is always a privilege for legal officers of the Department of State to have an opportunity to discuss with members of the bar some of the problems which are of mutual interest. When I learned that our distinguished Assistant Secretary of State, Henry F. Holland, due to circumstances beyond his control, would not be able to participate in the present meeting as he had planned to do and that I might pinch hit for him, I welcomed the opportunity to be with you and to discuss the subject in which I am deeply interested, namely, the future program of the Inter-American Bar Association. I realize that it is difficult for me to substitute for the vigorous Texan who was to have addressed you on this occasion, and I trust that on some future occasion you will have the privilege of hearing one of his learned and interesting addresses.

As you know, I have recently been in Texas attending the Ninth Conference of the Inter-American Bar Association and consequently I am very enthusiastic about the capable Texans who made the plans and carried out the arrangements for this highly successful meeting of judges and lawyers from nearly every nation in this hemisphere. It was inspiring at the rollcall at the opening of the conference to have lawyers respond who had traveled many thousands of miles to participate in that meeting, which was attended by members of our profession from Canada to Argentina and by representatives from other parts of the free world. Those present were especially moved when the 23 delegates and official representatives from the free Government of Argentina arose and received an enthusiastic welcome from the other delegates.

Our brilliant leader, President Robert G. Storey, reported at the close of the Conference that some 563 delegates had participated in it and that approximately 1,000 persons, including members of families and other interested persons had taken part in some of the meetings. The joint meeting in honor of past President Herbert Hoover [1] was attended by over 2,500 persons who listened intently to his address on the subject "World Experience With the Karl Marx Way of Life."

Upon visiting this great State of Florida which has so many important contacts with Latin America and so many citizens related to residents of other parts of the Americas, it is especially interesting to note the rapid development that has taken place here in recent years, especially along cultural lines. The attractions of outdoor living in Florida have been depicted in many recent publications and it is only natural that we should look forward to a time when our colleagues from other countries of this hemisphere may have an opportunity to visit your great State at a conference of the Inter-American Bar Association, similar to the one which has just been completed in Dallas. Officers of the association were greatly pleased and highly honored to receive such an invitation at the close of the Dallas conference for 1959 and it is my sincere hope that our friends from the North and the South may have an opportunity to find out for themselves the relative advantages of Florida and Texas. In the circumstances, it seems quite appropriate for me to tell you something about the future program of this great association to which you have extended an invitation in order that you may have some conception of the size of the group and the general nature of the guests who may accept your cordial invitation 3 years from now.

HISTORY

Accordingly, I will give you a brief résumé of the history of the Inter-American Bar Association and then discuss some of the projects which this organization has undertaken to study and present reports on at later meetings.

The Inter-American Bar Association was founded at Washington, D. C., on May 16, 1940, and consequently will be 16 years old in another week. For several years discussions had taken place in North and South America about the desirability of establishing such an organization of lawyers of this hemisphere. Dr. James Brown Scott and Col. John H. Wigmore had presented papers on the subject and the American Bar Association at its meeting at Kansas City in 1937 adopted a resolution on the subject. In South America, Dr. J. Honorio Silgueira, who was president of the Argentine Federation of Bar Associations, proposed in 1926 to the Institute of Brazilian Lawyers that a closer relationship should be developed among the bar associations of Argentina, Bolivia, Brazil, Chile, Paraguay, Peru and Uruguay. The subject was also discussed at Pan American conferences. Consequently, when the Eighth American Scientific Congress met in Washington in May 1940, a group of distinguished lawyers who were members of Section Nine on International Law, Public Law and Jurisprudence of that congress, proceeded to consider a draft constitution for an Inter-American Bar Association which had been prepared by a committee of the section of International and Comparative Law of the American Bar Association of which I was chairman. This draft as revised, became the constitution of this organization which now has 80 members, chosen from among the legal organizations of this hemisphere.

When the American Bar Association met in Philadelphia in 1940 [2] it ratified the action of its representatives who signed this constitution. Since then its presidents have attended nearly all of the nine conferences that have thus far been held and its section of international and comparative law has actively supported the objectives of the organization. We were greatly pleased to have Hon. Smythe Gambrell, present president of the American Bar Association, carry forward this practice at the meeting of the association in Dallas at which he delivered an impressive address.

FLORIDA JOINS

It is especially worthy of note that the Florida bar became a member on January 1, 1942, pursuant to a resolution of the board of governors dated October 10, 1941. The

[1] For complete address of Mr. Hoover see the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 102, No. 67 for Wednesday, April 25, 1956, pp. A3351–A3353.

[2] ABA reports, vol. 65, section action, p. 329; house of delegates action, p. 96.

constitution was accordingly signed by President Robert R. Milam and attested by Edwin R. Bentley, executive secretary. The Dade County Bar Association became a member on September 8, 1943.

An outstanding citizen of Florida, Cody Fowler, of Tampa, participated in our first conference at Habana and was of great assistance to the officers in making that meeting a success.

PURPOSES

The purposes of the association are of special significance in view of the recent developments in some of the nations beyond our southern border. Article I of the constitution sets forth these purposes as follows:

"To establish and maintain relations between associations and organizations of lawyers, national and local, in the various countries of the Americas, to provide a forum for exchange of views.

"To advance the science of jurisprudence in all its phases and particularly the study of comparative law; to promote uniformity of commercial legislation; to further the diffusion of knowledge of the laws of the various countries throughout the Americas.

"To uphold the honor of the profession of the law; and to encourage cordial intercourse among the lawyers of the Western Hemisphere.

"To meet in conferences from time to time for discussion and for the purposes of the association."

The association has great potentialities for accomplishing these constructive purposes. Closer ties of personal friendship and increased mutual confidence among the leaders of the bars of the Americas has contributed to improvement in the administration of justice. The exchange of legal literature has been useful in the consideration and drafting of new legislation. The small differences and great similarities between the civil and common law are being revealed to practitioners who become familiar with both systems. An intelligent understanding of such diversity as exists in the customs and procedures employed to achieve justice by resort to reason and to use pacific means of settlement of disputes will serve to strengthen both systems of law. The meetings of the association provide special opportunity for the lawyers of the new world to cooperate in strengthening the foundations of democratic institutions so that they may be maintained free from the abuses of autocratic governments.

Dr. Fernandez Supervielle, the first president of the association, at its first meeting expressed its aspirations when he said: "The war we are witnessing is a struggle between the unbridled fury of the material forces of man, applied to evil by the selfish and criminal instinct of a group of men, and the supreme effort made by peoples who aspire to carry the spiritual and moral progress of human beings to a higher degree than has been so far reached. The struggle must end in the triumph of spirit over matter, and then a new era and a new life is to begin for humanity • • • Let us hope that • • • with the help of God, the lawyers of this continent will be able to apply their greatest efforts to the task of leading these young and vigorous American countries to the forefront in world affairs, and over the road to a more peaceful, more secure, more worthy and more Christian life—over the road of a true civilization."

MEMBERSHIP

In many of the American nations associations of lawyers have been organized, some on a national basis and others on a city or State basis. It was decided to admit to membership only approved lawyers' associations, with the understanding that individual members, members of a member association may participate in the activities of the association, as delegates to conferences or as members of committees or sections.

A member association may be represented at conferences by as many delegates as it desires, but each delegation is limited to one vote.

At Dallas, an important amendment of the constitution was made whereby individual membership was authorized, consisting of four categories, namely, junior, senior, associate and life membership. This important amendment does not change the fundamental structure of the association as composed of bar organizations but permits individuals to participate in the work of the committees and other activities.

ORGANIZATION FOR CONFERENCES

In connection with the proposed conference in Florida it is desirable for interested members of your association to become familiar with the organization under which conferences have functioned. The association has held nine conferences, namely, Habana, Cuba, 1941; Rio de Janeiro, Brazil, 1943; Mexico City, 1944; Santiago de Chile, 1945; Lima, Peru, 1947; Detroit, Mich., 1949; Montevideo, Uruguay, 1951; Sao Paulo, Brazil, 1954, and Dallas, Tex., 1956. At the Detroit conference in 1949 an organization structure was adopted, providing for 14 committees dealing with the following subjects:

Public international law.
Private international law.
Constitutional law.
Municipal law.
Civil law.
Civil and commercial procedure.
Commercial law.
Criminal law and procedure.
Administrative law and procedure.
Social and economic law.
Legal education.
Legal documentation.
Activities of lawyers.

At the seventh conference in Montevideo a junior bar section was organized and it has taken a very active part in the Dallas conference.

On recommendation of the Argentine lawyers a committee on laws relating to natural resources was established at the eighth conference in Sao Paulo. From this summary statement, you will realize the wide scope of subjects which are considered at our conferences, the interest which specialists in particular fields of the law have in the preparation of papers and in attendance at these meetings and the significance of the resolutions that are finally approved. I should point out that the council of the association is its governing body and is composed of 50 members chosen in part by the member associations and in part at each conference. This council carefully examines resolutions coming from the various committees to make certain that they are not in conflict with each other, that they have been adequately studied and should be promulgated as the considered views of the organization. As a result of this process of discussion in committees and review by the council, 41 resolutions were adopted at the Dallas conference.

It is a pleasure to advise you that at the close of the Dallas conference, Prof. David S. Stern, of Miami University School of Law, was elected a member of the council, and Marshall J. Langer, as assistant secretary general.

TENTH CONFERENCE ARRANGEMENTS

Dr. Adolfo Bioy, president of the Argentine Federation of Bar Associations, extended a cordial invitation to the delegates in Dallas to hold the tenth conference in Argentina, probably in November 1957 or early in the following year. Dr. Eduardo Augusto Garcia, Argentine Ambassador to the Organization of American States, supported this invitation with a message from his government expressing the hope that it would be accepted. Accordingly, it was decided to hold our tenth conference in Argentina with the Argentine Federation of Bar Associations as host. The following Argentine lawyers were elected to the offices indicated:

Dr. Adolfo Bioy, president.

Dr. Horacio Premoli, vice president for Argentina.

Dr. Mauricio A. Ottolenghi, member of the executive committee and of the council.

Dr. Alberto G. Padilla, assistant secretary general.

Looking into the future from this background, what course may we expect the Inter-American Bar Association to follow during the next 15 years? The role of a prophet is always a risky one. I recall that the Prophet Elijah was carried up to heaven in a chariot of fire and his associate Elisha was fed by the ravens. Consequently, I have no desire to follow the fate of these two prophets and shall therefore be cautious in my predictions. Believing, as I do, in the firm hold which the Inter-American Bar Association has established in the hearts and minds of the many lawyers of this hemisphere, who have been participating in its conferences, I believe it is wise to expect that this association will continue in its course of uniting the lawyers of this hemisphere, in strengthening bonds of understanding, mutual respect and friendship. Accordingly, I predict:

1. That the tenth conference of the Inter-American Bar Association will be held in Buenos Aires in November 1957 (or early in 1958) and will supply an opportunity for the lawyers from other countries to join with their colleagues in Argentina in carrying forward the program for recognition of the fundamental rights of the individual man and the elimination of injustices which have occurred there under the recent regime.

2. The Buenos Aires Conference will provide an opportunity for completion and adoption of a uniform code of ethics for judges and practitioners. The studies already conducted in this field under the leadership of the distinguished Mexican jurists, Miguel S. Macedo and the late Carlos Sanchez Mejorada, have had beneficial results in some countries.

3. The studies that have been conducted in regard to a uniform negotiable instruments law, under the leadership of the distinguished Peruvian lawyer, Dr. Felix Navarro Irvine, will be further advanced and may result in the adoption of a model project on this subject.

4. Legal education in the Americas will be greatly advanced by studies and discussions between deans of law schools, professors and officers, interested in the exchange of students among the law schools of this hemisphere. The excellent report prepared by Dean Claude Horack through the cooperation of the Department of State with this association, provides a basis for finding a solution to this difficult problem. The law schools of Florida are already cooperating actively in the exchange program and I wish to recognize particularly the good work that Dean Russell Rasco has accomplished in this respect. The Buenos Aires Conference will supply an opportunity to bring together the deans of law schools in the Southern Hemisphere to consider this important subject, as the Dallas conference provided a forum for the law school deans of North America to discuss it.

5. Collection and the translation of the commercial laws of the Americas will be an important phase of the Buenos Aires Conference. At the Sao Paulo Conference some progress was made in acquiring knowledge about corporation laws of the Americas as a result of a paper presented by Ray Garrett, of Chicago, and progress was made in this field at Dallas as a result of intensive studies made under his leadership with the assistance of personnel from the Inter-American Law Institute and the Law Institute of the Americas:

6. Investment of capital in the development of resources throughout the Americas requires protection from excessive taxation and possible expropriation. It has been brought out that the proper climate must be established in order to plan investments and to have them thrive and produce results. To accomplish this, laws are required to protect private capital and private investments from confiscatory action or expropriation. Developments are taking place in the field of double taxation as pointed out by the excellent paper presented at the Dallas Conference by Mitchell B. Carroll of New York, a recognized expert in this field. Studies are also being made in respect to taxation at Harvard Law School under the leadership of Prof. William S. Barnes. The future prosperity and progress of this hemisphere depend to a large extent upon these measures for the future encouragement of private initiative.

7. The protection of patents, trademarks, and copyright is another important field in which I believe progress will be made through the activities of the lawyers functioning in this association. Progress in the collection, translation and compilation of laws in these fields has been advocated by this association and Mr. A. Arnold Brand, of Chicago, has taken an active part in initiating this project, as a delegate of the American Patent Law Association. The extent to which our material progress is based upon the protection given to the work of inventors and authors is well recognized. The importance of extending such protection to persons in other parts of this hemisphere cannot be overemphasized and it is believed that through this association progress will be made in the years ahead.

8. The developments in aviation have had special significance for the Americas. Areas that previously were inaccessible have been opened up. Under the leadership of William A. Roberts, of Washington, D. C., resolutions relating to this subject were adopted at the Dallas conference and it is believed that further developments and regulations will be aided by our subsequent activities.

9. All of these material projects, however, will be of no avail if the governments in this hemisphere fail to resist the insidious efforts of communism to infiltrate into their agencies and to take control of the functions of government. Addresses delivered at the Dallas conference strongly presented the need for maintaining resistance to these Communist efforts. As stated in the purposes of this organization, we desire "to uphold the honor of the profession of the law and to encourage cordial intercourse among the lawyers of the Western Hemisphere." The friendships which are established during these conferences among the leaders of our profession constitute one of the basic means of fighting Communist efforts to bring about dissent and misunderstanding between our respective countries. Dr. Eduardo Salazar of Quito, Ecuador, chairman of our executive committee, in an address at the opening session of the Dallas conference made the following important statement about the duties of the lawyer:

"A lawyer who is not willing to fulfill this higher duty to his society is a mere earner of a livelihood. He fails in that case to repay his debt to the society which created him.

"But the task before us is not an easy one. The fight for freedom and justice under law is not a comfortable one but the life without such freedom is certainly worse. We have dozens in this room who have made and are making that fight. Some will ask, however, if the lawyer owes this duty to society, certainly he owes it only to his own. But what shall be the measure in this shrunken world of ours to strike the frontiers of that society. I submit that it is no longer his city, no longer his State, no longer his nation but his hemisphere. Each of us practices a profession that cannot live without liberty and none of us can survive when that liberty is challenged, impaired, destroyed and trampled upon in any part of the whole—no matter how remote or distant it might seem."

10. Our greatest objective is to promote the maintenance and preservation of peace, especially in this hemisphere. This organization, through the study of international law problems is contributing to the adoption through discussion of greater uniformity in the principles of international law. We are proud of the accomplishments of the Organization of American States and are confident that excellent results will be accomplished under the leadership of Dr. Jose A. Mora, a distinguished lawyer who has been of great assistance to this association in connection with its seventh conference in Montevideo and in other activities.

In concluding this résumé of some of the things that I believe will receive emphasis in the work of the Inter-American Bar Association in years that lie ahead, I should emphasize the fact that there are a number of other matters which deserve recognition and comment but cannot be dealt with in the time that is available. Many persons have contributed greatly to the success that has been achieved thus far and only by continued team work and cooperation can those objectives be attained. My last prediction is that Miami will be the place of our 11th conference in 1959.

Thank you for the opportunity of discussing these subjects with you.

Danny Kaye

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 5, 1956

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, Brooklyn is always proud of its citizens who make their mark in the world, regardless of the field of endeavor.

It is particularly proud of those who, while doing so, make a substantial contribution to the welfare and well-being of our country. We have even more right to boast when one of our citizens secures for himself a place in our hearts by making that contribution on a world-wide scale. Such a Brooklynite is Danny Kaye.

In that connection, I am pleased to call the attention of our colleagues to the following editorial which appeared in the Washington Post of July 4, 1956:

O. K., DANNY

There is a moment of special magic in the entrancing show which Danny Kaye and his audience have been giving together for the past fortnight at the Carter Barron Amphitheater. At a signal from him, all the footlights and floodlights go out and everyone present strikes and holds aloft a match. The tiny flames illuminate and enhance the sylvan beauty of the setting; and some thousands of spectators are drawn closer together in a shared delight. Danny Kaye is a magician at drawing people together; he makes his audience perform with him and sing with him and laugh with him; he lifts them out of themselves, uniting and refreshing them in fulfillment of the immemorial function of the clown.

When this zany entertainer comes to the close of his booking at the Carter Barron on Saturday night, he will be off at once to Paris to start work anew on the TV film he has been making for the United Nations International Children's Emergency Fund. He has been all over the world on this generous undertaking, freely giving of his prodigious energy and talent so that life may be made brighter and more hopeful for youngsters of every nationality and race. He will leave behind him in Washington a host of friends grateful for his gifts and his warm giving of them—grateful for what he has done here and for what he is doing as a civilized member of the human family.

Slovakia's Brave Fight for Freedom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 5, 1956

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter which I received from Dr. Stefan G. Lukats, vice chairman, National Committee for Liberation of Slovakia, Munich, Germany, which is an extremely interesting and forceful narration of the continuing fight that the brave and patriotic Slovaks are making and have been carrying on for some years against Communist tyranny:

The Honorable DANIEL J. FLOOD,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN FLOOD: Today I want to talk about an Iron Curtain country, a country still struggling for freedom and independence despite a stranglehold yolk of totalitarian oppression. A brave country, a desperate country. A country not yet without hope. And I mention its plight because hope cannot hold out forever against machine guns.

You in America have grown used to freedom and it is hard for you to imagine what life would be like without it. Sometimes you don't think about the have-nots often enough and that is why I am taking this opportunity to remind you rather than acquaint you with the facts.

The brave country I am going to tell you about is Slovakia and I choose the Fifth of July, because today is a religious feast for the Slovaks and for Slavs generally. In the year 863 two Saints, Cyril and Methodius, carried Christianity to Slovakia. These holy missionaries consolidated what for Slovakia was a new religion.

The Slovaks remember this and that is why today is of special significance for them.

It is also of special significance at this time that Communist tyranny is now attempting to obliaterate that significance. Having found it impossible to annul the anniversary altogether, they are distorting it and molding it to their own purposes—not as a Christian celebration but under the guise of a feast day celebrating the unification of the Slav nations. A unification, I might add, forced rather than fostered upon the Slav peoples.

This Communist propaganda, calculated to tighten the ties between the smaller Slav peoples such as the Slovaks, the Poles and the Ukrainians with the Rusian bloc, is another deceptive Kremlin method aimed at subjugating these oppressed and captive nations. However, the Slovak people are not easily misled in their pious adherence of the

ideals set forth by St. Cyril and St. Methodius.

They see no reason or special need for any kind of cooperation with the Kremlin. On the contrary, they seek only new ways to shatter the Iron Curtain that separates them from the West.

And theirs is no passive resistance.

The first record of resistance goes back as far as the first beginnings of Communist tyranny, as far back as the Communist revolution of 1917 in Russia. Immediately after they took over in Russia, the Communists tried to incite similar revolutions throughout Europe. Slovakia in those days was part of the Austrian Empire and the Communists thought they could incite a revolt in Slovakia by promising her the right of self-determination.

They didn't succeed.

The Slovaks, then as now, refused and refuted such an offer because communism was not, is not, and never will be in line with the ideological concepts and Christian traditions consolidated more than 1,000 years ago by the two missionaries whose feast they will try to celebrate today.

The Communists, however, persisted in their efforts to woo their southern neighbor, demanding for them since 1924 the application of self-determination for Slovakia.

It is not surprising then, that in 1939 when Slovakia did become independent, that Russia was among the first to recognize that independence in the form of a republic.

In fact, the U. S. S. R. appointed a Soviet envoy based in Bratislava, hoping he would be able to create conditions and circumstances whereby, sooner or later, that independence would become enmeshed within the Soviet sphere of influence.

The Slovaks as a whole, however, have resisted Soviet blandishments—even in an hour of great need when they needed help in an armed uprising against the Nazis in 1944, they refused too close a cooperation with the Kremlin and spilt blood rather than compromise or gain political advantage.

They knew too well there could be no true cooperation with a political system that threatens the very foundations of any Christian culture or civilization and which today threatens or throttles the entire world.

Only a few sympathizers, collaborators and traitors were at the command of the Kremlin in Slovakia up to 1945 and even after the Communist coup d'etat in Prague during the February of 1948. I know it is true to say that only political opportunists and morally corrupt men jumped on the Communist bandwagon in Slovakia. The great mass of the people remained staunchly anti-Communist and profoundly Christian.

It is significant and heart-warming that whereas the Slovaks have steadfastly refused aid toward self-determination from the Communists, they have just as steadfastly pleaded with the United States of America for that aid. They recognize that our country, ever the champion of human rights, represents real freedom and independence. It is their wish, this captive people's wish that the United States of America help them regain what they have lost, the blessing of liberty.

They would if they could demand America's aid. But they can only ask—although taking into consideration the fact that the United States of America is ever preaching freedom, they could almost take this country at its word.

They could almost demand a guaranty that, should the opportunity at any time arise, the United States will be ready to aid in any way whatsoever. They need assurances that the United States of America will stand stalwart and unafraid in its great strength to speak for those who are allowed no voice.

The feast day celebrating the coming of St. Cyril and St. Methodius to Slovakia is a day on which the Slovaks not only commemorate their religious foundation, it is a day on which they rededicate themselves to the rights of independence and democracy. This is the day when Slovaks behind the Iron Curtain and also Americans of Slovak ancestry commemorate the past, consider the present and look to the future for the honor and respect and dignity a nation needs.

And since this is primarily a day of dedication to those ideals America holds dear, I could not let this day pass, without calling upon you to assure Slovaks everywhere that America is not blind to their misfortune and not unaware of their persistency in fighting communism.

I call upon you to assure them that America will not stand unfeelingly on the sidelines when the time comes for Slovakia to regain her full freedom and independence.

Today, in Slovakia, is a Christian feast, a religious celebration and whether or not the religion celebrated there is yours, whether or not you believe in what they believe, you must believe the Slovaks have a right to that belief and to freedom and democracy and the right of self-determination.

I urge you, dear Congressman FLOOD, to protect these rights and guard them as jealously as though they were your own, for a disease with the potency of communism is contagious and must be stamped out.

With kindest regards, I am, sir.

Respectfully yours,

Dr. STEFAN G. LUKATS,
Vice Chairman, National Committee for Liberation of Slovakia.

MUNICH, *July 1, 1956.*

Under God the People Rule

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. FRANK CARLSON

OF KANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, July 5, 1956

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, a young man from the State of Kansas by the name of Truman Clark, of Sublette, Kans., is a junior in the Christian College at Dallas, Tex. As a part of his school work in a class on government, he selected the name of the senior Senator from South Dakota, KARL E. MUNDT, as a subject for one of the papers he had to prepare as part of his class work. It is a very execllent paper, describing the background and some of the work of our distinguished colleague. As it is a very fine paper, I shall ask unannmous consent to have it printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

I noticed one particular comment which I thought was very interesting, which tells of the Senator's work. It reads:

In addition to the farm bill and the election reform amendment, Mr. MUNDT had this spring spoken on very few subjects. I find this commendable in him—he does not speak when he has nothing important to say, but rather listens.

I think that probably is a very important statement for other Members of the Senate to take note of.

I ask unanimous consent that the composition be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the composition was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNDER GOD THE PEOPLE RULE [1]

The General Beadle State Teachers College, in Madison, S. Dak., never was a very famous college, and if it still exists, certainly is not now a very well known school, but back in the years 1927 to 1936, this little school had a social science and speech teacher named KARL E. MUNDT.

Today, Mr. MUNDT is a very outstanding Member of the United States Senate, where he is serving his second term, after five terms as a Member of the House of Representatives.

He represents his native State, South Dakota, where he was born June 3, 1900, in the town of Humboldt. Today, he lives in Madison, where he once taught, when not in Washington. He has been married since 1924.

KARL MUNDT is a well-educated man, having received his bachelor of arts degree in 1923 from Carleton College, in Minnesota, and 4 years later, his master of arts degree from Columbia University, in New York City.

His is a varied and distinguished background. He has been a farmer, a member of the South Dakota Game and Fish Commission, a high school teacher and superintendent, and has been in the real estate and insurance business, in addition to the already-mentioned college faculty position. He was once the national vice president of the Izaak Walton League, and is now the national president of the National Forensic League (of which he is a cofounder).

Mr. MUNDT has further proved his versatility in his writing; he has written articles for such widely varied magazines as Liberty, Collier's, Country Gentleman, Nation's Schools, The Christian Advocate, U. S. News and World Report, and Tomorrow.[2]

While a Representative, KARL MUNDT was a member of two very prominent committees, the House Foreign Affairs Committee and the House Committee on Un-American Activities. He sponsored the Voice of America Act, which was passed by the 80th Congress, coauthored the Mundt-Nixon anti-Communist bill, and was the author of the congressional resolution which led to the forming of UNESCO.[3]

Since becoming a Senator, he has continued through the years to be a leader in progressive legislation, having coauthored the famous, yet ill-fated Mundt-Coudert bill which had to do with election reform, in 1950. Today, this bill has come back as a subject of congressional debate, as we shall soon see.

This spring, Senator MUNDT has concentrated his efforts on two main issues: the farm bill, and the Presidential election reform amendment.

In the farm bill issue, MUNDT began the congressional year with a firm stand on it, and has worked diligently for the things he believes should be in it. He is a member of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry which referred the bill, after an 8-to-7 vote, to the Senate. Incidentally, he is a minority member of that committee, and commented in one speech that he was proud of the way politics was kept completely out of the work of that committee, since there was never a straight party vote in it.[4] I believe this illustrates what I feel is one of Senator MUNDT's greatest asset—his ability to look beyond party lines, even though he is proud of his party, and to make his work a matter of representing the people, not the Republican Party.

The first major speech MUNDT made this spring concerned the farm program. On January 9, he commended President Eisenhower's farm message to Congress in emphatic terms: "* * * the President's farm message to Congress presents bold, positive, and constructive new changes in our overall farm program. It gives bright hopes for a better future for our American farmers."

Footnotes at end of speech.

He went on to say that the soil-bank proposal should receive complete support from Congress, and then outlined the reasons why he felt the soil-bank would help—these he called its five constructive features.[6]

Finally, he returned, in his speech, to the farm program in general, and again lauded the President's proposed program, noting that it was not a "piecemeal" program, but rather that it offered a direct solution to each separate problem. He closed with another plea for prompt congressional action.[6]

That plea was answered, and largely through Senator MUNDT's committee work the Agriculture Act of 1956 (S. 3183) became a big part of the senatorial debate during February and March, continuing into April.

During all this discussion, Mr. MUNDT expressed, from time to time, his views as to what things would adequately solve the farm problem. He believed that the soil bank and price supports would work together.[7] Further, he believed that these price supports should right now be rigid, and for 2 years should be 90 percent price supports, to allow the farmer a period of security.[8]

He readily admits that both flexible and rigid price supports have in the past failed to solve the farm problem, but says they did so because always there was a reduction of acreage whenever a visible surplus was at hand.[9] He said this when he was fighting to keep in the bill the 90-percent price supports, but his efforts along this line failed, and the final bill had no such provisions.

Senator MUNDT also wanted this farm program to be on a voluntary basis, not forced on the farmers, but attractive enough to them to gain good cooperation.[10]

Another thing Mr. MUNDT fought for was his constituents—the wheat farmers. On March 13, he deplored the fact that while most other farm products had been given a boost by good legislation, nothing had yet been done to improve the lot of the wheat farmer. He urged the passage of an amendment to remedy this (the amendment was introduced by Senator FRANK CARLSON of Kansas, another wheat-minded legislator), and it succeeded in becoming part of the bill.[11]

A very noticeable characteristic of Senator MUNDT is the fine way he works with his fellow Senators in committee and on the Senate floor. Especially he does so with Mr. CASE, the other Senator from South Dakota, and the other Plains State Senators from Kansas, Nebraska, and North Dakota. They and their constituents all have primarily the same interests and needs in legislation, being from very similar areas of agriculture and finance.

Another amendment to the farm bill which MUNDT backed was one to increase the industrial use of agricultural products. He felt that this would help whip the surplus farm-goods problem.[12]

Senator MUNDT believes in getting the job done, and he showed this very thoroughly on March 19, when he said, "I think Congress needs an Easter recess; but I think America needs a farm bill worse than Congress needs a recess."[13]

He said this even though he believed that the farm bill was not too good: "Personally, I do not think it is as good a bill as it was when it was brought to the floor of the Senate from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry."[14] However, he still backed it, for, as he later stated, he believed it was the best one that could be gotten during the present session of Congress.[15]

Mr. MUNDT asked for action, and on that same day he got just that. The farm bill was passed, by a 93 to 2 vote (1 Senator was ill).[16]

Since then, we know, President Eisenhower has vetoed it, but I feel that if KARL MUNDT had been allowed to lead the actions of the Senate the bill would have been a much better piece of legislation, both in Mr. Eisenhower's opinion and in solving the farm problems of America.

The other main issue in which Senator MUNDT played an important role during the past 3½ months was the joint resolution for an amendment to the United States Constitution which would reform the election of the President and Vice President.

This was a compromise between the two widely known plans of reform, the Lodge-Gossett (or Daniel-Kefauver) proposal, and the Mundt-Coudert plan.[17] Mr. MUNDT calls this compromise the "so-called Daniel-Kefauver-Mundt-Thurmond substitute".[18]

KARL MUNDT spoke at length on this resolution several times, and itemized what he felt were the advantages of the compromise amendment. First, he said it would restore the proper balance between rural and city areas in a national campaign, eliminating the unit vote in the electoral college and forcing the campaigns to operate on a national basis.

Second, he pointed out that it would keep unusual events of nature (such as blizzards, floods, etc.) or any local election fraud from determining the outcome of a national election.

Third, it would provide equality of votes among citizens, so that a person in New York would not be voting 45 electoral votes to only 4 electoral votes for a person in Delaware, as it is now, since now the total electoral votes go to the winner, even if the winner carried that State by only 1 vote. Mr. MUNDT pointed out the unfairness of this situation very well, with a humorous, imaginative, yet shockingly possible story of one drunken bum in New York City accidentally winning the presidential election for some candidate, over all the combined votes of several small States. I thought this, incidentally, served to show another prerequisite of a good public servant which Mr. MUNDT has—a good sense of humor.

Fourth, he showed how it would provide a safeguard against dishonest elections by eliminating the temptation to cheat in a heavy electoral area.

His fifth point was that it would encourage a two-party system in places where there is now only one party, for all practical purposes. Yet, on the other hand, it would tend to discourage the third or "splinter" party, except on a nationwide basis.[19]

In explaining just why all this should be done, and why he feels the Constitution should be changed in this matter of presidential elections, KARL MUNDT said: "It should be changed because by the compromise amendment we go as far in the direction of the popular vote for President as we can go and still maintain the concept of this Republic being a commonwealth of States."[20]

In addition to the farm bill and the election reform amendment, Mr. MUNDT has this spring spoken on very few subjects. I find this commendable in him—he does not speak when he has nothing important to say, but rather listens.

However, on March 1, he did introduce a fairly important bill, especially so on this year—a bill relating to campaign contributions. This bill would require each candidate and each political committee in a State primary campaign to file (in Washington, with both the Secretary of the Senate and the Clerk of the House of Representatives) the same records on campaign funds which they are required under State law to file.[21]

Senator MUNDT believes that this law would stimulate States to strengthen their laws regulating State primaries and conventions. This, in turn, would keep people from being forced to pay for the campaign of a party or candidate they did not prefer, as a labor union, etc.[22]

Throughout this paper, we have pointed out why Mr. MUNDT is such an able Senator. He has had many years of experience as a Congressman, yet is still progressive minded. He makes sound, logical arguments, not relying on sarcasm or mudslinging. He is a good, hard-working member of two more committees than the one already mentioned, the Committee on Government Operations, and the Appropriations Committee.[23]

All these and other things can be said of KARL MUNDT, but I believe he paid himself the finest tribute that can be said of a Senator, when on March 8 he commented, "I went out to South Dakota and consulted with a great many farmers on the question. * * *"[24] It matters not what the question was, or what answer he got; what matters is that he went to the people.

I hope the people of South Dakota never forget this man KARL MUNDT, and how well he has upheld their motto—"Under God the People Rule."

---

[1] State motto of South Dakota. The American Peoples Encyclopedia, vol. XVII, p. 969.
[2] Congressional Directory, p. 144.
[3] Who's Who in America, p. 1854.
[4] CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, No. 30, p. 2704.
[5] Ibid., No. 3, p. 236.
[6] Ibid., p. 237.
[7] Ibid., No. 41, p. 3790.
[8] Ibid., No. 41, p. 3793.
[9] Ibid., p. 3790.
[10] Ibid., No. 48, p. 4482.
[11] Ibid., No. 44, p. 4069.
[12] Ibid., No. 46, p. 4327.
[13] Ibid., No. 48, p. 4506.
[14] Ibid., p. 4505.
[15] Ibid., No. 59, p. 5470.
[16] Ibid., No. 48, p. 4512.
[17] Ibid., No. 51, p. 4735.
[18] Ibid., p. 4753.
[19] Ibid., No. 54, p. 5050.
[20] Ibid., p. 5038.
[21] Ibid., No. 36, p. 3197.
[22] Ibid., p. 3198.
[23] Ibid., No. 41, p. 3666.
[24] Ibid., p. 3815.

Footnotes at end of speech.

Footnotes at end of speech.

East Coast Case

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. THOMAS J. DODD

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 23, 1956

Mr. DODD. Mr. Speaker, in a few days the Civil Aeronautics Board will hear arguments in the long-pending east coast case. For many Atlantic seaboard Members of this body, the Board's forthcoming decision is of vital, if not crucial importance.

We represent areas along an airway that is the most heavily traveled in the Nation, perhaps in the world. For years, we have had to endure utterly inadequate north-south air transport. This is a matter of record. I speak also from personal experience, on your part and mine.

Between Boston and Miami, only one carrier offers through, one-plane service. Between New York and Miami, this company shares as much of the traffic they can accommodate, with limited operations in and out of intermediate points.

This promises to be the year when the Civil Aeronautics Board will act to designate a third, and perhaps a fourth carrier to meet the urgent need for additional and improved service between the Northeast and Florida.

It is in this latter connection, Mr. Speaker, as a Member from the New England region, that I speak today. The Civil Aeronautics Board is clearly a quasi-judicial agency, independent of the legislative branch. But it is my hope that the Board will fully weigh the merits of the case it is now considering in terms of the intent and will of the Congress, as set forth in the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938.

The declaration of national air transportation policy embodied in that statute and the criteria established by the Congress call for rulings in the public interest, convenience, and necessity.

I submit that the New England region, the oldest industrial area of the Nation, and the home of the first domestic airline established at what is now Logan International Airport in Boston in 1925, is deserving of greater consideration than was indicated by the Board's examiner, Mr. Thomas L. Wrenn, in his recommendation last April 3.

In his report, Mr. Wrenn proposed that Delta Airlines, which already flies between New York and Atlanta and provides connecting service to Miami, be certificated to make direct New York-Miami flights as the third carrier on the East coast route.

The New England congressional delegation reacted with dismay to this finding, Mr. Speaker. So did some of our New York City and Baltimore colleagues, as I recall. A number of our southeastern members were equally unhappy about Mr. Wrenn's rejection of the applications of two other carriers who, I believe, should receive more favorable treatment in the impending hearing before the board.

I refer to Northeast Airlines, one of the original certificated carriers and New England based, and to Pan American World Airways, which pioneered in international service.

The New England delegation has been on record in urging the Board to reverse Mr. Wrenn's recommendations insofar as Northeast is denied its application for extension of its route southward from New York to Miami. In the House of Representatives, virtually all regional members share this view. This is particularly true of those from the northern New England States, which depend only on Northeast for scheduled air transportation.

In reference to Pan American World Airways, I speak for myself, Mr. Speaker, and for what I believe to be the best interests of my State, my region, and the national convenience, necessity, and advancement.

It is a fact that a high percentage of United States air passengers flying southward to Florida along the Atlantic seaboard are international passengers, bound for the Caribbean and ports of call throughout South America.

It is a fact that New England, which has played a major role since the dawn of the Union in the expansion of inter-American trade and the prestige of our Nation abroad, is more closely linked to sister nations of this hemisphere than ever before. Something more than 40 percent of all foreign investments in Latin America is New England capital.

It is a fact that in 1954 a substantial percentage of total New England industrial employment was in enterprises dependent largely on imports from Central and South America.

New England is intensely aware of its great stake in Latin America's future, thanks to such alert forces as Pan American, which inaugurated the first United States international airline in 1927, flying between Key West and Habana, Cuba, a 90-mile route which enjoyed a brisk business. From this evolved Pan American's Latin America system and its worldwide service into some 80 countries.

Pan American would offer New Englanders a direct, one-plane service from Boston to all major Latin American cities, via Miami and intermediate points, just as Pan American now flies from Logan International Airport in Boston to the major cities of Western Europe.

I submit, Mr. Speaker, that there is sufficient traffic between the Northeast and Florida to enable as many as four competing airlines to operate profitably. I suggest that the density of traffic on this route during the peak season would not only improve immeasurably the quality of the available accommodations—thanks to the stimulus of competition—but also would eliminate the subsidies now required by Northeast and Pan American.

In Pan American's case, the end happens to be in sight for subsidies, should the company obtain authorization for expanded operations. Northeast Airlines receive proportionately high subsidies for good reasons: This small trunk carrier, 1 of the original 13 to be certificated by the Federal Government, is the only one which serves numerous communities in New England which would otherwise be without air transportation. Moreover, its short-haul routes are unprofitable for obvious reasons, and its losses due to bad weather heighten its financial problem.

Objections have been raised to Pan American's bid to enter the northeast Florida market on various grounds. It is pointed out that Pan American is the largest overseas carrier, and therefore should be kept out of the domestic routes. Mr. Wrenn, in rejecting Pan American's argument to link its European and Latin American systems by service between the northern coterminals at Boston, New York, Philadelphia, and Baltimore-Washington, and Miami, cited what he termed a "disadvantage."

Pan American's case, he observed, was based largely on the difficulty the company has "in lacking direct access to the primary sources of traffic in the United States, particularly in relationship to its Latin American services, while its competitors have superior access to those sources of traffic."

Why should Pan American be restricted by such "disadvantages" if the chief victims of such barriers to competition are the people of New England, the Middle Atlantic States, and the Baltimore-Washington area? They are clearly protesting the status quo, and it is in complianee with the public interest, convenience and necessity that the Board must make its determination.

The Board is cognizant of its duty to rule on the best means of expanding and improving northeast Florida air transportation commencing this year, in 1956. Within the airline industry, it is acknowledged that Pan American Airways is admirably equipped to inaugurate schedules immediately, in DC–7 Clippers, including the new DC–7C model, the ultimate in piston-engine airliners for long-range, high-speed travel. It is my information that these new airplanes which are currently being delivered to Pan American, can reduce flight time on the east coast route by 1 hour and 45 minutes; on the fastest transoceanic routes, by 3 hours.

We also know that Pan American is the first of the United States carriers to usher in the jet age with United States-built jet airliners now on order.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, I would like to quote Examiner Wrenn's most interesting substantive finding as to Pan American's qualifications for serving the Nation's foremost route—a finding which he seems to have ignored in denying the company's application.

Pan American, he wrote, "should offer 18,103 long-haul passengers, accounting for 46 million passenger miles (based on 1954 figures), their first one-carrier service would use the latest type equipment and, with equipment on order could also put jet equipment into operation as soon as it is available, would provide first-class and coach service of the best quality, could satisfy seasonal demands better than any other applicant by drawing upon its other operations, has greater net worth than any other applicant, and, according to its estimates, could provide more benefits to the taxpayers in the form of subsidy reduction than any other applicant."

I trust, Mr. Speaker, that the Board will keep Mr. Wrenn's foregoing statement in mind when it undertakes to reverse him in the public interest.

On United States Reds "Must Go" List

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GORDON H. SCHERER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 5, 1956

Mr. SCHERER. Mr. Speaker, the members of the Committee on Un-American Activities are subject to constant attack by the Communists and the extreme left-wing. Every effort will be made in the coming election by these groups to defeat the members of this committee whether they be Democrats or Republicans.

In the Los Angeles area a campaign has already been started against my col-

league on the committee, DONALD JACKSON. In this connection, I call your attention to George Todt's column in the Wednesday, June 6, issue of the Los Angeles Valley Times in which Mr. Todt discusses the slogan being used by the Communists against my colleague, namely, "DONALD JACKSON has got to go." All patriotic Americans should know that we on the committee feel that for the good of the country "DONALD JACKSON has got to stay."

The article follows:

GEORGE TODT'S OPINION—ON UNITED STATES REDS MUST GO LIST

"What is a Communist? One who hath yearnings
For equal division of unequal earnings.
Idler or bungler, or both, he is willing,
To fork out his copper and pocket your shilling."

—*Ebenezer Elliott.*

"DONALD JACKSON has got to go." That is what the well-heeled Communist lady told the overflowing leadership dinner meeting of the comrades recently in a plush Hollywood clubhouse. Among those who wildly applauded and cheered this Red pronouncement was an anti-Communist agent planted in the audience. Afterward I heard a part of the story from the observer.

"The Communists really hate Congressman JACKSON," the agent told me. "They are out to beat him at the polls this time—and they are loaded. I have seldom heard such vulgarity and obscenity displayed against another California political candidate in all my experience. He must be hurting them somewhere where it registers. They are absolutely rabid about him."

Good for DON JACKSON. There is no better patriotic recommendation than to be loathed by such vermin as these. According to their mastermind, J. Peters, who wrote the Communist Handbook on Organization for the Communist Party of the United States, every one of them must subscribe to a traitorous oath upon entering the party. It says in part, "I pledge myself to rally the masses to defend the Soviet Union, the land of victorious socialism. I pledge myself to remain at all times a vigilant and firm defender of the Leninist line of the party, the only line that insures the triumph of Soviet power in the United States." Trojan horses? Quislings? Traitors? What do you think?

Now J. Peters writes that everyone—repeat, everyone—must subscribe to this oath upon entrance into the Communist Party of the United States. Whether this is done publicly and before witnesses is unimportant. The point is that it is an ideological requirement to submit to this treachery against the American people—or one cannot enter into the party in the first place. This includes Communists wherever they may be found—and never mind how kindly their appearance or facial expressions may be. They are not harmless, whether covering their activities by masquerading as the benevolent college professor, or the benign minister, or the circumspect public servant—or a host of other occupations useful to them.

We are insane if we do not stop quibbling about the way to handle the Reds with silk gloves or velvet ones—and get on with the real job of stamping out this domestic menace to our national safety in the world jungle we are living in today. It's time to stop the bluff. Most of the comrades could be quickly rounded up and jailed whenever the Department of Justice might give the capable J. Edgar Hoover, director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, the signal. They should be jailed, or deported to Mother Russia. And their American citizenship should be withdrawn. If any thinking person imagines this is being too hard on these skunks, please re-read the portion of the deadly Communist oath I have just given you in this column. These are Americans? This is a "political" party? Or are they the same kind of Red butchers who took over the satellite countries in Middle Europe? How many patriotic "reactionary" American citizens are already in their anti-American or Gestapo-type secret files? What numbers of our people have they earmarked for liquidation and extinction? Why should we help to play their game?

No, men like Congressman DON JACKSON must not go from the Washington scene. He knows the score concerning the Reds, and the only pity of it all is that there are not more of his stripe on Capitol Hill. For those of us who can find a little time to spare from our busy schedules and our own local political campaigns—here's a suggestion. Let's do whatever we can to see that the Communist lady I mentioned at the start gets the bird instead of the word. It couldn't happen to a more deserving person. We need Mr. JACKSON to stay on against the Reds.

Tyranny in 1956

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 25, 1956

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith an editorial entitled "Tyranny in 1956," which appeared in the July 4, 1956, issue of the Chicago Sun-Times:

TYRANNY IN 1956

Americans on the Fourth of July should reread the Declaration of Independence proclaimed to the world 180 years ago today. It will remind them of the kinship they have with the people of Poland and all other countries which in this 20th century are living under the kind of tyrany our forefathers overthrew to establish our free land.

Tyrany in 1956 is harder to dislodge than in 1776. The Minutemen had a fighting chance against the Redcoats. But today a few workers armed with only small guns and stout hearts are no match for jet planes and tanks.

A revolt such as the Poles staged last week in Poznan is a desperate way of calling attention of the world to the plight of the oppressed.

The plight is similar to that which moved the signers of America's Declaration of Independence to action; the methods of tyranny change only in degree over the centuries.

The Poles were driven to their desperate action because they have been ruled by the minions of a foreign power and the fruit of their factories and farms taken to strengthen that power. Our forefathers complained: "He [the king] has erected a multitude of new offices, and sent hither swarms of officers to harass our people, and eat out their substance."

The Poles—and others behind the Iron Curtain—are subject to rule by soldiers who, on the pretext that any resistance is a crime against the state, can commit legal murder. In the Declaration of Independence, Thomas Jefferson wrote:

"He has kept among us, in times of peace, standing armies without consent of our legislatures.

"He has affected to render the military independent of, and superior to, the civil power.

"He has combined with others to subject us to a jurisdiction foreign to our Constitution, and unacknowledged by our laws; giving his assent to their acts of pretended legislation.

"For quartering large bodies of armed troops among us.

"For protecting them by mock trial from punishment for any murders which they should commit on the inhabitants of these States.

"For cutting off our trade with all parts of the world.

"For imposing taxes on us without our consent.

"For depriving us, in many cases, of the benefit of trial by jury."

The American Declaration of Independence, which pledged the signers' lives, fortunes, and sacred honor to the rebellion, inspired oppressed people all over the world—and still inspires them.

It contained a philosophical idea that has a greater hold on the minds of men than Marxism ever could have: That men are endowed by their Creator—not by governments—with unalienable rights. And that these rights can be secured only by governments that operate with the consent of the governed.

This idea, based on Judeo-Christian religious principles, is stronger than tanks or jet planes. It is behind the ferment of rising nationalism in so many countries of the world, and must be one of the problems that are plaguing the present rulers of the Kremlin. It is the only basis for a system of government that can give true freedom and prosperity and the one that inevitably must prevail in the world.

Respect for Supreme Court Going Fast

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES C. DAVIS
OF GEORGIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 19, 1956

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, criticism of the United States Supreme Court is increasing day by day because of the Court's departure from reason, law, and the Constitution.

The following article from the Texarkansas Gazette for June 12, 1956, points out that never have so many people held the Supreme Court in such low regard as they do at this time:

RESPECT FOR SUPREME COURT GOING FAST

One needs only to read the newspapers to conclude that never have so many people held the Supreme Court in such low regard as they do at this time.

Here are a few examples picked at random from local and big city newspapers:

James F. Byrnes, a former associate justice of the Supreme Court, says the court "must be curbed."

"Power intoxicates men," Byrnes said in a copyrighted article in the U. S. News & World Report. It is never voluntarily surrendered, it must be taken from them, the Supreme Court must be curbed. With strong southern support the National Association of Attorneys General wants Congress to limit the United States Supreme Court's power to determine whether Federal laws supersede State statutes. The National Association also adopted a resolution

favoring nullification of a Supreme Court decision holding that the Federal Smith Act supersedes the Pennsylvania sedition laws. The decision prevents the State from prosecuting subversives under its own laws.

Senator STENNIS, Democrat of Mississippi, urges that Congress revalidate State sedition laws which were virtually nullified by a recent Supreme Court decision.

STENNIS said the decision was the latest in a series of cases in which the Supreme Court has disregarded established precedent to achieve further centralization of government.

A Waxahachie district judge says that political decisions by the United States Supreme Court likely is one reason the public generally has lost a lot of respect for courts and lawyers.

Criticism of the High Court came from District Judge A. R. Stout of Waxahachie in a talk before the Dallas Criminal Bar Association.

Judge Stout denounced recent decisions by the High Court as warning clouds of an end to free government.

He referred to the High Court's decisions as being made by "men more distinguished in politics than they ever were in law." He said that judges should be "fearless and able—not political experts."

These stories may reflect the feeling of lawyers generally over the country.

Not even the Supreme Court of the United States can function efficiently with so much ill will.

The Farm Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES B. BROWNSON
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 5, 1956

Mr. BROWNSON. Mr. Speaker, Rainbow Farm consists of nearly a thousand acres of land and produces about 1,400 meat hogs and 240 beef cattle yearly. Daniel I. Glossbrenner, who, with his son, owns and operates it, considers himself, and is considered, a farmer—and by necessity—a businessman. Needless to say, the present surplus storage and distribution problem affects him on all sides. He sells his swine and beef at the prices supply and demand puts upon them. But he must purchase feed at prices unnaturally created.

This former chairman of the Indiana State Agricultural Credit Commission now sees the need for this problem to be put into the hands of a Federal Agriculture Board. But Colonel Glossbrenner states his case most effectively in a letter he addressed to me the 20th of June. Under leave to extend my remarks, I ask that this letter be printed in its entirety in the RECORD so that it might receive the attention and consideration of my colleagues.

The letter follows:

RAINBOW FARM,
Indianapolis, Ind., June 20, 1956.

HON. CHARLES B. BROWNSON,
Member of the House of Representatives,
New House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BROWNSON: As politically discussed today, the farm problem is an all embracing Agriculture problem affecting the lives and security of each citizen. It is comparable only to the credit and money control problem as governed and controlled by the Federal Reserve Banking System through the Federal Reserve bank. The organic act establishing this system was passed by Congress in 1913, and amended in 1935.

Today, the accomplishment factors in the individual farmer's and rancher's problem consist of (1) know-how, based on experience; (2) movement of tonnage on and off the farm.

Over these two factors he has some degree of control. He has no control over his result, which expensively accumulates en masse in:

A. Storage: Domestic and export.

B. Distribution: Domestic and export and the cost thereof.

These two resulting factors can only be handled by an agency of the Federal Government at the highest level, having continuity of management.

The political parity price we get with each Congress is unfair and penalizes operations and encourages destruction of our soil. There must be some sane consideration given to—"Who pays the Parity Price." In this 5-million-farmer group in the United States of America no distinction is made. The land-owning cattle, hog, sheep, poultry and dairy men pay the parity price to the cash crop man, on every pound, bushel, or ton of feed, grain or supplement we buy. No Member of Congress has presented the case of the livestock man who buys feed on a controlled price base, and has to sell on the hoof on the uncontrolled price base. We are the biggest customer in the United States of America. As exists today, we would feed stored 1953–52 old corn if we could buy on the open market but it is locked up by a law that Congress made. A Federal agricultural board should have the power to release this storage at market prices when we need it. Why and how long will the livestock man pay the parity tax?

The basic principles of the soil-bank program, i. e., to pay farmers to withhold land and crop production and under certain conditions to divert it to "lower order" uses, has apparently met wide acceptance and may be an important feature of farm programs in future years.

Views differ widely, however, on important details. Some believe the program will only be of aid to farmers in the long run. Who owns this soil bank? "Bankers reported that about three-fourths of the farmland is purchased by farm owners and tenants and about one-fourth by nonfarmers. These proportions are identical to those reported by bankers in October 1953 and are quite similar to the proportion reported by the USDA for the nation early in 1955. The only noticeable change reported in buyers of farmland between 1953 and 1955 is that tenants have been purchasing relatively less and farm owners have purchased relatively more. This shift is probably a reflection of the keen demand by farm owners to purchase land for farm enlargement and the decline in farm income which in turn has slowed the accumulation of funds for down-payments by tenants."

The effect on the foreign policy of the continuance of the agriculture mess and frustration is exactly what the Iron Curtain policymakers want. They want us to argue about "Parity, percents, and losses due to storage." Indirectly and in our own Departments of Government they are preventing us from selling and shipping to our friendly allies, aid assistance exports. They laugh at us in the world wheat pool accepting a Winnipeg price base and ask if the St. Lawrence Waterway will change our base to Chicago? A board could do what is best for us.

The world economic war started before Stalin died. It is in high gear today, with Russian oil now being delivered in continental Europe. We should have the best storage plant in the world for our domestic reserve located on the Mississippi River and the Great Lakes. We should store our export reserves at the several ports of embarkation at the time of harvest and under license control of the board. Private capital should be encouraged to improve and erect new export facilities and aided, if need be, to make, barter, and trade deals to move surplus. Give a Federal agriculture board the power to barter and trade the Soviet Union out of the free world.

It is time to take the agriculture problem out of politics by separating the "storage and distribution problems" and policy future direction, from the Department of Agriculture. For 30 years or more each Congress has given the Secretary of Agriculture more to do and tied his hands tight. Agriculture has grown up on research in the last 10 years, and is now rolling on rubber. Each political change of Government of new Congress sinks us on the farm deeper to the axles.

I am summarizing my recommendation for the establishment of a Federal agriculture board:

By congressional action, establish an independent executive department to be known as Federal agriculture board consisting of nine men, landowners, too, appointed for the same term of years as the Federal Reserve Board; to control storage, distribution, and prices for all commodities, and meat and meat products in storage, and to coordinate the farm credit policy through the Federal intermediate credit banks with the Federal Reserve Board. This board must be on the same Federal Government level as:

1. Federal Reserve Board, established 1913.
2. Interstate Commerce Commission, established 1887.
3. Federal Power Commission, established 1920.
4. Federal Communications Commission, established 1934.
5. Federal Trade Commission, established 1914.
6. Federal Securities and Exchange Commission, established 1934.

The board should be charged with the accumulation, storage, and control of the domestic and export reserves, with power to establish the prices per unit—pound, bushel, bale, ton, at parity or less. They must have the power of decision to sell, release for sale, or barter at parity or less. This instant power of decision is vital to our economic life, if we are to compete in our world export markets against bureaucracy.

It is further recommended that the President specifically recommend to the country in a national TV speech, "That time and change in our economic position in the world demands the immediate establishment of a Federal agriculture board to operate for agriculture on the same level as our Federal Reserve Board.

"That he will cause the Secretary of Agriculture and request the House and Senate Agriculture Committees to, jointly, draft a bill separating all policy and control activities, markets, storage, credit and finance, from the Department of Agriculture and transfer same to the new board having powers of decision and action comparable to the Federal Reserve Board.

"That he will submit this recommendation to Congress in advance of their meeting in January in order that it may be considered at once on a patriotic basis, for earliest possible action."

It is as vital to our existence to govern and control our living food reserves, as it is to stockpile ammunition, and build our Air Force. Faced with the rapid increase of our population, we must establish this board at once.

Yours respectfully,
DANIEL I. GLOSSBRENNER.

Four Philosophies of Modern Times

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN H. RAY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 5, 1956

Mr. RAY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I would like to bring to the attention of Congress and readers of the RECORD throughout the country a thoughtful and timely address delivered by Rabbi Charles E. Shulman at the Rotary Club on Staten Island on June 5 last. I am a member of that Rotary Club and was present at the meeting of Dr. Rabbi Shulman's talk impressed me so much that I asked for a copy in order that I might place it in the RECORD. All who read the address will join in paying tribute to the wisdom and patriotism of Dr. Shulman.

The address follows:

FOUR PHILOSOPHIES OF MODERN TIMES

(By Rabbi Charles E. Shulman, Riverdale Temple, New York)

This period of world's history which the poet W. H. Auden has called "Age of Anxiety" has had its effects upon American citizens. We cannot live in a world of confusion and tension without being disturbed by the course of its events. Some of the effects on Americans indicate that they may have forgotten the paths their fathers trod in the search for adequate living. They are seen in the things we value, in the thinking we do, in the manner in which we view our world, in the purpose or lack of purpose in our lives, in the kind of gods we serve, in the way we face the nations across the seas.

We do not lack bread in America. Nor shelter. Nor comfort. Our standard of living is the highest in the world. Our basic problem in these times is not an economic one—not when 63 million Americans are employed and our national income is estimated annually at more than $400 billion. Not when business flourishes and trade unions are firmly established and respectable in their acceptance by society. These signs of wellbeing are physical ones. They might be called evidences of the quantitative character of our American civilization. But these external symbols of national development cannot hide some of our present deficiencies. The richer we become as a nation the more tense we seem to appear, the more insecure. Here we are, wealthier than ever before and becoming daily more wealthy, and yet we are devoting less and less of our great wealth to public welfare. Our national income rises, our stores are filled with gadgets and gimmicks, our consumer goods are enormous in quantity. But our schools are more crowded and dilapidated than they ever were before. Our teachers are more weary and underpaid. Our playgrounds are more jammed and dirty. Our national parks are more neglected. Our law enforcement bodies are more overworked and harassed. And we wonder why we have more prejudice, more selfishness and more juvenile delinquency than formerly.

We have physical abundance—houses, automobiles, televisions and frozen foods to suit any taste. But our spiritual problem is greater than it was a generation ago. We are desperately looking for peace of mind, peace of soul, peace of heart and peace of all else; we are buying popular religious books by the thousands to give us inner security that we so badly need. We definitely seek to better the quality of our lives, to match our physical quantitative blessedness and to teach us how better to use our gadgets of the new atomic age. We need aid of the kind that will help us be a noble influence for freedom and justice and decency both in our wonderful land and in lands abroad. It is high time that we went beyond the necessities of living which our national abundance affords us so well, beyond the physical preoccupation with a job, a square meal, a new suit of clothes, an automobile and a house in the suburbs, and thought some about individual dignity and individual character in our society in this period when we tend to become indifferent to our neighbor's existence. It is time we added some vision to our life, that we remember clearly that where there is no vision the people perish.

Our real problem in this period of physical change in our living due to wonder drugs and airplanes that fly 1,500 miles an hour, and television and hydrogen bombs in a shrunken world is to know what to do with what we have, to help others to live so that this abundant physical life may be shared more, to emphasize the things of the spirit that have been so greatly neglected in recent years, to turn our minds to the primary purpose of our existence, to develop individual and national character. We must think more about such things as education and religion which stress intelligent and noble living and turn our gaze on such individual and social needs as greater opportunities for minority groups, better planning for our cities and suburbs, slum clearance, decent housing, improvement of life for the sick and the aged, a sense of justice toward people abroad who long for the good life that we do, and the necessity of helping democracy in other places on earth. Let us face up to our responsibilities as free people. Our treatment of the Negro in this country must sooner or later honor the decisions of our own Supreme Court of the United States, if we are to survive as a Nation. Our concern for the freedom of the Jewish people in the State of Israel must be as important as our respect for the income from Arabian oil and Arabian dictators who purchase arms from the Soviet Communists for war purposes that could conceivably be turned against us if our free world is to exist. Our interest in Asia must be governed by more enlightened policies than pure trade and commerce if we are to have the good will of the people of India and Indonesia and others who can be our friends and allies in making our world order secure and peaceful. If we concentrate only on the material things, if we persist in thinking only of the quantitative factors in our national life that give us physical comfort and pleasure we will forget the warning that one of America's distinguished poets, the late Stephen Vincent Benet uttered a few years ago:

"You will not be saved by General Motors,
You will not be saved by prefabricated houses,
You will not be saved by dialectic materialism,
You will not be saved by the Lambeth Conference,
You will not be saved by Vitamin D,
You will not be saved by the expanding universe,
In fact you will not be saved."

There are four philosophies in our time that are followed by men. One of them is cynicism. One is nihilism. One is materialism. And one is idealism. In our brief survey of these philosophies we may be able to see more clearly the causes that underlie some of the confusions and tensions of the day.

The philosophy of cynicism is tied to an ancient group called the cyrenaics, founded by the Greek philosopher Aristippus of Cyrene. Their course was called Hedonism—self-indulgence. The end and aim of existence or such people is pleasure. They are indifferent to their neighbors, indifferent to their civic duties, indifferent to world events. Their religion is one of comfort. Their attachment to any cause is only in terms of their own convenience. As freemen they will exercise their ballot on election day only if it is not raining or if it is comfortable for them to do so. They are not aroused by the social ills of their time. They put their faith in gadgets and more gadgets. Of such people a clergyman, Reverend Edward Ziegler, of Roanoke, Va., thought when he rewrote the Twenty-third Psalm in terms of the gadgets of our day:

"Science is my shepherd, I shall not want,
It maketh me to lie down on foam-rubber mattresses
It leadeth me beside six-lane highways
It rejuveneth my thyroid glands
It leadeth me in the path of psychoanalysis
For peace of mind's sake.
Yea, though I walk through the valley of the shadow of the Iron Curtain
I will fear no Communist for thou art with me
Thy hydrogen bomb comforteth me.
Thou preparest a banquet for me
In the presence of the world's billion hungry people
Thou anointest my head with home permanents
My beer glass foameth over
Surely prosperity and pleasure shall follow me all the days of my life
And I will dwell in Shangrila forever."

2. The philosophy of nihilism. This is a philosophy of power leading nowhere socially or politically. There are individuals who live and dream of naked power for its own sake. They constitute one of the problems of our time because of the shrunken nature of the universe. And they vitally affect our life and thinking in America because of the instability they can create in the life of peoples everywhere. We fought World War II because of this philosophy in Germany under Hitler and Italy under Mussolini and Japan under Togo. If you would appreciate the consequences of this dreadful philosophy when it assumes authority you can find it in Norman Cousins' evaluation of Hitler's book Mein Kampf which was the bible of Nazi Germany. Cousins tells us that for every word in that book 125 lives were lost in the world. For every page in that book 4,700 lives were lost. And for every chapter in that book 1,200,000 lives were lost.

We are witnessing the recrudescence of that philosophy of nihilism in Egypt today, ruled by a handsome young power-driven dictator and the dictators of the Arab States who are in league with him. How else can we judge the cynical course of these Arab nations in the Middle East whose rulers turn one face toward the oppressed and illiterate masses whom they control, and tell them that Communist Russia is their only friend because it is supplying millions of dollars worth of arms with which to destroy the young state of Israel, who spend millions of dollars of the royalties paid them by the oil companies of the Western World to set up antidemocratic and anti-Semitic propaganda agencies in the United States accusing Americans of double loyalties in their American citizenship because they support the state of Israel and help this young democratic nation attain its peaceful goal. The second face of these Arab dictators is turned to America and to the free world with the pious statement that they have bought arms from the Communists to protect themselves against Israel. But if you make a pact with the devil you will not easily escape from the clutches of the devil. Communist Russia does not grant favors without demanding something in return. And the Arabs with their philosophy of nihilism, while enjoying

their power and their new weapons of destruction, will awake one day to find themselves puppets of Soviet Russia and against interests of free people everywhere.

3. The philosophy of materialism. This is the twisted heritage of Karl Marx that rules half the population on earth today in Russia and its satellites in China, Indochina, parts of France, Italy, North Africa, and in the Mediterranean lands. What does it stand for? Its philosophy is that the history of all existing society in the world is the history of class struggles, freeman and slave, patrician and plebian, lord and serf, guild master and journeyman, oppressor and oppressed—all carry on perpetual warfare. Also that the production of the immediate requisite material means of existence and therewith the extant economic development phase of a nation or an epoch constitutes the foundation upon which the state institutions, the legal outlooks, the artistic, even the religious ideas of those concerned have been built up.

The trouble with this philosophy is that it fails to account for the obvious differences between people which are in the same stage of economic development. It leaves out of account such vital factors as race, religion, and nationality. It does not reckon with the vast importance of human personality. It is doubtful whether a single historical event could be interpreted in terms of this theory.

And this philosophy of materialism has been buttressed by dictatorship and slavery and oppression and cruelty and violence and bloodshed. The state as an octopus has swallowed the individual. The dictator is supreme. The few rule the overwhelming majority and the majority is silent. The whims of the oligarchy prevail. One day it is Lenin who is the top figure. Another day it is Stalin. Today it is Khrushchev.

We have learned a great deal about the way in which this philosophy is forced upon people from above. The silent masses can do little about it without suffering torture and death. The dictators will not brook questioning of their course of conduct. When Khrushchev was challenged by the British labor people during his visit to England to release the prisoners who differ with him he grew furious and told the Englishmen to mind their own business. The American Protestant mission of churchmen who just returned from Russia reported to their fellow Americans that the antireligious campaign is not quite as crude as it was some 20 years ago in Soviet Russia, that Mr. Khrushchev has just issued a secret directive to the Communists to stress more subtile means of oppression against all religion in the country. And like the smiles of Khrushchev and Bulganin in their meetings with Western leaders this policy of deceit is all the more dangerous than outright hostility. Now these godless Communists who are so cruel and intolerant of the religions of men in their own lands which they dominate are posing as the protectors of the religion of the Arabs in the Near East.

We have a way of measuring the success of the materialistic philosophy of communism as it is practiced by the dictators who rule with an iron hand. That way is through the stories that filter out of the Iron Curtain from time to time. One of them used to be told about the Fascists in the thirties of our century. It tells about Khrushchev entering a movie theater and sitting incognito in the back row. Suddenly his picture was flashed on the screen and everyone stood up in salute. He sat back enjoying the scene when an usher tapped him on the shoulder and whispered: "You'd better get up too. I don't like him any better than you do, but get up. It's safer." Another story concerns the schoolteachers in Soviet dominated lands. They have had to postpone the history examinations in schools and colleges because they won't know the correct answers for a while. Still another story concerns the classroom where each child was given a picture of Prime Minister Bulganin and told to take it home and hang it in a corner of the home. The next day a little girl appeared with the picture. She had brought it back. "What's the matter?" asked the teacher, "don't you like Bulganin?" "Oh, yes," she answered. "I like Bulganin all right but we don't have any corner in our room. We live in the middle of the room." A fourth story concerns a new jet plane that transported a citizen in Russia from Pinsk to Minsk in 4 minutes 32 seconds flat. The citizen was overwhelmed. He rushed to the home of a friend in Minsk and cried: "What a country. What a government. Not only the greatest constitution and the greatest leaders, the greatest army and the greatest ideas, but now we have a wonderful jet-plane that brought me here from Pinsk in less than 5 minutes." The friend refused to be impressed. "So you got here from Pinsk in less than 5 minutes. What good did it do you?" "What good?" he answered, "It enabled me to be the first in line to buy a pack of matches."

4. The philosophy of idealism. This is the philosophy of the potential in each human being as an individual. It is the philosophy on which America has been founded and built. We can thank God that it still prevails in our midst as a guide to us and our children. So much has been said and written about American shrewdness and inventiveness, American concentration on material things, that it would be good to weigh our national achievements in our brief history on the scales of their true merit.

In the year 1897 Dr. Charles Eliot of Harvard University, one of the truly great educators of his day and the originator of the famous 5-foot book shelf of Harvard Classics, spoke on America's 5 great contributions to civilization. He pointed out that under our philosophy of idealism property has never been safer in any form of government, that no people have ever welcomed so ardently the new machinery and new inventions generally, that religious toleration was never carried so far and so universally, that nowhere have the power and disposition to learn been so general, that nowhere has governmental power been more adequate or more freely exercised to levy and collect taxes, to raise armies and to disband them, to maintain public order, to pay off great public debts—National, State and town, that nowhere has property been so widely diffused, that no form of government has ever inspired greater affection and loyalty or prompted to greater personal sacrifices in supreme moments. This is essentially true of America and American idealism.

Dr. Eliot then spoke words that should be remembered by every living American who values this country and all that this country represents in his life. He said:

"The ultimate effects of our American inventions are quite as much intellectual and spiritual as they are physical and they are developing and increasing with a portentous rapidity which sometimes suggests a doubt whether the bodily forces of men and women are adequate to resist the new mental strains brought upon them.

"Five contributions of America constitute our heritage—the keeping of the peace, religious toleration, the development of universal suffrage, the welcoming of newcomers, the diffusion of wellbeing—I hold to have been eminently characteristic of our country and so important that despite the qualifications and deductions which every candid citizen would admit with regard to everyone of them they will ever be held in the grateful remembrance of mankind. They are reasonable grounds for a steady, glowing patriotism. They have much to do both as causes and effects with the material prosperity of the United States. But they are essentially 5 moral contributions, being triumphs of reason, enterprise, courage, faith and justice over passion, selfishness, inertness, timidity and distrust. Beneath each one of these developments there lies a strong ethical sentiment, a strenuous moral and social purpose. It is for such work that multitudinous democracies are fit.

"In regard to all 5 of these contributions the characteristic policy of our country has been from time to time threatened with reversal—is even now so threatened. It is for true patriots to insist on the maintenance of these historic purposes and policies of the people of the United States. Our country's future perils, whether already visible or still unimagined, are to be met with courage and constancy founded firmly on these popular achievements in the past."

America's philosophy of idealism has guided our inventions and our free enterprise. America's moral aspiration has touched and inspired the peoples of the world in days past. We must not forget this as we contemplate our present-day association with the nations of the world—the people who are still free and who look to us as examples of the kind of free men and women they would like to follow if given the opportunity. We must help the world to know better what American stands for. The defense of this great Nation, as Norman Cousins has reminded us, rests today as it did all along, not on arms, but on what we stand for in the world. The first front is the moral front. What other people see when they look at America. The kind of hope that comes to life at the mention of our name. The crisp conception of justice inside America and in our dealings as a nation; any ideas we may have about the pooling of sovereignty in the creation of effective world law—all this is what counts. Military preparedness without it is motion without action.

When we become weary of things, confused by the conflicting philosophies of our time, when we wonder about the future of democracy in a world of such disintegration and tension and change it would do us good to read our immortal American documents once again. Among these is the Constitution of the United States and its famous preamble, "We the people of the United States, in order to form a more perfect union, establish justice, insure domestic tranquility, provide for the common defense, promote the general welfare and secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity, do ordain and establish this Constitution for the United States of America."

The philosophies of cynicism and nihilism and materialism ignore the general welfare. Our problem today and tomorrow is to revive strongly in this Nation the conception of the general welfare, a conception that has tided us over many wars and crises in the centuries of our existence. It was dear to the Founding Fathers of this Republic. It is indelibly stamped in the preamble of the Constitution of our land. It teaches us that under this general welfare clause we have developed from small colonies to the greatest nation on earth. But we must heed its instruction. We cannot expect equality abroad to be effectively taught by us if we restrict equality at home. We cannot expect to confer on others the blessings of liberty if we deny them at home. We cannot export democracy elsewhere unless it functions adequately in the United States. We must have a fighting faith in the philosophy of idealism as did those who preceded us on these shores. And in God's good time that faith will kindle a flame that will light up the fires of democracy everywhere on earth.

The School-Construction Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 5, 1956

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, an editorial in today's Washington Post sounds a fair warning that if the Powell amendment is adopted there will be no school-construction aid this year.

The editorial follows:

SCHOOLROOMS DENIED

Members of the House evidently would rather have school integration as an abstract issue than additional schoolrooms as a practical fact. That is the sad conclusion to be drawn from the 164-to-119 teller vote adding the Powell amendment to the school-construction bill. This amendment would deny funds to States which have not desegregated their schools. Representative DAWSON, a veteran Negro legislator, courageously warned his colleagues in what may unhappily be an epitaph: "If you tack the Powell amendment on this bill you'll have no school-aid program this year."

One can respect the principle of those who felt they had to vote for the Powell amendment out of conscience and still deplore their lack of pragmatism. The Powell amendment stands no chance of passage in the Senate, and the dismal prospect is that it will serve to kill the entire school bill there; but, even if somehow it were enacted into law, it would not solve the school-segregation problem one whit faster. The Supreme Court has declared school segregation illegal, but it has left to Federal courts the determination of what constitutes "all deliberate speed" in individual circumstances. That approach, which respects differing conditions, is far more likely than legislative fiat to encourage compliance.

The Powell amendment, in fact, would work a double penalty. The States which would be denied funds are precisely those which are in greatest need of compassionate help in providing additional facilities for adjustment; and the practical effect of the effort to exclude noncomplying States would be to deny Federal school-construction funds to all States. Meanwhile there is more and more testimony that the United States is lagging behind Russia in technical training, and that the country is simply not keeping up with the increasing educational load. If Members of the House, reinforced by those returning from the Fourth of July holiday, will take a statesmanlike look at the compelling need for classrooms quite apart from the inflammatory and extraneous racial issue, they will reconsider in the formal vote today and pass a school-construction bill without the red flag of the Powell amendment.

PRICE OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

The Public Printer is authorized to furnish to subscribers the daily RECORD at $1.50 per month, payable in advance.

Remit by money order payable to Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C.

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

LAWS AND RULES FOR PUBLICATION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

CODE OF LAWS OF THE UNITED STATES

TITLE 44, SECTION 181. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; ARRANGEMENT, STYLE, CONTENTS, AND INDEXES.—The Joint Committee on Printing shall have control of the arrangement and style of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and while providing that it shall be substantially a verbatim report of proceedings shall take all needed action for the reduction of unnecessary bulk, and shall provide for the publication of an index of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD semimonthly during the sessions of Congress and at the close thereof. (Jan. 12, 1895, c. 23, § 13, 28 Stat. 603.)

TITLE 44, SECTION 182b. SAME; ILLUSTRATIONS, MAPS, DIAGRAMS.—No maps, diagrams, or illustrations may be inserted in the RECORD without the approval of the Joint Committee on Printing. (June 20, 1936, c. 630, § 2, 49 Stat. 1546.)

Pursuant to the foregoing statute and in order to provide for the prompt publication and delivery of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the Joint Committee on Printing has adopted the following rules, to which the attention of Senators, Representatives, and Delegates is respectfully invited:

1. *Arrangement of the daily Record.*—The Public Printer will arrange the contents of the daily RECORD as follows: First, the Senate proceedings; second, the House proceedings; third, the Appendix: *Provided,* That when the proceedings of the Senate are not received in time to follow this arrangement, the Public Printer may begin the RECORD with the House proceedings. The proceedings of each House and the Appendix shall each begin a new page, with appropriate headings centered thereon.

2. *Type and style.*—The Public Printer shall print the report of the proceedings and debates of the Senate and House of Representatives, as furnished by the Official Reporters of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, in 7½-point type; and all matter included in the remarks or speeches of Members of Congress, other than their own words, and all reports, documents, and other matter authorized to be inserted in the RECORD shall be printed in 6½-point type; and all rollcalls shall be printed in 6-point type. No italic or black type nor words in capitals or small capitals shall be used for emphasis or prominence; nor will unusual indentions be permitted. These restrictions do not apply to the printing of or quotations from historical, official, or legal documents or papers of which a literal reproduction is necessary.

3. *Return of manuscript.*—When manuscript is submitted to Members for revision it should be returned to the Government Printing Office not later than 9 o'clock p. m. in order to insure publication in the RECORD issued on the following morning; and if all of said manuscript is not furnished at the time specified, the Public Printer is authorized to withhold it from the RECORD for 1 day. In no case will a speech be printed in the RECORD of the day of its delivery if the manuscript is furnished later than 12 o'clock midnight.

4. *Tabular matter.*—The manuscript of speeches containing tabular statements to be published in the RECORD shall be in the hands of the Public Printer not later than 7 o'clock p. m., to insure publication the following morning.

5. *Proof furnished.*—Proofs of "leave to print" and advance speeches will not be furnished the day the manuscript is received but will be submitted the following day, whenever possible to do so without causing delay in the publication of the regular proceedings of Congress. Advance speeches shall be set in the RECORD style of type, and not more than six sets of proofs may be furnished to Members without charge.

6. *Notation of withheld remarks.*—If manuscript or proofs have not been returned in time for publication in the proceedings, the Public Printer will insert the words "Mr. ——— addressed the Senate (House or Committee). His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix," and proceed with the printing of the RECORD.

7. *Thirty-day limit.*—The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD any speech or extension of remarks which has been withheld for a period exceeding 30 calendar days from the date when its printing was authorized: *Provided,* That at the expiration of each session of Congress the time limit herein fixed shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee.

8. *Corrections.*—The permanent RECORD is made up for printing and binding 30 days after each daily publication is issued; therefore all corrections must be sent to the Public Printer within that time: *Provided,* That upon the final adjournment of each session of Congress the time limit shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee: *Provided further,* That no Member of Congress shall be entitled to make more than one revision. Any revision shall consist only of corrections of the original copy and shall not include deletions of correct material, substitutions for correct material, or additions of new subject matter.

9. The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the full report or print of any committee or subcommittee when said report or print has been previously printed. This rule shall not be construed to apply to conference reports.

10. *Appendix to daily Record.*—When either House has granted leave to print (1) a speech not delivered in either House, (2) a newspaper or magazine article, or (3) any other matter not germane to the proceedings, the same shall be published in the Appendix except in cases of duplication. In such cases only the first item received in the Government Printing Office will be printed. This rule shall not apply to quotations which form part of a speech of a Member, or to an authorized extension of his own remarks: *Provided,* That no address, speech, or article delivered or released subsequently to the final adjournment of a session of Congress may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

11. *Estimate of cost.*—No extraneous matter in excess of two pages in any one instance may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by a Member under leave to print or to extend his remarks unless the manuscript is accompanied by an estimate in writing from the Public Printer of the probable cost of publishing the same, which estimate of cost must be announced by the Member when such leave is requested; but this rule shall not apply to excerpts from letters, telegrams, or articles presented in connection with a speech delivered in the course of debate or to communications from State legislatures, addresses or articles by the President and the members of his Cabinet, the Vice President, or a Member of Congress. For the purposes of this regulation, any one article printed in two or more parts, with or without individual headings, shall be considered as a single extension and the two-page rule shall apply. The Public Printer or the Official Reporters of the House or Senate shall return to the Member of the respective House any matter submitted for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which is in contravention of this paragraph.

12. *Official Reporters.*—The Official Reporters of each House shall indicate on the manuscript and prepare headings for all matter to be printed in the Appendix, and shall make suitable reference thereto at the proper place in the proceedings.

Daily Digest

HIGHLIGHTS

Senate passed numerous sundry bills, clearing seven for President.

House rejected school construction bill and disapproved two reorganization plans.

Senate

Chamber Action

Routine Proceedings, pages 10678–10693

Bills Introduced: 7 bills and 2 resolutions were introduced, as follows: S. 4169–S. 4175; and S. Res. 304–S. Res. 305. Pages 10679–10680

Bills Reported: Reports were made as follows:

H. R. 6218, relating to Federal assistance to Menominee Tribe of Indians to prepare for termination of Federal supervision (S. Rept. 2411);

H. R. 9280, to provide for formulation of plan for control of property of Menominee Indian Tribe (S. Rept. 2412);

H. R. 9974, to amend act regarding cutting of timber on Menominee Indian Reservation, Wis. (S. Rept. 2413);

S. 3926, authorizing Secretary of Interior to charge for special services to purchasers of timber from Indian lands (S. Rept. 2414);

S. 3927, conveyance to Indian tribes of certain improvements or facilities on tribal lands, with amendments (S. Rept. 2415);

S. 147, to require that international agreements other than treaties, hereafter entered into by U. S., be transmitted to Senate within 30 days after execution thereof, with amendments (S. Rept. 2416);

S. 3227, authorizing construction, operation, and maintenance of Little Wood reclamation project, Idaho, with amendment (S. Rept. 2417);

S. 3556, providing transfer of title to movable property to irrigation districts for operation and maintenance, with amendment (S. Rept. 2418); and

S. 3658, to authorize the subsurface storage of oil or gas in restricted Indian lands, tribal or allotted, with amendments (S. Rept. 2419). Pages 10678–10679

Bills Referred: 23 House-passed bills were referred to appropriate committees. Page 10678

Boy Scout World Jamboree: Senate concurred in House amendments to S. 2772, authorizing loan of certain Armed Forces equipment to Boy Scouts of America at World Jamboree. This action cleared the bill for White House. Page 10692

Sundry Bills Passed: Senate took from calendar and passed 12 sundry bills, as follows:

Without amendment and cleared for President:

NATO Parliamentary Conference: H. J. Res. 501, to authorize participation by U. S. in parliamentary conferences of NATO;

National park concessions: H. R. 3897, to relieve the Secretary of the Interior of certain reporting requirements in connection with proposed National Park Service awards of concession leases and contracts, including renewals thereof;

Coastwise vessels: H. R. 6025, to amend the shipping laws to prohibit operation in coastwise trade of vessels rebuilt outside U. S.; and

Private bills: Two private bills: H. R. 3350 and 3351.

With amendment, to be sent back to House:

Distilled spirits transfers: H. R. 11714, extending for 2 years existing authority of Secretary of Treasury in respect to transfers of distilled spirits (with floor amendment by Senator George adding language concerning treatment by shareholders in a regulated investment company of undistributed capital gains);

Coast Guard promotions: H. R. 11402, to extend existing application of Temporary Promotion Act of 1941 to the Coast Guard;

Metal scrap duty: H. R. 8636, to extend for 1 year the suspension of duties and import taxes on metal scrap; and

Private bill: H. J. Res. 580.

With amendment and cleared for House:

Advisory Committee on Arts: S. 3419, providing for establishment of a Federal Advisory Committee on the Arts;

Homestead and desert-land entries: S. 3458, to grant leaves of absence to homestead entrymen and to permit suspension of cultivation and improvement operations on homestead and desert-land entries; and

Shipbuilding surveys: S. 3705, requiring periodic survey of national shipbuilding capability.

Pages 10693–10704

Memorial Addresses: By unanimous consent, it was agreed that on Monday, July 9, at conclusion of routine morning business, Senate will hear memorial addresses

Appendix

Suggested Aids for Small Business Enterprises

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. EDWARD J. THYE

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, July 6, 1956

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, a letter signed by George J. Burger, vice president of the National Federation of Independent Business, and addressed to Dr. Arthur Burns, Chairman of the President's Cabinet Committee on Small Business.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NATIONAL FEDERATION OF INDEPENDENT BUSINESS,
Washington, D. C., July 5, 1956.

Dr. ARTHUR BURNS,
Chairman, President's Cabinet Committee on Small Business, Executive Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR DR. BURNS: I am glad to have the privilege to discuss with you and your associates on the President's Special Cabinet Committee To Strenghten the Economic Position and Foster and Sound Development of Small Businesses, the following subject matters that have been directed to us by our nationwide membership, comprised exclusively of independent business and professional men, all voting members. I believe the total membership will disclose the federation to be the largest business organization of its kind in the Nation, numbering approximately 102,000 members.

Any position we take is on direct nationwide instruction of our members and no officer or group of officers can speak or act officially for the federation until they receive the instructions from the membership.

At the time the President made the announcement of the creation of this Special Cabinet Committee, we commended the action of the President. We also said we trusted that this was not a partisan move, and we further stated that the No. 1 proposition to be considered by the Committee was "antitrust law enforcement and strengthening of these laws."

ANTITRUST

We know from practical experience of owning and operating an independent business establishment that the key to success or failure of a small business enterprise, whether at the production or distribution level, rests largely in the enforcement of these major laws to protect the free-enterprise system.

We believe there is need for strengthening amendments to these laws, such as is proposed in the present Congress, which will curb deliberate and continual violations of antitrust laws. We find that fines are no deterrent.

It doesn't make much difference how efficient small business may be, or how well financed they may be—if these laws are ignored, or there is weakness in the enforcement, it then means certain destruction to small business of this Nation.

As a help also in this direction, the local United States Government attorneys should be utilized in detecting violations at the local level.

To bring about impartial, sincere, and vigorous enforcement of the antitrust laws it is our belief that the Antitrust Division of the Department of Justice should receive increased appropriations, earmarked for antitrust enforcement. Through this competent personnel would be attracted, which would result in the Department continuously being staffed with well-informed personnel having full knowledge of our economic situation.

The procedure in the Federal Trade Commission should be reviewed, and the agency should confine itself to major economic cases or questions before the Commission, so that relief could be secured at the local level for small business through the free-enterprise system. This agency, too, should receive increased appropriations which would attract competent personnel, resulting in the agency continuously being staffed with well-informed personnel having full knowledge of our economic situation.

CONGRESSIONAL SMALL BUSINESS COMMITTEES

During their existence these past 15 years they have proved invaluable to the future welfare of small business. It can be said without fear of contradiction that through the creation of these committees by the Congress many of the Government agencies, for the first time, took the proper steps in creating departments within the agencies on small business problems.

We believe these committees should be strengthened by giving them full standing committee status, with full legislative authority.

SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION

We have closely observed the operation of this agency. It has made progress in aiding small business. It can make greater progress providng the agency is made a permanent agency of the Government, and the full control rests in the hands of the Administrator, subject to review by the Congress.

It is our belief that the agency should exercise its right in going in and taking prime contracts and subletting them to small business institutions. We make this recommendation in view of the fact the following report appeared in the Senate Small Business Committee Newsletter of June 30, 1956:

"Small business share of defense contracts dropped to new low point in 9-month period ending March 30. Report released by Department of Defense shows small business has received only 19.7 percent of the dollars spent by Defense thus far in fiscal 1956. In fiscal 1955 small business got 21.5 percent of the dollar value of all prime contracts awarded to business firms for work in the United States. In fiscal 1954 the small business share was 25.3 percent."

TAXES

Some definite recommendation should be made by the committee that immediate steps be taken by the Congress in enacting legislation which will permit small business to set up necessary reserves so that they may be able to have funds available to take care of their business requirements during normal or lull periods in our economy.

Such legislation has already been introduced in the present Congress and this could be used as a pattern in bringing about this due recognition for tax relief for small business.

GOVERNMENT IN BUSINESS

It is our belief that proper steps should be taken for the Government to cease its operations in those fields where it works a tremendous disadvantage to small business.

We believe that the armed services should carefully scrutinize the operations of the Government ship stores and post exchanges, and determine whether under present mass distribution of products such branches of the Government, during peacetime, are a necessary adjunct of the Government.

TARIFFS

It is well to realize that reciprocal trade with other nations must continue, but this should be carefully scrutinized as to each and every arrangement so that it doesn't work a hardship on our domestic economy.

Many large corporations in the Nation are operated on an international basis so they gain no matter what way the regulation is put into effect, but, on the other hand, reciprocal trade might result in destruction, or an unfair competitive condition for all types of businesses in our Nation's economy, other than the international corporations.

GOVERNMENT FORMS

We realize that in some instances the numerous forms now required by Government law for businesses of all descriptions to complete sometimes give invaluable information to the Government, but at the same time recognition must be given to the fact that in many instances small business establishments are unable to fulfill the requirements of completing such a maze of forms. It requires outside help, which adds greater expense to the small business operation, or places an undue hardship on the owner of a small business establishment should he attempt to complete the forms himself.

LABOR

On behalf of our members we have repeatedly urged, in our appearances before the platform committees of both political parties, in 1948 and 1952, that labor be brought in under the full provisions of the antitrust laws. This must not be misunderstood as being antagonistic to organized labor because such is not the case, but we do believe, with the increasing concentration in labor leadership, it is necessary today that they be brought in under the antitrust laws, which, in itself, could even be a help to the constructively organized labor movement.

On this subject matter, we also think that the Wage and Hour Law Division of the Department of Labor could stand some reviewing in its enforcement of the wage and hour law as it applies to small business.

We live with this situation daily in our contacts with our nationwide membership. Small business is not asking for any preferential treatment, but we do believe there is necessity for fair and equal administration of the labor laws.

The above subjects are the major subjects for consideration during our conference, and

we trust that appropriate action will be taken by the committee in reporting out recommendations along the lines of the above outlined subjects.

Sincerely yours,

GEORGE J. BURGER,
Vice President.

Saving of Money for Taxpayers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANDREW F. SCHOEPPEL
OF KANSAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, July 6, 1956

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, on Monday, July 2, 1956, the Miami Herald published an article entitled "'Timid Taxpayers' Saved Money as WILLIAMS Tracks Down Fakers," by Jeanne Bellamy.

I ask unanimous consent that the article may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DELAWARE SENATOR IS CAREFUL, METHODICAL INVESTIGATOR—TIMID TAXPAYERS SAVED MONEY AS WILLIAMS TRACKS DOWN FAKERS

(By Jeanne Bellamy)

WASHINGTON.—Are you a timid taxpayer? If so, you might be minus a lot of money today but for Senator JOHN J. WILLIAMS, of Delaware.

Here's the way he tells the story:

Three men working for the Internal Revenue Service had a bright idea. It was based on the knowledge that people are afraid of income tax men.

They spotted timid taxpayers, as they called them. Then they faked tax assessments, collected the money and put it in their own pockets.

They aren't working for the Government any more. They're in the penitentiary because WILLIAMS got a tip that something fishy was going on in their office.

He is the Senator who has been blowing the whistle on wrongdoers for the past 8 years.

It doesn't come naturally to WILLIAMS. He is a blue-eyed, jut-jawed ex-farmboy from the poultry country of southern Delaware.

WILLIAMS isn't a lawyer or a detective. He is a grain merchant, partner in a Millsboro, Del., firm that sells chicken feed in hundred-pound sacks.

WILLIAMS wasn't out gunning for anybody when he came to the Senate 10 years ago.

"I had no idea I would ever get mixed up in that kind of work," he said. "When I started it, I had no idea it would branch out."

But it did, and WILLIAMS has a report on 214 indictments of Treasury employees or ex-employees or people who gave them payoffs.

"There have been 101 convictions, a few were freed by juries and the rest are pending," he says.

WILLIAMS disclaims credit for much of that. He does think his speeches in the Senate, citing names, dates, and figures, encouraged the cleanup.

Such speeches are WILLIAMS' way of yelling, "Stop, thief."

He's no orator. Fellow Senators say they can hardly hear him when he reads one of his exposés.

People shrugged at first. Some thought he had been sold a bill of goods, as WILLIAMS recalls.

Nobody takes his charges lightly any more. He gets action.

That's because WILLIAMS never goes off half-cocked.

He got started back in 1947 through suspicion that an embezzlement was going on in the Internal Revenue Office in Delaware.

"I was doing a little checking, and got a fellow from the General Accounting Office to help," WILLIAMS related.

The approach was to check delinquent accounts. That involved asking people to open their tax records, which many were reluctant to do.

"In the process, I found my own name on the list of delinquent accounts. It was a bit of a shock because I had paid all my income taxes.

"I didn't have any trouble persuading myself to open my tax records, and I had made all my payments by check, so we took it from there. We soon closed the case out, and the fellow went to the penitentiary."

His statements in the Senate about that one brought WILLIAMS a flood of tips. They came by mail, by phone, and in person.

The biggest was about the tax-fixing ring. It came from a man who walked into WILLIAMS' office and "sat here for 3 hours, letting the girl take down his report on condition I would never use his name."

Has he got any new ones coming up?

"I have never said that I would have another report," is his answer. "I don't like the idea of saying, 'Look out, I'm a-coming later.' When I get a case done and am satisfied it is right, I put it out."

He gets a good deal of mail praising what he has done. He also has letters criticizing him for accusing certain individuals. Neither rocks him.

"The fact that I accuse a man doesn't mean he is guilty," he says. "That is for the courts to decide."

His theory is that corruption in Government occurs in waves. When it's exposed, those who are tempted get wary and the people have their eyes wide open.

"It goes that way for a while, and then there's a letdown. Let's hope there won't ever be another letdown."

Massachusetts Cranberries

SPEECH
OF
HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 5, 1956

(Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I hold in my hand a very attractive basket which was presented by the National Cranberry Association. In it are some delicious cranberries grown in the district of my colleague from Massachusetts [Mr. NICHOLSON]. It only shows how active my colleague is for his constituents whether it be for the sale of cranberries grown in his district; whether it be for veterans' legislation; whether it be for the saving of the textile industry for which he has worked so hard or for rivers and harbors, or for the Great National Guard installation in his district. I like to draw attention also to the fact that my colleague from Massachusetts works constantly for what he considers to be for the good of the country, and he is a great fighter for everything that he believes in, just as he was a great fighter in World War I in France. I am very grateful to him, and the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, and the Nation also should be grateful to him.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I am glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. NICHOLSON. I am at a loss for words at the sentiment the gentlewoman is expressing. The gentlewoman must have a great deal of admiration for me.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Yes, I do; and I also have a great deal of admiration for your wife.

Mr. NICHOLSON. I assure you the admiration it mutual. The gentlewoman is very kind and I want to thank her for the opportunity to give some of this cranberry sauce to the Members, and I think after today they need it.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. In closing I congratulate the gentleman and statesman on the great services he has achieved during his career. I was glad to see the very fine picture he had taken at the White House a few weeks ago with President Eisenhower.

Declaration of Independence, 1776–1956

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 5, 1956

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, we have just celebrated our greatest national holiday, July 4, or, as it is sometimes called, Independence Day.

It might be well at this time to renew acquaintance with the document that was the result of pioneer action in declaring the 13 United States free and independent.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I am including the Declaration of Independence as originally executed:

THE DECLARATION OF INDEPENDENCE, 1776—IN CONGRESS, JULY 4, 1776—THE UNANIMOUS DECLARATION OF THE THIRTEEN UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

WHEN in the Course of human events, it becomes necessary for one people to dissolve the political bands which have connected them with another, and to assume among the powers of the earth, the separate and equal station to which the Laws of Nature and of Nature's God entitle them, a decent respect to the opinions of mankind requires that they should declare the causes which impel them to the separation.

We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness. That to secure these rights, governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed,—That whenever any Form of Government becomes

destructive of these ends, it is the Right of the People to alter or to abolish it, and to institute new Government, laying its foundation on such principles and organizing its powers in such form, as to them shall seem most likely to effect their Safety and Happiness. Prudence, indeed, will dictate that Governments long established should not be changed for light and transient causes; and accordingly all experience hath shewn, that mankind are more disposed to suffer, while evils are sufferable, than to right themselves by abolishing the forms to which they are accustomed. But when a long train of abuses and usurpations, pursuing invariably the same Object evinces a design to reduce them under absolute Despotism, it is their right, it is their duty, to throw off such Government, and to provide new Guards for their future security.—Such has been the patient sufferance of these Colonies; and such is now the necessity which constrains them to alter their former Systems of Government. The history of the present King of Great Britain is a history of repeated injuries and usurpations, all having in direct object the establishment of an absolute tyranny over these States. To prove this, let Facts be submitted to a candid world.

He has refused his Assent to Laws, the most wholesome and necessary for the public good.

He has forbidden his Governors to pass Laws of immediate and pressing importance, unless suspended in their operation till his Assent should be obtained; and when so suspended, he has utterly neglected to attend to them.

He has refused to pass other Laws for the accommodation of large districts of people, unless those people would relinquish the right of Representation in the Legislature, a right inestimable to them and formidable to tyrants only.

He has called together legislative bodies at places unusual, uncomfortable, and distant from the depository of their public Records, for the sole purpose of fatiguing them into compliance with his measures.

He has dissolved Representative Houses repeatedly, for opposing with manly firmness his invasions on the rights of the people.

He has refused for a long time, after such dissolutions, to cause others to be elected; whereby the Legislative powers, incapable of Annihilation, have returned to the People at large for their exercise; the State remaining in the mean time exposed to all the dangers of invasion from without, and convulsions within.

He has endeavoured to prevent the population of these States; for that purpose obstructing the Laws for Naturalization of Foreigners; refusing to pass others to encourage their migrations hither, and raising the conditions of new Appropriations of Lands.

He has obstructed the Administration of Justice, by refusing his Assent to Laws for establishing Judiciary powers.

He has made Judges dependent on his Will alone, for the tenure of their offices, and the amount and payment of their salaries.

He has erected a multitude of New Office, and sent hither swarms of Officers to harass our people, and eat out their substance.

He has kept among us, in times of peace, Standing Armies without the Consent of our legislatures.

He has affected to render the Military independent of and superior to the Civil power.

He has combined with others to subject us to a jurisdiction foreign to our constitution, and unacknowledged by our laws; giving his Assent to their acts of pretended Legislation:

For quartering large bodies of armed troops among us:

For protecting them, by a mock Trial, from punishment for any Murders which they should commit on the Inhabitants of these States:

For cutting off our Trade with all parts of the world:

For imposing Taxes on us without our Consent:

For depriving us in many cases, of the benefits of Trial by Jury:

For transporting us beyond seas to be tried for pretended offenses;

For abolishing the free System of English Laws in a neighbouring Province, establishing therein an Arbitrary government, and enlarging its Boundaries so as to render it at once an example and fit instrument for introducing the same absolute rule into these Colonies:

For taking away our Charters, abolishing our most valuable Laws, and altering fundamentally the Forms of our Governments:

For suspending our own Legislatures, and declaring themselves invested with power to legislate for us in all cases whatsoever.

He has abdicated Government here, by declaring us out of his Protection and waging War against us.

He has plundered our seas, ravaged our Coasts, burnt our towns, and destroyed the lives of our people.

He is at this time transporting large Armies of foreign Mercenaries to compleat the works of death, desolation and tyranny, already begun with circumstances of Cruelty and perfidy scarcely paralleled in the most barbarous ages, and totally unworthy the Head of a civilized nation.

He has constrained our fellow Citizens taken Captive on the high Seas to bear Arms against their Country, to become the executioners of their friends and Brethren, or to fall themselves by their Hands.

He has excited domestic insurrections amongst us, and has endeavoured to bring on the inhabitants of our frontiers, the merciless Indian Savages, whose known rule of warfare, is an undistinguished destruction of all ages, sexes and conditions.

In every stage of these Oppressions We have Petitioned for Redress in the most humble terms: Our repeated Petitions have been answered only by repeated injury. A Prince, whose character is thus marked by every act which may define a Tyrant, is unfit to be the ruler of a free people.

Nor have we been wanting in attentions to our Brittish brethren. We have warned them from time to time of attempts by their legislature to extend an unwarrantable jurisdiction over us. We have reminded them of the circumstances of our emigration and settlement here. We have appealed to their native justice and magnanimity, and we have conjured them by the ties of our common kindred to disavow these usurpations, which, would inevitably interrupt our connections and correspondence. They too have been deaf to the voice of justice and of consanguinity. We must, therefore, acquiesce in the necessity, which denounces our Separation, and hold them, as we hold the rest of mankind, Enemies in War, in Peace Friends.

WE, THEREFORE, the Representatives of the UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, in General Congress, Assembled, appealing to the Supreme Judge of the world for the rectitude of our intentions, do, in the Name, and by Authority of the good People of these Colonies, solemnly publish and declare, That these United Colonies are, and of Right ought to be FREE AND INDEPENDENT STATES; that they are Absolved from all Allegiance to the British Crown, and that all political connection between them and the State of Great Britain, is and ought to be totally dissolved; and that as Free and Independent States, they have full Power to levy War, conclude Peace, contract Alliances, establish Commerce, and to do all other Acts and Things which Independent States may of right do. And for the support of this Declaration with a firm reliance on the protection of divine Providence, we mutually pledge to each other our Lives, our Fortunes, and our sacred Honor.

New Hampshire: John Hancock, Matthew Thornton, Josiah Bartlett, Wm. Whipple; Massachusetts Bay: Saml. Adams, John Adams, Robt. Treat Paine, Elbridge Gerry; Rhode Island: Step. Hopkins, William Ellery; Connecticut: Roger Sherman, Sam'el Huntington, Wm. Williams, Oliver Wolcott; New York: Wm. Floyd, Phil. Livingston, Frans. Lewis, Lewis Morris; New Jersey: Richd. Stockton, Jno. Witherspoon, Fras. Hopkinson, John Hart, Abra. Clark; Pennsylvania: Robt. Morris, Benjamin Rush, Benja. Franklin, John Morton, Geo. Clymer, Jas. Smith, Geo. Taylor, James Wilson, Geo. Ross; Delaware: Caesar Rodney, Geo. Read, Tho, M'Kean; Maryland: Samuel Chase, Wm. Paca, Thos. Stone, Charles Carroll of Carrollton; Virginia: George Wythe, Richard Henry Lee, Th. Jefferson, Benja. Harrison, Thos. Nelson, jr., Francis Lightfoot Lee, Carter Braxton; North Carolina: Wm. Hooper, Joseph Hewes, John Penn; South Carolina: Thos. Heyward, Junr., Edward Rutledge, Thomas Lynch Junr., Arthur Middleton; Georgia: Button Gwinnett, Lyman Hall, Geo. Walton.

Public versus Private Power at Niagara

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 14, 1956

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Westfield (N. Y.) Republican, of recent date:

PUBLIC VERSUS PRIVATE POWER AT NIAGARA

One could search the Congress of the United States from end to end without finding a single Representative or Senator who would not assert with great emphasis his belief in private enterprise and his abhorrence of socialism in any form. Yet, actions speak louder than words. On a clear cut issue of socialism versus private enterprise, the Senate recently voted for socialism.

Investor-owned private utility companies pioneered the development of power from the Niagara River in New York State some 60 years ago. Today by virtue of a treaty with Canada, more water from the Niagara is available for conversion into power. A group of five private companies who know the river and have the resources in hand to undertake its further development have been eagerly seeking permission from the Federal Government to do so. Their proposal has been opposed by the lobby that never sleeps—the public power lobby which has been trying for 25 years to squeeze out private utility companies wherever possible and place control of power production in Government hands.

Initially, when the Federal Government began to intrude into the field of power production and distribution, public advocates sought to justify this action on the basis of flood control, reclamation, irrigation, and navigation—all purposes which are properly within the Federal authority. Dams were necessary for these purposes and the production of electric energy was supposed to be an incidental byproduct. As long as the water was flowing over the Federal dams so the argument went, it was a shame to let it go to waste.

In the Niagara situation even this pretense is cast aside. No reclamation, irrigation, flood control, or navigation is involved. Electric power production, pure and simple, is the sole purpose. The argument now is that flowing water is a resource which belongs to all the people and therefore it should not be harnessed for private gain.

This argument overlooks the obvious fact that flowing water is flowing water and nothing more. It does not become valuable energy until someone invests the money to build the dams, the spillways, the power stations, the generators, and the distribution lines which will turn it into electricity and distribute it to homes and industries.

This takes a lot of money and much planning, patience, and engineering skill. In the case of the Niagara project, some $400 million of venture capital will have to be invested.

It is specious to argue that Niagara's water belongs to the people and that private parties seek to use this resource for their own interests. The true question is: Does Congress really believe in the free economic system of this Nation, or will it allow itself to become entangled in the sophistries of the Socialists.

If the privately owned companies are allowed to risk their stockholders' money in the venture, they will create facilities which would pay to the Federal Government over $20 million in taxes each year. If the Government of New York State builds and operates these facilities there will be no tax revenue, but hidden deficits which will have to be made up by taking money from taxpayers.

Businessmen everywhere have as much at stake in the Niagara project as the five investor-owned utility companies directly involved. The Nation, including particularly its lawmakers, expects private business to provide steadily increasing economic activity and more jobs. But competition with its own citizens by a Government supposed to be devoted to economic freedom is a sure way to discourage the growth and development of business on which the future prosperity and well-being of the Nation depend.

Businessmen would be justified in rising as a body to protest to the House Committee on Public Works, where the bill now rests, and to individual Members of the House of Representatives, this gross disregard of the principles which are essential to the dynamic growth and effective functioning of the free economy of this Nation.

Foreign Aid Benefits American Industries

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT B. CHIPERFIELD
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 5, 1956

Mr. CHIPERFIELD. Mr. Speaker, regardless whether the foreign-aid programs are justified from a national security standpoint they do benefit our economy.

Eighty-two percent of all the money appropriated is spent right here in the United States and the remaining American dollars must eventually be spent in this country.

I have the distinct honor of representing what is often referred to as the farm equipment capital of the world. A close examination of purchases made under foreign-aid programs discloses that the farm equipment industry and allied manufacturers in this area benefited to a large extent under these programs.

In the period May 1949 through December 1955, the International Cooperation Administration and its predecessor agencies have financed orders from the following companies in the amounts shown:

J. I. Case	$11,330,000
John Deere	15,248,000
International Harvester	75,454,000
Minneapolis Moline	1,448,000
Caterpillar	62,714,000
R. G. Latorneau	7,547,000
Butler Manufacturing Co	2,200,000
Clearing Machine Corp	6,648,000
Rockford Machine Tool	638,000

The United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees—Is He Friend or Foe?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. TIMOTHY P. SHEEHAN
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 6, 1956

Mr. SHEEHAN. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Julius Epstein, of New York City, testified on May 18 before the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee and offered a further written statement on June 26.

In his statement of June 26, Mr. Epstein points out the case of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees, Dr. G. J. van Heuven Goedhart. The background of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees would seem to me to raise a question as to whether or not he is able to perform his job.

Mr. Epstein's statement is as follows:

On May 18, 1956, I testified before the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee (chairman, Senator JAMES O. EASTLAND, of Mississippi). In my testimony I revealed that the present United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees, Dr. G. J. van Heuven Goedhart had written in 1946 an introduction to the Dutch edition of the book by M. Sayers and A. E. Kahn, "The Great Conspiracy Against Soviet Russia." In this introduction Dr. van Heuven Goedhart highly praised the book, written by the two well-known American Communists. The book was enthusiastically welcomed in the Daily Worker by William Z. Foster, national chairman of the American Communist Party as well as by the Soviet press and the Communist Party newspapers and periodicals around the world. The book by Sayers and Kahn was also required reading for American prisoners of war to be brainwashed by Chinese and North Korean Communists. It is, of course, a 100-percent defense and justification of Soviet imperialistic policy and especially a complete justification of every crime Stalin had ever committed.

As a result of my testimony of May 18, 1956, Senator JAMES O. EASTLAND wrote a letter to Ambassador Henry Cabot Lodge, Jr., the Representative of the United States of America to the United Nations, on May 18, 1956.

Ambassador Lodge answered Senator EASTLAND'S letter on May 21.

On June 5, 1956, Dr. van Heuven Goedhart held a press conference in The Hague, Netherlands. According to a report, released by the Netherlands news agency, ANP, on June 6, 1956, Dr. van Heuven Goedhart wholeheartedly defended his endorsement of the pro-Communist book by Kahn and Sayers. I quote from the press release: "As regards certain reproaches made against him in the United States in connection with a preface he wrote to the book The Great Conspiracy Against Russia in 1946, Mr. van Heuven Goedhart said he thought it was one of the best he had ever written. 'I do not think there is the slightest occasion to defend myself against the nonsense uttered with regard to this preface,' he said. If some United States Senators thought he was a Communist then he was in the same company as Professor Oppenheimer."

Dr. van Heuven Goedhart's remarks made at his press conference on June 5, 1956, clearly show he still holds the same pro-Soviet and especially pro-Stalin views as expressed in the book by Sayers and Kahn and fully endorsed by van Heuven Goedhart in 1946.

On June 22, 1956, Senator EASTLAND addressed another letter to Ambassador Lodge, calling his attention to Dr. van Heuven Goedhart's statement of June 5, 1956. In this letter Senator EASTLAND wrote:

"In other words, as late as June 6 of this year, Mr. van Heuven Goedhart regarded the statements in his introduction to The Great Conspiracy Against Russia as some of the best he had ever written. And as for his views on communism, Mr. van Heuven Goedhart considers himself in the same category as J. Robert Oppenheimer—whose security clearance was withdrawn by the Government of the United States after his intimate, extensive, and dangerous connections with Communists and communism had been established.

"I will appreciate being advised whether you consider that this latest statement by Mr. van Heuven Goedhart affects in any way his qualifications to serve as the United Nations official in charge of its program for refugees from Communist oppression and tyranny." (Full text of Senator EASTLAND'S letter is attached as exhibit 5.)

Only with Dr. van Heuven Goedhart's introduction to The Great Conspiracy Against Russia and his statement of June 5, 1956, in mind can we now understand why Dr. van Heuven Goedhart, as U. N. High Commissioner for Refugees, participated in the Soviet-sponsored repatriation of refugees from countries behind the Iron Curtain. In his speech before committee 3 of the 10th General Assembly of the United Nations in New York on October 4, 1955, Dr. van Heuven Goedhart said: "There are, as the members of this committee know very well, three different possible solutions. [Of the refugee problem.] One is the decision to go back, the repatriation. One is the resettlement in another country and three is the integration into the economy of the country where the refugee has found asylum. The first solution—repatriation—can nearly always be easily realized. * * * Looking back for 1 more second upon those 10 years (1945–55), Mr. President, I would like to note that millions and millions more refugees have been repatriated in the course of those 10 years than ever have been resettled or integrated."

The U. N. High Commissioner for Refugees, Dr. G. J. van Heuven Goedhart, is the first official who ever described repatriation of refugees from Communist tyranny as a solution, even as the number one solution to the refugee problem. His reference to the millions and millions of refugees who have been repatriated since 1945, is especially repulsive since a very large fraction of those millions of refugees repatriated since 1945 were forcibly repatriated in violation of the Geneva Convention as well as of the American tradition of ready asylum for political exiles.

Dr. van Heuven Goedhart's participation in the repatriation of refugees to Iron Cur-

tain countries—by sending his representatives together with the Soviet repatriation missions into the diplaced-person camps—is contradictory to the American policy of preventing redefection of refugees from Communist countries. How can we expect those refugees to have any confidence in the U. N. High Commissioner for Refugees if he is pioneering redefection and if he has just reaffirmed his pro-Communist and especially pro-Stalinist views as late as June 5, 1956? We cannot expect any confidence in him.

I wish to make it abundantly clear that I do not desire to deprive refugees of any assistance which they might receive if Congress were to appropriate funds to UNREF to be administered by the U. N. High Commissioner for Refugees, Dr. van Heuven Goedhart. However, until a more suitable High Commissioner for Refugees succeeds to the post presently held by Dr. van Heuven Goedhart, I believe that it is defeating the purposes of the Congress and of the American public to appropriate funds to be administered by him. Until there is a change in the personality presently holding the post of U. N. High Commissioner for Refugees I urge that the $2.3 million requested as the United States contribution for the program administered by the U. N. High Commissioner for Refugees be appropriated to the Department of State (Bureau of Security and Consular Affairs) or to the President of the United States to be used to assist the American voluntary agencies which work abroad with refugees to overcome the Soviet redefection campaign. By so doing, the Congress will fulfill the hopes of the refugees and will serve the best interests of the United States.

Mallinckrodt Chemical Works at St. Louis Did the Impossible in Nation's Atomic Energy Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 6, 1956

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith a very fine article on the pioneering the Mallinckrodt Chemical Works of St. Louis did in the atomic energy field. The story was written by Mary Barrett and appeared in the July 1, 1956, issue of the St. Louis Globe-Democrat.

As a member of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy I have had the opportunity on several occasions to visit the Mallinckrodt atomic operations. To this fine organization I extend my personal congratulations, proffer my best commendations on its magnificent performance in the Nation's atomic energy program.

The article follows:

OLDEST CHEMICAL WORKS WEST OF THE MISSISSIPPI DID THE IMPOSSIBLE IN NEW ATOMIC ERA

(By Mary Barrett)

St. Louis, which has been accused by uninformed observers of being old-fashioned and slow to change is, perhaps, more than any other city in the Midwest, in step with the atomic age. The company that deserves much of the credit for this is Mallinckrodt Chemical Works, the oldest chemical company west of the Mississippi, whose smoke-stacked buildings sprawl over 35 acres at 3600 North Broadway.

Mallinckrodt's initial contribution to the atomic era was necessarily kept quiet for a long time, but it is now known that the company did the impossible and did it well.

In producing the first bulk pure uranium dioxide used in the Manhattan atom bomb project, Mallinckrodt achieved the highest degree of purification ever achieved on a commercial scale by the chemical industry, and did it in recordbreaking time.

In 1942, when atomic energy seemed possible and the Government found that enough impure uranium oxide concentrates were available to construct an atom bomb, the next need was for a refiner. It was known that ether extraction could be used to provide pure uranium dioxide on a small scale, but large-scale production was called for.

Mallinckrodt was already famous for producing pure chemicals and for handling ether, and the St. Louis company was assigned the job of refining crude uranium ore for the Manhattan project. From April to July 1942, production leaped from test-tube size to 1 ton of dioxide a day. This was done with no guideposts from the past, no precedents to go by.

After project 42–17, as it was called, was completed and the A–bomb had fallen, the Smyth report commented.

"It was a remarkable achievement to have developed and put into production on a scale of the order of 1 ton per day a process transforming grossly impure commercial oxide to oxide of a degree of purity seldom achieved on a laboratory scale."

Mallinckrodt's AEC operations now represent a substantial investment by the AEC, with a $39,800,000 expansion program in process. This includes the building of a $33,300,000 plant at Weldon Spring.

The reputation for producing pure chemicals which brought Mallinckrodt the AEC work has been 89 years in the making. The high standards established by the three Mallinckrodt brothers in 1865 have never been relaxed.

When Gustav, Edward, and Otto Mallinckrodt started to produce fine chemicals in the fall of 1867, there was not another plant like theirs this side of Philadelphia and no wholesale druggist between St. Louis and California. Most chemicals were imported from Europe.

When it began, Mallinckrodt chemical works consisted of 3 small buildings where 4 employees produced a few items such as bromides, bismuth salts, acetic and butyric ethers. Most of these medical products were produced by purification of commercial grade chemicals and preparations of a few simple organic compounds. Mallinckrodt was one of the first manufacturers of bromides in the United States and was the first to produce chemicals in easy pouring granulated form instead of the old large crystals.

In the late nineties the company began manufacture of the alkaloids, cocaine, and morphine, which it still supplies. A little later the manufacture of products of nutgalls was started: gallic acid, tannic acid, and pyrogallic acid. During the early 1900's one of Mallinckrodt's most important steps was taken: The development of the highest grade of ether for anesthetic purposes. It was partly because of the company's development of this line that it was chosen for the AEC work.

Mallinckrodt Chemical Works began manufacturing photographic chemicals in 1883, while portable cameras were still a novelty and 2 years before the roll film appeared. Their latest development in the graphic arts field is synthetic etching powder, which replaces the old dragons blood.

The first large venture in the industrial branch of the fine chemicals industry was introduction of burnt alum for use in baking power in 1876.

Today, Mallinckrodt sells over 1,500 chemicals in quantities up to millions of pounds. More than 200 industries depend on the company as a source of chemicals.

Products turned out by Mallinckrodt fall into seven general categories: Industrial chemicals, bulk pharmaceutical chemicals, medical specialties, photographic chemical supplies, turf fungicides, reagent chemicals, and uranium products.

Between 400 and 500 basic organic and inorganic chemicals are put through a variety of processes to make many industrial products. Stearates, sold by tonnage in carload lots, are used in plastics as mold release agents, in oil and grease as jelling agents, in the paper industry to improve coatings, in the cosmetic industry in face powders and anything that needs smoothness, in the paint industry as a flatting and suspending agent.

Electronic chemicals, also used in industrial products, go into radio and television tubes and other electronic devices.

Pharmaceutical chemicals, with which Mallinckrodt began its operation, are still an essential part of the business. The company furnishes ingredients for drugs in bulk supply to pharmaceutical manufacturers. These include such things as iodides, mercurials, iron salts, bismuth compounds, phenobarbital and theophylline.

The company has led the field in development of X-ray contrast media, containing iodine, that are given intravenously to permit X-ray of internal organs.

Mallinckrodt's newest product in this line, Miokon sodium, is notable for its success as a contrast medium and for the absence of side effects in most of the clinical tests.

Perhaps the most important of the company's medical specialties is pure ether used for anesthesia. It is vital to the patient's welfare and comfort that ether be as free as possible of peroxides and aldehydes, and Mallinckrodt has long been famous as a leader in this field. Their research has been so extensive that the company even developed a special ether container freer of impurities than older ones had been. High standards of purity are especially important in reagent ether used in laboratories.

Soda lime, another Mallinckrodt product used in the operating room, absorbs carbon dioxide, permitting the reuse of ether. After much research, Mallinckrodt Chemical Works developed the first successful indicating type of soda lime, which shows when it can no longer absorb carbon dioxide efficiently by changing color.

In the photographic field, Mallinckrodt produces basic chemicals for professional and advanced amateur photographers, including such items as developers and fixers, silver nitrate and etching powder which the company invented. Until Mallinckrodt developed it in 1935, the very crude dragon's blood was used. It is estimated that more than three-quarters of all etchers now use the company's uniform synthetic product.

Mallinckrodt helps keep golf course greens green with their turf fungicides which control such green-keeper bugahoos as brown patch, snow mold, dollar spot, copper spot, and red thread. It is possible to lose a $5,000 green in one summer to one of these blights, without preventive use of turf fungicides. In addition to the three types previously developed by the company, Mallinckrodt has produced a new one, Kromad, which is nonmercurial. This makes it nonpoisonous to grass and safer to use than old varieties.

Purer than pure are over 400 reagent chemicals produced by Mallinckrodt for use in laboratories. The extra-pure "AR" (analytical reagents) grade chemicals are used to test the purity of other chemicals. In 1912 Mallinckrodt manufactured for the National Bureau of Standards the first chemical primary standard to be prepared on a commercial scale in the United States.

Work with uranium continues to expand at Mallinckrodt. A small plant at Hematite, Mo., will be in operation soon for commercial production of uranium oxide used in the manufacture of fuel elements for atomic powerplants.

Work with uranium has led to production of other special metals, such as columbium, thorium, and rare earth, for which a new plant was recently put into operation. Ore in large quantities arrives here from the Northwest and from it Mallinckrodt extracts such products as their respective oxides.

Production alone is not the only concern at Mallinckrodt. Research in many areas of chemistry is constantly in progress. Chemists are at work in a bright new organic research laboratory on such things as contrast media, analgesics, reserpine. A chemical-control laboratory tests the quality of a sample of each lot before it is sent out to customers.

Since 1946, about $10 million has been spent on capital improvements at Mallinckrodt, for increased warehouse space, new laboratories, and expanded manufacturing facilities.

Safety protection is just one of the several outstanding personnel practices at Mallinckrodt. Guard rails, ventilation, fire-prevention rules are important. The company maintains its own fire department.

In 1931 the company instituted a pension plan for its employees, when only 750 such plans existed in the country. Mallinckrodt pays for employee hospital-surgery insurance in addition to a group insurance plan in which it pays part.

There is an unusually low rate of turnover in personnel at the company, indicating its good working conditions. Mallinckrodt employs 2,700 people: 2,250 in St. Louis, the rest in its New York and New Jersey plants.

Looking to the future Mallinckrodt intends to expand both its medicinal lines of diagnostic, analgesic, and anesthetic chemicals and its activity in the uranium and special-metals fields, according to Charlton MacVeagh, vice chairman of the board and treasurer.

MacVeagh sums up the forward look of St. Louis' oldest chemical company:

"I feel we are equipped to meet the challenge of the needs of medicine, pharmacy, industry, and what they call the atomic age."

Sale of Surplus Vessels

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN H. RAY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 5, 1956

Mr. RAY. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing today a joint resolution to permit the sale of two transport and cargo vessels to any citizen who has sufficient financial strength and operating experience to undertake the project and secure approval by the Federal Maritime Administrator. The purchaser must recondition the ships at his own expense in American yards and must operate them under the American flag on essential trade routes 3 and 4. These routes run between the United States and Cuba and the United States and Mexico. The ships are now idle in the reserve and have been declared surplus by the Government. They can be repossessed by the Government if needed. Use of these ships will restore the American flag to these essential groups and should help expand our trade with Cuba and Mexico.

I think passage of the resolution will be very much in the public interest, and I hope the resolution will receive widespread support among the Members of this House.

Better Living Under President Eisenhower

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLIFTON (CLIFF) YOUNG
OF NEVADA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 6, 1956

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Speaker, partly as an outgrowth of the great depression, the Federal Government—and, in fact, government at all levels—has assumed a degree of responsibility for the economic and social well-being of the individual not envisioned by our Founding Fathers. The Eisenhower administration has placed this enlarged responsibility in proper balance and focus and has given it life through a program of action.

The most significant landmark of action in the changed concept of the Federal Government's role in the field of social welfare was the establishment of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, one of the first accomplishments of the Eisenhower Republican administration. By this action the everyday human problems of health, education, and welfare were given Cabinet status. Significantly, this was the first new executive department to be created in 40 years.

The Eisenhower administration's emphasis on people and human values has been marked by a concentrated drive to strengthen and expand Federal-State activities for the improvement of the health, education, and the social and economic security of the individual. This has been done in a manner which has sought to encourage individual self-reliance without fostering a spirit of dependence on government.

From the earliest days of the Eisenhower administration, a persistent effort has been made to secure more funds for the most important activities which were brought into the new Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. In fiscal 1957 the administration sought a 24 percent increase in the Department's appropriations. This included $450 million for programs provided for by new legislation. The Department sought these additional funds in order to strengthen its activities and provide for new or improved research in every field within its responsibility.

The Eisenhower administration has asked Congress for the largest increase in funds for medical research ever recommended in any one year—some $27 million. Much of this money will be used to expand the activities of the National Institutes of Health, the principal medical research activity of the United States Government. Another goodly portion of these additional funds will increase the Federal Government's grants to medical schools, hospitals, health agencies, and skilled scientists for the conduct of medical research.

The administration has proposed a new program of Federal grants-in-aid to medical schools and other nonprofit research institutions for the construction of additional research and teaching facilities. This proposed program would cover a 5-year period and calls for Federal grants totaling $250 million. These grants would have to be matched by the recipient institutions.

Passed by the Senate and still pending in the House is the Eisenhower administration's request for legislative authority to expand and improve its programs for the training of practical nurses, professional nurses, and public health personnel. This authority, if granted, would set in motion a procedure to provide more personnel in the nursing field, and to release doctors and other skilled medical personnel to duties which more efficiently use their higher skills.

The administration has opened a determined attack on mental illness by its request for authority from the Congress to establish a system of grants-in-aid to finance special demonstration projects to develop improved methods for caring for the mentally ill. This program will set in motion a new Federal-State assault on one of the Nation's most vexing health problems.

In the field of education, the Eisenhower administration sought $6 million for operating expenses for the Office of Education in fiscal 1957—an increase of about $3 million over fiscal 1956. These additional funds would expand the services of the Office of Education and would provide a far-reaching program of cooperative educational research. The objective is to throw light on the problems which have been retarding the progress of education in America.

The Eisenhower administration has proposed that the Congress authorize a program of Federal assistance for school construction. This program is one which would encourage greater school building efforts by States and local communities. It would distribute Federal funds where the needs are greatest and the financial resources are weakest. The program guarantees against Federal interference in the conduct of our public school system. It would authorize the use of Federal funds in such a manner as to avoid creating a political pork barrel.

In the area of social security, the Eisenhower administration requested and received from the Congress in 1954, an increase in social-security benefits for everyone covered by the system. In addition, social-security protection was extended to some 10 million workers not theretofore covered. The system is being operated with commendable efficiency and further expansion and improvement in the program that is being sought by the Eisenhower administration.

The Eisenhower administration, from its first days in office, has sought ways and means of reducing the cost of medical care to the individual. A request for legislative authority designed to encourage the expansion and improvement of private voluntary health insurance programs is pending before the Congress.

This proposal seeks to improve the benefits of private health insurance and thus to encourage more individuals to secure such coverage. It proposes to do this without putting the Government in the insurance business.

The Eisenhower administration has been seeking authority to authorize a system of grants to strengthen and improve State and local programs to control and reduce juvenile delinquency. A concerted Federal-State-local attack on this problem is envisioned.

An increase in funds has been recommended for enlarged Federal grants for basic child-welfare services. This request includes a suggestion that the law be amended to allow the use of child-welfare funds wherever they are needed. The law, as it now stands, restricts the use of such funds largely to rural areas.

The vocational rehabilitation amendments sponsored by the Eisenhower administration, which became law in 1954, expanded and improved the Federal vocational rehabilitation program and provided more funds, more facilities, more research, and more training for skilled personnel. This new emphasis is already bringing about a steady increase in the number of persons who are conquering physical handicaps and returning to productive lives.

The Eisenhower administration is sparking a national "employ-the-older-worker" program. In 1954, there was created in the Department of Labor, a "Committee on the Older Worker." On April 2, 1956, President Eisenhower established a Federal Council on Aging to coordinate the interdepartmental policies and programs of the Federal Government concerned with the problems of older people. A Federal-State Conference on Aging was held in June, 1956, to bring together some 250 State and Federal officials concerned with the problems of older people. Thus, the Federal Government, through a program of cooperation with the States and with private individuals and institutions, is leading an assault on age barriers to employment and the other special problems of older persons, including health and housing.

The healthy economic climate, which has been fostered by the Eisenhower administration, has produced a rising level of life in America. This, when added to sincere interest in the social well-being of the individual, is providing a more satisfying life for the American people.

The Late Harley M. Kilgore

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ELIZABETH KEE
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 6, 1956

Mrs. KEE. Mr. Speaker, Monday the Members of the United States Senate will pause from their important legislative duties to pay fitting, appropriate, and justly due tribute to the memory of two outstanding late Members of the United States Senate—former Vice President Alben Barkley, and the late United States Senator, Harley M. Kilgore, of West Virginia.

On February 28, 1956, our dearly beloved and highly respected counselor and friend, Harley Kilgore, was called to join his Father in the land of rest and peace.

While I am not capable of adequately paying just tribute to the memory of this illustrious West Virginia son, who has done so very much for all of us, I pause for this moment of respect to our tried and true friend.

Time being the great healer it is, the first shock of grief has passed since Harley Kilgore raised his voice for the last time in the United States Senate Chamber. However, the emptiness is still here. Every true son and daughter of West Virginia still feels a great sense of loss at the passing of this great American. The word "great" is used advisedly, for no man has labored more valiantly for the principles of this Nation than our late beloved friend, Harley Kilgore. His outstanding leadership and his accomplishments were a tremendous source of inspiration to all who new him.

Because of his proven ability, the senior statesmen of our country often turned to Harley Kilgore for sage counsel. Now that leadership and counsel are missing, never to be completely replaced.

While our personal loss has been overwhelming, while the loss to our home State of West Virginia, our Nation and the freedom loving people the world over has also been great, I know that we are each and every one better off because of the life and work of Harley Kilgore. He was extremely fortunate in that he enjoyed the comfort of a wonderful wife who did so much to help him along the way. Mrs. Kilgore is a lovely, charming, intelligent, and understanding lady who was always by Harley's side and anxious to do everything possible to help him.

Senator Kilgore's son Bob, and his daughter Eleanor, were the most loyal children a man could have. Their children, the Senator's grandchildren, were the refreshing joy of his life.

Equally comforting for us to know, the Senator had the satisfaction of knowing the full meaning of the words, "Well done, thou good and faithful servant."

Harley Kilgore was a modest man, never one for too much talk. He believed that a man was as he did, not as he said. There stand many monuments to him today in our home State of West Virginia. They are not of marble nor of bronze. These monuments are living flesh and blood—young men and women whom he helped to find their way into a productive role in society. As long as he lived, he believed that the greatest gift of mankind was its youth, and with that thought as his guide, he lived a full and useful life under God with His Divine help and inspiration.

When Harley Kilgore passed away, the world lost a leading statesman, the Congress lost an outstanding Senator of experience and proven ability, and West Virginia lost a great Christian leader, an impartial jurist, a powerful spokesman and a compassionate son.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, may I say that I strongly feel that it is up to us to redouble our efforts, to do our job better, in order to justify the friendship Harley Kilgore so generously gave to each of us.

"Smear Politics" Decried

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN D. DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 6, 1956

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to insert into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article by the distinguished columnist, Mr. Roscoe Drummond, appearing in today's Washington (D. C.) Post and Times Herald.

In his column, Mr. Drummond effectively treats the vicious smear tactics which have been used during the past several elections by the Republican Party, and by many of the high officials of government belonging to that party.

I hope that all our citizens will read this excellent article which goes so far to show the basic falsity and viciousness of this form of campaigning. I am sure that the American people will again reject this form of slander at the polls, as I hope the Republican Party will between now and election, for its own good, if for no other.

"SMEAR POLITICS" DECRIED—GOP INNUENDOS ON REDS ASSESSED

(By Roscoe Drummond)

Really now, in the kind of world we are living in today, hasn't the time come when American national politics ought to get up out of the mud puddle and shed the low blow, un-American tactics of trying to smear your political opponent with the innuendo that he is enmeshed with the Communists?

I am convinced that United States voters distrust these smear-the-whole-landscape, mud-pack charges, disbelieve them, are bored by them, and will, in the end, penalize the politicians who think they can survive by feeding on them. They did in the 1954 congressional elections.

But it is a trade still plied by some and the latest example is a memorandum released by the staff of the Senate Republican policy committee proclaiming that the Communist Party in the United States wants "the Republicans defeated" and hopes for "a Democratic victory" this fall.

This is a tricky, dishonest, and dishonorable thing. No wonder it was coldly and angrily condemned by leading Democratic Senators on the floor this week and that Senator WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND, Republican leader, had the good grace—man of integrity that he is—to repudiate it unreservedly.

But this kind of carefully circulated insinuation has been made before, and after its sponsors think it has done its dirt, withdrawn. It will take more than Senator KNOWLAND'S and Senator ALEXANDER SMITH'S disavowals to free the Republican Party from the taint of very shoddy tactics.

There can be no doubt that the staff of the Senate Republicant policy committee knew what it was up to. It attached a cagily worded disclaimer to its release. The disclaimer read: "Note: Neither the members of the Republican policy committee nor other Republican Senators are responsible for the statements herein contained except such as

they are willing to endorse and make their own."

There are only two things wrong with such a half-hearted disclaimer. Republican Senators may not be responsible for staff statements they do not themselves endorse, but they are responsible for actions of the policy committee staff. Second, the staff must think there are Republican Senators who will want to endorse these statements and make them their own or the staff wouldn't prepare them. Is the staff of the Republican policy committee employed to publicize statements so their superiors can repudiate them?

Actually this Republican staff memorandum does not bear out its own assertions. It puts a title on its release which asserts that the "Communist Party pleads for Democrats to win" and in the first paragraph it claims that "the official Communist line has now been announced" and that the Communists consider "a Democratic victory is essential."

The fact is that the official Communist Party line has not been announced and the Republican memorandum quotes just one State Communist functionary who suggests that Communists pursue "an independent course which influences the direction of the Democratic Party."

Finally, how do Republicans think they are serving the Nation or themselves by suggesting that the Communists are to be believed or that they say what they are going to do or do what they have been saying? Communists are required to be liars and I shouldn't think that Republican Senators would want to pay their staff to persuade us that they are not.

The Republican committee staff seems entranced by the syllogism which they suggest but do not prove: The Communists want to hurt the United States; the Communists—so they claim—support a Democratic victory; therefore a Democratic victory would hurt the United States. Let us see where that kind of reasoning carries them.

The Communists have imprisoned and liquidated more socialist leaders than they have capitalist leaders. Is this Republican staff trying to persuade us that because the Communists hate socialists we ought to approve socialism?

The Communists indorse the Supreme Court's public school desegregation verdict and Vice President NIXON described Earl Warren, after delivering he verdict, as a great Republican Chief Justice. Is this Republican staff trying to call Mr. NIXON pro-Communist?

They are doing all these things if their logic in the first instance is to be accepted.

I would hope that at his next press conference President Eisenhower would use his great moral influence to strike these un-American tactics from the hands of his party as un-Republican.

Supporters of Senate Resolutions 85 and 86 Have Unusual Backgrounds

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOS. E. MARTIN

OF IOWA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, July 5, 1956

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. President, on many occasions I have voiced my objections to international commodity agreements designed to stabilize the prices and volume of raw materials involved in international trade. Chapter VI of the now defunct Habana Charter for an International Trade Organization provided for such agreements.

President Eisenhower and Secretary Dulles have clearly indicated their disbelief in economic panaceas which would attempt to stablize the world markets at the expense of the freedom of all producers and consumers.

On May 28 and 29 of this year, a subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations conducted hearings on Senate Resolutions 85 and 86. The proposals embraced in these resolutions were condemned by the Departments of State, Interior, and Agriculture. The resolutions were endorsed by a number of organizations, including the National Farmers Union, the Americans for Democratic Action, and the United Automobile Workers.

I have just read an article, published in the magazine U. S. A.; the article was written by Alice Widener, the editor of the publication. She has assembled some interesting background data on the supporters of these resolutions, which I am sure will enlighten my colleagues as much as it startled me.

I have been advised by the Public Printer that the article is estimated to make approximately 2⅓ pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at a cost of $179.67.

I ask unanimous consent that Mrs. Widener's article entitled "A Key Resolution," from the magazine U. S. A., may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A KEY RESOLUTION

(By Alice Widener)

On May 28 and 29, 1956, a subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, with Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY, Democrat, of Minnesota, as chairman, conducted hearings on Senate Resolution 86 which was introduced in the 84th Congress, March 1955, by 23 Senators led by Senator JAMES E. MURRAY, Democrat, of Montana.

A typically impractical and dangerous product of leftwing economic and social thinking, Senate Resolution 86 proposes that the President should enter into negotiations through the United Nations to establish an International Food and Raw Materials Reserve. This resolution further provides that efforts should be made to effect international stabilization of prices of food and raw materials.

In reality a proposal for socialistic economic planning, Resolution 86 was advanced by its proponents as a means of getting rid of agricultural surpluses and feeding hungry people in underdeveloped countries.

A novel aspect of the plan is that currencies paid to the International Food and Raw Materials Reserve by purchasers of materials may be used to assist in the financing of approved economic and social development programs, including universal education—public, general, and vocational—universal literacy, public health, and medical care. In other words, the reserve is to be transformed into a world cureall. Even for alchemists, such a transformation would be a rather tall order.

VAGUE IDEAS, SPECIFIC AUTHORITY

The 23 Senators sponsoring Resolution 86 include such New Deal stalwarts as MURRAY, DOUGLAS, HUMPHREY, JACKSON, KEFAUVER, LEHMAN, NEELY, NEUBERGER, and SPARKMAN. Having no precise idea of how the reserve-into-panacea alchemy could be accomplished, they merely express in the resolution the idea that it is "the sense of the Senate" that the administration should "enter into international negotiations for the purpose of preparing a specific plan."

The resolution then provides that "the plan and agreement, or agreements, developed in accordance with section 3 hereof (authorizing executive negotiations through the U. N.) together with full supporting material and information on operating methods, shall be presented to the Senate of the United States for approval."

At the May 1956 hearings on Resolution 86, the Humphrey subcommittee heard administration testimony given by Deputy Assistant Secretary of State Thorsten Kalijarvi, by Assistant Secretary of the Interior Felix Wormser, and by Assistant Secretary of Agriculture Earl Butz.

Each of these officials pointed out the complete impracticality of the concept for an International Food and Raw Materials Reserve. They testified that the President is sympathetic to the objective of relieving hunger, but believes that international machinery of the type proposed would be unworkable and wholly ineffective.

LONE VOICE

On May 29, nongovernmental witnesses appeared before the subcommittee. In opposition to Resolution 86 was Simon D. Strauss, vice president of American Smelting and Refining Co., who appeared on behalf of the American Mining Congress.

CHORUS IN UNISON

In favor of the resolution were the following witnesses:

James G. Patton, president of the National Farmers Union.

Paul Sifton, national legislative representative of the United Automobile Workers, who appeared for Walter Reuther.

John Gunther, legislative representative of Americans for Democratic Action, appearing for Robert Nathan, chairman of the ADA executive committee.

Benjamin Graham, economist.

Study of the background and viewpoints held by the foregoing list of witnesses favorable to Senate Resolution 86 is helpful in trying to gage the quality of their economic judgment.

TENOR

Mr. Benjamin Graham, for example, would like to monetize the world's commodities in place of gold. His unusual economic theories were included in the report Commodity Trade and Economic Development, prepared by a group of experts appointed by the Secretary-General of the United Nations pursuant to U. N. General Assembly Resolution 623 (VII) adopted in December 1952.

This U. N. resolution was opposed by the United States.

Nevertheless, the U. N. Economic and Social Council, acting in 1954 on the experts' report, established a Commission on International Commodity Trade.

Fortunately for Americans, the United States Government voted against the establishment of this U. N. Commission and has refused to take part in its deliberation.

At the May 29 Humphrey subcommittee hearings, the other witnesses favorable to resolution 86—James G. Patton, Paul Sifton, and John Gunther (representing Robert Nathan)—suggested that creation of the International Food and Raw Materials Reserve is a way to stop communism.

This suggestion naturally leads to inquiry about the witnesses' attitude toward communism and the degree of their own aversion to it.

VOICE FROM THE PAST

On May 29, 1956, Mr. Paul Sifton testified before the subcommittee that the attitude

of administration witnesses unfavorable to the resolution on the previous day "reminded me, if I may say so, of the attitude of the twenties and the thirties."

Since the witness himself brought up the past, it is enlightening to study what was Mr. Sifton's own attitude in the 1930's, an attitude which might be taken into account by Senators considering resolution 86 and weighing the value of Mr. Sifton's endorsement of it.

Mr. Sifton used to be a playwright.

In a revolutionary play, 1931, urging the use of violence, Paul and Claire Sifton began the script with the authors' note:

"1931 is concerned with an individual in the tidal movement of a people caught in a situation which they can neither explain, escape, nor exorcise. As the play develops, the contrapuntal design of the 10 interludes suggests a ground swell that is bearing Adam, his group, and the audience itself, on to revolution of one sort or another."

The finale of Paul and Claire Sifton's 1931 is even more dramatic;

"Suddenly onto the stage spills a streaming crowd of men and women, Adam among them. They are not singing. The singing continues offstage. The song is not the Internationale, it is that and more, a wordless battle hymn of ferocious desperation.

"They walk steadily across, eyes ahead. Halfway across, gunshots start. Two fall. Two waver, turn, and run. The others go on; more shots; they go on. As they near the other side, machine-gun fire begins."

CURTAIN

For Fight magazine, November 1933, official organ of the American League Against War and Fascism (described by the House Un-American Activities Committee as "strictly under the control of the Communist Party until 1937," and listed as subversive by the United States Attorney General) Mr. Sifton wrote:

"UNCLE SAM WANTS YOU

"(By Paul Sifton)

"Hey, there, Big Boy, Uncle Sam wants you for the next war. He wants you to take $30 a month (less payments for bonds and thrift stamps, and so on) for doing this:

"Saying yes, sir, to bright boys in officers' pink pants;

"Packing 60 pounds of clothes, shoes, hardware, and food on your back through mud, ice, dust, and heat;

"Digging trenches in the ground like a half-witted woodchuck while your family back home scratches around for food and fuel;

"Shooting holes in men like yourself across a line;

"Getting wounded yourself, in the leg, or arm, or chest, or guts;

"Getting gassed so that your skin curls up like bacon on a fire and you cough up your lungs;

"Dying all at once or by inches or maybe living to stand in breadlines after it's over.

"How's that? 'Like hell,' you say? Then speak up, say it now. Say it loud. Back it up with action before the leading citizens can get the war started, before they begin slapping you around with bayonets.

"You do the leading; set the fat boys back on their bottoms and keep them there; keep them blocking; keep them ducking; don't let them tie you up with their bull about patriotism.

"Ask them how close to the front they got in the last war—in any war; ask them how much money they made while you, or your brother or father, were fighting to make the world safe for Mellon and Insull and Krueger and Krupp.

"Tell them you know that they know they're sunk unless they can start a war * * *; tell them they and their fancy pieces of paper and the whole capitalist shell game can sink and be damned.

"Tell them that we've got another war on, closer home, a war to establish a workers' peace, a workers' government.

"(They know this anyway, but they hate to be told.)

"If you want to make it snappy, just tell them the workers have been played for saps long enough. Tell them to go to hell. Then make it stick.

"Remember, all the bankers, politicians, generals and admirals in the world can't fight a war until they've kidded, lied, and terrorized the workers into dying for them. What do you want, a workers' peace or a bosses' war? It's up to you.

"You've got to move fast to stop it. Already they've kidded lots of you into thinking that another war with Japan, or maybe Germany—'would be a good thing for prosperity.' Whose prosperity? Not yours.

"Don't be a mug. Make up your mind what you want and then go after it."

As well as having written the foregoing article for the official organ of a subversive organization, Mr. Sifton is shown in the records of the House Un-American Activities Committee as having been associated with the American League Against War and Fascism, the Congress of American Revolutionary Writers, and the National Committee for the Defense of Political Prisoners. All these organizations were listed as subversive by the Attorney General of the United States, April 29, 1953.

During the Roosevelt Administration, Paul Sifton was appointed as Assistant Administrator of the Wages and Hours Administration in the Department of Labor under Secretary Perkins. Later he became Legislative Representative for the National Farmers Union wherein he evidently gained experience for his present post of lobbyist for Walter Reuther's UAW.

The National Farmers Union has had a rather colorful history, and it is not surprising that both its former employee, Paul Sifton, and its present president, James G. Patton, appeared before the Humphrey subcommittee, May 29, 1956, on behalf of an essentially Marxist plan: the creation of an International Food and Raw Materials Reserve.

THE UNDERLYING THEME

The name James G. Patton occurs in several reports and quotations of testimony issued by the House Un-American Activities Committee. In its report, No. 1115, 80th Congress, the Civil Right Congress as a Communist-Front Organization, there is the following statement on page 19:

"It is worthy of note that subsequent to the formation of the Civil Rights Congress in Detroit on April 27–28, 1946, and the enlistment of additional sponsors, the names of a number of members of the initiating committee, having served their decoy purposes, disappeared from the organization's letterhead, among them being James G. Patton."

Also worthy of note is the fact that the president of the Civil Rights Congress, George Marshall, was head of the Robert Marshall Foundation which was an abundant source of funds for the Communist Party. On September 7, 1950, the House Un-American Activities Committee revealed that the National Farmers Union was receiving $7,500 a month from the Marshall Foundation.

Another House committee report (No. 1951, 81st Cong.) shows that Mr. James G. Patton was a sponsor of a testimonial dinner in honor of former Senator Claude Pepper, Democrat, of Florida, held by the American Slav Congress, which is listed as a subversive organization by the Attorney General.

On March 31, 1950, James G. Patton appeared before the House Committee on Un-American Activities and gave a statement in opposition to passage of the Mundt-Nixon bill, H. R. 7595, predecessor to the McCarran Act which established the Subversive Activities Control Board designed as a vital protection of our Nation's internal security.

Concerning the Mundt-Nixon bill, Mr. Patton testified:

"By this time, it should be clear to everyone that repressive legislation of the kind before this committee not only does not achieve the objectivity it is designed to achieve but actively interferes with the fulfillment of the American traditions.

"H. R. 7595, the Mundt-Nixon bill, has been before Congress some time now. Its provisions are well known and it is not necessary at this time to go at length into its specific provisions.

"The National Farmers Union always has regarded this legislation as unconstitutional * * *

"Aside from the constitutional objections, we also feel that such bills as the Mundt-Nixon bill inevitably tend to cast the American people in the image of totalitarianism. * * *

"As for H. R. 3903, the Wood bill, we have somewhat the same objections but on a minor scale to this bill as we have to H. R. 7595. H. R. 3903 is the same type of legislation. Its provisions for barring Government workers from contributing to organizations officially labeled as subversive appears to us to be simply another way of cluttering up the statutes. * * * we believe that the so-called loyalty check program itself is an extravagant misuse of Government power. * * *

"As to the provisions in the bill which attempt to extend this kind of screening to private employees of firms obtaining governmental defense contracts, we regard them as wholly fantastic. The establishment of the kind of comprehensive snoopery that would be required to enforce such a provision would involve an enormous amount of useless expense to the Government, wholesale invasions of personal liberties, and a genuine foundation for an American police state. * * *

"In summary, we urge that the committee permanently table both of these measures."

Fortunately, Congress protected our country against subversion through passage of the McCarran Act embodying many features of the Mundt-Nixon bill, and disregarded leftwing opposition including that of James G. Patton.

Judging by his record, it is not surprising that he uses his position as President of the National Farmers Union to favor socialistic measures such as those proposed in Senate Resolution 6 which favors international price control of agricultural products and raw materials.

ADA WIELDS BATON

Of course, it is to be expected that the leftwing Americans for Democratic Action should favor Resolution 86, as is revealed in the May 29 testimony of ADA Legislative Representative John Gunther, who appeared on behalf of ADA Executive Committee Chairman Robert Nathan.

It is enlightening to study the background of Mr. Nathan, for he plays such an important role in ADA, an organization closely allied with many members of the Democratic Party leadership, including Mr. Adlai Stevenson.

Immediately after World War II, Robert Nathan formed his own business firm and chose as an associate Laughlin Currie, a former assistant to President Roosevelt. In its issue of April 9, 1956, Time magazine reported as follows about Currie, who was born in Nova Scotia:

"In 1948 Elizabeth Bentley told the House Un-American Activities Committee that Lauchlin Currie had aided the Communist underground in Washington; Currie hotly denied her accusations, but his name kept turning up in FBI reports and congressional investigations.

"In 1950, Currie left the United States, became an economic adviser to the Columbian Government * * *. Last week the State Department said that Lauchlin Currie, by staying abroad 5 years, had automatically forefeited United States citizenship."

In 1952, the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee report on the Institute of Pacific Relations stated on page 170: "All three (Hiss, Currie, and Rogov) have been charged with being connected with the Soviet intelligence apparatus."

Surely, Mr. Robert Nathan's judgment was extremely faulty in choosing Laughlin Currie as a business associate.

Since 1946, the firm of Robert Nathan Associates—according to files of the Foreign Agents Registration Division within the Department of Justice—has entered into business relations with several foreign principals. From November 29, 1946 to October 31, 1948, the firm acted as agent for the Polish Supply and Reconstruction Mission to North America. This was a mission of the Communist Polish Government.

Robert Nathan Associates has also represented the French Government, the Indonesian Republic, the Jewish Agencies of Palestine, and the Israeli Embassy in the United States. The firm was also a participant in a contract not to exceed a maximum dollar cost of $1.5 million made by the Economic Cooperation Administration in 1951 for technical assistance to the Government of Burma. On August 11, 1951, the American Metal Market reported: "The contract calls for the presence in Burma of Robert R. Nathan, economist, during the preparation of the general economic studies of the national economy under the preliminary survey."

It seems fair and reasonable to ponder on whether Mr. Nathan's keen interest in channeling United States and U. N. aid funds to foreign countries is wholly altruistic.

WHO'S TO PLAY FIRST FIDDLE?

It also sems fair and reasonable to suggest that the entire Senate, in considering Resolution 86 which calls for an International Food and Raw Materials Reserve, should ponder on the May 28–29 testimony before the Humphrey Subcommittee of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

Will the Senate heed the well-founded warnings of the administration's witnesses: Deputy Assistant Secretary Kalijarvi, and Assistant Secretaries Wormser and Butz?

Will the Senate heed the wise advice of Mr. Simon D. Strauss, vice president of the American Smelting & Refining Co.?

Or will the Senate permit themselves to be influenced by the Socialistic views of U. N. consultant Benjamin Graham, James G. Patton of the National Farmers Union, Robert Nathan of Americans for Democratic Action whose statement was read by John Gunther, and Paul Sifton of the United Automobile Workers?

SIFTON SINGS IN TUNE

Mr. Sifton's prejudice against the American system of free enterprise is clearly shown in his testimony before the Humphrey subcommittee concerning the United Nations Special Fund for Economic Development (SUNFED).

Though the 1953–55 national conventions of the National Foreign Trade Council formally declared opposition to the creation of SUNFED and any other international agency or mechanism designed "to funnel American taxpayers' money into dubious economic channels," Mr. Sifton testified as follows about SUNFED on May 29, 1956:

"Mr. SIFTON. Sitting here yesterday, I just had a sense of total unreality, Mr. Chairman. What month was it, what year, what century are we in, when we hear a straight isolationist doctrine preached that says anything done through the U. N. is difficult, and bilateralism is the thing to do? * * *

"Mr. Patton said [today] the issue is scarcity in war, abundance in peace. That is right. That is what is back of this, and I am glad that the chairman of this committee has got the impatience and the indignation of youth, and that the chairman——

"Senator HUMPHREY. Thank you.

"Mr. SIFTON (continuing). Intends to offer an amendment for SUNFED is great news for organized labor, for the AFL–CIO and for the UAW, for the International Confederation of Free Trade Unions, all of whom have put this right up near the top of their international-affairs program because they realize that if you do not take that step of economic development—and food can be used as live capital in that—you are in effect with the other agencies, the technical assistance and the World Health Organization, and all the other specialized agencies of the United Nations, you are getting people trained up, educated, healthier, and filled with ambition, they are getting all dressed up and all eager, with no place to go to work." (Transcript of hearings, pp. 199–200, May 29, 1956.)

"Mr. SIFTON. Mr. Chairman, I think we have part of the answer to your question: Why is anyone against SUNFED?

"I have from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a statement inserted in there by Mr. Robert F. Loree, the chairman of the National Foreign Trade Council, in which he states, and I only read one sentence out of it, but I think it does explain why some people are against it: 'The proposed special fund,' said Mr. Loree, 'by encouraging underdeveloped countries to believe that their needs for development capital would be met from international public funds provided through grants or on easy terms, would remove the compulsion'—I repeat—'compulsion on these countries to establish the proper environment if they are to attract the investment of productive private capital.'

"What does this amount to? This [Mr. Loree's statement] amounts to a proposal to put the banana republic system on a global basis." (Transcript of hearings, pp. 202–203, May 29, 1956.)

As anyone can see who is familiar with oft-repeated Communist slogans, Mr. Sifton's use of the hackneyed anticapitalist smear "banana republic system" is most revealing.

THE HARMONIOUS AMERICAN WAY

Also as anyone can see, who is familiar with the reality of conditions in the underdeveloped countries, the best economic way of rendering them real assistance is through an increased flow of private investment. The idea that the job can be done by American taxpayers, constituting only 6 percent of the world's population, is a delusion. Even if American taxpayers were willing to lower their standard of living and undertake such a job, their sacrifice would be unavailing. The plain truth is that the job can't be done in such a way.

Achievement of desired economic development and industrialization in underdeveloped countries can come only through creation of a proper climate of investment in which these countries' own funds can be channeled into productive employment.

It is highly significant that no witnesses from the National Grange and the American Farm Bureau Federation, or from any other outstanding conservative farm organization, endorsed Senate Resolution 86 as a measure to get rid of agricultural surpluses.

In considering congressional and United Nations resolutions in favor of a U. N. International Food and Raw Materials Reserve, and in favor of SUNFED, members of the legislative and executive branches of the United States Government will surely face economic facts as they really are.

What, really, is Senate Resolution 86?

It is a Marxist-made key.

This key resolution would enable Socialists to open the United States national safety deposit box and squander Americans' assets acquired by their hard work and thrift under the free system of popular capitalism, a mainstay of the American way of life.

Educational Benefits to World War II and Korean War Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. TORBERT H. MACDONALD
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 6, 1956

Mr. MACDONALD. Mr. Speaker, on June 26, 1956, I introduced a bill to amend Public Law 346, 78th Congress, and Public Law 550, 83d Congress, which laws grant, among other things, educational benefits to World War II and Korean war veterans.

I stated at the time that certain deficiencies in these two laws should be corrected at once. Also, I pointed out that these deficiencies came to light early this year when a Senate subcommittee investigating the Communist ownership of GI schools, discovered that under existing provisions of these laws the Veterans' Administration was required to expend Federal funds for tuition of veterans attending schools which are Communist-owned. In fact, over $3 million was paid out by the Veterans' Administration to four schools, which were the subject of the subcommittee hearings, and which, because of Communist connection, should be ineligible to participate in the veterans' training program.

The bill I introduced—H. R. 11955—was a companion bill to S. 4078 introduced by Senator MCCLELLAN and all the members of his Senate Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations.

In essence, the bill would require private schools, below the college level, which are training veterans or seeking approval to train veterans, to submit to the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs affidavits signed by the owner or owners and by the members of the governing body that he is not and never has been a member of the Communist Party or any organization that believes in or teaches the overthrow of the United States Government by force or by illegal unconstitutional methods.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to bring to the attention of my colleagues a very illuminating editorial which appeared in the Washington Evening Star, under date of July 2, 1956, written by one of the very distinguished journalists, Mr. David Lawrence. As is customary with Mr. Lawrence, he not only expresses his thoughts in a clear and persuasive manner, but documents his observations with facts.

Mr. Lawrence's editorial should be read by every Member of Congress. It will remind us of our responsibilities in the field of education. It will also call to our attention what I believe to be a dereliction of duty on the part of the Veterans' Administration. For a period of 9 years the Veterans' Administration failed to recommend corrective legislation or at least apprise Congress of the deficiencies of these laws. It resulted in an inexcusable expenditure of Federal funds in support of Communist-owned schools. It is for this reason that I joined Senator MCCLELLAN and his colleagues in intro-

ducing legislation to correct this situation.

The editorial follows:

VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION INACTION—$3 MILLION OF TAXPAYERS' MONEY PAID TO COMMUNIST-OWNED SCHOOLS

(By David Lawrence)

The United States Government used more than $3 million of taxpayers' money from 1946 to 1952 to pay for the education of war veterans in four schools owned wholly or in part by members of the Communist Party.

This conclusion was reached by the Senate's permanent subcommittee on investigations, of which Senator MCCLELLAN, of Arkansas, is chairman.

Clumsy administration in the veterans' agency in those years and, to some extent, lack of alertness on the part of State agencies which had approved the schools were responsible for the situation.

More than $2 million in Federal funds were expended to a private high school in New York City that had in it many pro-Communist teachers, but the bulk of the veterans were trained at the school even after the Veterans' Administration was aware that it was Communist-dominated.

The Senate committee has called for new legislation by Congress to prevent any further Federal support of Communist-owned schools. It is apparent that some of the existing laws are inadequate to take care of the situation.

Most significant in the subcommittee's report—which, incidentally, is unanimous—is the statement made concerning the importance of confidential informants. The subcommittee does not reveal just what handicaps the investigating agencies of the Government may have been under in connection with the ascertainment of the facts concerning the influence of the Communists in the schools, but the subcommittee says:

"These hearings have served to re-emphasize to this subcommittee the important contributions that may be made by confidential informants to the exposure of the Communist conspiracy before the courts and congressional committees. To this end they have made extreme sacrifices of which the American public generally is unaware.

"It is to be expected that Communists and Communist sympathizers will lauch smear campaigns against these former party members who have a unique knowledge of the real purposes of the Communist Party, U. S. A. However, the subcommittee is particularly disturbed by a recent increase in similar unjustified attacks from misguided quarters avowedly anti-Communist. By such activities they are either unwittingly or deliberately promoting Communist causes.

"The result of such attacks has been an increasing reluctance on the part of former members of the Communist Party or undercover agents to testify in courts or before congressional committees. This Government is thus being deprived of its best source of facts concerning an organization dedicated to its overthrow by unconstitutional means.

"It is of interest that those groups attacking informants are not heard from when informants on non-Communist matters are involved.

"The very nature of the Communist conspiracy has always rendered its exposure exceedingly difficult. Now that the party has gone underground, that difficulty has greatly increased, necessitating an even greater dependence on confidential informants within the party in order to keep abreast of its activities and at appropriate times to publicly expose its real objectives.

"Reckless and unjustified attacks against all confidential informants and their use by our Government are strongly condemned by this subcommittee. They accomplish nothing except the rendering of assistance to the Communist Party.

"This subcommittee is firmly opposed to the expenditure of Federal funds for institutions owned or controlled by Communists."

Maybe the Justices of the Supreme Court who inveighed against confidential informants in one of their decisions recently will read what the Senate subcommittee has just said on the subject.

The subcommittee, incidentally, points out that, under existing laws, the Veterans' Administration "did not have and does not have legal authority to discontinue payment of Federal funds to schools reliably reported as Communist owned." But the Senators point out nevertheless that the Veterans' Administration "was on notice as early as 1946 of the deficiencies in this area" of public law.

The criticism of the Veterans' Administration is phrased this way:

"For a period of over 9 years, the Veterans' Administration failed to recommend corrective legislation or at least apprise Congress of the deficiencies of these laws. Such inaction is strongly condemned by this subcommittee. It resulted in an inexcusable expenditure of Federal funds in support of Communist-owned schools."

It is interesting to note that the new bill to correct the situation is sponsored by the full membership of the subcommittee, which means Democrats as well as Republicans.

Observations on Russia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE H. BENDER

OF OHIO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, July 6, 1956

Mr. BENDER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the second of two articles appearing currently in the Cleveland News, and written by one of its feature staff writers, Miss Doris O'Donnell.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Cleveland News of June 7, 1956]

DORIS O'DONNELL IN RUSSIA—LEARNS NEW FREEDOM STILL MEANS BONDAGE FOR PEOPLE

(Editor's Note.—News Reporter Doris O'Donnell, first Cleveland journalist to visit Russia since World War II, is back in Cleveland. The News today publishes the second installment of the exciting story of her adventures and observations, written without restriction from the exhaustive personal diary kept by Miss O'Donnell during her tour of cities and rural areas of the Soviet Union.)

(By Doris O'Donnell)

Moscow, U. S. S. R.—Freedom today in Russia is like the freedom of people taken out of solitary confinement, but kept in prison.

This is the impression I got every place I went in the Soviet Union.

No matter whether I talked with an engineer, interpreter or teacher, it was the same—the bondage of people without an independent voice.

The Russians have no conception of freedom as we know it in America.

They have been beaten over the head by czars or dictators so long that the opportunity to talk with an American seems to them daring. But they are doing so, on cue from the top political leaders.

When a Russian registers at a hotel, he turns in his identification card. Until a few weeks ago, he could not change jobs. Today he applies for permission 10 days in advance of quitting.

Rarely does a single Russian leave the U. S. S. R. Russians travel outside their orbit in groups or delegations.

A Russian lunching with a foreigner is also a rarity. I had met two Russians in Cleveland in April. One was the cellist, Rostopovich, and the other was his interpreter, Edward Ivanian, of the Soviet Ministry of Culture. Both had expressed eagerness to show me Moscow when I arrived.

I telephoned Mr. Ivanian and invited him to lunch. He said he was busy and would return my call. I never heard from him again.

A Russian teacher of French at the Stalingrad Agricultural Institute said she longed to visit France.

"Why don't you?" I asked.

"Well, perhaps someday," she said, adding hastily, "This summer, though, we can get free passes to Poland and Czechoslovakia."

The Soviet concept of freedom as measured against ours was illustrated during the recent visit of French Premier Guy Mollet and other French officials.

Some 3,000 French-Armenians begged the French to intercede for their return to France. These people had been lured to the Soviet Union by visions of a Communist paradise.

Now, disillusioned, they want their French citizenship back. The matter is under consideration by the Kremlin.

My freedom—and I use the word loosely—was a dubious thing here in the realm of the hammer and sickle. I would have liked the comforting thought that I could leave any time I wanted to.

I was not sure this could be done. My passport was taken by the night clerk at the National Hotel the moment I arrived. In fact, most of the time my passport was not in my hands.

I do not know that I was shadowed or followed or spied upon, but I suspect all my movements were jotted down by my interpreters and filed in the dark crenelated pigeonholes of the Kremlin. With all the foreign, and particularly free western, visitors coming to Russia this year, the espionage agents are going to get a big workout.

A foreigner, particularly an American woman, is so conspicuous on a Moscow street that it is impossible to travel anywhere unobserved.

High-heel shoes are as sensational as a neon sign, of which there are few in Moscow.

By contrast, the Russian women wear flat-soled shoes, or shoes with 1-inch high broad cork heels. The men's shoes are thick-soled styles, although many men wear cast-off military boots.

Further, in Moscow and to a lesser degree in other cities I visited, Russia militiamen are stationed at every intersection. Some are traffic policemen. Some patrol the streets. Others perch in sidewalk cubby-holes that look like over-size Mason jars.

From their elevated positions they sharply watch the street scene and keep a finger on who is coming and going. I did not see inside the glass jar, but there must be telephones connecting the vast police network.

I don't know whether airmail letters sent to the United States were opened or not. Nor do I know whether my incoming mail was tampered with.

But I do know two nonneurotic Americans who have become students of Russian glue.

They absolutely swear their mail is opened and reglued with a thick heavy yellow mucilage like nothing produced in America.

One American opened two letters from Florida, both written on tissue air mail stationary. He contended the regluing was so

messy parts of the letters were obliterated. All I can say is, they were the most glued-up letters I ever saw.

If the Soviet postal system is censoring mail, it gives a funny mental picture of clerks sitting around steaming open letters.

Believers that mail is censored aid their cause by pointing out the seven to 14-day time lapse for letters to reach here from New York.

Any foreigner can sink into a cloak-and-dagger mood in Moscow, which is a grim-looking city where even new buildings look like old warehouses.

For instance, rooms assigned to American, French, British, German and Canadian correspondents and tourists are the best, the kind of layout ordinarily reserved for a visiting Congressman. Microphones—if they exist— are behind wall ventilators. Well, you can't prove it by me.

My room at the National Hotel had a huge sitting room full of Victorian plush furniture, a small bedroom with a mahogany veneer wardrobe, and bath. There was a perfect view of Red Square, the Kremlin, Lenin Museum, St. Basil's fairy-like cathedral and the henna-marble mausoleum where the bodies of Lenin and Stalin are on public view.

Whether my room had electronic eavesdroppers or not, I am certain that Intourist knew where I was all the time.

First of all, the foreigner here must rely almost entirely on the services of Intourist, the official Soviet travel agency.

There are Intourist offices in the three hotels used for nonsatellite foreigners. They are the National, Savoy, and Metropole. The real swanky Moscow hotels are the Moscow on Red Square and the Sovietskaya, about 10 miles from Red Square.

It took a while to realize the importance and scope of Intourist. I was ready to brush it off. But a visit to the press department of the Foreign Ministry changed my mind.

Mr. Popov, assistant to the press chief, let me understand that it is Intourist that handles all visits to schools, hospitals, etc.

"You must ask Intourist," he said in his British-accented English, in answer to my requests.

"How about getting photographs of buildings and people?" I inquired.

"Ask Intourist," he said.

"I would like to interview Madame Bulganin, Madame Khrushchev, and Madame Furtseva," I said.

"You will write letters to them. Intourist will handle the letters," Popov said.

The three women whom I was anxious to see were English-speaking Mrs. Bulganin, wife of the Soviet premier; Mrs. Khrushchev, wife of the top man in the Supreme Soviet; and Ekaterina Furtseva, somewhat of a mystery woman to foreigners. She ranks nearly tops in the Communist Party, and is the only woman on the presidium, holding the post of alternate member.

The Russians have a telephone system, but it seemed more business was transacted by letter.

The visit to the Foreign Ministry building, a 20-story skyscraper (and one of Moscow's best-looking buildings) was the result of a letter to Leonid Ilychev, head of the press department.

A telephone call followed the letter and by appointment I was led by a young woman through a soldier-guarded door in the Foreign Ministry to the press office.

I've read about the psychological advantage of light shining upon a person's face during a questioning period, and it happened to me.

I was directed by Ilychev's assistant, Popov, to a seat opposite the only window in the room. Popov sat in the shadows on my left, and his assistant, Morovioff, faced me. I was conscious of my bright lipstick getting the full force of daylight. Few Russian women wear lipstick or rouge.

What seemed like hours of silence was a few moments, but neither man spoke. They offered me no encouragement to ask questions, although the air was full of them.

Finally I plunged into my purpose for being in Russia. I wanted, I said, to find out how the Russian people lived, how they dressed, how they worked. I said American women are intensely interested in the Russian women, especially in the wives of the leaders.

"Our women do not come before the public as yours do," Popov said.

"But," I insisted, "the American women know nothing about Madam Bulganin, for instance, and everyone knows about Mrs. Dwight D. Eisenhower."

Morovioff made notes of everything I said, including a list of things I wanted to do. Popov finally suggested I visit the editors of the magazine Soviet Woman, and talk with members of the Women's Anti-Fascist League.

Abruptly and rather awkwardly the interview ended. There was no chitchat.

An Intourist ZIS, a big luxury car similar to an American pre-World War II Packard, had brought me to the Foreign Ministry, but I had dismissed it. That was wrong, Morovioff indicated, as he called for another to return me to the National Hotel.

It is common to keep a chauffeured Intourist car or even an ordinary cab waiting, even 2 or 3 hours. The drivers usually sleep on the front seats.

From then on, Intourist was my right arm. I gave its offices a list of places to go, people to see, and hoped for the best.

There are a half-dozen girls in the National's Intourist office, plus their chief, Mr. Rogov. Two speak English, one, French, one, German, and the other two handled the telephone calls in Russian, directed by the others.

It was never easy to get a direct answer about anything.

"Yes. We will let you know," was the stock phrase.

Intourist arranged my visits to middle schools, nurseries, a polyclinic, a hospital, plus interviews with several people. I had bought coupons in New York, a requirement for travel here. For $30 a day on the "luxe" plan, I got my room, 3 meal tickets, plus 1 for tea, and the services of a car, driver, and interpreter.

On the trip to the ZIS auto works, where the ZIS limousines are made on special order, there were 4 Americans and 2 Russian interpreters. Our group included a correspondent, a New York student, a Connecticut businessman, and myself.

This arrangement was time consuming. Each of us had questions, and the interpretations for all were long and tedious.

Joseph Livingston, financial columnist for the Philadelphia Bulletin, had struck up a warm friendship with his male interperter. Driving back from the ZIS works, the interpreter pointed out his apartment.

"Let's stop and visit your wife," Livingston said.

"Oh, no," the interpreter replied. "That is not done. My wife must have time to get the house ready. In Russia, we call up our friends and ask whether we might visit."

He was embarrased by Livingston's request. To cover his confusion, he hauled out his wallet with snapshots of his pretty children and wife.

The Russians, I learned, deem it both socially and, I presume, politically incorrect to call unannounced. This may be a result of overcrowded living conditions. Anyway, I did manage to call unannounced at two apartments, as I shall tell about later.

Every place I was taken by Intourist guides I found conditions as perfect and as flawless as the Russians could manage them. In fact, the kindergartens and nurseries were so spotless and orderly it appeared no one ever used them.

This kind of freedom—where a foreigner can visit schools and hospitals—is a big thing to the Russians, I feel sure.

Many never met an American before. I was genuinely surprised at the number of Russians studying the English language and their eagnerness to practice it on Americans. In fact, I thought most of the guides had never spoken English outside the Institute classrooms.

But their kind of freedom and mine are as far apart as the moon and the earth. I only hoped as I met and talked with teachers and doctors that they could learn about our brand of freedom.

Proxy Solicitations Under Revised Proxy Rules of Securities and Exchange Commission

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. EVERETT M. DIRKSEN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, July 5, 1956

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by J. Sinclair Armstrong, Chairman of the Securities and Exchange Commission, before the 10th annual meeting of the American Society of Corporate Secretaries, on the subject Proxy Solicitations Under the Revised Proxy Rules of the Securities and Exchange Commission.

I am informed by the Public Printer that the manuscript will make approximately 2⅓ pages, at an estimated cost of $179.67.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PROXY SOLICITATIONS UNDER THE REVISED PROXY RULES OF THE SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

(Address by J. Sinclair Armstrong)

After 2 years of intense study, in January 1956 the Securities and Exchange Commission adopted revisions of its proxy rules designed to clarify and make more specific the intent of the rules as they relate to contests for the election or removal of directors.[1] The revision constituted amendments to the Commission's regulation X–14, adopted under section 14 (a) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, applicable to corporations, the securities of which are listed on national securities exchanges.

Prior to these amendments adopted by the Commission in January 1956, the proxy rules did not contain provisions specifically directed to the many disclosure problems arising in proxy contests for control of listed corporations. The more general disclosure requirements of the rules, which were primarily directed to solicitations for the usual meeting of security holders for the purposes of electing directors or for taking other appropriate corporate action, were applied on a case-by-case approach to the problems which arose in proxy contests.

When I addressed your annual meeting a year ago at Bretton Woods, I told you how our work in revising the rules were going forward. I will review that briefly and tell you of our progress since that time.

Footnotes at end of speech.

At the end of the 1954 proxy season, in August of that year, the Commission directed that the proxy rules be reviewed by the Division of Corporation Finance from the point of view of the problems presented by proxy contests and that proposals for amendment be submitted for its consideration. It was felt at that time, however, that additional experience to be gained under the rules then in effect during the 1955 proxy season would assist in the development of the new rules for proxy contests which would be suited to the changing patterns of proxy solicitations, particularly in contests for control.

A proxy rule revision proposal was first announced by Commission release in August 1955,[2] but prior to that time I had discussed the problems and some of the proposals in February 1955 before your Chicago chapter, and also in June 1955 in my statement to the Subcommittee on Securities of the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency. Following the public announcement in August 1955, we had the benefit of many well-considered and constructive comments from the public. We received and reviewed comments submitted in writing upon the original August 1955 amendment proposal and the modified proposal published December 14, 1955, and those advanced orally at a public hearing held November 17, 1955. We also considered all of the testimony, proceedings, and reports of the Senate Banking and Currency Committee, and its Subcommittee on Securities, bearing on the proxy problem and resulting from that committee's 1955 Stock Market Study. Thus the Commission's action in adopting the revision in January of this year was the culmination of several years' concentrated study and review of soliciting material filed in connection with proxy contests during that period.

The amendments reflect in large measure codification of the administrative interpretations and practices of the Commission in the proxy contest cases under the general rules as they had been in effect. In addition, the rules were amended more precisely to define and to elicit detailed information about persons deemed to be participants in a proxy contest.

In announcing the adoption of the revision in January, I stated my belief that the amendments of the proxy rules represented an important step forward under the Federal Securities Exchange Act for protection of investors in securities listed on national securities exchanges. Proxy fights for control of corporate management represent contests for the power to direct the use and disposition of significant aggregations of capital represented by corporate assets and credit. These, in turn, are represented by billions of dollars of outstanding securities held by public investors. The savings of the public investors, channelled through our capital markets into the securities of corporations, have provided the capital funds by which the American system of free private enterprise has been built and developed. As owners of the corporate enterprises, public investors should have the right at the very least under our free enterprise system to be fully and fairly informed about the interests which seek to elect directors and about the nominees who offer themselves or are offered by others to assume responsibility for management.

As owners of the businesses, with billions of dollars of savings invested, public investors have a great stake in the outcome of all corporate elections. The careful and intelligent exercise of their voting rights is of the utmost importance if persons best qualified, by reason of background, experience, and ability, to advance the best interests of the corporation and its stockholders are to be selected. This is particularly true in proxy contests, as opposing factions vie for the stockholders' favor and statements and counterstatements, charges and countercharges, sometimes are more confusing than enlightening.

The revised rules are designed to aid and protect public investors in the exercise of their voting rights by assuring detailed factual information about the participants, both the nominees for elections as directors and those actively participating in their election campaign. This includes information about their identity and background, their interest in securities of the corporation, and certain other important information having a bearing upon the contest.

The revised proxy rules established for the first time uniform ground rules governing preproxy statement solicitations, a significant development of recent years, and defining in more precise terms than did the prior rules the types of disclosure required in contests for the election or removal of directors.

Under the new rules, in a proxy contest, no solicitation of proxies by an opposition group may be commenced unless a statement concerning each participant in that solicitation is first filed with the Commission and each national securities exchange with which any security of the corporation is listed. This statement must set forth the detailed information required by a new schedule provided by the rule (schedule 14B). If the solicitation is by management in opposition to another group or in anticipation of opposition by another group, the information required by the new schedule 14B with respect to management participants must be filed promptly after the first solicitation. The term "participant" includes, in addition to the corporation and its directors, and any nominees for directors, all persons and groups primarily engaged in, financing and responsible for, the conduct of the proxy solicitation. Those taking the initiative in organizing a stockholders' committee or group or contributing more than $500, or lending money or furnishing credit for the purpose of financing or otherwise influencing the contest, are included in the definition of participant. These provisions should make available to the security holders information about the background and the financial and other interests not only of all persons who are nominees for election as directors, but also of all persons who may represent the real interests behind the formal nominees, and should reduce substantially the difficulty we have had in the past with undisclosed principals, or "fronts."[3]

Each participant is required to disclose, in the document filed in response to schedule 14B, his occupational background and personal history, the amount of the corporation's securities he owns, the transactions in which the securities were acquired, the circumstances under which he became a participant in the solicitation, and any arrangement or understanding respecting future employment or other transactions with the corporation. A summary of this information concerning participants must be included in the respective proxy statements of the contesting groups.

These disclosures are vitally important for the protection of investors in contests for corporate control. When persons seek to be appointed fiduciaries of the property interests of security holders, conflicts of interests should be identified and disclosed. In the past, participants in proxy contests have sometimes attempted to conceal their background, financial interests in the corporation and activities in the solicitation for proxies.

In contests for the election of directors, the proxy statement is also required to include a description of the methods of solicitation and the material features of solicitation contracts, the anticipated cost of solicitation, and whether reimbursement for solicitation expenses will be sought from the corporation.

Many of the more difficult problems in any proxy contest spring from the fact that a considerable portion of the corporation's outstanding shares are often held in street names and their ownership is constantly changing. Participants in a proxy contest no longer can rely on being able to communicate with the beneficial owners indirectly through solicitation of the stockholders of record. Therefore, the widespread use of paid advertisements, prepared press releases, press interviews, and radio and television broadcasts, has become common in attempting to reach security holders and to sway the opinion of the public and persons who may advise security holders with respect to giving, revoking or withholding proxies. Whether statements are written or oral, are prepared in advance or are spontaneous they nevertheless constitute part of a continuous plan to influence stockholders and are deemed subject to the Commission's standards of fair disclosure and, specifically, to the rule prohibiting false and misleading statements.[4]

It would be impractical for the Commission to scrutinize in advance of publication all statements made to the general public by participants in an election contest. The new rules require, however, that copies of soliciting material in the form of prepared speeches, press releases, and radio and television scripts must be filed with the Commission promptly after their use. As an administrative convenience to the public, such documents may be filed, and if filed, will be reviewed by the Commission, in advance of use.

The new rules continue to require that all advertisements used as soliciting material in a proxy contest be filed with the Commission prior to publication. Reprints or republications of any previously published material used in soliciting proxies also must be filed prior to use, together with a statement identifying the author and any person quoted in the article and disclosing whether the consent of the author and of the publication to use the material has been obtained, and if any consideration has been, or will be, made for its republication.

The annual financial report of a corporation to its security holders is not usually considered to be proxy soliciting material and is not treated as a "filing" with the Commission. However, if any portion of the annual report discusses the solicitation of an opposition group, that portion is made subject to the proxy rules by the 1956 amendments and must be filed with the Commission prior to distribution.

The basic theme, flowing through specific provisions of the type I have mentioned, is the statutory standard, expressed in the rules,[4] that no solicitation shall be made which contains any statement which, at the time and in the light of the circumstances under which it is made is false or misleading with respect to any material fact or which omits to state a material fact necessary to make statements made not false or misleading.

The Commission has given examples of statements which, in the heat of proxy fights, may be made and which, depending on the particular facts, may be misleading. These include:

(a) Predictions as to specific future market values, earnings, or dividends.

(b) Material which directly or indirectly impugns character, integrity, or personal reputation, or directly or indirectly makes charges concerning improper, illegal, or immoral conduct or associations, without factual foundation.

(c) Failure to so identify a proxy statement, form of proxy and other soliciting ma-

Footnotes at end of speech.

Footnotes at end of speech.

terial as to clearly distinguish it from the soliciting material of any other person or persons soliciting for the same meeting or subject matter.

(d) Claims made prior to a meeting regarding the results of a solicitation.

In the heat of bitter struggles for control, argumentation of this type in proxy soliciting material may tend to confuse and mislead security holders and the public and impair the free and fair exercise of the corporate franchise.

The statutory authority of the Securities and Exchange Commission to regulate the solicitation of proxies, as well as Commission rulemaking and administrative policy in this respect, has become increasingly important and the subject of much discussion, in the Congress, in the press, and generally. In part this has been caused by the public interest in a number of highly publicized and bitter contests for control of several large, well-known corporations. So it is appropriate for me again to state the role and function of the Commission. The Commission, as a bipartisan independent regulatory agency of the Government, objectively and impartially scrutinizes the proxy material of participants for the purpose of enforcing the standards of fair and adequate disclosure to investors which are clearly set forth as primary objectives of the Federal securities laws. The Commission makes no attempt to guide, control, or interfere in the strategy of participants in a contest for control. The Commission does not undertake, in fact we avoid, any attempt to shape or define issues except as they may be a byproduct of fair disclosure. These are matters for the parties themselves to choose and develop. The Commission is and must be scrupulously neutral; it neither takes sides nor plays favorites in proxy contests. The objective of the Commission in prsecribing rules under the Securities and Exchange Act to govern proxy solicitations is to obtain for investors and stockholders the fair disclosure of material facts and to prevent, by seeking appropriate injunctive relief in the Federal courts as the statute provides when necessary, the dissemination of false and misleading statements.

It has been suggested, in proceedings connected with our administration of the rules, that in view of the apparent similarity of proxy contests to political campaigns the clash of debate, the charges and countercharges, rebuttals, and sur-rebuttals of the opposing groups will bring out enough of the facts to enable the shareholders to form an adequate judgment as to the merits of the competing parties. There has been challenge in the courts of the Commission's jurisdiction in cases of stockholders' disputes with management. The argument has been advanced that in such cases the various groups soliciting proxies should be free to engage in the same type of campaign oratory as that of participants in a political contest.

The legislative history of the Exchange Act indicates that the Congress was concerned with the abuse of proxies by seekers of corporate power as well as by management. One of the congressional reports states that "the rules and regulations promulgated by the Commission will protect investors from promiscuous solicitation of their proxies, on the one hand, by irresponsible outsiders seeking to wrest control of a corporation away from honest and conscientious corporate officials; and, on the other hand, by unscrupulous corporate officials seeking to retain control of the management by concealing or distorting facts."[5]

In this connection, it is also interesting to note the recent decision of the United States Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, rejecting such contentions. The court of appeals affirmed an order which granted the Commission a preliminary injunction against a group soliciting proxies in opposition to the management, enjoining further solicitations in violation of the proxy rules by means of false and misleading statements and without disclosing all of the persons on whose behalf the solicitations were being made.[6] Although these proceedings were brought under the Commission's proxy rules as in effect prior to the January 1956 revision, the court held, among other things, that schedule 14A of the rules requires disclosure of all persons who in fact are leading factors in the opposition group's formation and activities notwithstanding the circumstance that some of such persons are not technically designated committee members or nominees.

Two paragraphs of the opinion of the court of appeals are most important. The first is as follows:

"Appellants argue that section 14 (a) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (15 U. S. C., sec. 78n (a)), and regulations adopted thereunder are unconstitutional as unauthorized delegations of legislative power and otherwise, but these contentions have no merit. *American Power & Light Co.* v. *S. E. C.* (329 U. S. 90); *Yakus* v. *United States* (321 U. S. 414). Furthermore, the Commission's proxy rules as applied either to management or to insurgent stockholder groups are clearly authorized by the statute."

The word "otherwise" refers to appellants' contention, made in the argument before the Court, that the proxy regulation provided for censorship by the Commission and abridged the constitutional guaranty of freedom of speech. This the Court rejected.

The second paragraph of its opinion I want to emphasize says:

"Appellants' fundamental complaint appears to be that stockholder disputes should be viewed in the eyes of the law just as are political contests, with each side free to hurl charges with comparative unrestraint the assumption being that the opposing side is then at liberty to refute and thus effectively deflate the campaign oratory of its adversary. Such, however, was not the policy of Congress as enacted in the Securities Exchange Act. There Congress has clearly entrusted to the Commission the duty of protecting the investing public against misleading statements made in the course of a struggle for corporate control."

It was particularly pleasing to me to have this decision rendered by a court of very high standing sustaining our rules against the challenge that they violated constitutional guaranties of freedom of speech and press because of fears expressed in the press, which I believe have now been allayed, that the act of the Congress imposing standards of fairness and accuracy of disclosure with respect to certain corporate acts such as proxy soliciting in some way impinged on these traditional and deeply cherished constitutional liberties.

Legislation[7] now pending in the Congress would extend the financial reporting, proxy solicitation, and "insider trading" provisions of the Securities Exchange Act to about 1,205 corporations, the securities of which are not listed on a national securities exchange but in which there is a substantial public investor interest. Generally, the corporations which the bill would bring within these provisions of the Exchange Act are those which meet Federal jurisdictional requirements, and which have 750 or more stockholders of record of a class or debt securities of $1 million outstanding in the hands of the public and total assets of $2 million. Of the 1,205 companies, 963 have more than $5 million of assets and 673 have more than $10 million of assets. The aggregate assets of the 1,205 corporations is over $35 billion.

In connection with this legislative proposal, the Commission has made a study with respect to the financial reporting and proxy soliciting practices of these corporations. This study developed the fact that the proxy soliciting material and practices of most of the corporations which would be subject to the bill are wholly inadequate to furnish investors with the information necessary to exercise an informed vote when judged by the standards of disclosure established by the Commission's proxy rules under section 14 of the Exchange Act. This deficiency in information is particularly striking in connection with the election of directors. Typically, only a notice of meeting and a form of proxy are furnished their security holders by these corporations, and nothing resembling a proxy statement is provided. In three-fourths of the cases, not even the identity of nominees for election is disclosed, let alone pertinent information concerning them. In many cases where proposals are submitted for stockholder action, no ballot is provided on the form of proxy by which the stockholder can vote for or against the proposal.

Taking into consideration the data contained in our report to the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency on the study, and on the basis of our continuing study of the problem, we have advised the Congress that we believe enactment of the bill, subject to certain changes we have suggested, would be in accord with the basic purposes of the Federal securities laws and that the principles and objectives of the bill are sound. The legislation would provide additional protection to investors in corporate securities, in which there is broad public investor interest and which are sold and traded in the interstate securities markets, by requiring fair disclosure of the business and financial facts pertaining to the corporations issuing them, thus contributing to the stability of the markets and the protection of investors against fraud and deception.

Parenthetically, I should say that we have recommended that the Congress defer the extension of section 16 (b) of the Exchange Act of these corporations until further information can be developed on the effect which the application of this section, which provides for the recovery by the corporation of profit from short-swing (6-month) trading by directors, officers and 10 percent stockholders, would have upon the maintenance of adequate over-the-counter trading markets and new capital markets for the securities of these corporations.[8]

Another problem of the regulation of proxy solicitations involves the giving of proxies by brokers and dealers for listed securities registered in their names but owned by customers.

Section 14 (b) of the Exchange Act makes it unlawful for any such member, broker, or dealer to give a proxy with respect to a listed security carried for the account of a customer in contravention of such rules and regulations as the Commission may prescribe as necessary or appropriate in the public interest or for the protection of investors. The report on stock exchange practices which was issued by the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency at the time when the Securities Exchange Act was passed, in referring to this provision, states:

"The rules and regulations [of the Commission] will also render it impossible for brokers having no beneficial interest in a security to usurp the franchise power of their customers and thereby deprive the latter of their voice in the control of the corporations in which they hold securities."[9]

Section 14 (b) has never been implemented by rule.

The Commission is seeking to develop a workable rule which will prevent brokers from assuming or usurping their customers' voting rights and which at the same time will not interfere with the orderly solicitation of proxies and the voting of shares.

Footnotes at end of speech.

Footnotes at end of speech.

Footnotes at end of speech.

We are considering the adoption of a rule which would set out the conditions under which members of a national securities exchange and brokers and dealers who do business through members, may give proxies covering securities listed on an exchange and carried for the account of customers.

The Commission first circulated for public comment a proposed rule, X–14B–1, on this subject in May 1955. Many thoughtful and helpful comments were received. After consideration of these comments, a revised proposal was circulated in April 1956. The revised proposal clarified and simplified the proposed requirements and covered a number of practical problems raised in the comments. Further suggestions have been received and we are now considering them. A good deal of careful thought is going into our effort to achieve a workable rule which will give the owners of stock held in the names of brokers and dealers a more effective voice in the affairs of the corporation in which they have invested.

---

[1] Securities Exchange Act Release No. 5276, January 17, 1956.
[2] Securities Exchange Act Release No. 5212, August 23, 1955.
[3] Rule X–14–A–9.
[4] Rule X–14–A–9.
[5] Senate Committee Rept. No. 1455, 73d Cong., 2d sess., p. 77.
[6] *S. E. C.* v. *May, et al.*, C. A. 2, January 11, 1956.
[7] S. 2054, H. R. 7045.
[8] Report of the Securities and Exchange Commission on S. 2054 to the Committee on Banking and Currency, 84th Cong., 2d sess. (committee print, May 25, 1956).
[9] Senate Rept. No. 1455, 73d Cong., 2d sess., p. 77.

Excerpts From Speech of Representative Hugh Scott, of Pennsylvania, Present General Counsel and Former Chairman, Republican National Convention, at the 47th Annual Convention of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, San Francisco, Calif., June 29, 1956

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUGH SCOTT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 6, 1956

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I would like to insert the following speech in the RECORD:

EXCERPTS FROM SPEECH OF REPRESENTATIVE HUGH SCOTT, OF PENNSYLVANIA, PRESENT GENERAL COUNSEL AND FORMER CHAIRMAN, REPUBLICAN NATIONAL COMMITTEE, AT THE 47TH ANNUAL CONVENTION OF THE NATIONAL ASSOCIATION FOR THE ADVANCEMENT OF COLORED PEOPLE, SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF., JUNE 29, 1956

I intend here to contrast the Republican record of 3 years of promises kept with 20 years of Democrat deceit, doubletalk, and demagoguery.

Just the facts, ladies and gentlemen, just the facts.

The Republican Party of 1956—the party of peace, prosperity, and progress—is also the party of performance within the area of its pledges.

As Americans we are blessedly fortunate to be living in peaceful, prosperous days—days that are better than the "good old days" that never really were—and we are living in days when the last barriers to the fullest freedom for every single American are crumbling away, are falling down.

How did this happen? What happened to one of the political parties—the Republican Party—where in the past on the Washington level both parties had looked the other way in the face of injustice, discrimination and second class citizenship?

What happened? The times cried out for a man to really lead us all to face the facts: that freedom isn't freedom unless it's freedom all the way—for everybody. We found that man in President Eisenhower.

He said in 1952: "In a time when America needs all the brains, all the skills, all the spiritual strength and dedicated service of its 157 million people, discrimination is criminally stupid. I pledge to devote myself toward making equality of opportunity a living reality for every American. There is no room left in America for second-class citizenship for anybody."

Nearly 4 years have passed. The Republican Party has quickened its pace, faced its responsibilities, kept its promises, and became the first political party in this century to do important things as a united party to roll up a genuinely good record of things done in the area of civil rights.

The Democratic Party is still split hopelessly—its candidates frantically wearing two faces for purposes of geographical interchangeability, its Congress in control of the southern Do-Naught-Crats. Some of its committees, such as Education and Labor, do not dare to hold meetings for fear of the specter of civil rights. And when such meetings are held, on rare occasions, civil-rights proposals are filibustered to extinction by southern Democrats.

Their candidate, Mr. Stevenson, is so afraid of losing the vital support of the Talmadge-Eastland bloc in the Democratic committee that he proposed on February 12 (Lincoln's Birthday) in Portland, Oreg., that the desegregation issue be removed from the campaign. He was already in hot water for pussyfooting in California, where on February 7 he told a Negro audience in Los Angeles that if he became President he would not deprive segregated schools of Federal funds. He also ducked interposition by saying he didn't understand it. He then topped off his speech by offering a target date for integration of January 1, 1963. I quote him: "Government power should be used only to the extent that the public will support such use. I favor a cautious temperate approach to the whole problem."

Instead of helping him, these and other west-coast statements of Stevenson drew the fire of Roy Wilkins, your executive secretary, who felt Mr. Stevenson had already put the question of civil rights into the campaign himself by calling for gradualism and a target date of January 1, 1963, for its termination.

So at Timberline Lodge, Oregon, on February 13, Mr. Stevenson was very hurt and registered surprise that Roy Wilkins or any Negro leader would charge him with advising Negroes not to claim their rights or to do so gradually. This is what he said: "I have never suggested * * * I agree with Mr. Wilkins that 'this problem can be solved by good will, good deeds, and with understanding and forbearance.' That is exactly what I have been saying." Mr. Wilkins used those words in his comment, but he also called for "determination to obey the law." Mr. Stevenson very adroitly left this part of the Roy Wilkins statement out. Nor did he comment on this part of Mr. Wilkins' speech: "The Negro himself is American enough to resent and reject the suggestion that any American should refuse to claim those rights which have been declared to be his under the Constitution."

George Meany, president of the new AFL-CIO joined with Mr. Wilkins. He felt Mr. Stevenson is running away from the school segregation question. Meany said he favored patience in letting States gradually desegregate so long as they made continuing planned progress in that direction, but Stevenson's position seemed to favor "postponing things forever, and that's nonsense to me." I might note that Mr. Meany's position is that of the Supreme Court. It is also the position of President Eisenhower and the only lawful way under the Court's decision.

Mr. Stevenson, whose solution for ending the Korean war was: Patience and negotiation and whose solution for civil rights is to postpone the whole thing for 7 years (that is, until the eve of the 1964 presidential campaign) hopes to befuddle the whole problem of civil rights until he can plump into his basket the delegates from northern cities and southern citizens councils.

With this odd combo he plans to skid by the hard issues, doubletalk himself out of the tough question of what he would do, and hopes to come across the line first.

If he should—which God forbid—who would he owe his election to, if not to the southern governors and their delegations who alone can now make possible his selection as nominee?

Would Stevenson, as President, do anything for the Negro citizen? Anything for civil rights? Or would he keep his promise to you to postpone the whole problem for 7 years until July 4, 1963?

Stevenson counts on you to lie down and take it while he gets in bed with those who would deny you the full rights of free citizenship. He figures that you voted for him before and that you will again—so he dares to risk a virtual sellout to the segregationists.

Paraphrasing Mr. Churchill: "What kind of people does he think you are?"

Now, let's turn to a much brighter picture.

While Stevenson was forgetting you for 4 years and postponing you for 7 more, what was the record on civil-rights progress in Washington?

There President Eisenhower and the Republicans blazed new trails, set up new recognition for you and for all Americans, regardless of color.

Here are some of the things we Republicans achieved which had never been accomplished by the Democrats:

The first action of the President of the United States was to put his own immediate house in order, by which I mean the executive department. There, by precept and example he showed the way to others responsible for decent government. He established a long series of first, including the first Negro administrative assistant to the President, the first Negro secretary in the office of the Assistant to the President, the first invitations to stag dinners of Negroes in substantial numbers. These may seem to be small things in themselves, but they had not happened before, and they set the climate and the atmosphere and indicated the direction in which the new administration intended to move.

Moreover, in the armed services the abolition of practices of segregation were completely eliminated, a process which had begun in an earlier administration but the vast burden of which had been assumed by the present administration in carrying to completion provisions for the elimination of all segregated responsibilities involving the difficult problems in human relations concerned in the integration of such areas as the Norfolk and Charleston, S. C., Naval Bases, which bases are the principal industries in those communities. The impact of this action and of similar action elsewhere has been tremen-

dous in its effect on community relations. This administration has also abolished segregation in all Federal facilities, and in the District of Columbia a notable example is found in the Thompson Restaurant case which opened up the restaurants and hotels upon a completely integrated base. The nature of the job involved in ending segregation in the District of Columbia may be illustrated by the fact that 84 separate executive operations were required in order to end segregation in each and every separate branch and subdivision of the District Government. This was a monumental task which had never before been even attempted.

Furthermore, this administration found 2½ years ago that 47 hospitals operated by the Veterans' Administration were segregating veterans according to color. Today not one hospital under the Veterans' Administration is segregated. And this administration believes and has put into practice its belief that those who fought in our wars together are entitled to equal medical and hospitalization facilities wherever Federal moneys are spent.

Today, under this administration no new construction can take place on airports if such contracts have been placed on a segregated basis. The President's Committee on Government Contracts has functioned as an action committee under the leadership of Vice President NIXON, Secretary of Labor Mitchell, John Roosevelt, and with the cooperation and guidance of such prominent figures as George Meany and Walter Reuther. This Committee enforces the nondiscrimination clauses in Government contracts. In addition the President's Committee on Government Employment Policy is actively operating to end discrimination and discriminatory practices in Government itself. The good faith shown by the Department of Justice in the prosecution of cases for the Government such as the Thompson Restaurant case and the school segregation case for both of which the NAACP worked tirelessly, are the direct result of the announced policy of President Eisenhower.

We Republicans are proud, too, of the request of Attorney General Brownell for workable civil-rights legislation. This legislation provides for the establishment of a bipartisan Commission on Civil Rights, with power of subpena, to investigate racial tensions and the establishment of a separate Civil Rights Section in the Department of Justice under a full-time Assistant Attorney General.

The bill (of which I am one of the three authors in the House of Representatives) also provides for important changes in "right to vote" laws:

1. Addition of a section which will prevent anyone from threatening, intimidating, or coercing an individual in the exercise of his right to vote, whether claiming to act under authority of law or not, in any election, general, special, or primary, concerning candidates for Federal office.

2. Authorization of the Attorney General to bring injunction or other civil proceedings on behalf of the United States or the aggrieved person in ay case covered by the statute.

3. Eliminate the requirement that all State administrative and judicial remedies must be exhausted before access can be had to the Federal courts.

That legislation has been delayed, first by Democrat filibustering in the Judiciary Committee, then by Democrat delays in the Rules Committee (where all Republicans favor the bill and one-half the Democrats oppose it bitterly).

This is in keeping with the Democrat record; although in control of Congress for 22 out of the last 26 years, they never acted on a single civil-rights bill—not even in the 75th Congress where northern Democrats greatly outnumbered southern Democrats.

In very sober truth, remember this: A vote for the Democrats this year in San Francisco, Los Angeles, Chicago, New York, Philadelphia is a vote for a southern Democrat control of Congress, it's a vote for the Democrat control of the House Rules Committee where civil rights bills get the suffocation treatment.

And a vote for any Democrat in a Federal election is a vote for EASTLAND.

Your votes furnished the margin in 1954, in all probability, which put the southern Democrats in control of the committees where the laws you want die on the vine.

You forged the iron for the very beartraps set out to slow you down.

Will you do it again?

Will you vote to keep EASTLAND on top of the Judiciary Committee?

A vote for Stevenson will fix your feet for 4 years more.

Will you do it?

I sincerely hope you won't.

If you cast a Democrat ballot, that choking sensation you feel will be you strangling yourself.

I hope you will turn to the party which, at this time in our history, has advanced your progress and the progress of all Americans, economically to new heights, politically to new horizons.

These words of President Eisenhower on April 17, express our position in this day of stress. "* * * The Republican Party must be inspired by a concern that comprehends every American; that sets up no walls of birth or creed or party; that ranks all men and women of decency and good will equal in their dignity. Under God, we espouse the cause of freedom and justice and peace for all people."

Thanks to the decency and the inherent goodness in the character of President Eisenhower, his administration has registered the greatest advance for the rights of racial minorities since the Emancipation Proclamation itself. Nor has his administration sought to postpone consideration of this question or of its many difficult phases. The time to meet injustice is not on July 4, 1963 because it happens to be the 100th anniversary of the Emancipation Proclamation The time to meet injustice, the time to oppose evil with good, constructive, honest legislation is not at any time in the future.

The time is now.

Fire Island Inlet

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. STUYVESANT WAINWRIGHT

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 3, 1956

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, a running dispute of local interest has been going on for some time in regard to the Fire Island Inlet. A well-known daily newspaper, Newsday, has given this dispute excellent coverage. Their treatment has been fair and unbiased. Probably the best article on the subject has been written by Tom Morris. The following article appeared on Monday, June 25, 1956. On Tuesday, June 26, I presented my arguments in behalf of a comprehensive study. This is also set forth.

Robert Moses, chairman of the Long Island Park Commission, claimed in dramatic fashion that there was no dispute. Newsday devoted a blank page to dramatize Mr. Moses' unwillingness to recognize any viewpoint but his own. In other words, they used the entire left centerfold of the paper to present my viewpoint and the right centerfold of the paper appeared blank.

I am also setting forth two editorials on this subject, one appearing in Newsday and the other in a chain of newspapers owned and operated by the former Republican Congressman from the area, W. Kingsland Macy. Mr. Macy has never been overenthusiastic, to say the least, about any program in which I have been interested. However, he has, as a public service, allowed me freedom of a news column in his papers. My viewpoint on this subject has appeared in that column on several occasions.

[From Newsday of June 25, 1956]

STORM OVER FIRE ISLAND INLET

(By Tom Morris)

The tides keep rolling in and the sands keep piling up, but nobody yet has figured out what to do with Fire Island Inlet.

For nearly 100 years the creeping sands have moved west, threatening to cut off the Atlantic Ocean from the Great South Bay. And for nearly 100 years everybody has said: "Something ought to be done about it."

They're echoing the same words now. Meanwhile, the inlet—the South Shore's most vital waterway—is choked with treacherous sand bars and is being closed up fast. Imbedded in the shifting sands are the problems of Federal, State, and Suffolk County governments as well as the many organizations and thousands of boatowners and beach dwellers.

All the groups have boiled down to two separate points of view: Should the inlet be dredged out again? Or should surveys be continued to find a way of cutting a new inlet through western Fire Island?

The plan for dredging the inlet generally is called the stabilization plan. Those in favor are behind a bill now before Congress which calls for the spending of $2 million to get the job started. That bill has just been unanimously passed by a House subcommittee and soon will be brought up before the House Public Works Committee.

Those favoring the new inlet have found a champion in Representative STUYVESANT WAINWRIGHT. The Wainscott Republican, while in general accord with the stabilization plan, said he wants further surveys made of the entire shore. He believes John Q. Public may well get a better long-term financial shake if a new inlet is cut. He also feels the people will be freed from future worry about sand build-ups that way.

The stakes are big. What the outcome will be is uncertain. There are possible solutions to the inlet problem. Fire Island Inlet, born centuries ago, has always been a precocious child of nature. Long Island can't live without it, but living with it has been a headache for 50 years.

The bill now before Congress is sponsored by Senators IRVING M. IVES, Republican, New York, and HERBERT LEHMAN, Democrat, New York, in the Senate, and by Representative FRANK J. BECKER, of Lynbrook, in the House. The legislation grew out of a 10-year study by the United States Army Corps of Engineers and the Long Island State Park Commission.

If Congress assents, the Army would begin this summer to dredge 2.5 million cubic yards of sand from the inlet. The sand would be pumped through an underground pipe to the badly eroded Oak Beach and Cedar Beach shore on the north side of the inlet. The bill calls for $85,000 a year for maintenance during the next 15 years, if it is necessary.

AREA'S FUTURE IN THE BALANCE

Everyone from Park Commissioner Robert Moses, to WAINWRIGHT, to fishermen and boaters wants an inlet at Fire Island as a link between the ocean and Great South Bay.

But the problem is over how to get one—permanently. Many persons, including WAINWRIGHT, fear the Army-Park Commission project is being unnecessarily hurried to cover past inaction. Many think any permanent solution still lies hidden in the drifting sands.

The immediate and long-term future of property owners, commercial fishermen, pleasure craft operators, oil tanker concerns, and the entire area hangs in the balance as the answer is sought.

On one side there is plenty of support for surveys on cutting a new inlet. It centers around middle and Eastern Suffolk, where fears are high that Moriches and Shinnecock Inlets may suffer if a large amount of Federal money is funneled to Fire Island Inlet. On Fire Island itself there is heavy pressure from the Fire Island Antierosion Committee in favor of a more general beach rehabilitation project.

Threaded into the opposition to the Army-Park Commission plan is a feeling in some quarters that the proposal is being jammed through by State and Federal officials with deaf ears to other points of view.

The suspicion isn't new. Many Fire Islanders, for example, live in fear of State construction of a bridge across the present inlet. They say such a bridge would divert money that could be used for beach erosion and also destroy the cherished rusticity that has made Fire Island one of the world't best-known summer resorts.

Plans to build such a bridge eventully were dusted off by Sidney M. Shapiro, chief park commission engineer, last September 9 in an address at Hofstra College. He said: "Ultimately, the 5 miles of oceanfront at Fire Island State Park, reached by an extension of the Captree Causeway across Fire Island Inlet in place of the present shuttle ferries, will be developed."

Others have said the stabilization plan has "unspoken undercurrents."

Joseph Glancy, of Northport, operator of a Sayville oyster firm and a student of the inlet problem, charged: "The park commission wants this new dredging and sand-pumping plan to get the new sand moving toward Jones Beach."

"Inlet troubles killed the oyster industry in Great South Bay. This new plan is short-sighted and a mistake. The whole county would be better off with a new inlet to facilitate tidal flow. WAINWRIGHT is the only guy with guts enough to stand up and say so."

Joseph Meade, of Babylon, former beach-condition expert for the Navy and Coast Guard on Long Island, said the new plan would not work unless a huge jetty were built west of the mouth of the inlet. He argued that the fast, erosive tides in the inlet were partially caused when the park commission in 1930 closed down an inlet east of Cedar Beach, cut through in 1910 by a storm. Meade said this inlet was closed to build the Ocean Causeway, now endangered by erosion.

Capt. Eugene Osborn, of Center Moriches, district Coast Guard commander from 1931–35, and Long Island commander in World War II, said: "Serious consideration should be given a new inlet west of the lighthouse." He said: "Natural forces from the bay and ocean may well open an inlet there again."

But for all the misgivings about the Army-Park Commission plan, there is heavy support for it. Leading the fight is the Fire Island Inlet Committee of Nassau and Suffolk, which has more than 100 member organizations and claims to represent 1 million persons in Suffolk and Nassau.

Capt. Eric Westerlind, of West Islip, committee chairman, said it would be foolish to cut a new inlet because of the cost. He said a big ditch would disturb the natural northeast-southwest migration of fish that makes the area a sportsman's mecca.

In 1948, Secretary of the Army Kenneth C. Royall told Congress a new inlet would cost $9,280,000. "In addition," he said, "the effect of closure of the natural inlet on the shoreline cannot be predicted, in view of the immense changes to nature that would occur."

Also backing the stabilization plan, supervised by Army Gen. Theron D. Weaver, are Gen. William F. Cassidy; Col. Clarence Renshaw; Thorndike Saville, dean of engineering at New York University; Morrough P. O'Brien, dean of engineering at the University of California; Dr. Lorenz G. Straub, director of the hydraulic laboratory at the University of Minnesota; Gov. Harriman, the Suffolk Board of Supervisors; and Babylon and Islip townships.

MOSES SEES NO DISAGREEMENT

Moses has refused to recognize that any disagreement within the stabilization plan exists. But WAINWRIGHT, caught in the cross-currents is under pressure from both sides.

He said he had asked Moses if he would agree to a new-inlet study in return for support of the stabilization. "He refused," Wainwright said, adding that he "sincerely felt," in the interests of erosion at Oak Beach, that the stabilization plan should be carried out. But, he added, if the bill came to a house vote, he could throw it to a rules committee by getting three objections, which would be easy. As to whether he would try to hold up the project that way, he said, "I'll cross that bridge when I get to it."

In the meantime, the Wainscott Republican hopes Moses will see the light of day.

Today's worry over the right thing to do is as justified as it is old. The inlet is used by 1 million persons a year and by 5,000 boats. Though 2 miles wide as a body of water, the navigable channel for most boats is only 250 feet wide. Tankers, about 4 of them daily, must snake through a course 90 feet wide to avoid menacing bars.

Add to the imposing commerce of the inlet the concern of thousands for a waterway integrally laced to the romance of coastal living and the reasons for disagreement multiply.

The inlet is a boon when it is clear, a carrier of death and ruin when filled.

Why is it such a blessing in disguise? Chiefly because the natural drift of shore sand on Long Island is from east to west. Fire Island presumably began its southwest journey because of prevailing wind and tides.

By 1858, when the Federal Government built the present lighthouse at Democrat Point, the point was the western tip of Fire Island. Since then, Democrat Point has crept west at an amazing speed, threatening to seal off the ocean from the bay. By 1900 it had begun to spell trouble.

In 1906, Congress first received, and rejected, a request for Federal aid. The same thing happened in 1927. Eleven years of inaction passed and then the 1938 hurricane struck Long Island.

With the inlet in desperate condition, a $900,000 jetty, now almost buried in sand, was built in 1939 at Democrat Point by the Federal and county governments. Since 1940, the situation has grown steadily worse. Spot dredging was tried several times but did little good.

ANSWER OR DEATH TRAP?

By 1949, proposals for a new inlet plan were again in vogue. It first had been seriously suggested in 1934 by transportation tycoon Bertell W. King, of Babylon. The Army rejected the idea in 1947 though the Suffolk supervisors favored it. Harry T. Tuthill, then county highway supervisor, had prepared plans for a new inlet to be located near Kismet. He made the plans at the confidential request of former Representative W. Kingsland Macy.

The controversy has dragged on, in one degree or another, since. Some said the new inlet would be a final answer. Others said it would be an insane death trap.

From April 1949, to February 1954, a plan proposed by the Army to spend $228,000 for dredging the inlet and $85,000 for annual maintenance bogged down in Congress despite efforts by former Representative Ernest Greenwood and then Wainwright to get it through.

In February 1954 the Army agreed to keep the channel 250 feet wide and 10 feet deep until the survey that produced the stabilization plan was finished. Congressional haggling had been silenced by the storm of November 6–7, 1953. The Army said it would be "flying in the face of God" not to "finish what nature started." After November 1954 a temporary truce in the Battle of Fire Island Inlet was called.

But the bars quickly began to form and drove the channel into the Oak Beach shore, where there are 190 homes. Amid general concern, the Army-Park Commission plan was unveiled last July.

The Federal Government appropriated $840,000 for the work, the State $580,000, and the county $580,000. The inlet plan is part of a $6 million project extending from Jones to Fire Island Inlet. A separate study is underway by the United States Beach Erosion Board on what to do about erosion from Kismet to the Hamptons.

Most observers predict that the stabilization plan will pass in Congress. Yet not even the strongest supporters of the plan predict it will head off nature's incessant challenge. They hope that a portable land dredge proposed for Democrat Point will be able to keep the inlet clear at a reasonable yearly cost and work faster than the erosion.

Weaver recently told a House committee: "Unless something permanent is done, Fire Island Inlet will be closed and part of Fire Island itself will be cut through by tidal action." But, will "something permanent" result from more stabilization, by continuing the study of a new inlet, or by both?

[From Newsday of June 26, 1956]

WAINWRIGHT, MOSES GIVE

(By Representative STUYVESANT WAINWRIGHT)

At the outset let me emphasize two points. I am not opposed to the technical features of the Moses plan as I am not an engineer. Also, I am now and always have been a vigorous advocate of a proper inlet. One of my proudest possessions is the plaque presented to me 2 years ago by the Fire Island Inlet Committee for having obtained maintenance funds for this project. Incidentally, neither my predecessor, Mr. Greenwood, nor I ever had one word of encouragement or support from Mr. Moses during the battle in behalf of this project.

The question before us is not whether the Moses plan is good or bad. The question is why does Mr. Moses refuse to consider studies or any other plan. You will note that I do not say the Wainwright plan, nor for that matter do I suggest any set proposal. My proposal is that the Army Engineers be allowed to determine whether the Moses plan is the best answer to a permanent inlet. Before we pour a possible $8 million of our tax money into a Rube Goldberg experiment, new to the field of engineering, I urge a study of all other possibilities. At no time during the research on the Moses plan were the Army Engineers ever allowed to study the advisability of relocating the inlet. In fact, Mr. Moses refused to consider such an idea, advising me that he called such a study "reckless."

Why is Mr. Moses so bitterly opposed to studying this project? For two reasons: He feels it would jeopardize his plan, that his

plan might be ruled out; and, two, that the result of a further study might call for the cutting of a new and permanent inlet. To answer Mr. Moses' first objection, I suggested that his plan and my study proceed simultaneously. He rejected this. As for a new inlet, he says it was studied years ago and ruled out. This is absolutely false in that the Army has never built the necessary Vicksburg model nor given anything more than a cursory opinion. This opinion, arrived at 10 years ago, was heavily influenced, so I believe, by Mr. Moses' personal intervention. It was not an unbiased study.

What were the old objections to a new inlet? There were but two given; that the salinity of the water would be changed; and two, that it would cost too much money. As to the first objection, since the date of the report (1946) the Moriches Inlet has come into proper operation. This has improved the saline content of the water to a great degree. It would be ridiculous to suppose that the flushing of the bay would be destroyed by the building of a permanent inlet.

The second objection must, perforce, be abandoned by Mr. Moses because of the cost of his own project. A new inlet according to House Document 762 (80th Cong.) would cost $9,280,000. Mr. Moses' plan may cost well beyond that before it is finished. The principal purpose of the Moses plan is to put sand on Oak Beach. The present inlet is trying hard to close (at the rate of over 240 feet per year). Should the inlet close, he would not need the sand for Oak Beach. But before the inlet closes by act of God, we would obviously have to build a permanent and stable cut with a 12-foot draft.

What are some other advantages of a permanent inlet? Stability, security, and safety. The inlet has posed a problem for each generation of Long Islanders. It has never been tackled on the grounds of "Let's build something that will last, something we won't have to pour maintenance money into each year." Why shouldn't the people of Long Island be entitled to know that they have an inlet on which they can count on as being there. Give the fisherman and boatman this necessary and desirable security. Provide him, too, with a safe inlet; not one where he risks his life every time he goes through the opening.

Long Islanders will soon need this stability, security, and safety. When Mr. Moses rejected any studies of a new inlet our population in Suffolk alone was well under 300,000. In a few years we will reach the million mark. We will need a really good inlet to supply our fast growing business enterprises with their necessities. These are but a few of the economic reasons why we are entitled to a first-class inlet rather than a patchwork temporary job which regularly comes apart at the seams.

In closing let me point out one important item. Mr. Moses says the benefit from the erosion phase would greatly aid property in Nassau County. Yet Suffolk County is asked to bear the entire local cost. Don't you think the tax load should be evenly spread according to the benefits to be derived? You see, there are so many reasons why we should not be steamrolled into doing something which we will regret in years to come. Unfortunately, those responsible will probably no longer be holding public office. There will be no recourse. Now is the time to review the problem in the typical American way. Consequently, I urge Mr. Moses not to avoid a study.

Let's put all the cards on the table.

[From Newsday of June 28, 1956]

BENEVOLENT DESPOT AT WORK

Park Commissioner Robert Moses is a benevolent despot. Few people could quarrel (or would dare to) with his record of extraordinary accomplishment. In the hundreds of jobs he has done for the State—and Long Island—he has carved out a permanent record of achievement. But his standard method of operating is clearly despotic. He decided what to do, puts his head down, rallies allies and charges until the job is done. If anyone gets in his way, Moses drives his opponents into the ground like so many tent pegs.

There is some merit in his method; he gets things done and a great deal would have gone undone had Moses not been so bulldogged. But Moses' tactics are also fraught with danger. The trouble with a benevolent despot is that he may start doing things that should not be done. Then his benevolence fades and only his despotism is left.

The current fight over the Fire Island inlet is just such a case. The issues are complicated. But basically they involve the question of what is to be done to prevent the creeping sands of the Fire Island inlet from cutting off the Great South Bay from the Atlantic Ocean. Moses has put his full weight behind the Army Engineers' "stabilization plan" to dredge the inlet and keep it open. Now—he thinks—he will get the $2 million needed to start the job.

In typical Moses fashion, he has insisted that everyone is solidly behind the scheme. Moses says everybody is; his formidable battery of aids, assistants and batmen all chorus that there is no opposition to the plan. But their claim is patently false. Suffolk Republican Congressman STUYVESANT WAINWRIGHT, who frankly concedes he is no engineer, charges that Moses is using "steamroller" tactics. "The question before us," says WAINWRIGHT, "is not whether Moses' plan is good or bad. The question is why Mr. Moses refuses to consider studies of other plans." When Moses was invited to reply to WAINWRIGHT's sharp attack on him printed in Newsday, Moses characteristically and disdainfully replied: "I have heard of no controversy with regard to the United States Army Engineers' plan for the stabilization of the Fire Island inlet."

Moses has heard of the controversy. Wainwright has consistently maintained—and Moses knows it—that the stabilization plan may be a "patchwork," which the Army engineers have approved because they were "heavily influenced by Mr. Moses' personal intervention." Wainwright further charges that the investigation which led to Moses' plan was "not an unbiased study." We have no idea whether Wainwright is right. But it seems to us he makes a perfectly valid proposal, which Moses refuses even to acknowledge. The Suffolk Congressman wants the possibility investigated of an inlet being dredged in an alternate place as a permanent solution to the Fire Island Inlet problem. Perhaps the inquiry will prove that Moses is right. But without such a study no one will ever know whether Moses is right or not.

Yesterday Moses won a big victory. The House Public Works Committee voted out to the floor of Congress the plan he backs. The bill includes no provision for really investigating further the possibility of creating an inlet any place but the area that Moses wants it. Last night, Wainwright reiterated his opposition to the bill because, he charges, it offers no guaranty of a "permanent solution."

Wainwright stands very much in the minority. Moses has rallied supporters from Governor Harriman down. But in the minority is not always a bad place to be. Wainwright's objections deserve a public answer. Moses' refusal to even recognize any disagreement with his own scheme is despotism at work—and we are not even sure it's benevolent despotism at that.

[From the Suffolk Consolidated Press of July 4, 1956]

WAINWRIGHT AND MOSES

County officials are beginning to see that State Park Commissioner Robert Moses is pushing his beach protection and Fire Island Inlet stabilization plan for the sole purpose of safeguarding State property west of the inlet; that he wants to unload a State obligation on the county and Federal governments. Congressman WAINWRIGHT is opposed to the Moses plan and so is County Board Chairman Phil Hattemer, even though the supervisors went along with the Moses plan in the hope that some of the Government money eventually would help bolster the beach east of the inlet.

To date WAINWRIGHT's is the only voice raised loudly against the Moses project approved last week by the House Committee on Public Works and which, incidentally, has not heard of the suggested new cut across the Great South Beach to take the place of the ever-shoaling inlet.

WAINWRIGHT's voice must be thin, indeed, if a House committee goes over his head and takes the assertions of a Nassau County Congressman as gospel. It has long been known that Moses had and has powerful political friends in the neighboring county. That Suffolk's representative is ignored, therefore, does not come as a surprise. And it all can be blamed on the close Nassau-Suffolk ties of the past 5 years—ties that would relegate Suffolk to a second-rate entity.

Just because Moses says "this is it," doesn't mean that a better plan cannot be found. But he wouldn't be averse to throttling an idea other than his own. For this reason he wants to hear nothing of WAINWRIGHT's demand that a study be made of the feasibility of a new cut as suggested some years ago.

The big thing just now is for WAINWRIGHT to impress on the Washington legislators that they are being asked to provide funds that should be made available by the State solely for the protection of State property.

As for county money, Hattemer might do well to reappraise the situation and ask to have the recent resolution rescinded until such time that thorough studies and surveys are made.

New York State Is Doing Something About Its Housing Problems

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 5, 1956

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, New York State, under the leadership of Governor Harriman and his very able State housing commissioner, Joseph P. McMurray, is making real progress toward solution of that State's housing problems.

I am happy to call to the attention of our colleagues the following item by Charles Grutzner, which appeared in the New York Times of July 5, 1956, which indicates the fine job being done there:

TWO HOUSING PROJECTS HERE SHARE IN NEW STATE LOANS—MIDDLE-INCOME BRONX CO-OPS AIDED BY $6,324,736 OUTLAY—50-YEAR MORTGAGES MADE FROM $50 MILLION FUND

(By Charles Grutzner)

A new source of mortgage money is being tapped for private construction of middle-income housing in 2 sections of the Bronx and in 2 upstate cities.

State Housing Commissioner Joseph P. McMurray announced yesterday that he had issued commitments for $6,324,736 in State loans. This is the first money made available out of the $50 million mortgage fund

set up to implement the Mitchell-Lama Act, which was passed by the 1955 legislature to encourage building at rents of $19 to $25 a room for families with incomes up to about $7,500 a year.

The 50-year, low-interest mortgages—up to 90 percent of the development costs—are available to private builders and cooperatives who agree to a 6-percent profit limitation.

The mortgages announced yesterday are:

$2,802,736 to the Park-Reservoir Housing Corp., which will build a 288-apartment cooperative costing $4,503,420 south of Van Cortlandt Park. Average monthly carrying charges will be $17.96 a room after down payment of about $625 a room. There are to be one 12-story building at Orloff and Van Cortlandt Avenues and two 14-story structures near 238th Street, between Cannon Place and Sedgwick Avenue. About 10 percent of the apartments will be specially designed for the aging.

$1,550,000 to the Woodlawn Veterans' Mutual Housing Corp., which will build a nine-story structure of 99 cooperatively owned apartments costing $1,717,991 on Katonah Avenue between 234th and 235th Streets. Average monthly carrying charges will be about $20 a room after down payment of about $400 a room.

$1,489,000 to the Love-Weichman Limited-Profit Housing Co., Inc., for construction in Buffalo of a two-story garden-type development of 124 apartments to rent at an average of $19.90 a room. The project cost is estimated at $1,654,000.

$483,000 to the Senior Citizens Housing Co., Inc., for construction in Rochester of a one-story, garden-type development of 60 apartments costing $537,000. Rental will be to elderly persons only, with rents averaging $16.02 a room. There will be 30 apartments of 2½ rooms and 30 of 3½ rooms. The 6 buildings will cover only 12 percent of the 9½-acre site.

ALL SITES ARE VACANT

All four sites are on vacant land. This will make is possible, Mr. McMurray said, for construction to start as soon as final plans are completed, within a few months.

It will also obviate the touchy problem of tenant relocation, which has brought much criticism of the Federal-city program of tearing down the homes of slum dwellers who cannot afford to pay the rents of the new apartments built on the sites of their old homes.

Additional commitments will be issued in the next few weeks, here and upstate. Mr. McMurray said the entire $50 million would be out on loan within the next 4 months. Among local projects under consideration are another in the Bronx, 1 in Manhattan, 3 in Brooklyn, and 2 in Queens.

Applications for mortgages from all parts of the State already exceed $50 million. These can be met in full and other projects initiated if the voters approve in November a proposed additional $100 million bond issue for the loan fund.

The law making the State loans possible was sponsored by State Senator MacNeil Mitchell, Manhattan Republican, and Assemblyman Alfred A. Lama, Brooklyn Democrat-Liberal. The $50 million bond issue was approved in a referendum last November.

The 1956 legislature voted to enlarge the mortgage fund by $100 million and Governor Harriman signed the measure. It is this proposition that will come up for referendum in November's general election.

The mortgage loans are made without cost to the State, yet the private developers get the advantage of the low interest on State bonds. They pay the same interest rate on the loans that the State pays on the bonds. This is now less than 3 percent. The builders pay for the administrative services that the projects receive from the State division of housing.

No cash subsidies are involved, but some of the projects are able to keep rentals within a desirable range for middle-income families by taking advantage of local tax abatement.

Mr. McMurray has received informal approval from the board of estimate for tax abatement, amounting to 40 percent of the value of the projects, for the two Bronx projects announced yesterday and for several of those for which mortgage commitments are pending.

One of the latter projects is Senior Village, to be built in the Brownsville section of Brooklyn, between Linden Boulevard, Rockaway Avenue, Hegeman Street, and Bristol Street.

Plans were announced recently by the Amalgamated Meat Cutters union, which will sponsor the 400-apartment cooperative. A $4,600,000 State mortgage commitment is in the works for this project, which will have carrying charges of $19.97 a room after down payment of $300 to $350 a room.

Mr. McMurray has agreed, at the request of Borough President Hulan E. Jack, to set aside $6 million in mortgage funds for a project in Manhattan. The site has not yet been determined.

The State, in taking the 50-year mortgages, is requiring of the builders standards of design and construction to assure what Mr. McMurray called "good living for at least a 50-year span."

The standards include cross ventilation and good vistas for every unit, living spaces off foyers, bedrooms in remote, quieter areas.

Address Delivered to Annual Independence Day Luncheon of the Hi Hatters Club, San Diego, Calif., by Capt. David L. Martineau, United States Navy, Assistant Chief of Naval Personnel for Special Projects

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEON H. GAVIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 6, 1956

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address:

ADDRESS DELIVERED TO ANNUAL INDEPENDENCE DAY LUNCHEON OF THE HI HATTERS CLUB, SAN DIEGO, CALIF., BY CAPT. DAVID L. MARTINEAU, UNITED STATES NAVY, ASSISTANT CHIEF OF NAVAL PERSONNEL FOR SPECIAL PROJECTS

Members of the Hi Hatters Club and distinguished guests, it is indeed a real pleasure to be here with you today. I have been hearing fine things about the Hi Hatters Club for a number of years. Not since the days when I was a junior officer have I had the pleasure of duty in the San Diego area. So I have not had the privilege of knowing you better until today.

Certainly it is a real tribute to the San Diego area that more people in the Navy, officers and enlisted, active and retired, prefer to live here than in any other place. Just before leaving on this trip, I decided to verify what I have known to be true for a long time. So I inquired within the Bureau of Naval Personnel and ascertained that on the shore duty eligibility list for enlisted men, San Diego still stands first in their preference by a wide margin.

I feel particularly honored to have been asked to speak to you on this occasion of your annual Independence Day luncheon, and also one that honors the many distinguished officers who are your guests today.

I would like to tell you something about some features of the naval personnel program, particularly about what is being done to improve career incentives for both officers and enlisted men within the naval service.

Our national policy calls for maintaining an active duty military force far larger than during any previous time, short of war. An overall force that numbers some 2,900,000 officers and men in the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marine Corps.

But within this force, 1 million men are leaving each year. That means that we must replace and rebuild nearly one-third of the total force annually. It would be difficult, to say the least, for any successful business or industry to maintain itself on such a basis.

Everyone recognizes and agrees that our Nation is in the midst of a tremendous transition period in technology. It is a transition that is having a profound effect on our weapons, old and new, and our entire national security.

It is also at the bottom of the long debates that have been conducted recently in the Congress on the matters of defense appropriations and the development and employment of weapons. And it has also served to fire up some new and rather bitter controversy within the armed services themselves, especially between the Army and the Air Force, though I should add that they seem to have been confined largely to those at the Indian level.

So far, the Navy has managed to keep clear of this interservice quarreling. There is a story going around Washington regarding the recent debate and action in the Senate on the Defense Appropriations Bill, that the Air Force got $1 billion while the Navy got a Good Conduct Medal.

Be all that as it may, a Good Conduct Medal is still a very good thing to have, and I for one feel that the Navy has been following a very wise course.

With it all, however, one subject on which everyone is completely unified and agreed, personnel is the No. 1 problem.

There are seated within this audience today many officers who are occupying key positions of command and responsibility in the Pacific Fleet and in the San Diego area. They are the ones who must operate and support the Fleet. They are the ones who must grapple each day with the difficulties and problems in personnel.

Today, as the representative of Vice Admiral Holloway, the Chief of Naval Personnel, I would like to pay a tribute to these officers and to the magnificent job they are doing. I would like, also, to assure them that they enjoy the highest admiration and support of everyone in the Bureau of Naval Personnel, even though there may be moments when some doubts may enter their minds about that.

So much has been said, particularly during recent weeks, about the negative side of the personnel picture. Today I would like also to tell you something about its positive features and about some of the important corrective measures being taken in the legislative area.

But first, let us look at how the size of the overall military force relates to the problem.

I can still recall the year 1932 shortly before I was commissioned when the number of officers on active duty in the Navy was less than 7,000; we had an enlisted strength of under 80,000 and the total naval appropriations for that year amounted to $300 million. In 1937, shortly before the outbreak of World War II, the entire active duty force for all the armed services had increased to about 300,000, or approximately one-tenth of its present size. During World War II, the

total armed services strength at the peak of mobilization stood at some 12 million.

In the years immediately following World War II, the total active-duty forces were cut to something less than a million and a half. With the advent of the Korean war, they were expanded rapidly to about 3,700,000. During the past 2 years, we have been stabilized at approximately our present strength of something under 3 million including 900,000 in the Navy and Marine Corps.

This stabilization in strength of forces has definitely been an improvement over the fluctuations of previous years.

Without the stimulus of a fighting war, or compulsion of the draft laws, it is extremely doubtful that we could ever maintain the present size force on a wholly voluntary basis—whatever the inducements. The problem is further accentuated during periods of high economic prosperity and peak industrial employment—such as the present. Nevertheless, we must maintain this force on active duty for the long haul—and at a higher state of combat readiness than ever before.

Surely, we must take every possible step to reduce personnel turnover to a minimum. But we must also learn to accept the fact that we cannot eliminate it. If we continue with the present size force, the number of men who reenlist is not always going to be as high as we would like.

It was just 2 years ago in 1954 that reenlistment rates had dropped alarmingly to their lowest points. The overall rate in the Navy fell to below 10 percent. Including only the first cruise men, it was below 4 percent.

These low rates were partially explained by the fact that enlistments were expiring of all those who had entered service during the rapid Korean expansion, including very large numbers who had never intended to remain in the Navy. They had patriotically carried out their obligation and were returning to civilian life.

But it was also a fact that we had expected more of them to stay. Most alarming, however, was the fact that the reenlistment rate of our career personnel had fallen sharply to a point below 50 percent. By career personnel, I mean those who had previously enlisted one or more times. Normally, they reenlist at rates well above 75 percent.

The other services were also experiencing similar difficulties. Something was wrong.

It became clearly evident, not only to the armed services, but to the Congress and to the President, that remedial measures were called for. The losses of both officer and enlisted personnel had reached prohibitive proportions, and the increasing rate at which career regulars were leaving was particular cause for concern.

The principal factors causing these excessive losses of trained personnel in the Navy could be summarized something like this:

The inherent nature and inconveniences of naval life, as opposed to the lure of greater comforts and more stable opportunities in civilian life.

Such factors as the long periods of enforced absence from their families, when contrasted to the more attractive advantages of civilian employment, were producing pressures and personal problems that were causing men to leave the service at higher rates than ever before.

At a time when the operational demands on our personnel had become heavier than during any other so-called peacetime period in our history, the unfavorable disparity of military pay with that offered by industry continued to widen.

Furthermore, industry was offering more of the nonwage benefits which at one time, and not so long ago, had been unique to a military career. Prior to World War II, for example, such career benefits as a favorable retirement system, adequate medical care for servicemen and their families, survivor protection, and housing, were some of the principal military benefits that were seldom enjoyed in industry. But since the end of World War II, these and other benefits were being overtaken by industry. Consequently, many of the former advantages of career military service steadily reduced in comparison to those of industry.

In early 1955, in a special message to the Congress, President Eisenhower carefully reviewed and pointed up this serious situation. He outlined a program for increased compensation to servicemen more in line with that offered by industry. He further recommended that the traditional service benefits be considerably strengthened in recognition of the unusual difficulties being faced by the serviceman and his family.

Just prior to this time, the Career Incentive Task Force had been formed for the purpose of planning, coordinating, and accelerating the necessary legislative program through the Congress. It was a special team composed of members from each of the armed services, and one that has since proven highly successful in speeding up action on the various bills within both the executive branch and the Congress. In doing so, it has also provided an excellent example of effective unification.

The first bill to be handled by the task force was the Career Incentive Act of 1955 which provided selective increases in basic pay, also in hazardous-duty pay and per diem, and a new dislocation allowance.

But this bill did not provide any pay increases for those officers or enlisted men who are merely performing obligated service. It was a career bill and the first one ever to give special recognition to career service. As such, it marked a break with the traditional military pay pattern which many seasoned Washington observers said could not be accomplished.

As a result of the prompt consideration and action given to it by the Congress, the first increased paychecks were being cashed within 2 months from the time committee hearings had been commenced.

The pay legislation of last year marked an important step forward in several respects. But quite understandably, there were those who thought the proposed increases should have been greater, even at the risk of incurring stronger opposition to the bill.

That brings to mind a story told by the late Senator Barkley. It was about a certain employer. One day, he decided to surprise one of his old employees by giving him a bottle of whisky. Several days followed before he saw him again.

Finally, when they did meet, the boss asked him, "How did you like that bottle of whisky I gave you the other day?"

The old fellow replied, "Well, I'll tell you. If it had been any better, I don't think you would have given it to me. If it had been any worse, I don't think I could have drunk it. It was just right."

And it was generally agreed by the experts that our pay bill was about the best deal that could be made at the time. But since then, there has been a lot of pressure to provide pay differentials for technicians and specialists who are in scarce supply. Another extensive study of the entire pay structure by a high-level board is already underway.

Earlier this month, the President signed into law another very important career incentive measure—to provide improved medical care for the dependents of service personnel. Prior to its enactment, at least 40 percent of the dependents were unable to receive adequate medical care. This was caused largely by the shortage of doctors and the overcrowding of service hospital facilities.

Family medical care has long been one of the traditionally military benefits. The failure during recent years to provide it on a reliable basis has been one of the major deterrents to career service.

Now, for the first time, specific statutory authority exists to provide medical care to the dependents of both active and retired personnel in any military or Public Health hospital to the extent that they are available.

Of particular importance is an entirely new feature in this law that will authorize the use of civilian hospitals and facilities for the wives and children of active-duty personnel—whenever they do not have convenient access to military hospitals, either in this country or abroad.

The cost to a service family for each admission to a civilian hospital will be limited to a payment of $25, or an amount equivalent to the subsistence charge in military hospitals, whichever is the greater.

The remaining cost will be carried by the Government under a medical service or insurance plan to be contracted for with private agencies by the Secretary of Defense.

This new law will become fully effective by next December upon the completion of the necessary arrangements now in progress. It marks a big step forward in making career service more attractive.

We should all take special steps to highlight and stress the positive advantages of this and other types of beneficial legislation, for it amounts to a very substantial career inducement. And we should also appreciate that Congress has been given splendid help and support to this entire career incentive program.

We are fortunate that one of the best and strongest committees in the Congress is the House Committee on Armed Services. Having worked with and seen a lot of this splendid group, I can tell you that one of its most able and effective members is Congressman BOB WILSON.

BOB WILSON is a very active and well-informed supporter of the Navy and of the other armed services. He is an exceptionally fine person in every way, and a very great credit to his district and to the people who have elected him.

I should like now to say a word about the Doctors' Career Incentive Act which became law in April of this year.

This was must legislation to prevent the imminent dissolution of the hard core of experienced doctors who are vital to the health and readiness of the Navy.

At its present strength, the Navy requires some 3,600 physicians on active duty. Less than one-third of these are Regular Navy career doctors, and these have been resigning in prohibitive numbers during the past 3 years. The ratio of resignations to appointments during the past 3 years in the Medical Corps has been 7 to 1; the Dental Corps, 4 to 1.

Since only a very few Reserve doctors apply for active duty, the remaining number must be drafted. Young doctors just out of medical school can be obtained under the general draft law. But in order to obtain a sufficient number of experienced doctors, they have had to be drafted under the Special Doctors' Draft Act, which is due to expire next year. But even if this unpopular and discriminatory legislation were to be extended, the pool of experienced doctors eligible to be drafted will be depleted.

It was, therefore, clearly evident that unless drastic measures were taken to reverse the present trend, the Navy, together with the other armed services, was faced with the grim prospect of its active duty doctor strength consisting of conscripted "green" doctors fresh out of medical school.

The bill, as it went to the Congress, provided that all doctors be given promotion and longevity credit for the years spent in medical school. By doing so, it merely placed

them on a par with their line contemporaries and corrected an injustice of long standing. All doctors have been 4 to 5 years behind their college contemporaries in the line, because of the years they must spend in medical or dental school in order to even qualify for their commission.

We should also remember that the potential doctor must finance entirely his own medical education following his graduation from regular college, during which time his line contemporary has a military status and receives a salary.

In considering the bill, Congress concluded that the proposed corrections did not constitute sufficient inducement to meet the critical medical situation. The bill was then amended to provide increases in special pay for those doctors who remain voluntarily on active duty after completion of their obligated service.

I believe we should recognize the fact that doctors perform a very personal and essential service in caring for the health of our personnel, both active and retired, and also for the dependent members of their families. While a doctor's training is a long and expensive one, his services are in particularly great demand everywhere. His financial opportunities in private practice are usually far greater than we can ever provide under military pay structure.

This bill has definitely stemmed the heavy losses of career doctors in the Navy.

The survivor-benefits bill is a career-incentive measure of far-reaching importance to all service personnel, present and future, and to their surviving widows, children, and dependent parents. It will provide more adequate and stable benefits to the dependents of service personnel whose deaths occur while on active duty, or on inactive duty if service connected. It will also remove many of the inequities and inconsistencies existing under present law and will greatly improve the overall survivorship structure.

The widow of any regular, whatever his rank or length of service, is presently entitled to only $70 per month from the Veterans' Administration if her husband's death was service-connected and occurred in peacetime—$87 when such death occurs during wartime.

On the other hand, the widow of a reservist may be entitled to as much as $525 per month under the Federal Employees Compensation Act which applies only to reserves. This unintentional but glaring affront has long shouted the question: "Why be a Regular?"

For the present flat payments, the new bill will substitute a much more reasonable benefit and one that bears at least some relation to attained pay at the time of death.

The widow of any serviceman whose death occurs while on active duty would be entitled to monthly compensation amounting to $112 plus 12 percent of his basic pay.

This will provide a range of payments from $112 to $266, to continue until the widow dies or remarries.

Full social security benefits will be permanently extended to all active duty personnel—and on the same contributory basis that is applicable to all other citizens under social-security coverage.

Social-security benefits will also be related to basic pay, up to $350 maximum wage credit allowed. They will provide monthly payments to a widow and minor children up to $200. In addition to the compensation from the Veterans' Administration.

The bill in its present form will also authorize the payment of social security old-age benefits to a serviceman and also his wife, after they attain age 65, up to a maximum of $162 monthly.

While no further Government insurance will be written under this bill, let me emphasize that it does not in any way affect any existing rights—under either Government or national service life insurance. Nor does it change in any way, the present Contingency Option Act whereby retired personnel may elect annuities to be paid after their death to their widows and minor children.

The only cost to the serviceman for this excellent type of family security and protection, will be that payable to social security. This will amount to 2 percent of basic pay up to a maximum payment of $7 monthly.

This bill has already passed the House and has been favorably reported by the Senate Finance Committee. Its final passage by the Senate this session is clearly indicated.

It will be a No. 1 morale builder, when it is fully understood, and a very important new incentive for career service.

It is quite in order that I should tell you at this time that the Navy has led the way in originating and emphasizing the great need for these three vital career incentive bills. As the Chief of Naval Personnel, Vice Admiral Holloway has given these bills the strongest kind of support and is personally responsible in a large measure for their success.

The improved career incentive program, together with the vigorous measures being taken at all levels within the Navy during the past 2 years has produced results. This can be seen from the improved reenlistment rates and the reduction in officer resignations.

The overall reenlistment rate has now increased from below 10 percent in 1954 to 33 percent at the present time. That of first-cruise men has increased from 4 to 12 percent over the same period. These are still not high enough by any means. But they do show progress.

The reenlistment of career personnel is highly satisfactory, being well above 90 percent.

Our most serious enlisted personnel problem lies in the fact that in certain critical skills we are still losing men at an excessive rate. In the aviation electronics and radar ratings, for example, we are presently able to fill only 70 percent of the petty officer requirements, and the first-cruise men are reenlisting at the rate of only 6 percent.

These are quite typical of other critical-skill areas where we are having considerable difficulty in retaining enough capable and expensively trained technicians beyond their first enlistment. The training and experience they have obtained in the Navy are also in great demand in industry. While we are making some progress, their reenlistment rates are still far below what they should be.

All in all, we have made a lot of progress since 1954. Congress has given us some very beneficial legislation and more is on the way. Navy life has been improved in many respects. The downward trend in reenlistment rates has been checked, and fewer officers are seeking to resign.

We are definitely on the upgrade and reaching a position where we can make a much stronger case for a naval career to the competent, able men we must have.

Very oftentimes—success is a journey more than it is a goal.

All of us, including our many fine civilian friends and supporters such as you gentlemen, have an important responsibility to take positive and effective action to highlight the beneficial and favorable aspects of the Navy's personnel program, especially as they have been recently improved. By doing so, we will also be acting to dispell some of the negative attitudes that have become much too predominant during the recent years—both in and out of the Navy.

Take a look at some of the advertisements in the service journals and newspapers. You will see that a number of private companies in their efforts to entice our trained personnel are taking full advantage of these negative attitudes. Here are some deplorable examples of what they proclaim:

"Slipping on a tweed jacket is just one of the enjoyable details in becoming a civilian again" or

"Service made you a man—Alcoa can make you successful."

We should strive to discourage this type of advertising.

The Secretary of Defense has just recently appointed a high level advisory committee on technical and professional compensation. It is made up of some very distinguished and well-informed civilian and military members. Its chairman is Mr. Ralph Cordiner, the president of General Electric Co.

That committee will give particular attention to the difficult question of whether pay differentials should be authorized for the various types and degrees of technical specialties. Specific recommendations are also expected regarding pay adjustments in the area of command and management responsibilities. Proposed legislation implementing the committee's recommendations, as finally approved, should be ready for submission to the next Congress.

At the first meeting of his committee held earlier this month, Mr. Cordiner told of an extensive survey of employee attitudes made at the General Electric Co. by an independent research group. These included what the employees held to be the most important aspects of job satisfaction. I am sure they will be of interest to everyone of you here, because you will recognize them as having universal application in any organization. Here they are:

First, a feeling of belonging—the sense of pride and continuity in one's job.

Second, individual rights and dignity—the status and respect accorded an individual, as opposed to complete mass uniformity.

Third, good bosses—superiors who command respect, maintain firm discipline, and treat people fairly.

Fourth, compensation and benefits—to maintain a reasonable standard of living and status in one's community.

It would be quite impossible to solve our personnel problems in the Navy, or anywhere else for that matter, if pay alone was the sole dominating factor. But we know that it is not. Surely the attitudes I have mentioned reflect the very vital and far-reaching influence of effective leadership. At all levels in the Navy, leadership is called for to a higher degree than ever before if we are to attract and retain for career service the high-caliber, dedicated personnel we must have.

In closing, let me leave with you a thought expressed recently by Admiral Burke:

"There are many who say all our good people are leaving the service—but I say, 'The best ones are staying.'"

Poland

SPEECH

OF

HON. RICHARD B. WIGGLESWORTH

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 3, 1956

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WIGGLESWORTH].

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Speaker, All of us appreciate the brilliant and courageous record of the people of Poland over the centuries. All of us appreciate the indebtedness of this country to the people of Polish descent who have contributed so greatly.

It is an inspiration to all that Poland and the Polish people have consistently refused to compromise with evil.

We all appreciate the unbelievable suffering which they have undergone under Communist domination.

They have our heartfelt sympathy.

We are confident that the indomitable spirit of Poland and its people will ultimately triumph.

Ike's Choice

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUGH SCOTT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 6, 1956

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am inserting Mr. Edward T. Folliard's column of July 3, 1956, as it appeared in the Washington Post and Times Herald:

IKE'S CHOICE—NOBODY WILL HAVE TO SHOVE HIM INTO RACE

(By Edward T. Folliard)

Perhaps the greatest political fallacy of the times is the notion that President Eisenhower is being dragooned into running for a second term—that shrewd and callous Republicans are sacrificing him so that they can hold onto the levers of power.

It makes a good story, and undoubtedly carries conviction for some people. This would be true especially of those who find it hard to understand why a man of 65, with a secure place in history and in the hearts of his countrymen, would want to continue in a job like the Presidency after a heart attack and an abdominal operation.

The trouble with the story is this: It just doesn't square with the facts in the case.

The No. 1 fact is that President Eisenhower likes his job and wants to hold on to it. He had a taste of retirement at Gettysburg while convalescing from his heart attack, and he didn't relish it.

It was not necessary, therefore, to pressure him into throwing his hat in the ring for the 1956 race. But suppose that it had been: Who would have brought the pressure?

Not many men would have the gall to tell a soldier-statesman like Dwight D. Eisenhower where his duty lies, especially after a heart attack. Not only that, but there is something about the office of President—an aura, a splendor—that discourages presumptuousness and forwardness.

The man in charge of the Republican Party's fortunes this year, National Chairman Leonard Hall, has said that he never broached the question of a second term in talking to President Eisenhower after his heart attack. There is no reason to doubt Hall, and every reason to take him at his word.

White House staff members say that they wouldn't have dared to bring pressure on the President to run for a second term. They say further that they never mentioned politics to him unless he himself first brought up the subject. Anyone who knows how they feel about the "Boss" would find that easy to accept, too.

Nevertheless, the story persists that in some way an unidentified Republican inner circle virtually compelled General Eisenhower to declare for another 4-year term.

Stephen A. Mitchell, former chairman of the Democratic National Committee, made a speech in Denver on June 16 and credited a "select inner circle of Republican politicians, businessmen, and advertising agents" with pushing the President into a second-term race after his heart attack.

Referring to the President's abdominal operation, Mitchell said that the "Republican secret high command" has put out propaganda that his health in the future will be better than ever.

"They are determined," Mitchell said, "to make the President do their bidding and (carry) the Republican Party load for them regardless of what it costs nim. * * *

"They know they have little or no chance of winning the November election without the President as a candidate. They have, therefore, determined to go to any length and to any cost to him or to them to make him run for reelection. * * * It means nothing to these men that another man and his family might be sacrificed to their political purposes. * * *"

The question arises: Is Steve Mitchell saying things like this because he thinks it is good Democratic politics, or does he really believe that President Eisenhower wanted to retire but allowed himself to be talked into running again?

If Mitchell was under the impression that the President was eager at one time—before his heart attack—to leave the White House and settle down in Gettysburg after a single term, he had plenty of company. The President himself said things that encouraged this view.

But a month or so after President Eisenhower arrived at his Gettysburg farm to convalesce from his heart attack, some of his friends noticed a significant change in him. They said he had tried out the so-called delights of retirement and didn't like the experience. They said he found himself bored, restless, and eager to get back at his desk at the White House.

"They believe," the Washington Post and Times Herald reported on December 26, "that the Chief Executive's disillusionment—his boredom and restlessness in his final weeks at Denver and later at Gettysburg—points strongly to a second-term race next year, provided his doctors tell him he can do the job."

Asked about the boredom talk at a news conference a month later, the President sought to explode it by saying he had "a thousand things to do in this world."

However, Robert J. Donovan in Eisenhower—The Inside Story, a first-rate book on which he had White House help, says this about the President's convalescence: "For Eisenhower, Gettysburg came close to being 5 weeks of torment."

"His morale slumped," Donovan says. "His spirits were low. He fretted over Government affairs. * * * He was tense and nervous and stalked about the house with a golf club for a cane."

Donovan goes on to tell how, by the time the President got back to the White House 5 days before Christmas, he was itching to do more work.

Apropos the increasing demand for the President to run for a second term, Donovan says that the pressure had little or no effect on him.

"Eisenhower," he says, "did not feel that he owed the leaders of the Republican Party any obligation to run again, and he followed his own thoughts."

But the President, Donovan says, was very much impressed by the argument that he might, by serving a second term, be able to make a contribution to world peace.

It is a fantastic thought, but there are some who believe that General Eisenhower was thinking seriously of retiring after a single term, but changed his mind after his heart attack.

Anyway, this much is certain: Nobody had to twist his arm to get him to throw his hat in the ring.

The South Won't Surrender

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENDERSON L. LANHAM
OF GEORGIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 6, 1956

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Speaker, with leave to extend my own remarks in the RECORD, I am including an article written by John Temple Graves which appears in the American Mercury for July 1956. The article is entitled "The South Won't Surrender."

This is one of the finest things I have seen concerning the South's position on the momentous question of segregation. I agree wholeheartedly with what Mr. Graves says and just hope that the people of the United States generally can be brought to realize the South's position and its determination to maintain the separation of the races in our public schools.

The article follows:

THE SOUTH WON'T SURRENDER

(By John Temple Graves, editor of the Birmingham (Ala.) Post Herald)

With fellow Conferedates who have a Little Bo-peep philosophy of the South today, I don't confederate.

"Leave us alone," they say, "and we'll come home, wagging our tails behind us.

"Give us time, don't push, and gradually we'll get to be exactly like Chicago, Detroit, Los Angeles, New York or some other heaven-on-earth, and glory be."

It isn't true. There are respects in which the South isn't coming home at all. It proposes a tmenty-and-a-half-century home of its own and to house the region in it—a home with touches of Williamsburg and My Old Kentucky Home and a glint even of the Suwannee River—but with fixtures modern beyond what current modernity knows.

Our United States is earth's great place, but if you travel it as I do, you can see that it hasn't yet written the last words on everything. We are modestly convinced we can write some in the South. Especially on labor and race relations.

On labor relations because, coming late to industry, we don't have to be southern editions of certain damnations of Detroit and other northern cities. Our industry is powered by electricity, oil, and gas, not steam. These are decentralizers. Requiring no huddles, they make no eyesores and heartburns. You have room to breathe, grow, and be free and fair in the South, to be separate and individual. You don't have to be a Socialist or a slave or a faceless item of an eating society.

On race relations, we think, we can write some last words, too. That is because we live where the races live, where the masses of them are, and we have been living here together a long time. It's our peculiar problem, the most delicate and difficult with which any people anywhere have ever had to deal. It is a police problem, a biological one, a cultural and an economic, and we are passionately certain that it can be served only in terms of that separte but equal philosophy for which the Supreme Court stood through half a century until it forsook precedent, Constitution, and commonsense in 1954, in favor of Swedish sociologist Gunnar Myrdal.

We may be wrong, but this is the way we are. What keeps America a nation of so many economies, geographies, origins, and accents "one and united," is respect for the

varieties making it up. Respect, sometimes, for their right to be wrong.

The South's program against racial integration is for more than delay and mere resistance. It is for magnificent American succession. It is for winning America to Americanism (yes, we call it that). The South believes resistance by delay can be continued until the rest of the country sees the Constitution and the Star-Spangled Banner by some dawn's light. Already there's half-light in the Saturday Evening Post, the United States News, Newsweek, the Wall Street Journal, the American Mercury, and some other national periodicals, as well as in columnists like Dorothy Thompson, David Lawrence, Westbrook Pegler, and, in his fashion, Walter Lippmann.

We see nothing un-American in a racial separation that has existed from the first days and before, and continues all over the country today. And we see much that is American in opposing too much government too far from the governed, in prizing quality in individuals, and in saying with our Constitution that there are things 51 percent of us just simply can't do to 49 percent—or even to a fraction of 1 percent.

For this the South is "interposing"—and invites other interposers. "Interposition" is a word currently popularized by young James Jackson Kilpatrick, successor to Douglas Freeman as editor of the Richmond News-Leader, for what Jefferson and Madison did in the names of Kentucky and Virginia in 1798 against a Federal sedition law that they deemed contra to the Constitution and the compact with the States. They said in the name of sovereignties remaining in their States that the law was void and would remain so until a constitutional amendment might effectuate it. Nothing happened. Nobody undertook to force Virginia or Kentucky, and 3 years later the author of Kentucky's resolution, Thomas Jefferson, became President of the United States.

Nothing has ever happened, in fact, when interposition (or nullification) has been declared throughout our history. Calhoun's South Carolina declared it in 1832 against the tariff of that year, and all that happened was that a new tariff was drawn up. Georgia declared it in 1838, when ordered not to move the Cherokee Indians, and not only did nothing happen but President Andrew Jackson, siding with Georgia, said "John Marshall had made his decision, now let him enforce it." Wisconsin declared it against the Dred Scott slave decision just before the Civil War, and nothing happened.

Right down to today, nothing has happened. Within the year, both Georgia and Virginia have refused to abide by orders of the Supreme Court, asserting State sovereignty, and nothing has happened.

But interposition as talked and declared in the South now doesn't mean actual nullification (except in Mississippi—they mean business there). In Virginia, where the movement originated and was planned to mean nullification, the assembly has confined itself to asserting the unconstitutionality of the desegregation decisions without calling them void. In my Alabama, an interposition bill which has been passed is only a protest. What interposition has come to mean in the South is not nullification but the total of all the things employed, planned or imaginable for preventing mixture of races in the public schools.

It includes placement laws giving school boards a right to assign pupils on a basis of aptitude, public order and, in reverse, that psychology on which the Supreme Court leaned for Myrdal's sake. It includes private schools in lieu of public ones, three-way schools, public funds to individuals, local juries which will say "not guilty" (under our Anglo-Saxon tradition, juries, with their local opinion and understandings, outrank even the Supreme Court), and the gerrymandering of school districts. It includes old-fashioned legal filibustering, too—every delay, obfuscation, subterfuge and multiplication the law allows.

The Court's decision having tortured the Constitution, the South is torturing the decision. If any cry shame, the South says the Court has tortured the Constitution's welfare clause, its interstate commerce clause, its 10th amendment, its forgotten 9th, its separation of Federal powers, its fundamental original promise that sovereignties (like education) not granted to Washington should remain in the sovereigns that formed the Union.

If we are violent, we don't mean to be—honestly. We are only human, like New Yorkers, Detroiters, and Chicagoans. "Moderation" in southern resistance now doesn't mean what Adlai or Ike mean and, of course, isn't in mention-distance of Estes and Averell. It doesn't mean "gradualism" for us but law-abiding, nonviolence, decency, and intelligence in "neverism." Even though sectors of the outside press cry havoc at the fall of a southern rock and (even as they ignore racial and industrial blood in their own backyards) neverism is remarkably free of violence so far. God knows what may have happened before this is printed, for provocation multiplies and human nature continues human, but as of now, the only monstrosity is the Till murder in Mississippi.

That was a monster in anybody's book or town, reflecting low life all around and shame on everybody, North and South. For the rest, the awful Autherin Lucy disorder (after the NAACP insisted not only on her admission but on maddening ballyhoo with the admission) scored only one broken window's worth violence. The "terrible bus strike" in Montgomery has been all piety and peace. The attack on Nat (King) Cole in Birmingham resulted not only in no damage to Nat but in universal local condemnation of the hoodlums responsible and, better yet, in discrediting to near-dissolution an outlaw and fascist element of the Citizens Councils there which had already been denounced by genuine councils whose rosters in Jackson, Miss., and many Louisiana, South Carolina, and Alabama centers read like Rotary Clubs for respectability.

How do we sober and respectable citizens of the modern South get this way? What has created among us this determination so solid, meaningful, and immense? What is so awful—actually—about integration?

We are this way, as I said before, for reasons of (1) police necessity, (2) culture, and (3) biology. And we ask that the record show we don't mean (not any longer) injustice, discrimination, denial of franchise, or other civil rights, legal or economic inequality—or hate. The hate is in Chicago, Detroit, Los Angeles, and such. We don't even mean total segregation, not any longer. In notable respects, many bars are down and many others were going down until the Supreme Court's decision stopped every stoppable advance.

What we mean is public-school integration of the southern masses. We won't consent to this, immediately, gradually, or ever.

We are certain it would mean public disorder, at the schools, among parents, and throughout the community. We are certain, too, and cite the District of Columbia's experience, that it would mean cultural and scholastic debasement.

Differences in morals, in mental aptitude, sanitation, etc., which were pointed out by Editor Tom Waring of the Charleston News and Courier in his epochal article in the Atlantic Monthly, admittedly result in part from underprivilege. But they exist, and generations of privilege will be needed to remove them.

Many southerners believe there are differences other than ones which result from underprivilege—profound racial differences. That, of course, is unscientific in the estimate of those who share Lysenko's now discredited contention in Russia that environment is everything and you can make rye out of wheat if environmental pressure is right. We have Americans just as insistent as Stalin was that science must fit ideology and sentimentality.

"Oh, Mr. Graves, if only you knew anthropology!" Langston Hughes, Negro poet and fellow traveler, lamented over me in an America's Town Meeting of the Air debate in New York some years ago. What he should have said was, "If only anthropology knew!" Science simply doesn't know or pretend to know.

We believe that bloodshed or mixed blood or both would come if white and colored masses of the South were forced together as the NAACP proposes to force them under the Supreme Court mandate. And we believe both are bad. Is it contradictory to say there is a natural antipathy which would make a police problem of putting the races massively into the same southern schools, and to say at the same time that putting them in those schools would mongrelize the South?

What did Abraham Lincoln mean when he made that little-noted nor long-remembered comment that "there is a physical difference between the two races which in my judgment will forever forbid their living together. * * *"? Did he mean bloodshed or mixed blood? Since he was no scientist (and since Science itself doesn't know), his remark is noted here only for the record. Some believe there is a natural antipathy and that Nature has a use for it, just as she has for the natural attraction between sexes.

But you can't have it both ways, at any rate. If you deny the antipathy and the police problem, you must admit the biological problem. If you say that the affection that white southerners profess for Negroes denies antipathy, you don't know the affection. It isn't physical. If you argue against antipathy—that babies are not born with it, that it has to be taught—you forget that neither are they born with sex attraction.

The South doesn't expect the rest of the country, with its comparatively small Negro population, to agree on the need of public-school segregation where there are great numbers of both races. It doesn't expect either political party or any President to agree. What the South does hope to win is national appreciation of the width, immensity, and unanimity of its convictions—like none since the Civil War—and of its common cause with Americans who believe that the Constitution meant the South to decide for itself.

It is not arrogant or immodest for the South to think it is coming to a power that may give it a certain right of might, too, on these things. Out of the reconstruction darkness, out of following decades of defamation, false report, political underprivilege and economic oppression by freight rates, steel price differentials, tariffs, and such, the South is coming at last to industrial power, solidly based on a resurrected agricultural power. New industries—notably chemicals, paper, steel, lumber, metals and (of course) textiles—are pouring in. Their measure is the decentralizing electricity which makes our industrial prospect so different from steam-made huddles of industry in the North and East.

The Southern Co. has just reported electric sales up 113 percent since 1947, customers 80 percent, capital 108 percent. By all economic indices, the South is growing faster than the rest of the country, and the Deep South fastest of all. President Lewis M. Smith, of the Alabama Power Co., expects his company's generating capacity to be increased 40 percent by 1959. Average per capita southern income has increased from 47 percent of the average elsewhere before the war to 64 percent now.

All things considered, the greatest potential new market in the Western Hemisphere

is the South's as its purchasing power mounts to the national level. Industry is coming now for customers and taking steps to manufacture customers, where once it came only for raw materials and cheap labor. There is equal revolution in agriculture—truck, wheat, fruit, and small grain where once was only one crop; livestock income actually exceeding cotton and tobacco in some States; terraced and contoured hillsides, power dams, irrigation ditches—holding for use the priceless waters that have run to waste and destruction; lespedeza, kudzu, crimson clover, saving the soils; tractors moving over acres where man and mules have sweated through other decades; and best of all, the southern farmers with more knowledge of his land and ownership of it than ever in history.

Add political power. The Nation's major minority may be here—now that the Negro minority is about to be divided between the two parties and the organized labor minority, lately put together, is splitting at the seams and center and (for trying to put integration and unionization into one package) on the southern quadrant. The South is more united and passionate than it has been since Appomattox. It has had a balance of power in Congress since 1946, come Democrats or Republicans.

As one good result of its otherwise deadly Democratic loyalty, it has through seniority the chairmanships of the major congressional committees. And it is in position to swing the national presidential election this year or, if not that, to establish itself as the major factor 4 years hence.

Is it a holdup that the South proposes? We don't see it like that. We think the promise of power is something to be employed for our vital Southern concerns, but even more, for a Constitution, for an anti-Socialist cause against too much Government too far from the governed, for return to the individual against social-mindedness gone mad, for the American right to be wrong, the American right not to be imposed on by a central government or a tyranny of 51 percent, for American vitalities that depend on preservation of America's traditions.

The finest Negroes in the world live in North Carolina. They got that way segregated in an enlightened State. One of them was the late C. C. Spaulding, who built a great Negro insurance business. It was my lot in other days to sit with him on a number of educational and interracial Southern committees, and I remember how he would always bring in his philosophy that what the two races needed most in the South was the economic and political power which was surely coming to the South.

I remember him last month when I talked at a luncheon in my Birmingham of the Hungry Club, an organization of leading Negro businessmen, ministers, and educators. The hunger is not for food, since they are as well-fed and heeled as any of us, but for that righteousness the Bible says shall be fed to those who hunger and thirst after it. We agreed at this meeting to talk only of what we had in common—and there was a sense of relief throughout that integration wasn't going to come up and put a pall of self-consciousness over old friends.

We found we had more to talk about than the walrus said, and we talked it to the tune of much laughing and understanding and mutual sensibility and good will. We talked of C. C. Spaulding and what it was going to mean to both races as the South came to power. We talked of education, of the need of all of us, white and colored, to qualify evermore for great days coming. We talked of law-abiding and God and the United States and the hope of peace on earth.

And we talked of how white people and colored people in the South like each other. We agreed that there was a certain condescension on the white man's part, but we agreed too, that this was because in most cases the colored man has been employed by the white, and we thought the liking could endure into coming days of Negro advance to economic equality.

Nat (King) Cole became an overnight hero in Alabama for refusing to play the NAACP game of hate and integrate. If he had favored his hurt back after the assault in Birmingham, if he had failed to return to the stage for the ovation awaiting him from 4,000 whites, if he had not gone on with his second performance for the colored people, if he had not spoken glowingly of Birmingham when he flew back to Chicago and of love for his native South, the NAACP might have blown the incident up as they did the sordid Till murder case in Mississippi.

But because he behaved as he did, a merciful reminder was given us, white and colored, of that strange but true affection we have had for each other through the generations—and of our hope to save it from what the Supreme Court has done.

Air Force Nurses Have New Chief

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 6, 1956

Mr. DORN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, the people of my district and particularly Oconee County are proud of Col. Frances Loy. She rose from humble circumstances to become the new head of our Air Force Nurse Corps. Colonel Loy has written a new chapter in the success story of American women. Her career of service should be an inspiration to us all. The following article from the Washington Evening Star is a just tribute to an amazing young lady with ambition and courage. I wish her well in this new opportunity:

[From the Washington Evening Star of July 5, 1956]

SERVICE SCENE—AIR FORCE NURSES HAVE NEW CHIEF

(By Ruth Dean)

A charming southerner whose 5 feet 9 inches handicapped her from becoming a flight nurse until after World War II is the new director of the Air Force Nurse Corps.

Even today, Col. Frances Lay recalls her futile effort to volunteer for nursing duty in the clouds as one of the strangest experiences of her life.

It was 1943. The war was on, and the 28-year-old nurse from Walhalla, S. C., commissioned 4 years in the Army Nurse Corps, wanted to go overseas. She was chief nurse at Randolph Airbase in Texas.

Her new-found love for flying plus the new flight nurse program which had begun a year before prompted her to volunteer for this type of overseas duty.

"Sorry, you're too tall. Our height limit is 5 feet 7 inches," was the disappointing answer she got. So she spent the rest of the war with the ground forces as chief nurse at an Army general hospital in England.

ALL SKILLS

It was to prove an invaluable experience however for the brown-eyed girl with the dimpled smile. Flight nursing requires all the skills of hospital nursing plus a graver responsibility.

A flight nurse must act often in the absence of a physician aboard the flight. Often she is dealing with emergency cases being flown to distant points, for more specialized medical care.

The patient's life is literally in her hands. So, the value of years spent in hospital nursing can't be counted too highly.

Colonel Lay's chance to realize her long-frustrated ambition finally came in 1948. After a succession of assignments at Army hospitals following her return from the European theater, she put in a request for duty at airbase hospitals. She returned to Randolph Field.

By this time, planes were bigger, the Air Force had become a separate service and physical requirements had changed. Nurses as tall as Colonel Lay—and even taller—were and are now admitted to flight nurse training.

Her acceptance as a student at the flight-nurse school at Randolph Field she calls "the pinnacle of my career." There she learned the specialized care of patients in the air, patients that can vary from blue babies to an Air Force soldier dangerously ill with a brain tumor.

"We have very few real emergencies in our business because our business is to avoid them," she says firmly.

After her intensive 9-week flight-nurse training, Colonel Lay put her study into practice for a year.

She would, perhaps, have liked to continue her flight duties, but the Air Force had other plans for her. They sent her back to school—this time to get a degree in nursing education at the University of Minnesota.

Then for the next 5 years she was chief nurse at the Air Force School of Medicine at Gunter Air Force Base, Ala., where she was responsible for the instruction given to all flight nurses and for the orientation program given to all newly commissioned nurses in the Air Force.

Washington was her next stop.

Six months ago she came here as deputy director to Col. Verena Zeller, the Air Force Nurse Corps' first director. When Colonel Zeller retired last week, she stepped up into the top position.

How does it feel to be in charge of 2,609 Air Force nurses, 836 of whom are flight nurses?

Naturally, Colonel Lay is happy and honored to have the job.

As for the future of Air Force nursing, Colonel Lay thinks flight nursing is one of the greatest developments in military nursing that has happened in our generation.

Prospects of a Brighter Future

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 6, 1956

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial which appeared in the Scranton Times on Saturday, June 30, 1956, in which this newspaper comments on the Douglas-Flood area redevelopment legislation designed to aid economically distressed regions:

At long last, it may be that the expressions of sympathy which Scranton and other depressed communities have been receiving from official Washington for a number of years may be replaced by something a little more tangible.

The House Banking and Currency Committee has sent to the floor the bill cosponsored by Luzerne's Congressman DAN FLOOD, and Illinois' Senator PAUL DOUGLAS, which would set up a Federal fund from which loans and grants could be made to economically distressed areas for industrial development. The measure would authorize up to $250 million in loans and $50 million in outright grants.

Spokesmen for the Scranton Chamber of Commerce and our Life organization in supporting the bill made it plain to Congress that we are not seeking any handouts. Scranton is asking only for loans which could be used to finance the construction of industrial plants, these loans to be paid back from rentals or from the possible sale of the factories. Such a procedure would be only an extension of the Life program which, within its limitations, has been most successful to date.

The favorable committee report on the Flood-Douglas bill, of course, is no guaranty of its passage. There has been strong opposition to the principle of the legislation, notably from the United States Chamber of Commerce. Added to this is the fact that Congress is anxious to adjourn in mid-July, which creates the danger that the depressed area bill may be lost in the shuffle before it can get through the House and Senate. But we can hope, at least.

Legislation to Correct Unfair Automotive Industry Practices

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 2, 1956

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the following is my testimony before the House Judiciary Committee in support of legislation to correct the unfair practices in the automotive industry:

STATEMENT OF REPRESENTATIVE ABRAHAM J. MULTER, DEMOCRAT, 13TH DISTRICT, NEW YORK, BEFORE THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY, JULY 2, 1956

Mr. Chairman and distinguished members of the committee, I appreciate the opportunity of appearing before your committee to present my views concerning proposed legislation to eliminate certain unfair practices in the automotive industry. I am aware of the long, untiring efforts of committees to protect the public interest and to stave off the serious consequences threatening our economy because of certain unfair marketing practices in the industry.

I know that this hearing has been scheduled to consider S. 3879 which was passed by the Senate and the chairman's bill, H. R. 11360. I trust you will not consider me presumptuous when I say to this committee that that bill hardly begins to touch the problem. It deals with only one of many unfair practices, and I believe it does not sufficiently attack even that one.

In this statement, with your permission, I will cover all of the problems, as I understand them, affecting the situation, and then give you my recommendations, for whatever they may be worth, for the guidance of the committee.

You will find that all of these matters have been fully documented and covered by supporting testimony in many congressional hearings, and in this Congress before the House and Senate Committees on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

THE PUBLIC INTEREST

In commenting on some of the existing unfair practices in the automobile industry, I should like to specificate one underlying fact; namely, that in the automobile market both the consumer and the dealer have little choice in the selection of the manufacturer. As you well know, the year 1955 saw the disappearance of one more private automobile manufacturer—Kaiser-Willys. Today only five sources remain—General Motors, Ford, Chrysler, American Motors, and Studebaker-Packard. It is an anomalism that as the market has grown the number of companies in the market has lessened. The public was only amused upon reading in the press that the General Motors Corp., the biggest manufacturer in this country, which is at the same time the country's largest automobile manufacturer, in testifying before the Senate Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee in December 1955, said that it "is the servant of the dealer." It is public knowledge that dealers have been forced into serflike submission to the manufacturer. The dealer's plight is manifest from the figures, such as those submitted by the General Motors Corp. last December showing that the 1953 return on net worth for dealers averaged 14.40 percent, and was reduced in 1954 to 9.4 percent. Comparable figures show that the corporation earned 20 percent in 1953 after taxes and bonuses, and almost 24 percent in 1954. In 1955, it was over 28 percent.

MANUFACTURER-DEALER RELATIONS

Committees in this Congress have directed their attention to the subjects of territorial security for automobile dealers, bootlegging and so-called phantom-freight. There are also other unfair marketing practices in the industry that must be appraised in evaluating the position of the industry in our economy. With the committee's permission, I will comment on all of these practices.

A substantial part of the problems which beset the industry stem from the dealer agreement which is so drawn that manufacturers may grant or withdraw the franchise at will. I am in favor of the principle which would validate manufacturer-dealer contracts establishing exclusive representation by dealers for fixed periods of time. Heretofore, such contracts have been at the will of the manufacturer. In my opinion, manufacturers have wielded their whip of economic power too long, and if we are to avoid repetition of the picture of the thirties, and if we are to meet our obligation to the public, legislation must be enacted now to protect our economic structure.

As long as manufacturers want to have dealers under contract to handle only particular makes of cars, the manufacturers should be required to sell only to such dealers and to prohibit bootlegging. Manufacturing should be required to cancel the franchise of bootleggers. I have incorporated many of my views in H. R. 10310, which I introduced on March 29, 1956.

As a result of the recent congressional investigations, we have observed newspaper reports that the manufacturer's cancellation privilege will be superseded by a provision requiring the cancellation to be for cause. But will the manufacturer be compelled to define the term "cause"? There is no uniformity among the court decisions construing automobile franchise agreements.

Incidentally, some State legislatures are making strides in revoking the manufacturer's arbitrary cancellation privilege. In my own State of New York, Governor Harriman on April 20, 1956, signed a bill amending the New York general business law, for the purpose of prohibiting automobile manufacturers from arbitrarily revoking the franchises of dealers in New York State. Under the law effective October 1, 1956, auto manufacturers are required to register with the secretary of state and are prohibited from terminating a dealer contract except for cause. A maximum penalty of $1,000 fine is imposed for each violation. We should not be surprised to learn that automobile manufacturers opposed the legislation, claiming that "the public interest is not sufficiently affected." In his statement upon signing the bill, Governor Harriman announced it was his firm conviction that "it is very much in the interest of the people that small- and medium-sized business should be protected against unfair exercise of economic power."

In view of the peculiar nature of the automotive industry, coupled with the clear proof that previous congressional admonishments have been flouted, it is the duty of the Congress to enunciate a public policy that will protect the consumer interests in their relations with the economic giants who not only produce this article of necessity, but also control its distribution, as well as the price thereof.

ADVERTISING ABUSES

The dealers must pay for advertising literature they do not want and would not order. It is sent in to the dealer in such quantities as the manufacturer thinks he should distribute, and the dealer is billed and must pay for that literature even though he throws most of it into the wastebasket. The dealers must pay a fixed sum per car to the manufacturers toward the cost of advertising. The dealer's name and address is never part of that advertising, only the product is mentioned. This policy would cease if the responsibility for exaggerated and fraudulent advertising were laid at the door of the manufacturer and if the manufacturer were prohibited from requiring dealer constributions toward the cost of such advertising.

Only recently, as a result of testimony adduced at congressional hearings, the Federal Trade Commission filed charges against the General Motors Corp. for false and deceptive advertising. Independent manufacturers have reported that General Motors' use of the words "genuine Chevrolet" to describe parts used in making repairs is diverting business from the independent manufacturers and small repair shops. The parts manufacturers contend that the items, distributed and warranted by General Motors, actually are bought by General Motors from the independent manufacturers. The implication is that the "genuine Chevrolet" parts are superior to the same parts sold by competitors without such label.

DELIVERIES WITHOUT ORDERS

Manufacturers require dealers to file each month several reports showing sales and inventory volumes. The manufacturer bases his deliveries to the dealer upon these figures. Whether or not the dealer considers this quota salable is immaterial.

Moreover, the dealer has no control over the various built-in accessories that are billed as extras. For instance, the automobile is listed as equipped with vacuum windshield wipers, but is later shipped in with an electric wiper billed as an extra. Every car comes with a hole in the dashboard for a cigarette lighter, but the lighter is an extra.

It is the manufacturer, also, who determines the stock of parts and accessories that the dealer must purchase from the automobile manufacturer. The dealer could purchase these same parts and accessories directly from the parts manufacturer and much cheaper, too.

The only way to abolish this practice is to prohibit lump-sum bills and to require of the manufacturer and of the dealer a complete itemization of all charges. No amount should be collectible by either for extras unless ordered in writing by the buyer.

OLD CARS SOLD AS NEW

The need to eliminate the unfair practice on the part of some dealers in selling

as new automobiles those which have been towed or driven from the factory or used as demonstrators has long been recognized but completely ignored. Under legislation I have introduced, it would be a violation for any manufacturer or dealer to replace or disconnect the speedometer on an automobile or to change its reading in a manner to mislead the public as to the mileage, condition, or usage of the automobile.

The foregoing, as well as the other unfair automobile marketing practices commented upon throughout this statement, are dealt with in the omnibus bill, H. R. 10310, which I introduced on March 29, 1956, to provide for the enactment of a general motor vehicles law.

AUTOMOBILE FINANCING

Not to be overlooked in any compilation of unfair automobile marketing practices are the reports of substantial overcharges under the package finance deals. Dealers complain, too, they are forced to grant wild credit to consumers in order to satisfy quotas in manufacturer's race for sales.

Insofar as General Motors' installment sales are concerned, it should be noted that if the purchaser defaults, the manufacturer has recourse against the dealer. Contemplate, if you will, the situation of the small-business man—the average dealer with an investment of his life's savings in showroom, service station, autos, and parts. Should the market fall, upon whom would the loss rest? Upon the dealers themselves, because the manufacturers have so directed. If my memory serves me, the total amount of installment paper on all consumer items last year was $26 billion—of which $14 billion represented the automobile business. Thus far in 1956, auto installment loans extended in January and February totaled $2.5 billion—an increase of 14 percent over last year. Yet, on the other hand, production and sales are running about 26 percent below a year ago.

In April of this year three large finance companies announced increases in auto-loan costs which will be passed on to the dealers. Dealers, in turn, must either absorb the costs or pass the increase on to their consumers. The consequences are that the squeeze is continually put on the dealers. General Motors defies the country to compel it to accept any shrinkage in its predetermined profits. Incidentally, GMAC has not yet made any statement on its installment costs. It, of course, is the largest auto finance company. As a group, the finance companies account for 55 percent of the auto installment credit volume. The other 36 percent is handled by the banks which have also recently raised rates. Is it not fair to assume that General Motors will also make such an additional charge?

CHEATING OUR SOLDIERS

At this point I should like to touch on a matter that involves the now well-known adage: "What is good for General Motors is good for the country." You will see in a moment that we can now change that to "What is wrong for the insurance companies is not wrong for the automobile companies."

On September 8, 1955, I wrote to Secretary of Defense Wilson, calling his attention to a scheme by which armed-services personnel returning to this country are being duped and mulcted of thousands of dollars in connection with the sale to them of new automobiles. I indicated that the matter had been called to the attention of the automobile manufacturers who have failed to do anything to prevent these practices. I further stated that the Secretary of Defense need not make any determination of whether these practices are fraudulent or merely unethical, but urged him to direct all commanding officers to alert their men to these practices to afford them an opportunity to protect themselves accordingly. My letter of September 8, 1955, is exhibit A, which I submit herewith. I received an answer, dated September 23, 1955, a copy of which is submitted as exhibit B, in which the Department of Defense refused to take any action. I replied by letter of September 28, 1955, a copy of which I also submit and mark exhibit C, again indicating the need for departmental action. No answer has been received to my last letter.

Now let us see what happened when the Department's attention was called to similar fraudulent practices by insurance salesmen. No General Motors was involved. An investigation was instituted which confirmed the charges. A complete set of regulations was promulgated by the Department of Defense, including a directive to commanders of all bases, making them responsible for protection of the men against such frauds. Another reason for different treatment of the phony automobile salesmen is that the fraudulent business is so profitable that the automobile manufacturers have sent their own direct representatives overseas to grab this business.

MANUFACTURING WARRANTIES

What is the situation today? The consumer may need a new automobile, but he dreads the purchase. Breaking in the car means running back and forth to the dealer to correct inherent mechanical failures that are uncovered long after the guaranty period has expired. The attitude of the consumer is aptly defined in unsolicited letters I received, which were printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—one appearing in the January 31, 1956, issue (pp. A993–A995); another in the February 9, 1956, issue (p. A1331); and a third and fourth in the March 21, 1956, issue (pp. A2543 and A2548 respectively). The dealer, on the other hand, is called upon as a regular procedure to comply with, not his warranty, but a warranty the company requires him to make. What has been the dealer's redress? The answer the dealer receives from the manufacturer is to step up or maintain his sales volume—even if that means come-on advertising, bootlegging, price packing, and any other unfair-trade practice. Even outright fraud is countenanced by the manufacturer.

Many an inexplicable accident is caused by defective vehicles. The manufacturer, upon whom the blame should rest, passes the responsibility on to the dealers who cannot assume nor begin to fulfill the obligation. The automobile manufacturer today makes only a spot check of 1 out of every 10 or 20 automobiles that leave the assembly line. The company's warranties are plainly worthless, and the dealer upon whom the responsibility falls gives a minimum of service until the guaranty period expires; after which, he charges the consumer for repairs.

In testifying last December before a Senate committee a spokesman on behalf of 1 of the 6 manufacturers in the country stated: "The manufacturer assumes the greater risks and bears the ultimate responsibility to the customer." Should we not make certain, then, that this responsibility is firmly fixed? My bill, H. R. 10309, prohibits the interstate sale, transportation, or use of a new automobile unless accompanied by a certificate of fitness from the manufacturer or assembler, showing that the automobile has been inspected and found in good working order and, further, that it has been road-tested and found in good operating condition.

BOOTLEGGING

This topic needs very little amplification. Every Member of Congress is fully familiar with the practice which has grown up in this industry at the active instigation and with behind-the-scenes connivance of the automobile manufacturers. On the other hand, they require a dealer to handle only their new cars. Then they load him up with more cars than he can sell to the consuming public. Then they help him dispose of those cars to nonfranchised dealers. When a complaint is made to the manufacturer about this unfair practice, the manufacturer responds that he can do nothing about it because of the antitrust laws. When we seek to amend the antitrust laws to prohibit such practice the manufacturers come in and complain that it would be an unfair restriction upon their right of free enterprise.

MANUFACTURER REACTION TO CONGRESSIONAL HEARINGS

On the heels of the disclosure of so many unfair practices in the industry, we now see by the papers that the manufacturer pretends he is reforming. General Motors Corp. has predicted the beginning a new era, an era of good will, in relations with its dealers. The Ford Motor Co. announced dealer-management talks to show dealers how they will gain by joining the fight against bootlegging. In so doing Ford said this was the first time dealers have been called to discuss the bootlegging problem with top management. I say to you, gentlemen of the committee, that such overtures are too late.

The public confidence can only be restored by the affirmative action of this Congress. Let us recall that a similar false contrition permeated the atmosphere in 1938 after the Congress enacted House Joint Resolution 594, which directed the Federal Trade Commission to investigate the policies of motor vehicle manufacturers and dealers in their relation to the public interest. The Commission, 1 year later, made public its findings, which were not at all unlike the unfair practices that are now paraded before congressional committees. Unfortunately the Congress took no action at that time for the reason, among others, that the industry itself rejected any type of Federal legislation.

THE MANUFACTURERS' WAY OF ELIMINATING AN UNFAIR TRADE PRACTICE

The elimination of acknowledged unfair practices in the automobile industry cannot be left to the discretion of the industry itself. Let me illustrate. The phantom freight charge has long been prevalent in the automobile industry. A similar practice among steel producers, "Pittsburgh plus," was eliminated in the thirties. Under this practice, the manufacturer ships the automobiles to dealers from nearby assembly plants and requires the dealer to pay for the transportation in an amount equivalent to, or even greater than, the rail freight rates from the factory to the dealer's delivery points.

Let us examine the 1954 shipment record for motor vehicles as reported in the 35th edition of Automobile Facts and Figures, 1955. Of the 6,601,071 motor vehicles shipped, 80.5 percent or 5,314,842, left the factory by highway—on a big truck that hauls several other cars, or towed behind another new car. Shipment by boat accounted for 5.6 percent, or 370,044; while rail shipments accounted for only 13.9 percent. In other words, only 916,185 out of a total of 6,601,071 motor vehicles shipped went by rail. You have seen reports stating that the phantom freight charges have annually amounted to over $250 million. And what has the manufacturer to say? Ford has admitted that in 1954 it gained $50 to $60 million on its total distribution charges. General Motors testified before a Senate committee that its excess of collections over actual freight paid for last year would be about $152 million. We may rest assured those were conservative estimates. Do not forget that the excess profit-per unit in previous years was much greater, because it was not based on the lower freight rates announced at various times by the industry.

I urge that the public announcements now being flaunted in our faces by the manufacturers as to their mended ways is merely an attempt to becloud the issue.

As of February 29, 1956, Chrysler Corp., General Motors Corp., and the Ford Motor

Co. eliminated phantom freight charges. These three manufacturers at the same time increased the wholesale price of their cars to their dealers. This in the face of the Chrysler testimony that they paid out more for freight charges than they collected. The manufacturers contend they should be permitted to deal with the so-called phantom freight on an industrywide basis. Their testimony and their actions, in my opinion, indicate they cannot be trusted to solve these problems.

As long as the industry practice is to collect a separate charge from the public which is represented as the cost in making delivery of the automobile from the factory to the consumer, then the industry should not be permitted to collect any more than such actual cost. For this purpose I have introduced H. R. 7935, which would amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to require every seller of property, who collects from the purchaser any amount as a charge for the transportation of such property, to furnish such purchaser a statement showing the amount of transportation charges, if any, taxable under section 4271 (a) of such code, and the amount of tax imposed.

I have heretofore referred to the report filed by the Federal Trade Commission in 1939, pursuant to its study of the automotive industry. It should be noted that, irrespective of whether or not legislative action was necessary, the Government controls of World War II, limiting production, obviated the need for positive action by the Congress at that time. Nevertheless, we find the same unfair practices prevalent in the industry today, and what is worse, on a larger scale. In these circumstances, our duty to the public is not discharged by a formal disclosure of their nature.

In conclusion I should like to make this observation. The manufacturers representing the automotive industry can best be described as giant octopuses whose tentacles of economic power extend over every phase of the industry, as well as over many unrelated products. On the other side of the picture are the 42,340 dealers—90 percent of whom are small-business men, the very backbone of our free-enterprise system. In most cases they are the civic and philanthropic leaders in their communities. In the past their position has been one of dignity among their fellow citizens. They are fast becoming the most despised members of their communities. There were 219 dealer bankruptcies in 1953, the highest number since 1938. Two hundred and forty-one dealer mortalities occurred in 1954. The April 30, 1956, issue of Automotive News gives some interesting figures on General Motors' dealer terminations. The figures are based on the first 10 months of 1955 as against 1954. In 1955 there were 178 nonrenewals against 150 for 1954; 214 involuntary terminations in 1955 against 192 for 1954; 1,908 voluntary terminations in 1955 as against 1,585 for 1954.

It is high time to put this House in order.

RECOMMENDATIONS

There are several legislative ways of remedying all of these very bad conditions in this industry. It can be done by enactment of a combination of the various bills which have been referred to the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committe. It can also be done by this committee's reporting a bill which would write into the antitrust laws a fair code of practices which would cover all of these matters. There is little point in attempting to take them one at a time and treat each of them by a separate bill. The only way to clean up this industry is by doing the full job.

With all due respect to the Senate, its bill, S. 3879, will accomplish very little, if anything. I doubt whether any law can be enacted which will require anyone to renew a contract which has expired or is about to expire. To provide merely for compensatory damages in the event of cancellation or termination of a contract will accomplish nothing except to clog the court calendars with litigation.

What compensation can the court fix in the event of an unlawful or improper cancellation of a contract? The loss of future earnings is not compensation. If the dealer has a large investment in a service station which is connected to his showroom, what compensation is he to get when his contract is canceled? He still owns the service station. The same applies to his showroom. Is the court to say that a showroom for a Buick car is worth less than for some other car? Or that the automobile showroom cannot be sued for any equally valuable purpose other than as an automobile showroom?

Any law like this, to be effective, will have to carry with it a provision for double or trible damages and punitive damages, plus some arbitrarily fixed sum large enough to serve as a penalty which will deter the improper practice.

Surely this committee will agree that, as important as it is to prevent cancellations of franchises, it is even more important to prevent fraudulent advertising and bootlegging and phantom freight charges, and to require certificates of fitness and safety. These latter items are for the protection of the general public.

Certainly it is just as important in trying to protect the dealer, to also prohibit the manufacturers from requiring the dealers to buy and pay for automobiles and parts which they do not order, and to prohibit the requirement of the dealer to buy only the accessories carrying the name of the automobile manufacturer when in fact those accessories are manufactured by others than the automobile manufacturer.

Again, Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, permit me to thank you for the opportunity to attend here and express my views on these very important matters.

EXHIBIT A

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., September 8, 1955.

Hon. CHARLES E. WILSON,
Secretary of Defense, Department of Defense, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY: For some time Members of Congress have been receiving complaints about the tactics being used by various dealers in selling new automobiles to members of the Armed Forces returning from posts outside of the country.

It seems that some of these retailers have sent representatives abroad who through fraud and deceit induce these men who are about to return to the United States to sign contracts, and to pay deposits for the delivery of new automobiles to them at the port of their arrival in this country. As part of this scheme these retailers have made exclusive rental agreements for offices in the hotels in this country at which these men and their families are temporarily lodged upon their arrival here. The deceptive practices are continued at those places until the delivery of a new automobile is made and payment obtained.

No purpose can be served by setting forth in this letter the nature of the fraudulent representations that are made, nor is it necessary for the purpose of this letter to determine whether or not these practices are actually fraudulent or merely unethical business practices. The result of all of these practices is that these men are being duped and taken advantage of. They are paying more for these automobiles than if they bought them in their hometowns or, for that matter, if they bought them at the port of arrival. They are paying higher finance charges than they would pay if they took the opportunity of financing their automobiles in their hometowns or in the city in which they are discharged from the service, and they are being deprived of the inspection and service that ordinarily goes with a new car purchase when made in their hometown.

The automobile manufacturers, when apprised of these practices, have taken the position that these retailing practices are no concern of theirs.

I believe you will agree with me that in the absence of the manufacturers undertaking to prevent these practices, something must be done to help these men.

My suggestion is that you immediately issue a directive requiring commanding officers in all stations outside of this country to alert the men under their command to this situation, and to advise those men that it is inadvisable for them to make such purchases while abroad, or, for that matter, even at the place of arrival in this country, or the place of discharge from the service in this country, and that their best interests will be served by their making such purchases from dealers in their home communities. The hometown dealers, in almost every instance, can arrange for the delivery of a new automobile to them at their point of arrival or discharge in this country, which would then be available for them for transportation to their hometowns.

I hope you will agree with me that such a directive will serve a very useful purpose. As a matter of fact, the directive and the notice from the local commanding officer can be appropriately worded so that neither manufacturers nor retailers need be accused of any wrongdoing or impropriety and yet provide some measure of protection to the members of our Armed Forces.

With kindest personal regards, I am,

Sincerely yours,

ABRAHAM J. MULTER.

EXHIBIT B

ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF DEFENSE,
Washington, D. C., September 23, 1955.

Hon. ABRAHAM J. MULTER,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. MULTER: This is in reply to your letter of September 8 concerning certain practices of automobile dealers in selling to members of the Armed Forces returning from overseas posts.

You appreciate, I am sure, that no agency of the Department of Defense sponsors any plan of automobile sales such as you describe and the Department is therefore without jurisdiction to discontinue it. The selection of an automobile salesman or sales contract is a matter of individual choice.

Overseas representatives of United States automobile dealers are not amenable to military control. So long as they comply with the laws of the locality in which they do business they can offer their merchandise for sale to both civilian and military. Control of this group like their contemporaries at the port would appear to rest with the automobile dealers, their trade associations, and perhaps, the manufacturers.

I believe that the directive you suggest would be more restrictive than is appropriate for issuance by this Department and that it might affect the legitimate activities of firms and dealers who render real service to our personnel. I believe that the objective we seek, the use of caution and judgment by the servicemen in their purchases from unknown vendors, can best be accomplished by a continuation of the present normal counseling given by commanders to their troops. I am taking the liberty of sending a copy of your letter to the military departments.

Your interest in the welfare of our Armed Forces personnel is appreciated.

Sincerely yours,

CARTER L. BURGESS.

EXHIBIT C

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., September 28, 1955.

CARTER L. BURGESS,
Assistant Secretary of Defense,
Department of Defense,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BURGESS: Receipt is acknowledged with thanks of yours of September 23.

I fail to understand how the directive as suggested by me is in any manner restrictive. It does not require the Department or any commanding officer to take a position on the matter, nor in any manner to interfere with automobile dealers in this country or abroad. It has always been proper for the Defense Department to alert the members of the Armed Forces against dangers that they may encounter, whether physical, moral, or financial.

Alerting these men to these practices is in direct line with such procedure.

Sincerely yours,

ABRAHAM J. MULTER.

The CHAIRMAN. We have many questions which I know you, as an exceptionally able lawyer, can be of help to us in answering.

Mr. MULTER. I made notes on much of the Senator's testimony, and notes on some of the questions addressed to him, and I will comment upon them during the course of my remarks.

The question which your committee is considering now, Mr. Chairman, is not new to this Congress or any of its predecessors. It has been the subject of testimony on many occasions. Two committees of this Congress have taken considerable testimony on the overall subject. You will find in my prepared statement that I have subdivided the overall problem and given it various titles. And the strange thing about it all is that the titles are very much like the titles you will find in the report that I hold in my hand.

This entire volume is a report of 1,077 pages. This report was prepared by the Federal Trade Commission and submitted to the Congress on June 5, 1939, after the Congress, in 1938, had adopted House Joint Resolution 594, directing it to conduct a complete investigation of the problems involved in the automotive industry.

The Congress at that time had conducted quite lengthy hearings on this subject, before it adopted this resolution calling for this investigation.

Mr. Chairman, I understand that Congressman ALBERT's statement is very much briefer than mine; and if it meets with your permission, I have no objection to stepping aside.

Mr. ALBERT. I do not want to do this, if it will interfere with your testimony; but my statement is brief, and I would appreciate it if I could go on, Mr. Chairman, at this time.

The CHAIRMAN. Certainly.

Mr. ALBERT. Thank you, ABE; I appreciate that.

STATEMENT OF HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER—RESUMED

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Chairman, when I started my testimony I was referring to the report of the Federal Trade Commission, which, after a very exhaustive study—it spent over a year in their investigations—it included in its report not only what it turned up during that year, but what it learned from the investigation of complaints that had been made even before the Congress had directed this all-inclusive study.

When you get to the conclusions in this very voluminous report, you find these headings or titles.

The situation as it existed at that time, the evils that were complained of at that time, are just the same as you will hear about during this hearing by this committee. They are the same as they heard on the Senate side in its committees' hearings and in the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee of this House this very year.

I read from the 1939 report.

The first title is: "Concentration in the Motor Vehicle Industry." Then there is "Competition in Production and Prices"; "Competition Among Motor Vehicle Dealers"; "Padding New and Used Car Prices"—that is what we today are calling packing prices—"Dealer Price-Fixing Activities"; "Unfair Methods of Motor Vehicle Manufacturers in Their Relations With Their Dealers"; "Manufacturers' Treatment of Dealers", "Abuses of Installment Financing"; "Itemized Invoice Needed for Consumer Protection"; "Deception in Charges for Transportation of Motor Vehicles"; "Sale of Driven Cars as New Cars."

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. MULTER, that report considered among other things the distribution, as I understand, of General Motors cars. Is that correct?

Mr. MULTER. It included that, but it covered the entire automotive industry.

You will find that almost every witness is going to refer to the same subject matter. He may use different words, as I did in my statement. My titles may sound a little different, but actually we cover the identical subject matter.

Now, one of the principal objections that is raised to this and all the other legislation introduced in this session of Congress is that you shouldn't pick on one industry and legislate against one industry. Well, then, we shouldn't have legislated on the security exchanges, there should be no Security Exchange Act today, there should be no regulation of the railroads, there should be no bank merger bills, because all of those laws—and there are dozens of others—are directed to specific industries, just as these bills are.

When I sat down to draft the legislation which I introduced in this session I thought that the thing to do, the approach, would be bills of general application to cover our entire economic situation where these problems or evils or wrongdoings would crop up. I thought we should have a law of general application that would cover them all.

Well, I say to you, that would be an almost impossible task. What you must do is address yourself to each industry as the testimony is adduced, showing what the situation is in that industry and how you can cure it.

The CHAIRMAN. I am very much impressed with that argument.

Mr. MULTER. Now, there were several questions raised this morning with reference to the bill that you are considering, which is a counterpart of S. 3879, which passed the Senate in slightly different form from the bill as introduced there. The two bills were identical when introduced, but it has come out of the Senate with some changes.

With all due deference to the Members of the Senate and to the author of the bill, I think they have put the cart before the horse. If you follow the same principle, you will be doing that, too. Every man has a right to go to court today, but the situation in this industry is such that when he arrives—when his proof is completed, his case is dismissed, because he has no actionable cause of action.

In other words, the fundamental situation is not changed by this bill as passed by the Senate and your own bill H. R. 11360 does not change it.

In order for a man to go to court and make a recovery in a civil suit, he first must have a legal right, not a moral right, a legal right; and then he must establish that that right has been violated or impaired or impeded and then, on top of that, that he has sustained damage.

Now, if you say, when he has proved the violation of a legal right, he shall recover punitive damages, you have given him a cause of action; but if you give him only compensatory damages, then you must inquire—what are the damages in cases of this kind?

Mind you, we are dealing now with contracts, the contract between the dealer and the manufacturer. No matter how unfairly it may have been arrived at, no matter how he may have been coerced into entering into it, on the dealer's part, as against the manufacturer, he still did not have to make the contract if he did not want to. He can get no damages because he, the dealer, accepted a bad contract.

If you are going to say that "We are going to let him recover damages because that contract is not renewed"—obviously from the report of the committee on the Senate side, they do not talk about a contract that has an option of renewal and is not renewed, but they say that if the contract has expired, or is about to expire and is not renewed, then he shall have a cause of action unless the manufacturer acts in good faith.

Look at the language: "The term 'good faith' shall mean the duty of the automobile manufacturer, its officers, employees, or agents to act in a fair, equitable, and nonarbitrary manner so as to guarantee the dealer freedom from coercion, intimidation, or threats of coercion or intimidation, and in order to preserve and protect all the equities of the automobile dealer which are inherent in the nature of the relationship between the automobile dealer and automobile manufacturer."

Now, that is the language in the House bill. I think that both bills had the same language, then, in section 3:

"An automobile dealer may bring suit against any automobile manufacturer," and so forth and:

"And shall recover twofold damages by him sustained and the cost of suit, including a reasonable attorney's fee, by reason of the failure of said automobile manufacturer to act in good faith in performing or complying with any of the terms or provisions of the franchise, or in terminating, canceling, or not renewing the franchise with said dealer."

Now, they added on to the Senate version: "*Provided*, That in any such suit the manufacturer shall not be barred from asserting in defense of any such action the failure of the dealer to act in good faith."

In other words, both sides must act in good faith, and it is fair to ask that both sides under a contract act in good faith—but the dealer's contract is about to expire and the manufacturer says, "I am not going to renew."

Well, when does he act not in good faith? When he says to the dealer, "You did not sell enough cars, I am going to put a dealer in here who is going to sell more cars"—is that bad faith?

Or suppose he says, "I think your service station is not being operated the way that we would like to have it done."

Each of them is going to bring in any number of dissatisfied customers. Their files will be full of complaints from customers who went in for service. And the dealer says, "Well, I have done the best I can for you, but you need a new motor in this car."

You are going to run up against an impossible situation in a bill of this kind unless the first thing you do is to enact a code of fair practice.

Mr. MCCULLOCH. If I may interrupt. If that is not done, are we not faced with a law which in effect requires the renewal of contracts or the reexecution of contracts in practically every instance; and wouldn't the same reasoning apply between landlord and tenant, where there was a lease of a storeroom, for instance, which calls for rental based upon the gross business done. Are we not

entering into a field in a manner that is wholly new in the field of our jurisprudence?

Mr. MULTER. I am not afraid of the newness of this or the novelty of the section, Mr. McCulloch; but you touched this morning and you have touched now upon a very important constitutional question: Can you make any man make a contract with any other man?

Now, you can lay down a code of fair practice and say, "In all your dealings you must do thus and so; there must be no bootlegging; there must be no delivery of items not ordered; you can charge only for that which is billed"—talking now about extras—"you can give the man a contract for a territory."

This is the first time that I know of where the people against whom the antitrust laws were aimed come in and say, "You cannot do these things because of the antitrust laws." They do not come in and say, "This is a good thing, let us do it, change the antitrust law, so that we can do it."

The CHAIRMAN. May I ask you this question? Suppose General Motors has a dealer contract with Mr. Smith and Mr. Smith is inefficient, there is no doubt about his being inefficient. Would General Motors have the right to cancel or refuse to renew Smith's contract as a dealer, under this bill?

Mr. MULTER. Well, I should say, even if there is doubt that the man is inefficient, and they come in and say that he is inefficient, "We will cancel out," the manufacturer could make that contention in good faith.

Well, surely you are not going to say to the manufacturer, "You must keep an inefficient dealer"?

The CHAIRMAN. But I want to be sure that this legislation is so drafted that the manufacturer cannot refuse to renew the contract for that reason.

Now, the point is, if all you need is good faith on one side——

Mr. MULTER. Well, I think the Senate version requires good faith on both sides.

The CHAIRMAN. The Senate's report says this, on page 3, line 15:

"*Provided*, That in any such suit the manufacturer shall not be barred from asserting in defense of any such action the failure of the dealer to act in good faith."

Now, that does not cover it.

Mr. MULTER. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. Now, where is there language to permit the manufacturer to refuse a renewal of a contract under these circumstances?

We have in the report of the Senate the following, on page 5:

"The bill does not prohibit the manufacturer from terminating or refusing to renew the franchise of the dealer who is not providing the manufacturer with adequate representation."

Now, that is only a conclusion in the report.

Mr. MULTER. Yes. And when it got to the floor——

The CHAIRMAN. Perhaps somebody will point out to me something in the bill on which that can be grounded.

Mr. MULTER. When they got to the floor, the question was raised that the bill should provide just that, and they added the proviso that you find at the bottom of page 3 of the bill as passed the House.

The CHAIRMAN. As passed the House?

Mr. MULTER. As passed the Senate. You will find this proviso added:

"*Provided*, That in any such suit the manufacturer shall not be barred from asserting in defense of any such action the failure of the dealer to act in good faith."

The CHAIRMAN. That is not the point. The manufacturer simply says, "The dealer is inefficient."

Now, the question is, if the dealer is in good faith, although inefficient, would the manufacturer still have the right to dismiss him?

Mr. MULTER. The way the Senate bill was passed, I would say the manufacturer would have lost his right to cancel out—the manufacturer would have lost his right to cancel, under the Senate version of the bill, regardless of inefficiency, if the dealer is acting in good faith. If the dealer just happens to be a bad dealer and cannot do the job, but if he is acting in good faith and is doing the best he can, that would be a complete answer.

The CHAIRMAN. Then the manufacturer could not dismiss him?

Mr. MULTER. No. The manufacturer could not refuse to renew.

The CHAIRMAN. That would be barbarous, I would think. I think you would have to construe it this way, I will say to the gentleman from New York; if the manufacturer refuses to renew because the dealer is inefficient that does not show bad faith on the part of the manufacturer. And if the manufacturer is not acting in bad faith, I think he is within his rights in not renewing and the dealer could not successfully maintain the suit. Otherwise it would be a barbarous bill.

Mr. MULTER. I think the fault, if I may say, sir, with the drafting of this legislation is that you have provided a remedy, without having first stated what the things are that you want to remedy.

In other words, you have no declaration of policy of the things that you say are wrong in this industry which must be corrected.

The CHAIRMAN. Isn't there a preamble?

Mr. MULTER. No, sir; unless you call the title a preamble.

The CHAIRMAN. Yes. That is the preamble.

Mr. MULTER. You start with your title, which is almost in the nature of a preamble, and then you have your definitions, and after your definitions you then go into the provision that a lawsuit may be maintained.

The CHAIRMAN. Go ahead, Mr. Maletz.

Mr. MALETZ. Mr. MULTER, may I say this? As I understand it, under both the Senate and House bill, the question as to whether the manufacturer is acting in good faith or bad faith is a question of fact to be determined by the jury after receiving evidence of all the circumstances, for example, of the cancellation.

If a dealer has been canceled out because he has not provided adequate representation, presumably what the dealer would do would be to sue the manufacturer. The dealer would have the burden of proof, would he not, of establishing that the manufacturer had acted in bad faith?

But I would assume that under the circumstances, which you and the chairman have been discussing, the dealer would be unable to sustain that burden of proof; is that not correct?

Mr. MULTER. Let us assume that he does. Let us assume that he shows bad faith; he brings in the zone manager or the regional manager from the manufacturer's office, who says, "Yes; I didn't like the color of this fellow's tie the day I called on him, and that is why I canceled out"—obviously bad faith.

The CHAIRMAN. Yes. But if he——

Mr. MULTER. Then what happens? The man has a contract that is cancellable at will or runs for 30 days or for a year.

Mr. MALETZ. Well, it is so——

Mr. MULTER. He has no option to renew. And the day the contract runs out the manufacturer says, "I am not going to renew your contract."

Now, what are you going——

The CHAIRMAN. At that point the manufacturer says, "I am not renewing the contract because you are inefficient; you do not give me proper representation." And I assume that charge is true. Certainly the dealer has no claim, or should have no claim, against the manufacturer.

Mr. MULTER. Let us take it the other way——

The CHAIRMAN. Is that right? Do you agree with that?

Mr. MULTER. Let us agree that where the inefficient dealer—there is no question about his inefficiency—the manufacturer has the right to cancel out and does cancel out; there is no lawsuit or no right of recovery in a lawsuit.

The CHAIRMAN. Right.

Mr. MULTER. Let us go to the other case, the case you were trying to correct, the case where you were trying to help the dealer. The dealer has run a fine business. He has done well for himself and done well for the manufacturer. But the zone manager's brother needs a franchise, and this is a good place for him, and he goes in and says, "Look. You take my brother as a partner or we are going to cancel out."

The CHAIRMAN. That is bad faith.

Mr. MULTER. Bad faith of the worst kind. Now, where do you go from there?

The CHAIRMAN. Under the Senate bill, you get compensatory damages, having shown that bad faith; under the House bill, you get double damages.

Mr. MULTER. Where is the legal obligation that has been violated to give you your right of action? Just because the manufacturer has acted in bad faith, can you give the man a cause of action?

The CHAIRMAN. You mean that we should spell out in the legislation exactly what "damages" mean?

Mr. MULTER. You will have to first spell out a cause of action.

The CHAIRMAN. That is a cause of action if he does not renew the contract and shows bad faith. That is a cause of action.

Mr. MULTER. For how long must he renew the contract? One year? Ten years, or a lifetime?

The CHAIRMAN. It is not a question of renewal now; it is a question to be determined by the jury under the facts.

Mr. MULTER. I am afraid that any time this gets to any court, the court is going to say, "You have not established a cause of action. This legislation does not give this man a cause of action of such definiteness that we can enforce it."

The CHAIRMAN. Let me ask you this. Are you in favor of giving some remedy, and if so, what?

Mr. MULTER. Oh, yes.

The CHAIRMAN. How would you?

Mr. MULTER. I say you write into the law a code of fair practice, and you indicate there that these things, A, B, C, D, and E——

The CHAIRMAN. How could you do that? A code of fair practice in the law?

Mr. MULTER. I am giving a——

The CHAIRMAN. I would like to work it out with you, but I——

Mr. MULTER. I am giving you a broad definition of what I think you must do.

The CHAIRMAN. You have a bill yourself, have you not?

Mr. MULTER. Yes, H. R. 10310.

(H. R. 10310, referred to, is as follows:)

"H. R. 10310

"A bill to provide for the regulation of motor vehicles on the highways of the United States, and for other purposes.

"*Be it enacted, etc.*, That this act may be cited as the 'General Motor Vehicles Act of 1956'.

"DECLARATION OF POLICY

"SEC. 2. It is hereby declared to be the policy of Congress through the exercise in this act of its power to regulate commerce, in accordance with which policy all of the provisions of this act shall be interpreted, to promote safety in the operation of motor vehicles by the general public on the highways of the United States, and to regulate the trade practices between manufacturers of motor vehicles and their franchised dealers and the general public.

"DEFINITIONS

"SEC. 3. As used in this chapter—

"(a) 'Manufacturer' means any individual, partnership, corporation, association, business trust, or any other form of business enterprise, or any branch or agent thereof engaged in the business of manufacturing or assembling motor vehicles or of selling motor vehicles for resale, or servicing or financing motor vehicles intended for resale.

"(b) 'Dealer' means any individual, partnership, corporation, association, or any other form of business enterprise, or any branch or agent thereof, engaged in the business of purchasing motor vehicles for resale and of exchanging or servicing motor vehicles.

"(c) 'Motor vehicle' means any motor driven or propelled vehicle, except airplanes, road rollers, traction engines, power shovels, and other equipment used in construction work and not designed for or employed in general highway transportation, as well as farm and agricultural machinery, and vehicles designed for running on tracks or rails.

"(d) 'New motor vehicle' means a motor vehicle which has never been the subject of a sale with intent to pass an interest therein and has never been driven, pushed, towed, or propelled over a public highway.

"(e) 'Used motor vehicle' means a motor vehicle which has been sold, bargained, or exchanged, given away, or whose title has been transferred from the person who first acquired it from the manufacturer or dealer, and so used as to have become what is commonly known as second-hand, within the ordinary meaning thereof, or which has been driven, pushed, towed, or propelled over a public highway.

"(f) 'Franchise' means the right, privilege, or authorization accorded the dealer by the manufacturer, whether by contract, agreement, or otherwise, to purchase, sell, and service motor vehicles.

"(g) 'Commerce' means commerce among the several States or with foreign nations, or in any Territory of the United States or in the District of Columbia, or between any such Territory and another, or between any such Territory and any State or foreign nation, or between the District of Columbia and any State or Territory or foreign nation.

"UNLAWFUL PRACTICES

"SEC. 4. It shall be unlawful for anyone to sell, ship, transport, drive, push, tow, or propel any motor vehicle in commerce unless accompanied by a manufacturer's certificate of fitness which must state (i) that the motor vehicle and all the parts and accessories thereon have been inspected and found in good working order, safe and ready for operation on the public highways, and in complete accord with all specifications as set forth in all descriptive and advertising matter, and (ii) that the vehicle has been road-tested for 500 miles and found in good operating condition after having been road-tested for at least 100 miles at each of the speeds of 15, 30, 45, 60, and 75 miles per hour.

"SEC. 5. It shall be unlawful for any manufacturer or dealer to sell, ship, transport, drive, push, tow, or propel in commerce a motor vehicle with equipment, parts, or accessories different from or in addition to those specified in the current literature and advertisements of motor vehicles of the same make and model for which an additional or extra price or charge is made or sought to be collected for such equipment, parts, or accessories: *Provided*, That nothing herein shall prohibit the order or shipment of any motor vehicle equipped in accordance with the specifications set forth in a written order or written agreement of the parties, which separately itemizes each additional or extra item by full description and price.

"SEC. 6. (a) It shall be unlawful for any manufacturer to sell, ship, transport, drive, push, tow, or propel in commerce any motor vehicle without first having sealed the speedometer thereof so as to prevent tampering therewith or to prevent its operation.

"(b) It shall be unlawful for anyone to replace, disconnect, or prevent the normal and proper operation of the speedometer on any motor vehicle or change its reading in such a manner as to mislead or deceive a person as to the usage, mileage, condition, or other character of the motor vehicle.

"SEC. 7. It shall be unlawful to deliver a motor vehicle to a retail purchaser unless such delivery shall be accompanied by an itemized invoice of the cash sale price which shall separately set forth the amount attributable to each part, piece of equipment, and each accessory; Federal excise tax; State or local taxes; transportation; advertising; handling charges; service; motor-vehicle license; motor-vehicle title registration; and any other charge included in the price of the vehicle delivered: *And provided further*, That when sale of a motor vehicle is made other than on a cash-delivery basis the invoice shall also include the components of the charges added to the sale price by reason of the fact that the vehicle is delivered under a time sale or other agreement, separately stating the amount of each item charged in connection with the financing and the insurance, if any; and also indicating whether or not, and if so, how much of such charges are refundable if the balance is paid before maturity.

"SEC. 8. It shall be unlawful for any manufacturer or dealer to charge or collect as a charge for transportation of a motor vehicle or taxes thereon any amount in excess of the actual cost to such manufacturer or dealer of the freight or other transportation charges incurred or taxes payable by the manufacturer or dealer in making delivery of such motor vehicle.

"SEC. 9. It shall be unlawful for any manufacturer or dealer to advertise, or cause the advertisement of a motor vehicle in a manner so as to confuse or mislead, or to tend to confuse or mislead, a prospective purchaser as to the price or description of such motor vehicle that is intended to be or has been delivered at the dealer's place of business.

"SEC. 10. No manufacturer shall directly or indirectly require any dealer or group of dealers to advertise or pay for the advertisement of the manufacturer's product except by the usual signs at a dealer's place of business indicating he deals in the manufacturer's products.

"SEC. 11. It shall be unlawful for any manufacturer to threaten to terminate, to terminate or cancel, or to fail or refuse to renew the contract, agreement, or franchise of any dealer because of the dealer's unwillingness or refusal to purchase parts, accessories, equipment, or tools of any particular type, kind, or description from said manufacturer.

"PRICE DISCRIMINATION

"SEC. 12. It shall be unlawful for any manufacturer in any manner whatsoever, or by any device or method whatsoever, to discriminate pricewise between dealers by way of discounts, rebates, or other allowances to any dealer over and above, or any different from, any discounts, rebates, or other allowance available at the time of such transaction on equal terms to all other dealers. Volume discounts, allowances, or rebates are hereby expressly prohibited.

"MANUFACTURER-DEALER RELATIONS

"SEC. 13. (a) Every contract or agreement between a dealer and a manufacturer by which such dealer in motor vehicles operates as such under a franchise granted by such manufacturer may include provisions to provide for the termination or cancellation of the contract by mutual consent or upon breach of provisions specifically contained therein, and such contract shall be canceled only for one or more of the reasons stated therein.

"(b) Nothing contained in this act or in any other law shall render unlawful any contract or agreement between a manufacturer and a franchised dealer, in which such manufacturer agrees that such franchised dealer shall have the sole and exclusive right to sell in a specified geographical area and/or for a specific period of time a new or used motor vehicle produced or distributed by said manufacturer.

"(c) Nothing contained in this act or in any other law shall render unlawful any contract or agreement between a manufacturer and a franchised dealer in which such dealer agrees to sell only within a designated geographical area and to refrain from selling outside said area any new or used motor vehicle produced, assembled, or distributed by said manufacturer.

"(d) Nothing contained in this act or in any other law shall render unlawful any contract or agreement between a manufacturer and a franchised dealer in which such dealer agrees not to resell, either directly or indirectly, any current model motor vehicle made by such manufacturer, to any person, partnership, corporation, or other entity engaged in the business of selling new or used motor vehicles other than a person or entity operating under a franchise or authorized dealer agreement with such manufacturer.

"(e) Nothing contained in this act or in any other law shall make it unlawful for a manufacturer of motor vehicles to enforce any agreement authorized by subsection (d) by refusing to sell to, or canceling the franchise of, any dealer who knowingly engages in the sale of a motor vehicle of current model made by such manufacturer to any person, partnership, corporation, or other entity engaged in the business of selling new or used motor vehicles other than a person or entity operating under a franchise or authorized dealer agreement with such manufacturer.

"ENFORCEMENT

"SEC. 14. Any manufacturer or dealer shall be entitled to sue for and have injunctive relief, in any district court of the United States having jurisdiction over the parties, to enforce the terms of valid agreements or to enjoin violation thereof, or against threatened loss or damage by a violation of this act, when and under the same conditions and principles injunctive relief against threatened conduct that will cause loss or damage is granted by the courts, and upon the execution of proper bond against damages for an injunction improvidently granted: *Provided, however*, That the parties may agree to accept the decision of an arbitration body to be composed of three members—one of whom shall be selected by the manufacturer; one of whom shall be selected by the dealer; the third of whom shall be selected by the two appointees, provided the third person so named shall not be a manufacturer or dealer, or a stockholder, officer, or employee of, or person affiliated with, either a manufacturer or a dealer.

"SEC. 15. Anyone who shall be injured in his business or property by reason of anything prohibited or made unlawful by this act may sue therefor in any district court of the United States in the district in which the defendant resides or is found or has an agent, without respect to the amount in controversy, and shall recover twofold the damages by him sustained, and the cost of suit, plus a reasonable attorney's fee.

"PENALTIES

"SEC. 16. Any person violating any of the provisions of this act shall, upon conviction for each violation, be fined not more than $10,000, or imprisoned for not more than 1 year, or both.

"SEC. 17. Whenever a corporation shall violate any of the provisions of this act, such violation shall be deemed to be also that of the individual directors, officers, or

agents of such corporation who shall have authorized, ordered, or participated in doing any of the acts constituting, in whole or in part, such violation, and such violation shall be deemed a misdemeanor, and upon conviction therefor of any such director, officer, or agent, he shall be punished by a fine of not exceeding $5,000 or by imprisonment for not exceeding 1 year, or by both.

"SUITS BY UNITED STATES

"SEC. 18. The several district courts of the United States are invested with jurisdiction to prevent and restrain violations of this act; and it shall be the duty of the several district attorneys of the United States, in their respective districts, under the direction of the Attorney General, to institute appropriate proceedings to prevent and restrain such violations and for damages and penalties. Pending final determination of the matter, the court may issue such temporary restraining order or prohibition as shall be deemed just in the premises.

"SEC. 19. A final judgment or decree rendered in any criminal prosecution or in any suit or proceeding brought by or on behalf of the United States under this act to the effect that a defendant has violated said laws shall be prima facie evidence against such defendant in any suit or proceeding brought by any other party against such defendant under this act as to all matters respecting which said judgment or decree would be an estoppel as between the parties thereto.

"SEC. 20. Whenever any suit, proceeding, or criminal prosecution is instituted by the United States to prevent, restrain, or punish violations of this act, the running of the statute of limitations in respect of each and every private right of action arising under said act and based in whole or in part on any matter complained of in said suit or proceeding shall be suspended during the pendency thereof, and the time within which to bring such suit or proceeding shall be extended by the length of time elapsed between the institution and final determination, by appeal or otherwise, of such suit, proceeding, or criminal prosecution.

"TECHNICAL AMENDMENTS

"SEC. 21. (a) Part II of subchapter C of chapter 33 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to tax on amount paid for transportation of property) is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof the following section:

"'SEC. 4274. Statement of Transportation Charges.

"'(a) Requirement: Any person who, in connection with any sale of property, collects from the purchaser any amount as a charge for the transportation of such property shall, in any case in which any part of the amount attributable to such transportation is taxable under section 4271 (a), furnish such purchaser a statement showing—

"'(1) the amount attributable to such transportation upon which a tax is imposed by section 4271 (a), and

"'(2) the amount of such tax.

"'(b) Treble damages:

"'(1) Recovery by purchaser: Any person who, by reason of any misrepresentation in the statement required under subsection (a) of this section, is required to pay any amount as a charge for the transportation of property, including the tax imposed thereon, which exceeds the amount actually paid by the seller for such transportation, including such tax, may, within 2 years after the date of such payment, bring a civil action against the seller to recover three times the amount paid as such transportation charge, including such tax, in excess of that actually charged the seller. Whenever any person successfully maintains an action under the provisions of this paragraph, such person shall be entitled to recover, in addition to the amount provided in the first sentence of this paragraph, a reasonable attorney's fee, to be fixed by the court, which fee shall be taxed and collected as part of the costs in the case.

"'(2) Recovery by United States: In any case in which a person entitled to bring a civil action against a seller under the provisions of paragraph (1) of this subsection, shall fail to bring such action within the period of time prescribed therein, the Attorney General is authorized to bring a civil action against the seller in the name of the United States, within 2 years after the expiration of such prescribed period of time, to recover three times the amount paid as a charge for the transportation of the property purchased, including the tax thereon, which exceeds the amount actually paid by the seller for such transportation, including such tax, plus the sum of $500 as additional costs of the suit, the amount recovered to be paid into the Treasury of the United States.

"'(c) Cross-references:

"'(1) For penalty for false statement to purchasers relating to tax included in purchase price, see section 7211.

"'(2) For penalty for failure to furnish statement required by this section or for furnishing false statement, see section 7276.'

"(b) The table of sections for such part II is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"'SEC. 4274. Statement of transportation charges.'

"SEC. 22. (a) Subchapter B of chapter 75 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to offenses in connection with certain taxes) is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof the following section:

"'SEC. 7276. Misrepresentations in connection with tax on amount paid for transportation of property.

"'Any person required under the provision of section 4274 to furnish a statement who willfully furnishes a false or fraudulent statement or who willfully fails to furnish a statement showing the information required under section 4274, shall, for each such offense, upon conviction thereof, be fined not more than $10,000, or imprisoned for not more than one year, or both."

"(b) The table of sections to such subchapter B is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"'SEC. 7276. Misrepresentations in connection with tax on amount paid for transportation of property.'

"SEPARABILITY OF PROVISIONS

"SEC. 23. If any provision of this act, or the application of such provision to any person or circumstance, shall be held invalid, the remainder of the act, and the application of such provision to persons or circumstances other than those to which it is held invalid, shall not be affected thereby.

"EFFECTIVE DATE

"SEC. 24. This act shall take effect 90 days after its enactment."

Mr. MULTER. First, you have a declaration of policy, and the declaration of policy—mind you, in my declaration of policy, I seek to protect the buying public as well as the dealer. And I think it is just as important, if not more important, to protect the man who buys and uses the car on the street as it is to protect the dealer. Today he does not get the protection that the manufacturer advertises it guarantees to him.

Now, after your declaration of policy you have a section on definitions. And then we come to unlawful practices. You specify what shall be unlawful.

The CHAIRMAN. What page is that?

Mr. MULTER. On page 3 of my bill, beginning with section 4.

Now, I don't pretend that you must take every one of these practices and designate them unlawful, nor do I pretend that it is all inclusive. The committee may add some to it. But I think that is the manner in which you must proceed.

The CHAIRMAN. Your bill regulates motor vehicles on the highways of the United States; doesn't it?

Mr. MULTER. That is only a small part of it. And then in section 5:

"It shall be unlawful for any manufacturer or dealer to sell, ship, transport, drive," and so forth, "with equipment, parts, or accessories different from or in addition to those specified."

Nothing shall prevent an order for extras, if the order is in writing.

Then you have section 6:

"It shall be unlawful for any manufacturer to sell, ship, transport," and so forth, "any motor vehicles without first having sealed the speedometer thereof so as to prevent tampering therewith or to prevent its operation."

That is to prevent this business of riding the car over the road from place of assembly to place of delivery to the consumer. In other words, he is actually getting a used car today delivered to him as a new car, because the speedometer is connected when it is ready for delivery to the buyer at the dealers shop.

Then I have a provision:

"It shall be unlawful to deliver a motor vehicle to a retail purchaser unless such delivery shall be accompanied by an itemized invoice of the cash sale price," and so forth, to prevent this business of phantom freight charges.

Then I have the provision:

"It shall be unlawful for any manufacturer or dealer to charge or collect as a charge for transportation," anything except what is actually charged therefor.

And then a provision:

"It shall be unlawful for any manufacturer or dealer to advertise, or cause the advertisement of a motor vehicle in a manner so as to confuse or mislead, or to tend to confuse or mislead, a prospective purchaser as to the price or description," and so forth.

And then this provision:

"No manufacturer shall directly or indirectly require any dealer or group of dealers to advertise or pay for the advertisement of the manufacturers' product."

Mr. MALETZ. May I ask you this question. Going over your bill rather hurriedly, you have sections 13 (b) and (c).

Mr. MULTER. That is right.

Mr. MALETZ. Section 13 (b) provides that "nothing contained in this act or in any other law shall render unlawful any contract or agreement between the manufacturer and a franchised dealer, in which such manufacturer agrees that such franchised dealer shall have the sole and exclusive right to sell in a specified geographical area."

And then subsection (c):

"Nothing contained in this act or in any other law shall render unlawful any contract or agreement between the manufacturer and a franchised dealer in which such dealer agrees to sell only within a designated geographical area, and to refrain from selling outside such area any new or used motor vehicle produced, assembled, or distributed by said manufacturer."

Now, wouldn't those provisions of the bill be contrary to the policy of the antitrust laws?

Mr. MULTER. I am aware of the fact that the Attorney General has rendered an opinion to that effect. I think his opinion is wrong. But right or wrong, if this Congress agrees that it is wrong for the law to so provide, then I think you must enact legislation to clearly provide, it is wrong.

Presently the manufacturer says to his dealer, who looks for an exclusive franchise

with limitation of area, "I can't do it, I will be violating the antitrust law," and refers to the opinion as the reason why he can't do it.

Let's leave that to a matter of contract between the parties. I know there is a division among the dealers as to whether that is good or bad.

The CHAIRMAN. As I understand it, you suggest that we follow the pattern of your proposed bill, which is, of course, a broad one, by inserting under the Senate or House bill some sort of standards or criteria which would guide the courts and dealers and manufacturers in the future.

That is your suggestion?

Mr. MULTER. That is my suggestion, sir.

Now, whether you will adopt all or some of these, whether you will adopt a provision prohibiting bootlegging or not, or price discrimination—and there is price discrimination in this industry today—their volume discounts are in direct violation of the Robinson-Patman Act.

The CHAIRMAN. Of course, we start out with the idea of protecting dealers from this monolithic, duopoly, that is, General Motors and Ford.

Now, if we keep that in mind, if we seek to protect the dealers against these corporations, hadn't we better keep our sight trained on that alone rather than going beyond that?

Mr. MULTER. I think, Mr. Chairman, with all due respect to that view, that you are missing the boat and you are not doing your full job if you do not also write into any law you write protection for the driving public.

You must go beyond just protecting the dealer, you must protect the buying public, too, and you can do it.

The CHAIRMAN. I don't want to argue with you about your bill, but I don't think you give the public protection when you give exclusive selling rights in certain areas. That is not protecting the public.

Mr. MULTER. As I said, there is a tremendous difference of opinion even among the dealers; you will find some dealers that say, "We should have this exclusive contract for a certain territory," and others that say no. The little fellow that can't sell his allotment in his area wants to rove all over the country selling it. And the other fellow that can sell in his area doesn't want the other man coming in.

You may never resolve that, but I say again, that should be a matter of contract between the dealer and the manufacturer.

The CHAIRMAN. I might say this: I have been studying the antitrust laws for many years, as a member of this committee and otherwise, and during the period when I have been on this committee I have always deemed that activity which you now seek to legalize is a violation of the antitrust law.

Mr. MULTER. That is right.

But in the light of our experience, in the light of what has gone on through these years, in the light of all the testimony adduced before the congressional committees—and you will hear much of it again during these sessions of the committee—I think it is time to review that.

You may not change your mind about it, but certainly you ought to give it very serious consideration as to whether or not the time hasn't arrived—at least, as to that part of it which applies to this industry, must be changed.

The CHAIRMAN. Let me ask you this:

Considering these bills with their limited range which are before us, where the State licensing statute, as for example, in Colorado, requires a court order in any case before a cancellation of a franchise of a dealer becomes effective, can you tell us what effect the passage of the bill before us would have on that statute?

Mr. MULTER. Has the statute been tested?

The CHAIRMAN. It is the law on the books. But the question is what effect that law we are attempting to pass will have on that situation.

Admiral Bell, you can answer that.

Mr. MULTER. I would say offhand that if a court order is necessary as a condition precedent to cancellation, any cancellation without it certainly would give rise to a very strong cause of action under this bill that you are considering, if it is enacted.

The CHAIRMAN. You asked a question whether the law has been tested. I understand Geneal Motors has proceeded to test it by a three-man court.

Mr. MULTER. You say they are testing it in the courts now?

The CHAIRMAN. I understand it is being tested now.

Let me ask you this other question——

Mr. MULTER. In other words, if that kind of a law is constitutional, then certainly this law that you are considering now would be constitutional, and you would be able to tell these manufacturers, once you issue a franchise, that is a franchise in perpetuity.

The CHAIRMAN. We use the term "automotive vehicles"—do you think that should include tractors and motorcycles and other such vehicles?

Mr. MULTER. Not unless there is proof adduced before your committee which would show that the same abuses apply in that phase of the industry. I don't know what the situation is with respect to farm machinery, I don't know what it is with reference to buses, motorcycles or bicycles.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you think the pending legislation, is adopted, would apply to existing contracts?

Mr. MULTER. You run into the question of retroactivity there. Certainly, this bill, unless you specifically provide that it shall be retroactive in effect—the very first rule of construction is that legislation is not retroactive in effect but prospective only, unless the language specifically and clearly indicates that it is retroactive.

The CHAIRMAN. If it does not apply to existing franchises, the bill would not have much applicability, would it? There are a lot of these franchises that are——

Mr. MULTER. Now, if you declare the public policy to be along this certain line, that public policy can be enforced as to existing contracts.

But, if you are going to make it retroactive and say that the public policy which we announced today will be thus and so, and that it will give a cause of action as to anything that was not contrary to that public policy heretofore, that is, that acts or conduct that occurred in the past with reference to an existing contract because of change of public policy or because of an enunciation of a new public policy, that would be retroactive in effect, and I believe your bill would be unconstitutional even if you specifically sought to make it so.

I believe that a bill which will be prospective in its outlook—as far as future conduct is concerned if it says, "Anything you do hereafter, after this, even under the existing contract"—that that would be good, provided that you do not go so far as actually to deprive the man of any property right under the contract. You could not deprive him of his rights. You could not, under the guise of public policy, take away from this man, his property; but if you say that hereafter, in interpreting these contracts, you must pursue this course of conduct because the public policy of the country requires you to and if the law makes it a violation to act contrary to such policy, after enactment of the statute—I think it would be enforceable.

The CHAIRMAN. Now, would you have a statute of limitaitons?

Mr. MULTER. I have not examined into that, but I am certain that the statutes of limitations that are on the statute books today would apply.

Now, they have different statutes in different States. For instance, in the State of New York, under the State law, the general statute of limitations in almost every instance is 6 years——

The CHAIRMAN. I know it varies from State to State.

Mr. MULTER. That is right.

The CHAIRMAN. From 1 year to 6 years generally.

Mr. MULTER. That is right.

The CHAIRMAN. If you do not put a statute of limitations in this act, then the statutes of the State would apply, and they would vary.

Mr. MULTER. Yes, they would vary from one place to another; which would not be good.

The CHAIRMAN. That is right.

Mr. MULTER. I think it should be uniform.

The CHAIRMAN. To have a uniformity which would provide for some period of time?

Mr. MULTER. Yes, and I think, having that in mind, that uniformity, at least to that extent, would be a very good provision of the bill. Your bill should have a statute of limitations written into it.

The CHAIRMAN. One further question; what is the status of your bill?

Mr. MULTER. I testified fn support of the bill on both the House side and the Senate side. The House subcommittee has not yet met in executive session on that or any other bills on which they have taken testimony. The hearings are closed but they have not yet acted or reported on the bills.

Now, I may point out one thing with reference to the remedy that you provide. You provide a remedy by court suit.

Suppose they write into these contracts an arbitration clause. Would you say that the man, nevertheless, can go to court or should go to court?

You see, in my bill, 10310, in setting up the enforcement provisions, I give them the right to go to court; and I also give them the right to have arbitration, if they so agree, the arbitration to be by a board of arbitrators of three, 1 appointed by the manufacturer, 1 by the dealer and the third not to be affiliated with the industry in any way.

The CHAIRMAN. Well, neither bill precludes arbitration; that would be voluntary.

Mr. MULTER. But if you don't put into the bill a provision as to what kind of arbitration, then your contract coming forth from the manufacturer could have a provision permitting him to name the arbitrator.

The CHAIRMAN. And if they are unable to agree, they can go to court.

Mr. MULTER. But you still have the situation—what kind of a contract the dealer is going to get. Today he must take the contract offered to him by the manufacturer. You do not need any of this legislation if the manufacturer is going to sit down and deal in good faith at arm's length, and fully and openly negotiate with the dealer—but they won't do it. They haven't done it. These bills H. R. 11360 and S. 7879 do not require it.

The CHAIRMAN. Admittedly. But as Senator O'MAHONEY this morning said, the motor companies have become so concerned that they are not likely to give reasonable cause——

Mr. MULTER. No, I do not go along with that. They were chastened immediately after this report came down in 1939 (exhibiting document); but for how long? And, now they are coming forward and telling us, "Leave this up to us, let us police the industry. We can do the job."

If this session closes without legislation, you can expect trouble again. The manufacturers will not reform for very long.

The CHAIRMAN. I may say that if the same party controls this House in the new session, the motor companies better watch out if they engage in coercive practices and their

representatives who are in this room, I hope will bring that message back to their principals.

Mr. MULTER. Now, let me pursue this one step forward, as far as the Senate bill is concerned.

I don't know whether you have in mind going along with the Senate version on compensatory damages, or staying with your version of double damages, and I do not want to put the committee in a position of giving an expression of opinion at this time.

The CHAIRMAN. I think at this point I may say that probably when I drew my bill I did not realize how punitive the damages were going to be—

Mr. MULTER. Let us consider that for a moment. I said that unless you provide for a penalty or for punitive damages there will be no recovery. After the plaintiff dealer has established his cause of action, and the court says, "Now, come forward and let us have your damages"—what are his damages?

The CHAIRMAN. It is very difficult to say, and I would not——

Mr. MULTER. Let me pursue it, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. You cannot anticipate all of those——

Mr. MULTER. Let me pursue it for a moment.

The CHAIRMAN. We are pioneering here.

Mr. MULTER. And that is why I want to pursue this with you for a few moments.

Assume I am representing the dealer and am trying my case before you as the judge, and I start to offer as part of my proof of my damages the evidence of profits, what they have been over the years that I have had this franchise, and I say, now, that I want to offer this proof so that you will have some idea of the profits I am going to lose in the years ahead and I want compensation for my loss of profits during each of the years that I would have had that franchise if it had not been canceled or if it had been renewed.

The CHAIRMAN. Well, that strikes me that that is the best proof, as to what the profits might be——

Mr. MULTER. Good——

The CHAIRMAN. How could you prove any loss—I would consider that kind of evidence relevant or material——

Mr. MULTER. But I do not think it comes within the definition of compensatory damages.

The CHAIRMAN. Why not? How can you prove compensatory——

Mr. MULTER. Compensatory damages are in my opinion, your actual losses, not prospective losses that might occur in any one of several events even if there had been no cancellations.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you feel that the word "damages" standing alone is better?

Mr. MULTER. Certainly I urge strongly that the word "compensatory" must be taken out, because the word "compensatory" will be limited to actual damage.

If he owns the building, the building has value, no matter how you are using it; if he has a lease, the leasehold has value, not matter how he is using it; and as far as his inventory is concerned, I think that every one of these franchise agreements requires the manufacturer to take back the inventory at cost, so he has lost nothing there, and——

The CHAIRMAN. I think your point is well taken. If you use the word "damages," you will have broader coverage than if you use "compensatory damages," is that right?

Mr. MULTER. Yes; with the probability—well, with the possibility of the court, nevertheless interpreting it to mean only actual damage.

The CHAIRMAN. That is all we want.

Mr. MULTER. What will he get there? If he makes out a cause of action, he will get attorneys' fees, and maybe 6 cents. Assuming that the court is going to take into account his prospective loss of profits, for how many years? You have arrived at the average earnings during the last 10 years or 5 years or whatever it may be of $100,000 a year—for how many years are you going to give him those lost profits?

The CHAIRMAN. Well, it is like a negligence case, the man gets his damages.

Mr. MULTER. That is right——

The CHAIRMAN. And the previous decisions will tell us what proof can be offered; and, as time goes on in a case of this sort, after passing this bill, it will be more or less standardized. But in the beginning the damages that the man alleges are very indefinite, depending upon many things——

Mr. MULTER. It certainly is; it depends on what he is doing, what he has earned, how he has——

The CHAIRMAN. That is what you are going to have here, I think——

Mr. MULTER. The stumbling block to recovery of substantial damages, which these bills do not remove, is the question if whether you can write into law a provision giving to a contract a term of years where none has been provided by the parties. These bills attempt to hurdle that obstacle by giving the court the right to speculate as to whether it will be 1 year, 2 years, or a lifetime. Each court will pull out of the air, whatever period it likes. The same court may apply different terms to each lawsuit. In a jurisprudence, which declares contracts expire at will, where the parties fail to agree on a specific term. You cannot permit that.

I am afraid that if you do not write into this bill the words "punitive damages," or provide for penalties, specific penalties, you are going to give this man a cause of action without a right of recovery of any money.

The CHAIRMAN. In other words, you think we should have penalties in the bill?

Mr. MULTER. Oh, yes.

The CHAIRMAN. In addition to damages?

Mr. MULTER. Yes, because otherwise he will walk out of court with the satisfaction of having been told by the court and jury: "You are right, but there is nothing that this man owes you."

The CHAIRMAN. That is something to consider, whether we should have sanctions, penalties, as a matter of law.

Mr. MULTER. You gentlemen undoubtedly will be told how the automobile dealers of the country are thriving and have done so well through the years.

In that connection, may I anticipate and give you this answer to that? In the June 1956 Dun's Review, there are statistics on failures by divisions of our industry. Incidentally, I think you will all agree that big industry and big companies have been not failing and are not failing; they are not going into bankruptcy. Some of them are liquidating and taking their capital gains, but they are not folding up because of adverse conditions or inability to earn profits.

In the automotive group of the retail trade in the 4 months of 1956, there were 232 bankruptcies as against 157 in the same period of 1955, and the total liabilities for the 4 months of 1956 were $9,900,000 against the same 4-month period of 1955 of $3,800,000.

You will hear from the representatives of the automobile dealers, and I think they will make out a pretty good case of their need for help.

I think, Mr. Chairman——

The CHAIRMAN. We certainly know that the dealer needs a lot of help now. I read with great interest last night an article in the current issue of Atlantic Monthly which called attention to the glut of cars that were rammed down the throats of the dealers by the three big manufacturers. One dealer now is offering a vacation to Bermuda if you buy one of his cars; another is offering a Geiger counter, and with that you can find uranium, and if you do not find the uranium when you get his car, he will give you 10 shares of uranium stock. I do not know what value it would have.

Another dealer provides that if you buy one of his Pontiac cars, you get a discount of $1 per pound of weight of the man and his wife.

I do not know how much weight that would be, but it would be a discount.

Another man offers, I think, 2 Chevrolet cars at $999, but there are only 2 in the shop; so you have to race there to get the 2. I do not know what kind of crowd went after those 2 cars.

But that article shows the desperate plight of the dealers. Of course, it also shows that in the period of 1953–54, which was called a lush period, that the dealers made a great deal of money and that prior thereto they also made considerable sums of money. And there is a repetition of the testimony of Mr. Curtice before one of the Senate committees that the squawks are mainly coming from those dealers who made these vast sums of money in those lush years who now are put to it to sell the cars that are being offered to them.

There is no doubt that the dealers are being hard pressed now to sell their cars.

The important things is that it is a very anomalous situation in our economy: Three huge companies can force and ram down the throats of dealers such a vast number of cars.

There was undoubtedly the prospect of a glut of cars in this country; yet the manufacturers had the power to do these things.

There is where the danger lies, that these companies should have that power to be able to accomplish that kind of evil. And it is an evil.

Mr. MULTER. You are going to be told, too, I am sure, that this year the manufacturers have not done so well. I think that the statistic is that they have done about 13 percent less in profits this year than last year. But bear in mind these figures: In 1953, General Motors earned 20 percent after taxes and bonuses on its capital investment; in 1954, 24 percent; in 1955, over 28 percent.

Now, the 13 percent less does not bring that down to 15 percent. It is 13 percent of the 28 percent worse this year so far than last year.

The CHAIRMAN. Am I correct in stating that last year, the calendar year 1955, General Motors had a gross profit of about $1 billion?

Mr. MULTER. That figure sounds right to me. I could get you the exact figure—I am sure I have it here somewhere—and submit it to you for the record. But that figure sounds right to me.

Incidentally, when the manufacturers are before you, I trust you will pursue them on this question of bootlegging. They will tell you about what a great job they are doing with their dealers today and how they protect them and are really rendering a fine public service in that connection.

I have in front of me, and I will leave it with you, a photograph of a Packard agency, and the sign in the window takes up one entire window right on the corner, a Packard agency, an authorized Packard dealer: "1956 Oldsmobiles, all models, big saving."

The CHAIRMAN. What was that?

Mr. MULTER. "1956 Oldsmobiles, all models, big saving."

Now, the point I am making is that this is typical of the so-called bootlegging that is going on throughout the country, not only the used car lot selling new cars, but even so-called authorized dealers carrying automobiles that are supposed to be handled only by so-called exclusive franchise dealers of other companies. The manufacturers do nothing to prevent this practice, because all they are interested in is the volume sales.

The CHAIRMAN. Is that all?

Mr. MULTER. There is one other point I would like to touch on very briefly. I have touched on it in my statement.

The CHAIRMAN. I hope you will not be too much longer.

Mr. MULTER. I will be less than 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. We have not finished this morning's witnesses.

Mr. MULTER. A practice grew up among the dealers of sending men into military installations from which the boys were being sent home, and selling them cars there, making all sorts of misrepresentations to the men.

A similar situation occurred in the insurance industry, and the Defense Department found insurance salesmen were going into these places and selling the men insurance under false representations and outright fraud.

But when that matter was called to the attention of the Secretary of Defense, he immediately issued a directive and made every base commander responsible, required him to issue licenses to the insurance salesmen and made him responsible for the actions of these salesmen so as to be sure that the men and the service were not taken advantage of in the sale of insurance.

Now, when I learned of this practice in the automobile industry, I sent off a letter to the Secretary of Defense, Mr. Wilson, and called his attention to it. I did not ask him to do what he did in the insurance business; I did not ask him to make his commanding officers responsible. I merely asked him to issue a directive to his commanding officers requiring them to alert the men under their command to these fraudulent practices. And I said to him, "Don't predetermine the question. Don't make a finding of fraud or misrepresentation, but just tell these commanding officers that they must alert their men to be on guard against this thing."

And I got back from the gentleman, the Secretary of Defense, a letter saying that they could not do that; that would be restrictive of private enterprise.

In other words, what is good for General Motors is good for the country; what is bad conduct by the insurance companies, is not bad conduct by General Motors.

That situation was called to his attention as far back as September 1955.

My last letter to him on September 28, 1955, is still unanswered, except that the manufacturers have sent their direct sales representatives into those places to try to garner the business which the dealers were getting before.

That, Mr. Chairman, completes my statement unless there are some other questions.

The CHAIRMAN. The record will be left open for any changes or additions you want to make.

Mr. MULTER. Thank you, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you very much.

Father Flood Takes Leave

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 6, 1956

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Wilkes-Barre Times Leader:

FATHER FLOOD TAKES LEAVE

Departure of the Reverend Leo F. Flood, CSC, director of King's College Foundation and former president of the institution, for North Dartmouth, Mass., to join a mission band, will be regretted by this community where he made hundreds of friends during the past 6 years.

A member of the Congregation of the Holy Cross for more than a quarter century, Father Flood leaves behind him in Wilkes-Barre an impressive record of achievement. It was during his administration that King's made its greatest strides, acquiring the former Lehigh Valley Coal Co. property for its main building and the Marion Apartments for a dormitory. The program also was accelerated, paving the way for accreditation.

Father Flood's warm personality was no small asset to King's and unquestionably contributed to his success and the advancement of the college.

His new assignment, after a tour of parochial and educational duty, returns him to a field where he spent 12 years, with Notre Dame University as headquarters. It is a role in which he should excel if his popularity in greater Wilkes-Barre is any criterion.

Foreign Aid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. AIME J. FORAND

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 6, 1956

Mr. FORAND. Mr. Speaker, under leave already granted me I offer for printing in the RECORD a very thought-provoking editorial that appeared in the June issue of the Knights of Columbus' magazine Columbia.

The editorial follows:

THE NATIVES ARE RESTLESS

This journal is determinedly and properly noncommittal in purely political matters. We feel, however, that it is not out of order to suggest to the consideration of the various gentlemen, of various political persuasions, who will be offering their talents to the public service in this very political year, some facts which have been uncovered in a casual and undocumented exploration of grassroots sentiment. The grassroots we have surveyed are, in the main, neatly plotted along a 50-foot front with another small plot in the back of the ranchhouse for which the young occupant is in hock for an amount of money equaling somewhat more than the value of the whole shebang under any reasonably objective standards.

But they are young and they are the heads of young families and they are either back from the wars and the police action or they have done their drafted time in the Armed Forces and they have to live someplace, and peace, it's wonderful. But these young people and their poppas and mommas and aunts and uncles have taken to counting and they do not think it is so wonderful at all. And this is the basis of our friendly tip to the candidates of 1956: the natives are restless.

To put the reason for their restlessness in one word, it is money. Believe it or not, dear and respected candidates for this and that, the feeling grows among the citizens that their ever-solicitous Government is peeling them too close to the rind in the matter of taxes. This in itself should be valuable information for any candidate, but we'll diagram it a bit.

These citizens are muttering that they have been paying too long and too much for so-called services that they either do not want or do not need and for the support of projects that they do not, as a whole, approve or the need for which they do not understand or accept. They are mildly resentful of the multitudinous nickel nips that are taken off them by the means of the nuisance taxes but they have become quite solidily angered by the major gouge which is the income tax.

They are aware that this painful "bite" is plucked out of their pay envelopes before the flap is sealed for the simple reason that there is no other way of collecting it and the powers that be could not build jails enough to hold the delinquents, if the citizens ever were given the chance to become delinquent—which they would do with an enthusiasm that would edify even Monsieur Poujade, of France, whose followers are notably allergic to taxes. So the tax is "withheld," in the pious phrasing of the law, and the victim is expected not to miss what he never had. But, alas! he is not quite that stupid, and he not only misses it but is concerned about where it goes.

These citizens are not tax-dodgers by nature or inclination and they are aware that the necessary operations of government cost money and they are willing to pay for same—so long as they are necessary and there is some evidence of an effort to keep them to that limit. These citizens also have heard that the shooting war is over and they are wondering how long it will be before that fact is reflected in a reduction of the tax demands upon them. They know about the Communists and the "cold war" and they do not need any fatherly lectures on the need for keeping Uncle Sam's military muscles firm.

Nor are these citizens blindly opposed to foreign aid or to any kind of aid to anyone who is really in need of it. They are not cheap or miserly, but neither do they want to be the officially designated boobs of all creation. They are unconvinced of the usefulness of pitching apparently endless billions of their tax dollars—and in this game, chum, there are no other dollars—into a "gee whiz there's more where that came from" operation in various distant areas of the globe.

These restless natives, RFD 1, U. S. A., are of a mind to put at least a mild brake on the eleemosynary outgo, so to speak, and deal themselves in on a little domestic aid and relief, just for a change. They are especially cold to the currently publicized theory that their money will not be graciously received in foreign parts unless it is forwarded with no strings. Such strings as might have been attached heretofore must have been of the most delicate gossamer: none has been strong enough to pull a dollar back to its native land.

To get back to the main point, John Citizen, U. S. A., has had it more than plenty in the matter of being clipped, taxwise, for the support of eccentric operations at home and abroad. If anyone is going to siphon off his excess buying power (how's yours, pal?) he would like to hold his own siphon for a change and maybe lay up a buck for a rainy day. In fact, may it please the gentlemen who yearn to administer the affairs of the Republic, the citizens would like to have the use of a little more of the money they earn.

The Leadership I Believe In—Herbert Hoover

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 5, 1956

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am including a brief article by

former President Herbert Hoover, one of our elder statesmen. In this short article, Mr. Hoover expresses his deep religious faith and belief in the leadership of Jesus Christ. The article follows:

THE LEADERSHIP I BELIEVE IN

(By Herbert Hoover)

"There is a God governing the world."—Abraham Lincoln.

The present world struggle is much more than a contest in armaments or economics. It goes deeper than that and touches the souls of men.

Some people seem to forget that the primary dogma of Karl Marx's socialism was atheism and substitution of economic materialism for religious faith. Marxism denies the existence of God. It defiles ideals and denies spirit.

Prior to Marx, and since the very beginning of recorded time, every civilized race has believed in a Supreme Being. They have realized that the laws which control the orderly movement of our world are not economic materialism.

Religious faith is deeply imbedded in our Western civilization. The Sermon on the Mount established the transcendent concept of compassion and good will among men. From those principles have come our moral foundations, our obligations as our brothers' keepers, and our respect for the dignity of man.

I would not have you think that I believe our civilization is perfect, or that we do not have a multitude of problems if we would improve the life and invigorate the spirit of our peoples. But these problems can be solved only by free men.

I prefer to go forward under the leadership of Christ than backward under that of Karl Marx.

I believe that if we keep the faith, and maintain free minds, still new horizons and new frontiers will open to us, revealing daily new areas of adventure and enterprise, new vistas of beauty and belief.

U. S. S. R. Attitude Toward Pacific Settlement of International Disputes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 6, 1956

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article written by Richard F. Staar, Ph. D., professor of political science and departmental chairman, Harding College, Searcy, Ark., in which Mr. Staar presents further proof that the U. S. S. R. has never really desired peaceful settlement of international disputes except on its own terms:

SOVIET ATTITUDE TOWARD PACIFIC SETTLEMENT OF DISPUTES

Ever since the October revolution and the successful overthrow of the Kerensky government in Russia, the Communists in that country have characterized themselves as "champions of international peace." In support of this contention they have called upon the world to view the array of peace notes, appeals and declarations, records of conferences on interwar problems and disarmament, treaties and pacts of neutrality, and nonaggression which the Soviet Government has either supported or entered into over the years. On its face, this is an impressive record, indeed.

In order really to understand the attitude of the Soviet Union toward the pacific settlement of international disputes, one must first determine what the Russians actually mean when they talk about peace or war. The purpose of this paper, however, is merely to review the record of Soviet diplomacy, in order to determine the U. S. S. R.'s bona fide attitude toward the international settlement of disputes.

DIPLOMATIC NEGOTIATION

The Soviet Union has repeatedly stated and shown in practice a preference for bilateral talks rather than other means of settling disputes. This has been exemplified in many conciliation treaties. The Soviets have always claimed that their international agreements are more stable than those of any other state.

The fact of the matter is that the Russians have kept faithful to treaty obligations only when such a course was to their interest.[1] During the years that the U. S. S. R. was weak and afraid of being crushed it sought security through negotiation (1920–21), international conferences (1922–25), political agreements (1925–31), connection with the Frenct alliance system (1932), the League of Nations (1934–39), and Hitler (1939–41).

The situation following the Second World War was predicted 27 years ago by a Soviet international lawyer:

"The 'splendid isolation' in the traditional policy of the United Kingdom will be reproduced historically by the Soviet Republic, with the difference that not water will separate Russia from the European continent but borders of a different character * * * those of the great concept."[2]

Today, the frontiers of de facto control have extended to include most of the Balkans and half of Germany.

GOOD OFFICES AND MEDIATION

Both of these methods are essentially similar. There are only a few examples of acceptance by the Russians of mediation offers by other powers. The allied powers invited the Bolsheviks to Prinkipo in January 1919 for a conference that would conclude the civil war then raging in Russia. The Soviets immediately accepted by radiogram.[3]

This meeting failed to bring about peace. A second attempt was made in March 1919, when William Bullitt unofficially represented the United States on a trip to Moscow for the purpose of determining the possibility of acceptable terms to both the Soviets and their enemies. The former signed a draft treaty, thus showing their willingness to conclude peace with the anti-Bolshevik forces.[4] The agreement never went into effect.

A third example under this same category was the Soviet acceptance of a 1926 French mediation offer concerning a dispute with Switzerland. The trouble arose from the assassination of a Bolshevik diplomat. The Russians agreed to remove their boycott of Switzerland, providing that the latter meet certain conditions.

It would seem on the basis of the foregoing prima facie evidence that the Communists recognize the value of mediation by third parties. Such a superficial conclusion breaks down, however, when one examines the setting in which these incidents took place. The Bolsheviks were in extremely precarious conditions.

The first two illustrations happened during the civil war, when the Soviets were battling for their very existence on all fronts. The last example took place at a time, when the political situation was extremely dangerous due to the exhaustion and disorganization resulting from this same civil war. In view of the preceding, it would seem more justifiable—especially since the U. S. S. R. to date has never accepted any other offers of mediation—to assume that the positive Soviet attitude toward good offices and mediation was not manifested ex principio but rather because of necessity.

COMMISSIONS OF INQUIRY

This method of settling international disputes involves a definite procedure, established at the Hague Conferences of 1899 and 1907. The Soviets have never resorted to such fact-finding commissions. The reason for this negative attitude was explained by Maxim Litvinov in a 1922 speech.[5]

"Commander Hilton Young has asked whether it is impossible to find an impartial judge in the whole world. It must be established first that there exist not 1 but 2 worlds: the Soviet and the non-Soviet. * * * One party [to a dispute] will propose a Communist judge, like the chairman of the Third Internatoinal; the other party perhaps the head of the League of Nations. * * * Maybe only an angel could solve the Russian problem."

Even U. S. S. R. satellites have been candid in their criticism regarding international commissions of inquiry.[6] Neither the Soviet Union nor its Balkan satrapies (Yugoslavia, Albania, Bulgaria) permitted United Nations' commissions to enter territories under their control during the civil war in Greece. A similar refusal met the later attempt by U. N. representatives when they attempted to perform their legal duties in North Korea to bring about free elections.

ARBITRATION

The Russians prefer diplomatic action or even commissions of conciliation to this quasi-judicial process. They welcome arbitration only for commercial disputes on questions involving the conflict of laws, i. e., private international law.[7]

Again the reason for this attitude has been made quite clear by Soviet writers:

"The necessary minimum and basic premise for any arbitration is a community of mind on legal principles. Insofar as such a community is lacking, any attempt to secure an impartial authority for two parts of humanity that speak such different languages is a priori hopeless."[8]

In other words, there are no impartial states when a question involves differing economic systems according to the Communists. The idea of compulsory arbitration by third parties, therefore, has always been opposed by the U. S. S. R. The following exceptions only tend to substantiate this rule.

In a treaty signed by the Soviets with the proletarian Government of Finland on March 1, 1918, compulsory arbitration was one of the provisions. Both parties to the agreement were, however, workers' states. Also, the arbitrator was to be selected from the proletarian party of Sweden.

In December 1922, the Russians accepted the principle of international arbitration for political disputes with non-Socialist states, under the condition that a simultaneous agreement for disarmament be signed.[9] It was known a priori to the U. S. S. R. that the capitalist states would not accept the latter stipulation. In view of this, the whole proposal takes on the character of a propaganda maneuver, calculated to prove at no cost the peace-loving nature of the Socialist Fatherland.

The Soviets have demonstrated that they prefer to settle disputes by means of mixed commissions. Most of the treaties of conciliation, signed by the U. S. S. R. between the two World Wars, contain provisions for such commissions.[10]

Footnotes at end of speech.

Footnotes at end of speech.

All Russian treaties of this type are restricted by the provision that if agreement is not reached through conciliation, then no further obligation rests on the parties. The conciliation commissions are partiary and do not have a neutral chairman.

Soviet conventions for conciliation procedure usually contain a provision for submitting all disputes—regardless of nature—between the two parties, which cannot be settled through regular diplomatic channels within a reasonable length of time.[11] Some of these treaties contain explicit reservations. One is found in the convention with Poland, which precludes the applicability of conciliation to disputes concerning territorial questions.

Some Soviet treaties provide that precedence be given to special procedures established by previous agreements binding upon the parties. If such special procedures are provided for in these other agreements, the disputes falling under their provisions are not approached in accordance with the treaty for pacific settlement, but, instead, are handled in conformity with the provisions of the special agreement.[12]

Many of the treaties signed by the U. S. S. R. provide for the appointment of different commissioners for each session of the commission, despite the fact that the commissions established by these treaties meet periodically. They are, in a sense, more permanent than the so-called permanent commissions constituted by other treaties, which seldom if ever convene.

Each of the countries appoints two persons from among its own nationals. The sessions are presided over by one of the nationals of the party in whose territory the commission is sitting. Meetings are held alternately in the capitals of the two states. A session usually lasts 14 or 15 days and is held toward the middle of each year.

Under the system of annual sessions, no applications are necessary, except when one of the countries demands an extraordinary session. In that case, the party requesting the meeting must inform the other party of the "urgent circumstances" occasioning the request. With regard to ordinary meetings, each state shall "communicate to the other, through the diplomatic channel, the list of questions which it desired should be dealt with at that session" (identical in all treaties).

Often, experts appointed by the parties are allowed to be with the commission as advisers. The conciliation commission usually decides the procedure of its meetings. Any person is heard, whose evidence is deemed to be useful. The countries are obligated to furnish the commission with all data and assistance that is found to be necessary.

All members must be present for the proceedings. Most treaties require a unanimous decision. The commission submits a joint report on all disputes referred to it as well as a consolidated settlement proposal on the basis of interpretations that must be sound at law.[13] It usually recommends that its proposals be accepted by the two parties through diplomatic channels. The high contracting parties are bound to inform each other within 90 days as to whether they accept the proposals.

There have been some examples of mixed commissions established for a specific purpose. One was set up to map the Soviet-Afghanistan boundary by a convention between the two states.[14] The commission had three persons from each side and was empowered to decide the ownership of islands. Its report was subject to approval by the two high contracting parties. A similar mixed border commission was provided for the following year in an agreement between the Soviet Union and Finland.[15]

COMMERCIAL ARBITRATION

This topic relates to disputes arising from transactions between non-Communist individuals or corporations on the one hand and Soviet state trading corporations on the other. As such, it concerns only one state directly—the U. S. S. R.

The Foreign Trade Arbitration Commission in the All-Union Chamber of Commerce was established in Moscow by decree of June 17, 1932.[16] Soviet agencies transacting business in the United States, for example, always included a clause in their contracts with American corporations which provided that arbitration would take place only before this Soviet commission in Moscow. All decisions were final and binding.

A postwar trade agreement with Poland contains a similar provision. Article XI of this agreement, which was signed on February 2, 1946, by the Minister of Navigation and Foreign Trade of Poland and the Foreign Trade Board of the Soviet military administration in Germany, reads as follows: [17]

"All disputes arising out of the present contract or in connection with it shall be subjected to the pronouncements of an arbitration commission attached to the All-Soviet Chamber of Commerce in Moscow whose decision is final and obligatory for both parties."

The most famous case of commercial arbitration was perhaps that between the Lena Goldfields Co., Ltd., and the U. S. S. R. The type of arbitration agreed upon here was different from the foregoing illustrations. The Soviets bound themselves in a contract to have a three-man arbitral commission, consisting of a national from each side and a neutral umpire.[18] The U. S. S. R. eventually withdrew its commissioner, Dr. Chlenov, and never paid the 13 million pounds sterling which was later adjudicated as damages.

It would seem that experiences of this type have proven to the Russians that they cannot rely on any third party to see matters from their point of view. Therefore, the Communists now keep to their own Foreign Trade Arbitration Commission, where they are certain that the verdict will always be made in accordance with their wishes.

CONCLUSION

In general, it can be said that while the U. S. S. R. acknowledges the usefulness of international law, it reserves the privilege to deny the application of those provisions that it finds inconvenient. "This desire to retain freedom of choice springs from the Soviet conception of law as an instrument of the state and the state as an instrument of a dominant economic class." [19]

---

[1] U. S. Congress, Senate, Committee on the Judiciary, Soviet Political Treaties and Violations, S. Doc. No. 85, 84th Cong., 1st sess. (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1955), 62 pp.

[2] E. A. Korovin, Das Voelkerrecht der Uebergangszeit (Berlin: Verlag Dr. Walther Rothschild, 1929), p. 43. Translated by R. F. S.

[3] Desyat let vneshnei politiki SSSR, pp. 64 ff., as quoted by T. A. Taracouzio, the Soviet Union and International Law (New York: The Macmillan Co., 1935), p. 294.

[4] Sovetski Soyuz v borbe za mir, pp. 66 ff., as cited in ibid.

[5] Conference at The Hague, June 26–July 20, 1922, Minutes and Documents, as cited by Korovin, op. cit., p. 47. Translated by R. F. S.

[6] "You observe that nowadays commissions are perfected instruments for painting given situations in the colors desired by their masters. Our [United Nations] commissions reflect the majority that has been formed here. They do the work which the masters of that majority give them to do, and I think that this provides a further extension of the parallel between Greece and Korea. The commission which you dispatch will have a majority that will be a reflection of the majority in the Assembly." Speech by Bebler (Yugoslavia) in "Consideration of Dispatch of a Commission to Korea by the General Assembly," General Assembly Plenary Meetings, Verbatim Record, 113th meeting, November 14, 1947, U. N. Doc. A/PV/113, p. 111.

[7] V. N. Durdenevsky and S. B. Krylov, Mezhdunarodnoye pravo—uchebnoye posobie (Moscow: Ministerstvo Inostrannykh Del, 1946), p. 111.

[8] Korovin, op. cit., p. 47. Translation by R. F. S.

[9] I. V. Kliuchnikov and A. Sabanin, Mezhdunarodnaya politika noveishego vremeni v dogovorah, notah i deklaratsiah (Moscow: Gospolizdat, 1925), p. 121.

[10] An excellent summary on the subject is available in United Nations, Systematic Survey of Treaties for the Pacific Settlement of International Disputes 1928–48 (Lake Success: U. N. Publications Sales No. 1949 v. 3), 1202 pages.

[11] Compare the conventions on conciliation procedure entered into between the U. S. S. R. and Germany, January 25, 1929, League of Nations' Treaty Series, XC, 219, Reg. No. 2041; henceforth cited as LNTS; Finland, April 22, 1932, ibid., CLVII, 401, Reg. No. 3614; Estonia, June 16, 1932, ibid., CXXXI, 309, Reg. No. 3021; Latvia, June 18, 1932, ibid., CXLVIII, 129, Reg. No. 3409; Poland, November 23, 1932, ibid., CXXXVI, 55 Reg. No. 3125; and France, November 29, 1932, ibid., CLVII, 421, Reg. No. 316.

[12] "The procedure laid down in the Polish-Soviet Agreement of August 3, 1925, for settlement of frontier disputes shall remain in force. Should they not have been settled amicably by means laid down in the above-mentioned agreement, either contracting party may refer them to the Conciliation Commission provided for in the present article." U. S. S. R.-Poland, November 23, 1932, op. cit.

[13] United Nations, Memorandum on the Soviet Doctrine and Practice With Respect to Arbitral Procedure (Lake Success; U. N. Doc. A/CN.4/36, 1950), p. 14.

[14] Agreement between the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and Afghanistan on border questions, signed in Moscow on June 13, 1946, Vedomosti Verkhovnogo Soviets S. S. S. R., No. 6 (460), February 12, 1947, p. 4. Translation by R. F. S.

[15] Treaty Between the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and the Finnish Republic Concerning the Transfer to the Territory of the Soviet Union of a Part of the Territory of Finland in the District of Yaniskoski Electric Station and the Regulatory Dam of Niskakoski, signed in Helsinki February 3, 1947, ibid., No. 19 (473), June 11, 1947. Translation by R. F. S.

[16] J. N. Hazard, Soviet Commercial Arbitration, International Arbitration Journal, I (spring 1945), p. 10.

[17] News and Notes, ibid., I (winter 1946), p. 391.

[18] The three men were Sir Leslie Scott, Dr. S. B. Chlenov, and umpire Prof. Otto Stutzer. For a brief discussion of this case, see Evsey S. Rashba, Settlement of Disputes in Commercial Dealings With the Soviet Union, Columbia Law Review, XLV (July 1945), pp. 539–540.

[19] J. N. Hazard, The Soviet Union and International Law, Illinois Law Review, XLIII (November–December 1948), p. 606.

Footnotes at end of speech.

As Many Republicans as Democrats in Oregon Want the High Hells Canyon Dam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDITH GREEN
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 6, 1956

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an excerpt from a letter I received this week from Mr. Byron C. Brinton, editor of the Record-Courier, of Baker, Oreg. I am especially anxious to call the attention of this Congress to what Editor Brinton says in his letter and in the editorial from the June 28, 1956, issue of his paper, which I also insert here, because they express the concern of countless thousands in my State regarding the construction of a high dam at Hells Canyon. Excerpts from the letter follow:

I think the thing we are most incapable of doing is to impress upon leaders from all over the Nation that while Hells Canyon has stirred the imagination of granges and unions and necessarily of public power people and of Democrats, it is the grassroots enthusiasm of the people of Oregon and Idaho—as many Republicans as Democrats—who pray that the great project will be built that has inspired a most courageous fight against the most powerful economic forces ever thrown at American citizens anywhere and at any time.

Here adjacent to the site we feel the urge of a great Nation harnessing a great natural wealth for the long pull not only in achieving greater things for the American people but also greater security in a troubled world.

Those of us who have been so thorough as to prove beyond a doubt the superiority of the high dam are gratified, indeed, that the committees of the Congress have put this great engineering argument into words for the bodies of Congress to act upon. And therefore all that we can say is that we hope the Members of the Congress can become as immune to the confusing, selfish, partisan, and malicious controversy as we have become in our fight and will feel that same thrill in furthering the high dam that will serve the American people so well on the long pull.

The following is the editorial from the Record-Courier of Baker, Oreg.:

CONGRESS HAS THE AUTHORITY TO STOP LOW DAMS

Regardless of the unfortunate strategy of the private utility to rush construction of an adverse project in the reservoir area of the proposed high dam at Hells Canyon in this county, the issues have not changed and the Congress must not be coerced by precipitous action of an arrogant private monopoly attempting to influence the course of public legislation.

The allegation by the private utility in its lobby in the Congress and in the press that it is compelled under its alleged FPC license to rush its project at this time is not valid. Under the terms of article 28 (a) of the license the 36-months' construction period does not commence until the project is begun and the beginning according to both the license and section 13 of the act could be delayed by the company a full year at least and with almost certain agreement with FPC by 3 full years.

The allegation by the private utility that the public must reimburse it for millions of dollars worth of work cannot be proven by the company itself at this time and in any event cannot be considered as an element in the decision in Congress which ought to be based upon the resource issue and not upon the ability of the private utility to buy immunity from a Federal high dam by imprudent and arrogant haste.

Whether the company is making a reimbursable investment in the canyon or risking its investment hinges upon certain phases of law now at issue or which will or ought to be at issue both in Washington, D. C. court of appeals and in Oregon. It seems to us the legality of the FPC license now under court appeal, and the legality of a company building a dam without compliance with the solemn laws of the State of Oregon would have considerable bearing upon the matter of reimbursement. These issues must be adjudicated before any contention is made that would attempt to beat the public over the head with a thing which itself might be illegal in the case of Federal license or possibly criminal in case of breach of an Oregon statute.

A major premise of the company before the FPC and of the FPC itself was that Congress would not act on the high dam and therefore the FPC should license a low dam. This is a challenge to the constituted authority of the Congress and any use of it, with or without a financial club now being wielded because of premature low dam work either here in Baker or on the floor of the Congress, must be frowned upon and the Congress must act completely within its constitutional authority to restrict or control the authority of governmental Commissions in the name of the people.

We think it will be eminently clear to clear-thinking legislators what has been going on. They will act accordingly. And they no doubt will take a look at Oregon law (that clearly states the company must have an Oregon license), they will take note of the ruling by the Attorney General that they must have a license, will wonder what happened to the prosecution on the law, and they will hear the testimony that the company has been building a dam and that the State of Oregon can't stop 'em and hear the private utility side of the Congress shout that the Congress of the United States can't stop them.

Well, that in itself is quite an issue, indeed.

But we trust that clear-thinking Senators and Congressmen will see the real issue clearly. The precipitous haste of the power company in playing politics with other people's money and its arrogance against locally constituted authority can be settled in the courts. But the waste of resources can never be settled except now. Congress has the authority to order that a high dam be built and that the low dam nonsense be stopped. We are sure they will act on that authority.

Airline Pilots: They Never Look Out the Cockpit Window

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLAIR ENGLE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 6, 1956

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Speaker, the tragic collision between the TWA and United Airline planes over the Grand Canyon has brought howls from some quarters about air congestion. The fact is that there was no air congestion over the Painted Desert when that accident occurred. It is one of the loneliest and most isolated areas in America. Those two airliners probably had 500 miles in any direction all to themselves, as well as 20,000 feet below them and as high as the airplanes would fly above them. Certain people in commercial and military aviation have been trying for years to chase the private business and pleasure pilot completely out of the air. Now they want to make this accident the basis for renewing their arguments that all airplanes should be equipped with such high-falutin', expensive, radio and radar navigation aids that everyone except the airlines and the military will have to stop flying. The private, business, and pleasure pilots fly more hours and more miles annually than all the commercial airlines.

The Aircraft Owners and Pilots Association, which is the most active and effective group speaking for the business and pleasure pilot, has long contended to the official agencies of our Government, first, that airline pilots simply do not look out the cockpit window; and, secondly, they do not have very much window to look out of even when they want to.

It is a common practice for airline pilots to bury their heads in the cockpit from the time they take off until the time they get ready to land. Proficiency in "flying on the gauges" is supposed to be a mark of the highest professional competence, and altogether too many airline pilots disdain to look out the window. As a consequence, we business and pleasure pilots fly around any major airport at the risk of our necks. If we do not get out of the way, we are apt to get run over, because we can be absolutely certain that the airline pilots will not be looking out of the cockpit. There have been repeated instances of the airliners literally running over the top of lighter and slower aircraft.

Furthermore, the AOPA for years has been insisting that the Government should require better visibility in commercial airlines. Did you ever look in the cockpit windows on a TWA Constellation? They do not look like windows—they look like gunnery slots. The fact is, that the pilot could not see very much if he took a notion to look out the window. These airplanes could be very easily built so that there would be a wide range of visibility for the men in the cockpit.

When congressional committees take up the matter of air safety, I hope they will keep some of these considerations in mind and not be stampeding into a super-duper system of radar-controlled flying on the basis of an accident that occurred as the result of the collision of two aircraft which were all by themselves at 21,000 feet over the Colorado Canyon, with hundreds of miles in every other direction to fly in.

Relevant to this matter, I attach a copy of a letter written by Max Karant, the vice president of the Aircraft Owners & Pilots Association, under date of June 2, 1956, to our colleague, Congressman MOLLOHAN, which contains an ex-

cellent discussion of the problem of air congestion:

JULY 2, 1956.

Hon. ROBERT H. MOLLOHAN,
Chairman, Legal and Monetary Affairs Subcommittee, Committee on Government Operations, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN MOLLOHAN: I am impelled to write this letter concerning the collision between the TWA Super Constellation and the United DC–7 over the Grand Canyon, because of the press reports that were quickly attached to that accident. Within hours of the accident both the press and broadcasting industry had been supplied with material which, in effect, said that this accident was what everyone had been expecting for some time, that it was due to the congested air space, that the present air traffic control system's serious deficiencies were responsible, etc. In other words, it is apparent to me that someone quickly twisted the facts connected with this accident to an "I told you so" conclusion, as though to imply that this accident was caused by factors beyond the control of the people involved.

Because of this effort to use this terrible tragedy to suit the purposes of the professional airspace users who want the sky to themselves, I feel it necessary to comment on the facts as they are presently apparent. My comments are based, however, on the facts that have come to me through the published accounts of the accident, and the background information gathered by the press.

First, it should be readily apparent that this accident occurred in one of the most remote, desolate portions of the United States. It did not even occur on an airway; airways are the only portions of the airspace directly under the jurisdiction of air traffic control.

Both these airliners apparently were flying "off airways," a type of operation that has been in wide use for many years. In this particular case, these aircraft were being flown through an area equipped with virtually no radio-navigation aids on the course they were flying, making accurate navigaton impossible. Such radio aids—especially those needed for instrument operations—are concentrated on the airways. In this case, however, both pilots chose to make their flights off-airways, an often-used timesaving practice. But pilots electing to fly IFR (under instrument flight conditions) off airways elect to do so deliberately, knowing full well that they do not have the full protection of air traffic control when they do so. This type of instrument flight operation has been a source of debate and discussion for years, because of the known hazards.

This basic information is well known to all pilots, especially the professionals. The newspaper reports indicate that this was a factor in the collision between these two airliners. According to those reports, the TWA pilot asked ATC (air traffic control) for clearance to fly at 21,000 feet instead of the 19,000-foot altitude he was using. ATC knew of the United flight at 21,000 feet, and told the TWA captain he should not fly at that altitude because of the presence of the United DC–7 there. The TWA pilot, according to press reports, then asked for permission to fly 1,000 on top, and permission was granted.

If these reports are correct, the key to this accident appears to be that "1,000 on top" clearance. All pilots who fly on instruments are thoroughly familiar with the meaning of such a clearance, and the responsibility it places upon them. It means that the airplane so cleared can be climbed upward until it comes out of the top of the clouds into the clear. The regulations specify the 1,000-foot clearance so that other aircraft climbing on instruments up through the clouds will not blindly run into an airplane flying in the clear on top of the clouds, but so close to the clouds that it would be impossible for the other plane to avoid a collision.

However, once any pilot accepts such a clearance, he knows it then is his responsibility to look where he's going, because he's then flying in clear air, and this is VFR (flying under visual flight rules). Now, if this TWA captain did not for some reason manage to get in the clear on top of the clouds before he reached United's 21,000-foot level, he would be obligated—both by law and by ordinary commonsense—to avoid that altitude at all costs. Remember: It is reported that he had been advised not to fly at that altitude because of the proximity of the United DC–7.

What is so deplorable to me, however, is what appears to be deliberate distortion of these facts by some airline proponents, within hours of a terrible tragedy involving two of their own aircraft. They have indulged in quick résumés of the Harding report, particularly the portion that merely quotes the airlines themselves as claiming there are an average of four near-misses a day involving airline aircraft in the United States. They neglect to point out, however, that this still unsubstantiated claim originally dealt with the problem in very busy terminal areas. It was not intended to convey the impression that the off-airways airspace over the Grand Canyon—one of the country's most desolate areas—at 21,000 feet was a major problem.

Unfortunately, a considerable area of mystery will probably surround this accident forever. As I believe I testified before your committee, AOPA has some time ago strongly supported a proposal by the Civil Aeronautics Board to require all United States air transport aircraft to be equipped with automatic flight recorders. These recorders automatically and continuously record each plane's altitude, speed, heading, climb, and descent, and any stresses to which the plane's structure may be subjected. These recorders are fireproof, and designed to withstand shocks of up to 100 times the force of gravity.

The airlines' representatives in Washington opposed this proposal, contending such recorders would add nothing to the safety picture, but would involve them in a lot of unnecessary recordkeeping.

Had both these airliners been equipped with these recorders many of the most urgently needed facts relating to this tragedy would become known as soon as the recorders could be found.

Needless to say, we deeply regret this terrible accident. It is most unfortunate that this tragedy must so quickly become the cause of such unwarranted public controversy. It is particularly deplorable that some people would take such an opportunity to deliberately mislead and confuse the public with irrelevant discussions of the air traffic control system and other aspects of the airspace-use problem. I sincerely hope your subcommittee will take a careful look at all these facts.

Sincerely,

MAX KARANT,
Vice President, Aircraft Owners and Pilots Association.

Self-Employed Renew Pension Pleas in Canada

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 6, 1956

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Mr. Dalton Robertson which appeared in the Financial Post, of Toronto, Canada, on June 23, 1956:

SELF-EMPLOYED RENEW PENSION PLEAS—UNITED KINGDOM TAX CONCESSIONS INSPIRE NEW PRESSURE HERE

(By Dalton Robertson)

The recent decision of the United Kingdom Government to make tax concessions to help self-employed persons provide for retirement, has raised new hopes for similar action in Canada.

Until now, Ottawa has resisted pressure from this group—doctors, lawyers, accountants, grocers, druggists, etc.—who sought to have their contributions to pension schemes exempted from income tax. Salaried employees of companies which have an approved pension plan receive this special tax treatment already, but people who work for themselves have received no such concessions.

Strengthened by the United Kingdom precedent, however, various individuals and groups are arming themselves for another go at the Minister of Finance. The proposed exemptions in the United Kingdom have already been drawn to his attention.

THE CASE FOR

The self-employed businessman or professional man states his case this way: When it comes to making contributions to a retirement plan, we believe we should have the same taxation privileges as employees who work for a company where there's an approved pension plan. The employee's contributions are exempt from income tax. The employer, who usually makes a contribution, is also freed from taxation on his payment.

When the employed person retires and his pension starts to pay off, this income will be taxed. But at that point taxation is not likely to be as heavy as in the higher income period when he's making contributions. Thus the employed man not only gets tax exemptions which help him build toward a retirement income, but he is able to defer income tax until a time when his total income is likely to be smaller.

Contrast this with the man who is saving for his own retirement fund. He has to pay income tax on his savings through earning years when his tax rate is highest. And he has, the self-employed point out, no employer to double his savings.

GOVERNMENT REACTION

Several organizations—primarily those representing professional men—have been asking the Federal Government to consider changes in tax legislation for a good many years. Early in 1954, 12 interested groups spearheaded by the Canadian Bar Association, Canadian Medicial Association, and Ontario Chartered Accountants made a joint attack and presented a detailed brief to the minister of finance.

Douglas Abbott, then minister of finance, did not see his way clear to do anything about their requests. His successor, Walter Harris, has also been reluctant to tackle the problem.

Mr. Abbott summed up his stand saying: "The implications of such a move are extremely far reaching. It is difficult to know what volume of savings would be attracted by this monetary incentive, but I am inclined to think it would be extremely substantial. * * * I have not felt that I wanted to take the responsibility for such a far-reaching move at this time. * * * The difficulties still appall me."

TODAY'S CONDITIONS

That was 1954. Today, say the self-employed, conditions are different and have changed enough to let the Government alter its stand:

There's now a precedent. With the British concessions (which the United Kingdom Gov-

ernment calls "a measure of fiscal justice") the Canadian Government has less real reason to hedge longer on the issue; it can be done.

Concessions would complement the Government's monetary policy. Exemptions would encourage saving, which would be to the good if the Government is as seriously concerned about possible inflation as it makes out.

It's timely. The pressures of an election year might make 1957 the logical moment politically to introduce tax exemptions for the self-employed.

But chief stumbling block for the self-employed's cause is the fact that exemptions would cost the Government a substantial sum in lost tax revenues.

In their joint brief of 1954 the associations requesting changes declared—and still do—that their members receive inequitable and unreasonable treatment under the Income Tax Act because:

Preparing for a professional career calls for long training and a large capital outlay in no way recognized for tax purposes.

During the relatively short period of peak earning power, income-tax rates are so high as to make it exceedingly difficult to compensate for earlier expenses and lay aside for later retirement at the same time.

Professional people rarely build up a business organization with substantial capital reserves which will provide continuing income; rather earnings drop sharply with any lessening of the energy or capacities of the individual.

The Canadian Government has been reluctant to reshape its tax legislation to ease what the self-employed consider a discriminatory situation. One big reason, it would be difficult to make an adjustment for one group of taxpayers, yet maintain a tax incidence equitable to all. And, by no means a small consideration for the budget makers, it would involve a substantial loss of income for the Federal Treasury.

Self-employed are pointing to the recent British concessions. "If England, in spite of heavy financial commitments, has accorded tax relief to the self-employed, why can't Canada?" they ask.

UNITED KINGDOM PLAN

Full details of the United Kingdom plan are not yet available. But, in bringing down the British budget, Harold Macmillan, Chancellor of the Exchequer, stated:

"I propose to give effect, though in a simplified and modified way, to the recommendations of the second Millard Tucker committee on relief to the self-employed in respect of provision for retirement. This will grant relief from income tax and surtax within certain limits in respect of premiums paid to provide a deferred annuity on retirement.

"It will apply to professional men in practice, to individuals and partners in businesses which are not companies, to controlling directors of companies, and finally to employees who are not entitled to any benefit under schemes set up by their employers."

Stating that a condition of tax relief would be that benefits secured by premiums be payable as annuities and not as lump sums, Mr. Macmillan said that tax exemptions would be limited to pension contributions not exceeding £500 or 10 percent of earned income in any 1 year. Beneficiaries, he thought, would range from city accountant to village grocer.

Two related concessions were also announced. The Chancellor plans to relieve from income tax life insurance company annuity funds insofar as they represent invested premiums arising from deferred annuity business for the self-employed. A further exemption stated "purchased life annuities not connected with a pension scheme should not be taxed in full, the part representing a return of the purchase money should be exempt."

These steps will be a strong anti-inflationary force, the British Government believes. Substantial savings will accumulate, they think, as people take advantage of the exemptions possible in accumulating a retirement fund.

Biggest block to the introduction of tax concessions will be the possibly large loss of government revenues. Rough estimates place this at a minimum of $60 million to $70 million if the self-employed are accorded an exemption for pension plans of 10 percent of yearly earned income.

Since this is a fair sum for the Government to forego—especially when it still officially argues that there is nothing unfair about the present system—some groups of the self-employed predict that it will have to make the most of its concessions. With an election looming, they feel that this would be the opportune time for an announcement.

While tax concessions, if made, would in all likelihood apply to all self-employed, professional men feel most strongly about the necessity for them. It has been pointed out to the professional man that he could incorporate and thus gain certain tax advantages. But the professionals consider this would be detrimental to their professions, their clients, and to society itself.

Their reasoning: A professional service to be worthy must be a personal service. Therefore it cannot have created an artificial person in the form of a corporate being, between the giver of the service and the recipient.

There is another side to the view that tax concessions for the self-employed are a measure of fiscal justice. The employed person who contributes a tax-exempt portion of his earnings to a pension fund does not control that money and cannot obtain it for emergencies. Meanwhile, the self-saver can at least save any way he wants—stocks, bonds, mortgages, real estate—and be free to liquefy his assets, or use them as security for loans.

Against this, the self-employed are saving without the benefit of tax exemptions, employer contributions, or deferred income tax.

The Picture of Aging

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDITH GREEN
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 5, 1956

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, one of the greatest challenges confronting American society today arises from the tremendous and continuing increase in the number of our older citizens. It is encouraging in the face of this challenge to see the growing responsible public concern with this subject. One evidence of this is a very thoughtful discussion in an editorial in the Portland Oregonian of June 25 of this year. Under unanimous consent I include this editorial in the RECORD:

GOLDEN YEARS NOT ALL GOLD

In the back of the young American worker's mind is the vague picture, perhaps a little more clearly defined by insurance companies' rosy advertisements, of his eventual retirement to the bliss of a 52-week vacation every year. No longer concerned with alarm clocks and time clocks, he'll be ready at age 65 or thereabouts to sit back and loaf for the rest of his life on the income from his pension, social security, and investments.

How does this picture really look, once one becomes an actual part of it? Recently the Twentieth Century Fund, an endowed foundation for research on economic and social problems, made a survey of the status of Americans over the age of 65. The survey, which shows how America's senior citizens live and what they live on, and how successful they have been in reaching their goal of a twilight life of fulfillment and dignity, is both enlightening and disturbing.

For most people over 65, the survey shows, retirement years are not the time of rest and contentment they are popularly supposed to be. Instead, poverty and unhappiness are the lot of a majority in this age group.

Evidently this prospect becomes more clear to people as they approach retirement age, for a study of the reasons for retirement showed only 9 percent quitting work voluntarily at age 65 for more leisure time. A majority, 56 percent, quit because their employers' age policies gave them no choice. Twenty-six percent retired because of illness or accident, and 9 percent for miscellaneous reasons.

Obviously the chief reason for discontent among senior citizens is financial worry. Only 15 percent of Americans over age 65 have incomes of more than $2,000 a year; 38 percent receive less than $1,000, and 36 percent have no income at all. Of the fortunate few with incomes over $5,000, retirement is being enjoyed by 73 percent. Half of those receiving between $1,000 and $2,000 like their lives of leisure. But of oldsters with incomes of less than $1,000, only 38 percent are finding life to be fun.

Of the approximately 12 million senior Americans, 2,700,000 are gainfully employed. Another 1,400,000 would like to work, but are barred under present employment customs. Some 90,000 are physically and mentally at par, but can't find jobs. Five million elderly Americans are living out the remainder of their lives doing menial household tasks; a great many, it may be assumed, the unhappy and not particularly welcome guests of younger relatives.

The existence of this large, unhappy minority in America's social structure shows plainly the need for a revamping of our traditional ideas about employment and retirement. Somehow the job system must be revised so that elderly people can find useful, gainful things to do when they cannot afford to, or don't want to, loaf. A good place to start would be at the State level. The next Oregon Legislature ought to take a sharp look at existing unemployment compensation and accident insurance statutes which make it economically impractical for employers to add elderly and handicapped persons to their payrolls.

Congress Can Protect Itself

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. L. FORRESTER
OF GEORGIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 6, 1956

Mr. FORRESTER. Mr. Speaker, the Valley Times, San Fernando Valley, Calif., Thursday, June 28, 1956, issue carries on page 12 thereof an editorial by Hon. George Todt, entitled "Congress Can Protect Itself."

Mr. Todt has no patience whatever with the group who contends that it is improper to criticize the Supreme Court. He feels that this group actually does not know history. He directs the attention of that group to the immortal words of Thomas Jefferson, to wit:

In questions of legislative power, let no more be heard of confidence in the Supreme Court, but bind it down from mischief by the chains of the Constitution.

The editorial is so splendidly written and so completely American that everyone should have the privilege of reading it. It is a privilege on my part to afford that opportunity. The editorial reads as follows:

GEORGE TODT'S OPINION

CONGRESS CAN PROTECT ITSELF

"Four things belong to a judge: to hear courteously, to answer wisely, to consider soberly, and to decide impartially"—Socrates.

The angry murmur coming out of Capital Hill in the direction of the judicial branch these days almost paraphrases itself in Jefferson's immortal words to read anew: "In question of legislative power, let no more be heard of confidence in the Supreme Court, but bind it down from mischief by the chains of the Constitution." And Congress is talking about doing just that. However, talk and action are often poles apart.

Congress appears to believe that the judiciary has been taking too many liberties in the interpretation of the law—so much so that the law, as Congress intended it to be, seems to be no longer recognizable even to those who made it. Consequently, the legislators may consider writing some stiff statutes to protect themselves in their own legislative field. But it still remains to be seen whether the lawmakers can concoct measures so ironclad that their intent may not be ameliorated by further "judicial interpretation." This has the makings of a splendid game of chess for the future between these two heretofore "equal and coordinate branches of the Government." Who will win out in the end?

Since all of the wounded outcries are coming from Congress in this instance, and none are emanating from the bailiwick of the Supreme Court, the appearances would tend to indicate that the aggression or encroachment—if any it may be called—is definitely emanating from the judiciary against the legislative.

Actually, it is an unhealthy sign whenever we are able to note a tendency of any of the three coordinate branches to encroach upon either or both of the others. The Founding Fathers set it up the way they did in order to decentralize governmental power—so that too much of this corruptive force of political power could not come to be lodged in the hands of any one man, or body of oligarchs. They did this for our own good, not because they were incapable of conceiving a "streamlined, centralized, collective pattern" on European lines.

But 5,000 years of recorded history taught our wise men at Philadelphia that "power corrupts," as they so succinctly put it, and they purposely divided the governing power of our American state into the present three equal and coordinate branches—with checks and balances to insure that none would be overrun in the future by either, or both, of the other two partners in government. Today there are many shallow thinkers who prate that our Constitution is not "modern" enough to suit our needs, and they cry for "change" to streamline our needs. Boiled down, this invariably spells reactionary authoritarianism, totalitarianism, and tyranny.

The people of America desire to retain confidence in our Supreme Court and see it retain its traditionally strong, healthy role in the shaping of the national destiny in the future. But this does not mean that we want it to encroach upon the rights of an equal and coordinate branch of the Government, such as the legislative.

Congress is well within its rights to investigate such a condition, if it exists, and to remedy the situation with appropriate legislation so well worded and ironclad that it cannot leave any room for doubts or judicial misinterpretation of intent. Congress has the power to defend itself from judicial forays into its territory whenever it wishes; perhaps it is the party at fault in not producing appropriate legislation earlier which would have properly fenced the Supreme Court within its own allocated area. It is time for Congress to act and thereby commence to close the gaping wound caused by the rift created from allowing this controversial matter to get out of hand. It calls for healing.

Communications Favoring a School Construction Law

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL ELLIOTT

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 6, 1956

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following communications on the Kelley school construction bill, which was before the Congress during the past several days:

ALABAMA STATE SUPERINTENDENT OF EDUCATION URGES PASSAGE OF SCHOOL CONSTRUCTION BILL

STATE OF ALABAMA,
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION,
Montgomery, Ala., June 22, 1956.

Hon. CARL ELLIOTT,
Member of Congress,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN ELLIOTT: Your efforts to provide Federal funds for the sorely needed additional school-building facilities in Alabama are highly appreciated. The friends of education in this State urge that the Kelley bill, H. R. 7535, without cripping segregation amendments, be passed.

It is inconceivable that the Congress of the United States of America will appropriate billions of dollars to rehabilitate foreign nations and fail to appropriate adequate funds to house the schoolchildren of America. Alabama makes at least the average financial effort of the Nation in supporting public education based on financial ability to finance education and yet the school-building survey, financed partly by appropriations from Congress, shows that Alabama needs over $300 million more school-building facilities to house the schoolchildren of this State. • • • The school-building deficit becomes greater year by year because of the increasing enrollment in public schools and colleges.

Your efforts to get Congress to pass the school-building appropriation will be highly appreciated.

Sincerely yours,

A. R. MEADOWS,
State Superintendent of Education.

ALABAMA EDUCATION ASSOCIATION URGES PASSAGE OF SCHOOL CONSTRUCTION BILL

MONTGOMERY, ALA., *June 25, 1956.*

Hon. CARL ELLIOTT,
Washington, D. C.:

Your active support to legislation effecting education has been gratifying. Your particular support for H. R. 7535 (Kelley bill) at the present time is of utmost importance. We encourage you to vote for the Kelley bill and against the Power antisegregation amendment.

ALABAMA EDUCATION ASSOCIATION,
WILLIAM N. EDDINS,
Director, Public Relations.

ALABAMA CONGRESS OF PARENTS AND TEACHERS APPROVES KELLEY BILL

MONTGOMERY, ALA., *June 23, 1956.*

Hon. CARL ELLIOTT,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.:

Kelley bill, H. R. 7535, will come to a vote between June 23–29. Urge you to actively support this bill and work toward its final passage. Alabama would receive approximately $10 million per year for 4 years to build much needed school buildings.

Mrs. JAMES HOLLADAY,
Chairman, Committee on Legislation, Alabama Congress of Parents and Teachers.

BOARD OF DIRECTORS APPROVES KELLEY BILL

WASHINGTON, D. C., *July 4, 1956.*

Hon. CARL ELLIOTT,
Washington, D. C.:

It is our sincere belief that record vote should be taken on Powell amendment and on final passage of school construction bill. Will appreciate your being on House floor to help accomplish both these important votes.

William G. Carr, executive secretary, National Education Association; John Lester Buford, president, NEA, board of directors, NEA, comprising J. W. Letson, Alabama; Donald Lawvere, Alaska; C. A. Carson, Arizona; A. L. Whitten, Arkansas; Hazel Blanchard, John Palmer, Mary Jo Tregilas, California; Anna Maud Garnett, Colorado; Mrs. Elma Leblond, Connecticut; Grace C. Moore, Delaware; Helen E. Samuel, District of Columbia; Thomas D. Bailey, Florida; M. D. Collins, Georgia; James R. McDonough, Hawaii; Elmer Crowley, Idaho; Helen Ryan, Illinois; Paul Grigsby, Illinois; Audrey Shauer, Indiana; Verl Crow, Iowa; F. L. Schlagle, Kansas; Mrs. Willie C. Ray, Kentucky; George H. Deer, Louisiana; Clinton F. Thurloy, Maine; Harry R. Poole, Maryland; Albert M. Johnson, Massachusetts; Ruth Winter, Michigan; Laura M. Farnam, Minnesota; H. V. Cooper, Mississippi; Louese Phillips, Missouri; Oliver W. Peterson, Montana; Chester O. Marshall, Nebraska; Albert G. Seeliger, Nevada; Mabel M. McKelvey, New Hampshire; Lena M. Porreca, New Jersey; William B. O'Donnell, New Mexico; James A. Cullen, New York; Earl C. Funderburk, North Carolina; W. G. Byers, North Carolina; Mary Fowler, North Dakota; H. C. Roberson, Margaret Boyd, Ohio; Garland Godfrey, Oklahoma; Margaret Perry, Oregon; Harvey E. Gayman, Mrs. Audrey Graham, G. Baker Thompson, Pennsylvania; Jose Rivera, Puerto Rico; Marie R. Howard, Rhode Island; Gladys Robinson, South Carolina; Joy Hamrin, South Dakota; Andrew D. Holt, Frank E. Bass, Tennessee; Myrtle M. Hembree, Dana Williams, Texas; Clifton Cook, Utah; Gertrude E. Sinclair, Vermont; Mary Delong, Virginia; Helen E. Holcomb, Washington; Mrs. Nan Temple Davis, West Virginia; S. R. Slade, Wisconsin; Velma Linford, Wyoming; Cornelia Adair, Richmond, Va.; Florence Hale, Connecticut; Frederick Hunter, Oregon; Uel Lamkin, Missouri; Mrs. Josephine Preston, Washington; Agnes Samuelson, Iowa; Henry Smith, Indiana; George Strayer, New Jersey; Willis Sutton, Georgia; Charl O. Williams, District of Columbia.

ALABAMA DELEGATION OF SCHOOLTEACHERS ATTENDING NEA CONVENTION IN PORTLAND APPROVES KELLEY SCHOOL-CONSTRUCTION BILL

PORTLAND, OREG., *July 4, 1956.*

CARL ELLIOTT,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.:

Eighty-one members Alabama delegation of teachers attending NEA convention in Port-

land commend you for continuing support of H. R. 7535 and urges you to help secure final passage without Powell amendment. List of names of delegates follow by letter.

FRANK GROVE,
Executive Secretary, Alabama Education Association.

PRESIDENT, AEA DIVISION OF CLASSROOM TEACHERS, APPROVES KELLEY BILL

PORTLAND, OREG., *July 5, 1956.*

Congressman CARL ELLIOTT,
Washington, D. C.:

Twenty-four thousand Alabama teachers urge your every assistance in securing further consideration of Kelley bill.

RUTH W. CARLISLE,
President, AEA Division, Classroom Teachers.

AFL–CIO Endorses High Hells Canyon Dam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDITH GREEN
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thrusday, July 5, 1956

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a letter I received this morning from the American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations. We in the Northwest are deeply gratified to know that organized labor has demonstrated great understanding of the importance of maximum development of the Nation's rivers for the greatest benefit to the largest number of our people by endorsing the construction of a high dam at Hells Canyon.

The letter follows:

AMERICAN FEDERATION OF LABOR AND CONGRESS OF INDUSTRIAL ORGANIZATIONS,
Washington, D. C., July 3, 1956.

Hon. EDITH GREEN,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSWOMAN: The American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations endorses pending legislation reported by the House Interior Committee, to authorize a high dam at Hells Canyon on the Snake River, and urges you to support this legislation.

Organized labor is persuaded that the demand for increased energy for industry, agriculture, and the home requires the use of all possible sources of energy to their maximum if we are to meet the demand of the immediate future. Today we know the demand for industry amounts to 7.7 kilowatt-hours per man-hour of work. Sound predictions of the demand in the future show a minimum need by 1970 of 14 kilowatt-hours per man-hour of work. It is for this reason that the AFL–CIO in their merger convention held last December in New York City, specifically endorsed construction of the high dam at Hells Canyon on the Snake River.

The proposed high dam which would be authorized by the pending bill would provide large blocks of low-cost power. The lower dams proposed by the Idaho Power Co. would produce less electricity at higher cost to the company and electric consumers. Abundant, low-cost electric energy is an essential ingredient of the industrial development which brings jobs for labor, health to the economy, and prosperity to our Nation and its people.

The high dam at Hells Canyon would add a total of 1,124,000 kilowatts of prime power, compared with a total of only 680,000 kilowatts for the smaller dams. The cost per kilowatt-hour of power from the proposed power-company dams would be more than twice as much as power from high Hells Canyon Dam.

The high Federal dam would provide nearly four times as much water storage for flood control (3,880,000 acre-feet of useful storage as opposed to only 1 million acre-feet for the power-company project). The high dam would provide greater benefits in navigation, conservation, and recreation. It could make possible irrigation of large areas.

The high Hells Canyon Dam is an essential part of the comprehensive plan for the development of the Columbia River, one of our Nation's great natural resources. If we permit a private power company to destroy this basinwide plan with partial, piece-meal dams, we shall be turning our back on the lessons of the history of exploitation of our natural resources.

At stake in the Hells Canyon controversy is the future of our water resource development programs. Our rivers belong to our people, and organized labor is proud to join with others in calling for maximum development of the Nation's rivers for the greatest benefit to the largest number of our people. Therefore, we support legislation to authorize a Federal high dam at Hells Canyon, and we call upon the Congress to enact this important measure.

Sincerely yours,

W. C. HUSHING,
Codirector, Legislative Department.
ROBERT OLIVER,
Codirector, Legislative Department.

Marquette University's Birthday Presents

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 29, 1956

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I want to enclose an article which appeared in the Davenport, Iowa, Catholic Messenger of May 31, 1956, written by Mr. Donald McDonald and entitled "One University's Birthday Presents."

Mr. McDonald very aptly calls attention to the fact that Marquette University—

decided a year ago to celebrate its 75th birthday not by looking back at its past performance and not by soliciting praise for its present accomplishments. Instead, the university embarked upon an ambitious and what must have been certainly an expensive project designed to make a substantial addition to the total content of truth in the American political society.

This was a most praiseworthy and constructive undertaking which benefited our entire Nation, and which produced a series of national conferences and other symposiums on vital topics of current and future interest. In this manner, Marquette University substantiated its anniversary-year theme: "The Pursuit of Truth To Make Men Free."

I want to take this opportunity to commend Mr. McDonald's article, and Marquette University's birthday presents to our society, to the earnest consideration of the membership of this body.

ONE UNIVERSITY'S BIRTHDAY PRESENTS
(By Donald McDonald)

Three of the most refreshing and vitalizing developments in Catholic education in this country in the past few decades have occurred within the past year. I refer to (1) the establishment of the Sister-Formation Conference organized to improve, nourish, and sustain the intellectual, spiritual, and professional competence of our sisters; (2) the published critical survey of American Catholic intellectual life by Father John Tracy Ellis, a survey whose reverberations are still being felt in educational circles; and (3) the series of five national conferences on some of the most important issues of the day sponsored by Marquette University during its 75th anniversary year now drawing to a close.

It is the latter which I should like to discuss here. Perhaps I should preface my remarks with the acknowledgment that Marquette is my alma mater. This fact may increase the warmth of my enthusiasm for what the school has done this past year. But it does not affect the basic reason for either my enthusiasm or the gratitude which all American Catholics should reveal.

There is, I suppose, a variety of ways in which a university can signalize its jubilee. It can publish histories about its past achievements. It can hire speakers to eulogize itself. It can sponsor fetes and festivals and parties of every description. It can bring in carts of $2 bills and new silver dollars, put them in the hands of students and impress upon the local business community the commercial impact of the university in its midst.

Somehow, none of these methods seem to quite fit the real function of a university, the noble and honorable responsibility of teaching and spreading truth.

Marquette University decided a year ago to "celebrate" its 75th birthday not by looking back at its past performance and not by soliciting praise for its present accomplishments. Instead, the university embarked upon an ambitious and what must have been certainly an expensive project designed to make a substantial addition to the total content of truth in the American political society.

The university has sponsored a series of five 3-day national conferences to support and substantiate its anniversary-year theme: "The pursuit of truth to make men free." The titles of some of these conferences are themselves indicative of the seriousness with which the university takes its obligations to be in fact, as well as in word, "a center of learning":

"From Disorder to World Order"; "Interprofessional Cooperation for the Improvement of Our Health and Welfare"; "Problems of Communication in a Pluralistic Society"; "The Role of the Independent School in American Democracy."

In addition, the school has sponsored a number of other symposia and exhibits dealing with such political and cultural matters as the use of the Fifth Amendment today; contemporary art and music; and assessment of both the tactics and ideology of Communism, mainly from the viewpoint of "experts," refugee-intellectuals from behind the Iron Curtain.

Now, contentwise, these major academic conferences alone would be enough to earn the acclaim and respect of American citizens. At each conference 8 to 10 speakers delivered formal papers on as many aspects of the central theme under consideration. In addition, the university invited from 35 to 40 "discussants" to each of the conferences, paid their traveling and living expenses for the duration of the conference, and asked the discussants for nothing but their critical interest and critical, round-table discussion of the papers read at the meeting.

This is indeed refreshing and intellectually exhilarating. But beyond the immediate

effect of bringing together scholars for 3 days of penetrating discussion of fundamental issues of the day, there will, I think, be a long-term, enduring effect which is bound to produce an added honor and respect for both Marquette and the Church in general.

For the lecturers and discussants invited to Marquette during this past year have included Catholics and non-Catholics alike. If the university accomplished nothing more in its 75th anniversary year than to prove that Catholic and non-Catholic scholars have much to learn from each other, that the barrier between them is too frequently unnecessary and too often based on questionable ground, that the Catholic university is not an academic ghetto protected by the moat of fear and contempt, I say if Marquette did nothing but this it did a great deal.

To the campus at Marquette came great and illustrious scholars from our Catholic colleges and universities: Notre Dame, Georgetown, Catholic University of America, St. Louis University, Loyola of Chicago.

But to the campus also came professors (nationally recognized authorities in their fields) from such schools as Duke, Cornell, Northwestern, Illinois, Minnesota, Indiana, Wisconsin, University of Chicago, Ohio State, Pennsylvania, Johns Hopkins, New York University, Yale, and Harvard.

Early in May, at the university's final conference (on the role of the independent school in the United States), those attending witnessed what must seem scandalous in some Catholic circles: A panel discussion on the partnership of independent and public schools in this country between Msgr. Frederick Hochwalt, director of the education department, National Catholic Welfare Conference; Dr. William G. Carr, executive secretary of the National Education Association; and Dr. Arthur S. Adams, president of the American Council on Education.

All of this is not to suggest that the professors, educators, editors, physicians, lawyers, judges, and Government officials who came to Marquette suppressed their differences and disagreements in a 3-day aura of insipid fellowship. It is only to suggest that (1) the area of agreement on controversial issues is much larger than we suspect or than some of the more violent and inflammatory editors in the Catholic press are willing to admit; and (2) that it is possible for people to disagree without becoming disagreeable and to argue without becoming uncharitable.

It is indeed somewhat surprising, and gratifying, to note the happy and healthy consequences which flow inevitably from a single-minded pursuit of truth. Mutual respect and mutual admiration between Catholics and non-Catholics, despite some basic philosophical differences—these are indeed precious values in an age when suspicion, hatred, and distrust seem to fluorish like a rank undergrowth. It is good to record that a Catholic university led the way this year in enhancing those values.

Mr. Quinn Rides Again

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. B. CARROLL REECE
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 6, 1956

Mr. REECE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, on June 16, 1955, I reviewed the writings of Mr. T. K. Quinn, who has frequently appeared before congressional committees dealing with the problem of monopoly and concentration of economic power—see CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 101, part 7, page 8852.

My only concern with Mr. Quinn's economic theories stemmed from the fact that he has been a frequent witness before congressional committees, where he described himself as a former big business executive. He was supposedly giving the committees of the Congress an inside look behind the scenes. Accordingly, I wanted my colleagues to be in a position to properly evaluate his testimony. Whenever anyone presents proposals for changes in public policy he must expect that they will be revjewed against his previous stated positions. I hold no personal animosity toward Mr. Quinn. My only concern is to protect our economy from unsound proposals.

I stated that Mr. Quinn's present dislike of large corporations arose from the failure of the Monitor Corp., which he formed after World War II. In reviewing his book, entitled "Giant Business: Threat to Democracy—the Autobiography of an Insider," I said:

This book for the first time reveals the basis for his present animosity toward big business. Immediately following the war, Mr. Quinn formed the Monitor Corp. to merchandise and distribute a diversified line of household appliances. The firms from whom he expected to purchase these appliances were unable to obtain sufficient steel, and it was necessary for the Monitor Corp. to be completely reorganized as a result of the failure of its suppliers to deliver appliances to it. I find that it was only after this occurred that Mr. Quinn remembered that he left General Electric 8 years before because of the reasons set forth in "I Quit Monster Business."

Mr. Speaker, the Monitor Corp., headed by Mr. Quinn, was not organized to be a small business. In an advertisement which appeared in the Saturday Evening Post of November 17, 1945, the Monitor Corp. described itself as "Sixty men and—the boy in the 7-league boots." "They selected not just one plant to build a whole line, but 24 plants each particularly suited to make one appliance.—They enlisted not just 1 but 24 research staffs, comprising a total of 148 engineers." The advertisement also stressed that the 24 plants employed 32,000 workers.

Fortune magazine in its issue of October 1945 described the formation of the Monitor Corp. as follows:

Next month a double-page 4-color splash in the Saturday Evening Post will signalize the launching of a new type of enterprise into the home-appliance field—a distributors' cooperative marketing a line of appliances produced to their order by 30 anonymous manufacturers. Whatever the venture's fate, it will add another lively episode to the history of its volatile organizer, Theodore Kinget Quinn, man of enthusiams, onetime youngest vice president of General Electric, erstwhile director-general of WPB's labor-management production drive (p. 279).

Last December Quinn announced the formation of Monitor Equipment Corp., to be served by Quinn as president and to be owned in equal parts by 60 home-appliance distributors. The company will sell, under the brand name Monitor, a new high-quality line of appliances complete from refrigerators to steam irons, from toasters to television sets, supplied under contract by a number of medium-sized manufacturers. The 60 participants whose combined territories blanket the United States include many for whom the word Monitor has pleasant associations: former General Electric distributors Rex Cole, of New York; L. H. Bennett, of San Francisco; L. H. Driscoll, of Charlotte; Beckett Electric, of Dallas. Quinn confidently predicts a sales volume of more than $100 million. His own hold on the project is insured through 51 percent stock ownership of T. K. Quinn Co., management consultants, to whom Monitor will pay one-half of 1 percent of the distributors' purchases for 20 years (p. 280).

Certainly Mr. Quinn expected to be operating a big business. According to Fortune, the T. K. Quinn Co.,, of which 51 percent was owned by Mr. Quinn, was to receive one-half of 1 percent of the distributors' purchases for 20 years. If a sales volume of $100 million had been achieved, Mr. Quinn's annual personal income, according to the Fortune article, would have been $255,000. The failure of the Monitor Corp. and the loss of this anticipated income, I still maintain, is responsible for Mr. Quinn's repeated attacks on not only big business, but our entire social structure.

In the Fortune story on the formation of the Monitor Corp., the article also said of Mr. Quinn:

Quinn, the economist, assails existing antitrust legislation as "mental windmills of outmoded competition" thoughtlessly designed to "prevent our economy from evolving naturally," and defends the "self-regulation" of industry as most important to the public interest. He talks a great deal about teamwork, fair dealing, and goodwill, and he is convinced all men must avoid hasty conclusions (p. 280).

Mr. Quinn's present insistence that the antitrust laws must be rewritten to curb big business obviously represents a complete change from the position he took when he wrote "Liberty, Employment, and No More Wars."

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Quinn has just written a new book entitled "Giant Corporations—Challenge to Freedom" published by the Exposition Press. Mr. Edward Uhlan, the president of the Exposition Press, Inc., in the publisher's foreword to Mr. Quinn's latest book said:

A publisher can judge books; he cannot stand in judgment of issues. But as Mr. Quinn's publisher and editorial adviser, I have become involved and find myself identified with the cause that he espouses. T. K. Quinn, an unusual combination of scholar and practical businessman who has observed and participated officially in the workings of both very large and small operations from the inside, is recognized as America's most knowledgeable critic of giant business and is an outstanding champion of the independents. Like any ardent critic who writes from a deep faith in the American way, he has become a controversial figure because of his forthrightness, penetrating analyses, and especially his definite proposals to create greater free enterprise for the many as distinguished from the few.

Later attacks have centered around Congressman CARROLL REECE, former chairman of the Republican National Committee, who undertook to show that Mr. Quinn had tried to profit personally from wartime associations. This charge was based on old allegations of Congressman Jerry Voorhis of California, who later reexamined the evidence, declared frankly the information was false, withdrew the accusations, and publicly commended Mr. Quinn and his work. Mr. Reece's

subsequent vague charge that Mr. Quinn has been "inconsistent"—that statements in a book written many years ago contradict his present position—were answered both in later committee testimony and in a direct reply printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—though opponents still quote only the original charges (pp. 7–8).

Mr. Speaker, I have reviewed the direct reply by Mr. Quinn to my detailed documented review of his writings which appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of July 28, 1955. Mr. Quinn supplies no information in his statement to refute any of the quotations which I used from his first book Liberty, Employment, and No More Wars." He supplied 4 quotations, 3 paragraphs from 1 chapter, and the fourth from another, which in no way refute the many quotations I inserted which were taken from numerous chapters in his several books.

Mr. Speaker, specifically Mr. Quinn in his book Liberty, Employment, and No More Wars said:

Monopoly was seen to be an evil and as an antidote the antitrust laws were passed to enshrine the old competitive order and fix it on the future, regardless of growth, progress, or evolution. Then natural law proceeded to make cynical jokes of our man-made antitrust laws. Within the past 40 years there has been a veritable slaughter of small-independent business men. Corporations and combinations of them have grown by leaps and bounds, until the independent is the exception and the huge organization is the rule. Officially we have not yet recognized the immutability of the natural law. Instead, we continue to fight it, superficially and hopelessly, of course; but the fight is kept up at tremendous and useless, legal expense. I hasten to say that it is not all wasted. Some combinations and artificial price-boosting agreements and practices are clearly antisocial, as mere forms of commercial larceny. But the overall trend toward big business within limits which have not yet been set, and a constantly higher and further division of labor means lower factory costs and is inevitable in the progress of civilization. The fact that we have badly handled the accompanying social developments does not change, one whit, the inevitable trend (pp. 85–86).

When we speak of the United States, its resources, abilities and accomplishments, then Ford, General Electric, General Motors, A. T. & T., U. S. Steel, Dupont, et cetera, are sources of American pride and strength as much as our great battleships, the George Washington and Golden Gate Bridges, the Smithsonian Institution, or the Merritt Parkway. They are a part of this great country. Where would we be in this war without them?

Our "Sherman Antitrust Act" and the "Clayton law" were belated attempts to enforce the old competition. Both Federal laws were based upon the assumption that competition was still the beneficent force that it was in the early days of industrial development. Their authors saw competition vanishing before cooperation and consolidation and attempted by legal enactment to resurrect and revitalize it. They sought to break up trusts and combinations by law, as if legal enactments could change natural, economic laws. By prosecution and persecution industries may indeed be destroyed, the whole Nation may be plunged into disaster, but the old rugged individualism and unrestricted competition cannot be restored in this new age (pp. 83–84).

These statements are so completely at variance with the theme of his new book that once again I shall set the record straight.

In Liberty, Employment, and No More Wars Mr. Quinn stated the trend toward big business was inevitable—that it could not be changed by legislative action. In Giant Corporations Mr. Quinn takes a diametrically opposite position. He says:

To the confirmed evolutionist, elephantine organization is an inevitable, unavoidable development incident to the machine age. Karl Marx considered it a collectivism that would captivate mankind. And to the extent that we have accepted his doctrine, he has appeared to be a prophet. The advocates of mergers, combinations and superorganizations, not their opponents, are following in the philosophic footsteps of the father of communism. We see in the development of mass forces a gravity impact that is sacrificing individuality in favor of material welfare and an illusory security. Noble-spirited thinkers and writers like Thoreau and Emerson and the liberal-minded of our time uphold the human and spiritual values of the individual against super organization. They would have us take hold of organization and mechanization and make the white elephants subordinate to, rather than masters of, spiritual man. They would say with Samuel Johnson, "Sir, I know my will is free." The practical question, then, is whether or not we choose to accept the doctrine of inevitability and with it the continuing reign of constantly bigger and bigger elephants or, on the other hand, to force them under the control of the people, where they belong (pp. 191–192).

Mr. Quinn denies that he is a Socialist, but yet repeatedly suggests socialist solutions to industrial problems. In Giant Corporations he says:

The expression "creeping socialism" can be used in such a way so often that we come to assume without the slightest warrant that there is something wrong or dangerous in it. It can be used by backward, selfish men to stop health insurance or the public building of roads or schools. The truth becomes lost in the propaganda campaign. I am not a socialist, but if I am forced to choose between government by a few, private, giant businesses, economic rulers with selfish, often shortsighted motives, on the one hand, and democratic socialism on the other, I shall unhesitatingly choose the latter, under which at least I have an effective vote (pp. 98–99).

Mr. Quinn proposes that the Government should enter into any business field in order to promote inventions. He says:

The cost of securing a patent, the long time required, the need to secure financing and to build an organization to produce and market the product and the cost of defending the patent against able lawyers, most of whom represent the big companies, is quite beyond the ability and means of the individual inventor.

Still, as we have seen, he is the one most likely to have original, basic ideas. We have come now to the point where the Government itself must establish means of encouraging the independent inventor. A Federal agency could undertake the responsibility, as agent of the inventor, to ascertain the value of the invention and then to see that remunerative licenses are issued to avoid monopoly and at the same time to compensate the inventor fairly. When necessary, in unusual circumstances the agency could be empowered to launch the product itself. Its power to do so would make the exercise of the power unnecessary in 99 percent of the cases, perhaps all of them. In answer to those who may raise the cry of socialism against this suggestion we should ask: What else can be done? Must we stand by and witness the further suffocation of American creative ability (pp. 178–179)?

Mr. Speaker, certainly if we establish a Federal agency to ascertain the value of inventions and then engage in the production of new products as Mr. Quinn proposes, we will have embarked upon socialism with a vengeance.

The above quotation is not the only instance in his new book Giant Corporations—Challenge to Freedom, in which Mr. Quinn proposes the Government enter into competition with private business. He believes that the Government has a responsibility to promote full employment. He says:

Government insistence on full employment is about the strongest force we have to prevent monopolies from holding prices up to the point at which production may be dangerously restricted and the machinery of business slowed down, although we suffer now more from over- than from underproduction. Let the Government stand by ready to go into business, any and every business, that may be necessary to maintain full employment, or at least to provide somehow the indispensable purchasing power. Shorter work hours will follow if they become practical and the retirement and pensioning of the senior citizens sooner is indicated in the interests of a wholesome economy. The only danger then would come from inflation, because the Government would have to borrow for the purpose and the debt, credit, and money supply could get out of hand (p. 122).

This too, is socialism and nothing else. Mr. Quinn's statement that the credit and money supply could get out of hand is the understatement of the year.

Mr. Quinn objects to programs to keep subversives from working in defense plants. He said:

There are many instances now of private corporations performing work on Government contracts for war material. Tens of billions of dollars are necessarily going into guns and tanks and planes. Where the work is of a secret nature, a new and strange personnel situation is created. Private corporations are assuming the authority to determine whether or not employees are loyal to the country. When an employee is discharged for disloyalty or because he pleads the fifth amendment, the employer assumes a political role that may deprive the employee of his livelihood and of his civil rights in direct violation of the Constitution of the United States. It is wrong and it is illegal, but it is being done. Only by a public court trial may an American citizen be found legally guilty of disloyalty to the country. He is within his constitutional rights if he pleads the fifth amendment or any other law of the land, despite any inferences or assumptions that may be drawn. Any lesser treatment is a feudalistic type of inquisition, however popular it may be momentarily. The corporation is not necessarily at fault. The point is that our society has so developed that the system itself assumes feudalistic characteristics and the individual tends to become inconsequential. His rights are lost in huge organizations in which numbers rather than individuals count (p. 105).

Mr. Speaker, keeping subversives and spies out of defense plants does not violate the constitutional rights of anyone. Throughout the operation of our security program no individual has been convicted of disloyalty by a private em-

ployer as Mr. Quinn suggests. Most unions, employers, and fair-minded citizens agree that the national security demands the exclusion of any security risk from a sensitive defense plant.

Mr. Quinn believes that the antitrust laws have not been properly enforced under the present administration. He says:

It is scarcely coincidental that under the present 1952–56 administration there have been a minimum of vigorous prosecutions under the antitrust laws (p. 122).

Many students of the antitrust laws, who have no reason to praise the record of the present administration, disagree with Mr. Quinn. Judge Stanley Barnes, who is retiring as the Assistant Attorney General in charge of the Antitrust Division of the Department of Justice, has aggressively enforced the antitrust laws. Our colleague, the distinguished gentleman from New York, Mr. CELLER, who is the chairman of the House Judiciary Committee, said:

I have been in Washington many years and have followed the activities of the Antitrust Division of the Department of Justice most assiduously. I know of no one who has given so much of his effort and so effectively to the work of that Department as Judge Barnes.

Our colleague, the distinguished gentleman from Texas, Mr. PATMAN, who is chairman of the House Small Business Committee, said:

I have been impressed with the type of effort he has put forth * * * and I hope that he is successful in what he is trying to do.

In the other body, the distinguished senior Senator from Illinois, PAUL H. DOUGLAS, said:

I have a very real respect for him, and I think he is one of the best officials in the present administration.

Our former colleague, the distinguished junior Senator from Alabama, JOHN SPARKMAN, who is chairman of the Senate Small Business Committee, said to him:

I think you and your Division are doing a very fine job.

Thurman Arnold, the Assistant Attorney General in charge of the Antitrust Division during the New Deal years, said:

I have watched some of the cases he has brought, and I have been very much impressed with his integrity and his vigor in antitrust enforcement.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that the statements by Members of Congress and Thurman Arnold are more representative of the effectiveness of the prosecution of the antitrust laws under this administration than the opinions of Mr. Quinn.

Mr. Quinn believes that the whole world is out of step and only the liberals are right. This insight into his approach to the complex problems of our industrial society is afforded by his comments on the objectivity of the press. He is opposed to one-sided presentations of any subject. He believes that "the other side" and the truth may be found in the left-wing press. He said:

We should look with suspicion upon every one-sided presentation of any subject. For "the other side" and the truth about vital public questions, I have found invaluable over a period of many years such publications as the Progressive, the New Leader, the New Republic, the Nation, and the Reporter. Significantly, these publications carry a minimum amount of advertising. Their editorial policies are not for sale to anyone, but this freedom is purchased at a price which may make it financially difficult for them to continue (pp. 132–133).

I believe it will help my colleagues to evaluate Mr. Quinn's proposals if they know that "the truth" is what the editors of the New Leader, the New Republic, the Nation, and the Reporter say it is.

Mr. Quinn is fighting to turn the clock back to a simpler society without any impersonal complex organizations. I am sympathetic with his desire to achieve better communication between management and workers and between the various levels of management, itself. However, the problems of communication are just as serious in a $50 million business as they are in a billion dollar business. Fortunately, great progress has been made in integrating management and the worker into a harmonious whole in our large corporations. Mr. Quinn, himself, in Liberty, Employment, and No More Wars said:

Our large corporations have worked out better than Government, practical ways and means of getting men to work together in a common cause. Indeed, they have done such a good job of it that human adjustments, an equilibrium of desires and loyalties beyond anything attained by Government have been achieved by private industry (p. 83).

Mr. Speaker, let me contrast this statement with the following which is taken from his new book, Giant Corporations—Challenge to Freedom:

The pressure is on each one to stay where he is, however hopeless his prospects, and to dry up, if necessary, as somebody's man—the corporations,' the Government's, or the Army's. This is what modern giant organization is doing to the individual—making of him a supine dependent whose outlet, like the serf's, too easily becomes self-indulgence. Human nature learns to accept or tolerate failure that each one can charge to himself, but failure chargeable to others who may not even be identifiable can never be accepted by men of spirit (p. 106).

If we are to operate with the only kind of economy which will produce the weapons to maintain our military strength against the Communists, we must maintain large organizations including organized groups within the Government and within the Army, to which Mr. Quinn also seems to take exception. His aversion toward organizations is so great that he says:

Any comparison between the way we do things in this country and the way they are done in Russia may be quite unpopular just now. But the plain truth is that there is little, if any, difference organizationally between Russian economic totalitarianism and economic totalitarianism of General Motors or the United States Steel Corporation (p. 97).

General Motors and the United States Steel Co. undoubtedly have their faults, but the difference between them and Russian economic totalitarianism is so great that very few would venture such a comparison. American corporations must deal with independent unions. They are in competition with other firms in the same industry and with other industries for the consumer's favor, and the Government, through the antitrust laws, prevents them from enjoying a monopoly. The management of any American corporation must act as a trustee for the interests of the stockholders, the consumer, and the employees. Any of these groups are free to bring pressure to bear upon the management and each of them has access to the Government. In Russia, the steel trust and the automobile trust are the government. Mr. Quinn's comparison shows how far he has been carried away by his emotional antipathy toward big business since 1945.

Mr. Quinn attacks the system of industrial development which has made this country great in which the manufacturer of a complex industrial product, the prime contractor, uses countless subcontractors to manufacture parts within their capabilities. He says:

Now, it happens that the reputation for quality, performance, and service of almost all completed products is made up of many parts, elements, and contributing services. A producer of piston rings, for example, for an automobile manufacturer loses his identity in the completed end product. Although he contributes proportionately to the final product, he never shares in its reputation. He may devote years of creative work to the production of the best piston rings imaginable and still remain always in the precarious position of being wholly at the mercy of the will or whim of the end product assembler—who, in the case of defense products for the Government, is called the prime contractor. The parts or subcontracting manufacturer does not participate as a part owner of the reputation of the completed product to which he contributes. The plus value which he helped to create is lost to him. Because he has no known identity, he is liable to be forced out of business or taken over at any time by the buyer of his parts product. As the number of potential buyers decrease (it is down to six in the automobile industry) the chances for any parts producer to sell to others diminishes. Moreover, the requirements of giant manufacturers—that is, assemblers of completed products—are so great in volume that the small-parts manufacturer tends to concentrate on the business of one primary company. Increasingly, therefore, he is at the mercy of his one big customer. The result is that the big buyer, not the small supplier, dictates the price and the specifications. They can be so difficult or impossible to meet that the little fellow is driven out of business or forced to merge or sell out to his big buyer at a sacrifice price. Under such conditions, without governmental regulations, the tendency is for the big fellow to get bigger and the little fellow smaller, if he lives at all. The fault in the arrangement is that the big fellow is always in the dominant position and he is permitted legally to grab the plus values, which belong, in proportion, as much to the suppliers as to him (pp. 155–156).

In the first place, the prime contractor must be responsible for maintaining exacting production standards, to which Mr. Quinn objects, as it is his responsibility to see that the parts supplied by the several subcontractors assemble into a satisfactory end product. The facts completely belie Mr. Quinn's thesis that the producer of components is at the mercy of the prime contractor. He specifically cited the manufacture of automobile piston rings. It so happens that most of the piston rings used on Ameri-

can cars are manufactured by one of the smaller companies, the Perfect Circle Co., with total assets of less than $20 million. This company, small thought it be, through aggressive engineering and high quality of product, has maintained its integrity and independence. There is still ample opportunity for the subcontractor who can deliver the goods and do a satisfactory job.

Mr. Quinn proposes a graduated corporate income tax in order to encourage the distintegration of large companies. He says:

If an average of 52 percent on corporate profits is required for revenue, there is no good reason of policy why corporation tax rates should not be graduated. They could be as low as 10 percent on $10,000 of gross profit and as high as 75 percent when gross profits exceed a billion dollars. The 75 percent rate would of course bring a storm of protest from a score or so of giant corporations, because it would result in a decentralization move, which is exactly what we want. The Frigidaire Division of General Motors, for example, could easily become a separate corporation, as it should be, since there is no relation between automobiles and electrical home appliances. The separation would be accomplished by the incorporation of Frigidaire and the separation of the book value of the investment in this division. Shares in the new company would then be distributed to present shareholders of General Motors in proportion to the book value of their holdings. In this same way the trucking business, coach business, diesel-engine business, etc., could easily be decentralized without damage to anyone, except those who wish to hold intact the predominant market and capital power of monster General Motors, regardless of the effect on the country. United States Steel could thus be decentralized into dozens of separate companies and the opposition of the Attorney General to the proposed Bethlehem-Youngstown and other steel mergers would begin to make sense. In this same way other giant corporations could be separated into several companies without fragmentizing them or damaging any property right (pp. 170–171).

The difficulty with this proposal is that a profit of $1 million in some lines might represent monopoly profits, and in others, where the capital investment per worker is higher, might represent a totally inadequate return.

Mr. Quinn categorically states that there is no relation between automobiles and electrical home appliances. Therefore, any company which happens to make both should have these functions divorced. It is true the two products are not made on the same assembly line, but both manufacturing operations draw on the same fund of scientific and engineering knowledge. Mr Quinn says:

General Motors is much too big and powerful. The fact that its management personnel are attractive men, socially minded, according to their lights, is beside the point. The corporation should certainly be restricted to the automobile industry and then further decentralized if we are to maintain a healthy economy and check our totalitarian trend (p. 182).

Mr. Quinn's efforts to restrict firms to a single industry would make it impossible for companies to operate the vast new technical centers which hold such promise for our future economic development. What is more important, they are a necessity in the race for military supremacy with the Soviets.

Since the war American industry has invested billions in new research facilities. According to Mr. Quinn, these are probably unnecessary. He says:

Mr. Slichter's confidence in the creative ability of the giant corporations appears unlimited. I wonder how he would explain the fact that in the electrical-appliance business, to which he refers, not a single product now in use—refrigerators, lamps, washing machines, vacuum cleaners, fans, irons, broilers, ranges, shavers, mixers, etc.—36 in all, was ever created or invented by any of the giant corporations in that field—General Motors, General Electric, or Westinghouse. What has Mr. Slichter to say about this? Mr. H. Stafford Hatfield in his excellent book The Inventor and His World states, "It is frequently said * * * that advance in the future will come exclusively from the magnificently equipped research laboratories of the great trusts and corporations. There is no evidence of this except the ipse dixit of the corporations themselves." Mr. Hatfield lists the following inventions which have not come from great research laboratories but from the independent work of individuals—monotype, casehardening of steel, photogravure, moving pictures, the dial telephone, the diesel engine, carborundum, the telegraph and telephone, electric train control, the submarine, the safety razor, the airplane, bakelite, the gyrocompass. "The very latest example of the victory of individualism in invention," he adds, "is television, worked out by a young Scotsman with the slenderest resources in a cellar in Soho" (pp. 68–69).

I do not doubt that it is possible to design washing machines, vacuum cleaners, fans, and irons without technical centers. However, the fundamental knowledge necessary to produce guided missiles, nuclear weapons, and the electronic equipment for our aircraft warning systems can only be produced with the assistance of the best research facilities industry can secure. To be sure, the individual scientist will always be the key to each new development, but he no longer can operate in isolation. The engineering work behind the development of the H-bomb by DuPont required a series of more than 2 million blueprints. A new jet interceptor now being designed requires more than 370 engineers working on the drawings for just that 1 plane. In 1940 a typical fighter plane required only 17,000 engineering man-hours. Today a modern fighter requires 1,400,000 engineering man-hours. The planes that will be flying in 1960 will require more than 2 million engineering man-hours to design. The computations necessary to design modern aircraft require electronic computers which can make literally thousands of computations in a second. The rental cost on these machines, I am told, is $40,000 a month. These are the reasons why technical centers are necessary.

Recently a great new technical center was dedicated by the General Motors Corp. in Detroit. The research activities of this corporation have already had an impact far beyond the motor vehicle. It developed the first successful mechanical heart which will save the lives of many patients where heart surgery is necessary. It produced the new centrifilmer for purifying vaccines such as the Salk vaccine. If we followed Mr. Quinn's premise that this organization should confine its efforts to automobiles, these humanitarian projects would not have been undertaken.

President Eisenhower participated in the dedication of this great research center. He said:

It is truly an honor to participate with you today in this dedication of this new and great research center of America. It is a new adventure for frontiersmen. The history of America is a history of frontiers, and each frontier has been a challenge to Americans to dare more, to do more, to go forward faster and on a broader front.

We had geographical frontiers; always lying out there in the West and the Appalachians, challenging every person that was an inhabitant of those first Thirteen Colonies. And so we had Lewis and Clark, and Pike, and all the rest opening up that great country. Even today some of those frontiers still remain. And we have great and gallant Americans exploring the Antarctic and the Arctic. Always a frontier—the challenge—and the response.

We had our economic frontiers. We started as a Nation of small farms and little shops when the fur trade was in its infancy. And we learned about the gold in California; we learned about the great expanse of the West where we could raise cattle and produce our food. Frontiersmen went into them. We built roads and railroads to open up all those lands. Inventors came along and we had great machines to meet our needs. And so we had the great economic revolution of the 19th and 20th centuries that has so changed our lives.

We were a Nation of political frontiersmen. The reason that today we so admire Franklin and Washington and Patrick Henry—Jefferson, Lincoln, is because they dared to think new thoughts about the way that men should govern themselves—the institutions and the procedures they should set up—and devised a scheme that has stood the test of time and has met our need for progress, with men enjoying equal justice, rights, and the great opportunities.

So it might be said that the frontiersman is symbolic of the United States. General Motors was founded by frontiersmen, people who were not satisfied with what we had and were determined to make it possible for men to travel faster and better and in greater comfort. Among those frontiersmen, two of your greatest were, of course, Alfred Sloan, Jr., and Mr. Kettering. Their accomplishments were so great in the technological field that today their names are household words in our country. Even though they have at least partially laid aside their work in that regard, they are still frontiersmen, showing us all how duties and citizenship can better be performed, how men can better discharge their duties in this country as citizens.

Here with me today is another frontiersman. I have just had lunch with him—the President of the great country of Indonesia. America is honored that President Sukarno has come to visit us. He wants to see, among other things, this great research center you are establishing, and he is going to visit you on May 28.

This particular center is a place for leadership in furthering new attacks on the technological frontier. Beyond that frontier lie better and fuller employment, opportunities for people to demonstrate yet again the value of a system based on the dignity of the human being, and on their free opportunities in life. Beyond it lie people, better capable of working with others and so that they may share what they learn with our friends in the world.

We hope that we will be fortunate enough to be able to give President Sukarno something that he may carry to his people. We would be very proud indeed if he should find something here worthwhile carrying back.

So in this technological center, we have this development of new machines responding in their efficiency to the constantly inquiring mind of the technician, that they in turn will produce yet broader freedoms and richer dignity for human beings, more rewarding lives, for all America and we hope through all the world.

Mr. Speaker, on previous occasions I have expressed my concern with the misuse in United Nations debates of statements made for political purposes within the United States. The Communist bloc in the United Nations assiduously read every attack upon our Government and our business institutions. The May 26, 1956, issue of the Nation carried an article by Mr. Quinn entitled "Sovereign State of GM, World's Biggest Corporation." He attempts to identify General Motors with the Eisenhower administration. He says, "The corporation has had three of its representatives in President Eisenhower's Cabinet." I presume that the three Cabinet members to whom Mr. Quinn refers are Secretary of Defense Wilson, the Postmaster General, Arthur Summerfield, and the former Secretary of the Interior, Douglas McKay. In order to set the record straight, it should be pointed out that Secretary McKay and Postmaster General Summerfield never worked for General Motors, but were automobile dealers. The theme of Mr. Quinn's article Sovereign State of GM was that the corporation and its dealers were at odds with one another. If that is so, it is difficult to see how the presence of two General Motors dealers in the Cabinet could be of advantage to General Motors. Mr. Quinn can't have it both ways.

My particular concern with the article in the Nation is the following statement: "GM constitutes a privately-owned economic world state empowered to make agreements with foreign governments and interests which the political state that chartered it could not legally make." Mr. Speaker, this statement will be thrown back at us in the debates within the United Nations to embarrass us. If we are to expand foreign investment and to lift the burdens of foreign aid from the backs of the American taxpayer, we must encourage foreign investment by American business. The Congress has ample power to deal with any American corporation which may make any agreement with a foreign government contrary to national policy. It is true that when the Federal Government was formed the States relinquished their authority to conduct foreign relations. Private corporations are not conducting the foreign relations of the States which chartered them nor of the Federal Government. They are engaging in worldwide commercial transactions which must be carried on by private corporation unless we wish to see the Federal Government engage in State trading. Again, Mr. Speaker, such a course would be socialism to which I am unalterably opposed.

Mr. Speaker, the Congress has a responsibility to secure the benefits of big business for all of our citizens without condoning abuses of economic power which may restrict the opportunity of anyone. We must constantly review all of the laws to make sure that we retain the good and reject the bad. This cannot be done with a meat ax which would destroy the technological base of our modern society. Whatever is evil must be exorcized with a scalpel. The task before the Congress requires the knowledge and skill of the surgeon, not the approach of a butcher.

Failures of the Nasser Regime

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 29, 1956

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the following article, which appeared in the May 3, 1956, issue of the Reporter makes interesting reading:

EGYPT: POTEMKIN VILLAGE ON THE NILE

(By Hal Lehrman)

When Col. Gamal Abdel Nasser and his colleagues seized power in July 1952, Egypt's vital statistics read in large part like the Ten Plagues: 96.5 percent of its land was uninhabitable desert; the population density was 1,600 persons per square mile; a single cultivated acre had to feed and maintain 3.6 human beings; the national per capita income was $100 annually; the illiteracy rate was more than 82 percent; the average life expectancy at birth was 30 years. Foreign observers were acutely aware of these conditions. Nasser did not have to perform prodigies of efficiency to acquire a reputation abroad. He needed only to confront Egypt's vast misery, firmly announce his intention to make it vanish, and then begin chipping away. This he has done—and the reputation has followed.

Perhaps the most attractive aspects of the Nasser regime, in the eyes of foreign beholders, are its honesty, youth, and energy. Under King Farouk the royal administration, high and low, functioned according to the classic Oriental system of baksheesh. Politics was a perpetual competition among old-line parties and the old men who headed them. Intrigue and maneuver left little energy for problems of national welfare. The junta has undeniably swept this apathy and corruption away, along with the political parties in which they festered. Youth now stands at the controls: Most Cabinet Ministers are under 40.

Non-Egyptian witnesses have appreciated the contrast between Nasser vitality and Farouk torpidity. Perhaps influenced by a desire to see a healthy, stable, productive Egypt, western reporters have tended to minimize mistakes and aberrations or even not notice them—and magnify the achievements.

The result has been a sterotyped image, widely imprinted. Critical readers this side of the map may feel a recurrent irritation over the military junta's behavior in foreign policy. But on internal policy there is nearly universal acceptance of the notion that the junta is progressive and reformist, a paragon of efficiency and sound intentions.

ROBOTS ON DISPLAY

Every newly arrived foreign correspondent in Cairo is strenuously invited to visit Liberation Province, a stretch of reclaimed wasteland off the road to Alexandria, about 55 miles northeast of the capital. Fellahin who once were landless serfs of Nile feudalism have been settled there as independent farmers in spick-and-span new villages. The area is officially described as a pilot project—the beginning of a large-scale program.

It is administered by an autonomous board directly responsible to the cabinet. Each village has been endowed with a multipurpose cooperative managed by functionaries representing the central regional directorate. The cooperatives are staffed with Government technicians, financed with Government funds, and equipped with Government-supplied machinery which is operated by hired crews from outside. Every fellah is inscribed as a member of the local cooperative and assigned a 5-acre interest. But all the land of the village is considered a single farm, its occupants "one family and one hand."

The visitor finds some 600 families established in conditions that are clearly superior to their former destitution. Agents of a central governing board are busy looking after the inhabitants' every need. The happy peasants wear neat government-issue clothing. The wives are even being lectured on birth control, and husbands are discouraged from arbitrarily divorcing wornout wives and acquiring fresh ones—an attack on the prime Egyptian curse of overpopulation.

But closer inspection reveals a pervasive authoritarian tone. Small families are obligatory. According to some of the local farmers we talked with, parents are told, informally but firmly, that more than three offspring will mean expulsion. The free clothes are uniforms—one color for males, another for females. The cooperatives do more than help the new proprietor; they very nearly make him superfluous. They do everything for him, from providing seed and fertilizer and cultivating the soil to harvesting and marketing his crop.

The new enterprise is unable even to meet expenses of current operations as long as it must provide income for idle farmers. (The management now hopes, by introducing tomato canneries, sugar-beet refining plants, and other small industries, to squeeze extra income out of the crops.) At short range, Liberation Province ceases to be a pilot project, since its multiplication, in its present form at least, would be ruinous to the national economy. It becomes instead, a Potemkin village.

AGRARIAN REFORM

Land reform is another triumph claimed for the junta. Government brochures give the impression that a nationwide agrarian revolution is underway. All royal estates have been confiscated and, one is assured every square inch of ground owned by other landholders in excess of some 200 acres each has been expropriated for distribution to the land-starved masses. To prove it, the visitor is conducted to a village where a former large estate is now segmented into many little pieces. He duly notes that the new smallholders have groceries on their shelves, unpatched clothes on their backs, perhaps even a radio in the house or a bicycle at the door. Certainly nothing like that existed in Farouk's day. But how typical or widespread is this progress?

The highest estimate, by the most optimistic government spokesmen, of the amount of land ultimately to be distributed under the agrarian reform is 600,000 acres. But even this figure is only about 10 percent of all the cultivated land in Egypt.

Furthermore, only 250,000 acres had been parceled out by the end of 1955 after 3 years of fanfare. It is going to take the junta another year just to finish requisitioning the estates, to say nothing of their redivision.

Land reform in backward countries is a notoriously slow proces. So it may seem unfair to condemn Nasser for not having settled everything in 3 years. But should he be applauded for dragging his feet when

nothing prevents him from lifting them, and when he boasts that his new reforms are already fundamental? At best, Egypt simply does not have enough arable land for its people. But agrarian experts point out that a limit of 100 acres on the size of estates might have made a genuine difference to Egypt's peasantry, and would have been just as practical politically as the innocuous 200-acre limit at which the junta halted. Left with 200 Nile acres—among the most fertile in the world—each of the pashes against whom the regime has raled so virtuously remains very comfortably a pasha. Besides, even the 200-acre limit is largely a hoax. If the pasha has sons, the law enables him to hold on to 300 acres. He has been allowed to sell off his excess acreage privately before requisition—sometimes becoming a concealed owned by sale to his own impoverished tenants. It is even possible to obtain massive exemptions from the legal limit by promising to begin large industrial-crop or reclamation projects.

Furthermore, the demand for labor on shrunken estates has gone down faster than the supply of laborers who have not received land and who therefore still need to hire themselves out. Farmhands complained to this writer that the pasha in their vicinity had been able to cut wages as much as 50 percent because of the increased competition for jobs.

The big winner in the agrarian reform is the state itself. Every new owner works off his obligation by making 30 annual payments to the High Committee for Land Reform, which supervises the program. This rent adds up to twice the initial market value of his property. Part of the money goes to the expropriated owner as compensation. The remainder is held by the Committee. The official explanation is that these funds are required to meet "administrative expenses." One would expect them to stay at a steady low level because of constant and prompt disbursement. Instead, the Committee's account in the National Bank of Egypt has been steadily climbing.

A final, and at long range perhaps the most serious flaw, is the regime's failure to use the agrarian reform as an opportunity to attempt at least a beginning in the training of a self-reliant peasantry. More than 160 cooperatives are already functioning; a total of 400 is projected. These can be justified as an essential aid to ignorant, impoverished people who would be helpless if they had to make their way from the start without assistance. But when these people are left permanently dependent on imported government crews and machines, they are likely to be as helpless as ever if the aid should cease. Like his robot counterpart in reclaimed Liberation Province, the so-called independent farmer on redistributed land gets little chance to display initiative or even to learn.

STEEL AND SHIFTING SANDS

Another major exhibit for foreign approval is a giant steel mill now under construction near Helwan below Cairo. By the middle of 1957, according to official claims, this plant will be producing 220,000 tons annually, which would replace two-thirds of the steel now imported. The officials do not mention that this domestic steel will cost Egypt three times as much as foreign steel.

Farouk can claim the dubious credit for the idea of putting Egypt into the steel business. Back in 1937 it was decided that since iron ore existed at Aswin in the south, a steel mill should be built there. Designs for an Aswan plant piled up—until after several years it occurred to the planners that Aswan was an expensively remote point to which to bring fuel. Accordingly, the site was moved much farther north to Helwan. Iron ore from Aswan and coke brought in from abroad would be delivered to Helwan by Nile barge. But building was delayed for a few years more while still a third site was debated: Kosseir, with important deposits of iron and an advantageous location on the Red Sea, permitting large reduction of freight charges (which make up five-eighths of the cost of coke to Egypt). Meanwhile, German-delivered machinery had been rusting on the sands for a decade.

When the junta came to power it resolutely reverted to the Helwan location. There is no guaranty that the mill—construction costs of which have been increasing inexorably—will really be completed this time. But if it is, it will operate with ore mined in uneconomically thin layers, at an expensive depth, extravagantly far away from the place where it is to be processed, and with coke hauled from abroad at crippling freight rates. The Nasser government, however, will have in its helmet the bright feather of industrializing the country.

PIE IN THE SKY

What about the dynamism that makes the junta so impressive?

To attack illiteracy, disease, and general backwardness, the régime has launched a combined service unit program which is to erect a school, clinic, workshop, and community hall under 1 roof in 800 villages. But the few units constructed to date are extravagantly lavish. It has been estimated that three-fourths of the limited funds thus squandered might have been better employed in the training of technicians, of whom Egypt has a chronic shortage.

Like other countries with a narrowly based agricultural economy, the new Egypt sees a panacea in industrialization. But planning for it tends to be irrational. An imposing hydroelectric plant at the low Aswan Dam, one of the major completed projects of this planning, is already beginning to look like a white elephant. To begin with, more than $2 million was lost when construction was begun at one site and then abandoned. Now the machinery has been installed—but some 700 miles of transmission lines must be strung northward from Aswan before the power will be available to population centers now without electricity (or income to pay for it) and to industrial clients. But, apart from a new fertilizer plant at Helwan, the industry the new power supply must serve in order to be economically justifiable does not exist—and neither does the capital with which to begin creating this industry.

An important potential source of investment in the industrialization Nasser passionately desires is private capital, domestic and foreign. Yet his regime paralyzes such prospective investors by a contrary policy of red-hot nationalism and finger-in-the-pie economic controls.

Business establishments are being compelled to discharge most (non-Moslem) local employees because they lack Egyptian nationality. Because the ranks of Egyptian elite workers and professionals are thin, employers must fill vacancies with second- and third-raters. Further, the Government has powers to confiscate properties without appeal. It issues decrees which oblige companies to retire directors at 60, insist that their replacements have regime approval, and make the presence of a state agent mandatory at board meetings.

Part of the motivation behind the land reform was a desire to maneuver the agrarian rich into becoming industrial investors, but they are holding onto any expropriation money they get, or else they are putting it into nonproductive real estate, because there is no rent ceiling on new structures. Hence the rash of building in Cairo which gives a spurious impression of prosperity.

In its zeal for experiment, the regime has tended to undervalue experience. It has snubbed experienced men and given their posts to overambitious youngsters. "The economic incoherence is frightening," said one foreign expert who was well disposed toward the regime. The Nasser reforms, with honorable but rare exceptions, constitute a jumble of uncompleted plans, in a maze of disconnected agencies and ministries, supported by commitments far beyond capacity to pay.

THE HIGH ASWAN DAM

Some of these plans may possibly be scrapped after conclusion of the impending agreement on western financial aid to the high Aswan Dam.

For political rather than economic reasons, the United States, Britain, and the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development are prepared to help Nasser with his major development project: a high Aswan Dam. Negotiations were particularly sticky because the bank had gravely scrutinized Egypt's welter of economic programs and policies and proposed certain rectifications and controls against which dictatorial and nationalist vanities had bridled. Nasser may have sufficient funds for his share of the $1.3-billion project, but only if many other schemes for which he has already been applauded by uncritical onlookers—good or bad, on paper or half implemented—are abandoned.

The Aswan project itself exposes characteristic foibles of the junta. The regime has habitually asserted that the dam's storage of unused Nile waters would reclaim 2 million acres; when pressed, Egyptian officials admitted that maybe only 1.3 million acres would actually be new soil—the other 700,000 would simply be made more fertile. Now, however, officials are commencing exuberantly to jumble both sets of figures and come up with 2.7 million acres. For a long time Cairo disdained to consult Khartoum, although the dam as planned would involve the Sudan's vital interest in the Nile and even create a vast lake flooding more than 100 miles of Sudanese Nile territory and obliterating the Sudanese town of Wadi Halfa.

Finally, the dam is envisaged by Nasser as his monument, the basis of his claim to the gratitude of Egyptian posterity. The junta has hailed the project as the cure-all for Egypt's electrification, industrialization, and land-hunger problems. Yet there are no visible funds or even sensible plans for the factories and other massive economic developments that the dam's hydroelectric facilities are presumably to power. (These facilities are over and above those already noted at the low Aswan). Nor is there the slightest reason to believe that, even with the high dam completed in 18 years and irrigating a third as much land as Egypt cultivates today, it will be anything like a cure-all. The added acreage will barely keep pace with the added population, which swells at an annual rate of more than 3 percent.

PHILOSOPHY

The views of Nasser's chief lieutenants clearly reflects the authoritarian character of the regime. "What this country needs is drive," Interior Minister Zakaria Mokhialdin, commander of the police and director of counterespionage, told me. "Human qualifications," he went on, "are more important than knowledge or experience. Sincerity and hard work are the best teachers." But what if the sincere hard worker goes wrong? Who controls him? "I suppose you mean we ought to have a parliament," he replied. "We had one under Farouk, and nothing got done. Well, we'll have a parliament again. Not that we need one. The people are satisfied with us. If they weren't it would be reported to me. But we want the people to participate more. There will therefore be a parliament soon. Its form doesn't matter. It will meet, discuss, and advise—somehow. But no opposition. Not to the basic principles of our revolution."

Much of the same philosophy was expounded to me by Lt. Col. Anwar al Sadat, who is both Minister of State and leader of

the Islamic Congress. Recalling that he had once successfully arranged the assassination of a royal Egyptian pro-British Cabinet Minister, Sadat assured me that political murder was now no longer patriotic, because "Egypt today is at last ruled by Egyptians." But could his opponents criticize him? I inquired. "Certainly not," he retorted. "This is a revolution. We will permit no attacks upon it. Egyptians are a simple people. Four out of 5 are illiterate. They would be easy victims for any demagog."

AND A CONSTITUTION

With such a mentality shaping it, the constitution Nasser finally granted Egypt this January has inspired no grateful odes to liberty. It is the junta's second effort. The first drafting commission included distinguishing jurists and others representing a wide range of opinion beyond the military. They produced an exemplary document. It created a parliament composed of genuine representatives. It firmly gave the franchise to women literate enough to fill out a voter's application. It bestowed on women with a university degree the right to sit in parliament. In its opening paragraph it abolished military rule. The junta straightway rejected the work of its own commission and clamped a censorship on discussion of the draft—including the fact that it had been rejected. The assignment of writing a constitution was taken up this time by the revolution command council itself.

The substitute version, now unveiled, clouds its intentions toward votes for women in the following triumph of verbiage. "The state secures for the female citizens means for reconciling their family duties with their public responsibilities."

According to current reports, male voting will be compulsory but female optional—which is tantamount to no votes for women at all in millions of rural households where they have little more than chattel status. Article 191, snatching back whatever freedom the previous 190 articles may have inadvertently released, stipulates that preconstitution laws and mechanisms established by the junta in restraint of freedom "cannot be annulled or their validity questioned." A law is still to be written that will inform the Egyptian people who are to be elected to the national assembly, by whom and how. But it is certain that, with all other parties barred, Nasser's rubberstamp Liberation Rally—renamed National Union and empowered to nominate all candidates—will continue to have a great deal to do with running the government.

DEGREES OF DESPOTISM

Is Nasser popular? In neighboring states, yes. To them, Nasser at the moment seems the brightest light in Islam since Mohammed—because he has defied the West, in the Czech arms coup and other matters, and gotten away with it.

But inside Egypt his glory is diluted by the reality of day-to-day life. In the anonymous darkness of even the humblest Cairo movie house, Nasser's handsome face evokes only silence, and sometimes a derisive whistle. Anyone who applauds gets punched by unidentifiable fists, or as least is invited menacingly to shut up.

By Western standards, Farouk's rule was intolerable, with an abundance of terror and internment camps. But the monarchy's police apparatus angled mainly for big fish. Obscure subjects could grumble out loud with reasonable impunity. Even General Naguib, whose administration was hardly a model of freedom, at least stood for a "liberty" soon to come.

Still diseased, still illiterate, and incapable as yet of full self-government, the Egyptian people at large will accept rule by a clique, but only up to an uncertain limit. There has to be enough elasticity in the tyranny for a seditious speech now and then, even a refreshing street riot. Failing that, the man on top of the obelisk may be feared but not admired. So it is with Nasser. His police are too efficient.

Is Nasser, nevertheless, firmly seated? Superficially, he seems to have cut off any chance of revolt. While his cabinet contains only a minority of 8 officers (as against 10 civilians), the military members meet apart with him, usually at night and under heavy guard, at a former Farouk lodge on Gezira Island, as the all-supreme Revolution Command Council.

Nasser's two closest colleagues, Colonel Mokhialdin and Maj. Gen. Abdel Hakim Amer, respectively manage police and army for him. A Free Officers Corps of 350 picked men holds the key positions in every branch of government. Some 40 of these officers report directly to Nasser.

The street, normally a threat to any Egyptian regime, is for the moment intimidated. Most leaders of the once dangerous Moslem Brotherhood have been executed, jailed, or exiled, and several thousand rank-and-file fanatics are still behind bars. Traditional parties like the Wafd and Saadist are illegal and disbanded. The Communists, never strong or particularly well led in Egypt, are more rigorously suppressed than ever. Finally, the two remaining classic sources of popular unrest—students and proletariat—seem to have been expertly frustrated. One of Nasser's majors is Minister of Education. A lieutenant colonel controls labor as Minister of Social Affairs. Today the universities are politically sterile; the trade unions, built up deliberately by the regime as strongarm squads, constitute an auxiliary militia that can be mobilized on an instant's notice to "demonstrate" in favor of Nasser's republic.

THE POTENTIAL DANGERS

But beneath this well-managed surface serenity, Nasser cannot relax too confidently even in his own junta household. During his first 3 years in power he purged 4 overambitious colleagues one at a time, streamlining the junta down to its present 8. Since then he has had to send 1 of the remaining 8 off on an extensive "tour" abroad to reduce his size in the public eye (Wing Commander Gamal Salem, the Deputy Premier), fire half the top staff of "radical" writers on another's newspaper (Al Goumhouriya, edited by Colonel Sadat), and read the riot act to a third for meddling in politics instead of building parks and boulevards (Wing Commander Abdel Latif Baghdadi, Minister of Municipal and Rural Affairs).

After challenge from intriguing rivals in the junta itself, the next biggest threat to Nasser lurks in the military establishment. His free officers represent only a small fraction of the entire officer caste, on which they spy and by which they are feared and sullenly hated. There is a new crop of junior officers who shared neither in the revolution nor in its spoils and therefore yearn ominously for more freedom. Even among the older field officers who helped make the revolution, some have been brutally shoved aside.

A sinister nucleus of Moslem brotherhood leadership still functions from Damascus. As for the students, the regime may boast it has captured their loyalty—but not so much, evidently, that Colonel Mokhialdin dares remove the heavily armed police who patrol every school entrance and admit nobody unable to prove he is a student or professor. "It's only to keep out persons who haven't paid tuition fees," the Interior Minister first tried to persuade me; later he conceded there still might be agitators on the prowl.

Add to the list of potential subversives an increasing breed of neoliberals unaffiliated either with the old discredited political parties or with the new holders of power. There is a significant reservoir of educated outs who despise the muscle-bound ins and are waiting quietly for the day of true liberation.

No organization is visible within or among these various centers of potential sedition. Nobody risks complaining above a murmur except in intimate private interview. For the moment, at least, Nasser is on the crest of the wave churned up by his arms deal with the Soviet bloc.

But an energetic conspirator would not have far to search for partners in a future revolt—if only he knew how to avoid soliciting government spies as accomplices. One strategic error by Nasser, one substantial defeat abroad for his prestige, and candidates for the succession will not be lacking.

Our Gold Supply Is Growing Short

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLAIR ENGLE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 6, 1956

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Speaker, recently I placed in the RECORD some information in regard to the foreign claims against our gold reserves. Technically all foreign claims in dollars can be converted into gold and at present the outstanding dollar claims are equal to about half our gold supply. An article in the Washington Post shows that there has been an actual earmarking of almost $7 billion, which is approximately 32 percent of our gold stocks. The steady increase of the earmarking indicates a lack of confidence in the American dollar. Furthermore, we should be doing something about building up the gold stocks. A copy of the article is attached for the information of the Members:

GOLD STOCKS SET ASIDE REACH RECORD VOLUME

With gold earmarked by our Federal Reserve banks for foreign accounts reaching a record volume of $6,968,000,000 on March 31, or approximately 32 percent of our $21,716,000,000 of gold stock, it becomes increasingly important that the reserve authorities enlighten Congress and the public on matters of ownership, trends, origin, and causes of this heavy earmarking, said Walter E. Spahr, executive vice president of the Economists' National Committee on Monetary Policy.

The heavy earmarking of gold, 1953–56, is hardly a compliment to our nongold dollar, Spahr said. The heaviest earmarking of gold before suspension of redemption in 1933, was $463,931,000 in October 1931. The volume earmarked then amounted to approximately 11 percent of our $4,160,000,000 of gold stock, not counting that in circulation.

Gold earmarked for foreign account is in addition to our gold stock, he explained. Therefore, had the foreign owners of this large volume of earmarked gold preferred dollars to gold on March 31, 1956, they could have increased our gold stock to $28,684,000,000.

To obtain a picture of a trend in the earmarking of gold it is necessary to go to every Federal Reserve Bulletin for the period involved and to compile a table, Spahr stated.

He said increases in the volume arise from conversion into gold of dollars held by foreign central banks and governments—that is, by drawing down our gold stock—or from exports of gold by them to our Reserve banks for earmark rather than for exchange for dollars.

Since the beginning of 1953 there has been a persistent increase in the volume of gold

placed under earmark. Spahr reported. In 1952, the monthly average was $4,923,067,000. In 1953, the average rose to $6,118,492,000. In every month, except four, from January 1954, to April 1956, inclusive, there was an increase in the amount of gold placed under earmark for foreign account. The peak, during this period was the $6,968,000,000 on March 31, 1956.

The following table provides data on our earmarking of gold for foreign account for the period 1922 to April 30, 1956.

Gold held under earmark by Federal Reserve banks for foreign account

[Data compiled from the monthly Federal Reserve Bulletins]

YEARLY AVERAGES OF MONTHLY DATA, 1922–53

(000 omitted)

1922	[1] $2,300
1923	[2] 2,256
1924	16,567
1925	27,517
1926	40,567
1927	100,058
1928	99,958
1929	112,250
1930	122,733
1931	208,783
1932	275,475
1933	197,725
1934	13,658
1935	9,775
1936	51,000
1937	167,758
1938	420,158
1939	964,233
1940	1,518,966
1941	1,979,700
1942	2,506,775
1943	3,114,658
1944	3,725,392
1945	4,177,966
1946	4,166,583
1947	3,744,517
1948	3,813,850
1949	3,918,133
1950	4,875,775
1951	5,813,200
1952	4,928,067
1953	6,118,492

MONTHLY DATA 1954—APR. 30, 1956

(000 omitted)

1954:	
Jan. 31	$6,527.0
Feb. 28	6,537.0
Mar. 31	6,539.0
Apr. 30	6,501.5
May 31	6,549.8
June 30	6,566.7
July 31	6,639.4
Aug. 31	6,704.8
Sept. 30	6,739.4
Oct. 31	6,774.0
Nov. 30	6,810.7
Dec. 31	6,808.9
Average for year	6,641.51
1955:	
Jan. 31	6,818.6
Feb. 28	6,819.4
Mar. 31	6,847.1
Apr. 30	6,889.0
May 31	6,890.0
June 30	6,890.9
July 31	6,891.0
Aug. 31	6,893.9
Sept. 30	6,883.3
Oct. 31	6,890.4
Nov. 30	6,917.5
Dec. 31	6,941.3
Average for year	6,881.03
1956:	
Jan. 31	6,949.5
Feb. 29	6,965.2
Mar. 31	6,968.0
Apr. 30	6,951.1
Average for 4 months	6,958.45

[1] Average for 3 months, October–December.

[2] Average for January–March and July–December.

LAWS AND RULES FOR PUBLICATION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

CODE OF LAWS OF THE UNITED STATES

TITLE 44, SECTION 181. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; ARRANGEMENT, STYLE, CONTENTS, AND INDEXES.—The Joint Committee on Printing shall have control of the arrangement and style of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and while providing that it shall be substantially a verbatim report of proceedings shall take all needed action for the reduction of unnecessary bulk, and shall provide for the publication of an index of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD semimonthly during the sessions of Congress and at the close thereof. (Jan. 12, 1895, c. 23, § 13, 28 Stat. 603.)

TITLE 44, SECTION 182b. SAME; ILLUSTRATIONS, MAPS, DIAGRAMS.—No maps, diagrams, or illustrations may be inserted in the RECORD without the approval of the Joint Committee on Printing. (June 20, 1936, c. 630, § 2, 49 Stat. 1546.)

Pursuant to the foregoing statute and in order to provide for the prompt publication and delivery of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the Joint Committee on Printing has adopted the following rules, to which the attention of Senators, Representatives, and Delegates is respectfully invited:

1. *Arrangement of the daily Record.*—The Public Printer will arrange the contents of the daily RECORD as follows: First, the Senate proceedings; second, the House proceedings; third, the Appendix: *Provided*, That when the proceedings of the Senate are not received in time to follow this arrangement, the Public Printer may begin the RECORD with the House proceedings. The proceedings of each House and the Appendix shall each begin a new page, with appropriate headings centered thereon.

2. *Type and style.*—The Public Printer shall print the report of the proceedings and debates of the Senate and House of Representatives, as furnished by the Official Reporters of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, in 7½-point type; and all matter included in the remarks or speeches of Members of Congress, other than their own words, and all reports, documents, and other matter authorized to be inserted in the RECORD shall be printed in 6½-point type; and all rollcalls shall be printed in 6-point type. No italic or black type nor words in capitals or small capitals shall be used for emphasis or prominence; nor will unusual indentions be permitted. These restrictions do not apply to the printing of or quotations from historical, official, or legal documents or papers of which a literal reproduction is necessary.

3. *Return of manuscript.*—When manuscript is submitted to Members for revision it should be returned to the Government Printing Office not later than 9 o'clock p. m. in order to insure publication in the RECORD issued on the following morning; and if all of said manuscript is not furnished at the time specified, the Public Printer is authorized to withhold it from the RECORD for 1 day. In no case will a speech be printed in the RECORD of the day of its delivery if the manuscript is furnished later than 12 o'clock midnight.

4. *Tabular matter.*—The manuscript of speeches containing tabular statements to be published in the RECORD shall be in the hands of the Public Printer not later than 7 o'clock p. m., to insure publication the following morning.

5. *Proof furnished.*—Proofs of "leave to print" and advance speeches will not be furnished the day the manuscript is received but will be submitted the following day, whenever possible to do so without causing delay in the publication of the regular proceedings of Congress. Advance speeches shall be set in the RECORD style of type, and not more than six sets of proofs may be furnished to Members without charge.

6. *Notation of withheld remarks.*—If manuscript or proofs have not been returned in time for publication in the proceedings, the Public Printer will insert the words "Mr. ——— addressed the Senate (House or Committee). His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix," and proceed with the printing of the RECORD.

7. *Thirty-day limit.*—The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD any speech or extension of remarks which has been withheld for a period exceeding 30 calendar days from the date when its printing was authorized: *Provided*, That at the expiration of each session of Congress the time limit herein fixed shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee.

8. *Corrections.*—The permanent RECORD is made up for printing and binding 30 days after each daily publication is issued; therefore all corrections must be sent to the Public Printer within that time: *Provided*, That upon the final adjournment of each session of Congress the time limit shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee: *Provided further*, That no Member of Congress shall be entitled to make more than one revision. Any revision shall consist only of corrections of the original copy and shall not include deletions of correct material, substitutions for correct material, or additions of new subject matter.

9. The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the full report or print of any committee or subcommittee when said report or print has been previously printed. This rule shall not be construed to apply to conference reports.

10. *Appendix to daily Record.*—When either House has granted leave to print (1) a speech not delivered in either House, (2) a newspaper or magazine article, or (3) any other matter not germane to the proceedings, the same shall be published in the Appendix except in cases of duplication. In such cases only the first item received in the Government Printing Office will be printed. This rule shall not apply to quotations which form part of a speech of a Member, or to an authorized extension of his own remarks: *Provided*, That no address, speech, or article delivered or released subsequently to the final adjournment of a session of Congress may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

11. *Estimate of cost.*—No extraneous matter in excess of two pages in any one instance may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by a Member under leave to print or to extend his remarks unless the manuscript is accompanied by an estimate in writing from the Public Printer of the probable cost of publishing the same, which estimate of cost must be announced by the Member when such leave is requested; but this rule shall not apply to excerpts from letters, telegrams, or articles presented in connection with a speech delivered in the course of debate or to communications from State legislatures, addresses or articles by the President and the members of his Cabinet, the Vice President, or a Member of Congress. For the purposes of this regulation, any one article printed in two or more parts, with or without individual headings, shall be considered as a single extension and the two-page rule shall apply. The Public Printer or the Official Reporters of the House or Senate shall return to the Member of the respective House any matter submitted for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which is in contravention of this paragraph.

12. *Official Reporters.*—The Official Reporters of each House shall indicate on the manuscript and prepare headings for all matter to be printed in the Appendix, and shall make suitable reference thereto at the proper place in the proceedings.

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

REPRESENTATIVES WITH RESIDENCES IN WASHINGTON

OFFICE ADDRESS: House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

[Streets northwest unless otherwise stated]

Speaker, Sam Rayburn

Abbitt, Watkins M., *Va*
Abernethy, Thos. G., *Miss*--6278 29th St.
Adair, E. Ross, *Ind*--4200 Cathedral Ave.
Addonizio, Hugh J., *N. J*
Albert, Carl, *Okla*
Alexander, Hugh Q., *N. C*
Alger, Bruce, *Tex*
Allen, John J., Jr., *Calif*
Allen, Leo E., *Ill*--University Club
Andersen, H. Carl, *Minn*--4545 Conn. Ave.
Andresen, August H., *Minn*
Andrews, George W., *Ala*--3108 Cathedral Ave.
Anfuso, Victor L., *N. Y*
Arends, Leslie C., *Ill*--4815 Dexter St.
Ashley, Thomas L., *Ohio*
Ashmore, Robert T., *S. C*
Aspinall, Wayne N., *Colo*--Arlington Towers, Arlington, Va.
Auchincloss, James C., *N. J*--113 S. Lee St., Alexandria, Va.
Avery, William H., *Kans*
Ayres, William H., *Ohio*

Bailey, Cleveland M., *W. Va*
Baker, Howard H., *Tenn*
Baldwin, John F., Jr., *Calif*
Barden, Graham A., *N. C*--2601 Woodley Pl.
Barrett, William A., *Pa*
Bass, Perkins, *N. H*
Bass, Ross, *Tenn*
Bates, William H., *Mass*
Baumhart, A. D., Jr., *Ohio*
Beamer, John V., *Ind*--110 Maryland Ave. NE.
Becker, Frank J., *N. Y*
Belcher, Page, *Okla*
Bell, John J., *Tex*
Bennett, Charles E., *Fla*--1530 38th St. SE.
Bennett, John B., *Mich*--5804 Bradley Blvd., Bethesda, Md.
Bentley, Alvin M., *Mich*
Berry, E. Y., *S. Dak*--2720 Terrace Road SE.
Betts, Jackson E., *Ohio*
Blatnik, John A., *Minn*
Blitch, Iris Faircloth, *Ga*
Boggs, Hale, *La*
Boland, Edward P., *Mass*
Bolling, Richard, *Mo*--3409 Lowell St.
Bolton, Frances P., *Ohio*--2301 Wyo. Ave.
Bolton, Oliver P., *Ohio*
Bonner, Herbert C., *N. C*--The Dorchester
Bosch, Albert H., *N. Y*
Bow, Frank T., *Ohio*--4301 Mass. Ave.
Bowler, James B., *Ill*
Boykin, Frank W., *Ala*--The Washington
Boyle, Charles A., *Ill*
Bray, William G., *Ind*
Brooks, Jack B., *Tex*
Brooks, Overton, *La*--4413 46th St.
Brown, Clarence J., *Ohio*--Alban Towers
Brown, Paul, *Ga*--Boston House
Brownson, Charles B., *Ind*
Broyhill, Joel T., *Va*
Buckley, Charles A., *N. Y*
Budge, Hamer H., *Idaho*
Burdick, Usher L., *N. Dak*
Burleson, Omar, *Tex*--2737 Devonshire Pl.
Burnside, M. G., *W. Va*
Bush, Alvin R., *Pa*
Byrd, Robert C., *W. Va*
Byrne, James A., *Pa*
Byrnes, John W., *Wis*--1215 25th St. So., Arlington, Va.

Canfield, Gordon, *N. J*
Cannon, Clarence, *Mo*
Carlyle, F. Ertel, *N. C*--The Washington
Carnahan, A. S. J., *Mo*
Carrigg, Joseph L., *Pa*
Cederberg, Elford A., *Mich*
Celler, Emanuel, *N. Y*--The Mayflower
Chase, Jackson B., *Nebr*--Sheraton-Park
Chatham, Thurmond, *N. C*
Chelf, Frank, *Ky*
Chenoweth, J. Edgar, *Colo*
Chiperfield, Robert B., *Ill*--1713 House Office Building
Christopher, George H., *Mo.*
Chudoff, Earl, *Pa*
Church, Marguerite Stitt, *Ill.*--2122 Mass. Ave.
Clark, Frank M., *Pa*--3735 Gunston Rd., Alexandria, Va.
Clevenger, Cliff, *Ohio*--The Jefferson
Cole, W. Sterling, *N. Y*--1610 44th St.
Colmer, William M., *Miss*
Cooley, Harold D., *N. C*--2480 16th St.
Coon, Sam, *Oreg*
Cooper, Jere, *Tenn*--The Washington
Corbett, Robert J., *Pa*
Coudert, F. R., Jr., *N. Y*
Cramer, William C., *Fla*--Hunting Towers, Alexandria, Va.
Cretella, Albert W., *Conn*
Crumpacker, Shepard J., Jr., *Ind.*
Cunningham, Paul, *Iowa*
Curtis, Laurence, *Mass*--3314 O St.
Curtis, Thomas B., *Mo*

Dague, Paul B., *Pa*
Davidson, Irwin D., *N. Y*
Davis, Clifford, *Tenn*--4611 Butterworth Pl.
Davis, Glenn R., *Wis*--2550 South Joyce, Arlington, Va.
Davis, James C., *Ga*
Dawson, William A., *Utah*
Dawson, William L., *Ill*
Deane, Charles B., *N. C*
Delaney, James J., *N. Y*
Dempsey, John J., *N. Mex*--2500 Q St.
Denton, Winfield K., *Ind*
Derounian, Steven B., *N. Y*
Devereux, James P. S., *Md*
Dies, Martin, *Tex*
Diggs, Charles C., Jr., *Mich*--2705 13th St. NE.
Dingell, John D., *Mich*
Dixon, Henry Aldous, *Utah*
Dodd, Thomas J., *Conn*
Dollinger, Isidore, *N. Y*
Dolliver, James I., *Iowa*--3752 Jocelyn St.
Dondero, George A., *Mich*--The Continental
Donohue, Harold D., *Mass*
Donovan, James G., *N. Y*
Dorn, Francis E., *N. Y*
Dorn, W. J. Bryan, *S. C*
Dowdy, John, *Tex*
Doyle, Clyde, *Calif*--3877 30th St. N., Arlington, Va.
Durham, Carl T., *N. C*--The Lee House
Eberharter, Herman P., *Pa*--3101 4th St. N., Arlington, Va.
Edmondson, Ed, *Okla*
Elliott, Carl, *Ala*
Ellsworth, Harris, *Oreg*--4301 Mass. Ave.
Engle, Clair, *Calif*--3840 Lorcom Lane Arlington, Va.
Evins, Joe L., *Tenn*--5044 Klingle St.
Fallon, George H., *Md*
Fascell, Dante B., *Fla*
Feighan, Michael A., *Ohio*
Fenton, Ivor D., *Pa*--3725 Macomb St.
Fernandez, A. M., *N. Mex*--200 C St. SE.
Fino, Paul A., *N. Y*
Fisher, O. C., *Tex*--Calvert-Woodley
Fjare, Orvin B., *Mont*
Flood, Daniel J., *Pa*--The Congressional
Flynt, John J., Jr., *Ga*
Fogarty, John E., *R. I*--3627 Chesapeake St.
Forand, Aime J., *R. I*--4108 Dresden St., Kensington, Md.
Ford, Gerald R., Jr., *Mich*--514 Crown View Dr., Alexandria, Va.
Forrester, E. L., *Ga*
Fountain, L. H., *N. C*--The Westchester
Frazier, Jas. B., Jr., *Tenn*--Fairfax Hotel
Frelinghuysen, Peter, Jr., *N. J.*--3014 N St.
Friedel, Samuel N., *Md*
Fulton, James G., *Pa*

Gamble, Ralph A., *N. Y*
Garmatz, Edward A., *Md*
Gary, J. Vaughan, *Va*
Gathings, E. C., *Ark*--6377 31st Pl.
Gavin, Leon H., *Pa*
Gentry, Brady, *Tex*
George, Myron V., *Kans*--3801 Rodman St.
Gordon, Thomas S., *Ill*
Grant, George M., *Ala*--4801 Conn. Ave.
Gray, Kenneth J., *Ill*
Green, Edith, *Oreg*
Green, William J., Jr., *Pa*
Gregory, Noble J., *Ky*--2401 Calvert St.
Griffiths, Martha W., *Mich*
Gross, H. R., *Iowa*
Gubser, Charles S., *Calif*
Gwinn, Ralph W., *N. Y*

Hagen, Harlan, *Calif*
Hale, Robert, *Maine*--2722 N St.
Haley, James A., *Fla*
Halleck, Charles A., *Ind*--4926 Upton St.
Hand, T. Millet, *N. J*
Harden, Cecil M., *Ind*--The Congressional
Hardy, Porter, Jr., *Va*
Harris, Oren, *Ark*--1627 Myrtle St.
Harrison, Burr P., *Va*--4519 So. 34th St., Arlington, Va.
Harrison, Robert D., *Nebr*
Harvey, Ralph, *Ind*--110 Maryland Ave. NE.
Hays, Brooks, *Ark*--314 2d St. SE.
Hays, Wayne L., *Ohio*--Arlington Towers, Arlington, Va.
Hayworth, Don, *Mich*
Healey, James C., *N. Y*
Hébert, F. Edward, *La*--104 Cockrell St., Alexandria, Va.
Henderson, John E., *Ohio*
Herlong, A. S., Jr., *Fla*
Heselton, John W., *Mass*
Hess, William E., *Ohio*
Hiestand, Edgar W., *Calif*
Hill, William S., *Colo*--110 Maryland Ave. NE.
Hillings, Patrick J., *Calif*
Hinshaw, Carl, *Calif*
Hoeven, Charles B., *Iowa*--100 Maryland Ave NE.
Hoffman, Clare E., *Mich*--Methodist Bldg.
Hoffman, Richard W., *Ill*
Holifield, Chet, *Calif*
Holland, Elmer J., *Pa*
Holmes, Hal, *Wash*
Holt, Joe, *Calif*
Holtzman, Lester, *N. Y*
Hope, Clifford R., *Kans*--3541 Brandywine St.
Horan, Walt, *Wash*
Hosmer, Craig, *Calif*
Huddleston, George, Jr., *Ala.*
Hull, W. R., Jr., *Mo*
Hyde, DeWitt S., *Md*

Ikard, Frank, *Tex*

Jackson, Donald L., *Calif*
James, Benjamin F., *Pa*--200 C St. SE.
Jarman, John, *Okla*
Jenkins, Thomas A., *Ohio*--The Mayflower
Jennings, W. Pat, *Va*
Jensen, Ben F., *Iowa*--2120 16th St.
Johansen, August E., *Mich*
Johnson, Leroy, *Calif*--630 North Carolina Ave. SE.
Johnson, Lester R., *Wis*--3816 Pope St. SE.
Jonas, Charles Raper, *N. C*
Jones, Paul C., *Mo*--3613 Greenway Pl., Alexandria, Va.
Jones, Robert E., Jr., *Ala*
Jones, Woodrow W., *N. C*
Judd, Walter H., *Minn*--3083 Ordway St.

Karsten, Frank M., *Mo*
Kean, Robert W., *N. J*--2435 Kalorama Road
Kearney, B. W. (Pat), *N. Y*
Kearns, Carroll D., *Pa*--Sheraton-Park
Keating, Kenneth B., *N. Y*--1612 34th St.
Kee, Elizabeth, *W. Va*
Kelley, Augustine B., *Pa*
Kelly, Edna F., *N. Y*
Keogh, Eugene J., *N. Y*--The Mayflower
Kilburn, Clarence E., *N. Y*--The Gen. Scott
Kilday, Paul J., *Tex*--3507 Albemarle St.
Kilgore, Joe M., *Tex*
King, Cecil R., *Calif*
King, Karl C., *Pa*
Kirwan, Michael J., *Ohio*
Klein, Arthur G., *N. Y*
Kluczynski, John C., *Ill*
Knox, Victor A., *Mich*
Knutson, Coya, *Minn*
Krueger, Otto, *N. Dak*--112 Schotts Court NE.

Laird, Melvin R., *Wis*
Landrum, Phil M., *Ga*
Lane, Thomas J., *Mass*
Lanham, Henderson, *Ga*
Lankford, Richard E., *Md*
Latham, Henry J., *N. Y*
LeCompte, Karl M., *Iowa*—Sheraton-Park
Lesinski, John, Jr., *Mich*
Lipscomb, Glenard P., *Calif*
Long, George S., *La*—2136 31st St. SE.
Lovre, Harold O., *S. Dak*—1605 Sherwood Road, Silver Spring, Md.
McCarthy, Eugene J., *Minn*—419 Raymond St., Chevy Chase, Md.
McConnell, Samuel K., Jr., *Pa.*
McCormack, John W., *Mass*—The Washington
McCulloch, Wm. M., *Ohio*—Westchester Apts.
McDonough, G. L., *Calif*
McDowell, Harris B., Jr., *Del.*
McGregor, J. Harry, *Ohio*—The Westchester
McIntire, Clifford G., *Maine*—220 2d St. SE.
McMillan, John L., *S. C*—1201 S. Barton St., Arlington, Va.
McVey, William E., *Ill*—The Coronet
Macdonald, Torbert H., *Mass.*
Machrowicz, Thaddeus M., *Mich.*—812 Park Ave., Falls Church, Va.
Mack, Peter F., Jr., *Ill*
Mack, Russell V., *Wash*
Madden, Ray J., *Ind*
Magnuson, Don, *Wash*
Mahon, George H., *Tex*—Alban Towers
Mailliard, William S., *Calif*
Marshall, Fred, *Minn*
Martin, Jos. W., Jr., *Mass*—The Hay-Adams
Mason, Noah M., *Ill*—The Baronet
Matthews, D. R. (Billy), *Fla.*
Meader, George, *Mich*—3360 Tennyson St.
Merrow, Chester E., *N. H*
Metcalf, Lee, *Mont*
Miller, A. L., *Nebr*—2801 East-West Highway, Chevy Chase, Md.
Miller, Edward T., *Md*—2901 Conn. Ave.
Miller, George P., *Calif*
Miller, William E., *N. Y*—3708 Calvend Lane, Kensington, Md.
Mills, Wilbur D., *Ark*—2701 Conn. Ave.
Minshall, William E., *Ohio*
Mollohan, Robert H., *W. Va.*
Morano, Albert P., *Conn*
Morgan, Thomas E., *Pa*
Morrison, James H., *La*—4301 Mass. Ave.
Moss, John E., Jr., *Calif*—204 Jefferson St., Alexandria, Va.
Moulder, Morgan M., *Mo*
Multer, Abraham J., *N. Y*
Mumma, Walter M., *Pa*—The Coronet
Murray, James C., *Ill*
Murray, Tom, *Tenn*
Natcher, William H., *Ky*—5108 Bradley Blvd., Bethesda, Md.
Nelson, Charles P., *Maine*
Nicholson, D. W., *Mass*
Norblad, Walter, *Oreg*
Norrell, W. F., *Ark*—2301 Conn. Ave.
O'Brien, Leo W., *N. Y*
O'Brien, Thomas J., *Ill*—The Hamilton
O'Hara, Barratt, *Ill*—The Congressional
O'Hara, Joseph P., *Minn*—2813 31st St.
O'Konski, Alvin E., *Wis*—4000 Mass. Ave.
O'Neill, Thomas P., Jr., *Mass.*
Osmers, Frank C., Jr., *N. J.*
Ostertag, Harold C., *N. Y*—100 Maryland Ave. NE.
Passman, Otto E., *La*
Patman, Wright, *Tex*—117 Carroll St. SE.
Patterson, James T., *Conn.*
Pelly, Thomas M., *Wash*
Perkins, Carl D., *Ky*
Pfost, Gracie, *Idaho*
Philbin, Philip J., *Mass*
Phillips, John, *Calif*
Pilcher, J. L., *Ga*
Pillion, John R., *N. Y*
Poage, W. R., *Tex*—2309 Skyland Pl. SE.
Poff, Richard H., *Va*
Polk, James G., *Ohio*
Powell, Adam C., Jr., *N. Y*
Preston, Prince H., Jr., *Ga*
Price, Melvin, *Ill*
Priest, J. Percy, *Tenn*—The Berkshire
Prouty, Winston L., *Vt*
Quigley, James M., *Pa*
Rabaut, Louis C., *Mich*
Radwan, Edmund P., *N. Y*
Rains, Albert, *Ala*
Ray, John H., *N. Y*
Rayburn, Sam, *Tex*
Reece, B. Carroll, *Tenn*
Reed, Daniel A., *N. Y*—The Woodner
Rees, Edward H., *Kans*—1801 16th St.
Reuss, Henry S., *Wis*—1650 30th St.
Rhodes, George M., *Pa*—1809 Franklin St. NE.
Rhodes, John J., *Ariz*
Richards, James P., *S. C*
Riehlman, R. Walter, *N. Y*—3210 Wis. Ave.
Riley, John J., *S. C*
Rivers, L. Mendel, *S. C*
Roberts, Kenneth A., *Ala*—6102 Cromwell Dr.
Robeson, Edward J., Jr., *Va*
Robsion, John M., Jr., *Ky*—1500 Delafield Pl.
Rodino, Peter W., Jr., *N. J*
Rogers, Byron G., *Colo*
Rogers, Edith Nourse, *Mass*—The Shoreham
Rogers, Paul G., *Fla*—Sheraton-Park
Rogers, Walter, *Tex*
Rooney, John J., *N. Y*
Roosevelt, James, *Calif*
Rutherford, J. T., *Tex*
Sadlak, Antoni N., *Conn*
St. George, Katharine, *N. Y*
Saylor, John P., *Pa*
Schenck, Paul F., *Ohio*—3801 Conn. Ave., Apt. 307
Scherer, Gordon H., *Ohio*—The Mayflower
Schwengel, Fred, *Iowa*
Scott, Hugh, *Pa*
Scrivner, Errett P., *Kans*—2331 Cathedral Ave.
Scudder, Hubert B., *Calif*—4545 Conn. Ave.
Seely-Brown, Horace, Jr., *Conn.*
Selden, Armistead I., Jr., *Ala.*—4625 B 36th St. So., Arlington, Va.
Sheehan, Timothy P., *Ill*
Shelley, John F., *Calif*
Sheppard, Harry R., *Calif*
Short, Dewey, *Mo*
Shuford, George A., *N. C*—Sheraton-Park
Sieminski, Alfred D., *N. J*
Sikes, Robert L. F., *Fla*
Siler, Eugene, *Ky*
Simpson, Richard M., *Pa*—5205 Lawn May, Chevy Chase, Md.
Simpson, Sid, *Ill*—2100 Mass. Ave.
Sisk, B. F., *Calif*
Smith, Frank E., *Miss*
Smith, Howard W., *Va*—204 W. Walnut St. Alexandria, Va.
Smith, Lawrence H., *Wis*—2480 16th St.
Smith, Wint, *Kans*
Spence, Brent, *Ky*—Sheraton-Park
Springer, William L., *Ill*
Staggers, Harley O., *W. Va*
Steed, Tom, *Okla*
Sullivan, Leonor K., *Mo*
Taber, John, *N. Y*
Talle, Henry O., *Iowa*—4613 Harrison St.
Taylor, Dean P., *N. Y*
Teague, Charles M., *Calif*
Teague, Olin E., *Tex*—6015 Mass. Ave.
Thomas, Albert, *Tex*—2901 34th St.
Thompson, Clark W., *Tex*—Sheraton-Park
Thompson, Frank, Jr., *N. J*
Thompson, Ruth, *Mich*
Thompson, T. A., *La*—1600 Kenwood Av., Alexandria, Va.
Thomson, E. Keith, *Wyo*
Thornberry, Homer, *Tex*
Tollefson, Thor C., *Wash*
Trimble, James W., *Ark*
Tuck, William M., *Va*
Tumulty, T. James, *N. J*
Udall, Stewart L., *Ariz*
Utt, James B., *Calif*
Vanik, Charles A., *Ohio*
Van Pelt, William K., *Wis*
Van Zandt, James E., *Pa*—Arlington Towers, Arlington, Va.
Velde, Harold H., *Ill*
Vinson, Carl, *Ga*—4 Primrose St., Chevy Chase, Md.
Vorys, John M., *Ohio*—2032 Belmont Rd.
Vursell, Charles W., *Ill*—The Congressional
Wainwright, Stuyvesant, *N. Y.*
Walter, Francis E., *Pa*
Watts, John C., *Ky*
Weaver, Phil, *Nebr*—9408 Crosby Rd., Silver Spring, Md.
Westland, Jack, *Wash*
Wharton, J. Ernest, *N. Y*
Whitten, Jamie L., *Miss*—5804 Nebraska Ave.
Wickersham, Victor, *Okla*
Widnall, William B., *N. J*
Wier, Roy W., *Minn*
Wigglesworth, R. B., *Mass*—3257 N. St.
Williams, Harrison A., Jr., *N. J.*
Williams, John Bell, *Miss*—1001 26th Road S., Arlington, Va.
Williams, William R., *N. Y*—1241 Pa. Ave. SE.
Willis, Edwin E., *La*
Wilson, Earl, *Ind*
Wilson, Robert C. (Bob), *Calif.*
Winstead, Arthur, *Miss*
Withrow, Gardner R., *Wis*
Wolcott, Jesse P., *Mich*—3707 Thornapple St., Chevy Chase
Wolverton, Charles A., *N. J*—1336 HOB
Wright, Jim, *Tex*
Yates, Sidney R., *Ill*
Young, Clifton (Cliff), *Nev*—2705 Westminster Pl., Alexandria, Va.
Younger, J. Arthur, *Calif*—4545 Conn. Ave.
Zablocki, Clement J., *Wis*
Zelenko, Herbert, *N. Y*

DELEGATES

Bartlett, E. L. (Bob), *Alaska.*—1718 33d Pl. SE.
Farrington, Mrs. Joseph R., *Hawaii.*

RESIDENT COMMISSIONER

Fernós-Isern, A., *P. R*—2210 R St.

OFFICERS OF THE HOUSE

Clerk—Ralph R. Roberts.
Sergeant at Arms—Zeake W. Johnson, Jr.
Doorkeeper—William M. Miller, 1732 S St. SE.
Chaplain—Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., 1421 Montague St.
Postmaster—H. H. Morris.

OFFICIAL REPORTERS OF DEBATE

SENATE

James W. Murphy, 7 Primrose St., Chevy Chase, Md.
John D. Rhodes, 3535 Williamsburg Lane.
Gregor Macpherson, 3111 44th St.
Herbert N. Budlong, Kurtz Rd., McLean, Va.
J. Chester Wilfong, 4408 Fourth Road North, Arlington, Va.
Charles J. Drescher, 3738 North 4th St., Arlington, Va.
Francis J. Attig, 3919 Livingston St.
Nicholas J. Cinciotta, 400 Williamsburg Dr., Silver Spring, Md.
Elmer L. Koons (assistant), 826 Aspen St.
Willard W. Pruett (clerk), 1200 North Stuart St., Arlington, Va.
Placidino Zagami (clerk), 5805 10th Place, Chillum, Md.

HOUSE

W. L. Fenstermacher, 2929 Connecticut Ave.
Roy L. Whitman, 4820 Linnean Ave.
F. S. Milberg, 5032 Massachusetts Ave.
E. B. Clark, 604 Bennington Dr., Silver Spring, Md.
Frank E. Battaglia, 957 East-West Highway.
Claude S. Scheckel, 6 East Blackthorne St., Chevy Chase, Md.
Albert Schneider, 7516 14th St.
Paul L. Miller (clerk), Shadyside, Md.
Sidney W. Williston (assistant clerk), 1830 Longford Drive, Hyattsville, Md.
Bjarne J. Sigurdsen (assistant clerk), 1921 You Place, SE.

Appendix

The American Stockman and the American Way

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. ROSS ADAIR
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, July 7, 1956

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Earl L. Butz, Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, recently delivered another scholarly and factual address dealing with problems of agriculture. This was given before the South Dakota Stock Growers Association, Deadwood, S. Dak., on June 7, 1956, and, under leave to extend my remarks, I include it herewith:

THE AMERICAN STOCKMAN AND THE AMERICAN WAY

The American stockman is a real stronghold of individual freedom in the American economic system. He is a laborer, a manager, and a capitalist, all rolled up into a single package. He is a private enterpriser in the best sense of the word. He is an independent businessman in the best tradition. He is a stanch supporter of the American way.

We have come through years when the American free-enterprise system has been under general attack. Important and powerful groups of people in this country have questioned the fundamental premises upon which our competitive economy is built.

Neither the American stockman nor his organizations are included in the groups attacking our free-enterprise system. The ranch family—both husband and wife—is articulate with respect both to our economic system and our form of government. They are conversant with the basic foundations of our system. They understand it. They believe in it thoroughly. They are truly advocates of the American way.

What is the American way? Obviously, different people view it differently. No one can describe it adequately in a paragraph. Let me list a few attributes of it which are pertinent to this discussion.

The American way holds the individual to be superior to the State, and not the State above the individual. It believes the citizen should support his Government, and not the Government its citizen. It encourages a maximum of economic freedom for individual producers, consistent with the common good. It places major dependence upon relatively free markets and free economic institutions. It holds that ever increasing and efficient production of goods and services by all our people is the best guaranty of a high living standard for everyone. It is based upon the premise that the end of production is consumption—not purposeless storage or senseless waste. It does not hold that a Government warehouse is really an effective market for food and fiber. It stresses that the individual citizen should always be the senior partner, and Government the junior partner.

There are many well-meaning citizens among us who have strayed far from this concept of the American way. Growing numbers of our people would turn increasingly to Government for security guaranties of one kind or another, and junk the economic system which has made us great.

SOME PEOPLE WANT CONTROLLED MEAT PRICES

There are too many people in America today who do not really believe in the free-enterprise system, but who look increasingly to Washington for price supports, price regulations, price ceilings, and the like. Some of the people and organizations who a few months ago were pressing for price floors under live cattle and hogs are the very ones who 5 years ago in the Korean war were crying loudest for price ceilings on beef and pork in the retail counters of America. These people don't want higher livestock prices as much as they want controlled meat prices. They would move away from price as a regulator of our economic system. They would substitute for it Government regulation and rationing.

Freedom of choice is one of the basic pillars upon which the American economic system is founded. We often refer to ours as the competitive or the private enterprise system.

This implies freedom to enter into a given field of endeavor or to stay out, freedom to expand production or to contract it, freedom to adopt innovations in production and marketing or fredom to continue in the old pattern, freedom to seek new markets and new methods of distribution or freedom to plug along with the same old customers, freedom to grow with a dynamic industry, or freedom to choose ones course as he sees fit.

This kind of economic system has its opportunities and its rewards, but it is also demanding of those who would succeed above mediocrity.

Consider for a moment how far we have deported from the traditional concepts of freedom in American agriculture. The Federal Government is well along the way to becoming the senior partner with American farmers. The Commodity Credit Corporation today owns a hoard of food and fiber unparalleled in the history of the world. The bins and warehouses of the CCC provide a residual but seemingly unsatiable market for a wide variety of food and fiber no one else seems to want very badly. Ability of the CCC to buy, and still keep on buying, is so extensive that it staggers the imagination. When its storage quarters become filled, still more space is provided. When it begins to run out of money, either its notes are conceled or its borrowing authority is extended.

As we sit here today the Government either owns or has under loan approximately 1.1 billion bushels of wheat, 1.1 billion bushels of corn, 13.2 million bales of cotton, 300 million pounds of cheese, 325 million bushels of other feed grains. And yet the United States Government neither eats food nor wears fiber. The Government really has very little use for the stuff.

SURPLUSES DEPRESS FARM INCOME

It has been reliably estimated that were it not for the presence of excessive Government-owned surpluses, farm prices would be from 10 to 15 percent above present levels, and farm income last year would have been some $2 billion higher. This would have meant a 20-percent increase in net farm income.

As a Nation, we have gotten ourselves into the current almost unbelievable food and fiber situation primarily because many of our people believed, or at least hoped, an act of Congress could brush aside fundamental demand and supply relationships. We set out to legislate price at artificial levels, without effective measures to maintain consumption rates or to curb production increases. We shackled price as an economic throttle and provided no substitute regulation, other than Government controls. In most cases, these proved to be too lenient and too late.

The American livestock industry, against this gackground of ill-conceived economic activity on the part of Government, is to be congratulated for keeping its feet on the ground. There have been sporadic requests, it is true, for Government to establish price floors under live cattle and hogs. However, we have resisted pressure to place direct price supports on livestock. Such a program would create more problems than it would solve. Your national association and the various State and other cattlemen's organizations throughout the country have flatly refused to have any part of a program of controls and regimentation such as some of the professional politicians have advocated. If any additional evidence were needed, this action has proved again that our cattle industry has lost none of the independence which has made it great.

CATTLEMEN REJECT "PIE IN THE SKY"

Your decision to pursue sound economic programs is the more significant when you realize that the cattle industry has been going through a period of serious adjustment. We have more cattle in the Nation than at any time in our history, and the unusual supply has brought greatly increased marketings and lower prices. On top of this, the widespread drought throughout the southwestern cattle country in recent years has further aggravated the problem. But your cattlemen and their leaders have constantly refused to be pushed off sound economic foundations by any "pie in the sky" panaceas advanced by vote-hungry politicians.

We have continued to believe that the people who actually raise cattle know their own problems better than anyone else. We have constantly sought the advice of your own leaders. And we have refused to be distracted or frightened by the anguished cries of those who are more interested in November's votes than in November's cattle prices.

We are firmly convinced that the problems of the cattle industry will not be solved by drugstore cowboys who, if they happen to see a branding iron might mistake it for a television antenna. We will have stronger cattle prices and higher cattle incomes in the years ahead if we take the freedom road rather than the one which leads to control and regimentation.

I wish I could say to you today with complete assurance that our major cattle problems are all behind us. The relative stability of cow numbers and some firming of prices during the past several months is reassuring. The difficult problem in the marketing of heavyweight well-finished cattle during the past winter is now clearing up. However, prices of stockers and feeders are still a little below a year ago, and the cattle slaughter rate remains high.

The cattle situation first became serious in 1953 because of a combination of increased cattle numbers and a severe drought over wide areas which forced increased marketings

and lower prices. At that time the Department undertook a large beef purchase program to help bolster the cattle market. We purchased about 250 million pounds of beef at a cost of more than $90 million.

During 1954 and much of 1955, the cattle market was more stabilized and may now again be returning to more stability. By good fortune, the large increase in cattle and beef production has coincided with high employment and record incomes of consumers. More dollars have been available to be spent for meat than ever before.

RECORD CATTLE SLAUGHTER LAST YEAR

Cattle and calf slaughter last year turned out even larger than in 1954. Slaughter last year was the largest on record, amounting to nearly 40 million head of cattle and calves. Just 5 years ago, cattle and calf slaughter was only about 26 million head. This represents more than a 50 percent increase in the past 5 years.

Last year's record beef output provided the highest rate of consumption per person: 81 pounds in 56 years of record. Even this large supply did not depress prices very much until the latter part of the year. At that time many feeders delayed marketing their cattle in expectation of the usual seasonal advance in price. A large overproduction of long-fed overweight cattle resulted. As the market for heavyweight beef is relatively limited, the large supply affected the market not only for heavyweight cattle, but also for other grades and weights as well. The situation continued until this spring, when the supply of very heavy cattle began to ease.

The Department has been working closely with all segments of the cattle and beef industry in an intensive promotional effort to stimulate consumer demand for beef. The Department is cooperating with various trade groups, such as retailers and restaurants, and with newspapers, magazines, radio stations, and TV outlets in focusing consumer attention on the plentiful supplies of beef. Retail and other trade groups have greatly intensified their merchandising activities in order to increase consumer buying of beef.

The Department has purchased more than 12 million pounds of beef for nationwide distribution to the school-lunch program. This quantity is in addition to the large volume of beef purchased locally by the participating schools.

We are also trying to stimulate exports of beef. Beef is now being bought under an agreement to sell 40 million pounds, worth $10 million, to Israel for Israeli currency. Also, during recent months a total of 20 million pounds of beef has been moving from the United States to Spain under an agreement worked out between the 2 Governments.

Let's look now at the prospects ahead in the cattle business.

CATTLE CYCLE NEAR ITS CREST

A record 97.5 million cattle and calves were on farms and ranches January 1, 1956. This was an increase of more than three-quarters of a million head from a year earlier. All the gain was in young slaughter stock. Total cow numbers were unchanged from last year, and heifer numbers were down a little. This was the seventh consecutive yearly increase in cattle numbers. The low point in the present cattle cycle was at the beginning of 1949. In the past 7 years cattle numbers have increased about 27 percent. Much of this increase occurred during 1950–52; numbers have gone up more slowly during the past 3 years.

Most of this increase in the cattle inventory during the upward phase of the present cycle has been in beef cattle, and most of it in breeding stock. During the past 7 years, beef cow numbers have risen more than 60 percent.

We are not able to foresee accurately when the peak of the present cattle cycle will be reached. The cycle has now extended the same length of time as the previous cycle. It is quite possible that this will prove to be the peak of the cycle, and that numbers may decline for the next few years. However, it is also possible that, with the present large numbers of breeding stock and the tendency in the past few months to hold back cows and heifers from slaughter, the downward phase of the cycle may be delayed. Also, the reduction, when it does begin, may not be as great as in previous cycles. Nor should it be, because of our growing population and our higher levels of demand for beef.

Influencing the outlook for the immediate future is the sizable inventory of young stock on hand, and the unsatisfactory profits in cattle feeding last winter which have retarded demand for replacement feeder stocks. On January 1, 1956, about 1.2 million more steers and one-third million more beef calves were on farms than the previous January. More than half the increased number of steers has already moved to slaughter. However, the remainder will contribute to slaughter the rest of the year. Following low returns from feeding last winter, cattle feeders have reduced their placements on feed the last few months below those of last year. Prices for feeder cattle are about to begin their usual seasonal decline. Until confidence of feeders is restored, prices of feeder cattle may remain less than last year. On the other hand, since the backlog of fed cattle is being worked off, prospects are bright for a price upswing for fed cattle this summer. If this occurs, it will ultimately strengthen prices of feeder calves and steers.

For the longer future the cattle industry today is in a fundamentally strong position despite its apparent difficulties. There are good prospects ahead for your industry. During the last 7 years our population has increased very substantially, and we can expect the rise to continue. We can expect an increase of about 25 million persons in the next decade. This would add to our present total population of around 166 million persons, almost as many more people as are now living in the western half of the United States, less Texas.

WE ARE EATING BEEF AT A RECORD RATE

Another favorable factor is the upward trend in meat consumption. Indications are that consumption of beef in 1956 will set another new record at 82 pounds per person. This compares with an average of only about 54 pounds per person during 1935–39. This sharp increase in beef consumption provides a sound basis for continued growth of the industry.

One of the things that hurt the cattle industry most last year was the sharp increase in pork production at the same time that you were marketing a record quantity of beef. This was the first time in a long while that supply cycles of beef and pork crested together, and it was an important factor in causing lower proces for both cattle and hogs. However, hog producers reduced farrowings this spring, probably by as much as 5 to 7 percent below a year ago. It is likely that they will also reduce fall farrowings. Prices of hogs have recovered almost $7 per 100 pounds from their lows of last December. Their present higher level is partly seasonal. However, after midsummer the supply of hogs for slaughter will be less than a year before and prices may be expected to retain a much firmer base than last fall.

Prices for lambs also have recovered significantly. They were reduced last winter under the pressure of large supplies of pork and beef. Present highs for lambs also are partly seasonal, reflecting the end of the fed lamb season and the beginning of the spring lamb supply. Nevertheless prices during their seasonal downtrend this summer may compare favorably with those of last year.

Although some adjustment is needed in the cattle inventory, it obviously must be combined with efforts to maintain a continuing strong demand for beef by our growing population.

The American cattle industry must continue to grow with our growing population and with our increasing preference for more protein in the diet. It cannot grow adequately if it should succumb to the temptation to substitute a Government market for the commercial market it now enjoys. It could never have grown to its present size if cattlemen had accepted Government price supports and controls.

Few, if any, agricultural commodity groups have ever expanded after accepting the favor of Government price supports and the necessary production and marketing controls which follow. On the contrary, the production of many price-supported commodities has shrunk in recent years. When the benevolent hand of Government is called upon to control prices and direct the flow of goods opportunity to produce and market is usually rationed among producers.

Production and marketing controls in some form are the inevitable Siamese twins of price supports. Producers are limited to a percentage of some historic base of what they have produced in the past. Government production and marketing controls are essentially backward looking—not forward looking. Under these circumstances, producers with above average managerial capacity and ambitions are severely limited in what they can do. They suffer; consumers suffer; all America suffers.

WHERE WILL YOUR PRICE BE SET?

The American stockman wants to get his price in the marketplace if he can. He wants to sell his products in the marketplace in Chicago or New York City or Los Angeles through the channels of a free price system, rather than having a Government agency standing between consumer and producer saying, "This is the price. We set it in Washington."

The current struggle centers on the important question of whether farmers will get their price in the marketplace, or whether they will get part of their price in the marketplace and the rest through the tax collector.

Many agricultural leaders have become firmly convinced that there is no magic about payments from the Treasury. You simply send the money to Washington in the first place so you can get some back from Washington later. They have become convinced further that you cannot send a dollar to Washington and get a dollar back. You get back 60 cents and a lot of blanks to fill out.

They have also become convinced that with this system of subsidies there must inevitably come a system of control which transfers from the individual farmer to a central planning agency many of the managerial decisions that traditionally have been made on the individual farm and ranches of America.

The farmers of America, both individually and collectively, must continue to be salesmen for the American way. They must acquaint themselves with the issues in agricultural policy. If they genuinely believe in the freedoms they profess, they must understand the basic premises upon which those freedoms rest.

We must strive to preserve a proper relationship between agriculture and Government. You must always keep the individual farmer the senior partner and Government the junior partner. It would be easy to preserve that relationship. You must be ever vigilant that our great agricultural industry assumes the responsibilities put upon it

by our private enterprise system. Otherwise Government will become the senior partner.

You must preserve an atmosphere in which freedom of choice remains one of the basic pillars of our economic system. Under such a system individual producers and individual processors can grow and prosper as far as their ambition and their ability will take them. The right to succeed will be open to everyone.

In our free society, the right to succeed carries with it the right to fail. If, through legislative action of one kind or another, we remove the right to fail, we ultimately remove the right to succeed beyond mediocrity. Men of vision and ambition do not want that. They know their future is most secure in an environment which guarantees freedom to choose, freedom to experiment, freedom to become more efficient, freedom to seek and develop new markets, freedom to dream, and freedom to enjoy economic rewards if their dream is successful.

We pledge the personnel and the resources of the Department of Agriculture to work alongside you in our common march toward these goals.

Good Advice for Mr. Dulles

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES M. QUIGLEY
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 6, 1956

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks, I include an editorial from the July 5 issue of the Harrisburg (Pa.) Patriot, relative to the oratorical gyrations of Secretary Dulles. To the sentiments expressd by the Patriot, I can offer an enthusiastic amen. The editorial follows:

SECRETARY DULLES SHOULD LEAVE FREE-WHEELING ORATORY TO OTHERS

It won't be long now before Republican orators across the land will be lauding John Foster Dulles as "one of the greatest Secretaries of State in our country's history." Some of the partisan extremists will go even further than that and call him the greatest.

On the other side of the oratorical coin, Democratic campaign speakers will be chalking him up as "one of the worst Secretaries of State in our country's history." And the extreme partisans among them will go all the way and label him the worst.

This has become the presidential campaign year fate of our Secretaries of State in recent years. There were times 4 years ago when one was almost led to wonder how the United States ever had managed to survive in this dangerous world if former Secretary Acheson was even half of what some of the more violent political orators charged him with being.

Just what niche both Mr. Dulles and his predecessor, Mr. Acheson, will occupy in the rollcall of our Secretaries of State remains to be seen. The roll of world events, and their part in them, still is going on, and only future historians will be able to appraise their reputations with any reasonable degree of accuracy.

Americans, for their part, can take all of this political oratory with a grain of salt. They well might advise the politicians and the candidates at every opportunity that if there is restraint no place else in the campaign, our country's foreign policy and the men who administer it should not be dragged helter-skelter through the rough and tumble of the political arena.

Mr. Dulles, for his part, can make a contribution toward the nurturing of this restraint.

Mr. Dulles, it seems to us, could stand far more restraint in his own oratory and in all of his public statements and congressional testimony. The Secretary of State is given far too much to over-claiming and over-emphasizing. Just last week, he gave lock, stock, and barrel credit to "the unity and combined strength of the free world" for bringing the Communist world into its present state of confused transition. Certainly, this unity and strength was a major factor, but it cannot be the sole big reason for the apparent turmoil among world Communists. There is a historic vacuum when a dictator dies, and the leadership of a despotism goes up for grabs. A government by despots has no provision for an orderly succession of leadership.

Other recent oratory by the Secretary said the menace of communism is on the decline, and while we all hope and pray that is true, Mr. Dulles pictured it far too much in terms of all black and all white. It recalls his testimony before a congressional committee just a year ago next week that the Soviet economy was "on the point of collapsing."

The Secretary, too, in recent months, has larded his pronouncements far too much with dramatic, soap-selling phrases.

To criticize Mr. Dulles for what we consider to be his oratorical failings is not to discount one whit his devotion to the cause of freedom, his talents, and the physical beating he unselfishly is taking as he carries on the conduct of American foreign policy in combat with the Communists.

Several weeks back, on May 26, in a speech defending his record of keeping Congress and the people informed, Mr. Dulles furnished his own "boxscore"—130 meetings with congressional committees and groups of Congressmen, 70 press conferences, 54 major foreign policy speeches. Since that time, his "boxscore" has been considerably built up.

Certainly, Mr. Dulles should speak out from time to time on his stewardship. But, where a Secretary of State is concerned, there is also such a thing as talking too much.

It is our belief that if Mr. Dulles would speak softer and far less often he could better conduct the quiet and earnest pursuit of diplomacy which is, after all, a Secretary of State's major responsibility. He would be well-advised to leave the bulk of the international propagandizing and the side flings at political oratory to others.

A Letter to My Constituents

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. T. A. THOMPSON
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, July 7, 1956

Mr. THOMPSON of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter to my constituents:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., July 23, 1956.

MY DEAR FRIEND: I am taking this means of asking you for your vote and support in my reelection. During the past 4 years I have worked for you in Congress on a full-time basis. I have found the experience gained in my 18 years' service in State government prior to coming to Congress of much help in my duties here. I have worked closely with our Louisiana delegation in Washington and sincerely believe that the last 4 years have been years of accomplishment.

Our district has received millions of dollars for flood control, soil conservation, watershed programs, and development of our rivers and harbors. Many new industries have come into our district because of our vast resources and friendly treatment by our people, and more industry will come. This means more and more jobs for our young men and women who will be able to remain at home instead of being forced to go to other places for employment.

I am happy to have had a part in development of a permanent Air Force base in our district. Lake Charles Air Force Base brings more money into the district than all of the industry in Lake Charles combined. This helps to raise the economy of our people. Also, Fort Polk has been reopened and made a permanent installation, and this has greatly helped the economy in the district. Increased acreage allotments have been accomplished for our farmers, as well as assistance in disposing of their surplus products.

Southwest Louisiana is one of the great areas of the United States. In the years ahead we will see developments that will astound the Nation. Sometimes it is difficult for our people to receive the attention from our Federal Government that is due them. I have spent my full time protecting your interests, and I assure you I shall continue to do so. We must continue to fight against those in Government who would rob us of our rights and privileges as a sovereign State.

There are many things to be done. Soon, under my recently enacted bill, the Government will begin a 5-year program to eradicate the water hyacinth from our streams. I have programs planned for disposal of surplus cotton and rice and other programs which will benefit all the people of our district.

As long as I am your Congressman your problems will be mine and you may be assured that my services will be available to you at all times. With our combined efforts, the Seventh District will flourish and its people will prosper.

I will never forget your help and your vote for me on election day, July 31.

Sincerely, your Congressman,
T. A. THOMPSON,
Member of Congress.

Another Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN V. BEAMER
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, July 7, 1956

Mr. BEAMER. Mr. Speaker, the strong and natural impulse and determination of freedom demanded by people is well expressed in certain court cases in Indiana and in other parts of the United States at the present time.

As one illustration, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I include an editorial from the July 1 issue of The Indiana Farmers Guide:

ANOTHER INDEPENDENCE DAY

Elsewhere in this issue you will find articles describing various provisions of the Agricultural Act of 1956, including the new soil bank, and announcing the wheat referendum to be held July 20. American farmers have come to expect such regulations, and many of their fellow citizens residing in cities and towns across the Nation are con-

vinced that the situation is inevitable and virtually irrevocable.

But as we pause to observe the July 4 anniversary of our magnificent, fighting Declaration of Independence, we note that a small group of patriotic farmers who believe in the old-fashioned American virtues of hard work, property rights, and personal independence have taken a bold stand against Government interference with their farm operations. Organized about 2 years ago, the Independent Farmers of Indiana, Inc., is composed of self-reliant farm owners and operators who are completely opposed to all Government farm programs, particularly the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, which means virtually all of the present crop control programs.

Our attention was called specifically to this organization by a visit from the president, Ethan Stangland, of near Albion, and one of the directors, Willard Youse, of Hoagland. This is the same Ethan Stangland who is engaged in a courageous fight in the Federal courts to do what he pleases with the wheat on his farm. Other defendants in the actions filed in May 1955 by the United States Government under existing farm laws are Max Munk, of Kendallville, and J. Walter Bowyer, of Peru. They were charged with raising more wheat than the ASC said should be raised on their farms and with failing to sell the excess wheat to the Government—not for selling the wheat without a marketing card, or transporting it off the farm, but for an act which did not go beyond the boundaries of their farms. The defendents have never applied for nor accepted any ASC payments or controls on their farms.

Even the two different Federal judges involved in these cases do not agree in their initial rulings. The defendants denied the charges and asked for a trial by jury. The United States district attorney filed a motion for summary judgment. Last January 13, Judge Luther M. Swygert in United States district court at Fort Wayne found for the Government in the Stangland and Munk case. On March 28, however, Judge W. Lynn Parkinson in United States district court at South Bend found against the Government in Bowyer's case. The summary judgment in the Stangland-Munk case denied the defendants a trial by jury, which is a fundamental right guaranteed in the Bill of Rights. They have filed an appeal to the Seventh United States Circuit Court of Appeals in Chicago. If the Government appeals the Bowyer case, the 3 cases will have 1 hearing.

Many other farmers have already come to the aid of these three embattled farmers, who are challenging the constitutionality of the Farm Crop Control Act which allegedly deprives them of basic rights. The fight is being carried out through the Indiana wheatgrowers defense fund of which Robert Trimmer, R. R. 2, Albion, is treasurer, and the Churubusco State Bank is depository.

The purposes of the Independent Farmers of Indiana go beyond those of any other farm organization. Here are their eight points: (1) To promote the general welfare of the farmers of the United States; (2) to insist that the Constitution of the United States be adhered to by the officials of our Government; (3) to oppose all subsidies in any form; (4) to oppose the regimentation of American agriculture; (5) to work to secure the American market for the American farmer by adequate tariff protection; (6) to work to prevent and for the repeal of any and all legislation that is contrary to the American way of life; (7) to demand that the Government balance the national budget; (8) to oppose the involvement of the United States in any entangling foreign alliances.

Undoubtedly, there are many people who will say that this organization is reactionary, behind the times, doesn't face facts, etc. But with the wheat issue as a rallying cry, we cannot help but recall those immortal words emblazoned on a monument at Concord: "Where once embattled farmer stood and fired the shot heard 'round the world." Maybe the American farmer's freedom is meeting one of its final tests 180 years later. It could be that we are selling a birthright for a mess of potage.

Memorial Day Address by Hon. George A. Dondero, of Michigan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES M. QUIGLEY
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 6, 1956

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks I include the text of a speech made by our colleague, the Honorable GEORGE A. DONDERO, at the annual Memorial Day ceremonies at Gettysburg National Cemetery:

MEMORIAL DAY AT GETTYSBURG 1956

This is Memorial Day. It is a day of memories.

Americans everywhere around the world gather reverently as we do here at Gettysburg today, to honor the Nation's dead. Their dust remains an inspiration to their countrymen.

Because of their sacrifice, on the Capitol Building at Washington—kissed by the sun of day and watched by the stars at night—waves the unconquered flag of your land and mine.

The struggle for freedom never ends. It was purchased with blood. It must be preserved by devotion. So Memorial Day is a day of honor, a day of remembrance, a day of reckoning, a day of accounting and above all a day of high resolve. We resolve anew today "that these dead shall not have died in vain" and with the help of God, who has never foresaken this favored land, we shall maintain our high resolve through future generations.

If the time should ever come when we no longer remember what brave men and women, living and dead, have done for us, in that day our Republic will no longer deserve preservation.

No one can stand on the battlefield of Gettysburg, on this spot, on this day and in this hour of history without a deep sense of humility. Here was fought one of the greatest and most significant battles of all time. Here were spoken from a page and a half of ordinary ruled paper the lines of an address that has never been surpassed on American soil. To me it has always seemed a near miracle that a man with President Lincoln's limited education, whose invitation to come here to make "a few appropriate remarks" was an afterthought, and whose educational opportunities were so meager, could produce such a gem of English literature as the Gettysburg Address. Many years ago I asked Robert Lincoln, the President's son, the extent of his father's education, and he replied: "Father did not have anything to start with and hardly went to school at all." Lincoln's lines not only gave mankind the essence of the meaning of the struggle then being waged but also serve in this hour and for all ages as a prayer of deliverance for all people.

Abraham Lincoln the man, Gettysburg the place, and the soldier dead were the occasion for the ceremony on November 19, 1863. These combined to create for the free world an eternal light in man's unending struggle for the happiness God intended him to possess. Here at Gettysburg representative government ceased to be an experiment of 4 score and 7 years. The battle and the speech gave it the stature of perpetuity. Today, 4 score and 13 years later, Lincoln's question, "whether this Nation or any nation conceived in liberty can long endure," has again been tested in the crucible of war and answered affirmatively at least for our day.

The circumstances dedicating this burial ground take on a shining luster and a sublime grandeur from the complete absence in the spirit of Lincoln's Address of any note of hostility. It is weighted with the tragedy of the event and the whole war. It broods over the hero dead as though on both sides they had fought for the clarification of a great deal and perished to realize it.

Great utterances have been delivered in many places down through the centuries. This one had the singular gift of expressing the basic meaning of the United States, in the noblest language, at a moment of deep national bereavement, by an American President forever stamped as typical, and whose entire life work is summed up in these compactly beautiful sentences of that short oration. Never in the history of literature was so much said, so wisely, in so few words.

We know now that the address was not written on the back of an envelope, nor was it the inspiration of the moment. We know it represented the deepest soul searching of a profound and thoughtful President putting into 3 minutes of the spoken word what he had been thinking about for many years. The longer he lived the greater was his faith in the freedom of man and the stronger his conviction that it must be preserved.

What we have in the Gettysburg Address is deep thinking expressed in simple language. Its infinite compassion, its dedication and its hope that "this Nation under God shall not perish from the earth" place it with the most sublime literature of the Hebrew prophets.

Whatever part of this Republic might be destroyed in a physical sense, its spiritual foundations, with these words, remain imperishable.

The real headline or top attraction of the Gettysburg dedication 93 years ago was not Abraham Lincoln at all, but perhaps the greatest of the great orators of that day. He was a former Member of Congress, former president of Harvard College, former Minister to Great Britain, former Secretary of State, former Governor of Massachusetts, and former United States Senator—the matchless Edward Everett. Yet the purest and most perfect prose was spoken not by the most educated American of his time who had attended temples of learning on two continents but by a most uncommon commoner from Illinois whose hands knew the feel of an axe handle and who hardly went to school at all. Yet the few "appropriate remarks" he was invited to deliver here stand forever as the symbol of our American philosophy of government.

There is still another circumstance equally challenging that holds us here today in this reverent hour of recollection and memorial.

"The world," said Lincoln with the humility of the lonely and the great, "will little note nor long remember what we say here, but it can never forget what they did here." Now 93 years after we find the Gettysburg Address as well as "what they did here" as much the living tradition of our country as the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution of the United States. Indeed I venture to suggest that we have to turn to the Bible and to our books of prayer to find words better remembered, more frequently quoted or vested with such moving spiritual force.

It was because of what was done here and precisely because of what was said here that we gather today to add our homage to the generations that before ours paid their tribute as will the generations that are to come after. Where we now stand is holy ground, a shrine as durable as man's love of freedom and as precious as his willingness to sacrifice life to maintain it.

We are rightly humble before the presence that watches over these sacred acres, and we should take as much as we can of inspiration from these surroundings for the tasks destiny has thrust upon us in an age where again freedom and slavery face each other in a world divided.

It may be that another American will in the decades to come add to the luster Abraham Lincoln gave to the American dream. It may be that another American taking his fire from the eternal light brought forth here will help mankind of a future day march to its hour of victory over the enemies of liberty. Perhaps we had less than 2 short years ago an approach to the Lincoln tenets of faith in the words of President Eisenhower, who stated on July 7, 1954, "I will not be a party to any treaty that makes anybody a slave."

Freedom has its life in the hearts, the actions and in the spirit of men. This we know as we meet today in commemoration and communion; a weapon touched by the finger of God was forged here by Abraham Lincoln, a weapon of the soul and of the heart that cannot be vanquished by any force so long as man lives.

We have been obliged to forge some dreadful weapons to preserve our heritage. But no weapon we have forged is as enduring, no weapon is as strong, no weapon so grips our inmost conscience as that weapon of the mind that Lincoln tossed to man, like a torch, on the field of Gettysburg in 1863.

Hail the Young Men of Layton

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM A. DAWSON
OF UTAH
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, July 7, 1956

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, a signal honor has been conferred upon the Layton Junior Chamber of Commerce. I am particularly proud of the young men of my hometown for having won first place in towns of 10,000 and under in the United States for last year's program of accomplishments. These young men have not only brought honor and distinction to Layton and Davis County, but the State of Utah as well. Knowing many of them as I do, I can only commend the National Jaycees for making this most worthy award.

For the information of my colleagues I am inserting an editorial from the Deseret News and Telegram extolling my fellow townsmen:

HAIL THE YOUNG MEN OF LAYTON

The town of Layton, Davis County, and the whole State of Utah can take a lot of pride in the honors won by the young men of the Layton Junior Chamber of Commerce. And a lot of comfort in knowing that many of these same young men will be directing our affairs in the coming years.

The Layton Jaycees not only won first place among towns of their own size, 10,000 and under, for last year's program and accomplishments, they won first place in the open competition for Jaycee chapters of every size and from every part of the Nation. That is a tremendous accomplishment, with some 2,300 livewire Jaycee chapters competing for the honor.

The Deseret News and Telegram joins the rest of the State in saluting the Layton Jaycees—and in confidently looking to them for forward-thinking leadership in the years to come.

Motion Pictures in World War II

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH F. HOLT
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 28, 1956

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Speaker, recently at Fort Myer an impressive tribute was paid to the motion picture industry of America, the studios in California and 6,000 actors and actresses who gave their services to the United States armed services during World War II.

On that occasion Maj. Gen. Donald P. Booth, Deputy Chief of Staff, presented to Eric Johnston, president of the Motion Picture Association of America, a citation, in which it was stated that the motion-picture industry contributed without cost, some 4,700 complete films which were distributed in combat and isolated areas and 6,000 motion-picture artists made more than 55,000 appearances at military posts at home and abroad. The citation also paid tribute to the unarmed motion-picture cameramen who photographed battle actions and to the industry for making films of service backgrounds.

Two helicopters brought the famous 3d Regiment drill team for the ceremony, which included a parade of the veteran troops at Fort Myer and an exhibition of the latest communication apparatus of the Signals Corps.

As a Marine Corps veteran of World War II, I know personally of the stimulating effect the movies and artists had in building and sustaining the morale of our fighting men in the Army, Navy, and Marine Corps.

As representative of the district in California where most of the studios are located, I know personally that the citation was fitting when it said "the motion-picture industry has always supported the Armed Forces of the American people."

The citation follows:

MILITARY DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON.
CITATION

The Military District of Washington extends its sincere thanks and heartfelt appreciation to a most generous and willing ally of our Armed Forces, the Motion Picture Association of America, representative of the producers and distributors of the motion picture industry.

We in the Army vividly recall the numberless exploits and services performed by unarmed photographers whose versatile lenses pursued us into the trenches, over the barricades, and onto hostile beaches. Thus, many pages have been added to our Nation's history which otherwise might have forever remained untold.

We are thankful that posterity will be able to view our efforts on the battlefield where we fought so hard to preserve the ideals which we cherish. We hope that such vivid portrayals will serve as an inspiration to all to continue forever our fight for freedom and world peace. In the field of service entertainment, the generosity of the American motion picture industry is unsurpassed. During World War II, the industry contributed, without cost, some 4,700 complete 16-millimeter programs to men in combat and isolated areas. During the same period, approximately 6,000 motion-picture artists made over 55,000 appearances at military posts at home and abroad. The industry, in producing motion pictures with service backgrounds, has contributed greatly to enhancing the prestige of the Army and creating a better public understanding of its aims.

The United States Army feels that the motion picture industry has always supported the Armed Forces of the American people, and the Military Distirct of Washington is proud to pay tribute to the Motion Picture Association of America, an organization whose efforts have contributed so significantly in support of the interests and ideals of the United States Army.

JOHN G. VAN HOUTEN,
Major General, United States Army, Commanding.
JUNE 10, 1956

Hells Canyon: National Asset or Private Windfall?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDITH GREEN
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, July 7, 1956

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, one of the most important issues facing this Congress — and the voters — is whether we will have the comprehensive development of the water resources vital to the economy and welfare of the people of the Northwest and of the Nation, or whether these resources will be given away by the administration to an absentee-owned corporation to half develop the area for quick profit. Many of the people of my State of Oregon are up in arms against the Republicans' betrayal of their interests—as witness the resolution of the Baker County Commercial Club unanimously adopted on July 3. Under unanimous consent, I include the club's letter and resolution in the RECORD.

I also include the article concerning the power issue written by the eminent news commentator, Mr. Thomas L. Stokes, which appeared in the Washington Evening Star Thursday, July 5.

BAKER COUNTY COMMERCIAL CLUB,
Baker, Oreg., July 3, 1956.

Hon. EDITH GREEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE GREEN: The Baker County Commercial Club urges your support to the Hells Canyon legislation now pending before Congress.

The enclosed resolution states our position on this most important matter. Our membership, polled by secret ballot, has expressed almost unanimous support of the high dam.

Your favorable consideration will receive not only the thanks of the great majority of people here, but also the thanks of many generations of Americans yet to come.

Very sincerely yours,

BARD JOHNSON,
President.

BAKER COUNTY COMMERCIAL CLUB,
Baker, Oreg., July 3, 1956.

RESOLUTION FAVORING HIGH DAM AT HELLS CANYON

Whereas Baker County Commercial Club is the most representative and one of the largest groups of business, professional, agricultural, and mining people in this area; and

Whereas the commercial club is one of the original financial sponsors of National Hells Canyon Association and one of the grassroots groups carrying on the fight for the high dam and full development of Snake River; and

Whereas this is the home county of the Snake River development, be it high or low dam, and this area of Oregon is a major part of the Snake River Basin and our streams are the most immediate tributaries upstream from the dam sites; and

Whereas the effort of selfish interests to maintain monopoly control of the power resource east of the Blue Mountains has shamefully and maliciously injected controversy into the schedule of programed comprehensive Federal projects, particularly at Hells Canyon despite its merit; and

Whereas in all significant elections in Baker County and in Oregon since 1948 the people have overwhelmingly voted the high dam preference; and

Whereas the future economic well-being of this section is contingent upon the adequate utilization of its greatest resources—water and land and minerals—and the high dam most fully assures full use of the water, proper reservation for its future consumptive use upon our land and low-cost energy for the processing of our mineral wealth; and

Whereas the Federal Power Commission examiner, after long hearings, determined the high dam to be the more nearly ideal development, better in coordinated power production by close to 500,000 kilowatts, cheaper in kilowatt-hour cost by 2.65 mills compared to 6.69 mills for low dams, superior in flood-control storage by 2½ million acre-feet, and immeasurably better in recreation and other values; and

Whereas private development has declared itself superior to the sacred laws of Oregon governing water, built a bridge crossing a navigable stream prior to obtaining a Federal permit, failed to consult county authorities relative to road floodage, failed to complete negotiations with the State for highway floodage, failed to include major access highway facilities into Hells Canyon as a part of its development, and failed to wait legal clearance of its Federal license; and

Whereas minor preliminary construction by the power company at the Brownlee low dam site shows no promise of economic advantage to this region, stoppage of low dam work through high dam authorization would actually stimulate rather than restrict business investment here: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Baker County Commercial Club does most respectfully petition the Congress to authorize the high dam at Hells Canyon and by copies of this resolution does respectfully urge the able members of the Oregon delegation sponsoring this worthy legislation to convey this message from the people of eastern Oregon to the Congress.

BARD JOHNSON,
President.

[From the Washington Evening Star of July 5, 1956]

DEMOCRATS AND THE POWER ISSUE—FEDERAL VERSUS PRIVATE DEVELOPMENT OF RIVERS SEEN AS CAMPAIGN ARGUMENT

(By Thomas L. Stokes)

Once again the Democrat Party in Congress has decided to seize upon and project further the vision first glimpsed by a Republican President half a century ago—Theodore Roosevelt—and transferred into reality on several fronts by two of its own Presidents, Franklin D. Roosevelt and Harry S. Truman.

This is the public development of our great river systems for reclamation, navigation and production of hydroelectric power which has been stifled by the Eisenhower administration. Instead, the present administration has devised something it calls the partnership policy which in most cases would mean that waterpower sites still not utilized would be handed over to private power companies to exploit for fancy profits through high rates charged the consumers for electricity.

In no other area has the Eisenhower administration surrendered so supinely to big business and finance, with which the vast monopoly is interwined. Luckily for consumers, this attempted handout has been dramatized by an inconsistency that even a schoolboy can understand. This is the way the administration readily lends the financial support of our Government, either directly or through the International Bank, to build great dams in India, Egypt, Israel, Latin America, and other parts of the world while it forbids any such for our own people.

Luckily also, there is Congress and there is the Democratic Party that controls it and is looking for issues in this election year. It has found its opportunity in two areas of greatest undeveloped potential, one in the Northwest, one in the Northeast, and the leadership has pushed bills for each forward in the last few weeks.

One is the Pfost-Morse bill for Hells Canyon, which has been approved in the last several days by the Interior Committees of both House and Senate and now is on the calendar in both branches for final action. This measure would authorize Federal construction of a high dam across the Snake River along the Oregon-Idaho border at Hells Canyon as recommended by the Army engineers. It was their verdict that this was the best way to utilize all the potentials of the Snake River for flood control, recreation, and production of hydroelectric power, and the only way to carry out the overall plan for integrated development of the Columbia River system at which they have been working for 30 years.

By passing this bill, Congress would annul the administration scheme, originally pushed by former Secretary of Interior Douglas McKay, and rubber-stamped by the Federal Power Commission, that called for private development through three low dams by the Idaho Power Co., a Maine corporation, absentee owned. This would fail to utilize all the potential at Hells Canyon and would also cost consumers, including industry, much higher rates than under public development. Already the Idaho Power Co. has started preliminary work on one of the low dams, and the Hells Canyon Association, composed of consumers, farmer and labor organizations, is trying to stop construction by a suit in the Federal courts here in Washington.

The other project, that in the Northeast, is the $440 million redevelopment of the Niagara River to produce 1.5 million kilowatts of power. This is not a Federal enterprise but would be developed by the New York Power Authority, a State agency, under terms of the Buckley-Lehman bill which passed the Senate in middle May and was recently reported favorably to the House by its Public Works Committee.

As to the Niagara project, President Eisenhower always has taken the position that it was up to New York to decide how it should be developed. An alternative before Congress was a bill authorizing developing by five private companies which once passed the House, but now is supplanted by the State development measure.

Public development through the New York State Power Authority is envisaged by the sponsors as a means of providing low-cost electricity over a wide area, including Pennsylvania and much of Ohio, as well as New York. At the present time, rates in New York are much higher than those across the border in Canada. In 1952, for example, in Toronto, the average home used 367 kilowatt hours a month at a cost of $3.81, while in Rochester 100 kilowatts cost $4.36. Or compare Windsor, Canada, 200 miles from Niagara Falls, where average home use was 286 kilowatt hours a month at a cost of $3.65, with New York City, where the average home paid $4.44 for only 100 kilowatt hours. So the comparison goes across the border wherever you choose to pick your samples. New York rates have been increased still further since 1952.

Both the Niagara and Hell's Canyon developments are sound, self-liquidating enterprises. The savings by the economic operation possible in each would mean much to the consumer's budget in this era of high-living costs. There seems no reason why a great country such as ours could not do as much for its people in reducing electric utility costs as does Canada, where public development of its water resources is so long established that it is taken for granted as the only sensible way.

Wilson and the Red Air Threat

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEON H. GAVIN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 5, 1956

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Washington Evening Star of July 6, 1956:

WILSON AND THE RED AIR THREAT—SECRETARY VIEWED AS BELIEVING SOVIET'S ECONOMIC SETUP MITIGATES DANGER

(By Constantine Brown)

There is an honest difference of opinion over the lag of the American Air Force in comparison with the U. S. S. R.'s. Uniformed service leaders and their supporters in Congress are genuinely alarmed by the progress the Russians have made. Gen. Nathan Twining, Air Force Chief of Staff, is said to have been more impressed than he has announced publicly by the quality and quantity of Soviet aircraft. On the other hand, Defense Secretary Wilson does not believe in the Reds' capabilities to wage a successful war.

The difference between the civilians and the military in the Pentagon spring from the fact that the men in uniform look at the situation strictly from an operational point of view, while Mr. Wilson—who is advised

also by economists—looks at the overall economic angle. He is convinced that the Soviets under present conditions could hurt us only slightly should they decide to strike. Their economy transportation, industrial capability for producing war materials to sustain a war of any length and the morale of the peoples of the U. S. S. R. tend to nullify the obvious progress in their air and naval building programs.

These advisers of the Secretary of Defense point to World War II. Before the Japanese hit us at Pearl Harbor they had a definite superiority in naval power and military manpower. The Japanese military machine in 1941 and the subsequent year was considered among the finest in the world. They had more planes (particularly their Zeros), more capital ships and more submarines than we had. They had a ground force far superior to ours which marched from victory to victory all over southeast Asia. At the outbreak of the war they possessed at least one 50,000-ton battleship which our Navy considered then as the queen of the seas.

There was nothing wrong, say these advisers of Secretary Wilson, either with Japanese patriotism and their willingness to die for their country, or their technical know-how and industrial establishments, which were among the best in the world. Yet Japan went down in defeat—not at the time she actually surrendered but at least 18 months before. The reason was the economic conditions in that country, which, despite its technological advances and temporary supremacy of the seas, could not bear the brunt of war for long.

It could be said, the economists admit, that the situation is not altogether comparable between the great land mass which forms the U. S. S. R. and the small Japanese islands into which were then compressed some 70 million people. Russia is not dependent on seaborne traffic to feed herself and her war factories. And she does have vast quantities of natural resources on her own soil.

But at the same time Russia does not have the same cohesive population Japan had. There is almost the same lack of food and consumers' goods in the Soviet Union, and particularly among her subjugated satellites on whose loyalty she must count in event of war, as there was during the days before she achieved her present perfection in nuclear weapons and long-range bombers.

The Japanese people were almost 100 percent behind their war lords in World War II and were fanatically prepared to die for their country and emperor. Not so in the Soviet Union, particularly since the downgrading of Stalin, who had become during his dictatorship almost as much of a sacred cow as the Emperor of Japan was to his people.

Now as in the past, the Russian Empire is composed of people of many races, religions, and languages. These peoples are kept together in a tenuous coalition mostly through fear of the central authority in the Kremlin. A satisfied stomach and an occasional pair of shoes would do much to keep the loyalty of these people in times of hardship.

Had it not been for the immediate intervention of America and Britain with food and war materials when Hitler's legions got Stalin's divisions on the run in 1941, there is little doubt that the Soviet regime would have collapsed and the U. S. S. R. might have become pulverized into a number of states under the impact of the Nazi blows. The national spirit in the U. S. S. R. awoke when the peasants and workers were called to defend their own land, and then it succeeded only because the United States and the British Empire rushed not only weapons but also food and clothing for the defenders of the Russian soil. Communism is imperialistic, but the Russian peoples are not.

These economic considerations explain the lack of enthusiasm on the part of the Secretary of Defense to spend more than he considers absolutely necessary to match the Soviet military machine plane-for-plane and ship-for-ship.

Ike Needs Whom?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES M. QUIGLEY
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 6, 1956

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Speaker, the cry is already going up, and it shall reach a crescendo by November, from our brethren across the aisle that "Ike need me" in the Congress.

Sometimes, as we watch the rollcall votes, we wonder just whom Ike really needs. A particular case in point was the vote on the mutual security bill, which Mr. Eisenhower has referred to as the keystone of his whole foreign policy.

An interesting commentary and analysis has been made by Roscoe Drummond, in an article published in the Harrisburg (Pa.) Patriot for July 4. It might be noted that the Patriot has been a strong supporter of Mr. Eisenhower. The article follows:

DEMOCRATS GO TO BAT ON FOREIGN AID—LOOK WHO SAVED THE PRESIDENT

(By Roscoe Drummond)

Principally because of its own faltering in leadership, the Eisenhower administration is fortunate that it is getting through Congress as good and as sizable a mutual aid bill bill as its now in process of being passed.

In large part the credit belongs to the patriotic good sense of Senators LYNDON JOHNSON and WALTER F. GEORGE—who did more for the President's cause than any Republican—and to the votes of Democratic Members.

Emasculating cuts in foreign aid funds were avoided, although the fight will come all over again when the appropriations are finally made.

The proposal to end peremptorily all aid to Yugoslavia was defeated.

Other crippling amendments affecting East-West trade and aid to India were lost.

In all these moves adverse to the President, in an almost evenly divided Senate, there were always more Democrats than Republicans supporting the White House and more Republicans than Democrats opposing what Mr. Eisenhower was asking.

There were several critical test votes which showed the President's indebtedness to the Democratic leadership and to Democratic support.

On the amendment precipitately to cut off aid to Tito—an amendment sponsored by Senator STYLES BRIDGES, of New Hampshire, and supported by Minority Leader WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND, of California, the two senior Senate Republicans—President Eisenhower's views were opposed by 23 Republicans and 15 Democrats and were backed by 29 Democrats and 23 Republicans.

The White House position was that assistance to Yugoslavia ought not to be hastily foreclosed until developing events and reevaluation show whether Tito is going to be an uncritical ally of the Kremlin. The bill required the President to explain his reasons to Congress for whatever decision he made. No wonder Senator JOSEPH O'MAHONEY, Democrat, Wyoming, strongly supporting Mr. Eisenhower's position, turned to Senator BRIDGES, who was seeking to take all discretion from the White House, and remarked: "Don't you trust the man you want to run for President?"

Further, most of the pressure and most of the votes behind the ultimately unsuccessful efforts to cut in half the amount of aid to India and to make United States aid to all countries conditional upon their following exactly the same policies in East-West trade as we do, came principally from the President's own party.

I think it has to be recognized that from the President down, the administration is in part to blame for the near defeat it has just escaped. The administration seemed to be listless and inadequate in expounding to the country the continuing need for an effective mutual-aid program to counter new Soviet tactics and woefully tardy in bringing the leaders of Congress to an across-the-table bipartisan conference at the White House. These came long after there were ample danger signals on the Hill that the bill was in peril. When one Democratic leader asked at the opening of the conference, "Why are we meeting only now?" there was no good answer.

Further it must be frankly stated that one reason why the White House is now asking an unusually high foreign aid figure is that it has been using gimmicks to bring about a fat budget surplus is this election year. And one way this has been done has been by cutting foreign aid commitments to the extent that the pipelines have been unwisely depleted. The bill may still suffer from this short-sighted action.

It always seemed to me a mistake that as President Eisenhower and the other officials of the administration, with the exception of Harold Stassen, were so chary of giving clear credit to the Marshall plan for the tremendous dividends it paid the United States in security and savings and in European solidarity.

Although Mr. Eisenhower has briefly spoken contrariwise at one or two press conferences, he let the fallacy that foreign aid is a "giveaway" program become widely accepted during the past 3 years without vigorously countering it. This is why his own mutual aid program came within an inch of going down the drain in Congress during the past few weeks.

There is no justification for any give-away of the American taxpayers' money. If economic and military aid to nations struggling to maintain their own independence does not serve our own security, it should not be voted at all.

The Marshall plan devoted $12 billion to saving western Europe from economic disintegration. It was a prudent investment. If western Europe had come under the domination of the Kremlin in 1948—and it was near to it—nothing we could have done would have compensated for the loss. Instead of spending $12 billion in 4 years to avert it, we would be spending at least $12 billion more every year to defend against the consequences.

Worship and Work—History of St. John's

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRED MARSHALL
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, July 7, 1956

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an editorial from the Commonweal of June 29, 1956, paying tribute to the monks of

St. John's Abbey at Collegeville, Minn., on their centennial observance.

It also recommends a history of the first 100 years, Worship and Work, written by Father Colman Barry, a monk of St. John's.

The editorial follows:

WORSHIP AND WORK

In the days of its youth in the Dark Ages, the venerable Order of St. Benedict helped keep alight the flickering fires of Western civilization. The Roman Empire had collapsed and chaos reigned. The monasteries of Europe carefully preserved and laboriously copied out the priceless texts of our cultural and religious heritage. At the same time they showed their contemporaries how to clear and till the land in order to build up a material base for an ordered human existence.

During the 19th century the Benedictines experienced a remarkable revival and expansion which persist to this day. In Europe and America they have been confronting a society whose essential unity was broken into fragments by the 16th century Protestant revolt and which was yet further weakened by the industrial revolution's creation of a rootless, urban proletariat. To fulfill their appointed task in the spirit of their common rule under these conditions has presented the world's various autonomous Benedictine communities with a new challenge.

This could hardly be better exemplified than by the first hundred years, just completed, of St. John's Abbey of Collegeville, Minn. Its tasks have varied and expanded at each stage. The founding Bavarian Benedictines had first to establish the monastic life of prayer in common in the Minnesota wilderness (as they likewise did concurrently at Latrobe, Pa. and Atchison, Kans.). The extent to which they ministered to the needs of the American frontier from the outset is attested by the few years required for them to receive an independent status from Rome. The degree to which these hardy monks were able to transmit the full life of the church, as they had experienced it in Europe, to the primitive American frontier was truly remarkable. It comprises some of the most colorful pages of Colman J. Barry's extremely able historical account of the first hundred years of St. John's (Worship and Work, St. John's Abbey and University, Collegeville, Minn., $5).

As is brought out in this impressive new volume, it was the conjunction of Abbot Alcuin Deutsch, who served as head of the community from 1921 to 1950, and Father Virgil Michel, who died in 1938 at the age of 47, that brought St. John's to the forefront in the annals of American Catholic life. Abbot Alcuin was the chief instigator of a liturgical revival which was to radiate beyond the abbey's walls to all corners of the United States. Father Virgil was imbued with similar convictions as to the necessity for a widespread return to liturgical worship, that primary and indispensable source of the true Christian spirit (St. Pius X). He founded Orate Fratres, a monthly review which became Worship at the time of its 25th anniversary, and the Popular Liturgical Library ,which is still producing inexpensive booklets of liturgical teachings and actual texts.

But Virgil Michel was also preeminent for his vision of the connection between universal participation in the full prayer life of the church and the urgently needed solution of the social question. He believed it literally providential that Leo XIII and St. Pius X were virtually contemporaries. He insisted that Christian social action and the nonindividualistic liturgical movement should stimulate each other, that the mystical body supplies the true basis for Christian solidarity.

Accomplishments such as these reflect the dynamism and zeal of a religious community whose first concern is the official prayer life of the church. For St. John's Abbey in its first century has, among other things, built up one of the most respected universities in the Middle West, ministered to the spiritual needs of several generations for miles around, set up a continuing series of constructive social action and rural life institutes for adults and at the same time sent forth its men again and again to establish a dozen or more new autonomous monasteries and priories along a vast arc which extends from Mexico and Puerto Rico to Tokyo, Japan. We are happy to join in paying tribute.

Letter to My Constitutents

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES H. MORRISON
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, July 7, 1956

Mr. MORRISON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD I include a letter which I am sending to my constituents:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., July 1956.

MY DEAR FRIEND: I am writing this letter to ask for your vote and support in my reelection. Election day, as you know, is July 31 and your support will be deeply appreciated by me. I will also be deeply grateful if you can contact your friends, neighbors, and relatives and urge their support of my candidacy for reelection.

It has been my privilege and honor to be your Congressman for the past 14 years or 7 consecutive terms. I am extremely appreciative of the confidence that you have placed in me and also of the fact that you have elected me by a larger vote each time that I have come for reelection. With your generous support in the past, you were responsible for me being unopposed for the past two terms.

I have certainly tried in every way to justify your confidence by trying to assist each and every person who called on me regardless of their walk in life or political alinement. No problem has been too small nor none too large to receive my urgent attention. I think you will agree with me that I have tried to be one of the best Congressman that ever served the sixth district.

I do not want to appear boastful as to my efforts but I do feel that by writing you this letter that it will enable me to let you know how extremely grateful I am to serve as your Congressman.

Your Congress has faced a multitude of difficult issues and problems during the past years. I have consistently voted for all measures that would aid the farmers, the old folks, the businessmen, the laboring man and the veterans and for the various bills that improve our security and standards of living.

I pledge to do everything within my power to continue to help you to remedy the troubles that beset you at this time and to improve your working and living conditions. You may therefore, rest assured that I shall continue to put forth my best efforts in your behalf.

I trust that my legislative experiences for the past 14 years and my record as your Congressman in these 14 years will warrant your continued consideration for your vote for my reelection July 31.

With kindest personal regards and best wishes, I am

Sincerely yours,

JIMMY MORRISON,
James H. Morrison,
Member of Congress.

P. S.—As I have said in the past, I want you to feel that at any time I can ever serve you in my capacity as Congressman, please do not hesitate to call on me. I am enclosing my remarks from a speech I made on the floor of Congress and hope that it will be of interest to you.

Best regards.

J. H. M.

Galloway Calhoun

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRADY GENTRY
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, July 7, 1956

Mr. GENTRY. Mr. Speaker, the Honorable Galloway Calhoun, past grand master of Masons of the State of Texas, past imperial potentate of the Shrine of North America, president and chairman of the board of trustees of the Shriners Hospitals for Crippled Children, was elected by the board of directors of Indiana Technical College, Fort Wayne, Ind., to receive an honorary degree of doctor of humanities which was to have been conferred upon him in person at the commencement exercises on May 20, 1956, when the eminent scientist, Charles F. Kettering, was the speaker.

Because of ill health Dr. Calhoun could not attend the exercises. His friend of long standing, Dr. George E. Stringfellow of West Orange, N. J., long time business associate of the late Thomas Alva Edison, member of the imperial divan of the Shrine and a member of the board of directors of Indiana Technical College, received the citation in behalf of Dr. Calhoun. Dr. Stringfellow was authorized by the board of directors of Indiana Technical College to present the citation to Dr. Calhoun at the annual meeting of the Texas All State Shrine Association in Houston, Tex., on May 26, 1956, on the assumption that Dr. Calhoun would be able to be present. Dr. Calhoun, however, had not sufficiently recovered his health to attend this very successful affair and the Governor of the State of Texas, the Honorable Allan Shivers, received the citation from Dr. Stringfellow for Dr. Calhoun.

In presenting the citation, Dr. Stringfellow read the following message from Dr. Archie T. Keene, president of Indiana Technical College:

Mr. Calhoun, because you realize that to be effective, any efforts in behalf of humanity must be rooted in unflinching personal integrity; because you know that prosecution of the evil-doer should be undertaken only by the pure of heart and that the strength for such efforts comes from rectitude and simplicity; because you realize that the sick and the weak give to the strong and the able an opportunity to develop gentleness, humility, and gratitude; and because your own concern and love for the physically unfortunate have grown to the place where you are willing to sacrifice your own vitality and talents for their welfare—which is the ultimate in unselfishness—Indiana Technical College, upon the approval of its board of directors, is honored to pay tribute to you and through the authority in it vested by the State of Indiana confers upon you the degree, doctor of humanities (honoris causa), with all of the

rights, titles, privileges, and obligations appertaining thereto.

ARCHIE T. KEENE,
President.

In receiving the citation for Dr. Calhoun, Governor Shivers said:

Thank you, George Stringfellow, President Kendall Baker, of the Texas Shrine Convention, imperial sirs of the Imperial Council of the Shrine for North America, distinguished guests, ladies and nobles of the Mystic Shrine.

It is a proud moment for me that I have been selected to receive this honorary degree of doctor of humanities from Indiana Technical College, on behalf of our great and good friend, Galloway Calhoun, who cannot be with us this evening because of illness.

We can say to all of you that we truly love Galloway Calhoun, and in his behalf we express our gratitude for this recognition. No citizen of Texas has been more interested in his fellow man than has Galloway Calhoun. He has contributed generously of his time and talents, as well as his economic resources, to make this Nation secure in its freedoms, more able to cope with its ever increasing problems, and to create a better feeling among all people. I know I can express his deep regrets because of his inability to be with us here tonight. His contribution to the great humanitarian work of the Shrine for North America has been invaluable.

His legion of friends are saying a prayer for his speedy recovery, and in his behalf I am privileged to say thanks many times over to you, and to the members of the board of Indiana Technical College and all its faculty, for this additional honor which has come his way.

Mr. Speaker, the people of all walks of life in my congressional district and the State of Texas feel that they themselves are honored through this award to a great American citizen by one of our country's outstanding educational institutions. We who know Galloway Calhoun intimately realize full well that it is a worthy and most deserved tribute to one who, throughout his life, has given his utmost in service to humanity.

NAACP Injures Negro Race

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. S. HERLONG, JR.
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, July 7, 1956

Mr. HERLONG. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I include an editorial from the Orlando Morning Sentinel which is most timely:

NAACP INJURES NEGRO RACE

The unfortunate situation in our State capitol at Tallahassee shows how racial relations can deteriorate when attempts are made too suddenly to alter the customs of generations.

Because two Negro students demanded the right to sit in the white section of a local bus, as the Supreme Court had indicated they had every right to do, a boycott was instigated when they were put off the bus.

There are many things that are not right in this world and everyone should try to improve bad conditions wherever they exist. But fools rush in where angels fear to tread. And too many times rabid reformers only succeed in making matters worse.

The boycott of the bus company in Tallahassee was managed so well that Saturday night it went out of business. Now the city's 14,000 Negroes are without transportation facilities.

Even worse, considerable animosity has been aroused among the white people against those who participated in the boycott and Negroes are complaining of police intimidation. There are threats of extending the boycott to other lines of business.

In condemning the action of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, Governor Collins said, "If it is interested in advancing the welfare of our Negro citizens, it should concern itself with other conditions of far more importance than where people sit on buses."

There are so many things which need to be done for the benefit of the Negro race before integration becomes possible. The NAACP could make a real contribution to Negro welfare if it devoted its energies to improving his health and sanitation, his sense of moral values, his attitude toward work, and responsibility to family and community.

In seeking these goals the Negroes would have the cooperation of their white friends everywhere throughout the South. They could have better schools, better housing, better health facilities, and better economic opportunities on a segregated basis.

Once they have achieved equality, there would be less opposition to integration.

H. R. 11375 Will Boost Milk Consumption

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LESTER R. JOHNSON
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, July 7, 1956

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, since the passage of my bill, H. R. 11375, by the House, I have received some additional information on how my bill will increase the consumption of milk under the special school milk program.

Before I present this information, I wish to point out that under the present authority many agencies and institutions are not eligible to receive school milk unless the children are underprivileged and are on a public-welfare or charitable basis. We do not apply this discrimination to the milk received by elementary and secondary schools; therefore, I believe that the law should be amended to remove this discrimination from child-care centers, nursery schools, settlement houses, and other youth programs of a nonprofit nature such as summer camps, and so forth.

I have been informed that comparatively few child-care organizations in all of our States are eligible to receive milk under the present authority. For example, small-population States, such as Vermont, Utah, Wyoming, and Nevada, report that less than six organizations are eligible to receive milk under the present authority.

In the southeast States of North Carolina, Kentucky, Georgia, and Alabama the number of child-care agencies, organizations, programs that are eligible is estimated to be from 15 to 30.

Michigan estimates that only about 50 organizations—serving about 2,500 children—are eligible now to receive school milk. Minnesota estimates that it has only 25 organizations—serving 2,000 children—eligible under present authority.

Wisconsin, which has demonstrated considerable interest in the extension of the mink program to organizations other than schools, recently made a survey to determine the number of programs eligible under the present law. The results of the Wisconsin survey show that only 31 child-care institutions serving 4,600 children are presently eligible.

On the other hand, under my bill—H. R. 11375—it is estimated that 279 organizations or programs, serving approximately 85,000 children, will be eligible for school milk.

The present legislation excludes many organizations serving a very substantial number of children. These include the Boy Scouts, Girl Scouts, Camp Fire Girls, 4–H Clubs, WMCA, church groups, and summer camps operated by city recreation departments or park commissioners.

For example, 270 camps in Massachusetts now receive surplus foods; however, only 20 to 25 of these camps can qualify for the milk program under present authority. In the greater Boston area summer recreation programs serve some 50,000 children daily. While certain units in this Greater Boston program may qualify, the State agency does not wish to participate in the program except on a communitywide basis.

The same reaction is reported from Philadelphia where extensive recreation programs are operated for children from late spring through early fall.

Under H. R. 11375 all of these programs, agencies, organizations, and institutions would be eligible to participate in the special school-milk program.

I certainly must emphasize the fact that children are very active during the summer months. This is one time when they should have all the milk they can use for nutritional purposes. The broader authority for extension of the school-milk program under H. R. 11375 will certainly increase the consumption of milk, and it will provide children with nutritional food at a time when they need it the most.

A True World Peace Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DeWITT S. HYDE
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, July 7, 1956

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I would like to include an article, featured in the summer issue of the Washington magazine, World Affairs, written by my friend, Dr. Joseph F. Thorning, professor of international relations in the University of Santo Domingo and a Maryland educator, author, and lecturer. This article is entitled

"A World Peace Congress: Christians in Action." It is clear that the spiritual resources of our Judaeo-Christian civilization are equal to the problems which confront us in the age of thermonuclear energy.

The article follows:

A WORLD PEACE CONGRESS: CHRISTIANS IN ACTION

(By Joseph F. Thorning, professor of international relations, the University of Santo Domingo)

The peace movement is not a monopoly of the Soviets. This was demonstrated on a world scale, when delegates from every free nation and representatives of many countries behind the Iron Curtain met for 10 days (February 26–March 8) in the Dominican Republic. The keynote of this gathering was the motto of the American Peace Society: "Peace is the tranquillity of order." Without bombast or bellicosity, without nationalistic overtones or the futile posturings of self-styled "pacifists," spokesmen (ladies and gentlemen) from Asia, Africa, Australia, Europe, Canada, Hispanic America, and the United States presented, by word and deed, an affirmative program for human brotherhood based upon undiluted Christian doctrine.

It was significant that the principal orators in this international gathering were not ecclesiastics but youthful, dedicated lay leaders. Outstanding in this category was Prof. Enrico Medi of the University of Rome. The gentleman, fresh from his experience at the Geneva International Conference on the peaceful uses of nuclear energy, described, with a wealth of mathematic formulæ, the lightninglike advances which scientists were making toward creating a superabundance of economic goods. It was Dr. Medi's contention that mankind was much closer to the solution of the ultimate problems in the domain of thermonuclear energy than would be suspected by the uninitiate. "The human race," this specialist insisted, "is moving forward in the antechamber of Paradise. Global food supplies, comfortable homes on every continent, suitable raiment for every climate, and transport for all, rivaling that epitomized in the fable of the magic carpet, await discovery just beyond the final, paper-thin barriers to new worlds of scientific truth. What reason is there to engage in fratricidal slaughter when we have traversed nine-tenths of the journey, through deserts and over mountains, to the Promised Land? The folly of war, the crime of wholesale incineration, can serve as the only roadblocks on the highway to happiness."

The world dimensions of this dream did not keep the delegates from a careful consideration of the problems that afflict humanity on a more modest scale. The Family, Its Nature, Qualities, and Purposes was the subject of an excellent address by Prof. Félix Obieta of Madrid, Spain. Youth Education for Farm Work was a theme developed by Prof. Fernand Boulard, of Paris, France, while the advantages and limitations of agricultural and fishing cooperatives for production and marketing were described, in intimate detail by Prof. Michael McKinnon, of St. Francis Xavier University, Antigonish, Nova Scotia. The shipment and sale in Boston of two crates of lobsters, it was pointed out, formed the starting point of a whole system of regional education for farmers and fishermen, with a consequent 100 percent increase in the standard of living for these workers and their families. A brief history of social security laws constituted an integral part of this discussion. It was the role of Dr. Pedro Troncoso Sánchez, in a masterly dissertation, to sum up the economic and sócial features of progress in the Dominican Republic under the general heading "The Commonweal, Chief Purpose of the State."

In the midst of the serious toil of the International Congress on Christian Culture for the Peace of the World, it was refreshing to have flashes of brilliant wit and humor spread by three notable representatives of the British Commonwealth (Messrs. Douglas Woodruff, Bruce Marshall, and Dr. M. McNarney). Mr. Bruce Marshall, the novelist, delighted his listeners by pointing out that religious, peace-minded people did not have to be dull. He recommended that imagination and sound feeling should inform, enchant, and enlighten the attitudes of Christian apostles of peace. "Why should God's crusaders for brotherly affection," he asked, "be content to denounce reality rather than to deal with it? What is to be gained by constantly becoming embroiled in rear-guard actions? Peace is a Christian ideal; peace is an interesting, happy experience; peace is fruitful and fructifying. Too many religionists, like militarists, tend to despair of human nature. Since man possesses his soul, made in the image and likeness of God, he holds within himself and in the divine spirit of his neighbors a fountain of eternal hope. Human betterment comes about by love of virtue, not merely by the detestation of sin. Therefore, the Christian man of letters pictures life as God made it, not as the preachers sometimes depict it, sulfurous with fire and smoke. Whereas the agnostic despairs of his own destiny and is dismal in his interpretation of life's suffering and setbacks, the Christian paladin of peaceful living is at home in history and in the world as it is. Since Satan is the real deity of the unbeliever, why should not the faithful Christians move forward with letters, arts, sociology, and science?"

A similar note was sounded by M. J. Paul Chartier, editor in chief of the celebrated Radio-Cinéma, illustrated magazine of France. Deploring the tendency to wax melancholy about the salaciousness and superficiality of many Hollywood-Paris-Rome productions, this gifted journalist declared that the public could demand and get the best in motion-picture art. In his view, good entertainment, exemplified in pictures such as Pygmalion and Julius Caesar, were also good box office. "Religion," he stated, "is a better treasure trove for silver screen than classic drama, the latter a cultural source that, repeatedly, has been tapped with golden results. Christians must become entrepreneurs and promoters. The masterminds and the merchandisers must not be necessarily drawn from the ranks of the pagans or infidels. Motion-picture stars, male and female, can be keyed to the cause of Christian humanism. Many of them hunger and thirst after justice. But neither the artists nor the technicians nor the producers can be courted with tommyguns. They can be won to the peace movement and to the Christian apostolate by intelligent admiration for what they create in the magic-lantern world of the true, the good, and the beautiful."

Peace Among the Nations was the topic confided to a youthful member of the Italian Parliament, the Honorable Giuseppe Vedovato. "Law and politics," he elucidated, "must be predicated upon the fact that the human race is the human family. Although the members of the same family may disagree or quarrel, they are organically united. Consequently, until they establish their family relationships upon juridical principles they are living outside the plan of nature's God." Touching upon the cultural aspects of family living on a world scale, Dr. Vedovato, who is one of the Vice Presidents of UNESCO, indicated that, although agnosticism had been a feature of this organization's initial phases under the influence of Mr. Julian Huxley, this was no longer as prominent a factor as it had been. Consequently, he urged that God-minded people do their best to enter the activities of UNESCO with the conviction that culture could not be divorced from religion. "Since the human family can be united only by love," Deputy Vedovato concluded, "Soviet collectivism, which promotes militant atheism, can never offer any motivation superior to expediency, if, indeed, it does not spread envy and hatred."

Switzerland, which has such an excellent reputation as a "little League of Nations," was represented in the conference by M. Robert Bénoit-Cherix, professor of religious literature in the University of Fribourg. He emphasized the responsibility of the individual citizen to come to the assistance, spiritual and temporal, of his neighbors. "World peace," he declared, "does not transcend the need of a citizen's body and soul for personal charity; no organization can take the place of a friend who is willing to persevere in the role of a Good Samaritan."

This view coincided with that of the principal delegate of China, Dr. Paul K. T. Sih. "It may be stated sadly," he suggested, "that we are living in a cold peace, for the flames of charity are lacking. * * * If you seek peace apart from God, you will have wars and wars. Without God there is no ultimate frame of reference for human beings or for any other creatures. A righteous peace program must pit faith against terror; truth against falsehood; and love against hate."

The spokesman for Asia at the final session of the World Congress was Dr. Kotaro Tanaka, chief justice of the supreme court of Japan. Both chief justice and Mrs. Tanaka, it may be remarked, are fervent Christians and both took an outstandingly brilliant part in the gathering. What they reported about the importance of the Far East was thoroughly interesting. But most impressive was their personnal example of conscientious devotion to duty at all sessions, their painstaking record of the comments by each speaker, their industry in transcribing their notes from Japanese to English, German, Spanish, and French, their obvious sense of solidarity, in the light of Christian love, for their fellowmen. No couple from any country won deeper respect from all who saw them or had occasion to exchange opinions with them.

It was hardly astonishing, therefore, that the final declaration of the International Congress began with these principles:

"All men are essentially equal, whatever may be their race or the class to which they pertain, or the stage of civilization which they have reached. All have an identical origin in God, by creation; all have the same nature, a body and an immortal soul; all have been redeemed by Christ; all can be reborn to the life of Grace; all are called to the perfect possession of God in Christ."

Eastern Kentucky State College Extended International Recognition

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN C. WATTS
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, July 7, 1956

Mr. WATTS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I desire to insert an article appearing in the April 6 issue of the Christian Science Monitor which I believe will be of extreme interest to the membership of the House.

It relates to the outstanding achievement of a small teachers' college located in my congressional district in Kentucky. This accomplishment is most extraordinary because it dwells in a

field ordinarily unique and removed from the normal endeavors of the average teachers' college.

Long has Eastern Kentucky State been recognized as one of the foremost and progressive institutions of its kind in the country. This commendation concerning its success in promoting a system of study and dissemination of information on matters relating to world mindedness is well merited and reflects the untiring efforts of the management and faculty of this institution to advance the standing of Eastern in the fields of education.

The director of the center of international relations, Mr. Glenn A. McLain, is a very dear friend of mine, and I know personally of his work and endeavors to insure the continued and broadening success of this undertaking. To him and to the faculty of Eastern Kentucky State I extend my sincere congratulations. They have well earned this recognition.

The article follows:

THEY SEE WIDE HORIZONS IN THE BLUEGRASS STATE

(By Glenn A. McLain, director, Center of International Relations, Eastern Kentucky State College)

RICHMOND, KY.—Teachers colleges are seldom famous for giving their students an outstanding knowledge of world affairs; and perhaps this, in particular, is not expected from a teachers college located in the heart of the Middle West and drawing largely from the region directly around it. Yet for over 28 years the study of world affairs has been a notable part of the teaching program of Eastern Kentucky State College. This school has, indeed, achieved an international reputation for its emphasis on world-mindedness.

Leadership rests with a World Affairs Club. Founded back in 1927 under the guidance of Dr. L. G. Kennamer, head of Eastern's department of geography and geology, it has been consistently active through the years. Under its sponsorship, discussions, film programs, and world-famous speakers have brought the world to Richmond's doorstep, and in turn sent out hundreds of graduates having an unusual grasp of the importance of a knowledge of world affairs in facing the problems of their own State and communities.

ESPECIALLY SELECTED

In May 1954 the Foreign Policy Association of New York selected Eastern as one of 40 institutions and organizations in which to establish a center of international relations. Eastern also became one of 19 educational groups in America sponsored by the United States Department of State to distribute United States foreign policy materials, and 1 of 22 colleges in the Nation which is working with the United Nations as a depository for U. N. materials. The groundwork already done by the World Affairs Club had opened the way.

For many years the club had kept a large collection of materials on Kentucky and on world problems. This was greatly increased, and is now used as resource material by schools, colleges, and community organizations throughout the State.

Part of this collection includes a clipping file from newspapers. This file, which covers 1,000 subjects in the field of international relations, is based largely upon articles printed in the Christian Science Monitor during the past 10 years. Many former Eastern students, now teachers and professional leaders, have been trained to us this simple inexpensive way to build a topic file on any of a variety of subjects.

SOME OF ACTIVITIES

That the program at Eastern is considered unique in its field in the entire Nation, is due to a large extent to the members of the World Affairs Club. These students have been generous in volunteer work and have shown outstanding leadership in developing speakers' events.

From May 10, 1954, until October 10, 1955, for example, a total of 872 teachers at all levels of instruction have been included in the mailing list of the Center of International Relations. During the academic year 1954–55, 316 personal requests for materials on everything from conservation in Kentucky to United States policy in the Far East were filled by the World Affairs Club staff of the center.

A great many of these students spent their weekends, time between classes, and afternoons, in the center typing up packages, making posters, unwrapping mail and answering or processing the over 100 letters and 200 packages which weekly flowed into the center. Over 1,300 organizations in the field of world affairs have the center on their mailing lists and many times during the past year truckloads of mail have been sent to the center for distribution throughout Kentucky.

WASHINGTON RESOURCES

Washington resources have been developed for the club and center by the public services division of the State Department, and many Washington legislators have placed Eastern on the mailing lists of every congressional committee and subcommittee in the Congress. World Affairs Club members handling these valuable materials have developed skills in handling Government and many other types of resources which few college students know how to use, either in teaching or in other professional fields.

Last year, 11 speakers of international importance came to the Eastern campus as the guests of the club. The list was headed by the Australian Ambassador, Sir Percy Spender, who made a radio broadcast with the president of the club, Patti Ann Poyma, and local townspeople. After a banquet attended by over 200 Richmond citizens and students of Eastern, the Ambassador was entertained informally by the students in the dormitory. This kind of off the cuff activity with the students has been of major importance to the club throughout the years at Eastern. Many speakers from Austria, Germany, Finland, Israel, and other countries have gone into the classrooms and let down their hair for the benefit of the students.

As the club rounds out yet another year of its pioneer work at Eastern, a new development is already under way. Last autumn what is said to be the first international relations center in America at the high-school level was established in Harlan, Ky. The World Affairs Club and the Center of International Relations at Eastern expect to go on and establish many other such centers during the next 3 years.

Northwest to the Orient

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY S. REUSS
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 21, 1956

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial from the Milwaukee Sentinel of April 18, 1956, should be pondered by all who are interested in the current Civil Aeronautics Board inquiry into certification for flying the northwest route to the Orient:

DIRECT LINK

The right of Northwest Airlines to fly the northern Pacific route to the Orient without disabling competition is again coming up for review before the Civil Aeronautics Board next month.

This is another chapted in a long-standing effort by Pan American World Airways to gain access to the shorter northern route in addition to the longer but more lucrative southern route via Hawaii for which it already holds a certificate.

Northwest has resisted this effort on the grounds that competition would reduce its revenues to the point where it would again require Government subsidy—a condition from which it has been free since 1954.

The matter is of concern to businesses and individuals throughout Wisconsin because of the advantage they enjoy in Northwest's direct link between our State and the Orient.

We wish to suggest that they be alert on this situation, and prepare themselves to register their positions when the case comes on for public hearing before the CAB in May.

Statement by Charles H. Callison

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LESTER R. JOHNSON
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, July 7, 1956

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, it has been my great pleasure, since coming to Congress to become personally acquainted with Charles H. Callison, conservation director of the National Wildlife Federation. I would like to call my colleague's attention to a statement Mr. Callison made before the House Agriculture Committee recently in support of legislation to provide for the development of the recreational and wildlife resources of our national forests.

STATEMENT BY CHARLES H. CALLISON, CONSERVATION DIRECTOR, ON H. R. 1823 AND SIMILAR BILLS

The National Wildlife Federation is made up of some 3 million conservation-minded citizens through its member organizations in the States, Alaska, and the District of Columbia. These people and their families represent a substantial segment of the 40 million sportsmen and sportswomen who hunt and fish in this country. They also are among the principal recreational users who made 46 million visits to our national forests last year.

It is a privilege to appear before this important subcommittee of the Congress to express enthusiastic endorsement by the federation of legislation that will provide for development of the recreational and wildlife resources of the national forests. Medical authorities tell us that outdoor activities are a safety valve through which the people can relieve themselves of the tensions and anxieties that beset our society. One of the most popular and frequently recommended antidotes is a trip to the out of doors to fish or hunt, hike or camp, picnic, or enjoy other of the many relaxing pastimes that are to be experienced within the 180 million acres of the national forests. If I may insert a personal reference, 3 years ago I was having some stomach trouble. It was about this time of year, and I was racing around like mad trying to keep up with the multifold activities of Congress. My principal job is to produce

a legislative reporting service which goes to the member organizations of the National Wildlife Federation, to the State wildlife agencies, and to other conservation groups and leaders throughout the country. I went to see a physician about the persistent rock in my stomach, and he told me I was on the verge of developing an ulcer. He prescribed a diet and some pills, but his principal advice to me was, "Take some time off and go fishing."

The national forests belong to the people and are open to their use. There is no more important resource than the human resource. We cannot place a price on human health and happiness. Neither can we justify or excuse the continued failure to provide the funds needed to develop and utilize the recreational resources of the national forests.

We are not going to keep these millions of recreation seekers out of the national forests. We cannot afford to let the attrition of their very numbers despoil and endanger the forests and the wildlife resources within them. We cannot in good conscience fail to provide the necessary sanitary facilities to protect the health of these millions. Five and one-half million dollars per year as proposed in the bills under consideration—or even twice that amount—would be cheap insurance indeed.

Public recreation has become a third major use of the national forests, ranking in importance along with timber production and watershed protection. It is not difficult to show that, from the standpoint of the public welfare, recreation is the most important product or use of certain national forests that lie within easy access of smog-ridden, tension-laden metropolitan areas. The Inyo National Forest of California and the Allegheny National Forest of Pennsylvania, are examples.

The social and economic importance of the national forests for hunting, fishing, camping, hiking, and other forms of outdoor recreation is a fact created and recognized by the American people. It is a fact not yet recognized by the Federal Government that determines policy and appropriations for those forests.

While the curve of recreational use has been zooming toward the 46 million visit mark, appropriations for servicing and maintaining the recreational facilities—the campgrounds, the picnic areas, the roads and parking areas, and the sanitary facilities—have not kept pace. There have been some small increases in recent years. The appropriation act already approved for fiscal year 1957 carries $3,097,250 for sanitation and care of public campgrounds. This isn't even enough for operation and maintenance of the present run-down and inadequate facilities. It is less than 7 cents per recreational visit. It provides no money for needed capital improvements. In 1952, when the total of recreational visits was running around 35 million per year, the Forest Service estimated $7,169,000 was needed at once to put existing recreational areas in good condition. The Service estimated another $17,135,000 was needed to expand the capacity of existing recreation areas and to construct new areas and facilities to take care of the public overload. A total capital investment needed—in 1952—of over $24 million. I don't know what their current estimates are, but I trust they will be given to the subcommittee.

The condition of recreational facilities on national forests has deteriorated until the public health and safety—and the resources themselves—are seriously endangered. The fire hazard has increased. At places like the Big Pines recreation area in the Angeles National Forest of California, the Barton Flats area in the San Bernardino National Forest, the Powder River area in the Roosevelt National Forest, conditions so slumlike and unsanitary have developed during peak seasons in recent years as to disgrace the Government of the United States.

Wildlife managers point to the fact that some 3,220,000 big game animals—one-third of the national total—live in these publicly owned forests. This number includes 2,820,000 deer, 246,000 elk, 82,000 black bear, 690 grizzly bear, 14,000 mountain goats, 9,660 bighorn sheep, 10,000 moose, 27,000 antelope, and 17,000 peccary.

In addition to providing range for more than 90 percent of all the elk in the country, the wildlife-rich national forests support a large part of the bighorn sheep and nearly all of the mountain goat and grizzly bears to be found outside of the national parks.

Hunters harvested some 473,000 big game animals from the national forests during the 1954 hunting seasons. This total includes some 312,000 mule deer and 85,000 whitetail deer. In addition, 8 out of every 10 of the 41,000 elk taken in the United States come from these forest areas.

Yet, on the basis of current appropriations for wildlife work on these lands—a pittance of $365,000 for the next fiscal year—we would be making an annual investment of less than a dollar per head for each deer or elk taken home by a hunter if the whole sum were expended on big game. Such an allocation, of course, would leave nothing for the important small-game resources or for maintaining the vast sport fisheries in 81,000 miles of streams and 2¼ million acres of lakes and reservoirs within the National Forests. These comparisons serve to illustrate that our present rate of investment in these public game ranges and fishing waters is ridiculously shortsighted.

This kind of neglect of a great natural resource is theopposite conservation. It is sheer waste.

What could the Forest Service do with additional funds for wildlife habitat improvements? Here are some things urgently needed:

Proper location and construction of timber roads and skid trails to eliminate or minimize siltation of streams.

Reservation of sufficient natural openings and brush areas to meet game browse and feeding needs. Fencing of key food and nesting areas.

Planting or reservation of natural groups of conifers for wildlife shelters, and planting or release of fruit-bearing trees and other species that are valuable for wildlife food.

Planning for use of timber-harvesting roads so they may also serve sportmen's needs and secure adequate harvest of big game in areas where there are problems oversupplies of big game.

Management of streamside and lakeshore borders to preserve cover conditions for aquatic animals, such as waterfowl, beaver, and fish.

Seeding of skidways, roadsides, and landings on timber-sale areas where wildlife forage plants will grow and where such seeding will not be inimical to timber-production objectives.

Creation of water holes and construction of watering devices in areas where water shortages tend to limit wildlife populations.

Building of fishing lakes.

(We are submitting for the record, if the subcommittee will permit, a longer listing of direct wildlife habitat improvement measures needed in the national forests.)

Today, except for the small amounts spent on cooperative planning and administration of habitat improvement projects that are paid for by State agencies and other cooperators, the Forest Service has no money to invest in this important phase of the wildlife program. That there is great need is demonstrated by the fact that the State game and fish departments themselves spent nearly one-half million dollars on the national forests last year. With the funds that would be provided by the bills under consideration here, the Forest Service could enter into cooperative projects that would offer real inducements to the States for even greater investments. After all, this is Federal land we are dealing with. The States are limited in the amounts they can spend on national forest lands, but they can justify spending more if Uncle Sam will carry his share of the load. The allocation of $2½ million per year for the wildlife part of the program would be a modest amount.

National forest receipts accrue from timber sales, cottage and resort-site leases, grazing, and other special-use permits. Total of receipts in fiscal year 1955 was about $82 million. The $5½ million ceiling proposed in most of the bills before the subcommittee would be considerably less than 10 percent. The estimate of receipts for fiscal year 1956 and for succeeding years exceeds $100 million.

We would favor increasing the annual authorization or ceiling to $7½ million, as recommended in bills recently introduced in the Senate. Actually, $7½ million is more realistic than $5½ million in view of the increasing costs and booming recreational needs. The returns in benefits to the public health and welfare, in better hunting and fishing, and in protection of the timber, soil, water, and wildlife resources, would be tremendous.

We have heard and studied the technical and academic objections to the earmarking of national forest receipts for the purposes specified in this legislation. The public isn't going to take much stock in such arguments in view of the present earmarking provisions which set aside 35 percent of the money received from the national forests for county roads and schools, and another 10 percent for roads and trails within the national forests. We suggest that the earmarking objections have been raised by those who are reluctant to allow recreational uses to come into their own as a part of the multiple-use pattern of national-forest management.

In closing I would like to say that the National Wildlife Federation has long felt that this is one of the most important conservation problems needing action by the Congress. This legislation has been endorsed and advocated by every one of the State wildlife federations and sportsmen's leagues that belong to our national organization. We urge your favorable and speedy action. It is going to be difficult to explain to the many millions of interested citizens that it is too late now to pass this bill because of the crowded calendar. We shall observe, as we have in the past, that there will be new bills reported from committee and passed by both Houses in the final week of the session.

Thank you for the opportunity and privilege of presenting our views.

DIRECT WILDLIFE HABITAT-IMPROVEMENT MEASURES NEEDED IN THE NATIONAL FORESTS

1. Stream and lake improvement to create more favorable conditions for fish life:

(a) Streambank stabilization.

(b) Providing shade by planting along streams.

(c) Small check dams and deflectors to improve shelter and pool conditions.

(d) Providing gravel in lakes.

(e) Provide cover in lakes by sinking brush piles.

(f) Removal of undesirable vegetation from ponds.

(g) Pond fertilization.

(h) Raising of water levels in lakes to prevent winter lows.

2. Building of flow maintenance dams.

3. Diverting water to unstable natural lakes.

4. Building of fishing lakes.

5. Building of ponds and marsh areas for waterfowl.

6. Building of water places, such as ponds, sping development, "guzzlers," in arid sections to provide drinking water for wildlife.

7. Making food and cover plantings:

(a) Groups of conifers in extensive stands of hardwoods.

(b) Legumes and grasses in forest and other openings.

(c) Browse on big game winter ranges.

(d) Willows for streambank stabilization and shade.

(e) Oriental chestnut and other trees for most production.

8. Cultivation and fertilization of food plots.

9. Opening up dense brush fields to provide access by game and also variety of forage plants.

Dr. Leonard A. Scheele—An Outstanding Public Official

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. HESELTON

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, July 7, 1956

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Speaker, this country has suffered a great loss in the recent resignation of its Surgeon General, Dr. Leonard A. Scheele. But I am confident that many more people than he realizes recognize the magnificent contribution he has made during his terms of office. I am certain that they are grateful to him for what he has done so effectively for years in their behalf. And I know that, although they regret his decision to leave his great office, they appreciate fully his reasons for doing so and join with Members of this House, who know him well and admire him greatly, in wishing him the fullest measure of richly deserved happiness and continued service to his fellow citizens in his new work.

I am glad to place in the RECORD two fine editorials.

The first is from the July 1 Holyoke (Mass.) Transcript-Telegram:

EVERYBODY'S DR. SCHEELE

There has never been a Surgeon General of the United States Public Health Service, whose name has been so well known throughout the United States as Dr. Leonard A. Scheele. Every home in the Nation knows something about him. It was his job under the law to set up the administration of the Salk vaccine against polio. All those thousands of children in Holyoke who have had polio vaccine can say that Dr. Scheele was their top doctor.

The polio vaccine issue was the first major problem to come before the new Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. To have cast those three tremendously important phases of our public life in one basket was not the best thing for public service or the public life. There should be a department for education alone as the changing standards of our changing life will prove.

In the polio case when some of the drug concerns to which making the vaccine was entrusted tried to set their job too speedily, and let some live germs go through, the blame was laid at the doors of the new department that was trying to give every child in the Nation the protection against polio.

Secretary Hobby turned the situation over to Dr. Scheele, the Surgeon General who had been in Public Health Service for 23 years. Dr. Scheele held his own, intolerable though the burden seemed. Secretary Hobby resigned. It was not her fault, neither was it Dr. Scheele's fault. But he assumed the responsibility. Now the Salk vaccine and its administration has reached every child in the land whose parents will accept it. The excellence of our public health organization has been proven.

There has come a chance to Dr. Scheele to go into a pharmaceutical job that will give him a large salary. He will have more money for the education of his children. That is his explanation. We can have an idea that he can toss his head up and say, "I got caught in a terrible situation for which I was in no way personally responsible. Under my oath of office I did have a responsibility. I have cleared that up."

The Salk vaccine administration has been extended to the childhood and the young mothers of America. The AMA is rising up to say that vaccination against polio should be in the hands of private doctors except in welfare cases. "I do not have to give battle to that idea. I have a right to accept a more lucrative and less disturbing field." And Dr. Scheele has a right to say just that. But he won't.

The second is from the July 1st New York Times:

DR. SCHEELE RESIGNS

The Surgeon General of the United States Public Health Service is not usually a conspicuous figure in the news. He works, day in and day out, at the head of an immensely important and vastly complicated service. His work is a combination of the scientific and the administrative, and he must be good in both fields. He usually tries to keep it from being spectacular or controversial.

Dr. Leonard A. Scheele, who has just resigned the post after the best part of a young lifetime in service, had to be an exception. He was in the position of authority when one of medicine's dramatic mileposts was reached, the perfection of a vaccine against polio. When some trouble arose about testing he was obliged to act and did so. His name, in public memory, will always be connected with these incidents and episodes.

This should not make us forget, however, that he has long been a diligent and faithful public servant who has helped all of us with his skill and intelligence. We regret that he feels obliged now to turn to a private career. It would be ungenerous to wish him less than the greatest success, which he deserves.

Readjustment of Postal Rates

SPEECH

OF

HON. KENNETH J. GRAY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 6, 1956

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H. R. 11380) to readjust postal rates and to establish a congressional policy for the determination of postal rates, and for other purposes.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. GRAY].

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Chairman, I want to use the brief time allotted to me to talk about something that has not been talked about here today. I want to talk about the service that the American people are receiving from the Post Office Department. There has been one Member after the other come to this microphone and speak out in behalf of Mr. Summerfield and the Post Office Department. But, how many have come and talked about the three basic segments of our American economy, namely, the small-businessman, the workingman, and the farmer? I am bitterly opposed to this bill because those three classes of people in my district are against it. One reason is because of the service they are receiving. When I came to the Congress in January 1955, one of the first letters on my desk was from the Post Office Department. It says:

DEAR CONGRESSMAN GRAY: Investigation has disclosed that the fourth-class post office in Sora, Ill., may probably be discontinued at an annual saving of $1,700, or $17,000 over a 10-year period.

Very frequently thereafter, I received one of these letters telling me of a post office closure. There have been numerous fourth-class post offices closed in my congressional district, forcing many inconveniences upon the people including receiving their mail a day late. That is one of the reasons they are against this postal rate increase. They do not mind paying for something that they are getting, but they are not getting much.

I wish my friend, the distinguished gentleman from Tennessee, the chairman of the committee, was here because he talked about the extensive hearings that were held on this bill. Sure, they were held. I know because the committee room is just down the hall from my office. Yes; but how many days were spent talking about the service that the American people are getting from the Post Office Department? I have not read the hearings, but I dare say that there was not 1 day spent to see why we are getting less service at higher costs.

Each time the Post Office Department closes a post office, ignoring the service curtailed, they brag about how much saving is being effected, but I would like to know where all this money is going that is being saved? In my district since I took office less than 2 years ago, the alleged savings would amount to several thousand dollars. In the name of economy they are closing post offices not only in my district but throughout the country. This should amount to several hundred thousand dollars in savings. Service certainly is not being considered in this economy drive. I was particularly interested to listen to the remarks of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK] when he said:

You vote the postal employees a pay raise but don't want to raise the revenues with which to take care of the increased cost.

It is my opinion that more than enough has been saved in the closing of post offices to more than take care of the small raise voted the employees.

In each instance of a post-office closure, the residents residing in the community affected petitioned the Post Office Department to keep the facility open. I have always believed that this is a government of, for and by the people; however, in the case of the Post Office Department, the demands of the people are ignored. In addition to the post-office closures, I have had absolutely no

success whatsoever in getting rural mail routes extended. I have had numerous petitions by farmers in my district requesting service. I realize that there is a necessary departmental requirement of three families per mile of extension, however, the Department uses no commonsense in interpreting the regulation. One particular case recently where 5 families were without mail service because of a 1-mile extension and the Department said they could not comply with the request to extend mail service to these five families because it would require a two-tenths-of-a-mile extension farther than the established regulation. As a result, the five families in question are still without mail service. How do you think they feel about this proposed rate increase? How do you think the thousands of families who were once able to go to their local post office and buy stamps and send packages and receive their mail as soon as it was brought in who are now forced to drive many miles where a post office is located in order to get service immediately feel? In many instances their mail is a day late because the rural carrier leaves the post office early in the morning and subsequent deliveries to the main post office are not delivered until the following day. How do you think these thousands of people who are affected by this rate increase feel? I can tell you how they feel. They feel that they are not getting adequate service at the present rates, much less being shouldered with an extra tax that is not justified.

Mr. Chairman, I have several weekly and daily newspapers in my district. Due to economic conditions of southern Illinois, we have lost considerable population. This has forced a hardship on these newspapers. This unfair tax will will be a burden very hard to bear. I have talked personally with many of them and they too feel the post-office service is grossly inadequate. One publisher in my district informed me that in order to get his newspapers in the mail the day they are printed, he is forced to drive to the Post Office Department with the papers himself in order to meet outgoing mails. Mr. Chairman, do you think with that kind of service we are justified in imposing an extra tax on those people.

The post-office employees are doing a good job under the conditions in which they are forced to work by the complicated and lengthy regulations handed down by the bureaucrats in the Post Office Department. Mr. Chairman, I cannot in good conscience vote for this rate increase. My people do not mind paying a greater tax if they are getting adequate service, but mail service in southern Illinois in general is wholly inadequate. Instead of improving the service under Postmaster General Summerfield, we have received nothing but sad news concerning closures, failure to extend rural routes and curtailment of incoming, and outgoing mail to most of the larger towns, including my hometown of West Frankfort, Ill. If the Post Office Department's foresight isn't any better than its hindsight concerning the service they are rendering, I cannot see any possibility of a justification for an extra tax burden upon the workingman, the small-business man and the farmer from my congressional district who is already paying far more to the Post Office Department than he is receiving in service.

I urge my colleagues to vote against this unfair and unwarranted rate increase, at least until such time as service has been adequately restored.

Tito Is Up to Mischief Again—He Would Organize a Third Force Between East and West

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 5, 1956

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, American subservience to the Communist dictator Tito is ridiculous. In the next few days we shall have for consideration again the question as to whether or not we should continue to supply Tito with military materiel. In view of this dictator's conduct in the past 30 days when he has pledged allegience with the rest of the Communist world, we find him now engaged in a new venture, namely, the establishment of a so-called third force which would constitute a defensive area between the Communist and the free world of the West.

Tito is ambitious. Tito is a Communist. He shares with the Red dictators the hope of world conquest and the imposition of Marxism upon all people everywhere.

Mr. Speaker, an Associated Press dispatch from Frankfurt, Germany, yesterday stated that Tito has launched this ambitious campaign and has already discussed with other nations the preliminary moves. He will use as the fulcrum for his program neutralist nations in Asia and Middle East leaders who are playing cozy with the dictators in the Kremlin.

I am inserting at this point a portion of the Associated Press dispatch from Frankfurt dated July 6:

According to Tito's own statements, a third force would work on two basic principles:

1. It would be neutral in the sense it would be part of no bloc and would take orders from no one, but it would arm itself to protect its independence.

2. It would practice peaceful active coexistence with both ends of the Moscow-Washintgon pole and attempt to mediate the East-West differences that started the cold war.

In what is considered a campaign kickoff, Tito has invited the chiefs of state or two prominent neutralist countries—India and Egypt—to a series of conferences at his Adriatic island retreat of Brioni in mid-July.

There has been no announcement of an agenda, but it has been predicted the talks will wind up with a statement spelling out the meaning of "active coexistence" and an invitation to all nations to adopt this philosophy. The informants said Tito's argument is that all ideologies must be submerged in a greater goal of world peace.

Tito is understood to be counting on firm support from both India's Prime Minister Nehru and Egypt's President Gamal Abdel Nasser.

Tito likes the phrase "coexistence without neutrality," and western diplomats believe Nassar probably will buy this and that Nehru might accept it if neutrality is defined carefully.

Among other major declarations which western quarters anticipate from Brioni is one calling on the United States to agree to seating Communist China in the United Nations.

Some sources also except Tito, Nehru, and Nasser to call for attaching Nationalist China's Formosa Bastion to the Red mainland and the removal of Chiang Kai-shek from power.

With Nasser present, it is considered certain the Brioni Conference also will deal with deal with conflicts in north Africa and the Mediterranean: those involving Israel, Cyprus, and Algeria.

Tito plans to follow the Brioni Conference with talks with Greek leaders on the island of Corfu late this month.

These talks are expected to concentrate on the Balkan alliance between Turkey, Greece, and Yugoslavia.

With Greece and Turkey at loggerheads over the disputed island of Cyprus, Tito will again find himself a third force in a position to make his influence felt.

Poliomyelitis Vaccination

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. HESELTON
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, July 7, 1956

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Speaker, recent developments as to the increased production of the Salk vaccine has been most encouraging. And the results of vaccinations seem to be equally encouraging.

I hope very much that Secretary Folsom will be justified fully in his apparent opinion that no other legislation by Congress is required beyond the extension of authority already granted to June 30, 1957.

However, I think it is advisable to take this opportunity to make the record clear at a time when everyone anticipates an adjournment of Congress soon.

I quote the following paragraph from the report of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce on January 30, 1956:

The highest incidence of paralytic poliomyelitis for the United States as a whole occurs in the age groups below 20 and in pregnant women. These are the groups which are eligible to receive vaccinations with funds authorized in the act. Your committee is recommending no change in this limitation at the present time. Your committee has received information, however, which indicates that in some States the incidence of paralytic poliomyelitis and the severity of the cases is as great or greater in some age groups above 20 years. Your committee trusts that the Surgeon General and others responsible will review from time to time the voluntary national priority sys-

tem now in effect in relation to experiences in the various States to determine whether the priority groups should be modified to include individuals in selected age groups above 20 years, and advise the Congress of any corresponding changes in this legislation which might be desirable.

The following is a release from the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare of July 2, 1956:

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION, AND WELFARE,
Washington, D. C., July 2, 1956.

Release of a total of 17,172,396 cubic centimeters of poliomyelitis vaccine during June, almost twice as much as ever before released in a single month, was announced today by the Public Health Service.

Of this amount, 6,192,891 cubic centimeters were released last Friday, June 29. Altogether 79,058,460 cubic centimeters have been released to date.

Commenting on the record production in June, Marion B. Folsom, Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, said:

"I am very pleased with the rapid increase in vaccine production in recent months, and with what this means in increased protection for children against polio.

"I am advised that there are 53 million persons in the top priority group of children under 15 and expectant mothers. Enough vaccine has now been released to provide two injections for three-fourths of this group.

"The period of acute shortage of vaccine now appears to be over in many parts of the Nation. In areas where demand still exceeds supply, we may look forward to an easing of the shortage soon if production continues at the present rate.

"I urge parents, physicians, and health officials to cooperate in making maximum use of the increasing supply of vaccine as it becomes available. We should all remember that vaccination in July may prevent polio in August or September, the months when the danger is greatest."

The record production in June increased the total released during the past 3 months to 35,249,256 cubic centimeters. This compares with slightly less than 14 million cubic centimeters released during the previous 3 months of January, February, and March, and less than 30 million cubic centimeters released during the 9 months of 1955 after the program started in April 1955.

Dr. Leonard A. Scheele, Surgeon General of the Public Health Service, recommended that States extend their priority groups for the vaccine to include all children under 20 as soon as the supply of vaccine in the State warrants such action.

"In States where demand for vaccine for the 0 to 15 age group continues high, it is important to satisfy that demand before broadening the priority group," he said. "However, in States where there is a lag in demand for this group, every effort should be made to obtain maximum use of the vaccine before the peak of the polio season by extending priorities."

Dr. Scheele pointed out that this procedure was recommended by the National Advisory Committee on Poliomyelitis Vaccine last April. The committee at that time recommended that States concentrate their polio programs on children under 15 and expectant mothers until maximum coverage of this group has been achieved. The Public Health Service, in accepting the committee's recommendation, said that the States should immediately broaden their priority group when this goal was reached. There are about 53 million persons in the priority group of 0 to 15 and pregnant women, and about 65 million persons would be included as the age limit is extended to 20.

Of the 6,192,891 cubic centimeters of vaccine released June 29, the Public Health Service reported that Eli Lilly & Co. had produced 4,143,501 cubic centimeters and 2,049,390 cubic centimeters were produced by the Pitman-Moore Co. Except for 882 cubic centimeters which are licensed for export, all of this supply goes to States and Territories for distribution through public agencies and commercial channels to private physicians.

The Public Health Service also reported that it is reallocating 744,192 cubic centimeters which had not been used by the States to which they were originally assigned. The areas and the amounts they turned back are: Alabama, 147,402 cubic centimeters; Arkansas, 33,300 cubic centimeters; American Samoa, 306 cubic centimeters; Canal Zone, 1,026 cubic centimeters; Idaho, 5,805 cubic centimeters; Mississippi, 33,138 cubic centimeters; Missouri, 146,844 cubic centimeters; North Carolina, 149,940 cubic centimeters; Puerto Rico, 135,945 cubic centimeters; Tennessee, 41,913 cubic centimeters; Texas, 44,892 cubic centimeters; and the Virgin Islands, 3,681 cubic centimeters.

Altogether, States and Territories have now been allotted 64,747,305 cubic centimeters; the National Foundation for Infantile Paralysis has received 13,732,134 cubic centimeters; 16,281 cubic centimeters have been licensed for export; and 562,740 cubic centimeters went into commercial channels before controls were established.

The attached table shows how much of the new and reallocated supply released June 29 will go to each State and Territory.

Distribution No. 33: Number of cubic centimeters (doses) of poliomyelitis vaccine available by States

	Number of cubic centimeters
Alabama	149,409
Arizona	45,639
Arkansas	88,155
California	479,637
Colorado	59,238
Connecticut	79,281
Delaware	14,364
District of Columbia	30,447
Florida	136,710
Georgia	171,324
Idaho	28,989
Illinois	345,492
Indiana	173,052
Iowa	108,756
Kansas	81,369
Kentucky	134,766
Louisiana	140,526
Maine	39,114
Maryland	105,714
Massachusetts	178,461
Michigan	298,809
Minnesota	134,145
Mississippi	111,609
Missouri	158,283
Montana	28,647
Nebraska	54,450
Nevada	8,388
New Hampshire	20,664
New Jersey	192,618
New Mexico	40,437
New York	538,182
North Carolina	198,999
North Dakota	29,826
Ohio	348,471
Oklahoma	93,501
Oregon	67,905
Pennsylvania	413,334
Rhode Island	28,926
South Carolina	112,302
South Dakota	30,384
Tennessee	148,365
Texas	370,602
Utah	37,107
Vermont	15,957
Virginia	151,839
Washington	105,228
West Virginia	89,694
Wisconsin	151,488
Wyoming	13,527

Distribution No. 33: Number of cubic centimeters (doses) of poliomyelitis vaccine available by States—Continued

	Number of cubic centimeters
Alaska	6,588
Hawaii	22,473
Puerto Rico	141,426
Virgin Islands	1,314
Canal Zone	1,800
Guam	2,358
American Samoa	1,521
Department of Defense	174,591
Total	6,936,201

I call particular attention to the sound recommendation by Dr. Schule that States extend their priority groups for the vaccine to include all children under 20 as soon as the supply of vaccine in the State warrants such action. I hope that the Department will use every effort immediately to assist the States and local communities in working out a satisfactory program and that it will not content itself with simply issuing bulletins and releases. I believed last January that its simple request for a blanket extension of time left a great deal to be desired. During the 4 months since then events have led me to believe that the Department should have requested by now an opportunity to report to Congress and advise the legislative committees as to what, if anything, should be done further by Congress before its adjournment. There is still time for that but it is running out fast. I hope the Department will take such action soon as may be satisfactory to itself, to the Congress, and to the American people in the weeks between adjournment and next January.

I include the additional views I submitted on H. R. 8704:

ADDITIONAL VIEWS ON H. R. 8704

I did not vote to report this bill favorably.

I am convinced that Public Law 377 of this Congress, the Poliomyelitis Vaccination Act of 1955, should be extended beyond the terminal date, February 15, 1956. But I am not convinced now that it should be extended to July 1, 1957, without more consideration of certain facts. Since I have no doubt that it will be extended to that date, I believe I should state briefly the matters I think should be considered further by the Department, this committee, and Congress prior to July 1, 1957. I know that this committee has every intention of continuing its interest in the administration of the program and I understand that reference will be made to that in the report.

This committee and Congress wisely set the present terminal date at February 15, 1956, so that this new and vitally important program would be reviewed early in this session. The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare recognized this in his letter transmitting the draft of this bill stating that it was the congressional intention "to provide an opportunity for reviewing program developments early in the second session of the Congress before completely implementing the Federal grant provisions of the act."

The Department reported its estimate that there would be sufficient vaccine available by December 31, 1956, to provide for 3 injections for each of the 65 million children under age 20 and expectant mothers, but added that this was based upon 100-percent demand which it conceded was unlikely. It based its request for the extension to July 1, 1957, on the recommended 7-month interval between second and third injections.

It seems to me that this committee should have been given evidence of any departmental plans as to adjustments which should be made as soon as production of the vaccine permits, to make additional vaccinations in the older age groups possible.

Undoubtedly such adjustments will be made and I hope they will prove satisfactory to all concerned. However, without intending any reflection upon anyone, it seems to me that this committee should not be asked to approve a blanket extension of such duration in the absence of the most complete information available as to possibilities during that period.

This committee recommended, and this Congress accepted the recommendation, of an upper age limit of 19 years, with the addition of "any expectant mother," in the definitions under the act (sec. 10 (b) (1), and see also sec. 4). I believe that recommendation was sound. But I cannot accept the argument that it should necessarily be continued to June 30, 1957. It constitutes an important limitation and I hope it will be considered fully long before that date.

Last year this committee had before it the clear and sound warning that it would not discharge its full responsibilities by confining its thinking to the admittedly vital problem of prevention among those under 21 years of age.

At its hearings (pt. 2, pp. 134, 136, 137) Dr. Albert B. Sabin, of the Children's Hospital Research Foundation, Cincinnati, Ohio, testified in part as follows:

"It is important to stress that this is no longer a disease we should call infantile paralysis, because the disease occurs with great frequency in young adults and, furthermore, is much more severe in those in later life than in earlier years * * *. I submit, gentlemen, that these in the third decade (age 21 to 30) are just as much in need of preventive measures as are all the others * * *. To summarize this, then, the problem in the United States is to prevent paralysis in young adults in whom it is most severe, as well as in children in whom it is more frequent."

Last year, and mostly subsequent to the passage of this law, Massachusetts suffered its worst epidemic of poliomyelitis. At the suggestion and with the financial assistance of the National Foundation of Infantile Paralysis a special study was made.

It appears that of 3,819 cases, there were 675 in the age groups between 10 and 20. However, there were 574 in the age groups from 20 to 30, 232 in the age group from 30 to 35, and 104 in the age group from 35 to 40.

It is my recollection that a great many of the cases among the young adult groups were most severe.

Any instance of this disease is tragic. All who have contributed toward its prevention are richly entitled to the gratitude of this Nation.

But the responsibilities of this Congress toward insuring the best possible program are great. I do not believe they will be discharged completely by a simple extension of the date. For emphasis, I repeat my appreciation of and agreement with the contents of what I understand will be in the committee report on this point.

JOHN W. HESELTON,
Member of Congress.

Readjustment of Postal Rates

SPEECH
OF
HON. MELVIN R. LAIRD
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 6, 1956

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H. R. 11380) to readjust postal rates and to establish a congressional policy for the determination of postal rates, and for other purposes.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Chairman, the question which faces each Member of Congress today is whether the users of our Post Office Department should pay part of our $500 million post office deficit or whether the income taxpayer should be required to finance all of this deficit. At the present time 60 percent of our postal deficit is paid by individual income taxpayers and 40 percent of our postal deficit is made up from corporation income taxes. The hearings before the Post Office and Civil Service Committee show that 75 percent of the mail carried by the Post Office Department is mailed by large users of the mails.

The legislation we are considering today will not place the Post Office Department on a self-financing basis, but will go a long way in reducing the current deficit in this Department.

I have always opposed deficit financing wherever it exists. It seems only fair to me that the users of the mails should help eliminate part of our present postal deficit. Under existing postal rates, the individual taxpayer is charged with 60 percent of this postal deficit. If this bill passes, less than 30 percent of the postal deficit will be charged directly against the individual.

PRICE OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

The Public Printer is authorized to furnish to subscribers the daily RECORD at $1.50 per month, payable in advance.

Remit by money order payable to Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is located in Statuary Hall, House wing, where Mr. Frank Brodie is in attendance during the sessions of Congress to receive orders for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month, and where single copies may also be purchased. Orders are also accepted for the printing of speeches in pamphlet form.

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

SENATORS WITH RESIDENCES IN WASHINGTON

OFFICE ADDRESS: Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

[Streets northwest unless otherwise stated]

Vice President, Richard Nixon

Aiken, George D., *Vt*.....Carroll Arms.
Allott, Gordon, *Colo*.....
Anderson, Clinton P., *N. Mex.*..... 6 Wesley Circle.
Barrett, Frank A., *Wyo*.....The Woodner.
Beall, J. Glenn, *Md*.....
Bender, George H., *Ohio*.....120 Schotts Court NE.
Bennett, Wallace F., *Utah*.....
Bible, Alan, *Nev*.....
Bricker, John W., *Ohio*.....The Mayflower.
Bridges, Styles, *N. H*.....
Bush, Prescott, *Conn*.....
Butler, John Marshall, *Md*.....
Byrd, Harry Flood, *Va*.....The Shoreham.
Capehart, Homer E., *Ind*.....The Westchester.
Carlson, Frank, *Kans*.....Sheraton-Park
Case, Clifford P., *N. J*.....
Case, Francis, *S. Dak*.....4635 Mass. Ave.
Chavez, Dennis, *N. Mex*.....3327 Cleveland Ave.
Clements, Earle C., *Ky*.....The Congressional
Cotton, Norris, *N. H*.....
Curtis, Carl T., *Nebr*.....
Daniel, Price, *Tex*.....
Dirksen, Everett M., *Ill*.....
Douglas, Paul H., *Ill*.....
Duff, James H., *Pa*.....
Dworshak, Henry C., *Idaho*.....
Eastland, James O., *Miss*.....5101 Macomb St.
Ellender, Allen J., *La*.....
Ervin, Samuel J., Jr., *N. C*.....
Flanders, Ralph E., *Vt*.....
Frear, J. Allen, Jr., *Del*.....
Fulbright, J. William, *Ark*.....
George, Walter F., *Ga*.....The Mayflower.
Goldwater, Barry M., *Ariz*.....
Gore, Albert, *Tenn*.....
Green, Theodore Francis, *R. I.*..... University Club.
Hayden, Carl, *Ariz*.....
Hennings, Thomas C., Jr., *Mo.*.....
Hickenlooper, Bourke B., *Iowa.*..... 5511 Cedar Parkway, Chevy Chase, Md.
Hill, Lister, *Ala*.....
Holland, Spessard L., *Fla*.....Sheraton-Park
Hruska, Roman L., *Nebr*.....
Humphrey, Hubert H., *Minn.*.....
Humphreys, Robert, *Ky*.....
Ives, Irving M., *N. Y*.....
Jackson, Henry M., *Wash*.....
Jenner, William E., *Ind*.....
Johnson, Lyndon B., *Tex*.....
Johnston, Olin D., *S. C*.....
Kefauver, Estes, *Tenn*.....4848 Upton St.
Kennedy, John F., *Mass*.....
Kerr, Robert S., *Okla*.....
Knowland, William F., *Calif.*.....
Kuchel, Thomas H., *Calif*.....
Laird, William R. III, *W. Va*.....
Langer, William, *N. Dak*.....2101 Conn. Ave.
Lehman, Herbert H., *N. Y*.....Sheraton-Park
Long, Russell B., *La*.....
McCarthy, Joseph R., *Wis*.....
McClellan, John L., *Ark*.....
McNamara, Pat, *Mich*.....
Magnuson, Warren G., *Wash.*..... The Shoreham.
Malone, George W., *Nev*.....The Mayflower.
Mansfield, Mike, *Mont*.....
Martin, Edward, *Pa*.....
Martin, Thos. E., *Iowa*.....4545 Conn. Ave.
Millikin, Eugene D., *Colo*.....
Monroney, A. S. Mike, *Okla.*.....
Morse, Wayne, *Oreg*.....5020 Lowell St.
Mundt, Karl E., *S. Dak*.....122 Schotts Court NE.
Murray, James E., *Mont*.....The Shoreham.
Neely, Matthew M., *W. Va*.....
Neuberger, Richard L., *Oreg.*.....
O'Mahoney, Joseph C., *Wyo.*..... Sheraton-Park
Pastore, John O., *R. I*.....
Payne, Frederick G., *Maine*.....
Potter, Charles E., *Mich*.....
Purtell, William A., *Conn*.....
Robertson, A. Willis, *Va*.....
Russell, Richard B., *Ga*.....
Saltonstall, Leverett, *Mass*.....2320 Tracy Pl.
Schoeppel, Andrew F., *Kans.*.....
Scott, W. Kerr, *N. C*.....
Smathers, George A., *Fla*.....
Smith, H. Alexander, *N. J*.....Sheraton-Park
Smith, Margaret Chase, (Mrs.), *Maine.*.....
Sparkman, John J., *Ala*.....4928 Indian Lane
Stennis, John, *Miss*.....
Symington, Stuart, *Mo*.....
Thye, Edward J., *Minn*.....
Watkins, Arthur V., *Utah*.....
Welker, Herman, *Idaho*.....4823 Tilden St.
Wiley, Alexander, *Wis*.....2122 Mass. Ave.
Williams, John J., *Del*.....
Wofford, Thomas A., *S. C*.....
Young, Milton R., *N. Dak*.....Quebec House So.

OFFICERS OF THE SENATE

Secretary—Felton M. Johnston.
Chief Clerk—Emery L. Frazier.
Sergeant at Arms—Joseph C. Duke.
Secretary for the Majority—Robert G. Baker.
Secretary for the Minority—J. Mark Trice.
Chaplain—Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D.

STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE SENATE

Committee on Agriculture and Forestry

Messrs. Ellender (chairman), Johnston of South Carolina, Holland, Eastland, Clements, Humphrey, Scott, Symington, Aiken, Young, Thye, Hickenlooper, Mundt, Williams, and Schoeppel.

Committee on Appropriations

Messrs. Hayden (chairman), Russell, Chavez, Ellender, Hill, McClellan, Robertson, Magnuson, Holland, Stennis, Clements, Johnson of Texas, Bridges, Saltonstall, Young, Knowland, Thye, McCarthy, Mundt, Mrs. Smith of Maine, Messrs. Dworshak, Dirksen, and Potter.

Committee on Armed Services

Messrs. Russell (chairman), Byrd, Johnson of Texas, Kefauver, Stennis, Symington, Jackson, Ervin, Saltonstall, Bridges, Flanders, Mrs. Smith of Maine, Messrs. Case of South Dakota, Duff, and Welker.

Committee on Banking and Currency

Messrs. Fulbright (chairman), Robertson, Sparkman, Frear, Douglas, Lehman, Monroney, Morse, Capehart, Bricker, Ives, Bennett, Bush, Beall, and Payne.

Committee on the District of Columbia

Messrs. Neely (chairman), Bible, McNamara, Morse, Frear, Beall, Hruska, Case of New Jersey, and Allott.

Committee on Finance

Messrs. Byrd (chairman), George, Kerr, Frear, Long, Smathers, Anderson, Douglas, Millikin, Martin of Pennsylvania, Williams, Flanders, Malone, Carlson, and Bennett.

Committee on Foreign Relations

Messrs. George (chairman), Green, Fulbright, Sparkman, Humphrey, Mansfield, Morse, Long, Wiley, Smith of New Jersey, Hickenlooper, Langer, Knowland, Aiken, and Capehart.

Committee on Government Operations

Messrs. McClellan (chairman), Jackson, Kennedy, Symington, Ervin, Humphrey, Wofford, McCarthy, Mundt, Mrs. Smith of Maine, Messrs. Cotton, Bender, and Martin of Iowa.

Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs

Messrs. Murray (chairman), Anderson, Jackson, O'Mahoney, Bible, Neuberger, Laird, Scott, Millikin, Malone, Watkins, Dworshak, Kuchel, Barrett, and Goldwater.

Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce

Messrs. Magnuson (chairman), Pastore, Monroney, Smathers, Daniel, Ervin, Bible, Wofford, Bricker, Schoeppel, Butler, Potter, Duff, Purtell, and Payne.

Committee on the Judiciary

Messrs. Eastland (chairman), Kefauver, Johnston of South Carolina, Hennings, McClellan, Daniel, O'Mahoney, Neely, Wiley, Langer, Jenner, Watkins, Dirksen, Welker, and Butler.

Committee on Labor and Public Welfare

Messrs. Hill (chairman), Murray, Neely, Lehman, Kennedy, McNamara, ———, Smith of New Jersey, Ives, Purtell, Goldwater, Bender, and Allott.

Committee on Post Office and Civil Service

Messrs. Johnston of South Carolina (chairman), Pastore, Monroney, Hennings, Scott, Neuberger, Laird, Carlson, Jenner, Langer, Curtis, Martin of Iowa, and Case of New Jersey.

Committee on Public Works

Messrs. Chavez (chairman), Kerr, Gore, McNamara, Neuberger, Wofford, ———, Martin of Pennsylvania, Case of South Dakota, Bush, Kuchel, Cotton, and Hruska.

Committee on Rules and Administration

Messrs. Green (chairman), Hayden, Hennings, Gore, Mansfield, Jenner, Barrett, McCarthy, and Curtis.

UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT

Mr. Chief Justice Warren, of California, Hotel Sheraton-Park, Washington, D. C.
Mr. Justice Black, of Alabama, 619 S. Lee St., Alexandria, Va.
Mr. Justice Reed, of Kentucky, the Mayflower.
Mr. Justice Frankfurter, of Massachusetts, 3018 Dumbarton Ave.
Mr. Justice Douglas, of Washington, 3701 Connecticut Ave.
Mr. Justice Burton, of Ohio, the Dodge.
Mr. Justice Clark, of Texas, 2101 Connecticut Ave.
Mr. Justice Minton, of Indiana, the Methodist Building.
Mr. Justice Harlan, of New York, 1677 31st St.

OFFICERS OF THE SUPREME COURT

Clerk—Harold B. Willey, 3214 N. Wakefield St., Arlington, Va.
Deputy Clerk—Reginald C. Dill, 1329 Hemlock St.
Deputy Clerk—Hugh W. Barr, 4701 Connecticut Ave.
Marshal—T. Perry Lippitt, 6004 Corbin Road.
Reporter—Walter Wyatt, 1702 Kalmia Rd.
Librarian—Helen Newman, 126 3d St. SE.

UNITED STATES JUDICIAL CIRCUITS

JUSTICES ASSIGNED
TERRITORY EMBRACED

District of Columbia: Mr. Chief Justice Warren. District of Columbia.

First judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Frankfurter. Maine, New Hampshire, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Puerto Rico.

Second judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Harlan. Vermont, Connecticut, New York.

Third judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Burton, Pennsylvania, New Jersey, Delaware, Virgin Islands.

Fourth judicial circuit: Mr. Chief Justice Warren. Maryland, Virginia, West Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina.

Fifth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Black. Georgia, Florida, Alabama, Mississippi, Louisiana, Texas, Canal Zone.

Sixth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Reed. Ohio, Michigan, Kentucky, Tennessee.

Seventh judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Minton. Indiana, Illinois, Wisconsin.

Eighth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Clark. Minnesota, North Dakota, South Dakota, Iowa, Nebraska, Missouri, Arkansas.

Ninth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Douglas. Washington, Oregon, Montana, Idaho, California, Nevada, Arizona, Alaska, Hawaii.

Tenth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Clark. Colorado, Wyoming, Utah, Kansas, Oklahoma, New Mexico.

Appendix

Farmers Union Discusses Farm Problems

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LESTER R. JOHNSON
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 9, 1956

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks, I wish to insert in the RECORD a copy of a special fourth of July broadcast made over 12 Wisconsin stations by Mr. Bob Moses, of the Wisconsin Farmers Union.

Mr. Moses discusses some of the pertinent economic facts staring Midwest farmers in the face at this time. I commend the address to my colleagues. The full text of the broadcast follows:

SPECIAL FOURTH OF JULY FARMERS UNION BROADCAST

The United Nations Food and Agriculture Organization recently reported that farmers throughout the world are getting less money for their crops, but that the hungry still have to pay more for food than they can afford. The 1956 report of the FAO added that the decline in farmers' purchasing power poses a great threat to general economic stability.

Here in the United States farm prices have been bolstered in recent months, according to figures of the United States Department of Agriculture. However, it would be a cruel and misleading blow to our agricultural community to believe that we have seen the end of the farm recession. A great share of the upsurge in farm prices is of a strictly seasonal nature. Farm prices generally rise in the spring months, but this year's increase has included a restoration in livestock prices, which had taken a terrific tumble in 1955.

You don't have to remind a Midwest hog farmer what happened to his market last fall and winter. Hog prices shrank as much as 50 percent in a short 3-month period late last year. When the bottom falls out of a wagon, you either get in a new bottom or don't run your wagon. In the hog slump of last year, the bottom had fallen clear out and hog farmers were losing money on sending hogs to market. It is to the credit of the hog producers that they decided to repair the damage and stay in agriculture.

In the processor-dominated economy which is American agriculture, the American farmer can merely hope that the seasonal upsurge in farm prices this year will continue, and that eventually he will gain back some of the 25-percent drop in farm income he has experienced since 1952. If farm income depended upon hope or promises, the farmer could feel a sense of security. But since the farmer cannot name his price, nor can he strike for higher wages, he is at the complete mercy of a processor-dominated economy.

A good example of how the farmer is the forgotten man in America's economy is shown in the great profits amassed by the large meat-packing companies in the last 6 months. It would be well to keep in mind that during this 6-month period, the price of hogs fell to about 10 cents a pound, well below the farmer's cost of production. In the dark days of 10-cent hogs, economists figure that hogs were averaging slightly over 50 percent of parity.

The large meat-packing firms figure their business years from October to October. For the 6-month period of the current fiscal year, ending April 28, not a single packing company failed to report sizably increased profits. Yet in these same 6 months, hog farmers were taking hogs to market at 10 cents, 11 cents, and 12 cents a pound. Only since the April 28 6-month reports of the packers have hog prices reached the 15- and 16-cent-a-pound level.

Here is the record for 6 of the largest packing companies in the country, including the 4 largest. Earnings of Swift & Co., the giant in the industry, were $11 million for the first 6 months of this year, an earning 2½ times as high as for the comparable period a year earlier. The second largest packer, Armour & Co., more than tripled its net earnings during the first 6 months of this year to around $10½ million.

These 2 packing companies, Swift's and Armour's, are by far the 2 leading firms in the industry. Between the 2 of them in the last 6 months they sold over $2 billion worth of meat and received for these selling services about $22 million in net profits. These two companies were buying this meat from farmers, hog farmers and beef ranchers alike, whose income was being depressed. While the prices received by these livestock producers reached near disaster levels, the income of the $2 billion packing companies were increasing from 2½ to 3 times the earning level for a comparable 6-month period a year earlier.

What about some of the other firms, you say? No, Swift and Armour were not alone in building up packer profits at the expense of our farmers. The No. 3 firm in the industry, Wilson & Co., released its 6-month earnings recently and found that their earnings during the months of 10- and 12-cent hogs had increased by more than 5 times over the same period the year before. The 6-month income this year reached $4.8 million compared to close to $900,000 for last year.

Then there's the Cudahy Packing Co. which learned recently that its earnings were larger in the last 6 months than they have been for any full year since 1947. The record: Net income of almost $3½ million, compared with over 1 million the year before. Other firms reporting sizable packer profits in the last 6 months were the Hormel Co. of Austin, Minn., and the Rath Packing Co. of Waterloo, Iowa.

Incidentally, the Rath Co. is one of the smaller packers but from October 1955 to April 1956 its net income, or profits, increased by 8 times over the 6-month earning figure for a year earlier. Yet the sales for this company were just about the same during the last 6 months.

The folks in cities and towns must be asking themselves how such a situation can exist whereby one segment—the farmers—are given as much as 50 percent less for their products while, on the other hand, another segment—the packers—roll up as much as 3, 5 or even 8 times the profits they ordinarily receive. The housewives, the city workers and the people with small businesses must begin to wonder if all of this is fair to our farmers. It must be particularly perplexing to the folks on Main Street when they read that the cost of living is now headed to an all-time high.

The unequalled cost of living, which is just around the corner, is announced by the Commissioner of Labor Statistics in the United States Labor Department. Last week, housewives were told that there wouldn't be any relief from the climb in retail food prices until fall, when the harvest comes in and many of the fruits and vegetables now dominating the cost of living index will go out of season. But if the cost of food is now affecting the cost of living index, housewives cannot blame the farmer. Actually, food prices are now just 4.8 percent lower than they were in August of 1952, the all-time peak for food prices. However, in the same span of time that consumer food prices have dropped by only 5 percent, the prices paid to farmers have fallen off sharply by about 30 percent.

Comparing a 5-percent drop in consumer food prices to a 30-percent drop in prices paid to farmers, the city housewife has just cause to ask: "Why didn't my food prices come down more in line with the low-farm prices, or if that wasn't possible, why couldn't the farmer have gotten a little more for his products?" Neither the farmer nor consumer have profited in recent years from low-farm prices. In a recent monthly publication, the First National City Bank, one of the world's largest banks, gives the answer. The large food processing companies in the United States increased their profits by about 10 percent during 1955, a year which saw farm income drop off by another 10 percent.

If the folks in the cities and towns have come to understand that falling farm prices do not necessarily bring about comparably lower food prices, then they must also realize that those large food processing industries have been reaping huge profits at the expense of the farmer and consumer. The packers are not alone. The large dairy processors are off to another record year in increased processor profits, a year which may exceed the banner year of 1954, Ezra Benson's year of lower dairy supports and cheese windfall scandals. In that year, the big dairy processors cleaned up at the expense of the dairy farmers to the tune of 35 percent more profits than the year earlier.

There is one large industry which is not as fortunate as the food processors. Yes, there is one large group of manufacturers which are feeling the pinch of continued lower farm income. That is the farm equipment industry. To some extent the recent troubles of the automobile manufacturers can be attributed to the farm price slump, but there are other factors involved in the auto production cutbacks and factory layoffs.

Let us consider briefly what has been happening in the farm equipment industries in the past few months. Of the large companies manufacturing farm equipment, only the largest company reported that its net income during the last 6 months had gone far below the corresponding 1955 figure. Even International Harvester found itself in serious trouble, with net profits up only one million dollars for the 6-month figure but with 2,400 workers laid off during the month of June, and International president, John McCaffrey, predicted that sales for the 12-month full-year period would be below the previous full-year period.

Some of the other farm implement firms have had rougher going. For example, the John Deere Co. saw its net income fall off by 45 percent in the last 6 months, ending April 30. Sales to farmers were down by 21 percent. Minneapolis-Moline lost a million and a half dollars in the 6-month period, and their sales were down as well.

A well-known Canadian firm, Massey-Harris, announced last month that it is slowing output of farm machinery in the United States and Canada because an expected spring pickup of sales in the United States had not materialized. (The Canadian government announced last week that net income in Canada during 1955 increased 22 percent, at the same time that American farm income was dropping 10 percent.) Here in Wisconsin, the J. I. Case Company of Racine is having tough times, as their income loss during the first 6 months amounted to almost $4.8 million. This equals a sales dropoff of 18½ percent from the previous year. Case Co. president, John T. Brown, felt that the best thing that could happen to his company would be a "particularly good harvest." The Case Co. has closed one of its plants in Racine and is anticipating another factory shutdown of its Burlington, Iowa, plant.

As Detroit is to the auto industry, the Quad-City area in Illinois and Iowa is to the farm-equipment industry. In the industrial area along the Mississippi River which includes Moline, East Moline, and Rock Island, Ill., and Davenport, Iowa, there are 12 farm implement factories. By mid-May, employment in these Quad-City plants was down to 13,700 from the 21,300 employed 3 years ago. This means about one-third of the normal work force is out of work because of the farm price slump and subsequent lack of farm implement buying.

As if the farm rescession hadn't hit the farm equipment industry hard enough, there is indication that it will be hit even harder before the year is over. The Wall Street Journal last week told how "the soil bank is sending shivers through the already-shaken farm-machine industry." The business publication was referring to the acreage-diverting measure of the Eisenhower administration which is now in effect for American agriculture.

An unnamed official of one large firm told the Wall Street Journal reporters that "I just don't see how all that land can be taken out of production without hurting this business to some degree." The paper then quoted "an economist with one of Chicago's big banks" in this way: "There will be some offsetting factors, of course, but I believe the acreage withdrawals will tend to restrict the over-all demand for equipment more than if the soil bank weren't there."

What does all this prove to the folks in towns and cities who know little of farm life? It simply means that if agriculture is left to drift for itself, unprotected, and in the main unorganized and unrepresented by a farm organization, it can practically bankrupt itself, while filling the coffers of one industrial group, the food processors, and at the same time bringing misery to another industrial group, the farm equipment industry. The consumer, like the farmer, benefits not at all from such a system.

On the other hand, if the farmers, as the producers of the food and fiber, had the dominant say-so in what they received for their commodities, then everyone would be happy. This, basically, is the program of the Farmers Union.

Until the program of the Farmers Union is completely put into practice; until the farmers, through their marketing and supply cooperatives, can take a greater part in what prices shall be received; then the substance of the U. N.'s Food and Agriculture Organization report will continue to hold true.

Using the United States as a basis, the FAO report says in brief that farmers are getting less for their crops; consumers have to pay more for food than what they can afford; and the loss in farmers' purchasing power poses a "great threat to general economic stability."

Readjustment of Postal Rates

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 6, 1956

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H. R. 11380) to readjust postal rates and to establish a congressional policy for the determination of postal rates, and for other purposes.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Chairman, first, may I say that I have served on the Post Office and Civil Service Committee for 10 years. I have also served under the able chairmanship of the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES] and the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. MURRAY].

I can assure the Congress that every bill this committee has brought to the floor of the House has certainly received the most careful, the most lengthy, and most impartial consideration; of that there can be no possible doubt.

I would like to address myself especially to first-class mail, because I think a great many things have been said about first-class mail that need to be cleared up, to say the least.

First of all, it is contended that first-class mail pays its way, and therefore the rate should not be raised in any way. I am reliably assured that first-class mail does not pay its way; that even after we pass this bill and raise the rate to 4 cents an ounce, it will still cost about three-tenths of a cent per piece. But laying that to one side, let us ask ourselves what is the history of the Post Office and of first-class mail? Let us go right back to the beginning.

Benjamin Franklin, who was the father of our postal system, stated unequivocally that postage rates are not in the nature of a tax, but rather are fees paid for service.

How do we pay for our first-class mail now? What do the first-class users of mail have to do? They have to pay for this deficit.

We have done a lot of talking about the little fellow and certainly we should be careful of his rights. I would like to assure you, however, that no little fellow came before this committee to protest against the raise in the first-class rate. Why? Because, although it may be the fashion to talk down to the little fellow, he is quite aware of where his money goes. This is where his money goes and where his money will go. Here are the exact figures, which I have taken considerable trouble to get and they are correct. If the postal rate bill is passed, it will cost the average American family, of whom there are 40 million, an additional $1.76 per annum. If it is not passed, the deficit will continue to be supported by tax money. In other words, to tell these people that because their rate is raised they are not paying anything is a lot of demagogery, and we know it. They will pay. What will they pay? They will pay $7 per year. That is, the exact difference between $1.76 and $7 per year.

When we say that first-class mail should not be taxed as heavily, we should take into consideration certain matters. First, may I tell you that, if you do not raise the first-class rate, you might as well leave here now and not bother with the bill at all, because it is not worth the trouble to pass.

First-class mail in the year 1932 cost 1.7 cents per piece to carry. Nevertheless, without any great trouble the rate in that year was raised to 3 cents. I believe we were assured that that would be temporary. It was so temporary that in 1947, by unanimous consent, it was made a permanent rate, which it has been up to the present time. So there was no question then of making it pay its way. It was paying a good 2-cent surplus for all those years to help carry the Department.

Now we are only asking for the 1-cent raise, which is almost a necessity if you are going to raise your third class, and I think there is little argument but what that should be 3 cents. In other words, when first-class mail was first raised in the year 1932—and it has never been raised since—it paid 30 percent over its allocated cost. We are doing nothing like that today.

To go back to the individual, to this little fellow whose thoughts and aspirations we are always careful of except when it comes to voting his money away, and, after all, we should be careful of him. Most of us are little fellows, and we know what that means. He as an average would prefer, believe it or not, to pay 5 cents. Up to the north of us in Canada where they are more advanced in many things, they have a 5-cent first-class postal rate, and it has worked no hardship at all.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FULTON. May I congratulate the gentlewoman on her excellent and logical statement.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. I thank the gentleman. Even at 5 cents, you will be sending a first-class letter farther for a lower rate than anywhere in the world today. That is a statement that cannot be challenged. At 3 cents you are just giving it away.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KEATING. I think the gentlewoman has expressed the most convincing argument for an increase in the first-class rate of any I have heard. In other words, it would actually cost every family or the average family about $5.25 to defeat this bill, the amount they would have to pay in addition?

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. That is exactly correct, and I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

Verdict: Commendable Homicide

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM C. CRAMER
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 9, 1956

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Tampa Morning Tribune of July 7, 1956:

VERDICT: COMMENDABLE HOMICIDE

Democrats and Republicans are angrily blaming each other for the death of the Federal school aid bill.

Well, as one coroner, we blame nobody for this killing on the confused floor of the House. In our opinion it was a clear case of justifiable homicide—not merely justifiable but commendable.

For this was a bad bill.

Some deemed it bad because, in the showdown, it brandished an antisegregation amendment. Others denounced it because it would have divvied up the proposed construction money on a basis of population rather than existing need for classroom.

But these should have been secondary considerations.

The bill was fundamentally bad because it handed over to the Federal Government partial responsibility for the support of our public schools, which are and ought to remain the obligation of community and State.

For that reason alone it deserved to die.

If blame is to be assessed, it should fall upon those Congressmen who regularly sing hymns to States' rights and bewail the march of centralized government—yet would have voted for Federal school aid without blinking an eye if the form of the bill had suited them.

This, we submit, is plain hypocrisy.

How can local and State governments claim the right to run their own affairs if they willingly pass their responsibilities to Washington? How can they complain that the Federal Government is preempting tax sources if they constantly call upon Washington for money which they ought to raise themselves?

It should be obvious to the thickest wit that we can't expect to have it both ways. If we beg bread at the Federal door we're going to have to chop wood at the Federal command.

And where does "Federal aid" come from, anyway? Sooner or later it comes out of our own pockets—plus administrative costs and probably plus interest on money Washington borrowed to "give" to us. For the Federal Government, please remember, is $272.7 billion in debt.

There's less excuse for the school handout than for most Federal aid programs. For one thing, schools are not interstate like main highways; they're local. For another thing, there can't be a valid claim of a nationwide "emergency" in school housing. With the exception of a few special situations around new Government plants or military bases, States and communities have known for a long time what their school needs would be. If they haven't taken steps to provide the classrooms, they can blame no one but themselves.

Florida, because of its tremendous growth, has a harder problem than most States in keeping facilities up with enrollment. Yet by joint local and State effort it has managed pretty well. It can continue to provide adequate—if not ideal—schools as long as its citizens will pay the bill. If they aren't willing to pay, then they don't deserve any outside help.

There's not a single one of the 48 States that lacks the resources to give its children a decent education. Statistics show that for 1953–54 no State spent more than 4 percent of its total income for schools and most spent less than 3 percent.

Federal school aid apparently is dead for the session. Instead of weeping for the lost $1600 million, true friends of the schools will get busy raising the money in their own States—where it would have come from, anyway.

Control Follows the Purse

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM C. CRAMER
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 9, 1956

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the St. Petersburg Independent of July 5, 1956:

CONTROL FOLLOWS THE PURSE

Acceptance by the House of Representatives on a voice vote of the Powell amendment to the Federal school bill exposes the utter hyrocrisy of the militant integrationists who would force the end of school segregation in the South overnight.

The rider, sponsored by Representative ADAM POWELL, the Negro Congressman from New York, would deny Federal aid for school construction to those States that have not complied with the edict of the United States Supreme Court on ending school segregation.

Admittedly until the last decade the South has been shamefully delinquent in failing to provide schools for its Negro citizens equal to those of the whites. During the last decade, however, great strides have been made in overcoming this delinquency. In every Southern State more funds have been spent proportionately on Negro than white schools.

Much of the Federal aid that Congress now proposed to grant the States for school construction, would, in the Southern States, have gone to build new Negro schools.

The integrationists demand the end of segregation in Southern schools purportedly because they believe this will result in better educational opportunities for Negro children.

But in sponsoring and supporting the Powell amendment they cut the ground from beneath this argument.

In effect they are saying: "We want our Negro children to have better educational opportunities. The way we do this is to deny the South Federal funds with which to build Negro schools."

The maneuver, of course, is intended to coerce and intimidate the South into integrating its schools immediately. It holds forth a billion and a half in funds collected from the States and says, "Here is a wad of money. End segregation and you can have it. Otherwise you get none."

But at the same time the integrationists expose the falsity of the great tears they constantly shed in behalf of the southern Negro.

While they cry out in mock pain over the unequal or lack of educational opportunities for Negroes in the South, they are, at the same time, perfectly willing to sacrifice any opportunities that might be made available in an effort to force the South to follow their dictates.

This rule or ruin attitude is typical of the fanaticism that marked the course of the abolitionists in the era leading up to the Civil War. For them there is no compromise, no moderation, no middle road. Either the South falls in line or suffers the consequences.

Since it was first proposed that the Federal Government appropriate huge sums to aid the educational effort of the States, many educators as well as State officials and parents have rightly feared that Federal aid inevitably would result in Federal control of the public schools. Supporters of the measure have brushed aside these fears as groundless. There has been a great deal said and written about how Congress would provide Federal aid with no strings attached.

But even before the measure comes to a final vote in the House a rider is approved which immediately attaches strings to the funds and sets out to dictate the operation of the public schools.

This should be fair warning of what is to come if the Federal Government is permitted to get its foot in the door of our public schools.

If House Members are foolish enough to give final approval to the measure, we hope wiser heads will prevail in the Senate and kill it.

We have never been convinced of the need for Federal aid. We believe the States are fully capable of meeting the needs of their schools if the effort is made. Indeed, if they cannot or will not assume this basic responsibility, then the States may as well forego any thought of sovereignty, local self-government and responsibility and assume the status of conforming puppets of big centralized government.

Federal School-Aid Bill Deserved To Be Defeated

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM C. CRAMER
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 9, 1956

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the followihg editorial from the Tampa Times of July 7, 1956:

FEDERAL SCHOOL-AID BILL DESERVED TO BE DEFEATED

The House of Representatives has killed the Federal school-aid bill primarily because of the antisegregation amendment nailed to it, but although the segregation issue may get the blame, there are many other compelling reasons against Federal aid that the bill properly should be killed.

In the first place it has never been accurately shown that schools are facing an emergency which demands Federal assistance. As Raymond Moley wrote in the Times yesterday, the whole argument of educators for financial help from the National Treasury is based on a hodgepodge of statistics which prove exactly nothing.

The United States is enjoying a period of unprecedented prosperity, shared by all of the States. There has been no indication that any of the 48 States are so poor that they cannot provide adequate schools for their children, if they so choose.

Education is, and always has been, primarily a local problem. This is as it should be. The individual communities of the Nation should accept and guard the responsibility of educating their own youngsters according to local preference and tradition. The moment education becomes federalized and dominated by one set of standards prescribed by a Washington bureaucracy, individuality will be destroyed and the way will

be paved for one giant program of brainwashing.

The children of the Nation are not children of the state by any means. They have an identity with their families and local communities which must be preserved. Federal aid to schools is a step in the direction of Federal domination of the educational system and a trend toward separating the child from his personal heritage and molding him into the image desired by the State.

In addition, Federal aid to schools has its economic disadvantages. It means that the taxpayers of such States as Florida, where school standards are relatively high, will be called upon to pay for the education of children in such States as Mississippi, where standards are low. The dollars which go for Federal aid will be fewer because they must pass through the bureaucratic machinery in Washington where inefficiency diminishes their purchasing power.

In numerous instances it has been shown that higher educational standards mean better living standards in the community. Better educated pupils return their developed skills to improving their environment. For obvious practical purposes the individual States and communities should see to it that teaching standards are high. This should be a matter of local pride; it cannot be stimulated by dollars from Washington.

The United States has no low-income States. There is not a single State which does not have the potential resources to provide good schools. If these States now possessing low educational standards will not improve their own lot, it is not fair to ask the rest of the Nation to carry the reponsibility which local citizens refuse to accept.

The professional educator argues that it is the child which suffers. But the parents of that child have a right to leave the States with low standards and see that their youngster has better educational opportunities. In many cases, this is happening. The States with poor school systems are losing population to those States with better schools. Educational considerations are not the only factors in this migration, but they play a big role.

The House defeat of the Federal aid bill does not mean that it is dead permanently. Its proponents will try to breathe life into the issue again, but efforts to shift this responsibility to the Federal Government must be stoutly resisted.

Brownell's Political Corn

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELMER J. HOLLAND

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 9, 1956

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include in the RECORD an editorial from the Pittsburgh Press, under date of July 7, entitled "Brownell's Political Corn."

I feel that the enclosed editorial expresses the opinion of many people. Attorney General Brownell's last-minute investigation of General Motors as a monopoly is only designed to get a few votes between now and November, and then to forget the suit the day after election.

The same deceit has been used throughout by this big-business administration. When a paper like the Pittsburgh Press which has supported the administration comes out and calls it political corn it demonstrates that even some Republican supporters are getting sick and tired of the fakery that is now being practiced.

The editorial follows:

BROWNELL'S POLITICAL CORN

If Secretary Ezra Benson were to go on a General Motors-sponsored TV program to announce that the Agriculture Department had decided to blacklist Corn Products Co.—

It is doubtful that honest old Ezra would do such a thing, but if he did—

Well, it would be no worse than Attorney General Herbert Brownell's performance Wednesday night, when he went on a Corn Products-sponsored TV program to announce that the Justice Department would file an antitrust suit against General Motors.

It might be good politics, because this is an election year and some farm spokesmen have been accusing Ezra of loving the food processors more than he loves the farmers. But, repeating, it's doubtful that Ezra would play politics that way.

And, of course, there is no way of knowing how long Mr. Brownell carried that official news item around in his hot little hand before he stepped up to the TV camera to perform a governmental act under the auspices of a sponsor with a name appropriate to the performance.

But it is known that Mr. Brownell attained his present position by his skill in politics, that General Motors has been a large and growing corporation through the 3½ years Mr. Brownell has been Attorney General, that Democrats have been accusing the Eisenhower administration of favoring big business, and that Mr. Brownell didn't announce his suit against the symbol of big business until well along in an election year.

The traditional way for the Justice Department to break the news of an antitrust action is to file the complaint, making it a matter of court record, and give out a press release or hold a press conference available equally to all mediums of public information explaining the reasons for the suit.

But Mr. Brownell chose an unorthodox way of making his announcement, arousing controversy that might possibly draw more attention to the idea that the Republicans, in this election year, are hell bent for protecting the little fellows against the big fellow.

For his performance, Mr. Brownell received a leather-bound 20-volume encyclopedia and newspaper reporters participating in the Corn Products press conference received a cash honorarium for 30 minutes of acting the role they are paid all week to do for their own newspapers.

However you grind it, it's corn.

Veterans' Benefits

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LESTER R. JOHNSON

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 9, 1956

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to put into the RECORD a letter I received recently from Mr. Everett Guse, Veterans' Service Officer for Trempealeau County, one of the 11 counties in the ninth congressional district.

I believe Mr. Guse has made a fine presentation of the case for veterans' benefits and against the recommendations of the Bradley Commission. I am in full accord with Mr. Guse's views and I am glad to call this letter to the attention of my colleagues. The letter follows:

VETERAN'S SERVICE OFFICER,
Trempealeau County, Whitehall, Wis.

Hon. Congressman LESTER JOHNSON,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN JOHNSON: We have been doing some thinking on the recent so-called Bradley report, Hoover report, and veterans' benefits in general.

We sincerely hope that this so-called Bradley report has caused you to become somewhat concerned over the future benefits of those who sacrificed for our freedoms. The future benefits of our veterans should be of grave concern to every true American. I wish to call to your attention some of the facts as I see them from day to day while assisting the doughboy and the GI.

If all red-blooded Americans would stop to reflect just a few moments on the very first statement of the Bradley report, I am sure that the balance of the report would be considered insignificant. The statement I refer to is "Military service in time of war or peace should be treated as discharging an obligation of citizenship and not of itself as a basis for future Government benefits."

I think Mr. Bradley and his Commission are forgetting the soldier, the sailor, the marine, etc., who fought to preserve our democratic Government so that it is still possible for us to extend to these veterans their just and deserving benefits.

I am sure Mr. Bradley and his Commission have forgotten that the man and the woman who put on the uniform of his country and went forth to face the hazards and uncertainties of war did more than the average citizen. The man actually engaged in war did more than the man engaged in the shipyard and factory; the man who dug the trenches and foxholes and fought therefrom did more than the man who dug the ore or compounded the high explosives; the man who flew our fighters and bombers did more than the man on the ranch or the man who maintained the railroad; the man who fought the sea battles and the man who established the beachheads did more than the man who built the training stations or issued the ration stamps.

Mr. Bradley doesn't, but I am sure you realize the man who served his country in combat did more and is deserving of more than those who didn't. The man in the Air Force during World War II, no doubt, many a time wished he was back home on good solid ground instead of flirting with death. Doesn't that veteran deserve more than his classmate who was deferred during the entire war to help a beekeeper produce honey? A very good friend of mine quit his job and accepted employment on a farm in order to avoid the World War II draft. Should he be entitled to the same benefits as those who went forth to battle? I am sure there are thousands of similar cases.

One can aptly say that no man can put on the uniform of his country during war but what it takes something from him. He has given even though he may not be on a hospital bed or visibly crippled.

A veteran receiving nonservice connected pension would perhaps be on some welfare or relief roll if he was not receiving his veterans' pension. He is proud that he served his country and receives his pension with pride. This should be a significant fact.

We trust you are cognizant of the needs of the veteran. Recognizing this need, we beg you and expect you to exercise the influence of your position to safeguard the veterans' benefits and diligently strive for greater veterans' benefits; more hospital beds; more

medical care; a greater veterans' service to the veteran, his widow and children. These and other veterans' benefits are the things a grateful Nation owes those who fought to preserve its freedom.

Let's always bear in mind that there was a big difference between firing on the field of battle and keeping the home fires burning.

Very truly yours,

EVERETT GUSE,
Veterans' Service Officer,
Trempealeau County, Wis.

Northwest to the Orient

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAL HOLMES
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 9, 1956

Mr. HOLMES. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to insert in the RECORD two editorials from the Yakima Daily Republic on a subject of importance to the State of Washington.

[From the Yakima Daily Republic of April 21, 1956]

THE TIME HAS COME

It has been a little more than a year since President Eisenhower directed that Northwest Orient Airlines operate its North Pacific-Orient route under a temporary permit for 7 years. The Civil Aeronautics Board had recommended permanent certification, but the President said he wanted the line to prove it could operate without Federal subsidy before granting permanent certification. He wanted the carrier to "demonstrate its ability to operate without subsidies within a reasonable period of time."

We note that Northwest will put on its sixth oriental flight per week April 29. Northwest has been operating without need for a subsidy ever since the President signed the order, in fact from a month before the order was signed. This proves the airline's short route to the Orient has arrived, economically speaking; that Northwest has successfully sold the advantages of the Pacific Northwest gateway in travel to and from the Far East.

For these reasons we believe the time has come for the President to certify the route permanently. Temporary authority is a handicap to a carrier. It is harder to plan for the future when that future may not be permanent. Among all the American-flag international carriers only Northwest's application was made to hinge on subsidy-free operation. All others have permanent routes, but only TWA and NWA do not require subsidy. That's an added reason for permanent certification.

[From the Yakima Daily Republic of May 22, 1956]

SUPPORT FOR NORTHWEST

We commend the Yakima Chamber of Commerce for its support of Northwest Airlines' application for immediate permanent certification of its Great Circle route to the Orient. The examiner for the Civil Aeronautics Board is about to make his report on the prehearing conference in this case and the Board soon will be passing a recommendation on to President Eisenhower, so the chamber's support is well timed.

The airline is operating on a 7-year temporary certification, ordered by the President to give the company time to show it could operate without a subsidy. It has been operating without subsidy since January 1, 1955, and we believe it has proved its point.

It is not only to the advantage of the airline to have a permanent certificate, it is to the advantage of the Pacific Northwest to have our own gateway to the Far East recognized as a permanent route. We have the shortest route to the Orient and long have advertised our region as the gateway to Alaska and the Orient. It is up to our region to guard its position.

The Civil Aeronautics Board once before recommended a permanent certification and likely will do so again. We trust the President will accept 17 months' operation without a Federal subsidy as the proof he requires.

Labor Fears Government Development of Niagara

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES C. AUCHINCLOSS
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 9, 1956

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks I am very pleased to include a full page advertisment which appeared in the New York Times on Sunday, July 8, which was paid for by the New York State Association of Electrical Workers-AFL, protesting against the enactment of the so-called Niagara public power bill, H. R. 11477, recently reported out by the Committee on Public Works of the House by a small margin.

As a member of the Public Works Committee of the House for several years, I regret the action taken on this important legislation without the serious study which it merits. Many members of the Public Works Committee have never had the opportunity to learn about this proposal through the medium of hearings and although a record has been written on this subject and the proposal for Government operation has been definitely rejected by the House of Representatives, this new proposal has not had careful study by the Committee on Public Works of the House. The provisions in this legislation are contrary to the economic foundations of our country, based on which we have gone forward to be the greatest and strongest nation in the world. It is no wonder to me that members of the labor unions who are patriotic citizens are greatly concerned.

The advertisement follows:

LABOR FEARS GOVERNMENT DEVELOPMENT OF NIAGARA

To the honorable Members of the United States House of Representatives:

The Free Trade Union movement and the free-enterprise system together have made our country the greatest Nation in all the world. It is most essential that we keep it that way.

Based upon this fundamental principle the New York State Association of Electrical Workers whose 80,000 members work in all branches of industry, and the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers (550,000 members) throughout the United States, are opposed to governmental development of Niagara power.

This message is written to you because in Washington today there is a bill pending before your honorable body which seriously threatens free trade and the American system of free enterprise, and we are against it.

The so-called Niagara public power bill (H. R. 11477), introduced in the Senate by Senator HERBERT H. LEHMAN, of New York, and in the House of Representatives by Congressman CHARLES A. BUCKLEY, proposes that Government displace regulated business enterprise in the development of additional water from the Niagara River for electric power to be distributed on a priority basis to preference groups (municipal distribution systems and rural cooperatives) representing only 5 percent of the power customers of New York State. This establishes a privileged class of citizens and is wholly un-American.

We are opposed to this discriminatory bill because it violates the principles of free enterprise and fair play because there is no valid reason for Government to compete with its citizens in the electric business, or any other business, and because the bill marks a long step toward further nationalization of American basic industry.

We like free trade; we like the free enterprise system that has made America great and the life of the American labor man the envy of the world. Our American system of getting things done makes sense—we want to retain it.

In opposing this legislation, we ask you to bear in mind that:

1. The Niagara Power Development does not involve any governmental function such as navigation, irrigation, reclamation, flood control; it involves only the generation of power.

2. The electric utility companies of the State of New York are ready, willing, and able to proceed immediately to develop the power in the Niagara River—all that's required is congressional approval.

3. If government is authorized to develop water for electric power purposes because water is a natural resource, other natural resources, such as gas, oil, lumber, and minerals, will eventually be taken over by government. We do not like the direction in which this public power bill is headed.

4. Business-managed electric utilities pay their full way in taxes; government power projects do not. Taxes evaded in the great development like the Niagara ($23 million annually in additional taxes if utility companies do the job) will have to be made up later by all taxpayers.

5. Under business-managed operation customers are fully protected in the rates charged them for their electric services by a duly-authorized, efficient State-regulating agency—the New York State Public Service Commission. There is no regulation of political operation.

6. Past experience shows that fair and lasting labor agreements with government agencies are almost impossible; organized labor has, and is, reaching excellent agreements today with business-managed electric utilities. We want to continue this way.

7. We agree with President Eisenhower that this issue should be decided in accordance with the wishes of the local people concerned. In the project area, working men, farmers, industry, representatives of local governments, and every category of electrical user and taxpayer overwhelmingly reject the public power bill. (Note below.) It is supported substantially by public-power extremists who are only remotely concerned but who insist on imposing their philosophies upon the people directly concerned.

8. Hundreds of thousands of International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers members earn their livelihood and support their families as employees of the free enterprise system in the light and power industry. And hundreds of thousands of other citizens re-

ceive an income from their investments in the power companies. Truly this is one of the basic industries in the country. On its record it deserves to be protected.

9. As members of organized labor we do not propose to have our welfare directed or determined by any bureaucratic official of the Government, whether it be municipal, State, or national, no matter how good the intention may seem to be. Government ownership would tend to make the American worker a servant to his government, whereas his government should be a servant to him.

10. The development of the Niagara River power project by the power companies of the State of New York, received the endorsement of the New York State Federation of Labor representing 1,300,000 members.

On July 9, 1953, your honorable body, by a decisive bipartisan vote of 262 to 120, passed the bill, introduced by Congressman WILLIAM E. MILLER, of New York, and Congressman GEORGE A. DONDERO, of Michigan, for the development of the Niagara River by the five major New York State business-managed electric utilities. We believe it was a sound position then; we believe it is a sound position now.

We sincerely hope that you sustain that decision by voting "No" on the so-called Niagara public power bill.

The Miller-Dondero bill guarantees equality to all in the sale of power under rates regulated by the New York Public Service Commission. The development will pay its full way in taxes and preserve the American way of free enterprise; the free trade union movement and the free enterprise system, marching together, have made this country the greatest nation on earth; let's make sure we keep it so.

Your consideration of this most important matter will be deeply appreciated.

Jefferson said: "That government governs best which governs least." It is as true today as it was yesterday.

Respectfully submitted.

NEW YORK STATE ASSOCIATION OF ELECTRICAL WORKERS–AFL,
WILLIAM BUTLER, *President*.
JOHN R. WEIGELT, *Secretary-Treasurer*.

NOTE.—The results of surveys by Congressmen OSTERTAG, MILLER, and PILLION, of New York, among the voters in their territory and by the American Agriculturist show that 75 to 90 percent of the voters who replied were in favor of free enterprise. Hundreds of independent organizations such as farm bureaus, the New York State Grange, the New York State Association of Town Boards, labor unions, the Supervisors' Association of the State of New York, women's clubs, etc., have all endorsed free enterprise.

The Cyprus Situation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KARL E. MUNDT
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, July 9, 1956

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a press release by Mr. Refik Koraltan, Speaker of the Turkish Grand National Assembly, being a message to the world parliaments. This press release deals with the Cyprus situation.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FROM THE PRESIDENT OF TURKISH GRAND NATIONAL ASSEMBLY TO WORLD PARLIAMENTS

Following is the text of a message sent by Mr. Refik Koraltan, Speaker of the Turkish Grand National Assembly, to the World Parliaments:

"Mr. Rodopoulos, Speaker of Greek National Assembly, is understood to have sent on June 6, on behalf of that Assembly, a message to all world parliaments. In this message Mr. Rodopoulos claims that Turks of Cyprus—which he qualifies as gangs and a negligeable minority—are killing, wounding, and plundering Greek population of that island. He protests these acts and requests assistance.

"This message, in which it is attempted to distort completely the realities for the purpose of, on the one hand, throwing the responsibility for crimes perpetrated in Cyprus on the innocent Turkish population, and on the other, of drawing the sympathy of world public opinion to the cause of annexation of Cyprus by Greeks, has created deep indignation throughout Turkey.

"The Turkish Grand National Assembly, of which I have the honor of being the speaker, has during its session of June 13 decided with unanimity to charge me to express the indignation felt in Turkey, and to assert the truth to all parliaments to which the Speaker of the Greek Assembly has sent his above-mentioned message.

"In consequence, on behalf of the Turkish Grand National Assembly, I hasten to submit to your attention and to that of the Parliament of your country, the following.

"The Turkish community of Cyprus is not an insignificant minority as alleged by Mr. Rodopoulos. They represent in the midst of a total population of 500,000 for the whole island, a mass of 120,000 people as against around 370,000 people of the Greek-speaking community.

"For a year a secret organization called EOKA, has been performing acts of systematic terrorism. This organization is composed of a certain number of people of the Greek-speaking community and of officers, specialists in terrorism and volunteers who have secretly come from Greece.

"The members of the EOKA have not only illegally kept the arms which they possessed, in defiance of the orders from the local authorities inviting the population of the island to surrender them, but have also secretly received arms from Greece or secured them through funds also received from Greece.

"This group has recently started to murder police constables working under orders of local authorities and to execute organized incursions on a large scale into villages which are partly inhabited by Turks, in order to perpetrate bloody and shocking acts of aggression against them and to destroy their property. All these facts are corraborated by factual evidence and documents.

"As for the Turks of Cyprus, not only have they turned in their arms to the local authorities by complying with the order, but they have, unlike EOKA, never received outside arms aid.

"They are, therefore, deprived even of the material means for perpetrating terrorism of which they are accused in the message of Mr. Rodopoulos. Furthermore, those Turks who are qualified in the message of Mr. Rodopoulos as gangs, have distinguished themselves with their compliance with the laws and regulations and with their preference of defending their just cause through legitimate means despite the fact that they are opposed to enosis with all their hearts.

"It is an indubitable truth that the acts to which they have resorted for expressing their disgust in the face of the atrocities committed by the terrorists and for exercising their legitimate right of self-defense cannot be compared in any way, neither in nature not in intensity, to all that the terrorists have.

"Intensive propaganda is being made to deform the realities not only on the subject of what is happening in Cyprus, but also on the subject of the whole of the so-called Cyprus question with the sole purpose of bringing about the unjust and unfounded annexation of the island to Greece.

"From this point of view equally, there exist a great number of official documents depicting the true picture of the affair and exposing the ulterior motives that are pursued, and explaining the thesis and attitude, based on justice and equity, of Turkey which has a vital interest on the island. Even a résumé of the essential points of these documents will unduly prolong the present message. I will, therefore, confine myself on behalf of the Grand National Assembly, to beg Your Excellency as well as the Parliament of your country:

"1. Not to lose sight of the fact that any ill-advised and unjust change in the status of Cyprus will create a vital injury not only for Turkey, but for the peace and security of the free world.

"2. Not to heed subversive and provocative propaganda.

"3. To bear in mind the truth that the so-called question of Cyprus is not a simple question of the application of the principle of self-determination, but the outcome of a certain number of unlawful political calculations the realization of which must never be permitted for political, historical, strategical, and a variety of other reasons.

"4. In view of the preceding observations, to remember that if Your Excellency or the Parliament of your country should, by taking into consideration only documents and claims emanating from a single source, and by being influenced by subversive and distorting propaganda, take any action, even with the best of intentions this might occasion immense damage the extent of which cannot be foreseen, to the cause of justice and equity and to the triumph of the truth.

"Please accept, Your Excellency, the assurances of my highest consideration.

"REFIK KORALTAN,
"Speaker of the Turkish Grand National Assembly."

The Hood River Valley

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, July 9, 1956

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, one of the most picturesque portions of the Pacific Northwest is the beautiful Hood River Valley, extending from the glacial slopes of the 11,245-foot Mount Hood to the shores of the Columbia River. This is one of the great orchard areas of the entire world. It also is the scene of such cultural enterprises as the annual Hood River music festival, featuring a talented emigree from Finland, Dr. Boris Sirpo.

The achievements and geography of the Hood River region have been graphically described in an article written by J. L. (Jack) Travis, staff correspondent of the Oregonian, of Hood River, Oreg., and published in the Oregonian Sunday magazine of July 1, 1956. For the infor-

mation of other Members of the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that the splendid article by Mr. Travis, from the Oregonian, be printed in full in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMEMBER THE HOOD RIVER VALLEY

(By Jack Travis)

Beautiful, productive, self-ontained Hood River Valley has in the last few years been brought much closer to Portland and the Willamette Valley. The new water-grade highway along the Columbia River and the opening of a road through almost forgotten Lolo Pass, from Hood River over the northwest shoulder of Mount Hood to Zigzag, now make it easier than ever to spend an afternoon or a day viewing the valley's natural beauties, fishing for steelhead and trout in Hood River and its tributaries, admiring spring blossoms or taking part in the seemingly endless activity of the harvest in the fall.

"An hour to see—a lifetime to remember," says the chamber of commerce. This section of Oregon has been semi-isolated by the natural boundaries of Mount Hood to the south, the Columbia River to the north, and forest-covered wilderness hills and mountains to the east and west.

As the crow flies, it is only 19 miles from the remotest year-round resident, on the slopes of Mount Hood on the south, to the Columbia River on the north. At its widest point at the Columbia River, Hood River Valley measures only 9 miles.

Within the valley live around 12,000 people. The city of Hood River is the only incorporated community in the valley. Cascade Locks, 20 miles down the Columbia from the valley, is the only other incorporated town in Hood River County.

Other communities in the valley include Parkdale, the city nearest the mountain; Odell in the center of the valley; Dee, the home of the Oregon Lumber Co., now purchased and operated by the Edward Hines Lumber Co., of Chicago, and Mount Hood, a small community in the upper valley near Parkdale.

Between these communities lie acres and acres of some of the finest apple, pear, and cherry orchards in the world. Interspersed are neat, trim, luxuriant strawberry fields. The growing and processing of these fruits is Hood River Valley's largest industry.

The heavily forested hills and mountains on three sides of the valley make possible the logging, lumbering, wood products, and hardboard industries that run agriculture a close second.

The valley was first settled in 1852 by a Dr. Farnsworth and a man named Laughlin. Families of hardy pioneer stock started clearing and planting the valley almost immediately. The first commercial orchard began producing about 1876.

In 1900, the Hood River Commercial Club and real-estate men started a campaign to advertise the valley. Between 1902 and 1914, many easterners and midwesterners, drawn by stories of promising orchards, excellent climate, and wonderful scenery, migrated to the valley.

During this time, a university club with well-appointed clubrooms was established in Hood River. At Parkdale, graduates of Princeton University formed an informal Princeton Club. It was from newcomers of this stripe that the valley has received its prominence in cultural matters.

A number of families of Finnish and Japanese ancestry arrived in the valley at about the same time. From the Finnish strain came Hood River's reputation for appreciation of good music. Years later another Finn of international musical reputation, Boris Sirpo, brought the Hood River Music Association into being and firmly placed the valley into the spotlight. Sirpo's work is now being carried on under the direction of the brilliant Clayton Hare through the music association.

It was the Japanese who showed through hard work and long hours what could be done in the growing of the valley's world-famous fruits.

Today children and grandchildren of these early developers of the valley are active in the political, business, and social life of the community.

A number of the early growers of the valley banded together shortly after the turn of the century to form a growers' cooperative. Today the Hood River Apple Growers' Association handles a large percentage of the apples, pears, cherries, strawberries, and peaches grown in the valley. Grower-owned, its various plants and equipment for sorting, grading, packing, storing, canning, and juicing represent a present-day valuation of from $9 million to $10 million.

Hood River County has a unique distinction of being the first and only county in the United States to place its county land under the management of the United States Forest Service. A 10-year agreement was entered into in 1945, and so successful were the results that a new agreement was signed in 1955 for the next 99 years.

Friendly Hood River Valley looks to the future for greater industrial development, confident always that nature has assured its residents one of the finest places in the world to live.

Pooling of Health Insurance Companies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. PERCY PRIEST

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 9, 1956

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced a bill to encourage the extension and improvement of voluntary health prepayment plans or policies. The introduction of this bill was requested by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, the Honorable Marion B. Folsom, in a letter addressed to the Speaker dated June 29, 1956. This letter, which explains the bill, follows:

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION, AND WELFARE,
June 29, 1956.

Hon. SAM RAYBURN,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I am enclosing for your consideration a draft bill which would permit private insuring organizations—either small insurance companies or voluntary associations—to enter into voluntary agreements for the purpose of helping to extend and improve health prepayment plans or policies. The President pointed out in his special health message to the Congress of January 26 that this type of legislation was under consideration by the administration.

The draft bill would authorize the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, after consultation with the Federal Trade Commission and with the approval of the Attorney General, to approve voluntary agreements between private insuring organizations for pooling or coordinating their resources and efforts in developing plans or policies designed to meet current needs for adequate health prepayment protection. The bill would require that data and technical materials developed as the result of operations and activities carried out under an approved agreement be made publicly available. The bill would also provide that reinsurance made available pursuant to the agreement could be purchased by insurance organizations who are not parties to the agreement. Approval of any voluntary agreement would be withdrawn if there is substantial failure of the organizations to comply with any provisions required in the agreement, or if it is determined that continuation of such agreement will no longer further the objectives of the bill or would otherwise be contrary to the public interest. The bill also provides for consultation by the Secretary with representatives of State insurance supervisory agencies in order to obtain their advice and recommendations in the development of standards for approving voluntary agreements, and on other needs arising in the administration of the program.

The provisions of the bill are applicable only to voluntary associations like the Blue Cross and Blue Shield, and (since the larger insurance companies are generally in a position to undertake experimentation and developmental activity on their own) to insurance companies doing less than 1 percent of the total commercial health insurance business in the United States. Actions pursuant to approved voluntary agreements which affect interstate commerce would be exempted from Federal and State antitrust laws and the Federal Trade Commission Act.

This proposal would make possible accelerated efforts to develop improved voluntary health insurance. Considerable progress has been made in the past few years in broadening voluntary health insurance coverage so that an estimated 105 million American people now have some prepayment protection against the costs of hospitalization, about 90 million have surgical expense insurance, and approximately 50 million have prepayment coverage against the costs of other physicians' services primarily in connection with hospitalized illness. However, there are four areas referred to in the draft bill where additional progress is needed:

1. Major medical expense insurance: Even though major medical expense insurance—now protecting more than 5 million people in this country—is the fastest growing type of prepayment coverage, there is need for more widespread use of this form of insurance.

2. Coverage for the aged: There is also need to develop better coverage for retired and other older persons for whom there is increased likelihood of expensive illness.

3. Coverage in rural areas: Persons who live on farms and in other rural areas, or who work in small plants or are self-employed, generally are not well protected against the costs of hospitalization and medical care, and better methods of reaching such persons need to be developed.

4. Coverage of substandard risks: More prepayment protection is needed for persons who have chronic conditions such as heart disease or cancer or other disabilities—the so-called substandard risks.

We believe that encouragement should be given to insuring organizations to develop improved plans to help meet these and other needs. The program set forth in the appended draft bill would be a useful further step toward this goal.

The very large insurance companies are generally in a position to undertake on their own the developmental activity and experimentation which is essential to the furtherance of more effective voluntary health insurance. We anticipate that these organizations will proceed, as many of them are, with individual efforts toward the development of new and improved forms of coverage.

At the same time, under the provisions of the appended draft bill, joint developmental action and experimentation by smaller in-

surance companies or by voluntary associations would be possible.

Finally, we believe that the offering of Federal reinsurance in accordance with the President's recommendation to the Congress last year would also help extend and improve voluntary health insurance. The provisions which would carry out the recommendation made by the President last year are contained in title I of H. R. 3458 and H. R. 3720. You will recall that an earlier version of these provisions was considered by the House of Representatives during the 83d Congress and recommitted for further consideration. The President's recommendation to the 84th Congress contained provisions designed to meet certain of the objections to the earlier version of the bill, and also focused on specific areas of unmet need in health insurance.

Although private reinsurance is available from several sources, we believe that a systematic offering of such reinsurance by the Government on a limited basis with the specific objective of encouraging new and improved forms of protection would result in wider use of such reinsurance as an aid in introducing new types of prepayment plans. We also believe that the knowledge acquired, the information exchanged, and the experience resulting under a Federal reinsurance program would serve as a further stimulus and aid in the whole development of voluntary health insurance.

We therefore recommend that the Congress give consideration to the reinsurance proposal as well as to the appended draft bill. We believe that the two proposals, as a supplement to the effort of individual insurance organizations, would help to achieve improvement in voluntary health insurance in this country.

We shall appreciate it if you refer the draft bill to the appropriate committee for consideration.

The Bureau of the Budget advises that enactment of this proposed legislation would be in accord with the program of the President.

Sincerely yours,

M. B. FOLSOM,
Secretary.

Vice President Nixon Performs Another Outstanding Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CRAIG HOSMER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 3, 1956

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, Vice President NIXON's current visit to the Far East is paying substantial dividends to the American people, just as have his previous activities both at home and abroad. On Saturday the Los Angeles Examiner editorially commented on his speech in Manila as follows:

NIXON SAYS IT

In timing and substance the Manila speech of Vice President NIXON on the occasion of Independence Day in both this country and the Philippine Republic was magnificent.

Mr. NIXON established by skillful contrast the difference between America's policy of friendship, equality, and independence toward Asian nations and the brutish tyranny of the new Soviet colonialism that has already colonized into slavery such areas as North Korea and North Viet Nam. Previously he had buttressed the American position by making recognition of Philippine sovereignty over United States airbases there unmistakably clear.

On the subject of neutral nations the Vice President's words were equally reasoned and strong.

He could understand, he said, how some nations on the fringe of Soviet conquest could decide to refrain from military alliance, although he pointed out the historic danger of such a course. But there can be no sympathy, he went on, with that form of neutralism that professes to see no moral distinction between Communist tyranny and freedom, between godless oppression and God-fearing affirmation of the dignity of man.

We think the Vice President has done this country an outstanding service.

The Bradley Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. T. JAMES TUMULTY
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 31, 1956

Mr. TUMULTY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I set forth the action of the New Jersey Disabled American Veterans, Department of New Jersey at their 36th annual convention held in Wildwood, N. J., June 21 to June 24. May I say I agree with them in their objection to the vicious Bradley report:

DISABLED AMERICAN VETERANS, DEPARTMENT OF NEW JERSEY, CONVENTION RESOLUTION

Whereas the present administration of the Federal Government has ordered a study of veterans programs and benefits, by a commission headed by Gen. Omar Bradley, which commission produced a series of pronouncements and recommendations, known as the Bradley report; and

Whereas a study of said Bradley report discloses that its recommendations are designed to drastically curtail veterans' benefits, including the total elimination of all benefits for millions of veterans; and

Whereas these recommendations, if implemented, would have a disastrous effect on veterans, particularly disabled veterans, their families and dependents, because the Bradley report seeks to reverse the 150-year-old American tradition and policy, in the words of Abraham Lincoln, to "care for him who shall have borne the battle, and for his widow and for his orphan," and seeks to demolish and wreck the system of veterans' benefits built up so laboriously over the years: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, by the delegates of the New Jersey Department, Disabled American Veterans, in convention assembled, That this department highly resolve and go on record, as being unalterably opposed to the said Bradley report in its entirety, as being a deadly and direct threat to the welfare of this organization, its members and their families and dependents, and to all veterans, and as being a bald, deliberate, cynical breach of faith with the American veteran; and be it further

Resolved, That this department, its officers, member chapters and membership, do all in their power to oppose its implementation, in any way, legislative or administrative, and that copies of this resolution be forwarded to appropriate officials of the Federal and State governments, the United States Congress, the New Jersey Legislature, and to the national convention, Disabled American Veterans, 1956, in San Antonio, Tex., for adoption and support.

Address by Stasys Lozoraitis at Festival of Lithuanian Art and Music

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EVERETT M. DIRKSEN
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, July 9, 1956

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, on June 16, 1956, the National Lithuanian Society of America presented the festival of Lithuanian Art and Music here in Washington, D. C. This presentation graphically showed the true culture of the Lithuanian people through the many years of their great history. The festival was climaxed by a dinner at which the Honorable Stasys Lozoraitis, Chief of the Lithuanian Diplomatic Service gave the principal address and it is that address which I would like to bring to the attention of the Senate and the people of the United States by having the address printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY STASYS LOZORAITIS, CHIEF OF THE LITHUANIAN DIPLOMATIC SERVICE, AT THE FESTIVAL OF LITHUANIAN ART AND MUSIC, HOTEL STATLER, WASHINGTON, D. C., JUNE 16, 1956

I consider it a great privilege to be able to speak, in the capacity of Chief of the Lithuanian diplomatic service, at this distinguished gathering which climaxes the Festival of Lithuanian Art and Music and which is lent special significance by the generous presence of so many representatives of the Government and people of the United States of America and other nations.

In the folk art and music presented at this festival is heard the voice of Lithuania, and beating of her heart; in them her soul is mirrored. This Lithuanian soul, despite tragic hardships under Soviet occupation, remains free and thirsts after but one thing: To throw off Soviet-Communist slavery and to return to her rightful place among the democratic, Christian nations of the West to which the Lithuanian nation belongs by right of her history, faith, and culture.

This is the ultimate and unshakable will of the Lithuanian people. Our nation has not accepted and will never accept the so-called incorporation into the Soviet Union. In fact, this incorporation was an act of brutal aggression, the result of force, as contrary to international law and morality as it was to the will and interests of Lithuania. This premeditated international crime was carefully planned by the Soviet Government. In August and September of 1939, the Soviet Government reached an agreement with Hitler, forming a plot which opened the gates to the Second World War. One of the most important elements of this plot was the destruction of the independence of the Baltic States and their forced incorporation into the Soviet Union. The Soviet Government enacted this criminal plan in two stages: Military and quasi-elective. In October 1939, by the threat of force, the Soviet Government imposed on Lithuania the so-called Mutual Assistance Pact in accordance with which it was able to introduce Soviet garrisons into Lithuanian territory, promising, however, to respect Lithuania's sovereignty and independence. But in June 1940, taking advantage of the fact that the democracies of western Europe

had succumbed to Hitler, the Soviet Government presented the three Baltic States—Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia—with a totally unfounded ultimatum. This action was followed up by an attack on the Baltic States and their occupation by the overwhelming Red army. In Lithuania, at sword's point the Soviets indulged in electoral manipulations by which means the occupying force organized a so-called parliament composed of Communists, and authorized it to vote for the annulment of Lithuanian independence and the incorporation of Lithuania into the Soviet Union. This was the beginning of terrorist persecutions, mass deportations, and the annihilation of the most basic human rights in Lithuania, by which the Soviet Government has inflicted and continues to inflict the most grievous wounds. Only 2 days ago we marked the 15th anniversary of the beginning of one of the greatest crimes in the hisory of Europe—the deportation of thousands of Lithuanians, Latvians, and Estonians to certain death in the slave camps of Siberia.

Lithuania's painful experience in dealings with the Soviet Union is and remains a manifest example of how the Soviet Union interprets international coexistence. In the same way, soon after the establishment of the Soviet regime, in Russia, in the days of Lenin, the Soviet Government carried on a whole series of aggressive acts toward its western neighbors of which Lithuania was one. However, a decisive defense closed the path of Soviet expansion to the west and forced the Soviet Government to change its tactics, replacing open aggression with a coexistence policy. This new Soviet tactic manifested itself in the abundant peace, nonaggression, and other security treaties which the Soviet Union concluded with its western neighbors. I surely would not be exaggerating by saying that in no other part of the world was there devised such a broad system of guaranties against every possible form of aggression as there was between the Soviet Union and her neighbors. To any person of good faith this system would certainly have seemed an inviolable barrier. Such guaranties existed also between Lithuania and the Soviet Union. Notwithstanding all these things, the Soviet Union seized the first opportunity—in 1939–40—to put an end to peaceful coexistence and to violate solemn treaties into which it had freely entered.

It is for this reason that Lithuanians, having had such tragic experience with the Soviets, now follow attentively and with misgiving the new tactic which the Soviets unveiled since Stalin's death. This tactic has two aspects.

First, it would seem that the Soviet Government is experiencing troubles within the regions which they occupy and rule, and must contend with the fact that the Soviet population and the populations of the nations enslaved by the Soviet Union abhor the political regime. For this reason, the Soviet Government wishes, in certain internal affairs, to give the impression that the regime is now less rigid. Therefore, I think it worthwhile to remember that this lessening of tension fails to affect any basic question. The Communist Party remains the supreme, deciding factor, totally beyond appeal. The dissolution of basic human rights remains in effect. In this way the Soviet regime remains what it was, as contrary to human nature as it is dangerous to world civilization.

As to the second aspect, that of foreign policy, the opposition of the west, under the leadership of the United States, to Soviet expansion, forced the Soviet Government to devise a new policy and to proclaim the watchword of peaceful coexistence. The purpose of this tactic is to lull the alertness of the west, to bring it to political and moral disarment and to the recognition, or at least to the forgetting, of the results of those international crimes of which the Soviet Union is guilty in attacking and occupying a whole series of nations, among them Luthuania. This tactic seeks to demoralize international relations and to make expansion possible where military means would be impractical—by means of subversion. It seems to me that, although the new Kremlin leaders are second-string men, their new strategy is as dangerous as was the old one. In this way the struggle of the Soviet Union, and indeed of bolshevism, to subjugate the entire world—the struggle begun by Lenin and carried on by Stalin—is now being implemented by Stalin's successors. In this struggle, the civilized world has a silent ally. This ally is the group of millions belonging to the nations enslaved by the Soviet Union. These peoples, among them the Lithuanian Nation, continue a moral resistance to the Soviet Government, and, I believe, by so doing they hinder the plans of Soviet imperialism. In this struggle the west has also a powerful weapon. Opinions are sometimes voiced that in this fight against communism a new ideal is needed. I do not think that this is the case. There are two ancient but always valid ideals: faith in God, and the devotion of peoples and nations to the principle of freedom. The intensified proclamation and implementation of these two ideals is that powerful weapon which I just mentioned. Its use in conjunction with peaceful coercion of the Soviet Union must bring the elimination of the danger which the Soviet Union constitutes to civilization. An indispensable condition in the elimination of this danger is the restoration of freedom to the Soviet-enslaved nations which look with hope to the west for deliverance.

Ladies and gentlemen, the Soviet will never give up their proclaimed plans. It is only when they can no longer practice them that they put them aside until the times again become propitious. May the Western World not forget its plans for freedom and justice; may it carry them forward methodically and without compromise.

From that fatal day when the Soviet Union attacked and occupied Lithuania, the understanding attitude of the American Government and people in regard to the case of Lithuanian freedom, has been a source of comfort and of hope to the Lithuanian Nation. Our people will never forget that from the very beginning America condemned the illegal occupation of Lithuania and refuses to recognize it. Our Nation remembers with gratitude, remembers the repeated statements of high-placed American officials recognizing Lithuania's right to the restoration of her freedom. And the fact that this festival, this manifestation of the soul and culture of Lithuania, could only take place in the United States—in their Capital—will be welcomed by all Lithuanians and they will derive from it special significance.

I am certain that I express the feeling of all Lithuanians, at home and abroad, when I thank the United States for their sympathy toward Lithuania. Furthermore, I am also convinced that I speak for all my countrymen in extending best wishes to President Dwight D. Eisenhower for his speedy recovery.

Ladies and gentlemen, may I consider your presence here as a sign of your sympathy for Lithuania? I will long remember this evening and I will always be grateful to the National Lithuanian Society of America for inviting me. I feel sure that this society has done much to help the Lithuanian cause and Lithuanian-American relations by the zealous organization of this festival.

Ladies and gentlemen, during the lifetime of one generation the United States of America twice was forced to take up arms and fight for the ideals of freedom, law, and justice. In this cause hundreds of thousands of American youths gave their lives but the Soviet Union blighted the ripening of the fruits of their sacrifice. I believe that those ideals, always alive in this huge Nation, will totally triumph through peaceful means, and that this will bring, to my country as well, the restoration of freedom and independence.

The Civil Rights Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. WILLIS ROBERTSON
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, July 9, 1956

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the weekly newsletter of my distinguished successor in the Seventh Congressional District of Virginia, Representative BURR P. HARRISON, in which he discussed the so-called civil-rights bill now under consideration by the House. Representative HARRISON'S analysis of that bill is lucid and accurate, and I fully endorse the position he has taken in opposition to it.

There being no objection, the newsletter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

YOUR CONGRESSMAN REPORTS

(By Representative BURR P. HARRISON)

During the sessions of Congress, I receive many well-informed letters from citizens of the Seventh Congressional District concerning pending legislation. It has been amazing to me, therefore, that I have not been getting mail about the so-called Civil Rights Act of 1956, which the House of Representatives is getting ready to pass.

Even a casual reading of this bill, sponsored by the President, reveals it as one of the most drastic measures ever to receive consideration by Congress.

It would set up a Federal Commission with a staff of snoopers who could roam the length and breadth of the United States, armed with subpenas, looking for civil-rights incidents. One fo the objectives of this Commission would be to advance the idea of complete racial integration in private business.

Any State or local official, any businessman; in fact, any citizen, could be hauled before this Commission, under threat of a prison term for contempt, and required to answer the allegations of any troublemaker that he had been subjected to unwarranted economic pressures, whatever they are, because of color, race, religion, or national origin.

It does not take much imagination to predict where the agents of this Commission would do most of their snooping. Under its authority to investigate legal developments, any Southern judge, sheriff, or police chief could expect to receive a subpena if the Commission thought the official had not handled a civil-rights case in accordance with its ideas of what civil rights are, and how they should be protected.

The chairman of the House Judiciary Committee admitted last week that the bill would permit charges to be brought in a Federal court against any member of a State legislature who voted for an interposition resolution on the school-integration issue. This raises the question as to whether Southern Members of Congress who signed the anti-integration manifesto likewise could expect to find themselves indicted and brought to trial.

But these are among the milder provisions of the Civil Rights Act of 1956.

The measure would authorize the Federal Government, through the Attorney General, to take any civil rights case into a Federal court, even though it might be active in a State court at the time. And believe it or not, the person claiming he was being discriminated against would be assigned a Government lawyer, free of charge, to handle his case.

Now, you might say:

"Why talk about such a bill? Congress never would vote such a thing."

It will vote such a thing, if given a chance, and the House of Representatives is likely to get its chance soon. Consider these facts:

1. The prestige of President Eisenhower is behind this bill. In a message to the convention of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, he stated the bill, "will materially assist the Government in discharging its responsibility to safeguard the constitutional rights of every citizen." 2. Despite the respect in which Representative HOWARD W. SMITH, of Virginia, is held as chairman of the House Committee on Rules, northern Democrats and all the Republicans ganged up on him and cleared this bill for floor debate by a vote of 8 to 3. 3. Mr. Eisenhower's floor leaders in the House are clamoring for a vote on the bill, and the northern Democratic leaders are promising it.

Parliamentary delays can be used against the measure, but the House limits debate. The bill will pass by a heavy majority whenever it comes to a vote. Sponsors are confident they have the votes in the Senate too; so the only recourse of the minority fighting against this extreme legislation is the unlimited debate permitted in that body.

It is difficult for citizens of Virginia to realize the great numerical strength of the proponents of such legislation as this in the Congress. When President Truman's Fair Employment Practices Commission bill was up in Congress—and it was a cream puff in comparison with the current measure—I offered an amendment to provide that a minister of the Gospel could not be sent to jail for refusing to employ an atheist in his church—a situation which was possible under the bill. The amendment was adopted tentatively but then voted down.

Formerly, some of this extremist racial legislation could be blocked by a coalition of southern Democrats and Republicans. Now, under the urging of the President, the Republicans have formed a coalition with northern Democrats against us.

That is why the House is heading for a vote on a bill which includes such unbelievable language as to provide legal service at taxpayers' expense to get a Federal court injunction against persons the complainer thinks have engaged "or are about to engage" in infringement of a claimed "civil right."

Under such a law, a casual frown at the wrong time and place might send you to Federal prison.

Persecution of Jews

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EVERETT M. DIRKSEN
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, July 9, 1956

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, recently the Syrian Ambassador to the United States delivered an address at a forum conducted by Illinois Normal University and in the course of his address statements were made which evoked very considerable feeling, some of which found editorial expression. There appeared in the Chicago Daily News on Friday, June 29, an editorial to this effect, I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

VICIOUS FALSEHOOD

For a sample of the kind of reasoning that blocks a peace between Israel and the Arab nations we give you the remarks of Farid Zeinddine, Syrian Ambassador to the United States. Speaking at a Normal University forum, this diplomatic envoy asserted:

"The American Jew is not an American emtionally or even ultimately. A Zionist cannot have real allegiance to the country in which he lives."

The effrontery of this attempt to pass on the qualifications of American citizens is matched only by the bitter prejudice that it reveals. It is interesting to note that a substantial number of American Jews are opposed to Zionism, giving as one reason that it would invite this false allegation. But it is equally a falsehood when applied to the great numbers of Jews who support Israel.

It was undoubtedly Hitler's massacres that give the greatest impetus to the dream of a homeland safe from persecution. American Jews view this effort with the same earnest, sympathetic and helpful attitude that Americans of Irish descent gave to the cause of Erin's freedom and that Greco-Americans give to the cause of their countrymen on Cyprus.

To say that this makes them any less good Americans is vicious nonsense. It is totally out of place in the language of an accredited diplomat from another country.

Ignoring the Children

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EARLE C. CLEMENTS
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, July 9, 1956

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, an editorial entitled "Ignoring the Children," which appeared in the July 7, 1956, issue of the Washington Post and Times Herald.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IGNORING THE CHILDREN

The death of the school-construction bill in the House of Representatives on Thursday was nothing less than a national disaster. The measure was put to death by a combination of prejudice and politicking in an atmosphere of confusion and finagling discreditable to Democrats and Republicans alike, and to the House itself as a lawmaking body. As a result, increasing numbers of American children next year and the year after will be in unsafe and overcrowded schools; for some there will be no classroom space at all. A decade from now the country will feel the direct effects of this folly; the scientists and technologists and engineers needed for national security in the future will lack the requisite training; the educated citizenry indispensable to the wise direction of a self-governing society will be inadequately prepared. The neglect of such needs amounts to legislative irresponsibility.

Both parties must share the blame for unconscionable jockeying for political advantage over the formula for allocation of Federal funds in aid of education. Had they focused on the overriding need to provide money for school buildings, they would have been able to reach agreement on a difference which was certainly secondary in importance. Asked yesterday if the administration would want the measure that went down to defeat, White House News Secretary Hagerty said simply, "We are interested in schoolrooms." That interest should have been controlling. But the Democrats refused to consider the administration proposal that would have distributed funds in part according to need, while the Republicans stubbornly refused to support the Kelley bill which apportioned the money strictly on a basis of school-age population.

Responsibility for adoption of the Powell amendment must be borne in very large measure by the Republicans. The rollcall in this crucial question found 148 Republicans and 77 Democrats for it, 146 Democrats and 46 Republicans opposed. But when the bill itself, with the Powell rider tacked on to it, came up for a vote, only 75 Republicans supported it. It is difficult to interpret this as anything but cynical politicking. Having squeezed what benefit they could out of voting for a rider that doomed the bill to death, most Republicans joined callously in burying it. The President has indicated that he will continue to press for passage of Federal aid to education. But no one now seriously hopes that the measure can be revived.

It takes a long time to plan schools and build them. Perhaps next year Congress will recognize its responsibility and provide the financial assistance without which the country's public-school systems cannot meet their obligations. But children need schooling while they are children; they cannot wait. Many who are now of school age will suffer an irreparable injury from the shabby conduct of the House of Representatives on Thursday. They have been denied a part of their American birthright.

Are You a Vote Slacker?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KARL E. MUNDT
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, July 9, 1956

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, this is election year, and office seekers are soliciting votes from among the people of this country. However, I think that it will be safe to predict that many an office seeker will feel disappointment, after the polls close, that so few voters have exercised their voting franchise.

In the July 8 issue of Family Weekly, the magazine section appearing in the Daily Plainsman, Huron, S. Dak., there appears a thoughtful article, "Are You A Vote Slacker?", written by Joseph N. Bell. This article analyzes reasons why people fail to go to the polls. It reports the basic reasons why citizens do not grasp the importance of voting. I believe that it is of great value and should not only be of interest to those who will seek office this year, but should stir the interest of people of this country, especially those who have not realized the

importance of exercising a voice in the selection of candidates for office.

I ask that this article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ARE YOU A VOTE SLACKER?

(By Joseph N. Bell)

The earnest young man was a brand-new American. He had won his citizenship a few months before and had just participated in his first election—anywhere. His eyes glowed as he discussed this great blessing of voting.

"It felt good to vote," he said, and shivered a little as he recalled the experience. "Where I come from nobody votes. Here I looked forward to its as a real opportunity, and I was proud when I cast my ballot. Voting is my way of doing something for the privilege of being an American.

"What kind of a country would this be if people didn't vote? A man has to take an interest in his country and his community."

This young man was answering questions put to him by interviewers of a Chicago organization called Science Research Associates. Their mission was to determine for the political science department of the University of Chicago why only half the citizens over 21 voted in the last Chicago mayoralty election.

This new American citizen, with his clear-cut sense of duty, would have been distressed to hear some of the answers:

"I don't have time to vote because I work nights and sleep during the daytime."

"Elections don't accomplish anything. Law-enforcement bodies don't become more efficient. Things are always just as before."

"I'm just not interested in voting like some people."

"I've never voted because I don't want to pay poll tax."

"I've wanted to vote, but I just never took much interest in elections. Besides, I can't take the time from my business."

"I intended to start a TV repair store and thought declaring my politics would hurt me in the future."

These are Americans speaking—young and old, rich and poor, laborers and white-collar workers, men and women. They have one thing in common: They don't vote. And, sadly enough their numbers are discouragingly large. Traditionally, only a little more than half the registered voters in the United States vote in presidential elections; for Senators and Representatives, the percentage drops sharply, especially in a nonpresidential year; and in local elections, the number of eligible voters who never get to the polls is scandalous.

Why do so many ignore this basic prerogative of democratic government?

Strangely enough, the research team found that the answer to this question lay in another question: "Why do people vote?"

Most nonvoters could give no compelling reason for not voting. The long-nurtured assumption that a person will vote unless something happens to prevent him was not confirmed by the survey. Nor did the type of election, the personalities involved, the intensity of the campaign, or the weather have great significance.

By and large, voting emerged as a general habit—a way of life. And in the process, it underscored a vital and sometimes little-emphasized function of the American family: to impress the voting way of life on its children—by example.

Of those interviewed who voted, more than half mentioned their family in connection with early election experiences; they remembered voting participation by the members of their family; recalled their parents' belief in or loyalty to a candidate or a party.

This background of family interest in practical democracy—more than any other single factor—contributed to active voting participation in adulthood.

Says Prof. Jerome G. Kerwin of the political science department of the University of Chicago, under whose direction the survey was made: "The importance of the family in political education and participation is reemphasized by this survey."

What else did the researchers find out about voting versus nonvoting Americans? Two other main points emerged.

One-fourth of the voters said they had no reason for their choices. Typical of this group was a woman who commented: "I just didn't feel capable of judging the candidates. There were so many I hadn't heard of before. I was all mixed up."

Yet, never before have there been so many means of communication between candidates and voters. Three-fourths of those surveyed who voted said they saw a candidate on television, 16 percent saw a candidate in person, and 65 percent were visited by an organization worker.

Thus the overwhelming majority of voters cast their ballots on the basis of reasonably enlightened convictions as to the personalities, issues, or parties involved.

But young people fell down decidedly on the voting job. The median age of nonvoters was 33 (for the voters, it was 47), and researchers found a great deal of political apathy among young people of voting age.

The composite of the nonvoter was: Young; inclined to be restless and mobile, seldom putting down roots in a community (more than half hadn't lived at their present address for 2 years); and a tenant rather than a homeowner (less than 10 percent owned homes). He also had very little history of political background at home to impress him with the importance of voting.

Professor Kerwin concludes gravely, "Far too many young people are nonvoters. A democracy should not have to wait for advancing age for adults to start going to the polls."

How can the average American be active in politics, short of running for office? There are many ways, but the place to start is at home. Your first job in discharging the duty of every American is to make sure you and your family are registered and eligible to vote, and know the candidates and issues well enough to vote intelligently.

Then, if you feel the urge to work further for candidates of your choice, there are a number of other doors open to you. The most effective way for you to be politically active is through an organization—and there is usually one to fit your own ideas. To find out, you can contact party headquarters in your city; get in touch with your ward or township committeeman or precinct captain; or affiliate yourself with one of the special groups sponsored by both major parties as well as independent political organizations—groups like the Young Republicans, Young Democrats, Independent Voters, and the League of Women Voters.

In answering survey questions, few people denied the value of voting. Almost everyone thought it was a good thing—even those who didn't vote. The greatest enemy was apathy. Thus, in this election year, you might profitably ask yourself these questions:

1. Do I vote in all elections? Not just the glamorous presidential elections, but for school boards and bond issues in my own community; for city, county, and State officials; for special problems brought before the electorate?

2. Do I vote intelligently, by acquainting myself with the issues and candidates before casting my ballot?

3. Am I setting a good example in practical democracy for my children, my friends, my neighbors, and my business associates by championing the cause of intelligent voting?

4. Am I working actively to improve whatever defects may exist in our democratic system—rather than standing off and criticizing?

5. Am I honestly discharging my basic obligation as an American citizen—to contribute, at the very least, an enlightened ballot to the operation of the greatest democracy in the world?

Tribute to Walter S. Robertson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. H. ALEXANDER SMITH

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, July 9, 1956

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, I have had called to my attention an editorial in the St. Louis Dispatch of Sunday, May 20, 1956, which pays a well-deserved tribute to Walter S. Robertson, Assistant Secretary of State, who recently made an outstanding address at Staunton, Va., in celebration of the centennial of the birth of Woodrow Wilson.

Secretary Robertson is one of our outstanding, stalwart champions of President Eisenhower's foreign policy, especially our foreign policy in the Far East, which is Secretary Robertson's responsibility. The editorial to which I refer is entitled "Partisanship Set Aside," and makes an important contribution to the whole subject of our foreign policy at the present time.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PARTISANSHIP SET ASIDE

Walter S. Robertson is one of the most responsible officials in the Eisenhower administration. As Assistant Secretary of State for Far Eastern Affairs he shoulders the responsibility for United States policy with respect to the perplexing problems of the Orient. His specific assignments have taken him to the Geneva Conference of 1954 and to the Manila Pact Conference at Bangkok last year.

Because Assistant Secretary Robertson is this trusted official of the Eisenhower administration special importance attaches to an address he delivered at Staunton, Va., the birthplace of Woodrow Wilson. The occasion was a notable gathering, including Ambassadors or their representatives from 35 countries, in connection with the centennial year of the birth of the World War I President.

Mr. Robertson's review of the Wilson career was in striking contrast to the slurs frequently thrown at that great President by Republican partisan speakers. There was no low blow at Woodrow Wilson as the first of three Democratic Presidents to get the country into war. There was no attempt to dismiss him as a visionary, an impractical idealist, an egghead.

On the contrary, Mr. Robertson made a point of saying that when war came in

Europe in 1914, Wilson was primarily concerned to keep our Nation out of it. He told how Wilson as a boy of 8 had seen at first-hand in Georgia the horror that follows in the wake of war.

Because Wilson's devotion to peace was genuine and compelling the Democratic President struggled through 3 years of the war in Europe to find a common ground on which the belligerents could meet. Of this Mr. Robertson said:

"Wilson's statesmanship stands out as mature and inspired. He could not have tried harder than he did to bring about peace without victory, but no man could have held back the tide of events that was to follow—the sacrifice of more hundreds and thousands of lives, the achievement of power by the Communists in Russia, the internal collapse of Germany and the eventual rise of nazism, bringing on Europe another and near fatal war."

The Assistant Secretary of State not only commended Wilson's 14 points as a "historic peace program" with "overpowering psychological effect" that shortened the war. He commended also Wilson's vision in proposing the League of Nations and in insisting that it be part of the World War I peace treaty. Then Mr. Robertson made this remarkable statement:

"President Wilson's defeat came not in Paris but at home. It is not my purpose to explore the causes of that rejection. No one can question the earnest patriotism of the opposition. No one can question that the blame must be shared.

"It is enough for us to recall that on August 8, 1945, the United States Senate voted in favor of American membership in the league's successor, the United Nations, vindicating Woodrow Wilson's ideals by the startling vote of 89 to 2.

"We had by then paid in copious measure for our failure to joint the League of Nations that Woodrow Wilson had founded."

What relevance does the Wilson example have for us today? Mr. Robertson made it very clear when he recalled how Wilson's idealism was "derided" in the 1920's and then said: "We have had to learn once more that when Wilson said 'the world must be made safe for democracy' he was expressing the necessary and transcendent objective of our Nation's foreign policy, the end we still must achieve if we mean to survive."

At the start of 1956 the hope was expressed on this page that the centennials of those two great men of ideas, Woodrow Wilson and his Supreme Court appointee, Louis Dembitz Brandeis, would somehow raise the level of campaigning in the presidential election year.

Certainly Assistant Secretary of State Walter S. Robertson has done his part to set partisanship aside and to give credit where due. His address at the historic and lovely town of Staunton, Va., ought to be required reading for Republican and Democratic speakers in the months ahead. It has the stamp of statesmanship.

The Jungle of Tax Confusion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN MARSHALL BUTLER

OF MARYLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, July 9, 1956

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, a speech on the subject of "the Jungle of Tax Confusion," which I delivered at the Glen Burnie Rotary Club on July 5, 1956.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Yesterday, we celebrated Independence Day—the Fourth of July. One hundred and eighty years ago, the Continental Congress meeting in nearby Philadelphia, set forth its bill of complaint against the English Crown. King George, the declaration said, was imposing taxes upon the colonists without their consent. I wonder today how many of us will admit to having given consent to that mass of largely unintelligible laws which we call the Internal Revenue Code. I am sure that most of us, in any case, would like the opportunity to withdraw whatever consent, directly or indirectly, we have given. I am not quite prepared to urge each of you to adopt your own declaration of independence, or even to follow the lead of the Governor of Utah in refusing to pay the Federal income tax. But you can do something to help yourself and the Nation to overcome this millwheel which hangs around the neck of each of us. I believe that we can have tax revision that will make sense. So firm am I in that belief that I have introduced a joint resolution in the Senate for setting up the machinery to make such a revision; for that I shall ask your support.

Two years ago under the able chairmanship of Representative DANIEL A. REED, the House Ways and Means Committee did a monumental job of revising the antiquated internal revenue code. This hoary document had not undergone revision for 75 years. DAN REED and the Republican 83d Congress are to be complimented on this achievement. A valuable service was rendered all taxpayers and many improvements were made in simplifying the tax laws and closing some loopholes. But the job of making taxes fair, simple and understandable still lies ahead.

I say to you in all frankness—and I do not meant to belittle anybody or any Member of Congress—the Congress was then unaware of what it did; it still does not know; the administering officers are still trying to find out; millions of taxpayers, their lawyers and accountants are still struggling, and the courts for years to come will be studying the law to learn what actually happened so that they can tell the administration and the taxpayers their rights and liabilities.

Instead of the clearness and simplicity which should characterize a law which affects so many, we have a jungle of confusion. Rare indeed is the man who can read the tax law, or even the tax forms, and know where he is headed or how to extricate himself from the jargon which conceals the inequities and discriminations which the law inflicts.

It ought to be possible for a taxpayer to settle his case simply, but so long as we have complication, confusion and uncertainty, there will be long drawn-out litigation. And what is worse, courts are more and more changing their collective minds, so that what may appear settled today will be unsettled tomorrow.

The year 1176, which witnessed the birth of the Declaration of Independence, also saw first another famous document. I refer of course to Adam Smith's "Wealth of Nations," first published in that year, and which contained his famous canons of taxation. However, as one student of public finance recently wrote, Smith's canons of taxation resemble the Ten Commandments in the frequency of their repetition and the degree to which they are sinned against. One of these canons was that taxes should be certain and not arbitrary. They should be clear and plain to the contributor and every other person. How far short our tax laws fall in that respect, I leave to the personal experience of each of you.

Smith also contended that taxes should be equal or equitable. Justice in taxation can be achieved only if taxpayers are assured of impartiality of treatment. I have largely drawn the theme of my proposed joint resolution from the lack of equality or equity and justice in the law. I have called on the Congress to establish a commission to study and report on those inequalities and inequities and injustices.

DISINCENTIVE IN THE TAX LAW

We can deplore inequity and inequality and even uncertainty and perhaps struggle along with both, but if a law obstructs incentives, discourages job and wealth-creating investment in enterprise, operates against small business while promoting monopoly, then the law may justly be condemned. Let me illustrate how the law operates against small business and promotes monopoly.

I am reminded of the remark someone made not long ago to the effect that whenever Congress spoke of small business, it spoke of the fair-haired boy, but whenever Congress enacted tax laws, the needs of small business were forgotten.

Perhaps the greatest difference between small business and large business—aside from size—is the different sources of capital. Big corporations turn to public subscriptions of new stock or bond issues. Small business must rely almost exclusively on retained earnings. As applicable to small business, the corporate income tax strikes not only at the product of past success, but more important, at the only significant source of funds for further growth. In imposing heavy taxes on small business, the law effectively prevents small business from using profits to expand and compete on equal terms with big business.

Big business has another important advantage, because of its multiple lines of activity. When one of its lines has a bad year and suffers losses, these losses reduce other earnings, income taxes are reduced, and the big business continues. However, one bad year for a small business with a single line and the creditors move in and the owner out.

The death tax, or the threat of death taxes, also causes the disappearance of small business. The impact of the tax on a privately held small business frequently stimulates sales to competing firms. Often the only way to raise the money to pay the tax is to sell the business itself. Or the threat of the tax provides a strong inducement for the owner to prefer liquidity to having all assets tied up in the plant and equipment of a going business. Many a husband realizing that on his death, his wife will never be able to raise the funds to finance the heavy estate tax, has decided to sell out to a large competitor, taking in exchange either cash or stock in a larger business which has a ready market.

You may say, and truthfully, that the same tax law applies to big business as to small business. And I will of course agree. But the fact is that in operation, the small business is the one that most feels the burdensome impact. Often, big business can hire expensive legal and accounting talent that will find loopholes of which the small enterprise cannot avail itself. I don't mean to suggest by what I have said that I have joined the ranks of those who condemn business just because it is big. Quite the contrary. But what I do condemn mostly is the high rates written into the law, and the resulting overwhelming burden. Because of the huge burden, it becomes extremely profitable for taxpayers to find devices for evasion and avoidance. The next step is for the Congress to protect the revenue. New technical and often incomprehensible language is added to the law and inevitably new hardship cases are created. Then we strive to provide relief here and there for some of the worst hardship cases—or those with the best lobby—and the result is complication heaped upon complication, and frequently a new inequity.

FORMER COMMISSIONER ANDREWS

The problems which I have set forth have been brought into sharp focus recently by the writings and press interviews of former Commissioner of Internal Revenue, T. Coleman Andrews. Our tax structure needs a complete overhaul, he said. To paraphrase—we need to bring that structure under control, before we become slaves of our own creation. We need a system that is generally understandable, fair, and compatible with our ideals of freedom.

Mr. Andrews is a man who, as head of the tax-collecting activities of the Federal Government for 33 months, took in more than $180 billion in taxes. You would hardly expect a man in his position to protest against the law he had been administering. But it is my thought that perhaps no one is in a better position than he is, to know how bad the law really is, how uncertain it is, how inequitably it operates, how it discourages or makes impossible new investment.

I have not overlooked, just as Mr. Andrews did not overlook, the terrific burden which the income tax imposes on the person with low income. As Mr. Andrews said: "The minimum rate of 20 percent takes a whale of a slug—$400—out of a taxable income of $2,000. I sure wouldn't want to pay that much if my income were that low. But it hits the people in the middle brackets even harder, and is slowly but surely destroying the middle class."

One of the most unhappy features of the tax laws is that those who frame them have not been content to view the revenue-raising functions of taxes as the sole purpose for levying them. For most of the years 1932 to 1952, the tax law was used to "soak the rich," to redistribute the wealth, to promote and enforce so-called social reforms.

We must move away from the thought of reducing everybody to the lowest common denominator. We must cease to penalize success. I do want to get across the idea and emphasize the thought that we need private business and industry, and we need people who will invest their savings to make jobs for others, add to the national income and wealth, and of course make a profit for themselves. We must recognize that businessmen are entitled to a return after taxes commensurate with the risk they take. Otherwise it does not make sense for them to invest. But there is a segment of this country, and an important segment, that denies this. Much though they will not admit it, they are following closely on the heels of Marx and the doctrines of the Communist manifesto which lays down, as one of the spearheads of communism, a high graduated income tax.

As Mr. Andrews has said: "There are only two ways in the world that business activities can be financed. One is through savings. The other is through Government handouts. May the Lord deliver us from the latter."

What has all this to do with confusion in the jungle of tax laws? To answer my own question, it has much to do with it. When tax rates are reasonable, there is relatively little to be gained by evasion and avoidance. Quite the reverse when rates are steep.

When rates soar to their current highs, numerous cases of hardship develop. We must admit that over the years Congress has bowed to the seemingly inexorable demand to soak the rich. High rates have so stifled incentive and opportunities to invest that relief has had to be given sometimes in very devious ways. Complicated language has been used to conceal simple actions. More complicated language has been added to prevent abuse of concessions and to restrict opportunities for evasion and avoidance. Exceptions to general rules have been followed by exceptions to exceptions. In the language of coiners of phrases, "Erosion of the tax base" has set in. As the erosion progresses, and it is bound to progress, we shall have to raise rates to preserve the revenue, and this in itself will lead to further erosion. Competent authority argues that if we could have a simple tax law, and eliminate the concessions and reliefs, the exceptions and limitations, we could cut rates by one-third or one-fourth and still produce the same amount of revenue. We need an investigatory commission such as I propose to study this. Before I discuss that, let me set forth for you one more entanglement that adds confusion in the tax jungle.

OVERLAPPING FEDERAL, STATE, AND LOCAL TAXES

I refer to the uncoordinated overlapping Federal-State-local tax structure with which the entire Nation is cursed. There is hardly a tax which the mind of man has so far been able to conceive that is not exacted by two or more levels of government. Income taxes are levied by the Federal Government and most of the States, and many local units of government. Excise or sales taxes are levied by all of the States in one form or another.

In addition to the lack of economy in operation and efficiency in administration of these laws, there are baffling compliance problems for the taxpayers. The problem of overlapping is multiplied by the lack of uniformity.

What is income or a deductible expense under one law is something else under the other. Exemptions vary. Commodity excise taxes are levied on the manufacturer by one jurisdiction and on the retailers by another. Or both jurisdictions may exact their burden at the same level, but the scope of application of the laws, or the exemptions, may vary. All this adds confusion, increases compliance costs, and encourages a disrespect of government. What is needed, perhaps more than anything else, is for the Federal Government to get out of certain revenue fields and leave them for exclusive State and local cultivation. For too many years, the Federal Government, through its economic position, has preempted all the really fruitful taxes and left to the States and local units the choice of duplicating Federal levies or confining themselves to numerous minor exactions principally of a nuisance character.

It is one thing to realize that we have a confused tax situation which lacks coordination—a tax system which has substituted complication for simplicity, inequity for equity, discrimination for equality, depressing burdens for incentive; it is quite a different proposition to introduce coordination and restore simplicity, equity, equality, and incentive. We can do it if we have the will for it. What worries me, however, is that the Congress and the States may lack the spirit and drive to set revision wheels in motion. Through inertia, we may just stand still. But as I said, I am convinced that something can be done if we go about it in the right way. Of one thing I am certain, and that is that the groundwork for the type of revision I contemplate can never be laid in the Halls of the Congress or even in the meeting rooms of the committees. A wholly new and fresh look is needed. The right way to approach a solution of this problem is through the creation of a commission modeled on that type of investigation which has operated so successfully under our greatest elder statesman, former President Herbert Hoover.

NEED FOR A HOOVER-TYPE COMMISSION

I have given expression to my thinking on this matter by introducing into the Senate, Senate Joint Resolution 167, to establish a study commission to report to Congress. I contempate a commission of 12 men representing the best tax brains in the country. It will certainly need all the imagination and ingenuity at its disposal. I would have 4 members appointed by the President, 4 by the President of the Senate, and 4 by the Speaker of the House. In general, the Commission should strive to bring order out of chaos and remove the inequalities and inequities that so characterize the tax law today. I am confident that a properly constituted commission can bring in recommendations for a more just, more equitable, less complicated tax system than we now have. In particular, I think the Commission should study the effect of the Federal tax laws on low- and middle-income tax payers, and on small business.

It should examine the effect of taxes on stimulating the growth of monopolies, because—strange though it may seem—our Federal tax laws are fostering mergers and consolidations. The Commission should thoroughly examine the charge that our tax system is dissipating the incentive for productivity, both of individuals and business.

I don't think it makes sense to expect any commission to come up within a few weeks with the answers to problems which have grown and expanded for half a century. My thought then is for a long-range study rather than a quickie that can do little more than bring together the random suggestions which we already know about. Rather we need new answers with an overall scope in their coverage. I think 2 years of hard continuous concerted effort is needed to formulate the kind of tax system we should have. It is no simple task to bring order and system out of the chaos in which we now live.

We must protect the power of the Federal Government to raise revenues needed to support itself in peace and war. We must protect our States and cities as well. The system should be so devised as also to make it possible—or at least not make it impossible—for States and cities and towns to finance themselves properly under all emergencies. They cannot do that today. The system must also be so devised as to keep alive and flourishing private businesses and the men who own them as well as those who work in them. We must have a system which is equitable and void of the discrimination which so pervades our present law.

Raising Postal Rates

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GORDON CANFIELD

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 9, 1956

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, the Passaic, N. J., Herald-News is one of the many newspapers in our country insisting on the Congress voting realistic rates to erase the yearly deficit of our Post Office Department now approximating $500 million and soon to approach $1 billion without remedial action. Last Saturday this New Jersey newspaper in my congressional district editorialized as follows:

RAISING POSTAL RATES

Whether the Senate will act on, or pigeonhole, the House measure for boosting postal rates is a moot question. Nevertheless passage of the bill by a healthy margin is overdue recognition that it is high time the mounting postal deficit be cut back. The administration has sought this for 3 years.

Raising ordinary postage from 3 to 4 cents, air mail stamps from 6 to 7 cents and hiking second-class rates on newspapers, magazines, and periodicals won't put the Post Office Department on a cash basis. But it will drastically cut down on the anual postal debt

that now runs close to a billion dollars a year.

Making the user pay is always sound and fair economics.

Returning to Capitol Hill today, I am glad to note that the Washington Evening Star in its Sunday edition had a lead editorial capitioned "Sound Vote on Mail Rates." This editorial reads in part:

The House has taken proper and courageous election-year action in voting to raise postal rates enough to bring in an estimated $430 million annually. We hope the Senate, which thus far has shown little interest in the matter, will concur.

Operations of the Post Office Department consistently have been run at a loss—in recent times approaching a half billion dollars a year. The explanation has been simply that those using the mails the most have not been paying a fair price for the service received. The net effect, of course, is that the taxpayers as a whole have been subsidizing a Government venture that benefits some groups far more than others. The formula contained in the bill just passed would correct this inequity by putting the service on approximately a fair pay-as-you-mail basis. Ordinary first-class mail rates would be raised from 3 cents to 4 cents—bringing in an estimated additional $296 million. Domestic airmail rates would be raised from 6 cents to 7 cents an ounce—calculated to bring in another $16 million. Small increases in several other categories would yield about $120 million more.

Opening of the "World's Greatest Airbase" at Portsmouth, N. H.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. NORRIS COTTON
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, July 9, 1956

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, on June 30 it was my pleasure to be present at the dedication of the world's greatest airbase, a new Air Force Base at Newington, near Portsmouth, N. H.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an account of the development of the airbase and its dedication, published in the Army, Navy, Air Force Journal of July 7, 1956.

In addition to outlining the details of the ceremony and the key importance of the new base to the defense of the Nation, the articles gives just recognition to the senior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], who contributed so much to the locating and the building of this great base in southeastern New Hampshire.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Army, Navy, Air Force Journal of July 7, 1956]

SECRETARY QUARLES FORMALLY OPENS "WORLD'S GREATEST AIR BASE" AT PORTSMOUTH, N. H.

PORTSMOUTH AIR FORCE BASE, N. H.—The Air Force formally opened its newest and most modern base here June 30 with Secretary Donald A. Quarles, leading Air Force generals, Senator STYLES BRIDGES, Republican, of New Hampshire, and New Hampshire Gov. Lane Dwinell participating.

New Hampshire citizens, in numbers variously estimated as between 100,000 and 120,000 came from near and far to attend the ceremonies, and see the air show which included the first public performance of the Thunderbirds, the Air Force's precision formation acrobatic team, since they switched to North American supersonic F–100 Super Sabres.

The new base is the home of the 817th Air Division commanded by Brig. Gen. Walter E. Arnold, USAF. It is to be a 2 wing base, but so far only 1 wing, the 100th Bombardment Wing, to be commanded by atomic expert Col. Ariel W. Nielsen, USAF, has been activated. It is equipped with Boeing B–47 medium bombers. Lt. Col. Andreas A. Andreae, USAF, is commander of the 817th Air Base group.

The new division is part of the Eighth Air Force, commanded by Maj Gen. Walter C. Sweeney, Jr., USAF, who came from his headquarters at Westover Air Force Base, Mass., to take part in the opening.

To the visiting civilians it was an opportunity to inspect what had come to be called the "off-again-on-again" base—for so great was the opposition to the Air Force's decision to build here that there were many switches in plans over the past 5 years before construction finally was started.

To the visiting Air Force personnel, the new base was a marvel of what can be done when a base is built from scratch instead of just growing as the older ones have done.

General Arnold likes to refer to it as the world's greatest Air Force base and it is generally agreed that it comes close to meriting that accolade—as close as careful planning based on worldwide experience and the availability of $70 million construction money can make it.

The only drawback, and it is a serious one, is the utter lack of family housing. This forces the married personnel to rent quarters in an area that is largely a summer resort where housing is scarce and costly. Some live as far as 50 miles from the base.

Secretary Quarles told the Journal following the ceremony that formal approval had just been granted for 1,100 family units under title 8. Construction will begin promptly, he said, and it is expected that first occupancy will be in early 1957. Estimated cost will be nearly $13 million. A total of 1,700 family units has been programed under title 8 and eventually will be built. This Capehart housing is privately constructed but the Government assumes the mortgage. Service families occupying the units merely forfeit their quarters allowances instead of paying rent to the private builders as under Wherry housing, which usually cost them more than their allowances.

Study also is being given to the construction of a school for service children on the base, he said.

The official ceremonies were opened with a welcoming address by General Arnold and the invocation by base Chaplain Ronald C. Reny. At the conclusion of a short address, Governor Dwinell presented an official New Hampshire State flag to General Arnold as a symbol of cordial relations between the people of New Hampshire and the Air Force personnel at the base.

Senator BRIDGES, whose strong personal support of the base project in the face of vigorous and vocal local opposition was largely instrumental in seeing it through to conclusion, reminded the vast audience that "Portsmouth Air Force Base provides this Nation with an unequaled facility from which a portion of the retaliatory capabilities of the Strategic Air Command can be launched in the event the Kremlin should be so rash as to attack us."

Also introduced was General Sweeney, 8th Air Force commander; Maj. Gen. Francis H. Griswold, USAF, SAC vice commander in chief, who represented Gen. Curtis E. LeMay, USAF, who was unable to attend.

Lt. Gen. Emmett O'Donnell, USAF, Deputy Chief of Staff for Personnel, representing Gen. Nathan F. Twining, spoke of the Air Force's pride in having a base in New Hampshire.

Another speaker was Mr. John E. Holden, chairman of the Air Force base liaison committee, who for the past 2 years has been a leader in the movement to have the base built.

Secretary Quarles told the visitors that by sometime next year there will be more than 150 big strategic aircraft operating from the new runway. "The base will have," he said, "some 90 B–47 stratojet bombers, 40 KC–97 tankers, and a dozen Douglas C–124 Globemaster transports, along with support and liaison planes. This will give this base," he declared, "more airplanes than you might find in the entire fleet of one of our major commercial airlines."

"The men who are to be stationed here," Secretary Quarles stated, "need housing and schools and churches for their families. There should be educational facilities for their self-improvement and recreational facilities where they can find wholesome relaxation when they are off duty.

"We are here in southeastern New Hampshire because this location meets these standards to a high degree. We do have a problem about housing for our married officers and airmen, particularly during your busy summer season. But by the time another summer rolls around, we expect to be well along with construction of new housing on the base which will help to relieve this shortage."

Brig. Gen. Robert J. Fleming, Jr., United States Army, now heads the Army Corps of Engineers' New England District, which has charge of the construction of the base, was among the honored guests. Under direction of Resident Engineer Robert Johnson construction is nearing completion, with nose hangars for the B–47's and some other items still going forward.

Also present was Capt. Eliot Olsen, United States Navy, Chief of Staff and aide to Rear Adm. John A. Snackenbury, United States Navy, commander of the nearby Portsmouth Naval Base.

Following the ceremony the crowd was thrilled by the biggest air show ever put on in this section of the country. It included a flyover by B–47 Stratojets and an inflight refueling demonstration with a KC–97 tanker and a B–47 jet bomber. There also was a flyover of Convair B–36 bombers.

Highlights of the show was the acrobatics of the famed Thunderbirds who came from Nellis Air Force Base, Nevada with their brand new North American F–100's.

Status-of-Forces Agreements

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK T. BOW
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 25, 1956

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, some of my colleagues in discussing the status-of-forces agreements seek to infer that those who desire a modification of the agreements are trying to save our servicemen from all punishment for any wrong they may commit.

At the same time we have comparisons of sentences being offered to show that servicemen are not punished as severely in foreign courts as they are by courts-martial. Apparently those who fear our men might escape punishment are also torn by the fear they may be punished too much.

The men who are presently serving sentences in prisons abroad as a result of this easy justice of foreign courts know what they would have preferred. They almost unanimously told our colleagues who visited them that they would have preferred to have been tried by court-martial, by their compatriots. Whatever the sentence, they felt they would have received the advantages of our system of justice and the protection of our Constitution. They would have had a fair trial by American standards, not measured by the deceptive standards set up in article VII of the NATO Status of Forces Agreement, or by the vagaries of foreign justice.

This claim that penalties are easy in a foreign court is not supported by the case of one of our servicemen in Italy which has just been revealed. He was found guilty of robbery without intent to steal and sentenced to 2 years' imprisonment with a fine of 30,000 lire. It is scarcely necessary to point out that a crime defined with such contradiction on its face does not exist in our jurisprudence. This conviction is difficult to justify even in Italy since there was testimony indicating that the soldier had only recovered from a young woman money which he had previously given to her.

The defenders of the status agreements who point to sentences in foreign courts as justification for the abandonment of our servicemen's rights belong to that cult which presumes all of the accused are guilty. A mitigated sentence is little solace to the victim of questionable justice.

Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, July 7, 1956

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith an editorial which appeared in the Belleville (Ill.) Daily Advocate on July 3, 1956. The editorial, entitled "Independence Day," follows:

INDEPENDENCE DAY

The Declaration of Independence, 180 years old tomorrow, is unique among documents setting forth the claims of mankind to political liberty.

It does not assert the superiority of one class over another, it does not seek to validate a contract with any sovereign.

It asserts the unalienable natural rights of all men.

Prior to that time this philosophy had been discussed. Here it found pragmatic expression backed by the will of a people ready to fight for it.

Among people whose Government and laws largely are traced to English law and tradition, Magna Carta is regarded as the greatest and perhaps first succinct assertion of political rights. But Magna Carta lacks the scope of the Declaration of Independence in that it was a class document; the barons were irate with a king who had deceived them and trampled on what they conceived to be their rights.

Moreover Magna Carta's reference to free men has little affinity with the universal meaning of free men in the Declaration of Independence.

The Declaration of Independence is the work of men whose courage it is not easy to estimate at this point in time. They were not strong like the barons at Runnymede but weak and almost without organized sinews of war.

The whole philosophy of free government is contained in these words of that immortal document:

"We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness. That to secure these rights, governments are instituted among men deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed. That wherever any form of government becomes destructive of these ends it is the right of the governed to alter or abolish it, and to institute new government, laying its foundation on such principles and organizing its powers in such form as to them shall seem most likely to effect their safety and happiness."

People today appeal often to the Constitution as to a first cause when in fact they should appeal to the Declaration of Independence which is the common law upon which our basic political structure is reared.

President Eisenhower on the Job for Peace and Prosperity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL A. REED
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 9, 1956

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, the citizens of the United States are not being deceived by the partisan political claptrap of the Democrats that President Eisenhower is a part-time President. No President has put in more effort and time and with greater success to keep this Nation out of war than has our President.

Under leave to extend, heretofore granted, I am inserting an editorial which appeared in the Jamestown, N. Y., Post-Journal, July 6, 1956:

We have read so much about President Eisenhower being a part-time President; of the dangers of having a man in the office who is not 100 percent sound of wind and limb that it seems time that some stress be placed on the fact that Mr. Eisenhower has performed a service to this country which is being almost overlooked. He has surrounded himself with a staff type of government which has proven under fire that it works efficiently.

Even before the President's first illness there was much to do about the man-killing qualities of the office and learned discussions about how authority should be delegated to preserve the President's health.

It is an interesting and intriguing experience in retrospect to remember how the then General Eisenhower prepared for the D-day invasion of France as Allied commander in chief. How he organized and inspired and made possible the military stroke that brought an end to World War II is history. At that time analysts agreed that it was the general's ability to assert leadership by surrounding himself with the right aides, representing several nationas, and then coordinate and inspire them to a spectacular performance that brought success. Every man, woman, and child in America, regardless of politics, lauded these attributes to the skies. How times change.

When General Eisenhower became President Eisenhower, he did the same thing in the White House. What was the result? On September 24, 1955, the President was the victim of a heart attack. On June 8, 1956, he suffered an attack of ileitis. Thus in the year ended June 30, 1956, Mr. Eisenhower was ill or convalescing 115 days and Sherman Adams, capable chief of staff to the President, and his many aids were in charge of the White House for nearly one-third of the year. Was this organizational ability recognized? The Democrats, lacking any other issue, have made much of the President's state of health, but they have very carefully skirted the big issue—that, despite this illness to the President of the United States, the setup he perfected has carried on without a hitch. Such sniping was not confined to the period after the President's illness. For 3 years before that there were sly references to the fact the President was spending too much time on the golf course.

We feel that in this presidential election year the voters should do some individual thinking about the President and his office. What is wrong with the staff type of government Mr. Eisenhower has created? Why shouldn't he have time to play golf or conserve his health? Why shouldn't any man elected to the office? Surely no President, as head of the greatest business machine and the greatest government, can hope to make every decision. The test of his ability then is to be able to surround himself with a staff that he and the Nation can trust.

Actually, except for very brief periods during the acute phases of his two attacks of illness, President Eisenhower has been fully able to decide questions of high policy. If an attack upon the United States had come while the President was under anesthetics, Mr. Adams would have turned to Vice President NIXON for his orders. As for routine matters, it makes no difference whether the President is in bed or at his desk. His capable staff, headed by Mr. Adams, handles them anyhow.

We think it is good for the country, this efficient staff type of government. Certainly few if any Presidents before him have made such an attempt to delegate functions of the office, certainly not in 25 years. We think the voters, whether they be Republicans or Democrats, should realize that a "part-time" President, in the sense that no man can carry the load alone, must become a permanent fixture. We feel that one of Mr. Eisenhower's greatest achievements in office is to establish a staff that proved it could function smoothly in such an emergency as two serious illnesses of the President.

Economy of World Requires Expansion of Export Trade

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. DODD
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 23, 1956

Mr. DODD. Mr. Speaker, a healthy world economy is perhaps one of our best

offensive weapons against the menace of international communism. The export of quality products, made in America, serve as our good-will ambassadors to foreign lands, and demonstrate the high quality of American workmanship.

There is a great deal of vigorous competition among the manufacturing countries of the world for this export trade, and I am happy to say that American-made products are more than holding their own in this competition. About 10 percent of all our industrial production is shipped abroad, and the expanding world economy will doubtless absorb an even greater percentage.

Under leave granted, I insert an article by Mr. Gerald M. Coholan, export manager of the Stanley Works of New Britain, Conn.:

[From the Daily Freight Record World Trade Week Issue]

ECONOMY OF WORLD REQUIRES EXPANSION OF EXPORT TRADE—MECHANICS OF TRADE HAVE BEEN IMPROVED

(By Gerald M. Coholan)

As long as man lives above the level of the cave and below the level of the treetop, he will be obliged to provide means of shelter for himself and his family. As long as he finds a fascination in taking materials in hand and fashioning them for his own immediate use, and for the use of others, we will have industry, however great or small. And as long as these conditions prevail, we will need hardware and tools.

This is basic reasoning. From the standpoint of national economy it is also basic that these human habits have created and will continue to create, for all means of transportation—ships, train, truck and plane—cargo by the thousands of tons, to meet the broadening needs of our economy and the needs of the peoples of all the continents of the world.

Roughly, 10 percent of American industrial production goes to export. It would be difficult to estimate the proportion of our output of hardware and tool production that goes abroad, but we know that the American manufacturer supplies a substantial volume in many of the world markets. We also know, however, that recovery from the effects of the last war is well under way in nations that were knocked out of the competition for several years, and that Americans are now fighting to hold markets which 5 years ago they considered secure.

COMPETITION FROM EUROPE AND JAPAN

In the field of hardware and tools, a very strong competition is encountered from Germany, Japan and Sweden, as well as other Western European countries. In addition, there is the competition of local manufacturers, and, in many countries, local competition becomes extremely serious because their governments immediately raise the import duties on the items of local manufacture or in some instances, absolutely prohibit the import of such items.

HIGH QUALITY MARKS AMERICAN PRODUCTS

The strongest point for American hardware and tools in the foreign markets is the traditional high quality that identifies American craftsmanship. Because of America's high standard of living, with our attendant higher production costs, we face a price disadvantage with all of our foreign competitors. But the reputation which the Americans have built up through the years stands us in good stead when competition warms up, and most users of hardware and tools abroad want to see first what the Americans are offering before they decide to buy.

Today, the whole world is a market for American industry. In Europe the competition of the Western European manufacturers is extremely strong, and in the Far Eastern countries, competition of local manufacturers and Japanese is becoming more serious. The Latin American market may be described as wide open, there you find the products of all nations. There is a growing interest in industry among the Latin Americans themselves, as a facet of the more intense nationalism that has marked the postwar period. Latin America will continue to be an attractive market for American manufactured products for some time to come.

Iraq and Iran constitute a good market for hardware and tools and India, Burma and Thailand have developed. In each of these the German, Japanese, and Swedish manufacturers are active and constitute the principal competition to American goods.

In the years since the war, the volume of building construction underway in this Nation and in every other nation of the world has reached fantastic volume which is reflected in sales of hardware and tools. A dozen circumstances combined to make this so.

In the first place, nations hit directly have had to rebuild. And in the second, nations have to take up a slack—particularly in private homes—that had been created by reason of the concentration on special war plants during the years of the fighting.

In the United States, we have seen this condition in the form of suburban developments that have sprung up on the fringe of every city in the land, in vast apartment developments both by Government and by private interests, and in public's reaction to the attractions of modern home plans. To this add the thousands of manufacturing plants and other commercial buildings.

EXPORT SURGE IS ON IN OTHER COUNTRIES

But we are not alone in our activity. The surge is on abroad, too, nor is the damage effect of the recent war the only spur. I spent many years in South America, and whenever I return there, I am amazed at the tremendous new building. I think particularly of Venezuela which is riding one of the greatest booms ever to hit any South American country. I think also of cities like Sao Paulo, Brazil, the fastest growing city in the world, which is caught up in a tremendous industrial expansion, the type that always demands factories and vast new housing projects to take care of the workers and their families. It is unfortunate that this market is temporarily closed to us because of lack of exchange.

UNITED STATES MANUFACTURERS SEEK EXPORT SHARE

Now, all this means tools and hardware, and it would be pleasant to consider it a field waiting for the plucking by our American manufacturers. But that is not true. I think the American manufacturer is doing well in the fight for his share. Probably it is good, in the long run, that the competition is strong, because it will spur us to maintain that quality or workmanship which is our greatest strength and which, without competition, might soften up.

The mechanics of the export trade have improved in some ways, but remain disconcerting in others. For example, the movement of cargoes from piers in foreign ports has been speeded up. There was a period after the war when foreign ports were jammed, and ships had to lie waiting offshore sometimes for weeks, for a berth. That condition is now much improved. However, the bugaboo of dollar payments still prevails in some countries. Exporters are not paid as fast as they should be. In some countries even this has been solved and we can hope for improvement elsewhere.

On the whole, the export trade looks good.

New England and Latin America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES T. PATTERSON
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 25, 1956

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Speaker, the people of New England are intensely interested in the forthcoming decision of the Civil Aeronautics Board to allow expanded and improved air passenger service between our region, Florida and Latin America.

We of New England, Mr. Speaker, really need such expanded service. The airway between the Northeast and Florida is officially deemed to be the heaviest traveled in the world. Between Boston and Miami, however, it is served by only one carrier; between New York and Miami by two. On the Washington-Chicago line the public has a choice of five carriers—all of them prosperous.

The people of Southern New England have been particularly hurt by the inadequacy of air carrier schedules from there to Miami and Latin America. Furthermore, restrictions on operations within the area and in other areas on the east coast have hampered them.

To meet these needs, two airlines are now seeking to provide direct service from Boston to Miami. They are Northeast and Pan American Airlines, both of which enjoy the support of many distinguished men here from both sides of the aisle.

I am particularly interested in Pan American's application. It proposes to link its European and Latin American operations with the Northeast by providing one-plane, one-carrier service along our east coast to and from cities in Florida and Latin America.

Such a service by Pan Amreican offers tremendous advantages to our people. In the first place, Pan American is acknowledged to be the only applicant which could begin frequent schedules immediately upon authorization by the Civil Aeronautics. Furthermore, the most modern passenger aircraft should be used. Also, Pan American proposes a unique all-cargo service. Under their plan Boston and New York would serve as our gateways for passenger and cargo service to Miami and all Latin America.

This would benefit New England enterprise tremendously. As the Nation's oldest industrial region, New England has closer historical and economic ties with Latin America than does any other region. Our industries, particularly the great number serving the national defense, urgently need Latin American raw materials to manufacture their products. Furthermore, our neighbors to the South provide us with tremendous and rapidly growing markets for our finished goods.

This applies particularly to the people of my district, whose well-being deeply concerns me. A great many people in the Naugatuck Valley are employed in industries which rely almost completely upon Latin American materials. Many of these people make products for defense. As the economies of New Eng-

land, especially of my district, and Latin America become more and more closely interrelated, such service as Pan American Airlines offers becomes tremendously important.

Such an expanded service would also facilitate vacation travel between the two areas. Many people from Florida and foreign cities beyond like to spend some of the summer in New England. We look forward to seeing them, just as we look forward to visiting them in the winter months. Many of us know from firsthand experience the difficulty of getting a plane reservation at the peak of the vacation season.

If Pan American is authorized to start passenger and cargo service to and from Latin America and Florida and New England, all these problems will be solved. It would mark the beginning of a new era for United States airline transportation within the Western Hemisphere. Not only would it supply one-carrier, one-plane flights from New England to Latin America, but it would provide through service from both areas to European ports of call. There would be no more long and irksome delays and transfers.

So in closing, Mr. Speaker, I hope that Pan American Airlines will get the chance to provide their excellent services. They would be a boon to the whole to eastern and South America, and to New England in particular.

Address by Hon. Theodore Francis Green, of Rhode Island, at Commissioning of Research Vessel "Crawford"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, July 9, 1956

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, an address delivered by me on the occasion of the commissioning of the research vessel *Crawford*, of the Woods Hole Oceanographic Institution, at Woods Hole, Mass., on June 30, 1956.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS OF UNITED STATES SENATOR THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN, OF RHODE ISLAND, ON THE OCCASION OF THE COMMISSIONING OF THE RESEARCH VESSEL "CRAWFORD" OF THE WOODS HOLE OCEANOGRAPHIC INSTITUTION AT WOODS HOLE, MASS., ON JUNE 30, 1956

Ladies and gentlemen, it is a great privilege for me to take part in the commissioning ceremonies of the research vessel *Crawford* in these home waters of the Woods Hole Oceanographic Institution. It is a pleasure to be here amongst many friends and scientists of the institution who have done much to advance the sciences of oceanography and meteorology in the service of our country. It also, incidentally, gives me the opportunity to present my views on the hurricane-research program.

As many of you know, I have taken a great interest in furthering legislation in Washington which will provide funds to assist in reducing the present yearly losses of lives and property from destructive hurricanes. Since the great 1938 hurricane, which brought death and disaster throughout much of New England, I have taken a special interest in hurricanes, and in the activities of the several Government agencies responsible for providing the public with the protective measures needed to lessen the fear and damage of these awe-inspiring seaborne storms.

It was not until 1954, however, that there arose any great public interest in the adequacy of our coastal storm-warning systems, Hurricanes Carol, Edna, and Hazel not only brought unprecedented damage to many of our Middle and North Atlantic States—they also brought a quickened realization that more effective hurricane-warning services were urgently needed for the entire coastal area from Texas to Maine.

At almost the same time, it became apparent from inquiries among scientists that much of the desired improvements in storm-warning services could not be realized without a broad supporting hurricane-research program.

In the spring of 1955, at the annual meeting in Washington of the American Geophysical Union, it was my privilege to speak to many illustrious scientists on some of these problems. At about this same time I learned that the Weather Bureau did not have sufficient funds to maintain the type of storm-warning service the public rightfully expected, and had practically no funds whatsoever for hurricane-research studies.

As many of you know, the congressional drive for funds in June of 1955 resulted in the first appreciable increase in appropriations for the Weather Bureau since the end of World War II. Even more important, perhaps, was the fact that this increase made possible the formation of the National Hurricane Research project, and the starting of broad long-range research programs on hurricanes, tornadoes, and severe storms of all types.

Leading investigators have emphasized that solutions to many of the remaining hurricane problems can come only through patient accumulation of new facts through a widened research by dedicated scientists.

It is with great satisfaction to me, therefore, to note that the Woods Hole Oceanographic Institution is embarking on a carefully planned, long-range research program devoted to the scientific study of the causes of hurricanes.

It seems most fitting that this nonprofit research marine institution should be located in New England, a section of our American coastline so rich in maritime tradition, and so experienced in both the blessings and the furies of our coastal waters. These shores have been visited and ravaged by hurricanes since the days of our earliest colonies, and hardy sailors have launched their sturdy craft from these neighboring bays on journeys through all the seas of the world.

It thus seems most appropriate that here amidst the historic maritime traditions of New England should arise one of this country's outstanding institutions devoted to the scientific study of the sea.

So, I gladly take this opportunity to pay tribute here to the Marine Biological Laboratory, and to the United States Fish and Wildlife Station, and to the nearby Goast Guard base, all of which have joined with the Woods Hole Oceanographic Institution to make this spot a world center of marine sciences. Cape Cod and the old Bay State are to be congratulated on the achievements of this group of men and their work.

Descendants of those early New Englanders who hunted the whale from small boats, and fearlessly sailed their square riggers through uncharted seas to the Orient, have been proud of their maritime heritage through many changes in New England history. They may now point with additional pride to the contributions made to the knowledge of the seas by these scientific laboratories at Woods Hole.

I understand that many research projects are carried out here under contract with the military services, Government agencies, private industry, scientific organizations, and universities. The future of this work seems bright indeed, for, in spite of the excellent results already achieved here, the study of the seas is still relatively in its infancy. A concentrated research attack on the ocean—often called the last frontier available to modern explorers—is bound to bring vast new storehouses of knowledge for the endless benefit of mankind. The rollcall of industries who already have directly benefited from knowledge recently taken from the oceans is growing daily—for example, the list of interests already include aviation, oil, chemical, marine, fishing, communications, and construction.

The importance of increasing our knowledge of the formation and behavior of hurricanes can hardly be overemphasized. In each of the past 2 years hurricanes have cost the lives of hundreds of people and caused property losses of almost a billion dollars.

Simultaneously with securing greatly strengthened hurricane operations and warning services it is essential, I feel, to enlarge our hurricane research efforts far beyond the modest beginnings which the Congress has made possible this year.

We need to know, for our own protection, much more than we now do about many important problems on the origin and behavior of hurricanes. Many of these problems might best be solved by teams of oceanographers and meteorologists. For example, in my own State of Rhode Island, and along Narragansett Bay, we would like to have more accurate and timely forecasts of changing water levels caused by coastal storms.

This improved forecast service, I am told, can come about only after considerable research in the integrated relationships between tidal action, sea surges, salt water levels, rainfall amounts, river stages, coastal geography, and the speeds and tracks of advancing hurricanes.

Similar interrelationships of scientific disciplines most likely are applicable in the search for needed solutions to air flow and moisture mechanisms which cause tropical storms to grow, and to speed up, and to change direction, and to increase or decrease in intensity.

I need not mention to the many experts assembled here any more examples of the hurricane problems meriting early attention by research workers. I only wish to endorse their efforts and to hope that effective support to carry out these services to our coastal citizens will be forthcoming when needed.

The United States, large as it is, cannot afford to permit a loss from hurricanes every few years of a billion dollars of wealth, especially when for a small fraction of that amount much of the loss in property and lives can be prevented.

I believe there is a widely held opinion in New England and along the coastal areas farther south that this country now should make certain that we have provided an entirely adequate warning system against the hazard of hurricanes. I am hoping that in the next few years, with your support, we will be able to reach that goal.

One year ago, and again this year, I urged the Congress to vote large increases in the amount of appropriations which the Budget Bureau had initially allotted to the Weather Bureau. I am of the firm belief that the Weather Bureau does not yet have the resources to give the hurricane protection services actually needed by the people of the United States. There is little doubt that much of the staggering storm losses of 1954

and 1955 could have been avoided if the Weather Bureau had the proper radar equipment and other observation facilities along the coast.

Similar devastating occasions may arise in the coming hurricane seasons, so I see no reason for further delay in providing the needed staff and facilities which can mean the difference between life and death along our entire coast line.

As many of you here know, I have also strongly advocated additional appropriations for research activity on storms. I have long felt that much greater emphasis should be given to a basic and intensified search for more profound knowledge of the origin and behavior of storms. The future welfare of our coastal communities may well depend on a better understanding of interacting processes of the atmosphere and the oceans.

It is perhaps too much to expect that sudden outstanding achievements can result from the modest hurricane research programs for the next year, but it is encouraging to note the great enthusiasm of the research scientists who are now able at least to embark on their projects after so many years of denial. For example, some workers have even suggested the intriguing possibilities that we may be able to modify the conditions in which hurricanes form, thereby preventing their full growth into devastating storms.

All leaders in the weather sciences are now agreed that increased hurricane research activities will be amply repaid in the greater knowledge and confidence that can be given weather forecasters, who now are compelled to predict the precise future path of hurricanes in the next 24 hours without sufficient knowledge of all factors affecting storm movements.

It needs to be emphasized—yes, frequently emphasized—that desired progress in hurricane research programs cannot and will not be made in the coming years if only token sums are to be made available by the Budget Bureau for important and fundamental areas of hurricane research activity. Unless more substantial sums are made available for long overdue storm-research programs, I fear we must expect more disasters in the years ahead when future Hurricane Carols come roaring across our coasts without adequate warning.

I understand that the research hurricane forecaster today has become increasingly interested in furthering his knowledge of oceanography and the interchanges between the ocean and the atmosphere. The recent studies of storm surges by scientists of the Woods Hole Oceanographic Institution, I am told, will be of great value to Weather Bureau forecasters this year when they make their predictions of expected high-water levels accompanying costal storms.

I understand also that the surface temperatures of the sea may be an important factor in the formation of the tropical storms that develop into hurricanes. Knowledge of the wandering currents of the seas may provide clues to more accurate long-range forecasting. The extent of salt particles in clouds may also be a critical factor in the cause of rain over certain areas.

Such developments, it seems to me, emphasize the importance of contributions which can be made by the science of oceanography to the advancement of meteorology, and the eventual improvement of weather forecasting.

Our weather forecasters no doubt are pleased to have on their team such a vigorous group of oceanographers interested in tackling research problems of mutual interest.

Weathermen also will be pleased to note that the first journey of the *Crawford* as a research vessel of the Woods Hole Oceanographic Institution will be on a primarily meteorological mission. In fact, the *Crawford* is unique, I am informed, in being the first ship ever to have been specifically fitted with scientific equipment for the definite objective of investigating areas which hurricanes are generated.

Among other tasks, the scientific crew of the *Crawford* will evaluate the conditions of heat and water vapor which rise from the sea surfaces into the atmosphere east of the West Indies, and sometimes there produce the energizing forces that finally sytematize into hurricanes which slowly move toward our shores.

The *Crawford* thus has a new and historic role to fill. I am proud to be here at the commissioning of this ship, and wish it well on its long journeys to far-off seas in the days ahead.

Perhaps the data soon to be collected by the scientists aboard the *Crawford* will help unravel the secrets of hurricane formation. If such good fortune prevails, we may today be witnesses of the beginning of an epoch which will record the end of the hurricane menace.

In the meantime, however, it seems prudent for all of us to continue our efforts to secure the resources needed by the Weather Bureau to provide adequate storm warning protective services to all of our citizens.

I note with pleasure that one of the purposes of the associates of the Woods Hole Oceanographic Institution is to give added strength and support to basic research studies in oceanography.

In closing, I must tell you I am deeply impressed with the high-minded spirit which prompts your support of scientific studies of the seas. This form of American philanthropy advances the progress of science toward a better world for all people everywhere.

Funds for Connecting Channels

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, July 9, 1956

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, last Friday night it was my pleasure to deliver a talk in Menomonee Falls in my State on the subject of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence seaway—its past, present, future.

I referred in the course of this talk to the importance of prompt completion of the work on the deepening and improving of the Great Lakes Connecting Channels, so as to assure that we in the upper lake States get the full benefit of this mighty project.

I was pleased to receive from Mrs. Carl Romanik, State legislative chairman of the Wisconsin Federation of Business and Professional Women's Clubs a resolution which had been adopted at the 36th annual convention of the federation held at Green Lake last month. The resolution commended Congress' role in connection with the seaway and the channels, and paralleled my own views for the prompt allocation of funds for the channel work.

I send to the desk the text of the Menomonee Falls talk and of the Wisconsin federation resolution. I ask unanimous consent that they be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the speech and resolution were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY, OF WISCONSIN, PRESENTS GREAT LAKES PROGRAM FOR MIDWEST, UNITED STATES PROSPERITY; URGES TEAMWORK BY LAKE STATES

(Excerpts of address by Hon. ALEXANDER WILEY, Republican, Chippewa Falls, at the summer festival in Menomonie Falls, Wis., July 6, 1956)

It is a real pleasure to join with you at this outstanding summer festival. It is both a time of rejoicing and a promise of still more pleasure to come in this beautiful summer season.

I should like to talk to you tonight about another great promise on the horizon—the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence seaway. I would like to take a brief look at its past, but most important of all, to concentrate on the future of this marvelous new frontier.

My basic message is this:

A PEACEFUL REVOLUTION FOR GREATER PROSPERITY

The Great Lakes-St. Lawrence seaway is going to revolutionize the economy of our own and of other Lake States. It will do so to a greater degree than any other single development in this century.

The seaway will offer a tremendous shot in the arm for all Wisconsin—not just for our port cities, but for all our cities and towns in the interior.

Just how much of a lift it will provide for us will depend basically on our own initiative, imagination, and drive.

To realize the fullest benefits from the seaway, we must take action on a several-point program which I should like to suggest a little later on.

VAST ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITIES UNDER SEAWAY

The economic outlook under the seaway is literally breathtaking. On completion of the work at the International Rapids section, in the 1959 shipping season, 37 million new tons of shipping will be added to the annual enormous shipping of the Great Lakes.

We, of Wisconsin, will—through the deepened upper lake channels—enjoy thereafter direct contact with 75 major ports through 3 great oceans of the world.

The farmers of Wisconsin will be able to ship their excellent products more inexpensively throughout the world, and to fulfill their purchasing needs more inexpensively, by virtue of lower transportation costs.

Midwest business, likewise, will thrive, selling and buying to and from the world. We of the Midwest will likewise get the benefit of low-cost Labrador iron ore to fuel our Midwest furnaces.

The seaway navigation construction is, of course, a mammoth engineering undertaking. It includes the construction of 7 great locks, for 27-foot channels, replacing the 25 obsolete 14-foot locks. Five of the new locks are to be built in and controlled by Canada; two are United States enterprises.

So sound was this overall seaway project that the bonds to cover the costs of the construction were sold within half an hour, and were, in fact, completely oversubscribed.

NO STATE FOUGHT HARDER THAN WISCONSIN

I say to you factually, my friends, that no single State worked as hard for the seaway as did we. No single State had as firm and unyielding a faith as did we—faith that despite the repeated setbacks in the long 30-years battle, despite all these disappointments—faith that right would eventually triumph.

Now it is for us to capitalize on the seaway, because no single State is more entitled to enjoy the benefits of it than we of Wisconsin, who led in the fight for its enactment.

A PROGRAM FOR THE LAKE STATES

Let me suggest, now, therefore, a several-point program—for Wisconsin and for its Great Lakes neighbors, to achieve the fullest benefits from the seaway.

First, we must accelerate the improvement not only of our Great Lakes harbors but of

all the transportation feeder arrangements—rail, truck, auto—by which our port cities are served.

What we need is a modern transportation network throughout our State—a network which will assure prompt, efficient moving of goods to and from our Badger ports.

Right now, I am working in Washington for a broad survey by the United States Corps of Engineers of the adequacy of our Great Lakes port facilities all along the line.

FIGHTING THE WATER-STEAL BILL

Secondly, we must prevent arbitrary lowering of Great Lakes water levels. The loss of a single inch of lake levels can mean the loss of as much as 2 million tons of lake shipping.

The biggest single threat of the lowering of levels, arises right now from the notorious Chicago water-steal bill, which is once more before a Senate committee, having been passed, unfortunately, by the House of Representatives.

If this bill were to pass the Senate, and if it were to be signed by the President (which is very doubtful), it would cost a fortune to lake shippers. It would cost Wisconsin harbors huge additional sums for harbor-dredging purposes. Remember, if a ship gets stuck because the water in the harbor simply is not deep enough for its particular draft, that can cause the shipping firm a small fortune. And it can cause terrific overall delays all along the line.

The Chicago water steal is utterly contrary to the best interests of all the Lake States. It is contrary to our interest with our good neighbor, Canada; it is contrary to a decision in 1930 of the United States Supreme Court. (In that decision, the Court retained jurisdiction over future lowering of lake levels. All this is why I will continue to battle against the Chicago water steal—with all the power at my command.

We want lake levels to be worked out carefully—in the interest of shipping, of property owners, and of others.

IMPROVING WISCONSIN ROADS

A third point in our lake program is the constant improvement of our highway network, feeding our port system.

Fortunately, Wisconsin will benefit considerably from the new superhighway program under the $33 billion Federal highway law, which was signed by the President last week.

Already, our State has an enormous highway-improvement program of its own. Roads are, of course, part and parcel of the strengthened transportation network, about which I spoke earlier.

I want, as I know you want for our State of Wisconsin, to enjoy the reputation of having the best transportation system in our country—and the best feeder system.

PREVENTING DISCRIMINATION AGAINST MIDWEST

I have mentioned thus far three points in my program for Wisconsin, and for the Lake States.

I want to mention now that it is absolutely essential that we, of the upper Midwest, receive the proper recognition which is our due, from the executive agencies in Washington. We must not be treated as an orphan child. Our needs must not be ignored.

Too often, we have been discriminated against. Too often, we have gotten the short end of the stick. I should like to cite to you, for example, the recent order of the Interstate Commerce Commission, as a case in point, illustrating our problem of being discriminated against.

This recent ICC order provided for only 2 days free time for rail care serving Great Lakes ports, as against 6 days free time for ships serving ocean ports.

As soon as word came to me regarding this outrageous discrimination, I protested to the ICC and demanded prompt reversal of its order.

Thus we see, for the present time, an example of the lack of recognition of our lake needs.

It is an example, too, of apparent sabotage efforts which are still being attempted by some eastern railroads—"diehard sources," committed against us of the Midwest. They don't, apparently, want to reconcile themselves to the fact that we are now on a great ocean artery.

Well, if they persist in wanting to battle us, then we will certainly take them on. And we will beat them as completely as we did in the main seaway fight. Only this time, it is not going to take us 30 years to do so. We are going to lick them promptly and decisively.

We, of the upper Midwest, however, would prefer to work constructively and not to have to combat other regions. We have always felt that American prosperity is so huge, its future opportunities so vast, that there is more than enough room for all regions to prosper simultaneously.

Some of the eastern railroads, however, still seem to have the misguided philosophy that "there are just so many slices to the limited economic pie," and that the East has to hog most of the slices. We would prefer—and we believe in a bigger pie for all, so that there will be ample slices for every area. I refer to bigger slices of income, of purchasing power, of wealth, of production, of distribution—in an ever expanding, not a stagnant America.

PROMISING ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT OF TACONITE ORE

As still another point in our program, we must and will accelerate other economic development in our State.

I cite as an example, the promising taconite ore development, which holds great promise for our north country.

But this is just a sample of varied, new economic horizons which await us, if we apply ourselves diligently, as I know we will.

A BRIEF LOOK-SEE AT THE PAST

Thus, we have seen my friends, a few of our future vistas.

It might be well now to turn briefly back to the past, so as to see our present in proper perspective.

I will not take time tonight to review in detail the long battle which we conducted on behalf of the Great Lakes seaway.

Just hitting the high spots, however, you will remember that for three decades, we had to oppose an "unholy alliance" of forces which were determined that we would never have direct access to the deep water ocean ports of the world.

We faced the combination, therefore, of Eastern port influences (in New York, Philadelphia, and Baltimore, for example), influences in southern and gulf coasts ports, as well as perhaps some Pacific interests which feared Midwest competition.

For a time, some private utilities mistakenly opposed the water power phases of the project, even through the greatest single untapped source of power on the North American continent was going unused, and even though there was a terrific power shortage in that area.

We faced in particular, the skillful opposition of powerful railroad interests, spearheaded by a few eastern railroads, to which I have already referred.

By contrast, many of our midwestern railroad people realized full well that they themselves would actually not be hurt by the seaway—indeed that they would benefit from it. But they tended to be pulled along into opposition by the powerful eastern railroads.

We faced the opposition, too, of the coal interests which tended to identify their future with the coal-using railroads.

Year after year, the battle went on. Time after time, the seaway bill was defeated, either in the Foreign Relations Committee or in the House Public Works Committee or on the floor of the Senate.

OUR SUCCESS IN 83D CONGRESS

I will not recall each of those skirmishes. But I will recall how, in 1953 and 1954, a golden opportunity arose on which we capitalized.

At that time, it was my personal privilege to serve as chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

In that post, I was fortunately in the most strategic spot to advance the seaway's cause.

Of course, if I had wanted to, I had had a choice of becoming—instead—the chairman of the Senate Judiciary Committee, and thus abandoning my Foreign Relations post.

There were some people at that time who advised my taking the Judiciary chairmanship. They felt that the people of our State were more interested in my work on the Judiciary Committee than they would be in my work on the Foreign Relations Committee.

WHY I CHOSE FOREIGN RELATIONS POST

But for two basic reasons, I choose the Foreign Relations post:

In the first place, it would enable me to render service on behalf of the greatest single goal of all—the goal of world peace, preventing a dreadful atomic-hydrogen bomb conflict.

And in the second place, if I did not choose the Foreign Relations assignment, the next ranking Republican on it—who would become chairman—had either been lukewarm or hostile to the seaway.

With a seaway supporter at the helm, however, of the full committee, I could arrange for a favorable seaway membership on the subcommittee. This I promptly did.

And it was not too long before we secured not only a favorable report in the seaway subcommittee, but a favorable report in the full committee, and then favorable action in the full Senate.

THE DEBATE OVER A 1-STEP OR 2-STEP BILL

Let us recall too, that for a time, there was some concern over our strategy in the pro-seaway camp itself.

There were friends among our seaway supporters who said that we had to adopt a combined 1-step bill, so to speak. They wanted it to include the upper channels (affecting the States beyond Lake Erie) as well as the main navigation works on the lower seaway—in the International Rapids section.

I personally opposed that strategy for a number of reasons:

1. In the first place, for years and years, we had been defeated in our effort to try to combine both phases.

We felt, therefore, that our chances would be infinitely improved, if we secured approval of the seaway in two separate stages—first, the main navigation works, and secondly, the upper channel work beyond Lake Erie—for oursleves and other Upper Lakes States.

I pointed out, for exemple, that the main navigation works would be paid for by self-liquidating bonds (retired by toll payments), whereas the channels would be paid for by Treasury appropriations.

To combine the two financial phases in one bill would tend to confuse the issue somewhat, and our opponents would quickly exploit the mixed nature of the bill.

2. Secondly, I knew that, if once we won the major battle, we would get quick approval of the upper channels.

OUR QUICK VICTORY ON THE CHANNELS

I am delighted to say that my plans and strategy worked out exactly as they were intended.

We did secure the passage of the main seaway law. It was signed by the President at

the White House in an historic ceremony on May 13, 1954.

And then, the channel bill—which others and I promptly introduced—was approved in the 84th Congress. As a matter of fact, contrary to the unfounded fears which had been expressed by some of our seaway supporters, the channel bill went through—with absolutely no opposition whatsoever. There was not a single voice lifted against it either in the House of Representatives or in the Senate. It passed the Senate on the Unanimous Consent Calendar, meaning that, just as I had predicted, no one whatsoever opposed it, (once the main seaway fight had been won).

Now, fortunately, we are making good progress in the actual engineering work. I am in close touch with the Seaway Development Corporation and with the Corps of Engineers as work proceeds. All possible speed is, of course, essential.

Just a few weeks ago, it was my privilege to deliver the main address at the impressive dedication—near Masena, N. Y.—of Eisenhower lock on the St. Lawrence seaway.

I was pleased at that time to receive a glowing tribute from an official spokesman for the administration, Assistant Secretary of the Army, George H. Roderick. He kindly referred to me as the "Father of the St. Lawrence seaway law."

But the battle for the seaway was a combined effort—throughout.

It was not any single man's accomplishment. It represented the successful teamwork by our Great Lakes States, and, in particular, by united forces in the State of Wisconsin.

CONCLUSION

Teamwork, cooperation, those will be the keynotes for Wisconsin and Great Lakes prosperity in the years to come.

And in the time up ahead, as summer festivals roll around again, we will have ever more to be thankful for, ever more over which to rejoice.

Present Status of Slovakia and the Situation of the Catholic Church and Its Bishops Under Communist Rule in Slovakia

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 9, 1956

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following memorandum on the present status of Slovakia and the current situation of the Catholic Church and its bisphops under Communist rule in Slovakia, issued by the 38th convention of the Slovak Catholic Federation of America, May 16, 1956, Chicago:

MEMORANDUM ON THE PRESENT STATUS OF SOLVAKIA AND THE SITUATION OF THE CATHOLIC CHURCH AND ITS BISHOPS UNDER COMMUNIST RULE IN SLOVAKIA

RÉSUMÉ

The Slovak Catholic Federation of America is an organization of Americans of the Catholic faith and of Slovak descent. The Federation is primarily dedicated to the dissemination of religious education among its members, and has always manifested a lively interest in the life and development of Slovakia, that ancient Central European country whose population now verges on 4 million persons, of whom 86 percent are Catholic.

For many generations the Slovak people were held in subjection and forced to suffer cultural, social, and political discrimination at the hands of changing foreign regimes and national governments. Now, after a brief period of independence, the Slovak Republic is once more suffering under foreign oppression. Since 1945, its national institutions have been slowly abolished and its religious life, which stems from spiritual traditions dating back a full millenium, are being throttled by international communism, to which Slovakia fell victim through no fault of her own. Politically dependent on Prague, economically exploited by the Soviet Union, Slovakia was locked into the Soviet orbit and transformed into a dark corner of the present Prague regime, thus remaining deprived of a healthy feeling of soldarity with the community of Christian nations and of the comfort and security attendant thereto. With its political leadership liquidated, imprisoned, or exiled; its bishops jailed or otherwise prevented from exercising their spirtual mission, Slovakia, in silent agony, turns hopeful eyes to the Western world, pleading for some consideration of its tragic fate, even if immediate help seems impossible.

The problem of Slovakia must surely be a particularly sore spot on the conscience of the great powers, which, ignoring the aspirations and rights of the smaller nations, continue to pursue their traditional game of rivalries and struggles for zones of influence in various parts of the world.

The Slovak Catholic Federation of America wishes to take advantage of this opportunity to draw the attention of the civilized world to the problem of Slovakia and to her religious situation.

MEMORANDUM

A. Origins of Slovakia as a nation

Slovakia is an ancient country which lies in the very heart of Europe. Christianity was introduced and began to spread there as early as the beginning of the ninth century. Within the central European region, the principality of Nitra was the first political unit of the Christian era. Prince Pribina is noted for having built the oldest Catholic church in that area. This chapel, which bore the name of St. Emmeram, was consecrated in 833 by Archbishop Adalram of Salzburg, and still stands today, a tangible symbol of the ancient roots of Christianity in Slovakia.

During the second half of the ninth century, Slovakia's political and religious life was marked by a promising development: It became the core of what under Prince Mojmir and his successor, Rastislav, was to be known as the Moravian Empire. Rastislav, a wise ruler, invited two preachers, St. Cyril and Methodius, to come from Constantinople in 863, with a view to strengthening Slovakia through the force of living Christianity. By their work they were to become not only apostles for Slovakia, but for other Slavic peoples as well. Since that time, Christianity has constituted a precious heritage to all succeeding Slovak generations.

B. Slovakia within Hungary

In 907, the Moravian Empire collapsed and fell prey to a German-Magyar coalition and invasion. After a century of power struggles involving Germans, Magyars, and Slavs, Slovakia became, at the beginning of the 11th century, a principality within the framework of the multinational Kingdom of Hungary. And even though it remained a part of that kingdom for centuries, Slovakia still preserved intact its ethnographical individuality and its religious traditions. It withstood the Tartar invasion of the Danubian region during the 13th century, and was able, where the greater part of its territory was concerned, to escape direct Turkish domination during the 16th and 17th centuries, when the Turks established themselves in south and central Hungary.

During and after the reformation, Slovakia also became the theater of extensive struggles for power in Upper Hungary, in which the opposing interests of Austria, France, Russia, and the Ottoman Empire played a preponderant role. In those conflicts, religion was promoted and defended by ruling houses and by monarchs, as an important factor in international peace and military relations. The population of Slovakia, however, thanks to the salutary activities of the Jesuit University of Trnava (1635–1777)—the only institution of higher education then existing in Hungary—remained in its great majority loyal to Catholicism. And even after that university was transferred to Buda, Slovakia still retained her high spiritual life and education, to such an extent that historians often referred to it as the "pars nobilior Hungariae."

Toward the end of the 18th and the early 19th centuries, when the ideas of the American and French revolutions had begun to influence the current of European thought, the Austrian empire passed through an important transformation. Latin was ultimately abandoned there as the language of administration and education, and replaced in the crownlands of Austria by German, in Hungary by Magyar. Consequently, the non-German and non-Magyar nationalities of that heterogeneous empire began to defend their own national language and rights. In these circumstances, Anton Bernolák, a Catholic priest (1762–1813), carried out the first codification of the Slovak language. Later the Slovaks, compelled to struggle against pervading centralism from Vienna on the one hand, and from Budapest on the other, put forth a remarkable effort to obtain the assurance of their national rights within a special self-governing unit or crownland which would have included the ethnographic territory of Slovakia. The March 28, 1848, Petition of Liptovský Sv. Mikuláš, and the June 7, 1861, Memorandum of Turčiansky Sv. Martin, attest eloquently to this effort of the Slovak people to bring about a federative reform of the Hapsburg monarchy. That era produced one of the outstanding figures of Slovakia's religious and national life: Stefan Moyses, ordinary bishop of Banská Bystrica, founder and first chairman of the Slovak Institute of Arts and Sciences, Matica Slovenská (1863). This great patriot and spiritual leader left the imprint of his powerful personality on the national and spiritual life of his generation. In 1870, the Association of St. Adalbert was founded by Rev. Andrej Radlinský. Its subsequent activities as a Catholic publishing company operating on a cooperative basis were successful in keeping alive the spark of national and religious life among the Slovaks during the most difficult period of their national existence. Indeed, after the Austro-Hungarian Compromise of 1867 which left the Slovak nation outlawed culturally and politically by Budapest and forgotten by the Western World, Slovakia faced the classic dilemma of Hamlet: "To be or not to be."

C. Slovakia as a part of the Czecho-Slovak State

The First World War was an opportunity for the Slovaks to withdraw from the feudal kingdom of Hungary under which they had sought in vain to assure their national existence and culture through a federal constitution. During that war two Czechs, T. G. Masaryk and E. Benes, and a Slovak, M. R. Stefanik, founded a Czecho-Slovak National Committee in Paris, for the purpose of obtaining the consent of the Allied and Associated Powers to the establishment of a Czecho-Slovak State. On May 30, 1918, representatives of the Americans of Czech descent signed an agreement in Pittsburgh with officials of the Slovak League of America, adopting the program of liberation of

the two countries of their origin, and emphasizing that the future Czechoslovakia should be a federative republic. Equality between the Slovaks and the Czechs on a nation-to-nation basis was, therefore, a fundamental principle in the creation of that state. T. G. Masaryk, to become the first President of the new country, subscribed to this principle by affixing his signature to the Pittsburgh agreement.

It was unfortunate, therefore, when the Czechs later decided to develop Czechoslavakia on the principle of a fictitious Czechoslovak nation, bypassing the provisions of the Pittsburgh agreement and actually reserving for themselves, in the name of the apparently democratic majoritarian principle, the right of decision even in matters which were properly in Slovakia's domain. In 1920, a constitution was adopted in the name of that Czechoslovak nation, by a parliament appointed by the revolutionary Government. This step provoked a strong reaction among the Slovak population—a reaction which found its proper expression in a movement for autonomy and, later, for a free Slovak state.

Now did the new Czechoslovakian state look favorably upon the development of the church in Slovakia. Mararyk's concept of natural religion, together with his anthopocentric ethical humanism, was strongly opposed to the faith in a revealed god, and was adopted and promoted as an official political philosophy. A spirit or secularist relativism pervaded the whole educational system of Czechoslovakia. The church was forced, therefore, to fight for its schools, for its share in education, for the rights inherent in its mission.

Of exceptional importance in Slovakia's further spiritual evolution was the fact that, since 1921, the newly appointed bishops were sons of the Slovak people. In this way the national and religious aspirations of the nation, the clergy and the hierarchy, were converging into a single spearhead which formed a solid, cohesive political and spiritual force. While Monsignor Hlinka's people's party, the strongest political faction in the country, defended the interest of the church in parliament, the hierarchy supported the party's platform in its fight for Slovakian autonomy.

D. The Slovak Republic

During the crises of international alliances of Czechoslovakia which followed Munich, the Slovak People's Party, weary of Prague's empty promises, finally managed, on October 6, 1938, together with 4 smaller political parties, to establish a regional government for Slovakia. The Czechs were thus forced to accept a structural reform of the whole State and its transformation into a federation, with Czechia, Slovakia, and the Carpathian Ukraine as members. It was at that time that Msgr. J. Tiso became chief of the Slovak Government.

However, since 1937 Hitler had cherished plans to dismember Czechoslovakia. The Sudeten German problem was to serve him as a pretext. For a period, he was undecided as to how to handle the question of Slovakia. The alternatives were: occupation by Hungary, division between Germany and Hungary, or independence. When Monsignor Tiso was summoned by the German Chancellor to Berlin on March 13, 1939, and made aware of these alternatives, he returned to Bratislava where, after his report to the Slovak Diet on March 14, the free Slovak State was unanimously proclaimed. In so doing the Diet not only saved Slovakia from partition or foreign occupation, but also carried out the centuries-old aspiration of the Slovak people for self-determination.

During World War II, Germany exercised pressure upon Slovakia, as it did upon other Central European countries, at the international level. Msgr. Joseph Tiso, who had become President of the Slovak Republic on October 26, 1939, preserved Slovakia's essential rights and kept his country free from the ideological influences of Nazism. In spite of the burdens of the general conditions of war in Europe, Slovakia, under a free Slovak Government, experienced a period of great cultural revival, industrial development, and economic prosperity. By rapid administrative reorganization in all fields and at all levels, by increasing production of consumer goods, and by intensifying international trade, the Slovak Republic emerged as a new factor in Central European politics. Realizing the difficult circumstances under which the Slovak Republic had made its debut on the international scene, the Slovak people threw itself with enthusiasm into the building up of the new nation. By their spontaneous support of the Bratislava Government, they demonstrated that the concept of a free Slovak State had become a powerful motivating force in their political thinking.

The Slovak Republic, as recorded in the special report No. 8 of the Select Committee on Communist Aggression of the United States House of Representatives in 1955, was not "a perfect democracy in the traditional sense"—Western sense—but, "in general, it was an expression of the self-preservation instinct of the Slovak Nation." The fact is that the Slovaks enjoyed more freedom and democracy during the war than even most neutral countries.

E. Czechoslovakia between 1945 and 1950

Owing largely to the alliance signed in Moscow by E. Beneš and Generalissimo Stalin on December 12, 1943, the reestablishment of Czechoslovakia became an objective of the official Allied postwar program. In the spring of 1945 Soviet units, pursuing the retreat of the German Army, entered the territory of Slovakia. The Czechoslovak Government of E. Beneš, which had been formed and appointed in Moscow, followed on their heels, Slovakia, occupied by the Red army, was thus once more united with the Czech lands to form the so-called Czechoslovak People's Republic.

What was thereafter euphemistically referred to as the liberation of Slovakia was in fact nothing but a complete violation of the right of political and cultural self-determination of the Slovak people. Not only did the reunification with the Czech lands take place without any consultation of the Slovak people, but a regime of terror was immediately introduced in the country against the patriots who had preferred the Slovak Republic to foreign domination, as well as against the religious leaders who had not ceased warning the people of the danger of communism.

The record of the National Front Government of E. Beneš and K. Gottwald, which at first operated under the supervision of the Soviet Army, is in broad terms as follows: 33 prominent persons executed in accordance with sentences imposed by a Draconian political justice; hundreds of persons killed as an act of personal or political revenge; tens of thousands of patriots arrested and then sentenced to long years of imprisonment, including the loss of property and social position; 20,000 Slovaks deported to the Soviet Union as a consequence of political denunciation.

The tactics used by the Communist in Czechoslovakia against Catholicism are indicative of Lenin's theory of nationalities: while adopting a policy of good-will toward the Czech Catholics, it was decided to crush the church in Slovakia. Thus the National Front Government in Prague, of which Msgr. Ján Srámek and Msgr. František hala happened to be members for the Czech Christian Democratic Party, ordered the imprisonment of Msgr. Ján Vojtaššák, Bishop of Spiš; Msgr. Michael Buzalka, Auxiliary Bishop of Trnava; Msgr. Ján Pöstényi-Kyusucky, Director of the Association of St. Adalbert; 170 priests and several thousands of Catholic laymen.

Various legislative and administrative measures were then introduced with a view to limiting the Church's prerogatives. The school system was nationalized, after the buildings and the equipment of the Catholic schools had been confiscated. Laws were passed limiting church ownership of property. Religious instruction became merely optional. Crucifixes were removed from schools, and teachers known for their religious convictions were dismissed. The Catholic youth and men's and women's groups, and the institutions of Catholic charity, were dissolved and their property confiscated. The Catholic press was completely suppressed.

When Msgr. Karol Kmet'ko, Archbishop of Nitra, launched a campaign in July 1945, in favor of private schools, and soon obtained over 260,000 signatures, his action was declared illegal and many religious persons and laymen who had been active in the campaign were imprisoned.

Toward the end of 1946 and early 1947 Monsignor Tiso, former President of the Slovak Republic, was brought to trial. The basic defendant, however, was the Slovak people, with their aspirations for national independence and religious freedom. This was confirmed by the former archbishop of Nitra, Karol Kemt'ko, who was the true leader of Slovakia at that time of confusion. Summoned by the public prosecutor as a witness against Tiso, the archbishop firmly defended him and his policies. When Justice Sujan asked him whether he supported Czechoslovakia or a free Slovak state, the archbishop replied: "If Slovakia had any real possibility of becoming free, all of us would be for independence."

Tiso, however, was made to expiate for the entire Slovak nation. His fate was, in fact, predetermined by the composition of the jury of the National Tribunal in Bratislava. Strangely enough, in a Catholic country, such as Slovakia predominantly is, 5 out of 7 members of the People's Tribunal were Communists, 1 was a Democrat, and 1 was neutral. Though the feelings of the Slovak population were overwhelmingly on Tiso's side, he was condemned to death for two reasons: as a victim of Czech politics, which were aimed at keeping Slovakia under political control, and as a victim of Bolshevism, as he himself expressed it in a last message to the Slovak people entrusted to his confessor. All efforts at intercession with President Benes on the part of the Holy See, of Archbishop Kmet'ko representing the Slovak Episcopal Conference, and of various organizations of Americans of Slovak descent begging that mercy be granted to Monsignor Tiso, were bypassed. He was executed on April 18, 1947.

In February 1948, the Marxist majority of the Czechoslovak Parliament, holding 153 out of 300 seats, decided in favor of a dictatorship, thus abandoning the principles of a National Front Government. After that, the political and religious situation in Slovakia was to become still worse. Although the Communist Party in Slovakia formed a minority of 30 percent of the electors, it managed, with the help of Prague, to impose its exclusive power on the regional Government in Bratislava, at the same time extending the persecution of non-Communists. The Central Government's pressure upon the church also became more acute, in spite of a tactical Te Deum which Monsignor Beran, archbishop of Prague, had agreed to sign on June 14, 1948, the day of President Gottwald's inauguration. The regime adopted as its goal a separation of the bishops from Rome, of the priests from the bishops, and of the believers from the priests, in an all-out effort to found a schismatic National Catholic Church. On June 10,

1949, with the help of some pro-Communist patriotic priests, the government began to organize a false Catholic Action movement—i. e., a movement in favor of National Catholicism. On June 20, this movement was declared schismatic and its leaders and followers were excommunicated by Rome.

In order to weaken the power of the bishops over their clergy, the Government passed a law through Parliament in October 1949, confiscating the remnants of any property that might have been retained by the Church, and converting priests into public officials under the control of a new Ministry: the State Office for Denominational Affairs. This department has the right both to appoint priests to, or replace and dismiss them from their offices. An oath of office was decreed, obliging all holders of an ecclesiastical office to proclaim their loyalty to the new regime. Through these legislative and administrative measures, the freedom of the Church's action was restricted in a way never heard of before.

In April 1950, the religious orders of Slovakia were practically disbanded and their members sent to labor camps or put under direct police supervision in concentration monasteries. The Greek-Catholic diocese of Presov was forced to undergo a special evolution. As is known, the Greek-Catholics, though united with Rome, have retained their Slav liturgy. This was evidently the reason why the Czechoslovak Government, with the help of local Communist agents, decided to eliminate that diocese. On April 18, 1950, the population of Presov was mobilized to a "peace rally," where 820 "delegates of the Committees for a Return to Orthodoxy," together with 100 priests, adopted a resolution breaking off with Rome. The reluctant bishop, Msgr. Paul Gojdic, was imprisoned.

F. Trial of the three Slovak bishops

The struggle of the Communist government against the Church was to reach its climax in a spectacular trial brought against the three Slovak bishops: Msgr. Ján Vojtassák, Ordinary of Spis; Msgr. Michael Buzalka, auxiliary bishop of Trnava; and Msgr. Paul Gojdic, bishop of the Greek-Catholic diocese of Presov. The first two of these were jailed in 1945 and released some months later. In 1945, the situation was not considered propitious for a direct attack against the hierarchy.

Five years later conditions had changed considerably: the Communist government had attained totalitarian power in the nation, and accordingly ordered the imprisonment of the three aforementioned dignitaries. The public prosecutor was instructed to bring them to trial.

The act of indictment which the public prosecutor, Ján Fejes, read against the three bishops on January 10, 1951, before the state court in Bratislava, will ever remain a historical document. In it the criminality of the defendants is built up from the viewpoint of Marxist-Leninist justice. As a matter of fact, the entire social system of Europe before World War I and after it was condemned. In addition to the bishops themselves, various moral and physical persons, as well as social classes and institutions, were judged in absentia: the Holy See, the Pope, the Austro-Hungarian Empire, the feudal system in Hungary prior to 1918, the traitorous Slovak People's Party of Monsignor Hlinka, the Slovak bourgeoisie, the Fascist Slovak state, Monsignor Tiso, the Slovak Democratic Party, the exiled Slovak leaders, Karol Sidor and Ferdinand Durčanský, etc. The bishops were presented as aiders and abettors of those reactionary and anti-Communist forces. They were also accused of assorted personal crimes. They were said to have supported Hitler's war against the Soviet Union; after the liberation of Slovakia, it was alleged that they took an unfriendly attitude toward the restored Czechoslovak State; they were accused of sowing discontent among the Slovak people against the infusion of socialism in the Republic; of excommunicating people who were members of the Communist Party, the Communist trade unions, or the Catholic Action, which sought an agreement with the government; of cooperating in the creation of an illegal, disruptive espionage network, the center of the espionage activities of the church being the apostolic nunciature in Prague; it was alleged that, by their frequent protests and inciting pastoral letters, they were hindering the Government's policy of creating a united, State-controlled system of schools and education in the Republic; finally, they were accused of having set up a secret hierarchy, and consequently founded an underground organization of the church.

At the close of this pages-long act of indictment, the public prosecutor summarized the crimes of the defendants as follows:

"1. The accused, Jan Vojtaššák and Dr. Michael Buzalka, especially in 1938 and up to the middle of March 1939, in Bratislava and elsewhere, attempted to change the constitution of the Republic by force, especially as concerns the independence, unity, or democratic form of the State, this being done under particularly aggravating circumstances;

"2. During the war, in the years 1939–44, in Slovakia and elsewhere, all of the accused worked for the enemy's advantage and under particularly invidious circumstances;

"3. During the years 1945–50, all of the accused in Spišské Podhradie, in Bratislava, in Prešov, and elsewhere, associated constantly with other criminals in the attempt to undermine the People's Democratic regime, and the economic and social structure of the Republic which is guaranteed by the Constitution; and for this purpose they worked in direct contact with a foreign power; and in this latter crime, Dr. Michael Buzalka and Paul Gojdič gave particularly serious offense;

"4. During the period mentioned under point 3, all of the accused associated constantly in Spišské Podhradie, in Bratislava, in Prešov, in Prague, and elsewhere, with other criminals, in the espionage of State secrets, with the intention of betraying them to a foreign power; and with this intention they entered into direct contact with a foreign power, and did actually spy on and betray state secrets. Dr. Buzalka and Paul Gojdič continued this activity over an extended period and an extensive and dangerous area; and the espionage of Th. Dr. Michael Buzalka involved a particularly important state secret."

As is evident from the nature of these accusations, they are of so general a nature that every Catholic bishop, merely by fulfilling his legitimate function, must inevitably fall into the trap of distorted interpretation of Communist criminal justice. According to the latter, the greatest crime consist, of course, in being a bishop.

Taking into consideration that during their preventive custody the defendants were under tremendous moral and physical pressure; that they were not permitted to bring witnesses and hire attorneys for their own defense; that they were at various times silenced when attempting to explain their attitude; one can easily foresee the results of this trial. On January 15, 1951, Monsignori Buzalka and Gojdič were sentenced to life imprisonment and Monsignor Vojtaššák, an old man of 73 years, to 24 years.

By its whole nature, this trial was to exert great pressure upon those bishops who up to that time had refused to submit to the Government. Msgr. Joseph Carsky, Apostolic Administrator of Košice, and Msgr. Ambrose Lazik, Apostolic Administrator of Trnava, took their oath of allegiance to the regime on March 12, 1951; while Msgr. Edward Nécsey, Apostolic Administrator of Nitra, followed them on April 11, 1951. In so doing, they stressed, however, that this act should not be interpreted as contrary to their canonical obedience to the Pope, as the head of the Catholic Church.

Later on, two more dignitaries were imprisoned: Msgr. Štefan Barnás and Vasil Hopko, respectively auxiliary bishops of Spiš and Prešov. Placed on trial under similar conditions, they were sentenced in 1952 to 15 years' imprisonment.

G. Balance sheet of religious persecution

The balance sheet of religious persecution in Slovakia is of unprecedented enormity: of 7 dioceses, the Greek-Catholic diocese of Prešov has passed, with the active help of the regime, into the hands of an orthodox, Moscow-controlled Eparch; of 9 bishops, 5 are in prison; Msgr. Robert Pobožný, bishop of Rožnava, held for a long time under house arrest, was removed by the police to an unknown place. Only the three aforementioned bishops, who took their oath of allegiance to the regime, still remain in office. Their activity and correspondence is, however, supervised by an official of the Office for Denominational Affairs, sitting in the episcopal chancery.

The four dioceses whose bishops died (Banská Bystrica), were imprisoned (Spiš and Prešov), or removed (Rožnava), are now under the administration of capitular vicars, i. e., patriotic priests loyal to the regime and practically appointed by the Office for Denominational Affairs. Having been elevated to their functions in a manner contrary to canon law, the capitular vicars were excommunicated by the Holy See. Thus, there are priests and believers who follow them, and those who refuse to do so. Consequently, the regime managed to bring about a split in the church from top to bottom, creating confusion and suspicion among both clergy and congregation.

According to the latest reliable statistics, there were 1,345 Catholic parishes in Slovakia. Now 241 of them are administered by the schismatic priests, and 130 are without any priests at all. Of 2,018 secular priests, 340 are in prison. Of 564 seminarians, 450 are in labor camps, while 46 entered a State-controlled seminary. There were formerly 331 monasteries, and all of them were confiscated. Of 400 priests of religious orders, 350 are in concentration convents. Of 744 lay brothers, 490 are in prison or in labor camps. There were formerly 3,971 female religious persons; 2,000 are now in labor camps, and others are in hospitals working under lay direction.

There were, in 1945, 1,800 Catholic grade schools in Slovakia, some tens of junior high schools, about 10 senior high schools, 9 seminaries, and a faculty of theology. Now, there is but one state-controlled faculty of theology in Bratislava. As to the Catholic press, there used to be 30 monthlies, 4 weeklies, and 1 daily newspaper. Now, patriotic priests are publishing, under Communist supervision, 1 weekly and 2 monthlies. Of nine Catholic publishing houses, there remained after the confiscation only that of the Association of St. Adalbert, in Trnava. But even this old cooperative publishing house must operate under a board of directors composed of Communists and pro-Communists.

CONCLUSION

Communism has destroyed Catholic institutions in every country of the Soviet orbit, and seeks to demolish the very church itself. It brought about a colossal spiritual devastation of all the Christian nations by exerting physical and moral pressure upon the masses as well as on their spiritual leaders. By this trend toward an intellectual proletarianization of men, it seeks to create the conditions for a universal proletarian state. During the last 11 years in which international communism has considerably advanced the frontiers of the Soviet orbit, it

now manifests interest in having its ignoble conquests recognized by the Western world. Therefore, it incessantly promotes the formula of "peaceful coexistence."

In their tactics toward the Western democracies, the present rulers of Moscow are so shrewd that they did not even hesitate to downgrade Stalin and to wash their own hands of the crimes committed by Bolshevism since its inception. They have restored to their class honor many of those dead Communists, who had fallen victim to the tremendous struggle for power which constantly goes on within the party. They have also recently released many of their own deviationists from prison.

But the fact that they did not express any regret for their injustices toward the church; that, of all those unjustly imprisoned, they have not released a single bishop or priest, makes it quite evident that international communism has no intention of abandoning its final goal.

In consideration of the aforementioned facts, the Slovak Catholic Federation of America hereby adopts, together with the present memorandum, the following resolution:

1. The United States of America Government is requested to put the imprisonment of Slovak and other bishops and priests behind the Iron Curtain on the agenda of the next session of the U. N. General Assembly, and to ask their immediate release.

2. The thousand-year history of Slovakia proves that there is no spiritual freedom in a country which must live under foreign domination. The Government of the United States is hereby requested to take steps to have Slovakia's rights of self-determination granted by the United Nations Organization.

3. In using information media toward Slovakia, the American Government is respectfully requested to employ people who not only speak the Slovak language, but who are also able to approach the Slovak people in terms and in the spirit of their national history and culture.

Rt. Rev. Msgr. M. K. MLYNAROVICH,
Chairman.

Rt. Rev. THEODORE KOJIŠ, O. S. B.,
Chairman of the Cultural Committee.

CHICAGO, May 16, 1956.

ANNEX

To the Central Office of the Slovak Catholic Action, Rome:

The central office of the Slovak Catholic Action is indeed right to call attention to an event of paramount importance which occurred in its beloved fatherland 35 years ago, and in which I had the honor to participate in execution of an important mission: The consecration, after World War I, of the first three Slovak bishops, on February 13, 1921.

That day was a Slovak national holiday, a day of great joy. Among all the participants it created not only a warm atmosphere and a deep impression, but it left in their hearts a recollection that would never vanish from the memory of those present.

This recollection is to me all the more thrilling in that the Slovaks who still enjoy freedom are obliged to celebrate it in foreign countries, as escapees from their beloved fatherland. Others in Slovakia may well think of it, but this at a time when their country is suffering, under the yoke imposed by the enemy of their homeland and of Christ, by that enemy who seeks to destroy forever both the religion of Christ and their native land.

The Slovaks will be able to endure this hard trial with the traditional loyalty which is befitting to them, with that reliance on religious faith, on the Church, and on Christ, which so distinguished them. They will do it in the hopeful expectation that God in His divine mercy will put an end to their suffering on a day which, as we firmly believe, is inevitably approaching.

Such is the wish close to the heart of all those who love and admire this gifted, noble, industrious, spiritual-minded and gallant nation. Such is the wish that we all express and subscribe to, above all for the venerable Msgr. Vojtaššák, the last of the three bishops we had the pleasure to consecrate. We pray that this bishop and confessor may once more enjoy liberty; that he may return to his Episcopal mission, to the people who love and venerate him; that Slovakia may once more have her place in the community of free nations and serve God in sincere freedom.

C. CARDINAL MICARA,
Vicar General to His Holiness.

ROME, *February 2, 1956.*

Unanimity by Dissent

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 7, 1956

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the following item from the June 1, 1956, edition of Israel Speaks makes very interesting reading, particularly in the light of what is happening in the Middle East since the publication of the item:

BIG POWER POLICY: UNANIMITY BY DISSENT

(By Robert Stone)

JERUSALEM.—No peace for the Middle East. A cease-fire is more expedient and therefore highly desirable, from the political viewpoint of the Big Powers.

This decision, unanimously reached by the United Kingdom, the United States, France, and the Soviet Union, did not come suddenly. Neither did its unanimity derive from one common purpose. Quite the contrary. It was born of dissent.

The new—or, perhaps, not so new—policy resulted from a sharp conflict of views which the laborious international discussions of the last few weeks failed to resolve. Once the smoke had lifted after the Anglo-Soviet talks at London, the NATO Council sessions and behind-closed-doors palavers at the U. N., it was found that the Big Four—each for different reasons, of course—desired the continuation of the truce arrangement.

What actually happened at these talks in London, Paris, and New York, did not make the headlines. According to well-informed sources, Eden agreed, during his talks with B. and K., to put the Baghdad Pact into cold storage and halt British arms deliveries to its members in return for Russia's promise to stop shipments to Egypt and her allies. Secretary Dulles hit the ceiling when this report reached him, and brought tremendous pressure to bear on the British Government, insisting that even a temporary arms embargo to Baghdad countries was unacceptable to Washington. The outspoken British magazine, The New Statesman and Nation, commenting on this editorially, says that "the British Government, which now places Anglo-American unity above all other considerations in the Middle East, climbed down and agreed to continue arms deliveries."

The French, however, stood firm, and even after a heated private session, reiterated their intention of supporting the Russian embargo when—or, rather, if—it comes up before the Security Council.

U. N. RESOLUTION

In other words, the Big Three Western Powers were headed for a major internal clash. The issue of a Middle East arms embargo had to be shelved.

This, then, is the background of the decision that gave birth to the British resolution now before the Security Council, which requests the U. N. Secretary General to make himself available once more for the consolidation of the present Arab-Israel cease-fire agreement. The Security Council sessions on the Middle East have just begun as this is written, but it can safely be predicted that the British resolution will be passed by the permanent members of the Council after only perfunctory debates.

Any other course is unthinkable in the light of the separate motives that animate the British, American, French, and Russian Governments. These believe that by evading the inflammable Middle Eastern issues surrounding the Israel-Arab crisis they can prevent—or at least postpone—the fateful day when they will have to make a final decision on the Baghdad Pact, the Cyprian powder keg and the Algerian nightmare. Besides, Washington still hopes to sweep the Israel question under a thick and silent rug, so as to avoid disturbing the presidential election campaign.

To express it another way: The big powers believe, each from the standpoint of its own interests, that by refusing to touch the complex power aspects of the Middle Eastern crisis they can clamp down the lid over that area until East-West tensions have relaxed still further. And the only policy, or lack thereof, which can attain this end, so the big statesmen think, is to exaggerate the permanency of Mr. Hammarskjold's cease-fire success, leaving it to the Secretary General, and to him alone, to deal with the Arabs and Israel as he sees fit.

OUT OF SIGHT

Mr. Hammarskjold may some day discover that all the praise heaped upon him has buried him. Nothing, not the slightest tremor of international power politics, will be permitted to rock Dag Hammarskjold's fragile diplomatic skiff. Only this strategy will keep conflicting British, French, American, and Russian Mid-Eastern interests, even if they continue to smolder, out of sight for at least the time being.

During this period of suspension, as it were, the United States and British are expected to keep up arms shipments to the Baghdad Pact countries, the Soviet Union would supply nonmembers of that pact and France may sell Israel a few more jet planes. In this way everybody will be happy. No peace and yet no war, say the political masterminds. Politicians do not as a rule think of issues in terms of historical eras; their time calculation rarely goes beyond the conjectural length of their tenure of office.

Yet the whole thesis of a peaceless Middle East and a continuous arms race kept from exloding by the prestige of the United Nations is foredoomed to failure. For Premier Nasser is developing a great talent for the powerpolitical game. As a matter of fact, he believes, and perhaps he is right, that he can play it with the Big Four. He has already circumvented the United Nations by dealing Communist China into the game. An Egyptian military mission is now on its way to Peking. Al Kahira, Cairo's powerful daily, exultantly greeted Nasser's "masterstrike." "What about Chin, you (Western) idiots," it wrote, "which through your ignorance is not even a member of the U. N.? * * * As though Russia were the only place in the world to obtain arms apart from the Western capitals!"

NASSER'S AMBITIONS

No matter what the United Nations decides regarding the arms race in the Middle East, and even if Russia should agree to cancel the balance of the arms deliveries from Czechoslovakia to Egypt and other Arab countries (which she will not do), the Cairo bloc of Arab nations can laugh off any embargo threats from the U. N. They could,

conceivably, vote for it and rely on supplies from Peking.

Nasser's Pan-Arabian ambition is more than a dream. Its tentacles reach into French North Africa, the Sudan and the entire southern tier of the Middle East. Egypt can no longer be contained as a small and separate local entity of the Middle Eastern map.

Since the Hammarskjold mission, the Prague-Cairo "commercial arms deal" has been transformed into a Cairo-Peking-Moscow political axis. The Arab armies will receive their marching orders whenever they are ready to strike. If they have not moved as yet, it is not because of the 22 additional U. N. truce observers on the Gaza strip. The manpower needed for the avalanche of MIG-15 fighters, IL-28 twin jet bombers, heavy tanks, submarines and torpedo boats that have already been unloaded at Alexandria and Port Said—this manpower is not yet sufficiently trained.

There was a time, not so long ago, when Washington and London could prevent the Middle East from sitting down at the Big Power card table. But that does not apply any more.

Today only a strong Israel can check Col. Nasser's expansionist plans. Washington and London know it, but, for a variety of reasons, refuse to draw the inescapable conclusions.

Is the State Department hoping for a sudden reversal of Egypt's foreign policy? Does it still believe that Premier Nasser is really only bluffing? How many political poker hands must one win to be taken seriously at the Big Power table? Passing has never won the jackpot in any game.

2014739—A License Number With Meaning

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BARRATT O'HARA
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, July 7, 1956

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I am extending my remarks to include the following article from the Chicago Sun-Times:

TO UREY, 2014739 HAS MEANING FOR WORLD'S FUTURE

It is, appropriately, the atomic weight of heavy hydrogen and the symbol of the hydrogen age.

On a scientific whim this year, Dr. Urey requested the unusual number for his license plates.

The scientist's office in the Institute for Nuclear Studies, 5640 South Ellis, is directly across the street from the stadium and his car frequently is parked near the plaque that reads:

"On December 2, 1942, Man Achieved Here the First Self-Sustaining Chain Reaction and Thereby Initiated the Controlled Release of Nuclear Energy."

Urey's discovery of heavy hydrogen has already made possible the hydrogen bomb. And if the right combination is ever found, the release of its energy could turn the water of the oceans into a fuel that would have 30 times the energy of an equal volume of gasoline. Other possibilities in the use of heavy hydrogen have scarcely been glimpsed.

Urey began his work with heavy hydrogen in the early 1930's, and won the Nobel prize for his discovery in 1934.

Heavy hydrogen, he demonstrated, has an atomic weight of 2.015, or 2.014739 if it is carried out for additional decimal places. The atomic weight of ordinary hydrogen is 1.008, and of hydrogen-3 or tritium, 3.012.

Thus two atoms of heavy hydrogen, or deuterium as it is also called, weigh 4.030.

But one atom of ordinary hydrogen and one of tritium weigh only 4.020.

4.030 and 4.020.

In these 10 points of difference lie the energy that may determine the course, if not the fate, of this world. It is the release of this energy that in one way or another has produced the bomb and that may in the future create unlimited new sources of power.

The plaque and the license number may influence the future of the earth.

The President's Health

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 5, 1956

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the following two items from the New Republic of July 2, 1956, make interesting reading:

WHILE WE WAIT

If Franklin D. Roosevelt had suffered a coronary thrombosis in the fall of 1943; if, within 9 months, he had had to undergo intestinal surgery for a serious ailment which often recurs after surgery; and if the country had not been at war, would the American voter have decided that the President's best interests and those of the country required his retirement at the end of his third term? That, Mr. Roosevelt would have said, is an "iffy" question.

It is not an "iffy" question now. At this writing President Eisenhower will remain in the hospital a week longer than first predicted. He will not be back on the golf course in the near future. He will not be back at work in the White House for at least the next several weeks. Meanwhile, we wait in suspense for the patient's answer to the question: Do you feel well enough to undertake the burdens of the Presidency for another 4 years?

Ordinarily, one does not accept a patient's opinion about his own future capabilities as final. But Eisenhower is not ordinary. His hold on the sympathy and respect of the American public is so great that many otherwise rational people say frankly: the President is an honest and patriotic man; if he says that he can, he can.

And, if we turn from the somewhat limited opinion of the patient to the more detached and informed opinion of the physician, what do we find? Some have cautiously observed that all may not be as rosy as Press Secretary Hagerty would like us to believe. But others have made astonishingly confident claims which commonsense must reject. On whose judgment can we rely?

Who shall decide, when doctors disagree,
And soundest casuists doubt, like you and me?

(Pope, Moral Essays, Epistle III)

THE PRESIDENT'S HEALTH

We can't remember a time when Washington was so completely flooded with cynical jokes as it is now over Eisenhower's health and the GOP's dilemma. Stories have these main points, all brutal—the assumption that the President has no will of his own but is just putty in the hands of Leonard Hall; Hagerty's buildup of the theory that the President is carrying on his duties as usual; the motives of the White House doctors (who previously enthusiastically cleared Ike's health after a head-to-toe examination—that didn't find, or concealed, ileitis) who now say his life expectancy is "increased" at 65, after a heart attack and major surgery. The sad thing is that nearly everybody who laughs likes Eisenhower personally. The jokes aren't really funny; they are inherently degrading. But they seem to fit the time and are universal. They are the escape mechanism for people who can't do much else about the refusal of the communications media and the Nation to face facts. All right, here is one, to give the merry mood of Washington at the end of June, in the year 1956: Ike and Dick are standing at the traditional spot on Inaugural Day, half way down the Capitol stairs. They have just taken the oaths; everything is fixed now; the election is riveted down. NIXON turns to Ike and says boyishly, "Race you up the steps." * * * Funny, eh?

Civil Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 8, 1956

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the following item from the New Republic of February 27, 1956, is important reading at that time when the House Government Operations Committee is considering its report on civil-defense legislation:

IF THE ENEMY DID ATTACK

(By Haldore Hanson)

In the first full investigation of the Nation's civil defenses in 6 years, leading scientists have recently come before Congress to spread on the public record some jolting facts about expectable American casualties from a general enemy attack under the present state of civil defense (more than 60 million killed and wounded).

But so great is the public apathy and so cynical are press correspondents on the subject of civil defense that only flippant feature stories about the hearings have appeared in most newspapers. Apathy grows partly from relaxation in the cold war, partly from a mistaken belief that the Air Force and the distant early warning system have our national defenses under control, or soon will.

It isn't so, these leading scientists warned Congress. They made severe charges against the Federal Civil Defense Administration and its administrator, Republican ex-Governor Val Peterson of Nebraska. They suggested constructive remedies. One witness estimated that an adequate civil defense program could be had for a Federal cost of $4 to $7 billion spread over a 10-year period, plus an equal amount in tax incentives for private construction. This year's appropriation is only $69 million.

The House Committee on Government Operations called as witnesses Dr. James Killian, president of Massachusetts Institute of Technology; Dr. Willard Libby, member of the Atomic Energy Commission; Dr. Lloyd Berkner, head of Associated Universites, Inc.; Dr. A. G. Hill, Director of the Weapons Evaluations Group of the Joint Chiefs of Staff; and Dr. Merle Tuve, pioneer nuclear psysicist connected with the Carngegie Institution. Few experts are so well informed. In quality of talent the hearings resembled a televison spectacular.

Severest criticism of United States civil defense was advanced by Dr. Tuve, who testi-

fied as chairman of the Advisory Committee on Civil Defense, National Academy of Sciences. In that capacity Dr. Tuve has access to all plans of the Civil Defense Administration and to related information in the Air Force and Atomic Energy Commission. Both he and his assistant, Mr. Willard Bascom, were subpenaed by Congress to divulge for the first time the findings of their 2-year study of civil defense.

When comments of all these scientists are combined into one indictment, the following are the major charges:

Count 1: The United States today has no national warning system to announce an enemy attack Siren and horn warnings of local communities will reach only 15 to 25 percent of the population. We are spending billions on our distant warning system, which will transmit a signal to the Air Force, but to relay this warning to the poor taxpayer, who paid for it, all civil defense organizations put together are spending only $16 million.

Count 2: We have known publicly since March 1954, the enormous civilian casualties which radioactive fallout following an atomic explosion could cause, but our civil defense authorities have not distributed instruments for measuring fallout, and no such instruments are now available in most American communities. There is no plan for the rapid measuring of the intensity of fallout after an attack, and without this information there can be no adequate disaster plan. Nor is there any plan for postattack communications to serve the time when most existing communication systems would be knocked out.

Count 3: Recent civil defense evacuation exercises in large cities on the east and west coasts were based on the assumption that the enemy will strike with manned aircraft, and will drop only single bombs in the center of target cities which have had 1 to 3 hours warning. This assumption is obsolete, since the Russians already have submarines capable of launching nuclear projectiles, with no warning, into any city within 300 miles of our coasts. And the intercontinental ballistic missile, which is considered to be only a few years away, could strike with not more than 10 to 20 minutes warning. Our civil defense plans should therefore be based on shelters which could be reached in a few moments.

Count 4: The Federal law on civil defense, delegating most responsibilities to the States, is also obsolete. A single bomb will spread havoc over many States, perhaps a score. But the Federal Civil Defense Administrator has at no time suggested a change in the law to permit more centralized disaster operations. This is the basic flaw.

Count 5: The present administrators of civil defense have failed to contract for realistic technical studies which would serve as the basis for civil defense policy. FCDA needs studies on warning systems, bomb shelters, fallout surveys, among others. The Army, Navy, and Air Force all use outside contractors to conduct such research.

Count 6: Val Peterson, present Administrator, is a devoted public servant and a personally likeable man, but he and his top lieutenants seem to have no conception of what should constitute an acceptable performance by their organization. (A Republican member of the congressional committee defended Mr. Peterson, pointing out it was Congress which had cut the civil-defense appropriation every year. But Dr. Tuve replied, "I am convinced they would have had a much larger fraction of these requests appropriated if technical studies had been adequately carried out.")

Count 7: In sum, civil defense is our only defense activity based on the proposition that war is not coming. Even Washington, D. C., concededly one of the principal enemy targets, spends on civil defense only one-sixth as much as it does on its zoo.

This is the indictment. But the testimony was not wholly negative. Each witness suggested some remedies, in the testimony which filled more than 1,000 pages in the first 2 weeks and is expected to continue for a month or more.

Here are some of the premises on which the expert witnesses told Congress we should act in building an adequate civil-defense plan.

We will live with the threat of nuclear war for at least 100 years, perhaps 500 years. There is not the slightest hope that civilized nations, by common consent, will destroy their ability to carry out nuclear war.

If nuclear attack comes by manned aircraft, our Air Force expects to destroy no more than half of a massive enemy assault wave, despite all radar lines, fighter aircraft, Nike, and other missiles. If the attack is launched by submarine, there is no defense against the short-range missile. If the attack is by intercontinental missile, there is no known way to shoot the missile down after it approaches its target.

Fifty to seventy nuclear explosions would make a very large part of the United States temporarily uninhabitable.

But the scientists offered this hope. Most casualties outside the bomb crater area can be avoided, and a workable society can soon rise again, if reasonable civil defense precautions are taken. Dr. Tuve estimated 80 percent of all casualties could be avoided if the Federal Government were to present a sound technical plan to the Nation, and expend $4 billion to $7 billion of Federal funds over a 10-year period. In none of those years would the cost exceed 5 percent of our military budget.

A sound technical plan would include a national warning system which could reach the entire population in a few minutes. It would involve bomb shelters of moderate strength, mass produced, low in cost.

(Witnesses described at length a national warning system, combining outdoor devices such as sirens, horns, and explosions, and indoor devices attached to gas lines, electric lines, telephone circuits, or radios. The scientists favored a system as nearly automatic as possible, operating from a central point.)

A sound defense plan would arrange for a national survey of radioactive fallout immediately after an attack. If attack came today, this survey would be based on wind charts prepared by the Weather Bureau every 12 hours. This would give the approximate direction of fallout, but would not measure the intensity of radioactivity, nor would the survey cover the entire country, and some of the guesses would be based on wind measurements 12 hours old, hence very unreliable. Only a wide distribution of radioactive measuring devices and a system of post-attack communications can fill this gap.

The new defense plan must make cities less vulnerable to attack by bringing about new patterns of growth over the next 50 years. Streets must be wider to serve as fire breaks. New buildings would have shelters. Deep underground garages should be designed as public shelters. And new industries would be dispersed, together with the needed power facilities and roads. European nations have already put these growth patterns into use. So have some United States industries. It is the United States Government which lags.

One witness insisted the Federal Government itself has fumbled the dispersal plans. The only Government agency that has been moved out of Washington is the Civil Defense Administration (Grand Rapids, Mich.) and the highest defense authorities of the Nation recently approved the construction of half a billion dollars worth of new buildings in the general vicinity of the White House and the Pentagon in Washington.

Dr. Tuve urged two steps to start the wheels rolling on a new defense program. First, the President should appoint a commission to formulate a new division of responsibility between Federal and State governments, assigning to national authorities a great part in dealing with the nationwide aspects of disaster. Second, the President should instruct the Civil Defense Administrator to place contracts immediately with suitable private research organizations for studies on the technical factors in civil defense. These studies, Dr. Tuve estimated, would cost no more than $4 million, and the money is already available.

A new defense plan, based on sound technical studies, Dr. Tuve concluded, could save up to 60 million casualties, and "convert an otherwise obliterating catastrophe into a situation in which there remains an intact, workable, and purposeful society."

Some people, he observed, say if nuclear war comes, they want to die in the first assault. "There is not the slightest doubt in my mind that I want to be one of the survivors. Our being prepared for survival * * * may well be the final deterrent to any war."

Brooklyn College

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 8, 1956

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, all New Yorkers have a right to be very proud of their colleges, and particularly Brooklyn College which is located in my congressional district.

I am pleased to call the attention of our colleagues to the following item which appeared in the National Review of May 2, 1956:

FROM THE ACADEMY

(By Russell Kirk)

QUANTITY WITH QUALITY

Brooklyn College is one of the largest, and one of the best, among American educational institutions. With some 25,000 students (counting the night school), four-fifths of whom are first-generation Americans, and a great many of whom work to keep body and soul together, this college (a part of the City College of New York) has a truly impressive record of intellectual attainment. Eighty percent of its graduates recommended for admission to medical schools succeed in entering, a remarkable proportion; Brooklyn ranks 12th in 1 list of the Natiton's 50 leading educational institutions; the average entering student ranks far above the average American college student in intellectual ability; and Brooklyn's graduates win a great many graduate fellowships. All this is achieved despite a limited budget and the lowest costs, to the student, in New York City.

The lively history of Brooklyn's 25 years, written by Dean T. E. Coulton, was published late last year by Harper: A City College in Action. I have myself written the history of a university, and know this to be no easy undertaking; but Dean Coulton has succeeded in turning out a vigorous and sometimes witty book, valuable to anyone who needs to understand the problems of educational administration in this winter of our discontent. For the most part, A City College in Action has to do with the administration of President Harry D. Gideonse, a man of mark.

Dr. Gideonse, a distinguished social scientist, came to Brooklyn from the University of Chicago in 1939. His courage and ingenuity have done much to elevate the whole tone of learning at Brooklyn and to bring peace and order to a campus often

seriously menaced by Demon Ideology. By and large, American college presidents are not an outspoken breed; but President Gideonse has been fearless in speech and action. Never giving ground before the impudence of politicians or the malign intrigues of Communists, he has won through to conspicuous success. No college president's reputation stands higher; and, far from being an artful dodger, Dr. Gideonse always has been contemptuous of equivocation. He has not hesitated to take up unpopular causes; he contended against the Communists when they were at the height of their influence in New York, and exposed the shallowness of Nehru's policies in India when Nehru was a little tin god, and had some good words to say for European colonies when anticolonialism was all the rage, and spoke out against fanaticism in Israel although—or perhaps because 85 percent of his students were Jewish. Most arduous of all, his educational end was the establishment of a sound liberal-arts education in a time given over to vocationalism; and in this, too, he won. He has succeeded in giving primacy to the ancient intellectual and moral disciplines of humanitas among a polyglot student body and within the least tradition-governed of all cities.

For an apprehension of the complexity of the problem of academic freedom—a subject commonly treated as if it were a simple absolute—one could hardly do better than to read Dr. Coulton's chapters on "Stalinism" and on "Everybody's Business." President Gideonse has been one of the most vigorous of college presidents in freeing faculty and students from the bullying of leftist cliques; it is heartening and amusing to review his rebuffs of the inquisitorial American Civil Liberties Union, New York Civil Liberties Union, Americans for Democratic Action, and Students for Democratic Action. At the same time, he has successfully defended his faculty against vague charges of subversive activity, and has dealt the radical right as hard blows as he has dealt the radical left. Only his mordant sense of humor, I think, could have sustained him through all the petty tribulations and backbitings of the forties. All the plagues which afflict college presidents were visited upon him: the scurrilous student newspaper dominated by Communists, the hubris of city politicians, the threat of rackets in athletics, ideological and popular pressures of every description.

Higer education, President Gideonse knows, is an aristocratic undertaking in our mass-age. He believes that an end of a good college is the pursuit of "individuality in the achievement of diversity and excellence"; and he has endeavored always to "overcome the equalitarian and conformist tendences of a democratic framework." He is not of the number of those who would have learning sacrificed to doctrinaire equalitarianism; and he does not talk the empty language of abstract rights without concrete duties. In his foreword to A City College in Action, Dr. Gideonse describes the success of Brooklyn in reconciling student participation in the academic community with the claims of order and moderation; voluntary programs conducted by both faculty and students have replaced demogoguery and indifference, in considerable part:

"Democracy in student activity once meant hectic participation once a year in an empty battle of slogans and leaflets. Today no one is accorded the right to share in the government of student life unless there is a record of participation in the student community itself. The exaltation of rights and the minimizing of responsibilities, which together have undermined the vitality of our student society as well as of the larger community of which it is a part, have now encountered a new insistence in our student constitution that rights are priviliges which must be earned in the shared discharge of common responsibilities."

I think that I discern in President Gideonse's firm and moderate policies of administration some influence of his youth in the Netherlands: the principles of just and balanced authority, of family rights and duties, of religious understanding, of prudent polity, which have marked Dutch character and society. It is fitting that a native of Rotterdam should preside over a great college in a city founded by men of his breed, and should reconcile the claims of tradition with the necessities of megalopolis.

A Real Ambassador of Good Will

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 5, 1956

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the following item from the July 2, 1956, issue of the New Republic again demonstrates how our State Department is continually missing the boat:

TRUMAN IN ENGLAND

The Eisenhower team is still suspicious of Truman. An amusing example of this just occurred. The administration thinks Truman is the kind of a bounder who would use the occasion of a speech in London to attack his own country's foreign policy. The British like Truman; they had wanted to give him a mass rally in London last week, with Churchill presiding. But hints came to the Foreign Office from Washington that this wouldn't do. As the London Sunday Times put the views, as they were passed on to Whitehall, Truman's "remarks might well inflame political passions in his own country."

Well, Truman spoke—and what did he say? He made a powerful speech urging Britain and America to keep their guard up. And he said some courteous things about Ike's recovery.

Eisenhower will never understand Truman. They are different types. Truman couldn't have remained silent about McCarthyism; he couldn't have omitted a tribute to an old friend like Gen. George Marshall, as Ike did in Wisconsin; he couldn't have refrained from endorsing Senator ALEXANDER WILEY in 1956 if political conditions were reversed and his chief Senate foreign-affairs supporter were endangered in a primary. Truman is closer to the earth.

PRICE OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

The Public Printer is authorized to furnish to subscribers the daily RECORD at $1.50 per month, payable in advance.

Remit by money order payable to Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C.

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is located in Statuary Hall, House wing, where Mr. Frank Brodie is in attendance during the sessions of Congress to receive orders for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month, and where single copies may also be purchased. Orders are also accepted for the printing of speeches in pamphlet form.

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

SENATORS WITH RESIDENCES IN WASHINGTON

OFFICE ADDRESS: Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

[Streets northwest unless otherwise stated]

Vice President, Richard Nixon

Aiken, George D., *Vt*.....Carroll Arms.
Allott, Gordon, *Colo*.....
Anderson, Clinton P., *N. Mex.*—6 Wesley Circle.
Barrett, Frank A., *Wyo*.....The Woodner.
Beall, J. Glenn, *Md*.....
Bender, George H., *Ohio*.....120 Schotts Court NE.
Bennett, Wallace F., *Utah*.....
Bible, Alan, *Nev*.....
Bricker, John W., *Ohio*.....The Mayflower.
Bridges, Styles, *N. H*.....
Bush, Prescott, *Conn*.....
Butler, John Marshall, *Md*.....
Byrd, Harry Flood, *Va*.....The Shoreham.
Capehart, Homer E., *Ind*.....The Westchester.
Carlson, Frank, *Kans*.....Sheraton-Park
Case, Clifford P., *N. J*.....
Case, Francis, *S. Dak*.....4635 Mass. Ave.
Chavez, Dennis, *N. Mex*.....3327 Cleveland Ave.
Clements, Earle C., *Ky*.....The Congressional
Cotton, Norris, *N. H*.....
Curtis, Carl T., *Nebr*.....
Daniel, Price, *Tex*.....
Dirksen, Everett M., *Ill*.....
Douglas, Paul H., *Ill*.....
Duff, James H., *Pa*.....
Dworshak, Henry C., *Idaho*.....
Eastland, James O., *Miss*.....5101 Macomb St.
Ellender, Allen J., *La*.....
Ervin, Samuel J., Jr., *N. C*.....
Flanders, Ralph E., *Vt*.....
Frear, J. Allen, Jr., *Del*.....
Fulbright, J. William, *Ark*.....
George, Walter F., *Ga*.....The Mayflower.
Goldwater, Barry M., *Ariz*.....
Gore, Albert, *Tenn*.....
Green, Theodore Francis, *R. I.*—University Club.
Hayden, Carl, *Ariz*.....
Hennings, Thomas C., Jr., *Mo.*
Hickenlooper, Bourke B., *Iowa.*—5511 Cedar Parkway, Chevy Chase, Md.
Hill, Lister, *Ala*.....
Holland, Spessard L., *Fla*.....Sheraton-Park
Hruska, Roman L., *Nebr*.....
Humphrey, Hubert H., *Minn.*
Humphreys, Robert, *Ky*.....
Ives, Irving M., *N. Y*.....
Jackson, Henry M., *Wash*.....
Jenner, William E., *Ind*.....
Johnson, Lyndon B., *Tex*.....
Johnston, Olin D., *S. C*.....
Kefauver, Estes, *Tenn*.....4848 Upton St.
Kennedy, John F., *Mass*.....
Kerr, Robert S., *Okla*.....
Knowland, William F., *Calif.*
Kuchel, Thomas H., *Calif*.....
Laird, William R. III, *W. Va*.....
Langer, William, *N. Dak*.....2101 Conn. Ave.
Lehman, Herbert H., *N. Y*.....Sheraton-Park
Long, Russell B., *La*.....
McCarthy, Joseph R., *Wis*.....
McClellan, John L., *Ark*.....
McNamara, Pat, *Mich*.....
Magnuson, Warren G., *Wash.*—The Shoreham.
Malone, George W., *Nev*.....The Mayflower.
Mansfield, Mike, *Mont*.....
Martin, Edward, *Pa*.....
Martin, Thos. E., *Iowa*.....4545 Conn. Ave.
Millikin, Eugene D., *Colo*.....
Monroney, A. S. Mike, *Okla.*
Morse, Wayne, *Oreg*.....5020 Lowell St.
Mundt, Karl E., *S. Dak*.....122 Schotts Court NE.
Murray, James E., *Mont*.....The Shoreham.
Neely, Matthew M., *W. Va*.....
Neuberger, Richard L., *Oreg.*
O'Mahoney, Joseph C., *Wyo.*—Sheraton-Park
Pastore, John O., *R. I*.....
Payne, Frederick G., *Maine*.....
Potter, Charles E., *Mich*.....
Purtell, William A., *Conn*.....
Robertson, A. Willis, *Va*.....
Russell, Richard B., *Ga*.....
Saltonstall, Leverett, *Mass*.—2320 Tracy Pl.
Schoeppel, Andrew F., *Kans.*
Scott, W. Kerr, *N. C*.....
Smathers, George A., *Fla*.....
Smith, H. Alexander, *N. J*.....Sheraton-Park
Smith, Margaret Chase, (Mrs.), *Maine.*
Sparkman, John J., *Ala*.....4928 Indian Lane
Stennis, John, *Miss*.....
Symington, Stuart, *Mo*.....
Thye, Edward J., *Minn*.....
Watkins, Arthur V., *Utah*.....
Welker, Herman, *Idaho*.....4823 Tilden St.
Wiley, Alexander, *Wis*.....2122 Mass. Ave.
Williams, John J., *Del*.....
Wofford, Thomas A., *S. C*.....
Young, Milton R., *N. Dak*.—Quebec House So.

OFFICERS OF THE SENATE

Secretary—Felton M. Johnston.
Chief Clerk—Emery L. Frazier.
Sergeant at Arms—Joseph C. Duke.
Secretary for the Majority—Robert G. Baker.
Secretary for the Minority—J. Mark Trice.
Chaplain—Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D.

STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE SENATE

Committee on Agriculture and Forestry

Messrs. Ellender (chairman), Johnston of South Carolina, Holland, Eastland, Clements, Humphrey, Scott, Symington, Aiken, Young, Thye, Hickenlooper, Mundt, Williams, and Schoeppel.

Committee on Appropriations

Messrs. Hayden (chairman), Russell, Chavez, Ellender, Hill, McClellan, Robertson, Magnuson, Holland, Stennis, Clements, Johnson of Texas, Bridges, Saltonstall, Young, Knowland, Thye, McCarthy, Mundt, Mrs. Smith of Maine, Messrs. Dworshak, Dirksen, and Potter.

Committee on Armed Services

Messrs. Russell (chairman), Byrd, Johnson of Texas, Kefauver, Stennis, Symington, Jackson, Ervin, Saltonstall, Bridges, Flanders, Mrs. Smith of Maine, Messrs. Case of South Dakota, Duff, and Welker.

Committee on Banking and Currency

Messrs. Fulbright (chairman), Robertson, Sparkman, Frear, Douglas, Lehman, Monroney, Morse, Capehart, Bricker, Ives, Bennett, Bush, Beall, and Payne.

Committee on the District of Columbia

Messrs. Neely (chairman), Bible, McNamara, Morse, Frear, Beall, Hruska, Case of New Jersey, and Allott.

Committee on Finance

Messrs. Byrd (chairman), George, Kerr, Frear, Long, Smathers, Anderson, Douglas, Millikin, Martin of Pennsylvania, Williams, Flanders, Malone, Carlson, and Bennett.

Committee on Foreign Relations

Messrs. George (chairman), Green, Fulbright, Sparkman, Humphrey, Mansfield, Morse, Long, Wiley, Smith of New Jersey, Hickenlooper, Langer, Knowland, Aiken, and Capehart.

Committee on Government Operations

Messrs. McClellan (chairman), Jackson, Kennedy, Symington, Ervin, Humphrey, Wofford, McCarthy, Mundt, Mrs. Smith of Maine, Messrs. Cotton, Bender, and Martin of Iowa.

Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs

Messrs. Murray (chairman), Anderson, Jackson, O'Mahoney, Bible, Neuberger, Laird, Scott, Millikin, Malone, Watkins, Dworshak, Kuchel, Barrett, and Goldwater.

Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce

Messrs. Magnuson (chairman), Pastore, Monroney, Smathers, Daniel, Ervin, Bible, Wofford, Bricker, Schoeppel, Butler, Potter, Duff, Purtell, and Payne.

Committee on the Judiciary

Messrs. Eastland (chairman), Kefauver, Johnston of South Carolina, Hennings, McClellan, Daniel, O'Mahoney, Neely, Wiley, Langer, Jenner, Watkins, Dirksen, Welker, and Butler.

Committee on Labor and Public Welfare

Messrs. Hill (chairman), Murray, Neely, Lehman, Kennedy, McNamara, ———, Smith of New Jersey, Ives, Purtell, Goldwater, Bender, and Allott.

Committee on Post Office and Civil Service

Messrs. Johnston of South Carolina (chairman), Pastore, Monroney, Hennings, Scott, Neuberger, Laird, Carlson, Jenner, Langer, Curtis, Martin of Iowa, and Case of New Jersey.

Committee on Public Works

Messrs. Chavez (chairman), Kerr, Gore, McNamara, Neuberger, Wofford, ———, Martin of Pennsylvania, Case of South Dakota, Bush, Kuchel, Cotton, and Hruska.

Committee on Rules and Administration

Messrs. Green (chairman), Hayden, Hennings, Gore, Mansfield, Jenner, Barrett, McCarthy, and Curtis.

UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT

Mr. Chief Justice Warren, of California, Hotel Sheraton-Park, Washington, D. C.
Mr. Justice Black, of Alabama, 619 S. Lee St., Alexandria, Va.
Mr. Justice Reed, of Kentucky, the Mayflower.
Mr. Justice Frankfurter, of Massachusetts, 3018 Dumbarton Ave.
Mr. Justice Douglas, of Washington, 3701 Connecticut Ave.
Mr. Justice Burton, of Ohio, the Dodge.
Mr. Justice Clark, of Texas, 2101 Connecticut Ave.
Mr. Justice Minton, of Indiana, the Methodist Building.
Mr. Justice Harlan, of New York, 1677 31st St.

OFFICERS OF THE SUPREME COURT

Clerk—Harold B. Willey, 3214 N. Wakefield St., Arlington, Va.
Deputy Clerk—Reginald C. Dilli, 1329 Hemlock St.
Deputy Clerk—Hugh W. Barr, 4701 Connecticut Ave.
Marshal—T. Perry Lippitt, 6004 Corbin Road.
Reporter—Walter Wyatt, 1702 Kalmia Rd.
Librarian—Helen Newman, 126 3d St. SE.

UNITED STATES JUDICIAL CIRCUITS

JUSTICES ASSIGNED — TERRITORY EMBRACED

District of Columbia: Mr. Chief Justice Warren. District of Columbia.

First judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Frankfurter. Maine, New Hampshire, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Puerto Rico.

Second judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Harlan. Vermont, Connecticut, New York.

Third judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Burton, Pennsylvania, New Jersey, Delaware, Virgin Islands.

Fourth judicial circuit: Mr. Chief Justice Warren. Maryland, Virginia, West Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina.

Fifth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Black. Georgia, Florida, Alabama, Mississippi, Louisiana, Texas, Canal Zone.

Sixth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Reed. Ohio, Michigan, Kentucky, Tennessee.

Seventh judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Minton. Indiana, Illinois, Wisconsin.

Eighth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Clark. Minnesota, North Dakota, South Dakota, Iowa, Nebraska, Missouri, Arkansas.

Ninth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Douglas. Washington, Oregon, Montana, Idaho, California, Nevada, Arizona, Alaska, Hawaii.

Tenth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Clark. Colorado, Wyoming, Utah, Kansas, Oklahoma, New Mexico.

REPRESENTATIVES WITH RESIDENCES IN WASHINGTON

OFFICE ADDRESS: House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

[Streets northwest unless otherwise stated]

Speaker, Sam Rayburn

Abbitt, Watkins M., *Va*
Abernethy, Thos. G., *Miss*—6278 29th St.
Adair, E. Ross, *Ind*—4200 Cathedral Ave.
Addonizio, Hugh J., *N. J*
Albert, Carl, *Okla*
Alexander, Hugh Q., *N. C*
Alger, Bruce, *Tex*
Allen, John J., Jr., *Calif*
Allen, Leo E., *Ill*—University Club
Andersen, H. Carl, *Minn*—4545 Conn. Ave.
Andresen, August H., *Minn*
Andrews, George W., *Ala*—3108 Cathedral Ave.
Anfuso, Victor L., *N. Y*
Arends, Leslie C., *Ill*—4815 Dexter St.
Ashley, Thomas L., *Ohio*
Ashmore, Robert T., *S. C*
Aspinall, Wayne N., *Colo*—Arlington Towers, Arlington, Va.
Auchincloss, James C., *N. J*—113 S. Lee St., Alexandria, Va.
Avery, William H., *Kans*
Ayres, William H., *Ohio*

Bailey, Cleveland M., *W. Va*
Baker, Howard H., *Tenn*
Baldwin, John F., Jr., *Calif*
Barden, Graham A., *N. C*—2601 Woodley Pl.
Barrett, William A., *Pa*
Bass, Perkins, *N. H*
Bass, Ross, *Tenn*
Bates, William H., *Mass*
Baumhart, A. D., Jr., *Ohio*
Beamer, John V., *Ind*—110 Maryland Ave. NE.
Becker, Frank J., *N. Y*
Belcher, Page, *Okla*
Bell, John J., *Tex*
Bennett, Charles E., *Fla*—1530 38th St. SE.
Bennett, John B., *Mich*—5804 Bradley Blvd., Bethesda, Md.
Bentley, Alvin M., *Mich*
Berry, E. Y., *S. Dak*—2720 Terrace Road SE.
Betts, Jackson E., *Ohio*
Blatnik, John A., *Minn*
Blitch, Iris Faircloth, *Ga*
Boggs, Hale, *La*
Boland, Edward P., *Mass*
Bolling, Richard, *Mo*—3409 Lowell St.
Bolton, Frances P., *Ohio*—2301 Wyo. Ave.
Bolton, Oliver P., *Ohio*
Bonner, Herbert C., *N. C*—The Dorchester
Bosch, Albert H., *N. Y*
Bow, Frank T., *Ohio*—4301 Mass. Ave.
Bowler, James B., *Ill*
Boykin, Frank W., *Ala*—The Washington
Boyle, Charles A., *Ill*
Bray, William G., *Ind*
Brooks, Jack B., *Tex*
Brooks, Overton, *La*—4413 46th St.
Brown, Clarence J., *Ohio*—Alban Towers
Brown, Paul, *Ga*—Boston House
Brownson, Charles B., *Ind*
Broyhill, Joel T., *Va*
Buckley, Charles A., *N. Y*
Budge, Hamer H., *Idaho*
Burdick, Usher L., *N. Dak*
Burleson, Omar, *Tex*—2737 Devonshire Pl.
Burnside, M. G., *W. Va*
Bush, Alvin R., *Pa*
Byrd, Robert C., *W. Va*
Byrne, James A., *Pa*
Byrnes, John W., *Wis*—1215 25th St. So., Arlington, Va.

Canfield, Gordon, *N. J*
Cannon, Clarence, *Mo*
Carlyle, F. Ertel, *N. C*—The Washington
Carnahan, A. S. J., *Mo*
Carrigg, Joseph L., *Pa*
Cederberg, Elford A., *Mich*
Celler, Emanuel, *N. Y*—The Mayflower
Chase, Jackson B., *Nebr*—Sheraton-Park
Chatham, Thurmond, *N. C*
Chelf, Frank, *Ky*
Chenoweth, J. Edgar, *Colo*
Chiperfield, Robert B., *Ill*—1713 House Office Building
Christopher, George H., *Mo*
Chudoff, Earl, *Pa*
Church, Marguerite Stitt, *Ill*—2122 Mass. Ave.
Clark, Frank M., *Pa*—3735 Gunston Rd., Alexandria, Va.
Clevenger, Cliff, *Ohio*—The Jefferson
Cole, W. Sterling, *N. Y*—1610 44th St.
Colmer, William M., *Miss*
Cooley, Harold D., *N. C*—2480 16th St.
Coon, Sam, *Oreg*
Cooper, Jere, *Tenn*—The Washington
Corbett, Robert J., *Pa*
Coudert, F. R., Jr., *N. Y*
Cramer, William C., *Fla*—Hunting Towers, Alexandria, Va.
Cretella, Albert W., *Conn*
Crumpacker, Shepard J., Jr., *Ind*.
Cunningham, Paul, *Iowa*
Curtis, Laurence, *Mass*—3314 O St.
Curtis, Thomas B., *Mo*

Dague, Paul B., *Pa*
Davidson, Irwin D., *N. Y*
Davis, Clifford, *Tenn*—4611 Butterworth Pl.
Davis, Glenn R., *Wis*—2550 South Joyce, Arlington, Va.
Davis, James C., *Ga*
Dawson, William A., *Utah*
Dawson, William L., *Ill*
Deane, Charles B., *N. C*
Delaney, James J., *N. Y*
Dempsey, John J., *N. Mex*—2500 Q St.
Denton, Winfield K., *Ind*
Derounian, Steven B., *N. Y*
Devereux, James P. S., *Md*
Dies, Martin, *Tex*
Diggs, Charles C., Jr., *Mich*—2705 13th St. NE.
Dingell, John D., *Mich*
Dixon, Henry Aldous, *Utah*
Dodd, Thomas J., *Conn*
Dollinger, Isidore, *N. Y*
Dolliver, James I., *Iowa*—3752 Jocelyn St.
Dondero, George A., *Mich*—The Continental
Donohue, Harold D., *Mass*
Donovan, James G., *N. Y*
Dorn, Francis E., *N. Y*
Dorn, W. J. Bryan, *S. C*
Dowdy, John, *Tex*
Doyle, Clyde, *Calif*—3877 30th St. N., Arlington, Va.
Durham, Carl T., *N. C*—The Lee House

Eberharter, Herman P., *Pa*—3101 4th St. N., Arlington, Va.
Edmondson, Ed, *Okla*
Elliott, Carl, *Ala*
Ellsworth, Harris, *Oreg*—4301 Mass. Ave.
Engle, Clair, *Calif*—3840 Lorcom Lane Arlington, Va.
Evins, Joe L., *Tenn*—5044 Klingle St.
Fallon, George H., *Md*

Fascell, Dante B., *Fla*
Feighan, Michael A., *Ohio*
Fenton, Ivor D., *Pa*—3725 Macomb St.
Fernandez, A. M., *N. Mex*—200 C St. SE.
Fino, Paul A., *N. Y*
Fisher, O. C., *Tex*—Calvert-Woodley
Fjare, Orvin B., *Mont*
Flood, Daniel J., *Pa*—The Congressional
Flynt, John J., Jr., *Ga*
Fogarty, John E., *R. I*—3627 Chesapeake St.
Forand, Aime J., *R. I*—4108 Dresden St., Kensington, Md.
Ford, Gerald R., Jr., *Mich*—514 Crown View Dr., Alexandria, Va.
Forrester, E. L., *Ga*
Fountain, L. H., *N. C*—The Westchester
Frazier, Jas. B., Jr., *Tenn*—Fairfax Hotel
Frelinghuysen, Peter, Jr., *N. J*.—3014 N St.
Friedel, Samuel N., *Md*
Fulton, James G., *Pa*

Gamble, Ralph A., *N. Y*
Garmatz, Edward A., *Md*
Gary, J. Vaughan, *Va*
Gathings, E. C., *Ark*—6377 31st Pl.
Gavin, Leon H., *Pa*
Gentry, Brady, *Tex*
George, Myron V., *Kans*—3801 Rodman St.
Gordon, Thomas S., *Ill*
Grant, George M., *Ala*—4801 Conn. Ave.
Gray, Kenneth J., *Ill*
Green, Edith, *Oreg*
Green, William J., Jr., *Pa*
Gregory, Noble J., *Ky*—2401 Calvert St.
Griffiths, Martha W., *Mich*
Gross, H. R., *Iowa*
Gubser, Charles S., *Calif*
Gwinn, Ralph W., *N. Y*

Hagen, Harlan, *Calif*
Hale, Robert, *Maine*—2722 N St.
Haley, James A., *Fla*
Halleck, Charles A., *Ind*—4926 Upton St.
Hand, T. Millet, *N. J*
Harden, Cecil M., *Ind*—The Congressional
Hardy, Porter, Jr., *Va*
Harris, Oren, *Ark*—1627 Myrtle St.
Harrison, Burr P., *Va*—4519 So. 34th St., Arlington, Va.
Harrison, Robert D., *Nebr*
Harvey, Ralph, *Ind*—110 Maryland Ave. NE.
Hays, Brooks, *Ark*—314 2d St. SE.
Hays, Wayne L., *Ohio*—Arlington Towers, Arlington, Va.
Hayworth, Don, *Mich*
Healey, James C., *N. Y*
Hébert, F. Edward, *La*—104 Cockrell St., Alexandria, Va.
Henderson, John E., *Ohio*
Herlong, A. S., Jr., *Fla*
Heselton, John W., *Mass*
Hess, William E., *Ohio*
Hiestand, Edgar W., *Calif*
Hill, William S., *Colo*—110 Maryland Ave. NE.
Hillings, Patrick J., *Calif*
Hinshaw, Carl, *Calif*
Hoeven, Charles B., *Iowa*—100 Maryland Ave NE.
Hoffman, Clare E., *Mich*—Methodist Bldg.
Hoffman, Richard W., *Ill*
Holifield, Chet, *Calif*
Holland, Elmer J., *Pa*
Holmes, Hal, *Wash*
Holt, Joe, *Calif*
Holtzman, Lester, *N. Y*
Hope, Clifford R., *Kans*—3541 Brandywine St.
Horan, Walt, *Wash*
Hosmer, Craig, *Calif*
Huddleston, George, Jr., *Ala*.
Hull, W. R., Jr., *Mo*
Hyde, DeWitt S., *Md*

Ikard, Frank, *Tex*

Jackson, Donald L., *Calif*
James, Benjamin F., *Pa*—200 C St. SE.
Jarman, John, *Okla*
Jenkins, Thomas A., *Ohio*—The Mayflower
Jennings, W. Pat, *Va*
Jensen, Ben F., *Iowa*—2120 16th St.
Johansen, August E., *Mich*
Johnson, Leroy, *Calif*—630 North Carolina Ave. SE.
Johnson, Lester R., *Wis*—3816 Pope St. SE.
Jonas, Charles Raper, *N. C*
Jones, Paul C., *Mo*—3613 Greenway Pl., Alexandria, Va.
Jones, Robert E., Jr., *Ala*
Jones, Woodrow W., *N. C*
Judd, Walter H., *Minn*—3083 Ordway St.

Karsten, Frank M., *Mo*
Kean, Robert W., *N. J*—2435 Kalorama Road
Kearney, B. W. (Pat), *N. Y*
Kearns, Carroll D., *Pa*—Sheraton-Park
Keating, Kenneth B., *N. Y*—1612 34th St.
Kee, Elizabeth, *W. Va*
Kelley, Augustine B., *Pa*
Kelly, Edna F., *N. Y*
Keogh, Eugene J., *N. Y*—The Mayflower
Kilburn, Clarence E., *N. Y*—The Gen. Scott
Kilday, Paul J., *Tex*—3507 Albemarle St.
Kilgore, Joe M., *Tex*
King, Cecil R., *Calif*
King, Karl C., *Pa*
Kirwan, Michael J., *Ohio*
Klein, Arthur G., *N. Y*
Kluczynski, John C., *Ill*
Knox, Victor A., *Mich*
Knutson, Coya, *Minn*
Krueger, Otto, *N. Dak*—112 Schotts Court NE.

Laird, Melvin R., *Wis.*
Landrum, Phil M., *Ga.*
Lane, Thomas J., *Mass.*
Lanham, Henderson, *Ga.*
Lankford, Richard E., *Md.*
Latham, Henry J., *N. Y.*
LeCompte, Karl M., *Iowa*—Sheraton-Park
Lesinski, John, Jr., *Mich.*
Lipscomb, Glenard P., *Calif.*
Long, George S., *La.*—2136 31st St. SE.
Lovre, Harold O., *S. Dak.*—1605 Sherwood Road, Silver Spring, Md.
McCarthy, Eugene J., *Minn.*—419 Raymond St., Chevy Chase, Md.
McConnell, Samuel K., Jr., *Pa.*
McCormack, John W., *Mass.*—The Washington
McCulloch, Wm. M., *Ohio*—Westchester Apts.
McDonough, G. L., *Calif.*
McDowell, Harris B., Jr., *Del.*
McGregor, J. Harry, *Ohio*—The Westchester
McIntire, Clifford G., *Maine*—220 2d St. SE.
McMillan, John L., *S. C.*—1201 S. Barton St., Arlington, Va.
McVey, William E., *Ill.*—The Coronet
Macdonald, Torbert H., *Mass.*
Machrowicz, Thaddeus M., *Mich.*—812 Park Ave., Falls Church, Va.
Mack, Peter F., Jr., *Ill.*
Mack, Russell V., *Wash.*
Madden, Ray J., *Ind.*
Magnuson, Don, *Wash.*
Mahon, George H., *Tex.*—Alban Towers
Mailliard, William S., *Calif.*
Marshall, Fred, *Minn.*
Martin, Jos. W., Jr., *Mass.*—The Hay-Adams
Mason, Noah M., *Ill.*—The Baronet
Matthews, D. R. (Billy), *Fla.*
Meader, George, *Mich.*—3360 Tennyson St.
Merrow, Chester E., *N. H.*
Metcalf, Lee, *Mont.*
Miller, A. L., *Nebr.*—2801 East-West Highway, Chevy Chase, Md.
Miller, Edward T., *Md.*—2901 Conn. Ave.
Miller, George P., *Calif.*
Miller, William E., *N. Y.*—3708 Calvend Lane, Kensington, Md.
Mills, Wilbur D., *Ark.*—2701 Conn. Ave.
Minshall, William E., *Ohio*
Mollohan, Robert H., *W. Va.*
Morano, Albert P., *Conn.*
Morgan, Thomas E., *Pa.*
Morrison, James H., *La.*—4301 Mass. Ave.
Moss, John E., *Calif.*—204 Jefferson St., Alexandria, Va.
Moulder, Morgan M., *Mo.*
Multer, Abraham J., *N. Y.*
Mumma, Walter M., *Pa.*—The Coronet
Murray, James C., *Ill.*
Murray, Tom, *Tenn.*
Natcher, William H., *Ky.*—5108 Bradley Blvd., Bethesda, Md.
Nelson, Charles P., *Maine.*
Nicholson, D. W., *Mass.*
Norblad, Walter, *Oreg.*
Norrell, W. F., *Ark.*—2301 Conn. Ave.
O'Brien, Leo W., *N. Y.*
O'Brien, Thomas J., *Ill.*—The Hamilton
O'Hara, Barratt, *Ill.*—The Congressional
O'Hara, Joseph P., *Minn.*—2813 31st St.
O'Konski, Alvin E., *Wis.*—4000 Mass. Ave.
O'Neill, Thomas P., Jr., *Mass.*
Osmers, Frank C., Jr., *N. J.*
Ostertag, Harold C., *N. Y.*—100 Maryland Ave. NE.
Passman, Otto E., *La.*
Patman, Wright, *Tex.*—117 Carroll St. SE.
Patterson, James T., *Conn.*
Pelly, Thomas M., *Wash.*
Perkins, Carl D., *Ky.*
Pfost, Gracie, *Idaho.*
Philbin, Philip J., *Mass.*
Phillips, John, *Calif.*
Pilcher, J. L., *Ga.*
Pillion, John R., *N. Y.*
Poage, W. R., *Tex.*—2309 Skyland Pl. SE.
Poff, Richard H., *Va.*
Polk, James G., *Ohio.*
Powell, Adam C., Jr., *N. Y.*
Preston, Prince H., Jr., *Ga.*
Price, Melvin, *Ill.*
Priest, J. Percy, *Tenn.*—The Berkshire
Prouty, Winston L., *Vt.*
Quigley, James M., *Pa.*
Rabaut, Louis C., *Mich.*
Radwan, Edmund P., *N. Y.*
Rains, Albert, *Ala.*
Ray, John H., *N. Y.*
Rayburn, Sam, *Tex.*
Reece, B. Carroll, *Tenn.*
Reed, Daniel A., *N. Y.*—The Woodner
Rees, Edward H., *Kans.*—1801 16th St.
Reuss, Henry S., *Wis.*—1650 30th St.
Rhodes, George M., *Pa.*—1809 Franklin St. NE.
Rhodes, John J., *Ariz.*
Richards, James P., *S. C.*
Riehlman, R. Walter, *N. Y.*—3210 Wis. Ave.
Riley, John J., *S. C.*
Rivers, L. Mendel, *S. C.*
Roberts, Kenneth A., *Ala.*—6102 Cromwell Dr.
Robeson, Edward J., Jr., *Va.*
Robsion, John M., Jr., *Ky.*—1500 Delafield Pl.
Rodino, Peter W., Jr., *N. J.*
Rogers, Byron G., *Colo.*
Rogers, Edith Nourse, *Mass.*—The Shoreham
Rogers, Paul G., *Fla.*—Sheraton-Park
Rogers, Walter, *Tex.*
Rooney, John J., *N. Y.*
Roosevelt, James, *Calif.*
Rutherford, J. T., *Tex.*
Sadlak, Antoni N., *Conn.*
St. George, Katharine, *N. Y.*
Saylor, John P., *Pa.*
Schenck, Paul F., *Ohio.*—3801 Conn. Ave., Apt. 307
Scherer, Gordon H., *Ohio.*—The Mayflower
Schwengel, Fred, *Iowa.*
Scott, Hugh, *Pa.*
Scrivner, Errett P., *Kans.*—2331 Cathedral Ave.
Scudder, Hubert B., *Calif.*—4545 Conn. Ave.
Seely-Brown, Horace, Jr., *Conn.*
Selden, Armistead I., Jr., *Ala.*—4625 B 36th St. So., Arlington, Va.
Sheehan, Timothy P., *Ill.*
Shelley, John F., *Calif.*
Sheppard, Harry R., *Calif.*
Short, Dewey, *Mo.*
Shuford, George A., *N. C.*—Sheraton-Park
Sieminski, Alfred D., *N. J.*
Sikes, Robert L. F., *Fla.*
Siler, Eugene, *Ky.*
Simpson, Richard M., *Pa.*—5205 Lawn May, Chevy Chase, Md.
Simpson, Sid, *Ill.*—2100 Mass. Ave.
Sisk, B. F., *Calif.*
Smith, Frank E., *Miss.*
Smith, Howard W., *Va.*—204 W. Walnut St. Alexandria, Va.
Smith, Lawrence H., *Wis.*—2480 16th St.
Smith, Wint, *Kans.*
Spence, Brent, *Ky.*—Sheraton-Park
Springer, William L., *Ill.*
Staggers, Harley O., *W. Va.*
Steed, Tom, *Okla.*
Sullivan, Leonor K., *Mo.*
Taber, John, *N. Y.*
Talle, Henry O., *Iowa.*—4613 Harrison St.
Taylor, Dean P., *N. Y.*
Teague, Charles M., *Calif.*
Teague, Olin E., *Tex.*—6015 Mass. Ave.
Thomas, Albert, *Tex.*—2901 34th St.
Thompson, Clark W., *Tex.*—Sheraton-Park
Thompson, Frank, Jr., *N. J.*
Thompson, Ruth, *Mich.*
Thompson, T. A., *La.*—1600 Kenwood Av., Alexandria, Va.
Thomson, E. Keith, *Wyo.*
Thornberry, Homer, *Tex.*
Tollefson, Thor C., *Wash.*
Trimble, James W., *Ark.*
Tuck, William M., *Va.*
Tumulty, T. James, *N. J.*
Udall, Stewart L., *Ariz.*
Utt, James B., *Calif.*
Vanik, Charles A., *Ohio.*
Van Pelt, William K., *Wis.*
Van Zandt, James E., *Pa.*—Arlington Towers, Arlington, Va.
Velde, Harold H., *Ill.*
Vinson, Carl, *Ga.*—4 Primrose St., Chevy Chase, Md.
Vorys, John M., *Ohio.*—2032 Belmont Rd.
Vursell, Charles W., *Ill.*—The Congressional
Wainwright, Stuyvesant, *N. Y.*
Walter, Francis E., *Pa.*
Watts, John C., *Ky.*
Weaver, Phil, *Nebr.*—9408 Crosby Rd., Silver Spring, Md.
Westland, Jack, *Wash.*
Wharton, J. Ernest, *N. Y.*
Whitten, Jamie L., *Miss.*—5804 Nebraska Ave.
Wickersham, Victor, *Okla.*
Widnall, William B., *N. J.*
Wier, Roy W., *Minn.*
Wigglesworth, R. B., *Mass.*—3257 N. St.
Williams, Harrison A., Jr., *N. J.*
Williams, John Bell, *Miss.*—1001 26th Road S., Arlington, Va.
Williams, William R., *N. Y.*—1241 Pa. Ave. SE.
Willis, Edwin E., *La.*
Wilson, Earl, *Ind.*
Wilson, Robert C. (Bob), *Calif.*
Winstead, Arthur, *Miss.*
Withrow, Gardner R., *Wis.*
Wolcott, Jesse P., *Mich.*—3707 Thornapple St., Chevy Chase
Wolverton, Charles A., *N. J.*—1336 HOB
Wright, Jim, *Tex.*
Yates, Sidney R., *Ill.*
Young, Clifton (Cliff), *Nev.*—2705 Westminister Pl., Alexandria, Va.
Younger, J. Arthur, *Calif.*—4545 Conn. Ave.
Zablocki, Clement J., *Wis.*
Zelenko, Herbert, *N. Y.*

DELEGATES

Bartlett, E. L. (Bob), 1718 33d Pl. SE. *Alaska.*
Farrington, Mrs. Joseph R., *Hawaii.*

RESIDENT COMMISSIONER

Fernós-Isern, A., *P. R.*—2210 R St.

OFFICERS OF THE HOUSE

Clerk—Ralph R. Roberts.
Sergeant at Arms—Zeake W. Johnson, Jr.
Doorkeeper—William M. Miller, 1732 S St. SE.
Chaplain—Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., 1421 Montague St.
Postmaster—H. H. Morris.

OFFICIAL REPORTERS OF DEBATE

SENATE

James W. Murphy, 7 Primrose St., Chevy Chase, Md.
John D. Rhodes, 3535 Williamsburg Lane.
Gregor Macpherson, 3111 44th St.
Herbert N. Budlong, Kurtz Rd., McLean, Va.
J. Chester Wilfong, 4408 Fourth Road North, Arlington, Va.
Charles J. Drescher, 3738 North 4th St., Arlington, Va.
Francis J. Attig, 3919 Livingston St.
Nicholas J. Cinciotta, 400 Williamsburg Dr., Silver Spring, Md.
Elmer L. Koons (assistant), 826 Aspen St.
Willard W. Pruett (clerk), 1200 North Stuart St., Arlington, Va.
Placidino Zagami (clerk), 5805 10th Place, Chillum, Md.

HOUSE

W. L. Fenstermacher, 2929 Connecticut Ave.
Roy L. Whitman, 4820 Linnean Ave.
F. S. Milberg, 5032 Massachusetts Ave.
E. B. Clark, 604 Bennington Dr., Silver Spring, Md.
Frank E. Battaglia, 957 East-West Highway.
Claude S. Scheckel, 6 East Blackthorne St., Chevy Chase, Md.
Albert Schneider, 7516 14th St.
Paul L. Miller (clerk), Shadyside, Md.
Sidney W. Williston (assistant clerk), 1830 Longford Drive, Hyattsville, Md.
Bjarne J. Sigurdsen (assistant clerk), 1921 You Place, SE.

Daily Digest

HIGHLIGHTS

Both Houses cleared bills on mutual security, military construction, and narcotics control for President.

Senate heard memorial addresses in tribute to the late Senators Kilgore and Barkley, and passed by 53 yeas to 22 nays bill on airline capital gains.

House debated foreign aid appropriations.

Senate Finance Committee approved customs simplification bill.

Senate

Chamber Action

Routine Proceedings, pages 10930–10961

Bills Introduced: 6 bills and 4 resolutions were introduced, as follows: S. 4184–S. 4189; S. J. Res. 190; and S. Res. 307–S. Res. 309. **Pages 10933–10934**

Bills Reported: Reports were made as follows:

Four bills and 12 resolutions, as follows, were reported during adjournment on July 7 under prior authorization:

H. R. 9774, to convey certain lands of the U. S. to Volusia County, Fla. (S. Rept. 2429);

H. R. 8817, providing for conveyance of certain U. S. land in city of Corbin, Ky., with amendment (S. Rept. 2430);

H. R. 10204, a private bill (S. Rept. 2431);

S. 3779, to amend act of August 27, 1954, with respect to Uintah and Ouray Reservation in Utah (S. Rept. 2432);

S. Res. 306, providing an additional $100,000 for the operation of the Subcommittee on Privileges and Elections of Committee on Rules and Administration (S. Rept. 2433);

S. Res. 285, arranging for studies to be made regarding foreign assistance by U. S. Government, with amendments (S. Rept. 2434);

S. Res. 286, providing for additional time for filing a report by Subcommittee on Disarmament of Committee on Foreign Relations (no written report);

S. Res. 293, to print additional copies of H. Doc. 210, How Our Laws Are Made (no written report);

S. Res. 294, extending time for study of the Government employees' security program (no written report);

S. Res. 297, extending time for making a report and providing additional funds for the Special Committee on the Senate Reception Room (no written report);

S. Res. 299, to print additional copies of Senate Judiciary Subcommittee hearings on juvenile delinquency in the U. S. (no written report);

H. Con. Res. 242, providing for 10,000 additional copies of the report entitled "Special Study Mission to the Middle East, South and Southeast Asia, and the Western Pacific" (no written report);

H. Con. Res. 243, authorizing the printing as a House document of the Constitution of the U. S. together with the Declaration of Independence (no written report);

H. Con. Res. 245, authorizing the printing of additional copies of H. Rept. 2189, 84th Congress, on the subject of communism (no written report);

H. Con. Res. 248, authorizing the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy to print 30,000 additional copies of the hearings of the Research and Development Subcommittee on Shortage of Scientific and Engineering Manpower (no written report); and

H. Con. Res. 251, authorizing the reprinting of H. Doc. 210, 83d Congress, How Our Laws Are Made (for use of the House) (no written report).

The following bills were reported today, July 9:

H. R. 10269, to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to place metallurgical alumina on the free list (S. Rept. 2435);

H. R. 11995, to provide that the 1955 formula for taxing income of life-insurance companies shall also apply to taxable years beginning in 1956 (S. Rept. 2436);

H. R. 6595, to amend certain provisions of law relating to the estate tax, with amendments (S. Rept. 2437);

H. R. 9083, to amend the Internal Revenue Code to extend the period for amortization of grain-storage facilities, with amendments (S. Rept. 2438);

H. Con. Res. 244, providing for a joint committee of Congress to represent Congress at unveiling of the Commodore John Barry Memorial at Wexford, Ireland, on Sept. 16, 1956 (S. Rept. 2439);

H. J. Res. 621, 626, 627, 638, 639, 637, 620; H. Con. Res. 246; H. J. Res. 617, 618, 636; S. 579, 1407, 1626, 3068, 3103, 3127, 3155, 3179, 3182, 3188, 3193, 3257, 3258, 3354, 3358, 3370, 3440, 3487, 3521, 3657, 3813, 3814, 4015, 3191, 3306, 3364, 3537, 3557, 3360, 3713; H. R. 5808; S. 3285, private bills (S. Repts. 2440–2482, respectively);

S. Res. 287, requesting that reports of results of tests of samples of opium seized in illicit traffic be communicated to Commission on Narcotic Drugs of the U. N. (S. Rept. 2483);

S. Res. 289, to commence negotiations with the Mexican Government in order to secure a more effective control over illicit narcotic drugs (S. Rept. 2483);

S. Res. 290, urging certain countries to ratify or accede to protocol of 1953 limiting cultivation of the poppy plant and use of opium, with amendment (S. Rept. 2483);

S. Res. 288, urging certain countries to proscribe heroin, with amendments (S. Rept. 2483);

H. R. 7049, to revise and codify titles 10 and 32 of U. S. Code relating to Armed Forces and National Guard, with amendments (S. Rept. 2484);

H. R. 9137, waiver of requirements of section 142, title 28, U. S. Code, for the holding of court at Bryson City, N. C. (S. Rept. 2485); and

S. Res. 309, increasing by $10,000 limit of expenditures by Committee on the Judiciary (no written report)—referred to Committee on Rules and Administration.

Pages 10929, 10932–10933

Bills Referred: Four House-passed bills were referred to appropriate committees. Pages 10930, 11020

CCC Borrowing Power: Senate disagreed to House amendment to S. 3820, to increase borrowing power of Commodity Credit Corporation, asked for conference with House, and appointed as conferees Senators Ellender, Johnston (South Carolina), Holland, Aiken, and Young. Page 10956

Late Senator Kilgore: Senate adopted S. Res. 307, providing for suspension of legislative business for delivery of memorial addresses on life, character, and public service of the late Senator Kilgore. Page 10961

Late Senator Barkley: Senate adopted S. Res. 308, providing for suspension of legislative business for delivery of memorial addresses on life, character, and public service of the late Senator and former Vice President Barkley. Page 10981

Memorial Addresses: Pursuant to the terms of S. Res. 307 and 308, numerous addresses were delivered in tribute to the memory of the late Senators Kilgore and Barkley. Pages 10961–10990

Theodore Roosevelt Centennial: Senate disagreed to House amendments to S. 3386, authorizing appropriations for Celebration of 100th Anniversary of Birth of Theodore Roosevelt, asked for a conference, and appointed Senators O'Mahoney, Daniel, and Watkins as conferees. Pages 10990–10991

Indian Claims Commission: Senate insisted on its amendments to H. R. 5566, to continue the Indian Claims Commission to April 10, 1962, agreed to conference requested by House thereon, and appointed as conferees Senators O'Mahoney, Anderson, Neuberger, Watkins, and Goldwater. Page 10991

Narcotics Control: Senate adopted conference report on H. R. 11619, Narcotics Control Act of 1956, clearing bill for the President. Page 10991

Mutual Security: Senate adopted conference report on H. R. 11356, mutual security program for fiscal year 1957, clearing bill for the President. Pages 10991–10994

Government Mail: Senate concurred in House amendment to S. 1871, to amend the act to reimburse the Post Office Department for the transmission of official Government mail matter, clearing bill for the President. Pages 10994–10995

Platte River: Letter from Secretary of Army transmitting report dated April 26, 1955, from Chief of Engineers, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on review of report on the Platte River, Colo., Wyo., and Nebr., was referred to Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed as S. Doc. 136. Page 10935

Kanawha River: Letter from Secretary of Army transmitting report dated May 17, 1956, from Chief of Engineers, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on review of report on the Kanawha River, W. Va., Va., and N. C., was referred to Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed as S. Doc. 137. Page 10935

Airline Capital Gains: By 53 yeas to 22 nays, Senate passed S. 3449, reinvestment by air carriers of proceeds from sale of operating property and equipment, after rejecting by 22 yeas to 62 nays Williams motion to recommit the bill to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. Committee amendments to the bill had been adopted on June 14, 1956, when the bill previously was under consideration. Today two amendments offered from the floor to the bill were rejected, as follows:

By 37 yeas to 46 nays, Williams amendment to prevent "windfall" benefits to any airline by subtracting amount of capital gain from amount invested in new equipment; and by 32 yeas to 43 nays, Humphrey amendment denying benefits under the bill to any airline receiving annual gross income of more than $50 million. Pages 10990, 10995–11010

Military Construction: Senate adopted conference report on and cleared for President H. R. 9893, to authorize certain construction at military installations. Pages 11010–11012, 11015

Coastwise Trade: Senate made its unfinished business S. 3877, to promote development and rehabilitation of coastwise trade and to encourage construction of new vessels. Page 11010

Armed Forces Osteopaths: Senate insisted on its amendment to H. R. 483, appointment of osteopaths in

Medical Corps of Army and Navy, asked for conference with House, and appointed as conferees Senators Russell, Stennis, Symington, Saltonstall, and Smith (Maine). Page 11015

Treaties Received: Senate received 3 treaties, as follows, which were referred to Committee on Foreign Relations:

Treaty of amity, economic relations, and consular rights with Iran, signed at Teheran on August 15, 1955 (Exec. E, 84th Cong., 2d sess.);

Treaty of friendship, commerce, and navigation between U. S. and Nicaragua with protocol relating thereto, signed at Managua January 21, 1956 (Exec. G, 84th Cong., 2d sess.); and

Treaty of friendship, commerce, and navigation between U. S. and Kingdom of Netherlands, together with protocol and exchange of notes relating thereto, signed at The Hague March 27, 1956 (Exec. H, 84th Cong., 2d sess.). Page 10933

Nominations: Three Army nominations in the rank of general were received. Page 11020

Program for Wednesday: Senate adjourned at 7:51 p. m. until noon Wednesday, July 11, when it will continue on S. 3877, coastwise trade, to be followed by S. 3410, annuities for widows and dependents of judges, ratification of International Wheat Agreement (Exec. I, 84th Cong., 2d sess.), S. 147, transmission of international agreements, S. Res. 285, foreign aid study, S. 3784 and H. J. Res. 569, commemorative medals, H. R. 10075, 10479, 9578, 11520, 9774, 8817, and 10204, land transfer bills, S. 3779, Utah Indians, S. Res. 306, additional funds for Committee on Rules, and S. Res. 286, 293, 294, 297, 299, H. Con. Res. 242, 243, 245, 248, and 251, miscellaneous printing and reporting resolutions. The bills on this list that are not considered on July 11 probably will be taken up during balance of week.

Committee Meetings

(*Committees not listed did not meet*)

APPROPRIATIONS—SUPPLEMENTAL

Committee on Appropriations: Committee continued its hearings on supplemental appropriations for fiscal year 1957, with testimony, as follows:

On judiciary items in the bill—with testimony from Harold H. Burton, Associate Justice of the Supreme Court; Henry P. Chandler, Director, and John C. Brown, Budget and Accounting Officer, both of the Administrative Office of the U. S. Courts; L. A. Ziernicki, Chief of Real Estate Division, Region 3, GSA; and T. Perry Lippitt, Marshal of the U. S. Supreme Court;

On sundry State Department items in the bill—with testimony from William C. Herrington, Special Assistant for Fisheries and Wildlife to the Under Secretary, Loy W. Henderson, Deputy Under Secretary for Administration, Robert Murphy, Deputy Under Secretary, and C. Burke Elbrick, Deputy Assistant Secretary, all of the State Department; and Fred S. Poorman, Deputy Commissioner, Public Buildings Service, GSA;

On funds for the D. C. Auditorium Commission—with testimony from Robert V. Fleming and Mrs. Eugene Meyer, both members;

On funds for USIA—with testimony from Theodore Streibert, Director, who was accompanied by his associates; and

On funds for operation and maintenance of Army and Air Force in Germany—with testimony from C. Burke Elbrick, Deputy Assistant Secretary of State for European Affairs; Maj. Gen. W. S. Lawton, Chief, Army Budget Division; Brig. Gen. C. R. Hutchison, Assistant Chief of Army Budget Division, Lyle Garlock, Assistant Secretary of the Air Force; and Maj. Gen. Robert S. Moore, Special Assistant to the Assistant Secretary of Defense, Comptroller.

Hearings continue tomorrow.

MILITARY QUARTERS ALLOWANCE

Committee on Armed Services: Subcommittee on Military Construction held hearings on H. R. 5731, to permit members of the uniformed services to occupy inadequate quarters without loss of quarters allowances, with testimony from Albert Pratt, Assistant Secretary of the Navy for Personnel and Reserve Forces, and Rear Adm. E. B. McKinney, Director of Shore Establishment Development and Maintenance Division, Navy.

CUSTOMS SIMPLIFICATION, TAXATION, AND ALUMINA

Committee on Finance: Committee, in executive session, ordered favorably reported amended H. R. 6040, to amend certain administrative provisions of the Tariff Act of 1930 and to repeal obsolete provisions of the customs laws, and without amendment H. R. 11995, to provide that the 1955 formula for taxing income of life-insurance companies shall also apply to taxable years beginning in 1956, and H. R. 10269, to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to place metallurgical alumina on the free list.

COMMITTEE BUSINESS

Committee on the Judiciary: Committee, in executive session, ordered favorably reported the following:

H. R. 7049, to revise and codify titles 10 and 32 of U. S. Code relating to Armed Forces and National Guard; H. Con. Res. 244, providing for a joint committee of Congress to represent the Congress at the unveiling of the Commodore John Barry Memorial at Wexford, Ireland, on September 16, 1956; and an original bill to amend the Trading With the Enemy Act and the War Claims Act of 1948;

The nominations of Victor R. Hansen, of California, to be Assistant Attorney General, and Scovel Richardson, of Missouri, and John E. Henry, of Montana, to be members of the Board of Parole; and

Forty-three private immigration bills (H. Con. Res. 246, H. J. Res. 617, 618, 620, 621, 626, 627, 636, 637, 638, 639, S. 579, 1407, 1626, 3068, 3103, 3127, 3155, 3179, 3182, 3188, 3191, 3193, 3257, 3258, 3285, 3306, 3354, 3358, 3364, 3370, 3440, 3487, 3521, 3537, 3557, 3657, 3660, 3713, 3813, 3814, 4015, H. R. 5808).

Committee indefinitely postponed further action on 32 private immigration bills (S. 856, 857, 2449, 2583, 2945, 3028, 3098, 3105, 3192, 3205, 3274, 3294, 3300, 3301, 3351, 3378, 3390, 3403, 3432, 3563, 3578, 3618, 3625, 3627, 3687, 3701, 3712, 3716, 3733, 3921, 3954, 4090).

Also, the chairman was authorized to request that the committee be discharged from further consideration of S. 4048, relating to intercorporate relations between General Public Utilities Corp. and the Manila Electric Co., and that the bill re-referred to Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

TRAINING OF FEDERAL EMPLOYEES

Committee on Post Office and Civil Service: Special subcommittee held and concluded hearings on S. 3287, to authorize the training of Federal employees at public or private facilities. Testimony generally favoring the purpose of the bill was heard from Philip Young, Chairman of Civil Service Commission; Percival F. Brundage, Director, Bureau of the Budget; Lewis B. Cuyler, Hoover Commission; Michael Markwood, president, National Federation of Federal Employees; Royce Givens and Lt. Francis Dunn, both of Metropolitan Police Association; and Mrs. Adria Lynham, director, Washington School for Secretaries.

CONSERVATION

Joint meeting: Committees on Public Works and Interior and Insular Affairs concluded their joint hearings on S. Res. 281, conservation and development of land and water resources, after hearing testimony from Robert E. Merriam, Assistant to the Director of the Bureau of the Budget; Fred Mynatt, Assistant General Counsel, Department of Agriculture; James C. Bradley, representing Department of Interior; and Willard W. Gatchell, General Counsel, FPC.

House of Representatives

Chamber Action

Bills Introduced: 13 public bills, H. R. 12143–12155; 10 private bills, H. R. 12156–12165; and 3 resolutions, H. J. Res. 677–679, were introduced. Pages 11064–11065

Bills Reported: Reports were filed as follows:

H. R. 6681, amending the Bankruptcy Act relative to referral of proceedings, amended (H. Rept. 2644);

Disposition of executive papers (H. Repts. 2645 and 2646); and

H. R. 8937, to fix the term of office of district judges in Alaska (H. Rept. 2647). Page 11064

Conference Reports Adopted: Adopted conference reports on the following three bills and sent them to the Senate:

Mutual security: H. R. 11356, the Mutual Security Act of 1956;

Narcotics control: H. R. 11619, the Narcotic Control Act of 1956; and

Military construction: H. R. 9893, the Military Construction Act of 1956. Pages 11021–11034

Committee To Sit: The Committee on the Judiciary was granted permission to sit during general debate on Tuesday. Page 11034

Calendar Wednesday: Pursuant to a unanimous-consent request the House dispensed with Calendar Wednesday business in order on July 11. Page 11034

Indian Claims Commission: Disagreed to Senate amendments to H. R. 5566, relative to termination of existence of the Indian Claims Commission; requested a conference with the Senate, and appointed as conferees Representatives Haley, Shuford, Edmondson, Westland, and Utt. Page 11034

D. C. Legislation: The following bills pertaining to the District of Columbia were considered and passed by the House:

D. C. highway-railroad: S. 2895, relating to payment of cost and expense of constructing railway-highway grade elimination structures in D. C. (amended and returned to Senate);

D. C. highway-railroad: S. 2704, authorizing funds for construction of certain highway-railroad grade separations in D. C. (cleared for President);

D. C. railroad spur: S. 2705, to authorize the Philadelphia, Baltimore & Washington Railroad Co. to construct a branch track or siding over Second Street SE. in D. C. (cleared for President);

D. C. security gifts: H. R. 11090, concerning gifts of securities to minors in D. C. (sent to Senate);

Inaugural policing: H. J. Res. 667, providing for maintenance of public order and protection of life and property in connection with Presidential inaugural ceremonies (sent to Senate, amended);

D. C. cemeteries: S. 2896, to amend the act relating to cemetery associations in D. C. (cleared for President);

D. C. police: H. R. 7538, to provide five longevity increases for certain members of the Metropolitan Police force (sent to Senate, amended);

Potomac River bridge: S. 2568, to amend the act authorizing construction of Potomac River bridge to be known as the Theodore Roosevelt Bridge (amended and returned to Senate);

Potomac River bridges: H. R. 10947, to provide names for highway bridges over the Potomac River at 14th Street in D. C. (sent to Senate); and

D. C. memorial stadium: H. R. 11967, relative to consideration of a site and design for a National Memorial Stadium in D. C. (sent to Senate). Pages 11035–11047

D. C. Beer Sales: The consideration of H. R. 4697, to amend the Alcoholic Beverage Control Act of the District of Columbia of 1934 relative to the sale of beer in chainstores was prevented by the point of order that the bill was ordered reported by the committee when the House was in session and the committee had not obtained permission to sit during the session of the House. Pages 11047–11048

Mutual Security Appropriations: Adopted H. Res. 583, providing for the consideration of, the waiving of points of order against, and 4 hours of debate on H. R. 12130, making appropriations for mutual security for fiscal year 1957. After nearly 1 hour of debate further consideration of the bill was deferred to Wednesday. Pages 11049–11063

Early Meeting Hour: Pursuant to a unanimous-consent request the hour of meeting of the House on Wednesday was fixed at 10 a. m. Page 11063

Program for Tuesday: Adjourned at 5:01 p. m. until Tuesday, July 10, at 12 o'clock noon, when the House will consider rules for the consideration of certain bills.

Committee Meetings

GEN. NATHAN F. TWINING

Committee on Armed Services: Met in executive session and heard Gen. Nathan F. Twining, Chief of Staff, Department of the Air Force, accompanied by Maj. Gen. Joe W. Kelly and Col. Mayhue D. Blaine, report on his recent visit to Russia.

LAND CONVEYANCE

Committee on Armed Services: Ordered favorably reported to the House the following bills:

S. 976, to release U. S. interest in certain land in Montgomery, W. Va.; and

H. R. 5519 (amended), to convey and exchange certain tracts of land in El Paso County, Tex., to the U. S. Government.

The committee also approved one Navy acquisition project No. 150.

WEST COAST PIPELINE

Committee on Armed Services: Subcommittee on Special Investigations held hearing on the military necessity for pipeline to Los Angeles, Calif. Witnesses heard were Capt. C. G. Drescher, USN, Chief, Armed Services Petroleum Purchasing Agency; Dr. Arthur S. Flemming, Director, Office of Defense Mobilization; T. S. Petersen, president, Standard Oil Co., California; Maj. Gen. L. E. Cotulla, Staff Director, Petroleum Logistics, Department of Defense; and H. J. Barton, Chief of Branch, Division of Petroleum, Department of the Interior.

GOVERNMENT INFORMATION

Committee on Government Operations: Subcommittee on Government Information heard the following representatives of the Department of Defense in regard to practices and policies which restrict information to the Congress and the public: Robert T. Ross, Assistant Secretary of Defense; Philip Allen, Deputy Assistant Secretary for Public Affairs; Leonard Niederlehner, Deputy General Counsel; and C. Herschel Schooley, Director, Public Information. Hearings continue on Tuesday.

ACCOUNTS SUBCOMMITTEE

Committee on House Administration: Subcommittee on Accounts heard Representative Bonner on H. Res. 566, to provide funds for the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries; and Representative Rabaut on H. Con. Res. 258, accepting without cost to the United States copies of the recording, Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag, and providing for distribution of such copies.

PUBLIC LANDS

Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs: Held hearing on H. R. 10371, providing that withdrawals or reservations of more than 5,000 acres of public lands of the United States for certain purposes shall not become effective until approved by act of Congress. Witnesses heard were Wesley A. D'Ewart, Assistant Secretary, Interior Department, accompanied by Earl G. Harrington, Cadastral Engineering Staff Office, Bureau of Land Management; Donn Miller, Office of General Counsel, Air Force Department; and Maj. Edward A. Turrou, Office of Adjutant General, Army Department.

FOREIGN AGENTS

Committee on the Judiciary: Subcommittee No. 3 held hearing on S. 1273 and H. R. 4105 to amend the Foreign Agents Registration Act to require the registration with the Attorney General of any combination of individuals supervised, directed, controlled, or financed, in whole or in substantial part, by any foreign government or foreign political party. Witnesses heard were Nathan B. Lenvin, Chief, Foreign Agents Registration Section, Department of Justice; V. W. Clapp, Chief Assistant Librarian, Library of Congress; Dr. Keyes Metcalf, representing the Association of Research Libraries; Dan Lacy, American Book Publishers Council, Inc.; Solicitor Abe McGregor Goff, Post Office Department; Winslow H. Osborne, American Friends Service Committee. Statements for the record were submitted by the American Library Association; American Federation of Teachers; and the American Civil Liberties Union.

ANTITRUST

Committee on the Judiciary: Antitrust Subcommittee No. 5 continued hearings on S. 3897 and H. R. 11360, to supplement the U. S. antitrust laws to enable automobile dealers to bring suit against automobile manufacturers regarding termination of franchise. Witnesses heard were John W. Gwynne, Chairman, Federal Trade Commission; Robert Bicks, Department of Justice; William T. Gossett, vice president and general counsel, Ford Motor Co.; William Hufstadter, vice president in charge of sales, General Motors; Lloyd Halverson, National Grange; and Senator Monroney.

OIL AND GAS LEASES

Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries: Completed hearing on proposal of Department of Interior to issue oil and gas leases on an additional 6,560 acres of the Railroad Valley, wildlife management area, in Nye County, Nev. John L. Farley, Director, Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of Interior, was heard.

FLOOD CONTROL

Committee on Rules: Granted an open rule with 2 hours of debate on H. R. 12080, omnibus rivers and harbors flood control bill. Supporting witnesses were Representatives Blatnik, Dondero, Jones of Alabama, Kluczynski, and Dempsey.

MINERAL PRODUCTION

Committee on Rules: Granted an open rule with 1 hour of debate on S. 3982, to provide for the maintenance of production of tungsten, asbestos, fluorspar, and columbium-tantalum in the U. S., its Territories, and possessions. Supporting witnesses were Representatives Engle, Durham, and Young.

AGRICULTURE

Committee on Rules: Completed hearing but took no action on H. R. 11708, to increase the amount authorized to be appropriated for purposes of title I of Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954. Supporting witnesses were Representatives Cooley and Hope.

COASTWISE TRADE—VESSELS

Committee on Rules: Considered but did not complete hearing on H. R. 11122, to promote the development and rehabilitation of the coastwise trade and to encourage the construction of new vessels. Supporting witnesses were Representatives Bonner and Tollefson. Committee will resume hearing on this bill on Tuesday.

EXCISE TAX

Committee on Ways and Means: Completed review of draft of legislation embodying recommendations of the Subcommittee on Excise Tax Technical and Administrative Problems and agreed that Representative Forand would introduce the bill as soon as it is ready so that it will be available to the public for comment during adjournment.

Joint Committee Meetings

AGREEMENTS FOR COOPERATION

Joint Committee on Atomic Energy: Subcommittee on Agreements for Cooperation held an executive session to discuss international agreements for cooperation. Witnesses heard in this session were Chairman Lewis L. Strauss, and Dr. Willard F. Libby, Thomas E. Murray, and Harold S. Vance, members, all of the Atomic Energy Commission.

D. C. TRANSIT

Conferees continued in executive session to resolve the differences between the Senate- and House-passed versions of S. 3073, the D. C. transit bill, but did not conclude their work and will meet again Wednesday, July 11.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS FOR TUESDAY, JULY 10

(*All meetings are open unless otherwise designated*)

Senate

Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, executive, on S. 3429, to amend the credit provision in the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, and on other bills, 10 a. m., 324 Senate Office Building.

Committee on Appropriations, on supplemental appropriations for fiscal 1957, 2 p. m., room F–37, Capitol.

Committee on Armed Services, executive, to hear Gen. Nathan F. Twining, Air Force Chief of Staff, 10 a. m., 212 Senate Office Building.

Committee on Banking and Currency, executive, on S. 3911, regulation of bank mergers, S. 3868, to extend Export-Import Bank Act of 1945, and S. 3832, disposal of Government-owned rubber research laboratories at Akron, Ohio, 10:30 a. m., 301 Senate Office Building.

Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, executive, on committee business, 10 a. m., 224 Senate Office Building.

Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, Aviation Subcommittee, on section 1 of S. 3914, to amend Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938 regarding foreign air transportation, 10 a. m., room G–16, Capitol.

Committee on the Judiciary, Subcommittee on Juvenile Delinquency, to explore possibility of using surplus military installation for Boys' Town-type projects, 10 a. m., room P–63, Capitol.

Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, executive, on committee business, 10:30 a. m., 135 Senate Office Building.

House

Committee on Armed Services, executive session, Subcommittee on Acquisitions and Disposals on real-estate projects, 9 a. m., 313–A Old House Office Building.

Committee on Banking and Currency, executive session, on H. R. 11000, providing for the striking of medals in commemoration of the 100th anniversary of the birth of the late Justice Louis Dembitz Brandeis; and S. 3732, to provide insurance against flood damage, 10 a. m., 1301 New House Office Building.

Committee on Education and Labor, Special Subcommittee on Aid to the Blind on bills to authorize wider distribution of books and other special instructional material for the blind, and to increase the appropriations authorized for this purpose, 10:30 a. m., 429 Old House Office Building.

Committee on Foreign Affairs, executive session, on S. 3638, amending the United States Information and Education Exchange Act of 1948, 10:30 a. m., G–3 Capitol Building.

Committee on Government Operations, Subcommittee on Legal and Monetary Affairs on Federal role in civil aviation. Charles J. Lowen, Civil Aeronautics Administration, and other CAA officials will be heard, 10 a. m., 1501 New House Office Building.

Subcommittee on Government Information on Defense Department policies and practices that have restricted the flow of information to Congress and the public. Maj. Gen. C. S. Melon, Jr., Army Chief of Public Information; Rear Adm. E. B. Taylor, Chief, Navy Office of Information, and others will be heard, 10 a. m., 304 Old House Office Building.

Subcommittee on Government Activities, executive session, to consider Senate bills, 11 a. m., 1537 New House Office Building.

Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, to mark up H. R. 10371, providing that withdrawals or reservations of more than 5,000 acres of public lands of the United States for certain purposes shall not become effective until approved by act of Congress, and pending bills, 10 a. m., 1324 New House Office Building.

Committee on the Judiciary, executive session, full committee on pending bills, 10 a. m., 346 Old House Office Building.

Antitrust Subcommittee No. 5 to continue hearings on S. 3789 and H. R. 11360, to supplement the United States antitrust laws to enable dealers to bring suit against automobile manufacturers regarding termination of franchise, 2:30 p. m., 346 Old House Office Building.

Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, to determine the necessity or desirability of additional Federal legislation to regulate pleasure boating in the United States, 10 a. m., 219 Old House Office Building.

Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, on S. 2875, to increase retirement benefits for Federal workers. Representatives of Board of Actuaries, Civil Service Commission; Joseph Campbell, Comptroller General of the United States; and Charles I. Schottland, Commissioner, Social Security Administration, will be heard, 10 a. m., 213 Old House Office Building.

Committee on Public Works, executive session, Subcommittee on Flood Control on pending bills, 10 a. m., 1302 New House Office Building.

Committee on Rules, to consider granting of rule on the following bills:

H. R. 12138, supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957;

S. 1644, Federal Construction Contract Act;

H. R. 3, establishing rules of interpretation governing questions of the effects of acts of Congress on State law;

And to continue consideration of request for rule on H. R. 11122, to promote the development and rehabilitation of the coastwise trade and encourage the construction of new vessels, 10:30 a. m., G–12 Capitol Building.

Committee on Un-American Activities, to hear John Cogley, director of a recently published survey by the Fund for the Republic on the subject of the so-called blacklisting of Communists and fellow travelers in the entertainment industry, 10 a m., 362 (Caucus Room) Old House Office Building.

Committee on Ways and Means, executive session, to consider Members' bills, 10 a. m., Committee Hearing Room, Old House Office Building.

Joint Committee

Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, Subcommittee on Research and Development, executive, on draft report on shortage of scientific and engineering manpower, 2 p. m., room F–88, Capitol.

Conferees, executive, on H. R. 7089, veterans' survivors' benefits, 10 a. m., 312 Senate Office Building.

United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 84th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 102 WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, JULY 10, 1956 No. 116

Senate

The Senate was not in session today. Its next meeting will be held on Wednesday, July 11, 1956, at 12 o'clock meridian.

House of Representatives

TUESDAY, JULY 10, 1956

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Most merciful and gracious God, we thank Thee for the privilege of prayer and its power to fortify and strengthen us when the struggle of life is difficult and our problems are hard to solve.

We humbly acknowledge that our minds are frequently thronged with a multitude of disturbing and disconcerting thoughts and we feel ourselves wavering between conflicting and opposite decisions.

Constrain us with a determination to bring all our plans and purposes, our desires and longings, into harmony with Thy divine will, in which is our peace.

Grant that we may be eager to invoke and worthy to receive Thy blessing and benediction upon everything which we shall endeavor to do during this day for the welfare of our country and all mankind.

Hear us in Christ's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Carrell, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed a bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 3449. An act relating to the reinvestment by air carriers of the proceeds from the sale or other disposition of certain operating property and equipment.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House to a bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 1871. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to reimburse the Post Office Department for the transmission of official Government-mail matter, approved August 15, 1953 (67 Stat. 614), and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendment to the bill (H. R. 483) entitled "An act to amend the Army-Navy Public Health Service Medical Officer Procurement Act of 1947, as amended, so as to provide for appointment of doctors of osteopathy in the Medical Corps of the Army and Navy," disagreed to by the House; agrees to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. STENNIS, Mr. SYMINGTON, Mr. SALTONSTALL, and Mrs. SMITH of Maine to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 9893) entitled "An act to authorize certain construction at military installations, and for other purposes."

MANNER IN WHICH ANTITRUST SUIT AGAINST GENERAL MOTORS WAS ANNOUNCED

(Mr. VANIK asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, permit me to call the attention of the House of Representatives to an editorial which appeared in the Cleveland Press of July 6, 1956, entitled "Political Corn," commenting upon Attorney General Herbert Brownell's television performance last Wednesday night when he went on a Corn Products-sponsored television program to announce that the Justice Department would file an antitrust suit against the General Motors Corp.

The preparation of this suit must have taken most of the Attorney General's time during the past 3½ years. You can almost bank on the assumption that it was most adroitly prepared with a confused cause of action and that the service of summons will inadvertently be made on the wrong person, perhaps some unsuspecting motorist.

It should further be a subject of congressional concern that public news and information, particularly information of such far-reaching importance as an antitrust suit prepared by a Republican Attorney General against the great General Motors Corp., should be distributed by public officials on private television time. News has a property value and the distribution of it on a private advertiser's television time is a conversion of public property in the news for the private profit or advantage of an advertiser and/or other persons. Releases of public information by public officials should always be made in a thoroughly public manner.

The Press editorial is as follows:

POLITICAL CORN

If Secretary Ezra Benson were to go on a General Motors-sponsored TV program to announce that the Agriculture Department had decided to blacklist Corn Products Co.—

We doubt honest old Ezra would do such a thing, but if he did—

Well, it would be on all fours with Attorney General Herbert Brownell's performance Wednesday night, when he went on a Corn Products-sponsored TV program to announce that the Justice Department would file an antitrust suit against General Motors.

It might be good politics, because this is an election year and some farm spokesmen have been accusing Ezra of loving the food processors more than he loves the farmers. But, repeating, we don't think Ezra would play politics that way.

And, of course, we have no way of knowing how long Brownell carried that official news item around in his hot little hand before he stepped up to the TV camera to perform a governmental act under the auspices of a

sponsor with a name appropriate to the performance.

But we do know that Brownell attained his present position by his skill in politics, that General Motors has been a large and growing corporation through 3½ years Brownell has been Attorney General, that Democrats have been accusing the Eisenhower administration of favoring big business, and that Brownell didn't announce his suit against the symbol of big business until well along in an election year.

The traditional way for the Justice Department to break the news of an antitrust action is to file the complaint, making it a matter of court record, and give out a press release or hold a press conference available equally to all media of public information, explaining the reasons for the suit.

But Brownell chose an unorthodox way of making his announcement, arousing controversy that might possibly draw more attention to the idea that the Republicans, in this election year, are hellbent for protecting the little fellows against the big fellow.

For his performance, Brownell received a leather-bound, 20-volume encyclopedia, and newspaper reporters participating in the Corn Products press conference received a cash honorarium for 30 minutes of acting the role they are paid all week to do for their own newspapers.

However you grind it, it's corn.

CORRECTION OF RECORD

Mr. HAGEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to correct the RECORD of July 9, 1956, at page 11026 where I questioned the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON]. The reporter got my language completely confused. According to the official report I made the statement:

I think the military should be satisfied with a smaller amount of land than they desire to take.

That language should be stricken and this substituted:

I think the military needs would not be met by the smaller acreage suggested by the Senate report and that the Senate report is erroneously in conflict with the expression of judgment in the authorization agreed upon by both Houses of Congress.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

EX-SENATOR CAIN AND THE SECURITY PROGRAM

(Mr. UDALL asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, I think it is unanimously agreed by those who have followed our security program carefully that no one has contributed more during the last 18 months toward putting commonsense and fair play into that system than has former Senator Harry P. Cain, who is a member of the Control Board on Subversive Activities. Senator Cain has worked tirelessly and with great courage to improve our security procedures.

His appointment expires on August 1 of this year. If I were a Republican and were asked what the President has done to improve the security system, I would reply, "He appointed Senator Cain." In my opinion, there is no better test of the President's sincerity in this matter than the Cain reappointment.

RELIEF OF CERTAIN RELATIVES OF UNITED STATES CITIZENS

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk House Joint Resolution 456 for the relief of certain relatives of United States citizens with Senate amendments thereto and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 1, line 7, strike out "under" and insert "and upon compliance with."

Page 2, line 4, after "Huffman", insert "Stella W. Janinis."

Page 2, line 4, after "Jackson", insert "Reinhold H. Meric."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RELIEF OF CERTAIN ALIENS

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk House Joint Resolution 580 for the relief of certain aliens with a Senate amendment thereto and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 1, line 7, strike out "Lee Fay Fan."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RELIEF OF CERTAIN ALIENS

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk House Joint Resolution 616 for the relief of certain aliens, with Senate amendments thereto and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 1, strike out lines 8 to 12, inclusive.

Page 2, line 1, strike out "3" and insert "2."

Page 2, line 6, strike out "4" and insert "3."

Page 2, line 11, strike out "5" and insert "4."

Page 2, line 16, strike out "6" and insert "5."

Page 2, line 21, strike out "7" and insert "6."

Page 3, line 1, strike out "8" and insert "7."

Page 3, line 6, strike out "9" and insert "8."

Page 3, line 11, strike out "10" and insert "9."

Page 3, line 16, strike out "11" and insert "10."

Page 3, line 21, strike out "12" and insert "11."

Page 4, line 1, strike out "13" and insert "12."

Page 4, line 6, strike out "14" and insert "13."

Page 4, line 11, strike out "15" and insert "14."

Page 4, line 16, strike out "16" and insert "15."

Page 4, strike out lines 21 to 25, inclusive, and insert:

"SEC. 16. For the purposes of sections 101 (a) (27) (A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the minor child, Gertraud Anna Giulio, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Frank Joseph Horak, a citizen of the United States."

Page 5, line 1, strike out "18" and insert "17."

Page 5, line 6, strike out "19" and insert "18."

Page 5, line 11, strike out "20" and insert "19."

Page 5, line 16, strike out "21" and insert "20."

Page 5, line 21, strike out "22" and insert "21."

Page 6, after line 2, insert:

"SEC. 22. For the purposes of sections 101 (a) (27) (A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the minor child, Jose Boo Lopez, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Patrick Louis Perry, a citizen of the United States."

Page 6, after line 2, insert:

"SEC. 23. For the purposes of sections 101 (a) (27) (A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the minor child, Lim Ginwey, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Lim Nuey, a citizen of the United States."

Page 6, after line 2, insert:

"SEC. 24. For the purposes of sections 101 (a) (27) (A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the minor child, Shiu Ming Ma, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Donald Herbert Deppe, a citizen of the United States."

Page 6, after line 2, insert:

"SEC. 25. For the purposes of sections 101 (a) (27) (A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the minor child, Roland F. Petersen, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Vernon L. Petersen, a citizen of the United States."

Page 6, after line 2, insert:

"SEC. 26. For the purposes of sections 101 (a) (27) (A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the minor child, Lampros Lazaridis, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Lazar and Bernice Christoff, citizens of the United States."

Page 6, after line 2, insert:

"SEC. 27. For the purposes of sections 101 (a) (27) (A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Paz Tupas Meeker shall be held and considered to be the minor natural-born alien child of C. A. Meeker, a citizen of the United States."

Page 6, after line 2, insert:

"SEC. 28. For the purposes of sections 101 (a) (27) (A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the minor child, Luciana Papa Powell, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of James M. Powell and Camille Powell, citizens of the United States."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ADVANCEMENT OF MAJ. GEN. HANFORD MACNIDER TO LIEUTENANT GENERAL

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 11677) to provide for the advancement of Maj. Gen. Hanford MacNider, United States Army Reserve, retired, to the grade of lieutenant general on the retired list.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, would the gentleman from Georgia, our distinguished chairman, explain briefly the bill or have its author do so?

Mr. VINSON. I suggest, inasmuch as I cleared the matter with the gentleman before I called it up, that the distinguished gentleman from Missouri, who is quite familiar with this bill, should briefly state to the House the distinguished military career of this outstanding general.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, I think all Members are aware that Hanford MacNider, of Iowa, is one of the greatest soldiers that this country has ever produced, having served in both World War I and World War II, and being wounded many times on the battlefield. Not only are the Members of the Iowa delegation but many of the Members all over the Nation, as well as some of our highest military men in the country, are heartily in favor of granting this recognition to a very outstanding and great American. I want to say that the bill will not cost the taxpayers one dime. It merely promotes him from major general to lieutenant general; wholly an honor but an honor richly deserved and written in sacrifice and blood. I am confident that every true American who loves his country will rejoice that this high recognition and signal honor is being bestowed by an appreciative Congress and a grateful people upon a stalwart, fearless, and exemplary soldier, a sterling patriot, and a great and good man.

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHORT. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Speaker, it so happens that Hanford MacNider and I both served in World War II; in fact, we slept in the same dugout at one time. He was a captain in the 9th Infantry, 2d Division, and I was a second lieutenant in the 15th Field Artillery. I was assigned as the liaison officer to the 9th Infantry. Of all the wonderful fighters and brave men, Hanford MacNider was one of the best, and I heartily endorse this bill.

Mr. SHORT. I thank the gentleman. Mr. Speaker, I would like to say, too, to the gentleman that I have been told by some of our highest ranking officers that he is the greatest fighting man they have ever known, coming back from the battlefield to the dugout with blood actually running out of his shoes and refusing to go to a hospital.

Mr. KEAN. He was what we colloquially call a fighting fool.

Mr. SHORT. He was and still is.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHORT. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa, the author of the bill. And I want to congratulate and thank him for his interest in this matter.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I hope this bill will be approved. Hanford MacNider, in my opinion, is one of this country's greatest living nonprofessional fighting men. Hanford MacNider has been awarded the Distinguished Service Cross; not the Distinguished Service Medal but the Distinguished Service Cross, with two clusters awarded for combat above and beyond the call of duty. He is a former Ambassador to Canada; a former national commander of the American Legion and of the Iowa Department of the American Legion. Major General MacNider has had a long and illustrious career, both as a military man and a civilian. As the distinguished gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHORT] has stated, this advancement to the grade of lieutenant general is purely a recognition of the honor that is due a great nonprofessional soldier. It should be noted that the bill explicitly provides that this advancement will not permit an increase of a single dime in the retirement pay of General MacNider.

I wish to take this opportunity to thank Mr. VINSON, chairman of the House Armed Services Committee, and the ranking minority member of the committee, Mr SHORT, for making it possible to consider this bill today honoring as it does one of the distinguished citizens of the Nation and the congressional district which it is my privilege to represent

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, if I might add one word, there are many Members of this House who, like the gentleman from New Jersey, served with Hanford MacNider I never did have that privilege or honor, but I have met him, and I know that he has been considered on different occasions seriously in years gone by as a presidential possibility.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

(Mr. SHORT asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, everyone knows of the great career of General MacNider, one of the outstanding generals of American history. I know that General MacNider will derive great pleasure and satisfaction in the knowledge that this bill, brought up out of order, has passed the House unanimously, conveying to him and to the entire country the great respect that all Members of the House, without regard to party, have for him and the admiration they have for the man himself, and the military leader.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I should like to say how extremely glad I am that this body is about to pass this bill. Gen. Hanford MacNider is known all over this country and abroad for his great work. His contribution has been just as great since the war as it was during the war, during his gallant fighting days. America should do him all honor. I have known him and his lovely wife for years. Their friends are legion and will rejoice over this appreciation of this great man.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That Maj. Gen. Hanford MacNider, United States Army Reserve (retired), shall be advanced on the retired list to the grade of lieutenant general effective as of date of enactment of this act.

SEC. 2. Nothing contained in this act shall be deemed to increase the retired or retirement pay received by the said Maj. Gen. Hanford MacNider and no other benefits shall accrue to him by virtue of the enactment thereof.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary have permission to sit during general debate tomorrow and Thursday.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Public Works have until midnight tonight to file sundry reports.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

CORRECTION OF THE RECORD

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, on page 10853 in line 14 of the first column of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of July 6, 1956, I am recorded as having said "impression." That should read "confession." I ask unanimous consent that the permanent RECORD be corrected accordingly.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the permanent RECORD will be corrected accordingly.

There was no objection.

SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION BILL, FISCAL YEAR 1957

Mr. SMITH of Virginia, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 534, Rept. No. 2648), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

Resolved, That during the consideration of the bill (H. R. 12138) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes, all points of order against the bill are hereby waived.

PERMISSION TO SIT DURING GENERAL DEBATE

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Public Works have permission to sit during general debate tomorrow.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

ASSISTANCE TO CERTAIN NON-FEDERAL INSTITUTIONS FOR THE CONSTRUCTION OF FACILITIES FOR RESEARCH

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 577 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (S. 849) to provide assistance to certain non-Federal institutions for construction of facilities for research in crippling and killing diseases such as cancer, heart disease, poliomyelitis, nervous disorders, mental illness, arthritis and rheumatism, blindness, cerebral palsy, tuberculosis, multiple sclerosis, epilepsy, cystic fibrosis, and muscular dystrophy, and for other purposes. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill, and shall continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. It shall be in order to consider without intervention of any point of order the substitute amendment recommended by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce now in the bill and such substitute for the purpose of amendment shall be considered under the 5-minute rule as an original bill. At the conclusion of such consideration the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any of the amendments adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or committee substitute. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ELLSWORTH], and at this time I yield myself such time as I may consume.

(Mr. BOLLING asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BOLLING. House Resolution 577 makes in order the consideration of S. 849 to provide assistance to certain non-Federal institutions for the construction of facilities for research in crippling and killing diseases. The resolution provides for an open rule and 1 hour of general debate. It also provides that it shall be inorder to consider without intervention of any point of order the substitute amendment recommended by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and the substitute shall be considered as an original bill for the purposes of amendment. Any Member may demand a separate vote on any of the amendments adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or committee substitute.

The bill, as amended, authorizes a 3-year grant-in-aid program on a matching basis of not to exceed $30 million for each of the 3 years to assist public and nonprofit institutions in the construction and equipping of facilities to engage in research in the sciences related to health.

As amended, the bill sets up a National Advisory Council on Health Research Facilities. The Council will have the Surgeon General as chairman and an officer of the National Science Foundation. There will be 12 members appointed by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare. Of the 12, 4 will be selected from the general public and 8 from among leading medical, dental, and scientific authorities.

The bill outlines certain factors which the Council must take into consideration when applications are submitted to assure equitable distribution of the grants. The Council shall, within 6 months after enactment of the bill, set up general regulations covering eligibility of institutions and the terms and conditions for approving applications. Also, the Council is to make annual reports to Congress summarizing its activities under this legislation.

A committee amendment provides for the recapture of funds if within 10 years after construction of any facility the applicant ceases to be a public or nonprofit institution, or ceases to be used for the purposes for which it was constructed.

A noninterference provision is included as a committee amendment to preclude any attempts to place such research facilities under Federal direction.

The committee unanimously approved the bill as amended. There was no opposition before the Rules Committee, and I urge the adoption of House Resolution 577.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN].

(Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and to speak out of order.)

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, 75 Members are not in the House at the moment. My assumption is that the lack of attendance is due to the effort to get an early adjournment, and the absent Members are either in committees or working on research problems so as to be better prepared to pass on legislation when it does come up.

The difficulty in understanding some of the bills that come before the House is due in part at least to the fact that committees of the House are holding hearings, hearings that continue from day to day almost continuously. It would not seem to be an exaggeration to state that some of these hearings have a political tinge, not red, but a sort of a pinkish color to them; that is to say, along the line of political propaganda. I am not talking about communism or anything of that kind, so please do not let me be misunderstood.

For example, the Committee on Government Operations through subcommittees, I think there are three subcommittees sitting today. We started out with the Chudoff subcommittee as it was originally authorized by a letter from the chairman of one of the Senate committees who told us to go into the question of the deposal of timber owned by the Government. That was fine. One of the objectives was to learn whether the inventory of the national timber was down to date. Another was to learn whether it was advisable to have area harvesting and manufacturing of the timber. Another was whether there should be access roads. That was all right. Another was whether there should be a cut which would permit and give an annual cut in the coming years. That was all right. All were questions which were, and are, vital to the Northwest. But those hearings degenerated, and I use that word advisedly, into a political attack upon the Department of the Interior. The digging up and rehashing of a charge and an issue that was decided out in the Northwest some 2 years ago. If there was any remedy for what had happened, if what happened was wrong, then the Department of Justice could have been appealed to there 2 years ago or even before that, but no such appeal was taken. They waited until this session of Congress. Then this subcommittee, staffed by former disgruntled officials and employees of the Department of the Interior, went off on a political tangent in an effort to help elect certain members of the opposition party—when I speak of the opposition party I mean the Democratic Party—and to defeat certain members of the Republican Party at the coming November election.

Look where we are getting now. Here we are in the last 2 or 3 weeks of this session of the House. Bill after bill is coming before us for determination. Some of them carry millions if not billions of dollars. Yet as stated just a moment ago, there are less than 75 Members on the floor. I am not critical nor do I want to make a point of order when we go into Committee of the Whole if we do or when the bills are called for consideration. I do not want to make a point of order at this time while the House is in session. But, Mr. Speaker, because I realize that the Members are away today working in committee or in their offices with this monumental load that is bearing down on them and despite the fact they are so inadequately paid, with so little time to attend to their duties a quorum should be present when legislation as important as that which is pending in on—but look, why should the Committee on Government Operations through three subcommittees or more be holding sessions day after day, especially when none is considerating legislation which should be enacted before adjournment? The Chudoff committee served notice, I think it was last night, that beginning next Monday they would hold hearings every forenoon and every afternoon. On what? Private-power companies. That committee has already put out a report, and I expect to speak on that later tomorrow, maybe today if some more of the Members get back from the arduous tasks they are

now on, calling attention to the fact that the committee put out a report charging a conspiracy between the Department of the Interior and the private-power companies. That is the report adopted by the Committee on Government Operations which has been released to the press. True—true, 5 members of the majority—Democrats all of them—disagreed with some phases of the report. So while the report purported to be signed and was signed, as I assume, by 17 Members——

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. May I have another 5 minutes?

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 additional minutes to the gentleman.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I thank the gentleman. That obviates any necessity of calling a quorum and will not take nearly as long as having to have the Members present. As I stated before, I do not want to take the Members away from their desks and offices and committee rooms and from the Congressional Library where they are doing the necessary research work and consulting with the department officials and the executive agencies trying to get information to enable them to form an accurate judgment on pending legislation. I do not want to do that. Far, far be it for me to do anything to hinder them from working today, especially when the task is so difficult—oh, no, they should not be called over here—they should not be called over here to vote on any bill no matter how much it might carry in the way of appropriations, until today's labors have been finished.

But, now back to these 5 Members of the majority party who filed disagreeing or more properly additional views—the report was adopted by 17 members of the committee—and if you subtract the 5 from the 17 then add the 5 to the 12 minority members, do you see where you get? The majority is gone—wiped out. So the report becomes the report of 17, 5 of whom are not in wholehearted approval of all of it. And 4 of the 5 expressly stated that the committee, made up of their own political bedfellows, had held hearings and condemned the private power companies without ever having given the companies a hearing.

Now that subcommittee is off again and beginning next Monday every morning and every afternoon and every day while the House is in session, mind you, while the House is in session, it intends to hold hearings in an attempt to prove their charge that a wicked, vicious—if my colleague, the gentleman from New York, could give me a few additional words to describe it—that a conspiracy—I fail for want of words to express it—I say they have already determined and reported that a wicked conspiracy exists. Now, lo and behold, next week and the week after, morning and afternoon, they intend to hold hearings to substantiate the report that they have all given out. They wish to seek and find evidence to support a charge they made—a verdict of guilty which they rendered without a hearing. I wonder what my young friend from California [Mr. LIPSCOMB] who has just come here so recently, and who has shown himself to be such an active and able—I am sorry there is not room on the ticket for 2 vice presidential candidates so that California could again put on the ticket a man of such outstanding ability as our friend and colleague [Mr. LIPSCOMB], who has made outstanding contributions to the Congress since he came here. Some of us older ones who are fading just rely on the good judgment, the outstanding ability of these young men to help us out when as today the load grows heavy and difficult. The only thing I can think of at the moment which distracts from my pleasure is that it is unfortunate that he cannot be in two places at once—must be here on the floor instead of working in the Library or on committee. But we all assume he has very religiously attended all of these committee hearings and rendered valuable service because of his experience in the legislature of the State of California.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I am happy to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I just want to concur in what the gentleman said about our colleague——

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. About the committee—about the committee report?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. About Mr. LIPSCOMB.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Oh.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I want to pay tribute to his constant attendance in committee and the hard work that he has done.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. And the exceptionally good work—you concur in that, do you not—the exceptionally good and efficient work? Yes; I notice you nodding in the affirmative. I want that to show in the RECORD because I think it might be gratifying to him to receive such an outstanding commendation from an experienced outstanding Member from his own State of California and who is so aware of our colleague's exceptionally fine record here.

The Committee on Government Operations under the House rules has permission to sit when the House is in session. That is the present rule, but I think it is unfortunate when so many committees are held so near the end of the session.

Certainly as one Member to another, permit me to ask, Is it right to hold committee hearings day in and day out this last couple of weeks of the session, especially when the hearings have nothing to do with pending legislation? How can we do justice to our constituents by procdure which takes us off the floor? How can we perform our tasks here on the floor if every day we are to have these committee hearings? It is very disagreeable to any Member to be forced to make a point of no quorum. But if that is necessary in order to legislate intelligently then it must be done by someone.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, with reference to the pending House Resolution 577, we find no objection whatever to the adoption of the rule on this side of the aisle. The bill is a worthwhile piece of legislation, which we hope will be adopted.

I yield back the balance of my time, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HEALTH AMENDMENTS ACT OF 1956

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up the resolution (H. Res. 580) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (S. 3958) to improve the health of the people by assisting in increasing the number of adequately trained professional and practical nurses and professional public health personnel, assisting in the development of improved methods of care and treatment in the field of mental health, and for other purposes. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill, and shall continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

(Mr. DELANEY asked and was granted permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ELLSWORTH], and at this time I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 580 makes in order the consideration of S. 3958, the Health Amendments Act of 1956. The resolution provides for an open rule and 1 hour of general debate.

The bill provides five programs designed to increase the supply of health personnel and health facilities, and to improve the methods by which certain health services are furnished.

Title I is intended to stimulate the training of more public health specialists by establishing a 3-year Federal program providing graduate traineeships for physicians, engineers, nurses, and other professional health personnel. The cost of this program is estimated at $1 million during the first year and double that amount during the second and third years.

Title II establishes a 3-year Federal program providing advanced training to

professional nurses. The Federal grants would be awarded to the training institutions who would select the individuals to receive the traineeship awards. The estimated cost during the first year is approximately $2 million and it is expected the cost in the second and third years would increase.

Title III establishes a 5-year program of Federal matching grants to States for expanding and improving vocational educational training programs for practical nurses. For the first 2 years of the program the matching provisions would require at least 1 State dollar for every 3 Federal-grant dollars, and for the remaining 3 years dollar-for-dollar matching would be required. An appropriation of $5 million annually would be authorized for this program.

Title IV of the bill will extend for 2 additional years the Hospital Survey and Construction Act, as amended, which would otherwise expire on June 30, 1957. This act authorizes an annual appropriation of $150 million for the construction of public and other nonprivate hospitals. An amendment to the act in 1953 authorized an additional appropriation of $60 million for construction of diagnostic centers, chronic disease centers, rehabilitation facilities, and nursing homes.

Title V authorizes the Surgeon General to make special project grants for the support of investigations, experiments, and demonstrations in the field of mental health with special emphasis placed on projects designed to improve the operation and administration of State institutions for the care and treatment of the mentally ill. In the 1957 budget provision is made for the submission of a budget request of $1,500,000 for special mental health project needs. This request is contingent upon the enactment of title V of this bill.

The committee report complies with the Ramseyer rule and I urge the adoption of House Resolution 580.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 580 makes in order a bill which appears to be very worthwhile. There is no objection on this side to the enactment of the rule. The bill should certainly be considered and passed.

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Can a Member be recognized on the bill itself for an amendment?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. When the bill is taken up for consideration; yes.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I wanted to be sure that I got in in time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will undoubtedly be recognized.

RIVERS AND HARBORS AND FLOOD CONTROL CONSTRUCTION

Mr. MADDEN, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 585 Rept. No. 2656), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 12080) authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors for navigation, flood control, and for other purposes. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill, and shall continue not to exceed 2 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Public Works, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF DENTAL RESEARCH

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 579 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (S. 3246) to increase the amount authorized for the erection and equipment of suitable and adequate buildings and facilities for the use of the National Institute of Dental Research. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill, and shall continue not to exceed hour , to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MADDEN: Page 1, line 9, preceding the word "hour", insert the figure "1."

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Indiana is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ELLSWORTH], and yield myself such time as I may use.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Indiana is recognized.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 579 makes in order the consideration of S. 3246, to increase the amount authorized for the National Institute of Dental Research. The resolution provides for an open rule and 1 hour of general debate on the bill.

S. 3246 as passed by the Senate, provided that section 5 of the National Dental Research Act of 1948 be amended to read $5 million instead of $2 million. The House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee reported this measure with an amendment making the amount authorized $4 million.

The amount is authorized for the erection and equipment of buildings and facilities for the National Institute of Dental Research at the National Institutes of Health at Bethesda. The program for the expansion of dental-research facilities was authorized in 1948 and plans for the buildings were drawn. Construction was postponed due to the Korean conflict. Since that time building costs have increased considerably and it is believed by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce that additional funds will be required to make possible the construction of the planned buildings and facilities.

The committee report complies with the Ramseyer rule, and I urge the adoption of the resolution so consideration may be given this bill.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, this resolution makes in order legislation having to do with the National Institute of Dental Research. We have no objection to the adoption of the resolution on this side.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

WASHOE RECLAMATION PROJECT, NEVADA AND CALIFORNIA

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 581 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 10643) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Washoe reclamation project, Nevada and California. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill, and shall continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes of my time to the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ELLSWORTH], and at this time I yield myself such time as I desire.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 581 makes in order the consideration of H. R. 10643, to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate and maintain the Washoe project in Nevada and California. Enactment of this legislation will also permit the construction of flood control works in the Truckee Valley which were authorized in the Flood Control Act of 1954, with construction contingent upon authorization of the Washoe project.

The resolution provides for an open rule and 1 hour debate on the bill.

This multiple-purpose project on the eastern slope of the Sierra Nevada will provide irrigation, power, flood control, public health, recreation and fish and wildlife benefits through regulation of the stream flow and storage of snowmelt flood waters on the East Carson and Little Truckee Rivers and drainage of surplus ground waters in some areas of the basins.

The legislation contains certain other provisions. The States of Nevada and California are negotiating a compact with respect to the waters of the Truckee and Carson Rivers, both involved in the development of the Washoe project. Language in the bill assures that the future water needs in the Little Truckee River watershed in California will be met, and additional language provides that when the compact is completed the operation of the Washoe project will be in conformance with the compact.

The total cost of the project is $43,558,000. Seventeen million, one hundred and eight thousand dollars will be allocated to irrigation and drainage and, up to the ability of the users to repay, and after suitable development periods for various project lands, the repayment would be made under 50-year repayment contracts and would total $8,180,000 over the period. The power investment of $18,209,000 would be repaid in 50 years, with interest. Net power revenues accruing after payment of the power investment with interest would repay that part of the irrigation and drainage allocation beyond the repayment ability of the water users. The allocation of $6,141,000 for flood control, $100,000 to recreation and $2 million for the development of fish and wildlife resources would be nonreimbursable.

I urge the adoption of House Resolution 581 so that the House may proceed to the consideration of H. R. 10643.

(Mr. DELANEY asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I know of no opposition to the rule on this side.

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PRODUCTION OF TUNGSTEN, ASBESTOS, FLUORSPAR, AND COLUMBIUM-TANTALUM IN THE UNITED STATES

Mr. TRIMBLE, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 586, Rept. No. 2657), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (S. 3982) to provide for the maintenance of production of tungsten, asbestos, fluorspar, and columbium-tantalum in the United States, its Territories, and possessions, and for other purposes. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill, and shall continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. It shall be in order to consider without the intervention of any point of order the substitute amendment recommended by the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs now in the bill, and such substitute for the purpose of amendment shall be considered under the 5-minute rule as an original bill. At the conclusion of such consideration the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any of the amendments adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or committee substitute. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

AUTHORIZING LOAN OF NAVAL VESSELS TO FOREIGN GOVERNMENTS

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 582 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 11613) to authorize the loan of naval vessels to the Governments of the Federal Republic of Germany, Greece, Portugal, Spain, and friendly far eastern nations, and for other purposes. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill, and shall continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Armed Services, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes of my time to the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ELLSWORTH], and at this time yield myself such time as I may use.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution makes in order the consideration of the bill, H. R. 11613.

The purpose of the bill is to authorize the President to lend 2 destroyers and 2 destroyer escorts to the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany, 2 submarines to the Government of Greece, 2 destroyer escorts to the Government of Portugal, and 2 destroyers to the Government of Spain for a period of 5 years, and at his discretion for an additional period of not to exceed 5 years. The bill further would extend the authority of the current law whereby the President, until December 31, 1956, is authorized to lend not to exceed 25 naval vessels not larger than destroyers to friendly far eastern nations, by providing a 2-year extension until December 31, 1958, and by increasing the number of such vessels to 50.

(Mr. TRIMBLE asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may use.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 582 makes in order the bill, H. R. 11613. According to the testimony given in the Rules Committee this is necessary in the interest of our national security. There is no objection to adoption of the rule on this side.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ELLSWORTH. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. How many vessels are involved in this?

Mr. ELLSWORTH. The resolution pending does not state. I cannot answer the gentleman's question.

The bill reads:

To authorize the loan of naval vessels to the Governments of the Federal Republic of Germany, Greece, Portugal, Spain, and friendly Far Eastern nations.

Mr. GROSS. Are these modern vessels? Does the gentleman have any idea what they are, whether they come out of the mothball fleet or what they are?

Mr. ELLSWORTH. I am unable to answer the gentleman's question. The matter before the House is whether or not the House will agree to the rule which will make in order consideration of the bill which the gentleman is asking about. During general debate on that bill I am sure the legislative committee responsible for bringing it to the floor of the House will be glad to answer fully the questions of the gentlemen from Iowa.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ELLSWORTH. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. As I read the bill it says that the President

may lend 2 destroyers and 2 destroyer escorts to the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany, 2 submarines to the Government of Greece, 2 destroyer escorts to the Government of Portugal and 2 destroyers to the Government of Spain, for a period of not more than 5 years. Then there is a provision that he can extend that for an additional period of not more than 5 years. I think the gentleman from Iowa is interested in the fact that all expenses involved shall be charged to funds programed for the recipient governments under the Mutual Security Act. I know the gentleman is interested in knowing who provides funds under the Mutual Security Act. I think Iowa contributes quite a share.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. I thank the gentleman for the information he has given the House.

I yield back the balance of my time, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. The House is adopting resolutions from the Committee on Rules, as I understand it, to make the considertion of these bills in order. When will the bill be called up?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Some of them may be called up this afternoon, the Chair will advise the gentleman.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Well, if they are to be called up this afternoon, let me say this. I already notice there is $2 million on one, $20 million on another, 10 or more vessels loaned for a period of 10 years, I will have to make a point of no quorum if they are called up today. I am trying to establish a record for economy.

Mr. COLMER. Would the gentleman from Michigan withhold that until we could dispose of the rules?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Sure. Mr. Speaker, my only point was that when the bills are taken up, I thought the Members ought to be here. They will have finished their office work and their committee work by that time, I am sure.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair understands the gentleman from Michigan.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATION ACT AND THE CIVIL FUNCTIONS APPROPRIATION ACT

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 526 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 7992) to enact certain provisions now included in the Department of Defense Appropriation Act and the Civil Functions Appropriation Act, and for other purposes. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill, and shall continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Armed Services, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ELLSWORTH], and pending that, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 526 makes in order the consideration of H. R. 7992, the so-called point of order bill. The resolution provides for an open rule and 1 hour of general debate.

The purpose of this bill, as amended, is to enact into permanent law numerous legislative provisions which have heretofore appeared in appropriation acts. Enactment of this bill will supply legislative authorization and will preclude the raising of points of order with respect thereto in the consideration of annual appropriation acts.

The proposed bill, as amended, contains 33 sections, most of which involve relatively minor matters. It also amends in minor respects some existing law authorizing the expenditure of funds for certain purposes and repeals certain statutory authorization heretofore applicable only to the Navy Department, thus providing a uniform authorization for all the military departments for such expenditures.

Section 27 repeals section 638 of the Defense Appropriation Act of 1956, which required the Department of Defense to submit to the Appropriations Committees of the House and Senate for their approval the proposed transfer to private industry of operations performed by civilian personnel of the Department of Defense for 3 or more years and which involved more than 10 employees. The committee adopted an amendment which gives to the Congress the full authority to pass upon each proposed transfer within reasonable limitations.

Section 10 authorizes the training in law at civilian universities of a maximum of 135 officers of the regular components of the Armed Forces within any 3-year period. Existing restrictions in the Defense Appropriation Act of 1956 and the 1957 act precludes such training.

These two sections are the only sections which present any departure from the authorizing language contained in previous appropriation bills.

The committee report complies with the Ramseyer rule, and I urge the adoption of House Resolution 526.

(Mr. COLMER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, there is no objection to the passage of this rule on this side. Therefore, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDING INTERSTATE COMMERCE ACT TO REGULATE USE BY MOTOR CARRIERS OF MOTOR VEHICLES NOT OWNED BY THEM

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 578 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (S. 898) to amend the Interstate Commerce Act, with respect to the authority of the Interstate Commerce Commission to regulate the use by motor carriers (under leases, contracts, or other arrangements) of motor vehicles not owned by them, in the furnishing of transportation of property. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill, and shall continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ELLSWORTH], and at this time I yield myself such time as I may consume.

(Mr. COLMER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. COLMER. House Resolution 578 makes in order the consideration of S. 898, which would amend that section of the Interstate Commerce Act having to do with the use by motor carriers of motor vehicles not owned by them. The Resolution provides for an open rule with 1 hour of debate.

Under proposed regulations of the Interstate Commerce Commission, the effective date for which has been postponed from time to time, motor carriers who lease motor vehicles that they do not own, must lease such vehicles for at least 30 days' duration. The Commission has stated that this rule was necessary to maintain effective control over the operational safety, carrier responsibility and the economics of the motor-carrier industry.

The 30-day lease requirement is the provision to which strong objection has been made, for it is contended generally, that it would for all practical purposes abolish "trip-leasing," the term given to the leasing of a motor vehicle, with driver, for a single one-way haul or a round trip. Currently the ICC has

granted exemption from the 30-day minimum leasing rules to agricultural haulers. However, it is believed that the exemptions should be provided for by statue so that the ICC could not at a later date cancel such exemptions.

If trip-leasing were abolished, truck haulers of agricultural commodities, livestock, fish, and other perishable products, who now obtain return hauls by leasing their trucks to authorized motor carriers would no longer be able to do so, but would have to return empty. Hence such haulers would have to charge more for hauling those products, thus increasing the cost of marketing and the spread between farm and consumer prices.

S. 898 provides that section 204 of the Interstate Commerce Act be amended so that the 30-day minimum leasing rule would not apply to motor vehicles used in the transportation of agricultural and other perishable commodities.

The committee report complies with the Ramsayer rule.

I urge the adoption of House Resolution 578 so that the House may proceed to the consideration of S. 898.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, there is no objection to the adoption of this rule on this side. Therefore, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MARKETING FACILITIES FOR HANDLING PERISHABLE AGRICULTURAL COMMODITIES

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 556, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 4054) to encourage the improvement and development of marketing facilities for handling perishable agricultural commodities. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill, and shall continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Agriculture, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ELLSWORTH], and at this time I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, this rule makes in order the bill H. R. 4054. That bill is one that has been before the House several times. In fact, it passed the House once. Substantially, it provides for the guaranty or insurance of loans for the construction of marketing facilities in metropolitan areas. The reason advanced for it is that in many large cities the marketing facilities are very inadeqaute and obsolete. In many cases they are far removed from the railroad. They are in rundown condition. Goods that are shipped in, such as perishables, for consumption in the markets of large cities are so far removed from other means of transportation that it becomes very expensive to take them off the railroad and put them on trucks and carry them to these marketing facilities and unload them there.

There has been no opposition to the bill in the Committee on Rules. It does not provide for the expenditure of any funds but it does provide for the insurance of these marketing facilities to the extent of 85 percent. It is somewhat similar to the various and sundry housing provisions.

I know of no objection to the rule. There will probably be some to the bill.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, the bill this resolution would make in order, H. R. 4054, appears to be one of those measures coming frequently before Congress which would require a considerable amount of discussion and understanding on the floor. Speaking for myself alone, after having heard the testimony given by the committee before the Rules Committee, I find myself having some doubts as to the wisdom of the bill. However, I was glad to vote in the Rules Committee for a rule to bring the bill to the floor. Therefore, I am urging the adoption of this resolution, because this bill, rather more than most of the others we have had under discussion today, deserves full and free debate on the floor.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

PROCEDURE IN THE HOUSE

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire as to the procedure? It is proposed now that the House adjourn?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. We have special orders yet to be heard.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. But no legislation?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. If the gentleman objects, there will be no legislation.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I certainly will make a point of order on some of these bills.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the circumstances, the Chair will proceed with the recognition of Members under special orders.

THE JERSEY FARMER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. HAND] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. HAND. Mr. Speaker, although New Jersey is widely known as the Garden State, its preeminent position in agriculture is sometimes lost sight of because most people are familiar with its concentrated metropolitan area in which are located thousands of modern factories, which make our small State the sixth greatest industrial producer in the Union.

FIRST IN ACRE CASH

The interesting fact remains that my State continues to rank No. 1 in cash receipts per acre, which has now reached the phenomenal figure of $195 per acre of agricultural land. Curiously, the next highest producers per acre are the like industrial northeastern States of Connecticut, Rhode Island, Delaware, and Massachusetts. The justly famous States of our Farm Belt in the Middle West are not even close competitors on a cash acreage basis.

What is perhaps even more unusual, New Jersey is fourth ranking State in cash receipts per farm. Although our average farm is only 70 acres in size, our cash receipts per farm are $13,542. We are only significantly exceeded by the State of California with an average acreage of 250, and the leader, Arizona, but the average farm acreage there is 4,000 acres compared to our 70.

New Jersey, the third smallest State in Union in geographical area, produced more than $366 million of agricultural products in the year 1955.

Our leading farm products are eggs, milk, vegetables, and poultry, but by far the greatest crop is eggs, of which we produce $121 million worth, a very substantial part of which is produced in my congressional district.

WE ARE FARMERS, TOO

All of this is by way of preface to indicate that this great agricultural producer is seriously neglected in our national legislation, which is concentrated for the benefit of the West and South. The first farm bill, which happily the President vetoed, would have adversely affected our leading crops of eggs, poultry, and milk, and was of no help whatever to vegetables. The second bill, while less harmful to a degree, still has the net effect of damaging agriculture in New Jersey. The concentration on artificially maintaining prices for grain crops simply causes the egg industry, for example, to pay more for what it needs than it would have to pay in a free market, while at the same time the price of eggs is not supported. The soil-bank plan which is, no doubt, of benefit to agriculture elsewhere, has an insignificant effect in New Jersey, except for some of our corn producers.

Nevertheless, Mr. Speaker, the average New Jersey farmer is going to work out his own salvation as best he can, but he hopes that some time in the future, the national farm policy will not be completely concentrated on wheat, corn, cotton, and tobacco—the so-called basic crops—which even include tung nuts and honey. It is hard for them to appreciate that tung nuts are basic to the national welfare while eggs are not.

THE APPROPRIATION BILL

This years' appropriation bill for the Department of Agriculture, however, is of interest and benefit to New Jersey as well as to the rest of the Nation. Our farmers are pleased with the committee report on soil conservation, which is as follows:

SOIL CONSERVATION

The committee has resisted efforts for the past 3 years to curtail the soil-conservation programs of the Department. Each year it has restored budget cuts in these activities.

In this bill, the committee has exceeded the budget for the Soil Conservation Service by $5 million, to assure adequate technical assistance to an increasing number of soil-conservation districts, and to accelerate the watershed protection and flood-prevention programs of the Department. Further, it has again included $250 million in the bill for the advance agricultural conservation program announcement for next year.

This action appears to be particularly appropriate in view of the need for increased attention to diverted acres and soil reserves. It is entirely consistent with the actions of the Congress and the administration in adopting the soil-bank plan, which had its genesis with certain members of this committee in January 1954. The organizations now operating the soil-conservation programs of the Department should be given adequate financial support in this bill to carry out any new programs of this type which might be undertaken. The committee feels that the amounts it has recommended for the next fiscal year will help these agencies to meet this additional responsibility.

The Soil Conservation Service assists soil conservation districts and other cooperators in bringing about physical adjustments in land use that will conserve soil and water resources, provide economic production on a sustained basis, and reduce damages from floods and sedimentation. The Service also develops and carries out special drainage, irrigation, flood prevention, and watershed protection programs in cooperation with soil conservation districts, watershed groups, and other Federal and State agencies having related responsibility. It is expected that the new soil-bank legislation will increase the work of this agency in these fields.

Conservation operations: The committee recommends an appropriation of $67,500,000 for 1957, an increase of $4,557,255 over the 1956 appropriation and an increase of $2,285,000 in the budget estimate.

ANIMAL DISEASE

We are likewise glad to see $22 million appropriated for plant and animal diseases and pest control, and over $2 million to control the gypsy moth, which is potentially a serious threat to our agriculture.

For fiscal year 1957, the sum of $3,500,000 was recommended for continuing the study of diseases of animals and poultry, a substantial increase over the amount allowed in 1956. The proposal to construct an animal and poultry laboratory at a cost of some $10 million is encouraging.

PRICE SPREAD

Two problems stand out in my mind, which are not receiving the attention they deserve. One is the very large spread between what the farmer receives for his product and what the consumer pays for such products. Last year, and again this year, the Congress has appropriated funds for a study of this question, which study is continuing in the Department of Agriculture. This spread is serious economically and also psychologically. By the time food gets from the farm to the ultimate consumer, having passed through wholesalers, brokers, retailers, delivery people, and usually very fancy packaging, the price the consumer pays bears no relationship to the original price of the product, which means first, that the farmer is not getting anywhere near his fair share of the cost of food, and which also means that the consumer tends to blame high-food prices on the farmer, when in fact the blame belongs elsewhere.

CROP INSURANCE

The second problem is crop insurance. As to this, the committee says in part:

The Federal Crop Insurance Corporation is a wholly owned Government corporation created in 1938. Crop insurance offered to agricultural producers by the Corporation provides protection from losses caused by unavoidable natural hazards, such as insect and wildlife damage, plant diseases, fire, drought, flood, wind, and other weather conditions. It does not indemnify producers for losses resulting from negligence or failure to observe good farming practices.

In the light of recent experience in certain areas of the country, the committee believes that the crop-insurance program should be tried on an experimental basis on peaches and other fruit crops. The committee directs that within the funds provided in the bill for 1957 such an experimental program be initiated.

However, the amount appropriated for this activity is $6,210,000 which indicates, obviously, that this insurance program is on an extremely limited basis.

Just as I favor Federal participation in insurance programs indemnifying our coastal and other areas against the devastating effect of hurricanes and storms, so I favor the extension of crop insurance on a premium basis to protect the farmer against natural hazards, which he cannot prevent and which are sometimes catastrophic. The problems to an extent are intermingled. In our last severe hurricane, for example, the publicity mostly dealt with coastal areas, but enormous damage was done to the fruit orchards and the poultry houses in the inland sections of my district.

Broadly speaking, Mr. Speaker, at least these things are needed, amongst others, for New Jersey agriculture:

First. Less concentration on the so-called basic crops, and more attention to the vital food stuffs which are grown in the Northeast;

Second. Less spread between the price the farmer gets and what the consumer pays; and

Third. A greatly improved and expanded crop-insurance program.

THE MANIFESTO AND THE SUPREME COURT

(Mr. ABBITT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ABBITT. Mr. Speaker, these are trying times in this great country of ours. We see on every hand agencies and arms of the Federal Government reaching out their octopuslike tentacles grasping and taking from the people rights and privileges that were delegated to our people by the Founding Fathers of this great country of ours in the Constitution. We see an arrogant Supreme Court attempting to change the habits, customs, traditions, and mores of our people. This Court has arrogated unto itself powers never given it by the Constitution in an attempt by judicial decree to compel the people of this country to accept the sociological and political philosophy of the individual members of the Court. This Court has usurped authority and is attempting to wreck the sovereignty of our individual States.

The fateful and horrible decision rendered by the Supreme Court of the United States of America on May 17, 1954, declaring segregation in the public schools of America unconstitutional is just one of the many decisions by the Court attempting to change our way of life.

The problem created by this illegal and unfounded decision based on the political philosophy and theory of the Supreme Court Justices has done more to disrupt and damage race relations in the South than we realized at the time of the decision. It is heartening, however, to see that gradually there is an awakening on the part of a large part of the American people, particularly the editors, to the awareness of our problem in the South and the necessity for combating, overriding and changing the dreadful decision referred to heretofore. It was not based on law and legal precedent.

The people of this country are fortunate indeed to have at this time as a Member of the House of Representatives from the great State of Georgia, the Honorable E. L. FORRESTER. Representative FORRESTER is one of the most able Members of the Congress. He is an outstanding attorney of national repute, a man of high integrity and entirely fearless. I am proud to call him my friend and count it a privilege to serve in the House of Representatives with him. Representative FORRESTER has written an article explaining in detail the manifesto submitted by 101 Members of the Congress expressing their views on the Supreme Court decision referred to hereinbefore.

In an endeavor to acquaint the people of this country with what is happening to them as a result of the recent decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States, I include with my remarks the article by Representative E. L. FORRESTER entitled "The Manifesto and the Supreme Court," which appeared in the July 1956 issue of Facts Forum, which is as follows:

THE MANIFESTO AND THE SUPREME COURT

(By Representative E. L. FORRESTER, Democrat, of Georgia)

On March 12, 1956, there was submitted to the Senate and the House of Representatives a declaration of constitutional principles signed by 19 Senators and 82 Representatives, which is now commonly referred to as "The Southern Manfesto." The word "manfesto" is perhaps not fully understood by everyone, and consequently some confusion has arisen as to its meaning. However, the word "manifesto" simply means a group declaration of principles.

That so-called manifesto was a declaration of our constitutional rights. I sincerely wish that every citizen had a copy of it. It is an immortal document, and as sure as the sun shines it will take its place as one of the greatest classics, and future generations from all sections of this country will be glad that someone spoke out for their fundamental and constitutional rights. I did not have the privilege of assisting in the preparation of that instrument, but I did have the privilege of signing my name thereto, and thereby telling posterity that I endorsed every word in it. That declaration was by Senators and Representatives from the section of our country that, more than any other section, wrote and gave us our Constitution.

Thomas Jefferson, George Mason, George Washington and the other framers of that Constitution suffered at the hands of a Government possessing centralized and complete power. Those men understood the tyranny that naturally and always follows all-inclusive power. The present generation, the beneficiaries of the work of those great men, has not had the experiences concerning the intoxicating qualities of unlimited power in the hands of human agents entrusted therewith. They have not personally experienced the fact that history indisputably proves, that human beings have always become tyrannical when all power is placed in their hands.

Framers of the Constitution labored for months; they strove to form a Union, giving that Union only the necessary powers to operate successfully, reserving to the States and our people all the rights not delegated to the Federal Government. Fear of tyranny, fear of unlimited power and fear of the loss of liberty were the influences operating in the minds of those great men. Those men were determined to preserve the rights won by patriots who risked conviction for treason to obtain those rights. Everyone should see that original document, and take note of the fact that they diligently sought to use the right words. The deletions, erasures, and substitutions of language completely illustrate that they intended our Constitution to be the judicial skeleton of our laws and the foundation of our Government.

They did not intend for these foundations to be wiped out because of clamor, hysteria, treaty law, or by judicial decree. On the other hand, they did anticipate that the future and changed conditions might make some changes and additions necessary.

They intentionally provided in our Constitution the machinery therefor. They did not intend to make these changes or additions impossible, but they certainly did not intend to make these changes or additions so easy that they could be accomplished without the knowledge of the people, and without the people having the opportunity to reflect thereon and to work their will. Inasmuch as our Constitution has been amended 22 times, the argument of some that amending imposes impossible requirements falls to the ground. Likewise, the position that our Supreme Court has taken to the effect that our Constitution must be interpreted in the light of the times or on changed conditions or that the Court has learned more about sociology since our Constitution and amendments thereto were adopted, becomes a usurpation of power which belongs—and, despite any United States Supreme Court decision, will always belong—to the people.

Decisions usurping these powers can be found in the words of Justice Frankfurter in *Wolf* v. *Colorado* (338 U. S. 2527), and in the article of Justice Douglas on stare decisis, and in *U. S.* v. *Classic* (313 U. S. 316, 319) and in the five cases known as the school cases, decided in May 1954 and reported in Three Hundred Forty-seventh United States Reports. Regarding the school cases referred to, the Supreme Court said, in approaching the questions presented to the Court: "In approaching this problem we cannot turn the clock back to 1868 when the amendment was adopted, or even to 1896 when *Plessy* v. *Ferguson* was written. We must consider public education in the light of its full development and its present place in American life throughout the Nation. Only in this way can it be determined if segregation in public schools deprives these plaintiffs of the equal protection of the law." What that court was actually saying was that it would not construe the 14th amendment, the basis of these decisions, according to the intentions of the lawmakers when that amendment was adopted in the Congress and that they would not construe the questions according to the intentions of the people who ratified that amendment. They were, in effect, saying that we will interpret the Constitution as it appears to us to be in harmony with our belief today, and if our beliefs change tomorrow, or a few days from now, we will again interpret that constitutional amendment as we wish it to be. In other words, we will make the Constitution a chameleon, changing its color according to our moods and fancies, and as we please.

I wonder what the architects of our Constitution would think. I ask the American people, what would Mr. Jefferson, Mr. Mason, President Washington and those other great men have said if some dreamer should have said to them while they were laboring over the creation of this instrument, "You need not be so careful in selecting the proper language for this instrument, for it will mean one thing today and another thing tomorrow." Everyone knows that under that hypothesis there would have been no Constitution.

If our Supreme Court has the right to change the meaning of our organic law whenever it sees fit, or to deviate in the slightest from the meaning and intent of our people who ratified that document then actually we have never had a Constitution. Further, it also means that what we understood were the bulwarks of our way of life have become an ambush to law-abiding citizens who planned their businesses upon the decisions of that Court yesterday. It is surprising and doubtless shocking, but the Supreme Court of the United States has declared that there is no restraint placed upon it that is not self-imposed. Under these declarations just quoted the Supreme Court is endowed with the powers of a dictatorship. Irrespective of what the Supreme Court says, there are restraints placed upon it. The framers of our Constitution saw to it that there were checks and balances. The Constitution itself is a restraint. Further, our Constitution provides that the jurisdiction of the Supreme Court on all constitutional questions shall be subject to such exceptions and regulations as Congress might make.

RESTRAINTS KNOWN

Restraints upon the Supreme Court are well known to many who would like to remove those restraints. S. 44, introduced in the 83d Congress, completely proves that these restraints were known to be in existence. S. 44 provided that the Supreme Court would have appellate jurisdiction on all constitutional questions, leaving out the present constitutional provision that Congress would have the right to make exceptions and regulations. Had S. 44 passed and been adopted, the Congress of the United States would have surrendered the power to make exceptions and regulations, and would have deprived the people from upsetting any of the erroneous decisions (and there are many) rendered by the United States Supreme Court, and no agency of the Government would have any power whatever save the Supreme Court, and the Supreme Court would have been completely free to interpret the Constitution belonging to 165 million Americans, without any lawful restraint. I will always be humbly grateful for the privilege that was mine to lead the fight in the House Committee on Judiciary and kill S. 44. I feel certain that the rank and file of our people do not know that there was ever a bill like S. 44, which by its terms would have deprived the people of any power whatsoever regarding the Supreme Court.

Some have said the southern Senators and Representatives had no right to issue that declaration of principles concerning the Supreme Court. Some have said that we took an oath to support the Supreme Court. I am astonished over such statements. We never took an oath to support the Supreme Court. We did take an oath to support the Constitution of the United States, and that oath carries with it the duty to criticize any branch of this Government that has violated the Constitution. That oath also carries the duty to do everything possible to preserve the Constitution. The arguments are ridiculous. Our history abounds in criticisms toward the Supreme Court.

President Jackson criticized the Supreme Court severely. Indeed, one of the contributing causes of the War Between the States was the refusal to accept the Supreme Court decision in the Dred Scott case. See Beveridge's Abraham Lincoln, volume IV, pages 157–158, stating that in 1858 the Republican leaders in the Senate accused the Supreme Court of being engaged in a scheme to spread slavery over the country. According to that book, the Republican Party joined that criticism in unity. Page 157 of that volume says that Senator Trumbull described the Dred Scott decision as the "odious and infamous opinion of a slave-driving Court," and that Court must be "wholly and totally revolutionized." See Nicolay and Hay, Lincoln Works, volume I, page 229, where Mr. Lincoln chided Judge Douglas for saying that no criticism or resistance should be made against a Supreme Court decision. Mr. Lincoln reminded Judge Douglas that he had applauded criticisms of that Court in the past and remarked, "It would be interesting for him to look over his recent speech and see how exactly his fierce philippics against us for resisting Supreme Court decisions fall upon his own head." Everyone remembers the harsh and continued criticisms of the Supreme Court by President Franklin Roosevelt. President Roosevelt referred to that Court as nine old and tired men, and endeavored to get rid of those Justices in every conceivable way. If we have lost the right to criticize the Supreme Court, Congress, or the President of the United States, then one of our greatest protections of constitutional government has been lost.

It was the combination of the school cases decisions and many other decisions that inspired a declaration of principles. For the last 20 years the Court has shown little respect for the rule of stare decisis, although that rule is hoary with age and indispensable as a rule of law. Stare decisis simply means "to stand by decided cases; to uphold precedent; to maintain former adjudications." The doctrine rests upon the sound principle that law by which men are governed should be fixed, definite, and known, and that when the law is declared by a court authorized to do so, such declarations, in the absence of palpable error, be accepted by the public as the law until changed by the legislative branch of the Government. The Supreme Court has made many decisions holding that stare decisis is peculiarly applicable to constitutional questions, but unfortunately it has also many times ruled that stare decisis is not applicable to constitutional questions. I think the public will agree that the rule of stare decisis should apply with more force to constitutional questions than perhaps any other legal question.

PRESIDENT MADE AGREEMENT

Another case that we do not like is *U. S.* v. *Pink* (315 U. S. 203). In that case moneys in a bank in New York were taken charge of by the courts of New York and that court was proceeding by well-settled law to administer those assets in a legal way. The President of the United States made an agreement with Soviet Representative Litvinov regarding those moneys, and though this agreement was made only by the President and was never submitted to the Senate for approval, the Supreme Court held that the President's agreement, like a treaty, superseded our Constitution and the laws of New York, thus saying that with one stroke of a pen the President could annihilate our Constitution and State laws.

In the case of *Missouri* v. *Holland* (252 U. S. 416), the Supreme Court held that a treaty made with Great Britain made a law which had theretofore been held unconstitutional completely valid, by ruling that this treaty was superior to our Constitution. Those rulings are not law, and have never been the law, and we reserve the right to criticize them. Thomas Jefferson said: "If the treaty power is unlimited, we have no Constitution." As a result of such decisions, the report of President Truman's Committee on Civil Rights in 1947 proudly pointed out that while our Constitution did not convey delegated powers to protect civil rights, that this could be overridden by means of treaties, and that the doctrine regarding treaty law had obvious importance in the field of civil rights legislation. That report said further that the Human Rights Commission of the United Nations was working on an international bill of rights, and if that was accepted by the United States, a strong basis for congressional action under the treaty power may be established. It is amazing to realize that for 120 golden years our Supreme Court held that our Constitution was supreme and that a treaty could not override its provisions; see *New Orleans* v. *United States* (10 Pet. 662, decided in 1838).

In *Shelly* v. *Kramer* (334 U. S. 1), the United States Supreme Court held that restrictive racial covenants in deeds were unenforceable, although for many years there was an unbroken background upholding racial covenants. It is true, of course, that these usually provided that the property conveyed would never be deeded to one of African descent. It necessarily follows, however, that any persons of African descent had the same right to incorporate in their deeds that the land could never be conveyed to any other race.

SUBMERGED LANDS WERE PROPERTY OF STATES

The result of the decision destroying these racial covenants was to cause damage to the property owners in this country exceeding the expense of some of our wars. It is a well-known fact that property in a neighborhood inhabited by mixed races immediately and seriously declines in value. The people suffering those terrific damages had relied upon the Court's former decisions that such covenants were valid and enforceable. When the United States Constitution was adopted, the States brought into that union their lands and their seacoasts, and throughout the ages it had been recognized that while the Government had a highway over the seas, the submerged lands were the property of the States. The Supreme Court a short time ago upset that ruling, and held that the United States owned those submerged lands. It took an act of Congress to destroy that erroneous decision. If those lands belonged to the Government, then the fish, shrimp, and all marine life belonged to the Government, and our citizens had been taking marine life from the sea unlawfully. Businesses built upon land that was a part of the sea would have automatically become the property of the Government.

Certainly the decisions regarding the five school cases aroused the interest of the Senators and Representatives signing the manifesto. It would have been news to Charles Sumner and Thaddeus Stevens, the two most rabid on civil rights, when the civil rights laws and the 14th amendment were passed, that their bills touched public schools. Both confessed many times that their legislation did not. In the middle of the debate of the 14th amendment Congress paused to pass a bill conveying property in the District of Columbia for the sole use of colored children (14 Stat. 342 (1866)). Segregated schools were established in the District of Columbia in 1862 when the War Between the States was raging, and segregated schools continued in the District until after the decision of the Supreme Court in 1954. Everyone knows that the District of Columbia, the seat of our Government, is and has been the guinea pig for all social experiments.

Stevens and Sumner knew schools were segregated in the District, and would have stopped them if they had had any legal basis therefor. In 1871 Senator Sumner tried to pass a law outlawing school segregation in the District of Columbia, but he was unable to do so. See S. 1244, 41st Congress, 3d session., CONGRESSIONAL GLOBE, 41st Congress, 3d session, 1053–1061. In December 1875 President Grant recommended to Congress a constitutional amendment to require all States to maintain schools for all children, irrespective of color. That recommendation was not followed by Congress. Had not segregated schools been the law in the District of Columbia and the majority of the States in the Union, there would have been no necessity for creating Howard University in the District of Columbia for the purpose of educating colored children at the expense of the taxpayers. Certainly if the intention had been to integrate the races, there could have been no justification for such a school. When the 14th amendment was ratified, there were 37 States in the Union. Twenty-three of those States had segregated schools, while some of the States had no public schools at all. There will be found no mention of education or schools in the 14th amendment or civil rights legislation, or in the Constitution of the United States. Public schools were and continue to be specifically reserved to the States by the 10th amendment.

SENATOR QUOTED

Even Senator Trumbull is quoted in CONGRESSIONAL GLOBE, 42d Congress, 2d session (1872) 3189, as saying: "The right to go to school is not a civil right and never was." In construing the former Supreme Court decisions regarding the 14th amendment and the civil-rights statutes, one must remember that the 14th amendment did provide for voting rights, sitting on juries, and other rights, implemented by civil-rights legislation. Any rights covered by the 14th amendment or implementing statutes come within the purview of the Supreme Court's jurisdiction. Any rights not covered in that amendment or implementing civil-rights statutes are not questions for the Supreme Court to consider. In 1896 the Supreme Court decided the case of *Plessy* v. *Ferguson* (163 U. S., p. 537), involving transportation facilities, a field coming within the 14th amendment and implementing legislation. That Court held that separate but equal facilities satisfied the Constitution. It is true that Justice Harlan, a relative of the present Justice Harlan, dissented in that case. Nevertheless, many State courts, including New York, Ohio, Indiana, and California had theretofore ruled that separate but equal facilities were sufficient.

The ruling in *Plessy* v. *Ferguson* was to the effect that the 14th amendment and the implementing civil-rights legislation were compiled with, though the facilities be separate, if equal. Justice Harlan's dissent in this case was never intended as a dissent on the question of schools. In *Cummings* v. *Board of Education* (175 U. S. 528 (1899)), Justice Harlan wrote the opinion. That was a case involving schools, and in that case he said that separate but equal facilities satisfied every constitutional provision and law, and the Court unanimously agreed with him. The reasoning of Justice Harlan is plain: In the Plessy case he felt that the Constitution and implementing legislation covering transportation was very different from school questions because schools were not touched by the Constitution or by legislation. A great distinction, to be sure. *Gong Lum* v. *Rice* (275 U. S. 78 (1927)), was written by Chief Justice Taft for a unanimous Court, and page 86 shows the holding to the effect that the question presented was one "within the constitutional power of the State legislature to settle without any intervention of the Federal courts under the Federal Constitution."

In that case, Lum, a Chinese, demanded that he be allowed to attend a white school rather than a colored school. The Court said that if the facilities were equal, the Constitution was satisfied. The 1954 decisions of the Supreme Court in the five school cases were virtually sterile with regard to precedents. That Court did refer to the slaughterhouse cases (1873) and *Strauder* v. *West Virginia* (1879). Any lawyer can certainly understand that those cases involved questions specifically covered under the 14th amendment and enabling legislation, and therefore could never be authority on a question completely divorced from the 14th amendment and implementing legislation.

PSYCHOLOGY HAS PLACE

The other cases cited as authority were decided in complete harmony with the separate but equal doctrine. It is shocking that in the 1954 school-case decisions the Supreme Court held that psychological knowledge at the time of the *Plessy* v. *Ferguson* case might not have been as great as modern authority. Psychology has its place, but psychology can never substitute for law. We respectfully maintain that the separate but equal doctrine is the only doctrine that makes good sense. Under these recent decisions one would assume that a male student would be within his constitutional rights to insist that he be enrolled in a school exclusively for females, and be permitted to share their dormitories, based on the contention that this all-girls' school had a better faculty than the male or coeducational school he was attending, and he was thereby deprived of his constitutional rights.

The Senators and Representatives signing the southern manifesto felt, and we believe many all over the United States are beginning to feel, that every vestige of States rights is being rapidly swept away, that our public schools have been the flowers of our democracy because they have been locally controlled. It is shocking to know that in the case of *The Board of Education* v. *Barnette* (319 U. S. 624), the Supreme Court struck down as unlawful a State requirement that schoolchildren salute the American flag. It is our opinion that the local authorities making that requirement were clearly within their rights and that the Court decision was completely erroneous. It is amazing that a State furnishing education to children cannot at the same time ask a little loyalty to the flag that made that privilege possible.

STATE COULD NOT LEGISLATE

We have a right to be discouraged concerning the rights of the States. On April 2, 1956, in the case of *Pennsylvania* v. *Nelson*, the Supreme Court by a split decision held that the State of Pennsylvania could not legislate against sedition, and upset a con-

viction by a court of Pennsylvania of an acknowledged member of the Communist Party for a violation of the Pennsylvania Sedition Act. That reversal was predicated on the ground that where the Government has legislated on that subject and occupied that field, any State law on that subject is superseded. That decision points out that 42 States, plus Alaska and Hawaii, have statutes prohibiting advocacy of the violent overthrow of our Government. Apparently, that decision has wiped out the laws of those 42 States and Alaska and Hawaii. The Federal law which the Supreme Court held was exclusive and prohibited State action is the law known as the Smith Act (title 18, U. S. C.) No one was more startled over the decision of the Supreme Court than was Congressman SMITH of Virginia, the author of that law.

That decision was rendered despite the fact that section 3231 of title 18 of the United States Code provides: "Nothing in this title shall be held to take away or impair the jurisdiction of the courts of the several States under the laws thereof." Pennsylvania is one of the great States of our Union, and it follows that any attempt to overthrow the Government of the United States is also an attempt to overthrow the government of Pennsylvania and the government of every other State in this Union.

Pending before the House Committee on the Judiciary now is H. R. 3, the same Congressman SMITH being the author thereof, and it simply provides that no act of Congress shall be construed to exclude State laws on the same subject, unless the act contains an express provision to that effect. By all means the people of this country should rise up and insist that H. R. 3 be speedily enacted. It is not expedient to try to pass a law to remedy only one Supreme Court decision. H. R. 3 would cover all congressional laws not containing the provision that State laws are excluded. On April 9, 1956, the Supreme Court in the case of *Slochowera* v. *Board of Higher Education of the city of New York*, ruled in a split decision that said school board could not discharge Slochowera as a schoolteacher because, when he was testifying before the Senate Subcommittee on Internal Security, he refused to answer questions concerning his membership in the Communist Party during the years 1940 and 1941 on the ground that his answers might tend to incriminate him. The board of education acted under section 903 of its city charter, providing that an employee of the city claiming the privilege against self-incrimination to avoid answering a question relating to his official conduct would have his employment terminated. The majority opinion of the Supreme Court says that no sinister meaning can be imputed toward a person asserting his rights under the fifth amendment. We do not agree with that statement.

FIFTH AMENDMENT PROTECTS

The fifth amendment does say that no person shall be compelled to give evidence against himself, and protects the individual from being convicted on such compelled testimony. It certainly does not mean that a person exercising that privilege can insist that he continue in the most sensitive area of our country, the schoolroom, and that the city is helpless to discharge him. Perhaps the public does not know that the same section 903 has been invoked many times against policemen in the city of New York, and that policemen claiming the fifth amendment have been discharged.

So long as the States are permitted to legislate and to exercise their rights retained in the 10th amendment, we have no fear for our country. We will stake our destiny upon our faith in the majority of the States of our Union. But when our States are not permitted to legislate on subjects covered by the Federal laws, then we see grave danger to our way of life. One United States Attorney General, entrusted with the destiny of our entire Union and our liberties, by reason of the fact that he alone is charged with enforcement of those laws, by his failure to act, his lack of sympathy with our ideals or even his lack of ability, could bring disaster upon our heads. Without reflection upon any Attorney General, past or present, a disloyal one could wreck our cherished institutions and destroy our liberties. Anyone familiar with Communist activities knows that their strategy is to infiltrate our most important Government agencies and our finest private institutions.

The signers of the declaration of principles have no apologies for their criticism. We support the Constitution of the United States. We recognize the powers belonging to the States and to the citizens of our Union. We have never asked the Supreme Court to "turn back the clock." We simply ask them to keep their hands off the clock and not attempt to keep time for America, that being the inalienalbe right of our 165 million American citizens. We know that good people all over our land share our views. No section has a monopoly on patriotism or loyalty. The American people are waking up. We do not wish to divide our people. We know that we are facing the most relentless enemy of human history. We want and expect to win this battle, both within and without our gates. America will stand up and be counted.

AIRPORT AT BURKE, VA.

(Mr. FLOOD asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, for the fifth time this year I rise to ask my friends on the other side of the aisle to follow President Eisenhower in suggested legislation. Since 1950 I have been appealing to the Appropriations Committee, and the subcommittee of which I sit dealing with CAA. I have offered a series of amendments in the Subcommitee on the Department of Commerce and in the full Committee on Appropriations and on the floor on main appropriation bills and on supplemental bills asking for funds to commence the construction of a new national airport at Burke, Va. The House and the committee have seen fit to reject those requests.

In 1950 we succeeded in getting the first million dollars to purchase the necessary land to begin the construction of this new airport.

In last night's Evening Star, Mr. Speaker, I saw a headline, "President Presses for the Burke Airport." Mr. Speaker, I hope this House and the Appropriations Committee in this body and the other body will give immediate consideration and attention to this essential and necessary addition to the safety of our Federal airways.

PROCEDURE IN THE HOUSE

(Mr. JONES of Missouri asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I take this minute to make some comment about the way we operate here in the House. Today we are finding it difficult to stretch out the business to remain in session for an hour, and of course no controversial issues will be considered.

Last Friday we had under consideration a bill to raise postal rates. Toward the end of the day a motion was made that all debate on the bill end in 15 minutes, and at that time vote on the bill, although there were some 6 amendments pending. In the division of the time, I was allotted 2 minutes to discuss what I thought was a rather important amendment.

Although the amendment on the first standing vote was defeated by a vote of 110 to 104, it was later defeated by a much larger vote. But, the next morning it was interesting—I had at least 25 Members who came to me and said that they had voted against the amendment because they did not understand it. I thought I had explained the amendment rather fully in the 2 minutes allotted to me. But, I want to say for the benefit of those who have expressed themselves in favor of an amendment which would restrict the activities of Members in sending franked matter, reprints from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, that they might have an opportunity to vote for that legislation later. I had already introduced a bill which has been referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service and those Members who are sincerely interested in practicing some economy can express themselves as being in favor of that bill which I hope the committee will report out.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

KEEP THE COURT SUPREME

(Mr. VANIK asked and was given permission to address the House for 10 minutes and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, during the past many weeks the Supreme Court of the United States, the third coordinate branch of our Federal Government, has been under a merciless attack by persons who oppose its decisions, primarily the decision of the Court banning segregation in the Nation's public schools. The history of our Nation is replete with attacks against the high court for its courageous stands on momentous issues. The Court has equally been criticized from time to time for its failure to show adequate courage in the face of dynamic, sociological change. There has in fact been no time in history when the decisions of the Court were pleasing to every American. In fact there is no time that the decsiion of any court is pleasing to more than 50 percent of the interested parties in any litigation.

It is an inherent right of any American to critically evaluate the work of any public official, elected, or appointed, who serves our Nation in either of the three branches of the Federal Government. That is the essence of our democratic system and the Justices of the Supreme Court must face fair criticism in the same manner as any Member of Congress or any executive in the administration. However, such criticism must be temperate and impersonal, directed toward the decision or to the action rather than to the person.

The vehemence of the current prolonged attack on the Supreme Court of the United States gradually destroys the

concept that the individual has for the administration of justice and respect for the law. The undermining of public confidence in the supreme legal authority of the United States Supreme Court undermines public confidence in all courts and impairs the law and order of the land.

It is argued that the recent integration decision is without legal merit and that it is contrary to the separate but equal decisions in previous cases. The separate and equal doctrine was an evolutionary step in the development of civil-rights law and in effect a moderate approach to the integration which is spelled out clearly in the American Constitution. If the Supreme Court deserves criticism on its integration decision, that criticism must be directed to the delay and the long road which the Court followed to finally reach its conclusion on the doctrine of segregated schools.

Recently a proposal was made to prohibit appointment to the Supreme Court without at least 5 years' experience in a lower court. Judicial experience is invaluable on the bench, but a lifetime of experience cannot provide sound judgment and sound reasoning where it did not originally exist. I suggest that this proposal is a blatant attempt to discredit a majority of the Justices, including the Chief Justice, who presently sit on that revered bench out of a deep and dedicated sense of duty. Their trust is unparalleled in the world. The proposal would have disqualified and denied to America the talents and genius of some of the most illustrious men in our history. John Marshall, who picked the Court up by the bootstraps and made it an important member of our executive-legislature-judicial triangle of checks and balances did not have 5 years' experience on the bench before his appointment. Nor did Roger Taney, who gave the Dred Scott decision on slaveholding a century ago; Salmon Chase, who had been in Lincoln's Cabinet; nor Melville Fuller, who was Chief Justice in 1896, when the Plessy against Ferguson case set up the separate but equal basis for segregation; nor Charles Evans Hughes.

It seems to me that the attacks which are being made upon the Supreme Court are designed as a retaliatory attempt to place in a position of public distrust an entire Court of fine and distinguished gentlemen for their rendition of a verdict which some persons find distasteful. It is nowhere provided in the Constitution that a decision must be pleasing to all sections of the country. Any group of people interposing against a decision which they do not like and declaring that it shall not be applicable are close to the brink of anarchy if their interposition is a belief that they can nullify the effect of a general decision upon their community.

The undisputable fact is that our Supreme Court has grown to keep pace with the increasing strength of our national Union. The courage of the Court has grown as the courage of the Nation has grown in the belief that this is a nation joined in the love of liberty and in the respect for equality under the law.

The Supreme Court's decision banning segregation in the Nation's public schools is the first long-overdue step in providing what the Constitution originally intended should be the law. The long road ahead calls for prompt legislative action to bring about a full measure of civil rights for every citizen. The current vicious attacks upon the integrity of the Supreme Court of the United States are, indeed, intemperate and not in the interest of the national well-being.

POSTAL RATE BILL

(Mr. HOLIFIELD asked and was given permission to address the House for 5 minutes and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, during the debate on the postal rate bill the other day, I made some arguments, which I thought were based on facts and which I still think were based on facts, with regard to assigning the deficit from the second- and third-class departments of the Post Office over to the first-class mail department users of the 3-cent stamp and 6-cent airmail stamp. The time was very limited and we had to avail ourselves of such time as the parliamentary procedure allowed us. Shortly after my remarks on the floor, in which I paid strict attention to the merits of the legislation and made no allusions to individual Members of the House, three Members of the minority party who are members of our committee—and I will not use their names because I did not know that I would have the time at this time to address the House and, therefore, had no opportunity to notify them—these three Members arose and in place of replying to my arguments on the postal rate bill, the proceeded to take me to task personally and intimated that I had not performed my committee duties as ardently as I should have.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. You realize very well, I am sure, that no one is subject to attack that way unless he has been doing a worthwhile job.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I thank the gentleman for his contribution. I will say this. I happen to be a member of 3 committees of the House—2 by choice and 1 by assignment of the leadership. The reason I was assigned to the Post Office and Civil Service Committee was that due to the fairly equal division of Members in the House, it was found that on the Democratic side I was the only Member not either serving on an exclusive committee or who was not already serving on two different committees. It so happens the House Committee on Government Operators is not an exclusive committee, and it also so happens that the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy is not counted as a House committee. My duties on both of those committees are very heavy. I am chairman of the legislative authorization committee of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, and I have very heavy duties with reference to all atomic-energy legislation pertaining to those subjects which go through my subcommittee. I am also chairman of the subcommittee on military operations of the Committee on Government Operations.

We have been holding hearings for some 5 months. We have been in session many mornings and afternoons. We have accumulated, I think, the most complete treatment of Federal civil defense that has yet been made by a committee of either body.

So my duties on those committees have prevented me from attending all of the meetings of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. However, I have tried to attend every meeting that I could. Particularly, I have tried to be there when legislation was voted out. So I do not think it was a courteous or kindly act on the part of my colleagues on that committee to make a disparaging remark about the discharge of my committee duties. I feel that I have probably put in as many hours in committee as any Member of the Congress, serving as I do on three committees.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I am glad to yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Is it not a fact that if you do attend to your duties on either one of the committees to which you have made reference you just cannot be here on the floor when much of this legislation is considered?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. That is certainly true. You cannot be in another committee that is meeting at the same time. Particularly if you are chairman of a subcommittee. You have to preside as chairman of that subcommittee, and you cannot desert your own subcommittee in order to go to another committee of which you may be a member.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Well, does it not follow that unless the matter which is being heard by the committee has to do with legislation which is about to come before the House, we should not be holding committee hearings during these last 2 or 3 weeks of the session?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I will say this much that the judgment of the chairman of a subcommittee must prevail in a case like this. In my own case, I have tried to arrange my subcommittee schedules so that I will not have meetings during the last 2 or 3 weeks of the Congress. But I was forced to hold hearings on the Atomic Energy Committee while the House was in session. As I say, that is a privilege of the chairman of a subcommittee.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

MUTUAL SECURITY APPROPRIATION BILL

(Mr. GROSS asked and was granted permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, in view of today's abbreviated session, indicating that there is no serious business pressing upon the House and probably will not be until the end of the session, I think we have every reason to expect that tomorrow, when the multi-million-dollar WPA bill is before the House, there will be no unreasonable limitation of debate.

STATEMENTS BY THE PRESS

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that one of our subcommittee chairmen, the gentleman from California [Mr. Moss] is on the floor, I would like to ask permission to address the House for 5 minutes at this time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, the reference was made to the gentleman from California [Mr. Moss], because yesterday in the committee a question which I consider of considerable importance came up. Because there might be some misunderstanding about the question which was raised, and that statement is made because of press comment, this time is taken. The point yesterday was this: Reference was made by the committee counsel to a newspaper article, parts of which were put in the record. My objection at that time was that if in committee hearings statements from the press were to be read and incorporated in the record, as evidence, whenever those statements charged any individual with misconduct of any kind then the one who wrote the statement should be called so that the committee might know what weight to give to that statement.

The chairman ruled, and correctly, I think, that the committee had no authority to investigate newspaper reports and newspaper articles. That is not difficult to go along with. That seems sound legally and in every other way. But that is not the situation to which my point was directed. Perhaps I did not make it clear. The situation yesterday did not raise the issue directly insofar as the individual was concerned, because no individual was by that article charged with misconduct. The article was being used to show that the recollection of the witness who was testifying before the committee was at fault.

On this point, and I would be glad to have the chairman of the committee comment on this, for as I view the hearings, he has conducted them fairly without any political tinge except possibly to show that the Eisenhower administration is a little more secretive than previous ones. However, I do not know of any executive department that has ever freely given any committee of Congress any information which would tend to reflect discredit upon the administration involved.

But this is the point, when a witness comes before a committee and then committee counsel or a member of the committee brings in and puts into the committee record a statement charging some misconduct on the part of the witness or a statement tends to substantiate some charge which has been made against either the department or an individual, the person who wrote that article should be required to come in and give the committee the source of his information. Otherwise we get uncorroborated, irresponsible statements on the record which may reflect and which at times do reflect upon a department or an individual who is under investigation, or whose name appears in the record.

Rule XI 25 (m) of the House provides:

(m) If the committee determines that evidence or testimony at an investigative hearing may tend to defame, degrade, or incriminate any person, it shall—

(1) receive such evidence or testimony in executive session;

(2) afford such person an opportunity voluntarily to appear as a witness; and

(3) receive and dispose of requests from such person to subpena additional witnesses.

The right of confrontation is a common law right guaranteed to one accused of a crime. The purpose of the sixth amendment reaffirming that right did not broaden it nor wipe out the exceptions nor can a State deny it—*Salinger* v. *U. S.* (272 U. S. C. 548). Nor is the right to confrontation limited to criminal trials or proceedings in Federal courts.

A conviction for contempt in a State court was reversed because the accused had not had opportunity to meet his accusers—*In re Oliver* (333 U. S. C. 257).

Because lawmakers should be especially careful to protect civil rights, congressional committees should not deny to anyone appearing before them the right to due process, the right to face and interrogate his accuser.

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Yes, I shall be glad to yield.

Mr. MOSS. First I want to thank the gentleman for his comment on the efforts of the chairman to keep the committee out of politics. I would, however, like to make one correction: We are not trying to prove that any administration is more secretive than any other; on the other hand, we are trying to look at facts.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. If the gentleman will let me comment there, that is a personal impression, that is all.

Mr. MOSS. The question the gentleman raises is purely an academic one, because I can envision no incident where the committee counsel would place in the record any charge that would become a basis for committee action.

The article referred to yesterday was not given the committee by a newspaper reporter but was taken by the staff from a newspaper for the information of the committee. I think the condition would be entirely different if a reporter referred an item to the committee for its study and consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

(By unanimous consent Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. In my opinion the issue is not an academic one. It will be with us a long, long time. My point is this, and I want to be sure I make myself understood. I agree with the chairman wholeheartedly that the committee has no authority to investigate the truth or falsity of the average newspaper editorial or news story. The individual, if there is an individual who is harmed, has his remedy at civil law, and sometimes under the criminal law. My point is this, where there is a newspaper article, be it editorial or news story, which reflects upon the Department or upon an individual and by referring to it or quoting from it or putting it into the record, in making that a part of the testimony, then my point is that having given evidence in the case the one who is responsible for the statement containing the article should be subject to cross examination so that we will know whether the report is factual or merely the expression of an opinion or just a figment of the imagination of the writer. Certainly a committee cannot accept as evidence an ex parte statement on a disputed issue of fact without giving the accused an opportunity to test the weight to be given it. The right to be confronted by the witness is as old as the common law itself. That is the point I am making.

Mr. MOSS. On that point specifically, an article placed in the record by counsel for the subcommittee or by any member of the committee can be objected to by any other Member. If the article is placed in there because committee counsel or a member of the committee personally clipped it from a newspaper, then I feel that the committee has no authority, and it would be highly improper for us to request the reporter who is in no way a party to the controversy to come in and disclose the source of his information.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. With all due respect to my chairman, there is a difference of opinion there. Making an article a part of the record automatically carries with it the right of the accused to be confronted by the witness. I think it involves a fundamental proposition, because by placing that article in the record it becomes evidence. Then the one who gives that evidence should, like any other witness who appears personally, be subject to cross examination. Otherwise, I may get an article in a paper, or I may come in with an affidavit, or statement, introduce it into the record with no opportunity on the part of anyone to question its truthfulness. Our rules permit the introduction in committee hearings of statements either sworn to or otherwise. The article or statement may be filled with vicious, scurrilous charges, and if I as the author cannot be called then to give the source of my information to substantiate my charges, we get into the position where we are doing what our rules, and which I think commonsense and common decency forbid. We are letting someone be accused without the opportunity of being able to answer.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

(Mr. MOSS asked and was given permission to address the House for 2 minutes.)

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Speaker, it is my opinion, as it has been right along, that the committee has no authority to investigate the press. If the gentleman objects to an article and desires to request that a reporter be subpenaed, the gentleman can make that request and at

that time the committee may determine whether or not it intends to go ahead pursuant to that request. But it is still the chairman's opinion that any such attempt to bring before the committee a reporter would be a highly improper procedure.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Even though his statement is put in the record?

Mr. MOSS. Even though his statement is put in the record. He has not requested that it be so printed.

CRITICISM OF EITHER HOUSE OF CONGRESS BY THE OTHER

(Mr. BOW asked and was given permission to address the House for 5 minutes and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, our distinguished Speaker of the House, on June 25, called the attention of the House to a rule that forbids any Member of the House from inserting in the RECORD anything which might be a reflection upon a Member of the other body. I agree with that rule. I think it is a good one, I think all Members of the House agree with that rule. However, Mr. Speaker, it seems to be a one-way street.

I should like to call the attention of the Speaker and the Members of the House to page A5384 of the Appendix to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of July 9. I shall not refer by name to the Member of the other body who inserted the matter in the RECORD, but I will say he is one of the leaders of the majority in that body. He has inserted an editorial which I shall read part of as follows:

> The death of the school construction bill in the House of Representatives on Thursday was nothing less than a national disaster. The measure was put to death by a combination of prejudice and politicking in an atmosphere of confusion and finagling discreditable to Democrats and Republicans alike, and to the House itself as a lawmaking body.

Mr. Speaker, as one Member of this body, I resent an editorial of that kind being inserted in the RECORD which casts a reflection upon the House of Representatives by a Member of the other body. I would suggest that the gentleman who has inserted that editorial, by reason of his leadership, could bring up a bill in the Senate himself. And, if he feels the way he does about it, he has been lax in his duty in not bringing that legislation before the Senate.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOW. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, I am very glad that the gentleman from Ohio has brought this matter to the attention of the Speaker. It seems to me it is something which the Speaker might wish to take up with the Member of the other body in question and with the other body as a body. I call the attention of the Speaker to the fact that in the same issue on pages 11016 and 11017 another Member of the other body, whose name our rules do not permit us to disclose, not only inserted in the RECORD exactly the same editorial, which is something not permitted on our side of the Capitol, and I understand is not normally permitted in the other body, but also a complete rollcall coupled with an attack upon the Members of Congress who had voted for the Powell amendment and against the bill. Now, it so happens that his attack does not affect me personally. But, I do, on behalf of my colleagues whom he is attacking in that article, resent the attack. The particular Member making the attack in the other body happens to be a good friend of mine for whom I entertain personally a warm regard, but I think it should be called to his attention that such action on our side against Members of the other body would be criticized, and very properly so, by the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and that his action may be violative of the principles of comity which should govern our relations. I think the gentleman from Ohio has performed a service by bringing this matter to the attention of the House.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOW. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. The gentleman was referring to this article on page A5384, ignoring the children.

Mr. BOW. That is correct.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Let me say to the gentleman that I read that article when it came out, and it was what you would expect if you were familiar with the publishers or the public policy of the Washington Post.

Mr. BOW. But you would not expect a Member of the other body to use it as an indictment against this body for its official action.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Well, I would say that they were selecting a mighty poor witness. But I would not want to comment. The rules forbid any comment about what I would expect of the other body or the Members of it.

Mr. BOW. I am delighted the gentleman is respecting the rules of the House. That we both agree upon.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. As far as I can. I have difficulty sometimes, when I see something in the RECORD that has been put in over there. I have difficulty in abiding by the rules for two reasons: First, because you cannot comment under the rules upon what they do over there, and then there are laws against the use of certain words, kinds of words, that might factually but not with propriety be used about the Members.

HOUR OF MEETING TOMORROW

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I understand the House has already agreed to meet tomorrow at 10 o'clock.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. That is correct.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield for a moment, the gentleman knows that our Members are very busy today. In the gentleman's opinion, will they be through with the tasks which they are trying to accomplish today in time to meet tomorrow at 10 o'clock?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I will say in response to the gentleman's query that I trust there will be a large attendance tomorrow at 10 o'clock. As I have already stated, the House has already agreed to convene at that time tomorrow.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. HAND, for 10 minutes today, his manuscript to be inserted following the other special orders of the day.

Mr. HESELTON, for 20 minutes, on Thursday and Friday next.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. GROSS in two instances, in each to include extraneous matter.

Mr. SEELY-BROWN and include an editorial.

Mr. BENTLEY in two instances, in each to include extraneous matter notwithstanding that one exceeds the limit and is estimated by the Public Printer to cost $173.25.

Mr. LIPSCOMB in three instances, in each to include extraneous matter.

Mr. OSTERTAG and include extraneous matter.

Mr. MORANO (at the request of Mr. HAND) in three instances, in each to include extraneous matter.

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin in two instances, in one to include extraneous matter.

Mr. WALTER and include an address by Major General Dean.

Mr. HAGEN and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. ABBITT (at the request of Mr. MCCORMACK) and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. FRIEDEL (at the request of Mr. MCCORMACK) and to include extraneous matter.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts and to include an article.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois in two instances and to include additional matter.

Mr. LESINSKI and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. ZABLOCKI and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. REES of Kansas and include extraneous matter.

Mr. VAN ZANDT (at the request of Mr. KEATING) and include extraneous matter.

Mr. MULTER in five instances and include extraneous matter.

Mr. MADDEN and include a speech by the first district commander of the American Legion of Indiana.

Mr. DIXON (at the request of Mr. DAWSON of Utah).

Mr. FLOOD and to include some editorials.

Mr. DODD (at the request of Mr. HAYS of Arkansas) in five instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. RODINO (at the request of Mr. HAYS of Arkansas) in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 26 minutes p. m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, July 11, 1956, at 10 o'clock a. m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

2051. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the audit of the Federal home loan banks for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1955, pursuant to the Government Corporation Control Act (31 U. S. C. 841) and the Federal Home Loan Bank Act (12 U. S. C. 1421) (H. Doc. No. 444); to the Committee on Government Operations and ordered to be printed.

2052. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a report of the Department of the Interior on the Farwell unite, Nebraska, of the Missouri River Basin project, pursuant to the provisions of section 9 (a) of the Reclamation Project Act of 1939 (H. Doc. No. 445); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs and ordered to be printed, with illustrations.

2053. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a proposed concession permit with Mrs. Arsena Robinson which, when executed by the regional director, region No. 3, National Park Service, will authorize Mrs. Robinson to provide accommodations, facilities, and services for the public within Timpanogos Cave National Monument, Utah, for a period of 5 years from January 1, 1956, pursuant to the act of July 1, 1953 (67 Stat. 271); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

[*Omitted from the Record of July 9, 1956*]

Mr. HESELTON: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. Part 2, minority views on H. R. 8902. A bill to amend subsection 406 (b) of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended (Rept. No. 2530). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

[*Submitted July 10, 1956*]

Mr. SMITH of Virginia: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 584. Resolution waving points of order against H. R. 12138, a bill making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 2648). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. MADDEN: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 585. Resolution for consideration of H. R. 12080, a bill authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors for navigation, flood control, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 2656). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. TRIMBLE: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 586. Resolution for consideration of S. 3982, an act to provide for the maintenance of production of tungsten, asbestos, fluorspar, and columbium-tantalum in the United States, its Territories and possessions, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 2657). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. KILDAY: Committee on Armed Services. H. R. 5519. A bill to authorize and direct the Secretary of the Army to convey certain tracts of land in El Paso County, Tex., to the city of El Paso, Tex., in exchange for certain lands to be conveyed by the city of El Paso, Tex., to the United States Government; with amendment (Rept. No. 2669). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. VINSON: Committee on Armed Services. S. 976. An act to provide for the release of the right, title, and interest of the United States in a certain tract or parcel of land conditionally granted by it to the city of Montgomery, W. Va.; without amendment (Rept. No. 2670). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BURDICK: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 8617. A bill to validate certain payments of sea-duty pay made to naval personnel serving on board vessels in the Great Lakes during the period November 1, 1950, to October 31, 1953; with amendment (Rept. No. 2671). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee: Committee on Public Works. H. R. 8265. A bill relating to the use of storage space in the Buford Reservoir for the purpose of providing Gwinnett County, Ga., a regulated water supply; with amendment (Rept. No. 2672). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee: Committee on Public Works. H. R. 8940. A bill relating to the sale of water from the Hulah Reservoir to the city of Bartlesville, Okla; with amendment (Rept. No. 2673). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee: Committee on Public Works. H. R. 11702. A bill to provide for the sale of lands in reservoir areas under the jurisdiction of the Department of the Army for cottage-site development and use; without amendment (Rept. 2674). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. RODINO: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 11907. A bill to amend title 28, United States Code, with respect to fees of United States marshals; without amendment (Rept. No. 2675). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DAVIS of Tennnesee: Committee on Public Works. S. 1358. An act to authorize modification of the flood-control project for Missouri River Agricultural Levee Unit 513-512-R, Richardson County, Neb.; without amendment (Rept. 2676). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. FORRESTER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 1154. An act for the relief of Hal A. Marchant; without amendment (Rept. No. 2649.) Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FORRESTER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 1708. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Ernest M Kersh; without amendment (Rept No. 2650). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. DONOHUE: Committee on the Judiciary: S. 3150. An act for the relief of Sgt. and Mrs. Herbert G. Herman; without amendment (Rept. No. 2651) Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 1243. An act for the relief of Kyu Lee; with amendment (Rept. No. 2652). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 1324. An act for the relief of Salvatore di Morello; with amendment (Rept. No. 2653). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 1627. An act for the relief of Alexander Orlov and his wife, Maria Orlov; without amendment (Rept. No. 2654). Referred to the Committe of the Whole House

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 3009. An act for the relief of Kiyoshi Kinoshita; with amendment (Rept. No. 2655). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 3473. An act for the relief of Kurt Johan Paro; without amendment (Rept. No. 2658). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 3579. An act for the relief of Elizabeth M. A. de Cuevas Faure; without amendment (Rept. No. 2659). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FEIGHAN: Committee on the Judiciary. House Joint Resolution 662. Joint resolution for the relief of certain relatives of United States citizens; with amendment (Rept. No. 2660). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FORRESTER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 2952. A bill for the relief of John H. Parker; with amendment (Rept. No. 2661). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FORRESTER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 4464. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Kathryn H. Wallace; with amendment (Rept. No. 2662). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FORRESTER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 5586. A bill for the relief of Otto B. Hauffe; without amendment (Rept. No. 2663). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FORRESTER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 7162. A bill for the relief of T. W. Holt & Co.; without amendment (Rept. No. 2664). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FORRESTER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 8056. A bill for the relief of Col. Adolph B. Miller; with amendment (Rept. No. 2665). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BURDICK: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 9028. A bill for the relief of Fred G. Nagle Co.; without amendment (Rept. No. 2666). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BURDICK: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 11822. A bill for the relief of Tom R. Hickman and Nannie Conley and husband, Jack Conley; with amendment (Rept. No. 2667). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. COOLEY: Committee on Agriculture. House Joint Resolution 642. Joint resolution to authorize and direct the Secretary of Agriculture to quitclaim certain property in Coahoma County, Miss., to the Home Demonstration Club of Rena Lara, Miss., Inc.; without amendment (Rept. No. 2668). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ADAIR:

H. R. 12166. A bill to repeal the act of

February 18, 1896, as amended; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BLATNIK:

H. R. 12167. A bill to authorize the payment to local governments of sums in lieu of taxes and special assessments with respect to certain Federal real property, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. ELLIOTT:

H. R. 12168. A bill to amend section 4 (a) of the Vocational Rehabilitation Act, as amended; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. HYDE:

H. R. 12169. A bill to establish the Chesapeake and Ohio Canal National Historical Park and to provide for the administration and maintenance of a parkway, in the State of Maryland, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. JUDD:

H. R. 12170. A bill to remove the present $1,000 limitation which prevents the Secretary of the Navy from settling certain claims arising out of the crash of a naval aircraft at the Wold-Chamberlin Air Field, Minneapolis, Minn.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LIPSCOMB:

H. R. 12171. A bill to authorize the payment to local governments of sums in lieu of taxes and special assessments with respect to certain Federal real property, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MORRISON:

H. R. 12172. A bill to exempt certain shipments of farm produce from the tax on the transportation of property; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MOSS:

H. R. 12173. A bill to authorize the payment to local governments of sums in lieu of taxes and special assessments with respect to certain Federal real property, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey:

H. R. 12174. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 so as to impose a graduated tax on the taxable income of corporations; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 12175. A bill to provide for the transfer of the Civil Service Commission Building in the District of Columbia to the Regents of the Smithsonian Institution for use in housing the National Collection of Fine Arts and National Portrait Gallery, to provide for the international interchange of art and craft works, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. WAINWRIGHT:

H. R. 12176. A bill to provide for the establishment of a Federal Advisory Council on the Arts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. YOUNG:

H. R. 12177. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934, so as to direct the Federal Communications Commission to provide for the licensing of television reflector facilities and VHF translator facilities; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BONNER:

H. Con. Res. 263. Concurrent resolution authorizing additional copies of the hearing on Labor-Management Problems of the American Merchant Marine; to the Committee on House Administration.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. EVINS:

H. R. 12178. A bill for the relief of Col. Benjamin Axelroad; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOSMER:

H. R. 12179. A bill for the relief of Jael Mercades; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WALTER:

H. R. 12180. A bill for the relief of Walter Schik; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. J. Res. 680. Joint resolution to waive certain provisions of section 212 (a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act in behalf of certain aliens; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. J. Res. 681. Joint resolution to waive the provision of section 212 (a) (6) of the Immigration and Nationality Act in behalf of certain aliens; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. J. Res. 682. Joint resolution for the relief of certain aliens; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. J. Res. 683. Joint resolution for the relief of certain aliens; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Appendix

The Expanding Reality of the Communist Calculus for World Conquest

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ALVIN M. BENTLEY

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 10, 1956

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, a great deal of confusion and misguided speculation in the free world has resulted from the Moscow exploitation of the concept of peaceful coexistence. Unfortunately, many are being lulled into a false sense of security and, in thought and spirit, are abandoning the captive nations and peoples in a finality of Red colonial slavery. These are the prime objectives of the current Russian propaganda drive. The skill and cleverness with which this drive is being managed, undoubtedly makes this period of the cold war the most dangerous of all.

An attempt to synthesize the many elements at work in the present situation, with a cautious appraisal of their significance, is provided in an interesting address on the Expanding Reality of the Communist Calculus for World Conquest, delivered on Saturday, June 30, by Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky in Winnipeg, Canada. Dr. Dobriansky, who is a professor of Soviet economics in the graduate school of Georgetown University and also chairman of the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America, appeared before the Ukrainian National Youth Federation of Canada.

This address is based on ideas incorporated in a previous address which I had the pleasure of introducing into the RECORD last summer. It maintains that the Communist calculus is in full operation despite Moscow's theatrics on peaceful coexistence and that unless our policy of national liberation is courageously and fully implemented in the near future, the chance of averting a third world war will diminish greatly. The address furnishes a working, integrated picture of the present phase in the cold war. Commending it to the reading of my colleagues, I include it in the RECORD, as follows:

THE EXPANDING REALITY OF THE COMMUNIST CALCULUS FOR WORLD CONQUEST

(Address by Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky, professor in Soviet economics, Graduate School, Georgetown University; chairman, Ukrainian Congress Committee of America, to Ukrainian National Youth Federation of Canada, Winnipeg, Canada, June 30, 1956)

In all humility, it was a source of great personal delight to be invited for this occasion this evening and, indeed, it is a real pleasure to have this opportunity to exchange views with friends across the border and, above all, with friends in the common cause of expansive freedom. The experience of addressing youth is always a pleasant and exciting one for me because youth represents a ready challenge to set ideas, a vigor to entertain the new and untried, and a vision to achieve the reality of its vibrant convictions. Of course, as in any field of thought and enterprise, there will, unavoidably, be points of disagreement due, perhaps, to different perspectives or shifts of emphasis enforced by practical criteria, but these should not deter us from exercising the highest measure of rational objectivity aimed at an essential mutuality of understanding beyond the parochial realm of personalities, parties, and vain pretensions of various sorts. My sole purpose this evening is to portray for you the manner in which we in the United States assess the present position of our cause in the complex of international developments and what, as citizens of this ultimate bastion of world freedom and national independence, we propose to do.

THE CAUSE OF THE NON-RUSSIAN NATIONS IN THE SOVIET UNION

Let us, for a moment, briefly review the main outlines of the cause of the non-Russian nations in the Soviet Union as we understand it and as we advance it within the United States. In essence, as you know, this cause is the cause of freedom and national independence of Ukraine, Lithuania, Latvia, Estonia, White Ruthenia, Georgia, Armenia, Agerbaijan, Turkestan, and other non-Russian nations, held captive in the Soviet Union empire. The essence of this cause necessarily promotes the real and genuine independence of the Russian people from centuries of autocratic government, totalitarianism, and costly Russian adventures in colonialism and imperialism. It is closely interwoven with the cause of national self-determination and freedom of all other captive non-Russian nations in Eastern Europe and Asia which share the common bondage under the yoke of imperialist Moscow. This cause of the non-Russian nations in the Soviet Union, for which there is overwhelming historical, political, and moral justification, is one of the most important and significant segments of the general cause of national and human freedom on the part of the free world.

As we view it—and I believe quite properly and soundly—this non-Russian action is inextricably tied up with the cause of freedom and justice championed by our own country and as best exemplified by our own Declaration of Independence. Sober analysis clearly demonstrates that it is crucial and determinative to the national security interests of the United States as we know it is to those of Canada as well. But most significant in the current situation, this action provides the best conceivable means of winning the cold war and defeating the global designs of Communist Moscow at the least cost and the maximum chance of averting a third world war. Once one grasps the present unfolding significance of the Communist calculus for world conquest, the full import of this truth conveyed by our action, becomes manifest and pressing.

The implementation of our program is understandably shaped by the fundamental premise that in advocating and advancing this non-Russian cause, which is so predominantly obnoxious to the oligarchical dictatorship in Moscow, we are serving the first and primary interest of the United States. What we do, therefore, must be and is within the legal and institutional framework of our Nation. Various legislative measures, projects, proposals, and acts are promulgated within this independent framework and cannot be otherwise. Some either do not understand this or do not wish to, but this is an unalterable fact contributing to the maximum efficiency of our endeavors and to the success of our efforts. We strongly believe that in serving our Nation, which, in ultimate effect, is the remaining powerful obstacle to worldwide Russian Communist dominion, we best serve the liberation interests of the Ukrainian nation, indeed, of all the captive nations in the present Russian Communist empire. Our energies are directed chiefly at the object of this mutual interest between the United States and the captive nations both within and without the Soviet Union and are spent on none other. In a consultative way, we join with all of like-minded inclination in the common effort, but we reserve to each the determination of honorable and respectable means toward the accomplishment of our mutual end.

The course that we have been pursuing in this decade has produced many sterling results, and promises to produce more. Knowledge and understanding of the various non-Russian nations in the Soviet Union are broader and deeper than ever before. A serious and distinct interest in this subject is observable in our institutions of learning, and it is an object of continuous study in many private and official circles. It receives appropriate treatment by invitation in various congressional hearings, and it poses tremendous potentiality for executive action. Only time and circumstance are required to actualize this potentiality in behalf of the enslaved Ukrainian nation and all captive nations in the Communist empire. That this actualization will take effect in the course of the cold war, we have no doubt whatsoever. The Communist calculus for world conquest will compel it.

THE COMMUNIST CALCULUS FOR WORLD CONQUEST

There is a Communist calculus for world conquest and its development poses a real and even frightening dilemma to the free world. Two years ago, precisely this August, it was my privilege to lecture before military groups at Fort Meade in Maryland. Being a professor, it is my happy vocation to contemplate ideas and at that time, the theory of this calculus was advanced. Shaped by the crucible of argument and debate, the theory was presented in a more refined form in an address to the Buffalo Advertising Club a year ago which, under the good auspices of the Honorable ALVIN M. BENTLEY, appeared in full text in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of July 28, 1955.

Now, what do we mean by the Communist calculus for world conquest? It maintains that the complexity and diverseness of data relative to the Soviet Union and the entire Communist bloc are reducible to three basic and determining variables. These variables are long-run categories accommodating and conditioning all sorts of short-run acts and programs aimed at the fixed goal of world domination by Moscow. The first of these variables is the genocidal consolidation of the Russian Communist empire. The second essential variable is the progressive attain-

ment by Moscow of substantial adequacy or superiority in arms and military prowess. The third variable is the fear of imperialist Moscow of free world retaliation, a variable that stands in direct relation to the deterrent power of the free world.

The theory holds that given the necessary time, achieve through skilled diplomacy, peaceful coexistence and acquiescent passivity on the part of the West, with the development and fruition of the first two variables, namely, empire consolidation and increasing select armed superiority, the third variable will radically lessen in importance and the free world will find itself without the deterrent material power to reinforce its policy of freedom. At the present rates of relative progress in politics and industry, the time necessary for this fruition is calculated not in terms of a generation, but anywhere from 5 to 10 years. While we comfortably bask in the momentary sunlight of peace and prosperity, induced largely by Moscow's policy of peaceful coexistence, the material and psychological forces entailed by these developing variables are at work, casting a real dilemma for the free world with doubtless increasing risks and danger to our respective national securities and futures.

THE EXPANDING REALITY OF THE CALCULUS

This theory is plainly not an optimistic one, but it is painfully realistic. In fact, steadily accumulating evidence over the past year, drawn from various essential sources, concretely supports the expanding reality of the calculus. The clever, cunning, and deceitful policies of Moscow in the current period cannot but accelerate the further expansion of this reality, while many quarters in the West are rendered confused, deluded and even helpless. Some even rationalize this expanding reality of the calculus as a healthy evolution, despite the fact that it generates behind the convenient facade of peaceful coexistence the unhealthy results of empire uniformity, armed superiority and the loss of power of deterrence for the West. Indeed, while scores of people are given to believe that the possibility of global armed conflict is receding, the material bases for such a conflict, with shifting advantage to the East, are increasing.

When we realistically survey the current situation in terms of our first variable, the formidable gains in empire consolidation cannot be doubted, and assuming our relative passiveness in policy and operation, they will continue to increase in behalf of Moscow's successful strategy. There is no evidence of any cleavage or disunity between and among the various dictatorial Communist governments. There is no evidence of any real loss of subservience on the part of these numerous governments to Moscow; nor is there any evidence of the possibility of rampant Titoism, for even Tito has negated Titoism. Despite recent events, the illusion of Titoism still possesses the minds of many officials in the West who cannot seem to grasp the Communist meaning of "national in form, socialist in content," which is an expedient concept for the annihilation of all patriotic forces dedicated to national and human freedom.

The steady integration of the empire, both political and economic, has been progressing uninterruptedly since the end of the last decade. The great hope of western support for the eventual liberation of the many enslaved nations in the Communist empire has steadily dwindled. Mass redefection of emigres who fled from this empire of national captivity provides perhaps the most grim evidence of this spreading hopelessness and, at the same time, of the remarkable success of the Kremlin's consolidation efforts. Through the expedient concept of "national in form, socialist in content," the well calculating dictatorship in Moscow will realize further crucial gains in this respect by the subterfuge of innocuous liberalization in its hold over the various captive nations in ite empire. Forms of economic and political decentralization will be furthered, propaganda play on the freedom, independence, and contentment of the captive nations will be intensified, and like-minded national quislings will be integrated into the ruling caste, all with the well-calculated purpose of empire consolidation and depriving the West of the use of its most formidable weapon against Russian colonialism and imperialism, namely the true patriotic force of nationalism resident in each of the captive nations.

This strategy, which greatly buttresses our first variable, is not new. Stalin used it on occasions to sap the strength of nationalist forces in the Soviet Union, as witness his insistence at Yalta on the membership of Ukraine and White Ruthenia in the United Nations. But, today, it is being employed with greater finesse, keener skill, and with doubtless success. It is, to be sure, being utilized by the oligarchical dictatorship as a risk to Moscow's domination over the captive nations, but a bearable risk so long as the West just passively observes and wishfully speculates on what is transpiring. The program of "national in form, socialist in content" can be pursued only to a point short of unleashing unmanageable forces that would destroy the empire itself. It would be naive for us to believe that the Kremlin is intent upon approaching this point too closely. However, it is not unreasonable for us to deplore the policies of the West that, in real effect, guarantee the success of this program by their sheer unimaginative and passive character.

It is no wonder then that the high priest of the policy of containment in the United States, George F. Kennan, has already written off the fate of the captive nations as a "finality for better or worse." The finality of national captivity is the chief consequence of myopic containment based essentially on deterrent material power. The containment policy, which is still being pursued without the name, is, strangely enough, one of the main contributors to the success of Moscow's empire consolidation effort. In the light of this analysis, it is no wonder, too, that the other day in response to a reporter's query on the possibility of "more freedom for satellite states," Marshal Tito replied, "Now they have ceased to be satellites" and demanded "Why do you people keep calling them satellites?" (Evening Star, Washington, D. C., Wednesday, June 27, p. A-33.) For the supposed personification of Titoism, Poland, Hungary, Bulgaria, Rumania, Slovakia, and Czechia are to be regarded as free and independent. This is the basic Communist meaning of "national in form, socialist in content."

The variable of empire consolidation is, of course, primary and prerequisite to all else. An insecure hold on the captive peoples scarcely provides the springboard for world domination. But the fruition of this variable is not sufficient. The fixed goal of world domination requires also the full development of the second variable, namely material adequacy and armed superiority. Some wish to portray the present phase of the cold war as one of economic competition, but here, too, there is nothing substantially new. The present dictatorship in Moscow is in the most orthodox economic manner carrying out the policies of Stalin in agriculture, in industry, in the high priorities of nuclear warfare. But, again, behind the facade of peaceful coexistence, with all of its harmless frills of cultural exchanges, diplomatic respectability, and incessant tributes to the cause of peace, under the present dictatorship these policies are being executed with greater skill and shrewdness.

It is not my intention here to glut your minds with statistics. However, let me point out certain crucial facts, validated by available statistical data, which unmistakably point out the fruition of our second variable. First, it is most misleading to compare absolute figures in the production of steel, pig iron, oil, coal, electricity, and other industrial essentials between the free world and the Communist empire, and comfort ourselves that our combined production exceeds theirs to such a marked extent that we have nothing to fear. An armed invasion of Western Europe would wipe out the pronounced differences instantaneously. But given these figures, the determining fact is the allocation of such productive output. With the absolute differences contracting by virtue of the greater rate of increase in industrial growth in the empire, the Kremlin can achieve armed superiority in many critical lines of modern warfare by its continued emphasis on capital goods production to the relative neglect of consumer goods. In fact, as demonstrated by many experts in various areas, it possesses such superiority now in submarine warfare, certain aircraft and in many lines of general military equipment.

Projected in the period of the next 5 to 10 years, these trends can only spell out the loss of the 1 power that the West has so far insularly depended on, namely the material power of deterring further Communist aggression. It might be argued that, awakened to the full formation of this second variable, we, too, would be compelled to devote more of our gross product to nuclear and conventional armament. Acclimation to an induced public atmosphere of peace and prosperity, poised on peaceful coexistence, would hardly provide the environment for such a race. Even granting the assumption of maintained power balance, which is a most tenuous one, indeed, allowances still must be made for the material power of equality, the worldwide subversive activities of the Kremlin, the forged uniformity of its empire, the superiority of its psychological warfare instruments, and the multiple advantages associated with its guaranteed capacity to make the first aggressive move. Fully supported by the basic requisites of empire consolidation and armed adequacy and/or superiority, these allowances, made on the basis of present facts, certainly tip the scales in the long-run favor of global Communist ambitions. The third variable—Moscow's fear of massive retaliation—would obviously be reduced to insignificance.

The de-Stalinization program significantly bears no relationship to the feverish strides being made in forming a tremendous economic and industrial base for decisive military and political power. These strides are in the Stalinist tradition. To accelerate the broad formation of this base, the present Communist rulers are liberalizing totalitarian bonds in the factories, forced labor camps, agriculture, and in product distribution in the hope of enhancing productivity. But here, too, within a safe margin of totalitarian opportunism calculated to achieve this base in the shortest time possible and at the same time, impress upon the free world the more liberal and peaceable tendencies of the present ruling clique. That they are succeeding in this respect, events in the Middle East, in Southeast Asia, in Western Europe, with the virtual demise of NATO, and even on our continent, where many feel relieved by the dulling effects of Soviet-sponsored peaceful coexistence, provide more than ample evidence. The remarkable skill and cleverness of the Kremlin, seizing upon the inbred passion of peace in civilized man, have produced a real and perilous dilemma for the West. In comparison to these elements of the Communist calculus, the present noise in the ranks of

world communism is transient and hardly a source of comfort to any serious thinking person.

THE PEACEFUL LIBERATION POLICY AND OUR OPPORTUNITY FOR A COMMUNIST DILEMMA

This dilemma of the West can and must be converted into a dilemma of the Communist empire. If ever an opportunity existed for such a conversion, with prospects for the defeat of imperialist Russian communism and the dissolution of its empire, it is now. A carefully and imaginatively implemented policy of peaceful liberation should address itself chiefly in creating pressures for further liberalization in the Communist empire, toward the points of real and genuine independence of the now captive nations, significant rises in the standards of living of all the peoples involved, and the complete abolition of the Iron Curtain. Such pressures concentrated beyond the allowable margins of Moscow's totalitarian opportunism are the the only means available to us to prevent the successful consolidation of the empire, the rapid buildup of the economic and industrial base of the empire, the disappearance of our deterrent strength, in fact, the formation of conditions ripe for a third world war with dim prospects of victory for ourselves. The target of our liberation policy is real and solid concessions to the captive peoples, not nominal and half-hearted ones easily afforded by the margins of totalitarian opportunism. The burden of proof as concerns the sincerity of the pronagandized liberalization program of Moscow would be placed squarely on the shoulders of the alleged reasonable men of the Kremlin.

Don't allow anyone to tell you that this cannot be done. Enough has been written on an implemented peaceful policy of liberation to show that it is practicable, sound, and our only victorious course in the cold war. This is our choice; without it, our dilemma deepens, and possible disaster grows; with it, the dilemma is the enemy's, and victory in the cold war comes within our reach. Resolutions, official speeches, broadcasting are not adequate; a program, as in part outlined by General Sarnoff last year, contains the real and efficient means toward victory in this mortal struggle. Our tremendously powerful assets and weapons are many, and are of moral, political, and physical character on both sides of the curtain. Ukraine, the other non-Russian nations in the Soviet Union, and all other captive peoples are our allies. Our efforts must be directed at the people and their destiny, not at their power-usurping governments. In this context, by virtue of their invincible resistance, their undying patriotism, and their close proximity to the imperialist base of the Communist empire, the non-Russian nations in the Soviet Union have the potential role of being in the vanguard of world freedom.

In my judgment, the policy of liberation is inevitable. The time for its most effective and economical use is now. If I may paraphrase a sentence from an excellent work on what in detail could be done, liberation embodies "new techniques which would make brain and nerve win victories over guns and concrete." (Commando Extraordinary, Charles Foley, Putnam's Sons, New York, p. 197.) Commandos of freedom are as necessary in the cold war to insure peace as they are in a hot war to insure armed victory. With the Communist calculus for world conquest at work, our present course is in the direction of too little and too late. Only through the processes of peaceful liberation can we reverse this dangerous course for the full protection of our national securities, for peace with justice, for the national independence of all the captive nations in the Russian Communist empire. With God's help, we shall not fail.

The Passing of Former United States Senator Francis J. Myers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 10, 1956

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorials—one from the Wilkes-Barre Times Leader of July 6, and the other from the Wilkes-Barre Record of July 7—lauding the outstanding public career of former United States Senator Francis J. Myers, who passed away last week in Philadelphia:

[From the Wilkes-Barre Times Leader of July 6, 1956]

FRANCIS J. MYERS

The death of former United States Senator Francis J. Myers, of Philadelphia, is a serious loss to the Democratic Party, particularly in a presidential election year.

As a Member of both Houses of Congress, he was a tower of strength to his party. He left an impressive record of public service in Washington, Harrisburg, and his native Philadelphia. Luzerne County thought very well of him, giving him a majority in the 1944 Senate contest of more than 1,100 over James J. Davis, who had many close ties here.

A seasoned and enthusiastic campaigner, with a flair for oratory and politics, Senator Myers continued to wield no little influence, even after he left office. The fact that he did not drop from the limelight, as so many do under these circumstances, testifies to his lasting qualities. Had death not intervened, he might have made a comeback since he was only in his prime and his prestige was considerable.

Friendly and capable, with a reputation for zeal and integrity, he was a true champion of the common man without jeopardizing the public interest.

His passing will cause widespread regret.

[From the Wilkes-Barre Record of July 7, 1956]

FRANCIS J. MYERS

Luzerne County knew Francis J. Myers as a frequent visitor, often as a speaker at a public affair, during his career in Congress for 6 years as a Member of the House and for another 6 years as a Member of the Senate. He made many friends in his community among Republicans as well as Democrats. This accorded with the fact that while he was a loyal supporter of Presidents Roosevelt and Truman, Senator Myers dealt with problems affecting Pennsylvania objectively without making partisan politics the primary consideration.

At the height of his career he was foremost among the Democratic strategists in Pennsylvania. After he had been defeated by JAMES H. DUFF for reelection to the Senate Senator Myers resumed his law practice in Philadelphia but with important active participation in public affairs through his chairmanship of the Philadelphia Redevelopment Authority and membership in the General State Authority and Greater Philadelphia Movement.

Nowhere was he held in higher respect than in his native city where on the occasion of his death at the age of 54 many tributes have been paid to the qualities that made him an outstanding citizens and public official.

Since 1945 Senator Myers addressed at least nine public affairs in Wilkes-Barre including those sponsored by Wilkes-Barre Civic Committee, Luzerne County Democratic Committee, Wilkes-Barre Chapter of the AMVETS, Ancient Order of Hibernians and Ladies Auxiliary, Wilkes-Barre area Postal Employees, Textile Workers Union of America, International Ladies' Garment Workers' Union, Luzerne County Democratic Committee, Duplan Silk Co. workers.

Commodity Credit Corporation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY ALDOUS DIXON
OF UTAH
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 10, 1956

Mr. DIXON. Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak in favor of H. R. 1132, which would increase the borrowing authority of the Commodity Credit Corporation from $12 billion to $14 billion.

Mr. Speaker, the Commodity Credit Corporation's primary source of revenue for price-support operations is its authorized borrowing authority. As the volume of price-support operations has increased, the Congress has also on eight different occasions increased the Corporation's borrowing authority from $500 million in 1938 to $12 billion in 1955. H. R. 11132 would increase that authority to $14 billion.

It is my understanding that the Secretary of Agriculture has asked for this extension because there is a likelihood that before the Congress could take action in early 1957 the Corporation may be forced to commit all of its $12 billion borrowing authority and still not meet farmer demand for commodity loans and purchase agreements, based on average yields, farmer participation, and so forth.

So many variable factors influence the demand upon the resources of the Corporation that an accurate budgetary estimate would be impossible. It might be needlessly large; or it might be hopelessly inadequate. For example, should farm prices decline even slightly, an even larger number of farmers then would be likely to place their crops under price support. Weather conditions, acreages planted, yields, consumption patterns, volume of consumer purchasing power, to mention a few, all have a direct effect upon the volume of price-suppport operations of the CCC. These cannot be predicted with any degree of accuracy.

In considering this bill, I think it is important to also realize that mere congressional extension of the borrowing authority does not necessarily imply a cost to the taxpayer. It is not an appropriation but merely an authorization. Funds invested in commodity loans, purchase agreements, and direct commodity purchases do not in themselves constitute an expenditure. This cost is determined when the actual commodity inventories are disposed of by the Corporation.

In any year when the amount of program expenditures equals the authorized borrowing authority, all program operations would have to be dropped or the Congress called into special session to provide relief. Neither of these alternatives seems desirable to me; first, because by legislation the Congress was given a definite price-support commitment to farmers; and second, calling a special session for such a matter would not only be expensive but also indicative of a lack of foresight on the part of the Congress.

Death on the Hill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STUYVESANT WAINWRIGHT
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 3, 1956

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, one of the most extraordinary phenomena in the newspaper fields has been the incredible growth of Newsday, the paper covering the district that I am fortunate enough to represent. Newsday has long since passed the struggling daily stage. It is now a forceful molder of public opinion.

Many of my associates in the realm of politics have developed that occupational disease, ulcers, over a particular drive being pressed by the paper. Yet, despite their feelings, even a limited analysis should force us to admit that the underlying philosophy of the paper is summed up in the words "community welfare."

This newspaper has written a number of editorials supporting my position. Naturally, these are never inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by anyone, much less myself. However, as Newsday is diametrically opposed to my position on Federal aid to education, I feel that it is sporting to place this particular editorial in the RECORD. Fundamentally, the difference between the editorial policy of the paper and myself lies in the fact that Newsday believes that a social welfare philosophy is neither dangerous nor does it cut initiative. Possibly they are right. For my own part I feel that the more government management that can be left to the local communities the better it is for our Nation. This applies particularly to education. The editorial follows:

DEATH ON THE HILL

The House has killed the $1.6 billion Federal-aid-to-education bill. In the final moments of debate on the bill, the issues were so confusing that Congressmen often did not even know what they were voting for. Amendments were tacked on amendments; new proposals were introduced; a motion to send the bill back to committee was voted down. But when finally the vote on passing the bill itself came up, the issues were clear enough. By a vote of 224 to 194 it was defeated.

There are a number of explanations of why the House should turn down an appropriation bill to help solve one of America's most pressing problems. But the basic reason the bill did not pass was that a number of Congressmen—including the three from Long Island—insisted on the Powell amendment, which would deny Federal funds to southern schools that do not adhere to the Supreme Court's desegregation decision. The Powell amendment was almost certain to defeat the school-aid bill, as we pointed out earlier in the week.

On the final vote for the bill itself, Long Island Congressmen BECKER and DEROUNIAN cast their votes for passage. Suffolk Congressman WAINWRIGHT voted against it. For one thing, WAINWRIGHT wanted the Powell amendment included in the bill. For another, he felt that unless the States were forced to match Federal funds, the bill should not be passed. His overriding reason, however, for coming out against the bill was that he thinks there is danger of control when the Federal Government gives money to State school systems.

We think WAINWRIGHT is wrong and has cast a vote he will one day regret. Of course, there is a danger of Federal control. But the danger in America is infinitesimal compared to the burning need for more school construction. By tradition and by law, the kind of Federal control WAINWRIGHT says he is concerned with, is such a remote possibility that it hardly justified his stand on the bill.

Not long ago a White House Conference on Education elaborately explored the needs of America's school systems. The verdict was that the population grows at a much faster pace than school construction. The projections in the report of the future of our schools did not make very happy reading. By voting down the school-aid bill the House has jeopardized the future education of millions of American youngsters—and those yet unborn. It has also added a dreary chapter to the legislative record of the do-nothing (or do-wrong) 84th Congress.

Revolt in Poland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT P. MORANO
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 10, 1956

Mr. MORANO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include a column of commentary by Miss Dorothy Thompson which appeared in the Washington Evening Star on July 9. This article deals with the uprising in Poznan, and the history and character of the Poles. It is a most informative article.

The article follows:

POLAND: PERENNIAL TIME-BOMB
(By Dorothy Thompson)

History placed Poland in an unhappy geographical position, with the vast Russian empire to the east and the rising power of Germany, originally of Prussia, on the west, and with no natural barriers to protect her, even before war took to the open skies.

The history of Poland, since the 18th century, from a time roughly corresponding to the birth of the United States, has been a history of partition between her more powerful neighbors, who before World War I, included, on her southern flank, Austro-Hungary.

For a century and a half, therefore, Poles lived under three fundamentally different regimes: Russian, Prussian-German, and Austrian, the last being the most culturally and politically compatible, since, like Poland, Austro-Hungary was a Catholic state with a more decentralized administration.

This atomization of the Polish nation would, it was hoped, serve the interests of the powers who sought to buy their own peace at her expense because each feared that a strong Poland, a nation of 20 million persons, might tip the balance of power by allying herself with one or the other side.

Each tried to break the Polish national spirit by the use and increase of non-Polish minorities, by attempts to convert Poles to Russian orthodoxy or Prussian protestantism, and innumerable other methods of blandishment and force. But the result was just the contrary.

Partition created modern nationalist Poland. Every Pole felt himself a Pole. "Polishness" took on the aspects of a devotion inseparable in many ways from that of a religion. Since the national cause against the Russian and Prusso-German overlords was closely associated with Catholicism, it was, in fact, a religious cause.

During the entire history of Polish subjection, Poland has been a perennial time-bomb. In war her legions were unreliable, and every internal crisis in Russia, Germany, or Austria was reflected by rebellions in Poland.

The Poles developed an almost unconscious technique of underground conspiracy, passive resistance, sabotage. They joined every revolutionary upheaval within the ranks of their masters, and equated all revolution with national freedom.

Abroad, in the West, to which many of them fled, they loyally supported the enemies of their enemies and fought for your freedom and ours.

At home, when occasion permitted, they played one master off against the other, with malice toward all.

Tenaciously protecting their language and religion, they produced, under subjection, an astonishing culture, all of it in the service of the Polish romance, served with romantic fervor.

Chopin, in Paris, was no less a national figure than Sibelius in Finland. Paderewski, thundering through the concert halls of two continents, was an ambassador without portfolio. Every Polish novel was a romance about Poland.

The Poles hated the Germans. They despised the Russians. They feared neither, being, one might say, mystically convinced that God was the sponsor of Polish national freedom, and that His cause cannot be lost.

Of all the East European peoples caught between Russian and German imperial ambitions, they were the most foolhardy, and alone among the Slavs were never tainted by Russian pan slavism. Russians were not their Slavic brothers. Russia was a boot on their necks. Temperamentally they are closer to the Finns and Hungarians, to whom they are not racially or linguistically related, than to the Czechs or Yugoslavs, who are also Slavs.

Alone among the eastern slavic peoples, they are not disappointed in communism. It is exactly what they expected, considering its source. Nothing good for Poland has ever come out of Russia. That they know from centuries of experience.

So why the rebellion in Poznan? The work (according to the latest explanation of the Kremlin's Central Committee) of American agents?

How very silly. Weeks ago this column predicted risings in Poland, fearing they would be premature. The Poles are simply running true to form and to their own character.

If they have more courage than prudence, it was always so. Courage and tenacity, not prudence, has kept Poland alive.

A lost cause that has ever refused to be lost.

Problems Facing the Small Farmer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALVIN M. BENTLEY
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 10, 1956

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I wish to insert the following letter which I have received from Mr. Frank W. Mortimore, of Morrice, Mich., regarding the problems facing the small farmer:

MORRICE, MICH., *June 27, 1956.*

DEAR MR. BENTLEY: Thanks for your interest in my initial attempt to convey to you my observations of family type businesses and their seemingly disappearance due to so-called progress. Although I didn't wish to mean the family type farmer was the only one suffering from this change it is the one closest to me.

In reply to Mr. Benson's letter to you concerning his views and purposes as told in answer to my thoughts previously expressed: First, I wish to say that recently I read in the small paper printed by the United States Department of Agriculture called the Agricultural Situation that sometime after World War II, 21 percent of the farmers had off the farm jobs and now it is estimated that 36 percent have off the farm employment. This indicates that this is their way of combating the price squeeze. This does not include the manager type farm of which the owner is in some other occupation and hires a manager for his farm or farms. Secondly, I believe that the commercial type farmers are the ones who will benefit from the subsidies. You see they are the ones who have been able to utilize the extension services from the agricultural agents of their counties and have been able to take advantage of the mass buying or purchases thereby defraying some of the high cost of operation.

The commercial type farmer, whether owner, manager, or hired manager does things on a larger scale making more efficient use of their equipment and can keep it replaced on better trade-ins as his volume is so much greater that he doesn't have to wear out the tools. Also the small farmer has to be a jack-of-all-trades and so can't afford to keep up with all the new ideas nor take the time to experiment with them as his operating margin is so narrow that he cannot spend the time or the money to fit the new methods to his farm. For example, he can ill afford the installation of a mow drier for the hay harvest or the bulk system for caring for his milk. The initial expense of these items is too great for the volume he handles. It would mean a poor dollar investment for dollar earned in labor or crop.

The larger operator makes use of self-propelled equipment and other large machinery to improve his conditions while the smaller operator is at such a disadvantage that he just can't compete. There are so many of us who are smaller operators that we can't all increase our land and that seems to be our problem. We cannot use the newly developed sprays for both insects and weeds or the hormones and the fertilizers. We can't always afford to fertilize as much as the county agent or others recommend. As we approach the saturation point the advantages are not so noticeable and for a gain we must use just enough to get the best yield for the amount invested. As before said the small operator has so many other things to study, to plan for besides doing the work that there is no time to do justice to everything and the small subsidy is such a small item that it doesn't help much. The restrictions are so great that we wonder what's the use and what is to become of the little man.

Sometimes between the Government regulations and the extension recommendations we wonder if living beyond our means is to be compulsory as one says to curtail acreage and the other says to sow more fertilizer and to use larger equipment, etc. So the surplus continues. We can't compete with the 40-hour weeks nor fringe benefits so we don't attract any of the laboring class for part-time work. Our cows do not lay off on weekends and holidays. We also must work with the seasons.

I think, as do many others, that the processing or in-between costs from the farm to consumer should be investigated. Also, I believe that more research into uses of existing crops and their surpluses as well as a search for new crops would be of value to all. One farm magazine states that some of the subsidies being paid could well be used for research such as is employed by the manufacturing field. Perhaps we would also gain a better idea of consumer demand. Maybe we should think about this instead of Government dole and politics.

One reads that the subsidies are such a help, but for the small landowner and operator it doesn't mean so much. For instance the wool situation: the subsidy was to be based on the national average price per pound subtracted from the support price. It was to the interest of the farmer to get as high a bid as possible for good wool. The buyers say what is the use of bidding higher, the Government will make up the rest. So they set a maximum price locally, about 45 cents per pound, whether the wool is short fiber, dirty or the best. It is all purchased for one and the same price. How does that encourage the small operator? What is more it looks as though the Government were buying the wool for the wool dealers. I correspond with a farmer in Australia and he says the reason that their wool is better than ours is because the government there buys it on strict conditions as to grades, cleanliness, and length of fiber. Then the mills know just what they are getting. No wonder the wool grown here doesn't meet the competition on the market. It also would appear that it never will. Another example of the subsidy would be that concerned with the milk or dairy industry. In this area grade B milk with a 3.5 butterfat test brought $3.20 per hundredweight in January, $3.15 on February 15, $3.10 on February 29. In March it brought $3.05 and since $3 per hundredweight even though $3.25 is supposed to be the government support price. I understand that the surplus grade A milk also dropped in this area. Some complicated explanation is that the national average test is 3.89 and so graded down to 3.5 makes it $3 or below. This seems to be the way that this subsidy works and with all the blanks and forms there are to fill out it just does not make sense or cents.

There are so many time consuming things that the family-type farmer can't do justice to them all. Our young people can't see any future with the insecurity, the hard work, and the time they must give to the armed services and so leave the farm for more lucrative opportunities. Only if one has a special love for rugged individualism do they stay to fight a gradually losing battle.

Mr. Benson says to be more effecient and in some cases that might apply as larger acreage uses the same equipment as the smaller, and by the statistics the farms are growing in size. We are using more fertilizer, better seed, and have improved livestock but we can't compete with so many restrictions as our costs accordingly are high. We are in too much of a price squeeze. The small operator usually in his own minor repair man, machinist, welder, veterinarian, and bookeeper. He must keep up on the latest methods of seeding, seeds and fertilizers, and insecticides and labor saving devices. He does the best he can with his small purchasing power but he must still be more efficient to meet conditions.

MR. BENTLEY, you took a trip over the flood area in your district this spring and saw the damage created. We know that similar conditions exist elsewhere in the country and that in many instances that the damage is more severe to property and human life. I believe that to some extent that man or the Government is to blame for this so-called natural disaster. You see we have encouraged the commercial farmer to use his cropland as efficiently as possible. To do this he has drained the swamps and cut down the forests to procure more acreage. Or perhaps the small farmer has been forced to sell his timber lot at a fair price to meet the current running expenses; at any rate it has been a mistake to destroy all of the protective cover of the land which nature has provided. This acts as a sponge to hold the water. When it is missing the water runs off quickly and nature goes on a rampage because her balance has been disturbed. The result is either a drought or a flood. One wonders if this could possibly have anything to do with the tornadoes, since we know that there are more extremes in temperature where our natural growing resources are unbalanced. That is something to think about, also we reclaim land then destroy it by upsetting the laws of nature. How can the Government help? Frankly, I don't know. Perhaps experiments of reforestation, wind breaks, dams, the soil bank, and encouragement of the balanced diversified farming which the family-type unit had might help. I believe that this kind of farming was better for the land for the conservation was greater. However, living conditions have changed and so must the methods, but still nature is the law of the land.

As to changes in methods of farming and other things one does not dare commit himself too far in advance for what is proper at the time is obsolete before the day is over. It takes much study and debate and sometimes I think there are too many politics in the farmer's problems, too many headlines in the papers about the costs of subsidizing them. The papers play up the consumer's side of the cost of food but fail to mention the producer's side. There are not enough headlines about the cost of handling the raw product. The consumer usually thinks that the producer gets the increase when the price of the product is raised on the grocer's shelf. For instance prior to the recent milk strike here, raw milk (grade A) was reduced like grade B from January to March at the farm but consumer prices remained the same. When the farmer was granted a small increase, the consumer price was raised also. In fact, the retail price was increased even before the producer ever received his raise, but the headlines didn't mention that the middleman was benefiting from the dairymen's strike. The same is true with the bread versus the wheat-marketing price.

Mr. Benson also says the output per worker is 2½ times what it was 25 years ago. I believe this is low as we have changed from horse farming to mechanized, which not only speeds up the work but releases land formerly used for animal feeding and hay for cash-crop farming. Of course, it must be remembered that the population has increased more in proportion than has farming. The Government has put acreage restrictions on crops but advocates increased fertilization, good seed, and cultural practices so therefore improved production has more than outgrown the restricted acres. Again it is the large commercial farmer who, with the same equipment, the same practices, the same incentive payments, who benefits. Somewhere I read that the barley supports went almost entirely to six Michigan growers and totaled many thousands of dollars,

while many other growers used theirs as feed and did not share in the subsidies.

This does not mean I am against the manager type or commercial farm for most of them do set a pattern that we in a small way can study and so might improve our own methods. Just as maybe a small factory although the competition is great, may if they have a good product be successful, so too can the small operator on the farm. Subsidies or the Government dole is not the full answer for the little fellow. If fewer subsidies were paid the part-time farmer would cease the production of surplus crops and stick entirely to his other occupation. This, to me, is the answer.

During World War II prices on all products were frozen such as farm produce or manufactured articles. For instance, gasoline was 18½ cents per gallon including taxes, now it is 30 to 33 cents per gallon. Wheat was set at $2 to $2.25 per bushel or thereabouts and is still about the same. So anyone who has the facts can see the cost-price squeeze is on. The consumer wants more services with the article he buys, whether it's packaging, delivery and upkeep, or insurance. For this he must pay but in a sense he doesn't know about it for it is not publicized. All he hears about is the millions that are being spent to subsidize the farmer and give him a 70 to 80 percent parity which means 70 to 80 percent of a favorable income. What other business can be told to live on three-fourths of a favorable or average income, and stay successful? That's why it hurts our pride to be on the Government dole so to speak.

Recently, the small local Farm Bureau groups had the problem of the small-time farmer discussed and it was almost unanimously agreed that they have to seek for off the farm employment to meet the challenge of living conditions. It was agreed that we in Michigan were particularly fortunate because there are chances for employment for the younger farmer. However, there is no immediate answer for those of us who are over the age of 40. I hope this gives a bit more information on our problems.

Thanks again for your consideration of problems of the district you represent.

Sincerely,

FRANK W. MORTIMORE.

New England and South America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT P. MORANO
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 10, 1956

Mr. MORANO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following editorial from the Bridgeport (Conn.) Post regarding the promotion of air travel and increased trade with South America:

NORTH AND SOUTH AMERICA

Pan American World Airways has gotten out a 15-minute film entitled "Salute to New England," which is available for television stations, chambers of commerce, and civic bodies of various kinds. It shows in dramatic form the possibilities which lie ahead in the planned development of greater trade and passenger traffic between the North and South American continents.

"Why not?" the cynic may say, "Pan Am has an obvious motive in this. It's their business."

Of course, it is, but what of it? Is there anything to be ashamed of in that? If those who have an obvious interest don't take some intelligent steps to promote it, then who will?

In this case, as it happens, Pan Am's interest is the interest of all of us, for New England in particular has everything to gain and nothing to lose by increased trade with the Latin American countries. We need their raw materials, they need our manufactured products, each can do better by making the most of this relationship.

This particular film is based upon a 2-months economic survey which brings us right up to date on the whole subject. Ray H. Trott, president of the New England Council, recalls the experiences of this section during and immediately following the depression when so many of our industries closed and there did not seem to be any future for many of the others. The situation was met in this area by an intelligent, carefully organized drive to create new industries out of old and this drive was successful.

The depression ended with our being better off industrially, not worse off, than before it struck. One of the immediate problems facing us today is to find an ever-increasing foreign market for the products of our ever-increasing domestic production. In this respect, Mr. Trott points out, the great opportunity is increased trade with South America. The Latin countries have the minerals, petroleum, forest products, and many other raw materials which we need, while New England by buying such materials will in turn open a new and much greater market for this area's most important natural resource—the know-how and trained industrial ability of our people. New England and Latin America were made for each other because each has what the other needs and the promotion of this exchange can be profitable to both.

The showing of the New England Council's film then should be a public service in awakening everybody to the possibility of this situation and encouraging every rational step to promote its development. And when it comes to promoting travel north and south across the equator the possibilities are boundless.

"So there," says our friend, the cynic, once more, "so that's where Pan American World Airways comes in."

Very probably, and again we retort, what of it? Aren't we just that much more fortunate to have some influential agency attending to this promotion through intelligent self-interest, than to have it neglected and lost sight of, through ignorance and indifference?

New History of the Democratic Party

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN LESINSKI, JR.
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 10, 1956

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, this is the sixth installment of the New History of the Democratic Party. It graphically illustrates the way in which America responded to the twin challenges of Fascist aggression and Communist aggression and wrote one of the brightest chapters in her history. We Democrats are proud that both of these battles for liberty were waged under Democratic administrations.

The final chapter in this great history is as follows:

DEMOCRACY ON TRIAL IN WAR AND IN PEACE
COMBATING THE FASCISTS AND THE COMMUNISTS
(Pt. 6 of a New History of the Democratic Party)

The Democratic Party rolled up victory after victory in the elections of the 20 years, 1932–52. The biggest vote getter was Roosevelt, 4 times the unbeaten champion of American politics. In 1936 he topped his opponent by 11 million popular votes and 515 electoral votes—the biggest majority in American history.

President Truman, also undefeated, had a political style all his own. With his simple, direct approach to the voters, he was able, in 1948, to score an amazing political upset.

Harry Truman did not mind being called a politician. "Politics," he once said, "is public service." The tarnish that clung to the word could be removed if enough citizens, through their parties, took part in politics. So, working behind Roosevelt and Truman, were countless Democrats of lesser fame but equal dedication. They manned sound trucks, rang doorbells, watched polls, and cheered speeches, in that great turmoil of democracy that is an American campaign.

It was important for the people of the world that the faith of Americans in democratic government had been restored by the Roosevelt administration's battle against the depression. For history had chosen America to lead the democratic countries in the historic struggles of the 20th century against fascism and Soviet communism. These twin dictatorships, to whom popular government and individual liberty meant nothing, were to challenge the democracies first in a global hot war, then in a cold war. The stakes were to be no less than the freedom of every person on earth. It was a fight that was to test all the nerve and strength America could muster.

For a democracy to meet this challenge first involved a great task of popular education. During the 1920's, the United States had become increasingly isolationist. Minds had to be changed, people convinced that the world had become so small as to make events in other lands bound to affect the well-being of America itself. President Roosevelt pointed up the evils of the Fascist dictatorships. He also took action to strengthen the bastions of freedom. A reciprocal-trade program was passed to promote friendship through increased trade. In South America the big stick was replaced by the policy of the good neighbor. Over bitter opposition from isolationist forces, a Democratic Congress approved, in 1940–41, a peacetime draft. This provided at least partial preparation for the war launched by the treacherous Japanese attack on Pearl Harbor.

Pearl Harbor changed minds quickly. It unified America as never before. The mighty story of victory over Germany and Japan is too recent to need retelling. No political party can take credit for winning that struggle and ending the war. To do so would be to disparage the work of the Armed Forces and the performance of the great industrial machine on the home front. But directing the entire effort was Franklin D. Roosevelt. Despite his concern with the fighting, he never ceased to plan for permanent peace. His declaration of the four freedoms and the Atlantic Charter were eloquent statements of the peace aims of democracy. The entire allied world hailed him as the supreme spokesman in the struggle for the preservation of liberty. But on the eve of victory, exhausted by his labors, he died. Although an entire world poured out its grief, the most fitting epitaph was that on his tombstone: "Died in action."

But victory over the Axis meant the end of only one form of dictatorship. Russia, America's wartime ally, also had designs on the freedom of the people of the world. The free world scarcely had time to catch its breath before the well-organized forces of world communism moved into the power vacuums fascism had left.

After 4 years of sacrifice and war, many in America wanted to relax. But the Truman administration kept a close eye on Russian actions. One of the earliest and most important examples of President Truman's alertness to Russian tactics occurred in 1946, when the Russians failed to live up to their agreement to evacuate their troops from strategic, oil-rich Iran. As a result of President Truman's forceful insistence, the Russians finally backed down and withdrew their troops.

In February 1947 with Communist guerrilla activities gaining in intensity in Greece, Britain advised the United States that it could no longer maintain its forces in Greece and Turkey, and would be forced to withdraw them in a matter of weeks. President Truman made a quick, bold decision. On March 12, before a joint session of Congress, he enunciated the now famous Truman doctrine—a policy of United States intervention where necessary to save nations in danger of being taken over by a dictatorship—and asked Congress to authorize a $400 million program of economic and military aid to Greece and Turkey.

The Truman doctrine is now regarded as a major turning point in the cold war with the Communists, for it told the world that America was determined to lead the free world in the fight against communism and its causes. It was followed by a series of dramatic programs that literally saved Western Europe from the grip of communism: An emergency-aid program that helped Europe survive the cold winter of 1947–48; the historic Marshall plan (a long-range coordinated aid program to take the place of previous piecemeal programs); and the Berlin airlift, another dramatic example of United States determination to resist every Russian pressure.

As the economic strength of the free world began to grow, the Truman administration turned to the task of shoring up its military strength. The North Atlantic Treaty became the first in a series of collective security pacts, designed to prevent Communist aggression by making it plain that any attacker of free nations would have to contend with the armed might of the United States. This treaty was supplemented by a program of United States military aid to the member nations.

While building these safeguards, the Truman administration did not neglect the United Nations, the dream of Franklin Roosevelt as the right institution for lasting peace. The crucial test of the UN came in Korea, where troops from UN countries turned back a naked act of aggression on the part of Soviet and Chinese communism. The heavy sacrifies made by the American people in this combat put a brake to Communist expansion in the Far East, paving the way for a relaxation of world tensions in the following years.

Thus, in 20 years, the American people, under Democratic leadership, had revolutionized their thinking about world affairs. They had accepted the responsibilities of being the greatest nation on earth. They had defeated fascism and built ip a strong network of defense against communism. The entire economy had adjusted to the fact that, as long as aggressors exist, the only sure way to keep peace was to keep strength. Democratic foreign policy was so well-grounded in the realities of the world situation, that the Republican Party, despite its criticisms, found it could not do away with a single major program when it came to power.

As the cold war progressed, defenses against Communists also had to be raised within the United States. The Communist Party in America was at peak strength during the Hoover administration when 103,000 persons voted the Communist ticket for President. During World War II, some of these Communists had taken advantage of the spirit of wartime friendship to try to infiltrate government and industry. But as soon as the postwar aggression became evident, the Democratic Party began to dig them out.

When the Democrats left office in 1952, there was only one-fourth as many Communists in the country as 20 years earlier. The top leadership of the Communist Party had been wiped out—prosecuted and imprisoned by Democratic administrations. New laws were added to the statute books, a loyalty program was set up in the Government, and the protective strength of the Federal Bureau of Investigation greatly increased.

To administer a successful internal security program required a delicate balancing between the dangers of subversion and the importance of individual freedom. The disloyal had to be separated from the dissenter, and the old-style progressive not confused with the Communist. The Democratic Party opposed those who tried to use fear of Communist infiltration to check social progress and defame minority groups. In fashioning its internal security programs, it tried to be guided by the warning of President Roosevelt: that "if the fires of freedom and civil liberties burn low in other lands, they must be made brighter in our own."

The program to extend the New Deal and defend democracy from communism occupied most of Harry Truman's terms in office. After seven of the most eventful years in history, he retired, and the Democratic Convention selected Adlai Stevenson as its presidential candidate. Stevenson, despite his distinguished record as Governor of Illinois, was not well known nationally at the time of his nomination. But beginning with his famous acceptance speech, in which he sounded the keynote for the Democratic campaign—"Let's talk sense to the American people"—the eloquence and forthrightness of Stevenson's campaign speeches made a quick and deep impression on the voters in the short period between the convention and the election. Although defeated by a military hero who had been in the public eye for a full decade before Stevenson appeared on the national scene, the Illinois governor received more votes than any other presidential candidate in history except two: Franklin Roosevelt and Dwight Eisenhower.

General Eisenhower's victory was not a victory for the Republican Party. Notwithstanding his personal popularity, the party won the Congress by the narrowest of margins, and quickly lost it 2 years later. Nor was the Eisenhower victory a repudiation of the Democratic legislation of the previous 20 years. Public pressure forced Eisenhower to embrace the New Deal in his campaign, and to keep the basic domestic and foreign programs intact.

The Democrats from 1952 to 1955 maintained a policy of constructive opposition to the Republican administration. Time and again, they saved President Eisenhower from the Right Wingers and isolationists within his own party. Although criticizing sharply where the President's program was not in the public interest, the Democrats were not content merely to oppose. Especially in the Democratically controlled 84th Congress, they proposed constructive alternatives.

Satisfied that it still represented the wishes of the great bulk of the people of America, confident that adherence to Jeffersonian principles would be rewarded with a popular mandate in the near future, the Democratic Party looked forward to future years of service to the people of America. The faith and purpose which had guided it through the first 150 years had been reasserted by many Democratic leaders, and summarized eloquently by Woodrow Wilson:

"The Democratic Party, and only the Democratic Party, has carired out the policies which the progressive people of this country have desired * * * I feel confident that we know the spirit of the American people, that we know the program of betterment which it will be necessary for us to undertake * * * Our principles are well known. We believe in political liberty and founded our great Government to obtain it * * * the liberty of men to choose their own lives and of people to choose their own allegiance. Our ambition, also, all the world has knowledge of. It is not only to be free and prosperous ourselves, but also to be the friend and thoughtful partisan of those who are free or who desire freedom the world over * * * I thank God that those who believe in America, who try to serve her people, are likely to be also what America herself from the first hoped and meant to be—the servant of mankind."

AFL–CIO Group Supports H. R. 10261

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, July 7, 1956

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution adopted on July 3, 1956, by the Oil, Chemical, and Atomic Workers International Union, AFL–CIO, supporting S. 4146 and H. R. 10261:

SUPPORT FOR GORE AND HOLIFIELD BILLS

The members of the Oil, Chemical, and Atomic Workers International Union, AFL–CIO, who work in the atomic-energy industry have consistently been supporters of programs in this field which redound to the benefit of our entire Nation.

As the first nation to use the power that lights the stars for destructive purposes, America has an obligation to be first in leadership in the peaceful uses of atomic energy without regard to mere motives of profit.

By their actions, the private utilities have clearly demonstrated to the people of the United States that they do not intend to build and operate atomic reactors for the production of power unless and until the United States Government finances such reactors for them. It is our fundamental belief that despite the utility industry's dragging its feet we must maintain this Nation's leadership in the race for world peace—as we are doing in the race for military leadership—by accelerating the power-producing-reactor program of the United States.

The Atomic Energy Commission for the year 1956 will use a total of 58,217,488,000 kilowatt-hours of electricity, or 12.8 percent of the total consumption of electricity in the entire United States.

Many manufacturing companies, in the interest of increased profits, engage in the common practice of building their own plants to produce electricity for their own power needs. By following this same principle, the United States could not be wrong in building atomic-energy reactors for the production of power on the sites of AEC installations to serve the needs of those facilities. Such an experimental reactor pro-

gram would materially reduce the cost of electric power produced by atomic energy.

The many companies that have operated plants for the Atomic Energy Commission over a period of many years and have experimented with prototypes of power-producing reactors already have the technological know-how to eliminate the trial-and-error of empirical methods the private utilities are presently insinuating must be overcome before they can make expenditures of stockholders' money.

We therefore urge that the Members of the 84th Congress consider and pass in this session the Gore bill, S. 4146, and the Holifield bill, H. R. 10261, so that a power-producing program can be put into effect immediately.

Such a program will provide concrete evidence to people of good will the world over that our Nation has taken the lead in this foremost of present peacetime uses of atomic energy. By providing a demonstration of the feasibility of atomic-power electric utilities, it will as well encourage the prudent investment of utility stockholders' money for expanding automatically produced electric power in the future.

Adopted July 3, 1956; Atomic Energy Workers Council, Oil, Chemical and Atomic Workers International Union, AFL–CIO, Washington, D. C.

JAMES GREENE, *President.*
THOMAS W. BOUCHER,
Secretary-Treasurer.
ELWOOD D. SWISHER,
Coordinator.

Civil Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 10, 1956

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the following is my testimony before the Military Operations Subcommittee of the House Committee on Government Operations on July 2, 1956:

STATEMENT OF REPRESENTATIVE ABRAHAM J. MULTER, DEMOCRAT, 13TH DISTRICT, NEW YORK, BEFORE THE MILITARY OPERATIONS SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS, JULY 2, 1956

Mr. Chairman and distinguished members of the committee, I appreciate the opportunity to present this statement to your committee in connection with this very important subject of civil defense. I know that your committee has labored hard and long with a most difficult problem.

Like many other Members of the Congress, I, too, introduced a bill on the subject. My bill bears the number H. R. 5943, and was introduced on May 2, 1955. Since the bill was introduced, I have received letters from all over the country approving the principle of my bill and urging its enactment.

Civil defense as we knew it during World War II is as obsolete and as useless as an old musket loaded by means of a powder horn. The dreadful but realistic view of the situation must accept the fact that if and when the bombs start falling, it will be absolutely essential to invoke martial law, at least temporarily, in those areas which are hit. If order will ever be brought out of such chaos, it will be done only because we will be able to bring into action at once a civilian force large enough and well trained enough to cope with the situation.

That is why my bill creates within the Defense Department a Department of Civil Defense, under the direction of a Secretary appointed by the President.

With an initial allocation of $25 million, the new Department would be authorized to prepare, on a nationwide scale, a comprehensive and effective program of civil defense, to make known to the public to the fullest possible extent, consistent with national security, the facts about the destructive power of the instruments of modern warfare, and to supply itself with an adequate number of personnel, either through the normal voluntary procedure, or, if necessary, by means of the Selective Service System. The bill also gives the President the power to transfer personnel into the Department of Civil Defense in case of a national emergency, as and when proclaimed by the President or the Congress.

There is an immediate, pressing need for such legislation. The civil defense program in the United States at present is utterly inadequate to cope with the danger of enemy attack. The problems of civil defense cannot be effectively separated from the problems of military defense.

The fiscal resources of the individual States and local communities are inadequate to guarantee equal minimum protection to all peoples in the United States, and although the patriotic efforts of part-time volunteer citizens is commendable, the complex requirements of an effective civil defense system call for full time, thoroughly trained personnel recruited on a national scale as in our present military departments.

Practically all of the Democratic members of the New York delegation have introduced bills similar to mine, or have indicated their support of such a bill and their agreement with the principles thereof.

I urge your committee to take early and forthright action on this very important matter.

George Meany's Further Statement on the Poznan Uprising

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 10, 1956

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I wish to include a telegraphed message sent by President George Meany, of the AFL–CIO, to a mass meeting sponsored by the Polish-American Congress, which took place in Chicago, Friday evening, July 6.

I believe that Mr. Meany's statement does not need any elaboration. Because it deals with the Poznan rebellion which has such far-reaching implications in the struggle of freemen against communism, I commend it sincerely to the attention of the membership of this body.

The statement follows:

Please convey to the mass meeting sponsored by the Polish-American Congress in Chicago the heartfelt sorrow of the workers of this country over the tragic fate of the workers of Poznan who were slaughtered in cold blood by their Communist oppressors.

In this modern day and age, it is an outrage against all our concepts of decency, humanity, and justice that unarmed workers, asking only bread and freedom, should be cut down ruthlessly by tanks and machineguns.

The heroic workers of Poznan who participated in the uprising have aroused the highest admiration and the deepest sympathy of freedom-loving people of every country. At the same time, the ruthless savagery with which the Communist puppet government of Poland suppressed the strike of workers protesting against starvation and exploitation has shocked the conscience of the entire free world.

To think that this atrocity against workers should take place under a regime which pretends to be a "working class democracy," a proletarian government. To think that such terrorism should occur right in the midst of the so-called liberalization trend behind the Iron Curtain.

What a scorching light has thus been shed on the real nature and meaning of the 20th Communist Congress decisions. How fraudulent and empty the pretensions of the new rulers of the Kremlin appear in the light of this new evidence of unmitigated brutality. What an eye-opener this occurrence should prove to those who have entertained illusions about the end of Stalinist terror and the beginning of humanization behind the Iron Curtain.

It is to be expected that the Moscow propaganda machine should denounce the demonstrations of the Polish workers as "enemy provocations carried out by imperialist agents." They tried to use similar camouflage 3 years ago to hide the true causes of the June 17 uprisings of the workers of East Germany. The Kremlin dare not admit that it is subjecting workers in all captive lands to inhuman exploitation in order to build up its gigantic war production and extend its imperialist penetration of underdeveloped nations in Asia and Africa.

According to news reports from Poland, order has been restored in Poznan and the city's streets are once more quiet. But the Polish workers, whose blood stained those streets, have not died in vain. They fought for the ideals of all liberty-loving people, from New York to New Delhi, from Chicago to Casablanca, from Berlin to Formosa.

We must keep up that fight. We must continue to expose the hyprocrisy of communism. We must extend a helping hand to its victims, wherever possible.

We must keep the hope for freedom, and eventual liberation alive in the hearts of the prisoners of communism enslaved behind the Iron Curtain. Let our faith in divine justice inspire us to pray and work for the day when human justice will prevail everywhere on earth.

Interfaith in Action

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SAMUEL N. FRIEDEL
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 10, 1956

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, as I have the honor and privilege of representing the Seventh Congressional District of the Free State of Maryland in the Congress of the United States, I should like to call its attention to the fact that my great State is fully entitled and justly merits its name as the "Free State."

Established 324 years ago by Lord Baltimore as a haven for persecuted Catholics, the Colony of Maryland established freedom of religion and was among the first places in the entire world to do so.

That this noble tradition still lives is attested by the holding of an annual in-

terfaith baseball game in the city of Baltimore where Protestant, Catholic, and Jew, represented by Boumi Temple of the Shrine, the Knights of Columbus, and the B'nai B'rith, have joined hands in order to raise funds which are devoted to charitable causes of all faiths.

At this year's annual interfaith baseball game, two Baltimoreans, active in civic affairs will be honored by the interfaith committee. These two gentlemen are Elkan R. Meyers and Nicholas C. Mueller.

Mr. Meyers will receive the interfaith award in appreciation of untiring efforts in behalf of the Red Cross, National Conference of Christians and Jews, Boy Scouts, Community Chest, the Associated Jewish Charities, the Jewish Welfare Fund, the Jewish Medical Center, and the Jewish Big Brother League.

Mr. Mueller will be honored in recognition of his services to the Big Brothers of Baltimore, the Optimists Boys Clubs, the Boy Scouts and other organizations.

Mr. Maurice R. Shochatt, the gifted editor and publisher of the Baltimore Beacon, wrote the following article, which appeared in the July issue of the Baltimore Beacon. Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the article in this address:

The 11th annual interfaith baseball game, to be played on Tuesday evening, August 14 at Memorial Stadium, is more than just a game. It represents more than rivalry of two cities, although the Baltimore Orioles and the Washington Senators are sure to provide the fans that night with one of the most exciting games of this season.

It represents more than another evening's entertainment, although the pregame pageantry, scheduled to begin at 7 p. m., will be extremely colorful and diversified. It represents more than another opportunity to see a celebrity in person, although the headliner to receive the annual interfaith award will truly be outstanding in every sense of the word.

For the annual interfaith game symbolizes much more than just another baseball game. It stands for the fact that the Boumi Temple Shrine, Knights of Columbus, and the B'nai B'rith have joined hands in the sponsorship of this game to indicate that all faiths can live harmoniously and peacefully side by side in Baltimore.

That sentiment is affirmed in the interfaith declaration of principles which states, in part: "Though our religious heritage is founded in the great faiths of Catholic, Protestant, and Jewish beliefs, we are all united in the great and unique brotherhood of American citizenry founded upon the equality of all men."

We therefore ask you to display your solidarity with these beliefs by attending the coming interfaith game on the evening of August 14.

Be with us that night, regardless where your seat in the stadium may be. For it is the spirit of the game that we ask you to bear in mind first and foremost above all. Furthermore, you can perform another good deed by making it possible for some underprivileged youngsters to attend this game through your generosity. Please also bear in mind:

1. That Baltimore is proud to have the record of being the first city in the United States of America to sponsor an interfaith baseball game.

2. That all the funds raised through the interfaith game are devoted to charitable causes of all faiths.

3. That, as part of this program, annual interfaith awards are presented to public and private senior high schools in the Baltimore area for services rendered in fostering interfaith.

Support the interfaith baseball game and help in the realization of the interfaith credo: "Work, live, play together."

Speech of Major General Deane at Colorado Conference, June 16, 1956

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS E. WALTER
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 10, 1956

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address:

SPEECH OF MAJOR GENERAL DEANE, COLORADO CONFERENCE, JUNE 16, 1956

Averell Harriman and I were together in the Soviet Union in the last 2 years of the last war. I can think of no place where Americans can get to know each other better than working side by side in the chilly atmosphere of Moscow. I wish I could give you the feeling of the service that Ambassador Harriman rendered to his country in those years. Indeed, I wish you could have representatives from each of the many governmental operations that the Governor has directed in the past 25 years to tell you of their personal experience in working with this great American.

In time of war, every question of statesmanship and diplomacy has facets that are military in character. Often military considerations predominate. It was for this reason that I was consulted on most of the questions that arose in Moscow during Ambassador Harriman's tenure, and thus had an opportunity to observe the manner and the effectiveness of his performance of that task.

KNEW THE SOVIETS

He came to Moscow prepared to an extraordinary degree, and you will find that he came to every position that he has held prepared to an extraordinary degree. He will go to the Presidency prepared to an extraordinary degree.

As far as his job in Moscow is concerned, he had visited the Soviet Union twice before taking up his position as Ambassador. He had been there once with Lord Beaverbrook, and it was at that meeting that the American lend-lease program initiating aid to Russia was formulated. Later Harriman went to Moscow with Winston Churchill, and it was at that meeting that the American position with respect to the establishment of a second front was explained to the Russian people. I know that these meetings were widely publicized in the Soviet Union. I know from personal experience that, unlike their leaders, the Russian people held Averell Harriman in the greatest affection and esteem.

Now, aside from these Russian contacts, Harriman had attended every British-American meeting during the war, from the Atlantic Conference of 1941, to the Quebec Conference in 1943. He had the complete confidence of the President and the Joint Chiefs of Staff. He was thoroughly familiar with their strategic objectives. Just prior to going to Russia he had administered the lend-lease program in the United Kingdom, and he had established close and friendly relations with the Prime Minister and the other political and military leaders of the British Empire.

So you see, he came to Moscow fully equipped, and he did a magnificent job. His objectives in Russia were at first military in character. Later, as the victory became apparent, the objectives became more and more political in nature. It was very interesting for me to observe the fine balance that Governor Harriman was able to maintain between helping the Soviet Union to help us win the war by furthering the alliance that would bring about an early victory while at the same time rigorously protecting the postwar interests of the United States. He never for one moment forgot what the situation would be after the war. He discerned and he warned that our wartime friendship with the Soviet Union was a fragile thing, born of expediency, and it was almost certain to collapse once the war was won.

PUSHES WAR EFFORT

There were countless military projects he helped put over in the Soviet Union. For instance, Hap Arnold was particularly anxious to have American bases in the Ukraine so that we could have shuttle bombing back and forth. This was anathema to the Soviet leaders. The idea of having American troops on Russian soil was not compatible with any of their thinking. They had even refused an American wing of bombers coming to Russia at the time of most dire need—when the Germans were approaching the Caucasus. Within 2 months of Ambassador Harriman's coming there, he had won from Stalin permission for the establishment of American bases. Within 6 months, American planes were operating from American bases in the Soviet Union.

Or again, on a more humanitarian scale, there were 100 or so American soldiers interned in Russia, whose planes had been forced down by accidents over Siberia. Harriman was determined to get those boys out. The Russians, on good grounds, said they couldn't possibly be released because it would be a violation of Russia's neutrality with Japan. Within 2 months Harriman had those boys released. He not only had Molotov's consent, but he had the Russian secret police prepare the most fantastic plot you can imagine for their escape. If you don't think that's being effective—you go to Moscow and try to duplicate it.

In directing the lend-lease program, Harriman scrutinized with the utmost care to make certain that what the Russians asked for was something to be used in the prosecution of the war. He resisted vigorously everything the Russians asked for that could only be used to broaden the base of their postwar economy. He is the man who stopped such things as port facilities, industrial facilities, and what not, going to the Soviet Union, often against the approval of people in Washington.

DEFENDS POLAND

I think that Harriman's defense of Poland is something that has not been made sufficiently well known. He was 1 of 3 persons who were designated by the heads of state to implement the Yalta decision with respect to the future of Poland. He is the only one who held out adamantly until the very end that the decision should be implemented in the spirit in which it was made. Had the British Government and our own Government held out with the same degree of firmness that Harriman did, Poland might not be behind the Iron Curtain today.

Perhaps his greatest diplomatic victory was the night of the Japanese surrender. He met with Molotov and the British Ambassador that night to formulate an agreed reply to the Japanese offer of surrender. During the course of those discussions, Molotov very cagily said that the command to accept the Japanese proposals and to ad-

minister Japan in the postwar years should be a joint command; and suggested that we might like to have General MacArthur and they would have Marshall Vassilevsky.

OUTWITS MOLOTOV

Well, that proposal was no sooner out of Molotov's lips than Harriman took him up one side and down the other and left him a burning crisp. He pointed out, with a great deal of justification, the part that had been played by the Soviet Union as against the part that had been played by the United States in the defeat of Japan; and what would have happened to the Soviet Union had not the United States taken that part. Siberia would have been a Japanese-occupied territory.

Molotov, of course, sputtered and fumed, but Harriman told him that you can take that reply to your boss. There will be no agreed reply to the surrender offer until you recognize that there will be a single command in the Far East, and that command will be an American command, and the commander will be Gen. Douglas MacArthur.

Harriman returned to his office with no agreed reply to the Japanese. Within 30 minutes Stalin's secretary telephoned and said that Mr. Molotov had misunderstood his instruction; they would be delighted to have General MacArthur as the Supreme Commander in the Far East.

If not for the firm position taken by Harriman at that time, if the question had been sent to Washington and became the subject of a debate, we would have had the most confused position in the Far East—the same confused position that we have suffered in Germany and Austria. But, fortunately, we had a man there at that time who had the courage to act fast and let the Russians know in no uncertain terms just where they got off on that particular issue.

ALWAYS ON THE JOB

How did he do all this? He did it by being everlastingly on the job. Averell Harriman is a fellow who is on the job when he wakes up in the morning, when he sits down to breakfast, when he meets you in the office, when he is talking to someone in the living room, and when he is trying to get to sleep at night. He just never quits his job.

There was one incident that rather amused me. Averell is a particularly concentrating person. This concentration is relieved, of course, by the magnetism of his smile, but when he's concentrating he doesn't smile very much. On one occasion I was sitting in the lobby of the Bolshoi Opera House with a man named Litvinov, who had been the Russian Foreign Minister.

Averell Harriman came by, and he was little stooped, he was very preoccupied, and he did look a little grim. Litvinov turned to me and he said: "Is it true dat dat man has a hundred million dollars?" I said: "Well, I don't know how much he's got. I saw in a magazine that he does have a huge fortune, and it did mention something about a hundred million dollars, but I have no way of knowing." And he gave a terrific sigh for an old Communist, and he said: "My God. How can a man look so sour with a hundred million dollars?" Of course, he wasn't sour—just absorbed in his thoughts.

More than stick-to-it-iveness, and that diligence that he has, he has the power of persuasive logic. Time and again Stalin—after talking to Harriman—made decisions in favor of the United States point of view against the advice of his own advisers. Harriman won his points by the keenness of his intellect and by knowing and understanding what he was talking about.

In Russia he operated mostly from midnight until dawn. That was when you always met the Russians. But would he come home from a 3 a. m. meeting and hit the hay and send a telegram the next morning—not Averell. He would come back from that 3 o'clock meeting, telephone me and wake me up and say: "Come on over. We've got a telegram to get out." Then we would go over and analyze the meeting and try and give the feeling of the situation to our President and Secretary of State. And when this was finished, long after daybreak, if he didn't have something else for me to do, then I might be able to get a little sleep. Everyone who worked for Averell Harriman knew that there was no end to office hours for the duration.

THE OUTSTANDING CANDIDATE

In Governor Harriman we have an opportunity to select a man of whose integrity there can be absolutely no doubt. He is a patriot. He is happiest when he is serving his country. He comes to public life prepared by experience. There is no American who has had the background and experience that he has had in domestic and foreign affairs. He brings to public service a superior intellect trained particularly in the fields of statesmanship, diplomacy, military affairs.

He is an outstanding economist, both by training and by experience. It has been his lot in the administering of lend-lease programs to go in deeply to the economy of countries. It has been his lot as the Secretary of Commerce to go into the economy of countries. It has been his lot as the administrator of military aid in the postwar period to know the economy of such countries as our allied friends in Western Europe. It has also been his lot to study the economy of our enemies; and I want you to be sure that he did that when he was in the Soviet Union. He was the person who initiated the idea of having an agricultural expert on the Embassy staff in the Soviet Union.

So I feel that most important of all he is trained in the field of economics. I think that this cold war, with everything else being stalemated, is going to be decided, in the long pull, by the economic stamina of the two sides. And I think Harriman would bring to the United States experience and knowledge in this field that cannot be duplicated.

Averell Harriman brings to public service a dedication and an intensity that is absolutely unremitting. So I say, that as a retired Army officer, as a contemporary of Ike's, as a registered Republican, I am going to vote for Averell Harriman. I commend him to you.

Foot-in-the Door Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. H. R. GROSS

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 10, 1956

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following editorial which appeared in the Waterloo (Iowa) Daily Courier on July 4, the day prior to the final vote in the House on the Federal school construction bill, H. R. 7535:

Foot-in-the-door legislation to establish the principle of Federal aid to education is now being considered by Congress.

Bills being debated provide only trivial amounts of aid. The House Democrats are proposing $400 million a year in building aid for 4 years. The administration proposal is for $250 million a year for 5 years.

Even the Democratic bill would construct in the whole Nation only about 115 schools a year comparable to Waterloo's new West High School. That won't even make a dent in actual school-building needs. These proposals are obviously only a means of starting a precedent.

No one has yet advanced a valid argument for this Federal assistance. True, some school districts are in trouble because there is an inadequate financial base within the district. But there is not a State in the Nation which cannot provide an adequate education to its children in adequate school buildings. The Federal aid drive comes from those who, failing to get State legislatures to vote the money, propose to get the money from Congress. The public is then supposed to think it is getting the funds for free.

Of course there are variations in the ability of States to finance education. But no bill has yet been seriously considered by Congress which would distribute Federal aid exclusively on a need, or equalization, basis. Even the richest State in the Union, New York, would get Federal aid under all bills considered by Congress. Thus, even though equalization is the only argument for Federal aid with a shred of validity, the pending bills do not propose that the money be distributed exclusively on that basis.

Representative SAMUEL K. MCCONNELL, ranking Republican on the House Education Committee, will, however, introduce amendments which would provide the aid exclusively on a need basis and which would require State matching funds. "Many States," he points out, "now make no contribution toward school construction. * * * It seems to me to be especially important, if the Federal Government is to provide funds for school construction, that State governments do likewise."

The building-aid bills should be defeated. If, however, Congress is determined to transfer a share of the responsibility for education from States to the Federal Government, it should do so only on an equalization or need basis. Under that type of program there is a greater possibility that the appropriations could be discontinued after the so-called emergency building needs of the present period have been met.

Who Is Russia Trying To Fool?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RAY J. MADDEN

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 10, 1956

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, the following article by Richard S. Kaplan, first district commander, department of Indiana, the American Legion, sets forth some interesting and factual statements concerning the Kremlin and its program of world conquest:

WHO IS RUSSIA TRYING TO FOOL?

(By Richard S. Kaplan, first district commander, department of Indiana, American Legion, 1955–56)

Premier Nikolai Bulganin and Communist Party Chief Nikita Khrushchev have destroyed the image of Stalin and have confessed that the great Stalin was a ruthless liar and murderer. They have apologized for the deliberate and senseless slaughter of millions of Ukrainians, Poles, Jews, and others in Soviet Russia since Stalin became head of the Communist state.

Those two honest (?) souls wept bitter tears as they made this confession, but forgot to tell the Rusian people that they were part and parcel of the Stalin conspiracy; that they stood idly by participating in the sadistic joy that was Stalin's as innocent people were shot from behind at his behest.

Now they ask that we forget all that has happened and believe these two who want peace—nothing but peace—at their price. I have no doubt in my mind that many thousands of Americans believe in the sincerity of Bulganin and Khrushchev. But they forget some very important facts and they do not realize that what is happening is that these two masterminds have switched signals. No more obvious threats of war. They intend to win a new way. This time, as the NATO ministers agreed, a few weeks ago, the world is facing a new and dangerous agile Soviet foreign policy based on economic and cultural penetration.

Let us analyze some indisputable facts.

Many years ago Nicolai Lenin, who has not as yet been denied by Bulganin and Khrushchev, and who was smuggled out of Switzerland in a boxcar and brought to Russia to sparkplug the underhanded overthrow of the Kerensky government, the only democratic government Russia ever knew, wrote these words, "It is inconceivable that communism and democracy can exist side by side in this world. Inevitably one must perish." Read those words over and over again until they sink indelibly into your mind. Those words constitute the fixed purpose of Russian communism, namely, to take over the rest of the world.

The writings of Marx and Lenin constitute the basic law of communism. If we are to listen to the two present leaders of Russia on the matter of coexistence peacefully, then we must be made to believe that a positive, inflexible, basic, and fundamental purpose of communism is about to be destroyed and that is pure, unadulterated hogwash. Eliminate this purpose and you destroy the purpose of existence for the Communists, and the Russian leaders know it. They have never for one moment forgotten the basic teachings of Marx or their revered saint, Lenin, and don't let anyone fool you on that score.

Let us again go back to Lenin's words. He also wrote: "We must in no case, not even in a single strategic maneuver, tie our own hands. If I pursue an enemy who does not move in a straight line, but zigzags, then I, too, must zigzag in order to reach him; when the turns of history are very sharp, the turns of the party's policy may also have to be sharp." This plan of action has not been repudiated by the present leaders of Russia.

Lenin also laid down this inflexible rule: "Until the final issue, between capitalism and communism, is finally decided the state of partial war will continue. We say 'a la guerre comme a la guerre.' Do they believe that the revolution can proceed calmly, smoothly, without torments, without infliction of pain, without terror, without horror?" And this fundamental belief has not been repudiated by Bulganin or Khrushchev.

The laws of communism are clearly laid down and defined. It's a struggle to the death between capitalism and communism. Lie, cheat, steal, make agreements but keep your fingers crossed and forget the agreements if it will serve your purpose. That's the Communist law and creed.

Doesn't Eisenhower know this fact? Doesn't Dulles know it? Don't the great leaders of the world know these facts? Certainly they do. They must know it. Then what in the name of all that is sane and holy keeps our leaders going around in circles and being whipped at every turn by the now sweet and gentle approach of the Russian killers?

Let's take a leaf out of the Russian book. It was Khrushchev who threatened, while visiting England, "Don't ever shake your fist at a Russian." It's about time we stop our diplomatic blunderings. Let's stop the efforts to use us as propaganda bait. Let's tell Russia in no uncertain terms, "Don't ever dare to threaten us or shake your hydrogen bomb in our face or you may find it exploding in your own kitchen." Let us get on with the strengthening of our Nation and the nations truly friendly to us. Give not an inch. Show communism that although we are a peace-loving people, we, too, can put iron in our fists when we are threatened.

The Communists understand only force and strength. They respect it. Then give them what they understand and respect.

There can be no peaceful coexistence between capitalism and communism. Marx said so. Lenin said so. Engles said so. And in this case, we believe those otherwise great liars.

But we will believe Bulganin and Khrushchev, believe everything they say, when:

They see to it that every slave laborer in Russia is freed.

They demand the immediate return of every Allied serviceman who was captured in Korea and whose disappearance has not been explained.

They return every ship this country loaned them under lend-lease during World War II.

They publicly acknowledge the debt they owe us for the gifts we gave to the Russian people during World War II.

They lift the Iron Curtain in Rumania, Albania, Lithuania, Poland, Estonia, Hungary and Russia, remove their stooges and allow the peoples of those nations the right to their own form of government.

Remove their stooges from East Germany and let Germany become reunited, without interference.

They denounce Lenin and Marx as imbeciles and would-be murderers.

Having acknowledged the thievery of Stalin, when they return the billions of dollars of machinery, factories, electrical supplies, and tools they stole and removed from the conquered nations.

When they punish the murderous Chinese Communists who tied the hands of our captured fighting men and then shot them in the back.

When, by their acts, they have shown their desire to become a part of the decent world, we shall, indeed, believe them. Until then, the Russians are fooling no one, that is, no one who knows what communism is and how it lives.

As of now the Russian Communists have only changed their pace. They're zigging where they formerly zagged. They're smiling where they formerly scowled. Why risk war when you can win by furnishing arms to the Arabs, encourage the Arabs to attack Israel, the only democratic bastion in the Mediterranean area, and force the Western nations into another war, with Russia standing by, furnishing nothing but the means of war, preserving her power and strength and always hoping that capitalism will let down its guard.

The rest of the Nation may be fooled by the charming words and smiles of Messrs. Bulganin and Krushchev but the American Legion will never permit these accessories before and after the fact to get away with their act. Let our diplomats shake hands and sit at diplomatic tables giving everything and getting nothing from the Russians in return. We, in the American Legion, will listen, watch, and be prepared for the worst.

Cutting the Carryovers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HORACE SEELY-BROWN, JR.

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 10, 1956

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. Mr. Speaker, under consent to revise and extend my remarks, I include an editorial which appeared in the July 9 issue of the Christian Science Monitor. This editorial very properly urges Congress to carry out the recommendations of the second Hoover Commission in reference to an improved system of accounting procedures for the Federal Government. I do hope before Congress completes its work during the present session that prompt and proper action may be taken on this legislation.

The editorial follows:

CUTTING THE CARRYOVERS

Congress, which has done so little to carry out the recommendations of the second Hoover Commission, has a golden opportunity to put one major reform into effect. This is the improved system of accounting embodied in the Kennedy-Payne bill recently passed by the Senate.

This measure would set up the accrued expenditure plan of accounting and budgeting. By it Congress would obtain from each spending agency of Government an annual report showing funds actually disbursed during the year just past, together with estimated expenses for the year ahead. As things stand today, Congress often appropriates without knowing whether funds already provided have been spent or are still available.

Much of the current controversy over mutual security (foreign aid) arises from misunderstandings about such carryovers. At one time the Army had $11 billion in hand for guided missiles, tanks, and ammunition, although it was spending no more than a fourth of that a year. It is estimated that this new fiscal year started with $53,900,000,000 in unexpended appropriations.

Many of these sums are obligated under contracts which will ultimately require payment. And opponents contend that long-range planning cannot operate on an annual accrued expediture basis. But the Bureau of Reclamation—which builds dams requiring long years of construction—uses the system successfully. It has helped many business firms, and is recommended by the Budget Bureau, the Treasury, and the General Accounting Office.

Hoover Commission experts believe that adoption of the system would save $4 billion a year. We would not guarantee any such figure, for the spirit of saving is more vital than the mechanics. But it does appear that this method would give Congress a better informed and tighter control on spending—which should spell economy.

In the House the companion measure of the Kennedy-Payne bill is the Rogers-Lipscomb bill. It is bogged down in the Government Operations Committee, where personal and partisan disputes threaten to hold it. But if public opinion is sufficiently mobilized, there is still time for Congress to adopt one of the most promising of the Hoover reform proposals.

Chasing the Pot of Gold

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. H. R. GROSS

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 10, 1956

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following editorial from the July 7 issue of the Des Moines (Iowa) Register:

The National Education Association, now in convention in Oregon, is reported making plans for the greatest education lobby in history. The NEA wants the full strength

of each local, State and national educational organization used in a united drive for Federal legislation. Top priority is to be given to a Federal aid-to-education bill.

The Iowa State Education Association, with some 25,000 members, can be expected to go along with this NEA program. The State association is on record as favoring Federal aid in building of classrooms. The House of Representatives killed the bill on Federal school building aid in a vote Thursday, probably ending hope of any action on this issue in the present Congress. But the NEA undoubtedly will continue to work for such aid. The 90 Iowa delegates now attending the NEA convention also presumably will believe they have a moral commitment to work for Federal aid to education.

However, it is to be hoped that Iowa teachers and the State education association will put first things first when it comes to lobbying and legislation. It should be recognized that Federal aid to education is not of great importance in Iowa. Iowa could handle its own problem of providing the additional classrooms needed to take care of increasing school population.

The $6 million of Federal aid which would have come to Iowa annually under the bill before Congress wouldn't go very far toward constructing school buildings on a statewide basis.

School people in Iowa can accomplish much more for education in this State by working for State legislation than by chasing the pot of gold at the end of the Federal aid rainbow.

Their assistance will be needed in informing the public of the need for a new program of State aid which will result in a better education for many Iowa youngsters at a more reasonable cost per pupil. That means primarily reorganization of school districts. This is a problem which won't be solved by national legislation.

The Arab Side

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 13, 1956

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following item which appeared in the June 1, 1956, issue of Israel Speaks. The author, P. L. Prattis, is the editor of the Pittsburgh Courier.

THE ARAB SIDE OF THE QUESTION
(By P. L. Prattis)

PITTSBURGH.—There has recently been organized at Harvard University a group which proposes to present to the American people the Arab side of the problem in the Middle East. The emergence of this new instrument of information (or propaganda) implies: (1) That there is an untold Arab side, and (2) that the American Friends of the Middle East, the American Council for Judaism, and other such agencies are not doing a complete and effective job of selling the cause of the Arabs to Americans. The entry of this new, perturbed group from the scholarly environment of Cambridge also raises the question: What is the Arab side?

I have visited in most of the countries of the Middle East (at least twice) and have read extensively the information and propaganda issued by the Israel and Arab Governments and by private organizations which support the one or the other.

The Arab side, in my opinion, rests upon eight (perhaps a few more) fundamentals which can be listed (not in the order of their importance) as: (1) fear of Israeli expansion; (2) concern over the plight of the Arab refugees; (3) concern over treatment of Arabs in Israel; (4) the intransigent attitude of Arab leadership and the refusal to talk peace; (5) the belief that Israel can be starved to death; (6) the rights of Arabs vis-a-vis the rights of Jews in Palestine; (7) the fear of popular, democratic government among the Arab ruling class, and (8) the use to which oil can be put as an instrument of Arab foreign policy.

EXPANSIONIST AIMS

If you visit in Lebanon, Syria, Jordan, or Egypt and talk with Arab leaders, they will tell you that Israel is preparing for a "second round" in order to expand at the expense of the Arab nations. You will be told that there is a covered map on the wall of the Knesset in Jerusalem on which Israeli expansionist aims are traced. Generally, the Israelis are said to be ready to try to make good on God's promise to Abraham this His people should have all the land between the River of Egypt and the Euphrates.

If you visit Jerusalem, you will find no such map as the Arabs have described no matter how carefully you examine the walls of the meeting place of the Knesset, nor do you find any responsible Israeli public official or private citizen talking or thinking about expansion. The Arabs have manufactured this one.

Again, you are told that there are nearly a million refugees and that their plight is a reproach to humanity. The American public should know that there are not nearly a million refugees, that two-thirds of the refugees are living on the same terms as the surrounding Arab population, that all of the refugees receive as much nutrition (or more) than the masses of the Arab people and that they receive more in terms of education, health and welfare. The camps one sees do not begin to represent the fraudulent total of refugees (dead and alive and the Arabs in these camps are at least as well off in terms of services as the nomads of the desert).

The Arab Governments have not shown their concern by helping in any substantial manner to foot the bill for housing, feeding, clothing, and generally caring for these refugees. Uncle Sam has already picked up most of the tab for that.

The Arabs compose at least one-tenth of the population of Israel. They are required to carry identification cards and a close tab is kept on their movements. What would America do if a tenth of her population was related to hostile neighbors who surrounded her on three sides? The United States with a population of 167 million makes her chief concern the probable existence of 50,000 Communists in our midst. What would she do if there were 16 million Communists among us and Russia was our next door neighbor?

ARAB INTRANSIGENCE

Repeatedly, the Arabs have pledged to one another that they will never recognize Israel. This intransigence is based on their belief that 2 million people, cut off from the Arab world, cannot live in the present confines of Israel. They therefore are willing to wait a hundred years for Israel to wear herself out trying to keep alive. They also hope to wear out the generosity of Jews in other parts of the world. That is a part of the Arab side.

The Arabs, and many others, believe they have primary rights in Palestine. That is a matter of endless debate. The Jews and Arabs, historically, have been in and around Palestine for about the same length of time, but Jewish sovereignty in Palestine, to go no further back than King David, prevailed centuries before there was any such thing as Arab sovereignty in the area. Arab sovereignty coincided with the spread of Islamism in the seventh century A. D. But just as Jewish sovereignty did not last, neither did that of the Arabs. The Turks are not Arabs and they held sway in in Palestine and other Arab countries for 4 centuries until their grip was broken in the First World War. Arab sovereignty in the Middle East was only restored after the Second World War. The Arabs didn't win sovereignty. It came to them as a product of the war aims of the free nations of the world. The Jewish people, therefore, have as much of a claim, based on either history or tradition, to sovereignty in Palestine as the Arabs.

COMPENSATION OFFERED

The Israelis did not take the land of the Arabs in Palestine. They started by paying cash on the barrelhead. When the Arab nations made war on Israel in 1948 and urged the Arabs in Palestine to flee, the Israelis were left holding the land. They have offered to compensate the former owners if the Arab governments will talk peace. That also is a part of the Arab side.

Not more than 2 percent of the people in Arab countries compose the ruling class. In all of these countries, the ruling class is allergic to the practical demonstration of democracy as it is revealed in Israel . The members of the ruling class do not want the masses of Arabs to see what democracy and free enterprise have done for the Israelis. They want to remove, cut out, or destroy, this "cancer of enlightenment."

Further and finally, these Arab peoples who are old in the arts of civilization and more crafty than they are given credit for, recognize that oil is their ace in the hole in the deadly game they are playing against Israel and the nations of the West. The Arabs have the oil which Europe needs. The West wants the oil (and is buying it), but the Arabs don't mind scaring the pants off the West by acting like they might sell to Russia. The more for Russia, the less for the West.

"If you want our oil, be reasonable about Israel," the West is cautioned.

Being reasonable from the Arab point of view is keeping hands off while they prepare for the next push which will drive the Israelis into watery graves in the eastern Mediterranean.

Middle East Tensions Must Be Relieved To Avoid War—An Opportunity for Israel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 5, 1956

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am inserting a challenging article that recently appeared in Jewish Newsletter. The article is by Mr. William Zukerman, a Jew but not a Zionist.

One may not agree with all that the writer says in the article; but I have been in the Middle East and have visited refugee camps, and I believe that if the suggestion which has been made by Mr. Zukerman is followed that it would go a long way to ease tensions and begin

a movement to stabilize conditions in that entire area. As a member of a subcommittee which has studied the refugee problem and general conditions in the Middle East, I commend this article for the serious consideration of those who are interested in peace in that area.

In this matter we are considering the welfare of human beings, Arabs and Jews alike, who for 100 years prior to partition, lived together peacefully. The article follows:

AN OPPORTUNITY FOR ISRAEL

(By William Zukerman)

The suspension of mass emigration of Moroccan Jews has placed the Government of Israel in a dilemma it has never faced before. For the first time in her short history, Israel's basic theory, the ingathering of the exiles, has received a sudden, sharp setback; and a major operation for which many preparations had been made and big funds raised ended in failure almost before it began. How will this affect the entire immigration work of Israel? Where will the manpower for immigration into Israel come from now? What will be done with the money already raised for Moroccan immigration? How will the new fund-raising be kept up with the immediate target removed? These are important questions which make up a crucial problem. Israel and the Zionist movement stand now at a crossing of the roads and a great deal depends on what road they will choose to travel.

This writer is not a Zionist and is one of the last persons from whom Zionists would take advice. But I am a Jew and a human being who has seen 20th century nationalism in action all over Europe and I am horrified at the thought of what may happen in Israel, in the Middle East, and to the Jews of the world—if the wrong road is taken at this crucial moment. I therefore feel impelled to offer a simple suggestion which seems to provide not only an answer to the vital questions raised by the ban on Moroccan emigration, but also to offer an opportunity for Israel to correct a grave error and right a grievous wrong which is at the very heart of the tragedy in the Middle East. I know full well that my suggestion will be received with scoffing by the small of faith and with fury by the fanatics, but I nevertheless advance it in all sincerity for the consideration of those people, Jews and non-Jews alike, who believe that Israel's basic problems are not entirely of a political nature and can best be solved in the framework of morality and humanitarianism.

A UNIQUE PROPOSAL

The simple solution and opportunity, which I envisage, is for Israel to open her doors for a limited number of Arab refugees to return to their lands and homes in place of the Moroccan Jews whom the ban keeps from coming.

According to official Zionist statements, the Jewish Agency was planning for the transfer of 40,000 Jews from Morocco to Israel this year. All the preparations for the transfer had already been made, and extra funds had been raised for this purpose in the United States of America. It is my sincere conviction that if an equivalent number of Arab refugees, or even a portion thereof, were permitted to return to their homes and lands in Israel this year, this would be a gesture of such true humanitarianism and moral grandeur that it could radically change the atmosphere in the Middle East morally, politically, and psychologically. This act of generosity and justice could contribute more than anything else attempted in recent years toward the reduction of bitterness and hatred between the Arabs and Israelis and toward improving the climate for peace in that area.

Despite the unconventionality and apparent unreality of the proposal, I am convinced that it can be realized with less trouble and effort than some of the measures tried in vain by Israel to bring peace in the Middle East during the last few years. I believe this for the following reasons:

I. Such a move on the part of Israel would in the first place be an obvious act of justice, sorely needed in a problem which is intrinsically moral, but which has heretofore been dealt with on a purely political basis. For anyone who can look at the Arab-Israeli conflict without nationalistic bias must feel that the Palestinian Arab refugees who had lived on their soil all their lives, as had their forefathers before them for centuries, are certainly more entitled to return to their own land than are Moroccan Jews who have lived in Morocco for centuries and still have their homes there. If there is room for another mass immigration in Israel now, as the Zionist leaders claim, certainly some of the native Arab peasants, who had been rotting in refugee camps for more than 8 years, should get priority to return to their homes, rather than Arab Jews from north Africa, especially if these latter are now prevented from coming. This is the first dictate of justice which has often been obscured in Israel by political and nationalistic considerations of the new State.

II. An act of humanitarianism such as this would also prove to be of great political benefit to Israel. Only hardened, congential militarists can believe in our age that physical force can ever settle a controversy such as the one between the Arabs and Israelis. And only nationalistic fanatics can believe that Israel can accomplish by force of arms what Great Britain, France, and other Colonial Powers have failed to accomplish. In a century when England gave up Suez and may have to give up Cyprus; when France gave up Indochina, Morocco, and may have to yield in Algeria; when Holland was forced to give up Indonesia, can little Israel force its will on the entire Arab world, even if she had all the arms requested from the United States? Every objective observer outside and even inside Israel is convinced that something besides force is needed to solve, or at least ease the Arab-Israeli conflict.

A dramatic gesture such as the repatriation of several thousand Arab refugee families willing to swear allegiance to the State of Israel could possibly be just the unconventional, phychological approach that is needed at present to reduce tensions and to better relations between the two peoples which alone can secure the political existence of Israel. For it is not enough to demand that the Arabs recognize the fact of the existence of Israel as a condition of peace. Recognition, if it is to be true, cannot be imposed by force, or by diplomatic protocol. It must come from within, the Israelis must help to bring it. This they can do best, as their own tradition teaches, by acts of justice, mercy, friendship, and generosity toward their neighbors, the Arab refugees outside and the Arab minority inside the country. Israel now has a rare opportunity to demonstrate its true desire for friendship and for peace in a dramatic manner that would be recognized by the entire world, including the Arab peoples and would be more effective than thousands of words and government declarations.

It is true that such a step may be difficult to take. It is in direct opposition to the intense nationalism that Israel has come to stand for ever since its inception. It would require the abandonment, or at least the modification, of the highly exclusive principle of Israel's immigration policy which is based on the ingathering of the Jewish exiles only, to include some native Arab exiles who are even more urgently in need of a home. It would require a change of heart from narrow chauvinism to universal humanism as the basis of the new State. It would require courage to admit errors and guilt and make amends for them. But this is a common experience of our period. The English, the French, the Dutch have abandoned, or radically altered their old ideas of colonialism and empires. Even the Communists are now trying to make the world believe that they are giving up their old ideologies, policies, and tactics. Why not the Zionists? Is it not an experiment worth trying in the interests of peace? For nearly a decade Israel has tried various means of force and these have led only to mounting bitterness and hatred which can eventually end in destruction. Is it not time to try the road which for centuries Judaism has preached as the only one that leads to peace—the road of justice, mercy, and humility?

Arabs' Anti-Jewish Campaign

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 13, 1956

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I direct the attention of our colleagues to the following item which appeared in the June 1, 1956, issue of Israel Speaks:

ARABS GIVEN FREE HAND IN ANTI-JEWISH CAMPAIGN

(By Zeva Shapiro)

NEW YORK.—"A fantastic allegation, since the Arabs themselves are Semites"—this was the gist of the indignant retort of an officer of the Arab Information Office to charges of anti-Semitic activity released to the public by the American Jewish Congress last April. This classic evasion of the issue fits in with the current Arab line as well as with recent pronouncements by Secretary of State Dulles in response to questioning on official endorsement of Arab discrimination against American Jews.

Mr. Dulles commented before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee a few months ago that the Arabs "have some practices which we may think curious * * *. We, perforce, accommodate ourselves to certain practices they have which we do not like; they, perhaps, accommodate themselves to certain of our idiosyncrasies which they do not like, but on the whole, they have a pretty arbitrary rule largely dictated by the strict tenets of Moslem faith."

Some data on curious practices of the Arab countries were yielded through a telephone check of the Arab consulates in New York this week. "I am very sorry, but we have instructions not to grant visas to members of the Hebrew faith" was the pointed though polite response of a secretary at the Syrian consulate.

The Lebanese consulate was more circumspect: "Do you know anybody there? You must have a reference from an individual or the Government in Lebanon before you can apply for a visa." "Iraq will not grant entry to anyone traveling through Israel"—a representative of that Government explained irately that "the ruling is a provision of the Arab League constitution."

JEWS EXCLUDED

American citizens of the Jewish faith are warned by the Passport Division of the Department of State that they will be denied the right to visit Arab lands. American Export Lines announce that persons of Jewish faith or Jewish name will be excluded

from certain cruise travel privileges in Arab ports. Airlines indicate in their schedules that Jewish passengers will not be allowed to disembark at Arab ports of entry.

Restrictions are not limited to pleasure travel by private citizens, but are being applied to Government and military personnel as well. Reports of Saudi Arabian restrictions against American military personnel at the Dahran base have not disturbed the official calm. A Saudi Arabian ruling prohibits the public announcement of Christian religious services; the display by chaplains of the crosses that are their insignias of rank; appearance in clerical garb except during services on the base.

Dismissing these practices with feeble excuses, State Department spokesmen show a bland indifference to the religious liberties of Americans, thus inviting foreign assaults on the rights of United States citizens.

Secretary Dulles, when asked by members of the Foreign Relations Committee on February 24 of this year, whether the terms of the mutual-security agreement between Saudi Arabia and this country disqualify Jewish servicemen from being stationed at the Dahran base, replied, "It may be."

A brief submitted to President Eisenhower and Mr. Dulles on May 13 scores the failure on the part of the United States to take a stand against Arab anti-Jewish discrimination. So far, the State Department seems to have decided to maintain its passive attitude and overlook the grave implications of permitting a foreign state to pass upon the religious qualifications of Americans abroad.

DISCRIMINATION IN EMPLOYMENT

In the field of employment within the borders of this country, Arab anti-Jewish discrimination has already had more serious consequences and a more blatant quality because it has involved the direct defiance of State fair employment practice legislation.

An ad in a New York City newspaper announced openings for welders in foreign countries. The New York State Commission Against Discrimination received complaints because applicants were asked to state their religious beliefs—a violation of the State's employment code.

After investigating the charges the State commission reported the following facts regarding the circumstances of the case:

"The company advised that it had an understanding with the Arabian Government to screen all prospective employees for work in Arabia before they applied for Arabian visas, for the purpose of excluding persons of the Jewish faith to whom visas will not be granted."

This condition for employment, though in absolute conflict with the terms and explicit purpose of fair employment practice legislation, was not challenged because, as the report goes on to state:

"A representative of the Department of State stressed the importance of not having anything interfere with the existing relationship between the Arabian Government and the Arabian American Oil Co. • • • Should it be disturbed in any way the international interests of the United States would be seriously affected."

ACTIVE COLLABORATION

The contagion has infected the highest levels. Army contractors, engaged in defense projects paid for by all of the American people, have collaborated with the Arab campaign. As one can see in the testimony of Maj. Gen. G. J. Nold, Deputy Chief of Engineers, United States Army, before a Senate subcommittee what was once tacit cooperation has turned into active support. Nold reported that Army contractors were no longer recruiting workers for the construction of military bases in Arab countries in New York where many of the applicants would be likely to be Jewish. From this point of view the Army regarded the Midwest as a more suitable recruiting point.

An inquiry into this affair by the chairman of the New York State Commission Against Discrimination was dismissed with a sanctimonious reply from the then Secretary of the Army, Frank Pace, Jr.:

"These (Army) contractors have not discriminated against qualified Jewish workers for Saudi Arabian projects. They are willing to recruit workers of this faith; however, these workers are unable to obtain the required visas from Saudi Arabia."

The lack of concern communicated by Secretary Pace's perfunctory note has become characteristic of the official attitude which contents itself with disclaiming responsibility for Arab practices against American citizens and with mild assurances that the discriminatory acts are contrary to the wishes of our Government.

Formal expressions of disapproval are less than adequate as a substitute for specific answers to questions such as the following: Has the United States protested to the countries concerned, the nature of its protests, to what extent have they been pursued, what course of action the United States intends to adopt if its complaints are not heeded.

Thus far, there has been no official comment on these questions.

A Worthy Tribute to Chairman Lewis L. Strauss, of the Atomic Energy Commission

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 10, 1956

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, the June 30, 1956, issue of Business Week carried an interesting story on Rear Adm. Lewis L. Strauss, Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission, and his policies designed to keep the United States in the lead in nuclear power.

The article follows:

HIS ATOM-POWER PLAN FACES A TOUGH BATTLE

One of the most controversial figures in Washington is Lewis L. Strauss, Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission.

The 60-year-old Strauss, never a man to duck a fight, now is in the middle of one of his toughest scraps since he became AEC's boss in July 1953. A congressional committee is looking into charges that our program for developing electric power from the atom—a program largely charted by Strauss—is seriously inadequate.

The charges—first leveled last year by Senator ALBERT GORE, Democrat, of Tennessee—really came to life in recent weeks. That happened when other Congressmen and some top Government atomic experts challenged our progress on atomic power during hearings of the joint congressional Committee on Atomic Energy. (Business Week, May 26, 1956, p. 65.)

Doubts: Senator GORE is pushing legislation to force the Government to build and operate six large atomic-power plants. These would be in addition to the 7 large plants (over 50,000 kilowatts of electric capacity) now being built or planned by private groups and Government-industry teams.

Most of the support for GORE's proposal comes from public power groups. But several members of the joint congressional committee and two of the Nation's foremost reactor experts, Dr. Walter Zinn and Dr. Alvin M. Weinberg, also have expressed serious doubts about our effort on atomic power.

What the experts fear, and what the joint committee is investigating, is the possibility that the United States may lose its world leadership in atomic power through sheer lack of aggressiveness. They wonder if we should build more large-scale power reactors. Much of this concern stems from recent announcements by the Russians that they are planning to build 10 big atomic powerplants, with a total capacity of 2 to 2.5 million kilowatts, over the next 5 years.

AEC views: Strauss, with a majority of the AEC Commissioners, insists that we are well ahead of the Russians and the British, who also are building a number of large plants. He feels our development program is good enough to keep us out in front. Only Commissioner Thomas E. Murray, last remaining non-Eisenhower appointee on AEC, disagrees.

Murray approves the Gore scheme in large part. However, he would have the Government build only five large reactors right now, more later if necessary to develop other types.

I. WHAT THE FIGHT'S ABOUT

Both the Russians and the British are going about atomic power development in ways differing radically from our program. The United Kingdom is building several types of small, experimental plants. But at the same time it is going ahead with eight large-scale, gas-cooled power reactors.

The Soviet Union apparently is building some pilot plants, but the emphasis seems to be on the 10 big plants, each of a different type.

The United States, on the other hand, builds pilot or experimental plants for every type of power reactor deemed by AEC's experts as worthy of testing.

Economics and strategy: The differences are a matter both of economics and world strategy.

From the standpoint of domestic economics, the pilot plant approach makes sense for the United States. No one expects to produce atomic power at anywhere near the 6 mills to 9 mills per kilowatt-hour that power from conventional fuels costs in modern utility plants in most sections of the United States. Atomic power is even further from competing with steam plants located near coal, oil, and gas deposits, or with hydroelectric installations.

All the experts believe that the larger the reactor plant, the better your chance of getting cheap power—because beyond a certain point construction costs don't jump in proportion to size. But since large-scale reactor plants are likely to cost in the $50 million to $100 million range, it makes sense to try out new designs in pilots at a tenth or less of the cost.

Britain's needs: The economics are entirely different in the United Kingdom, where conventional fuel must be imported and fuel costs are high. Britain desperately needs more power, so it makes sense to go ahead now with large-scale atomic plants.

Soviet strategy: Motives of the fuel-rich U. S. S. R. are something else again. The Kremlin is certainly aware of the international impact of the United States offer to help friendly nations with peaceful atomic development. So the Russian program of large atomic-power stations may well be a move to get the jump in the power-hungry nations such as Japan, India, and many South American countries, which think of atomic power in terms of large plants.

Weinberg, director of AEC's Oak Ridge National Laboratory, points out: "If the Russians by such development gain more friends than we, they will ignore costs and go ahead." This view is apparently shared by Zinn, until recently head of Argonne National Laboratory, and by Senator CLINTON ANDERSON, Democrat, of New Mexico, joint committee chairman.

II. WHERE STRAUSS STANDS

Strauss disagrees. The AEC chairman already has appeared before the joint committee and put in some telling licks against the Gore bill. While he was about it, he pooh-poohed the fears about our losing the international race for atomic power.

"It is important," he agreed, "that we maintain world leadership in the development of nuclear power. However, this ought to be genuine leadership based on sound scientific progress and technological development. We are confident that our present program now enjoys such leadership."

At last summer's conference on the peaceful uses of the atom at Geneva, he asserted, it was apparent to all observers that the magnitude and quality of our effort and our achievement was far and away the most outstanding.

Sales tell: Since the Geneva conference, United States firms have sold 5 research reactors (to Italy, Japan, Brazil, Spain, and West Germany), and 1 power reactor (to Belgium) abroad. Completion of several additional sales by United States firms is only awaiting the signing of diplomatic agreements with the countries involved.

"So far as we are aware," Strauss says, "no other foreign government or industry has made any such sales."

The implication is pretty clear. Nations that are buying reactors are turning to the United States for them.

Secret report: Sources close to Strauss say that rumors of Russian superiority in atomic power stem from a closed-door report to Congress by the Central Intelligence Agency. Several columnists subsequently reported that CIA said the U. S. S. R. has surpassed us in nuclear power.

CIA officials have formally denied the story. The Agency merely told Congress what it knew about the Russian program, made no interpretation.

Since other United States sources knew of the Russian plan to build 10 big power reactors, it presumably was reported by CIA. Some Congressmen apparently interpreted this to mean that the Russians were ahead, and passed on this impression to newsmen.

Reds' standing: The Soviet Union never has claimed to have more than a single nuclear powerplant, a 5,000-kilowatt station briefly described at Geneva.

Strauss makes no charge that the Russians cannot, or will not build their 10 big plants. It's pretty clear, though, that he doubts the plants will produce power at costs competitive with conventional sources either in Russia or the United States. It's just as clear that he feels we will get much closer to competitive nuclear power in the same interval.

Anti-Gore: Strauss opposes the Gore plan for Government construction of nuclear plants for a number of reasons. Most important are these:

It's contrary to the intent of the 1954 atomic law, which calls for Government-industry teamwork to develop atomic power.

We'll get economic nuclear power faster with the Government building small experimental plants and industry building or taking major responsibility for full-scale plants.

Taking on six big plants would divert large numbers of scarce technical personnel, disrupt AEC's developmental work.

AEC would get into the power business to such an extent it might be distracted from its primary responsibilities in the atomic field.

III. ODDS IN THE BATTLE

There's plenty of opposition to Strauss' view that United States progress with nuclear power is satisfactory.

Scorecard: So far, earth has actually been moved for only one large-scale United States plant to date—the one being built near Pittsburgh by Duquesne Light Co. and AEC. But work will soon start on two more, both completely financed with private funds, near New York and Chicago. Government and industry funds will go into additional plants in New England, Nebraska, and near Detroit. In a more preliminary stage are plans for another Pennsylvania plant.

For more speed: "Unless we do something, the Duquesne plant may provide the only atomic power we'll have by 1960," worries AEC Commissioner Murray.

A Congressman agrees. "It isn't so much that the Russians and British may be doing more," he says. "The fact is that we can build a lot more big plants. So we should."

"We have to set goals, and if that's what the British and Russians are doing, they're right," says a technical man.

Who gets the job? Right now the odds appear in favor of a shot in the arm for our atomic power effort, and against Lewis Strauss. There seems to be enough congressional steam up to get legislation, probably later this year, calling for more big plants. But there does not appear to be much sentiment for dropping the job entirely on AEC.

Of course, a few fast proposals by industry sources to put up additional big plants would slow down any legislation. Failing this, Congress probably will direct AEC to contribute more funds to big projects proposed by private or public groups. All-out Government financing is likely to be only a last resort.

IV. STORM CENTER

Like some of his other major decisions in the atomic fields, Strauss' stand on atomic power development has touched off a storm of angry protest. But then, on one ever disagrees mildly with Lewis Strauss. That's due, at least in part, to the great strength of his opinions.

H-bomb row: During his first stint as AEC Commissioner—he served as one of the first five Commission members from 1946 to 1950—Strauss achieved a reputation for the number and vigorousness of his dissents from majority decisions. Best known was his long row with Chairman David Lilienthal over development of the hydrogen bomb. He was for an all-out development program. Lilienthal and the majority of the Commissioners were against it.

In the end, President Truman ordered the full-scale program.

One-man show? Later, after strauss became AEC Chairman in 1953, there was the fight over the description of the Chairman's job in the 1954 law. It was originally proposed to designate the Chairman as the principal officer of AEC, and give him added managerial responsibilities.

This met with violent opposition from Commissioners Murray, Henry Smyth (who resigned after this hassle), and Eugene Zuckert (who was not reappointed when his term expired in the middle of the debate). By implication, at least, these three charged Strauss with trying to make AEC a one-man show.

Strauss denied having any part of the authorship of the principal officer proposal.

The final language of the law was something of a compromise. The Chairman was designated AEC's spokesman before Congress and the public, but each Commissioner was given equal authority and responsibility for official actions.

Position of strength: But for a reason that has little to do with legal language, Strauss is probably the most influential chairman AEC has ever had. Several months before he took over, he had come back to Washington to serve as a special assistant to President Eisenhower on atomic matters.

Ready access to the White House is always extremely important to any bureaucrat in prestige-conscious Washington. In Strauss' case, there's a lot more to it than that. There is every reason to believe that he is consulted—and listened to—at the White House on all matters relating to atomic policy.

No one believes, for example, that there's the slightest chance the White House will ever reverse Strauss on a major decision, as Truman reversed Lilienthal on the H-bomb.

This implies also that he has some say in selecting top AEC officers—the President appoints all five Commissioners and the General Manager.

Inconsistent?: Critics, who charge Strauss with being consistently inconsistent, cite the principal officer row as a case in point. Former staffers say he agreed before Congress with the principle of equal authority for all five Commissioners, then had reports from field offices and labs channeled through the General Manager's office.

This system, the critics contend, shuts off other Commissioner from considerable information they should have.

Dixon-Yates: The outstanding case of alleged inconsistency involves the aftermath of the Dixon-Yates contract.

During the congressional hullabaloo, Strauss vigorously defended the Dixon-Yates contract. But after the contract was canceled, AEC refused to pay the power companies involved for the preliminary work they had done. The reason given was that the contract was illegally negotiated, because a representative of a financial institution close to the power companies was involved in the negotiations.

Strauss has been bitterly attacked for this reversal.

Dedicated servant: "Some people cite this as a prime example of Strauss' insincerity," says a former AEC staffer. "It is nothing of the kind.

"He is by no means insincere. The orders to enter the contract came from higher authority—probably the Budget Bureau. So did the orders to cancel. Strauss sees himself as a public servant who follows orders from above. So he works sincerely in whatever role such orders impose on him. He's a dedicated man."

V. BANKS, NAVIES, AND ATOMS

This attitude toward his job as AEC Chairman comes out of the background Strauss brought to the position.

At 60, he can lay claim to two highly successful careers—in private business, and in Government service.

After serving with Herbert Hoover's post-World War I relief organizations in Europe, Strauss turned to New York and the investment-banking business, becoming a partner in Kuhn, Loeb & Co. At the time Eisenhower called him back to Washington, he was a consultant and financial adviser to members of the Rockefeller family.

Military emphasis: Most of his Government career has been with the armed services and the closely related atomic-energy program. A naval reservist for 27 years, he rose to rear admiral as the Navy's atomic-energy expert during World War II.

Still slim and erect, he shows other marks of his close association with the military. There's nothing of the bawling sea captain, in fact, quite the reverse, in his speech. But his answers to questions, whether asked by Congressmen or reporters, are quick and decisive. His self-discipline is just as obvious. It makes him a bundle of nervous energy, rather than a bundle of nerves.

Good administrator: AEC staffers uniformly give him good marks as a smart administrator, even including those who do not like the direction in which he is leading the agency.

A large number of staffers are scared to death of him, mainly because they have a second-hand impression that he is hardboiled. Another reason is that Strauss has established a strict chain-of-command operating procedure.

This replaced a setup under which almost any AEC staffer could go to a commissioner with a pet idea.

Too positive: Strauss has had many rough sessions with members of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy. Some weren't of his own asking. But he did not help himself in such scraps.

At least one Congressman feels Strauss has been too positive in his dealings with Congress, has made Congressmen feel he is talking down to them.

Press relations: A few Washington reporters think Strauss is one of the ablest members of the Eisenhower team. A lot more have reservations.

These stem largely from Strauss's well-known advocacy of stricter secrecy.

He has been a lot more at ease lately with the press.

Uranium diplomacy: Strauss is firm on policy matters under the critical broadsides, even when policy involves United States relations abroad.

One current controversy concerns United States insistence that fuels we supply for foreign reactors be returned to this country for reprocessing—separation of the unspent uranium from plutonium and other fission products. Some contend this offends some countries.

Strauss, however, points that reprocessing plants are enormously costly (only the United States, United Kingdom, and Russia have them), so reprocessing would be uneconomic for many countries. But this policy is subject to change if we can develop a reactor type that can be accompanied by a simple, inexpensive reprocessing plant.

Going slow: On criticism that AEC has been reluctant to conclude agreements to supply reactors abroad, Strauss cites manpower problems. One country inquired about a reactor, then found it had no scientists or engineers qualified to attend AEC training schools.

Until recently, such AEC training facilities have hardly been adequate to serve on any such international basis, but Strauss looks for improvement this fall. Until that happens, though, he contends it would be downright risky to turn over such complicated equipment to untrained hands.

VI. SOLID ACHIEVEMENTS

You can agree or disagree with Strauss' critics on a number of points. But you have to give him credit for many solid achievements.

Most important, probably, has been his role in the atoms-for-peace program. He personally denies producing the original idea. But he must have contributed heavily to legal and mechanical details that made it possible for this country to start exporting first.

And it fell to Strauss to work out the mechanics of bringing industry into atomic development on an enterprise basis, as called for in the 1954 law.

Something that is harder for the layman to appreciate is Strauss' influence with the military, and its effect on nonmilitary atomic work.

Safe man: There was a time when AEC was asked by the armed services to account—in terms of atomic weapons lost—for every bit of fissionable material diverted to peacetime use.

The fact that this accounting is no longer demanded is partially due to the presence of Strauss at AEC's helm. He would never be suspected of diverting needed material from weapons.

This is important. The services have a way of harassing bureaucrats whom they distrust. Such harassment could bog down our two-way—domestic and foreign—programs for peaceful development to an extent that might shock some of Strauss' severest critics.

Our Federal Security Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 10, 1956

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to direct the attention of our colleagues to the following editorial from the New York Times of July 9, 1956:

FEDERAL SECURITY PROGRAM

Ever since the basis for present Federal loyalty-security procedures was laid down by President Truman in 1947, and especially since extension and enlargement of the program by President Eisenhower in 1953, criticism has mounted against the Government's tendency to overstress a formalized security at the cost of individual liberty. The problem isn't easy, for the peculiar nature of the Communist attack requires our country to have an effective security system applicable to its own employees as well as to its physical defense. But security does not exist in a vacuum; and the requirements of our security system must be constantly weighed against the demands of that most basic of all American principles, liberty of the individual under law.

As more and more cases of injustice or stupidity have come to light, the necessity of revising Federal security procedures has constantly become clearer. In a few notable decisions, the Federal courts have restrained some excesses committed in the name of security. But the Department of Justice, which is where one might think the urge for reform would originate, has been exasperatingly slow to see that the kind of internal-security programs our country has been pursuing are shot through with faults that endanger the real security of the United States.

With a grant from the Fund for the Republic, the Association of the Bar of the City of New York undertook more than a year ago a thoroughgoing study and critique of the five Federal loyalty-security programs. The results of that study, carried out by a committee of distinguished lawyers headed by Dudley P. Bonsal of New York, are published in this newspaper today. Both the Fund for the Republic and the bar association deserve thanks for undertaking this sorely needed survey and carrying it through so well. Late in the last session of Congress, a committee was set up to do somewhat the same thing, but it will be months before that group makes its report. Meanwhile, the recommendations made by the Bonsal committee should serve as a rallying point for all who sincerely wish to see the Federal employee security program more effectively meet the demands of both security and liberty. This should not become just "one more survey" to be given a few platitudinous words of approval and then gently filed away.

Probably the most significant of all the recommendations is the one to curtail the program from its present scattershot coverage of some 6 million Americans to one-quarter that number. "We have to choose between a more effective security system in critical posts or a less effective one in all." The spirit of the recent Supreme Court decision in *Cole* v. *Young* points in precisely this direction: that a national security program should apply only to positions affecting the national security instead of to literally millions of persons remotely removed from any real security interest.

It is most disappointing to find Atorney General Brownell now supporting legislation designed to overturn the Cole decision by giving specific congressional sanction to extension of the security system throughout the Federal Government.

Next most important reform recommended by the Bonsal committee is a proposed change in the standards by which security risks are to be judged. Previous formulas would be dropped in favor of the one commonsense element, "the interest of the United States." In this respect, the proposal follows along the lines of new rules recently announced by the Atomic Energy Commission for its own security program. The Attorney General's list of allegedly subversive organizations would either be totally revised or it would be abolished. Security personnel, too often in the past eager beavers more anxious to make a killing than to do justice, would be carefully trained for their jobs.

The committee proposes a long list of procedural reforms (some now in effect) in screening accusations, in bringing charges, and in hearing cases. Uniformity and standardization would be brought into the program where both are now lacking. Confrontation by adverse witnesses would be encouraged though not in all cases required. The rights of the accused would be more carefully safeguarded. A Director of Personnel and Security would be established under the President to supervise the individual agency programs and also the closely related question of classification of information.

The proposals are marked by caution as well as conscientiousness. In some respects, they do not go far enough to undo harm that has been done in the past. The committee itself says its recommendations, except for the one reducing the scope of the program, lie within the general framework of what now exists. But their adoption would help remove a needless dark spot in the picture America now presents to itself and to the free world.

Every Citizen Has Stake in Farm Economy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LESTER R. JOHNSON
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 10, 1956

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I have voted 3 times on general farm bills since taking my House seat in the 2d session of the 83d Congress. On each of the three occasions I conscientiously attempted to analyze the proposed farm bill in terms of what it meant to agriculture, labor, business, and industry with respect to bolstering and stabilizing our total economy.

In my opinion, agriculture plays a far more significant role than most of us realize in the Nation's business and industrial economy. This conviction explains, in part, my interest in the farm problem and all agricultural legislation.

My second reason for concern with farm legislation stems from the fact that the Nation's farmers are in serious economic trouble. The current plight of farmers is dramatically spotlighted by statistics on declining farm income for the past 3 years and the increase in farmers' debts. Sooner or later the farm depression will affect other segments of our economy. In fact, the chain reaction from the farm depression is already

felt by some industries, and a sizable number of workers are unemployed because of the decline in farm income.

Thousands of my constituents—including farmers, labor, businessmen and professional people—have a stake in specific and general farm legislation. The interest of these groups in the farm problem is understandable because the Ninth District of Wisconsin is classified as 1 of the 88 rural congressional districts in the country.

I voted for the general farm bills because I believed positive action was required to put the brakes on declining farm income and also to boost farmers' income.

In support of my contention that agriculture is important to the total national economy I cite the fact that in 1953—the latest year for which I have a comparative analysis of industries—agriculture ranked first among the Nation's five leading industries. Here is the gross output of each of the Nation's five leading industries for 1953:

Agriculture	$35,430,000,000
Construction (plant and residential)	26,100,000,000
Oil (estimated refined product)	23,000,000,000
Automobiles	13,984,000,000
Steel	12,433,000,000

I realize the average person believes steel and auto are the largest and most important industries in the country. No one will dispute that steel and auto are gigantic and important to the Nation. Steel, for example, is often referred to as the solar plexus of our industrial economy. Nor is there much doubt that when steel and auto are in a slump the country is economically hurt.

However, auto and steel—as I shall discuss later—are affected when agriculture is depressed. In the statistics cited above you will note that the gross annual output of agriculture is larger than the combined annual output of the steel and auto industries. In fact, agriculture's gross annual output represents 32 percent of the total for the Nation's five leading industries.

During the past several weeks a number of news stories appeared in papers on the subject of depressed conditions in the auto and farm implement industries. The recession in the farm implement industry is directly connected with the decline in farm income. I suspect the farm depression has contributed more than its proportionate share to the sag in the automobile industry.

It is difficult to get a clear and comprehensive picture of economic conditions in the farm implement industry because there are some 1,200 firms producing farm machinery. The majority of the firms are small and produce specialized equipment. Most of the farm machinery is manufactured by six major companies.

According to my calculations—based on information in news stories—the six major producers of farm implements have around 40,000 unemployed workers. An Associated Press story for June 16 states:

> International Harvester reports that layoffs in its farm machinery division now totals 23,000 and expects it will go even higher while sizable inventories are being worked off. It (International Harvester) has a layoff plan, like that in the auto industry, which goes into effect September 1.

The same Associated Press story says "total farm implement industry sales last year topped $1.5 billion, soaking up 15 percent of net farm income. This year farm income will be lower, but the drop in farm equipment buying i even greater, as the farmer watches and waits." In my opinion farmers are not necessarily watching and waiting. In many instances, I am sure, farmers do not have the cash to buy needed farm machinery.

Economic surveys prove when farmers have the income they buy a certain amount of machinery each year to replace old equipment. For example, according to information I received from the USDA, farmers bought $6.7 billion worth of farm machinery—at manufacturers' platform prices—for the 4 years from 1950 through 1953.

You will note I referred to "manufacturers' platform price." The "manufacturers' platform price" does not include freight costs and the distributors' markup. Competent authorities estimate that freight costs and distributors' markup represents about 40 percent of the retail price. Assuming this estimate is fairly accurate, it means farmers spent about $11.1 billion for machinery from 1950 through 1953.

It is roughly estimated—because exact statistics are not available—farmers spent about $5 billion for farm machinery in 1954 and 1955. Thus, in the last 6 years farmers spent around $16 billion for farm machinery. It is difficult to understand—in the face of these statistics—why some people feel agriculture is not much of a factor in our business and industrial economy.

I am certain that the editors and publishers of the papers which carried glowing editorials in praise of President Eisenhower's veto of the farm bill will not buy the farm machinery farmers are not purchasing. Even if the implement manufacturers produced streamlined, two-tone tractors with pastel seat covers editors do not have use for surplus tractors. The economic facts of life are that only farmers are able to utilize farm equipment—and if farmers do not have the money they cannot buy machinery.

Earlier in these remarks I stated the farm depression may have some bearing on conditions in the auto industry. My reason for this contention is that farmers not only buy passenger cars, but they also provide a very good market for trucks. In 1953 the total registration in the country for commercial and private trucks was 9,160,280. Of this total, farmers owned 2,550,000—or 27.8 percent—of all trucks. Farmers, as you can see, own more than their proportionate share of trucks. Farm trucks—as is the case with all farm machinery—wear out and must be replaced. Yes, farmers are a good market for trucks when they have money.

Auto and farm implement workers are not the only industrial employees who have a stake in a prosperous agricultural economy. The Food and Materials Requirement Division of Commodity Stabilization Service provided me with the following information. It is estimated, says the division, that farmers during 1954 purchased production items requiring the following quantities of raw materials: 6.5 million tons of finished steel, 50 million tons of chemicals, 285 million pounds of raw rubber, 17.5 billion gallons of crude petroleum.

Agriculture is one of the largest single group consumers of petroleum. Thus, the oil industry has a stake in agricultural prosperity. Statistics for the other industries cited above indicate also that farmers are a good market for steel, chemicals, and tires.

The interdependence of farmers, labor, industry, and business and the mutual concern of these groups with general farm legislation is very well brought home to me by the operations of one factory in the ninth district. I refer to the United States rubber plant in Eau Claire, Wis. The United States rubber plant in Eau Claire, which employs a substantial number of workers living in Eau Claire, Chippewa Falls, and neighboring communities, produces brand-name tires for other companies and organizations.

For example, the Eau Claire United States rubber plant manufacturers all of the tires for National Cooperatives. One of the largest consumers of National Cooperatives' tires is the Farmers Union Central Exchange. I have been informed that Farmers Union Central Exchange last year purchased about 40 percent of the tires produced for National Cooperatives.

The Farmers Union Central Exchange, I wish to point out, serves 250,000 farmers in Wisconsin, Minnesota, North Dakota, South Dakota, Montana, and a part of Wyoming.

National Cooperatives also distributes its tires to other cooperatives serving farmers in various sections of the United States. In view of this, then, it is logical to assume that the Eau Claire United States rubber plant, its workers and the families of the workers have more than passing interest in the economic welfare of the 250,000 farmers served by Farmers Union Central Exchange and the thousands of other farmers buying National Cooperatives' tires.

I was aware of the significance of this situation each time I voted on a general farm bill. I realized that a farm depression can be felt by workers, plants, and businessmen in Eau Claire, Chippewa Falls, and the surrounding communities the same as it can be felt in any other industrial center. Declining farm income can create unemployment in some ninth district communities.

I also realized that a sizable number of unemployed workers in these communities will not help dairy farmers supplying fluid milk and other dairy products to the communities. It is a known fact that unemployed workers reduce their purchases of milk and dairy products. In turn the income of dairy farmers declines and the chain reaction affects the income of business and professional people in the communities.

This is only a brief explanation of what can happen to 1 factory as a result of a farm depression. The same analysis can be applied with equal force to every industrial city in Wisconsin and

all of the other States. I know Wisconsin farmers do not buy the total output of farm implements produced in the Wisconsin plants of Allis Chalmers' Massey-Harris and J. I. Case. Farmers in every State buy the equipment produced by these companies.

Wisconsin industrial plants manufacture a variety of other items—covering everything from power tools to all types of consumer goods—that are sold to farmers all over the Nation. It is my contention that a general farm bill—containing adequate support prices and other stabilizing provisions—means something directly or indirectly to every person in the country. This is my reasoning when I vote for a general farm bill.

I have emphasized this point because in the past few campaigns Wisconsin Republicans attempt to picture supporters of a general farm bill as selling out to cotton, peanut, and grain farmers. Well, cotton, peanut, grain, livestock, corn, hog, tobacco and all other types of farmers buy Wisconsin produced industrial goods when they have the money. Our industrial workers, when they are employed, buy Wisconsin milk and dairy products.

I kept this in mind every time I voted on a general farm bill. Certainly, I could not in good conscience have voted for unemployment of thousands of industrial workers in Wisconsin and other States just because the general farm bill didn't provide what I believed it should have contained for dairy farmers.

Wisconsin, the leading dairy State, is in an unusual position due to the fact that most of our milk production is utilized for manufactured dairy products. The great majority of Wisconsin farmers, for this reason, do not receive any direct benefits from the stabilizing influence of Federal milk market orders. As the leading State for manufactured dairy products, Wisconsin dairy farmers must rely on a general farm bill for economic consideration and protection.

Wisconsin dairy farmers do not receive much congressional support from House and Senate members representing dairy farmers covered by Federal milk market orders. This is understandable because the dairy farmers operating under Federal milk market orders are protected.

It must be borne in mind that there are only two States where dairy farming provides 50 percent or more of the farm income in the State. The two States are Vermont and Wisconsin. In Vermont nearly 70 percent of the farm income comes from dairying, and for Wisconsin it is 50 percent. Incidentally, Vermont ranks 17th in terms of volume of milk production.

Approximately 75 percent of the total milk volume in the country is produced in 13 States. In the top 13 volume producing States dairying ranks first in only 4 States as the leading income producer. Here are the 13 top volume producing dairy States and the rank of dairy farming as an income producer in the various States:

First. Wisconsin, dairying ranks first.

Second. New York, dairying ranks first

Third. Minnesota, dairying ranks second.

Fourth. California, dairying ranks third.

Fifth. Pennsylvania, dairying ranks first.

Sixth. Iowa, dairying ranks sixth.

Seventh. Ohio, dairying ranks second.

Eighth. Michigan, dairying ranks first.

Ninth. Illinois, dairying ranks fifth.

Tenth. Indiana, dairying ranks fifth.

Eleventh. Missouri, dairying ranks third.

Twelfth. Texas, dairying ranks fourth.

Thirteenth. Kansas, dairying ranks third.

In several of the States listed above a substantial number of dairy farmers are covered by Federal milk market orders; therefore these farmers will not urge their Congressmen to support provisions in a general farm bill to aid dairy farmers producing milk for manufactured products.

All of this adds up to the fact that it is a real problem to get the necessary congressional cooperation to raise dairy support prices on manufactured dairy products in a general farm bill. This situation raises the question of what strategy should be employed to get more congressional help in raising support prices on manufactured dairy products. Do we, as some people believe, get the help of other Congressmen by "sniping" away at other farmers covered in a general farm bill, or do we get support by cooperating with these rural Congressmen and persuading them of the justice of aiding farmers producing for manufactured dairy products.

I have pursued the policy of working with other rural Congressmen because I believe this is the only method of securing cooperation. I do not believe it is a sound tactic to alienate all of the Congressmen from areas where farmers producing basic crops are in the majority. Wisconsin congressional Members certainly do not have enough strength to bargain with or wield a political club over all of the other House Members from rural districts.

As a matter of fact, it is difficult to even pass a general farm bill because there are only 88 rural congressional districts in the country. In order to pass a general farm bill it is necessary to get every single one of the 88 House Members from rural districts plus the votes of around 120 Members from urban and suburban districts. This is a political fact of life that must be faced when working for legislation involving price supports for dairy products.

Special dairy legislation—such as the school milk program—does not provide for price supports. Incidentally, I have always supported the special school milk program. I do wish to make it clear that the school milk program does not raise price supports—it only provides a small additional market for fluid milk.

I also wish to point out that not all of the $75 million set up annually for the special school milk program goes to farmers. Dairy farmers' share of the special school milk programs funds amounts to only about $34 5 million out of the $75 million. The $34.5 million represents less than eight-tenths of 1 percent of the total income for dairy farmers last year.

It is estimated that 1.4 billion half pints of milk will be distributed through the special school milk program during the current school year. This sounds like an imposing amount of milk, but when it is translated down to pounds it only amounts to 753 million pounds of milk. The largest milk producing county in the ninth district—Clark—produced enough milk in 1954 to supply almost 70 percent of the milk used in the special school milk program for the last year.

I have stressed these figures to present economic implications of the special school milk program in its proper perspective with respect to dairy legislation. The special school milk program is excellent, and I have always supported it. In fact, my bill—H. R. 11375—which has passed the House, extends the school milk program to agencies that are not now eligible under present authority.

The special school milk program funds—which are spent in every State—do not provide the broad economic base needed for stabilizing the income of dairy farmers engaged in producing milk for manufactured dairy products. Wisconsin dairy farmers must still rely on what protection they can get from a general farm bill. I shall continue to press for legislation to improve the dairy price-support provisions in a general farm bill.

In closing, I wish to reiterate that agriculture is an important factor in our national economy. I hope my colleagues realize that a farm depression does affect the lives of millions of workers in factories, the mines, office, transportation, and service industries. I know many farmers are also aware of the fact that full employment is necessary to give workers the income with which to buy farm products.

In short, farmers, labor, business, industry, and professional people are dependent on each other for continued prosperity. If any one of these groups is hit by a depression for a long period of time, the other groups will be affected in the due course of time.

Farm income has dropped over $3 billion in the last year. Farmers also went into debt last year at the record rate of $2.5 billion. These facts should speak for themselves as to why there was need for a general farm bill this year.

Russia in the Middle East

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 8, 1956

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the following item from the May–June 1956 issue of the American Zionist speaks

volumes for the ineptitude of our State Department:

RUSSIA'S GAME IN THE MIDDLE EAST

(By Allen Lesser)

(Mr. Lesser, Director of Information of the American Zionist Committee for Public Affairs, is a noted journalist and author. He has been editor of several Anglo-Jewish publications and during World War II he served as Chief of the European Intelligence Section of the U. S. Office of War Information.)

When Moscow radio on May 4 broadcast an attack on Israel for acquiring quantities of new weapons and allegedly whipping up war fever, it gave fresh notice to the West of Soviet determination to accomplish its aims in the Middle East. The broadcast, which also attacked the World Zionist Congress as an instrument of the State Department "for propagation of war hysteria" in Israel, was delivered in Arabic and beamed by shortwave to the Middle East. It left no doubt that Moscow was still on the Arab side.

The aims and objectives of Soviet policy in the Middle East were outlined by Moscow radio broadcasts in the 8 days between April 17 and April 24.

In April of this year, when Israel-Egyptian tension mounted, Moscow began to shift pro-Arab broadcasts more and more to its satellite Polish and Red Chinese transmitters.

The broadcasts by Arab countries, however, continued to boast of Soviet support, and the Syrian Damascus radio even started a rumor that the Soviet Union would enlist a regiment of Moslem volunteers to fight with Egypt against Israel—a rumor to which Secretary of State John Foster Dulles referred in a press conference. Although the Moscow radio itself maintained complete silence on this point, there was nothing on the Arab propaganda transmitters to indidate any fear of a change in Soviet attitude. If Egypt suspected a change when the U. S. S. R. voted for the mission of United Nations Secretary Dag Hammarskjold to the Middle East, the Cairo radio broadcasts did not mention it.

In April, during the hostilities on the Gaza frontier, Cairo radio went all out against Israel and the West on a wartime basis. The Moscow radio, however, either refrained from comment altogether or merely quoted Egyptian communiques, also without comment. This reserve, extending over a week, was broken on April 17 when Moscow radio broadcast in all its languages the statement of the U. S. S. R. Ministry of Foreign Affairs on the Middle East.

This declaration appears to have been received by Nasser as a stunning blow. The first response from Cairo was a broadcast on April 18, expressing mild surprise that the United States had welcomed the Soviet Union's participation in Middle Eastern affairs. Subsequent Arab broadcasts continued to attack Israel but made no more than passing reference to the Soviet foreign policy statement.

The closest approach to comment came on April 22, in a Cairo broadcast dealing with the Yemen Pact. It consisted of one rather involved sentence quoted from an Egyptian newspaper, as follows:

"The inclusion of Russia in finding a solution of the existing problems between the Arabs and Israel has a clear significance, but it will not lead to the desired objective as long as the Arab countries are progressing along the road to full unity."

Not until April 24 was the Cairo machine prepared with a new propaganda line to meet the Soviet policy. As broadcast, the new line took a defensive tone, explaining why Egypt had made the Communist arms deal and insisting that Egypt was not at all disturbed by the turn in Moscow's policy. To emphasize its importance as a major policy statement, the Egyptians trotted out Col. Anwar al-Sadat, their Minister of State and secretary general of the Islamic Conference, to make the statement.

Colonel al-Sadat struck out at Great Britain and Turkey, charging the latter with being the "catspaw" in the Baghdad Pact. He accused Britain of supplying arms to Israel and said:

"The wailing of imperialism and its stooges simply because Russia mentions Israel as a state in its communique will not deceive us, or we should have asked Britain, America, and France to withdraw their recognition of Israel. Or at least let Britain, the champion of the Baghdad Pact, withdraw its recognition of Israel and close its embassy there.

"Our policy was based on Arab resurrection—in which the Arabs depend on themselves, their strength, their determination, their patience, and their disclosure of imperialist tricks. We feel our strength and we know our specific objectives."

Moscow put on a full propaganda display of its Middle East foreign policy statement in daily broadcasts of the Soviet Near Eastern service. For 72 hours Moscow radio, in all languages, broadcast favorable newspaper opinions and comments on the April 17 policy declaration. At the same time in its Arabic language Near East service, Moscow broadcast comments and features to reassure the Arab States that she was still on their side. These broadcasts make clear just what the Soviet Union's price is for peace in the Middle East. They also leave no doubt that at this time the Soviet Union does not want war in the Middle East. Typical of the comments on this point was the article in Pravda which the Moscow radio quoted on April 18. It said:

"The Soviet Union considers that armed conflict in the Near East can and must be avoided and that it is in the interests of all Near Eastern states not to let themselves be provoked into military operations, which is obviously sought by those who are interested in kindling conflicts in the Near East."

Again, on April 21, Moscow said:

"* * * it is necessary to display coolness and forbearance and not to allow the Arab States to get involved in military conflicts."

CONDITIONS FOR PEACE

In its broadcast Moscow laid down four conditions for her cooperation in keeping the peace. The Soviet Union wants first of all the dissolution of the Baghdad Pact; no armed intervention by the Western Powers in the Middle East; an end to the Tripartite Declaration of 1950; and finally, acceptance by the UN and the West as a participant in Middle East affairs. These four conditions are backed up by Moscow's implicit threat to continue and intensify propaganda exploitation of differences among the three Western powers and to keep up the tension in the Middle East.

A Moscow broadcast on April 18 in Arabic, dealing with the reasons for tension in the Middle East charges that the dispute between the Arab states and Israel was aggravated by the Western powers "in order to provide themselves with an opportunity for armed intervention in the affairs of the countries of the Near East."

The Moscow broadcast charged that the United States and Great Britain plan to reoccupy all the Middle East countries. It claims that "increasing numbers of units of the American Army are being transported to the Mediterranean region without the knowledge of the United Nations." The final comment in the broadcast deals with the Soviet government's readiness to "offer necessary support to the United Nations in the steps along the road leading to the establishment of peace in the Palestine region," in other words, to be a participant in Middle East affairs.

Behind this facade of diplomatic language lies the cold steel of Moscow's demands. A broadcast on April 21 continued to drive home the four basic points of the Moscow propaganda theme. It reiterated Soviet opposition to the "use of military groups hammered together by some Western powers, as well as the Arab-Israeli conflict for creating a threat to the national independence of the Arab countries. * * * It is for the sake of involving the Arab countries in a military conflict and over creating a pretext for a direct military intervention that the imperialists are restoring to provocation and are creating a tense situation."

Another Moscow broadcast quoting an Izvestia article refers to the United States and Great Britain as the "uninvited occupiers of the Near East."

MOSCOW THREATENS TROUBLE

A sample of the trouble-making that Moscow holds out as a threat if her demands are not met was presented in a broadcast in English on April 23. Opening with a discussion of the Bulganin-Khrushchev visit to Great Britain and commenting on the importance of the Near East oil for Western Europe, the broadcast explained that Great Britain was losing to the United States in "the struggle of the oil monopolies for the Near and Middle Eastern oil." It cited the London correspondent of the United Press as follows:

"He wrote that today the overt struggle for the control of the world's richest oil-bearing region become the main problem underlying the bold challenge of the Arab world to British rule in the Middle East. This is a dangerous struggle inasmuch as its roots are entangled with Anglo-American relations, the danger of war between the Arabs and Israelis, and the Western plan of defense against the Communists."

The sincerity of the Communist protestations that they were not responsible for the current Middle East flareup may be judged in part by a statement in Moscow's Near East broadcast on April 18. Expressing great concern over the fate of the Arab refugees, the broadcast said:

"The Soviet Union considers it essential that measures be taken as soon as possible to ease international tension in the Palestine area without any external interference and to improve the bad conditions suffered by hundreds of thousands of Arab refugees who have been deprived of their homes and means of livelihood."

The records of the United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East, however, show that not a single penny toward its budget has been contributed by the Soviet Union since the establishment of the agency in December 1949.

The Moscow radio offensive leaves no doubt that the U. S. S. R. is still on the side of the Arabs and that there will be no real peace in the Middle East unless their demands are met.

Harry S. Ditchburne

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BARRATT O'HARA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 10, 1956

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, it is with deep grief that I announce the death last week in Chicago of Harry S. Ditchburne, a veteran Republican leader and in 1933 the nominee of his party for State's attorney of Cook County. From 1927 to 1933 he was the ace prosecutor on the staff of the State's attorney. While we were of different polit-

ical parties and in many widely publicized murder trials of the era were on opposing sides, he always for the prosecution, I always for the defense, we held for each other a feeling of esteem and of affection. He was a great prosecutor, one of the all-time greats in the history of the criminal courts of Cook County, thorough in preparation, resourceful in presentation, impressing juries with his sincerity and his fairness.

It has been a quarter of a century or more since Harry Ditchburne and I were pitted in the courtrooms in homicide trials, first in the old criminal court in the near North Side, then at 26th and California when the new building was erected. In the intervening years I have seen him seldom. But the news of his passing comes to me as a shock. Illinois has lost one of her great sons, the bar one of its richest ornaments. To his widow, Bernice, and his sister, Mrs. Alex Mitchell, I extend my deepest sympathy.

Poznan Uprisings

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. DODD
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 10, 1956

Mr. DODD. Mr. Speaker, the heroic uprising of the patriots of Poznan on June 28 has caused a great deal of thinking and discussion throughout the United States and the free world generally.

This revolt of the Polish workers against the tyranny of communism came at a time when it seemed the free world was slipping down the path of appeasement.

But the heroism of the Poles, it is hoped, has checked a dangerous drift in the conduct of our foreign affairs and has reawakened the conscience of some statesmen and reminded some politicians of their 1952 election promises with respect to the many nations and millions of people enslaved within the Communist empire.

But the tragic fact remains that we still do not have a positive policy toward the nations and people enslaved by communism.

In its July 5 edition, the Catholic Transcript, of Hartford, Conn., carried a timely and thoughtful editorial on the revolt of the Poles in Poznan.

The editorial is appropriately titled "Our Nonpolicy."

It points up the fact that we do not have a policy toward the enslaved people, that fatalism and futility have been allowed to take over in the absence of a policy and that we have failed our leadership of the free world by failing to develop a policy which would cause the Western democracies to act in concert when rebellions against tyranny like that in Poznan occur.

When the East Germans revolted on June 17, 1953, we had no policy, and consequently, no action was taken to support the German patriots in their demands for freedom.

The Eisenhower administration had only been in office a few months—hardly enough time to work out the fundamentals of the Eisenhower policy of liberation for the enslaved people of the Communist empire. Consequently, American action in support of the German rebellion against Russian tyranny was limited to an exchange of diplomatic notes with the Kremlin and offers of food for the hungry workers.

Now, 3 years later, when the Poles have risen in revolt to remind the whole world of their enslavement and their passion for freedom, we stand as if paralyzed by the bravery of the Polish patriots.

Yes, we have again exchanged notes with the Kremlin and have again offered food to the fighters for freedom.

But how futile are these actions, how sterile these gestures compared to the sacrifices of the Polish patriots. All this, because the moral courage is lacking to forge a policy based upon sound American political and moral principles.

Only a week or two before the Poznan revolt the administration was advocating a kind of cooperation with the Communist regimes in the occupied nations of Central and Eastern Europe in order to encourage them to demand some political independence from Moscow.

This same policy was advanced as justification for continuing American aid to the Communist dictator Tito.

In certain circles in our Department of State, this is known as the policy of political evolution which is advocated as a substitute for the law of nature, which holds that man's historic answer to tyranny, degradation, and exploitation is revolt.

In my judgment this policy of political evaluation is nothing more than a clever extension of the cynical containment policy of George Kennan. The impracticality, not to mention the immorality, of such a policy is demonstrated by the fact that but a few days before the inspiring uprising of the Poles, this same George Kennan pronounced publicly that it was time we gave our formal and final approval to events which have taken place in Eastern Europe during and following World War II. That is what he means when he says, "There is a finality, for better or for worse, about what has now occurred in Eastern Europe."

The editorial of the Catholic Transcript points out that no such finality is recognized by the Poles and their fellow sufferers.

It is high time we developed a positive policy toward the many nations and millions of people enslaved by communism. The American people have been called upon each year to put up well over $40 billion for our national defense requirements.

They are entitled to a national policy which is consistent with our American political traditions. We must completely reject fatalism and futility in the development and in the exercise of our foreign policies.

The Catholic Transcript of Hartford, Conn., has made a notable contribution toward the development of a positive policy with respect to all the nations and people enslaved by communism. Its editorial of July 5 crystallizes the basic issue which has long faced our Government.

Members of Congess will find this editorial both stimulating and challenging.

It reads as follows:

OUR NONPOLICY

Cunningly contrived though the ostensible criticisms of the Kremlin by Communist leaders abroad may be, by contrast the revolt of the Poles in Poznan was not something artificially arranged. Here was an expression of rankling discontent with Communist tyranny and of an irrepressible passion for freedom. It seems to have been crushed, but even in defeat it speaks resoundingly to the world of both the agony and the dauntless spirit of a people whom we of the West helped a totalitarian monster to enslave.

It must prompt us to consider what our policy toward these gallant people should be. We have had none to date. True, an occasional vague generality about the victims of Red aggression, and of our own stupidity or indolence, is piously spoken. But neither our own Government nor the concert of Western democracies has worked out a course to be followed when rebellions like that in East Germany or in Poland occur. Thus a great opportunity is lost. On each such occasion we return to our witless way of treating the Communist governments as legitimate, and even our cowardly way of voicing sentiments like those of George Kennan to the effect that "There is a finality, for better or worse, about what has now occurred in Eastern Europe." No such finality is recognized by the Poles and their fellow sufferers. Why, then, should we have a nonpolicy of fatalism and futility?

Trouble in the Middle East

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 9, 1956

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the following article by Constantine Brown, from the Washington Evening Star of July 9, 1956, again tells a story that seems to be known to everyone but our Secretary of State:

IS MID-EAST EXPLOSION NEAR?—ISRAEL SUSPECTS ARAB CONFEDERATION—RUSSIANS SEEN FOMENTING TROUBLE

(By Constantine Brown)

New fears have arisen in Washington about the possibility of an explosion in the Middle East this summer. Rumors and reports, denied in turn by the Arabs and the Israelis, concerning troop movements and concentrations have come thick and fast in recent weeks.

According to observers on the spot, the Israelis are worried about the new moves, for an Arab confederation if it became an accomplish fact might enguif their country. This concern of Prime Minister Ben-Gurion is translated by some Arab leaders into the belief that Israel is getting ready for a preventive war.

Qualified observers in Washington feel that the time has passed for the Israelis to start a preventive action. It is true, they say,

that Israeli ground forces are still superior quantitatively and qualitatively to the combined Arab armies. But it is pointed out that the Arabs have now a definite superiority in the air.

The men in the Kremlin have supplied Egypt (and to a lesser extent Syria) with first-class offensive aviation. Egypt now has a sufficient number of bombers to destroy Tel-Aviv, Jerusalem, and Haifa within half an hour.

Egyptian pilots trained in the U. S. S. R. and in Egypt by Soviet experts can handle these planes skillfully. Thus at the Israelis' slightest move to rush the Arab forces which are on the Israeli borders, their three principal cities could be obliterated.

Israel not only lacks means to retaliate but does not have the necessary fighting planes to oppose air strikes. The Israelis have asked Washington for the sale or 3 or 4 dozen fighter planes.

Secretary of State Dulles explained that this country cannot provide arms to either side lest the balance of power be upset, and thus America would share a part of the responsibility for new and violent outbreaks in that explosive area. He told the Israelis that the United Nations had the machinery to cope with aggression.

Mr. Dulles said that the administration was sympathetic to Israel's difficulties and would attempt to obtain Canada's promise to sell the needed fighters. And, indeed, when Foreign Minister Lester Pearson came to Washington last month Mr. Dulles urged him to do something for Israel.

Mr. Pearson is reported to have agreed to deliver 20 to 25 planes to the Tel-Aviv Government. But on his return to Ottawa he was overruled by Prime Minister St. Laurent, who insisted that for domestic reasons it was essential that America provide at least some token planes. Only under such conditions would Canada commit herself to selling fighter planes to Israel.

The new acute state of affairs in the Middle East is ascribed by American high officials to the intervention of the Soviets. More specifically, it is attributed to the recent talks of Foreign Minister Dmitri Shepilov with the Arab chiefs in Cairo, Beirut, and Damascus.

Comrade Shepilov is outwardly advocating an improvement in Soviet-American relations. But he failed to indicate to the reporters to whom he talked last week that during his quick official trip to the Middle East and to Athens he had tried to place some new fuses in the powder barrel in that area.

Shepilov obtained the promise (some say the commitment) of Egyptian President Nasser to place at the disposal of the Soviet the air and naval power bases along the Suez Canal which are pledged by treaty to be available to Britain in case of need.

In exchange the Kremlin diplomat assured the Arabs that the U. S. S. R. will be able to hold back the Western nations in the event of Arab-Israeli hostilities.

Shepilov furthered the idea of an Arab confederation, not for the purpose of promoting a better understanding and peace in the Middle East, but as an instrument to remove us from the area extending from the Suez Canal to the Persian Gulf.

The practical objective for dislodging America and Britain from the Middle East is the peaceful conquest of the vast Arab and Iranian oil resources without which Russia cannot risk another aggression.

If it is necessary to sacrifice Israel to attain this oil objective, then it cannot be helped, according to the tenets of the Soviet foreign minister.

Ten years ago the U. S. S. R. supported the creation of the Israeli State. The Russians felt then that the best way to get a wedge in that region was to create the inevitable dissensions between Arabs and Jews. They may have indulged then in mere speculations. But they appear to have been profitable. Today we barely hold our own in Iraq, Iran, and Saudi Arabia.

Fourth of July

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. RHODES
OF ARIZONA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 29, 1956

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, under leave previously granted, I would like to include in the RECORD for the attention of the House an editorial that appeared in the June 29 edition of the Sunnyslope (Ariz.) Journal whose publisher is John Wagner.

I read many articles over the Fourth of July but this is one of the best it has been my privilege to read, and I feel that it should be brought to the attention of the Congress.

The editorial follows:

FOURTH OF JULY

Flags flying, family picnics with watermelons and fireworks are the insignia of our old-fashioned American Fourth of July observance.

It is also the day when our American motorists tune up their cars and equip them with new tires and parts for that holiday trip.

All of this relaxation is our way of expressing our happiness that we are still a free Nation.

Can you imagine a Fourth of July celebration in Russia? A nation whose beliefs are founded on a disbelief in God. The Great All In All who has given us this fine earth on which to work out our own salvation?

Instead of being free as the birds as we Americans are, the Russians are constantly shadowed. Fearful to talk to strangers, especially Americans who are in Russia on visits or business missions.

Our Founding Fathers have left us a legacy in this great Fourth of July holiday that no other nation enjoys. We love our freedom so much that we want other nations to share it with us. We have practically bailed out these bankrupt nations since World War II and have tried to show them the way to a better and freer way of life.

But alas. Even in this country and, yes, right in our own bailiwick we have some who sympathize with the way of the Soviets.

It would be a glorious thing to just trade off these people here for the Russians over there who earnestly want freedom and are fed up with the Soviet mode of living. No doubt the Russians would be the greater beneficiaries. They would get something they never had. And our grumbling Americans would get something they never bargained for.

Ever since the first human trod this earth no nation has enjoyed a greater freedom and wealth of living as we Americans have and do enjoy.

Our standards of living are practically at the highest point that can be reached. Where slaves and ill-paid workers carry on the most menial tasks in other countries, we in America just press a button and we have what we want.

Our refrigerators, heaters, coolers, stoves, washers, radios, and televisions are luxuries not enjoyed even today by many of the wealthy residents in other lands.

All of these are a commonplace thing in our homes. Even our cars are equipped with pushbuttons to raise and lower windows, and today are being refrigerated for our comfort.

Skeptics in other nations can't believe what they hear and read of America. Many do not give credence to the tales that touring Americans tell of our country. They believe that it is just another bragging American shooting off his loud mouth.

Soap and matches which can be bought here at a very low cost are unheard of even in Europe. Even touring Americans visiting some of the better hotels in Europe are charged extra for a small bar of soap. Also charged extra to take a bath.

Even with so-called scarcity of water in our hotter climates we still can take several baths a day if we want to without adding too much to our utility bill.

Our great American holiday reminds us of those brave men and women who struggled during our Revolutionary period to be freed from the yoke of dictators. They wanted to be free to worship God as they saw fit. They did not come here to establish a government which does not believe in God. They knew that a great power rules this universe, and they wanted to pay homage to such a Creator.

Today we enjoy all of the benefits that those early Americans fought and bled for. They left us a government that has never been equaled on the face of the earth.

Fourth of July on the surface is a day to picnic, relax, and enjoy fireworks. But its deeper significance is our observance of the day in memory of those who gave us freedom.

Wilson Versus the Field

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEON H. GAVIN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 5, 1956

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the New York Daily News of July 9, 1956:

WILSON VERSUS THE FIELD

Why is it that Defense Secretary Charles E. Wilson, about 2 out of every 3 times he breaks into print or the newsreels, is found to be having a fight with somebody?

The latest Wilson tussle occurred last week, with the Secretary and various members of the Senate Armed Services Air Force Subcommittee trading insults on the subject of speeding up delivery of B–52 intercontinental jet bombers.

An alarmed Congress has voted Wilson an extra $960 million over the President's defense budget, and wants him to spend most of the money on B–52's. Wilson says in effect that he isn't as scared as are some Members of Congress, that the big planes are coming off the assembly lines fast enough, and that he'll use his own judgment about spending the additional hundreds of millions.

When he isn't in a row with congressional politicians, Wilson is usually in some argument with military men, generally Air Force men. For example, Air Chief of Staff Nathan F. Twining, following his recent visit to Moscow, said we're ahead of the Russians in quality of aircraft but probably not in number. Wilson is much more optimistic than that, and often says so.

We aren't experts on these matters. But it does seem only fair to point out that Defense Secretary Wilson is a man on a hot

spot for reasons which do credit to all concerned, including Wilson.

He's the civilian chairman, you might say, presiding over the 3 branches of 1 of the world's greatest military setups—Army, Navy, Air Force.

Each service has a lot of officers, to say nothing of enlisted men, who think their outfit could lick any nation or combination of nations on earth singlehanded. Therefore, it's practically an article of faith in each separate service that it should get everything it asks for in the way of money and war gear.

NOBODY LOVES THE UMPIRE

It is entirely proper and patriotic, we feel, for the three services to think this way. As one prominent officer once put it: "Our military people are not hired primarily to see how little they can get along with; they are hired primarily to seek to get enough material to meet their responsibilities."

But if all three branches of the Armed Forces had a free hand to grab everything they could, they might bankrupt the Nation. It would all be done from the worthiest, most patriotic motives; but we'd be busted just the same.

The Secretary of Defense is hired partly to see to it that we'll get the biggest possible bang for each buck in case of war, and also that the Armed Forces don't gobble up every buck in sight.

Like the umpire in a ball game, therefore, the Secretary of Defense is bound to be loved by few if any people. Fighting men and battling politicians can be counted on to be after his scalp 24 hours a day. The more conscientious and effective he is, the more fiercely they'll hate him.

All of which, it seems to us, is an indication that Mr. Wilson is turning in a good job up to now, and deserves the thanks of the taxpayers, at least.

The Defense Secretary's problems might ease off considerably if we could ever get real unification of the Armed Forces.

It is true that the civilian managements of the services were unified by the National Security Act of 1947, setting up the Department of Defense with the secretaries of the Army, Navy, and Air Force outranked by the Defense Secretary.

IKE TO TRY UNIFICATION?

But, as a recent official Army staff paper pointed out, we now have "triplication" instead of unification among the fighting men themselves. Each branch is as fierce a rival of the other two as it ever was, and struggles to get the biggest appropriations and a monopoly on the latest weapons.

Maybe the answer, as this Army paper says, is to abolish the Joint Chiefs of Staff and put the whole military establishment under a single chief of staff. Maybe all branches ought to be put into one style of uniform.

We don't know. But there are rumors that President Eisenhower, if he is reelected, intends to make genuine unification an early order of business in his second term. We don't know of a more important single service the President could perform in the near future.

Anti-Semitism in Russia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 10, 1956

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the following two items appeared side by side in the New York Times of July 9, 1956. They shed much light on the Russian attitude, official and unofficial.

FOREIGN AFFAIRS—ANTI-SEMITISM BEHIND THE IRON CURTAIN

(By C. L. Sulzberger)

LONDON, July 8.—Ugly intimations of anti-Semitism, tolerated if not encouraged by the Communist regimes in power, are again appearing in Eastern Europe. There are hints that Marxist leaders, bewildered by the great post-Stalin debate, are either permitting or encouraging a new search for racial scapegoats to avoid blame for past or present ideological confusion. And, according to available evidence, Khrushchev is personally connected with this unpleasant recurrence of racial prejudice.

When Khrushchev was Prime Minister of the Ukraine after World War II he issued regulations barring Jews from important local positions. He was the first premier of a Soviet republic to prohibit activity of Jewish theaters, schools, and publishing houses. He forbade writing and acting in the Yiddish language and tolerated an anti-Semitic outbreak in Kiev so serious that Stalin sent Malenkov to investigate.

Khrushchev and Suslov are reputed to be the leaders of an anti-Semitic group within the present Moscow Presidium. Last March, when Soviet leaders attended a state funeral in Warsaw for the late President of Poland, Bierut, Khrushchev made several indiscreet observations that tended to confirm his reputation for prejudice. He was heard to remark: "Even a second-rate Kowalski [a typically Polish name] is more useful than a first-rate Rosenblum [a typically Jewish name]." During a meeting of the Polish Communist Central Committee he observed: "You have too many Abrahamoviches here."

PREJUDICE DENIED

When the Soviet boss was in London he was questioned on this subject by British labor leaders. He denied that there was any anti-Semitism in the U. S. S. R. Nevertheless, in May a group of French Socialists saw Khrushchev, Mikoyan, Shepilov, and Suslov in Moscow and pressed them on the issue.

The Russians argued there was no Soviet anti-Semitism and that such prejudices were merely a survival from capitalism. Mikoyan hastened to explain that fragmentary nationalism still existed in the U. S. S. R.—"even in Armenia, my own country"—because one could not extirpate all capitalistic remnants in thirty-odd years.

It was asserted that Soviet Jews wished to be assimilated into the rest of the population and for that reason did not have their own cultural institutions; that only because young Jews desired to study in Russian were there insufficient pupils for Jewish schools.

Shepilov said that the Jewish theater had been closed because it fell into disrepair and cost the state too much to fix. Mikoyan concluded that Stalin's famous doctors' plot had nothing to do with anti-Semitism but was merely another nefarious Beria conspiracy. Mikoyan cited a list of Jews holding important Soviet positions—curiously omitting Kaganovich.

Despite such explanations, Khrushchev expressed some odd opinions at the time of Bierut's funeral. Although there are now only about 50,000 Jews in Poland, where Hitler's most dreadful furnaces burned, there is a long Polish tradition of anti-Semitism. The Communist regime has not succeeded in erasing this—if, indeed, it ever tried.

SYMPTOMS IN POLAND

The two principal Warsaw bosses now are Marshal Rokossovsky and Ochab, who succeeded Bierut. Rokossovsky has a reputation in the army for anti-Semitism and is held responsible for dismissing several hundred Jewish officers. Ochab is a table-thumping militant and Khrushchev nominee. One of his first moves after gaining power was to fire Jakub Berman, detested party theorist and a Jew.

Jewish refugees from Poland report: "Anti-Semitism always existed among the masses. Now it comes from above. It is an echo of what is happening in Russia. It is said that Khrushchev is more prejudiced even than Stalin. In the Ukraine anti-Semitism is becoming increasingly intense."

Certainly, unpleasant symptoms are being reported. In May, five Jews were killed during riots in Kiev, the Ukrainian capital. A few days later the synagogue in Lodz, Poland, was desecrated. Polish newspapers are so full of articles condemning anti-Semitism that one is forced to conclude the disease is rampant. Do these editorials represent camouflaged attacks on Ochab by other party factions?

It is one of Europe's tragedies that along the broad belt between the Black Sea and the Baltic there is a powerful tradition of anti-Semitism. Embers of this still exist despite the Nazi holocaust. When the Communists took over, several of their leaders were Jewish intellectuals. This was emphasized by their opponents. The only outstanding Jewish Communists remaining in authority are Kaganovich in the U. S. S. R., Rakosi in Hungary, and Minc in Poland.

Are ancient prejudices to be revived during the great anti-Stalin political post mortem? As the Communists struggle for power among themselves and seek to readjust their ideology, do they intend to seek Hitlerian scapegoats? Is this a calculated aspect of Moscow's effort to seek favor with the Moslem Middle Eastern lands?

PLIGHT OF JEWS IN RUSSIA—HOPE EXPRESSED THAT KHRUSHCHEV'S STATEMENT PORTENDS FREEDOM

(The writer of the following letter is the author of Scapegoat of Revolution.)

To the EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

The Times of July 2 in a dispatch from Cairo reported that Soviet boss Nikita Khrushchev boasted in an interview for the Egyptian daily Al Ahram that "we have thrown them (the Zionists) out of our country (U. S. S. R.)." Mr. Khrushchev's words, if correctly quoted, have a sardonic quality, for the issue has never been the exclusion of Zionists, it has been their incarceration and banishment to slave labor camps in the remotest regions of the vast Soviet Empire.

Zionism has always been repugnant to Communist ideology. Karl Marx was the inspiration of this attitude because of his perverse misreading of the role of Jews in western civilization and his gleeful pinning on Judaism of responsibility for the evils of capitalism. Lenin, personally free of religious bias, was none the less impatient with anyone who conceived the Jewish people as more than a caste, and, writing at Lenin's suggestion a paper on the question, Stalin said that the Jewish people was "yet to prove that it even exists," and queried mockingly, "can one seriously consider petrified religious customs and tenuous residual psychological strands?"

SINGLED OUT

It was natural, then, that communism, when it came to power, should single out Zionism for unwelcome attention. This meant stark tragedy for Russian Jewry, whose majority was predisposed toward Zionism. Zionist activity in Russia, as elsewhere, included the maintenance of Hebrew cultural institutions, schools and publishing houses, and also training farms, some of them organized in farm societies of the ancient Essene pattern, where young men and women prepared themselves, with pristine religious faith, for pioneering in Palestine.

The Communists commissars, occasionally on a local level without prior consultation with their superiors in Moscow, moved in rudely and ruthlessly to suppress this movement and all its manifestations.

Economic discrimination and a diversity of social and legal impositions were put into effect by the Communist commissars to "persuade" members to disaffiliate from Zionist organizations, Hebrew culture circles and pioneer training farms, to discontinue all correspondence with relatives in Palestine and overseas and to terminate subscription to Palestine Hebrew newspapers. However, disaffiliation was insufficient. The Communists demanded that the Zionists denounce their friends to the police and publicly renounce Zionism. Few yielded, and the result was that the majority became victims of police persecution.

FORCED CONFESSIONS

Although Zionism was formally banned only in the fall of 1924, none but the most courageous dared under the circumstances to identify himself as a Zionist. Membership rosters were seized by the secret police, and Zionists soon found themselves facing interrogators who forced them, by means which Khrushchev himself has exposed in such bizarre fashion, to "confess" that they had acted as "agents for the entente," "imperialist saboteurs," etc.

Public trials of Zionists were discontinued in the mid-twenties because they had a strange way of backfiring against the prosecution. Hauled into court, the Zionist defendants, some as young as 14, repudiated their confessions and reaffirmed their faith in the manner of religious martyrs.

Wherever communism has come to power since World War I, with the notable and laudable exception of Yugoslavia, the Soviet pattern of persecution was repeated. Hebrew was banned, Zionists were rounded up and banished on the charge of acting as "imperialist agents." Notwithstanding their sharp criticism of Secretary of States Dulles' policy on arms for Israel, they are even now accused behind the Iron Curtain of being "informers for Dulles." In recent months, however, there has been some let-down in Rumania, to the extent only that some Zionists were released from prison and permitted to depart for Israel.

If Mr. Khrushchev has been quoted correctly by Al Ahram, then it might be suggested that he study more thoroughly the records of the "execrable Beria." He will learn that far from having "thrown them out of our country," his regime is keeping Zionists under lock and key. They could wish for nothing better than to be permitted to resume their lives in the freedom of Israel, and so would multitudes of Russian Jewry, whether Zionist or not, if the Kremlin continues to deny them the right to cultural freedom.

JUDD L. TELLER.

NEW YORK, *July 4, 1956.*

Our Heritage of Heroes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GLENARD P. LIPSCOMB

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 10, 1956

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I would like to commend to the attention of my colleagues the following address by the Honorable Roger Alton Pfaff, judge of the superior court of Los Angeles county, on the occasion of Memorial Day observances at Forest Lawn Memorial Park, Glendale, Calif., on May 30, 1956, entitled "Our Heritage of Heroes":

OUR HERITAGE OF HEROES

(By the Honorable Roger Alton Pfaff, judge of the superior court of Los Angeles County)

Ninety years ago at the close of the Civil War the women of Columbus, Miss., gathered the garlands of early spring and placed these flowered offerings on the graves of Confederate and National soldiers alike. This tender tribute touched the heart of the North and out of this compassionate gesture by these unnamed southern gentlewomen was born the beautiful custom we now call Memorial Day.

Today we join with millions of our fellow Americans in reverent remembrance of our honored dead. This day of memory has become throughout the years more than a patriotic occasion. Rather it has become a spiritual celebration, a time for quiet contemplation, and devoted dedication to the divine political principles our forefathers proclaimed nearly two centuries ago and for which more than 1 million of our fighting sons and daughters have sacrificed their lives upon the altar of their country's need.

Let us never forget the mighty acts of unselfish devotion and willing sacrifice by these American patriots of yesteryear. These were men imbued and ennobled by a sublime cause—the protection and preservation of Americanism—of the American way of life. What is Americanism?

Americanism is the sum total of nearly 200 years of struggle by the American people to effectively promote, practice, protect, preserve, and perpetuate those fundamental and divine principles of liberty, equality, and justice, to the end that no American ever need know fear of any man, nor envy of any man, but shall instead enjoy peace and righteousness under God.

We Americans can be justly proud of our mighty achievements.

For nearly two centuries we have maintained a republican, representative form of government based upon the divine rights of man.

We have created and preserved a democratic, capitalistic, economic system which has been fostered and perpetuated by the fundamental principle of the greatest good for the greatest number.

We have carved out of an unfriendly wilderness the most palatial national abode, with the highest standard of living ever dreamed of or enjoyed by any people in history.

We have proved that men of good will, regardless of their race, religion, or national origin can live together in peace and prosperity.

We have provided a social climate that offers unlimited opportunity for success and wealth to the fit and protection and security for the unfit.

We have fought seven bloody wars, not for territorial acquisition or national aggrandizement, but for the noble ideals of freedom and world peace. And we have done something more. When the guns were silenced we have sacrificed our substance to succor and rehabilitate our vanquished foe.

We have declared, as our national policy, the inalienable right of all men to be free and self-governing and furthermore have practiced what we preached by granting independence to the people of our former possessions.

We are a Christian Nation. America was conceived and created by godly men. Our jurisprudence is out of the Old Testament. On the coin of the Republic we boldly declared "In God we trust." America has achieved her greatness, not primarily because of her natural wealth—many others have such physical resources—but because the foundation of our form of government and way of life is firmly embedded in the rugged rock of our Judeao-Christian spiritual heritage.

Although we take pride in our past, a cardinal American characteristic is to constantly strive for future betterment. Henry Van Dyke summed it all up so beautifully when he said:

"I know that Europe's wonderful,
But something seems to lack,
The past is too much with her
And the people looking back.
But the glory of the present
Is to make the future free.
We love our land for what she is
And what she is to be."

For too many years last past there has been a determined effort on the part of the so-called intelligentsia—and in more recent years the disciples of dialectical materialism—to decry and condemn the teaching of orthodox history, which instills love of country and patriotism in the youth of our Nation.

The debunkers of our national heroes have told us that it is passé, and that we are immature to eulogize our great men; that we are provincial and nationalistic when we revere our flag; that we are foolish and infantile to be willing to fight and even die in defense of our native land.

Yet it has been our heritage of heroes and their glorious example of unselfish devotion to God and country that has inspired many a boy born in humble circumstances to achieve greatness. It was Abraham Lincoln who declared that as he read Parson Weems' laudatory Life of Washington by the flickering light of the fireplace in a humble log cabin he became inspired to educate himself and devote his life in service to his fellow man.

Let us remember today the battle cry of the intrepid Patrick Henry when he fearlessly declared "I know not what course others may take, but as for me, give me liberty or give me death!"

Let us listen with humble hearts to the immortal words of Nathan Hale when he proudly declared, "I only regret that I have but one life to lose for my country."

And in these days of Communist world conspiracy, when we hear misguided if not disloyal Americans declaring that governmental institutions have no right to demand of public servants an oath of loyalty, let us heed the words of the Father of Our Country. When traitorous Tories attempted to infiltrate his colonial army and even to poison him, Gen. George Washington issued the command, "Put none but Americans on guard tonight."

Let us here rededicate ourselves to the supreme American pledge of all time written by young Thomas Jefferson and to which the Founding Fathers fearlessly subscribed their names, "We mutually pledge to each other our lives, our fortunes, and our sacred honor."

There was not one single word in that famous Declaration of Independence that even slightly hinted at appeasement or solicited a political deal with despotism or an offer to compromise principle.

To compromise one's ideas is democracy; to compromise one's principles is immorality.

Memorial Day is not a tribute to war. It is a day of memory to our heroic dead who gave their last full measure of devotion that liberty, justice, and human rights might be protected and preserved for all posterity in a world of peace and brotherhood.

America's greatest living hero, General of the Army Douglas MacArthur has perhaps best described these honored dead when he declared, "By their sacrifice they come closest to the image of their Creator who died on the cross that the human soul might live."

A Voice for Liberty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 9, 1956

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to direct the attention of our colleagues to the following article about Dudley Baldwin Bonsal, which appeared in the New York Times of July 9, 1956:

A VOICE FOR LIBERTY: DUDLEY BALDWIN BONSAL

When city bar leaders chose Dudley Baldwin Bonsal to head their study of the Federal loyalty-security program, they picked a man who stands for liberty—both by tradition and by his own international work.

The first Bonsals (the name is pronounced BON-sel) came to America as English Quakers. They helped found Pennsylvania in 1682 with members of the Worrall family, from whom Mr. Bonsal's wife, Lois, is descended. On his mother's side, Mr. Bonsal derives from Richard Morris, who had come to New York under the Dutch even earlier. His great-great-grandfather, Gouverneur Morris, produced the 1778 Continental Congress statement that American independence must be recognized before any peace negotiations with the British.

Yesterday's Bonsal committee report for the Association of the Bar of the City of New York urged due-process reforms in the Federal civilian security risk program. Liberty, it said, must be upheld not only here but as "a continuing appeal to the oppressed in every land."

Efforts toward that world vsion were made by Mr. Bonsal as one of the 16 members of the International Commission of Jurists. The commission sprang from a congress of 150 lawyers from 43 countries, convened in Berlin in 1952 to learn about Communist perversions of law in East Germany.

Mr. Bonsal believes that if lawyers throughout the free world—particularly those on the borders of Communist countries—"reach an understanding about what communism is and means to the administration of justice this can be a very strong weapon in the cold war." This understanding the Commission promotes.

Allen T. Klots, then president of the Bar Association, selected Mr. Bonsal for the security study because he had already shown conscientiousness, integrity and ability to harmonize views. He had served on the association's executive committee, and is now its chairman; he had also headed its foreign law committee.

Mr. Bonsal is a 6-foot, healthily pink man of graciousness and charm. His law practice with Curtis, Mallet-Prevost, Colt & Mosle at 63 Wall Street has concentrated on private internaitonal law—representing American companies with interests abroad, foreigners with problems here.

From 1942 to 1945, he was chief counsel for the Office of Inter-American Affairs in Washington. He attended the 1945 Inter-American Conference on Problems of War and Peace in Mexico City as a United States delegation aide. Long counsel for the Foreign Bondholders Protective Council, he spent 7 months on a German debt conference in London in 1951.

He is the son of Stephen Bonsal, a topflight foreign correspondent who won a Pulitizer prize in history when he was 80 years old. He was born in Bedford, N. Y., on October 6, 1906. During his father's travels Dudley Bonsal attended elementary school in the Philippines and Switzerland.

He now lives in Bedford Village, N. Y., where he is a Protestant Episcopal vestryman. In the winter he stays in an apartment in the city. His daughter, Mrs. Lois Osler, has given him a grandson; his son Stephen has just been graduated from Yale. One brother, Philip, is United States Ambassador to Colombia; the other Richard, grows tobacco at Leonardtown, Md.

A registered Democrat, Mr. Bonsal splits a ticket unmercifully. He voted for President Eisenhower in 1952. For 1956, he hasn't made up his mind.

Hollow Celebration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT P. MORANO
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 10, 1956

Mr. MORANO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the text of a letter which I wrote to His Excellency Romuald Spasowski, the Polish Ambassador to the United States, in reply to an invitation to attend a reception in celebration of the national holiday of the Polish People's Republic on July 23.

My first thought upon receiving this invitation for the Communist celebration was the picture of thousands of dispirited Poles, men, women, and children, faced with the threat of ultimate starvation in a city called Poznan—a city supposedly flourishing under the Communist "people's republic," the founding of which will be celebrated on July 23.

This is the "people's republic" government which has refused the humane offer of the United States to provide food for these starving people of Poznan.

It is the same "people's republic" which turned tanks and guns on the oppressed humans of that city, humans whose only crime was that they dared to claim the rightful heritage of all mankind—the right to be free.

I am sure there will be no dancing in the streets of Poznan on July 23.

More than likely the citizens of Poznan will spend the day in quiet prayer—prayer for the end of the "people's republic"—prayer for the return of their freedom and their dignity.

Following is the text of my letter to the Polish Ambassador:

JULY 9, 1956.

His Excellency ROMUALD SPASOWSKI,
Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary, Polish Embassy, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. AMBASSADOR: Mrs. Morano and I regret that we are unable to accept your invitation to attend the reception in celebration of the national holiday of the Polish People's Republic on July 23.

Were we able to attend, I am certain that my conscience would not permit me to enter into the spirit of the "celebration" knowing in my heart that across the seas the people of Poland are in agonizing quest for food for their bodies and freedom for their souls.

I could not in good conscience accept your hospitality, the offerings of the festive table and bar, full knowing that in Poznan today valiant men, women, and children are facing starvation because they dared to seek the freedom willed them by God.

What a true celebration it would be if you could urge your government to reconsider, and on this day you, Mr. Ambassador, were able to announce the acceptance of the United States Government's humane offering of food for the hungry people of Poznan. This, indeed, would be cause for a celebration.

And the true celebration will come, I am sure, when the shackles of oppression are fully lifted, and the Poles regain their national prestige and the pride of a free people; in truth, that day will be a genuine national holiday in which your people too will join the celebration, wholeheartedly and with the same spirit of free men and women with which they formerly celebrated their national holiday of May 3.

In this celebration all Americans would happily participate.

Sincerely,

ALBERT P. MORANO,
Member of Congress.

Shortage of Materials for Arrow Shafts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LESTER R. JOHNSON
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 10, 1956

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to include letters I have received from Richard E. McArdle, Chief of the Forest Service of the United States Department of Agriculture, and from Wesley A. D'Ewart, Assistant Secretary of the United States Department of the Interior.

The letters are in answer to a letter from the National Bowhunter which I put in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on pages A4692–A4698 of the June 12, 1956, issue with respect to Government policies regarding shortages of material for arrow shafts.

I am glad to give the Department of Agriculture and the Department of the Interior an opportunity to answer the National Bowhunter article. The two letters follow:

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
FOREST SERVICE,
Washington, D. C., June 18, 1956.

Hon. LESTER R. JOHNSON,
House of Representatives.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN JOHNSON: This letter is in response to your request over the telephone for comments on your extension of remarks which appear on page A4692 of the June 12 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. We are glad of this opportunity to supply you with information in respect to Forest Service policies for sale of Port Orford cedar stumpage suitable for manufacture into arrow shaft stock.

Port Orford cedar grows in commercial quantities only in about three counties in southwestern Oregon. A substantial portion of the remaining Port Orford cedar stumpage is on the Siskiyou National Forest. There is also a considerable volume on Bureau of Land Management lands and on privately owned lands in Coos and Curry Counties.

The most suitable wood for arrow shaft manufacture is dead Port Orford cedar. This type of material is usually obtained from small, scattered patches of windthrown or standing dead trees. Most of these dead

tree groups are the result of forest fires of many years ago. With improved fire protection in recent years, there are hardly any additional deadenings to replace those which are being utilized. Hence opportunities to cut dead Port Orford cedar are becoming quite limited.

Until recently dead and down Port Orford cedar was relatively plentiful and users of Port Orford cedar for products other than arrow wood were able to satisfy their wants from quantities of Port Orford cedar developed in normal sales of other timber. At present, users of Port Orford cedar for other products are interested in purchasing any material merchantable as sawlogs, and are particularly interested in the higher quality logs which are suitable for arrow wood bolts. The only class of material for which competition is restricted to arrow wood manufacturers is that which contains high quality wood but which has been checked so severely that it will not yield lumber products. Practically all the known readily accessible sources of this latter class of material have been exhausted.

National forest timber is sold through competitive bidding except for small amounts, not exceeding $2,000 in value, where only the applicant is interested in the sale. At present levels of demand for dead Port Orford cedar suitable for arrow stock manufacture, several operators are interested in purchasing practically every lot which can be developed for sale. The forest service is therefore making its sales of Port Orford cedar on a competitive bidding basis.

One Oregon manufacturer of Port Orford cedar arrow dowels has raised strenuous objections against letting sales of Port Orford cedar suitable for arrow wood through competitive bidding. Because of the scarcity of raw material and the strong demand for it, it is impossible to supply all who want this class of stumpage through negotiated sales. Hence noncompetitive sales to selected parties would be indefensible favoritism.

The regional forester at Portland, Oreg., has agreed to offer as much volume of dead Port Orford cedar as can be located and found suitable for sale. In addition he will offer for sale live trees suitable for arrow stock from uncut stands of timber. At least the equivalent of 500 cords of green material on an individual tree selection basis will be offered for competitive bidding this year. These special sales exclusively of green Port Orford cedar are for the purpose of giving the arrow stock industry an additional source of wood.

In brief we want to cooperate with the cedar arrow industry in developing a competitive sales program suitable to the industry's needs, but we are unwilling to give this industry or individual arrow stock manufacturers preferential treatment by making noncompetitive sales of material which other users also want to purchase.

Sincerely yours,

RICHARD E. MCARDLE, *Chief.*
By EDWARD C. CRAFTS.

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, D. C., July 9, 1956.

Hon. LESTER R. JOHNSON,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. JOHNSON: Reference is made to your extension of remarks on pages A4692 and A4693 of the June 12, 1956, edition of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and to your recent communication with the Bureau of Land Management regarding shortages of material for arrow shafts.

I am deeply concerned about the growing shortages of such specialty products material as arrow stock, burl, figured wood, etc. This shortage is not confined, however, to specialty products material. There is an acute shortage of material for the entire timber industry in western Oregon.

The Bureau of Land Management administers much of the forest land under the jurisdiction of the Department of the Interior in western Oregon. To the extent possible with available funds, facilities, and personnel, it is making every effort consistent with good forest management to offer for sale the maximum amount of timber for general as well as specialty use.

In those instances where it is known that there is more than one prospective purchaser, Bureau timber is offered for sale either by sealed bid or at oral auction, and the highest qualified bidder is awarded the contract. Where it is known that no such competitive interest exists some timber is sold on a negotiated or noncompetitive basis at fair market appraisal.

During each of the past 7 years the Bureau of Land Management has invited prospective timber purchasers in western Oregon to submit advance notices of their respective needs in order that consideration could be given to those suggestions in developing an annual sale program for the following year. Suggestions of that sort from arrow stock manufacturers are welcome and can be expected to result in sale offerings for Port Orford cedar. This means of preparing sale programs has been accepted generally by the timber-using industry as being equitable for all concerned. In many instances the tracts listed in the sale programs have been suggested by prospective purchasers who have located the material involved, made an estimate of the quantity of timber in the area, located nearby public land survey cornors, and, when use of privately owned roads is involved, have secured written permission of the owner for any purchaser of Bureau timber to use the road or right-of-way. While these activities usually require some trouble and expense on the part of the applicant, he has no assurance that he will be awarded the contract for the timber when sold. The recipient of the contract is determined by the competitive bidding process.

It is my understanding from a recent report from one of our Oregon field offices that requests for Port Orford cedar, to be used in arrow stock, have been received from several sources and that a keenly competitive demand for this material exists. The competitive conditions for Port Orford cedar are so similar to those of Douglas fir and other commercial species in western Oregon that it does not appear to be in the public interest to grant certain prospective purchasers of Port Orford cedar privileges of purchase, which are not equally available to prospective purchasers of all Bureau timber offered for sale.

In an attempt to relieve current shortages of arrow stock material, the Bureau's western Oregon field offices have been instructed to make every effort to offer at least 500 cords of such material for sale during 1956. An estimated 288 cords were offered for sale in Coos Bay, Oreg., on June 22, 1956.

During the past 5 months the Bureau has processed and offered for sale tracts of timber which include an estimated 3,326,000 board feet or 6,652 cords of Port Orford cedar. It is recognized that some of this material may not be suitable for arrow stock, however it is reasonable to assume that a portion of it would be suitable and could be obtained by arrow manufacturers. In making use of such material some of which may be live timber, it is possible that the arrow makers would find it necessary to arrange for seasoning prior to turning out the dowels. It is understood, however, that the process of seasoning Port Orford cedar is well known. Inasmuch as the supply of suitable material which can be obtained from old dead trees is nearly exhausted, it appears probable that the producers of arrow stock will find it necessary to install facilities for the seasoning of lumber cut from green timber or buy rough stock from mills which are equipped to produce seasoned lumber.

It is my understanding that the Forest Service in the Department of Agriculture is undertaking a similar effort to market Port Orford cedar. I hope that these past and proposed sales, along with material available from other sources will enable the arrow industry to maintain continuous, full capacity operations.

The Bureau of Land Management had a recent request to export a large volume of Port Orford cedar logs on grounds that the purchaser of the timber could not use such material for plywood. This indicates that Port Orford cedar logs were for sale.

Port Orford cedar on the C. & C. lands administered by this bureau in western Oregon is not available for export to foreign countries. The export problem is controlled by the marketing area system which requires local manufacture of timber cut on those lands. The purpose of these marketing areas is to carry out a statutory requirement that timber be sold, cut, and removed in such a manner as to provide a permanent source of timber supply and contribute to the economic stability of local communities and industries.

Sincerely yours,

WESLEY A. D'EWART,
Assistant Secretary.

Working Together

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HAROLD C. OSTERTAG

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 10, 1956

Mr. OSTERTAG. Mr. Speaker, on June 28 I inserted in the RECORD an account of some farmers in western New York who banded together to plant the fields of an ailing neighbor, Edward Sheehan, of Warsaw, N. Y., who had been hospitalized by pneumonia.

Today I wish to insert a brief sequel to that story, in the form of a letter from Mrs. Charles D. Thomson, Sr., of Jachargen Farm, Warsaw. Both the incident and this supplementary information are, in my judgment, moving testimony to the essential goodness and neighborliness of our country, and illustrate the characteristics we should like to see extended to the peoples of the world—if and when we can cut through the redtape of power politics to reach them.

Mrs. Thomson's letter follows:

DEAR CONGRESSMAN OSTERTAG: Thank you very much for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of June 28, 1956. We are indeed grateful to you for taking time out of your busy day for such things.

We should like to tell you that there were two names unintentionally omitted from the list of neighbors who helped in this project. Perhaps you could add them to your list and send them a copy—they should be commended along with the rest.

They are: Mr. Norman Smith and Mr. Winton James, of Warsaw, N. Y.

Incidentally, my husband was the organizer of this project, but without the cooperation of everyone it could never have become a reality. These same neighbors had helped him out in time of sickness, so he realized how much it can mean to a farmer.

This is a great country we live in—all faiths were working together that day in the fields. Such things can help fight communism—can they not?

Sincerely yours,

Mrs. CHARLES D. THOMSON, Sr.

Patriotism Recognized

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, July 7, 1956

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am including an editorial that recently appeared in the Sunday Standard Times, New Bedford, Mass., on the subject of patriotism.

At a time when some well-intentioned people are imbued with the idea that world government is the solution for all of our international problems, this timely editorial points out that even the State Department recognizes that there is such a thing as patriotism. Some call it nationalism. Whatever it is, it is an important ingredient in the American way of life.

The publishers of the Sunday Standard Times are to be complimented for this important editorial.

PATRIOTISM RECOGNIZED

Robert C. Hill, Assistant Secretary of State, recently made some historic references to the value of patriotism. Discussing the Communist masters of the Soviet Union, who have sought to sell the American people upon the thesis that the Communist system represents the tide of the future, he remarked:

"I think you will concede that in some intellectual circles the very word 'patriotism' has become anathema. It is frowned upon as old-fashioned and somewhat ridiculous.

"Now it is axiomatic that a nation is as strong an its economy is healthy and as its people are unified. Such a nation is hard to beat, either by force of arms or through infiltration. That is why there has been a long, covert, intense campaign to make patriotism a nasty word, an absurd, archaic concept. For only if it can weaken our patriotism, and thus our unity, can communism defeat its mightiest opponent (the United States)."

These remarks are historic because the State Department for many years has supported, by action or implication, that type of thinking which suggests Americans should consider their own country last, if at all.

If this seems a harsh appraisal, consider the repeated refusals of Government, State Department-inspired, to give tariff or quota relief to domestic industries strangled by imports.

Consider as well the United States participation in the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade, an organization dedicated to free world trade. GATT already has resulted in increasingly serious trade concessions, principally at the expense of the United States. GATT, which never has been presented to Congress, was born in the State Department.

State Department leadership has been in the forefront of all the architectural proceedings which resulted in such major international organizations as the U. N., the ILO, and in less well-known world exchanges of things cultural, economic, and propagandistic, including UNRRA, foreign aid, and the United States Information Agency.

The accent in all of these "world" operations has been on the subordination of nationalism, and on the soft-pedaling of patriotism. Most of them have meant sacrifice and concession of rights, goods, services, or privileges by Americans for the benefit of someone else.

Thus, with Mr. Hill's utterances (which appropriately were made in the shadow of Faneuil Hall, Boston), the State Department has acknowledged publicly for the first time in years that patriotism might have a place in the American scheme of things. This can only bring the light of new hope into those shadowy corners of the national "attic" where patriotism has been placed along with the memories of economy in government and low taxes.

Bar Association Report on Our Security-Loyalty Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 5, 1956

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, a special committee of the Association of the Bar of the City of New York has just completed a year's exhaustive study and research on the Federal security and loyalty programs of our Federal Government. It has issued a 300-page report which is must reading for every Member of Congress. The committee consisted of W. B. Bonsal, chairman; Whitney North Seymour, vice chairman and a former president of the association; Henry J. Friendly; Hon. Harold M. Kennedy, a former United States district judge in Brooklyn; George Roberts; Richard Bentley, a former president of the Chicago Bar Association; Frederick M. Bradley, of the District of Columbia; Monte M. Lemann, of New Orleans, a former member of the National Commission on Law Enforcement and Observation; and John O'Melveny, of Los Angeles.

Following is the text of the summary of the report as issued by the committee:

SUMMARY OF CITY BAR REPORT ADVISING FEWER UNITED STATES LOYALTY SCREENINGS

SECTION 1

The problem

Communism is the weapon as well as the creed of the most aggressive and imperialistic of modern nations. It is a threat to the United States from the outside, intensified by the developments of modern science. Communism is also a threat to the United States from the inside because of the agents it employs to do its work here.

The measures for the protection of national security against communism are varied. The most important are those taken to promote positive security by advancing the economic and political strength of the Nation and by maintaining its sense of unity and self-confidence. A second set of measures is devoted to military security, which to a large degree is dependent on the continuing development of offensive and defensive weapons. A third set is concerned with international security. This involves the strengthening of the Nations of the free world and their common resolution to defend themselves against Communist aggression.

The protection of internal security is also an area of great importance. Communism has sent many agents and lured dupes into its espionage apparatus. In the recruitment of its dupes it has followed a policy of deception which strives to identify communism with the ideals it has done so much to defeat, democracy and liberalism. To protect internal security there are numerous measures. Some are penal in character and would punish through the criminal laws such offenses as treason, espionage, sabotage, and advocacy of the overthrow of the Government by force and violence. Others are preventive, and would discover unreliable persons and bar them from critical areas. Counter-espionage is the most important of them.

Civilian personnel security, to which this report is directed, is another of these internal security measures. The purpose of the personnel security system is to remove or block persons who through disloyalty or for other reasons might be dangerous to the national security in Government service or in particular types of private employment.

Balance and judgment urged

These numerous and varied means for the protection of national security must be seen as an integrated whole. Each of them should be fostered where its contribution is most important for national security. No one of them should be overdeveloped and thus harm or interefer with the others. This calls for balance and judgment in their development and use.

There are now several personnal security programs. One is the program for Federal civilian employees under Executive Order 10450, which is applicable to 2,300,000 persons. A second is the industrial security program of the Department of Defense. It covers the nearly 3 million persons who, as employees of contractors with the military departments, have access to classified information. A third program is that of the Atomic Energy Commission, which extends to its own employees and to those of its contractors' employees who have access to classified information. They come to about 80,000 persons. Then there is the port security program which applies to about 800,000 seamen and longshoremen. Finally, there is the international organizations employees program which extends to over 3,000 Americans in the employ of these organizations.

These programs operate under standards and criteria which are detailed in the governing law. The standard most widely used is that the employees retention in employment or continued access to classified information is clearly consistent with the interests of the national security. The more detailed criteria used under the programs aid in the application of the standards.

The programs are administered through procedures which fall into the following stages:

1. Investigation to ascertain whether there is adverse security information on the employees.
2. Screening to consider whether the information is substantial enough to call for the filing of security charges.
3. Hearing to determine whether the employee meets the security standard.
4. Appeal or review, in some agencies only.
5. Final decision by the head of the agency.

Civil service system used

Intimately connected with these personnel security programs are two other subjects. One is the civil service system. Its procedures, rather than the personnel security programs, are employed to remove the great majority of those members of the civil service who are found not to be trustworthy and dependable. The second is the system of classification of information. It classifies

the information to be kept secret in the interests of national security, and in so doing it largely determines the range of application of the personnel security programs. These two subjects are discussed in chapter IV.

In planning personnel security attention must not be directed to security alone. There is another value which must be preserved and guarded. It is individual liberty. Liberty is a quality to which this Nation since its foundation has been devoted and which it has cherished. To ignore or even to slight liberty would be to destroy our character as a people and as a nation.

The personnel security programs were initiated by 1 of the 2 major political parties and were revised and renewed by the other party, each presenting what was in effect a crash program for an emergency. What was once thought of as an emergency has turned into a long-continuing danger. Now it is time for careful study so as to plan a personnel security system for the duration of the cold war.

As a result of its study the committee has arrived at the findings which follow:

SECTION 2

The findings

The personnel security system should be maintained to help counter the continuing Communist threat. The programs should be modified in important respects to correct the weaknesses which have developed. These two basic findings of the committee are in accord with the views expressed by almost every one of the numerous persons with whom the committee conferred.

In evaluating the personnel security system the commitee has been guided by the need to protect national security and at the same time to adhere to the American tradition of individual liberty. Other security measures must also be taken into account, such as existing statutes which bar Communists from all Government positions. With these considerations in mind the committee has found weaknesses in four aspects of the programs:

1. There is a lack of coordination and supervision of the various personnel security programs.

2. The scope of the personnel security programs is too broad in that positions are covered which have no substantial relationship to national security.

3. The standards and criteria do not sufficiently recognize the variety of elements to be considered, including the positive contribution which an employee may make to national security, and they do not readily permit a commonsense judgment on the whole record.

4. The security procedures fail in various ways to protect as they could the interests of the Government and of employees.

These findings have led the committee to make the recommendations which appear in the following section. The recommendations appear again in chapter VIII at page 137, together with statements of the committee's reasons for the recommendations. At the end of each recommendation in the following section there is a parenthetical reference to the page of chapter VIII upon which that particular recommendation and its supporting statement will be found.

SECTION 3

The recommendations

A. Coordination and Supervision

1. The director of personnel and information security

1. The office of director of personnel and information security should be established in the Executive Office of the President.[1]

2. The director should be appointed by the President subject to confirmation by the Senate and serve at the pleasure of the President.

3. It should be the primary responsibility of the director to conduct a continuous review of and supervision over:

(a) The personnel security programs, in order to assure efficiency, uniformity, and fairness of administration, consonant with the interests of national security.

(b) The classification of information, so that only such information shall be classified as the interests of national security actually require.

4. In the performance of his responsibility the director should make recommendations to the President which, when embodied in regulations prepared by the director and approved by the President, would be binding upon the departments and agencies concerned.

B. Scope

2. Scope of personnel security

1. Clearance under the personnel security programs should be required for all sensitive positions and for no others.

2. The head of each department or agency should designate as sensitive only those positions within his department or agency the occupant of which would—

(a) have access to material classified as secret or top secret in the interests of national security, or

(b) have a policymaking function which bears a substantial relation to national security.

3. The President, on recommendation of the director, should specify criteria in accordance with which the head of each department or agency should classify positions.

3. Classification of information

The director should continuously review and, after consultation with the agencies involved, make recommendations to the President concerning the standards and criteria and methods to be used in the classification of information and its declassification when secrecy is no longer important to the interests of national security. These recommendations, when approved by the President, would be binding upon the departments and agencies concerned.

C. Standards and Criteria

4. Standard for personnel security

1. The personnel security standard for all sensitive positions should be stated as follows:

"The personnel security standard shall be whether or not in the interest of the United States the employment or retention in employment of the individual is advisable. In applying this standard a balanced judgment shall be reached after giving due weight to all the evidence, both derogatory and favorable, to the nature of the position, and to the value of the individual to the public service."

2. There should be no reexamination of cases already determined because of the change in standard here recommended, whether clearance has previously been granted or denied.

5. The employee's associations

A person's associations with organizations or individuals may properly be considered in determining his security suitability. But a conclusion against his security suitability on the ground of such associations should not be reached without adequate basis for determining that he shares, is susceptible to, or is influenced by, the actions or views of such organizations or individuals.

6. The Attorney General's list

1. The Attorney General's list of subversive organizations should be abolished, unless it can be and is modified and revised in the following respects:

(a) The list should not include any organization which has been defunct more than 10 years. (Information as to such organizations, however, would be available under the procedures set forth in paragraph 2 of this recommendation.)

(b) The list should give information as to the period and the general nature of the subversive activity of each organization listed.

(c) The list should be kept up to date by periodical supplements eliminating organizations which have been defunct over 10 years and adding new organizations found to be subversive since the last publication.

(d) The list should include only those organizations which have been given notice and an opportunity to be heard in conformity with the requirements of due process of law.

(e) The lists should contain a statement that mere membership in any of the organizations listed is not in itself to be construed as establishing the subversive character of a member unless membership has been made illegal by statute.

2. The Department of Justice should upon request make available to security personnel and boards relevant information in its files concerning all organizations, whether defunct or not, the character of which may be pertinent in a pending inquiry. Such information may be taken into consideration in the inquiry together with all other evidence presented.

D. Personnel

7. Security personnel

Personnel engaged in security matters should be individuals whose qualities and standing will inspire confidence in the fair, wise, and courageous administration of the programs. To this end the Director should establish training courses for security personnel. The training should include intensive and thorough instruction in:

(a) the nature of communism and the techniques of Communist espionage and infiltration in the United States and in other countries;

(b) the political history of the United States and of the world, especially in this century;

(c) constitutional and legal principles; and

(d) the relative reliability of various kinds of evidence.

E. Procedure [2]

8. Central screening board

1. A central screening board should be created in the Civil Service Commission. This board should have the responsibility, except as set forth in paragraph 3 below, of determining whether or not security charges should be filed against any person covered by a security program, whether a Federal or private employee.

2. The central screening board should act in panels of not less than three members. At least 1 member of each panel should be a lawyer, and at least 1 member should be a person whose only Government employment is his work on the board.

3. Subject to further action by the director, the Atomic Energy Commission and the Department of Defense should continue their present methods of screening to determine whether or not security charges should be filed, unless they wish to utilize the services of the central screening board. The director should determine whether any other department or agency may establish or maintain its own screening board.

9. Screening procedure

1. Screening boards should afford the employee an opportunity for an informal con-

[1] "The director" in these recommendations means the director of personnel and information security.

[2] Such highly secret investigative agencies as the Central Intelligence Agency and the Federal Bureau of Investigation would not fall within these recommendations except as the President may determine upon the advice of the director.

ference with the board or its representatives to answer adverse security information.

2. When a screening board determines that charges should be filed, it should prepare a specific statement of charges. If a person charged contends that charges are not specific enough to enable him to prepare his defense, the board should, in the exercise of reasonable discretion within the limits of security requirements, determine what additional information shall be furnished him.

3. Charges should include all adverse security information which is to be considered in making a security determination, except in extraordinary circumstances where security considerations clearly forbid.

4. Every employee against whom a security question is raised should be entitled to have an attorney advise and aid him in preparing statements to be submitted to a screening board, and should be entitled to assistance of counsel during his appearance before the board, with such participation by counsel in the proceedings as the board deems proper.

10. Treatment of charged employees pending disposition of charges

Pending the final disposition of charges against Federal employees or employees of private employers:

1. The pay of suspended employees should continue.

2. Employees under charges, if not retained in the positions held when charges are filed, should be transferred without loss of pay to nonsensitive positions instead of being suspended, whenever this is practicable and consistent with the interests of national security.

11. Hearing boards

1. Every charged employee, other than a probationary employee, should be entitled to a hearing before a hearing board of three members to be appointed by the head of the charging agency. One member but not more than one member of the hearing board should be an employee of the charging agency, at least one member should be a lawyer, and at least one member should come from outside the Government service. In the alternative, a hearing board may be composed entirely of persons outside the Government service but in such case also one member should be a lawyer.

2. The director should maintain a panel of qualified private citizens who are willing to serve on hearing boards, and appointment of the citizen members of such boards should be made from this panel.

3. In the appointment of the members of hearing boards consideration should be given to the value of continuity of service.

12. Hearing procedure

1. The charging agency should be entitled to have an attorney present at the hearing. He should have the duty and responsibility to see to it that all relevant facts known to him are brought out, whether favorable or unfavorable. The attorney should not participate in the deliberations of the board or be present at them.

2. It should also be proper for the charging agency to have other representatives, such as a security officer, at the hearing, but such representatives should not participate in the deliberations of the board or be present at them.

3. Every charged employee should be entitled to have an attorney present at the hearing to represent him. The attorney should have the right to offer evidence and examine and cross-examine witnesses.

4. Hearing boards should prepare written findings of fact and conclusions. These should be furnished to the charged employee for his use with only such deletions as are required in the interests of national security.

5. The charged employee should be furnished a copy of the transcript of the hearing for his use in the proceedings.

6. The security hearing should not be public.

13. Appearance of witnesses and confrontation

1. Except as provided below, screening boards and hearing boards should have the power in their discretion to subpena Government witnesses and witnesses for employees and to permit the submission of evidence by depositions, interrogatories, affidavits, letters, and other written statements.

2. When a subpena is granted, reasonable allowance should be made for traveling expenses and a per diem fee.

3. It should be the policy of the Government to permit the employee to cross-examine adverse witnesses before a hearing board when the hearing board believes this important for the development of the facts, unless the disclosure of the identity of the witness or requiring him to submit to cross-examination would be injurious to national security.

4. The identity of an informant who regularly provides or is employed to provide secret information should not be disclosed by requiring his appearance before a screening board or a hearing board or otherwise identifying him, whenever the head of the department or agency which obtained such information shall certify that the identification or presence of such an informant would be detrimental to the interests of national security. To the extent practicable and consistent with the interests of national security, certificates should be accompanied by data which would aid the board in evaluating the evidence given by the informant, including a statement of whether he obtained the information at first-hand or through hearsay.

5. As to all other witnesses, including casual informants, and with due consideration of the national security and fairness to the employee—

(a) the screening board should determine whether it desires a witness to appear before it for interview; and

(b) the hearing board should determine whether the witness should be produced for cross-examination, or whether because of special circumstances he should be interrogated by the board without the employee being present, or whether his evidence should be given to the board in other ways, such as by an affidavit or a signed statement. So far as consistent with the requirements of national security, a hearing board should make available to the employee the substance of all evidence it takes into consideration which was given by any witness whom the employee has not been permitted to cross-examine.

6. In determining the probative effect of information given by informants who are not made available for cross-examination by the charged employee, under the exceptions contained in paragraphs 4 and 5 above, screening and hearing boards as well as appeal boards and agency heads should always take into account the lack of opportunity for cross-examination.

14. The attorney for the charged employee and his fees

1. Every employee under investigation by a screening board or against whom charges are filed should be entitled to obtain an attorney of his own choosing to represent him.

2. In the event an employee is cleared at the screening stage, he should be reimbursed in the amount of his reasonable attorney's fee, the amount to be fixed by the screening board. If the proceedings reach the stage of an agency hearing board and if the employee is later cleared, similar reimbursement should be authorized, the amount to be fixed by the hearing board.

3. Employees of private employers contracting with the Government should be entitled to reimbursement by the Government for attorney's fees on the same basis as Government employees.

4. Bar associations are urged to make provision through lawyer reference plans or otherwise for adequate representation of employees in security proceedings.

15. Final determination

The head of the charging agency should have the power to make the final security determination.

16. Successive security determinations

1. It should be the policy of the Government to prevent insofar as is practicable and consistent with national security the repetition of security proceedings on substantially the same facts as to the same person, whether in the same agency or in different agencies.

2. In the absence of new evidence a security clearance should not be reopened.

3. When there is new evidence a security clearance should be subject to reopening only with the concurrence of the screening board and the head of the agency concerned. If a new hearing is directed, all relevant evidence, whether or not presented in the earlier proceeding, may properly be considered in making the new security determination.

4. The regulations to be promulgated by the director should include provisions for reciprocal recognition of clearances wherever feasible, and such regulations, upon approval by the President, would be binding on the agencies affected.

17. Applicants for positions and probationary employees

1. So far as consistent with the interests of national security, an applicant for a position covered by the programs who is denied employment should, upon request, in accordance with regulations to be established be furnished with a statement of all adverse security information concerning him, such statement to be as specific as security considerations permit, or a statement that there is no such adverse information.

2. An applicant furnished with a statement of adverse security information should have the right to file an affidavit denying or explaining it. Such affidavit should be placed in the personnel file which contains the adverse security information and should be part of any report of an investigation of the applicant.

3. A governmental agency should also afford an informal interview to an applicant for, or a probationary employee in, a sensitive position so that he may have an opportunity to explain adverse security information, in any case where the general counsel of the agency recommends that an interview be given because of the importance of the employment of the person to the agency.

F. Name

18. Name of the program

The name of the personnel security programs as a whole should be: The Federal Personnel Security System.

The committee believes that with the adoption of these recommendations the future personnel security system would be substantially free of the weaknesses and defects which have appeared in connection with the present programs. National security would be adequately protected and no reasonable citizen could feel that this was being achieved at the sacrifice of our basic principles of liberty and our sense of fairness.

Resolution of Sympathy for the Captive People of Poland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. DODD
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 10, 1956

Mr. DODD. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, July 8, in Hartford, Conn., nearly 1,000 Connecticut Polish Americans passed a resolution of sympathy for the captive people of Poland.

It was my privilege to appear at this great demonstration of faith and freedom. The Polish-American Congress of Connecticut has rendered a great service to the free world by this public protest and by adopting this resolution of sympathy.

At a time when there are so many people in the world who have forgotten what freedom really means, the courage of the Polish people as demonstrated in the Poznan uprising is a tremendous tribute and inspiration to the cause of freedom.

It is of great significance that the revolt in Poznan was led by young men and women. These are the people who have been raised under Communist tyranny and who have been subject to intense Communist propaganda. Yet human craving for freedom and liberty and justice has overcome all of the indoctrination and all of the false information and all of the distortion of education.

The young people of the free world who have had every opportunity to know and enjoy freedom can learn a great lesson from the young Polish people who have never had such an opportunity.

The resolution adopted in Hartford reads as follows, and I commend it to the attention of my colleagues:

RESOLUTION

We, the people of the State of Connecticut, gathered under the auspices of the Polish American Congress, District of Connecticut at the Polish National Home in Hartford, Conn., startled by the recent events in Poland, in particular the shocking massacre of helpless, hungry citizens of Poznan, express our indignation and solemnly protest such barbaric treatment of Polish citizens.

We call upon the free world to join in the growing chorus of indignation at the heedless disregard of basic liberties of man, to protest the violent rape of the freedom from want and the freedom from fear, to protest the wanton refusal to receive offered help, to protest the sacrifice of human lives for the sake of preserving absolute authority bogged in helpless political fear of its own people and bowed and chained to autocratic power in a distant capital.

We call upon the United States, its able and energetic leaders, and the whole free world to pierce the iron curtain, to deliver from the cross of communism and bondage, a freedom-loving peace who in the face of hopeless odds, in the face of tanks and armor, dared callenge their hated Kremlin-ruled leaders.

We call upon the United States to exert its mighty influence in the halls of the United Nations and through every avenue open to our great Nation that Poland receive for its people the offer of assistance so generously tendered.

We call upon the United States to demand fair trails for those who dared fight in defense of the freedom from want.

We call upon our great Nation to firmly resolve that peaceful coexistence is impossible unless peaceful existence is guaranteed to the people of Poznan and Poland.

We call upon the United States to firmly resolve that Poland must be free, that our guaranty of freedom must be honored, that we are bound to this pledge by the blood of the citizens of Poznan.

We call upon our Nation to recognize that the bitter struggle for freedom cannot cease till the whole world is free. Poznan has shocked us. The violence of Poznan is an angry outburst against a world that forgets. Let us resolve that their sacrifice shall not be in vain.

Respectfully submitted by the people of Connecticut gathered at the Polish National Home, Hartford, Conn.

Russia Undeniably Is Changing, but She Must Be Judged by Her Own Standards, Not Ours

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 10, 1956

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following article which appeared in the Belleville Times of Friday, July 6, 1956. Mr. Heinzen, the writer, has had vast experience as a correspondent on the European scene for many years. Mr. Heinzen takes a good look at Russia today and points out a few salient facts which make worthwhile reading. I am sure that the article will be found highly informative and significant.

ONE MAN'S OPINION

(By Ralph Eric Heinzen)

RUSSIA UNDENIABLY IS CHANGING BUT SHE MUST BE JUDGED BY HER OWN STANDARDS, NOT OURS

On this Independence Day, taking stock of the world situation dominated, as it is, by the controversy stirred up by the Kremlin's "new look" it becomes this One Man's Opinion that the Soviet Union is going through a set of experiences which have their parallel well back along the road of our own past. The Russians are not trying to lead the world down a path of their own making; they are still trying to catch up with our world after having started from far behind us. The unhappy truth is that they are catching up fast.

Both the United States and the Soviet Union were born of revolution; ours 180 years ago, theirs barely 39 years ago. Our evolution from a colonial status to our present wealth and productivity was slow and our position as the world's dominant power is of barely a decade's duration. In 39 years, Russia has been converted to modern technology, most of the progress having come from her wartime contact with the Western World during the war.

In attempting to assess any values to the changes which have taken place within Russia in recent months, most aptly demonstrated by the inspired demolition of the Stalin myth, it behooves the Western World to judge Russian policy, Russian production and Russian propaganda by Russian standards and scales, not by our own.

Regardless of the fantastic progress that Russia has made to become the world's No. 2 power in 10 short years, her political concept, her industrial production, her social standards are still primitive.

The Soviet Government enjoys authority among its people that the Western governments enjoyed in the Tudor period of our history. The average residents in the Soviet Union of today would no more think of open political action against the state than did the average Englishman in the reign of Henry VIII.

Back to Napoleon

They have a one-party political system. So did the Western World down to the Cromwellian revolution. A two or more multiple party political system involves the right of open political action against the government. This is less than 300 years old in Western society.

Soviet citizens may be emerging from political as distinct from objective justice. The West has begun to enjoy objective justice since about 200 years ago.

The Russians now have the foundation of a modern industrial system. They are about where Britain was at the end of the Napoleonic Wars and the United States was on the eve of World War I in 1914.

A new industrial complex emerging under primitive standards of justice within the context of a 15th-century one-party political monopoly system enjoys more competitive advantages against a modern Western system.

Perhaps the biggest single advantage is that the Soviet system has the ability to keep wages in balance with production; an ability which the Government of Britain already may have lost and which the United States Government may not be able to retain.

Satisfied with life

A companion advantage is that the Russian laboring class, having had so little in the past, is much more aware of a slight advance in its standards of living than of greater advantages enjoyed by working people in other countries.

One can speculate endlessly over the extent to which the Communist goal of communizing the world is a menace to our Western way of life. The Moselms, too, still intends, in theory, to convert the whole world to his religion. If he regained the military advantage over the Christian world he might well renew the forward march of Islam which we halted by the Crusades in the Middle Ages.

One need not speculate about the industrial advance in the Soviet Union today. It is as plain and dominant a feature of our times as was the forward stride of American industry between World Wars I and II.

Future favors newcomer

Unless something drastic happens, we will witness the rise of a modern industrial state in the Soviet Union over the next 2 decades which will match in speed and scope the rise of the American industrial system.

During its rise it will enjoy, on a larger scale, the competitive advantages which the Old South in the United States has been enjoying in recent years over New England, and for much the same reasons.

The early stages of advance are quicker than the later ones, particularly when there is an ample supply of cheap labor and lower and less expensive standards of social security. Competitive coexistence will not be on an equal basis until such time as Soviet living and social-welfare standards rise to the same level as those now enjoyed in the West.

But the Russian system which is coming into increasing competition with ours is not fueled by the dynamism of a new concept.

It is fueled by the dynamism of a primitive society moving into the fast stage of industrial expansion. The competition will become meaningful when the time levels come together—which must be several years in the future.

Threshold of new era

It is possible to argue inconclusively and disagree sharply over whether Stalin's economic policies speeded or delayed the development of industry in the Soviet Union.

This argument is immaterial to us today. The important thing we of the West must grasp and to which we must adjust our thinking and our policies is that the Soviet Union is on the threshold of modern industrialization.

Perhaps the Soviet state would have reached this point earlier had it been spared the ordeal of Stalin. Perhaps, as others believe, Stalin really gave us of the West more time to prepare for the emergence of a massive new industrialized state in the world by his stifling home policies. The essential fact remains that the passing of Stalin occurred at about the time when the groundwork for a modern industrial society had been more or less completed in the Soviet Union.

There is a disagreement inside the Kremlin today over the proportion of the output of Soviet industry which should be allocated each year to the respective tasks of broadening the industrial basis still further and of providing consumer goods.

More consumer goods

This is, however, argument over degree, not over substance. The substantial fact is that there are enough factories in the Soviet Union to provide both a steady increase in the flow of consumer goods and a steady increase in the scope and size of the industrial complex.

It is feeding its own growth and supplying more consumer goods each year. Productivity and the standard of living are going up at the same time. There is no visible reason why both should not continue to grow and grow very rapidly, during coming years.

This condition is the most important single force bearing upon policy decision in the Soviet Union today.

The men of the Kremlin are Communists. What they assume communism to mean influences their thinking and their decisions. But they are also men sitting on top of a vast complex of mines, oil wells, transportation systems, factories, and retail outlets, all of which are operating at a steadily faster and more productive rate.

What do they do with this vast machine? Do they concentrate on making it bigger or on distributing its produce to the people of the Soviet Union? How much bigger do they want it to become? Is slave labor essential to its continued growth or has it become a drag on the system because slave labor cannot consume so rapidly as free and well-paid labor?

Private capital is being accumulated in the Soviet Union today, in the hands of the Communists. As the Soviet industrial system revolves in ever faster motion, there will be increasing accumulation of capital. It will seek outlets as it did in the transition from feudal to capitalist society. Will it find the outlets?

So far the Soviet state finances itself largely out of a concealed sales tax. It has not yet begun to tax accumulated wealth as Western states do.

The maximum income tax is 10 percent and the maximum inheritance tax is 13½ percent. This system puts the bulk of the tax burden on the poor, particularly on the peasant. This encourages the accumulation of private capital. How long does this go on? What does it do to the practice of communism?

The answers lie obscurely in the future. The essential fact is that factors other than Communist theory bear heavily on the process of policymaking in the Kremlin.

Canned Fire in the Sweep of the Winds

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALFRED D. SIEMINSKI

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 9, 1956

Mr. SIEMINSKI. Mr. Speaker, should the random rain of a thousand thermonuclear missiles—canned fire—explode in the stratosphere or on earth, one wonders whether our control of the elements by then will have been fine enough to sweep the air with winds that would deactivate the radioactive particles as they traveled up, out, and away from man.

That question on the control of the elements is prompted by a rather interesting observation made to me by Mr. Scoyen, former superintendent of the Sequoia National Park, during a forest fire in Kings Canyon, Calif., last September.

As we stood on a road overlooking the canyon, Mr. Scoyen traced with his hand the line of travel of the fire and told how at one point the fingers of the fire seemed to reach out to choke to death the oldest living thing on earth, the General Grant grove of beautiful Sequoia trees, 2 and 3 thousand years of age, antedating even the birth of Christ.

And as his hand came to rest by his side, Mr. Scoyen looked over his shoulder and told how the fire had unexpectedly jumped across the road and burned some $7 million worth of timber that need not have been destroyed. Like one sighing at the loss of something sacred, Mr. Scoyen pointed down the canyon in front of us and said with a wistfulness, "if only we had known how to read the little breeze that climbed up the canyon this way before it burst into a big wind, we could have cut a fireline in time to have prevented the fire from jumping the road and saved that $7 million worth of timber for Uncle Sam."

At the time of the little breeze, the fire traveled through the canyon away from the road where we stood.

Perhaps, Mr. Speaker, there is yet some law of nature to be discovered, some law this side of the Creator that influences the destiny of man. Perhaps in time, Mr. Speaker, man might yet learn to hurl tornadoes and hurricanes like javelins into the sky to disperse and destroy man's foolishness against man.

Let us hope there will be those who will snatch this canned fire and use it for the greater comfort and glory of man.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

PRICE OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

The Public Printer is authorized to furnish to subscribers the daily RECORD at $1.50 per month, payable in advance.

Remit by money order payable to Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C.

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

Appendix

SUNFED as the Friends See It

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 25, 1956

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, over the past few months there has been a great deal of talk, both in and out of government, about the need for a reappraisal of United States foreign policy. It now seems apparent that, at least in the Senate and House Foreign Affairs Committees, such a restudy will take place.

It is my hope that out of such a study will come a more viable foreign policy than the one we seem to have at the present time. In particular, it is my hope that our experts will see the necessity for greater American participation in the economic programs of the United Nations. I should especially like to see American agreement to and support for the Special United Nations Fund for Economic Development. In my opinion, we could take no more worthwhile step in securing friends and allies throughout the world than through approval of this program.

The Special Fund, or SUNFED as it is called, has been receiving increasingly wide support recently. Our United Nations Ambassador, Henry Cabot Lodge, has indicated that he supports the program. Adlai Stevenson has also spoken out in favor of it. It is my feeling that many of my colleagues in the House would vote for such a proposition and the Senate as a whole supported the program when it was included in the current mutual security authorization bill.

Recently, I have had a magazine article appearing in the Friends' Quarterly called to my attention. This article is entitled "SUNFED: Friends Take a Look at the Special United Nations Fund for Economic Development." This article, written by William R. Fraser, considers the entire SUNFED program in some detail. I should like to include it as a part of my remarks since I feel that no organization outside of government is in a better position to evaluate a program of this type than the Society of Friends. This body has been working directly in the field of international relations—particularly economic and social development—for many years. The views they express are, therefore, based on wide experience and I believe are most worthy of consideration. The article follows:

SUNFED: FRIENDS TAKE A LOOK AT THE SPECIAL UNITED NATIONS FUND FOR ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

(By William R. Fraser)

This article reflects some of the thinking which has been done in the past few months by a group of Quaker economists, Friends associated with the United Nations, and Friends having practical experience in the administration of international technical assistance. Friends need not toil long on the basic question whether we as a religious society ought to be concerning ourselves with matters requiring a knowledge of economics. The obligation seems to be quite clear.

"To understand by careful and prolonged study the economic and social problems of our generation is an obvious duty for us all." (Friends Face Their Fourth Century, p. 58.)

"The elimination of economic inequality and the furthering of social justice are tasks of great urgency. Friends must stimulate and support all efforts which they feel would achieve these aims." (Op. cit., p. 64.)

"Let us join together throughout the world, to grow more food, to heal and prevent disease, to conserve and develop the resources of the good earth to the glory of God and to the comfort of man's distress." (A Message to Men Everywhere, Oxford Conference, 1952.)

THE NEED FOR ECONOMIC AID

In some 60 countries throughout the world men and women drawn from as many nationalities, each with his or her special training and experience to share, are working to impart to others in urgent need of it that technical skill and experience without which economic development is bound to be slow. This international program for the interchange of skills and knowledge has already shown that it can bring rich returns in human progress. But in itself it is not enough. Economic development calls also for the capital investment needed to build roads and factories, dams and power stations, by which the skills learned can be put to full use.

SUNFED

Current proposals for a Special United Nations Fund for Economic Development involve supplying a strategic part of the capital needs of underdeveloped countries through funds supplied by governments and to governments through the agency of some kind of United Nations machinery. Such funds are to be used primarily for purposes for which capital is not readily available through a flow of private investment funds, through the operations of the Bank for Reconstruction and Development, or from sources within the underdeveloped countries.

The principal type of capital need that cannot be met from these other sources is for the "social overhead" investments such as roads, schools, hospitals, and the like, which cannot be made to yield cash profits, at least not without thereby impairing their usefulness, and which do not yield foreign exchange to service even low-interest loans from abroad. In a prosperous country these needs can be financed from tax revenues or by internal borrowing, though the latter alternative is not without its dangers of producing inflation. In many underdeveloped countries securing capital internally for such needs might be possible only through harsh measures approaching the severity of those often adopted by dictatorial regimes, or through heavy taxation that would seriously interfere with the flow of private capital and with economic development in other directions.

Even where capital investment is potentially possible the influx of foreign capital is often inhibited by the risks, real or imaginary, which the investor feels are involved in investing in a country subject to political instability or perhaps only to mildly progressive or equalitarian tendencies. Among the risks are expropriation or nationalization with what is felt to be inadequate compensation; restrictions on the withdrawal or repatriation of profits and capital, and unduly severe or discriminatory taxation. The situation has in it some elements of a vicious circle; the fact that the investment is thought to be risky leads the investor to require, and feel justified in requiring, a higher rate of profit by reason of the risk; while the high rate of profit in turn leads the government of the underdeveloped country to feel that higher taxes are justified, or even tempts it to move toward nationalization. There may be occasions where a SUNFED investment might serve as a bellwether by demonstrating that the risks are not as great as private investors sometimes imagine, and might create conditions in which investment can then prove fruitful.

Private or government capital

Where arrangements are entered into by a donor and a recipient country great care has to be taken to avoid the domination of one party by the other. Some of the arrangements between the United States of America and countries receiving aid are less complicated than, say, the administration of the United Nations Technical Assistance Program, which involves the matching of requests for projects with available personnel, and also the balancing of projects against the funds which are related and which are not all in convertible currency. Operations controlled by a national legislator and a national executive encounter fewer obstacles and seem to reach larger proportions than is yet possible for any international administration. On the other hand, dependence upon one large donor tends to be resented, to breed suspicion, and perhaps also greater dependence. Many countries prefer international aid because it is less open to control by foreign "political strings." The recent report of the Randall Commission in the United States of America tends to recommend that armaments and military aid should be given by United States of America in the form of gifts, whereas other enterprises which the United States of America may encourage in underdeveloped areas should be financed by loans. But large loans are not an unmitigated blessing to an underdeveloped country, since the servicing of loans may run the country into debt. It should be noted also that there is a difference between offering equity capital and loan capital to an underdeveloped country, in that a different type of obligation is thereby laid on the country. Too much loan capital may lead to too heavy an obligation in the form of debt servicing and loan repayment, whereas too much equity capital may lead to

a form of economic imperialism, though the tendency toward this has been to some extent halted by the national laws enacted by countries in Southeast Asia.

While the flow of private capital for the development of underdeveloped areas may influence the foreign policy of the source country, the use of private capital may be less closely conditioned by national security considerations, and by the general foreign policy of the donor country. In this sense, private capital may have an advantage over Government aid. There may also be a feeling among recipients that aid from another government is charity, while capital invested by foreign entrepreneurs is expected to yield a profit to the investor and thus frees the recipient country from any moral obligation to be saying thank you. Unfortunately, private capital has in the past occasionally displayed less likeable characteristics. Sometimes too small a proportion of the profits have been ploughed back, too much of the profits may have been withdrawn for the benefit of the absent investor, and top administrative posts have often been reserved for citizens of the investing country.

Emotional and moral problems

All forms of aid raise difficult emotional and moral problems which we must be prepared to tackle sympathetically. This sympathy may come from a thorough identification of the giver with the recipient, or perhaps even from a deep understanding by each of the other's problems. A good debate in a committee of the General Assembly can and should produce such understanding. The quality of personnel sent to a country in connection with enterprises financed by foreign capital is of paramount importance in the establishment of a good cooperative relationship.

We must recognize, too, that there are risks inherent in promoting development which are likely to produce fundamental changes in the present social patterns. This mean. that an enterprise undertaken should be carefully planned and intelligently advised by persons caring for the social development of an area and its culture. Nor should we assume that such development will have any immediately pacifying effect. While poverty and misery may give rise to discontent in a country, discontent may become more active as development proceeds and as the population begins to realize that it need not forever content itself with the poor conditions it had known in the past. There is little point is discussing now whether it is wise for underdeveloped areas to undertake projects which will lead to industrialization and urbanization. Most of these countries are determined to develop their resources and to expand their industries, and not to remain simply producers of raw commodities for other industrial countries. Our attitude should be to examine what we can do to assist in creating conditions in which economic development can go forward.

As one area of the world is developed, there is a risk that the terms of trade hitherto obtaining between it and the more advanced countries may change to the disadvantage of the latter. It could be claimed that acceptance by an "advanced" country of such deterioration in its terms of trade might be considered a contribution to general world development, but this is not a comforting theory for those who are employed in an industry which has to contract, or for the inhabitants of an industrial country whose standard of living is dependent on imported foodstuffs and raw materials. We ought to be clear, when advocating the development of under-developed areas, that this could well involve sacrifices for our own western countries, but we must not, however, give way to any sense of pride in having undertaken a "sacrificial" enterprise. Any such sense of pride would quite corrupt the motivation behind the giving of economic assistance and would further complicate the already delicate relationships that are bound to exist between donor and recipient.

Adverse movement in the terms of trade is possible but not certain. An adverse change in the volume of trade is improbable since a high volume of trade, all other things being equal, appears to be easier to maintain between developed countries with complex needs than between poor countries. Changes adverse to particular industries are indeed probable but they should not exceed the power of adjustment of a lively economic system. Friends should be prepared to play their part in advocating the necessary measures for such lively adjustment.

Self-help

In order that the recipient country should not be "pauperised" and feel resentful at having to accept aid, the principle of self-help should be vigorously upheld. Capital supplied by other governments for the development of "social overheads" or "non-self-liquidating projects" should be matched by evidence in the home country of a determination to develop industries which the roads and schools are designed to serve. Assurance should also be given by recipient countries that proper provision will be made in their national budgets for the maintenance and the replacement of capital assets acquired through international economic aid. Such cooperation in drawing up plans for joint enterprises has already been demonstrated by UNICEF, which has set a good pattern for consultation between government planners, United Nations experts and representatives of donor countries. An advantage of this procedure is that some small surrender of independence on the part of all concerned takes place in favor of closer interdependence.

In requesting these assurances donor countries should avoid going to the other extreme of treating the underdeveloped countries as if they were underdeveloped children. It is said that insistence on this sort of assurance from countries which may in any case be politically unstable has made the International Bank unpopular, and there is a case to be made for the contention that the only way to encourage the reasonable use of foreign capital is in fact to trust to the commonsense of the users.

Development of armament

The resolutions passed at the last General Assembly tend to link economic aid to future reductions in arms budgets. This tendency aroused the fears of potential recipient countries who foresaw that no additional international capital might be forthcoming until the Great Powers had achieved sufficient trust in each other to undertake substantial reductions in their arms budgets. Friends will probably feel that if international economic aid is morally justified it should not wait on the implementation of disarmament. In fact, the uses to which such economic aid will be put should tend to ease the great political and social changes taking place in underdeveloped countries, and by turning discontent into constructive enterprise such aid may contribute to the pacification of the world. Although small reductions in arms budgets are not likely in themselves to increase the security of the world, since governments are likely to continue to jockey for military advantage so long as armaments are maintained at a high level, yet Friends would probably welcome a diversion of even small sums of money toward more constructive purposes.

We have not considered in any great detail the size of the budgets for economic aid which should be recommended. The proposed minimum at present stands at $250 million, which is very small in relation to the amount spent on armaments. The sum may, however, be acceptable for initial pilot projects.

Assurances needed?

Friends would probably want some assurances to be required from each recipient country to the effect that profits derived from international assistance would be distributed throughout the classes of that country and should not accrue only to those who already have higher incomes. Friends might also have something to say about the assurances needed in order to encourage the flow of private capital. Not all the needs of an underdeveloped country should be met by intergovernmental aid of the type which SUNFED presents, but if private capital is to flow then there will have to be some assurances of fair dealings. The acceptance of a code of behavior on the part of the recipient countries would encourage both private and public investment. Friends have some experience of the insistence on honest trading and upon confidence as a basis for commercial transactions, and it would seem that we could rightly apply this past experience to present problems.

Balancing food and population

We ought to be aware of the fact that if the available international capital is spread evenly, and therefore thinly, over large areas, the benefits of economic development in the form of higher industrial production and a rising material standard of living may only come after an interval of some years, and meantime disparity between population and food supplies may have increased. If, on the other hand, capital is concentrated in a few places, then political jealousies may be aroused, and if some small centers in a backward area are rapidly developed, then there would be larger problems of population increase and of population movement to be faced. Against these pessimistic views may be set the hope that improved health leads fairly quickly to higher productivity in agricultural regions. Development may involve some risk of inflation, but there are also steps which could be taken as anti-inflationary measures, such as the allotting of agricultural surpluses from North America to areas where there are new industrial concentrations of population. We do not think that the fear of population increase should be a deterrent against the developments of a country's resources, for the facts determining population increase and the equilibrium between population and food supply are not yet clear.

We have touched here on several large issues which we cannot explore more fully in this article, for obviously more earnest thought and study are needed. It should be apparent now that any undertaking of this nature will be complicated and will require sympathetic and far-sighted planning, as well as high moral purpose.

When Lawmakers Go the Other Way

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEON H. GAVIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 11, 1956

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by David Lawrence:

WHEN LAWMAKERS GO THE OTHER WAY—LIBERALS REPORTED BLAMING EISENHOWER BECAUSE CONGRESS CUTS FOREIGN AID

(By David Lawrence)

The so-called liberals are having no difficulty nowadays fixing the blame for the refusal of Congress to continue its giveaways

to foreign countries in as large a quantity as before. They are saying that President Eisenhower is culpable. The line taken is that somehow the President did not browbeat Congress, that he did not exercise his leadership, or that he was sick or indifferent or something.

But the truth is the sponsors of bigger programs of foreign aid are themselves largely responsible for the failure of Congress to appropriate as much as or even more money than the President requested.

For the palpable propaganda to get Congress to spend more money abroad was started a few months ago by the so-called liberals and was carried on vigorously by their auxiliaries here and abroad, particularly by certain sections of the press and even by many members of the New York clique who have access to the President. They overplayed their hand. Members of Congress became suspicious and resentful.

The argument was widely made that America was too much concerned with military alliances, that this was a time to win men's minds, that was needed was something imaginative in the way of foreign policy, that the United States must not insist on extending aid to foreign countries with strings attached, and that the Russians were being successful in their policies of competitive coexistence. Also a lot of dispatches were coincidentally sent from abroad designed to prove that America was losing prestige.

The Congress, however, didn't fall for any of this, though there were a few speeches planted here in Congress by the so-called "liberals" to emphasize their arguments. Such speeches were difficult for some of the Democrats to make because their own brethren simultaneously were engaged in cutting down the President's program in an effort to put him on the spot.

As a matter of fact, if political theory were realistically applied, the finger of criticism would be pointed today not at President Eisenhower but at the Democratic Party which controls both houses of Congress. The Democratic leaders told the Nation in the 1954 campaign that they would cooperate with the Republican President. The rank and file of the Democrats, however, have not followed their own leadership.

So today the song is different. Now it's the President who is said to be at fault for not leading vigorously enough, and it's the Republicans in his own party who are being held responsible by these critics. Indeed, the President is being openly urged to split with his own party, to call his own leaders names, to purge them.

All this overlooks the plain fact that for nearly 20 years now no party in Congress has been sure of a majority on important issues and no President has been able to lead his party in that sense. The reason is that there are four major blocs in Congress. Both parties are divided.

Eisenhower's leadership, for example, isn't a bit more effective than was Truman's or Roosevelt's on legislative issues. Thus, Truman faced continuously a split Democratic Party on civil rights and on labor legislation. The Taft-Hartley Act was passed over his veto by a coalition of Democrats and Republicans. Roosevelt again and again had the same experience with such a coalition. It beat his Supreme Court bill. He tried the purge system—butting into party primaries—and lost in almost every instance. Yet Eisenhower is being urged today to intervene in the Wisconsin Republican primary and thus assure victory for a Democratic nominee.

As leadership goes, Eisenhower is doing about as well as can be expected in dealing with a southern Democratic bloc that is against Federal aid for education, a northern Democratic bloc that wants it, a Republican bloc of independents who vote against giveaways of all kinds and a Republican bloc of administration stalwarts who go along with him on almost everything.

The internationally minded spenders ought, however, to be happy with the results. They should consider themselves lucky to get $4 billion out of Congress. The other $900 million which has been cut out of the program will go for armament. The Air Force enthusiasts will see to that, and, incidentally, isn't it a Democratic Senator who is leading the fight for more and more money for airpower and an unbalanced budget? One wonders how a Republican resident can exercise leadership over Democrats in Congress who are aspirants for the Presidency.

Citation to the New York World-Telegram and Sun

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. FREDERIC R. COUDERT, JR.

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 5, 1956

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the address of the distinguished president of the Board of Education of the City of New York, Hon. Charles A. Silver, upon the occasion of a citation to a great newspaper and the able men who manage it, the New York World-Telegram and Sun, for notable journalistic services to the schoolchildren of our city.

ADDRESS BY MR. CHARLES H. SILVER, PRESIDENT OF THE BOARD OF EDUCATION, AT PRESENTATION CEREMONIES OF CITATION TO THE NEW YORK WORLD-TELEGRAM AND SUN, JUNE 26, 1956

In a very few minutes it will be my privilege to present, on behalf of the entire Board of Education of the City of New York, a beautifully imprinted symbol of appreciation. This heartfelt citation is inscribed with the name of one of our great metropolitan newspapers in recognition of three decades of devoted service to our school system.

And yet it is so much more than that. A sheet of paper bearing a scant hundred printed words will be tendered in token of gratitude to a great instrument of public information which has published and distributed numberless sheets of paper with untold millions of printed words. It is a simple ceremony for which we have gathered here today and one whose human significance might be lost unless we see in those lines of print the everyday living drama of 7 million people, unless we hear in the roar of the giant presses the thunder of man's conscience, the birth cries of history created in each day's headlines.

Behind those headlines are the men and women who gather, record, and edit the news; theirs are the names that should appear on our citation; theirs is the enormous daily task of taking mankind's pulse and telling us the temperature, condition, and trend of the world community in which each of us plays a part.

In a very real sense, the life of everyone of us is the life we read about in the daily newspaper. It is the direct and immediate source of our most dependable knowledge of men and events. Today's front page foreshadows the future of civilization.

The newspaper is the most powerful force at work molding men's minds, influencing our actions, fashioning and changing our topics of conversation, even affecting our very choice of language. The editorial pages point the footprints of humanity on the march. The news columns picture the way we behave like human beings—and, sometimes, the way some of us do not. The daily paper is an endlessly continued tapestry of our tragedies, comedies, sins, triumphs, and follies.

It is more than the program of this play we call life; it is the prompt book, the script itself, the entrances and exits, the action, the dialog, and the daily surprises of unpredictable human nature.

As such, a newspaper bears a tremendous responsibility and becomes the greatest educative force we know. We, of the board of education, are striving to develop the talents and teach the arts of living to almost a million young people who emerge from our classrooms each year. Here, in our vast, sprawling city, we pride ourselves on the accomplishments of the largest public-school system in the world. And yet there is a larger and far more effective system of public schooling than ours, and that is the newspaper. It reaches and teaches hundreds of millions of people every day of the year in almost every corner of the globe. It deals in the most precious merchandise of all, words, and, through words, ideas.

Yes, my friends, we are here to do honor to a seemingly lifeless thing, contrived out of paper and ink.

But it is what is on that paper that counts. It is how much of the human spirit that flows in that ink which matters. It is the people who stand behind the news and opinion which appear in the newspaper that we actually propose to acknowledge and applaud by these exercises today. For even a newspaper as valuable and vital to the daily activities of our huge metropolis as the New York World Telegram and Sun is only the shadow of the men and women who make it, and it is our sincere and happy purpose to honor them for all they have done for our city and for the children of our city's schools.

That is why we salute Roy W. Howard, editor and president of the New York World-Telegram and Sun. You have kept your newspaper free of all partisan ties and independent of any political pressure. You have fought valiantly and tirelessly for good government in city, State, and Nation. You have opposed all things and persons you believed to be wrong, and you have championed whatever you felt to be right.

The name of Lee Wood, executive editor of the World-Telegram and Sun, is known to every man and woman who sits at a newsdesk or pounds a rewrite typewriter. I could say that Lee Wood is a journalist's journalist, but I think he himself would prefer to be called a newspaperman. Here we have no remote ivory-tower observer of world affairs, but a hard-hitting, shirt-sleeved worker at the task of publishing an honest daily report of the news. A man of strong personal opinions, he is known always to be ready to hear the other fellow's point of view. A man who moves in the electric atmosphere of the largest international issues, he is yet aware, at all times, of the little everyday problems of 8 million New Yorkers.

In any galaxy of newsdom's most notable figures, you, Lee Wood, must command a foremost place. The warmth of your own personality has made the World-Telegram and Sun reflect a deeper humanity and compassion. The courage of your own crusading spirit has carried over into its columns, reflecting your own integrity, your love of truth and zeal for freedom of thought and expression.

You have encouraged your feature writers and reporters to walk in the footsteps of the earlier giants of journalism, to give the news fearlessly, impartially, and accurately. You have promoted the cause of peace throughout all the world, yet you have not

ignored the obligation to pursue justice within your own local sphere of influence.

You have trusted in the intelligence of your readers, in the ultimate victory of good over evil and in the ability of an informed public to govern itself. You have preached the democratic ideal and you have given expression to the American dream in the inspired words of the motto that rings from your own masthead: "Give light and the people will find their own way."

Finally, we pay tribute to your constant emphasis of the growing importance of education in the news. Few men have as clear an understanding of the problems and aims of education as Jack Jacowitz, editor of the World-Telegram and Sun's daily school page. He has covered this vital news field for more than a quarter of a century. He knows the complex factors involved; he has battled widespread misconceptions and has beaten back the occasional irresponsible attacks on our school system. He has watched the forward march of education in our city from an on-the-spot post and he has reported his observations with clarity and fairness, rendering an unusual service for which we are constantly grateful.

Through the tireless and earnest efforts of Jacob Jacowit and his excellent staff, you have focused a steady beam of enlightened interest on every area of our local and national educative activities. You have turned the spotlight of your school page and your news columns on the vital function of education to defend the borders of freedom against all who would advocate any form of physical or intellectual enslavement. You have fought to assure a better tomorrow for the children growing up into good citizenship in our classrooms of today.

In recognition of all this, I have the profound honor of presenting to you this plaque in the name of the Board of Education of the City of New York, on which is inscribed this citation:

"AN APPRECIATION

"For more than 30 years the school page of the New York World-Telegram and the Sun has reported on the world of education.

"More particularly, the school page has mirrored the life of our vast and complex New York City school system. It has presented news of our daily proceedings. It has traced our growth and expansion; it has provided a convenient forum for teachers, supervisors, and parents; it has praised accomplishments and criticized weaknesses.

"Because of the accuracy and thoroughness of its news and the spirit of fairness which characterizes its criticism, the school page has made itself a valued and welcome visitor to our schools and homes.

"So much do we prize the school page that we give it a permanent place, in bound volume form, on the shelves of the teachers' reference library of the board of education. Now that we have received the 1955 volume from the bindery, we deem it fitting to express to the New York World-Telegram and the Sun, to its management, and to the able and conscientious staff of the school page our appreciation of a job well done."

Whose Road Program?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 11, 1956

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my own remarks and to include extraneous material, I wish to have inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article by Mr. Win Pendleton, of the Florida Press Bureau, 1147 National Press Building, Washington, D. C. This article, which has to do with the highway bill, recognizes the work of the Honorable Cecil Webb, one of Florida's former road board chairmen in the origination of this fine legislation:

WASHINGTON SEESAW
(By Win Pendleton)
WHOSE ROAD PROGRAM?

The road bill has passed. It took Congress more than 18 months to write one that they could agree on. The Republicans call it Ike's program. The Democrats are claiming credit for it because this is a Democratic Congress. Also, it's election year.

But let's check the record. Let's recall the occasion of the original presentation of the idea and give a wee bit of credit where credit is due.

On March 17, 1954, Cecil M. Webb, then chairman of the Florida State Road Board, visited President Eisenhower in the White House and proposed the biggest Federal road-building program in history.

On July 12, 4 months later, in New York City, Vice President RICHARD M. NIXON outlined this plan publicly. NIXON read a speech that President Eisenhower had planned to deliver. But due to the death of his sister-in-law, the wife of his brother Milton, President Eisenhower was unable to make the speech himself.

At that time, no mention of Cecil Webb was made by Vice President NIXON, although the plan was essentially the same that Webb had proposed on his March 17 visit to the White House. There was one difference worth noting: Webb had suggested an expenditure of $30 billion over a period of 6 years. President Eisenhower called for a road program costing $50 billion to be spent over a period of 10 years.

The bill that Congress passed last week provides for $32.9 billion during the next 13 years. That isn't exactly the way Cecil Webb had planned it, but it shows he was on solid ground.

Some people laughed at Webb for taking his idea directly to the President. Some people in Florida said he was just trying to show off. Even some members of the Florida delegation here treated Webb as though he should stick to making Dixie Lily grits and corn meal—and leave roadbuilding problems to them.

But, it should be noted that Congressman BOB SIKES, dean of the Florida delegation, did have faith enough in Webb's plan to arrange for the White House visit. And when Webb talked to President Eisenhower, SIKES sat in on the conference.

Among the high Florida road officials who went to the White House with Webb were Senator George Tapper, of Port St. Joe, then chairman of the State legislature's road committee; Sam Turnbull, State highway engineer; F. M. "Son" Turner, Jr., board member from Pensacola.

Later, as chairman of the road department, Webb published his plan in a booklet entitled, "Florida's Plan for Better Highways." This was a copy of a speech which he made to the committee on administration of the American Association of State Highway Officials in Seattle, Wash., November 8, 1954.

This is all in the record.

So, during the next few years, as this great network of 41,000 miles of interstate roads is under construction—remember who first took the idea to the President.

Sometimes when you hit a beautiful new stretch of completed highway on this network, or maybe complain and fuss about a miserable detour where the new roads are being built, take time out to remember the old motto which says, "There is no limit how much a man can accomplish if he doesn't care who gets the credit."

And remember, too, the visit that Cecil Webb made to President Eisenhower, in the White House, on March 17, 1954.

H. R. 5550

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 5, 1956

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, it looks as if it were quite unlikely that H. R. 5550, a bill to authorize the United States to enter into the OTC will be brought out on the floor of the House for debate in this Congress.

I regret this. Regardless of whether entry into the OTC is authorized or not, the subject matter is one that needs as much public debate and consideration as possible. My personal views are that the Ways and Means Committee needs to conduct further studies and hearings upon the broad subject of the delegation of congressional powers to the Executive in the field of the regulation of foreign trade if we are to adequately advise the House on OTC or any other matter in this area.

Inasmuch as the OTC probably will not be debated in this Congress, I am herewith inserting in the RECORD the supplemental views I wrote to accompany the report of the Ways and Means Committee on H. R. 5550, in which I discuss this general subject in some detail:

SUPPLEMENTAL VIEWS OF THOMAS B. CURTIS ON H. R. 5550

I joined in voting H. R. 5550 out of committee primarily because I felt that it was a measure of such importance that it should be presented to the House. This matter of United States foreign trade needs as much public airing as it can get. This committee has held lengthy hearings on the aspect of our foreign trade presented by H. R. 5550. However, a major question for this House to decide is whether these hearings provide sufficient data upon which the House can base an intelligent vote.

The first question to be resolved in considering H. R. 5550 granting the President authority to join the United States in the OTC is whether this can be considered intelligently on its own bottom without relation to the GATT.

AREA COVERED IN COMMITTEE HEARINGS

The decision was made to confine the subject to the OTC by the manner in which the hearings were set up, by the selection of witnesses and by the understanding given to witnesses that the subject matter before the Committee was limited. The executive-department witnesses who appeared before the committee supported this approach. They argued that the delegation of power sought by the executive in H. R. 5550 did not require congressional consideration of GATT, even though Congress has never had the question of GATT directly before it.

On the other hand, the chairman of the committee was very fair in permitting the witnesses to be questioned extensively on the subject of whether approval of OTC amounted to an approval of the GATT; and also on the subject of the jurisdiction, procedures, and operation of the power allegedly

delegated by the Congress to the Executive to enter into GATT.

However, if the various executive department heads who testified before this committee had been instructed that they were to be prepared to discuss the GATT and the executive department's authority to enter GATT, a great deal more pertinent information would have been made available to this committee and to the House membership through the hearings. As it is, much of the information in the printed hearings merely was supplied for the record and there has been no opportunity to question the witnesses on this material. Furthermore, the persons from the executive department who have first-hand information on the manner in which trade agreements operate and are negotiated, particularly members of the Committee on Reciprocity Information, of the Departmental Trade Agreements Committee, of the Tariff Commission, and of the United States Board of Trade Negotiators for GATT were not called before the committee for statements and examination.

CAN OTC BE CONSIDERED WITHOUT CONSIDERING GATT?

H. R. 5550 grants to the executive the power to enter into OTC, an organization designed to make GATT more effective and more permanent. It seems foolish to try to consider OTC without knowing what GATT is; what the President's authority to enter GATT consists of, its limitation, if any; how the President has exercised this authority; what procedures have been established for United States industry, agriculture, and labor to present their views and to have their views considered in the negotiation of trade agreements and with what degree of formality these procedures have been established; what control the Congress has retained in this area of regulating foreign trade, which is so explicitly designated in the Constitution as a power and responsibility of the Congress.

The position of the executive department witnesses that approval of OTC does not require a study of GATT is difficult to understand in the face of the fact that three times the Congress has explicitly stated in legislation collateral to GATT that by approving this legislation it is neither approving nor disapproving GATT. These congressional caveats spring from a series of doubts. Doubts as to the authority of the Executive to enter GATT at all and more serious doubts as to whether the authority of the GATT exceeds the President's authority to enter into multilateral trade agreements. Doubts about the procedures under which the Executive has exercised whatever his authority may be. Doubts as to whether foreign trade barriers have actually been decreased and whether foreign trade has actually increased as the result of GATT.

The Randall Commission, which was certainly friendly to the GATT, recommended that the subject matter of the GATT be presented to the Congress for its approval. Many of the nongovernmental witnesses appearing before the committee in favor of H. R. 5550 were forthright. They said, of course, Congress approving H. R. 5550 meant approval of GATT. Several witnesses stated that Congress by extending the Trade Agreements Act of 1934 from time to time with full knowledge that the Executive had used this act as the source of his power to put the United States in GATT had given approval to GATT, in spite of the insertion of the caveat clauses.

To sum it up then. It is time Congress considered GATT. To vote intelligently on H. R. 5550, establishing the OTC, we must consider GATT. The caveat clauses from a practical standpoint are meaningless. A caveat clause in H. R. 5550 saying that approval of H. R. 5550 neither approves nor disapproves of GATT is meaningless.

WHAT COURSE CAN BE TAKEN?

So let us look at GATT with the information we have been able to gather to see (1) whether we have enough information to go on and, (2) if we have, whether it is to the best interests of our country to approve or disapprove OTC and GATT.

My personal views are that this committee has not obtained enough information about GATT and the United States Government's relation to it to intelligently understand it. The hearings on H. R. 5550 were not set up to study GATT and most of the information about GATT in the printed hearings comes from data supplied for the record in answer to questions. As I pointed out before, there was no opportunity for asking questions about this data or questioning the witnesses who had first hand information about the manner in which the Executive Department enters into trade agreements under GATT. The best place, of course, to amend our procedures in writing trade agreements is in the extension of the Trade Agreements Act when it comes up again in 1958, but it could have been done at this time in considering the OTC.

Not having enough information about GATT would indicate that H. R. 5550 should be defeated. This, however, is not necessarily so. Two other possibilities exist. 1. To recommit the matter to the committee for further study. Of course, the public has been conditioned already to look upon this as a defeat of OTC; but if a further study by the committee were really made by going into the matter of GATT, this would not be a defeat, but a delay. 2. To approve OTC provisionally, on the theory that for the very immediate future our country stands to gain from a more rigid enforcement of the present trade agreements made under GATT and what defects there may be in the GATT and the manner in which Congress delegated power to the Executive to enter into GATT, can be corrected at a later date.

There is much to my mind that recommends this second course. I trust that the following discussion based upon our limited studies of GATT will bring out some points that bear on the course of action this House should pursue.

DELEGATION OF POWER BY THE CONGRESS OVER FOREIGN TRADE

Has the Congress constitutionally delegated the power to regulate foreign trade which the Constitution vests in the Congress, to the President, in the Trade Agreements Act of 1934 as amended?

There were some witnesses who questioned whether the Congress could constitutionally delegate any of its power to regulate foreign trade to the Executive. In my judgment, there is no question that the Congress can delegate its power in this area if it does so in a correct manner.

The constitutional question becomes, Did the Congress in the Trade Agreements Act of 1934 as amended delegate its power in a correct manner? This raises two basic points: (a) Was the delegation of power sufficiently limited as to extent? (b) Was the delegation of power sufficiently defined in the manner in which it should be exercised?

One witness who felt that the language in the Trade Agreements Act, although very broad and general, was sufficiently definitive as to the extent of the power conferred, cited similar broad and general language delegating power over interstate commerce by the Congress to the executive in the act creating the Interstate Commerce Commission. However, the Congress in delegating these broad powers created a very specific agency to carry out these powers, the Interstate Commerce Commission. Congress did not create a similar type agency to carry out the powers over foreign trade delegated in the Trade Agreements Act.

To fully study this question, however, the powers of the Tariff Commission, an agency previously established and of some years standing, must be reviewed. It is interesting to note, however, that the Trade Agreements Act in delegating whatever power that it did in the area of foreign trade did not refer to the powers previously granted to the Tariff Commission although it must be remembered that the Reciprocal Trades Act itself is an amendment to the Tariff Act of 1930. It is further pertinent to note that the two major amendments to the original Reciprocal Trades Act, the escape clause and the peril point provision confer additional powers on the Tariff Commission. Yet there has not been a clear delineation of powers in this area between the Tariff Commission and the executive under the Trade Agreements Act.

Furthermore, the executive department by Executive Order No. 10082 of October 5, 1949, established the Committee on Reciprocity Information and the Interdepartmental Committee on Trade Agreements to handle certain matters which arise in the United States preparation for entering into multilateral trade agreements under GATT. It is not quite clear just where the Tariff Commission fits in this scheme of things, particularly as in this same Executive order the Tariff Commission is directed to file an annual factual report of the operation of the trade agreements program with the Congress. This portion of Executive Order No. 10082 was enacted into law by the Congress last year in the extension of the Trade Agreements Act. These reports by the Tariff Commission are by no means confined to the subject of tariffs; they cover a wider area of foreign trade. Yet apparently the Tariff Commission has been given no jurisdiction in this area other than to "at all times keep informed concerning the operation and effect of provisions relating to duties or other import restrictions of the United States contained in trade agreements. * * *"

Regrettably, though these reports have been filed with the Congress for several years, no Committee of the Congress has been designated to receive these reports, study them and in turn report to the Congress on them. Many Congressmen bewail the loss of power of the Congress to the executive branch of the Government, some even call it usurpation of power—yet in all too many instances—as in this specific case—the loss of power comes from the Congress failing to exercise the prerogatives it has retained for itself. I am hopeful that in the future the Ways and Means Committee will receive, study, and if necessary, hold hearings on the Tariff Commission's annual report on the operation of our trade agreements. Had we been doing this in the past we would be in a position now of making a more intelligent and meaningful report to the House on H. R. 5550.

Furthermore, the Tariff Commission in its inception was designated to be an arm of the Congress. Just what it is an arm of today is questionable. This broad subject of the status of the Tariff Commission in multilateral trade negotiations and agreements remains unstudied by this committee and, as near as I can tell, it remains unstudied by anyone.

CREATION OF EXECUTIVE COMMITTEES

However, even though the Congress may not have created an agency similar to the Interstate Commerce Commission to carry out the delegation of authority to the executive branch of the Government over the regulation of foreign trade, and though the Tariff Commission's position in this area is rather vague and undefined, the executive department has done some definitive work itself.

By Executive Order No. 10082 it created the Committee on Reciprocity Information. This Executive order is set out in the hear-

ings and should receive the study of the House. The Executive also created an Interdepartmental Committee on Trade Agreements. Its structure and duties are not as well defined as those of the CRI. The personnel of the ICTA seems to be identical with CRI. The relationship of these executive committees with the Tariff Commission is likewise vague and undefined although there is a relationship.

The purpose of these two committees, essentially, seems to be to provide a forum whereby industry, agriculture, labor, and other groups concerned with the operation of the trade agreements and the possible negotiations of future trade agreements may present the facts and arguments surrounding their particular situation and concern.

The function of these committees is not that of administering the peril-point provisions. That is specifically a function of the Tariff Commission, although apparently the Executive uses these committees and whatever findings they make in order to exercise the further prerogatives he has to not abide by the findings of the Tariff Commission.

The difficulty in dealing with the CRI and the ICTA from the standpoint of industry, agriculture, and labor seems to be, according to the testimony of witnesses who had dealings with them, that one never knows what action the committees have taken, if any. Whether any findings have been made and, if made, whether they are reduced to writing and forwarded and, if forwarded, to whom. There is no opportunity to know whether the data and arguments presented by a special interest have been considered, ignored, or partially paid attention to.

BOARD OF TRADE NEGOTIATORS

Above all the difficulty experienced by industrial, agricultural, and labor groups lies in the fact that neither the CRI, ICTA, or the Tariff Commission have any function in the actual negotiation of the trade agreements. Who compose the United States Board of Trade Negotiators is a question mark. There has been no formalization of the Board of Trade Negotiators by Executive order. Apparently the personnel may change from day to day, the number of negotiators may change, the qualifications of the negotiators may be anything. In fact, there is no real name for our group of negotiators. I have referred to them as the Board of Negotiators because I don't know what else to call them. How the board obtains information about American industry, agriculture, and labor is uncertain. Theoretically the CRI and the Tariff Commission pass information to them. But this is pure theory. If the CRI reduces its factfinding to writing and recommendations and then passes this data in this form to the Board of Negotiators it does so as the result of no established procedure. Furthermore, any such findings or data, according to the Government witnesses, is secret.

One thing seems to be certain, however, that on the United States Board of Negotiators there are to be no special economic interests represented nor are special interests permitted to be around to give advice in the area of their special interests, either before or during negotiations. Nor does any group know what the Board regards as factual information about its economics, upon which it conducts the negotiations.

Certain witnesses have raised objections to this procedure on the grounds that other nations do not follow similar practices. For example, there was testimony that in recent negotiations involving textiles one of Britian's negotiators was a person in the textile industry who because of his special knowledge in the field was able to give Britain great advantage over the United States negotiators who were unfamiliar with the detailed economics of the industry.

It seems clear to me, without hearing further testimony, that the Congress has not done a proper job in spelling out in detail the procedures which should be followed in negotiating trade agreements. There is little question but that American industry, agriculture, and labor do not know where to go or how to go in presenting their cases before negotiations are entered into.

I am not talking now about a matter which has reached such an extreme position that the peril point or escape clause provisions in the Trade Act come into play. I am talking only about the ordinary negotiations where our negotiators should be in a position of strength through knowledge and where our economic groups should be assured that our negotiators are dealing in knowledge and not in ignorance. Above all, our economic groups at least should know by name and qualifications who our negotiators are and not be placed in the position of having their economic welfare placed in the hands of unknown persons operating under no known set procedure.

(I again want to point out that the information supplied for the record by the State Department on this subject was not available at the time of the public hearings, so there has been no opportunity for this committee to dig into the data for checking.)

ARE THERE SUFFICIENT PROCEDURES ESTABLISHED IN THE DELEGATION OF AUTHORITY?

Whether the congressional inaction of this area is such that the delegation of authority to the Executive is so vague and undeterminative as to be unconstitutional is almost academic. Certainly the congressional action is ill advised and not conducive to the national economic well-being and has put our citizenry in a position of not knowing how either to promote or to protect their economic welfare in the area of vast importance to them such as foreign trade is.

If Congress thinks it advisable to confer upon the Executive vast powers over the regulation of foreign trade, it should do so in a fashion that the citizens' basic right to petition the Congress is protected by adequate administrative machinery. I suggest it was the need of the people to have this right in regard to their economic interests that prompted the writers of the Constitution to confer the powers over both interstate trade and foreign trade to the Congress rather than to the executive department. I believe that the difficulty we are presently experiencing and have been experiencing with increasing difficulty in continuing with the reciprocal trade formula for handling our foreign trade does not lie in the concept of granting the executive the broad power to negotiate multilateral trade agreements or of Congress divesting itself of the power to write the details into our tariff schedules, but rather lies in the fact that our citizens feel that they have not had a fair opportunity to have their cases heard and considered * * * that faceless negotiators, loyal Americans and dedicated public servants though they may be, have through ignorance been hurting badly various domestic economic interests.

Furthermore, there was nothing more than the most general sort of testimony concerning the overall betterment of our foreign trade through GATT. The statements made were so general that one could only conclude that the witnesses felt the matter did not require proof. The only specific data presented to the Committee during public hearing on the economics of foreign trade whether it has increased or decreased, what the trends and causes were, was from Professor Glenn O. Saxon, of Yale. He argued from the data he presented that foreign trade had not increased as could have been anticipated in light of the increase in overall world gross national products. Certainly this committee should have more information than it has on the economic statistics of world trade. The data was supplied by the State Department on this subject for the record, but again this data, though interesting, pertinent and valuable, has not been subjected to examination or public scrutiny. It is a mystery to me why the witnesses for the executive department did not come prepared to testify at the public hearings with data rather than with general conclusions. The whole issue before the Congress and the people of our country in this area is what governmental action will help us best in increasing our foreign trade. It is important that we dig in and study this to see how well we really have been doing under our present approach and not just take it for granted that we are doing well.

GATT'S JURISDICTION IS GREATER THAN UNITED STATES PRESIDENT'S AUTHORITY OVER FOREIGN TRADE

There are many additional areas of confusion in this foreign-trade picture. The present Executive states through his Cabinet representatives that his sole authority to regulate foreign trade through the reciprocal trade formula and to enter into GATT comes from the Trade Agreements Act of 1934 as amended. It is important to review the testimony in previous hearings on the subject. This has not been a consistent position of the Executives. There have been claims to certain implied powers. The report of this committee, I understand, contends that the language in the Trade Agreements Act has implications which broaden the scope of the Executive authority. This committee did not discuss such a theory, and any such conclusion stated in the committee report is not yet the considered judgment of the committee. This matter should be clarified.

Be that as it may, the authority of the President to enter GATT stems from an amendment to the Tariff Act of 1930 which is called the Trade Agreements Act. Section 350 of that act states "whenever he (the President) finds as a fact that any existing duties or other import restrictions of the United States or any foreign country are unduly burdening or restricting the foreign trade of the United States he may act."

Article I of GATT states as follows:

"2. The contracting parties desire to contribute to these objectives through this Agreement by entering into reciprocal and mutually advantageous arrangements directed to the substantial reduction of tariffs and other barriers to trade and to the elimination of discriminatory treatment in international commerce."

It is quite clear, furthermore, from reading the preamble of GATT and the preamble of the Trade Agreements Act that the word "trade barriers" used in defining GATT's jurisdiction is an extremely broad term and encompasses considerably more than "duties or other import restrictions," even if the broad interpretation of these words claimed by the Executive and approved in the Committee Report is accepted. Health measures, currency exchange, quotas, etc. are just a few items included as "trade barriers" which would not be considered properly under the terms "duties and import restrictions" as they are used in an amendment to the Tariff Act of 1930.

The very fact that the United States obtained a waiver from the other countries to GATT in regard to our agricultural quotas set up in the Agriculture Act bring home the fact that GATT is considerably beyond the scope of authority delegated by the Congress to the Executive to enter into trade agreements.

A PRACTICAL REASON FOR ENACTING H. R. 5550

A practical point made in behalf of OTC is that foreign countries have utilized "trade barriers" other than "duties and import restrictions" extensively, some of which are

considerably more restrictive to modern trade than duties and conventional import restrictions. By creating OTC it is argued these other barriers to trade used by other countries but which they have agreed to eliminate by agreement, may be eliminated.

It is for this practical reason I have suggested that it is probably to the immediate advantage of the United States to enter provisionally into an organization that will make the trade agreements under GATT more enforceable. We have already made concessions along the lines of tariff reductions, but the reciprocity which we have anticipated has been long in coming. OTC would assist in the very immediate future in getting rid of some of these foreign trade barriers.

But in trying to gain this momentary advantage the Congress is certainly putting its stamp of approval on executive action in entering into a general agreement on trade which contemplates subject matters way beyond the subject matter Congress specified, in its delegation of power to the Eexecutive in the Trade Agreements Act. It could be said that the United States entry into GATT applied only to the subject matter contemplated in the Trade Agreements Act, but that it was perfectly proper for the United States to get concessions from the other countries of GATT on these other trade barriers. But then I would think we would have the question on the part of other countries of whether they have the same understanding of the limitation of the United States participation in GATT. Obviously they do not have the same understanding because some of the other countries in GATT raised the question on the United States agricultural quotas which was outside the United States Executive's delegated jurisdiction to deal with in the first place.

Should we continue in this uncertain state of either fooling our friends abroad or fooling our own people at home? Isn't it the better course of wisdom and valor to clear the matter up for all concerned? And as quickly as possible?

AMENDMENTS TO H. R. 5550 MADE BY THE COMMITTEE

The committee tried to correct some of the alleged dangerous possibilities in H. R. 5550 by amendment. First, language was inserted which attempts to limit the powers of the Executive in the area of foreign trade to those powers already delegated in the Trade Agreements Act. However, the idea of a previous Executive that certain implied powers exist in the Executive over the subject of foreign trade was left unexamined and untouched and, as stated, the Committee Report gives credence to an extended interpretation of the language in this act.

An amendment was adoted putting some responsibilities, authorities and qualifications on the head of the United States delegation to the OTC. Senate confirmation of this appointment is required. This is a big improvement.

An amendment to enlarge the voting power of the United States was discussed but not formalized and put to a vote. Information was given to the committee in executive session that the subject of voting power was discussed at the conference which gave birth to the OTC but that criteria such as population and amount of foreign trade were found to be more faulty than sovereignty as a basis for apportionment of vote. Why a compromise which reflected all these criteria could not have been developed remained unanswered. The writers of the United States Constitution when confronted with a very similar problem regarding the voting powers of the big and small States in the Federal Congress were able to successfully reflect a compromise between population and sovereignty. It seems little short of ridiculous that the concept of sovereignty should be so rigid that a nation of 165 million people and an annual gross national product of $400 billion should be classed in trade matters with nations of a million or less people and less than $100 million gross national product.

EFFECT OF CONGRESSIONAL DISAPPROVAL OF H. R. 5550

Finally, I come to the feature of this proposed legislation and the circumstances surrounding it which cause me the greatest concern. In discussing the course of action this Congress might take, I said in reference to a recommittal of this bill to the committee for further study: "Of course, the public has been conditioned already to look upon this as a defeat of OTC." So have the foreign nations in GATT been conditioned to look upon a recommittal of this bill, or anything but an almost blind passage of OTC by the Congress, as not only a defeat of OTC but a defeat of the entire conception of multilateral trade agreements. The executive witnesses as well as nongovernmental witnesses who testified for H. R. 5550 have resorted to this argument time and again during hearings and during executive sessions. It is a powerful argument. But I raise the question of who is responsible for this conditioning of the minds of our citizens and the minds of citizens and governmental leaders of foreign states on a matter which should be the subject of considerable objective study by the Congress?

Indeed, is the question of handling foreign trade and the implication of the establishment of OTC so simple and so cut and dried that no honest arguments can be presented other than those that openly and intentionally are designed to kill the technique of multilateral trade agreements? There are those who are convinced that the Reciprocal Trades Act and GATT have not benefitted the United States or world trade and who, therefore, seek to cut it down as much as possible and to even eliminate it, if that were possible. I do not agree with this position. I think that in spite of the poor case made for the GATT that it has accomplished an overall benefit for our country and foreign countries by contributing to an increase of foreign trade. However, I also think that it has accomplished much less than it could have accomplished if it were better organized and more clearly set up. Certainly I believe that it could have accomplished what it has accomplished without the accompanying damage it has done to certain segments of our domestic economy. I do not believe the OTC is the best way to remedy these basic structural defects in our procedures for negotiating multilateral trade agreements through GATT. The best way is to restudy and then rewrite the delegation of congressional authority to the President over foreign trade.

The failure of the representatives of the executive to present economic data to this committee on the status of our foreign trade and the effect the GATT has had upon it, if such effect can be determined at all from what economic data there is, is such as to negative their case that through GATT we are following the best course possible to increase world trade. It is true that the Congress has been badly at fault in not following yearly the progress of our foreign trade through the reports submitted to it by the Tariff Commission, but that surely does not excuse the executive department from not recapitulating in detail the data of these annual reports and presenting additional pertinent data at the formal public hearing where the general subject of foreign trade is up for review.

Furthermore, the failure of the executive witnesses to be prepared to discuss in detail the procedures established and followed in entering trade agreements under GATT and, indeed, their affirmative presentation of the preposterous idea that the Congress could intelligently approve the United States entering into OTC without studying GATT, further negatives their case.

The failure of the majority of the members of the committee to attend or follow the hearings on this matter, coupled with the poor presentation referred to, convince me of one basic thing. The conditioning of the public mind on this subject has been so well done that an objective study into the problem of foreign trade by the Congress was neither desired nor intended by the State Department personnel who are essentially responsible for this presentation. The theory seems to be the more ignorance there is the more certain the blind approval.

I am not convinced, as some persons are, that there is anything sinister in the attitude of the State Department bureaucracy who have taken charge of the regulation of foreign trade. (I have been impressed by the comprehensive data the State Department officials have presented to this committee for the record, when asked. However, I again point out that without this data being available to the public and made the subject of examination and questioning by our committee its value is greatly limited.) Rather, I am convinced that the attitude of the State Department personnel is one of basic loyalty to the overall welfare of our country, and I am further convinced that the individual persons occupying this particular drawer of the Federal Bureau are very able, hardworking and conscientious citizens. However, I do find an attitude of certainty that they know best what is in the welfare of the United States and that the Congress and the special economic interests that seek to influence and, on occasions, can influence the Congress, do not. Indeed, they feel that it is their duty to protect the overall welfare of the United States against what they regard as the shortsighted and selfish interests of all special economic groups.

This, of course, is benevolent dictatorship. Perhaps they do know best but I doubt it. I still feel that the collective wisdom existing in our citizenry is the best wisdom our society can obtain, not the wisdom of any small group, even though they be the wisest men in the society. It behooves us to follow procedures which best will enable this collective wisdom to be brought to bear upon the problems that face us. The institution of the Congress is no more than a set of procedures whereby the wisdom of our people may be gathered together and brought to bear upon the problems of our day. When Congress delegates its authority to the Executive, as it should, in various areas including the areas of foreign trade, it should do so in a fashion that this basic feature is preserved. This, in my opinion, is not the situation in respect to the regulation of our foreign trade today.

An Army doctor whose job it was to interview the Korean war prisoners in order to try to learn the techniques of Red Chinese brain washing made a significant statement in an interview which was published in the February 24, 1956, U. S. News & World Report:

"Question. Did the Communists feed prisoners propaganda?

"Answer. They certainly did.

"Question. What was the aim of this propaganda?

"Answer. To lower their opinions of America.

"Question. How?

"Answer. They began gently, capitalizing upon a sure-fire theme: the unpopularity of the Korean war. This was a subject dear to the heart of many a soldier."

The Constitution provides that only Congress may declare war, for the specific reasons that the writers of that great document felt, and rightly so, that any war in which our society is engaged must have the support of the people. One of my friends in the State Department said to me at the time of the Korean war—but if it had been referred to

the Congress, Congress might not have done the right thing and it was necessary for our national welfare under the circumstances to move into Korea at once.

Yes, similarly it is true if the GATT in all its ramifications were referred to the Congress it might not be approved, but I suggest following the course we are still following bears with it even greater dangers than any momentary setback. Personally, I believe that Congress would have approved the Korean war if the problems were forthrightly presented to it just as Congress would approve the GATT if it was presented forthrightly to it and there were proper procedures established for preserving the basic rights of our citizens in promoting their proper economic interests.

Propaganda Campaign Against High Hells Canyon Dam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDITH GREEN
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 11, 1956

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, many of us had hoped that the legislation to build High Hells Canyon Dam, shortly to come before the House, could be given sober, factual consideration and be debated solely in terms of the public interest involved. Unfortunately, lavish resources are being expended to obscure and distort the facts. This disservice to the public welfare appears to have as its purpose the promotion of the interests of a private utility corporation and as its means a campaign of thoroughly fallacious propaganda. The proponents of High Hells Canyon Dam are anxious to let the facts speak for themselves. They are confident of the verdict if it is based on fact. The opponents of High Hells Canyon Dam seem afraid to let this issue be settled on the facts. So outrageous has their misrepresentation become that the Portland Oregonian has felt it necessary to denounce this anti-High Hells Canyon propaganda.

I ask unanimous consent to insert at this point in the RECORD, the Oregonian's very effective indictment of this propaganda campaign:

[From the Portland Oregonian of July 5, 1956]

PHONY TAX ARGUMENT

We have no patience with the kind of attack on a proposed Federal dam in Hells Canyon of the Snake River being conducted by the Council of State Chambers of Commerce and injudiciously assisted by such local organizations as Oregon Tax Research.

The council has broadcast over the country a table showing an assumed cost of $508,300,000 for the Federal Hells Canyon project as allocated to each State on the basis of its respective share of the present Federal tax revenues. By this means is shown the tax cost of each State for Hells Canyon, ranging from $762,450 for Maryland to $75,990,850 for New York.

Oregon Tax Research not only circulates these figures but includes a reprint of an editorial in the Oklahoma City Times headed "Oklahoma, Can You Spare $5,000,000?"

This is a disservice to the Northwest and the Nation which can scarcely be explained by politics or tax conservation. Carried to its logical conclusion, this line of argument is that multiple-purpose projects have no benefits to the Nation as a whole; that there is no repayment of Federal investment in such projects; that natural resources must be developed solely by private investment.

Leaving aside the advisability of Federal or private construction of dams in the Snake, does Oregon Tax Research intend to say that the Federal Government should not have built Bonneville, Grand Coulee, Chief Joseph, McNary, The Dalles, Detroit, Lookout Point, and other great multipurpose projects which now are the backbone of the Northwest's economy? Does this agency dispute the Eisenhower administration's formula for repayment of 93 percent of the costs of McNary and similar dams from revenues of power sales? Does it assert that Oklahomans have no responsibility to contribute taxes to flood control in Oregon, and Oregonians no responsibility to help pay for flood control in Oklahoma?

In singling out Hells Canyon to raise the false issue of tax burdens by States, the Council of State Chambers of Commerce offers the same phony and emotional argument for use against other proposed Federal projects in the Northwest. These figures are not new. They were entered into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD last year. They can be used as an excuse for voting against a Federal dam at John Day, should the partnership bill not be approved.

Whatever agency wins in Hells Canyon, this line of attack is negative, defeatist and harmful to the Northwest's interests. It is also misleading, because it does not consider repayment from power revenues, and because it fails to recognize the national interest in power, flood control, navigation and irrigation.

Yes, Co-Ops Have Tax Problems, Too

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. NOAH M. MASON
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 11, 1956

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, throughout this session, there have been undercurrent rumblings of an attempt by certain cooperative lobbyists to induce the Congress to pass a law that would saddle our farmers with personal income tax on co-op patronage dividends which the courts have declared without market value. The cooperative press now admits this nefarious proposal.

You will recall, Mr. Speaker, that in 1951 Congress adopted legislation which purported to tax all earnings of farmer cooperatives either to the co-op corporation or to the farmers who received its patronage dividends. That tax was to apply not only to patronage dividends paid in cash, but also to those paid in stock or scrip or by what are called book allocations, meaning that the recipient is credited with money on the corporation's account books, though he may never in his life get it in cash dollars and cents.

The law was, of course, a complete and absolute phony. Under it, a co-op corporation could dodge all Federal income tax merely by going through the motions of allocating every penny of its earnings to farmer-members, while it kept the actual cash for whatever purposes its managers might devise. And if the poor farmer had to dig down into other earnings to pay tax on the dead horse he received that was strictly his worry.

Well, Mr. Speaker, a good many farmers did worry and some of them complained to the courts, and the courts ruled that the farmers certainly didn't have to pay income taxes on co-op patronage dividends that were received by them in the form of possibly worthless paper.

That threw the fat into the fire, and gave renewed substance to the demand I have made for many years—currently in H. R. 43—that cooperative corporations themselves should pay full Federal income tax on all their earnings before the distribution of those earnings in any form whatsoever.

So the co-op lobbyists got busy again, urging legislation which would make the farmer the goat. I must confess that I do not see how Congress can legislate value into something that the courts have ruled to be without value. Nor do I understand how the co-ops expect to hornswoggle their farmer-members into paying the income tax that the co-op corporations ought by rights to pay—especially when the farmers find out what is being done to them.

For the RECORD, here is the co-op proposal, as it appeared in the June 28 issue of the Cooperative Builder, of Superior, Wis., under this headline: "Yes, Co-ops Have Problems Too—Hear This: Co-ops Disown Tax Loophole Offered 'Em." The article was supplied by the Cooperative News Service:

YES, CO-OPS HAVE TAX PROBLEMS TOO—HEAR THIS: CO-OPS DISOWN TAX LOOPHOLE OFFERED 'EM

WASHINGTON.—Co-op refunds will be taxed the year the farmer gets them, regardless of what form they're in, under a proposal co-ops are asking Congress to consider.

Four nationwide co-op groups believe parts of the 1951 tax law need clarifying.

Jerry Voorhis, the Cooperative League's executive director, explained that co-ops supported the 1951 act, even though some of them paid more taxes, because it was "based on sound principles." It recognized, he said, that refunds to customers aren't income to the co-op; that co-op earnings (such as dividends it pays on stock and funds added to surplus) are income to the co-op and should be taxed as such; that co-op refunds (whether paid in cash, stock, debt certificates, or any other form) are income to the co-op patron if they affect his business.

CONFUSION

However, later court decisions confused this third principle, Voorhis said. Beginning with the Carpenter case, courts held that some noncash refunds did not represent income until they were redeemed in cash.

"By failing to prosecute this case very effectively or to appeal it to the Supreme Court, the Government developed a no-man's land," Voorhis said. "Under the law, co-ops weren't taxed on their refunds. Under the court decisions, co-op patrons couldn't be taxed on some noncash refunds."

WANT NO PART OF IT

The co-ops propose that the form of the refund make no difference. "We simply want to close up a tax loophole the courts handed us," Voorhis said.

The four groups working on this are the Cooperative League, National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, National Milk Pro-

ducers Federation, and National Federation of Grain Cooperatives.

More specifically, the four groups propose that co-ops' refunds represent income to farmers if made in the form of "capital stock, revolving fund certificates, retain certificates, certificates of indebtedness, letters of advice, or in some other manner that discloses in writing to the patron the amount of the patronage distribution or credit."

The co-op proposal rejects "fair market value" as a guide in determining the amount of a co-op refund. "The amount of a non-cash patronage allocation is the dollar amount specified therein."

Co-op refunds that don't affect a member's farming or business operation remain as they were. That is, refunds on consumer goods which don't affect a member's income—refunds on food, gasoline for the family car, household appliances, etc.—continue to be nontaxable.

The American Dollar

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM E. McVEY
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 11, 1956

Mr. McVEY. Mr. Speaker, one of the most disturbing elements in our domestic economy has been the course of the American dollar. The public has witnessed a decrease in the purchasing power of the dollar, amounting to almost one-half of it. There have been compensating factors to the workingman through increases in salary, but at the same time, life insurance policies of long standing have been cut in half of their former value. Savings deposits, bonds, pensions, and social-security payments have been depleted to a similar extent.

The administration which is now in power promised, before the election in 1952, a sound dollar. Let us see whether this promise has been fulfilled. In order not to become involved too extensively in statistics, decreases in the value of the dollar since 1939 are quoted for certain periods, rather than for month by month, down to the present time. A résumé of this situation is as follows:

(1935–39 consumer prices=100)

Date:	*Value of the dollar*
1939	101.4
1946	75.0
1950	58.8
1952	52.7
1953 (January)	52.0
1954 (January)	52.0
1955 (January)	52.0
1956 (January)	52.0

From the above table, it does seem that the promise of the administration with regard to a sound dollar has been kept. The period, beginning in January 1953, has been given because that marks the event when the Eisenhower administration took office, and there has been no downward drift of the dollar since that date. The figures quoted may be verified by the Library of Congress in Washington, D. C., the most impartial and authentic source of information to which we have access.

It is possible that the American people do not realize fully the meaning of this accomplishment because not everyone is aware of the fact that in France today approximately 350 francs can be purchased for an American dollar, as contrasted to the time when only 5 francs were available for the same amount of money. The development in France has been duplicated in most of the countries in Europe. In Italy, for example, 625 lira can be purchased for $1. We have seen an inflationary spiral destroy the currency of those countries one after another. There was a time, after the severe inflation in Germany, when a billion marks could be purchased for $1.50—notwithstanding the fact that at one time, only 4 of those marks represented the same value as the American dollar.

With the stabilization of the American dollar, there has been a stabilization of most of the elements in the American economy. There may be other accomplishments to which we may point with pride, but there is not one which means more to the great mass of the American people than the stability of the purchasing power of our currency.

The Devil To Pay at Hells Canyon

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD C. OSTERTAG
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 11, 1956

Mr. OSTERTAG. Mr. Speaker, the attempt to turn back the clock at Hells Canyon by substituting public power development for the private undertaking which has already been launched there adds up to the grossest kind of power politics. Private enterprise has been licensed by the Federal Power Commission to do the job there, and it is doing the job. It should be allowed to continue. There is no justification in reason or in commonsense why the cost of this project should be borne by the people of the country generally. Under private enterprise, the costs will be borne by those who profit from the development. Thus the area will benefit, labor will benefit, the localities will benefit, and our free-enterprise system will benefit. If the Federal Government steps in, however, none of these benefits will accrue, and the taxpayers generally will be the poorer.

Under leave to extend my remarks, Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD, excerpts from some recent correspondence I have received on this subject from constituents and others:

ROCHESTER, *July 5, 1956.*

DEAR MR. OSTERTAG: Having just finished reading a magazine article on the Government plans for power development at Hells Canyon in Idaho, I would like to register my protest at any further attempts by public-power interests to promote Government power development in the Northwest.

It is my belief that the Government has never come forward with accurate and reliable figures up to this time which would indicate that it is able to do a better job for the country as a whole than private interests have done up to now. When such figures are available, and with due allowances made for taxes, providing the Government can make it cheaper than private interests, I shall be in favor of public power, but not before that time.

Very truly yours,

JOHN I. NUGENT,
Vice President, Manufacturing Ritter Co., Inc., Rochester, N. Y.

EMPIRE STATE CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,
Albany, N. Y., June 29, 1956.

We think the Federal Power Commission should be sustained in its grant of a license to finance, build, and operate the facilities at Hells Canyon by a publicly owned, privately financed power company. We think the Senate- and House-approved Hells Canyon bills should be rejected.

Sincerely yours,

WILLIAM A. MILLS,
Executive Vice President.

JUNE 30, 1956.

Hon. HAROLD C. OSTERTAG,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Respectfully request that you vote against Hells Canyon bill. Plans of private taxpaying industry to meet needs of these areas should be encouraged. Taxpayers should not be saddled with $508 million dam cost.

GORDON W. MCCURDY,
McCurdy Co., Rochester, N. Y.

JULY 2, 1956.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: For the public good, please vote against Hells Canyon bills, which should be rejected for the reason same should be privately financed by a power company.

Sincerely,

F. X. MATT,
Chairman of the Board, West End Brewing Company of Utica, N. Y.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
July 2, 1956.

DEAR COLLEAGUE: I have just received petitions signed by 491 workmen employed on the construction of the Brownlee Dam in the Hells Canyon area on Snake River in my district. These men will lose their jobs if work on the dam is stopped. These petitioners requested me to get this information to Members of Congress.

In their own words they say:

"This construction project is now providing jobs for over 700 of us now, and employment is steadily increasing. Another 500 workers will obtain jobs here within a month, and the whole region benefits from this work.

"The Federal Power Commission made the decision for Brownlee, Oxbow, and Hells Canyon. We are at work here. Let's build, not destroy; and let's stop the legislative threats to our jobs."

With best wishes,

Sincerely,

SAM COON.

Maine 4–H Clubs Lead the Nation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLIFFORD G. McINTIRE
OF MAINE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 11, 1956

Mr. McINTIRE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the

RECORD, I insert an article which appeared in a recent issue of the Bangor Daily News, a newspaper of wide circulation in my congressional district.

Mr. Speaker, all of us are familiar with the splendid accomplishments of our 4–H Clubs in preparing our youth of today to take over the leadership in the agriculture of tomorrow.

The State of Maine has vigorously encouraged its young men and women to participate in 4–H Club work, and our State's youth—under the able and stimulating leadership of local leaders, county club agents, and Associate Director George E. Lord, and State Club Leader K. C. Lovejoy—has responded brilliantly, as is attested to by the following article:

MAINE 4–H CLUBS LEAD THE NATION

4–H Clubs led all others in the Nation in 1955 in the percent of members completing their projects.

Associate Director George E. Lord of the Maine Extension Service said today Maine has been the leading State in this feature of 4–H work for several years.

Last year, of the 5,567 young people enrolled in the 4–H Club work in the State, 95 percent completed their work.

New Power at Sea

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 11, 1956

Mr. WILSON of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the San Diego Union of July 1, 1956:

NEW POWER AT SEA: FROM MOBILE OFFENSIVE, EARLY DEFENSE

(By Rembert James, military editor, the Copley News Service and the San Diego Union)

A deadly family of new weapons, a force of air, surface and underwater craft so fast and maneuverable they would have been called impossible before World War II, plus a theory of strategy and tactic born of atomic explosives—these three things have combined to revolutionize the art of war at sea.

This is the conclusion any impartial observer must reach after inspection of the United States Navy in 1956.

The Navy's ultimate goal is an American fleet armed with nuclear-tipped missiles and powered entirely by atomic engines that can run for years without refueling.

This goal is 10 years—possibly 15 years—away. But the Navy already has revolutionized its traditional capacity to guard America's sea lanes.

With what it has now, the Navy is ready, willing and able to undertake the offensive—if need be—from mobile bases that could become America's most important line of action in any atomic war, large or small. And the latent power of an offensive, in the classic axiom of strategists, is the best weapon of defense.

From its aircraft carriers it can launch 1,700 combat planes, some of which are capable of reaching out more than 1,500 miles to deliver nuclear bomb loads equal in explosive force to more than 400 million tons of World War II TNT.

The greatest of these carriers is the U. S. S. *Forrestal*, soon to be joined by the new *Saratoga*, types of modern ships that have brought about the rebirth of naval airpower.

To go with such ships the Navy has a half dozen new airplanes that are credited by Navy men with extraordinary performance and usefulness. One is the Douglas A3D, a twin-jet bomber in the 600–700 miles-per-hour class, capable of carrying a hydrogen bomb to a target 1,500 miles from the carrier's deck. Three squadrons of these planes are now ready.

A second plane that the Navy is counting on heavily is Chance Vought's F8U Crusader, a supersonic fighter, which underwent tests aboard the *Forrestal* in April. Big production orders were placed for it after the tests.

Along with this airpower, the Navy has new and potentially vast capabilities in other directions.

The Navy already has 12 guided missile ships, including the world's first guided missile cruiser division. The cruiser division fires surface-to-air missiles to down enemy planes.

Six others of the 12 missile vessels fire surface-to-surface missiles that can destroy enemy surface ships or shore targets.

And designed to meet the challenge underseas is that symbol of the new atomic age—the nuclear submarine *Nautilis*, a vessel whose performance has been called fabulous by Navy Secretary Thomas. Her engines are still running smoothly after more than 30,000 miles, two-thirds of that distance submerged. They still do not need refueling, and probably will not for another 30,000 miles.

The Navy's primary job is to seize and keep control of the seas that cover 70 percent of the world's surface.

As Adm. Arleigh Burke, Chief of Naval Operations, and his admirals see it, the naval task force, built around airplane carriers, will operate dispersed over an ocean area two-thirds the size of Illinois.

Such a task force, with its far-ranging planes and missiles, could appear at any time off an enemy coast and rain down destruction. Then it would vanish to strike again the next day 600 miles away.

Advantages that the Navy believes are inherent in a naval force are:

1. Its mobility, permitting it to attack an enemy's heartland from a choice of many positions at sea—either with missiles or airplanes.

2. The same mobility, making it relatively immune from attack by an aimed, ballistic missile (an enemy would have to find the task force and attack it with planes, submarines or electronically guided missiles). The Navy believes it can shoot down enemy scout planes and intercept or outrun enemy submarines.

3. A naval force, operating at sea, shifts to the sea the impact of enemy attack—keeping the war away from heavily populated United States cities and those of its allies.

4. Operating at sea, an American naval force is immune from political complications—it cannot be thrown out of its foreign base because it keeps to the high seas and has no foreign base.

There is one other advantage that the Navy claims for its task force. This is that no enemy can afford to launch a surprise attack on the United States while a naval striking force is roaming the high seas—the retaliatory power of such a force is too great. The enemy must first find and attack the naval force, and the search effort to locate such a constantly moving force would give away the enemy's intentions.

Does the Navy have its wartime role worked out and approved by the highest Government officials in Washington, or is there a conflict with the Air Force over who does what?

The answer is that no question of such a nature ever is settled once and for all time. Too many changes are taking place, especially in guided and ballistic missiles.

This much is certain: the Navy no longer is in a defensive position as to roles and mission in relation to the Air Force and strategic bombing.

Potential targets have been divided up, with the great number of clearly strategic ones assigned to the Air Force, but with the Navy getting the job of hitting targets that involve control of the seas.

The Navy's strength has been given new recognition lately by President Eisenhower, who reminded Americans that "we have got a tremendous air power, a mobile air power, in the sea forces."

Defense Secretary Wilson said the same week that "everybody knows the Navy has a strategic striking power."

NAVY'S ROLE

The following text is excerpted from the nonclassified testimony last week of Navy Secretary Charles S. Thomas before a Senate subcommittee investigating United States airpower:

"There is, for the free world, no sound alternative to this collective undertaking (with allies). Isolation, long ago our refuge, today would only insure our encirclement by a hostile world. To carry out our collective security commitments, we must have access to our allies by the seas. We cannot fulfill our agreements without a strong modern Navy * * *

"For this our principal offensive weapon is the mobile airbase carrier task force. * * * We have recently developed and have on hand an antisubmarine weapon which will revolutionize antisubmarine warfare. * * *

"Freedom of action and variety of response are vital factors which the Navy alone provides. By maintaining flexible military machinery in our Armed Forces, by avoiding assumptions that an enemy will use any single strategy, we will not handcuff ourselves to bleak extremes of total destruction or helplessness. * * *

"In case of war, this (*Forrestal* class carrier) will be our principal naval weapon with which we control the seas and project our power from our own shores onto the enemy's territory. It represents a 10,000 foot concrete runway compressed into a 1,000 foot hull. This compressed runway moves rapidly on the 70 percent of the earth's surface (covered by water). We do not have to have agreements with other countries, pay rent, or ask anyone's permission to take these aircraft anywhere. They (100 modern aircraft) are on sovereign United States Territory wherever their moving base takes them. * * *

"With our newest planes now being introduced into the fleet, there will be few important targets in the world which, if called upon, the Navy could not reach with atomic weapons."

School Integration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ADAM C. POWELL, JR.

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 11, 1956

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

JULY 4, 1956.

Mr. DAVID LAWRENCE,
President and Editor, U. S. News & World Report, United States News Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I am a subscriber to U. S. News & World Report. I have read with great care

and concern the 53 pages of the current issue (July 6) devoted to integration in the public schools in Washington; an interview with Robert E. McLaughlin, president, District of Columbia Board of Commissioners; the excerpts taken from the book, The More Perfect Union, written by Dr. Robert M. MacIver, and published in 1948; and, finally, your long editorial entitled, "Conformity by Coercion?"

I think you deserve great credit for making your position and that of the publication you direct unmistakably clear. No one can read your editorial, speciously contrived though it is, without knowing that you, David Lawrence, do defend the right (?) of a segment of the dominant white majority in this Nation to degrade by coercion and any other means, legitimate or illegitimate, a minority of some 17 million Americans purely on the basis of their color.

You certainly cannot expect members of this minority group of Americans to accept your doctrine of the right of Americans to discriminate and to reject the ideals of the Declaration of Independence, the Bill of Rights, and the teachings of Jesus Christ. You have gone to great length and pains to set out your point of view, a point of view which rests on the assumption of inescapable superiority-inferiority relationships between color groups such as black and white. I wonder if you will admit that there is another point of view, that of the victims of discrimination, and that their point of view might have the same validity as your own. I wonder also whether you are willing to give a point of view which is a direct challenge of your own the same opportunity to be read by the same persons who read your editorial.

It is because I believe in your essential integrity (though disagreeing with your reasoning) that I write this reply to your editorial in the hope that you will see fit to enter this reasoning as part of the debate raised by differences in respect to segregation and integration.

You begin by emphasizing the necessity at this time of coming to grips with the issue of enforced integration in the Nation's schools. As an issue, you describe it as legal, moral, sociological, and political.

However, you ignore consideration of the issue from any of the foregoing aspects, and clothe it with a mantle of your own—conformity. To you the issue is simply conformity or nonconformity in organized society. This issue, you write, has for generations confronted mankind.

On your own, you then gratuitously transform the issue into a "perennial conflict" between theoretical equality and actual equality. This is an artificial prop, used later by you, to justify sin and crimes committed against the helpless minority by the white majority.

Does it not occur to you, Mr. Lawrence, that there is a necessity of coming to grips with the issue, not of enforced integration, but of enforced segregation.

You deplore the Supreme Court decision against public school segregation. You say that that decision makes law, but "disrespect for a law written by agents of the people in contradiction of the real will of the people leads to disobedience, disregard, or repeal."

All right. Granted. Did the millions of Negroes in the Deep South have anything to do with laws enacted to segregate them? Were not these segregation laws enacted to coerce Negroes into a conformity for debasement patterned by the dominant white majority? If Negroes were the dominant group, Mr. Lawrence, would you agree that they had the right to discriminate against whites and to segregate them in any manner which suited their fancy? You know better than that.

Always, there is begging reference by some persons to the 18th amendment and its failure. Because, in the opinion of many people and most voters, the 18th amendment did more harm than good, this experience is used to show what happens when a law is imposed that cuts across the realistic interests of the people. Rarely is the situation to which this prohibition experience applied analagous. There is certainly nothing analagous between the person right to get drunk, or to engage in harlotry, and the license, under law, to infringe upon, restrict or deny the rights of other citizens.

When you insist, Mr. Lawrence, that the majority group has the right to discriminate against me, where do you stop? You believe the majority group should have the right to discriminate in the schools. How about in the courts? How about at the polls? Do you believe I should have the right to vote, intrinsically, or at the pleasure of the majority? Which side of the street should I walk upon if the maority has a preference? Which jobs are for me and my children if the will of the majority, unfettered by law, unrestrained by conformity (?), is to determine a role and a place for me in American society?

You write: "We have, for example, said, in effect, that, because the people in the northern, eastern, and western parts of the United States constitute a numerical majority, their will must prevail over the people in Southern communities."

You don't like that—if true. All right. Would you have the will of the minority of Americans in eight Southern States prevail over that of the vast majority of the people in the other States? If so, Mr. Lawrence, what are you going to do about our position of leadership in the world of today? How are we going to operate vis-a-vis the Soviet Union?

If the kind of America you would have is to be one where white men have the right to treat a colored minority of 17 million as they please, what kind of future are you preparing for your grandchildren in a world that will be dominated by colored peoples?

Surely, Mr. Lawrence, you are not naive enough to believe that you belong to an inherently superior race, or that whites are inherently superior. Does it not occur to you that, during the last four or five hundred years, gunpowder, not brains, has made the difference between the majority colored world and the minority white world? And isn't one of the reasons you detest Russia the fact that Russia has betrayed her kind (white) and made arms (the big difference) available to those colored peoples who were not able to defend themselves?

The firearm is on both sides of the world today. It can no longer be used by one side (the white side) to impose inferiority on the other (the colored side).

If the 8 Southern States are allowed to enjoy their right (?) to discriminate today, if they will not conform to the realistic situation in the world today, then America as a whole must pay the penalty in the future for renouncing its ideals and relinquishing the stewardship of our Nation to a minority of Southern whites who were prepared to pull down the temple rather than forego their racial snobbery.

There is no good reason why there should be segregation in any public school district in the United States, but you are pleased to inject the bugaboo of possible intermarriage on a grand scale if the races began attending the same schools.

If that is true, Mr. Lawrence, what kind of an admission are you making? Are you saying that the bonds of attraction between young whites and young negroes are so strong and so irresistable that older whites have to set up artificial barriers (segregation) to keep these young whites and young negroes out of one another's arms? Or, are you saying that the young negro male possesses the power to hypnotize the young white female? As a consequence, here parents must send her to a school where she'll be protected from the allure of Negro swains. Would you be willing to admit that any of this is true? If not, what are you afraid of?

You have great facilities for research and investigation. Negroes and Whites have been going to mixed schools in Northern, Eastern, and Western States for decades. What evidence is there that this propinquity in the schools has led to intermarriage? There is none. Is there some difference about Southern whites or Southern negroes? Must one believe, as you suggest, and some southerners (tongue in cheek) proclaim that, once the barrier of segregation is removed, Southern white boys will want to marry negro girls rather than pursue relationships both clandestine and illegitimate?

You raise a question as to the validity of the 14th amendment. Would anyone have expected the rebel States to accept gleefully the provisions of this amendment? Sure, legislatures of the erstwhile rebel States ratified the 13th amendment abolishing slavery. But slavery was already gone. It was a dead institution. There was no way for the rebel States to reenslave the freedmen. An old way of life, obnoxious economically to Northern labor and industrial interests, had expired; and the plantation aristocracy knew there was no way to revive it.

But the 14th amendment was different. It had to do with behaviour. The rebel States said then that they did not want to behave as the amendment prescribed. They don't want to behave today—although they lost the war.

Your references to the philosophers, Santayana, Chesterton, de Tocqueville, and Hobbes, in support of the theory that a nation may have ideals like ours and still not be willing, through its members, to implement those ideals on an individual or personal basis, cause one to wonder whether you have ever read any of the philosophy of Jesus Christ. At no point do you quote Him. In your long, long rationale for segregation, you completely ignore the role of Christ's teachings in the everyday life of man.

When Christ exhorts to "do unto others as ye would have them do unto you," does that mean you would appreciate having Negroes do to you what southern whites now do to them if the tables were turned and the Negro became the dominant majority?

You quote Abraham Lincoln on "social equality." Your quotation comes from a campaign speech, a debate with Stephen Douglas in 1858. Was Lincoln expressing real convictions, or was he trying to win the debate, to win popular approval as against Douglas? Lincoln is very difficult out of the context of his times. The Smith Act today would send men to jail for expressing opinions much less violent and revolutionary than some expressed by Lincoln before he became President.

Jefferson, you write, warned against judicial tyranny. This is a caution against the present Supreme Court. Jefferson also warned against slavery. Did you forget that one?

It was Jefferson who wrote into the Declaration of Independence that all men are created equal. He said nothing about each man having the right to the same amount of money or property. That is a ridiculous extension of meaning on your part. The American ideal is for equality of opportunity. That is all. But there can be no equality of opportunity as long as one group (the strong) is granted the right (?) to discriminate against another group (the weak).

You conclude that "conformity by coercion is not liberalism. The answer is to be found in voluntarism." What is that, please? Where does voluntarism end and license begin? What is my voluntarism in relation

to your voluntarism? Your voluntarism gives you the right (?) to force me into a separate, inferior school—if you are strong enough. Does my voluntarism give me the right to reject the status your voluntarism provides for me?

The simple fact, Mr. Lawrence, is that, for better or for worse, you have made and are making your magazine and yourself an instrument to help perpetuate all that is worst in American life. In this sense, you are performing a disservice to the country.

America needs and can use all the gifts and strength and love and loyalty of all the different peoples which inhabit it. She needs unity and a common front as to the rest of the world. We need to marshal ourselves under the fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man. But, for you, there is no such fatherhood, no such brotherhood. There is a right to discriminate.

God forbid that the American people should widely accept your dictum. Then indeed would America begin her eventual decline.

Yours very truly,

P. L. PRATTIS,
Executive Editor, The Pittsburgh Courier.

Van Zandt Deserves Reelection

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD M. SIMPSON
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 11, 1956

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, it is gratifying to read of a well-deserved tribute being tendered a colleague in Congress because often there is a tendency to criticize and ridicule the legislative branch of Government and treat its Members in a contemptuous manner by magnifying our shortcomings while declining to acknowledge the serious attitude with which we perform our appointed tasks.

In the Pennsylvania delegation to Congress, we have a highly respected Representative in the person of JAMES E. VAN ZANDT of the 20th District of the Keystone State. JIMMIE, as he is affectionately known, is a human dynamo in the performance of his congressional duties as he represents his constituents with honor and fidelity. That he has succeeded in this respect is shown by the fact that he has served the people of Blair, Centre, and Clearfield Counties since 1939 with the execption of 3½ years which he spent as a naval officer in World War II.

The Clearfield Progress, published at Clearfield, Pa., and one of the most influential newspapers in central Pennsylvania, in the March 2, 1956, issue paid tribute to the sincerity and effectiveness of JIMMIE VAN ZANDT as a national legislator in an editorial titled "VAN ZANDT Deserves Reelection." So that JIMMIE'S many friends in Congress may read this fine tribute to an able and distinguished public servant, I am inserting the editorial in the RECORD as it echoes the sentiments of all those who know JIMMIE VAN ZANDT, admire his ability and many fine qualities and treasure his friendship.

The editorial follows:

VAN ZANDT DESERVES REELECTION

It has not been the general policy of the Progress of recent years to endorse political candidates. More than one election has taken place without the endorsement of this newspaper of even one candidate, let alone an entire party slate. That will continue to be our policy, even more so in the future than in past elections, for we are more and more convinced that endorsement of political candidates by this newspaper, for what it is worth, should be based on the caliber, ability, and record of the candidate, regardless of party affiliation rather than the mere fact that he represents one or the other of the major parties.

It is with this policy in mind that we offer our support and endorse to the fullest extent Congressman JAMES E. VAN ZANDT in his campaign for the Republican nomination in the April primary for another term and for reelection in the general election in November. We have nothing against Mr. VAN ZANDT'S opponent, John R. Stewart, but we feel Mr. VAN ZANDT'S present status in Congress and Washington is too valuable an asset to the district to give up.

We doubt if there are many congressional districts in the entire United States that have a Congressman of the ability and stature of JIMMY VAN ZANDT, or have a Congressman who works as hard for his district as he does. Certainly, there are no Members of the House of Representatives at Washington who have more knowledge of and serve better the needs and interests of their districts while at the same time serving their country on a national level.

Mr. VAN ZANDT'S record in Congress is well known to the voters of the Blair-Centre-Clearfield Counties district and needs no detailed listing at this time. His record in the Armed Forces, as a veteran, and as a citizen of our area also is well known and above criticism.

As a result of his years of service as this district's Congressman and his background as a Navy officer, Representative VAN ZANDT has earned a prominence that few Congressmen enjoy. He is a member of two of the most important committees of Congress—the House Armed Services Committee and the Joint House-Senate Committee on Atomic Energy. As such he brings distinction to the Blair-Centre-Clearfield Counties district that few congressional districts enjoy. With each term of office, he has gained in stature in Washington as a result of his ability and knowledge of the problems that face our Nation.

With all of his duties on the national and international level as a result of his important committee duties, Representative VAN ZANDT has never forgotten that his real job is to represent the folks back home to the best of his ability. He has worked tirelessly to improve the economic conditions in his district. Not all of his efforts have succeeded, but he has never once neglected the welfare of his constituents, and he has never stopped trying to improve the economic conditions of those who elected him to office. His policy of answering all letters from his constituents is noteworthy and his attendance record in congressional sessions matched by few.

He continues to be an important liaison between such important economic contributors to the area and the Government as Curtiss-Wright Corp. and the Pennsylvania State University. He has worked for the interests of the railroads and those employed, past and present, by the railroads; he has been equally diligent in the interests of the coal industry, small business and other industry of the area; a veteran himself, he has worked for the best interests of the veterans.

In every way, Representative VAN ZANDT has earned reelection to Congress in the general election next fall.

Burke Airport

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD J. THYE
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, July 11, 1956

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, there appeared in the Washington Post and Times Herald of Wednesday, July 11, 1956, an editorial headed "New Chance for Burke"—meaning, a new chance for the Burke Airport. In this session Congress should enact legislation authorizing and providing an appropriation for the airport; certainly before adjournment Congress should make some definite decision on the Burke Airport. It is a necessity.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the editorial printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEW CHANCE FOR BURKE

Evidently the concern sparked by the air tragedy over the Grand Canyon has pushed the administration into action on the Burke Airport. The $34 million appropriation request by President Eisenhower, though very welcome, is also very late. The question is whether it comes too late for Congress to act on it at this session. There are some who suggest that the request was deliberately delayed in the Department of Commerce. We prefer to think that the administration acted in good faith after finally becoming convinced that there is no realistic alternative to a second Washington airport. In any event we hope that Congress will face the facts more quickly than did the administration. Interim use of Baltimore's Friendship Airport for overflow traffic, as recommended by Secretary Weeks, will be a palliative but can in no sense be considered a permanent cure for the congestion here.

Construction of the Burke Airport has an indirect bearing on the broader question of preventing collisions through electronic methods of air traffic control. A committee under Maj Gen. Edward Curtis is studying this problem as a follow-up to the Harding survey for the Bureau of the Budget; we hope that the committee will come up soon with specific recommendations for tying in new facilities with the air-defense radar network and that it will suggest a formula under which users of the airways will bear part of the cost. The 24 "near misses" reported over Washington National Airport point up the problem here. Irrespective of the meaning of these reports, the early construction of a second Washington airport will be of real help in reducing present and potential hazards in this area.

Views differ on just how great these hazards are. The National Airport manages to handle an amazing amount of traffic in good weather, though no one can be sure just what is the saturation point. In bad weather, however, the facilities are severely taxed, and relief is imperative if the delays and cancellations are not to grow worse. The continued growth of air traffic, and the imminence of jet transport planes, make further clogging inevitable. Prudence and foresight call far Congress to end the 5 years of costly indecision, overrule the special-interest pleas of Maryland legislators who are trying to pawn off Friendship as a substitute, and start construction of the Burke Airport now.

The Robinson Clay Products Co., Akron, Ohio, Celebrates its 100th Anniversary Reflecting a Century of Progress in the Clay-Products Industry Based on Quality and Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 10, 1956

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to pay a well-deserved tribute to the Robinson Clay Products Co., with headquarters and general offices in Akron, Ohio, upon its 100th anniversary.

This enterprising and forward-looking firm operates one of its modern plants at Clearfield, Pa., which is located in my congressional district and which it acquired in 1920 from the Clearfield Sewer Pipe Co.

The Clearfield plant of the Robinson Clay Products Co., which is modern in every respect, plays an important part in the economy of the Clearfield area, providing employment for many families in that section of Clearfield County, where it is recognized as one of the basic industries.

In congratulating the Robinson Clay Products Co., its officers, and employees on a century of progress, I am joined in saying "Happy anniversary" by my colleague from Ohio, Representative WILLIAM H. AYRES, who represents the Akron district in the Congress of the United States.

Mr. Speaker, the Robinson Clay Products Co. is noted for its constant research and modern business methods which have enabled it to develop the latest technique in the manufacture of vitrified clay pipe and related products. As a result, it operates eight modern plants in Ohio and Pennsylvania, manufacturing quality products in the vitrified, refractories, and pottery, china, and glass divisions. In addition, branch offices are maintained in major cities in the eastern part of the United States and in Chicago, Ill.; Indianapolis, Ind.; and at Toronto, Ontario, Canada.

From a humble beginning in 1856 and fortified by undying faith in the future of America and its free enterprise system, the founders of the Robinson Clay Products Co. and their successors throughout its entire history have dedicated themselves with zeal and devotion to producing quality products and rendering unparalleled service to their customers. Such zealous devotion to quality and service has enabled the firm to make constant progress as evidenced by the fact that today it is recognized as occupying an enviable position for leadership and progress in the clay-products industry.

In recognition of the Robinson Clay Product Co.'s 100 years of progress, research, and development of new products, for its outstanding industry cooperation and contributions, for its progressive marketing and merchandising methods, for its continuing effort in bettering the American way of life—all of which have materially aided in elevating the clay industry to its high position in our American production economy—a distinguished-service citation was presented to the Robinson Clay Product Co. by the Brick and Clay Record, the Nation's oldest trade publication in the clay-products field.

In presenting the 100-year plaque to Mr. W. E. Robinson, president of the Robinson Clay Product Co., Mr. J. J. Svec, assistant publisher of the Brick and Clay Record, said:

> We are especially proud to be able to start this practice of presenting 100-year plaques with the Robinson Clay Product Co. because of its fine record in progress and development in the Robinson clay-product plants which has been made available generally to the industry. The belief that an industry can grow only as rapidly as its individual members is the basic premise upon which Robinson operates, and, therefore, all its improvements, both in product and plant, are readily made available to the remainder of the industry. This is an outstanding example of the American free-enterprise system.
>
> Another example of outstanding industry cooperation by the Robinson Clay Product Co. is in regard to the National Clay Pipe Manufacturers, Inc., a trade association representing the vitrified-clay sewer-pipe manufacturers of the United States. From its inception, this company has backed the efforts of the national group and has cooperated to the fullest extent.
>
> Although the Robinson Clay Product Co. does not stand alone in this type of cooperation and leadership, it is without doubt one of the foremost leaders in this field.
>
> The Robinson Clay Product Co.'s efforts along this line go beyond clay-pipe manufacturing and into the refractories industry and the whiteware industry as well. The Brick and Clay Record congratulates the Robinson Clay Products Co. on its 100th birthday and wishes this fine organization another century of successful operation.

The Robinson Clay Products Co. started with a one-kiln stoneware pottery. Tom Robinson, a skilled young potter, found a clay deposit in 1856 near Middlebury, Ohio. He formed the Summit Pottery Works, which was the beginning step in the formation of the Robinson Clay Product Co. and its present-day growth and expansion to eight separate plants. Backing and advice came from his father, William Robinson, Sr., his brother-in-law, Richard Whitmore, and an old friend of the family, Thomas Johnson.

The Summit Pottery Works at first turned out only stoneware, but production facilities and demanded increased so that, in 1863, the business moved to a larger building in Middlebury, which today is a part of Akron. Distribution was by the old Ohio Canal, when weather permitted, by railroads, by wagons, and by direct sale by peddlers. Through one of the many peddlers, the Robinsons learned of a large slip-clay deposit in Michigan, which is still producing.

Following the Civil War and the burgeoning days of the 1870's, progress of the Summit Pottery Co. was rapid. In 1873, Akron absorbed Middlebury and the Baltimore & Ohio Railway laid a new rail line almost directly through the pottery section of Middlebury. As a result of better facilities, the Robinsons progressed and profited proportionately.

It was about this time that sewage became recognized as a health menace and the public began realizing the necessity for sanitary sewer systems in urban areas.

Convinced that the construction of sanitary sewerage systems would establish a permanent market for clay pipe, the Robinsons built a plant for its manufacture in Akron in 1879. This addition was known as the Robinson Bros. Co. and was operated separately from the pottery works.

Motivated by the market boom, in 1887, Robinson Bros. and Richard Whitmore incorporated under the name of Whitmore-Robinsons & Co. Whitmore-Robinsons and Robinson Bros. were both expanding rapidly and, in 1891, Whitmore-Robinsons purchased the Wenz-Wagner Co., a fire-brick industry at Dover, Ohio, and changed its name to the Crown Fire Clay Co.

In 1899, the Royal Sewer Pipe & Fire Brick Co., of Midvale, Ohio, was acquired by the Robinson Bros. The Dover and Midvale plants are still owned and operated by the Robinson Clay Product Co. and are now designated as factories 5 and 6. The acquisition of these two plants marked the entry of the company into the refractories field.

A change of distribution methods in 1900 precipitated the merger of the Whitmore-Robinsons Co., the E. H. Merrill Co., and Markle & Inman Co. into the Robinson-Merrill Pottery Co., with branches and outlets all over the fast-growing eastern section of the United States.

In 1902 the company purchased the Canton & Melvern Fire Brick Paving Co., and this property was subsequently rebuilt for the manufacture of clay pipe. During these years of progress there had been additions to the principal personnel. Within the year following the formation of this partnership, William Robinson, Jr., joined the firm, and Thomas Johnson retired. In 1861 James B. Manton, who had married the senior Robinson's youngest daughter, was admitted to the firm.

In 1865 Henry Robinson, another son, joined the firm, and it was Henry who was to become the first president of the firm of Robinson Clay Product Co. when it was incorporated, in 1902.

In 1906 Henry died, and Byron W. Robinson took over the presidency until his death 2 years later. H. B. Manton, who joined the firm as a bookkeeper, was elected president and served in that capacity until his death in 1941.

William Eber Robinson, son of Henry, became the fourth president of the Robinson Clay Product Co., succeeding H. B. Manton in 1941. William Eber Robinson is president of the Robinson Clay Product Co. today.

Among the many glowing tributes tendered Robinson Clay Products on its 100th anniversary was the award of a scroll presented by the Akron (Ohio) Chamber of Commerce commemorating the occasion.

An additional highlight of the centennial year that elicited keen interest was the unveiling of a mural depicting the growth and progress of the company from a one-kiln pottery to its present leadership in the clay products industry.

In a lighter vein, among the avalanche of anniversary messages received by Robinson officials is an autographed photograph to President W. E. Robinson from Art Carney, CBS television star of Jackie Gleason's TV series The Honeymooners. Art, who has been nationally recognized as the "ambassador of clay pipe" is photographed in a characteristic pose in the manhole of a "cool" sewer. The famed "sewer worker" salutes President W. E. Robinson with the following autographed inscription: "To Eber: I've used your pipe for years. Best wishes. Art Carney."

The famous CBS television star by his anniversary greeting was in truth echoing the sentiments in real life of the thousands of satisfied customers of the Robinson Clay Products Co. who down through the years have found the name "Robinson" in the clay products industry synonymous with the firm's motto, "Quality and service," which has become its hallmark as one of the leading manufacturers of vitrified clay pipe and related products. This army of satisfied customers join Art Carney and all of us in a mighty anniversary chorus as we salute the Robinson Clay Products Co. and express our best wishes for continued success and achievement in the business and industrial life of our Nation.

Courageous Stand

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BOB WILSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 11, 1956

Mr. WILSON of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the San Diego Union of July 4, 1956:

COURAGEOUS STAND

Political opportunists were shown for what they are when Defense Secretary Wilson refused to be stampeded into expanding the Air Force more than he and President Eisenhower consider necessary. He told congressional critics that the extra billion dollars appropriated by Congress for the Air Force will be spent "when they are needed" and not for a stepup in B–52 bomber production.

Mr. Wilson's Democratic-led critics seek to put all the Nation's air eggs into the B–52 basket. And that in the face of Mr. Wilson's assertion that the United States soon will have an intercontinental ballistic missile which will make the B–52 obsolete.

That hardly sounds like a man who has been accused of placing a balanced budget ahead of the Nation's security requirements. It sounds like a Defense Secretary who wants full value for money spent. Unlike his critics, Mr. Wilson does not subscribe to spending money just because it's available.

Mr. Wilson's stated defense mission is to bolster the Nation's security without boastfully flexing America's muscles before the world. This he and Mr. Eisenhower are doing. While the extra billion dollars was for show, politically, and internationally, Mr. Wilson's policies are not. Sword rattling invites suspicion abroad. It has no place in Mr. Wilson's design.

Secretary Wilson has made it clear that thrift is not a vulgar word. As he said, "The security of the Nation comes first in military planning but the economic soundness of the country is part of that security."

Land Rackets Exposed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLIFTON (CLIFF) YOUNG
OF NEVADA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 11, 1956

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Speaker, it was recently brought to my attention that the Federal Bureau of Investigation is investigating certain land locators who are under suspicion of fraudulent activities connected with applications for the disposal of public lands in Nevada under the Desert Land Act.

One pertinent fact about this matter would seem to warrant nationwide attention. I am, therefore, taking this means of calling this newest brand of public land racketeering to the attention of my colleagues.

Although the promoters use the bait of Nevada lands, they offer it throughout the Nation and every State is thus involved.

It is my hope that in today detailing the procedure of the land locators in question it will serve to alert every State. I hope, also, that a better understanding of the operator's unethical practices will serve my colleagues in their efforts to alert their own constituents as to this menace.

The general method of operation followed by land locators engaged in fraudulent operations is something like the following.

The individual operators form a partnership or corporation. A firm name is selected which suggests that the firm is engaged in developing or operating farm lands.

The firm prepares a brochure giving the location and characteristics of the lands to be developed. The favorable characteristics are played up; the unfavorable characteristics are minimized or omitted. The fact that the land may be obtained from the United States at a price of $1.25 per acre is emphasized. Since the brochure is to be directed to city people who have ready cash, and who have had little or no experience with public land matters or with farming, the firm offers not only to prepare the application but also to develop the land as necessary for final proof.

Misstatements of facts, such as the regulations and procedures under the Desert Land Act, may appear in the brochure.

Large fees are specified. A going rate charged by land locators operating in the Pacific Southwest is $10 per acre—$3,200 for a 320-acre application—for preparing an application for a desert land entry, including the State water permit, irrigation plan, and other information to be submitted to the Land Office. The regulations of the Department of the Interior do not prohibit the preparation or delivery of an application by a third party, providing that the applicant personally inspects the land and signs the application.

Based on the brochure and other advertising and salesmanship, arrangements are entered into with various applicants, usually from urban areas outside the State.

When the applications are filed the Bureau of Land Management examines them for accuracy and completeness, and if they are in order, field investigation is made. In Nevada the State law provides that if a well is used for more than domestic purposes, a State permit is required. The State law does not require that the permit be obtained before the well is drilled. However, a usual practice is to obtain a permit before filing a desert-land application with the Bureau of Land Management.

Upon investigation it may be found by the Bureau that the climate, soils, or water supply, or all of them, may be inadequate for purposes of irrigated farming on a commercial scale as contemplated by the Desert Land Act, or that the lands are not more valuable or suitable for agriculture than for grazing. If the latter is the case, the lands are classified as improper for desert land entry, and the applications are rejected, subject to a right of appeal.

Where applications are rejected the land locator firm may offer to prepare an appeal for the applicant, or as an alternative, to prepare an amended application by which the application would be transferred to other lands which had not been classified by the Bureau. By this means the dissatisfaction of the client can be temporarily forestalled.

Land locators sometimes give a verbal guaranty that the moneys paid to them by their clients as their fees for services rendered will be refunded if the entry applied for is not allowed by the Bureau of Land Management. In other cases, a verbal or written agreement is entered into that all fees paid the land locator have been earned in full when the Land Office issues a receipt for filing fees paid with the application.

The first type of guaranty is of no greater value than the word of the locator firm, which usually is not worth much, because after a short period of exploitation the firm may completely disappear and be unavailable from which to obtain a refund.

The second type of guaranty is essentially valueless since the mere filing of an application and the payment of filing fees gives no necessary assurance whatever that the appication will be allowed.

The end result of an unethical land locator's operations all too often is that he suddenly disappears, leaving behind a trail of unpaid bills, fictitious checks, and clients who have been fleeced.

An insidious element in this type of operation is that the client somehow places his trust in the firm merely because of its indirect association with the disposal of public lands. Dissatisfied clients are apt to misplace the blame for the incident and direct it at the Bureau of Land Management.

Message Addressed to the Polish People in Poland by His Excellency August Zaleski, President of the Polish Republic-in-Exile

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. TIMOTHY P. SHEEHAN
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 11, 1956

Mr. SHEEHAN. Mr. Speaker, Dr. Julius Szygowski, Minister Plenipotentiary of the Polish Government-in-exile, has supplied me with copies of messages he has received from London which the Polish Government-in-exile and the President of the Polish Government have directed to the people of Poland following the recent demonstration in Poznan.

These statements illustrate the position of the legal Polish Government and are of interest not only to people of Polish ancestry but to all Americans who sympathize with the nations enslaved by the Communists.

The message, addressed to the Polish people in Poland by His Excellency August Zaleski, President of the Polish Republic-in-exile, is as follows:

MESSAGE ADDRESSED TO THE POLISH PEOPLE IN POLAND BY HIS EXCELLENCY AUGUST ZALESKI, PRESIDENT OF THE POLISH REPUBLIC (IN EXILE)

Citizens of the Polish Republic, I was horrified to learn of the numerous victims fallen to the criminal repressions used by the agents of Russian communism now in power in Poland against the heroic demonstrators protesting against the political and economic subjugation of Poland. I salute the memory of the Polish patriots who lost their lives and express my deepest sympathy to their families and all those who were wounded and who have suffered in any other way. Whilst fully aware of the fact that conditions in Poland are driving the population to despair and to active demonstrations against the Communist regime, I must warn you not to waste the vital strength of the nation by actions which in no way are commensurate with the sacrifices they imply. You must remember that not only is Poland herself under foreign occupation but surrounded by countries full of Soviet troops. In these circumstances all demonstrations and any kind of armed action can be suppressed by brute force with loss of life and national resources. I do not doubt that the time will come when liberation will be possible. At such a time the legal constitutional Polish authorities who are carefully watching the world situation from abroad will themselves appeal to the country for action. Until that moment save your strength and do not allow yourselves to be incited by people acting precipitately or by agents provocateurs in foreign and not in Polish interests.

AUGUST ZALESKI.

LONDON, *June 29, 1956.*

The message by the Polish Government-in-Exile is as follows:

POLISH GOVERNMENT IN EXILE, LONDON, ENGLAND

With regard to the riots which took place on June 28 in Poland, the Polish Government in exile wishes it to be known that they consider the statement of the Russian agents who are at present ruling Poland ascribing the cause of these riots to the activities of some imperialist agents and reactionary underground as utterly baseless.

It is an indisputable fact, that the economic situation in Poland under Communist rule is generally precarious and at the present time (before the new harvest is in) it is verging on a state of famine. This in our opinion is the direct result of the fact that Polish economy is run under orders from Moscow and largely in the interests of Russia with an utter disregard of the interests of Poland.

In these circumstances it is only natural that discontented and hungry workmen are apt to stage some demonstrations.

It seems that they have chosen Poznan for such a demonstration because of the International Fair which is being held there. They probably wanted to let the West know of their plight. From the reports of some of these visitors given to the British press it seems clear that at first the demonstration was of quiet character and the demonstrators cried "We want bread." It was the action of the authorities which changed this peaceful demonstration into a bloody riot.

It is to be feared that the Russian stooges governing at present in Poland will take this opportunity created by them to quell the so-called thaw, which, as is generally known, has taken greater dimensions in Poland than in any of the countries behind the Iron Curtain owing to the fact that Poland with her western civilization is always taking any opportunity to regain her freedom.

The House Should Be Ashamed of Itself

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLEVELAND M. BAILEY
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 11, 1956

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I wish to call the attention of my colleagues to an editorial in the Providence, R. I., Journal of July 8, under the caption "The House Should Be Ashamed of Itself."

The editorial makes some pointed comments that are timely and worthwhile. The editorial is as follows:

THE HOUSE SHOULD BE ASHAMED OF ITSELF

A Federal school construction bill died a-borning in the House this week in as shameful a debacle as has been seen in this entire session of Congress.

It died because President Eisenhower and his administration failed dismally to provide the leadership for compromise and the pressure for passage that might have saved the program.

It died because large segments of both parties wanted it to die for various reasons; it died because those who favored it were swept aside in a sea of bitterness and passion.

At the graveside now, both parties shed crocodile tears and brand each other as the killers, hoping for votes among the mourners when the November elections roll around.

There's no doubt many a Representative voted against the bill because of a firm belief that the Federal Government ought to keep out of education on the grounds that education is a local issue.

But the bill wasn't debated or killed on this issue.

It was killed because the issue of racial segregation in Southern States opened the gates to a welter of passion and to the conniving of small men who would make votes on that issue.

Republicans are telling Negro voters that the GOP favored an antisegregation rider but couldn't get Democrats to change the finance formula the GOP didn't like.

Northern Democrats urge their own support of the antisegregation rider and blame some southern Democrats and northern Republicans for defeat of the education proposal.

Southern Democrats are keeping quiet, but their elation must be great. And Representative ADAM CLAYTON POWELL, Negro Congressman from New York, who sponsored the rider, has proved nothing everyone didn't already know.

In the floor fight which came close to parliamentary chaos at one point, there was no attempt to compromise the finance formula, although such a compromise was not out of reach.

There also was no willingness on either side of the segregation line to seek under committee auspices a formula of understanding which might have been a real contribution to the racial problem.

So the bill is dead, and until November the Nation's voters will be under a crossfire of charges and countercharges which will profit none except—they hope—candidates for office.

Meanwhile, in hundreds of communities which are up against it financially, schoolchildren will continue to squeeze into overcrowded classrooms and trudge to split sessions.

Nice going, gentlemen of the House.

National Airport at Point of Saturation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PETER F. MACK, JR.
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 11, 1956

Mr. MACK of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I have long advocated additional airport facilities for the Washington area. This airport is second only to Midway in Chicago in aircraft movements and it is first in the density of aircraft in the traffic area. This high density is caused by the military bases which also use the airways and traffic control centers in entering and departing their traffic patterns.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to include a very interesting article which appeared in the Washington Evening Star yesterday by Charles J. Yarbrough. This article is as follows:

HARRIED NATIONAL AIRPORT CONTROLLERS STRUGGLE DAILY TO KEEP PLANES APART

(By Charles J. Yarbrough)

Harried air-traffic controllers got National Airport through another uneventful day yesterday.

It was a day when the sullen sky seemed to droop limply over the monument and sightseers could barely discern the Capitol dome from the observation deck.

It was a day when a Capital Constellation drank up some 80 gallons of fuel while sitting on a taxiway with 12 other aircraft waiting permission to take off.

It was instrument weather.

INSURANCE BUSINESS GAINS

Downstairs in the concourse and at the counters, air travelers were beginning to thicken again after a brief recession following the Grand Canyon air tragedy. Air insurance business was up. "People just don't

discuss that crash," one insurance merchant said.

Somewhere along the line a plane had created a 5-minute traffic delay and it wasn't hard for that 5 to build up to 15.

Nor did it help when an approaching plane had to circle the field because it was getting no indication that the nose wheel was down and locked. Controllers could see the wheel was down, but the pilot was getting no light on his indicator to prove it was locked.

The fire truck and the crash wagon rolled, but nothing else on the field moved until the emergency was over. The light came on as the nose wheel touched the runway.

Another half a hundred air travelers were safely down.

THREE HUNDRED AND EIGHTY THOUSAND PASSENGERS IN JUNE

It was almost another routine day for the traffic controllers, routine meaning busy.

During June, when National set another monotonous record, the controllers either brought down or sent away safely an estimated 380,000 passengers.

During the month National handled 24,822 aircraft movements, an all-time high. The daily record also fell on June 15, when the tower handled 939 movements—takeoffs and landings—in 24 hours.

There is no reason to believe that July won't set another record.

What, then, is saturation?

"ROOM FOR ONE MORE"

"The saturation point is hard to define," says chief controller Paul Moore, 47, of 4305 Nineteenth Place NE., who has been at National since it opened. "We thought years ago we'd reached it. But like the old saying, there always seems to be room for one more."

How then do they do it?

National, by comparison, has one of the best traffic control systems in the business. It is the only civil airport in the country equipped with both approach and departure radar control which is of such great help to controllers in their terrible responsibility of keeping airplanes separated.

They work an 8-hour day, sometimes longer on a day such as yesterday. They're on their feet almost 4 hours at a stretch, microphone in one hand, telephone in the other and plenty to do with a third if they had it. They take a break by doing another 4-hour stint in the darkened flight rule room peering at radar screens.

ONE HUNDRED AND SIXTY WORDS A MINUTE

They'd better not make a mistake.

They're talking at something like 160 words a minute to get them away from the ramps, on the taxiways, off the runways and to prescribed altitudes and still keep them at a minimum of 3 miles apart.

At the same time, they're bringing others into Washington's high-density zone at different altitudes, getting them into the pattern and bringing them down.

Here's a 90-second sample, taken from a tape recording made on the new-record day, June 15:

Controller: "AF 4648 clear for an immediate take-off on runway 33."

Pilot: "48 rolling."

Controller: "American 578 continue approach. There is a Commander rolling on runway 33. You will be No. 1 on runway 36."

Pilot: "American 578 about a quarter of a mile out."

Controller: "I have you in sight American 578. You are cleared to land on runway 36."

Pilot: "578 cleared to land."

Controller: "349, if you will move up I may be able to get you out. Hold clear of the runway."

Pilot: "American 349 will hold clear."

Pilot: "United 720 is pulling up over the approach lights. We are at about 1,600 feet. Over."

Controller: "United 720 start a left turn around and call base leg in the vicinity of the temple."

Pilot: "United 720."

Controller: "617 continue approach. The Convair will be cleared shortly."

Pilot: "Roger 617."

Pilot: "American 578 clear down runway 33."

Controller: "A left turn up the northwest runway 578 and change to ground control."

Controller: "AF 8617 is cleared to land runway 36."

Controller: "82 Alpha, if you are ready, take position runway 33 and hold."

SYSTEM INADEQUATE

For all the efficiency of its personnel and the good of its electronics National's system is inadequate simply because of the lack of air space.

The tower has handled as many as 68 operations in an hour—a pace impossible to maintain, says Mr. Moore. The June 15 record of 938 operations in 24 hours broke down to an average of 34.48 an hour.

All of which means that the traffic load is not spread. On a heavy day last January there were only two aircraft movements at National between 3 and 4 a. m. But between 8 and 9 a. m. the tower handled 62 and from then until 9 p. m. the controllers never had less than 43 an hour.

REMEDIES PROPOSED

Some answers:

Gear electronic aids up to the traffic volume. One expert points out that "we know now how to put signals into a cockpit to tell the pilot what to do without using voice communications. We have gadgets that will allow the pilot to report his position without voice.

"But until the operator, the pilot, the controller and the technical men can reach agreement on one system and build it, we won't have the answer. If the electronic people knew the day-to-day problems of the controller it could be done—and vice versa."

24-HOUR TRAFFIC

Another solution might be radical enough to take airline scheduling from the airlines to insist on a traffic spread over the 24 hours.

Another, and one currently stirring, is dual runways and dual instrument landing systems under which simultaneous takeoff and landing operations could be carried on.

"You gotta keep those airplanes apart," a controller said.

It was almost a plea.

The Mischief Worked by the Court

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. TIMOTHY P. SHEEHAN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 11, 1956

Mr. SHEEHAN. Mr. Speaker, the recent Supreme Court decision opening Government employment to subversives in nonsensitive positions calls for speedy action by the Congress in order to safeguard our national interest.

It is acknowledged that the purpose of the Communist followers is to bing on socialism, destroy freedom, and to liquidate our form of government.

I cannot conceive of any moral code or rule which requires a nation or government to be a party to its own destruction, and therefore cannot agree with the fallacious reasoning on which the Supreme Court based its decision.

The Chicago Tribune in its editorial of Tuesday, July 10, points out most forcefully the pressing need for immediate remedial legislation. The editorial is as follows:

THE MISCHIEF WORKED BY THE COURT

Congress has been urged by both Attorney General Brownell and Philip Young, Chairman of the Federal Civil Service Commission, to undo the Supreme Court's recent decision opening Government employment to subversives. Mr. Brownell and Mr. Young ask the prompt enactment of a bill introduced by Representative WALTER, of Pennsylvania.

On June 11 the Court rendered a decision removing at least three-quarters of all Federal workers from accountability under the loyalty-security program. It held, in ordering the reinstatement of Kenneth Cole, an employee of the Food and Drug Division, that a payroller could be removed only if he held a sensitive position in which his subversive sympathies might do active damage to the Nation.

The minority of the Court remarked that it is impossible to say what Federal job is sensitive: "The janitor might prove to be in as important a spot securitywise as the top employee in the building."

Mr. Young said that, since the Court's ruling, the Civil Service Commission had been compelled to restore 17 persons with clear records of subversion to Federal duty. He said that each month 21,000 persons enter Federal service, and that the effect of the decision will be to drop the security guards against most of them, the jobs for which they make application being classified as nonsensitive. Experience of the Commission has shown that some 2,400 applicants for Government jobs each year have backgrounds of subversive activity meriting thorough examination, but most of these people are now immune from any clearance.

The mischief caused by the Court in its ruling must be considerable, for Mr. Young in the past has never indicated any disposition to join what the liberals call "the witch hunters". But on this occasion he was moved to write a six-page letter to the responsible committee in Congress.

The Walter bill would simply retore the security program to the status it held before the Supreme Court intruded itself, as the minority opinion said, into Presidential policymaking. The case for this legislation is obvious and it should be promptly voted.

School Construction Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLEVELAND M. BAILEY

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 11, 1956

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I desire to call the attention of the Members to a recent radio broadcast by Mr. Edward P. Morgan of the American Broadcasting Co., in which he makes some pointed comments on the action taken by the House on the school construction legislation.

The broadcast was a severe indictment of the House membership for the petty prejudices they displayed in their efforts

to thwart the wishes of a vast majority of the American public who favor Federal grants-in-aid for schools. The broadcast follows:

The headlines say the House killed the school bill. I submit the school bill was never really alive. It was stillborn in a stifling atmosphere of smugness and niggling prejudice. Even if it seemed to respond, momentarily, to artificial respiration in the House it almost would surely have been strangled by the binding twine of filibuster in the Senate anyway.

How much longer is experience going to have to teach us before we learn what we keep telling ourselves—that education is gripped in a gathering crisis as one of the most urgent problems of this land. There has been study after study, report after report, on the crying need for more and better classrooms, for more and better teachers. Observers who move about the country say school aid is the one common issue everywhere. And yet what we get is a kind of curled-lip service from politicians, who couldn't be more extravagant with talk about how nothing is too good for American education and who couldn't be more parsimonious with action. What the House action showed yesterday in killing the Kelley bill was more than anything else a lack of conditioning of Members of Congress to present needs and a clinging, as New York Timesman James Reston put it, to "the habits of mind and political reactions of the past."

Federal aid to education was not defeated along partisan lines. Republicans are already trying to saddle the blame on the Democrats but they should not be permitted to get away with it. The administration's leadership was singularly uninspiring. More Republicans than Democrats voted against the bill. And fewer Republicans voted for the bill in final form than voted earlier for the Powell amendment, which stayed in. But the Democrats have nothing to be proud of in their own split. And they suffered from extremism in two directions—from the unrealistic insistence of New York's Representative POWELL on a nonsegregation rider to the stubborn opposition of southerners on almost all counts.

The principle of the Powell amendment, I think, is sound: States which defy Supreme Court decisions should sacrifice Federal aid. But the way the amendment was handled tended to veer the effort from the main target, which was more schools. Yet a look at proceedings in the House indicates the segregation issue was not the decisive one. It was a loathing on both sides of the aisle to accept the broader philosophy that if the school problem is to be solved the Federal Government must help. These prejudices must be recognized as sincere but where do they leave us?

Are we to continue to let the caliber of education suffer because we can't adjust to the demands of the situation? There is nothing divine about Federal aid but what have those against it to suggest in its place?

Even as the House was mangling the first major effort at Government assistance to schools yesterday, a Senate Subcommittee on Juvenile Delinquency issued a report pointing out that was only part of the problem. For 50 years, it said, teachers' earning power has been in sharp, steady decline and yet 205,000 new teachers are needed this year.

How are the Russians handling the education problem, by the way? The head of the Encyclopedia Britannica, ex-Senator William Benton recently went to the U. S. S. R. to find out. "By 1960," he reports, "in spite of acute labor shortages, all children are to be kept in school from 7 to 17. Every Russian youngster is to be given an education, a Communist education, of course, comparable to high standards of study and learning in an English public school or a French lycee but without the same emphasis on the humanities. The Soviet standard is far higher," says Benton, "than that of even the best American high school. It is perhaps comparable to a couple of years at a top college."

Is it possible that the Communists know their Thomas Jefferson better than we do? "If a nation expects to be ignorant and free," Jefferson once wrote, "it expects what never was and never will be."

American Taxpayers Cannot Support Foreign Countries Forever

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MORGAN M. MOULDER
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 11, 1956

Mr. MOULDER. Mr. Speaker, there was a time in the history of our country when the American patriots of the Original Thirteen Colonies rebelled against being taxed to maintain the military and economic power of a foreign country. The extent and amount of tax moneys then being collected to serve a foreign power is a petty sum in comparison to the colossal total sum of $141 billion that American taxpayers of the United States have paid to foreign governments since the beginning of World War II, and published estimates of the total amount that American taxpayers have contributed to foreign countries since the end of the last war range all the way from $55 billion to $67 billion, and I am reliably informed that more than $3 billion of this incredibly huge foreign giveaway was actually used to reduce the public debts of the receiving foreign nations when at the same time we were increasing our national debt. In other words, our Government borrowed money to pay the debts and operational expenses of foreign governments. The United States thereby increased its own national debt by $3 billion so that foreign governments could reduce their national debt by the same amount. This single $3 billion item is now costing the American taxpayers $90 million a year in interest charges. Just how much more ridiculous can we afford to be?

Why, if we accept the lowest published amount of our total postwar foreign aid, $55 billion, then on that basis the American taxpayers must in the future dig up more than $1,500,000,000 every year just for annual interest alone on the amount that foreign aid handouts have added to our Federal debt during the past 10 years. Back in the days before we quit minding our own business, $1,500,000,000 was enough to pay all the expenses for all Departments of the United States Government for full 2 years.

It is difficult to comprehend $55 billion, and my conception is not fully clarified by the calculation that if we received $1 for each minute that has elapsed since the birth of Christ, we would have slightly more than $1 billion. We can grasp a better understanding of the value of $55 billion by adding the assessed valuation of all the property, real and personal in the 13 biggest cities of this country: New York, Chicago, Philadelphia, Los Angeles, Detroit, Baltimore, Cleveland, St. Louis, Washington, San Francisco, Boston, Houston, and Pittsburgh, which amounts to a grand total of about $55 billion. We would be shocked by the suggestion that the industry and property of these 13 great cities, if it were physically possible, be shipped overseas and divided as gifts to foreign nations. Yet, our Federal Government has done precisely that in effect during the past 10 years.

Mr. Speaker, of one thing we can be sure: Respect never can be bought. The mere attempt to do so breeds disdain and irritation. What have we received in return for the handout of all of these foreign-aid billions? Has the handout program produced good will for the United States and strengthened the defenses of the free world against communism? Is there now any place on earth where affection and respect for the United States is greater and where the prestige of our Government is higher than it was 10 years ago? Where in the free world are those protective bastions against the spread of communism that our multibillion dollar giveaways were supposed to construct?

Right in the face of our continued worldwide generosity, the Kremlin Communists have quadrupled the population of their slave empire and extended the Iron Curtain to include more than a third of the earth. More than a half-billion dollars worth of our foreign aid went to India. Nevertheless, that country turned the visit of the Soviet dictators, Khrushchev and Bulganin into a triumphal tour. The most enthusiastic reception of those visiting Communist leaders was staged in an Indian town built with American money. The weapons we gave to France for her defense against communism are now being used by the French Government to suppress revolutions for national independence by the native Moslems in France's North African colonies. Because we paid all expenses incurred by France in her futile war to hold French Indochina, France will now ask us to provide additional billions for the suppression of the North Africans.

Meanwhile, France apologizes for the unpardonable act of a mob that wrecked the United States Consulate in Tunis last March 9. Ironically, France offers to pay for the property damages. If these violent foreign outbursts of love and affection for the United States become general throughout the world, still more foreign aid will probably be requested to enable the various governments to reimburse us for incidental destruction of American lives and property.

Mr. Speaker, just before the last general election in England our Government tossed a cool $200 million to Mr. Eden's government so that Mr. Eden could reduce British taxes and thus win the election. Naturally, there was no suggestion of American self-interest in this item of our giveaway program. The English people already love us $10½ billion worth, that being the amount of our postwar aid to Britain before Mr. Eden's tax-cut bonus. Our foreign-aid experts tell us that we must be carefully

considerate of the attitudes of these foreign governments; otherwise, these governments may refuse to take our money. Mr. Harold Stassen said as much to the Senate Permanent Investigating Subcommittee.

We have dangerously overextended ourselves. Our direct Federal debt of $280 billions is more than the public debt of all other nations put together. The softened attitude of the Eisenhower administration, beginning with the Geneva Conference a year ago, has cost us friendship and respect throughout the world. The Russian leaders after Geneva saw to it that Iron Curtain peoples understood they no longer had any hope of rescue by the United States.

Even if our giveaway policy could have been of value under any circumstances, it has been offset by the weak-kneed attitude of the administration toward Russia and China—countries that have tortured and killed our sons. Mr. Eisenhower has permitted General Twining, head of the Air Force, to accept an invitation to Moscow. Opinion is growing in foreign circles that after next fall's election Bulganin and Khrushchev will be invited to visit the United States, where it may be certain they will bring encouragement and joy to every Communist sympathizer. Moreover, it is now expected that the General Assembly of the U. N. will vote for the admission of Red China.

With the defeat of Hitler, Yugoslavia, under the dictatorship of Tito, became a full-fledged Communist satellite of the Kremlin. But just then, for some reason, Stalin refused to accept our offer of postwar Marshall plan money and commanded all of his satellite stooges to spurn the American giveaways. However, Tito, a born opportunist with a well-developed nose for the buttered side of his bread, took a self-serving second look at the American offer. He then staged a convenient public quarrel with the big Kremlin boss and immediately became a hero to the American State Department. Although he promised us nothing except a professed independence from Soviet Russia, we urged Tito to accept our economic and military aid with no questions asked, and no strings attached. He has received to date approximately $2 billion in consideraiton merely of our own tortured official conviction that, somehow or other, this self-confessed Communist bandit would be a defense bastion against Soviet aggression. Now Tito is back in triumph to the Kremlin, arm in arm with Khrushchev, marching in Tito's own words, "along the path of Marx, Engels, and Lenin."

Mr. Speaker, I want to know why the Eisenhower administration is giving our foreign-aid money to nations which are selling vital strategic war materials to Soviet Russia and to Red China. It has been revealed that, with the official but top-secret consent of the United States Government, our allies have been shipping 200 separate items of strategic machines and machine tools to Communist governments for the past 2 years. Of these items, the chairman of the Senate Permanent Investigating Subcommittee listed four types of mills and machines, some of which sell for a half a million dollars each. All of these are indispensably necessary to the manufacture of jet engines, guided missiles, aircraft, artillery weapons, and heavy ordnance.

By permitting the newest machine tools to be sent to the Soviet bloc, we allowed them to save from 3 to 5 years in engineering research and development. One prominent Member of Congress has said "that it would be better for the United States to permit shells, guns, or guided missiles to be disembargoed and sent direct from the United States to the Soviet Union, because these could be used against us only once. However, machine tools can and will be used to make armaments which may be used against us many times."

Mr. Stassen said that if he gave the list of these strategic materials to the United States Senate, he would be serving the enemy and maligning our allies. Please remember that, in many instances, the foreign factories in which these strategic materials are now made were built with American foreign-aid money. Our own American industries are prevented by law from shipping such materials directly to Communist countries.

On the other hand, we are giving the taxpayers' money to foreigners who use that money to produce the prohibited items and then proceed to sell them to our enemies at a profit. Nevertheless, at his press conference on March 7, President Eisenhower insisted that this procedure is desirable. He said that our allies now have an excess productive capacity; that they must continue to export to the Soviet Communists, unless we are to continue to give economic assistance to Western Europe indefinitely. But with or without this Communist trade, indefinite foreign aid is precisely what the President recommended to Congress last January 16. At that time, he urged that our current foreign-aid spending be doubled for what he called a long-term program for building and maintaining the economic strength of the free world. At that time, the President admitted that our foreign spending department had a backlog of seven billion unspent dollars, but this, he said, would be rapidly reduced. So it looks as if the Communists will continue to get their guided missile machines, and the bankruptcy of the United States to boot.

Mr. Speaker, the bill now pending before us for a vote today proposes to give away an additional $3,665,920,000 which amounts to more than the total assessed property valuation of the States of Nevada, Arizona, New Mexico, South Dakota, and Utah combined. During the past 10 years, our foreign-aid program has cost more than the totaled assessed property valuation of the States of New York and Pennsylvania combined.

Through various foreign aid programs the United States Government is giving away to foreign countries fine seed, tractors, combines and other farm machinery, and also providing and paying for construction of irrigation and flood control projects in foreign countries, as well as for hospitals and highways. Our Government has paid out and continues to expend hundreds of millions of dollars to advance increases in foreign agricultural production. Thus our Federal Government has increased foreign farm production as fast or more than Secretary Benson cut farm production acreage in the United States, and to the detriment of export of our own farm products.

No other nation in the world is giving its money or resources away to another country—not even their close neighbors. Neither have we ever received the benfit of such assistance from any foreign government. In fact the British have never offered to reimburse us for the hundreds of millions of dollars loaned to Great Britain during and following the First World War—nor any thought whatsoever of paying damages for burning our Capitol and the White House in 1812.

Each and every one of our 48 States and every congressional district in the States has cities and communities in need of additional educational facilities, school buildings, roads, highways, flood-control protection, hospitals and other public improvements. And every tax-paying American citizen needs and would like to have his or her taxes reduced.

The deficit of this one foreign-aid bill would save enough money to build many school buildings, roads, highways, and hospitals which are so badly needed at home.

The surest and most powerful protection we can provide against communism is to keep our own national economy strong and build our own military might so powerful that none will dare to challenge us.

Mr. Speaker, I have opposed this foreign aid giveaway program in the past and I will vote against this bill, H. R. 12130, which appropriates $3,675,920,000 of American taxpayers' dollars for giveaway to foreign countries.

Oil Imports Must Be Cut

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK IKARD

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 11, 1956

Mr. IKARD. Mr. Speaker, in the Sunday July 8 issue of the Sunday Wichita Falls Times was an excellent editorial entitled "Oil Imports Must Be Cut" and since this is a subject of vital importance to every person in the entire United States, I include this editorial in the RECORD:

OIL IMPORTS MUST BE CUT

Texas oil producers, beset with rising drilling and production costs and shortages of steel, continue to suffer from excessive oil imports that have grown to such proportions that they present a real threat to our national security should a major emergency develop any time in the future.

It is to be hoped that importing companies will heed the latest warning issued by Dr. Arthur S. Flemming, chairman of the President's Cabinet Committee on Fuel Resources, that they must drastically reduce

their import schedules for the third quarter of this year.

But we hold little hope that all companies will cooperate. Some have complied with Flemming's other past requests that imports be reduced but other companies have elected to increase, month after month, the amount of foreign oil they are bringing into this country.

Therefore, if such importers continue to ignore the pleas for a cutback in foreign oil shipments there is only one alternative. That is for Government action, under the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1955, to bring crude oil imports within the 1954 relationship recommended by the cabinet committee in February 1955 and recognized by Congress in amending the Trade Agreements Act.

We would like to remain as far away as possible from Federal Government controls over private business, but if importers continue to insist upon excessive foreign oil shipments their business ceases to be private business and becomes a matter of public welfare and interest since such imports will serve to cripple the domestic oil industry and prohibit the incentive needed for finding additional petroleum reserves here at home.

Compliance by the importers with Dr. Flemming's latest warning and request will at least be a partial step in the right direction, although imports would continue to be far in excess of the original formula arrived at by the President's Advisory Committee.

It is time for the national administration to quit dilly-dallying about the imports question and carry out the intent of the provisions of the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1955.

If immediate cutbacks are not made in imports of Middle East oil—and we do mean immediate—it is time for positive action. If the national administration cannot carry out the intent of Congress in enacting the legislation now on the books, then it is time for Congress to adopt more drastic legislation that will not permit any Federal official or advisory committee to ignore the situation.

The domestic oil industry needs protection against excessive foreign oil imports and every effort must be extended to provide that protection if our national security is not to be endangered.

Address by Rear Adm. Burton B. Biggs, Independence Day Celebration, Huntington, W. Va.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. M. G. BURNSIDE

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 11, 1956

Mr. BURNSIDE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks may I call to the attention of my colleagues a most excellent speech given at the Independence Day celebration in Huntington, W. Va., by Rear Adm. Burton B. Biggs, United States Navy. The speech follows:

Mayor Thuerer, distinguished guests, ladies, and gentlemen, it is an honor and a pleasure for me to take a small part in your celebration today. Since West Virginia is my home State, it is a particular personal pleasure to be in one of this State's most beautiful and progressive cities. This is true in spite of the fact that it took me quite a long time to get accustomed to cities. It so happens that I was born in the mountains of Fayette County, a matter of some 12 miles from the nearest railroad. The standing joke concerning my arrival on leave from the Naval Academy was that I would always be sure to get off at the proper station on the railroad. It was so easily identified by the conductor's announcement, "Hawks Nest, change to T. M. and W. (two mules and a wagon)." The mules and the wagon have disappeared but there is still no rail connection to that point. You may let your imagination run riot concerning the stories which my Naval Academy classmates conjured up concerning my native heath. They were not all from Texas but there were plenty of others who could tell a tall story. In spite of all these experts, I am sure that our friends from Ohio and Kentucky present here today will testify that they have been forced to become accustomed to certain peculiarities of West Virginians which put us in the tall-story class as well. I am forced to admit that our State is not as big as Texas but that we can give even them a run for their money in almost any other department.

In spite of the fact that the citizens of Huntington would have to form a sheriff's posse to find where I was born, I feel rather close to Huntington. Among your citizens is the son of the man who was responsible for my entering the Navy. It was Captain John E. Vawter who recommended to Congressman Adam B. Littlepage that he appoint me as a midshipman. I hasten to pay my grateful respects to their memory.

One hundred and eighty years ago today the Declaration of Independence was signed. That document set forth a number of basic principles upon which our country has been able to build this great Nation. Those principles are just as important today as they were when written. Our forefathers who took up arms to maintain and defend those principles did not require too much military training. Their equipment was of the simplest type and was with few exceptions in constant use in their pursuit of a livelihood. Today that is not the case. Our military weapons and equipment are extremely complicated and it requires much time and concentrated training to prepare our personnel to use these instruments. In order to do our part effectively, the Navy has set up a Reserve program under the Reserve Forces Act of 1955 which became law on August 9, 1955.

Our Reserve program provides for the enlistment of young men in the Naval Reserve for a period of 6 years. This enlistment contract also requires 2 of the 6 years years to be served on active duty with the fleet. Other provisions of the law provide for an 8-year enlistment with 6 months' active duty. Fleet units are at present large and complicated and the jobs our men perform are specialized elements of a large closely integrated unit. In view of these facts, we of the Navy feel that less than 2 years of active duty with the fleet is insufficient training for our ships' companies. Even 2 years is not excessive and at times in certain specialties it could be considered too short. In fairness to the Nation, to the Navy, and in particular to the young men whose training and safety is our responsibility, we feel bound to insure that these young men have sufficient training and experience to assume their full measure of responsibility in case they are called upon to defend our country in time of war.

In addition to the Navy qualification of our Reserve during these 2 years, we hope to return them to their communities as self-reliant members of the community. Naturally, we are interested particularly in having a considerable percentage of these young men decide to remain in the Navy and pursue their career with us. Whether they elect to remain in the Navy or to return to civilian pursuits, we wish them to be sure of their seasoned competence to perform in any assignment. We also expect that they will supplement their active duty training with training in our Reserve units such as the one you have here.

We have a total of 319 Naval Reserve training centers in commission. The one here in Huntington is 1 of 185 which serve for both sailors and marines. In some of the larger centers space is provided for the other military departments. There are in addition 28 Naval Reserve air stations devoted to training our naval pilots and technicians. These stations are in operation the year round. At present we maintain 72 schools for the training of our Reserve officers plus 25 extensions of these schools. We expect to have 20 more of these schools in operation by this fall. We must maintain and continuously modernize these educational plants in order to keep our Naval Reserve currently informed of the latest developments.

We are pleased that our Enlisted Reserve has grown by approximately 100,000 in slightly over a year. We expect this rate of growth to continue for several years. Regardless of the number of our personnel, we have one goal—quality. The level of training, the concentration of knowledge, and the continued improvement of their specialized knowledge shall continue to be the points of maximum emphasis. We, of the Regular Navy, must always remember that, for example, in World War II there were 20 reservists to every regular. Should there be any argument as to who won the war?

While the reserve of personnel for our Armed Forces is of great importance, there is another reserve that is of equal weight. If the industry back of an armed force is not trained and ready, that armed force is helpless. On the part of the Navy the Office of Naval Material is responsible for this essential item. I have heard accolades handed out to various cities but you should have heard a member of the Office of Naval Material telling me about the city of Huntington.

It appears that slightly less than 2 years ago this city had a problem of unemployment but your leaders did not call it by that name. The problem, as they stated it, read this way: "How can small-business men of Huntington, W. Va., cooperate to make the maximum use of their production resources to obtain more commercial and Government business?" The positive approach: not where can our people go to get a job but how do we go about creating jobs for them in our own city? This is now known as the Huntington approach.

Your "small industries committee" in its report gave the background: On December 11 and 12, 1954, our congressional Represenative, in cooperation with the Huntington Manufacturers Club and the chamber of commerce, arranged meetings of local manufacturers, labor organizations, and Government officials concerned with procurement. The Government officials attending, representing the Department of Navy, the Army, the Air Force, and the Small Business Administration expressed a positive interest in helping the small industries of the Huntington area obtain opportunities for bidding on defense contracts.

Fourteen manufacturers prepared brochures to help promote their products and many individual contacts were arranged with Government procurement officials who further indicated interest in helping Huntington develop a broader defense production program.

On June 21, 1955, an industrial workshop was arranged in Washington at the Navy Department by Huntington manufacturers. It was the first workshop held by a defense agency for small business firms. As a part of this effort, the manufacturers had personal conferences with representatives of the

various naval bureaus. Meetings were also arranged with Air Force procurement officials and Small Business Administration people concerned with organizing production pools. Following the Washington meeting, Huntington businessmen formed a committee to work on the problem of pooling their respective production capabilities in order to broaden their area of competition. Several avdisers were obtained from Government and industry to help outline a program of action during the week of July 18, 1955.

It is interesting to note that a total of approximately $3,729,782 in defense contracts has been awarded small firms in the Huntington area since January 1, 1955. This indicates that there are actual opportunities for Government procurement by small business firms in Huntington.

The Office of Naval Material in Washington has been keeping in close touch with your congressional representative and your industries' committee and the "Huntington approach" is continuing to pay off to the benefit of the Navy and of Huntington. In fact, it appears that what has gone before is only the beginning. Let us hope that the 14 to 1 odds on Huntington quoted in the brochure prepared by the members of your production pool will become 140 to 1.

It is this type of coordinated planning and execution that wins in any kind of endeavor. Numberless examples can be cited during the period of any war where but for the coordinated support of industry and the Armed Forces would have been ineffective. During World War II and the Korean conflict I was in a position to be very appreciative of this support. As has been mentioned, I was a fleet logistics officer during World War II and a service squadron and later force commander during the Korean unpleasantness. Many definitions have been proposed for logistics and logistics officers. The variety of names that are applied to a logistics officer knows no bounds. The most descriptive and one of the few usable in polite society is "vice president in charge of staff and things."

It is immediately apparent that a logistics officer has a keen appreciation of the fact that the stuff and things he is expected to have ready must be produced, packed and transported. If industry does not do a large proportion of this work, the logistics officer finds himself vice president in charge of Mother Hubbard's cupboard. To avoid this untoward condition we must have a widespread Huntington approach with the objective so aptly stated by your production pool members.

"In war or in peace these patriotic firms will cooperate fully to produce for United States defense."

During World War II the U. S. S. *West Virginia* was a concrete example of the way know-how and industrial might changes the course of wars. On December 8, 1941, the U. S. S. *West Virginia* was resting on the bottom of Pearl Harbor—sunk but her flag was still flying. This battleship was raised, repaired, and to some extent modernized. She met an enemy fleet in Surigao Strait in the Philippines and took a heavy toll of the ships trying to get to our landing beaches in the Leyte-Semar area. She continued to operate in various combat areas until the final day when the Japanese surrender took place in Tokyo. When this momentous event happened in Tokyo Bay, the *West Virginia* once more hoisted the flag that had flown over her battered hulk on December 8, 1941. Today this gallant ship is in the moth-ball fleet but the industry that put her back together has continued to improve and build bigger and faster ships armed with the latest type of weapons.

It is worthy of note that your production pool has pledged to produce in war or in peace for the defense of these United States. In my opinion the peacetime production is by far the more important of the two. It is only during times of peace when we can learn the techniques which save time, money and more important, lives in time of war. If we make serious mistakes in peace time, production usually costs us money but we do not necessarily lose a battle and many lives thereby. We had a lot of practice forced upon us prior to World War II actually breaking on our shores. We had that glorious gift of time. In these days of high speeds and long ranges of various types of equipment and weapons there is little doubt that the gift of time will be denied us. The answer is we must train our industry right along with our military forces.

Back in 1920 to 1922 the United States fleet developed what was called an approach formation. There was no radar to give you timely warning of the enemy's nearness so it was essential that the fleet be in a formation when in enemy areas which would lend itself to a rapid and accurate shift to battle formation. It is obvious to me that your congressional representative and your industry committees had the same idea and it fitted exactly into the type of procedure which the Office of Naval Material has been working on. Let us hope that we are not forced into battle formation. It is appropriate, however, that we continue to have our Huntington approach well organized and manned so that any would-be aggressor may observe and be warned.

Mutual Security Act of 1954

SPEECH
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 6, 1956

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H. R. 11356) to amend further the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended, and for other purposes.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, first I want to join the other members of my committee and of the House in paying tribute to our very able and distinguished chairman, the gentleman from South Carolina, DICK RICHARDS. He is not only a wonderful leader of the committee but he is as fine a gentleman as I have known. When our study mission in Asia last fall heard that he had announced his intention to retire from the Congress, we sent a cablegram urging him to reconsider. Unfortunately his mind could not be changed. It is our loss. We certainly wish him well in the years ahead.

Mr. Chairman, it is too bad that the many good programs in this bill about which there is little or no controversy are therefore given very little discussion, by us or attention by the public. The result is that a lot of people here and around the world, in their preoccupation with the things we argue about, do not realize a fraction of the real good that is being done by the programs being carried on without fanfare which really represent our country at its best.

It is hard in a democracy to put our best foot forward, because even if a bill finally goes through with all the funds that have been asked, the things that are said in debate sometimes hurt so badly they partially neutralize, if not more than offset, the good that our money and other forms of aid do.

But, since most of the money authorized in this bill goes for military assistance of one form or another under title I, and since most of the opposition this year seems to be to that portion of the bill, I, like the rest, have to give priority in these remarks to the military considerations.

Why has the executive requested funds for a military-assistance program, which is roughly three-fourths of the bill as it now stands? There is only one reason, and that is because the security of the whole free world, and that means the security of our Nation, are gravely threatened.

What is the threat? There is only one threat, and that is, of course, the avowed purpose and the unwavering will and the increasing capacity of the Communist world conspiracy to seize control of the whole world by one method or another.

Lest anyone have any misunderstanding on that point, Mr. Khrushchev recently reaffirmed it, stating that Communists would abandon their concepts and their program of world communization only "when shrimps learn to whistle."

Mr. Chairman, there can be no real peace or relaxation for us until the Communist movement fades or changes.

Our peace and freedom can be secure only when their purpose is changed or their will is weakened, or their capacity to conquer the world is reduced.

We cannot do much directly about changing their purpose or weakening their will; those must be done from within the movement or by pressures within the countries already conquered. But we can do something about reducing their capacity—their ability to impose their will on the free world. And the whole mutual defense assistance title of this bill, of course, has to do with that one task. It is to keep our enemies from ever getting to the point where they have the power to cow or to conquer the world.

There are two main means by which we can try to achieve that objective. One is to prevent the enemy from winning any more victories that will make him stronger. That is why we must resolutely oppose resumption of trade with Communist countries. That is why we must oppose the admission of Communist China into the United Nations. We must not do anything that will give the Communists more prestige, more power, more influence, because that would just build up the capacity to destroy us of an enemy that is openly dedicated to our destruction.

The other means is the positive effort to keep our own country strong and sound, and to help other free countries become strong and sound also, so that they can defend their independence and block any further gains by the Communist cancer anywhere.

In a sentence, our job is to prevent any increase in the strength of our enemy and to build up the strength and unity of ourselves and our allies.

Well, how well is the Kremlin doing? And how well are we doing in this worldwide struggle?

Let us look first at the overall picture with the individual countries and problems of which the various sections of the bill deal. It seems to me, looking at it in the large, the Kremlin is making three major shifts in the tactics by which it pursues its never-changing objective of world conquest and follows its ever-changing strategy of world revolution. Each of those three shifts, if successful, will increase our danger, not decrease it.

The first is a geographic shift. The Kremlin naturally tried to push to its west following the end of the war, because Western Europe is the most important prize, second only to ourselves. It tried to get Greece as a means of flanking Germany and picking off weakened, infiltrated, and divided Italy and France. We met the push with firm resistance in Greece.

The Kremlin then tested us with the Berlin blockade—which served also to divert our attention from its operations in China. The West responded with the Berlin airlift, refused to be intimidated, and the Kremlin backed off.

It then threatened all sorts of disasters if we did not abandon NATO. But we did not fold up. We do not give in to threats; it is when they smile and talk peace that we seem to lose our heads. We went steadily ahead to build and arm NATO. It did not lead to the threatened disaster. The Kremlin made no move against NATO.

Then the Communists everywhere warned that if we and Western Europe were to organize Western European Union and allow Germany to regain her full independence and to rearm, there would be dire consequences. To underline its threat, the Kremlin unilaterally abrogated the Soviet Union's pacts of friendship and nonaggression with Britain and France. But the Western World kept its nerve and stood firm. The Paris pacts were signed. Germany was given her independence and authority to rearm. Did it lead to war as predicted? No, indeed. Instead, the Kremlin proposed a chummy little conference to settle peacefully the problem of Austria.

It was clear that faced with strength in the West, the Soviet leaders were not going to start a war there. They promptly changed their approach and said, "Let us work out a stabilization of the European front. Let us have a security pact. Let us neutralize Germany."

Anything to free themselves from having to tie down most of their strength facing the West, because there was not very good fishing in Europe for the time being.

At the same time they were pushing to their east. They got control of Manchuria at Yalta and of North Korea just before V–J Day. They pushed ahead like a glacier over weakened and exhausted China. While we were bemused by the myth that we should not resist them in earnest because they were not really Communists, only democratic agrarian reformers, eager to improve the lot of the long-suffering Chinese, and to cooperate with us in building freedom and peace in Asia.

When they had overrun China, they moved into South Korea from which the blind and the faithless had persuaded us to withdraw our forces. Once more we responded as we generally do to brazen aggression, and turned them back. Once more they played their usual trick when faced with firmness. They said, "Let us have a truce." It was not, of course, because they wanted to end the struggle, but because they wanted to win at the conference table what they could not win on the field of battle. They wanted to shift from Korea, where they could not win, to Vietnam, where they had a better chance. They got North Vietnam.

The two objectives that they wanted next, naturally, were the great natural resources of southeast Asia and the industry of Japan. China's great usefulness is to furnish the base and the manpower with which to move to control of southeast Asia and of Japan. But there was one major obstacle standing in the way. That was the island of Formosa, with a good many strong airbases on it. Unless they can seize or persuade us to neutralize Formosa, so as to get its airfields and armies off their flank, they dare not go too far south or move against Japan. That is why they have to get Formosa, if they can. That is one reason why we cannot let them have it.

Just as they had with respect to our aid to Germany in Europe, they blustered that if any one gave military help to free China, it would greatly increase the danger of war; and that nobody could stop them from taking Formosa. Our President said in a press conference, "Well, they will first have to run over the 7th Fleet." Apparently they took a good look at the 7th Fleet and decided not to attempt to seize Formosa. Instead, they pulled the same old trick again—it seems always to work. They said, "Let us go down to Bandung and talk peace."

Confronted with strength and firmness on their west and strength and firmness on their east, they shifted their major efforts for the present, to their south. Here they face, in the Middle East and in south Asia, not strength and firmness, but awful weakness, division, and disunity. In the Middle East three explosions are taking place, all made to order for the Kremlin: First, Greece against Turkey and England over Cyprus. Anything that weakens Greece, anything that weakens Turkey, anything that weakens good relations between them, and between them and Britain can only hurt them and help the Kremlin.

Then there is the Arab-Israel explosion. It involves an area with more than half of the known reserves of oil in the world. It is the bridge across to Africa, that great, undeveloped by stirring giant of a continent about which the gentlewoman from Ohio [Mrs. BOLTON] spoke so illuminatingly and instructively this afternoon. And through it runs the Suez Canal, control of which would enable the Kremlin to cut East from West. Obviously, here is a prize, second only to Western Europe. Besides, mastery of it by the Kremlin would lead relatively easily to mastery of Europe.

Then there is the third explosion, the North African colonies against France.

One can hardly imagine a more ideal situation that the Middle East and North Africa for the Communists to exploit with their usual pattern of stirring up even more trouble and disorder. If the Kremlin can gain control in the Middle East now, it can come back to its eastern and its western fronts later.

In South Asia are other weak spots. Here is a vast area, from the Middle East clear over to New Guinea and the Philippines, which was controlled for centuries by European powers. While they differed among themselves, they still maintained, throughout the area, order of a fairly uniform pattern.

The European controls with their stabilizing influence are ended and the area, as someone has put it, has been Balkanized, just as Southeastern Europe was by the breakup of the Austro-Hungarian Empire after World War I.

Here are these newly independent countries with a fourth of the world's population—Pakistan, India, Ceylon, Burma, Vietnam, Malaya, and Indonesia—all striving to pull together their internal factions, develop national unity, establish sound political institutions, and build a sound economy.

Their first desire is to preserve their freedom from alien control; their second is to improve the lot of their people by industrialization, better agriculture, health, education, and so forth; the third is to develop democratic government. We wish them well in all three. In the meantime, they are weak, divided, and insecure. The cohesion of the area has been destroyed. They might be easy prey to Communist machinations and guile, bribes, and threats. Naturally the Reds, both in Moscow and in Peiping, want to fish in those troubled waters to their south.

And naturally most of the governments there want to be neutral in what seems to some of them to be only foolish quarrels between the United States and the Soviet Union, with both of whom they would like to be friends. Some of them are as blind to the Communist threat as many in America have been—and still are. What they need, as many of them see it, is just a chance, with friendly assistance from the outside, preferably from both sides, to try to get their own internal houses in order.

Obviously South Asia offers several ideal trouble spots for the Communists to exploit with their plausible prescriptions of quick cures for all ailments.

One of the special weaknesses in the area is the fact that several of the countries are so preoccupied with ancient feuds with their immediate neighbors that they fail to appreciate the over-all Communist peril. For example the Indians seem more disturbed about their dispute with Pakistan over Kashmir than they are about the Communist glacier moving down on them from the north.

A couple of weeks ago we heard here an eloquent and moving address by the President of Indonesia. His country already has 80 million people, the sixth largest population in the world. The 2,000 islands are spread over an area 3,000 miles long and 1,500 miles wide. They have vast undeveloped natural and human resources. You would think Indonesia's internal problems would be

enough to keep the country's leaders busy for some time. But many of them are more concerned with their dispute with the Dutch over a million or so Papuans in West New Guinea, whom they do not have—perhaps half of whom are still living in the trees—than they are about the 80 million people they do have.

In the whole area from Korea and Japan to Greece and Turkey, there are these local feuds which loom so large to the participants that the Communist danger is considered secondary, or even not fully realized.

This is true also of the Arab-Israeli dispute. What each side needs most of all in order best to serve its own people's needs, is peace and a settlement of the differences between them so that they can stand together against the common enemy of both.

Yet the bitterness and the hatreds and prejudices, and the suspicions and fears, and the sense on each side that it has been done a great historic injustice by the other—these keep them so preoccupied with the conflict between themselves that the Kremlin seems to have almost an open door, or even an invitation, to move in and destroy the independence of all.

I do not say this in criticism. It is a human reaction. It is like a patient who goes to a doctor with a painful boil. The doctor on examination finds the patient has also TB or a cancer. The doctor tends to forget all about the boil in his concern to tell the patient what he has to do to prevent this more serious affliction taking his life. But it is the boil that is causing the patient pain. His main interest is in relief from that and he will go to some other doctor who will take care of his immediate discomfort due to the boil rather than worry just now about the possible danger to his life from the cancer.

In contast to these weaknesses in Asia which the Kremlin can so successfully exploit to its advantage, there are some strong points in that area. This bill has a lot to do with preserving and further strengthening them. One is Korea, one is Taiwan, one is Pakistan, another is Turkey. In those four bastions, lying around the Communist bloc, are more than 2 million well-trained and equipped soldiers. It is possible for those countries to keep them in the field only because of the assistance provided in this bill.

Korea has the second largest standing army in the free world, Turkey the third, and Taiwan the fourth. In these major bastions, plus Japan, the Philippines, Thailand, and Iran, There are two and one-quarter million soldiers right on the job. They have splendid morale and the will to defend their countries, but they cannot do so unless they have assistance and support from the United States.

Occasionally somebody comes along and says that we are using other countries' men to fight our battles. That is categorically untrue. We are not trying to get other people to fight our battles for us. We are trying to give other peoples, in response to their request, the capacity to fight for themselves, to defend their own freedom. That does serve our interest, to be sure, just the same as our aid to Mr. Nehru, if it enables him to keep his country free and out of the control of the Communists, serves our interest in addition to serving his. But our objective is not to get other countries to provide cannon fodder for us, as our enemies charge; it is an effort to give these people the ability to retain their own independence—even their neutrality if they prefer that.

There is no reason why we should refuse to help a friend just because it also helps ourselves. In fact, I believe that whenever we do what is right for others, it will turn out to be beneficial to ourselves, too.

About one-third of the military assistance in the original executive request this year for $3 billion was scheduled to go to those four bastions I have mentioned. If we vote to cut down the assistance to those allies, I do not think, Mr. Chairman, we are going to be saving money. I am sure it will mean still greater expenditures.

For example, we had eight divisions in Korea. Now we have two divisions there. Why do we now have 2 instead 8 divisions? Only because we have built up and are supporting 21 South Korean divisions. It costs about 10 times as much money to keep an American soldier on duty for a year—disregarding the dislocations to his own life and income and family from his being in the service—as it costs to keep our Korean or free Chinese soldier in the field. If we cut funds for Korea so that it has to reduce drastically its armed forces, then we will certainly have to send more American units back into Korea. Does anyone want that? It will cost more money, not less, than we are authorizing in this bill.

I get letters, and so do you, saying, "Why send all this aid abroad? Why not use the money to build highways, hospitals, schools, and give better old-age assistance to needy Americans, or to reduce our taxes here at home?"

The argument is based on the belief that, if we do not spend this money for our defenses abroad, we will have that much more to spend on ourselves here at home. Unfortunately, it is a false belief. We will not have more to spend for things needed by civilians here; we will have to put all that money, and more, into expansion of our own Armed Forces. We will have less to spend for the well-being of our people, or for reducing the national debt or cutting our taxes.

This mutual-security program is about 10 percent of our total defense budget; that is all. If we reduce this 10 percent for those countries that lie around the only threat there is to our security, and those bastions are weakened, I do not hesitate to predict that it will cost us far more just to rebuild enough power of our own to approach the strength we now have through the existence and the combined strength of these allies.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JUDD. I would prefer to complete my statement.

Mr. GROSS. Is the gentleman going to have any time in which he can yield?

Mr. JUDD. I do not know. I am willing to stay here, no matter how late, to answer questions.

Mr. GROSS. So am I. For that reason, Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred and five Members are present, a quorum.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, the first shift that the Kremlin is making, lessening for the moment its pressure against Germany and Europe on its west, and against Korea, Formosa, Japan, and southeast Asia on its east, does not mean that the Communist threat to those areas is removed or even reduced. It means the Soviet Union is merely taking advantage of the situation whereby it accepts temporary stabilization of its eastern and western fronts where it is confronted with strength, in order to press to its south and into south Asia where it is confronted only with weakness and disunity. In my opinion, its present tactics make it more dangerous to us rather than less dangerous; and permit less relaxation of tension on our part, rather than more.

The second shift that the Kremlin is making in its world maneuvering is from power and threats to deception and tricks. It is doing exactly what a good football coach does when he has tested out his opponent's strength by a few power plays and finds he cannot break through the line. Stopped on the ground and unable to make gains through the line, the coach does not spend the rest of the afternoon calling the same power plays that do not work. No, he shifts to end runs and forward passes and trick plays. That is what the Communists are doing.

Our Secretary of State, Mr. Dulles, has said the Kremlin has been compelled to make these shifts because of the success of our policies. That is true. But, the fact that we have stopped its power plays on the ground does not mean that we can let down, assuming that we will be equally successful in stopping their trick plays and their open field offenses.

Furthermore, if we relax or open up too much in order to defend ourselves against their passes and their deception type of warfare, they can promptly shift back to power plays and come right through our line. They have not weakened their military power. That is, they are at least a double threat now, instead of a single threat.

They could not easily get through Turkey and the northern tier in the Middle East, so they threw a forward pass over it right into Egypt's arms.

They met firm resistance in southeast Asia, so they are seeking to throw a forward pass over southeast Asia to Indonesia.

Faced with firmness in Germany and Austria, they are seeking to throw passes to infiltrate France and Italy; or to flank western Europe, including Spain, by an end run through North Africa.

The fact that we have pretty good defensive plays to block their power plays does not mean there is any guaranty—unless we are extraordinarily smart, clever, and on top of the ball every min-

ute—that we will be equally skillful and successful in defeating this new tactic.'

Then there is a third shift that the Kremlin is carrying out, namely, a shift from vinegar to honey. Our mothers taught us we could catch more flies that way. Apparently the new leaders in the Kremlin are belatedly learning it, too—learning that Stalin's old policy of intransigence and threats was a mistake. It only stiffened our resolve. So they are making a drastic change in approach. They could not intimidate us with their tough tactics; we do not fold up under threats. So they are shifting from vinegar which only kept us awake and made the free world stronger and more united, to honey which regularly has lured the tired, or the gullible, or the peace dreamers into their traps.

What does this mean for us? It means that we have got to have better honey than they have—not necessarily more honey, but better honey.

Our program must be clearer, more attractive, and more convincing.

Mr. Chairman, when we are faced with a situation like the dangerous and frustrating one that confronts us in this year of 1956—every year the fundamentals are the same but the details this year are different—there are about three courses, it seems to me, that we could decide to follow.

First, we could say that since the mutual-security program has not succeeded as we wished—here we are with at least as great trouble as in previuos years—therefore, let us give up the program as a failure and stop all aid.

Second, we could say since we have not yet achieved that security and the unity in the free world which we hoped for—therefore we should double our aid—more of the same.

I do not think that either of those is the way or would give us any hope of improvement. The first would abandon the rest of the free world to the Reds; the second would only complicate the confusions and irritations that are developing. Either of them, in my opinion, would worsen our situation.

The third course is to improve our aid, to take a good look at it, and determine what parts are succeeding, are hitting the target; what portions are not succeeding, are not hitting the target; and then readjust the whole effort accordingly.

Because, Mr. Chairman, I am convinced and I think our study mission from the Committee on Foreign Affairs was convinced during its trip last fall through 25 countries and colonies from the Dardanelles to Japan and Korea, that the key thing in making the program more successful today is not the amount of our aid, but the manner in which it is given.

As the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WIGGLESWORTH], who accompanied us, used to say, it is not so much how much we give as how we give it.

What we must have is not necessarily a bigger program but a better one.

The first question almost everyone asked when we returned was: How much do you think we should appropriate for foreign aid this year? But that is not the essential or the most important question. It is not the size of the program, but the intelligence of it, the quality of it, that will determine its success or failure.

How can we make it a better program—one that gets down to the grassroots better than it has done heretofore? The answer to that question will not be found in recriminations or regretting the past or bemoaning those projects which were ill-conceived or badly managed and therefore quite properly failed.

Rather, the answer is to be found in hard-headedly restudying the whole enterprise. In the beginning we were pretty much venturing into a new field without blueprint or even compass. Now we have been at it for 8 years; we have available a great deal of data based on experience. We need to do a lot of homework on what that experience can teach us. We must make a long overdue reappraisal, not to assess blame for the past, but in order to win the future.

May I make about five main suggestions:

First, we must ask ouselves, what is our primary target. What are we trying to accomplish? I believe our primary target is, or should be, not just to make people fatter or healthier or stronger or richer or more productive; rather it is to win their hearts and minds, their confidence, both in the countries being helped and behind the Iron Curtain.

This is where the Communists generally have left us far behind. They have spent much less money; they have done far less to improve the economic condition of other peoples, but somehow they have been more skillful in their approach to those peoples.

We have done a better job with the tangibles; most countries we have helped are better off economically and stronger militarily. The Communists have done a better job with the intangibles; they have often given the impression of being more interested than we in the welfare of the people than in the power of their military establishments.

Surely the greatest paradox of our time is that we who believe and are constantly saying that our remarkable material achievements are the result of spiritual causes, have somehow got ourselves before the world as trusting primarily in material things—food, guns, and dollars. Whereas the Communists, who proclaim themselves materialists and deny even the existence of spiritual forces or values, have nevertheless managed to get themselves before much of the world as idealists, challenging men to forego material things, at least for the present, in order to work for things of the spirit—equality, comradeship, democracy, peace, relaxation of tension, and so forth.

Sometimes I wish our mutual security agencies had in them more men who had run for office. For the first task of the personnel of our International Cooperation Administration is the same as that of the office-seeker, namely, to win voters—to win the confidence, loyalty, support of people. Whatever other qualities he may or may not have, he succeeds only if he is able to win the confidence and support of a majority of the voters in his city or district. That is the job of those who work in ICA all around the world. The material improvements we bring are good in themselves, but their objective is also to win people's confidence so that they will want to stand together with us for freedom and security and prosperity for all.

Only as our programs win the hearts and minds, the confidence of people, and strengthen their will to defend their freedom, are we justified in spending all this money to increase their capacity to defend their freedom—their economic well-being and their military strength. To increase their capacity without winning their confidence is, in my judgment, an act of self-deception on our part.

Second, having determined our target—the winning of people's hearts and minds—we have to streamline the program to the essentials. Whatever hits that target, strengthen it, give it greater emphasis. Whatever fails to hit that target, or even worse, alienates people, drop it, or modify it.

In many countries we are doing too many things. And we are trying to do them too fast. We are like a teacher who would try to advance a pupil from the second grade to the twelfth grade in 2 years. We have to be a little more patient and not expect spectacular results overnight. We are dealing with people with long histories, strong traditions, deep suspicions. To crowd them too much is to defeat our own efforts.

We have to learn more about them; and be willing to learn from them. After all, they know quite a bit about their own country and have some ideas as to what to do about their problems. Our ignorance, and the resulting arrogance, lead us into a subtle form of imperialism, unrecognized because we know our purposes are benevolent.

There is also such a thing as an imperialism of efficiency. In our enthusiasm to help, we almost take them over. A man in Burma told us in 1953, "You Americans are so aggressively friendly." An efficient American arrives, looks around, and promptly starts in, "This is what you ought to do about your agriculture, your railroads, your schools, hospitals, and housing." Our very zeal produces an irritation that in some countries is approaching resentment. That is, we lose rather than win confidence. These peoples have fought up to 300 years to get freedom from one alien control, that of Europe; they react violently against what sometimes seems to them almost another alien control—this time by us. They want first of all their full independence, no matter how much they need our material aid, our technical skills.

In Vietnam, we found our representatives working hard and selflessly—at 89 different projects. When we suggested that might be spreading ourselves a little thin, one said, "But it's much better than it was. We did have 240."

Now, Vietnam is a country that has survived thus far only by a near miracle; it is hanging on by a thread. Some 10 or 15 main projects may well determine whether it pulls through or goes down. Why not simplify the program to those life-or-death essentials? If the

country makes it for 5 years, then we can go ahead with the frills, with more elaborate developments. The immediate need is the basic programs; too much beyond them only scatters our efforts, complicates our operations, and confuses the people of Vietnam.

Third, we have to have a long-range program. Why? Because we have a long-range problem. One does not solve a long-range problem with a short-range program. But a long-range program is not the same as long-range commitments or contracts for specific projects.

What did we do after Pearl Harbor? Did we say, "Let us declare war for 1 year; and then we will stop and debate for 2 months whether or not to fight Japan a second year"? No; we declared war to fight until we won. We committed ourselves to a long-range struggle.

But we did not commit ourselves to specific operations or strategies. We did not lose flexibility in the conduct of the war. We did not decide right then that we would put greatest emphasis for the whole war on landpower or on airpower or on naval strength. We retained control of the operation. But the world knew, both our allies and our enemies, that we had declared war to the finish. The world could count on us and so had confidence in us.

That is the interest of the amendment prepared by our chairman, the new statement of purpose and policy in the bill before us. It says to people who may be uncertain about us that as long as the threat to our common freedom exists, we are in it to win.

The program must have both continuity and flexibility—as the President's mutual-security message to us pointed out. The two are not in conflict. Continuity is necessary to keep flexibility on the track; flexibility to give success to continuity of effort.

The most important thing said in this whole cold war period, in my opinion, was said by General MacArthur in this chamber, "Once you get into a war, there is no substitute for victory." That requires long-range purposes and policies.

If we are going to identify ourselves with Korea, then Korea has to pull through.

If we are going to put ourselves on the side of Turkey, then Turkey has to make it.

If we are going to ally ourselves with West Germany, then West Germany has to win.

The world must see that it pays to be an ally of the United States; that we have not only the power, we have the will to stand by our friends; that they can count on us to the extent that they, in turn, are willing to do their utmost.

We have not made that clear to all countries yet. We have got to have a long-range program.

Fourth, we have to have better personnel.

They need to be better selected. It is not enough to be good technicians or engineers. They need to be broader gage. Their job is not just to build dams or dynamos or fertilizer plants; it is to win the respect and good will of people. The way some of our men, although highly competent technically, tend to throw their weight around, or deal with the local people with a patronizing, condescending attitude, is thoroughly insulting.

They also need to be better trained and prepared. You do not send out a military man to head a big operation with only a year or so of training. He has gone through West Point or Annapolis. The Communists do not send people into these countries with a few weeks' briefing. They have been trained for months, sometimes years, until they know their jobs. They are all-around professionals.

My dad used to say to me when I was in a big hurry to get something done, "You never lose by taking time to sharpen your tools. You will have more done at the end of the day."

We have been at this program now for 8 years, most of the time on a crash basis. We have not taken the time to sharpen our tools. We would do better and have more accomplished at the end of a year if we devoted more time and effort to training our personnel so that they know more about the people and the language and the history and the overall needs of the country to which they are going.

They need to stay longer. Most go for 2 years. Well, almost anyone is willing to sign up for 2 years to go halfway around the world and have the experience of a lifetime. But by the time he gets adjusted and on top of his job, it is time to go go home. Fortunately, more and more are signing up for a second tour when their usefulness will be much greater.

Mr. Chairman, I would suggest that in general we should not recruit for less than 3 years. Those who are not willing to stay 3 years would select themselves out. In most cases that would be a good thing. More can be done with half as many—if they are the right kind and better prepared.

And then they need to identify themselves more closely with the people. The President of a country that is one of our best friends said, "Your people work long and hard at desks in the capital cities, but our country is made up largely of farmers. They can't come in to see you during office hours; they are out in the fields. Besides they would be reluctant to come into your spick-and-span offices in their bare feet. Why don't you have office hours in the tearooms in the villages one evening or two a week? That is where the Communists are. You work with your papers and blueprints and programs; the Communists work with the people."

Our representatives also need to conduct themselves less ostentatiously than some of them do. Their success will depend not so much on how much they do for, as on how well the work with, the people among whom they are to live. To win the confidence of those people, we must identify ourselves with them.

Once we have determined more clearly our target, streamlined the program to its essentials, set ourselves to the long-range task, and secured better personnel, then, fifth, we need to decentralize much of the controls now held too tightly in Washington. Too often, operations get bogged down in redtape. In the proper concern to avoid mistakes or waste, almost everything has to come back to Washington for decision or approval. But that takes too long. The fiscal year is half over before the year's program gets started. More decisions need to be made in the field. If we have more first-class men there who are better trained and know their job, they can be given greater authority, and can make more decisions on the ground.

Mr. Chairman, in summary, about three main facts stand out as we evaluate the years of effort in scores of countires. One fact is that some of the projects unquestionably have failed. Some of our personnel have produced more antagonism than good will.

A second fact is that, despite the failures, most of the world is still free—and it would not have been free without this mutual-security program. Therefore, it has succeeded remarkably well in its overall objective.

The third fact is that the program has saved us money, net. Without it, we would have had to spend more, not less, because we would have had to expand greatly our own armed forces. If MSA were to be cut off, we would not have more money for schools, hospitals, highways, old age assistance, or tax or debt reduction here at home, as many assume; we would have less.

The question, therefore, is not whether to continue the program; but how. How can we improve it so that it will do a better job in the future than in the past?

This whole problem is not a test of our strength, as a nation, or of our resources; it is a test of our character.

It is a test of our maturity, our decisiveness, our steadfastness.

Our relations with some of the nations still on the fence, even with some of our closest allies, have not been going too well. It is a time of testing of them, yes, but equally of ourselves. We must make it clear to all that those who stand by us will never be let down.

One thing that tends to pull some toward the Communist side is the fact that the Communists do not hesitate to speak right up for those who lean in their direction—witness today in the Middle East and South Asia. For us to appear indecisive, unable to differentiate between our real friends and our enemies, will not lose us the friends and not win over the enemies.

Mr. Chairman, our difficulties are largely because we have not quite identified our basic problem. We have measured it too much in terms of supplying food, guns, and dollars. That we have done and can do. But men do not live by bread alone—or guns or dollars. We have not paid enough attention to the things of the spirit.

Men want to be apart; but they also want to be together. They want to be free; but they also want to belong, to be important, to be needed, to be appreciated. The Communists have understood that better than we have.

We have been able to succeed with the individual problems which we understood and set our hands to. Once we identify as our greater problem this task

of winning the confidence of men, their minds and hearts, and set ourselves to accomplish that, I have no slightest doubt that we can and will succeed with it too.

Program for American Prosperity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, July 11, 1956

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, the American people are determined to enjoy ever-greater prosperity. Naturally, my own deep interest is in assuring full employment and full purchasing power in the hands of all our citizens.

We of Wisconsin rightly feel that we should enjoy an ever-higher standard of living. And so, I seek more jobs, bigger pay envelopes, more income for all segments of Wisconsin. Prosperity, freedom, and peace—these are my goals for Wisconsin and for all America.

Along these lines, I send to the desk the text of an address which I delivered in Footville in my State, in Rock County, outlining several steps to assure strength for the American economy. I ask unanimous consent that the text of this address be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY, OF WISCONSIN, SAYS UNITED STATES MUST ACT TO SPUR PROSPERITY BY AN ALL-AMERICAN PROGRAM; URGES BROAD EFFORTS PARTICULARLY FOR VETERANS, FARMERS, OLD FOLKS

(Excerpts of address delivered by Hon. ALEXANDER WILEY, Republican, of Chippewa Falls, at Memorial Park Celebration, Footville, Wis., Rock County, on July 1, 1956)

I am delighted to join in this celebration with you.

Always, it is a pleasure to be among you, and to exchange views on our mutual problems.

The celebration today and on the Fourth of July—next week—are both joyous, and solemn, occasions. For it is, at these times, that we remember, with grateful hearts, others' sacrifices for ourselves and our country. And we rededicate our labors and our ideals to the protection of our freedom and of our hard-won progress.

My purpose in addressing you tonight is to share with you a few thoughts on how we may best serve our beloved America, serve our inspiring flag, how we may best protect ourselves from all enemies—both foreign and domestic.

A DESERVED TRIBUTE TO THE LEGION

It is appropriate that it is under the banner and emblem of the American Legion that we assemble tonight. For few organizations in our land have better served Old Glory than this greatest of all veterans' groups.

REMEMBERING GROUPS NEEDING OUR ATTENTION

It is of veterans that I basically speak tonight—the veterans of all our past conflicts, the gallant defenders of America to whom we owe so much.

But I speak as well of other groups in our land to whom I believe our Nation should turn its particular attention, as well—

Our farmers, for example, who have suffered extremely serious times.

Our old folks, caught, also, in the inflationary price squeeze.

AN ALL-AMERICAN PROGRAM

For these groups, for all groups, I recommend an all-American program tonight—a program in the public interest.

Here it is:

1. Highways: Start action as soon as possible under the Nation's vast new $37 billion road-improvement program.

This Federal-State project will pump new economic health into our own and other States—into our great tourist industry, our farm-to-market transportation. It will help reduce highway accidents, will cut traffic jams, will vitalize new communities.

2. Waterway: Speed construction of the channels on the upper St. Lawrence seaway—another mighty impetus to Wisconsin industry and agriculture.

BATTLE AGAINST ANTICONSERVATION FORCES

3. Conservation: Protect the Nation's outdoor heritage—our precious national resources—our forests, parks, lakes, and streams.

Speed up action under the newly approved anti-stream-pollution bill which will enable communities to cope with the serious sewerage problem.

Meanwhile, battle against greedy interests which attempt to exploit 100 percent public resources—belonging to all 167 million of us—for purely private gain.

PROTECT UNITED STATES FROM SUBVERSIVE FORCES

4. Preparedness: Assure all-out United States preparedness against the greatest single menace in the world today—aggressive, atheistic Communism

Strengthen our anti-Red laws here at home.

Continue fearless investigations of subversion.

Build up our arms program.

This means accelerated production of super-implements of war such as guided missiles, super-sonic jet planes, modern tanks, atomic guns, and ships, and the adaptation of other miracles of scientific technology.

5. Social security: On the civilian front, look better after the needs of our 14 million senior Americans, aged 65 years and older.

Pass the liberal House of Representatives version of Social Security improvement legislation.

It includes a fairer break for elderly women—aged 62 through 65 and beyond, yes, for working women, or retired women—single, married, and widowed.

6. Education: Protect our greatest assets—our young people.

Carry out the program of the White House Conference on Education so as to meet the problem of the Nation's overcrowded classrooms, swollen by our huge birth rate—4,100,000 babies alone last year.

HOUSE VERSION OF VETS' BILL CERTAINLY NOT GOOD ENOUGH

7. Veterans: Serve the heroes who served America. As I stated at the outset, stand by our gallant defenders.

What does this mean precisely?

It means having the United States Senate take up at the earliest possible date the whole issues of veterans' pensions and compensation, including survivors' benefits.

Let me say categorically, that I do not believe that the much-amended version of this pension bill, as approved by the House, last Wednesday, is anywhere good enough.

It definitely does not satisfy the current difficult needs—in these inflationary times—of our veterans with service-connected disabilities, and of veterans' widows and dependents.

These days, too many of our elderly veterans and their loved ones face extremely serious problems of eking out an existence.

Surely, this Nation—the richest Nation on earth—can afford to provide adequately for those who saved America on the blood-soaked battlefields of the Argonne Forest and Normandy and Iwo Jima and Taegu.

So, I say, let's really do justice by our veterans. Lets enact a comprehensive pension bill—not one full of omissions and flaws—but one worthy of the name of a greatful people, a grateful America.

Meanwhile, let's improve medical facilities for our veterans, let's extend the GI home loan program at least for another 3 years, and let's oppose the unsound Bradley Commission recommendations which would arbitrarily slash veterans' benefits.

OTHER ISSUES OF INTEREST

Now, friends, I have referred thus far to 7 fields of action of an All-American Program.

Time will only be available to cover just one additional area—our farm problem.

Of course, if time were to permit, I would be more than delighted to touch upon a great many other areas of our national economy which well merit our attention.

I am thinking, for example, of the problems of our Nation's law enforcement consider the combatting of the terrible problem of juvenile delinquency—a situation, involving 1,300,000 youngsters every year, getting enmeshed in trouble with the law.

I am thinking, too, of the problem of assuring integrity in American politics and American elections.

That means, for example, passing the honest elections bill. It has long been pending on the Senate Calendar, but it may be scuttled in the closing rush for adjournment.

I am thinking, too, of the Nation's health needs, or our housing needs or the needs of the Nation's airports (which are already jammed with planes and traffic).

And there are a great many other needs as well.

THE NEED FOR JUSTICE FOR FARMERS

No all-American program would be complete, however, without detailed reference to that great group of our fellow citizens which feeds this Nation; that great group which provides the backbone for our entire way of life.

I refer, of course, to the agricultural segment of our population.

I need not tell you in detail, my friends, that the rural areas have definitely been hard hit by serious economic problems.

I am not speaking simply of the farmer who has been caught in a terrible cost-price squeeze—costs going up, milk checks going down, or relatively stationary.

I am speaking, too, of the merchant in the town who has to sell to the farmer, and of everybody else who depends for his living on the farmer's purchasing power.

So, I say to you, my friends, that one of the great undone tasks in our country today is to assure a fairer break for the American who earns his living on the soil.

I say to you that it is unfair that prosperity should be booming for virtually every single other group in our population, while the farmer lags far behind in getting his fair share of the increased income.

I certainly don't want to see other groups' prosperity lowered in the farmer's behalf; and the farmer doesn't want that.

I simply want to see the farmer's own income raised. I want the farmer to get a fair break without, in any way, prejudicing the interests of America's consumers—our consumers of milk, butter, cheese, ice cream, nonfat dry milk solids.

After all, the farmer isn't even getting 50 percent of what the consumer is paying on the average for his bottle of milk.

I want the farmer to get a fair share of the consumer's dollar.

Simultaneously, I want the consumer to be able to afford to drink an ever-increasing

quantity of milk and to eat more delicious, nutritious cheese, for example.

I certainly don't want to see more farms forced out of business because of the inability of the farmer to get his cost of production, plus a reasonable profit.

MY EFFORT TO RAISE MILK PARITY SUPPORT

The farmer who sells manufacturing milk has faced particularly difficult times.

That is why I have been trying to raise minimum parity supports for manufacturing milk to at least $3.45 per hundredweight—a mere 20 cents may sound like a good deal to someone who is not too well familiar with farm problems. But that figure represents just around 8 cents per quart of milk, which is in turn only a third of what the consumer may be paying.

I haven't succeeded, as yet, with the Department of Agriculture in getting even this modest $3.45 level established, but I certainly intend to continue my efforts.

INCREASE DAIRY CONSUMPTION

As you all know, we have just marked the conclusion of another June Dairy Month. I hope that its conclusion will not mean that America will now forget the need to assure justice for the dairymen.

We need to observe Dairy Month—12 months a year. Every single month, we need the precious calcium of milk, as well as all the other body-enriching and body-building elements which "Nature's Most Perfect Food" provides.

Most important of all, every American must become acquainted with the fact that it is in his own interest voluntarily to increase his own consumption of dairy items.

The so-called milk surplus would disappear overnight if Americans would just drink a single glass of milk more per day.

And so, I pledge my continued efforts for the farmer, for a fair price for him. I pledge to work, too, for a modernized parity formula which reflects his real costs, and for other essential actions—like the prompt carrying out of the new soil bank program—in his behalf and in the public's behalf.

CONCLUSION

Thus, my friends, I have spelled out a few points in an overall program for our country. It is not designed, as I have said—within this limited time—to be anywhere near a complete program. But at least, it will serve as a good beginning, I think, to satisfy the needs of our expanding America.

This country faces unlimited horizons. It faces vast, exciting new frontiers.

There need be no limit on the growth of our country or on the progress of our country.

And so, under the leadership of right-thinking, right-acting persons, such as is so well provided by the American Legion in every community of our land we will go forward.

And as we come to celebrate Independence Day, 1956, we will inaugurate a whole new era, we trust, of peace and prosperity for our beloved land.

Secretary of Defense Charles E. Wilson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. THYE

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, July 11, 1956

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, there appeared in the Duluth Publicity of July 6, 1956, of which Mrs. Frieda J. Monger is the editor and publisher, a timely editorial entitled "Big Man in a Big Job."

I ask unanimous consent that it may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BIG MAN IN A BIG JOB

The whole country knows that since he first became Secretary of Defense, the able and greatly experienced Charles E. Wilson has steadily brought order and reduction of waste in his Department. Also with the practiced eye of one of the former greatest manufacturers of equipment, he is especially concerned with the rapidity of obsolescence of new airplane models when expanding the Air Force. He knows what he is doing.

Mr. Wilson is especially concerned with the growing serious threat to our national economy due to the confiscatory rate of crushing peacetime income taxes which if continued could hamstring our military effort in a future war.

Too many Washington politicians, smarting under the results of the necessary scrutiny and pressure which Mr. Wilson lays on spending, appear to lie in wait for a chance to leap on and twist the meaning of some word he may utter at a press conference, in order to make the going harder for him. Perhaps they hope to finally make him quit, although he is no quitter.

War is only one of the important avenues of maneuver in competition for world trade, the ultimate goal. Private enterprise of the United States holds its lease on prosperity only through its ability to undersell its competitors. It can successfully compete with foreign private enterprise, but not always with foreign government agencies or industries financed with United States taxpayers' money by the United States Government.

Instead of focusing attacks on Mr. Wilson, some of these Congressmen who rove Europe and Asia might better discover and report the change in Russian tactics to the beginning of a grand effort in economic warfare and competition with the West on the greatest scale the world has ever known. Soviet manners are changing but not the goal.

It appears that the Russians, who expected the West to sink into deep depression after the last war, having guessed wrong, have now shifted their major plans for future attack to economic competition. They now appear to have recognized that the West has built the Western World as we know it today by a system of government which gives freedom of action to the individual, thereby releasing individual energy, as compared to their totalitarian system which bottles it up. But they also hope to go the West one better with a still more efficient Asiatic system as they think, whereby they eliminate the equal opportunity for every man which is basic in Western political economy, and especially in the United States. They think this equal opportunity is our great weakness which they can exploit. Of course, they know very well that to give equal opportunity to all in a nation would soon develop a parliamentary system which would destroy the dictatorship which is necessary for communism to establish.

Thus we hear that in place of the equal opportunity for all, they conduct a search for brains—for the ablest men whom they promote to commanding positions in industry with higher salaries even than in the United States, and with various other inducements for achieving the lowest possible costs. These relatively few able, top men in industry can now pass on their houses and gardens and the accumulation of rubles in their bank accounts to their children with negligible death taxes. Income taxes in the highest bracket are generally reported to reach only 13 percent. There are already many very wealthy men in the management of Russian industry whose rubles, deposited in the banks, supply the Russian Government with an unlimited savings flow for their borrowing.

But for labor they plan to continue the present iron discipline backed by the Army, slave-labor camps where necessary, long hours, and the lowest bearable scale of living. This more efficient plan, as they believe, will within a few years make it possible for Russia and her satellite countries to undersell every nation in the world. They expect to industrialize some 900 million people in Europe and Asia. They are confident they can raise their steel production from the 50 million tons of 1955 to 75 million tons by 1960, and to 100 million tons later in the sixties. They already have the second largest machine-tool industry in the world which is rapidly growing.

For Western consumption they still talk about their Socialist state and a union of workers, etc., but in Russia there are no unions and not even socialism, which is totalitarian and next door to communism. They maintain the same old ruthless dictatorship to which the Russian masses have long been accustomed. Promotion of the international working class movement covers up the internal design to raise costs abroad with a temporary higher standard of living, so that the Russians can better compete later on. It is astonishing how the Communists continue to talk about their Socialist revolution—merely a term for western Socialist world consumption—when socialism is not even planned, but instead the iron rule of a cruel dictatorship using terror, threat, and force.

To slow us up in the West, and especially in the United States, they promote all brands of socialism over here which will raise our costs and lower the rate of production. They want labor in the West to take it easy. Through their agents over here they hope to help along inflation in the United States and to scare us into every possible Government expenditure, as for instance the building of the Egyptian dam at a cost of over a billion dollars, for which the Egyptians would give the credit to Russia for being so smart as to get the dam for them without cost to Russia or Egypt, rather than give any credit to the United States which would put up the money. They well know that only when the United States Government expenditures have been cut down will moderate curbs become really powerful in restraining the wage-price spiral.

Thus Russia appears to be quietly turning to thorough preparation for a vast, long-range economic war, while boldly drawing world attention to their aeroplane developments to deceive the West, knowing that both their own and the Western World aeroplane equipment must constantly continue to become more obsolete.

Reflections on Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STYLES BRIDGES

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, July 11, 1956

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask the unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from the July 5 issue of the Hampton Union, Hampton, N. H., one of New England's leading weekly newspapers

which is edited and published by a young and aggressive journalist, Edward Seavey. I think the editorial, which comments on my speech in the Senate on "The moral issues of American foreign policy" and Mr. Seavey's reflections on Independence Day, is one deserving of the attention of all Americans. For this reason I ask that it be placed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REFLECTIONS ON INDEPENDENCE DAY

We wonder how many, if any, of the thousands of holiday-minded vacationists on their way to the seashore or lake yesterday took a few moments out to reflect upon the true significance of the Fourth of July.

For it is much more than a summer holiday—being the day set aside to commemorate the adoption of the Declaration of Independence on that day in 1776.

In case you have forgotten your school days and memory lessons, the preamble to the Constitution contains this phrase: "We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal that they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness."

There are many today who are justly concerned about the loss of these hard-won freedoms as a direct result of the gigantic give-away program known as foreign aid.

With almost life or death urgency placed on our program of largesse to ungrateful nations by one-worlders, it is refreshing to hear some plain talk on our so-called foreign policy and especially from our own United States Senator STYLES BRIDGES, who has proven in the past that he understands the real threat of communism to this Nation and to the rest of the world's free people.

In a hard hitting speech on the floor of the United States Senate last Wednesday, BRIDGES spoke on The Moral Crisis in American Foreign Policy, which should provide us all with some food for thought as we reflect upon the meaning of Independence Day.

Senator BRIDGES warned his colleagues, "How we conduct our foreign policy, and whether we successfully handle the issues confronting us, will determine not only the fate of Americans now living, but the fate of generations to come—and perhaps the fate of our world. It is because of these awesome pending decisions that I ask for searching examination of our foreign policy—what it is and what it should be to best serve our people.

"I think we might well spend a few moments reviewing the fundamentals and thereby clear the air. Let us see whether we can determine the essentials for a foreign policy that would truly and effectively advance our national interests.

"So much has been written—so much has been said—and the confusion becomes so great, that we have lost sight of the simple obvious fact. That fact is that the purpose of our foreign policy is to promote and protect the true interests of our people. No one will deny this simple statement of purpose, and yet we go off into such incredible confusions.

"The real interests of our people: what are they? The ideals of the Republic: what are they?

"Our real interests are the preservation of our freedoms—our way of life. As individuals we want to realize ourselves morally, spiritually, economically—to live in decency and to raise our families in the best traditions of our free society. As Americans we want to be citizens of a Republic which provides a government under a constitution which guarantees those rights.

"Because of war and circumstance, the United States has become the leader of the free world. The power of example is of overwhelmingly critical importance. To the extent that we are determined to maintain our own freedom, our friends and allies will be disposed to follow our example.

"As Americans we want to remain free to live according to our democratic traditions—to work, to hold property, to raise our families, to live in our town, city, State, and Nation free from the danger of attack and foreign conquest.

"By foreign conquest I don't merely mean military conquest. I also mean intellectual and spiritual conquest. The time has passed when only men's bodies are conquered. We now live in a world where the dictators are as much interested in the conquest of men's souls and minds as that of their bodies and their land.

"Real security, which once defined in only military terms as being freedom from the danger of armed invasion, has a wider meaning now. Security now means not only physical defense against our enemies. Security now also means defense against spiritual and intellectual demoralization.

"I am concerned with our moral and spiritual security as I am with our military security. We are nearly all cognizant of our military security. Needless to say, our military security presents serious problems—but most of us are alert to these problems. Once aware and alerted, I have great confidence in American technological skill, American economic know-how, and American resourcefulness. These talents are a great asset in building a military defense.

"It is with the moral and spiritual side of our problem that I am greatly concerned. I don't say Americans are morally weak. I do say we are morally confused. Nowhere is this moral confusion worse than among our so-called liberal intellectuals. This confusion tends to paralyze the mind and will. The more extended the paralysis, the greater is the Communist victory.

"There are moral questions on which we cannot be neutral. The recognition of physical torture as a deliberate instrument of government, the employment of secret police, the use of summary trials and executions behind closed doors, the dragooning of forced labor—these and other practices of tyrannical despotisms have been abhorrent to our people.

"We can exercise self-restraint, I hope, in our international relations. We can respect the rights of other nations. We can understand the yearning of colonial peoples for their freedom because we ourselves were a colonial people once upon a time. We can refrain from meddling with the traditions and religion and customs of others. We certainly don't want to say 'Do it our way, or else.'

"But, by the same token, we cannot tolerate the systematic effort of Moscow to impose communism upon nations and peoples who do not want it. That is what the Kremlin has been doing for decades. Here a murderous coup d'etat as in Czechoslovakia. There a wrecking job done by infiltration as in Indochina. To suppose that the piecemeal absorption of other countries by the Communists is of no direct concern to us is insane.

"Those self-styled liberals who defend the 'right' of the Russians or Czechs, the Chinese or North Vietnamese, to go Communist are talking nonsense. They might just as logically defend the right of inmates of concentration camps to be slaves. The captive peoples did not 'go' Communist—they were driven into the Kremlin's prison of nations, hermetically sealed against escape.

"Let us never forget, also, that the Red Empire is not limited to the countries already behind its iron and bamboo curtains. Every Communist Party in what remains of the free world, every false-front organization operating under Moscow discipline, every guerrilla warfare contingent under Communist direction, is an integral part of the Red Empire. We are not dealing with a group of conventional nations but with a world-wide conspiracy dedicated to making this one world—one Communist world.

"The necessity of international political life makes it necessary for Foreign Offices, including our State Department, to treat Soviet Russia as if it were 'just another country,' but we know it is nothing of the sort. In reality, Soviet Russia, its satellites, and its allies are the core of an apparatus of power and coercion which penetrates in varying degrees, every nation on every continent of this earth.

"So why the new optimism? Why the disastrous letdown of our vigilance?

"If only our optimists today could be induced to do their homework in Communist history. They would realize that in the middle thirties, under cover of Stalin's pretense of live-and-let-live united fronts, the Soviets forged the weapons of subversion and infiltration which they exploited to the full when the line was changed.

"They would recall how generally it was then accepted that communism had matured, that it had ceased to be interested in world revolution, that Stalin the realist was concerned only with improving conditions in his own country. Those who tried to warn the world that communism had not changed its nature but was temporarily employing cunning instead of brute force, were denounced as Red baiters and alarmists.

"Yet, today we are neck deep in the same confusions and illusions, as if the 1930's had never been. In order to soothe our nerves and our conscience, we are fed with fairy tales about new looks in the Communist world and the magic of collective leadership.

"I am tired of this kind of talk, and I am especially tired of being told that I am an alarmist. I am no Johnny-come-lately in watching the Communists pitch curves at the so-called liberals.

"Now, we have the new look in Russia. What is the reason for it? We can only speculate.

"My own guess is that the reason is double. The first part of the reason is that their domestic political situation forced a new piece of window dressing. The rest of the reason is that those in charge of the Communist machine, never giving up their goal of world dominion for an instant, now believe that an exhibition of sweetness and light will soften up the West.

"The present Communist rulers cannot wash the blood from their own hands. Their helpless subjects have as yet no alternative but to pretend to accept the alibis.

"If ever there was a moment when the revulsion of mankind should have found forthright expression, it is now. The most extreme of the charges against the Soviet regime—those which our muddled pro-Sovieteers once denounced as inventions and slanders—have now been confirmed by the culprits themselves.

"But we see no such revulsion. It is as if free men had lost their capacity for telling good and evil apart—their capacity for indignation at the spectale of millionfold crimes—even the crimes of which they themselves were the victims.

"In the conduct of our foreign affairs, I am driven to conclude we have lost the compass of moral principle. More and more we operate in gray areas. Somewhere between good and evil. The excuse between good and evil. The excuse, of course, is 'political realism.' But history is our guaranty that such realism is a snare and a delusion.

"It was a false expediency which produced Munich and Yalta and the chain of appease-

ments on which our Soviet enemy has been nourished to his present dimenstions.

"What have we got in exchange for the billion dollars we gave to Tito? We fed him, bolstered him when Stalin tried to crush him, we supplied and equipped his army. And what do we get for our pains?

"We get a Tito honeymoon staged in Moscow. We get a statement from Marshal Zhukov to Tito that in war the Kremlin and Tito will fight 'shoulder to shoulder.' We get an official statement that Tito and the Kremlin 'will make stubborn efforts' to see that Red China is admitted to the U. N. Are we supposed to forget that the U. N. voted Red China an aggressor in the Korean War and that the ban has never been revoked? We get an official statement that East and West Germany must be reunited, not by plebiscite and popular vote, but by a negotiated deal. We get an official statement that Formosa must be handed over to Red China. Americans paid $1 billion for this.

"Let us bear in mind that every American compromise, however it may be explained, is multiplied in other countries into surrenders. Our job, to ensure our own security and to secure the survival of freedom on this earth, is to galvanize the stragglers, the fearful, the intimidated, by examples of moral valor and spiritual dedication. Such is the rule of leadership which, though we never sought it, we can reject only to our own peril.

"That, my friends, is what I meant when I said that attitudes and basic principles are no less decisive than actions and policies. An attitude of compromise on essentials, phony friendships with gangsters at any price, leads to one set of decisions. An attitude related to deep-rooted moral values leads to an opposite set of decisions.

"We dare not excuse a failure of nerve and a failure of principle, for those witness a weakening and threaten a collapse of our whole moral structure. If the present drift to cynical grayness, where once we knew the difference between black and white, is not arrested and reversed, we shall lose our ability to defend ourselves. Indeed, we shall have little left that is worth defending."

New Hampshire can be proud of its senior Senator for setting the record straight on our foreign aid and foreign policy program. It remains to be seen whether Americans will heed his warning.

Father Flynn of Minnesota

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD J. THYE
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, July 11, 1956

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, an editorial entitled "Father Flynn" appeared in the Minneapolis Tribune of July 9, 1956. The editorial concerns Father Flynn, of St. Thomas College, who died at the very young age of 54. Father Flynn was a great educational leader. He was an inspiration to all who were fortunate enough to make his acquaintance. For that reason, I ask unanimous consent to have the editorial printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FATHER FLYNN

Many, many people, not only in Minnesota but all around the country—Protestants and Jews as well as members of his own Roman Catholic faith—will feel a deep personal loss in the death of Father Flynn ("The Very Rev. Vincent Joseph Flynn" always seemed a too formidably formal designation for this hearty, friendly priest). His humanitarian activities leaped geographical, political, and religious boundaries and made friends everywhere. One always knew he was a very busy man, but it was only on his death and the listing of all of his wide-ranging civic, scholarly, and church affiliations that many of us realized fully how much of himself he gave to other causes than that of his immediate affection—St. Thomas College and Military Academy.

Father Flynn will be remembered in many places of the world as a scholar, a churchman, an educator, etc. But perhaps the people of this community may be excused if they remember him not so much for his more austere pursuits but for his readiness to be a friend to all.

Fishing for Leisure Time Use

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN D. DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 11, 1956

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, an address by my good friend, Richard H. Stroud, executive vice president of the Sports Fishing Institute, is of considerable interest to all Americans, since it so clearly outlines the problems which face the people of our land. It is of great importance because it sets up the basis of a program whereby conservation can be shown to be a matter of concern to all Americans, and whereby it can prosper for the benefit of all, by wise and powerful interaction:

FISHING FOR LEISURE TIME USE

The fisheries profession is a small one. But it faces squarely one of the greatest challenges to confront American civilization today. If it has the needed guts, intelligence, and imagination, it can in the next few decades establish the profession as a vital factor in the national welfare.

That challenge is: How shall our society make proper use of increasing amounts of leisure time brought on by a rapidly decreasing workweek? The 40-hour workweek is standard in industry, if not among fishery workers, and many people already work only 35 hours per week. Indeed, with the rapid growth of automation, the 30-hour week is close at hand. Some economists predict that Americans of this generation may yet find themselves yielding up their switches and push buttons to relief crews after working perhaps only 3 days per week.

At the same time there is growing evidence that the stress of modern living and the decreased physical activity accompanying it is wreaking havoc upon our society. The incidence of psychosomatic and of coronary and other physical ills has risen to near-epidemic proportions and is approaching the level of a national crisis. Leading medical authorities in these fields have testified before Congress or reported to leading medical groups their findings to this effect.

The solution to this serious problem is to provide an acceptable antidote. It must be not only painless but also attractive and eminently worthwhile. It must be completely relaxing of mind and body, yet it must require modest physical exertion. Sport fishing provides us with a near-perfect answer.

Already, fishing is well established as the most popular of all participation sports. At last count about 18¾ million citizens bought angling licenses. California was the only State that licensed most of its salt water anglers. Accounting for unlicensed anglers in all categories, a total estimate of 30 million Americans who fish for recreational purposes is believed by many to be conservative.

These figures serve only to emphasize that our combined efforts to shorten the time between bites are important. We might as well face the prospect now, that, where 1 out of every 4 walking Americans now fishes for sport, perhaps every other American may do so tomorrow. This could mean a three-fold increase in fishing pressures in our lifetime.

Such a growth of angling participation should be actively encouraged. We shouldn't be so concerned over increasing fishing pressure that we strive to suppress it. More than one great nation crumbled with the growth of leisure time which failed to develop a form of outdoor recreation or some other philosophy requiring proper husbandry of its natural resources. It does not seem too far-fetched to suggest that outdoor recreation such as sport fishing may hold our very salvation as a nation.

SPORTSMEN PLAY KEY ROLE

In any such event, it would appear likely that two of our current major fish management problems—superabundance of underutilized pan fish and abundant unharvested rough fish—will become our chief fish management assets. By this time, too, it should be apparent even to newly matriculated fishery biologists that the sportsman is an ally and not an enemy. College and university professors may finally recognize the need for fishery students to study the social sciences, psychology, and human relations.

We should never overlook the importance of the sportsman in our work. We exist for his benefit. Nevertheless, the sportsman has a vital role to play in creating suitable working conditions that make our efforts on his behalf possible. The fact is, we can't get along without each other.

Creation of proper working conditions constitutes a continuing and important challenge to the organized sportsmen. In most States low salary scales are a serious deterrent to progress in fish conservation. The average pay of professional fishery workers is only about two-thirds that of laborers in the building trades. If it were not for dedication to the job, and confidence in the future, few men would remain in this field.

A few States are beginning to realize that this is a serious problem. In one north central State, for example, the sportsmen are taking positive steps to correct this inequity. They realize that their fish and game director is grossly underpaid at the current $5,000 figure set by statute. He administers annual budgets of over $1,500,000. Even more important, his work strongly influences the condition of a recreation business amounting to over twenty times as much. No industry of comparable size would think of paying such a ridiculous low salary to its chief executive officer.

Consequently, the organized sportsmen have set up a Statewide, nonpartisan action committee to rectify the situation. It is dedicated to bringing about statutory changes to raise the director's salary to some figure between $10,00 and $15,000. This is still "peanuts" by industrial standards. But it will do much to help solve the salary problem for fishery and wildlife scientists. If successful it will be one of the outstanding conservation achievements of the decade.

MAXIMUM SPORT FOR THE MOST PEOPLE

As I see it, people are the most important part of fish and game management. All research and management activities should have as their ultimate objective to benefit people as a social unit in some way.

Such a philosophy rejects a single-use concept of natural resources. It definitely em-

braces a broad multiple use concept. And it demands greatly enhanced and broadened outdoor recreational opportunities.

Conservation needs a cause that is more appealing to the general public than ill-defined and vague intangible values. It needs a cause that is more influential at the conference table than mere dollar volume of business generated.

If we continue to place the emphasis in conservation planning only on the maintenance of suitable conditions for fish and game itself, we will continue to fight a losing battle of attrition against the stronger forces of resource exploitation in the utilities and industrial fields. If, however, we emphasize the creation, development, and maintenance of outdoor recreational facilities for the benefit of the general public—in the forms of fishing, boating, hunting, etc.—we gain new and potent muscles.

The sport of angling, for example, provides a bond of mutual interest that cuts straight across all racial, social, economic, religious, age, and sex distinctions.

If provision of maximum recreational opportunity for leisure-time use by people becomes the goal and the guiding force for our efforts, the natural resources must become properly managed for wise multiple-use purposes. This provides the new cause, together with the potential weapon—mass public opinion—needed to prevail in that cause.

I have nothing against intangibles as such. For example, I see no reason why it should not be possible to measure, and translate into dollar equivalents, the benefits accruing to national public health from frequent indulgence in proper outdoor recreation such as sport fishing. I see no reason, either, why it is not possible to measure and translate into dollar equivalents similar benefits accruing to worker efficiency on the industrial production line. The chief obstacle in the way, admittedly large, is money to undertake the needed studies. This, too, may not be insurmountable.

The implications of significant findings in these areas are staggering. Positive findings would provide overwhelming economic advantages for conservationists at any conference table.

WATER NEEDS FOR RECREATION CRITICAL

One of the best places to start is also nearest home. The most essential commodity for recreational fishing is water. Unless we get moving right now, we may run out of water for this purpose and in a hurry. For some unknown reason, representatives of the United States Soil Conservation Service are beating the drums for the lawmakers in many Eastern States to substitute Western States doctrine of prior appropriative use of surface water resources in place of the long-established one of riparian rights.

Essentially, the western doctrine holds that the first man to grab the water gets it, and may the devil take the hindmost. Eastern riparian rights doctrine holds that a water user shall pass the water on downstream unimpaired in quantity and quality. The latter has become generally modified to allow reasonable use to the extent that the water is not materially impaired for downstream users. It is a sound evolutionary change.

Irrigation in eastern agriculture poses a new problem of material consumptive use of water supplies. Already, at least 18 States east of the Rockies have water study commissions currently at work drafting proposals for revision of the State water laws.

The movement toward increased consumptive use of water must be carefully regulated if eastern public sport fishing, a nonconsumptive use of water, is to survive. We are not opposed to overhauling our water laws. They probable need it. But the western principle of prior appropriative use of water is a serious menace to angling and other important forms of outdoor recreation.

The doctrine of riparian rights, though old, has been a valuable weapon in the anti-pollution fight. Without it sport fishing might well have disappeared from many Eastern States.

If outdoor recreation is to be maintained or expanded in the next decade conservationists will also need to become aggressive. They will have to see to it that they occupy prominent places on the State water study commissions. And they must see to it that recreation is firmly and clearly established in law as a primary beneficial use of water resources. Otherwise, the special-interest water users and patronage-minded legislators will sell outdoor sports down the river. Only there'll be no river, just an empty ditch.

The proper action is to join up with the water study groups and indoctrinate them with the vital need for outdoor recreation. But this strategy generates a further responsibility to determine adequate standards of water quantity needed to accommodate increasing recreational demands. We already have acceptable standards of water quality. They alone are not enough to meet this new challenge in the face of increasing consumption of water supplies by agriculture and industry.

This is one of the reasons that make it imperative to plan resource use with conditions for people, rather than for fish or game, uppermost in mind. For example, we can readily assure that well-aerated pollution-free water will flow down the creek by enforcing present-day quality standards. Yet the quantity of water might amount to a comparative trickle. The water in a fluctuating reservoir might be pure as the driven snow—and cover no more area than the skating rink at Rockefeller Plaza.

Under these circumstances some fish could survive, fishing for the general public could not. Remember, too, that water sports include boating, water skiing, and swimming, in addition to fishing and hunting. Indeed, fishing has become inseparable from boating on many waters and these sports are growing hand-in-hand. The Outboard Boating Club of America has indicated that over 65 percent of all motors and boats sold are used primarily for fishing purposes.

How then should conservationists define adequate standards for water quantity? Certainly not on the basis of fish habitat needs alone. They must be set in consideration of human habitat needs for outdoor recreation which the fish and game make possible. We'd better be clairvoyant here—and soon. If not, we may wake up and find ourselves in the role of the Ivy League Sunday quarterback whose alma mater lost on homecoming day. It will be too late then.

Postal Rates

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD J. THYE
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, July 11, 1956

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I have in my hand 2 editorials on the same subject, 1 of which was published in the Washington Sunday Star of July 8, 1956, under the heading of "Sound Vote on Mail Rates," and the other appeared in the Washington Post and Times Herald of Wednesday, July 11, 1956, under the heading "Realistic Postal Rates."

Mr. President, I believe very firmly that postal rate legislation should be enacted at this session of Congress. For that reason, I ask unanimous consent that the two editorials be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Sunday Star of July 8, 1956]

SOUND VOTE ON MAIL RATES

The House has taken proper and courageous election-year action in voting to raise postal rates enough to bring in an estimated $430 million annually. We hope the Senate, which thus far has shown little interest in the matter, will concur.

Operations of the Post Office Department consistently have been run at a loss—in recent times approaching a half billion dollars a year. The explanation has been simply that those using the mails the most have not been paying a fair price for the service received. The net effect, of course, is that the taxpayers as a whole have been subsidizing a Government venture that benefits some groups far more than others. The formula contained in the bill just passed would correct this inequity by putting the service on approximately a fair pay-as-you-mail basis. Ordinary first-class-mail rates would be raised from 3 cents to 4 cents—bringing in an estimated additional $296 million. Domestic airmail rates would be raised from 6 cents to 7 cents an ounce—calculated to bring in another $16 million. Small increases in several other categories would yield about $120 million more.

President Eisenhower and Postmaster General Summerfield have been strong advocates of the postal increase as a matter of good business practice. The opposition has been primarily partisan and political, headed in the House by Democratic leader MCCORMACK, of Massachusetts, on grounds the increases would hurt small business concerns and average families. Fortunately the House Post Office Committee and the Rules Committee—both under Democratic chairmanship—broke with the party leader on the issue in order to permit a vote on the floor. The result was not only a victory for the administration, but for responsible management in the Federal Government.

[From the Washington Post and Times Herald of July 11, 1956]

REALISTIC POSTAL RATES

The House did a good piece of work in its surprise approval of the bill to increase postal rates. House Democratic leaders, who opposed the increase, deserve credit for bringing the bill to a vote in which they were overriden by Republicans. This newspaper has supported the bill vigorously for two principal reasons: (1) our belief that among all the hidden subsidies granted by the Government there is perhaps the least excuse for subsidies in artificially low mail rates that often serve to benefit, not the impoverished individual user, but commercial business; and (2) our conviction that newspapers and magazines, which have for years been favored with ridiculously low second-class rates, ought of all groups to pay their own way.

It is a pity that passage comes so late in the session and that the Senate has not held hearings on the controversial measure. Nevertheless, perhaps the example of the House will serve to stir action in the Senate, which passed a similar bill unanimously in 1951. We suspect that there is less political dynamite than legislators may fear in the proposal to increase first-class rates to 4 cents for regular mail and 7 cents for airmail. Few persons really would like the idea that when they stepped to the stamp window they were accepting a Government handout—which would be the real meaning of continued failure to place postal rates on a cost basis.

The Importance of Continuing the Antipollution Battle

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, July 11, 1956

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, on my recent trip throughout Wisconsin, I found a deeper interest than ever before in a subject that has always been of tremendous significance to my State, and that is the battle against stream pollution.

I was pleased to be able to report to the people of my State that the Federal Water Pollution Control Act had been extended.

It was a particular source of pleasure that, included in this extension, is a program for grants-in-aid to the States for sewerage treatment facilities.

Thus, when I visited the twin cities of Neenah-Menasha, I cited the fact that up to a maximum of $250,000 could be made available for the Twin Cities' own projected sewerage disposal plan.

I have in my hand now the text of a brief release which I issued on the occasion of my visit. It cites the fact that I am now doing everything I can to help accelerate the actual appropriation of funds under the Water Pollution Control Act. An authorization is, of course, no good unless there is an actual appropriation under the authorization.

I have in my hand, too, the text of a splendid feature, which was written by one of the top experts in the field of agriculture and conservation of my State, Mr. Lewis C. French, of the Milwaukee Journal staff. It is entitled "The Fight for Clean Water."

It tells in a factual, graphic manner the many-sided battle to clean up lakes, rivers, and streams.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of Mr. French's splendid article, as published in the June 3 issue of the Milwaukee Journal, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, along with the text of the press release, which I issued in Neenah-Menasha.

There being no objection, the article and release were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Milwaukee Journal of June 3, 1956]

THE FIGHT FOR CLEAN WATER—FEDERAL GOVERNMENT ENTERS ANTIPOLLUTION CRUSADE IN WHICH WISCONSIN HAS LED; CONGRESS SET TO ACT THIS MONTH

(By Lewis C. French)

While a summertime visitor to Milwaukee, California's Gov. Goodwin S. Knight gazed with sheer envy at the waters of Lake Michigan.

Scanning that shimmering lake—perhaps Wisconsin's most precious natural asset—the California governor thought of the costly efforts to get usable water enough for his thriving State. There were aqueducts tunneling through mountains, reservoirs costing millions, and great pumping stations to get distant river water. Still these measures fell short.

But look at lucky Milwaukee and Wisconsin: As far as the horizon and beyond, an almost unlimited supply of fresh water, and to the north, Lake Superior, even larger and colder.

Then as a guest of a Fox Point resident, the governor stepped into a shower bath and turned the faucet, expecting a cooling spray of that lake water.

But not a drop of water from that nozzle.

"Incredible—what goes on here?" asked the governor, a bit bewildered. "And with all that lake water for the taking at your front door."

WISCONSIN PIONEERED IN POLLUTION CURBS

Milwaukee officials have promised water system improvements to prevent the taps from running dry in the future, but that is only one aspect of the State's water problem. At least as important is protection of the purity of Wisconsin streams and lakes, both for beauty and sport and as a healthful water supply for all the State's people.

Congress is slowly awakening to an urgent fact that Wisconsin recognized some years ago: Clean water is more than a natural resource—it is a necessity of life.

It is a matter of pride that Wisconsin showed the Nation and the free world the way to keep the wild rush of roily waters from eroding the thin skin of fertile topsoil. This was done on the pioneer soil conservation project at Coon Valley in southwestern Wisconsin, started in 1933.

Then seeing the danger to its abundant water supplies from the poison of pollution, Wisconsin—prodded by conservation groups—revised its water laws in 1949. The State stiffened its regulations to force municipalities and industries to meet higher standards of water purity.

Today, Wisconsin is far out in front nationally in this campaign for curbing pollution. Now Uncle Sam is joining the crusade.

UNITED STATES TO GET TOUGH

At long last the United States Government through its Public Health Service and the Department of Agriculture proposes to get tough and even to spend some money protecting the purity of water supplies.

"The problem of water pollution control grows more pressing with population growth and with the development and expansion of industry," President Eisenhower said in his health message on January 27. "The present acts dealing with water supplies should be strengthened and made permanent."

Congress must do something soon, for on June 30, the 1948 Water Pollution Control Act—an inadequate piece of legislation—will expire.

The national lawmakers now have stronger measures pending. One calls for $2 million a year, 1956 through 1960, to help States and interstate agencies "establish and maintain adequate measures for prevention and control" of water pollution. The Federal Government would pay between one-third and two-thirds of a project cost.

The other pending measure would authorize $1 billion, with no time limit, for aid to municipalities in building sewage plants. The Federal contribution would be limited to one-half the cost, and not more than $500,000.

INDOOR PLUMBING RAISED DEMAND

The Nation's water problem is essentially to stop pollution. There are three great demands for water: The public, industry, and agriculture. There is water enough for all if it can be kept pure and reutilized.

All over the United States, including the farms and the crossroads hamlets, prosperity and higher living standards have moved sanitation indoors. Everybody wants running water and a bathroom.

Now every time you flush a toilet, it takes around 7 gallons of water. Take a shower. Down the drain goes 25 gallons of soapy water. Wash the dishes, and 2 more gallons. Most new automatic washers take around 25 gallons. Bath time for the kids, and count on around 30 gallons for each one, for the Saturday night washtub bath is a thing of the past.

And every drop of this household water in everyday living must be purified, made safe by expensive treatment equipment.

The Wisconsin committee on water pollution, making accurate chemical and biological tests, has found that many of our rivers, some of our lakes and even certain parts of Lake Michigan are badly polluted. Some areas, such as beaches at Green Bay where the Fox empties, cannot be used. There have been times when public use of several Milwaukee beaches stopped and waters of other industrial cities were placed on the questionable list.

INDUSTRY IS BIGGEST DESPOILER OF WATER

The Wisconsin committee often encounters resentment from the small villages. One of the greatest problems is that of the part-time farmer, living near an industrial center, putting in modern sanitary improvements. The urban workman seeking elbow room and a piece of land moves into his fringe urban-rural area. He, too, demands indoor plumbing. But too often these residents do not like the costs of building the sewers and treatment systems meeting the stiffer State standards.

Both Wisconsin and Michigan are making decided progress abating the nuisance of these toxic wastes. In Wisconsin there is but one county without sewers in its cities and villages, and of the communities with sewers, those having 97 percent of the population are connected to treatment plants.

"The biggest offender in despoiling water is industry," reads a Government report.

The rate at which our factories, mills, and powerplants gulp water is amazing. And it keeps going up and up. Some of the larger industrial plants use more water than whole cities.

The Milwaukee brewer needs around 300 gallons of water for a barrel of beer and one of the reasons Milwaukee became so famous for the brew was its fine water supplies. The Schlitz Brewing Co. alone uses 1,684,267,000 gallons a year. The A. O. Smith Corp., with its steel fabrication using water under pressure to test every length of pipe and for countless production operations, used 1,641,600,000 gallons last year.

The Wisconsin and Michigan paper mills need around 250 tons of water for a ton of sulphite wood pulp, and there are mills in Wisconsin using 30 to 40 million gallons a day. Every large paper mill often uses more water every working day than does a city of 50,000 people.

Hence the need for Wisconsin's strict pollution controls, backed up by the new Federal program.

"Industry is putting almost twice as much waste into the waterways in 1955 as in 1930," reads the Government survey. "The expected growth of synthetic and nuclear production with their poisonous byproducts magnifies the problem."

The Federal estimates are that the demand for clean and fresh water will more than double by 1975, industry needing at least 105 percent more, 70 percent more for municipalities and around 42 percent for irrigation.

In Minnesota two corporations have applied to the State for permission to pump 10,000 gallons a minute from ground waters to put into a reservoir and "sell to industry."

WELL LEVELS DROP

Whose waters are these underground supplies which percolate through the porous rock formations?

"Title to such water should rest with the State, in control of all people, and, when the right to use water is conferred, it should not carry with the permit the right to abuse the water," contends O. L. Kaupanger, secretary of the Minnesota emergency conser-

vation committee, Minneapolis, Minn., an alert civic group trying to check pollution of streams.

Wisconsin has laws limiting how much can be pumped, prior rights being vested in municipal users. Yet artesian well levels are dropping fast over most of Wisconsin.

Water demand now averages around 145 gallons a day for human use, compared to 95 gallons at the turn of the century. Add industrial requirements and your individual share is around 1,217 gallons a day.

Municipalities will have to spend $5.3 billion in the next 10 years to keep water usable, according to the United States Public Health Service. Industry will have to spend about as much; and if the States do not rap the knuckles of offenders, Uncle Sam will.

PROBLEM OF FAIRNESS TO SOME CITIES

"The only way we can win this pollution battle is with Federal aid," is the statement issued by the American Municipal Association. "We maintain water pollution is a national problem and that the Federal Government has a clear-cut responsibility to work with the States and municipalities toward its solution."

How much Uncle Sam will chip in is before Congress for decision.

If the billion dollar appropriation is made available it presents a problem to Wisconsin and Michigan. Both these States have stern State committees on water issues. Both have required many cities to stretch their finance and issue bonds to build modern treatment plants. And all these plants were built with the costs borne by the cities, not a cent from the State or the Federal Government.

"It does seem unfair now to come along and propose to share costs unless they make the legislation retroactive," says Theodore Wisniewski, of Madison, director of the Wisconsin committee. "We've set a time limit for compliance, citing the penalties. It is manifestly unfair for the backward cities in the other States to have such help if it be denied to those paying the bill in full in Wisconsin."

There is now sure to be an issue of State versus Federal rights on water controls. Industry, fearful of the stern look and whack of Federal health officers, will scream for State rights. "Let the States handle the pollution problem. They are doing all right."

BLOOD-RED WATER

But too long in the past, industries had pretty much their own way on disposing of wastes into streams. Here in Wisconsin some paper mill operators, dominating the economics of modest size cities, rode roughshod over the protests of local people.

On the Mesabi Range in the iron country, the powerful corporations used all the water they needed and seldom was a voice raised over the blood-red silt ruining white water streams.

In upper Michigan the copper mines strewed tailings along the rivers and lakes and not a voice was lifted, until the tough State committee was empowered to stop all pollution.

Under the new proposed Federal legislation the Surgeon General could declare any stream or lake a public nuisance from pollution.

Then he would inform those polluting the waters and the State to set a time schedule for a cleanup. If there were no compliance and no enforcement by the State, suit could be brought in the Federal court.

WISCONSIN A PARTY TO INTERSTATE PACT

With most States now having antipollution agencies protecting water supplies, the trend is for interstate agreements or compacts. The finest of these are the eight States of the Ohio River Valley in which uniform minimum standards are established.

Wisconsin found out early the reason for these agreements. For the minute the committee, finding positive evidence of gross and harmful pollution, would name the offender at a hearing, where would be the threat: "We will move out of the State." There would be an impressive listing of employees and payrolls.

The answer to this attempted block to proper enforcement was for the interested States to sign agreements to set standards and exchange information on offenders.

Wisconsin made compact first with Michigan and Minnesota. Then came the compact for the upper Mississippi River cleanup with Wisconsin, Minnesota, Iowa, and Illinois.

So, now when a corporation says it will move before it will spend money to obey the antipollution laws, the State committee, in effect, says: "Mister, you are not going any place without protecting water supplies."

SENATOR WILEY SAYS FEDERAL POLLUTION FUNDS URGENT—PLEDGES ALL-OUT BATTLE TO HELP TWIN CITIES

An immediate all-out drive to secure Federal funds under a "vital new antipollution law" was pledged today by Senator ALEXANDER WILEY, Republican, of Chippewa Falls.

While attending the Neenah-Menasha Junior Chamber of Commerce celebration of Independence Day, Wisconsin's senior Senator said: "Wisconsin's great paper industry and other industrial leaders have made wonderful progress in meeting the pollution problem. But we all recognize that the fullest additional Federal cooperation is urgently essential if we are to achieve further success."

Referring to the need for enlargement and improvement of the Neenah-Menasha sewage-disposal plant, Senator WILEY continued: "The sewage problem in this community is duplicated in many other Wisconsin cities who have been in touch with me on their participation in the provisions of the new antipollution law.

"The law has passed. But we must cross another hurdle before municipalities can start construction work on their projects—a separate appropriation measure to finance the program. I am, therefore, urging both House and Senate Appropriation Committees to get on the ball to see that the whole legislation is not grounded for lack of funds."

Looking further into our local pollution problems, the Senator commented: "Stream pollution in Wisconsin has entailed tremendous costs in time, money, and effort. It has reached the point where our cities alone cannot bear the terrific expenses of effective disposal plants and other antipollution projects. Municipal help is a necessity where the health and economic welfare of Wisconsin citizens are at stake."

The Senator stated: "The Pollution Control Act would pay one-third the costs of the Twin Cities' disposal plant, up to a maximum of $250,000 for your proposed $900,000 tripurpose project. This would mean a $125,000 saving for each town. Other general provisions of this bill also include: (1) A 5-year-grant program to States for pollution control planning and research; (2) enforcement measures against pollution of interstate waters; and (3) creation of a special Water Pollution Control Advisory Board."

Wisconsin Is Honored

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MELVIN R. LAIRD

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 10, 1956

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, last month in Miami at the Lions International Convention, Mr. Clarence L. Sturm of Manawa, Wis., was elected third vice president. The election of Mr. Sturm to this office assures his election as president of Lions International in 1959. We in Wisconsin are indeed proud of Clarence Sturm. He has a splendid record of public service as a citizen of Wisconsin as well as through Lions International. I would like to call to the attention of the Members of the House an editorial which appeared in the Marshfield News-Herald, Marshfield, Wis., under date of July 2, 1956. The editorial follows:

WISCONSIN IS HONORED

Wisconsin's 10,000 Lions Club members are elated this week by the fact that one of their number, Clarence L. Sturm, of Manawa, has been elevated to the third vice presidency of their international organization. Election to this office virtually assures accession to the presidency in 3 years, an honor which has not come to a Wisconsin man in nearly 2 decades.

Sturm, who was chosen by representatives of the 543,000 members of the world's 12,334 Lions Clubs at Miami Saturday, is eminently qualified to assume the duties and responsibilities that go with an honor of this kind, and his Wisconsin supporters know he will do them credit.

The service club, a peculiarly American phenomenon which has been introduced to virtually the entire world by its eager Yankee disciples, has grown to be a tremendous global force, and any man selected to head one of these associations—especially one of the "Big Three," Lions, Rotary, or Kiwanis—faces up to an enormous task.

In the case of Lions, 3 years of preparation through the vice presidential offices is climaxed by a presidential year in which the organization executive must devote virtually every minute of his time to personal visitations throughout the United States and in many of the other 74 countries in which there are Lions Club. In this capacity his opportunities for the improvement of interstate and international relationships are almost limitless.

In addition, he heads up an organization of local groups which, in the United States alone, engage in thousands upon thousands of humanitarian projects costing uncounted millions of dollars and incalculable manhours of work. A single example of such activity is the recent decision of the Wisconsin Lions Clubs to purchase an $18,000 tract of land in Portage County and equip it as a summer camp for blind children.

There has been much sophisicated and supercilious criticism of American service clubs, but they have done and are continuing to do a wonderful work, and the entire State of Wisconsin can take pride in the selection of one of its finest citizens to assume a major role in carrying on part of that work.

Senator Flanders' Proposal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH E. FLANDERS

OF VERMONT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, July 11, 1956

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Senator FLANDERS' Proposal," published in the Pittsfield Berkshire Eagle, Pittsfield, Mass., on June 25, 1956.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SENATOR FLANDERS' PROPOSAL

Walter Lippmann has been attacking the administration policy on Germany, and particularly the recent endorsement of Chancellor Adenauer's position by Secretary Dulles as completely futile and unrealistic. He has declared that instead of looking for common ground on which the allies can work together, Mr. Dulles has let Dr. Adenauer commit him to terms which are so extreme that they prohibit in advance any serious negotiations on the matter.

The Adenauer terms, writes Mr. Lippmann, provide that none of the allies is to come to agreement with the Soviet Union until Moscow has abandoned East Germany and agreed to a united Germany rearmed within the NATO alliance. Such terms are not only certain to be rejected by the Soviet Union; they will not be supported by our allies or even very long by the Germans themselves. Dr. Adenauer is no longer able to count on effective support in West Germany; he is faced with a united opposition and widespread dissatisfaction within his own party. Is it wise for the United States Government to be more inflexible and more extreme than the Germans themselves?

It is against the background of the Dulles position that the speech Tuesday in the Senate by Senator RALPH FLANDERS, Republican, of Vermont, must be read. Conceding that his suggestions were drastic and at direct variance with administration policies, Senator FLANDERS proposed that West Germany open direct negotiations with Moscow for German reunification. He suggested that Chancellor Adenauer be encouraged to ask Russia to release puppet East Germany in exchange for "a united Germany which agrees to be unarmed and neutral, but otherwise free." Admitting that the proposal might seem strange so close on the heels of the Adenauer-Dulles agreement, he offered it as a more practical plan than that supported by Mr. Dulles.

The Senate has been criticized in the past for trying to steer foreign policy in a different direction from that advocated by the State Department. Yet when the State Department's policy is obviously questionable, if not downright unrealistic, it is certainly the duty of dissident Senators to express their opinions. After all, foreign treaties are required to be concluded with the "advice and consent of the Senate" and the Senate is asked to appropriate the funds needed to finance our foreign policy. It is to be hoped that Senator FLANDERS receives support from others of his colleagues. Certainly the Dulles policy needs a thorough scrutiny.

The School-Aid Failure

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ADAM C. POWELL, JR.
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 11, 1956

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the New York Times of July 6, 1956:

THE SCHOOL-AID FAILURE—AN ANALYSIS OF THE FACTORS THAT LED TO DEFEAT OF ADMINISTRATION IN HOUSE

(By James Reston)

WASHINGTON, July 5.—The long struggle over Federal aid for public school construction ended tonight in bitterness and confusion.

The House of Representatives was so entangled in its own parliamentary maneuvers most of the day that few Members professed to know where things stood until the final vote killing the bill.

Even Roswell B. Perkins, the able young lawyer who is assistant to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, was wandering around the fringes of the House lobbies this afternoon wondering how the administration's plans and hopes had gone awry.

Southern Members were bitter about what they regarded as efforts to coerce them through the school construction bill to carry into effect the Supreme Court decision outlawing racial segregation in the public schools.

Many northern Democrats saw in the tactics of the Republican leadership more evidence that the Republican Party had started on a major campaign to bring the northern Negro vote back into the GOP column.

For example, there were 148 Republicans for and 46 against the Powell amendment, which President Eisenhower specifically opposed; whereas there were only 75 Republicans for passage of the bill and 119 against. It is true that the bill as finally presented was not precisely the same as the bill the White House wanted. The Democrats felt it was significant, however, that more GOP Members went down the line for the Powell amendment, which is popular with Negroes in the powerful northern cities, than did for passage of the bill itself.

A FEELING OF FRUSTRATION

Some members were resentful that the Federal Government proposed to give aid to the public schools but not to the parochial schools. And the inter-play of these racial, political, and religious considerations all contributed to the final result.

It is something rare in the history of the House when the chairman of a committee—in this case Representative Graham A. Barden, Democrat, of North Carolina and chairman of the House Education and Labor Committee—gives up the leadership of a bill in the middle of the debate. Yet that is what happened this morning and it was typical of the strong feeling of frustration that pervaded the whole procedure.

It also is relevant to the question of presidential and administration leadership that 119 Republicans voted against and only 75 for the bill that the President had been preparing for more than 3 years.

No doubt the racial issue, which produced the adamant opposition of the Southern Democrats was decisive. They were against the bill from the beginning. If it passed, even without the Powell amendment denying Federal funds to States that refused to carry out the Supreme Court integration decision, they felt that the sense of this amendment could easily be written into an appropriation bill for the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare next year.

Once the bill was on the books, many southern legislators felt, a brief amendment to the appropriation bill next year would have made a filibuster in the Senate against it extremely difficult. For to kill such an amendment on an appropriation bill, they would have had to try to block all appropriations for the entire Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and that would have been awkward if not impossible.

LACK OF ENGINEERS CITED

So the first major effort at Federal aid to the public schools of this century has lost, and everybody was talking in the House tonight about how the racial question had killed it.

Yet this is probably a very narrow construction of what actually happened. The racial issue dominated and inflamed the debate, but it was perfectly obvious to anyone talking all day to the legislators, that the whole principal of Federal aid to the public schools still troubles many Members who are not emotionally involved in the racial question.

The administration, though it tried, has clearly not persuaded a majority of the House that the development and even the security of the Nation in the coming era require a fundamental readjustment of Federal, State, and local responsibilities in the field of public education.

Congress has been providing Federal funds for generations to train an adequate corps of officers for the armed services of the country. The administration is convinced that in the developing "cold war" in the world the security of the Republic is now just as much involved in the adequate training of engineers, scientists, and other public servants as it was in the training of officers in the 19th century.

Though the Nation needs between 45,000 and 50,000 new trained engineers every year, it is now getting only about half that number. A large proportion of the brightest high-school students are still not going on to college, and many of those who do are so badly trained in mathematics, chemistry and physics that they are not equipped to do college work in these fields even if they have the necessary brains.

This was what was worrying top officials of the administration tonight in the light of the House vote. The first big test of the principle of Federal aid to education was defeated, but the problem of training the youth of the Nation to meet the Nation's expanding responsibilities remains.

Local and regional feelings, fears of political and social coercion, racial and religious emotions—all these have proved stronger than the argument that the country has an overwhelming need to adjust old habits to new responsibilities.

It will be difficult for historians to sort out all the factors that moved the legislators in this untidy and badly organized debate, but there is no doubt that the administration failed to make the crisis in the Nation's schools prevail over the habits of mind and political reactions of the past.

What Is Our Policy?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 10, 1956

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial from the New York World-Telegram and Sun of July 10, 1956, speaks volumes:

WHAT IS OUR POLICY?

A month ago, before his operation, President Eisenhower said:

"If we are waging peace, you can't be too particular sometimes about the special attitudes that different countries take. * * * Today there are certain nations that say they are neutral. This doesn't necessarily mean neutral as between right and wrong, or decency and indecency."

The President recalled that the United States was stanchly neutral for 150 years and urged that the word "neutral" not be translated as a choice between right and wrong.

Three days later, however, Secretary of State Dulles defined neutrality as "an obsolete conception and, except under very exceptional circumstances, an immoral and shortsighted conception."

And this was the opposite of what Mr. Dulles said in March when he told the Indonesians that neutralism was an understand-

able concept which would not interfere with either American friendship or aid.

Now Mr. NIXON is touring the nonneutralist area of Asia, giving yet another variant on this subject—coming close to Mr. Dulles' rejections of neutralism as immoral.

Which of these statements really represents American policy? No one knows. Worse still, we have managed, as so often, to confuse and offend while trying to play both sides of the street. The nonneutrals were upset by President Eisenhower's remarks on neutralism; the neutrals are agitated about those of Messrs. Dulles and NIXON.

This is similar to the American dilemma over colonialism. Our equivocation—even hypocrisy—on these issues, plus confusion caused by the babel of official voices, leaves us with the short end of the stick on both sides. If the American people don't know what our policy is on neutralism, how can our friends and enemies abroad know?

Relationship of Education and Psychology

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE H. CHRISTOPHER
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 11, 1956

Mr. CHRISTOPHER. Mr. Speaker, believing that the following article by Dr. George S. Reuter, Jr., Holden, Mo., is well worthy of extension in the RECORD, and feeling sure that it may be read and studied by Members of this House on both sides of the aisle with profit, I am glad to insert this article:

RELATIONSHIP OF EDUCATION AND PSYCHOLOGY

(By Dr. George S. Reuter, Jr.)

Many institutions of higher education in the United States combine education and psychology, but little study has been made as to the reason. Dr. Carl Newton Rexroad of Stephens College, Columbia, Mo., during his visit to the campus of Arkansas A. and M. College, from June 24 through June 26, 1953, as a consultant, made the administration and faculty keenly aware of this issue.

Dr. Rexroad explained the program that he directs where psychology is a part of the science department. This appears to be a good organizational pattern, because education is not a science, never was intended to be, and will never be. Psychology, on the only hand, was conceived to be a science from the beginning. The discipline behind psychology indicates that it is a science, while the opposite is true of education.

A few leaders in education have attempted to combine psychology with education, so as to end with a larger program with more students and more classes. Educators have been guilty of invading psychology and creating educational psychology. It is somewhat debatable, however, if psychology discouraged this invasion.

Psychology was weak and some thought combination provided strength. There are examples of a divided point-of-view among psychologists. One section insisted on pure psychology completely divorced from education and very closely related to the sciences, while the other group desired education as a part of their overall program.

As big business is constantly growing bigger through mergers, many fine educators feel is the only avenue for professional education. They omit the important fact that they will be building an institution without a soul. Why grow large simply for the exercise and without a sound philosophy?

Education has a vital role to play by staying in the areas of educational administration, secondary education, elementary education, curriculum, supervision, and industrial education. The way a part of graduate elementary education is taught, the public could assume that it is advanced psychology. This appears to be the only weak point in the armor of professional education, as listed above.

The reading clinic is extremely valuable to any institution if it is organized properly. It should not be a part of the education department or the English department. It should be a part of the psychology department. The reading clinic fails in the English department in that it does only about one-half of its true task. If it is used in the education department, then education will be married to science, and that marriage was never intended.

Guidance is not education either. It is a part of psychology. Some call it education, but it still remains psychological by nature.

This could also be said about music education, science education, art education, agriculture education, etc. They do not belong to education. They belong to the various departments of music, science, art, agriculture. Many will admit that this is the case, but they contend that revisions are needed in the curricula of these departments and that change is impossible, hence they must be divorced from an impossible condition, but they fail to realize that they are just creating another impossible state of affairs.

Let's maintain a pure education where great service can be rendered and stand by and let the other departments do likewise. We should not desire to conquer the world—only to render real service in an area that is fitted for us. The sooner we divorce education from psychology, the faster our professional growth will be.

Lexington Rancher Wins Grassman of Year Honor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, July 11, 1956

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, in a recent news story I have found a description of a successful ranch operation which emphasizes the benefits of good soil-conservation techniques. Mr. Alvin Wagenblast, of Lexington, Oreg., has just been recognized as Morrow County's "Grassman of the Year." I am sorry, Mr. President, that in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the picture which accompanied the story showing Alvin Wagenblast and his two sons, John and Steve, displaying sturdy stocks of pasture grass grown on their 560-acre ranch, cannot be reproduced. What an inspiration are these young Americans, learning about stewardship of the soil and sharing with their father the interest and care which have brought this enviable and deserved recognition. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the news item from the Pendleton East-Oregonian of June 28, 1956, printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the news item was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LEXINGTON RANCHER WINS GRASSMAN OF YEAR HONOR

HEPPNER.—Transforming a depleted, overgrazed ranch into fields of high-producing pastures and irrigated hayland has won for Alvin Wagenblast, Lexington, the "grassman of the year" title for Morrow county, it was announced Tuesday night at a meeting of the county farm bureau.

Taking over a 560-acre ranch just north of Lexington in 1949, Wagenblast has increased the livestock carrying capacity of his pasture and rangeland from 12 cows and calves to 150 head without injury to the soil or vegetative cover over the 7-year period of his ownership.

SEEDED SEVERAL ACRES

During the past 5 years Wagenblast has seeded 45 acres of permanent irrigated pastures, 75 acres of dryland grass, has 18 acres of irrigated bottom land prepared for seeding and an additional 75 acres of hill land in summer fallow for seeding next year.

Eventually he plans to seed 195 acres of wheatland to grass and continue seeding on his dryland hillsides wherever practical.

Grasses used in separate fields of vernal, talent, and ladak alfalfas are alta fescue, intermediate wheatgrass and akaroa orchard grass for his irrigated pastures. On dryland seedings nomad alfalfa, crested wheat and bulbous bluegrass is seeded.

WILL HAVE HAY SURPLUS

For the first time this year Wagenblast figures he will have a surplus of hay for marketing from his pastures that produced 8 tons per acre last year and show signs of a higher yield this season.

A regular system of weeding, clipping, fertilizing, irrigating by sprinkler and ditch and rotation grazing is followed by Wagenblast in his pasture management.

By deferring dryland grazing 6 months out of the year, grasses are gradually coming back to economic production. The entire property is cross fenced for rotational grazing.

BEEF HERD INCREASED

Beginning his beef herd by trading labor for livestock, Wagenblast by 1953 was able to purchase 10 head of purebred Herefords.

At present he has 113 cows, yearlings and calves and this fall by selling the last of the culls expects to have a completely purebred herd.

His livestock program includes vaccinating, spraying and culling. Machinery, added gradually, is kept in top condition for all farmwork.

Wagenblast, who came here from The Dalles, is married and has 2 sons, John, 9, and Steve, 7, whom he gives credit for real assistance on the ranch, eliminating the need for hired help during haying and harvest.

MASTER OF TWO GRANGES

This year he is master of both the county Pomona grange and the Lexington grange. He is a member of the Morrow County Livestock association and the Oregon Wheat Growers league.

A cooperator with the Heppner Soil Conservation District since 1950, Wagenblast stated he valued technical assistance from Tom Wilson of the soil conservation service and N. C. Anderson, county extension agent, for technical advice and assistance. He will compete with other county winners for State grass title in the "Grass is Gold" contest sponsored by the Portland chamber of commerce and locally by the Farm Bureau.

Why Foreign Aid Is in Trouble

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STEWART L. UDALL
OF ARIZONA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 25, 1956

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, those of us who believe the rough weather encountered by the mutual-security bill this year is attributable to President Eisenhower's failure to develop a coherent, long-range foreign economic policy are supported by the editorial reprinted below which appeared recently in the pro-Eisenhower Life magazine:

WHY FOREIGN AID IS IN TROUBLE

President Eisenhower tends to be lucky, but his luck is not always the Nation's. His middle of the road is a safe and sane position, but when his administration just wobbles there—or stalls—it can block progress.

These sour reflections are prompted by a series of minor events which illuminate a major—probably the major—shortcoming of this administration. This is its failure (now 3 years old) to develop a coherent, long-term foreign economic policy which will command general assent at home and understanding abroad.

The furious kicking around which Congress has been giving the foreign-aid bill is the chief current symptom of this failure. There are others. Joseph M. Dodge, the President's personal coordinator of foreign economic policy and planning, has just resigned after more than a year's work which failed to make any nationally visible imprint on the situation. His successor is slated to be Clarence Randall, an able fighter who may succeed in this assignment. But recalling the administration's first stab at a new foreign economic policy, the feeble Randall report of 1954, one may be pardoned the feeling that this is where we came in.

FOR LACK OF A PROGRAM

Congressman RICHARDS, of South Carolina, chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee, put responsible congressional sentiment in a nutshell when he declared mildly that "we should not continue to spend our money in the same old way or in the same old places."

As for irresponsible congressional sentiment, it has seldom had so vulnerable a target. "I come from a town," cried TUMULTY, of Jersey City, denouncing aid to Tito, "where when we buy votes we expect them to stay bought."

The unpopularity of foreign aid extends to other parts of the administration's program. The customs simplification bill, which passed the House long ago, has only now reached the stage of Senate committee hearings. The Organization for Trade Cooperation, which the United States helped design and has every reason to join, is apparently in too much danger of defeat to be risked on the floor of Congress. These piecemeal offerings have not carried the conviction they would if the administration had presented them as related parts of a grand world policy.

WAY BEHIND THE PEOPLE

This administration failure has had one further effect. It has encouraged, like gas rushing into a vacuum, the greatest irruption of half-baked proposals for saving the world since the early rhetoric of Truman's point 4.

Starting from a sound premise—that the President's foreign-air program was not imaginative enough——they reach some startling conclusions. AFL–CIO's Jim Carey, for example, wants us to set aside 2 percent of our gross national product each year for the next 25 years—i. e., some $200 billion—for foreign economic development. Businessmen talk about "reviving the spirit of the Marshall plan" or a "dynamic, multiphase, century-long campaign" for winning the world from communism.

All these spokesmen can legitimately claim to represent some degree of grassroots sentiment; on this subject Congress, as they accurately put it, is "way behind the people." This is indeed a gap between our national will to do something and Congress' unwillingness to vote money for it. But that does not mean there is a contradiction. The gap waits to be filled by an administration program.

Nehru, had he come to visit the President this month, would by his very presence—let alone his private questions—have forced a decision on this issue. His second 5-year plan requires some $1.6 billion of foreign capital; can he look to the United States Government for it, and, if so, on what terms? What can we ask him to do in turn to encourage that use of private capital, Indian and foreign, which we know will improve his plan?

SEPARATING MILITARY AID

Only a Presidential command decision will unify the policy of all United States Government departments, including George Humphrey's Department, toward the greatest political force in free Asia—and by that we do not mean Nehru; we mean the insistence of all free Asians on a rapid rate of economic growth.

The President's illness, by postponing Nehru's visit, has also postponed the command decision. If that is lucky for his (and his subordinates') peace of mind the luck extends no further.

Americans will certainly wish to participate in the coming economic development of Asia, Latin America, Africa, and all such areas. Not only does our growing stake in foreign trade advise it, but also, as President Black of the World Bank has said, "The underdeveloped areas present a challenge to this century just as the open prairie and the empty lands presented a challenge to the last."

We would want to participate whether the Soviets were offering their own version of foreign aid or not. And we need a policy of participation that will not veer as Soviet rivalry veers, but will be steadfast on its real target, which is the real improvement of living standards throughout the free world.

AN END TO HANDOUTS

Without here trying to spell out what such a policy should be, we may note three facts that bear on it. First, this is not a military policy, and should therefore be kept quite distinct from military aid. Most of the $4.9 billion in the present administration bill is military aid. If this were put into our regular defense budget, where it belongs, the remnant of strictly economic aid would look a lot less generous (and a lot less foolish) than it looks in its present company.

Second, the United States economy, the source of our capital, is still mainly a free and private one. Our Government needs and should have considerable sums to lend or even give to underdeveloped countries. But a long-term policy for a free economy must envision an end to handouts, and point to and beyond the day when every nation will pay its own bills.

Finally, capital is not the only key to growth. A comprehensive United States policy will include lending, but much else besides, notably trade and payments; and it will place them in their proper perspective from the standpoint of their purpose.

That purpose is not to buy votes, or cement alliances, or even (directly) to compete with communism. That purpose is to improve world living standards, including our own, by doing more and more business with all free nations.

More About Our Security and Loyalty Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 10, 1956

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following editorial which appeared in the New York Herald Tribune of July 10, 1956:

REPORT ON SECURITY

The report of the special committee of the Association of the Bar of the City of New York on the Federal loyalty-security program is the work of a responsible, unofficial group. It recognizes the Communist danger and the need for a security program within the Government to meet it. In discussing civilian personnel security, its principal subject, the committee makes few recommendations for fundamental changes in the present system, with the exception of its proposal that security procedures, as such, be confined to sensitive positions—and here the Supreme Court has already ruled to the same general effect. The importance of the report on this aspect of the question, therefore, lies chiefly in presenting a reasoned practical argument in favor of the main lines of the Court's opinion, and in providing a structure which might serve in readjusting the security program as a whole to what the committee rightly calls "a long continuing danger."

Part of such revision might well be the centralization of responsibility for the security program, as the report proposes, in a Director of Personnel and Information Security, to avoid some of the conflicts in interpretation of the regulations which have been caused by decentralization among the various agencies. Such an arrangement, with a central screening board within the Civil Service Commission, should make it easier to apply the rule of common sense which the committee suggests in appraising charges against Government personnel, as well as in such discretionary matters as the confrontation of the charged employee by accusers and witnesses when such procedure is not "detrimental to the interests of national security."

As to the scope of the security program, the Supreme Court, in ruling that the power of summary dismissal does not extend to non-sensitive positions, has stated the same principle adopted by the committee. But it is obvious that this principle requires administrative, if not legislative, clarification. The Attorney General, Mr. Brownell, as well as Mr. Philip Young, Chairman of the Civil Service Commission, have indorsed stopgap legislation, such as that proposed by Representative WALTER, to permit the President to extend the right of summary dismissal to all Federal posts until the Commission of Government Security, headed by Mr. Lloyd Wright, reports next year.

The bar association committee would have the sensitiveness of a job determined "by position and not by agency"; it would apply to those who had either "authorized access" to secret and top-secret material "or opportunity for unauthorized access," as well as to policymakers. "So the position of a secretary or a janitor," it correctly points out, "who had opportunity for access to the files of the Joint Chiefs of Staff would we classified as sensitive."

The committee goes on to say that adoption of its recommendations "would entail the abolition of * * * the Port Security Program" (now applying to longshoremen and seamen). The committee's argument in this

case—that sabotage on land could be more dangerous than sabotage at sea and that the provisions of the program might thus be extended almost universally—does not seem very striking. This newspaper believes there is a "special justification" for security measures on ships and in ports, because these provide a means of communication with foreign countries through which danger could come as well as good, and which are vital to national security in peace as well as in war.

With this qualification, the report has served a useful purpose in providing a temperate, judicious and well balanced survey of a critical subject. It has made a substantial contribution toward the great goal: "Both liberty and security must be maintained for the triumph of our cause in the world."

An Official's Creed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. RHODES
OF ARIZONA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 29, 1956

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, under leave previously granted I would like to include in the RECORD An Official's Creed which appeared in the Mesa Tribune Friday, July 6, 1956. It is a very appropriate time for this article to appear and I thought it should be brought to the attention of the Congress:

AN OFFICIAL'S CREED

With the September primary only a couple of months away, political announcements of intentions to seek public office are dominating news stories these days.

Some years ago a Texas political candidate suggested a public official's creed for all those persons seeking and winning public office. Here is what he suggested:

A conscientious public official serves the people as guardian of their welfare, defender of their institutions, servant of their will, and champion of their cause, by dedicating himself—

To put God and county above party, persons, and private interests;

To strive to promote a religious state, but to avoid a state religion;

To safeguard the people's right to free, unfettered elections, the secret ballot, and the honest count;

To encourage decentralized government as a safeguard to the liberties of the people, and to keep government their servant and not their master;

To uphold the law and expose corruption wherever it may be, and to oppose those who break the law in spirit as well as those who violate it in letter;

To strive to make his office an example of efficiency, economy, and integrity;

To give a day's work for a day's pay, and to require the same of his employees;

To make no private promises, grant no special favors, and receive no personal gifts which would compromise his official integrity;

To use no official power or information for personal gain to himself or to others;

To protect the institution of private property by discouraging the excessive acquisition of land and other goods on the part of the Government;

To defend the institution of private enterprise by keeping government out of business and out of competition with private capital;

To keep the public informed of his office's activities, to respect the right and function of the press as the people's informant, and to invite public scrutiny and constructive criticism;

To assist the public school in the civic education of children;

To be attentive to the activities and needs of other offices and branches of the Government;

To strive to make his personal conduct exemplary of morality and good citizenship, and to fulfill the duties of a private citizen as well as a public servant.

Why I Am a Republican—California Young Republican's Prize Winning Essay

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PATRICK J. HILLINGS
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 25, 1956

Mr. HILLINGS. Mr. Speaker, it was announced in Los Angeles by John Rousselot, president of the California Young Republicans, and Tom Smith, publicity chairman, that Mrs. Adele Anderson has won the California entry in the National Young Republican Federation Essay Contest. Mrs. Anderson is the former Adele Bowman of Santa Barbara and is now residing with her husband in Germany where he is serving in the United States Army.

Mrs. Anderson's essay, entitled "Why I Am a Republican," was chosen by a judging committee comprised of Dr. Robert Haugh, Pasadena City College; Dr. Carl Christol, University of Southern California; and Mr. Robert H. Finch, of Republican Associates, and former first place winner in the Hearst Intercollegiate Oratorical contest.

Mrs. Anderson attended Pomona College, where she graduated in June—magna cum laude and was a member of Phi Beta Kappa.

Adele has taken an active interest in Government and politics since high school, being a member of the Junior Statesmen of California and serving as State secretary of that organization for 1 year. The faculty at Pomona College selected her as 1 of the 2 students to enroll for the first semester of her junior year to study government in the American University in Washington, D. C.

Her winning essay will now enter the national contest which is being held in Washington, D. C. The first place prize in the contest will be a round trip to the Republican Convention in San Francisco.

The essay follows:

WHY I AM A REPUBLICAN

(By Mrs. Adele Anderson)

No party has a corner on the civic virtues of loyalty, patriotism, or honor. There is perhaps no major national policy that has not at some time during our history been held by both major parties. Parties differ most in the emphasis they place and the means they employ.

I am a Republican because this party more than any other party encourages and protects private enterprise, which is the very basis of our prosperous economic system. Private enterprise is the economic expression of individual freedom.

The Republican Party more than any other party respects private property, which encourages the pride of ownership, offers the highest incentive for improvement, and provides a means of deep satisfaction. The Republican Party recognizes that Federal governmental responsibilities can be met without domination.

The Republican Party more than any other is pledged to preserve the Federal structure of our system. Under their leadership the States retain the largest share of power and responsibility that they can effectively use and fulfill. The advantages of a Federal system are fully utilized while its disadvantages are minimized.

The Republican Party more than any other can adhere to principle rather than expediency, because it depends less upon the shifting interests of particular groups and more upon the support of individuals as American citizens. This party is least inclined to appeal for allegiance on the basis of minority group interests such as immigrants, racial groups, or labor. Its appeal concerns American citizenship rather than group membership. Precisely because of this appeal the Republican Party acts as a unifying factor in American life.

I am a Republican because the party is progressive but not radical. It preserves that which is valuable from tradition while keeping very much abreast of the times.

Dulles Is Taking on Role of Propaganda Dispenser

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN D. DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 11, 1956

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, because of the importance of the matter discussed, I insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article by Walter Lippmann appearing in the Detroit Free Press of July 5:

DULLES IS TAKING ON ROLE OF PROPAGANDA DISPENSER

(By Walter Lippmann)

For some time past before the President went to the hospital, there was talk in Washington of a rivalry between the State Department and some members of the White House staff who deal with foreign affairs.

The President, it was said, was not listening exclusively to Secretary Dulles, and this was why there was occasionally, as for example in regard to the neutrals, such a big difference between Mr. Eisenhower and Dulles.

Some observers even went as far as to say that there had begun to exist—as in Woodrow Wilson's day with Colonel House and Franklin D. Roosevelt with Harry Hopkins—a second Foreign Office in the White House itself. Things have never gone nearly so far as that.

For one thing, the President has too deeply ingrained a respect for official channels and regular procedure.

For another, what happened under Wilson and Roosevelt is possible only when the President seems to be his own Foreign Minister.

But it was true that in what might be called the higher strategy of the cold war, President Eisenhower has asserted his independent authority and has deviated from the State Department official line.

Since the President's illness, there have, of course, been no more of these deviations.

But what is more, Dulles has enlarged his own personal operations to take in propaganda and psychological warfare.

Since the publication of the Krushchev speech, denouncing Stalinism, the Secretary of State has made himself the chief propagandist, and has, with the fanfare of big publicity, used the Department of State as an engine of psychological warfare.

Hitherto, the psychological warriors, like the cloak-and-dagger men of the intelligence service, have been kept separate from the Foreign Service, whose business it is to conduct the acknowledged foreign relations of the United States.

Even though the administrative control of the progaganda has been in the Department of State, it has been assumed that the Secretary of State was not himself an active propagandist.

To be that is a new role; and it is, I believe, bad for our diplomacy and for our propaganda as well.

Mr. Eisenhower was following a sound rule, attested by experience at home and abroad, when in the person of C. D. Jackson and then of Nelson Rockefeller, he placed the chief of propaganda in the White House, away from the State Department, and under his own personal supervision.

This separation preserves the desirable distinction between foreign policy and propaganda. For the Secretary of State cannot afford to be regarded as a propagandist.

A Secretary of State who himself assumes the role of chief propagandist can succeed only in undermining his own credit as a diplomat. Like a doctor who sells patent medicine, he sacrifices his professional standing.

As a result of the campaign launched by Khrushchev against Stalin, the international Communist movement and the whole Communist orbit are passing through an agonizing reappraisal which may well have epochal significance.

What should be the American stand in the face of these developments? Should we, as eager beavers, call attention to ourselves, making ourselves out either prime movers in the upheaval?

Or shall we avoid giving the impression that we are somehow engineering the upheaval, that what is going on is not so much an upheaval from within the Communist world as it is a disturbance due to our intervention?

By taking the center of the stage and putting this Government in the spotlight, Dulles has provided the most obvious pretext, for the repression of the upheaval—that is the work of an anti-Communist underground backed up the United States Government.

This is the time when a shrewd American psychological warrior would be making himself invisible. And a wise Secretary of State would be holding himself aloof, not meddling with events which he cannot control.

Stalled At Dead Center

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 11, 1956

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the following column by the Alsop brothers, from the New York Herald Tribune of July 11, 1956, points up our lack of leadership in the executive departments of our Government.

MATTER OF FACT
STALLED AT DEAD CENTER
(By Joseph and Stewart Alsop)

WASHINGTON.—The American Government these days is a bit like a messy kitchen, with the unwashed dishes piled high in the kitchen sink, waiting for the cook to return. The cook, of course, is Dwight D. Eisenhower. And the dishes are a whole series of basic national policy decisions which are waiting to be made.

To be sure, the Government doesn't look like a messy kitchen. During the President's current illness, as after his heart attack, all seems to be going rather smoothly. Yet this appearance is deceptive. In the American system, only the President can make the really tough decisions. If the President is ill, or operating on a part-time basis, the really tough decisions simply do not get made.

Moreover, the President's two serious illnesses have coincided with basic changes in the world situation. There have been, for example, the upheaval within the Soviet-Communist empire, coupled with the rapid development of the new, adventurous, dangerously flexible Soviet policy. These changes are both an opportunity and a challenge, but, partly because of the President's illness and partly because this is an election year, the American Government has not really responded to them. It has gone on acting as though everything is as it was before.

Below the deceptively quiet surface of the Government, to be sure, there has been a great deal of painful, fogbound groping for new policies to fit the new situation. But nothing much has come of all this groping.

For example, one group in the Government, which includes men like Presidential advisers Harold Stassen and William Jackson and chief State Department policy planner Robert Bowie, has generally held that the changes in the Soviet regime are real and meaningful; and that every opportunity of testing Soviet intentions ought to be taken.

A contrary view is held by men like Under Secretary of State Herbert Hoover, Jr., and Secretary of Commerce Sinclair Weeks. The first group has maintained that this country should take the initiative in breaking down the Iron Curtain, that the more contacts with the Soviets the better, and that the gains involved in such contact far overbalance the risks. The second group has wished to maintain an impregnable Iron Curtain of American manufacture.

Largely thanks to William Jackson, the first group scored a partial victory when the President approved a modest "exchange of persons" program. But even this small policy decision took weeks of negotiation and feather-smoothing. And the basic issue—just how far to go to test Soviet intentions—remains undecided.

Again some of the younger policymakers have favored an aggressive policy for exploiting the new strains and stresses in the Soviet camp, resulting from the de-Stalinization policy. For example, after the Poznan riots, a serious proposal was made for a sort of Monroe Doctrine for the satellites, in effect warning the Kremlin against using the Red army to maintain its satellite empire. But this was rejected as too risky, and the policy now is to let the dust settle as far as the satellites are concerned.

Again, take the foreign economic and military aid program which is a chief buttress of American foreign policy. The revolt in Congress has alerted the administration to the fact that it is not good enough just to go on offering the same old program year after year. But even before the congressional revolt, there was much worried talking in the administration about the need for a "bold new approach" to meet the new Soviet challenge in the foreign aid field.

A speech for delivery by the President, modeled on former Secretary of State George Marshall's famous Harvard speech which initiated the Marshall plan, was drafted by a group headed by a former Presidential aid, C. D. Jackson, and submitted to the White House. But partly because no one had decided just what the bold new approach was to be, and partly because of the President's illness, the whole idea came to nothing.

Add the bitter, still unsettled defense debate, the drift in Asia, the policy vacuum in the Middle East, the failure to breathe life back into NATO. You then get an impression of the American Government stalled at dead center, displaying a somnambulistic tendency simply to go on doing what has been done before. There is only one man who can get the Government off dead center, which is another reason for hoping that the news from Gettysburg continues cheering.

Democracy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, July 11, 1956

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a most moving and eloquent poem entitled "Democracy," by Kathryn Fraser. Kathryn is a college student who has just moved to Oregon with her father and mother, Rev. and Mrs. Neil Fraser. Kathryn is to enroll in the University of Oregon.

Her poem symbolizes the equality of all peoples, all nations, and all religions which is inherent and implicit, not only in our own Constitution and Declaration of Independence, but also in the Bible.

There being no objection, the poem was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEMOCRACY
(By Miss Kathryn Fraser)

We are junior statesmen.
The politicians, Congressmen,
Teachers, lawyers, doctors,
Ministers, writers and scientists
Of tomorrow.

We are English, German,
Irish, French, Russian,
Spanish, Dutch, Chinese,
Scotch and Filipino.

We are Jews, Catholics,
Baptists, Presbyterians,
Lutherans, Quakers,
And Christian Scientists.

We are Republicans and Democrats.
We are Americans.
We are junior statesmen
Trying to make democracy work.

To us, democracy is freedom:
The liberty to act, think, and speak freely
Without hindrances
Other than the precepts of common decency
and morality.
To us, democracy is not
An indefinable term
Which we bandy about loosely
Without a clear idea of either its literal
Or practical meaning.

We know our responsibility to democracy.
And our duty to the "other fellow."
We have seen how it is much more than a form of government
Or a dream, or an ideal.
But we realize that it is a way of life.
It is the privilege of standing straight in church
And singing, "Praise God from Whom all blessings flow."

In quite another sense,
It is being able to cheer for our favorite team
At a football game.
It is the devotion with which we behold
Our Constitution and Declaration of Independence.
Closing and locking our doors at night
Is democracy,
For no one may enter unbidden.

Much shopping exhausts both us and our pocketbooks.
But this, too, is democracy.
The very act of mailing a letter
With the confidence that it will go
Unopened to its destination
Is democracy.

What is democracy to us
Who have barely begun to live?

It is the evolution
Of a deeper, freer faith in mankind;
A government which progresses,
Yet does not break with the honorable past,
And in everything fulfills the people's desires—
Be they good or bad.
For it is only through failure
And repeated beginnings
That a nation becomes great.

And for us,
Democracy is a fuller
More trusting belief
In the eternal goodness
And omnipotence
Of God.

Junior statesmen—
We are tomorrow's leaders.
On us the future rests.
Today we are the world's hope—
But soon we must become its security,
A supreme privilege.

We cry—
"Our torch shall not fail.
Nor shall it be dropped.
Closer and closer
To our goal shall we press.
Yet even as we attain it
We shall glimpse it far ahead,
Ever leading,
Ever inspiring,
Ever pressing onward,
Leaving behind milestones
Telling of our accomplishments
Which were once so impossible.

We shall not fail—
Even though we die
We shall have sacrificed ultimately
In giving our lives.
Our influence
Shall still be felt
Like a living presence.
We shall not fail!
We cannot fail!
A just cause never dies!

Danny Kaye: Diplomat

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 11, 1956

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, Brooklyn is proud to call attention to the following column by Martin Agronsky which appeared in the Washington Post of July 11, 1956:

DANNY KAYE: CLOWN AND DIPLOMAT

(By Martin Agronsky)

A clown has been here in our town for the past fortnight. He is Danny Kaye. Like the good clown he is, Mr. Kaye has been making people laugh. This is his trade.

An interesting testimonial as to how well he plies it was provided the other night by one of the most distinguished of our Supreme Court Justices—Felix Frankfurter. Mr. Kaye employs what is known in show business vernacular as a gimmick. It consists of repeatedly asking his audience near the end of his performance if they've had enough and are ready to go home. The idea is for the customers to yell "No." Mr. Justice Frankfurter led the nay shouters with unjudicial abandon. And he is not a man to suffer even mediocrities gladly—let alone, fools.

The audience as usual in this Capital City was polyglot. There were some from the diplomatic corps whose English would certainly not have been equal to the occasion were the comedian's appeal pinned entirely on how he used English words. But Mr. Kaye speaks the international language everyone knows—the language of laughter. The conjugations and declensions—the grammar of his esperanto—are a sense of humor.

An international clown like Kaye has a unique ability. It's to communicate person to person on a level that leaps with a laugh the usual geographical and ideological differences that confront the diplomats and statesmen. It offers a tempting question to those who feel the problem of communication is one of the most difficult barriers across the road to peace. Could the statesmen usefully swap their striped pants for a clown suit?

The trouble is there's a defect in such rosy imagining. The clown's talent is not the only one that everyone understands. Toscanini is a citizen of the world. The Russian ballet would be a hit in New York. Shakespeare is appreciated in any language. And so are Tolstoi and Whitman. Mathematics has only one language, no matter where it is studied. The same is true of the scientists' symbols. So humor is not the only universal language nor the only vehicle for the kind of people-to-people communication of which President Eisenhower has spoken. The arts and the sciences have long provided the potential means for international understanding. And like that which humor offers, none has yet succeeded where diplomacy has failed.

Mr. Kaye is a jester, but not a fool. The experiences he has had in the past 4 years—particularly in trying to make unfortunate children laugh in many lands as a voluntary envoy of UNICEF—the United Nations International Children's Emergency Fund—have not made him feel the time has come when the diplomats can be laughed out of business. Yet one encounter he told me about does seem to justify wondering if it might not be wise for all nations to require of their diplomats that they be able to demonstrate not only a sense of protocol, but also a sense of humor.

In Austria recently, the comedian was honored with an invitation to meet with President Theodor Koerner. As Kaye told of the encounter, the Austrian chief of state came alive—an old man, 82, slight, with close-cropped head of white hair, a wispy white goatee, a gentle quizzical smile, a feeling of strength beneath outward frailty.

The comedian had been ushered through one immense chamber after another—all souvenirs of the lost grandeur of imperial Austria—to await the President finally in a vast, high-ceilinged reception room. At the far end a door opened. The Austrian President, walking with a stiff-legged limp, came slowly across a great expanse of gleaming floor. Formally the comedian and the statesman met in the middle of the overwhelming room. The comedian, oppressed by the atmosphere, made uncomfortable by the feeling he was taxing an old man's strength, discarded protocol to ask: "Why don't we sit down?" To this the President replied quietly, "But I was supposed to ask you that," and led the way to his office.

In his more informal atmosphere, Kaye reminisced, the dialog began like this:

President: "I know why you wanted to meet me, Mr. Kaye, you wanted to see an old man."

Comedian: "No, Mr. President; I wanted to see a great man."

President: "Well, Mr. Kaye, now I must offer you some of our fine Viennese coffee."

Comedian: "Thank you, Mr. President, and would you tell me something? Would you have offered me coffee if I hadn't said you were a great man?"

President: "I think so. And now, Mr. Kaye, what would you like to talk about?"

Welcome to Unico

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON CANFIELD
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 11, 1956

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I desire to include an editorial from the Paterson (N. J.) Evening News, issue of Friday, July 6, regarding Paterson's newest service club and its high principles.

The president of Paterson Unico is Salvatore Viviano; its secretary is Fred Ardis; and its treasurer is Anthony Ragucci.

The editorial follows:

WELCOME TO UNICO

Unico, Paterson's newest service club, is a welcome addition to a select group of organizations which have done much for the city. Each club—Kiwanis, Rotary, Veritans and their kindred groups, have contributed not alone manpower, but spirit, enthusiasm, and tangibles to Paterson's progress.

And so with Unico, comprising leading young men of Italian ancestry. The fact of its nationality association in no way detracts from its thorough Americanism. It is only that Unico provides an opportunity for men of deep pride in the homeland of their forebears to gather together in a spirit of camaraderie and of useful citizenship.

The name Unico is significant in itself—U for unity of man; N for neighborliness; I for integrity of character; C for charity; and O for opportunity in all-around citizenry. Compositely, the man who embodies these virtues epitomizes the American ideal at its finest, and so an organization dedicated to such principles cannot help but be of benefit to any community fortunate to have it in its midst.

Unico, based upon the principles of service above self, has expanded remarkably in the past few years and it was inevitable that this city, with so many capable men of Italian extraction in its midst, should join the national procession.

Dotted across the land are so many magnificent causes which Unico has served. Scholarships for needy students by the hundreds; camp life for youngsters who would otherwise never enjoy the life; guidance for youngsters who might have gone astray; aid for the physically handicapped—these are but a few of the causes to which Unico around the country has been dedicated.

Unico is new in Paterson but the fierce and passionate ardor of the Italian people, spurred on by unquestioned Americanism, will soon reflect itself in a vigorous program by the new Paterson unit.

We wish Unico well. It has charted a constructive course to which we will be pleased to give our support in the days ahead.

Separation of Federal Home Loan Bank Board and Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, July 11, 1956

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, on July 16, Reorganization Plan No. 2 will become law, authorizing at that time the separation of the Federal Home Loan Bank Board and the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation into two separate agencies. This will happen unless recent resolutions reported to the House and the Senate are approved. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD three letters which I believe explain the position taken by many notable Federal savings and loan companies relative to this proposal.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PORTLAND FEDERAL SAVINGS,
Portland, Oreg., June 22, 1956.

The Honorable RICHARD L. NEUBERGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR DICK: I enjoyed very much being with you and Maurine in Washington, D. C. It was a pleasure to have you both present at our dinner party.

I am writing at this time in regard to Reorganization Plan No. 2, which was recently submitted to the Congress as a Presidential proposal.

Our savings and loan industry has made a thorough study of Reorganization Plan No. 2, and it is our feeling that the Presidential staff did not give proper consideration to the far reaching effects of the plan. No one consulted with our industry before the plan was presented, and we, therefore, do not know how much study was given to it.

The present single agency for handling savings and loan affairs has been developed over the last 25 years, resulting in a strong and progressive nationwide system of savings and loan associations, which now finance over 37 percent of all home loans. The approval of Reorganization Plan No. 2 would create another separate agency. This would not result in a reduction of agencies or expense, but would increase the agencies and the cost of the Home Loan Bank Board and the Insurance Corporation. The existence of two boards with overlapping responsibilities for savings and loan operation would result in conflicts of policy and great confusion in our business as well as in Congress.

Our association and the entire savings and loan industry is interested in constructive improvements and supervision of the savings and loan business. We are interested in simplification and strengthening of the Insurance Corporation. The United States Savings & Loan League is currently studying the Federal Home Loan Bank system and is planning to make recommendations for improvements as soon as the study is completed.

We hope that, in the meantime, this Reorganization Plan No. 2 can be defeated and, at a later date, improvements in the Home Loan Bank system approved by Congress.

Many thanks for past favors, and, if you have any questions on this, do not hesitate to write me. Please give my regards to Maurine.

Sincerely yours,

GUY E. JAQUES,
President.

FIRST FEDERAL SAVINGS & LOAN
ASSOCIATION OF THE DALLES, OREG.,
June 18, 1956.

Hon. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR NEUBERGER: As you are well aware, the President of the United States on May 17 presented to Congress Reorganization Plan No. 2 which has to do with the separation of the governing bodies of the Federal Home Loan Bank and the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation. As a director and managing officer of a Federal savings and loan association, an executive committeeman of the Oregon Savings and Loan League, and as the Oregon Director of the United States Savings and Loan League I wish to solicit your opposition to the plan on the basis that it has been obviously hastily drawn and that any plan affecting a major segment of the thrift and home financing field should be thoroughly studied by the appropriate committees established by Congress and representatives of the industry before drastic action is taken.

It is difficult for me to understand why it has been found necessary to submit this plan without first consulting the congressional committees normally concerned with the savings and loan industry, the Federal Savings and Loan Advisory Council as established by Congress, and the Federal Home Loan Bank Board. I know of no recent trend of events that has suddenly indicated that an emergency exists because savings and loan associations are or tend to operate in a manner detrimental to our savings members whose savings funds are also the concern of the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation.

I believe that I am correct when I state that the goal of the Hoover Commission is the attainment of efficiency and economy in government. It must be evident to any student of this plan and the savings and loan business that efficiency and economy are not the goal of Reorganization Plan No. 2. The message transmitting this plan to Congress, paragraph 11, indicates that economies to the Government may be effected by preventing unsound operation on the part of savings and loan associations rather than from the operation of governmental agencies. The fact that the major portion of the operational costs of the Federal Home Loan Bank System and the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation are born by the savings and loan industry is ample proof that there will be no savings to Government from an operational standpoint, in fact the establishment of an additional Federal agency is bound to increase the cost of the Government. It is also evident that the establishment of an additional agency could substantially increase the costs now being born by the savings and loan business which would be reflected either in the earnings to the public on savings or in the rate of interest on home loans. The cost must be raised from some source.

Haste in drafting Reorganization Plan No. 2 is evident by the departures from normal procedures when establishing governmental agencies. There is no provision that assures that the governing body of this agency will be bi-partisan as is provided for the Federal Home Loan Bank System and the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation. Also, it would seem advisable to limit these appointees to a definite term of office rather than to provide for an indefinite tenure.

The letter of transmittal with Reorganization Plan No. 2 indicates that this step is in accordance with the recommendations of the Hoover Commission when as a matter of fact the task force studying the Federal Home Loan Bank Board observed "Also, it supervises the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation. This appears to be a natural grouping of functions which requires no change." Recommendation No. 4 of the Hoover Commission Report stated "That no person be permitted to serve as a member of the Home Loan Bank Board and the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation at the same time." Also, the representative of the Housing and Home Finance Agency in 1955 voiced opposition to the separation of these two functions when appearing at the hearings on lending agencies before the House Committee on Government Operations. Reviewing the foregoing it is difficult to find any similarity between the findings of responsible congressional organizations and the Hoover Commission and the objectives of Reorganization Plan No. 2.

As a managing officer who has to contend with governmental rules and regulations, I wish to make it plain that I will welcome and support any congressional action that will increase the security of the savings and borrowing members of this association. I believe that the record of my colleagues, both past and present, will indicate a similar attitude. However, I am opposed to any action affecting any business that has not been conceived by the best brains in the country and then only after they have given the action their serious and detailed consideration.

I feel that "act in haste and repent at leasure" is a poor philosophy to aply to an industry that has as prominent a position in the Nation's economy as that enjoyed by the savings and loan associations.

I am forwarding a copy of this letter to your colleague Senator WAYNE MORSE.

Sincerely,

B. M. KEITH.

PIONEER FEDERAL SAVINGS
& LOAN ASSOCIATION,
Baker, Oreg., June 21, 1956.

Hon. Senator RICHARD NEUBERGER,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: I am writing you regarding the President's proposed Reorganization Plan No. 2, which, as you know, is a proposal to separate the Federal Home Loan Bank Board and the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation into two separate agencies. As you also probably know, this Reorganization Plan was submitted to Congress without consultation with the leaders of the savings and loan business and, I believe, without sufficient study. It would seem that this separation of operations would result in considerable increase in cost of operation, as well as an overlapping of responsibilities for the operation of savings and loan associations.

At the present time there is a committee of the United States Savings and Loan League in the process of making a very thorough study of the Home Loan Bank System with the idea in mind to propose support of any constructive improvement in the supervision of the Savings and Loan business. It is my thought that this committee, when their study is completed, could make some very valuable suggestions which would make any reorganization plan more effective and on a sounder basis.

As you know, Reorganization Plan No. 2 will become law on July 16 unless you and your colleagues take action to prevent it. I urge you to give this your careful study and hope you will be inclined to reject it in its present form.

Yours very truly,

CARL DAVIS, *Manager.*

Statement of Hon. Arthur G. Klein, Democrat, New York, July 11, 1956, Upon the Introduction of a Bill To Amend Section 401 (e) of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARTHUR G. KLEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 26, 1956

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced legislation providing for permanent certification of the airlines temporarily authorized by the Civil Aeronautics Board to conduct helicopter service in the Chicago, Los Angeles, and New York metropolitan areas.

The metropolitan helicopter services have proved themselves an essential part of the air transportation system of the United States. Their successful development is required in the interest not only of civil air transportation, but of the postal service and the national defense. In the event of an attack upon the United States, the availability of the helicopter organizations to carry out military and civil defense missions would be vitally important.

Commencing only 9 years ago with service confined to mail carriage, the helicopter airlines are now providing lift not only for mail, but for passengers, express and freight as well. The helicopters now available for civil use have limited capacity. However, by 1960 multiple-turbine helicopters capable of carrying 25 passengers will be available for civil use.

Within the next 5 years, the 3 present helicopter airlines alone will require some $25 million of financing to keep pace with the swift developments in this field—representing a 7-fold increase in capitalization. It appears that the market for civil helicopters of United States manufacture might approximate $200 million during this same period. New money in these amounts is not likely to be forthcoming unless helicopter transportation is placed on the same basis of financial and operating stability as that enjoyed by the other forms of air transportation.

Temporary certification by the Civil Aeronautics Board is not sufficient for this purpose. The problems of achieving expansion of this magnitude should not be multiplied by the handicap of temporary authorizations in which neither the public, the investors, nor the helicopter manufacturers can have any firm confidence. According the helicopter carriers permanent status will provide much needed assistance in the development of this important new form of air transportation.

Ineptness and Ineffectiveness

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 10, 1956

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the following article by Walter Lippmann, which appeared in his syndicated column in papers throughout the country on July 10, 1956, demonstrates a maximum of ineptness and ineffectiveness. The readers can conclude for themselves which or both of these adjectives apply to either or both the Republican Party and its leader, President Eisenhower. Whether we agree or disagree with all that Mr. Lippmann says, we must conclude that the Republican Party follows its leader with lip service in order to get itself elected, while its leader, the President, talks big but accomplishes little.

The item follows:

TODAY AND TOMORROW

(By Walter Lippmann)

CANDIDATE AND LEADER

To judge by what is happening in Congress to the President's legislative program, he is the unanimous candidate of a party that will not follow him as a leader. A heavy majority of the Republicans, acting contrary to the President's advice, have just voted for the Powell amendment which made it impossible to pass the bill to give Federal aid to the public schools. But for the Republican defectors, the Democrats could not have gotten Congress to overrule the administration on the size of the military appropriation, and in effect to pass a vote of no confidence in the President's military judgment. The President's very modest proposals to liberalize international trade are stalled because of Republican opposition. The foreign aid bill, the keystone of administration foreign policy, is being given what Life magazine describes as "a furious kicking around." None of this could have happened if the President had a reasonably united support from his own party.

Yet he has such overwhelming support for his running again that he will probably be renominated by acclamation. The same Republicans who oppose his policies and his measures are a chorus crying out that the future of this country, the future of the world, depend upon his being a candidate. What are we to make of this contrast between his candidacy and his leadership? The obvious explanation is the cynical one, that the dissenting Republicans do not believe in Eisenhower's policies but that they need him to win the election for them.

The relations between the President and his party in Congress are remarkable. His enormous popularity and prestige have made him, as he was far from being in 1952, the undisputed choice of the party for President. Yet he is as little able today as he was when he took office to unite and lead his party in support of his policies. The issues on which the party will not unite behind him are not small issues. They are the crucial and major issues of foreign policy, defense, education. What takes some explaining is how, though he and they are divided in Congress, they can be united for the presidential election.

This is possible because in General Eisenhower's conception of the American Government the President is not the leader of the system who makes it work but the officer who presides over the executive branch. He exhorts; he preaches; he proposes measures, he pleads for them. But he does not lead the Congress. In his book there are no rewards for men, like Senator WILEY, who take risks in order to follow him; there are no penalties for those who, like Senator KNOWLAND, so often oppose him. Yet in order to lead a party it is necessary not only to talk but also to use a discipline of rewards and penalties.

It is General Eisenhower's unwillingness to insist upon party discipline, his virtual neutrality between those who oppose him and those who support him, that account for his inability to lead Congress. His personal popularity, which is his party's prime asset, is freely available to all Republicans without any reciprocal obligation on their part. So the Republicans opposed to Eisenhower want him for President, being under no obligation to follow him.

The American political system has never worked well when the President is passive and unable to give a strong lead to Congress. For the American Congress is like other legislative bodies, as, for example, the French National Assembly. It is almost incapable of dealing successfully with big questions except under the leadership, which includes the discipline, of the Executive. On measures where the national interest is more than the net sum of opposing local interests, the Executive, that is the President, must be the active political force.

He cannot drop the big measures into the legislative assembly, making an occasional public comment and doing some private lobbying, but on the whole standing aside in an attitude of respectful neutrality. For the big measures are almost certain to be ground to bits by Congressmen responding to local pressures from their constituents. These measures can be saved and carried through the Legislature only if the Representatives can feel behind them, and can point to, a national pressure which is stronger than the local pressures. Except when there is an upheaval of popular sentiment, only the President can generate the national pressure.

The Kelley bill to give Federal aid to the public schools is a case in point. The national interest, as the President rightly saw it, called for the passage of this bill. It was known to all that there was no chance of passing it through the Senate as against a Southern filibuster, if the bill contained the Powell amendment denying Federal funds to States resisting integration. But a heavy majority of the Republicans in the House, joined by a third of the Democrats from the North, nevertheless voted to insert the Powell amendment.

Thus Federal aid to education was sacrificed by some 148 Republicans and some 77 Democrats who believed they were appealing to the Negro voters in their local constituencies. The President alone could have forced Congress to face the grave national need in this crisis of the American public-school system. With the President absent, or passive and silent, the national interest could not prevail.

The Administration's Unrealistic Policy in the Middle East

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 11, 1956

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, during the discussion on the foreign aid bill last month I urged our Government, as I did on several other occasions in the past year, to adopt a firmer policy in the Middle East and to end its policy of appeasement of the Arabs. I advocated that we should not appropriate any funds for

the Arab states because "they have betrayed the cause of the free world by their actions in making possible Russia's intrusion into the Middle East." At the same time, I suggested that we provide the necessary military aid to Israel for self-defense against her aggressive neighbors who are threatening her existence.

About a month has passed by since that discussion, but events of the past few weeks only confirm the view that the situation in that area has deteriorated to a considerable extent. On the one hand, the deterioration is due to Communist intrigue with the Arab rulers; on the other hand, it is due to failure on the part of the United States to pursue a firm policy and to act decisively.

During these past weeks we have witnessed the triumphant tour of Russian Foreign Minister Shepilov in the Arab countries. We have witnessed the parade of Communist military equipment through the streets of Cairo in connection with the "liberation of the Suez Canal area." There have been new threats against Israel by Col. Nasser, of Egypt and the Premier of Jordan.

In the meantime, the French Foreign Minister M. Christian Pineau was in Washington recently to consult with Secretary of State Dulles and among other things sought to convince our Government of the need to make arms available to Israel in order to maintain a semblance of military equilibrium in the area. Secretary Dulles, however, would not listen to the advice of the French Foreign Minister.

The result is that Israel is still unable to purchase arms in this country which she needs for defense purposes. Other countries now take the view that providing arms to Israel is a responsibility which should be shared also by the United States, but since the United States refuses to do so other Western countries likewise are holding back. This is a vicious circle which is not only hurting Israel, our stanchest alley in the Near East, but it is also hurting our own prestige and our position of moral leadership among the free nations.

The policy pursued by the present administration is a policy of hostility toward Israel. It may doom Israel's existence as a free and independent state. It may lead to a war in the Middle East, and possibly to a new world war. It is a most unrealistic and erroneous policy. There is a crying need for a change in this policy, and the sooner the better. Next week or next month may be too late.

Mr. Speaker, in connection with the situation in the Middle East, I wish to insert into the RECORD an article on the subject by Murray Frank, entitled "Dulles Piles Up Perilous Blunders," which was published in the June issue of the American Zionist, the official monthly publication of the Zionist Organization of America. The article is as follows:

DULLES PILES UP PERILOUS BLUNDERS

(By Murray Frank)

WASHINGTON, D. C.—The following two news items datelined Washington appeared in the press 48 hours apart:

May 17: "The Defense Department confirmed it is sending Saudi Arabia another shipment of military goods. Pentagon officials said they included shells for the 76-millimeter guns of the M-41 tanks."

May 19: "State Department Press Officer Lincoln White disclosed that 21 surplus Army half-tracks destined for Israel were taken off a freighter in New York harbor. The ship sailed without the military vehicles."

The above two items illustrate most vividly the operations of Secretary of State Dulles' policy of impartiality as between the Arab States and Israel. That policy was reiterated only the week before by Mr. Dulles in an address before the B'nai B'rith convention in Washington when he said: "We want friendly political, cultural, and economic relations with all of the nations of the area (i. e., Middle East) on a basis of impartiality."

Evidently, impartiality in Mr. Dulles' dictionary means denying arms to Israel for fear it would result in an arms race in the Middle East, while at the same time sending (one is tempted to say secretly smuggling through an obscure port in North Carolina) weapons to Saudi Arabia. What kind of logic is this from a nation which claims to be the moral leader of the free world? Do principles no longer hold any meaning for us? No wonder the Washington Post observed editorially:

"The sudden disclosure of the shipment (i. e., to Saudi Arabia) tends to make a mockery of the pious admonitions not to whet Arab-Israeli tension and of the refusal to sell defensive arms to Israel. To say the least, it makes the American moral position one of dubious flexibility."

As if this is not enough, it is learned here that the United States is planning to send a group of 95 military experts to Saudi Arabia to train its troops, and that offers had been made to send similar experts to train troops in Syria, Lebanon, and other Arab countries. This was learned recently when Pentagon representatives testified before a congressional Committee on Military Appropriations for the coming fiscal year.

TREADING DANGEROUS LINE

The question arises: Train Arab troops against whom? Against the Soviet hordes? What nonsense. Is it to maintain internal order in these countries? Then why so much arms and of modern design? That leaves only one other alternative: Preparation for a military attack on Israel. If so, why should the United States be a part to such schemes? Secretary Dulles is treading not only a thin line, but also a very dangerous line in the Middle East.

When disclosure of the shipment of arms to Saudi Arabia and the denial of arms for Israel was made, those who immediately raised their voices in protest were Senators HERBERT H. LEHMAN, New York, ESTES KEFAUVER, Tennessee, PAUL DOUGLAS, Illinois, HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, Minnesota, and Congressman EMANUEL CELLER, New York—all Democrats.

The Democrats lashed out bitterly against the Government's action in permitting arms to flow freely to Saudi Arabia, while blocking surplus Army vehicles for Israel. Some called it favoritism toward the Arabs at Israel's expense, others said it was inept and unrealistic, still others called it unabashed appeasement of the Arabs and deplored the fact that the administraiton clings to a bankrupt foreign policy.

How did the State Department explain it? Mr. Lincoln White, the Department's press officer and spokesman, said that the weapons for Saudi Arabia had been approved last August at the time a shipment of 18 tanks for Saudi Arabia was approved. One is tempted to ask: How many more arms consignments have been promised to Saudi Arabia or other Arab countries of which the American public does not know and may not learn until they are discovered by sheer chance accident? As for the half-tracks for Israel which were removed from the freighter, Mr. White explained that the license called for spare parts, but not for assembled vehicles. In Israel's instance, United States authorities suddenly become highly technical and insist on abiding by each letter of the law.

Meanwhile, official Washington was reported to be shocked and dismayed over Egypt's recognition of Communist China. Fear is expressed here that other Arab League members may follow Egypt's action, and our diplomats are bringing all sorts of diplomatic pressure to prevent such steps on their part. Presumably, new efforts at appeasement are in the making. The United States is truly falling hook, line, and sinker for Arab blackmail tactics, of which the recognition of China is another example.

Already there are rumors here that Egypt is on the verge of making a deal with Red China to obtain a new supply of arms, so that when the present deal with Czechoslovakia expires on July 1, the flow of Communist arms to Egypt will continue. The State Department is reportedly investigating these rumors and lending credence to them as a buildup for further concessions to the Egyptian dictator, Colonel Nasser.

At last reports, United States relations with Egypt are under consideration or reappraisal by the National Security Council, the top policymaking body in the country, and some optimists are predicting that the United States-Egyptian relations may worsen. Others even predict that Henry Byroade, United States Ambassador to Cairo, will be recalled because of his failure to keep Washington informed in advance of Egypt's recognition of China.

We do not share this feeling, because it would be the natural reaction and the logical position for the United States to take. From past experience, however, it is safer to predict that the State Department will embark on a new series of appeasements and of playing right into the hands of the Arab blackmailers. It is not that our officials are so naive. They are cynical, hardboiled, blinded by expediency, their minds are shut, their ideas are fixed.

Commenting on Egypt's recognition of China, the Washington Post stated as follows:

"Recognition of Red China by Egypt must be put down as part of the payoff in connection with the Communist arms deal last fall. It is important for what it signifies. Colonel Nasser has not moved into the Communist camp, but is acting as a Soviet stalking-horse against the West in the Middle East and in Africa. The Cairo move comes as a blow to the school of thought in Washington which still clung to the view that the United States had a residual influence with the Egyptian dictator."

EGYPT AND RED CHINA

More recently, Secretary Dulles stated that Egypt's recognition of Red China is an action we regret, thus indicating for the first time that official Washington is perhaps beginning to cool off somewhat on its earlier appraisal of Nasser. One must not be overoptimistic regarding such developments, because when he was asked whether the United States had become disillusioned with Nasser, Mr. Dulles replied:

"To the extent that he (Nasser) is a spokesman for Egyptian independence, we have sympathy with his point of view; but to the extent that he takes action which seems to promote the interests of the Soviet Union and Communist China, we do not look with favor upon such action."

A day later, President Eisenhower expressed a similar view. He called Egypt's action in recognizing China "mistaken," but added quickly that a single act on the part of a nation does not destroy friendship or stop the efforts to work with it. He sought to minimize the difficulties in current United

States-Egyptian relations by referring to it as a family spat. Similarly, the President also sought to minimize difficulties over Saudi Arabia by saying the United States is only sending a moderate amount of arms which are to be used for internal security; besides, he stressed, Saudi Arabia has no common border with Israel. At this point he again observed that the United States is trying to prevent an arms race in the Middle East.

Unfortunately, our top officials in the administration still prefer to believe that they can influence the Egyptian dictator and the other Arab leaders to proceed along the path of peace and righteousness. Hence the conviction in Washington that the way to achieve this objective is to refuse to take sides, namely, to continue the policy of impartiality between the Arab States and Israel. One need only compare the Arab position today with what it was 3 years ago, when Mr. Dulles first enunciated his policy, to see how far they have gone in rearming, in aggressive intent against Israel, in opposing the interests of the United States and the free world, and in bringing the whole Middle East to the brink of war.

Tribute to Rt. Rev. Msgr. Stephen J. Krasula

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. IRVING M. IVES
OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, July 11, 1956

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, Method M. Balco, who is secretary-treasurer of the eastern district, Slovak Catholic Federation of America, has called to my attention the fact that the Right Reverend Monsignor Stephen J. Krasula recently completed his 40th year as pastor of St. John Nepomucene Parish in New York City. This is a remarkable record in pastoral service.

Mr. Balco has written a tribute to Monsignor Krasula, and I have been requested to place that tribute in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Accordingly, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have this tribute printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the tribute was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A TRIBUTE TO THE RIGHT REVEREND MONSIGNOR STEPHEN J. KRASULA—TO HIS 40 YEARS OF LEADERSHIP IN NEW YORK CITY

(By Method M. Balco, secretary-treasurer of the eastern district, Slovak Catholic Federation of America)

On March 12, 1956, 40 years of pastoral zeal, efforts, and sacrifices of true leadership were achieved in the city of New York by the Right Reverend Monsignor Stephen J. Krasula, pastor of St. John Nepomucene Parish, 66th Street and First Avenue in Manhattan. The 40th anniversary was observed quietly, with the jubilarian celebrating Holy Mass of Thanksgiving and preaching to his beloved parishioners.

However, although the anniversary was observed quietly at the request of the jubilarian, the Right Reverend Monsignor Krasula nonetheless received many tributes paid to him by the leading Americans, and especially Americans of Slovakian origin and descent, among whom he is a national figure, admired and respected as such. Thousands of Slovakian exiles remembered the good monsignor in various countries also. The proverbial saying, "Life begins at 40" was often repeated.

The Catholic News, official organ of the New York archdiocese, paid tribute to the jubilarian in its current issue by publishing his picture and listing his spiritual achievements as a pastor of one of the largest Catholic Slovak parishes in America, founded and established by the Americans of Slovakian origin. The parish was founded on September 8, 1895 by the members of the St. Matthew's Society, branch 45 of the First Catholic Slovak Union of the United States of America, and Canada. The late Martin Challan, well-known manufacturer, was its first president, was the principal organizer aided by many others. Challan's son, John P., was later deputy police inspector in New York City. Former Mayor Vincent Impellitteri paid tribute to Martin Challan on his 100th birthday anniversary, officially proclaiming "Martin Challan Slovak Day" on November 12, 1953.

The parish had its first church at 289 East Fourth Street in the borough of Manhattan. The late Most Reverend M. Corrigan, archbishop of New York archdiocese was the first to aid the Catholic Slovaks of the newly organized parish, which was incorporated on June 10, 1899. In 1911 a new church was established at 314 East 57th Street and the Fourth Street church building was sold.

During the period of 21 years the parish had 23 priests administering to the scattered parishioners in all the 5 boroughs. Forty years ago, on March 12, 1916, Rt. Rev. Msgr. Krasula was installed as its rector by the late Most Reverend John Dunn, later auxiliary bishop of the New York archdiocese.

Before describing the progress of the parish under the leadership of Monsignor Krasula, let us briefly review his life history.

Msgr. Stephen J. Krasula was born on May 22, 1887, as the son of John and Helen Krasula in the city of Namestovo, county of Orava, Slovakia, then the province of Austro-Hungary. The parents were blessed with six children, namely Florian, John, Simon, Stephen, and Joseph; also one daughter, Agnes. The family had a drygoods store, which was later managed by the eldest son, Florian. John became a teacher, but died a year after receiving his diploma. Joseph remained in his hometown and experienced horrors of two world wars. Simon came to America, lived in Chicago where he died.

The father of the family died when Monsignor Krasula was 12 years young. The mother died in 1933 at the age of 81. The monsignor visited her in 1925, when he also made a pilgrimage to Rome during the Holy Year.

Monsignor Krasula in his youth had the privilege of knowing the leading Slovakian leaders and patriots. In his home town, Namestovo, lived the greatest Slovakian poet, Hviezdoslav, an attorney by profession. During his studies in the city of Ruzomberok, he was inspired by the leadership of Msgr. Andrej Hlinka, champion of Slovak rights for freedom. The Slovaks did not fare well during the youthful years of Monsignor Krasula, so in October 1907 he came to America to finish his studies for priesthood. The late Rev. Joseph Martincek, then pastor of St. John Nepomucene Parish, took him to the Rt. Rev. Msgr. Mooney, then vicar general of New York archdiocese who accepted the 20-year-old student as a seminarian. In 1908 he began his studies at the St. Joseph's Seminary, Dunnwoodie, N. Y. There he met another Slovak seminarian, Rev. John Kubasek, later pastor of Holy Trinity Parish in Yonkers, N. Y. They became close friends until Father Kubasek's death in 1950.

Seven years after his arrival to this country, Monsignor Krasula was ordained to priesthood on June 5, 1914, at St. Patrick's Cathedral, New York City, by the Most Rev. Bishop Cussack. He celebrated his first solemn mass in Yonkers, N. Y., where he became assistant pastor of the Holy Trinity Parish. He also administered to the needs of Catholic Slovaks of North Tarrytown, N. Y., who organized the Parish of Holy Cross.

A year after his ordination, he was sent as assistant to the ailing Father John Kropac, then pastor of St. John Nepomucene Parish on East 57th Street in New York City. When Father Kropac died suddenly on February 14, 1916, the young assistant Father Krasula was appointed and installed as pastor on March 12, 1916.

Forty years have passed since the young pastor assumed his arduous duties. Immediately after installation he showed his remarkable organizing abilities and proved his powerful qualities as a leader. From a small parish, with scattered parishioners in all the five boroughs, he organized and built one of the largest and most up-to-date parishes.

After many sacrifices, in 1925 he built a new church on the corner of 66th Street and 1st Avenue, which was dedicated by His Eminence Patrick Cardinal Hayes on May 30, 1925. In the rear of this edifice stands a modern rectory and a parochial school with a large auditorium. Later he built a convent on East 66th Street. The buildings with all modern improvements were constructed and equipped with necessary furnishings, and recently renovated with new marble altar and new organ. All this at a cost of over $1½ million. In spite of depression and World War II, all debts are all paid.

Monsignor Krasula founded and reorganized the existing societies, visited all his parishioners at least once a year and in 1926 initiated a regular daily parochial school with the teaching staff of Sisters of Saints Cyril and Methodius, from the Motherhouse in Danville, Pa.

Although the large and growing parish required all his attention, Monsignor Krasula never failed to assist and lead his Slovakian compatriots in all their endeavors for God and Nation.

He is associated with these national organizations: The First Catholic Slovak Union of United States of America and Canada; has a New York district named in his honor; the First Catholic Slovak Ladies Union; the Slovak Catholic Sokol, of which he is protector; the Pennsylvania Slovak Catholic Union elected him as honorary spiritual director; the Ladies Pennsylvania Slovak Catholic Union, also the National Slovak Society honored him on numerous occasions. The Slovak Catholic Federation of America, an affiliate of NCWC, in recognition of his great work elected him honorary supreme president for life. He is also active in the Knights of Columbus. He is known as the first president of the first assembly of the Slovak League of America, which organization was founded on May 26, 1907. The league elected him national vice president. He served with great distinction during World War I, being also member of the Czecho-Slovak National Council, which worked for the establishment of the first Czechoslovak Republic. The Republic was proclaimed on October 28, 1918. In this capacity he worked closely with Dr. Thomas G. Masaryk and his son, Jan, as well as other distinguished Americans. During the historical meeting of the Catholic priests with Gen. Milan R. Stefanik, held at Hotel Plaza in New York City, he acted as secretary. General Stefanik was a famous astronomer, aviator, and cofounder of the Czechoslovak Republic who served on the allied military staff of Gen. John Pershing during World War I.

Monsignor Krasula aided the Reverend Joseph Murgas, well-known scientist, who was chairman of the million-dollar drive for the establishment of Czechoslovakia.

On February 22, 1911, a Slovak Catholic Federation of America, an affiliate of NCWC, was organized for the purpose of aiding the Catholic Slovaks in their religious and cultural needs and aspirations. Monsignor Krasula worked for this noble organization since its inception. He was its national secretary as well as editor of official organ Dobry Pastier (Good Shepherd) during and after World War I. During World War II, he head as national chairman the Slovak Catholic Religious Relief Association, affiliated with the NCWC war-relief services. The association aided the hierarchy, clergy, and people in the war-torn Slovakia and the displaced persons. Under Monsignor Krasula's leadership over a half-million dollars was raised by direct contributions and tons of clothing and food was sent abroad. The displaced persons were given all the necessary aid and assistance with the cooperation and supervision of the NCWC war-relief services and its subsequent agencies, in which the good monsignor still assists in any capacity assigned to.

In 1926 he was host to the four bishops of Slovakia, who visited the United States; also to Msgr. Andrej Hlinka, Senator Dr. Joseph Buday, later to Dr. Milan Hodza, Premier of Czechoslovakia, as well as Jan Masaryk, then exile from his native country; he also welcomed the delegation of St. Vojtech Society, largest Slovak cultural institute in the world, whose five member delegation, including Msgr. Joseph Tiso, later martyred President of Slovakia, visited this country in 1937; also the Slovenska Matica (Slovak Academy of Arts and Sciences), for which he acted as treasurer.

During the official reception by the late Mayor LaGuardia, of New York City, in honor of Dr. Edward Benes, then President of the Czechoslovakian government-in-exile; also the official reception in honor of exiled King Peter, of Yugoslavia, Monsignor Krasula was official representative of His Eminence Francis J. Cardinal Spellman. Monsignor Krasula likewise was a host to Karol Sidor, former Minister to Vatican from Slovak Republic.

Holy Father Pope Pius XI, at the recommendation of His Eminence Patrick Cardinal Hayes, elevated him in 1930 to the honor of papal chamberlain with the title of very reverend monsignor and in 1937 to the rank of domestic prelate with the title of right reverend monsignor.

During World War II he published monthly the St. John's Messenger, which he sent to over 750 parish boys in service. Nineteen of them paid the supreme sacrifice. He also consoled the boys from his parish during the Korean conflict.

Monsignor Krasula is the best-known American of Slovak origin. In all parts of the globe where you find Slovaks, they can tell you that they at least heard his name and also have known his interest in the welfare of the homeless and those who need a helping hand.

On the 40th anniversary of Monsignor Krasula's most successful pastorate in New York City, many prayers were raised to heaven for his health and blessings. We add our humble felicitations and prayers with a sincere ad multos annos.

Primer for Americans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER E. CAPEHART
OF INDIANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, July 11, 1956

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, on Wednesday, July 4, there appeared in the Columbus, Ohio, Dispatch, one of the finest articles I ever have read, entitled "Primer for Americans."

This article was forwarded to me and I assume that it appeared in other newspapers throughout the country since it bears the copyright of Sigurd S. Larmon.

Mr. President, I shall shortly ask unanimous consent to place this article in the RECORD because I have been so tremendously impressed with it that I believe every Member of the Congress and all other Americans will agree that it should be required reading.

This is such a clear, concise, and forceful expression of the foundation of the America we love that I should like to see it placed in the hands of every schoolchild, given a prominent position in every public library, posted in public buildings and given the widest possible circulation in print.

Sigurd Larmon, after recounting brilliantly the principles of America, proceeds at the end of his dissertation to pose the fundamental question—the acid test—to those who seek to impose some special brand of tyranny upon America. His question is: "Is it with or against the principles of America?"

Mr. President, I now ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, the article entitled "Primer for Americans."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PRIMER FOR AMERICANS

You live in the United States of America. You are an American.

Real Americans like their country. They are proud of it. They think it is a good place to live. And they want to keep it good—to keep it getting better all the time.

Why is America the way it is? What makes it a good place to live? The answer is simply this:

Throughout our history most Americans have believed that every person has certain rights and duties and responsibilities.

Americans have believed that there are certain things people should do, and things they should not do.

They have also believed in certain things that people are, and are not.

The principles of America are these:

1. Each person is of importance and value as an individual.

2. We believe that all men should enjoy personal freedom.

3. We believe that all men are created equal.

In our Constitution, and in other laws of our land, there are set down principles to protect the rights and freedoms and equality of individuals.

4. The right to freedom of speech.

This includes freedom of the press, of radio, of motion pictures, of every means by which man may express his thoughts.

5. The right to freedom of assembly.

6. The right to freedom of worship.

7. The right to security of person and property.

8. The right to equal protection before the law.

9. The right to freedom from slavery.

10. The right to petition the Government.

11. The right to vote for people of your choice.

Other principles hold that every man has—

12. The right to a good education.

13. The right to live where he pleases.

14. The right to work where he wants to.

15. The right to belong to an organization.

16. The right to own property.

17. The right to start his own business.

18. The right to manage his own affairs.

19. The right to make a profit or to fail, depending on his own ability.

20. Every man is entitled to freedom and equality of opportunity.

21. Every man may earn his living when, where, and how he wants to.

There are also limiting principles.

Principles of individual freedom sometimes clash with those of individual equality. Therefore our rights as individuals must be limited, and those limitations are themselves principles.

22. The rights of an individual shall not interfere with those of other individuals.

Your right to swing your arms stops where the other fellow's nose starts.

23. The rights of any individual shall not interfere with the welfare of the people.

Freedom of speech does not give the individual the right to shout "fire" in a crowded theater.

24. Every individual owes obedience to the laws under which he lives.

The individual has the right to talk against a law, to work and vote to change that law, but not to disobey that law.

Principles that are patterns of behavior.

Many of our principles of individual freedom and equality are guaranteed to us by law. But we have other beliefs, other general rules of action and conduct that have grown to the status of principles. And these, too, are foundations of Americanism.

25. A man shall be judged by his own record.

A man's family background, his race or his religion, is not as important as what that man himself can do, for Americans believe a man must stand on his own feet.

26. A man is free to achieve as much as he can.

We believe that where any boy may become President, where any man may achieve greatness, there is the greatest incentive for every man to do his best.

27. To achieve anything, a man should be willing to work.

Americans have always known that "you don't get something for nothing," that to get anything takes a willingness to work.

28. Achievement also depends upon the ability to do a good job.

Add to "willingness to work" the ability to produce results and the combination is the basis for most individual achievement in our country.

29. Every man has the right to a fair share of the results of his work and his ability.

Because of this belief, America has not only produced more goods, but they have been more fairly and more widely shared by more people than in any other country.

30. Security is the ability of a man to provide for himself.

The only true security for any individual is the opportunity, the ability, and the determination to work and plan and save for his own present and future. Self-reliance is vital to individual independence and personal freedom. No man can be proud and free who depends on others for his security.

31. When an individual cannot provide his own security, the responsibility should be assumed by others.

We believe that no one should starve, or be without adequate clothing and shelter; so those who have more than their basic needs share the responsibility of providing the essentials of security for those who need help.

32. Each individual must deal fairly with others.

Honesty, fairness, and personal integrity are virtues that help free and independent individuals get along with each other without losing their independence.

33. Fair and free competition is a good thing.

34. Americans have always believed that competition among individuals or groups encourages greater effort, which in turn brings greater benefits to all.

Principles of individual responsibility:

Freedom for individuals carries with it an equal responsibility to use that freedom wisely. If we wish to remain free, we must faithfully fulfill this responsibility.

35. The individual is responsible for himself and his family.

He must protect them and provide for their present and future well-being.

36. The individual has responsibilities to the groups of which he is a part.

He must give of his best to his community, his church, his employer, his union, and to every group in which individuals cooperate for their mutual benefit.

37. The individual has responsibilities to his country.

He must be an active citizen, interesting himself in local, State, and National Government, voting wisely, thinking and speaking and acting to preserve and strengthen freedom, equality, and opportunity for every individual.

For America's future:

Most of us have faith in our country's ability to move forward, to improve, to grow, to provide more and more individuals with more and more of everything they want and need in life.

38. If we, the people of the United States, want to have more material benefits, we must believe in and follow these two principles:

39. The only way we can have more is to produce more; and

40. As we produce more, we must make it possible for more and more people to enjoy that which we produce.

If we, the people of the United States, want to have a better life, spiritually as well as materially:

41. We must stand firmly for our beliefs, our rights, our principles.

There are those who would chip away our confidence so that their special brand of tyranny might creep into America. They must not succeed. So, let us ask of every plan, or act, or idea:

Is it with or against the principles of America?

Support Census Bureau

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 11, 1956

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, in the past, it has been the policy of this Government, through its Bureau of the Census, to publish a Census of Business and a Census of Manufactures data for urban centers, that is, for thickly populated areas meeting certain qualifications.

I have recently learned that this policy was not followed completely in the 1954 censuses and that, because of changed procedures designed to effect economies, the usual thorough reports were not completed. For this reason, the Bureau of the Census, apparently because of limited funds, is not now able to provide data for a considerable number of urban centers.

I am informed that despite these difficulties the Bureau expects to tabulate data for the larger towns and other urban centers, which will be issued as special census reports. To say the least, I was surprised to learn that this vital census work, upon which many people and many industries depend, was necessarily abridged and substantially crippled as to the last business and manufactures censuses.

So far as I know, it certainly was never the intent of the Congress to curtail these reports and services so vital to large segments of our business economy. To my mind, this curtailment is to be greatly deplored. Moreover, I hope and urge that it may be speedily remedied and that the Bureau of the Census may be able to resume its former practice in accordance with established policy.

If additional appropriations by Congress are necessary to accomplish this end, I want to make it perfectly clear that I am prepared to advocate and support them, because it is most essential that business, the great American press and other media engaged in disseminating news and information to the public should have available, as in the past, full reports concerning business and manufacturing throughout the Nation.

Development of Market for Oregon Wheat in Japan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, July 11, 1956

Mr NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I have just received a copy of the June issue of the Portland (Oreg.) Harbor News, which is issued by the Portland Commission of Public Docks, of which Thomas P. Guerin is the general manager. This issue is devoted to an exposition of the extensive and notable efforts of the Oregon Wheat League toward development of the market for Oregon wheat in Japan. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have this most significant article entitled "Oregon Wheat Growers Score in Export Push," printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OREGON WHEATGROWERS SCORE IN EXPORT PUSH

A shining example of what can be accomplished by planned, intelligent export promotion of basic American products may be seen in the long-range program of Oregon wheatgrowers. Wheat is Oregon's largest farm crop—a soft, white wheat ideal for milling into cake, pastry, and biscuit flours, and for blending with high protein hard wheats for bread flours. Yet only about 25 percent of Oregon's wheat crop is used in the State for food, feed, and seed, which means that 75 percent of it must be marketed elsewhere. The picture is the same for Washington and northern Idaho, which with Oregon make up the Pacific Northwest wheat-growing region.

As long ago as 1926, Oregon wheatgrowers felt the need for a united approach to their problems. They organized the Oregon Wheat Growers League. Then, in 1946, growers decided that when postwar world demand for wheat declined, surpluses and acreage controls would be inevitable. A better approach, they decided, would be to put experts on the job full time finding new markets and expanding existing markets for wheat. The league's executive secretary, R. K. Baum, has been active in direction and participation in the program both in the United States and abroad.

At one time the Pacific Northwest region had a profitable market for its cake flour and soft wheat in Eastern and Southeastern States, but this market has been lost because of high freight rates. This leaves overseas markets as the main outlet. During the early postwar years, Government aid and foreign relief programs helped boost export movement to a volume that cleaned up the crop annually, and the emphasis was on greater production. Pacific Northwest wheat moved to all parts of the globe. This export movement has tapered off, taking less than half the crop in the past two seasons. This is of concern to Portland, too, for the commission of public docks maintains huge grain storage and export handling facilities.

At the request of growers, the Oregon State Legislature in 1947 enacted the Oregon Wheat Commission law which created a commission of five grower members, representing the main producing areas, and authorized a tax of one-half cent a bushel on all wheat sold commercially. Working closely with growers and checking its projects with the Oregon Wheat League, the commission has been spending an average of around $100,000 a year on a manifold approach to the surplus problem.

The United States sent a grain mission to Asia in 1949 to study markets there and early in 1954 the Department of Agriculture sent out trade missions at a time when surplus agricultural legislation was being considered by Congress. Many Asiatic countries expressed great interest. When Congress passed Public Law 480, providing for sale of surplus agricultural commodities with payment in local currencies, much of which would be respent by the United States in the purchasing country, new avenues were opened for reaching these markets. The big obstacle of dollar shortage had largely been overcome.

It was decided that a representative each from the Oregon Wheat League (Mr. Baum), from the Foreign Agriculture Service, and from the Millers National Federation form a team to visit Asia immediately to determine specific projects for each country to aid in expanding markets for United States grain products. The previous missions had found a significant increase in consumption of wheat products in Asia since the war and indication that the increase would be retained, although fluctuating with rice production. Too, several governments were willing to encourage wheat foods because they are cheaper than rice and will also result in diet improvement. A third favorable factor is the tremendous increase in population—it is estimated that every 10 years there will be 180 million more mouths to feed in Asia and it appears doubtful that food production can be increased to meet these demands.

The team worked in Japan, Hong Kong, Philippines, Singapore, Indonesia, Ceylon, India, and Pakistan and found definite encouragement in several countries where wheat was being adapted to the food habits of people in rice-eating areas. In India a project started 5 years before by the Oregon Wheat Commission and the Millers National Federation to sponsor nutrition research and extension aimed at improving the diet of the south Indian people had made tremendous strides. A demonstration car furnished by the commission had proven indispensable in demonstrating the preparation of wheat dishes.

The Oregon wheat groups played an important role in the introduction last year of a new wheat food called bulgor wheat, a popular wheat dish in the Middle East for centuries. It is made by boiling, drying, and cracking the wheat, resulting in a product that is high in food value yet easy to pre-

pare into a tasty dish of high nutritional value—cooking time only 15 minutes. In preparation, it has many uses similar to rice. Fisher Flouring Mills was persuaded to make this processed wheat in a new plant and the Department of Agriculture furnished wheat for trying the produce in Far Eastern countries. A. C. Hutchison, a representative of Fishers, found ready acceptance of the product by the Japanese from the standpoint of cost and nutrition after only a few months.

The biggest program to increase consumption of wheat by Asiatic peoples is that now underway in Japan, already the Northwest's biggest foreign wheat customer, but which is also believed to have the greatest immediate development potential. Considerable funds became available in Japan under terms of Public Law 480 for the furtherance of sales of surplus agricultural commodities. The wheat team has been in Japan for months working out 11 promotional projects, contracts for 4 of which have just been signed.

Wheat promotion efforts of the Oregon Wheat Growers League at the 15-day International Trade Fair in Osaka, Japan, during April turned out to be almost too successful. The exhibit was literally mobbed by crowds of Japanese. On the final day, in fact, more than 100 police had to be called out to keep the thousands of people from completely overrunning the wheat exhibit. As part of the 5-unit exhibit, baking demonstrations of cake mixes made a big impression on the Japanese public, millers and bakers, as did the scones, sweet breads and other baked goods. A Japanese home economist and four assistants spent full time preparing and explaining dishes made from Ala, the new bulgor, wheat food. Some 100,000 sweet rolls, countless thousands of samples of Ala, and recipe folders printed in Japanese were distributed during the fair. Twice as many people visited the exhibit as had been expected.

As we said, the work of the Oregon wheat people, coupled with the efforts of Government agencies, is a bright example of what should and can be done in promotion of world trade. In addition to having unequalled general cargo facilities, Portland is the leading grain port on the Pacific coast and has the largest tidewater grain elevator in the West. With a constant program of port development, we are keeping pace here at Portland, Oreg.—the progressive port of the Pacific.

LAWS AND RULES FOR PUBLICATION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

CODE OF LAWS OF THE UNITED STATES

TITLE 44, SECTION 181. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; ARRANGEMENT, STYLE, CONTENTS, AND INDEXES.—The Joint Committee on Printing shall have control of the arrangement and style of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and while providing that it shall be substantially a verbatim report of proceedings shall take all needed action for the reduction of unnecessary bulk, and shall provide for the publication of an index of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD semimonthly during the sessions of Congress and at the close thereof. (Jan. 12, 1895, c. 23, § 13, 28 Stat. 603.)

TITLE 44, SECTION 182b. SAME; ILLUSTRATIONS, MAPS, DIAGRAMS.—No maps, diagrams, or illustrations may be inserted in the RECORD without the approval of the Joint Committee on Printing. (June 20, 1936, c. 630, § 2, 49 Stat. 1546.)

Pursuant to the foregoing statute and in order to provide for the prompt publication and delivery of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the Joint Committee on Printing has adopted the following rules, to which the attention of Senators, Representatives, and Delegates is respectfully invited:

1. *Arrangement of the daily Record.*—The Public Printer will arrange the contents of the daily RECORD as follows: First, the Senate proceedings; second, the House proceedings; third, the Appendix: *Provided*, That when the proceedings of the Senate are not received in time to follow this arrangement, the Public Printer may begin the RECORD with the House proceedings. The proceedings of each House and the Appendix shall each begin a new page, with appropriate headings centered thereon.

2. *Type and style.*—The Public Printer shall print the report of the proceedings and debates of the Senate and House of Representatives, as furnished by the Official Reporters of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, in 7½-point type; and all matter included in the remarks or speeches of Members of Congress, other than their own words, and all reports, documents, and other matter authorized to be inserted in the RECORD shall be printed in 6½-point type; and all rollcalls shall be printed in 6-point type. No italic or black type nor words in capitals or small capitals shall be used for emphasis or prominence; nor will unusual indentions be permitted. These restrictions do not apply to the printing of or quotations from historical, official, or legal documents or papers of which a literal reproduction is necessary.

3. *Return of manuscript.*—When manuscript is submitted to Members for revision it should be returned to the Government Printing Office not later than 9 o'clock p. m. in order to insure publication in the RECORD issued on the following morning; and if all of said manuscript is not furnished at the time specified, the Public Printer is authorized to withhold it from the RECORD for 1 day. In no case will a speech be printed in the RECORD of the day of its delivery if the manuscript is furnished later than 12 o'clock midnight.

4. *Tabular matter.*—The manuscript of speeches containing tabular statements to be published in the RECORD shall be in the hands of the Public Printer not later than 7 o'clock p. m., to insure publication the following morning.

5. *Proof furnished.*—Proofs of "leave to print" and advance speeches will not be furnished the day the manuscript is received but will be submitted the following day, whenever possible to do so without causing delay in the publication of the regular proceedings of Congress. Advance speeches shall be set in the RECORD style of type, and not more than six sets of proofs may be furnished to Members without charge.

6. *Notation of withheld remarks.*—If manuscript or proofs have not been returned in time for publication in the proceedings, the Public Printer will insert the words "Mr. ——— addressed the Senate (House or Committee). His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix," and proceed with the printing of the RECORD.

7. *Thirty-day limit.*—The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD any speech or extension of remarks which has been withheld for a period exceeding 30 calendar days from the date when its printing was authorized: *Provided*, That at the expiration of each session of Congress the time limit herein fixed shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee.

8. *Corrections.*—The permanent RECORD is made up for printing and binding 30 days after each daily publication is issued; therefore all corrections must be sent to the Public Printer within that time: *Provided*, That upon the final adjournment of each session of Congress the time limit shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee: *Provided further*, That no Member of Congress shall be entitled to make more than one revision. Any revision shall consist only of corrections of the original copy and shall not include deletions of correct material, substitutions for correct material, or additions of new subject matter.

9. The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the full report or print of any committee or subcommittee when said report or print has been previously printed. This rule shall not be construed to apply to conference reports.

10. *Appendix to daily Record.*—When either House has granted leave to print (1) a speech not delivered in either House, (2) a newspaper or magazine article, or (3) any other matter not germane to the proceedings, the same shall be published in the Appendix except in cases of duplication. In such cases only the first item received in the Government Printing Office will be printed. This rule shall not apply to quotations which form part of a speech of a Member, or to an authorized extension of his own remarks: *Provided*, That no address, speech, or article delivered or released subsequently to the final adjournment of a session of Congress may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

11. *Estimate of cost.*—No extraneous matter in excess of two pages in any one instance may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by a Member under leave to print or to extend his remarks unless the manuscript is accompanied by an estimate in writing from the Public Printer of the probable cost of publishing the same, which estimate of cost must be announced by the Member when such leave is requested; but this rule shall not apply to excerpts from letters, telegrams, or articles presented in connection with a speech delivered in the course of debate or to communications from State legislatures, addresses or articles by the President and the members of his Cabinet, the Vice President, or a Member of Congress. For the purposes of this regulation, any one article printed in two or more parts, with or without individual headings, shall be considered as a single extension and the two-page rule shall apply. The Public Printer or the Official Reporters of the House or Senate shall return to the Member of the respective House any matter submitted for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which is in contravention of this paragraph.

12. *Official Reporters.*—The Official Reporters of each House shall indicate on the manuscript and prepare headings for all matter to be printed in the Appendix, and shall make suitable reference thereto at the proper place in the proceedings.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

SENATORS WITH RESIDENCES IN WASHINGTON

OFFICE ADDRESS: Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

[Streets northwest unless otherwise stated]

Vice President, Richard Nixon

Aiken, George D., *Vt*.....Carroll Arms.
Allott, Gordon, *Colo*.....
Anderson, Clinton P., *N. Mex.*.....6 Wesley Circle.
Barrett, Frank A., *Wyo*.....The Woodner.
Beall, J. Glenn, *Md*.....
Bender, George H., *Ohio*.....120 Schotts Court NE.
Bennett, Wallace F., *Utah*.....
Bible, Alan, *Nev*.....
Bricker, John W., *Ohio*.....The Mayflower.
Bridges, Styles, *N. H*.....
Bush, Prescott, *Conn*.....
Butler, John Marshall, *Md*.....
Byrd, Harry Flood, *Va*.....The Shoreham.
Capehart, Homer E., *Ind*.....The Westchester.
Carlson, Frank, *Kans*.....Sheraton-Park
Case, Clifford P., *N. J*.....
Case, Francis, *S. Dak*.....4635 Mass. Ave.
Chavez, Dennis, *N. Mex*.....3327 Cleveland Ave.
Clements, Earle C., *Ky*.....The Congressional
Cotton, Norris, *N. H*.....
Curtis, Carl T., *Nebr*.....
Daniel, Price, *Tex*.....
Dirksen, Everett M., *Ill*.....
Douglas, Paul H., *Ill*.....
Duff, James H., *Pa*.....
Dworshak, Henry C., *Idaho*.....
Eastland, James O., *Miss*.....5101 Macomb St.
Ellender, Allen J., *La*.....
Ervin, Samuel J., Jr., *N. C*.....
Flanders, Ralph E., *Vt*.....
Frear, J. Allen, Jr., *Del*.....
Fulbright, J. William, *Ark*.....
George, Walter F., *Ga*.....The Mayflower.
Goldwater, Barry M., *Ariz*.....
Gore, Albert, *Tenn*.....
Green, Theodore Francis, *R. I.*.....University Club.
Hayden, Carl, *Ariz*.....
Hennings, Thomas C., Jr., *Mo.*.....
Hickenlooper, Bourke B., *Iowa.*.....5511 Cedar Parkway, Chevy Chase, Md.
Hill, Lister, *Ala*.....
Holland, Spessard L., *Fla*.....Sheraton-Park
Hruska, Roman L., *Nebr*.....
Humphrey, Hubert H., *Minn.*.....
Humphreys, Robert, *Ky*.....
Ives, Irving M., *N. Y*.....
Jackson, Henry M., *Wash*.....
Jenner, William E., *Ind*.....
Johnson, Lyndon B., *Tex*.....
Johnston, Olin D., *S. C*.....
Kefauver, Estes, *Tenn*.....4848 Upton St.
Kennedy, John F., *Mass*.....
Kerr, Robert S., *Okla*.....
Knowland, William F., *Calif.*.....
Kuchel, Thomas H., *Calif*.....
Laird, William R. III, *W. Va*.....
Langer, William, *N. Dak*.....2101 Conn. Ave.
Lehman, Herbert H., *N. Y*.....Sheraton-Park
Long, Russell B., *La*.....
McCarthy, Joseph R., *Wis*.....
McClellan, John L., *Ark*.....
McNamara, Pat, *Mich*.....
Magnuson, Warren G., *Wash.*.....The Shoreham.
Malone, George W., *Nev*.....The Mayflower.
Mansfield, Mike, *Mont*.....
Martin, Edward, *Pa*.....
Martin, Thos. E., *Iowa*.....4545 Conn. Ave.
Millikin, Eugene D., *Colo*.....
Monroney, A. S. Mike, *Okla.*.....
Morse, Wayne, *Oreg*.....5020 Lowell St.
Mundt, Karl E., *S. Dak*.....122 Schotts Court NE.
Murray, James E., *Mont*.....The Shoreham.
Neely, Matthew M., *W. Va*.....
Neuberger, Richard L., *Oreg.*.....
O'Mahoney, Joseph C., *Wyo.*.....Sheraton-Park
Pastore, John O., *R. I*.....
Payne, Frederick G., *Maine*.....
Potter, Charles E., *Mich*.....
Purtell, William A., *Conn*.....
Robertson, A. Willis, *Va*.....
Russell, Richard B., *Ga*.....
Saltonstall, Leverett, *Mass*.....2320 Tracy Pl.
Schoeppel, Andrew F., *Kans.*.....
Scott, W. Kerr, *N. C*.....
Smathers, George A., *Fla*.....
Smith, H. Alexander, *N. J*.....Sheraton-Park
Smith, Margaret Chase, (Mrs.), *Maine.*.....
Sparkman, John J., *Ala*.....4928 Indian Lane
Stennis, John, *Miss*.....
Symington, Stuart, *Mo*.....
Thye, Edward J., *Minn*.....
Watkins, Arthur V., *Utah*.....
Welker, Herman, *Idaho*.....4823 Tilden St.
Wiley, Alexander, *Wis*.....2122 Mass. Ave.
Williams, John J., *Del*.....
Wofford, Thomas A., *S. C*.....
Young, Milton R., *N. Dak*.....Quebec House So.

OFFICERS OF THE SENATE

Secretary—Felton M. Johnston.
Chief Clerk—Emery L. Frazier.
Sergeant at Arms—Joseph C. Duke.
Secretary for the Majority—Robert G. Baker.
Secretary for the Minority—J. Mark Trice.
Chaplain—Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D.

STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE SENATE

Committee on Agriculture and Forestry

Messrs. Ellender (chairman), Johnston of South Carolina, Holland, Eastland, Clements, Humphrey, Scott, Symington, Aiken, Young, Thye, Hickenlooper, Mundt, Williams, and Schoeppel.

Committee on Appropriations

Messrs. Hayden (chairman), Russell, Chavez, Ellender, Hill, McClellan, Robertson, Magnuson, Holland, Stennis, Clements, Johnson of Texas, Bridges, Saltonstall, Young, Knowland, Thye, McCarthy, Mundt, Mrs. Smith of Maine, Messrs. Dworshak, Dirksen, and Potter.

Committee on Armed Services

Messrs. Russell (chairman), Byrd, Johnson of Texas, Kefauver, Stennis, Symington, Jackson, Ervin, Saltonstall, Bridges, Flanders, Mrs. Smith of Maine, Messrs. Case of South Dakota, Duff, and Welker.

Committee on Banking and Currency

Messrs. Fulbright (chairman), Robertson, Sparkman, Frear, Douglas, Lehman, Monroney, Morse, Capehart, Bricker, Ives, Bennett, Bush, Beall, and Payne.

Committee on the District of Columbia

Messrs. Neely (chairman), Bible, McNamara, Morse, Frear, Beall, Hruska, Case of New Jersey, and Allott.

Committee on Finance

Messrs. Byrd (chairman), George, Kerr, Frear, Long, Smathers, Anderson, Douglas, Millikin, Martin of Pennsylvania, Williams, Flanders, Malone, Carlson, and Bennett.

Committee on Foreign Relations

Messrs. George (chairman), Green, Fulbright, Sparkman, Humphrey, Mansfield, Morse, Long, Wiley, Smith of New Jersey, Hickenlooper, Langer, Knowland, Aiken, and Capehart.

Committee on Government Operations

Messrs. McClellan (chairman), Jackson, Kennedy, Symington, Ervin, Humphrey, Wofford, McCarthy, Mundt, Mrs. Smith of Maine, Messrs. Cotton, Bender, and Martin of Iowa.

Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs

Messrs. Murray (chairman), Anderson, Jackson, O'Mahoney, Bible, Neuberger, Laird, Scott, Millikin, Malone, Watkins, Dworshak, Kuchel, Barrett, and Goldwater.

Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce

Messrs. Magnuson (chairman), Pastore, Monroney, Smathers, Daniel, Ervin, Bible, Wofford, Bricker, Schoeppel, Butler, Potter, Duff, Purtell, and Payne.

Committee on the Judiciary

Messrs. Eastland (chairman), Kefauver, Johnston of South Carolina, Hennings, McClellan, Daniel, O'Mahoney, Neely, Wiley, Langer, Jenner, Watkins, Dirksen, Welker, and Butler.

Committee on Labor and Public Welfare

Messrs. Hill (chairman), Murray, Neely, Lehman, Kennedy, McNamara, ———, Smith of New Jersey, Ives, Purtell, Goldwater, Bender, and Allott.

Committee on Post Office and Civil Service

Messrs. Johnston of South Carolina (chairman), Pastore, Monroney, Hennings, Scott, Neuberger, Laird, Carlson, Jenner, Langer, Curtis, Martin of Iowa, and Case of New Jersey.

Committee on Public Works

Messrs. Chavez (chairman), Kerr, Gore, McNamara, Neuberger, Wofford, ———, Martin of Pennsylvania, Case of South Dakota, Bush, Kuchel, Cotton, and Hruska.

Committee on Rules and Administration

Messrs. Green (chairman), Hayden, Hennings, Gore, Mansfield, Jenner, Barrett, McCarthy, and Curtis.

UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT

Mr. Chief Justice Warren, of California, Hotel Sheraton-Park, Washington, D. C.
Mr. Justice Black, of Alabama, 619 S. Lee St., Alexandria, Va.
Mr. Justice Reed, of Kentucky, the Mayflower.
Mr. Justice Frankfurter, of Massachusetts, 3018 Dumbarton Ave.
Mr. Justice Douglas, of Washington, 3701 Connecticut Ave.
Mr. Justice Burton, of Ohio, the Dodge.
Mr. Justice Clark, of Texas, 2101 Connecticut Ave.
Mr. Justice Minton, of Indiana, the Methodist Building.
Mr. Justice Harlan, of New York, 1677 31st St.

OFFICERS OF THE SUPREME COURT

Clerk—Harold B. Willey, 3214 N. Wakefield St., Arlington, Va.
Deputy Clerk—Reginald C. Dilli, 1329 Hemlock St.
Deputy Clerk—Hugh W. Barr, 4701 Connecticut Ave.
Marshal—T. Perry Lippitt, 6004 Corbin Road.
Reporter—Walter Wyatt, 1702 Kalmia Rd.
Librarian—Helen Newman, 126 3d St. SE.

UNITED STATES JUDICIAL CIRCUITS

JUSTICES ASSIGNED
TERRITORY EMBRACED

District of Columbia: Mr. Chief Justice Warren. District of Columbia.

First judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Frankfurter. Maine, New Hampshire, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Puerto Rico.

Second judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Harlan. Vermont, Connecticut, New York.

Third judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Burton, Pennsylvania, New Jersey, Delaware, Virgin Islands.

Fourth judicial circuit: Mr. Chief Justice Warren. Maryland, Virginia, West Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina.

Fifth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Black. Georgia, Florida, Alabama, Mississippi, Louisiana, Texas, Canal Zone.

Sixth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Reed. Ohio, Michigan, Kentucky, Tennessee.

Seventh judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Minton. Indiana, Illinois, Wisconsin.

Eighth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Clark. Minnesota, North Dakota, South Dakota, Iowa, Nebraska, Missouri, Arkansas.

Ninth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Douglas. Washington, Oregon, Montana, Idaho, California, Nevada, Arizona, Alaska, Hawaii.

Tenth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Clark. Colorado, Wyoming, Utah, Kansas, Oklahoma, New Mexico.

Appendix

A Way to Freedom From Oppressive Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. RALPH W. GWINN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 11, 1956

Mr. GWINN. Mr. Speaker, I desire to set forth in the RECORD some remarkable figures that show the way to freedom from oppressive government.

The following are excerpts from a speech by Willis E. Stone, author of the proposed 23d amendment to take government out of business. He is president of the American Progress Foundation, 6413 Franklin Avenue., Los Angeles, Calif. The speech was made before the Congress of Freedom at Dallas, Tex., April 7, 1956:

Mr. Chairman, delegates to the 1956 Congress of Freedom, friends, this is a discussion of the possibilities of repealing our individual income taxes by first reducing the costs of government sufficiently to make this possible. At the same time we would achieve a solvent government, free from the scourge of deficit spending and retire part of its debt.

Enormous as such an undertaking may seem at first glance, it can be done whenever we, the American people, decide to perform the basic function of citizenship—that of defining the terms of our freedom in our organic law.

Let's face it. We cannot correct the overwhelming tax burden from which we suffer until we first correct the cause of that burden. If we honestly wish to remove the tax burden, we must first discover how our tax dollars are used, determine whether or not such governmental activities are valid, the legal means by which they can be eliminated if they are not valid activities, and to what extent the removal of impractical functions can solve the tax problem.

First, we must recognize that this is our responsibility because the administrators of government have no intention of reducing their spending simply because we want lower taxes. They have proved this. Heavy as our taxes have been, our bureaucrats have constantly spent more than we provide—$240 billion more during these past 20 years. This means that our bureaucracy has spent an average of $12 billion more than we have paid in taxes every year for 20 years.

This should demonstrate that merely wanting lower taxes is an empty wish. It should prove that the only possible way to get lower taxes is for us to discover and apply the means for controlling bureaucracy and reducing its mad spending. The moment we look objectively at the activities of the Federal Government we begin to recognize the monstrous proportions of the bureaucratic empires which have mushroomed during recent years.

By tracing the method by which these bureaucratic empires were created and developed, and witnessing the increasing tempo of the process, we may be in better position to apply the necessary controls.

The 1956 session of Congress saw a set of contradictions all of them holding some individual merit, which demonstrates the process. It began with a great hue and cry about the evils of our abundance which propagandists call "surplus." To eliminate this, enormous pressures were brought upon Congress to appropriate a couple of billion tax dollars to a "soil bank" which would take land out of production, solving the surplus.

At the same time, and on another front, a different set of propagandists were at work getting appropriations from Congress to provide for the free distribution of fertilizer so farmers could get as much produce, if not more, from the acreage they would continue to farm.

This nullification of the soil bank idea was complicated by still another drive, by still another set of bureaucrats, demanding a few billions of tax dollars with which to build dams and irrigation systems so that vast new areas could be brought into production.

To further complicate the issue, more tax billions were demanded for loans to improve production on the farms, and for the Commodity Credit Corporation to take the production out of the market place, trucking in Government trucks to Government warehouses and granaries, to be managed, traded an sold by governmental agencies operated by bureaucrats determined to perpetuate themselves in control of the growing bureaucratic empires such contradictory legislation spawns.

By the device of politically manufactured emergencies, more than 700 Federal corporate activities have been created. They have rapidly expanded to fabulous proportions, consuming gigantic quantities of our tax dollars.

Under the label of "foreign aid" the American taxpayers, who have never known military defeat, have been compelled by their own Government to pay more treasure into the coffers of foreign powers than all the vanquished people of history have been required to pay to their conquerors.

The domestic problem is even worse. About 700 Federal corporate activities have been established without any pretense of constitutional authority. They absorb, directly and indirectly, about half of all Federal receipts to pay their losses and hidden costs. They have already, by one device or another, taken over 40 percent of the land area and 20 percent of the industrial capacity of the Nation, riding the backs of the American people as interest free, rent free, cost free, tax free competitors of our own citizens.

Amazing charges, certainly, but easily proved by the claims of the bureaucratic empires themselves.

The Interior Department brags of its enormous empire, asserting (p. 203, 1955–56 United States Government Organization Manual) that: "The jurisdiction of the Department extends over the continental United States, to the islands of the Caribbean and South Pacific, and to lands in the Arctic Circle. It includes custody of 750 million acres of land." This equals 32.3 percent of the total land and water area of the United States and all its territories and possessions.

The Forest Service declares (p. 238, 1955–56 Manual) that it holds lands "aggregating about 188 million acres," which equals 8.1 percent of the total land and water area of the United States and its territories and possessions.

The Soil Conservation Service (p. 241, 1953–54 Manual) claims to have acquired lands which "aggregate more than 11,297,000 acres," which is nearly a million and a half acreas greater in extent than the combined areas of 4 of our States—New Jersey, Connecticut, Delaware, and Rhode Island.

These three Federal agencies alone have taken from the American people an area greater than the combined area of England, Ireland, Scotland, Wales, Portugal, Spain, France, Belgium, Holland, Luxembourg, Switzerland, Germany, Iceland, Denmark, Poland, Austria, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Italy, Monaco, Albania, Greece, Yugoslavia, Rumania, and Bulgaria.

We have believed that the function of Federal agencies was to protect us and our properties, yet these three bureaucratic empires have carried on a conquest greater than anything of modern times. With several hundred other bureaucratic empires also promoting their conquests, it is little wonder that our tax bill has become so agonizing.

We must reduce these bureaucratic empires to a dollars and cents evaluation to learn the exact extent to which the abolition of such practices can solve our tax burden. Once we know the dimensions of the evil we can recognize the all-important necessity of outlawing these practices.

The Federal corporate activities can be outlawed by an amendment to the Constitution, already introduced into Congress by Representative RALPH W. GWINN, Republican, of New York. It has been formally approved by the State of Illinois. More than 6,000 organizations have adopted resolutions of support for it. Known as the Gwinn amendment and also as the proposed 23d amendment, it is pending in Congress as House Joint Resolution 123. It provides that "the Government of the United States shall not engage in any business, professional, commercial, financial, or industrial enterprise except as specified in the Constitution."

This proposal in no way would alter the intent and purposes of the Constitution. It would only give the Constitution its proper force and effect. In doing this, it would stop the political gift of our tax dollars to foreign socialistic and communistic governments, leaving individuals to do this on a voluntary basis if they so desired. In 1954 the foreign grant and credits of your tax dollars amounted to $4,669,000.

This amendment would cause the Federal corporate activities to be sold back to the American people. It is estimated the land, buildings, and facilities, even under forced sale, would bring better than $50 billion, all of which would be applied to the national debt, particularly as series E and F bonds would probably be employed to buy those properties. Retiring $50 billion of the national debt in this way would reduce the taxes required to pay interest on it by $1,250,000,000 per year.

Also, the cost of amortizing that portion of the national debt would no longer exist and this would save the taxpayers $1,250,000,000 per year.

The average annual losses of the Federal corporate activities during recent years has exceeded $10 billion per year. The sale of the Federal corporations would eliminate these losses by eliminating their source, thus saving the taxpayers this amount of taxes every year.

Another important item is the fact that an estimated 1 million Federal employees apparently do nothing in their official life except provide services without cost to the Federal corporations. They are paid by the general fund, therefore their pay comes directly from taxes—your taxes. With the Federal corporate activities sold back to the American people, they will be more gainfully employed in private enterprise and 1 million pay envelopes, containing an average $4,000 per year will not require our tax dollar, saving the taxpayers $4 billion per year.

At least $3 worth of goods, services, and facilities are required to maintain every dollar of payroll, thus the saving of $4 billion in payroll means a related tax saving of $12 billion in goods, services, and facilities.

These five items of savings, possible by enacting the proposed 23d amendment, add up as follows:

The goods, services, and facilities that can be saved is	$12,000,000,000
The payroll that can be saved each year is about	4,000,000,000
The losses that will no longer require tax support are	10,000,000,000
The interest that will be saved will exceed	1,250,000,000
The amortization charge that will be saved exceeds	1,250,000,000
This adds up to a tremendous total of	28,500,000,000
Plus the savings resulting from putting foreign aid back into the hands of private citizens, on a voluntary basis	4,449,000,000
Means a total annual saving to taxpayers of	33,169,000,000
Compared with the total of individual income taxes collected	32,495,000,000
Indicates the Federal Government would have a surplus of	674,000,000

by repealing the individual income taxes (1954 level) at the same time the Federal corporate activities are sold back to the American people from whom they were taken.

So we can get the individual income tax off our neck on the very day we get the Federal bureaucrats out of competition with our business—and on that very day we will find that a veritable flood of new tax revenues will begin to flow into the Federal Treasury which will enable the Government to steadily retire the national debt and cut taxes in other areas.

This is the way it works. The very day we stop Federal income taxes, every person in the Nation will have an increase in net take-home pay exactly equal to the income taxes we now pay. This will not depend on any change in the rate of pay. It only depends on getting the Government back within constitutional limitations, getting bureaucrats out of competition with our private business, under the terms of House Joint Resolution 123.

This means that almost every one of us will have more than 15 percent more money to spend simply because we will have this amount of our earnings restored to us, in exactly the amount we reported on our tax Form 1040.

What would you do with your new income? Buy new drapes, or new furniture, or a new automobile, or even an airplane? Or perhaps invest in a business of your own, with new equipment. If you save your new income, putting it into the bank, it will be available for loans so others may expand their business or satisfy some important need.

However it is used, this better than 15 percent, new take-home pay will be spent for things, or services, or savings, increasing business volume tremendously. It is estimated the Federal Government will receive 15 percent more taxes from the increased volume done by the present business community, which would mean an increase of $3,231,900,000 in taxes each year from this source, based on 1954 standards.

Similarly, the sale of the Federal corporate activities would put about 20 percent more industrial and business capacity back on the tax rolls to share the burden, and this, at 1954 levels, would mean that this new source of revenue would yield to the Federal Treasury $4,309,200,000 per year.

The surplus in the foregoing computation	$674,000,000
The 15-percent increase from present business taxpayers will yield	3,231,900,000
The new tax payments—20-percent increase by new taxpayers	4,309,200,000
Based on the 1954 experience, the surplus and new tax sources can yield a total of	8,215,100,000
In 1954 the Federal Government operated at a deficit of	3,116,000,000
We can take care of that deficit and still leave the Government	5,098,487,000
This is enough to permit the abolition of gift and estate taxes	935,000,000
And still leave the Government, based on 1954 experience	4,163,487,000

That can be applied every year on the national debt, retiring it completely on this scale in much less than 50 years at the maximum.

This is a wonderful outlook, and it is all possible on the day we enact House Joint Resolution 123, now pending in the Congress. We can compel action on this by demanding that every Representative of ours, in Congress or in the State legislatures, get it enacted. We can demand that every candidate who seeks our vote declare his position on this question so we can know how to vote to serve our best interest as citizens and as Americans.

This is not the end of the equation. The cost of collecting individual income taxes amounts to about $200 million every year.

Then there is the item of printing the tax forms and all the auxiliary items that relate to collecting individual income taxes, which creates a deficit in the Government Printing Office of $100 million a year.

There is also the cost of postage, which amounts to an estimated $40 million per year just to handle the flood of parcels, booklets, and letters relating to collecting the individual income taxes. This appears as a deficit in the Postoffice Department and would no longer require deficiency appropriation of your tax dollars.

There is, in these three items, $340 million a year to help pay off the debt, stepping up the rate by which we can get back to solvency as a nation and cut other kinds of taxes. Every statistical fact proves that it can be done by the enactment of the Gwinn amendment, now pending in Congress as House Joint Resolution 123.

Instead of groaning under an inhuman load of individual income taxes, we could abolish and repeal the individual income tax laws.

Instead of operating the Federal Government at an annual average deficit of $12 billion a year, as we have been during the last 20 years, we can pay off the national debt at the rate of nearly $5 billion a year while operating on a balanced budget.

Instead of the violent conflict between Government and people regarding which shall own and operate the enterprises created by the people, we will have a Government devoted to protecting our lives and properties.

Instead of Government being the greatest pauper in history, it will be returned to a solvent position and will have the affection of the American people returned to it, and the affection of the citizens is the greatest asset any government can possibly possess.

All of this, just by enacting House Joint Resolution 123 as it is now pending in Congress.

But there is even more. Think of the time, the worry, and the money each one of us have been spending to conform to the tax requirements. All this would be saved. So would the time, money, and energy we spend in protective lobbying, special bookkeeping, reporting, accountants fees, and any number of other costly impositions which now involve us. Then there is the savings that will result because it will no longer be necessary to ferret out, prosecute, and incarcerate those who fail, for any reason, to conform to the more than 400,000 words now in the individual income tax laws.

Every person in the land can think of an infinite variety of other benefits that will come to every one of us on the day we take the Federal agencies out of competition with our individual business enterprise, thus stopping the waste of our tax dollars by the bureaucratic empire builders, and enabling us to use our own earnings in our own way and at our own pleasure by repealing the individual income tax.

The analysis presented here deals only with the dollars and cents elements of the Federal competition with private enterprise and the individual income tax laws. It does not take into consideration the advantages to every business when the threat of cost-free, rent-free, tax-free, cutthroat competition is removed.

Neither does it take into consideration the wide variety of benefits to come from a people whose genius is not restrained by political straitjackets of competition or the blight of impossible tax burdens.

This seems to add up to a wonderful vision of fabulous benefactions that stun the imagination, yet there is still one more highly important factor to be considered. When the Federal corporate activities are sold back to the American people, tremendous amounts of property will go back on the local, county, and State taxrolls. In some areas this will be an item of enormous importance.

In California, for example, the Federal bureaucracy owns 48 percent of the land area of the State. House Joint Resolution 123, which you recall provides that "the Government of the United States shall not engage in any business professional, commercial, financial, or industrial enterprise except as specified in the Constitution," will compel the Federal agencies to relinquish this vast empire, selling it back to the people. In this way about 40 percent more property will go on the local taxrolls to share the burden with the present taxpayers. This will reduce the amount of taxes to be paid by each taxpayer.

In Nevada, the difference will be even greater as the Federal corporations now own and operate 85 percent of that State. Returning these vast areas to the jurisdiction of the States in which they are naturally contained, means that the principle of States rights will be reestablished and the governor of such a State as Nevada, where he is currently governor of only 15 percent of a

State, will be governor of all the State, as was originally intended by the Constitution.

In each State and in each city and to each person the situation differs. But in every instance, without exception, the transfer of these vast bureaucratic empires back to the Ameriacn people means an infinite variety of benefactions beyond the power of human imagination—just as the Constitution itself held advantages for us far beyond the dream of even those who gave it life.

Well, there it is—a program of dollars and cents reality, built upon the hard facts of truth, supported with overwhelming quantities of irrefutable evidence. There can be no question of the tremendous financial advantage of restoring the American private enterprise system, giving the business of producing, distributing, and consuming the same constitutional protection we have always enjoyed in other fields. It all adds up to the simple equation that we can get the politicians out of our pockets the very day we get the bureaucratic empire builders out of our business. All that is needed is to fortify the terms already written into the Constitution, giving them reality and fact, by adding two more amendments.

First, House Joint Resolution 123, now pending in Congress, which provides that "the Government of the United States shall not engage in any business, professional, commercial, financial, or industrial enterprise except as specified in the Constitution."

Second, get action on a proposed constitutional amendment to provide that "Congress is prohibited from levying taxes on personal incomes, inheritances, or estates."

The day we really get together as a people, and labor jointly in the common cause as the Founding Fathers did, we can add these two amendments to the Constitution. Do you remember when Congress levied a tax of 10 percent on the purchase of 50 or more postcards? This 10-cent tax on a dollar's worth of postcards so enraged the American people that they went to work on their representatives in dead earnest. It was made perfectly clear to every person in office and every person who wanted to be in office that this tax had to be repealed instantly. Under this coordinated public pressure, the tax on postcards was repealed in a matter of days.

What about your personal income taxes? How much does it mean to you, personally, to get this one off your back? You know the answer as it applies to you, because it is the amount you reported on your income-tax form No. 1040. If you want that tax repealed—so you can keep that amount of your own earnings, then say so—and say it loud enough for your representatives to hear.

It's up to you to tell every Member of Congress and every Member of your State legislature exactly what you want—and what you are ready to do to get what you want. The day we do this with the same determination we displayed in the matter of the tax on postcards, the repeal of individual income taxes, and the enactment of House Joint Resolution 123 will be well on their way to accomplishment.

In this way the sovereignty of the States will be restored, just as the Constitution intended.

International justice, confidence, honor, and integrity will be restored.

The American theme of "equal justice under law" will be reestablished, with Government back at its rightful job of governing and regulating, protecting our lives and property.

This will constitute a great rebirth of liberty, making us free in fact, giving substance to our claim that ours is the land of the free and the home of the brave.

It will solve the most difficult of all our internal problems—the strife between management and labor—by restoring to labor the fruit of its toil, putting a greater net increase in the pay envelope of all Americans than any politician or labor leader ever dared suggest.

All this and much, much more is ours just as soon as we accept this challenge of Americanism, use our citizenship to define the terms of our freedom by adding these two amendments to the Constitution, and thus bring new vitality and greatness to our institutions of liberty—to the ideals of equal justice under law.

Federal Assistance to States for School Construction

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARLEY O. STAGGERS
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 5, 1956

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H. R. 7535) to authorize Federal assistance to the States and local communities in financing an expanded program of school construction so as to eliminate the national shortage of classrooms.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, we have been discussing the Federal aid to education bill, a subject that has been discussed for a long time. Men in this country, when public education first started, fought public schools. We did not have public schools throughout the United States until 1839 as a complete system of education.

The gentlemen who preceded me mentioned his State of Michigan and said that in 1874 the Supreme Court of Michigan held that local districts wishing to extend their schools beyond the elementary grades might do so. Today it is the custom throughout the United States that we provide public education through the high school days.

Five important words in the Declaration of Independence are, "all men are created equal." We lead peoples of the world to believe that every man in America and every woman has an equal opportunity, and that means in every field. Certainly this should be so in the basic field of education.

Recently a man in the city of Washington worth, I presume, at least $2 million, was discussing with me this fact of Federal aid to education, and I brought up the subject that in some of the States they just could not afford to give their children the kind of education they do in the richer States. He made the statement to me, "If those children can't get it, let them leave that State and go to some State where they can get it." I told him I thought that was the most absurd statement that a man I thought had good sense could make, because those children did not have the ability nor the opportunity to pick up and go to some other State to get their education. Perhaps their fathers and mothers should have, but why should we blame and penalize our children for the fact that they cannot get an education because of lack of teachers and facilities?

They say, "Where will the Federal Government come in?" As I understand the President's recommendation, and as I understood the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK], they too, advocated that we equalize educational opportunities somewhat throughout the United States. I believe the Kelley bill does that. I hope that when we go back into the House the Gwinn amendment will be voted down, and that the Kelley bill will be voted up. We then will have made some start in this Federal aid to education which will equalize the opportunity of every man's child to get an education equal with yours and mine. I hope that my children will be educated in West Virginia. We feel that we have good schools. I want them to have a good education. But I would want the right for every other American child in this land, to have an equal opportunity for a good education. I believe every good citizen wants that, because the strength of America is in the whole and not in the part. There are a lot of men who would have their children go to a good school but would deny that right to some poorer child.

Polish Embassy Reception

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. DODD
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 10, 1956

Mr. DODD. Mr. Speaker, in company with many of my colleagues, I received an invitation to a reception to be held at the Polish Embassy in Washington, D. C., on July 23 "in celebration of the national holiday of the Polish People's Republic."

I trust that no Member of Congress will attend this so-called celebration, for it would be shameful in my opinion if any Member of Congress, by so much as his presence, participated in a celebration marking the death of freedom and justice in Poland.

Mr. Speaker, I have written a letter to the Polish Ambassador refusing this invitation, and in my letter, I referred to the fact that 7 years ago I had refused an honor offered by this same Government.

I wish to make my own position a matter of record, and because I hope that my letter will be of interest to my colleagues, I include here a copy of it which reads as follows:

JULY 12, 1956.

Ambassador ROMUALD SPASOWSKI,
Embassy of the Polish People's Republic, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. AMBASSADOR: I have received your invitation to a reception "in celebration of the national holiday of the Polish People's Republic." In good conscience, I cannot and will not accept your invitation.

My reasons for so declining were made clear in a letter I sent to your predecessor, Ambassador Winiewica on April 23, 1949. In that letter I refused to accept the Officer's Cross of the Order of Polonia Restituta which was tendered to me in recognition of my efforts at the Nuremberg war crimes trial.

In the letter refusing the decoration, I stated, in part, as follows: "The record of your government in both domestic and foreign affairs is shockingly similar to the record of the Nazi tyrants as established in Nuremberg. Now the people of Poland are under the heel of a new tyranny which, like its evil predecessor, oppresses religious groups, terrorizes political opponents, and makes a mockery of the freedoms for which so many brave men and women gave their lives."

Now, more than 7 years later, I am even more firmly convinced that I was right in my expressions about your government.

Further in the letter I stated, "My great respect and admiration for the Polish people is undiminished by the misconduct of its present government." The anti-Communist uprising in Poznan less than 2 weeks ago by the citizens of that historic city who were willing to fight tanks with their bare hands for bread and freedom, has increased the already great respect and admiration that I have always felt toward the people of Poland.

It is my considered opinion, Mr. Ambassador, that the courage and love of freedom of the Polish people will once again see Poland a free nation. When that day arrives, and Poland has a legitimate and just and truly representative government, I will deem it a great honor to be invited to its Embassy.

Yours truly,

THOMAS J. DODD,
Member of Congress.

Stan, the American Man

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN P. SAYLOR
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 11, 1956

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, behind each player who participated in the all-star game is a success story that can serve to inspire the youth of our country. The road to big-league baseball is open to every boy, but it becomes so steep as it branches out into those 16 exclusive dugouts that only youngsters possessed of outstanding ability are able to go all the way.

On Monday, Stan Musial was presented with an award emblematic of his being named player of the decade. Yesterday, his brilliant performance at bat and in the field served to accentuate the judgment of those responsible for the selection. A word of tribute to Stan "the Man" belongs in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—not alone because he is one of the greatest baseball players of all time; rather because while achieving sports immortality he has remained the quiet, modest, humble, dignified, religious, refined, and sympathetic person that he was in the days of his boyhood in a small town of western Pennsylvania.

Stan Musial typifies the kind of fellow any father would want his son to be. This offspring of a steel worker was not tapped on the shoulder by fortune and invited into the Hall of Fame. When, after his career has come to an end and he becomes eligible to enter that edifice, his reward will have been made possible because of hard work, diligence, sobriety, and determination. Baseball has been a serious profession with Stan Musial. In it, he has invested study, training, and expert conditioning. From it has come commensurate financial compensation in testimony of the returns that are possible in a competitive system.

Despite the high salary which he came to command, Stan Musial shunned the profligate way of life that can be so inviting to celebrities in the sports and entertainment fields. He invested in private enterprise and is now a respected and successful businessman in St. Louis. He is a devoted husband and father, a veteran of our Armed Forces, and just about everything else that goes to make up the outstanding American.

America can use more men and boys of Stan Musial's caliber, whether or not they can swing a bat or play first base and the outfield. And if the rest of the world were so fortunate as to have a predominance of this type of character, the only defense programs required would be those planned by opposing managers to stop Stan Musial.

Drinking Is the Cure

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. W. STERLING COLE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 12, 1956

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, the surplus of dairy products has been a source of serious concern to our farmers, our Government, and our taxpayers for many years. A decline in dairy farm income significantly affects every segment of our economy for, when the dairyman is hurt and as his purchasing power drops, many lines of business and trade feel the impact.

As a Representative from America's second largest dairy State, I have been very much concerned about what we can do to bring about a supply-demand balance in fluid milk, and how we can make certain that consumption of milk continues to rise in 1956 as it did last year when the consumption increased by 3.3 billion pounds over the consumption of 115 billion pounds in 1954.

Many people seem to think of the surplus problem in terms of overproduction, but my own view is that it stems basically from underconsumption. Agricultural experts have pointed out that if every man, woman, and child in the United States would increase his milk consumption by a swallow a day we would use our total annual output of milk.

This means we could reduce the volume of fluid milk that goes into butter, cheese, and dry milk—products which the Government has purchased in large quantities to support dairy prices. I am informed by the Department of Agriculture that the cost to the Government in dairy support operations from July 1952 to March 1956, has been around $800 million.

I am glad to say that we have made some progress in reducing the surplus. But we still have a job ahead. The goal of balanced supply and demand in milk is within reach—if we can get more Americans to drink more milk.

More Americans will continue to drink more milk as long as the dairy industry continues to exercise its imagination and employs new merchandising ideas.

The industry already has taken long strides to improve the merchandising techniques of milk. For example, in recent years milk-vending machines have been providing milk in schools, railroad stations, public buildings, and factories. These machines are a response to an American public that likes and wants milk, but many times found that milk was not available where other beverages were being sold.

This year—on May 9—Senator WILEY, of Wisconsin, and I gave a milkshake-mix party in the main Senate dining room for 30 youngsters. These youngsters drank 60 pints of milk in 20 minutes.

It is interesting to me that Mrs. Lawrence Henderson, of Alexandria, Va., mother of two of the children who attended the party, reported this week that she has doubled the family's milk consumption and ended the problem of getting the children to drink milk since she was introduced to the mix.

I said on the floor of the House the day before the party:

Senator ALEXANDER WILEY, of Wisconsin, and I are giving a milkshake-mix party in the Capitol for a group of Washington children. It is my hope that this party will dramatize the need for increasing milk consumption and the effect which new products such as milkshake mix can have on that consumption.

I feel sure the dairy industry will continue to work hand in hand with manufacturers of all new products and techniques which will help sell more milk—just as the industry has done with vending machines and simple milk flavorings in the past.

The manufacturer of the milkshake mix served at the party said that from a projection of sales figures it can be estimated that the mix will sell hundreds of millions of extra quarts of milk this year. This is just one manufacturer. Other companies make milkshake mix, too; and their combined sales potential could represent a substantial contribution toward bringing milk consumption more in balance with milk production.

Just how much of a contribution these products make, however, depends to a large extent on the dairy industry. I am sure that those of us in the United States Congress are sincerely interested in increasing milk consumption and hope that the dairy industry and these manufacturers will seek to coordinate their advertising, public relations, merchandising, and other sales efforts.

The administration is doing its part to help the dairy industry. The Federal school-milk program is moving ahead. President Eisenhower signed a bill this year providing $25 million annually for school-milk distribution and extending the program until mid-1958.

The Department of Agriculture is also making a large contribution and I am interested in some remarks made by Secretary Benson in a June Dairy Month speech at Beaver Dam, Wis., this year.

The Secretary explained the results of research on milk consumption in 3 cities—1 in the South, 1 in the Midwest, 1 in the Northwest. In the southern city, during the week the survey was conducted, one-fourth of the children between 1 and 12 years old drank no fresh fluid milk at all. Among adolescents and adults the proportions drinking no milk were ever bigger. In the other two cities, the Secretary continued, "milk consumption was larger but still well below the good nutritional level."

There is a great incongruity in the above situation. Milk and other dairy products provide three-fourths of the calcium in our food supply. Childhood and adolescence are the times of greatest need for health-building calcium. Our youngsters must have the nutrients they can get from milk—as well as other essential nutrients—if we are to avoid a repetition of the appalling rejection rate of our young men by the armed services because of physical defects, many originating in malnutrition.

The Secretary said he believed that milk consumption can be increased. "But it cannot be done without keen imagination and new merchandising ideas." Then, just as Senator Wiley and I tried to do with our party, he called the attention of the dairy industry to new products which would help sell more milk.

Secretary Benson said:

"Industry has recently brought out a milkshake mix in three flavors—chocolate, vanilla, and strawberry. If this goes over, one can visualize the youngsters of the Nation setting up kitchen soda fountains by the millions—with benefit to themselves and the entire dairy industry."

I agree with Secretary Benson. Milk consumption can be increased and if it is increased it will be a benefit to the dairy farmer, to the Government, to the taxpayer, and to the youngsters of the Nation as well. I saw a perfect example of how children take to drinking milk when they find drinking milk is fun. Let us hope the dairy industry keeps its keen imagination busy and develops new ideas on how best to merchandise and sell milk.

A Third Term for Eisenhower?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEON H. GAVIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 11, 1956

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Washington Evening Star of July 10, 1956:

A THIRD TERM FOR EISENHOWER? — OPINION HEARD THAT GOP SHOULD HAVE ONE ELIGIBLE TO BALANCE TRUMAN STATUS

(By David Lawrence)

Because there is such a widespread assumption, even among Democrats, that President Eisenhower will be elected for a second term, there has begun lately some discussion as to whether or not the Constitution should be amended to permit him to run for a third term.

This is not as far away as it might seem. The present trend of discussion on Capitol Hill points to some kind of world crisis for 1960. Presumably by then the Soviet Government will have caught up with America in airpower and in nuclear weapons, and it could conceivably happen that there would be a demand from the American people that Ike should continue on in the White House.

The 22d amendment, which was declared effective on February 26, 1951, prevents Eisenhower from becoming a candidate for a third term, but it does not disqualify Harry S. Truman, because the language specifically exempted the incumbent President.

As long as Truman is eligible, there are those who feel that Eisenhower should also be. The concession to exempt Truman was made largely to win Democratic support in Congress, inasmuch as a two-thirds vote of both Houses of Congress was required. But such a personal exception violates the principle of the anti-third-term amendment itself, and the only way to equalize this is to permit 1 Republican as well as 1 Democrat to be eligible for a third term. For at the time the amendment was submitted the Republican Party was out of power.

If the Constitution were to be amended, moreover, the process would have to start in 1957. It took from March 1947 to February 1951 to get the 22d amendment ratified by three-fourths of the States. If an amendment were proposed in the 1957 session of Congress, it probably would be 1959 before final action would be taken by the States.

Naturally there would be opposition from some Democrats who fear Ike's vote-getting powers, but it would hardly be justified because the purpose of the amendment would merely be to equalize an unequal situation between the major parties. Truman, himself, probably would be the first to endorse the idea for, it will be recalled, it was General Eisenhower's magnanimity and friendliness to the then President which caused him to refrain from running against Truman in the 1948 contest. He might have won. The story is told that Truman at Potsdam in 1945 told the victorious American commander in chief of Allied forces in Europe that there was no honor which he would not help the general to attain. It was then that Ike expressed his unwillingness to run for the Presidency in 1948.

At the time of the nominating conventions in 1960, Ike would be only 69 and, if elected, he would be 70 at his third inauguration.

But Truman today is 71 and is eligible. Chancellor Adenauer is 80 and going strong. Winston Churchill was 79 when he withdrew from the Prime Minister's portfolio. In this era of vitamins and advances in medical care, 70 is not considered a mark of ineligibility for active service in many lines of business. Each case is individual. The prognosis of Ike's doctors is that, with the excellent care given him in the White House, he may live on considerably beyond his second term.

The American people are never much concerned about the age of their Presidents—nor have they in the past been impressed with the argument that a Chief Executive has to have the physique or the health of an athlete or that he has to spend every minute of his waking hours on the job. There have been some full time Presidents—and Harry Truman was one of them—who didn't require more than a few minutes in which to make some of the gravest errors that have been committed in the Presidency. The true story of the influence of the Truman staff on the then President has never been told. It isn't the time that a President takes to study a situation or to decide on it which counts but the amount of acumen and judgment he brings to the job in the first place.

If Ike in his second term keeps the Nation at peace and is able to maintain a deterrent force sufficiently large to prevent any other nation from starting a war, the chances are that in 1960 there will be a considerable demand to have him continue in office. It may be, therefore, that the Nation's principal concern in another year or so will be whether Ike will be eligible to run for a third term. Because of his devotion to public service, it can be assumed that he himself will not initiate retirement as long as he feels able to serve the American people.

Why Try To Bluff Our Way to Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM H. NATCHER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 12, 1956

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith an editorial entitled "Why Try To Bluff Our Way to Peace," which appeared in the July 5, 1956, issue of the Hancock Clarion, of Hawesville, Ky.

It has been my observation that in a great many instances our aggressive weekly newspapers play an important part in molding public opinion at the grassroots, and they exercise great influence in the operation of our Government. Certainly such newspapers have been the training ground for some of our outstanding journalists. The Hancock Clarion, under the able editorship of Mr. Roscoe I. Downs, clearly exemplifies the type of newspaper to which I refer.

The editorial is as follows:

WHY TRY TO BLUFF OUR WAY TO PEACE

Sometimes one wonders at the attitude of our military men, and our statesmen as well, when they go all out in expressing opinions that carry weight with the people who have placed their confidence in such leaders. What we have in mind in thus expressing our thoughts about our statesmen and military leaders, is what such leaders of the world, and not excepting our own leaders, have to say from time to time about conditions in the world that seem to us to be much like shadow boxing: Erecting a straw man and then knocking such dummy down to prove their might and power.

In our world today that is seeking to find the ways of peace, it would seem to us that many of our leaders fail to grasp the real significance of what peace is and how to go about in the effort to achieve it. It would seem that the only method they can devise is to try to throw a scare into the supposed enemy and in that manner, by fear bring about the desired result. In all the history of the world it has never been shown that fears has caused any major country to tamely submit to aggression. There is an element in human nature that calls for a psychological reaction to fear when the desire for freedom is at stake and love of country and patriotic zeal reacts in the human soul to fight, even if the odds are overwhelming.

In a recent article it is stated that a high United States Army general testified before a congressional committee investigating our air power, about what would be the result if our country got into a nuclear war. We quote a part of the general's testimony, and

the question asked by the committee chairman.

"If we got into a nuclear war and our Strategic Air Force made an assault in force against Russia with nuclear weapons so that the weapons exploded in a way where the prevailing winds would carry the southeast over Russia, what would be the effect in way of death?" The chairman asked; and the general replied:

"Current planning estimates run on the order of several hundred million deaths; that would be either way, depending on which way the wind blew.

"If the wind blew to the southeast, they would be mostly in the U. S. S. R., although they would extend into the Japanese, and perhaps, down into the Philippine area.

"If the wind blew the other way, they would extend well back into Western Europe."

While the members of the committee were shocked at the statement of the general as to the large number of deaths from such an all-out nuclear attack, little was said about what the result would be if Russia should release such an attack on the United States.

All of this it would seem to us is being made public for the purpose of scaring the world, and especially Russia, into a submission of peace, rather than by persuasion and neighborly greetings of friendship. It would seem to us that the greatest "weapon" for peace is not some great destructive power that kills millions of human beings, most of them innocent victims of such an attack, but a real effort to gain the friendship of our supposed enemies. We surely cannot hope to bring about a lasting peace on the earth by the "rattling of swords," which in these advanced days means the menace of atomic weapons.

With every advance in destructive weapons, greater and more destructive warfare has been engendered. Two of the greatest wars in history have been fought with the ever-increasing production of highly destructive weapons, and such weapons have not deterred the advent of war but have stimulated wars. Why do we think that by giving out such terrible descriptions of future wars we can hope to prevent war? Such claims in the past have never deterred a nation bent on war to refrain from going to war.

The only purpose we can see in giving publicity to such claims of destruction by nuclear warfare is that we can attempt to bluff Russia into a peaceful attitude, and that is hardly conceivable. We are sure that Russia will reply by giving all the gruesome details of what terrible destruction their own nuclear warfare would carry to our country and the "hundreds of millions" of our own people who would be killed. And it does seem that the distinguished authority who testified as to the "hundreds of millions" of lives that would be taken if our full-scale nuclear warfare should be launched against Russia, has been very loose with his numbers, for the entire population of both European and Asiatic Russia is only about 193 million, and even if such a warfare with divergent winds such figures would include most all of Europe as well as Russia. Of course, the "authority" hardly states the exact number in hundreds of millions, and that is left to speculation. In fact all of the entire estimate is but speculation aimed, it would seem, to frighten a supposed enemy.

In our own speculation in this matter of the great number of lives taken in case of such nuclear warfare, we are not attempting to minimize the danger of war and of the possibility of such an attack on our own country. But it is inconceivable that the United States would launch such an all-out aggressive attack on Russia or any other country unless attacked ourselves. We do not believe the American people would allow this country to engage in an aggressive war, in spite of what our military and political leaders might say. We have never been the aggressors in war and we feel sure that our country would not wage an aggressive war on Russia or any other country. We would defend ourselves, of course, and to the utmost of our ability in spite of the danger that might befall us by such destruction as could be hurled upon us.

This sparring between Russia and our own country would appear very much like two small boys trying to bluff each other and saying: "My Dad can lick your Dad." Such claims by small boys usually do bring the dads into the argument and a real fight is the result with all the hatreds and animosity that such a conflict brings.

While we are in complete accord with our efforts to build an adequate military defense that would become aggressive if attacked by any other country, we do not believe our cause for peace is being stimulated by such bizarre statements as to the "hundreds of millions" who would be destroyed by our forces in aggressive attack. We do not think that such statements can or would bluff Russia into a peaceful attitude, so why give such wide publicity to such statements that can only stir up still further the warlike attitude that prevails in Russia and among some of our own high-ranking military men and statesmen.

Our Constant Challenge

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. WILLIAM H. AVERY

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 11, 1956

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Speaker, Independence Day we reserve for reflecting upon our birth as a Nation and enjoy the day in celebration. On July 5 we dismiss from our minds yesterday's reflections on the responsibilities of our heritage. Just as we reserve Sunday as the Sabbath, and then on Monday we sometimes fail to heed our religious instruction given us on Sunday.

The Topeka Daily Capital graphically presented in two editorials the price and effort exerted for independence and the cost to maintain this hard-won freedom. "We Hold These Truths" appeared on July 4. "Eternal Vigilance" appeared on July 5.

This outstanding newspaper, founded and for a long time published by the late Senator Arthur Capper, has made an excellent presentation of the challenge that preserving our Republic is a daily task that must be met with vigilance and zeal.

The editorials follow:

[From the Topeka Daily Capital of July 4, 1956]

WE HOLD THESE TRUTHS

The American colonists had tried every means at their command to have the English King right the grievous wrongs that deprived them of liberty, and even of life. But the King ignored the rights which British subjects insisted belonged to them.

At first there was no thought of separation. Indeed, almost 3 months after the Battle of Lexington the Second Continental Congress was disavowing any ambitious designs of separating and establishing independent States. Even by July 1776 many Americans still had to be won over to separation from the mother country.

However, many patriotic colonists had become convinced that they could never enjoy justice and liberty without complete severance of the ties that had enabled the Crown and Parliament to impose exorbitant taxes and to fasten the yoke of oppression upon "these United Colonies (that) are, and of right ought to be, free and independent States."

The final draft, as written by Thomas Jefferson with the advice and counsel of Benjamin Franklin and John Adams, was formally adopted by the Continental Congress on July 4, 1776. But it was not read in public until 3 or 4 days later.

We suggest that all Americans ought to read the Declaration of Independence at least on the Fourth of July every year. It is too long for this space, but a part of the preamble of the historic (and most sacred) American document follows:

"We hold these truths to be self-evident: That all men are created equal; that they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights; that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

"That, to secure these rights, governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed; that, whenever any form of government becomes destructive of these ends, it is the right of the people to alter or to abolish it, and to institute a new government, laying its foundation on such principles, and organizing its powers in such form, as to them shall seem most likely to effect their safety and happiness.

"Prudence, indeed, will dictate that governments long established should not be changed for light and transient causes; and accordingly all experience has shown that mankind are more disposed to suffer, while evils are sufferable, than to right themselves by abolishing the forms to which they are accustomed.

"But when a long train of abuses and usurpations, pursuing invariably the same object, evinces a design to reduce them under absolute despotism, it is their right, it is their duty, to throw off such government and to provide new guards for their future security."

Adoption of the Declaration launched this Government upon its course. Although a long and bloody Revolutionary War ensued, the framers of the Declaration, and eventually the Constitution, never deviated from their determination to be free to "enjoy life, liberty, and pursuit of happiness."

Once the Revolutionary Army, under the valiant leadership of George Washington, had vanquished the British Crown's soldiers and the mercenaries hired to put down the rebellion, the American people began building their Government. During the long years there have been differences of opinion on methods and procedures, but rarely has any person dared to attempt betrayal of the country. And these abortive efforts were put down with a determination that discouraged others who would destroy the Republic.

Only in recent years have a relatively few misguided Americans espoused a foreign and wholly traitorous ideology, which, if allowed to get out of hand, would destroy our Government. The American people might well become aroused at the efforts to undermine the foundations upon which this Nation was built, and fight subversion and anti-American movements with the same zeal that the forefathers did in wresting freedom from a dictatorial king.

[From the Topeka Daily Capital of July 5, 1956]

ETERNAL VIGILANCE

Practically every able-bodied American yesterday enjoyed the fruits of the struggles of their forefathers to guarantee life, liberty, and pursuit of happiness.

They took long journeys on excellent roads to favorite recreation places, or perhaps visited relatives miles and miles away. They went golfing, fishing, picnicking, or merely lolled in the shade at home. Every individual was free to follow his own bent, without interference so long as his conduct did not encroach upon the liberty and happiness of his fellow-Americans. Or the safety of others on the highways and in other public places.

At no city egress or entrance was any person required to present visas, police permits or to seek official sanction for travel. There were no barriers at State lines with uniformed police demanding reasons for crossing. At service stations the attendants courteously supplied the fuel and oil, cleaned the windshield, collected the charges, and graciously waved a parting "come again."

All America was joyful, enjoying to the fullest measure the blessings inherited from their forefathers. It was Independence Day which is a sacred tradition handed down by the American heritage.

While 167 million Americans were celebrating their national birthday, half the human beings on this earth languished in slavery. Here and there the gleam of hope inspired by the natural desire for freedom caused defiance of tyrannical oppression.

In freedom-loving Poland desperate patriots defied their Communist overlords. Many died or were wounded in the uprising against intolerable slavery. East Germany seethed with unrest as the Red hierarchy tightened the yoke that holds millions in abject serfdom. Throughout Russia the population looked for a savior to lead them in victorious revolt against tyranny.

Every satellite nation was the scene of resentment at the heavily-armed guards protecting Communist officials from the wrath of outraged peoples. In the Middle East, Red-inspired warfare made life, liberty, and pursuit of happiness hazardous, if not impossible.

In far-off China nearly half a billion enslaved people went about their tasks, with rifles and bayonets at their backs. Brutal force kept them from the throats of their murderous rulers. Rifles cracked in Indochina, where a new freedom-seeking underground is sniping at the Red liberators who hold the land in despotic tyranny, and keep the people in subjection only because the cruel slave drivers have arms and munitions to enforce their ungodly authority.

There is no freedom, no independence of action, no pursuit of happiness behind the Iron and Bamboo Curtains. Human rights have been subjected to the whims of a relatively few merciless autocrats.

The American people today enjoy the greatest measure of liberty extant in the world. They are the inheritors of a way of life won by the blood of their ancestors. From every nation came fugitives from injustice and tyranny, to join the great melting pot that is the United States of America in this mid-20th century.

Every person who thinks must feel sorry for the millions of people held in durance vile by dictators who rule by brute force. The frequent uprisings indicate that the tyrants are living on borrowed time. Each incident, such as Poznan, is evidence of the flames being fanned by the desire for freedom.

The Red satellites are held by slender threads which threaten to break and precipitate revolution any day. And every American should fervently hope that the revolt against Communist masters will be well organized and effective. For the peace of the world, and perhaps the lives of millions of American boys depend upon breaking the stranglehold the Red demons have upon the throats of 500 million subjects.

Meanwhile, it behooves all of us to watch the ramparts of our own freedom. Evil influences are encroaching upon the liberties our forefathers bequeathed to all Americans. Little by little the Central Government, spurred by socialistic-minded demagogs, is tightening its controls over the lives of our people.

Every time we allow bureaucratic fuzzy-wuzzies to whittle away our traditional freedom of action, in return for a mess of pottage, we are pushed nearer the plight of the millions behind the despotic curtains.

We are being edged closer to the abyss whenever a Government agent—whether tax collector, price fixer, acreage arbiter, or controller of business and labor—moves into our lives to deprive us of life, liberty, and pursuit of happiness.

Eternal vigilance is the price of liberty.

Increasing Rates of Compensation for Service-Connected Disabilities

SPEECH
OF
HON. CHARLES A. WOLVERTON
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 12, 1956

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, the bill now under consideration (H. R. 12038) provides increases in service-connected disability compensation and to increase dependency allowances.

The bill relates entirely to service-connected compensation and additional allowances for dependents of veterans suffering from disabilities incurred in or aggravated by service in one of the branches of the Armed Forces. It applies to all wars and peacetime.

The need for the increases that this bill provides for is abundantly clear—in fact it is my opinion the increases could have been much larger and still be justified. The increases for all basic rates of compensation for disabilities rated less than total and the additional allowances for dependents amount to 10 percent. The rate for total disability, however, is increased from $181 to $225 monthly, or approximately 24 percent. The increases in statutory awards for certain World War I veterans, under the World War Veterans' Act of 1924, amount to more than 30 percent.

The necessity for the introduction of this bill as a separate bill to apply to service-connected disabilities alone, arises from the fact that another bill reported to the House, and passed by the House, applied only to non-service-connected disabilities. This situation arose because a parliamentary objection was made to the inclusion of provisions in that bill which would have given the increases as provided for in this bill for service-connected disabilities. The Chair sustained the objection which thereupon received from that bill the provisions now contained in the present bill. The objection made and sustained was only technical and was not decided by the Chair with any thought of opposition to the provisions, that applied to service-connected disabilities from the standpoint of their merit. However, as a result of such parliamentary action and decision it became necessary to introduce a new bill to provide the increases desired for service-connected disabilities and certain dependents. The bill now before us is that new bill.

The bill is meritorious and should have the full support of this House. It is a pleasure to give my support to this bill and I do so with the hope that it will become law at this session of Congress.

Translating Democratic Ideals Into Asian Realities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD C. OSTERTAG
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 12, 1956

Mr. OSTERTAG. Mr. Speaker, while the echoes of the foreign-aid debate are still jangling in our ears, I include in the RECORD an article from last night's Evening Star, which illustrates the one kind of foreign aid which will always be welcome, effective, and mutually satisfying:

SERVICE SCENE—CALLING DR. DOOLEY IS OPERATION LAOS

(By Ruth Dean)

"The woods are lovely, dark, and deep,
But I have promises to keep,
And miles to go before I sleep."

With these lines from Robert Frost, Dr. Thomas A. Dooley closed his book, Deliver Us From Evil, his best seller about his experiences in alleviating the misery among Vietnam refugees following the fall of Dien Bien Phu.

But the lines were prophetic because this former Navy doctor does have promises to keep and miles to go on another mission to the Far East.

The 29-year-old doctor, who is a combination of meteoric energy and fearless self-confidence, leaves Washington on Friday to conduct his own medical mission to Laos.

In his book (which Adm. Arleigh Burke has called a story of which the U. S. Navy is proud), Dr. Dooley said he wanted to make the Navy his career.

MEMORIES

But his memories brought back vivid scenes of how American medical aid and the big heartedness of American sailors had turned fear and suspicion into hope and confidence for 600,000 Vietnam refugees. These were the refugees he processed through a primitive Haiphong medical camp for United States Navy transport to southern Vietnam.

And Dr. Dooley knew he must go back—to do the same thing for another people caught in the tug of war between free ideals and international communism.

Since Dr. Dooley could not go to Laos as an American naval officer, he resigned from the Navy 2 months ago—much to their regret—and set about getting his Operation Laos under way. .

With proceeds from his book he is financing the operation in cooperation with the Research Corporation of New York.

He will be working under auspices of the International Rescue Committee, a private organization. The mission also has the approval of the State Department, the International Cooperation Administration, and the Laos Government.

It will be a pilot project. He is taking with him a small mobile unit composed of former Navy corpsmen who worked closely and devotedly with him in Vietnam.

It is a nasty, dirty job these corpsmen will face.

They remember the thousands of refugees who struggled into Haiphong with the open

running sores of yaws, the hideous deformities of elephantiasis, infants pathetically ill with cholera, malnutrition, and dysentery, not to mention the maimed bodies that bore witness to their keeping faith in the face of Communist persecution.

But as one corpsman put it to Dr. Dooley: "I don't know why you want to go back to that place, but if you think it's important, Doctor, and you want me to come along, I volunteer."

Two of the former corpsmen are leaving behind them recent brides who gave their reluctant consent to the 8-month project. The third member of the team is leaving college to join them.

With the same persuasiveness he used to get his medical team together, Dr. Dooley walked unabashed into the offices of one of the country's leading airlines—to be pledged free passage; a leading motor car corporation—and came away with a specially constructed jeep as a gift, and donations of almost $100,000 worth of medicines from one pharmaceutical firm, plus thousands of bottles of vitamins and protein extract from another.

CARE has already sent a midwife kit with enough equipment to deliver 250 babies.

He's not afraid to beg for humanity.

In addition, the United States Navy has donated a 6-month supply of field rations, which the unit will supplement with native food. Also at the request of Gen. J. W. O'Daniel, president of the American Friends for Vietnam, the Navy is also transporting all their equipment to Indochina.

Their base of operations will be Vientiane, the capital, from which they will fan out in 1- to 2-week operations with the various tribes in the mountain villages.

"Operation Laos" has a twofold purpose. Not only is there a crying need for medical attention—only one qualified physician for more than 2 million people—but Dr. Dooley thinks the project will represent a tremendous weapon of foreign policy."

PLATITUDES

"If America as a nation ignores the Asian physical needs while we hand him pious platitudes, we justify the Communists' characterization of our religion as an opiate of the peoples," he declared.

"We want to be on the offensive for America, not just denying what the Communists say about us, but getting there and doing something about it. We shall try to translate the democratic ideals we do possess into Asian realities that they can possess."

One of the strong points of the project, Dr. Dooley thinks, will be the medical unit's channeling of its activities through the Laos Ministry of Health, with its already established village dispensaries.

Dr. Dooley knows he'll be facing months of hard work in the midst of the worst diseases known to man but yesterday you couldn't have found a happier man in Washington.

He thinks he knows why. One of the world's renowned medical missionaries, Dr. Albert Schweitzer, put it in one sentence in a letter which Dr. Dooley treasures.

"Dear Dr. Dooley," he wrote. "I don't know what your destiny will be but I know that you will always have happiness because you have sought and found: how to serve."

Rule or Ruin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM B. WIDNALL

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 12, 1956

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, the responsibility for the failure of this Congress to pass a housing bill will not rest on the Republican Members of Congress or the administration. The blame will be entirely upon those who insist on tying radical and controversial measures to sound and desirable legislation about which there is no argument.

During the latter part of June, the Committee on Rules voted 6 to 4 to table H. R. 11742, a bill reported by the Committee on Banking and Currency, and referred to as the Housing Act of 1956.

Why did the Committee on Rules table this bill? The reason is clear. It was because it contained a number of provisions which are highly controversial. They are opposed, I believe, by most Members of Congress. They are contrary to the principles embodied in the President's recommendations on housing and are calculated to defeat them. For example, rather than helping to make mortgage funds more widely available through private channels, the bill actually would stifle the flow of private funds by Government competition through direct Government lending and forced purchase of mortgages at more than their market value. Furthermore, the public housing authorization exceeds what can be soundly planned or programed, or what communities are prepared to absorb. Public housing is divorced from the other parts of our housing effort designed to clear slums and blight, and renew and redevelop our communities. The bill refuses to acknowledge the need for an overall approach to the slum problem. It does not provide any incentive to the communities to do more than build more public housing. Public housing is presented as an end in itself.

For the sake of the welfare of our country and in order to maintain a high rate of housing construction to fulfill the needs of all American families, I trust that this Congress will reject all such extreme and unsound proposals, and pass a bill which confines itself to the desirable provisions which have been proposed—provisions which, generally, are noncontroversial and are supported by President Eisenhower, by the Administrator of the Housing and Home Finance Agency, Albert M. Cole, by Members of Congress, and by the public. These provisions, among other things, would:

First. Extend the home-loan-improve-program with increases in the maximum loan amounts and maximum term of loans.

Second. Liberalize the terms for FHA sales and rental housing mortgages.

Third. Give special aid to elderly persons in meeting their housing needs.

Fourth. Make mortgage funds more widely available through broadening the operations of the Federal National Mortgage Association in the secondary mortgage market.

Fifth. Continued and increased aid to colleges for dormitories and other facilities.

Sixth. Assist urban renewal through the liberalization of FHA's insurance terms for the repair and rehabilitation of housing and the provision of low-cost housing for families displaced by urban renewal.

Seventh. Provide better housing for families of men serving in our Armed Forces.

Eighth. Authorize an additional 70,000 units of low-rent public housing to be constructed over a 2-year period by communities which are participating in an integrated attack on slums and blight.

The bill which I introduced which had the approval of the administration embodied these features and could well be used, if there is any real desire to break the present impasse and pass a sound housing program.

I call upon those who favor extreme and controversial proposals not to make their adoption the price to be paid for support of these desirable provisions. Let them bring these proposals up separately for consideration on their own merits. If they refuse this, then the failure of the Congress to pass a housing bill must rest squarely upon their shoulders. Theirs will be a course of rule or ruin.

Uprising in Poland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT J. CORBETT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 12, 1956

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to associate myself with the thoughts expressed in the following letter treating with the recent outbreaks in Poland. The Polish people have in the past made great contributions to our civilization and would do so again if they were free and independent as they by right ought to be. We hope their ordeal will not long continue.

The letter follows:

POLISH AMERICAN CONGRESS, INC.,
WESTERN PENNSYLVANIA STATE DIVISION,
Monessen, Pa., July 9, 1956.

Hon. ROBERT J. CORBETT,
Member of Congress,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN CORBETT: The Western Pennsylvania Division of the Polish American Congress, representing Americans of Polish background in western Pennsylvania, voted at its meeting of July 1, 1956, to forward to our Representatives in Congress the following memorial statement and resolution concerning the recent outbreaks of workers in Poznan and other cities of Poland.

1. The Western Pennsylvania Division pays homage to the heroes of the uprisings in Poland. It realizes that the demonstrations were initiated by the desire for more bread and better working conditions, but had developed spontaneously into a more fundamental demonstration against injustice and oppression by the Soviet-dominated administration in that country. However untimely these demonstrations, they were inspired by the love of liberty and justice which is the heritage of Poles, Americans, and all freedom-loving peoples.

2. It is strongly urged that the liberation of such nations as Poland be included in the policies of our Government, and that appropriate steps be taken, by strong protests to the oppressor governments and by introduction before the United Nations for action, for the cause of the Polish people. Such steps would, in some measure, tend to compensate for the errors in the Yalta agreement.

3. Strong appeals ought to be forwarded to the present administration in Poland that

the trials in connection with the recent demonstrations of the workers be conducted in a just and humane manner, and not in the spirit of oppression and vengeance.

4. It is recommended that steps be taken to alleviate the hunger and distress of the subjugated peoples of Poland, but with the assurance that such aid will reach those really in need.

It is respectfully requested that you use your position and influence in Congress to further the above proposals, and that you give your support to such resolutions and legislation, in support of the same principles, which may be introduced in Congress.

Sincerely,

POLISH AMERICAN CONGRESS,
WESTERN PENNSYLVANIA DIVISION,
H. J. ZYGMUNT, *President*.
J. F. WATTRAS, *Secretary*.

Address by Attorney Joseph G. Tomascik, of Wilkes-Barre, at 25th Anniversary Banquet Honoring Rev. Father Michael J. Frohman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 12, 1956

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address of Attorney Joseph G. Tomascik at the 25th ordination anniversary banquet of Rev. Father Michael J. Frohman, pastor of St. Anthony's Church, Larksville, Pa., on June 24, 1956:

EXCERPTS FROM AN ADDRESS DELIVERD BY ATTORNEY JOSEPH G. TOMASCIK, PRINCIPAL SPEAKER AT THE 25TH ORDINATION ANNIVERSARY BANQUET OF REV. MICHAEL J. FROHMAN, PASTOR OF ST. ANTHONY'S CHURCH, LARKSVILLE, PA., JUNE 24, 1956

Reverend chairman, very reverend and reverend clergy, reverend jubilarian, ladies and gentlemen, and friends, there are several aspects connected with my visit here this evening that afford me a great deal of pleasure. Seeing President Benaglia and Professors Dupuis and Haladay sitting here at the festive board, serves to recall my more than 5 years of happy and fruitful service as a member of the professional staff of that fine educational institution we know as King's College. I'm pleased, too, to see my former student, Rev. Stephen Medwick, who was ordained to the sacred priesthood a few weeks ago, and who is one of the early graduates of King's to become a clergyman.

And then it's always a happy event for me to come to Larksville to see old friends and renew old acquaintance. I was just telling Mrs. Kielty, my dinner partner, that I know most of the people on Howard and Wilson Streets, who invariably came to the old political rallies I used to address in the Lark Theater back in the depression years.

But most of all, I'm pleased to be in Larksville tonight to serve as a kind of keynoter in deserved tribute to a good friend, an estimable gentleman, a superb administrator, and above all, a devoted priest of God, Father Frohman.

The priesthood is a noble calling—probably the noblest known to man. The priest is a trained, accredited, consecrated, and trusted friend at large, maintained by the church in his community to preach the word of God, to administer the sacraments, to solemnize marriages, to assist in giving Christian burial, and to exemplify, insofar as one man may, the good life, and to make known to the men, women, and children of his parish, by word and deed, the purpose and love of God revealed in Jesus Christ.

Our friend, Father Frohman, has notably lived up to this large responsibility during these past 25 years. I am sure he is looking back today at the events of his fruitful ministry, and I am equally sure he is looking ahead to years of expanding service.

However zealous a man is, and however brilliant and studious, he is nevertheless not the product solely of his own efforts. And driving over to Larksville this evening, I couldn't help thinking how Father Frohman, like most successful men, are the products of a magnificent heritage. One American philosopher has said that the education of a gentleman begins 100 years before his birth, "for the intangible something that distinguishes the tactful, courteous gentleman, whatever be his station, is not to be acquired, but must come with breeding and blood of generations. So the education of a priest must be founded in self-sacrifice, practiced piety, and heroism of long-gone forebears."

And Father Frohman was blessed with a splendid ancestry—parents who were among the pioneer Slovak settlers in Larksville, who gave unstintingly of themselves in order to bring a fruition a long-cherished dream to educate their children. Like Poland, Ireland, Croatia, and France, among others, Slovakia has long been the model of religious nations. From the loins of that hallowed land of the Tatras has sprung a race of priests in God's church that has traveled all over the world to make His name known and loved by all nations. And Father Frohman, though of a younger generation and a native American, belongs in this group. He has made certain, by his magnificent record of service, that Larksville and Wyoming Valley have not lacked this Slovak leaven. I know of no priest who has sown among his people the seed of God's word more prodigally, husbanded it more solicitously, and brought forth fruit more abundantly, than this fine clergyman we honor this evening. The magnificent physical assets of his parish, the love and affection of his parishioners, and above all, their spiritual zeal, are all monuments to Father Frohman's tireless, patient, and effective labors in the vineyard of Christ.

Much has happened in the 25 years since our jubilarian was ordained back in 1931. The intervening years have witnessed great change and upheaval. The tempo of the world has quickened. Customs, methods, governments, laws, traditions, beliefs—all are changing. Around the world the things that have been are on trial for their lives before the bar of the things that are.

During the last quarter of a century, man has gone far in building the world he lives in. He has gone far also in tearing it down. He is racing with himself in construction and destruction. For in spite of all our material achievements, we find ourselves facing the same old problems in human relations. We have invented machines which have brought us closer toegther, but we have not yet learned how to live together. We know more about killing, than we know about living. We have achieved brilliance without wisdom and power without conscience.

This is a situation which presents a clear challenge to all Catholics and particularly to those who wear the vestments of the church. For years the church has fought the growing materialism of this age. For centuries the Catholic Church has realized that in the training of a man there must be spiritual as well as material values, and that the spiritual values must take precedence over the material. Our Catholic schools and colleges are an attempt to meet the materialism of today and to instill in the young people who attend them the principles which will enable them to be useful members of society and not merely fatuous ornaments.

We need strong Catholic leaders in this country. We need them for our own people, and we need them to work with those who are not of our faith in common endeavor for the elevation of the moral tone in our American society. And above all, we need devoted men of God in the community, men like Father Frohman, to instruct us and to exemplify the highest ideals of our faith.

So long as Father Frohman remains in our midst (and we trust that it will be for the entire span of his ministry) our community's spiritual welfare will be well attended to. We honor ourselves today in honoring one who has ever been an honor to the Church. We congratulate him upon the success he has attained, and the love and affection in which he is held by his associates. Words are inadequate in the light of the resounding testimony of the many years he has spent in the service of the Master.

It has been said that when God made man He didn't arrange any of the joints of his bones so he could pat himself on the back. Father Frohman has never been known to pat himself on the back—although he has often been justified in doing so—but those of us who have observed his loyal, efficient, and tireless work realize that it is about time that we recognized the splendid service which he has given during the last 25 years.

It is good for us that we contemplate his character and the sincerity of his service. It seems, to me, as I think of it, to resemble a little the epistle to the Romans. First we have a broad, substantial groundwork of doctrine; then we have a beautiful symmetrical superstructure of evangelical practice; and then we have a most graceful consummation of courtesy and kindliness. Our guest is a plant of God's own right-hand planting—the texture of it is substantial, the form of it fair, the flower of it beautiful, and the product of it prolific. Here is fruit unto holiness. He adorns the doctrine as he abides by it. The Church of an earlier era glorified God in Paul. The church of the present era glorifies God in men like Father Frohman. His teachings will be remembered until the generation has expired; in many a family and at many a hearth in St. Anthony's parish, his visits in their religious aspects will be cherished in memory; and in many a heart his name lives in the finest and fondest associations.

I am confident that our friend has won and will continue to win the approbation of the Master, "Well done thou good and faithful servant." We honor him, and I know I bespeak the sentiments of all of us when I express the hope that he will continue to convey the good news of the Gospel, and hasten the day when "at the name of Jesus every knee shall bow, of things in Heaven, and things in earth, and things under the earth, and every tongue confess that Jesus Christ is Lord, to the glory of God the Father."

Sixteenth Annual Model Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES B. UTT
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 12, 1956

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I wish to include the following letter which appeared in

the July 1956 issue of the American Legion magazine:

SIR: On April 21, the 16th annual Model Congress was held on the campus of Brooklyn College and attending were 100-odd people from schools from throughout the New York area. What occurred there is something every American has a right to know. A number of bills were presented on the floor for consideration. One of the first asked for American recognition, diplomatic and cultural, of the Communist People's Republic of China. Almost every delegate spoke in favor of this motion. Only we, the undersigned, and very few others stood up and spoke against communism. The members of the Congress and a goodly portion of the leaders virtually laughed our motions and ideas off the floor. We said that we should stand up for the ideals we hold dear. We stated, let's try patriotism. We got shouts of "Fascist!" "Nazi!" "McCARTHY!" and so on. We spoke for American principles and one delegate called the Stars and Stripes a "rag." General MacArthur was called a traitor to his country and one of the officials said, "I hate MacArthur." The New York World-Telegram and Sun was called "a capitalist rag," and the American Legion and its national commander were called reactionary and Fascist. We firmly believe that every taxpayer has the right to know the extent of Communist infiltration of our public schools because many of the delegates in advancing their bills stated: "As my teacher has often said."

ALLEN C. BROWNFELD.
ROBERT LISAK.
BERT REIN.

BROOKLYN, N. Y.

Some Reasons Why Baptists Do Not Accept Federal Tax Money Under the Hill-Burton Act for the Building of Hospitals

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. GEORGE M. GRANT

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 12, 1956

Mr. GRANT. Mr. Speaker, I have been requested by the president of the Alabama Baptist State Convention and the superintendent of missions of the Montgomery Baptist Association to have inserted in the RECORD an article by Dr. A. Hamilton Reid, executive secretary, Alabama Baptist State Executive Board, which was published in the Montgomery Baptist Informant, and editor's note concerning the action taken by the executive committee of the Southern Baptist Convention.

SOME REASONS WHY BAPTISTS DO NOT ACCEPT FEDERAL TAX MONEY UNDER THE HILL-BURTON ACT FOR THE BUILDING OF HOSPITALS

(By Dr. A. Hamilton Reid)

I do not find where Southern Baptists as a denomination have ever definitely expressed their approval of the use of Federal tax funds as made available by the Hill-Burton Act of 1946 for the building of church owned and controlled hospitals. In this article I do not propose to speak for Southern Baptists or Alabama Baptists, but with a feeling that many Baptists and others are confused as to the Baptist position on this issue, I am writing in an effort to clarify the Baptist position.

The 79th Congress, on August 13, 1946, passed the Hospital Survey and Construction Act, commonly known as the Hill-Burton Act, appropriating $75 million annually for 5 years to assist the several States in the building of public and other nonprofit hospitals throughout the Nation. The 81st Congress amended the act extending its duration, increasing the annual appropriation to $150 million, and setting up more liberal terms for grants. The original act provided $1 in Federal funds for every $2 provided locally. The amended act provides a maximum of $2 in Federal funds for every $1 provided locally. The 83d Congress further amended the act extending the expiration date to June 30, 1957. The 83d Congress also passed the Medical Facilities Survey and Construction Act of 1954, providing a somewhat similar program of assistance for the construction of diagnostic or treatment centers, hospitals for the chronically ill and impaired, rehabilitation facilities, and nursing homes.

The purpose of the Hill-Burton Act as set forth in section 601 of the act is: "To assist the several States (a) to inventory their existing hospitals, to survey the need for construction of hospitals, and to develop programs of construction of such public and other nonprofit hospitals as will, in conjunction with existing facilities, afford the necessary physical facilities for furnishing adequate hospital, clinic, and similar services to all their people; and (b) to construct public and other nonprofit hospitals in accordance with such programs."

FEDERAL TAX MONEY EXPENDED UNDER THE ACT

As of April 30, 1956, the Federal Government had made grants to the various States totaling $752,847,000 under the Hill-Burton Act for the building of hospitals and other related medical facilities. Of this amount $140,180,000 went for the building of nonpublic and church owned hospitals. Of the $140,180,000 granted to such nongovernment organizations, $112,591,000 or 80 percent of the total went to one church denomination for the building of hospitals owned and controlled by that denomination. Of the total amount expended by the Government under this act throughout the Nation, 14.9 percent went for the building of hospitals owned and controlled by this one denomination.

As of July 30, 1955, the Federal Government had granted to Alabama under the Hill-Burton Act a total of $22,390,204.82 for the building of hospitals and other medical facilities. Of the amount granted to Alabama by the Federal Government for construction of hospitals, one church group, which is a minority group in the State, received $4,915,000 or 22.9 percent of the total including all grants made to city, county, and State hospitals and medical facilities.

RELIGIOUS FREEDOM AND THE FIRST AMENDMENT TO THE CONSTITUTION

Baptists and others came to this country in the early colonial days fleeing from religious persecution at the hands of state-favored and tax-supported churches. They did not immediately find religious freedom. They found it after much struggle and suffering. As a result of their valiant struggle and persistent efforts, the first amendment was written into the Constitution of our Government. This amendment reads:

"Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; or abridging freedom of speech or of the press; or the right of the people peacefully to assemble, and to petition the Government for a redress of grievances."

Our Government from the time the first amendment was enacted has interpreted its Constitution as granting freedom of religion to all of its citizens without special favor or restraint, and has not extended tax support to any church or to all churches. Each religious group has been left free to practice and propagate religion in its own way without special favor or hindrance from the Government. The Government has not recognized any state church, or the dominance of any church over the state. Religious freedom and separation of church and state is one of the fundamental principles that has made for the greatness of our American democracy.

The Supreme Court of the United States has consistently interpreted the first amendment as granting religious freedom to all citizens and special favors to no religious sect or group. As late as 1952 this Court rendered the following decision which came out of the McCullum and Zorach cases:

"Government may not finance religious groups nor undertake religious instruction, nor blend secular and sectarian education, nor use secular institutions to force one or some religion on any person. * * * Neither a State nor the Federal Government * * * can pass laws which aid one religion, aid all religions, or prefer one religion over another. No tax in any amount, large or small, can be levied to support any religious activities or institutions, whatever they may be called, or whatever form they may take to teach and practice religion."

BAPTISTS STAND ON THE CONSTITUTION

Southern Baptists own and operate many hospitals, schools, and other institutions. There are one or more Baptist hospitals in most of the large cities of the South, and in some of the smaller cities. Many new hospitals have been erected by Baptists in recent years, and others are in the process of being erected. There are 3 Baptist hospitals in Alabama—2 in Birmingham that are owned and operated by Birmingham Baptists, and 1 in Gadsden, owned and operated by the Baptists of Etowah County.

Baptists, as a denomination, have not accepted Federal tax money grants under the Hill-Burton Act, or tax money from any source for the building of their hospitals or any other institutions. It is the accepted position of Southern Baptists that it is a violation of the first amendment to the Constitution for the Federal Government to make tax money grants for the building of hospitals, or any other institutions, when such institutions are to be owned, controlled and operated by a church group. Southern Baptists also take the position that it is a violation of the Constitution of this great democracy that grants religious freedom to all of its citizens, for any church group whether it be Protestant, Catholic, or Jewish to expect special favors from the Government and accept tax money for any purpose. To grant tax money taken from the pockets of citizens of all religious faiths or no religious faith to any church group for any purpose is a violation of the great American principle of separation of church and State. In our democracy, men of all religious faiths and no religious faith constitute our governing bodies, and the Constitution demands of them that they recognize the freedom of all the people in matters of religion and make no laws favoring any religious group or groups, or restraining any religion.

CHURCH HOSPITALS ARE RELIGIOUS INSTITUTIONS

It is argued that hospitals are humanitarian service institutions. It is true that they are humanitarian service institutions, but it is also true that they are religious institutions when they are owned and operated by a church body. Denominational hospitals are built and maintained with a service motive, but like all other church institutions they are built and maintained for the development of the church's influence in society, and to propagate the teachings and practices of the religious group. It is true that all hospitals admit patients of any or all religious faiths, but it is also true that a certain amount of religious influence is found in every church hospital. Some

churches assert this denominational and religious influence more definitely than others. It is well known that the church group that has received more tax money for the building of hospitals than all other church groups combined has medical codes that are narrowly denominational and discriminatory. This denomination systematically promotes one sectarian faith through the environment and personnel of its hospitals. Furthermore, through its canon laws it denies certain freedoms to patients, doctors, and nurses which are commonly found in other hospitals. Any institution that places the canon law of the church above the laws of the State, is not a public institution, and should not be built by public tax money.

AMENDMENTS TO THE HILL-BURTON ACT

The Hill-Burton Act will expire on June 30, 1957. A bill to extend the act has been introduced in the Senate by Senator LISTER HILL, of Alabama, and in the House of Representatives by Representative PERCY PRIEST, of Tennessee.

Doubtless the majority of the American people would favor an extension of the act, but with amendments. The act, if extended, should first be amended and made to conform to the Constitution of our Government and the American principle of separation of church and state by discontinuing Federal Government grants to church bodies for the building of hospitals and other related facilities, when such institutions are to be owned and controlled by a church body.

At this time in our national economy when Federal security of loans is the prevailing principle and practice, the act might be further amended making it possible for church bodies and private groups to borrow money for the erection of hospitals on Federal approval of such loans. This would greatly help to meet the need for more hospital facilities in our country by making it easier for private and church owned hospitals to borrow money for the erection of buildings. This would not be a grant, but a loan to be paid with interest like other loans. Such loans with Government endorsement are now being made to colleges and universities throughout the country for the erection of income-producing buildings on college campuses.

A STEP TOWARD A WIDER BREAKDOWN OF THE CONSTITUTION

For the Federal Government to subsidize a church body by granting tax money to that body for the building of hospitals to be owned and controlled by that body, and for a church body to accept such a subsidy, is, in the opinion of Baptists and many other American citizens, an entering wedge for a further and larger breakdown of the Constitution of our Government, and the great principle of religious freedom.

A pressing issue before the Congress at this time is that of Federal aid to schools. One of the main issues that has prevented the passage of such legislation in the past has been the contention of some that such aid, if granted, should include nonpublic schools along with public schools. It is argued that a Federal school aid bill should be modeled after the Hill-Burton Act, and nonpublic schools included along with public schools. Should the Congress pass such a bill making public tax money available to church schools along with public schools, it would place both the Protestant denominations and the public schools in a very unfavorable position. It would give Government recognition and assistance to two school systems in this country—the public school system under the control of the State, and the parochial system under the control of the church.

The Protestant Church groups have encouraged and supported the public school system in this country from its beginning, and in the main retired from the field of elementary and secondary education in favor of the public school system. If the Federal Government should pass an aid to education bill making tax funds available for the building and support of church schools of any and all religious faiths, it would force the Protestant denominations in America to rething their educational program and reenter the field of elementary and secondary education as a necessary protection.

The Protestant churches throughout the Nation have erected educational buildings in connection with their churches which are now being used for Sunday School and other church purposes. Many Protestant churches would feel forced to convert these buildings into parochial schools and claim Federal funds for the support of their school programs. This would lead to the weakening or destruction of the public school system in America, as has happened in many other parts of the world. In turn this would lead to the failure of this great democracy.

Without a democratic education of all the youth in a common school system, it is doubtful if a democracy can maintain its unity and strength.

CHURCH PROPERTY AND TAXES

Baptists not only take the position that it is unconstitutional for churches and church-owned institutions to be subject to taxation when such institutions are used wholly for religious, educational, or benevolent services. The power to tax carries with it the power to control. If the Government has power to tax properties used wholly for religion, it has power to control religion.

In America there is freedom of religion and separation of church and state. There is no state supported and controlled church, and neither is there a church dominated state. An American citizen has freedom of soul and conscience in the matter of religion. At the same time, Baptists in general take the position that any and all properties owned by a church or a denominational group, and not used wholly for religious, educational, and/or benevolent purposes, but which are rented or used for a profit in any way should be taxed like all other personally owned properties even though the earnings from such properties may be used for religious purposes.

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—At the meeting of the executive committee of the Southern Baptist Convention in Kansas City on May 28, 1956, the public affairs committee of the convention was requested to make a thorough study of the so-called Hill-Burton Act and report its findings to the executive committee at its next meeting.

(Since the preparation of this paper the public affairs committee met in Nashville on June 19, 1956, and using this paper, which has been carefully and thoroughly documented, together with other material available, unanimously made the following recommendation to the executive committee at its meeting in Nashville on June 20, 1956:

("I. That the executive committee of the Southern Baptist Convention petition the Congress of the United States through the Labor and Public Welfare Committee of the United States Senate and its chairman, the Honorable LISTER HILL, of Alabama, and through the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee of the United States House of Representatives and its chairman, the Honorable PERCY PRIEST, of Tennessee, to take appropriate legislative action to amend the Hospital Survey and Construction Act, as amended, so as to discontinue and prohibit Federal Government grants for the construction of hospitals and other related medical facilities, when such institutions are to be owned, controlled, or operated by a religious body.

("II. That the executive committee of the Southern Baptist Convention petition the Congress of the United States through the Labor and Public Welfare Committee of the United States Senate and its chairman, the Honorable LISTER HILL, of Alabama, and through the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee of the United States House of Representatives and its chairman, the Honorable PERCY PRIEST, of Tennessee, that provision be made through appropriate legislative action, whereby long-term, Government-secured loans may be made for the construction of hospitals and other related medical facilities to be owned, operated, and controlled by a religious body or a public or private corporation."

(Following the presentation of the recommendation by Dr. Walter Pope Binns, president of William Jewell College, Liberty, Mo., the chairman of the public affairs committee, the executive committee of the Southern Baptist Convention unanimously adopted the recommendations.)

Don't Let Them Take It Away

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. WILLIAMS

OF DELAWARE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, July 12, 1956

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial commenting upon the New Deal 1952 Campaign Slogan, entitled "Don't Let Them Take It Away!" This editorial appeared in the Troy Daily News, Troy, Ohio, Saturday, July 7, 1956.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

"DON'T LET THEM TAKE IT AWAY"

John Roosevelt, son of the late president, and an ardent Ike supporter, recalled the Democrats' 1952 slogan, "Don't let them take it away," and observed in the National Capital, "The only thing that has been taken away is the mess we found here in January 1953."

Senator JOHN J. WILLIAMS, Republican, of Delaware, took the floor of the Senate the day that Matthew J. Connelly and Theron Lamar Caudle were convicted of conspiracy to defraud the Government in a tax case. He noted that the conviction of Truman's appointments, Secretary and Chief of the Justice Department's Tax Division under Truman, served "once again to remind the American people the extent to which corruption under the preceding administration had reached the top echelon in the Government." Then he disclosed these statistics:

As of November 20, 1954, for the period between 1950 and 1954, there had been 214 indictments and 101 convictions of corrupt officials in the Treasury Department under Truman.

There were 40 indictments for embezzlement of Government funds, 51 indictments of Treasury officials for failure to pay their own income taxes, and 50 indictments for falsification of Government records or reports.

"They were indicted for operating what, in effect, constituted a blackmail ring, in that they admitted their policy was to go to taxpayers, audit their accounts, and fake a large assessment, or threaten them with prison sentences on the basis that they could shake them down on the side to settle what, in effect, was a nonexistent tax case."

Two were indicted for operating a bookmaking establishment in the second largest tax office in the United States.

"There has also been convicted a former commissioner of Internal Revenue, Joseph

Nunan. The assistant commissioner, Daniel A. Bolich, was convicted. One alcohol tax commissioner was under indictment, and the trial was postponed because of his health.

"There are only 64 tax offices in the United States but 8 directors were indicted in Federal courts, and 5 ultimately were sent to the penitentiary. Eight out of 64, or 12½ percent of the top tax collectors in the United States, were indicted in the Federal courts for having accepted bribes or otherwise violated the law.

"Furthermore, the damaging indictment against the Truman administration is that these scandals had to be exposed over the opposition of the administration rather than through their cooperation. The fact that many high officials were involved explains this determined effort on the part of the preceding administration to cover up and protect these scoundrels."

Senator WILLIAMS knows whereof he speaks. He rocked the Nation time and again with his disclosures of corruption in Truman's Bureau of Internal Revenue. He can claim that he has never made an accusation of crime that has not been followed by an indictment.

A national news magazine said of him: "He is like a man who pulled a loose thread; he got interested, kept pulling until the whole covering that screened one of the worst United States scandals was uncovered."

Rochambeau Birthday Commemoration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRY FLOOD BYRD
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, July 12, 1956

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, because this may be of historical interest to many, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a copy of Miss Mayme C. Parker's report of the Rochambeau birthday commemoration held in Washington, Sunday, July 1, which was published in the Standard of Falls Church, Va., and other papers, on July 6.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ROCHAMBEAU CELEBRATION HAS MANY PARTICIPANTS

(By Mayme C. Parker)

The second annual commemorative ceremony of the Interstate Rochambeau Commission honoring the famous French Lt. Gen. Jean-Baptiste Donatien de Vimeur Count de Rochambeau on the general's 231st birthday on Sunday afternoon, was an occasion for remembering the aid of France in our cause of freedom in 1781, and a time of renewing our present international friendship. Many northern Virginia residents participated.

Mr. Charles Parmer, general chairman of the Commission opened the ceremonies by announcing: "When America was poor and friendless, fighting for liberty, and at the hour when General Washington wrote, 'We are at the end of our tether,' 'twas France who stepped to our side, our first friend in the cause of freedom."

The brilliant military performance of General Rochambeau serving with General Washington in the siege of Yorktown, in 1781, established the independence that all Americans cherish in our own national birthday celebration on July Fourth.

The commemorative service recognizing our French ally was held in Lafayette Square in Washington on Sunday where 54 years ago President Theodore Roosevelt accepted and dedicated the Rochambeau statue presented to this country by France.

The impressive program arranged by Mr. Parmer, was official in character with international overtone. Present were representatives of patriotic organizations, children's societies, business and church groups. The United States Marine Band was directed by Chief Warrant Officer Dale Harpham. The Rochambeau Fanfare, honoring the Marsal of France, was played for the first time under Mr. Harpham's direction.

Mrs. Woodrow Wilson, widow of the World War I President Wilson, guest of honor, placed the first wreath presented during the ceremony, flowers from the gardens of Mount Vernon, where no doubt General Washington and General Rochambeau walked together in September 1781. She was saluted by the five military services of the United States—the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, Coast Guard, and the Air Force, with their colors and the national colors. Mrs. Parmer escorted Mrs. Wilson with Capt. George B. Crist, USMC, as guard of honor.

A message from the White House was read with President Eisenhower's best wishes for the successful celebration honoring General Rochambeau who contributed so materially to the early history and strength of our country.

The Department of State honored the occasion of the 175th anniversary of Rochambeau's aid to Gen. George Washington by sending this message signed by the Secretory, Mr. John Foster Dulles:

"One hundred and seventy-five years ago Count Rochambeau came to the embattled Colonies in America and placed his sword at the disposal of George Washington, and in the service of freedom and independence. We are well aware of our debt to this illustrious French soldier-statesman, who not only helped free our country but who also helped lay the foundation for the strong traditional friendship between the French and American people.

"Today we are happy to renew our tribute to the honored memory of that noble son of France, whose passion for freedom was equaled only by his gallantry, loyalty, and devotion to the ideals that led this country to independence."

Washington's Yorktown victory orders, of October 20, 1781, were impressively read by Maj. Gen. Francis M. McAlister, United States Marine Corps. In these orders, General Washington highly commended General Rochambeau and his officers and men for their services.

Mr. Parmer then read an excerpt from Rochambeau's famed letter to the Continental Congress, asking to be considered "the first French soldier in the Army of General Washington."

The French Ambassador, Hon. Maurice Couve de Murville, presented the flowers of France in honor of his nation. He was accompanied by a full Embassy staff, including the Honorable Robert Valeur, first counselor, the Honorable Pierre Dupont, consul, and military and naval officers.

Nine-year-old Claudia Pineau presented flowers in honor of her grandfather, M. Christian Pineau, Foreign Minister of France. She was accompanied by Lt. Gen. Julian C. Smith, (USMC, retired), and her mother, Mrs. Frances Pineau, of Alexandria.

The Irish Ambassador, Hon. John Joseph Hearne, also placed flowers, as Mr. Parmer narrated that Irish troops served under Rochambeau during his campaign in America.

Members of the Mount Vernon Guard of the Mount Vernon neighborhood, who last year took part in the ceremony, have been made a permanent part of the observance, and they carried the colors of France and of the Irish Ambassador. The guards have been sponsored by the Francis Wallis chapter, Daughters of the American Revolution, among other organizations, and they appear at many patriotic occasions.

Mrs. William Grant, wife of Rear Admiral Granat, was present as chairman of the women's committee. Besides her American ancestry, she had five forebears serving with Rochambeau—one on his staff.

In addition to Maj Gen. Francis M. McAlister, personal representative of the United States Marine Corps Commandant, were the following: all, including General McAlister, laying flower of friendship on the Rochambeau statue, which had been given by Hunting Terrace—from its gardens by the ford where General Rochambeau crossed Hunting Creek, en route to Mount Vernon and Yorktown; Col. Henry Ahalt, United States Army; Capt. John H. Brandt, United States Navy; Capt. Allen Winbeck, United States Coast Guard; and Col. Robert E. White, United States Air Force.

The Reverend Dr. Frederick Brown Harris, Chaplain of the United States Senate, pronounced the invocation; and likewise the benediction in the absence of the Right Reverend Monsignor John K. Cartwright, of St. Matthew's Cathedral.

Mayor Leroy Bendheim presented a bouquet in the name of "Alexandria—through which Rochambeau passed twice."

Among the distinguished guests for the ceremony were Miss Ellen Coolidge Burke, 1200 Quincy Street, Alexandria, great great granddaughter of Thomas Jefferson; Dr. Henry Augustine Latane, 311 North Washington Street, collateral descendant of George Washington; and representatives of the States through which Rochambeau passed on his march from Rhode Island in the summer of 1781.

Guests by States included Mr. Claiborne Pell, State of Rhode Island and Providence Plantations; Mrs. Richard J. Reid, Jr., the State of Connecticut and the Daughters of the Cincinnati; Mrs. Logan Billingsley, the State of New York, her flowers from the gardens of Rochambeau's headquarters at Yorktown Heights.

Also, Mrs. Bessie E. Pryor, the State of New Jersey; Mr. A. Glenn Mower, Commonwealth of Pennsylvania (whose State already has placed the two markers along the Rochambeau route to Virginia); Miss Florence Harris, of Alexandria, who placed flowers for His Excellency, Gov. J. Caleb Boggs, Delaware; Miss Elizabeth Harris, Alexandria, who placed flowers for the Maryland freestate; and Miss Elizabeth Armistead Boothe, of Vicar Lane, Alexandria, who placed flowers for the Commonwealth of Virginia.

Miss Faustine Dennis, treasurer general, National Society Daughters of the American Revolution, and Mrs. James D. Skinner, of the District of Columbia Society, DAR, placed flowers for their organization. Mrs. J. Powell Wardlaw, regent, Commonwealth DAR chapter, Richmond, was also present.

Others were the Gold Star Mothers of Virginia, represented by Mrs. L. E. Tull; the Colonial Dames in Virginia, by Mrs. Joseph Crockett; the Society of the Cincinnati, by Mr. James O. Denby; the Sons of the American Revolution, Col. Robert P. Waters; Association for the Preservation of Virginia Antiquities, Washington branch, by Mrs. John Lee Coulter; the Children of the American Revolution, by Mrs. Charles Marbury Seaman, 1112 Duke Street, Alexandria; with Nancy Lee Barlow, of Arlington, as the Virginia Junior State Historian, CAR.

Others were Miss Annie Laurie Martin, Washington, Junior National Chaplain, Children of the American Revolution.

Representatives of the Alexandria CAR societies were from the Abingdon, the Dick Anderson, Washington-Lee, and others from Maryland, Virginia, and Washington societies.

Still others were Mrs. Charles C. Carlin, representing the Alexandria Gazette. Also Mr. Paul Eckman, chairman, Businessmen of Alexandria; Mr. Herbert Baker, Pohick Church, with greens from a tree planted in the churchyard by Mrs. Woodrow Wilson. Pohick Church was founded and attended by General Washington, and Rochambeau marched past the church on his way to Yorktown.

Mrs. C. M. Campbell, also of the CAR, was on the program, as was Miss Jean Forshee, 2404 Taylor Avenue, Alexandria, who in riding costume, represented Rochambeau, the horseman.

Mr. Patrick Hayes, of Alexandria, was chairman to greet distinguished guests for the Commission, and Mrs. Irene Bunting, 1212 Martha Custis Drive, was chairman of the children's committee.

The decorations committee was composed of Mr. Edward W. Alfriend IV, chairman, and Mr. John Hartman, Mr. Fred Kirschner, and Mr. Edward Worasila, all of Virginia. These supplied and arranged many of the floral wreaths, especially those from the gardens along the Rochambeau Route in Virginia.

Miss Esther Green, of Alexandria, was chairman of the Virginia Ladies Committee, assisted by Mrs. Charles Marbury Seaman, who also is leader of the local CAR.

Mr. David Bacon, Jr., served as aid to the chairman.

Virginia Commissioner Thomas J. Broyhill, of Arlington, served as first assistant to the chairman, Mr. Charles Parmer, aided by Mrs. Broyhill and their children.

Mutual Security Appropriation Bill for 1957

SPEECH
OF
HON. HAROLD D. DONOHUE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 11, 1956

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H. R. 12130) making appropriations for mutual security for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes.

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Chairman, as I stated here a few weeks ago during the course of debate on the authorization bill for foreign aid, the fundamental purposes of this legislation were, and still are, Christian to our character and practical to our own self-interest. Few Members here have any great disagreement with the original basic objectives of this so-called mutual security program: To prevent Americans from again having to fight and die on foreign battlefields, to help rehabilitate friendly allies and undeveloped countries, and to promote the safety of ourselves and the free world against any Communist threat.

The only fundamental question presented to us in this appropriation bill is whether or not it provides sufficient money to keep the program in reasonable operation while a thorough resurvey of our whole foreign aid policy and financial commitments to support it is conducted.

The vital and urgent necessity of a complete resurvey of our whole foreign-aid program and policy is only too unhappily evident from the most disturbing reports arriving almost daily in revelation of unstable conditions existing practically all over the world. It is unfortunately very clear that our foreign policy has been disastrously deficient in failing to keep up with and make proper adjustment to the changing attitudes of both our antagonists and our allies. As most of us know, the Senate has already voted for an investigation of the foreign-aid program by its Foreign Relations Committee, and there is legislation pending here for the same purpose. Such an investigation by the Congress in cooperation with the administration is long overdue and it cannot be initiated too soon.

In considering our action on this appropriation bill, let us seriously realize that even at this moment there is enough money outstanding to carry on the objectives of our program for at least 2 years; that we have spent, on this program since 1940, about $100 billion of the people's money in principal and interest; and, finally, that there is some $600 million more contained in this present bill than in the appropriation of last year. No less an authority than the Comptroller of the United States himself testified before the committee that overoptimistic foreign-aid planning has resulted in the appropriation of more money than could be spent.

The reductions in this bill before us will in no way disrupt the continuation of a reasonable mutual-security program. The most desirable point 4 operation, allies who have demonstrated friendliness, and areas of strategic military importance to us are all adequately provided for.

While we then accept our obligation to provide for this security against communism for ourselves and the free world, let us also accept and concentrate upon our primary obligation to the American people, whom we represent, to take the greatest care of their money and exercise the highest vigilance over the manner in which it is spent. The resources of this great Nation are not limitless and the burdens now beng patriotically assumed by each American taxpayer are truly staggering. It will profit us little to extravagantly attempt to buy uncertain friendships if the exorbitant price is the deteriorating morale of the American people and the grave danger of our own economic instability. Let us beware of both of these catastrophes which are more threatening than may appear on the surface. The American taxpayer has put both his faith and his money into our legislative hands. In legislative conscience, let us neither betray the one, nor dissipate the other.

Let us, rather, wisely and patriotically accept the reasonable reductions, in this foreign aid appropriation bill, recommended by the committee and sensibly wait until the results of the restudy and reexamination of the whole subject are available for our continuing legislative consideration in the best interest of our American taxpayers.

The Stockpile Twist

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. WILLIAMS
OF DELAWARE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, July 12, 1956

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, in today's Wall Street Journal there appears an article entitled "The Stockpile Twist."

Our stockpiling program was originally intended to be used for the purpose of accumulating those strategic materials which would be essential to our national defense in the event of an emergency. However, on many of these items our national defense needs have been taken care of, but the mining industry keeps insisting that the Government continue its purchase program at exorbitantly high prices, thereby converting this national defense measure to a simple price-support program for the mining industry.

This represents nothing less than an inexcusable raid on the Federal Treasury by a special group under the guise of national defense, and it should be stopped.

I ask unanimous consent that the article appearing in today's Wall Street Journal commenting upon this question be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STOCKPILE TWIST—CONGRESS AIMS TO PUSH MOBILIZERS DEEPER INTO PRICE PROP ACTIVITIES—DEFENSE HOARD RIVALS FARM SURPLUS IN COST—THREAT OF SPOILAGE INCREASES—A PAINFUL LOSS ON PALM OIL

(By Joseph L. S. Terrell)

WASHINGTON.—Congress is writing a new law that spotlights this little-known fact: The Government's stockpile of strategic goods has grown to rival, in terms of cost, the surplus farm hoard.

By latest accounting, taxpayers have tied up in the strategic cache a cold $7.5 billion. The hoard contains an assortment of some 70 war-essential items, mostly minerals and metals, including such items as aluminum, lead, natural rubber, hog bristles, and castor oil. This $7.5 billion inventory lags only slightly behind the $8.6 billion wrapped up in wheat, corn, cotton, and other products of the soil.

The stockpile program, though it bears a defense label, resembles Secretary of Agriculture Benson's farm program in still other respects. Both serve to bolster prices of goods the Government buys. And Defense Mobilizer Flemming, who manages the stockpile, sometimes has to sell at a loss stocks that are in danger of spoiling, just as Mr. Benson has to unload farm crops that threaten to grow stale.

TUNGSTEN, FLUORSPAR

The new law Congress is passing, with administration backing, would put Mr. Flemming in the out-and-out price-support business. The scheme calls for continued buying of tungsten, fluorspar, asbestos, and columbium-tantalum, although stockpile goals for these items have already been met. Lawmakers from producing States, labeling their bill a "stopgap" plan, felt the Government market could not be cut off at this time. Secretary of Interior Fred Seaton has

promised to hand Congress next year a long-range program for aiding the mining and minerals industries.

But to cushion producers for 2½ years against the hardship of losing their lucrative Government outlet, the lawmakers got behind the bill to keep Uncle Sam in the market. Officials agree that as other stockpile goals are met, new demands will arise in Congress for still more schemes to prop the mining and minerals industries.

Senator BENNETT, Republican, of Utah, sounded the keynote in a comment on the bill that's already nearing passage. Said he: "In many ways the problem of these minerals has many similarities with the farm problem, with the added complexity produced by the fact that our domestic surplus of production exists in the face of very large importations of metal and of our inability to get our cost down to the point where we can move into the world market as exporters."

The amount of each of the 70-odd stockpiled items bears a secret label. But to get an idea of the size of the mountainous hoard, suppose the full $7.5 billion were in aluminum. This would add up to a huge 14,478,000 tons, or roughly the equivalent of 9 years and 3 months' output based on 1955 rates.

SEVENTY YEARS' OUTPUT

If Mr. Flemming went shopping for $7.5 billion of lead, he could bring home the amount United States mines could produce in 70 years at last year's rate.

Or suppose Mr. Flemming spent the full $7.5 billion on natural rubber. This would add up to 11,160,000 tons, enough for 625 million truck and bus tires. At the current rate of consumption, that supply would last nearly 48 years.

For the fiscal year that ended last Saturday, the stockpile swelled by an estimated $712 million. According to budget estimates, Uncle Sam will shell out an additional $378 million in the new fiscal year, not counting any outlays stemming from the pending law. All told, the Government aims at a stockpile that will cost taxpayers $11.2 billion, again not counting any new laws.

The basic purpose of the stockpile is military, to assure the United States a sufficient domestic reserve of essential items in case of war. This purpose still exists, of course. But the program also has a distinctly domestic price support element, and will have even more when the pending bill becomes law.

Officials confess they have no way of knowing exactly how much it costs to store and guard the hoard. They do agree it's an expensive job. The materials now occupy space at 65 military depots, 16 Government warehouses, 107 commercial warehouses, 5 vaults, 7 Government sites for bulk ores, 15 commercial sites for ores, 10 commercial tanks for various oils, and 34 industrial plant locations. "We have an army of men to guard the stuff," reports one custodian.

SPOILAGE THREAT

As the stockpile grows, so does the threat of spoilage. To insure that their huge rubber heap won't go bad with age, the stockpilers now have to rotate some 7,500 tons a month, selling it to industry and buying back the same amount. "Eventually everything but the metals and minerals will be rotated," says one official.

And there's the increasingly tangled problem of disposing of materials that lose their "strategic" character as defense needs change or better materials are developed. Right now, for example, the Government is in the process of selling, among other things, some stocks of pyrethrum, a material used to make insecticides; 75,000 pounds will be up for sale in August, on top of 55,600 pounds already sold.

While officials cheerfully report selling the pyrethrum at $7 a pound, about what they paid for it, they tell of painful losses on another deal. The stockpilers recently decided they didn't need all the palm oil they had stashed away. They've found animal fats can also carry out palm oil's strategic duty of helping to finish the lead-and-tin-coated steel sheet known as terneplate. So they've sold some 48 million pounds of palm oil at a loss of some nine cents a pound, or about $4.3 million. That's about half the original price. And more palm oil remains to go on the block.

Perhaps within the next 2 weeks, the stockpilers will offer for sale thousands of pounds of hog bristles destined for paint brushes. Because nylon bristles have improved, the hog bristles have lost the strategic value they had when Red China quit selling them to the United States early in the Korean war.

RIDICULOUS BIDS

Other materials scheduled for sale, and awaiting only the end of a 6-month period to allow Congress' objections, include cordage fibers, quinine bark and emetine, a medicine base. On at least one of these, the profit-and-loss signs are ominous for the Federal salesmen. Bids recently received on quinine bark, reports one official, were so low as to be "ridiculous." "By the time the Government gets around to selling the stuff," he says, "nobody wants it."

Dr. Flemming doesn't admit of course that he's in the price support business. He argues instead that the stockpile program has a dual purpose: To store physically scarce materials that would be needed if the United States went to war again and to maintain what bureaucrats call a "broad mobilization base." Under this concept, the Government tries to maintain multiple sources of war-vital goods and, in the case of the stockpile, the Government applies this theory by furnishing markets.

The stockpile program started 10 years ago this year, shortly after World War II. Congress decided to store away minerals, metals and other items that would be needed if war broke out and might be in short supply. Even then, lawmakers from producing States looked on their handiwork at least partly as a price supporting operation. Goals were set for individual items to be hoarded away, and Uncle Sam went out to buy when and where he could, even in foreign markets.

In the spring of 1954, the stockpile program took on more of an appearance of a domestic subsidy. President Eisenhower ordered stepped-up purchases of about 40 metals and minerals on the recommendation of his Minerals Policy Committee, not as a defense measure but as a prop for United States producers.

REACTIVATING CAPACITY

In ordering the increased buying, Mr. Eisenhower said purchases would be made "ordinarily at such times as the Government decides that purchases will help reactivate productive capacity and in other ways to alleviate distressed conditions in connection with domestic mineral industries that are on an important element of the Nation's mobilization base." This Presidential directive came in March of 1954.

In June of that year, the Government started buying lead and zinc. Producers of these metals were in a bad way. Demand was down, prices low, and big inventories hung over the market. Lead and zinc producers were still unhappy, despite the Government buying, and were pushing for higher tariffs to protect them from imports. Mr. Eisenhower rejected the plea for higher tariffs and ordered still more buying of lead and zinc.

This part of the Government buying program is known as the "long-term stockpile."

Freedom and Authority

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 12, 1956

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I should like to insert the commencement address given by the Honorable William E. Morgan, president of Colorado A. and M. College, upon the graduation of the senior class of 1956 of the Agricultural and Mechanical College of Texas.

President Morgan is an old friend of mine and is a former student of the Agricultural and Mechanical College of Texas.

The address follows:

The topic I should like to discuss has to do with freedom and authority. It's a big subject for a short speech.

When Adam walked alone through the Garden of Eden, he had freedom—complete and absolute freedom. He was the world's first, and its only successful, anarchist. He was the last anarchist the world could tolerate.

When Eve came along, the struggle between freedom and authority began; not because Eve was a woman—though that might be argued with more than indifferent success—but rather because Eve was another person, herself endowed with certain inalienable rights to freedom. But they were rights neither more than, nor less than, those held by Adam. They were equal to Adam's, though Adam's were less than he had before Eve came along. You might say that when Adam multiplied, his freedom was divided.

From the time of Adam, the history of the world has been a struggle over this arithmetic of rights to freedom and liberty. Simple arithmetic was sufficient until Adam and Eve had children, and their children's children had children, and so on. The problems thus created called for a higher order of mathematics in analyzing the struggle between freedom and authority.

This problem has received the attention of philosophers down through the ages. It is coming in for its share of attention today, and it promises to command even more attention as the human race continues to multiply.

You need only read your daily newspaper to know that these are confused times. In such circumstances, we may take comfort from the men and women who founded this Nation. They too lived in a time of stress and strain and of many voices. It was just as difficult for them as it is for us to see clearly the main goals toward which they struggled. As one of our eminent present-day thinkers, Dr. Paul S. Havens, puts it, "Our task now, like theirs, is to find the main idea and to hold it, to see through propaganda, to get to the center of a problem without being ambushed on the periphery."

And, speaking of those early subjects of George III—those ragged revolutionaries who in 1776 impudently called themselves Americans—we should remember that their times, like stormy ocean waters seen at a great distance, appear to us quieter and calmer than they really were.

The issues confronting those rebellious colonists, and those confronting us, are as old as Plato. Plato did not have daily newspapers to read, nor did he have TV newscasters to report the news as it developed,

or radio gossips to speculate on the news before it even happened. But Plato knew what was going on in his world of city states, and he thought through this problem of the struggle between freedom and authority. He came up with an answer in terms of the state; through the state, and through social controls exercised by the state, would justice and equality be achieved. His answer was the state supreme, with the individual subordinated to the state.

Since Plato's time the glorifiers of authority have never ceased to advocate the firm control of men's lives by the state. Sharing this one doctrine, they have sought justification for it in appeal to the most diverse types of philosophy and social organization. Sometimes as theory, sometimes also as practice, it emerged—

1. In the medieval town economy, with control through merchant and craft guilds;

2. In mercantilism, with control through the state; and

3. In various forms of state socialism, with control residing in a party elite, presumably the modern counterpart of Plato's guardians.

And so it confronts us today, perhaps a more formidable challenge than it has been for well-night two centuries. Embalmed in the teachings of Marx and the Communist Party, it is now bolstered by a pseudoscience: the materialistic interpretation of history, the doctrine of the class struggle, prediction of the inevitable collapse of capitalism and rule of the proletariat. And, finally, it proclaims itself the only genuine democracy, as its advocates prattle of a classless society, free of inequalities and exploitation, which will know only peace and where, at last, authority allegedly will no longer be necessary.

It was just over a century ago that Marx and Engles issued their Communist Manifesto, urging the workers of the world to unite, and assuring them they had nothing to lose but their chains. It was an unabashed appeal to force and violence, utilizing, ironically, a completely authoritarian discipline to reach the goal, supposedly, of freedom. Frankly materialistic, it denies that man is of the Spirit. Having made man cheap, it is not strange that the protagonists of this doctrine have treated man cheaply, that firing squads and slave labor camps are part of their standard equipment. Yet this movement is international in mission, and almost universal in its appeal. It refuses to be confined.

Whether men or states, those who invoke uncurbed authority without regard to moral ends, are dealing in fundamental error. And the disastrous element in the materialistic view of man is that it removes the grounds for moral life. The struggle for power, ruthless and bloody, characterizing the political life of peoples committed to a materialistic view of man is no accident.

The only alternative is a respect for morality on the part of the individual, for in the long run the state reflects the morality of its citizens. Unless you, as individuals, develop moral and spiritual restraints, unless you subject your desires to an intelligent editing that results in moral ends, unless you make materialistic considerations always a secondary thing in whatever you do—your life on this planet must be written off as a moral failure. Indeed, if man fails to develop such moral and spiritual control over that complex instrumentality known as the state, man himself may very possibly be written off in the atomic fires he has kindled.

Fortunately, in the history of Western culture, there have been adequate answers to Plato and to subsequent glorifiers of authority. Interestingly enough, it was one of Plato's pupils, and the greatest mind of antiquity, who next made a major statement on the problem of freedom and authority.

As a fine example of just how perverse a student can be, Aristotle came up with a doctrine diametrically opposed to that of his teacher. He advocated a far greater measure of freedom and initiative on the part of the individual. It was he who insisted that the collective political wisdom of the many is likely to surpass that of their rulers, however good. Since his time, the movement of political thought through history might be likened to that of a pendulum, oscillating between the extremes of freedom and control.

Aristotle's doctrine ultimately found expression in the development of societies where the emphasis was placed on personal freedom, individual initiative, and private property as the bases for incentive to effort and achievement. As a doctrine of political economy, its advocates included the Physiocrats with their natural law, Adam Smith, Malthus, and John Stuart Mill. To them, liberty, equality, and fraternity started from the fundamental idea of personal freedom and extended to the areas of freedom to contract, freedom of competition, private property and profit, and free trade.

Thus, over a long period, the pendulum of history moved away from the extreme of an all-encompassing authority, and greater freedom emerged. This movement received enormous impetus from developments in religion. "Democracy," wrote Thomas Mann, "is the political name for ideals which Christianity brought into the world as religion." Christianity may not be unique in this respect, but its followers predominate in the Western World, and it suffices to illustrate my point.

Jesus stressed the intrinsic value of the human personality for its own sake. The doctrine of unalienable rights was thus a political corollary to fundamental religious teachings. A basic feature of both democracy and Christianity is the recognition of the individual as a free agent—a moral agent, of intrinsic worth in the universe, distinguished by a capacity for love of his fellow men. Small wonder, then, that the advocates of authoritarianism in its most virulent form today, are also advocates of the godless state.

In the strife and confusion of colonial Americe 180 years ago, when Washington, Jefferson, Franklin, and their colleagues turned to the task of formulating the main ideas—political, religious, and economic—upon which a new nation was to be founded, they turned not to Plato, but to the tradition of Aristotle. Number 10 of the Federalist Papers echoes, from across the centuries, much that can be found in Aristotle. The author was James Madison.

The framers of our Constitution were not blinded, however, by the authority of classical antiquity. And while they paid their respects to the Aristotelian tradition, they recognized it to be a tradition now supplemented and enriched by the Christian doctrine of love and brotherhood. They went on to embody the political counterpart of this Christian doctrine first in the Declaration of Independence, and then in the Constitution.

Moreover, they spilled their blood for the privilege of living under this doctrine of liberty and self-government. In a very real sense, they bought their freedom. But they did not buy it for you—they only made a downpayment on it as far as you are concerned. That much, at least, they pass on to you as a heritage. If you would preserve it, you need to remember Daniel Webster's words of caution, that "God grants liberty only to those who love it, and are always willing to guard and defend it."

It should now be evident why freedom has flourished best where Christian faith is strong. This Christian philosophy says in simple terms that you may not trample on the other fellow, or vice versa. It is a doctrine of love. All round us are those, who, with the characteristic abrasiveness of the realistic fellow, challenge the usefulness of so soft and pliable a doctrine in a world so harsh and brittle. By way of defending the abuse of authority in trampling on another's freedom, how many times have you heard the expression, "After all, we must be realistic about this?" I submit that it would be a truly realistic exercise for each of us to test his conception of freedom on Christian doctrine.

This leads me to conclude that you have a special task ahead of you. To recall the depression view of a college diploma as a search warrant for a job, this job I am talking about is already here, and it has a search warrant out for every college graduate in the land.

I take it that you subscribe to the fundamental precepts of Aristotle and of Christianity—precepts that are incorporated in the basic instruments of our American society. Your task, then, is to understand these fundamentals, to guide your action by them, to reject the tempting proposals that do not conform to these precepts.

If you do your task well, you will not fall for the snare and delusion of voting yourself a harvest that you do not sow.

If you do your task well, you will believe, as Woodrow Wilson believed, that liberty has never come from the government—the history of liberty is the history of the limitations of governmental power, not the increase of it.

If you do your task well, you will understand that you may preserve your liberty only by extending it to those who do not have it.

And, finally, if you do your task well, you will arm yourself as the weapon that your Nation's mortal enemy can never have—it is the least secret of all weapons—the weapon of the free citizen.

Tendency Toward Complacency

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. SPARKMAN
OF ALABAMA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, July 12, 1956

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Have We, Indeed?" published in the Birmingham Post-Herald, a Scripps-Howard newspaper, of Saturday, June 2, 1956. The editorial relates to the complacency which has been engendered throughout this country by some of the statements which have been made, even by President Eisenhower himself, with reference to the present Soviet attitude in world affairs.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HAVE WE, INDEED?

Congressman as well as many ordinary citizens are disturbed by the tendency in this country and among our allies to relax and bask in the smiles of the new men in the Kremlin. This trend is virulent in military matters. Too many want cutbacks.

This kind of complacency is only encouraged by such statements as this by President Eisenhower before the National Citizens for Eisenhower Campaign Committee.

"We know we have largely nullified its (Soviet) reliance on force and the threat of force."

Poetry: School of the Pacific Northwest

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, July 12, 1956

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a most informative and thorough article about poetry in the Pacific Northwest by Carolyn Kizer, in the New Republic of July 16, 1956. The title of the article is "Poetry: School of the Pacific Northwest."

Miss Kizer is a talented and gifted poet herself, a native daughter of the Pacific Northwest. Her parents are Ben and the late Mabel Kizer. Mr. Kizer is well known throughout the Nation as a distinguished lawyer, as a leader of regional planning projects both in the Pacific Northwest and Canada, and as director of our UNRRA operations in China during and after World War II.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

POETRY: SCHOOL OF THE PACIFIC NORTHWEST
(By Carolyn Kizer)

In the coastal strip of the United States stretching from the border of British Columbia to the southernmost reaches of the Los Angeles city limits there is a distinct culture area: That corner of the coast containing Seattle. Its current artistically creative mood has been energized largely by one man, the artist Mark Tobey, regarded by many as America's most distinguished elder painter. Junior to Tobey, and deeply influenced by him and by an interest in the Orient, which has profoundly affected both painters, is Morris Graves, whose European reputation is somewhat less, and whose domestic recognition is more advanced than that of Tobey. The oriental influence seen in their work is also increasingly reflected in the architecture, interior decoration, and taste of the Seattle area, generally.

In this same rainy, misty area, on which the sun never (or almost never) rises, with a climate tempered by the Japanese current and protecting mountains, with living traces of pioneer and Indian days, with a State university whose recent fame rests on its denial of a platform to J. Robert Oppenheimer and its football scandals, where anything resembling night-club or cafe life is almost unknown, a new Pacific school of poets has been emerging.

Its existence is quite apparent in recent issues of literary periodicals. For example, every issue of Poetry magazine for the first 6 months of this year (with the exception of one Japan issue) contains poems and reviews by Seattle poets. The current issue of Botteghe Oscure (No. XVII) has poems by six Seattle writers. In the forthcoming volume of New World Writing, in a section devoted to the best student poetry being produced at American colleges and universities, 4 of the 20 poets represented are students at the University of Washington.

This poetic activity is closely connected with the presence there for some years, of Theodore Roethke, the Pulitzer Prize-winning poet of 2 years ago who conducts the Poetry Workshop. During the year just past, Roethke has been a Fulbright professor in Italy, and his work has been carried on by Stanley Kunitz. Undergraduates, graduate students, instructors, professors, and neighboring poets share and criticize each other's work in an atmosphere amazingly free of the back-biting, in-fighting, jealousy, and the concomitant secrecy about one's own work usually found when two or more writers gather together. Nor has this busy atmosphere produced a lot of little pasteup Roethkes toddling along in the wake of the master. Except for the occasional outcropping of a strongly stressed trimeter line, heavily end-stopped, which Roethke adapted from Yeats and made his own, these poets are all highly individual in approach and technique. This is all the more remarkable seeing that this is a group which bears down heavily on critical analysis of its own work. In these poems one finds originality of imagery, few hammock-sag lines, and a readily audible, although natural, beat. As Roethke says, with considerable emphasis, "I teach a beat." And the level of aural sensibility is high.

As to program, these poets are united only in what might be called "the feeling area" of their work. This is the age of the fear of feeling, and for some time, while the more prominent younger poets in America have shown a technical proficiency which puts their English counterparts to shame, there has been a great deal of what Roethke calls "cosy" writing: the fear of the display of emotion, the fear of self-exposure, the desire to be emotionally sophisticated even at the cost of a lie. For a number of years, poets like Roethke and Kunitz had to buck the tendency of editors to encourage, and publish, this kind of writing, a tendency which is still the stock-in-trade of the New Yorker and some of the quarterlies. Thanks to the increasing acceptance of Roethke as a truly expressive force in American poetry, resistance seems to be wavering.

Two of the most interesting poets in this group are Carol Hall and David Wagoner. Mrs. Hall is the wife of a university professor, James Hall, who is a skillful poet himself. Mr. Wagoner has lived in Seattle only 2 years, was a former student of Roethke's at Pennsylvania State. He has published two novels, and a volume of poetry, Dry Sun, Dry Wind, and is an assistant professor in the English department. Somewhat younger, amazingly prolific, and the recent winner in the Yale Series of Younger Poets competition, is James Wright. Wright has almost completed his Ph. D. at the university, was previously a student with John Crowe Ransom at Kenyon College.

There are poets like Richard Hugo, who works for the Boeing Aircraft Co., and myself, who have no official connection with the University at present, but whose social and literary activities center around this group. There are younger workshop students of promise. Carol Christopher Drake, a young poet majoring in Greek, who has not yet graduated, but has already been published in Botteghe Oscure is an easterner. Jean Clower, a graduate student from Texas, is here because the last poet-in-residence with whom she studied told her that Roethke could help her with "that crazy stuff," her highly original poetry. Robert Krieger is a teaching fellow from Portland, Oreg., whose work has appeared in Poetry and the New Yorker. A gifted young Canadian, Errol Prichard, only 18 years old, is studying Chinese at the instance of Stanley Kunitz, and is experimenting with translations from the French and the Chinese.

I believe that Robert Graves once said that the amount of available talent does not vary from generation to generation, that what matters is whether this body of talent is stimulated to produce. Talent is in Seattle largely because Roethke is here; and he and the Workshop are here partly because of the wise, genial and sympathetic administration of Robert J. Heilman, Chairman of the Department of English. The surrounding social environment, with its American emphasis on home entertaining rather than cafe life, offers as a bistro only such places as the Blue Moon Tavern, a grubby oasis just outside the University's 1-mile-limit Sahara. Here the jukebox roars, Audrey the waitress slaps down schooners of beer, and poets, pedants, painters and other assorted wild-life make overtures to each other. They tell me the men's room walls bear quotations from Dante, in Italian, and a graffetto to the effect that "There is no God but Milton, and Arnold is his prophet." "Arnold" is Arnold Stein, the Milton scholar, who also published poetry, and is one of the critics to whom Roethke listens with especial care.

Roethke, when he is at home, occupies the magnificent house in the woods north of Seattle which Morris Graves built for himself, while Graves continues to paint in Ireland. The latest form of amusement hereabouts has been the writing of Japanese link poems, in concert, and lonely grapplings with the Haiku and Tanka forms. Someone just wrote a series of Tanka-type verses which describe Roethke's pastoral life at the home of Graves; the Japanese wall paintings, the geese on the great green lawn, and the poet muttering to himself in the courtyard as he works.

More Giveaways

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 12, 1956

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, in the closing days of every session of Congress efforts are made to push through bills that cannot stand the light of day and could not survive exhaustive hearings and debate. One such bill is the attempt again being made to give away enemy alien property seized during World War II, the title to which long since has vested in the United States Government by its action and which action has long since been ratified and confirmed by each of the enemy countries involved.

All of the agreements and conventions entered into with Germany after World War II specifically vest title in the United States Government to property which was located here and which belonged to German enemy aliens. Not only was title vested in our Government, but these agreements and conventions contain express waivers on the part of Germany or all of its citizens to make claim to, for, or against the assets of this property or the proceeds thereof.

To permit claims to be made against these assets or the proceeds thereof by enemy aliens, or to allow them any funds from the United States Treasury on account of such claims, runs counter to international law as well as American law, and does violence to ethics and morality.

I trust that most of the Members will join in opposing any attempt to enact legislation to give away any American moneys for such purpose.

In this connection, I am pleased to call attention to the following excerpt entitled "Alien Giveaway Is Maneuvered"

as it appeared in Drew Pearson's column of July 12, 1956.

ALIEN GIVEAWAY IS MANEUVERED

(By Drew Pearson)

Some of the cleverest backstage lobbying in this session of Congress has maneuvered a bill for the return of German property out of the Senate Judiciary Committee onto the Senate Consent Calendar where it may sneak by the entire Senate.

It means a giveaway of half a billion dollars, with the big German cartels who manufactured arms for Hitler, being the chief beneficiaries. United States taxpayers will have to make up the half billion.

In order to camouflage the German giveaway, the bill is dressed up in some high-flown language about compensating nationals of the United States who have war-damage claims. And while former POW's do get some benefit, the chief benefit goes to I. G. Farben, the giant Nazi cartel, and the former owners of American Bosch, Schering, North American Rayon, and so forth.

The Helicopter Heroes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, July 12, 1956

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, a splendid editorial from the New York Times of July 11, 1956, about the heroism of the Army helicopter crews who recovered the bodies after the tragic Grand Canyon air disaster. I also ask that there be included in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter which I have written to Secretary of the Army Brucker, suggesting that suitable awards and recognition be made available to these men because of their valor and heroism on peacetime duty.

There being no objection, the editorial and letter were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE HELICOPTER HEROES

Uncertainties still surround the airliner collision 12 days ago that claimed 128 lives in the Grand Canyon of Arizona, but one unassailable certainty stands out—the superb courage of the Army helicopter crews who made possible the recovery of the bodies from this horrible disaster. From the first day, when these crews fought turbulent air to reconnoiter and land, to the mass funeral services at Flagstaff at which five members that had risked death daily stood as part of the honor guard, these men distinguished themselves by selfless devotion beyond the ordinary call of duty.

They braved 40-mile-an-hour updrafts in the canyon. A pilot said his craft once shot upward like an elevator. Another made a landing on a spot no larger than the helicopter itself. "If you misjudged the distance by 10 or 15 feet you would drop maybe 1,000 feet into the canyon."

Besides taking out bodies themselves, the helicopters landed mountaineers preparing the way for other climbers. The whole job was a triumph of man over hazardous inaccessibility, in the worst commercial air disaster and the worst possible spot to reach. There were no lives left for these helicopter men to save, but they did their tedious, dangerous job with a heroism that commands the admiration of the Nation.

UNITED STATES SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON
INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS,
July 12, 1956.

Hon. WILBER E. BRUCKER,
Secretary of the Army,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: I have been favorably impressed by the heroism of the Army helicopter crews who have braved turbulent air and dangerous terrain to bring out the bodies of the victims of the recent air disaster and tragedy at the Grand Canyon of the Colorado.

It is my fervent hope that the Department of Defense is studying the possibility of rewarding this valiant group of men with some siutable recognition or medal, which is consistent with an outstanding feat of bravery not associated with action against the enemy.

I am sending copies of this letter to the two distinguished Senators from Arizona, where the tragedy occurred, in the thought that they may want to reinforce my suggestion.

Thank you very much.

Respectfully,

RICHARD L. NEUBERGER,
United States Senator.

India's Friendship Imperiled by Nixon

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 26, 1956

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, the President must make clear to the world that the recent statements by Mr. NIXON on the subject of neutrality do not reflect the official views of the United States. The harsh inflexibility of Mr. NIXON's views do not correspond with the President's own views on neutrality. It is in particularly bad taste and bad diplomatic relationship that Mr. NIXON should, on two occasions, have gone out of his way to give needless offense to the Government of India. The bad taste is compounded by the issuance of one of his statements from Pakistan.

All of Asia watches the experimental democracy of India with one eye, with the other eye on Communist China. The proving ground of democracy in Asia lies in the success of India's experiment, as against the tyranny of communism. India needs every encouragement to proceed in the ways of democracy. We must carry with us a measure of understanding of the staggering problems of India, which in the early years of its freedom, beset with every social and economic problem, nonetheless has chosen the path of freedom and has resisted the inroads of Communist ideology.

We have offered our aid in the spirit of free people helping free people to help themselves. Public lecturing to other governments avails us nothing.

These are the times that call for the utmost dignity on the part of spokesmen who presume to speak from high office and these are the times that call for the calm presentation of indisputable facts rather than indulgence and slogans. The stern shaking of the finger of admonition indulged in by Mr. NIXON is no happy prelude to friendship with India. America's leadership in the free world receives no support from such outpourings as Mr. NIXON's.

A 1916 Manifesto

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WATKINS M. ABBITT

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 12, 1956

Mr. ABBITT. Mr. Speaker, there appeared in the Lynchburg News a very forceful and impressive editorial on Tuesday, July 3, 1956.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I desire to include the editorial herewith:

A 1916 MANIFESTO

Among the most immoderate supporters of the Supreme Court's decree abolishing segregation in the public schools on social grounds has been and is the New York Times. In its diatribes, no less, it has expressed indignation at criticisms of the Court's decision violating precedent and reached without consideration of the Constitution and statutes made in conformity to it. It has made itself the defender of the sociological and ideological approach to questions of constitutionality. The cause is good, it seems to say, so the Court was right in making it law by use of usurped authority.

It is interesting therefore to note the quotation by W. D. Workman, Jr., in the Roanoke Times of the outraged comments made by the New York Times when President Wilson named Louis D. Brandeis to the Supreme Court. Brandeis, it contended, was concerned with sociology more than with law. It denounced the judicial appointment of an exponent of "theories of social justice" likely to be more occupied "with questions of a purley political nature concerning social welfare and social justice" than with the constitutional powers of the Government. There is no place on the Supreme Court, it declared, for an advocate of any cause and the Court can never put itself in the position of "pleading for any cause." Changes and reforms under our system of government, it said, "can be properly achieved only through legislation and not through judgment of the courts." That reads like the southern manifesto of which the Times has been so violently critical.

And, in light of what has followed, the Supreme Court's decision the Times now so stanchly supports sound prophetic;

"It (legislation by judicial decision) would introduce endless confusion where order has reigned, it would tend to give force and effect to any whim or passion of the hour, to crown with success any transitory agitation engaged in by a part of the people overriding the matured judgment of all the people as expressed in their fundamental low."

What the Times said of Brandeis could be said of Chief Justice Earl Warren except that part acknowledging the former's legal ability. The confusion the Times predicted would follow legislation by Court decree is

here. Force and effect is given by other decisions of the Supreme Court to "the passion of the hour." What the Times said in 1916 is as true now as it was then.

This editorial written 40 years ago when the Times was at the height of its influence ought to be required reading for the editors of the Times today.

Address by Charles H. Silver, President of the New York City Board of Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 26, 1956

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to make a part of our RECORD the following address by the very distinguished president of the New York City Board of Education, the Honorable Charles H. Silver, which was delivered at the commencement exercises of the Erasmus Hall High School on June 26, 1956. Erasmus Hall High School is one of Brooklyn's oldest and best institutions of learning. Its principal, Dr. John McNeill, is one of our finest educators, and Mr. Silver is one of the best presidents our board of education has had.

The address follows:

ADDRESS BY CHARLES H. SILVER, PRESIDENT, BOARD OF EDUCATION, AT COMMENCEMENT EXERCISES OF ERASMUS HALL HIGH SCHOOL, JUNE 26, 1956

There is a certain program that some of you may have seen on television. It starts by showing a news commentator seated at a desk and turning a calendar back to a celebrated date in history. Then he says: "What kind of a day was it? It was a day like any other day. And you are there!" The scene changes and the past unfolds, reliving a great moment in history. There is a great deal to be learned from the past.

But this is the present. This is June 26, 1956. What kind of a day is it? It is a day unlike any other day in the last 4 years you have spent at Erasmus Hall—and you are here—about to graduate. Now, your scene will soon change as your future unfolds.

Many who are called to speak on occasions like this will counsel you to face the future. They will urge you to face the future fearlessly and with a smile—and that is probably very fine advice. Yet, in a deeper sense, you cannot really face the future at all, because very few of us can possibly know anything about it. That is why I feel particularly fortunate and privileged that you have honored me with your invitation to be a part of your commencement exercises. Standing where I am, I need only turn to face you, the members of the graduating class, and I and all who are in this vast audience can look upon the future—for you are the future.

This is a strange and wonderful turning point in your lives. You are shutting a door forever on a great adventure which you have shared with 5,000 other students in one of the largest and most respected high schools in the world. More than that, you are opening another door upon an even greater adventure in which will come opportunities for further study, for starting upon a useful career and for coming to grips with the trials of everyday living.

You could not be better equipped for the tasks ahead. An Erasmus Hall diploma is a precious symbol of preparation for life. When you take it in your hand, hold it as a torch to light your way ahead. Hold it with pride as a mark of achievement, on this memorable day when you carry forth into the world all that you have gained from the great tradition of Erasmus Hall.

It is a tradition that was born almost two centuries ago when such men as John Jay and Alexander Hamilton gathered together their distinguished friends to give the people of Flatbush a place where their children could be taught. They named it after an immortal scholar and it became the first school of secondary rank to win the distinction of a charter from the Regents.

Even in the short while I have been among you, I have already felt a stirring awareness of the special atmosphere of this very special school. You could not have enjoyed a 4-year tenancy at Erasmus Hall without absorbing something of its greatness. This school has a soul—and it will always be part of your own souls wherever the patterns of your destiny make take you.

When I say that your school has a soul, I do not mean just the heritage of its glorious history. Erasmus Hall is more than history, more than stone and steel. Most of all, it is the people who work within its walls. They give it life and meaning—the teachers and the students. And just as Erasmus Hall will always be a part of you, you will always be a part of Erasmus Hall.

The spendid record of this graduating class will be woven into the golden tapestry of Erasmian achievement. I know how many of you have made outstanding progress in your studies. I know your fine records in winning merit scholarships, in the Westinghouse science talent search, in the State, Cornell and nursing scholarships and in qualifying as future scientists of America.

Your justly proud faculty has carefully informed me of the many awards your school newspaper and magazine have won in the Columbia scholastic press competition. I even know how well your basketball team acquitted itself in the city championships and the top standing of your tennis team. I only wish I could have been there to see some of the matches. But, in my job, what school would I cheer for?

Well, today, I'm cheering for your school and I'm cheering for you graduates, because you are about to play in the greatest game of all. I know that you will carry into the contest we call "life" those vital rules of the game that you have learned at Erasmus Hall, and that you will play it fairly and to win.

As president of the board of education, I see almost a million young men and women preparing for their tomorrow in our public schools today. I speak for the board as well as for myself when I say that these youngsters are on the way to fine useful manhood and womanhood.

Ever decade seems to come up with its own so-called youth problem. When I was eligible to be part of that problem they had not yet coined the impressive phrase, "juvenile delinquent." As I recall, the nice name they picked for us was "the lost generation." Then, a little later, when I had matured enough to be concerned about children of my own, we shook our heads sadly and made worried noises about what we chose to call "flaming youth."

Yet, somehow, my lost generation found itself and managed things fairly well and so did the generations that came after. And I'm not too troubled about you.

When I praise the youth of America, I express my faith in the future of America. I am not blind to the black marks some few have made in confusing liberty with license. But for every young person who transgresses the law and earns a lurid headline in the papers, I can show you hundreds, yes thousands, who are well on the way to respected places in society and to positions of security and leadership. The picture is bright and healthy, and so are our young people.

You are growing up in an era when great forces for good and for evil are striving for the welfare of the destruction of mankind. Lipservice is not enough; discussion is not enough. You are growing up in an hour of great decision and we want you to decide to do something. Think, speak, study, then act. If there are abuses, strive to erase them. If there are wrongs, work to right them.

You young people represent a multitude of graduates in every part of our vast Nation. You were never more needed than now. You will bear the brunt of the coming struggle between the free world and the slave world in which nothing will count more than education and the ability to defend democracy throughout the earth.

The stakes are high; for, if we fail, we lose our freedom. The outcome is in your hands, tomorrow is in your hands.

Face it without fear. The laurels you have won today are proof of your ability to protect the rights of mankind and to assure the survival of this God-loved land of ours against any enemies present or to come. If tomorrow's conflicts can be won, as I believe they can, in the classrooms of today, the victory is yours.

In our time, when we are so desperately in need of great minds and hearts, teachers, scientists, engineers, workers, planners, and healers. I cannot just say to you young people, "Do not let us down." The world you inherit may be faltering in many ways; it may, indeed, be falling into a void of confusion and despair. That is the challenge I ask you to face. It is not enough to say, Do not let us down; lift us up.

It is sometimes your lot to meet a person whose excellence of character and abundance of ability are such that, even at a brief meeting, his fine qualities are shown. Such a person, in my opinion, is John McNeill. Each occasion on which I have met him has cinfirmed and strengthened this opinion.

Dr. McNeill is with us tonight, I am glad to say. He is fighting his way back to good health with the same determined spirit with which he fought for his country and fights in behalf of the young people in his charge. He can well be proud of his notable career and we can be proud and are proud of John McNeill.

I remember the story he told me of the first day of his return to this school after his latest service in the Armed Forces. He explained his deep feeling as he approached the building. I thought to myself, as I listened, here is a true educator, worthy in every sense of the word to take his place in the line of great people who have headed this fine school. We all hope that, with God's help, he will soon be fully recovered and return to his post. While on the subject of the head of the school, may I commend Miss Corey for the competent manner in which she has filled this position during the absence of Mr. McNeill.

On behalf of the board of education, I congratulate the graduating class of 1956 of Erasmus Hall High School. I think it is quite proper that I congratulate your parents and your teachers, too, your principal and acting principal. They all have reason to share the pride we feel in the work you have done to reach this hour of reward.

And I would like to look ahead to another hour, to a far-off day when some all-seeing commentator may say: "It is June 26, 1976. What kind of a day is it? It is a

day better than other days. It is a richer, brighter, greater tomorrow. It is a better world, because you are there."

Young men and women of the graduating class, go forth with our blessing. We give you to tomorrow. We give tomorrow to you.

The Gift Horse's Mouth: Federal Aid to Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH W. GWINN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 11, 1956

Mr. GWINN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include an editorial from the Daily Oklahoman published in Oklahoma City on June 29, 1956, entitled "The Gift Horse's Mouth," which shows how Federal aid to education, as proposed in the Kelley bill, works out. Even though Oklahoma would get more from the Federal Government under the Kelley bill than it paid out in taxes, Oklahoma, as reported by the Daily Oklahoman, does not want it.

The editorial follows:

THE GIFT HORSE'S MOUTH

Veterans who oppose the proposed amendment for a new and wholly unnecessary State veterans' loan bureau have put out some literature showing the veteran looking the gift horse in the mouth, and finding that the gift is a complete phony.

The same thing can well be said of H. R. 7535, called the Kelley bill, which proposes a huge Federal-aid appropriation for public schools.

The main talking point of educators who promote this bill is that it would equalize educational opportunities.

It does nothing of the kind. Under its provisions Oklahoma would get $24 million, of which Oklahoma would have to pay back $18 million in additional taxes, and, by the time the bureaucratic brokerage was deducted, the remainder would be virtually nothing. It costs a lot of money to collect taxes in Oklahoma, and have collections supervised by Washington bureaucrats and piped back to this State.

New York State would get $177 million under the terms of the bill. Yet we are blandly told that this Federal-aid money would go to backward States that can't raise enough money to pay their way educationally.

And what will the States get in return for the money they pay in taxation, getting back a part of it through misnamed Federal aid?

They will get Federal control, despite a few feeble efforts to deny this.

William E. Carr, executive secretary of the National Education Association, told his organization in a speech that what he calls planned education is a necessary prerequisite to world government. He says it is the duty of educators to teach world citizenship in the public schools and thereby strengthen the United Nations to a point where it can be made into a world government.

Steve Stahl, executive vice president of the Oklahoma Public Expenditures Council, publicly challenged this statement, and his challenge appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. He asked Mr. Carr, in substance, this question: "How can you get planned education without having controlled education?" Mr. Carr shunned this question like smallpox. He did not dare to answer it. Up to the present day he has not answered it.

Mr. Stahl, in an address to the Oklahoma City Rotary Club, convincingly pointed out that Government, whether Federal, State, or local, must control that which it subsidizes. To have it otherwise would lead to total irresponsibility and chaos. The Supreme Court has already supported that formula. No one can seriously dispute it. If we get Federal aid for public schools, it is inevitable that we shall have an army of parasitical Federal bureaucrats telling us what we can or can't do in our public schools, as to curriculum, instruction, and administration.

The Kelley bill is up for final action. If you don't want Federal control through Federal aid, now is the time to make your wishes known.

Northwest's Fight for Certification

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOR C. TOLLEFSON
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, July 7, 1956

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a timely editorial appearing in my hometown newspaper, the Tacoma News Tribune:

NORTHWEST'S FIGHT FOR CERTIFICATION

Northwest Orient Airlines, in continuing its efforts to obtain a permanent certificate for its operations on the great-circle route across the North Pacific to the Orient, has asked the Civil Aeronautics Board in Washington, D. C., to correct the record as far as the White House is concerned regarding its subsidy-free international operations.

This is a matter vitally important both to the airline and to Puget Sound business interests cognizant of what such permanent certification means in the fight that is being made to put the Seattle-Tacoma International Airport on a parity with Los Angeles and San Francisco airports in the long-range struggle for trans-Pacific air traffic.

As matters now stand, Northwest is maintaining its six passenger flights weekly oriental service on a 7-year temporary certificate ordered granted to it on February 1, 1955, by President Eisenhower. In directing the CAB to grant the temporary certificate, President Eisenhower said: "I believe that permanent certification of Northwest Airlines is premature as long as subsidy payments are necessary for its operations. A temporary certificate will provide the carrier with the opportunity to demonstrate its ability to operate without subsidies within a reasonable period of time."

Actually, Northwest spokesmen point out, they were operating without subsidy when the Presidential directive was issued, but apparently the White House was not so informed. This is the error that the airlines wish to have corrected.

Northwest's plea for permanent certification has found active support in briefs filed by the Tacoma and Seattle Chambers of Commerce, the Seattle Traffic Association, and the Washington Public Service Commission. Northwest asks permanent certification so that it will have the same status as competitive airlines. It has been providing such service since 1947 under temporary orders. This would seem to indicate considerably more than a passing interest in the matter. The company's argument that a permanent certificate is essential for such important factors as construction of facilities, personnel security and other long-range planning problems assuredly seems to be logical.

The entire issue will be scanned in a full-scale CAB hearing to be held in the near future, although a definite date has not as yet been set.

Talking Through His Hat

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT H. BOSCH
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 11, 1956

Mr. BOSCH. Mr. Speaker, to understand that the Soviet Government has no conception of our freedom, we need only note the remarks of its leaders from day to day. Dmitri T. Shepilov has just recently given us another example of this complete lack of understanding.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include an editorial, Talking Through His Hat, from the Daily Mirror of July 9, 1956:

TALKING THROUGH HIS HAT

What Dmitri T. Shepilov, the new Soviet Minister of Foreign Affairs, does not seem to understand is that the United States is a free country and is governed by a written and sacred Constitution and that among the articles in that Constitution is one that reads:

"Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; or abridging the freedom of speech, or of the press; or the right of the people peaceably to assemble, and petition the Government for a redress of grievances."

Therefore when this minion of Khrushchev makes normal relations with the United States conditional on the "toning down of press and radio," using such a word as muzzling, he is talking through his hat. Who is to do this toning down? Is it to be our Government? Is it to be done by our officials?

Shepilov should have been briefed by Molotov and Gromyko and Malik and the other Russian diplomatists who have been to this country and by the numerous spies that they let loose upon us, that no newspaper in the United States is owned by the Government and that no decent one is controlled by the Government and that the only ones who are too strongly influenced by those in power are owned by weak men who like to be invited to Washington dinner parties.

Shepilov used to be the editor of Pravda, which is the official organ of the Communist Party of Soviet Russia. When Stalin was alive, Pravda only published what Stalin permitted it to publish. It extolled Stalin as the greatest genius of all time, the smartest man that ever lived, the winner of wars, the most glorious of architects, the noblest of philosophers, etc., etc., ad nauseam. After Stalin died or was killed or went mad or whatever happened to him, Pravda came under the control of Khrushchev and it followed closely the Khrushchev line of downgrading Stalin.

We can have no particular objection to Pravda's methods, for after all it is a party organ. The point must be made that Shepilov has had no experience with a free press; he himself has been the editor of a party organ, a kept, offical newspaper. Therefore

he is incapable of understanding the American way of doing things and there is no reason why we should change our way to please him.

Incidentally, Shepilov is coming to this country in November to attend the meeting of the United Nations which was postponed to be held after the American presidential election. It is expected that at this meeting a very powerful attempt will be made to admit Red China into the United Nations.

Shepilov made the point in his press interview that the United Nations cannot count on real respect as long as Red China is not a member. Then the answer must be that the United Nations will have to get along without real respect, so far as the American people are concerned.

It is more than likely that if Red China is admitted, the Congress of the United States will withdraw this country from the United Nations as it has indicated it will do by resolution. The process is simple: Cut off appropriations for our delegation to the United Nations and refuse to confirm the American Ambassador thereto. The power to determine such matters constitutionally rests with Congress.

So Comrade Shepilov is wrong on two counts: (1) There is nobody who can instruct the American press what is to be its policy; (2) if Red China is permitted to shoot its way into the United Nations, Americans ought to get out of the place.

Democratizing American Capitalism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 12, 1956

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, if the American capitalistic system of free enterprise is to survive, it is essential that the rights of the public, and particularly that part of it which holds stock in the big corporations, insurance companies and banks, be protected.

The testimony before congressional committees for years has demonstrated that these stockholders need more protection, not less, and that the big corporations and banks need more regulation and supervision rather than less. While this Congress has been striving to give the public more protection, the pressures of big business have been growing stronger and stronger, not only to thwart that worthy purpose but to remove more and more of the provisions of existing law which were enacted for the sole purpose of protecting the general public.

For years, cumultative voting of shares of stock has been required in all national banks. The tendency is more and more to require such cumulative voting as to all publicly owned corporations. Every year sees more States enacting such legislation covering its corporations and banks.

In the last days of this session there is going to be a concerted drive to push through a repealer of the cumulative voting requirement as it applies to national banks. I trust that every Member who feels as I do about this matter will exert all of his influence to prevent that happening. In that connection, I direct our colleagues' attention to the following column which appeared in the Washington Post of July 12, 1956, written by Malvina Lindsay:

MORE VOICE SOUGHT FOR NEW CAPITALIST

(By Malvina Lindsay)

It's tough luck for Communist propagandists to find that the fat man in a plug hat with a dollar sign on his stomach, who has so long been the stereotype of the American capitalist, is changing into a 48-year-old housewife of a family whose income is around $6,000.

The typical owner of American industry seems headed that way, a recent study of stock ownership by the New York Stock Exchange indicates. Women constitute 52 percent of this country's 8 million stockholders—who have increased about 1,500,000 since a similar study was made in 1954. (This does not include the millions who indirectly own stock through insurance companies, union pension funds and other institutions.)

But even more departure from the capitalist stereotype is under way. Another Stock Exchange study shows that people under 40 and residents of smaller towns and cities are doing an ever larger share of exchange business.

Direct management of industry is necessarily restricted to a small group. Yet the spread of its ownership among the people of this country is significant—and it is also discomfiting to those whose ideas of American capitalism are of the 1900 vintage.

Probably that is why Soviet leaders have been attacking the American concept of "people's capitalism," and why Dmitry Shepilov, Soviet Foreign Minister, has called it "as absurd an idea as fried ice." (Hasn't he ever heard of baked Alaska?)

What should be even more discomfiting to Communists and to all others who cling to the cartoon idea of the American capitalist are the movements afoot to give the people who own industry more voice in its affairs, to provide them better protection of their rights, and to awaken them to their corporate responsibilities. For such developments promise to give American capitalism more grassroots vitality.

As yet, however, Americans cannot be complacent about their roles as small capitalists. Corporate democracy still is far behind political democracy, as witnesses have been telling a Senate Subcommittee on Banking and Currency, which is considering bills to improve proxy voting regulations.

There has been criticism at the hearings of "feudalistic" relations between management and stockholders, and especially of the machinery for handling proxies (the forms on which stockholders give authorization for their votes). A plea for the secret ballot in corporate voting was made by Mrs. Wilma Soss, president of the Federation of Women Shareholders in American Business, Inc. She asked that funds be provided the Securities and Exchange Commission to make a study of practical ways and means of bringing this about.

Mrs. Soss, who has been campaigning for the secret corporate ballot as zealously as the early suffragists campaigned for the political ballot, declared that industry needed a modern proxy mechanism in preparation for the great expansion in stockholders that was expected. She predicted that, barring a war or major depression, there would be 20 million stockholders within a decade as a result of inflation, stock splits, population growth, expansion programs of industry, and birth of the atomic age.

Many of these new stockholders, she pointed out, would be employees of corporations—as a result of the spread of profit sharing—and therefore in special need of a secret ballot.

Other proposals to the subcommittee have included: mandatory cumulative voting to afford minority representation on boards of directors, aboltion of the stagger system of electing directors, and the provision of better facilities for dissenting shareowners to submit their proposals and arguments.

It is not only in this country that grassroots capitalism seems on the march. Some British companies are now providing train rides and free lunches for stockholders who attend annual meetings. A large chemical company is advertising that 85 percent of its stockholders hold on the average shares valued at less than 400 pounds and that 80,000 of its employees are owners under a profit-sharing plan. And Lady Norah Decker, British socialite, is sending autographed copies of her photograph to stockholders of the Birmingham Small Arms Co. asking for their votes to have her industrialist husband restored to the board.

Hells Canyon

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAMER H. BUDGE
OF IDAHO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 2, 1956

Mr. BUDGE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, there follows a copy of a communication addressed to me under date of July 9, 1956, by Mr. William E. Welsh, secretary-manager of the National Reclamation Association:

NATIONAL RECLAMATION ASSOCIATION,
Washington, D. C., July 9, 1956.

Hon. HOMER H. BUDGE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BUDGE: I have been requested to send to you a copy of the telegram as shown below, pertaining to Hells Canyon.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM E. WELSH,
Secretary-Manager.

The following telegram was sent by Guy C. Jackson, Jr., president, National Reclamation Association, to Hon. JAMES E. MURRAY and Hon. CLAIR ENGLE, chairman, respectively, of the Senate and House Interior and Insular Affairs committees:

"Last year Mr. C. Petrus Peterson, of Lincoln, Nebr., then president of the National Reclamation Association, appeared before the Subcommittee on Irrigation and Reclamation of the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs and made a statement in opposition to the Hells Canyon authorization bill, S. 1333, on behalf of the directors of the National Reclamation Association of 8 Western States, including all 5 States in the Columbia Basin.

"These eight States were Washington, Oregon, Idaho, Montana, Wyoming, Utah, South Dakota, and California.

"Mr. Peterson's statement said in part, 'We urge that the Federal Power Commission report be announced and that their findings and recommendations be accepted.' These same directors of eight reclamation States have now requested me to reiterate on their behalf, their continued opposition to S. 1333. The Federal power company's three-dam proposal is the best comprehensive plan and

the license makes full provision for complete protection of irrigation water rights; both present and future Congress should abide by that decision."

GUY C. JACKSON, Jr.,
President, NRA.

Finn Ronne To Command United States Base in Antarctic

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOR C. TOLLEFSON
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, July 7, 1956

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Speaker, I was delighted to learn through the attached news account appearing in the New York Times on July 7, that Capt. Finn Ronne had been named to command the Antarctic outpost which the United States hopes to place this year in the Weddell Sea area. I know of no man better qualified to assume this command. Captain Ronne has contributed greatly to the United States exploratory work done in Antarctica and has never been given the recognition to which he has been entitled for his contributions. We can be sure that the basis for future United States claims to Antarctic territory has been strengthened by his past efforts, and will further be enhanced by his activities in connection with his new assignment.

The news article follows:

FINN RONNE TO COMMAND A UNITED STATES BASE IN ANTARCTIC—NAVY EXPLORER IS NAMED TO FIND SITE AND SET UP A WEDDELL SEA POST

(By Walter Sullivan)

WASHINGTON, July 6.—Capt. Finn Ronne was named today to command the Antarctic outpost the United States hopes to place late this year in the southwest corner of the Weddell Sea.

It will be Captain Ronne's first visit to Antarctica since he led a 1947–48 expedition to the sector of Palmer Peninsula, below South America and on the west side of Weddell Sea. The expedition discovered and named Edith Ronne Land south of Weddell Sea.

Captain Ronne hopes that his base can be placed on Bowman Peninsula or Gardner Inlet; but no ship has been able to go within several hundred miles of this area. The 1947–48 Ronne explorations were made by air.

An alternative and more accessible location for the base would be at Gould Bay, discovered by Captain Ronne 380 miles to the southeast at about longitude 44 degrees W., latitude 78 degrees S.

The Weddell Sea station is one of six Antarctic outposts planned by the United States for the International Geophysical Year 1957–58, the coordinated worldwide scientific observations to begin next July. Rear Admiral Richard E. Byrd is officer in charge of the United States program with Rear Admiral George J. Dufek commanding the naval support forces.

Captain Ronne was frequently associated with Admiral Byrd's Antarctic ventures. Finn Ronne's father, Martin, served both with Capt. Roald Amundsen and Admiral Byrd, and Finn first went to Little America with Admiral Byrd in 1933.

In 1940–41 Finn Ronne made a 1,200-mile sledging trip that proved the insularity of Alexander Island. This was of special importance since the Soviet claim to a share in the Antarctic pie is largely based on Russian observations that erroneously made the area a "land." Finn Ronne showed that what the Russians had discovered was not part of the mainland.

The naval unit that will carry the 41 members of Captain Ronne's party into the Weddell Sea is to consist of the attack cargo ship *Wyandot* and an icebreaker—either the *Atka* or the *Staten Island*.

The *Atka* made a shallow penetration of the Weddell Sea in 1955. The Navy unit will be headed by Comdr. Edward A. McDonald, who was skipper of the icebreaker *Burton Island* on the 1948 Navy expedition to Antarctica.

Two long triangular tractor journeys are planned from the Weddell Sea base. The region south of this sea is unexplored although it has been seen in a few places from the air. It is hoped that one of the tractor parties will meet a similar group operating from Byrd Station at longitude 120° west, latitude 80° south.

Seismic soundings of the Antarctic ice cap to be made by these groups should provide a profile of the continental rocks underneath. As in oil prospecting, these soundings will be made by recording the echoes from a series of explosions.

Finn Ronne returned to active duty today as a captain in the United States Naval Reserve. He is also to head the 10 scientists at the Weddell Sea station.

On his flights in December 1947 the then Commander Ronne observed open water along the southern coast of the Weddell Sea. He hopes now that, if he can get in there early enough in the coming Antarctic summer, he may be able to follow the traditional route down the east coast of the sea and then along the southern coast to Gardner Inlet.

This inlet, covered with shelf ice, is reported by Captain Ronne to be an excellent airfield site. It lies 450 miles northwest of the projected site of an Argentine station on the Filchner Shelf ice and 540 miles south of Stonington Island, off the west coast of Palmer Peninsula, the nearest station in the other direction.

In Good Hands

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUGH SCOTT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 11, 1956

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am enclosing an editorial which appeared in the Honolulu Advertiser, Friday, June 29, 1956. This editorial is indicative of the high esteem in which Adm. Felix B. Stump is help by all who have come in contact with him. It is most heartening to know that we have such a man as Admiral Stump looking out for our interests in this crucial area of the world.

The editorial follows:

IN GOOD HANDS

The announcement that retirement of Admr. Felix B. Stump has been postponed for some 2 years will be received with general satisfaction. President Eisenhower has done well to retain our best qualified senior officer to guide our Armed Forces in the Pacific.

Admiral Stump came to this theater 3 years ago with a heroic war record and 2 Navy crosses. From his headquarters at Pearl Harbor he runs the largest and certainly the most important military command in the world. The United States Pacific Command stretches from the West coast of North and South America almost to Africa, and from the South Pole to Alaska. It borders many of the nations of Asia, vital areas in this age of unreason. This great and complex area may hold the key to future peace and security of the United States and of the world.

Admiral Stump as commander in chief, Pacific, has the responsibility of coordinating the efforts of all the Army, Navy, and Air Force elements in this hemispheric command. He has the further responsibility of building a common military-political alliance against aggression; he is military adviser to the Southeast Asia Treaty Organization. He is an ambassador in uniform whose attainments as a sailor-diplomat have been recognized internationally.

In his capacity as military statesman he has made dozens of trips to Asia. His face is a familiar one on Laos, Cambodia, Taiwan, Vietnam, the Philippines, Pakistan, and other faraway places where the United States is trying to preserve freedom and human dignity.

Hawaii's officials and citiznes also have developed a great respect and affection for this tall and stern but very human figure who has been moving about our community for the last 3 years. The admiral's brand of leadership is rare; and we are happy that President Eisenhower has recognized this and seen fit to continue Felix Stump in his present position as leader of the world's largest military command. It is reassuring. Also, we like having him and Mrs. Stump as neighbors.

A Worthy Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOR C. TOLLEFSON
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, July 7, 1956

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Speaker, my home city's newspaper, the Tacoma News Tribune, has commented editorially upon companion measures introduced by my distinguished colleague, Hon. WALT HORAN and myself, authorizing the Government to purchase paintings of Chief Joseph and other Nez Perce Indians, for installation at the administration building at Chief Joseph Dam in the State of Washington.

The comments follow:

A WORTHY PROJECT

If bills introduced by Representatives TOLLEFSON and HORAN are acted on favorably by Congress, a Tacoman's paintings of Chief Joseph and 21 other Nez Perce warriors and chieftains will become Government property and hang for all time in the administration building the Chief Joseph Dam.

The fate of the measures in an election year is problematical, but the idea is a worthy one and all Tacomans who know the history of the great Northwest will hope for its adoption. The pictures were painted by Mrs. Rowena L. Alcorn. Artistically and technically they are of the highest quality, and they represent years of work, travel, and

expense. The have been on display at the State Capitol and in museums, and have been widely acclaimed. Regardless of action on the pending bills, the paintings will be on display at the dedication ceremonies for the dam Tuesday, the Army already having arranged to have them transported there on a loan basis.

Acquisition of these paintings by the Government would be a signal and deserved honor for the Nez Perce Indians. That tribe has a proud record of early-day service to the white explorers and settlers. The tribe early embraced Christianity and in many ways helped lay the foundation of the white man's Northwest empire of today. Should the Government buy these paintings, it will be getting a bargain, both in art and Nez Perce gratitude.

Safeguarding Klamath Indian Assets

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. EDITH GREEN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 11, 1956

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, H. R. 11660 is a bill to amend the Klamath Indian Termination Act. It vitally concerns the welfare of the 2,100 members of the Klamath Tribe and the Klamath Reservation in my State of Oregon. This bill is badly needed to forestall a threat of forced liquidation of the tribal assets, estimated at close to $100 million, and to save from destruction the 800,000 acres of the Klamath Forest, one of the finest timber stands in the United States.

Because the stakes are so great and the need for this legislation so clear, support for H. R. 11660 has been overwhelming. Under unanimous consent, I include in the RECORD, at this point, some of the statements I have received in support of this bill:

JULY 2, 1956.

Both Mr. E. G. Favell and I are strongly in favor of both bills, particularly H. R. 11660. This latter bill will insure sufficient time for Congress to consider further amendments to the law which may appear advisable after the appraisal of the property has been completed during the early part of 1957.

It has been the opinion of the Department of the Interior that there will be ample time to submit such a stopgap amendment, if it is needed, after the new Congress has convened in January of 1957. Since we are not too familiar with the amount of time required for Congress to take action on such matters, we have depended on the opinion of the Department. However, now that the bills have been introduced we hope that the Department will give both of them favorable consideration.

We thank you for your interest in this mutual problem.

T. B. WATTERS,
Chairman, Management Specialists Committee Appointed by the Secretary of the Interior To Plan Termination for the Tribe.
KLAMATH FALLS, OREG.

JUNE 19, 1956.

Klamath Indian Tribal Committee officially on record favoring amendments to Public Law 587 embodied in the H. R. 11659 and H. R. 11660. Request and urge you to take every possible action expedite passage of these bills during current session of Congress with particular emphasis on H. R. 11660 at this time.

DELFORD LANG,
Chairman, Klamath Indian Tribal Executive Committee.

JUNE 21, 1956.

Thank you very much for your interest in this freedom move which is loaded with problems. As a matter of the Oregon Council of Churches Committee on Indian Affairs, I have become acquainted with the Klamath Indian problem. I assume that Dr. Talney has informed you of our proposed conference on Klamath Indian problems for September 27, 1956.

I could hope that the House Interior Committee will avail itself of the Stanford Institute of Research Report on the Klamath Indian situation. I have had the opportunity to read and study the report and it seems to me that Public Law 587 needs some revision.

Dr. JOHN C. NEVIN,
Minister, the Multnomah United Presbyterian Church.

JUNE 23, 1956.

Chairman HALEY,
Indian Affairs Committee.

I trust that your committee will look favorably upon Mrs. GREEN's bill to postpone action on the disposal of the Klamath Indian lands for a period.

The present most unfortunate legislation would result in a great disservice to the Indians and create a calamity—after a boom—in the community. The proposed bill will allow more time for study and reflection upon the best means for handling these lands for the permanent welfare of all concerned.

Piecemeal sale to the highest bidder of the forest and marsh lands would surely result in land mining. It would be a repetition of the same old story that has happened over and over by the cut-out-and-get-out loggers and by those who have overgrazed submarginal land to get a quick profit at the expense of the land's permanent highest use.

The tribal forest lands ought to be managed as a unit on a sustained-yield basis as they have so well been for the last 40 years. Diverse small owners could not and would not practice sustained yield. Inevitably, if the reservation were sold to the highest bidder in small lots, it would be gutted in a few years, after which there would be a period of land unproductivity and starvation for the industries of the community.

As for the Klamath marshlands they could go with the timberlands, but might more properly be acquired by the Fish and Wildlife Service to be administered as a bird and game refuge and for stock pasturage as at present. If they go piecemeal to the highest bidder the sources of the Williamson River will be dried up, much of what is now subirrigated meadow will become a dust bed and the rest will afford but mediocre pasturage (the soil is pumice and the elevation 4,700 feet), and the greatest nesting area of Canada geese and other waterfowl will be gone.

I might add that I have lived in Oregon 46 years, am personally familiar with the area, and have no ax to grind.

THORNTON T. MUNGER,
PORTLAND, OREG.

JUNE 14, 1956.

I want to commend you so highly for the two amendments, which I think are exceedingly helpful and will do much to alleviate some harmful aspects of the present law.

There is a large body of opinion among informed people that the law as now written is ill-conceived and was hastily passed without careful analysis. It will not only cause harm to the Indian people, but will create a serious economic and social dislocation for the Klamath people. The difficulty in fulfilling the purpose of the law becomes more and more apparent. Even the management specialists have protested vigorously the implications of the law and have pointed out that it is impossible to fulfill its requirements with fairness to the Indian people, and with any measure of economic security for the Klamath area.

Everything indicates that the whole law needs careful review, and whatever you and others who are deeply conocerned can do, I know will be most helpful for the general welfare of the Klamath Tribe and the whole Klamath area.

Dr. MARK A. TALNEY,
Executive Director, Oregon Counsel of Churches.

JUNE 21, 1956.

Chairman HALEY,
Indian Affairs Committee:

I have for many years been somewhat familiar with the Klamath Indian situation. Like a good many others we are concerned for the welfare of the Indians and, if it seems best to terminate Federal supervision, that this be done in a sufficiently deliberate and orderly fashion to assure that the assets will be handled to the long-term advantage of the Indians, and of the community and the people as a whole. A quick liquidation of the timber could be disastrous both financially to the Indians and to the economy of the area.

There is also the question of the adequate protection of the marshes within the reservation which are highly important to wildlife, particularly migrant birds including, of course, ducks and geese, a problem which I have the impression has scarcely been considered at all as yet.

I have not, as yet, been authorized to speak for the Federation of Western Outdoor Clubs, but I am sure the organization as a whole, and its member clubs, would strongly recommend that action be taken only after much more adequate study than has yet been made and full consideration of all the factors concerned. A postponement for 9 months is not a bit too long and the provision for expert study is certainly essential.

I might add, in case you should not happen to be informed, that the Federation of Western Outdoor Clubs is an organization of most of the outdoor and conservation groups west of the Rocky Mountains. It has some thirty-odd member clubs, including the great Sierra Club of California, and has some 25,000 members.

KARL W. ONTHANK,
President, Federation of Western Outdoor Clubs.

JUNE 19, 1956.

Chairman HALEY,
Indian Affairs Committee:

I have been on the Klamath Indian Reservation many times during the past 20 years. I have studied the plans for sustained yield management of the commercial timberlands on that reservation.

I am deeply concerned for the future handling of the timberlands on the Klamath Reservation under the procedures provided in Public Law 587. No provision was made for the continued management of the timber on a sustained yield basis. Oregan forest laws do not require sustained yield management of forest lands. In addition some 30,000 acres of the reservation is swamplands essential to the maintenance of the Pacific flyway of migratory waterfowl. There is about 600,000 acres of tribal owned commercial forest land on the reservation. About two-thirds of the commercial timberland has been logged over once under careful selective cutting. A fine stand of thrifty trees remain on the cutover part. About one-third of the timberlands is still virgin uncut timber. Under sustained yield, selective cutting, the property would produce each year forever

more than 60 million board feet of timber. Such stability is of real concern to Klamath County. It is my belief that disposal of these lands under the present law will result in relogging for a quick profit of most of the lands already selectively cut, and the clear cutting of the part now in virgin timber. This would be tragic for Klamath County. H. R. 11660 simply provides that as soon as the appraisal of the timber is completed, one copy of the report will be furnished to your committee and that Congress would then have 9 months to consider the need for plans for disposal of the property.

This is a logical approach to the problem. It is believed that during the 9 months some way can be found to retain the swamplands as part of the Pacific flyway for waterfowl and to make sure that the timberlands will continue to be managed on a sustained yield basis.

I earnestly recommend that H. R. 11659 and H. R. 11660 be favorably considered by your committee.

LYLE F. WATTS,
Retired Chief of the Forest Service. (from 1943 to 1952).

JUNE 26, 1956.

This in our opinion is a good bill and should be passed. If that great area of 1 million acres in Klamath County were to pass from public ownership, it would be a calamity not only to conservation in all of its aspects but to the economic well-being of much of the area of Klamath County. You may rest assured that if our aid is needed in promoting this legislation you can rely on our help.

ROLLIN E. BOWLES,
President, Oregon Division, Izaak Walton League of America, Inc.

JUNE 29, 1956.

I am disturbed somewhat at the attitude which the Department takes to your bills and cannot be as complacent as the Department has been all along in regard to the Klamath Tribe and termination.

Most certainly the language of the present law is so defective that no one seems to be in agreement as to what the law does say. I have had various opinions from different lawyers and they would agree with Tom Watters and the other management specialists that if at one time anyone knew just what the law does clearly say, that person no longer exists and certainly would not be found in the Department of the Interior. There will not be sufficient time for amendment in the next session.

I do not know whether you received a copy of the Stanford Research Institute report in regard to the date of termination and the consequences of termination, but this group of objective research people indicates that immediately upon termination the Indians can and will, to a large degree, demand immediate sale of their timber holdings in order to receive their cash returns.

Your suggested delay in action would help considerably and permit some organization, such as the Stanford Research Institute suggests.

DR. MARK A. TALNEY,
Executive Director, Oregon Council of Churches.

JUNE 26, 1956.

It is the Indian affairs that concern me and have since the first public announcement of the termination legislation for the Klamath Indians.

First of all the Federal hearing to determine readiness of those on the reservation and off for that matter, was inadequate and presented a picture of greater readiness in competing for jobs, etc., than really existed. The Stanford research survey proves that these people aren't ready. The survey should have preceded the legislation, obviously.

Secondly, your proposals for amendments to the present law 587 are absolutely necessary if the work of the management specialists is to be of value and the Indians' interests as well as the taxpayers are to be considered adequately.

The additional time for Congress to review and for the Secretary of the Interior to consider the appraisal facts is necessary, surely.

This last week I rode through the Indian lands with a forester of 30 years United States service all over the country and Puerto Rico. He thinks it undoubtedly the finest stand of Ponderosa he has ever seen and that cutting shows trees almost mature and those ready to harvest at intervals according to the best standards of sustained yield. If this land should pass into Oregon State Forest category, the 50 years of maintenance would be lost as a "yardstick" or demonstration. State laws require the very minimum toward "sustained yield." I agree with those that think the Federal Government should purchase and hold it intact but that can come after any hasty acts of Congress have been prevented by your legislation.

MRS. HARLAN P. BOSWORTH, Jr.
MEDFORD, OREG.

JUNE 21, 1956.

I have received your most interesting and encouraging letter and description of your bills to amend Public Law 587 (H. R. 11659) and H. R. 11660) and because our committee has been looking forward with considerable concern for some sign of that type of legislation, we sent out slightly less than 550 notices asking our members and friends to support these two bills.

MRS. PAUL C. SCHWANTES,
Secretary, Committee on Indian Affairs of the New York Yearly Meetings of the Society of Friends.

JUNE 19, 1956.

Although I am no longer the executive secretary of the Portland office of the American Friends Service Committee, I have kept in touch with developments on the Klamath reservation. I am extremely concerned with the present trend, and therefore believe your two proposals to be steps in the right direction.

I approve heartily of the two amendments (H. R. 11659 and 11660) which you propose to Public Law 587.

G. BARNHARD FEDDE,
Attorney.

PORTLAND, OREG.

JUNE 14, 1956.

Chairman HALEY,
Indian Affairs Subcommittee:

We would be pleased if your subcommittee is able to take up before the end of this session and to report favorably on the bills introduced by Congresswoman EDITH GREEN to amend the Klamath Indian Termination Act, namely, H. R. 11659 and H. R. 11660.

These bills seem to be very desirable corrections of the Termination Act, the need of which was probably not foreseen when the Congress enacted this legislation.

Rev. J. B. TENNELLY,
Director, Bureau of Catholic Indian Missions.
WASHINGTON, D. C.

JUNE 19, 1956.

Thank you so much for writing to me concerning the bills on the welfare of the Indians on the Klamath Reservation in Oregon. We have been watching these bills for a long time, particularly the first termination bills.

Church Women are most interested in fair legislation which will not put too great a burden on the Indian, and I am sure that these two bills which you have introduced are of great importance.

ESTHER C. STAMATS,
Director, Christian Social Relations, General Department of United Church Women, National Council of the Churches of Christ in the United States of America.
NEW YORK, N. Y.

JUNE 18, 1956.

Since concern for Indian Americans is one of the special interests of my committee, your letter to Mrs. MacLeod was given to me for reply.

I am impressed by the need for your bills and congratulate you on them. In a mailing to State chairmen and committee members next week I will mention the importance of writing their Representatives to support your bills.

MRS. JAMES M. EVANS,
Director, Christian World Missions, General Department of United Church Women, National Council of the Churches of Christ in the United States of America, New York, N. Y.

JUNE 18, 1956.

I have discussed your letter and the proposed amendments with some of my associates in the bank, and all of us feel that they are not only for the best interests of the Klamath Indians, but are entirely fair for everyone concerned with this vital legislation. If the Federal Government wishes to relieve itself of its responsibilities with respect to the Klamath Indians, and if it is to have the dominant voice in determining the program that is to be followed to effectuate this desire, then it would seem only fair that the Federal Government take care of all expenses in the carrying out of that program. As to the 9-month waiting period after the liquidation plan has been submitted to the Secretary of Interior, we do not believe that anyone could seriously question the wisdom of this amendment. Experience to date certainly indicates that the Klamath Indians have been somewhat confused by the liquidation program, and are not acting in unanimity, so it would seem to be prudent to forestall any impulsive action on the part of any of the tribal members.

JOHN N. ADAMS,
Vice President and Trust Officer, the First National Bank of Portland (Oregon).

Need For Speedy Revision of Immigration Laws

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERBERT H. LEHMAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, July 12, 1956

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, Brig. Gen. David Sarnoff, chairman of the board of the Radio Corporation of America and honorary chairman of the greater New York drive for the American Museum of Immigration, recently delivered an eloquent speech recalling to all of us the importance of seeing that America returns to its traditions of being the haven of the oppressed and the homeless. This must be done by obtain-

ing speedy revisions of our existing immigration laws.

I commend General Sarnoff's speech to all my colleagues in the Senate.

I ask unanimous consent that General Sarnoff's speech be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TEXT OF ADDRESS BY BRIG. GEN. DAVID SARNOFF, CHAIRMAN OF THE BOARD, RADIO CORPORATION OF AMERICA, AND HONORARY CHAIRMAN, GREATER NEW YORK DRIVE, AMERICAN MUSEUM OF IMMIGRATION

No American can stand here at the feet of the Goddess of Liberty without feeling a surge of patriotic emotion. The Beautiful Lady, as she has often been called, sums up so much of our Nation's history and destiny.

More than any other physical object on earth, this statue has become for all mankind a symbol of freedom and promise, justice and compassion. These are the American ideals. And today, when a fateful contest is under way between liberty and slavery, they are more important and more binding than ever before.

The statue's "lamp beside the golden door" makes bright the land we love and the values we cherish. But its rays are not for us alone. They reach into remote places the world over, to help disperse the darkness of despotism.

Her voice speaks to the "huddled masses yearning to be free"—to "the homeless, the tempest-tossed"—as eloquently as on the day those deathless words were first inscribed by Emma Lazarus.

Whether his ancestors came to these shores on the Mayflower or on a squalid steerage boat, an American cannot be immune to an upwelling of pride and gratitude as he looks upon the Statue of Liberty. Quite naturally these sentiments are more poignant for those who, like myself, are themselves immigrants or the first offspring of immigrants.

I was 9 years old when my parents had the good sense to bring me to the United States. This meant that I was young enough to absorb America and to be absorbed by it. At the same time, I was old enough to retain memories of the primitive world from which I had come. I was old enough, also, to know the difficulties of the newcomer's adjustment to a completely new way of life and thought.

Let me say a few words about that adjustment, which millions of new Americans—your forebears—have had to make. It is a bewildering experience to be transported, by a mere ocean journey, from the Middle Ages to the 20th century; from a fixed and frozen background to this infinitely dynamic America; from the past, one might say, straight into the future.

The great change, however much desired, is beset by problems and tensions and heartbreaks which few who have not been through it can feel. It is a remarkable fact, however, and one that redounds to the credit of our America, that this major adjustment, in time, creates in the overwhelming majority of immigrants and their offspring not only contentment but a deep love for the adopted land.

It is also a significant fact that in the measure that immigrants—and especially their sons and daughters—achieve a sense of "belonging" in America, they develop a sentimental interest in the regions from which their families migrated. They rediscover elements of beauty and strength in the cultures of their foreign ancestors.

Most important, they realize at last that their immigrant forebears not only took something from America, but gave something to America. They recognize the truth that the newcomers made a unique contribution to American civilization precisely because of their particular origins.

Though they arrived here penniless, the generations of immigrants did not come emptyhanded. They brought with them great gifts—the brain and the brawn that are cemented into America's highways and railways, skyscrapers and farmhouses, mines and factories, from shore to shore. They brought with them the hungers for human freedom, individual dignity, and self-improvement that are at the heart of the American dream.

When Israel Zangwill coined the phrase "the melting pot," it was quickly accepted as the image of American humanity. But it is not an altogether accurate, or indeed, desirable image.

"Melting pot" implies that the human ingredients are pressure cooked into a single and uniform compound, in which all trace of the original components is lost. Yet we know, as a matter of common experience, that this is not the case. And we know, too, that regard for the land and race from which an American has sprung, is not incompatible with complete love of and devotion to America.

It is not inconsistent that good Americans like the du Ponts still have a soft spot for things French, or that good Americans like the Skouras brothers have a special concern for helping the people of Greece, or that a good American and great restaurateur in San Francisco named George Mardikian, helped to find homes for thousands of displaced Armenians after the last war.

Americans of Irish descent could throw their hearts into the cause of Irish freedom yet remain good Americans. Today, Americans of Polish extraction do not impair their Americanism when they seek the liberation of Poland from the Communist yoke. American Jews are no less American because they work for the survival of the new state of Israel.

For it is the unique glory of our country that it neither demands nor imposes an artificial uniformity. Our strength lies in unity, which is a quite different concept. On the whole we not only tolerate but take pride in differences. America is less an amalgam than an integrated mosaic. Yet again and again, in time of danger or crisis, we have demonstrated a unity that has amazed the world. Enemies who counted on divisive influences because of our history of mass immigration have always been disappointed.

The temptation in proving that the immigrant has served America well is to cite celebrated names and spectacular careers. But I prefer to cite humble names by the millions.

Recently I paused before a war memorial in a small town in Westchester County. I glanced down the list of its sons who died in two world wars. The names in the roster were Anglo-Saxon and Latin, Slavic and Jewish, Scandinavian and Oriental. Yet all were true Americans. The same amazing unity and allegiance are revealed on the rolls of honor in every city, town, and hamlet of our beloved America. Each of these memorials is a portrait in miniature of this nation of immigrants, welded by common loyalty to high ideals to make and preserve a mighty country.

The American Museum of Immigration, under whose auspices we are gathered here this morning, is dedicated to keeping alive the consciousness of this towering fact. Its location, within the orbit of light shed by the torch of the beautiful lady, implies a further dedication—to defend and keep undefiled the free institutions which drew those immigrants to America. It is an enterprise in patriotism which merits the cooperation of all Americans.

Schedule of Courthouse Visits

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN E. HENDERSON
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 13, 1956

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Speaker, it is my practice to afford the residents of the 15th District of Ohio, whom I have the honor to represent, an opportunity to confer and talk with their Representative in Congress as often as possible.

In the past, I have established a schedule of courthouse visits and have announced that schedule as far in advance as possible. In so doing, residents of the district will know well in advance when they will have opportunities for such conferences.

Members of Congress reecive many letters from constituents, and a great amount of assistance can be rendered through the use of correspondence, but there are some problems and some difficulties that cannot be adequately taken care of through the mails. I have found that these courthouse conferences not only permit constituents to bring their problems to their Congressman, but also the conference provides the Congressman with an opportunity to find out the needs and reactions of the people whom he represents.

After Congress adjourns I will be at the courthouse of each of the seven counties of the 15th District from 9 a. m. to 4 p. m., in accordance with the following schedule:

Perry County, August 6.
Muskingum County, August 7.
Monroe County, August 8.
Noble County, August 13.
Washington County, August 14.
Morgan County, August 20.
Guernsey County, August 21.

No appointment is needed, and I urge any individual or group to meet with me on the date most convenient. Of course, I shall be glad to meet with residents of the 15th District in my office in Cambridge at any time that Congress is not in session.

For those who are unable to attend the courthouse conferences, I should like to announce at this time that I will be present at each of the county fairs where those who wish to meet informally with me may do so. I shall be present at the fairs on the following dates:

Muskingum County Fair, August 16.
Noble County Fair, August 30.
Washington County Fair, September 3.
Morgan County Fair, September 6.
Guernsey County Fair, September 27.
Barlow Fair, September 29.

If Congress has adjourned by the dates of the Monroe and Perry County Fairs, I shall attend those fairs also, on the following dates:

Monroe County Fair, July 26.
Perry County Fair, August 2.

Hot School Lunch

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CLARENCE CANNON

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 12, 1956

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, no expenditure made through the Department of Agriculture has been more beneficial or more popular than the appropriation for the school-lunch program.

It has improved health and physique. A surprising number of pupils attend school without breakfast. Even those from the wealthier homes often refuse to eat an adequate breakfast and the hot lunch provided by the program has brought added health and weight to practically the entire student enrollment of the schools in which it is served.

Almost without exception the school-lunch program has resulted in improved scholarship. Improvement in grades and class standing are invariably incident to the adoption of the program in schools throughout the country.

And not the least important effect of the program in this day of increasing juvenile delinquency has been the immediate simplification of problems of school discipline.

The Missouri Farmers Association, through a statement by President Fred V. Heinkel, released in its weekly news letter of June 20, charged that the United States Department of Agriculture had misinformed the Congress on the national program:

COLUMBIA, MO.—"At the urging of United States Department of Agriculture Congress has recently passed a soil bank law to restrict the production of food and to remove agricultural surpluses; then the department turned around and said we do not need the money necessary to feed our school children," charges Fred V. Heinkel, president of the State's largest farm organization, the Missouri Farmers Association.

"We do not have a surplus of food as long as any of our people are not getting enough nourishing food to eat. We have the food and we should be interested in seeing that our school lunch program receives adequate funds to provide nourishing lunches to our children," Heinkel continued.

Funds for payment of school lunch claims in Missouri are exhausted. Only 7½ percent of the claims for March are to be paid. No funds are available for April, May, and June claims.

Under the lunch program, schools must agree to offer lunches to all children regardless of ability to pay. In return, schools are reimbursed with Federal funds to help out with the program. Children from families that can afford it pay for the lunch. In Missouri the reimbursement figure will be approximately 3.3 cents per lunch this year provided meal includes one-half pint of milk, 2 ounces of a protein item, three-quarters cup of vegetable or a combination of vegetable and fruit, 1 serving of bread and a 2 teaspoon serving of butter.

In a separate school milk program, schools are reimbursed 4 cents for each extra one-half pint of milk over and above that served with the lunch.

The United States Senate approved an amendment to the second supplemental appropriation bill to provide an additional $10 million for the 1956 school-lunch operations. The conferees agreed to eliminate the amendment from the final bill that was adopted because the Secretary of Agriculture stated that he did not think the States "could use the additional funds effectively."

"This is a glaring example of the lack of interest on the part of the United States Department of Agriculture toward the school-lunch program and shows how the Department has continually issued misinformation to the Congress of the United States," Heinkel charged.

"Secretary Benson has demonstrated during the past several years when, even in the face of increased enrollments and the tremendous expansion of the lunch program, he has requested substantial decreases in the national school lunch appropriation. The recommended reductions were restored only because the people of the country acquainted their Senators and Representatives with the facts which apparently could not be obtained from the Federal agency charged with the administration of the National School Lunch Act," Heinkel said.

"Unfortunately, due to the time limitations, the people 'back home' had no chance to refute or to correct the completely erroneous recent testimony of the Secretary," Heinkel said.

"Federal regulations permit reimbursement of 9 cents for lunches, but the average reimbursement for school lunches served in the continental United States during the 1954–55 school year amounted to only 4.4 cents and this figure, due to continued expansion of the program, will be much lower during this school year. In view of these facts, the Secretary told the conference committee that the $10 million additional appropriation could not be used effectively," Heinkel continued.

"Results of a survey made of the eating habits of 716 public school pupils in the fourth, fifth, and sixth grade between the period of December 1 and December 15 at Cape Girardeau serves as a dramatic answer as to whether the appropriation could not be used effectively," Heinkel said.

"Their findings were amazing. For instance, only 13 percent had an adequate breakfast the day they were tested. Some said they ate none at all. In many cases a candy bar bought at the neighborhood grocery while waiting for the school bus constituted the meal.

"At suppertime the food the children reported measured up to minimum standards only in 15 cases out of each 100.

"The bright spot in the survey came in the report of the noon meal, and this is due to that 45 percent of the children tested ate in a school cafeteria where balanced and nutritious meals are offered.

"Another bright spot was that 85 percent of the children drank milk. Some of this could be attributed to milk being sold in the schools and in the cafeteria," Heinkel said.

"Typical" is the way nutritionists describe the Cape Girardeau story. "While the Cape Girardeau parents and school authorities are alarmed and are attempting to correct this situation, most communities do not realize the inadequacy of the diet their children are receiving," Heinkel said.

"It does show, however, the tremendous need for an expanded school-lunch program," Heinkel concluded.

In response, the Department of Agriculture issued a release to the newspapers which printed it under date of June 28, as follows:

OFFICIAL "NO" TO MFA SCHOOL LUNCH CHARGES—PROGRAM CHIEF DENIES AGRICULTURE DEPARTMENT FOOLED CONGRESS

WASHINGTON.—Agriculture Department officials have denied charges by the Missouri Farmers Association that they have "continually issued misinformation" to Congress on the Nation's school lunch program.

Dennis Doyle, acting chief of the program, said in an interview that the Department has "neither withheld information or misinformed" House-Senate conferees. He asserted that the lawmakers have been "supplied with tables which showed the status of Federal funds for the school lunch program in all the States."

Doyle replied to charges hurled by Fred V. Heinkel, president of MFA, who declared in a statement that funds for payment of school lunch claims in his State are exhausted.

Heinkel said "Only 7½ percent of the claims for March are to be paid. No funds are available for April, May, and June claims."

Under the program, schools must agree to offer lunches to all children "regardless of ability to pay." In return, schools are reimbursed with Federal funds to help out with the program. Children from families that can afford it pay for the lunches.

DOYLE said: "We recommend that State agencies establish variable rates of reimbursement so as to favor the neediest schools and to spread available funds over the entire school year."

He said the schools know far in advance of the start of the school year the exact amount of funds to be made available to them.

Earlier this year, when it looked as though no funds were available in some States for payment of school lunch claims, the Senate approved an amendment to a second supplemental appropriation bill to provide an additional $10 million for 1956 school lunch operations.

DOYLE denied Heinkel's assertion that Agriculture Secretary Ezra Taft Benson had stated he did not think the States could use the additional funds effectively.

The Secretary pointed out, DOYLE emphasized, the disadvantages of receiving the money so late in the year. He said Benson took the position that it would be too late in the school year for the additional funds to do much good.

DOYLE stressed that had the additional $10 million been forthcoming, the amount could not have been put to use until near the close of the school year.

DOYLE also pointed out that the Department has made about $115 million worth of commodities available for us by schools during the 1955–56 school year.

I am this morning in receipt of a letter from Jack Hackethorn, editor of the Missouri Farmers Association's bulletin, the Farm News, in which he points out:

Despite Mr. Doyle's denial, I insist that the United States Department of Agriculture has continually issued misinformation to Congress on the Nation's school-lunch program. Members of Congress must share this opinion, else why would they find it necessary to increase the school-lunch appropriation each year over the Benson budget request. It is because Congress is aware of the increased enrollments and the tremendous expansion of the program, facts which the Secretary has been very reluctant to admit. Has he not each year until this, tried to cut school-lunch appropriations? This year he asked for last year's appropriation, and Congress found it necessary to increase his request.

Doyle said that the schools know far in advance the amount of funds to be made available to them. It must be pointed out, however, that the schools do not know far in advance the amount of participation in the program.

He suggested State agencies establish variable rates of reimbursement so as to favor the neediest schools. On the other hand the State agencies are hardly in a position to discriminate between schools as to need. The school-milk program, a program set up in its entirety by the Secretary and his Department, makes no attempt to

establish variable rates of reimbursement so as to favor the neediest schools.

Doyle denied Heinkel's assertion that Secretary Benson had stated he did not think the States could use the additional funds effectively, claiming that the Secretary merely pointed out the disadvantages of receiving the money so late in the school year. Certainly Mr. Doyle must have known that Missouri and numerous other States withheld action on processing March and April claims with the hope that the deficiency appropriation would be approved and that they would be in a position to at least continue the prevailing, greatly reduced reimbursement rates during the last 2 or 3 months of the school year. An additional $10 million appropriation was made available for the special milk program and this came rather late in the school year.

Naturally we are strongly in favor of the school-milk program. It must be pointed out, however, that these funds cannot be used for the school-lunch program. In fact, the school-milk program applies only to that milk consumed over and above that consumed by the lunch program. If any schools are forced to curtail their lunch program the milk program is endangered.

Mr. Doyle said that about $115 million worth of commodities were made available for use by schools during the 1955–56 school year. Many of these, like pork, were made available too late to be used effectively and far too long after the collapse of hog prices. It is my understanding that there was $400 million or more in section 32 funds; yet the Secretary saw fit to offer only about $115 million. Certainly farm prices were down.

While on the subject of commodities, each year when Congress is considering appropriations for the school lunch has not the Secretary promised from 30 to 50 percent more commodities than are ever actually made available? This might be another example of misinformation.

Conformity by Coercion?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 12, 1956

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, David Lawrence, publisher of U. S. News & World Report, has again presented a national issue which must be faced by the people of this country.

In U. S. News & World Report of July 6 in an article entitled "Conformity by Coercion?" he has analyzed a situation which troubles most of us. Under leave to extend my remarks I am including his article at this point:

CONFORMITY BY COERCION?

(By David Lawrence)

It is necessary to come to grips with the issue of enforced integration in the Nation's schools. It is a legal issue, a moral issue, a sociological issue, and a political issue.

Yet all these diverse approaches only accentuate the real question—conformity or nonconformity in organized society. It is an issue that for generations has confronted mankind.

The perennial conflict fundamentally is between theoretical equality and actual equality.

Government usually is concerned with theoretical equality. But too often, in the passion for uniformity, obstacles arise to the practical application of the law. Sooner or later revision is found necessary. An adjustment to realistic conditions becomes inevitable.

Obedience to law is a precept with which few will disagree, but disrespect for a law written by agents of the people in contradiction of the real will of the people leads to disobedience, disregard, or repeal.

Conformity itself is a dangerous dogma when dependent solely on coercion. It is a device by which freedom often has been destroyed and totalitarianism substituted. Conformity of thought imposed by law is the tool of despots.

Conformity means that everybody must think alike, act alike, and obey the edicts of a central authority.

Our Constitution was built upon the fundamental principle that government derives its just powers from "the consent of the governed."

Realizing that our Republic was founded by groups with conflicting interests, often widely separated by big distances, our forefathers conceived the idea of separate States. Each State was to be sovereign—endowed with the right to govern itself within its own area. Only in the case of infringement upon other States was the national authority to be invoked.

The Founding Fathers, to be sure, realized that they could not apply a rule of conformity over the people of a vast territory. So they delegated to the several States the right to deal with their own sociological problems. This is why education, for example, has always been a local problem. It is also one of the reasons why the maintenance of law and order has been primarily a State and city responsibility.

Conformity cannot be successfully compelled where the customs and morals of the people are in conflict with statutory law. It has often ben truly said that government cannot legislate morals.

Perhaps the best demonstration of this in recent years was the experience of the Nation with the 18th amendment. For decades there had been attempts to solve the prohibition problem. Many States had passed "dry" laws. Congress tried to regulate the liquor traffic across State lines. The Federal courts, while upholding the interstate aspects, were careful to refrain from imposing upon each individual State an obligation to conform to a moral code which specified that people must not drink intoxicating liquors.

When the 18th amendment, however, was ratified in 1920 as a part of the Constitution, the entire Nation was asked to conform to a formula which forbade the manufacture and sale of intoxicating beverages anywhere in the United States. This meant that the will of a State was superseded entirely by national law.

What was the result? The effort to produce conformity failed. This was because the evils which came in the wake of the 18th amendment proved to be far greater than the evils which the amendment sought to correct. Disobedience of law became widespread.

Bootlegging, which began to thrive immediately after the amendment was adopted, brought in its wake vice and crime and organized gangs. Some of these gangs which had their origin at that time have not been entirely eradicated from our communities to this day.

It will be recalled that, while the 18th amendment was a part of the Constitution for nearly 14 years, it took less than 10 months during the year 1933 to get it repealed by the States after Congress submitted it to them.

This did not happen because public thinking on the use of intoxicating beverages had actually undergone any substantial change. Many people continued to think that the sale of intoxicating beverages was harmful to the community and that the manufacture of such products should be prohibited. Several States still have prohibition laws, varying according to local conditions. But the Nation voted for repeal because of a general condition—the American people found that, despite vigorous efforts to enforce the law, the illicit manufacture and distribution of liquor had intensified.

Historical experience should have taught us that there is a distinct difference between the theory of equal rights and the conditions, sometimes provoked by the application of laws which go counter to public sentiment in a community.

But, while we profess to believe in the right of a community to govern itself, do we always apply the doctrine in practice? We have tried in America to give city and State communities the right to govern themselves. Yet we interprose a Federal authority sometimes and virtually disregard local self-government. Thus we impair a great principle—the right of self-government.

We have, for example, said, in effect, that, because the people in the northern, eastern and western parts of the United States constitute a numerical majority, their will must prevail over the people in southern communities.

What we are attempting to do today in America is to compel the minority in the South to conform to the supposed will of the majority in the North. Do we aim thereby to wipe out State autonomy altogether?

There are basic rules to which both minorities and majorities will give their support. Thus, individual rights of association—the practice of religion, the right to educate children in accordance with local custom or tradition, and the right of the minority, even though living in the same community with the majority, to pursue its own racial or religious customs—have all been recognized as just principles in organized society.

The theory of equal rights means that there can be no denial of any public rights to citizens. Thus, the right to vote is a public right. The right to hold office is a public right. The right to own property is a public right. The right to obtain an education in a city or county school is a public right.

There are, to be sure, certain public utilites, such as conveyances, and certain public facilities where rules of limitation should not be imposed by the majority which would put the minority at a physical disadvantage.

But this is a far cry from requiring that each community must compel conformity in the educational process.

If education were entirely an impersonal affair and there were no social life at all in the schools, we would be dealing with a different problem.

But majority as well as minority groups have an equal right to freedom of association or nonassociation. Voluntarism is the key.

If one individual, for example, does the same work as another, he is entitled to equal pay, irrespective of race or creed or color. In some occupations where majorities object to working alongside of minorities, a problem of adjustment presents itself which in many instances can be solved by patience and some physical rearrangement of locker rooms and personal facilities so as to remove barriers to employment.

But attempts to impose conformity by coercion, whether in the legal or economic or social sphere, usually produce conditions not unlike those which followed the attempt to enforce the 18th amendment.

We already hear zealous extremists advocating that troops be sent "to enforce the Constitution" and compel the South to integrate its public schools.

It is not a problem that will ever be settled by bayonets. Nor will it be settled by exhorting people to forget prejudices bred in them.

II. AN ERA OF FRICTION

We have recently seen evidences of anger and violence in the North and South. We have also witnessed the use of retaliatory measures in communities in the South where the most amicable relations previously had prevailed between the races in the South. Voluntarism had make progress. Talk of coercion now retards progress.

It is an illusion to suppose that, under the threat of "law enforcement," these difficulties are going to lessen with the passage of time. For social customs and social life do not function by any rule of conformity. They are bound to continue in the diversity that human nature has provided.

There will inevitably be passive resistance to laws of enforced integration. The public-school systems of the South may even disintegrate so that education in that region may lag behind the rest of the country. It would be a tragic price to pay. But men of determination have been known to pay almost any price for what they consider to be the preservation of their inalienable rights. Prejudice cannot be legislated out of existence by law.

A compromise formula — segregation through equal but separate facilities of education—was first sanctioned in a Northern State. It was upheld by the Supreme Court of the State of Massachusetts in 1849.

For 30 years after the War Between the States, the Supreme Court of the United States wrestled with legal issues growing out of racial conflict, and in 1896 ruled that systems of "equal facilities, even though separate" were constitutional. This permitted minorities to live alongside majorities in harmony.

Now, however, 60 years later, the Supreme Court of the United States, having reversed itself, is attempting to impose conformity. It should be noted that the Court, in its decision in 1954, did not say the separate educational facilities previously provided had been unequal—indeed, they have at times been even superior for the Negro. The Court took the position that, although the facilities were equal, they could not be permitted to be separate. Reliance was placed on sociological reasons—not legal precedents. The basic argument accepted was that a psychological impact of an adverse nature had occurred—that Negro children felt themselves inferior wherever segregation was legalized. It was the act of "discrimination" itself which the Court held to be illegal.

Now, as a consequence, however, a counter-conflict on the sociological front has arisen. White parents in the South are arguing that the impact of integration will prove harmful to their children. Will the Court now give equal weight to this plea, or tell the white parents to send their children to private schools, which so many citizens cannot afford?

III. SOCIAL RELATIONSHIPS

So we are back again in the realm of the sociological—how can we get majorities and minorities to live harmoniously in the same community?

But it will be asked whether the right to attend a public school does not include the right to attend any public school. The right of assignment of pupils is a local—not a national—function. Even today, the most ardent exponent of equal rights would not deny that it is within the power of the State to set up schools in which there is segregation by reason of sex—all girls in one school and all boys in another school, irrespective of color.

If, for sociological reasons, it is deemed desirable to separate the sexes in the schools, there would be no constitutional barrier against this even though one State chooses to adopt the plan and another State does not. For we usually recognize as absolute the right of each State community to regulate its social life, provided there is no denial to anyone of the right to public education itself. The States can, moreover, if they wish, subsidize private schools—provided they do not discriminate as between individuals in allocating funds.

The question before the country today is whether communities are free to adjust their school systems to meet their own local conditions and local sentiment. Those States which desire to integrate their schools ought to have the sovereign right to do so, and those which desire to operate mixed schools in some counties and separate their schools in other counties, either by color or by sex or by intelligence tests, should have the same sovereign right.

It is argued, on the other hand, that, since the public schools are tax-supported and because tax receipts come from all citizens, all public schools must be opened to all citizens. But the same point—equality of participation—could be made with respect to admission to church organizations, private clubs and private schools. They, too, are supported by all taxpayers because an exemption from State and Federal income taxes is given them as "non-profit-making" institutions.

Theoretically, wherever the Government confers its favors, there rests authority to regulate—to withdraw those favors unless the regulation which imposes conformity is accepted. Today the President's Commission on Interracial Discrimination has adopted this principle as the genesis of its power. The Executive order under which the Commission functions provides that whosoever benefits from any Government contract must conform to its requirements against discrimination in employment if based on "race, creed, color or national origin."

The central issue in the school question, however, is one of social relationships. Rooted in the minds of many people in the South is a fear that personal associations begun in the elementary schools will lead to a state of mind among youth that will bring more intermarriage of races.

If intermarriage became widespread, it seems certain that communities would insist upon some other way of preventing them—either by ostracism or by curtailing economic opportunities in the community to those who deviate from custom.

If there were only a few intermarriages in a given State, they probably would not attract much attention. But once they became numerous, the local communities would frown upon them. Public sentiment sometimes is stronger than law in bringing about a reform or change which the law itself could never impose.

What are the limits of conformity? Conformity in theory is justified, especially when the entire national interest is involved—in times of national peril. Thus, in theory, we are not supposed to recognize any distinctions when it comes to military service. But actually we do discriminate here, too. Even the conscientious objector is allowed to refrain from participation in active combat. Able-bodied women are not compelled to fight in the front lines though women have equal rights of citizenship. "Equality" has its exceptions.

At most it must be said that the problem is not going to be solved if there is a failure to analyze studiously the viewpoints of the opposing groups. It is a situation that ultimately will have to bow to the enlightened principle that majorities and minorities each have a right to regulate their own lives and their own customs.

Thus, treaties signed at the end of World War I established an obligation upon some of the new governments in Central Europe to allocate public funds for educational, religious, and charitable purposes to "racial, religious, or linguistic minorities" within their borders. The League of Nations was given the task of guaranteeing the observance of these minority rights.

The more we examine the formulas that have been developed throughout the world to permit minorities to get along with majorities, the more we will find that adjustments precisely of this nature have been conducive to conditions of harmonious living.

IV. IS THE 14TH AMENDMENT VALID?

We hear the argument, "But it's the law of the land." There is a grave question whether the 14th amendment, under which integration is ordered, was ever legally submitted to the States and legally ratified. The specific point has never been passed upon by the Supreme Court, though the public has taken it for granted for years that the 14th amendment is an integral part of the Constitution.

What are the facts? It is necessary as an initial step for any amendment to the Constitution to be passed by a two-thirds vote of both Houses of Congress. Yet, in June 1866, when the 14th amendment was voted upon in Congress, each House had excluded all persons appearing with credentials in the first instance as Senators or Representatives from the 10 Southern States of Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia Florida, Alabama, Mississippi, Louisiana, Arkansas, and Texas. If these Southern States had been permitted to vote in Congress, the amendment would not have passed.

Then, when the amendment was submitted to the legislatures of the several States, it needed to be ratified by 28 States, which was three-fourths of the 37 States then in the Union. Ten States, therefore, were able to block ratification.

But the 14th amendment was never ratified by California, and was rejected at the time by Kentucky, Delaware, and Maryland. It was rejected during the latter part of 1866 and the early part of 1867 also by the legislatures of the 10 Southern States. For the 14th amendment had in it many objectionable clauses. Apart from its provision requiring States to guarantee "equal protection of the laws," the amendment sought to punish former Confederate soldiers by forbidding them to hold office even in their own States unless Congress by a two-thirds vote removed the disability. It was argued, moreover, in those days that the State governments in the South were not legal governments but were merely "rebel States." Yet these States at the time had already received presidential recognition, and when the same southern legislatures in 1865 had ratified the 13th amendment, which abolished slavery, their action was accepted as legal by the Secretary of State. For the South had, by its vote, made possible the three-fourths vote of the States necessary for the adoption of the 13th amendment.

Furthermore, in the Reconstruction Act of 1867 Congress arrogantly proclaimed that self-rule would be restored to the States and they would be permitted representation in Congress once more only when they adopted the 14th amendment. It was so stipulated in the law which had been passed over the veto of President Andrew Johnson. He emphazed its injustices and unconstitutional aspects, and denounced it as "a bill of attainder against 9 million people."

Here is what Senator Doolittle, of Wisconsin, a conservative Republican of the North, said about the proposal on the floor of the Senate:

"My friend has said what has been said all around me, what is said every day: the people of the South have rejected the constitutional amendment, and therefore we will march upon them and force them to adopt it at the point of the bayonet, and establish

military power over them until they do adopt it."

This was a flagrant case of conformity by coercion. The act of Congress was a direct violation of the letter of the Constitution. For Congress has no power to coerce the States when they pass upon the question of whether or not they will ratify or reject proposed constitutional amendments.

"Puppet" governments established in the Southern States did finally ratify the 14th amendment in 1868 but only under duress—with registration of voters being supervised by military commanders from the North and with millions of white voters deliberately disenfranchised by the Reconstruction Act because they had fought in the war against the Union. Ohio and New Jersey attempted unsuccessfully that same year to withdraw their acts of ratification before the Secretary of State formally proclaimed the amendment as adopted. Doubt was expressed at the time by the President as to the validity of the alleged ratification.

Can it be said that all this action was in accord with the spirit of American fair play? Will this record stand up as constitutional—as the "consent of the governed"? Would we say today that the people in any place under military occupation are able freely to exercise their sovereign rights? The Reconstruction Act for many years deprived the Southern States of their powers of governmental autonomy. They recovered these powers only after a long and tragic era of military compulsion.

Should not the Supreme Court today reexamine the validity of the 14th amendment? If an important decision of 1896 can be reopened and reversed by the Supreme Court in 1954, is it not logical to resurvey the doubtful procedure whereby the 14th amendment itself was forced into the Constitution? The present Court has shown itself quite solicitous lately that persons in our midst charged with disloyalty be given the protection of "due process." Cases involving Communists have, on the slightest pretext of technicality, been ordered for retrial. Can't we give the same consideration to the States which have demonstrated their loyalty to the Union?

If it were presented anew today, there would not be a two-thirds vote of both Houses of Congress to approve the 14th amendment unless a specific reservation were made on the points now at issue.

The reason is clear. More than a third of the membership of both Houses at present feel that the 14th amendment was itself amended by the Supreme Court in 1954 and that, as long as this new legislative action by the Court stands as the official interpretation, it makes the original language of the 14th amendment inadequate.

V. THE PHILOSOPHICAL APPROACH

What do the philosophers of history say about conformity?

George Santayana in Dominations and Powers (1951)—a work sometimes referred to as comparable to Plato's Republic or to the Ethics of Aristotle—makes this pertinent comment:

"This ideal of a perfect ultimate democracy rests on two assumptions: that human nature in all men is essentially similar, and that consequently mankind could not fully develop its vital liberty without coming to a unanimous vision of the world and a cooperative exercise of the same virtues. I think this is a biological error, and that what is identical in all life is only its germ, from which all plants and animals have developed centrifugally, as circumstances have allowed them to develop * * *.

"The uniformity in American principles, as proclaimed publicly and as genuinely felt by most people, is no index to a natural unity in the vital forces at work among them. The proof appears if we consider a notorious fact: the Constitution of the United States, since the Civil War, establishes the equality of all citizens, irrespective 'of race, color, or previous condition of servitude.' And this is not merely a constitutional sham, like so many of the provisions in paper constitutions in other countries. It expresses an earnest conviction, dearly defended, by a great part of the people.

"Nevertheless whenever a difference of race, color, religion, or breeding is not so overcome in the rush of common work or duty as to pass unnoticed or even unknown, if an attempt is made to ignore it in comradeship, society, marriage, or place of residence, the real difference in the soul is instantly recognized, and an irresistible impulse causes the groups to segregate.

"This is set down by democratic doctrinaires to prejudice or snobbery. They do not perceive that contrast of character and taste can be ignored when people are engaged in some instrumental action, to which their moral diversity is irrelevant; but that as soon as the labor is over and the liberal life of play, art, affection, and worship begins, both sides equally require moral comprehension and are equally chilled, bored, and rendered sterile when comprehension is absent.

"That a white man ought to hobnob with a Negro because otherwise he would not be Christian or unselfish involves a flagrant assumption of superiority. The Negro, if he is not a fool, loves his own inspiration, and expands in the society of his own people. Vital liberty differentiates. Only vacant freedom leaves all in the same anonymous crowd."

G. K. Chesterton, in his famous work Orthodoxy, wrote in 1908:

"In modern ideal conceptions of society there are some desires that are possibly not attainable: but there are some desires that are not desirable. That all men should live in equally beautiful houses is a dream that may or may not be attained. But that all men should live in the same beautiful house is not a dream at all; it is a nightmare."

Alexis de Tocqueville, of France, a renowned philosopher who visited America in the 1830's and compared it with the systems of government in vogue from ancient days, expressed himself vehemently on the subject of tyrannical majorities—the effort by law to impose upon the minority certain customs and rules that did not have universal sanction.

Yet de Tocqueville was hopeful about America's future, little realizing the grave conflicts that were to come in later years because of the abuse of the very principles about which he wrote in 1835:

"But in the United States, the majority, which so frequently displays the tastes and the propensities of a despot, is still destitute of the most perfect instrument of tyranny.

"In the American Republics the Central Government has never as yet busied itself except with a small number of objects, sufficiently prominent to attract its attention. The secondary affairs of society have never been regulated by its authority; and nothing has hitherto betrayed its desire of even interfering in them.

"The majority has become more and more absolute, but has not increased the prerogatives of the Central Government; those great prerogatives have been confined to a certain sphere; and although the despotism of the majority may be galling upon one point, it cannot be said to extend to all. However the predominant party in the Nation may be carried away by its passions, however ardent it may be in the pursuit of its projects, it cannot oblige all the citizens to comply with its desires in the same manner and at the same time throughout the country.

"When the Central Government which represents that majority has issued a decree, it must entrust the execution of its will to agents over whom it frequently has no control and whom it cannot perpetually direct.

"If an oppressive law were passed, liberty would still be protected by the mode of executing that law; the majority cannot descend to the details and what may be called the puerilities of administrative tyranny. It does not even imagine that it can do so, for it has not a full consciousness of its authority."

Perhaps it is in recognition of these very difficulties that Robert Morrison MacIver, whose name means as much to modern sociology as does that of John Dewey to philosophy, gives some pointed advice in his book, The More Perfect Union, excerpts from which appear on pages 106–133 of this issue. He offers a program for the control of intergroup discrimination. It is definitely sympathetic to integration. Yet he gives this word of caution:

"Discrimination and its evils are likely to be exacerbated by any changes that increase tensions or promote crises in a society, no matter what their source, whether economic, political, ideological, or any other. On the other hand discrimination is likely to be diminished by any changes that make for the general well being of a society or that provide more constructive outlets for the aggressive tendencies of its groups."

VI. LINCOLN ON SOCIAL EQUALITY

It is sometimes asserted, though mistakenly, that, once the Supreme Court has ruled upon a subject, there is no appeal—not even to public opinion. Lincoln didn't think so. He denounced the Supreme Court for its decision in the Dred Scott case. He was outspoken against social equality.

When Lincoln argued against slavery he pointed to the impairment of personal freedom within the community—the individual had been deprived of his liberty—the right to make his own life. But Lincoln said this did not mean enforced association between the races. Debating in Illinois with Stephen Douglas, in September 1858, Lincoln said:

"I will say then that I am not nor ever have been in favor of bringing about in any way the social and political equality of the white and black races—that I am not, nor ever have been, in favor of making voters or jurors of Negroes, nor of qualifying them to hold office, nor to intermarry with white people; and I will say in addition to this that there is a physical difference between the white and black races which, I believe, will forever forbid the two races living together on terms of social and political equality. And inasmuch as they cannot so live, while they do remain together there must be the position of superior and inferior, and I as much as any other man am in favor of having the superior position assigned to the white race."

But it is insisted: "The Supreme Court has spoken." De Tocqueville's eloquent answer may be applied to the issue today. He wrote:

"When I refuse to obey an unjust law, I do not contest the right of the majority to command, but I simply appeal from the sovereignty of the people to the sovereignty of mankind. Some have not feared to assert that a people can never outstep the boundaries of justice and reason in those affairs which are peculiarly its own; and that consequently full power may be given to the majority by which it is represented. But this is the language of a slave.

"A majority taken colectively is only an individual, whose opinions, and frequently whose interests, are opposed to those of another individual, who is styled a minority. If it be admitted that a man possessing absolute power may misuse that power by wronging his adversaries, why should not a majority be liable to the same reproach?

Men do not change their characters by uniting with one another; nor does their patience in the presence of obstacles increase with their strength. * * *.

"When an individual or a party is wronged in the United States, to whom can he apply for redress? If to public opinion, public opinion constitutes the majority; if to the legislature, it represents the majority and implicitly obeys it; if to the executive power, it is appointed by the majority and serves as a passive tool in its hands. The public force consists of the majority under arms; the jury is the majority invested with the right of hearing judicial cases; and in certain States even the judges are elected by the majority. However iniquitous or absurd the measure of which you complain, you must submit to it as well as you can."

VII. JEFFERSON ON JUDICIAL TYRANNY

Thomas Jefferson warned against the tyranny of judges. He wrote in 1804:

"But the opinion which gives to the judges the right to decide what laws are constitutional, and what not, not only for themselves in their own sphere of action, but for the legislature and executive also, in their spheres, would make the judiciary a despotic branch."

Then, long after Jefferson left the Presidency, he wrote in 1820 and 1821:

"It is a misnomer to call a government republican, in which a branch of the supreme power is independent of the nation. * * *

"A judiciary independent of a king or executive alone, is a good thing; but independence of the will of the nation is a solecism, at least in a republican government. * * *

"To consider the judges as the ultimate arbiters of all constitutional questions (is) a very dangerous doctrine indeed, and one which would place us under the despotism of an oligarchy. * * * The Constitution has erected no such single tribunal.

"The great object of my fear is the Federal judiciary. That body, like gravity, ever acting, with noiseless foot, and unalarming advance * * * is engulfing insidiously the special governments into the jaws of that which feeds them."

How much this is like the doctrines of Thomas Hobbes. In his famous work Leviathan, he wrote in 1651:

"Princes succeed one another; and one judge passeth, another cometh; nay, heaven and earth shall pass; but not one tittle of the law of nature shall pass, for it is the eternal law of God. Therefore all the sentences of precedent judges that have ever been cannot altogether make a law contrary to natural equity."

A modern writer—Walter Lippmann—in his book, the Public Philosophy (1955), says:

"There is a hiatus between the highest wisdom and the actual perplexities with which men must deal. An encyclopedia of all that the prophets and the philosophers have taught will not tell a man clearly and definitely how to make laws, how to govern a state, how to educate his children—how, in fact, to decide the problems that the priest encounters in the confessional, the doctor with his patients, the lawyer with his clients, the judge with the litigants, the man of affairs in his business."

VIII. FACING THE REAL ISSUE

Many people today are urging caution with respect to the integration problem—an approach that has come to be known as gradualism. Its fallacy lies in the belief that what cannot be resolved now will be resolved by postponement. It assumes that equality is a natural right in the community and that all forms of discrimination can be abolished by the passage of time.

The fetish of conformity, however, has demoralized the life of many nations in the world through the centuries. Where minorities have been suppressed and the right to pursue their own lives and customs has been impaired, there has been discontent and, at times, eruptions of violence.

We see today in the island of Cyprus a bloody war because nobody has yet devised a plan whereby the Turkish minority can live alongside the Greek majority. We see the same tragedy in Algeria—as between the French minority and the native majority.

Self-determination does not mean the delegation of power to a tyrannical majority. It means adjustment of minorities alongside of majorities. In no other way can there be a maintenance of equity for all concerned.

Can we not in America find a way whereby majorities and minorities may get along with one another in peace? The Constitution of the United States provided for separate but not equal States. There was no provision that each State must be equal to the other in voting for President or in choosing Members of the House of Representatives. Equality of representation was provided only in the Senate.

Theoretically, all men are created equal. It is a doctrine that could mean that all wealth in the community must be divided equally between all citizens. The Communists believe in such a doctrine. There have been men in America who have argued for the redistribution of wealth. Do any of us honestly believe that harmonious society can ever be achieved by a law that requires all incomes to be equal, or that the possession of property should be equalized between all citizens?

Equality is a theoretical goal. Its application will depend always on the mores of the community. Even in our day some of the loudest voices declaiming against discrimination are men who in their business and social relationships are practicing discriminations of various kinds. It is common knowledge that membership in some of the principal clubs and organizations in many of our large cities and in the fraternities in almost all of our colleges is barred to persons of certain races or religions, as the case may be. It is common knowledge also that employers in the North, for the most part, give preference to applicants of certain ethnic origions or races as against others. There is, therefore, continuously applied a doctrine of discrimination which negates the theory of equality.

One need not agree at all with the reasons given for such discriminations—indeed, one may be offended by their practice. But if we are to rely on theory, there is as much right to discrimination as there is to noncrimination. It is really the misguided attempt to override these separate and distinct rights of the individual by public law that causes the conflict of today.

Conformity by coercion is not liberalism. The answer is to be found in voluntarism—freedom's greatest vehicle of progress. It offers us the only solution to the vexatious problems of sociology in our Republic.

Westchester County and the Westchester County Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH A. GAMBLE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 27, 1956

Mr. GAMBLE. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted by the House, I present for insertion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an address by my good and longtime friend, Mr. Hugh W. Robertson, vice president, Westchester County Publishers, Inc., on the occasion of the fifth anniversary dinner of the Westchester County Association. I am sure the readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD will find this article concerning my home county informative and interesting.

The article follows:

WESTCHESTER COUNTY AND THE WESTCHESTER COUNTY ASSOCIATION

(By Hugh W. Robertson)

Thank you, Mr. Chairman, ladies, and gentlemen—and fellow members of the Westchester County Association, and I hope those terms are synonymous.

I think it is important before we weigh the value of the Westchester County Association during our 5-year life to look also at Westchester County, because occasionally it strikes me that being so close to the county, so many of us day after day don't see it in perspective that a newcomer does.

Now I'll let you in on a little secret. We had hoped to have the county executive, Jim Hopkins, here to make this speech tonight. But because of a commitment of long-term standing, he could not be here. I'm pinch-hitting for Jimmy and I hope to give you in substance what he would have said had he been here.

THE NEW LOOK IN WINCHESTER

I had the opportunity recently to see an advance showing of an administrative program which the New York Telephone Co. has put together consisting of about a hundred projection slides with an added comment by a representative of the telephone company. That is entitled the "New Look in Westchester" and for any of you who are looking for a showing for your luncheon clubs or dinners, I can recommend it highly. It gives you not only the historical background of Westchester, but an insight into the development of the last 5 or 10 years since World War II that I've seen nowhere else. I would make just one addition to that—instead of calling it the "New Look in Westchester" I'd like to borrow a title and call it the "New Forward Look in Westchester."

Now, to run over briefly the developments in Westchester County in the past 5 years, paralleling the growth of this association of ours: I may, at the risk of repetitions for some of you who have heard this before, give you just a few of what I consider interesting sidelights. Mr. Hopkins, our county executive, pointed out in discussing a budget the other day, that Westchester has a population which exceeds any 1 of 8 States. I made a little research myself beyond that. I got from Colby Kalloch the fact that we have 352,000 telephones in this county, which is more than those in Albania, Bulgaria, Greece, and Roumania combined. I checked on the auto registration. We had last year 269,998 cars, motor vehicles, registered in this county. That is, just to make it easy to remember, 2 short of 270,000 cars. That's more than any 1 of 6 States of the United States.

I checked our voting in 1952, the last presidential year. We voted 355,358. That's more than the total vote of any 1 of 15 States. And our assessed valuation as shown by the last figure in the new budget, is $2,098,000,000. And that's more than the assessed values of any 1 of 15 States. Not at all a small county that we are trying in this association to help.

NOT HOW BIG—BUT HOW GOOD

I want to hastily insert the idea that it isn't how big this county is that really counts, it's how good we are. And we are not going after sizes, after large figures, at the expense of quality. What we are trying to do is the best we can with what we have, and it's surprising what you can do with that.

For example: I read this interesting observation, and I think you'll find this in the little brochure that comes with your bill from the telephone company. You might not all know what is the third largest seaport of the northeastern section of the United States. It is Mount Vernon. You will be surprised, but when you check up your tonnage that's where Mount Vernon stands.

Now, Westchester itself is not so big geographically, only 450 square miles, yet we have the highest per capita income in the world in this county.

What we have been up against in this county and in this association, in this attempt to help the county, has been a guidance of growth which is certain. It's coming and if this association were to fold up tonight, this growth would continue. We do not claim credit for that, but what we are striving to do is to guide it, to help that growth, to keep it from harming those of us who are here and have our investments here. To cooperate, to get liaison.

CUTTING DOWN ON THE DEBT

How is the county doing? Well, the first place to look as a rule is to the financial statement. Let's start with the money. Back in 1936, this county owed an outstanding debt of $106 million. We have cut that down to $55 million, which is almost a 50-percent cut. Back in 1933, counting our bonds and the interest to which we were committed by those bonds, we owed $149 million. As of the first of next year, we've cut that to $48 million, which is about a two-thirds cut.

I don't know of any other government, county, State, municipal, and I know of very few of our families which can show such a good standing on the books. And yet we haven't done that by being over stingy or thrifty. For example: In the last 4 years we have spent, or committed, or made available $18 million for public improvements in this county.

Back there 25 years ago when I started attending the meetings of the county board of supervisors, out of every tax dollar that was collected, 55 cents went to pay off bonds or interest amortization. We've cut that down now to 13 cents out of every dollar and further than that, we are on the pay-as-you-go policy now, exclusive of sewers, which are district charges and on which we can expect the improvement will outlast by a good length of time the interest on the bonds themselves.

NOW IT'S PAY-AS-YOU-GO

It's not too well remembered that a number of years ago we didn't proceed on that theory. Someone has said we forged our grandchildren's names to promissory notes. Let's take the first large noteworthy improvement this county had up to World War I, the Bronx River Parkway, in which we shared the cost 25 percent and 75 percent with New York City.

But even at that we made those 50-year bonds and we didn't start paying off until 1938. By 1938 we had practically worn out one pavement. It's been repaved twice since then. We could say: "Here are the bonds, but where is the road?" That last bond on the Bronx River Parkway will not be paid off till 1988. We have altered that now—and I'm glad to see here tonight one name to whom I give a great deal of credit for that change in our fiscal policy, and that is former budget director, Bill Folger.

FROM A BUSINESS VIEWPOINT

Now how are we doing on industry? You may not know that we're second only to Erie County, outside of New York City, in the number of business firms. We have the fastest growing department store trade in the East. Our income payments in 1952, those which were paid to our residents, were $1,705,000,000. Now it's almost up to $2 billion. Is it any wonder that the department stores are moving to Westchester County?

How about buildings? Permits last year: We had 6,649 permits for one-family homes or apartment units at a total cost of $124 million. For 1953 it was 9,374 units at a $152 million cost. In industrial building in 1953, we had 383 units at $15 million. This year it is almost certain we'll break all records.

How about manufacturing? Last figures, 1953, we had 927 plants employing 50,300 people. What do we make? We don't consider Westchester usually as a manufacturing county because we have carefully guarded against every type of manufacturing which would depreciate adjoining property values, yet we have a tremendous range of it. Looking at some of the small things and the large things, a transistor hearing aid which is the size of—or only a little larger than this match cover—ranging from that up to some of the finest motorcars that have been assembled.

WIDE RANGE OF PRODUCTS

We have the world's best known nuts and bolts. We have candy mints that are known from Alaska to Africa. We have the magazine with the largest circulation in the world. We have the funniest animal cartoons that have ever been screened by Hollywood. We turn out greeting cards by the millions. We have foodstuffs made right here and bearing the trademark of Westchester which go all over the world, and we have the first atomic-powered production of electricity on the Atlantic seaboard now underway.

Some more of our outstanding products: We have the makers of scales here which will weigh one-hundredth of a milligram. We go from that to the largest elevators in the world. We have maps. We have the world's oldest candlemaker here. We have fabrics, wall coverings. We make powder puffs. We turn out those mints I mentioned * * * 10 billion Lifesavers. Enough if they were put side to side to circle the globe five times and still have enough left over for every kid in Westchester County.

We make cold-laid asphalt concrete, we have cameras for underwater use, we have closed TV circuit equipment which is just coming into use. We make pharmaceuticals including, right here in Westchester, the first chlorophyll that was ever turned out. One firm alone in Westchester makes one-third of a million dresses annually. We make X-ray machines. We turn out a million bottles daily of a certain soft drink. We started frozen bread here. We have an ice cream college, teaching people how to make the best usage of ice cream in soft drinks.

We even have a brewmaster where we teach people how to brew beer. Recently we made the world's largest diner here in Westchester and shipped in to Elkton, Md. We make wire and cables. We make a nuclear competometer. We have Columbia University's cyclotron. We have the biggest emery mine in the United States here. We have a timing device company which makes one so delicate, so fine, that it will measure one ten-millionth of a second. Now one ten-millionth of a second is exactly the time that elapses when the light turns green and the fellow behind blows his horn at you.

We have this new bridge coming across at Tarrytown which, as estimated by engineers, and rather conservatively, will be bringing by 1960—85,000 vehicles daily across and is to bring a hundred thousand population into Westchester markets. That's why I like to call ours the Empire County of the Empire State.

THE TASK FOR THE ASSOCIATION

Now that's Westchester. Let's look to the Westchester County Association. How have we helped?

I want to start off first by reminding you that this is a voluntary association made up completely of civilians. We have no authority whatsoever. No legal authority. Our only weapon is that of moral suasion or how we may be able to mold public opinion. And yet it seems to me that, through our committees, our directors, and most of all our members, we have formed a common pool into which have been poured ideas, plans, projects, to be tossed around and discussed and argued.

When a decision is reached we have in effect an impact that is greater than you can measure by any yardstick of an association because each of us in our individual business, in the circle of friends and business associates that we have, is empowered to advance that project and that idea.

It is impossible to measure the Westchester County Association and say it has been worth so much, so many dollars. All I know is that, if it hadn't been here, we would have had to invent it. Because this county needed it in the rapid expansion which has come as it did after the First World War, when more people came in and required better service utilities, transportation, hospitals, schools, highways, roads, which in turn attracted still more people. And the cycle continues.

THE TREND IN OUR DIRECTION

The principal feature of our association work in this 5-year period has been, I think, the cooperation which has brought recognition of Westchester County as the logical site for national regional headquarters. Especially those which feel they must be centralized. And I do not believe, as has been advanced in some quarters, that this decentralization is caused by orders from the Pentagon, or a feeling by the heads of these large corporations that they must get out of the large cities because of fears that bombs may be dropped.

Rather it is a recognition of a trend which is obvious to anyone who lives on the fringe, or in the suburbs of a large city. That is, those cities are gradually tending to strangle themselves with traffic, with rail transportation delays, with the rush and saturation, the noise, the tension, all of which have the effect upon the bodies and the human minds which are making us more and more a population requiring mental treatment. Follow the absorption of the clerical help in the cities, the sales taxes and most of all I think, unattractive working conditions.

This has been a trend in which the association has cooperated, and yet of the 60 major firms which have come to Westchester County in the last 3 years, not one of them has been solicited by this association. We have said that we are glad to show what we have, to lay it out on the counter: take a look at it, if you come, we'll be delighted to welcome you. But we have highpressured none of them.

The result of that is that in the 3 years mentioned we have a $354 million jump in our assessed valuation, and I think we're just in the edge of even greater prosperity. In that connection, the association last year had 580 inquiries from companies which wanted to move in or expand or establish branches.

Oddly enough, if I may interrupt or interpolate a thought here, one of the unfortunate aspects of this has been an almost hysterical countermovement in New York City in which some of the established realty interests have attempted to engage us in some sort of controversy as to the relative merits of New York City and Westchester County. I'm glad that our association has refused to be drawn into any such argument. It is our feeling that there's enough business to go around * * * that time will decide * * * we will welcome those who come, but we are not going to get into any name-calling or

mud slinging with any interests in New York City. We'll stand on our own merit.

OUR PROBLEMS—PAST AND PRESENT

I think in business we've done a good 5-year job. I think in public relations we haven't done so well. I think our publicity will stand a checking up. I think our membership should be better. We are 500 * * * we should have at least 5,000. I think that we've got to make more use of a greater number of our members who are not serving on committees, because that's where the real good work is done. The hard work, the surveys. Those people who come back with the correct answers, the facts, on which we can proceed. I think we can be judged also by the fact that we have not made mistakes which we might have made.

Let's consider the question of politics. We've been about 5 years living down the idea that this association was formed to produce the city of Westchester County, than which nothing could be further from the truth. We could have made mistakes in a partisan political sense, and yet I point to the fact that our former counsel is now the county executive of Westchester. I point to the fact that we have the minority leader of the board of supervisors as one of our directors and the leader of the minority party in the largest city as one of our directors.

We might have had trouble with our labor relations, yet two of our hardest working directors are the president and secretary of the Westchester Building Trades Council, the largest A. F. of L. union in the county.

THE BIG TASK OF TRAFFIC

Now I'm coming to the end, and this is looking ahead: Our problems. They are tremendous. We are going to see some of them when we get this bridge opened on the 15th of December across the Hudson. Without contact yet made to the Deegan Expressway I tremble to think of the traffic problems we're going to have on the west side of our county next spring. Particularly since that $750 million bond amendment was defeated are we up against it.

I think we've got to give a little thought to the question of whether or not we may have to raise our parkway tolls from 10 cents to 25 cents. We've seen Connecticut double them on the Merritt Parkway with hardly a ripple of public opposition. We're still paying 10-cent tolls on the Hendrick Hudson Bridge 10 years after that bridge has been paid for, but those tolls have very little public opposition.

That is something on which I think the association can be a great deal of help. I don't know what the end is going to be. I do know this: That we must consider seriously the effect, the cost that we're going to have to face in new roads or parkways. I suggest that we give serious thought to the question that we may in emergencies open our parkways to commercial traffic, insofar as the bridges will allow the trucks to pass underneath.

I think we've got to expand our airport—we've got to fight for a little better transportation facilities, and I'm delighted to read in tonight's paper that Mohawk is giving us back that flight to Utica and Syracuse and Rochester and Buffalo.

The association helped tremendously in better mail service, in intercounty delivery, and integration in the bus services, in our sewerage treatment, and in our community college in the establishment of scholarships by business firms.

WE CAN DO BETTER

I think we failed miserably on two cultural objectives. One was the establishment of a county library. I'm delighted that we are now going in on that cultural side of our program to help in the science fair for high-school students.

We've got to watch out particularly on the home proposition: That we do not allow vacant stores on Main Street to put an added tax burden on residences on the Soundview Avenue homes. We've got to be careful that we keep Westchester still open to the young married couples, to the G. I. boys. We must keep them with us and there is a job for the real-estate interests and the contractors.

On recreation we've done a pretty good job. We've got the new pool at Saxon Woods. We are going to have the new golf course at Dunwoodie. In all of this the association has been helpful, I believe, to the county and I think if County Executive Hopkins were here tonight he would be the first to admit it.

I'd say this in conclusion. We have not been hurried. We've done a good job. We could have done better, and we hope to do better. At least gives us an "A" for effort because we have tried. I think we have done what the philosopher urged when he said:

"Greatly begin—
Though thou hast time
But for a line
Make it sublime!
Not failure
But low aim is crime!"

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

PRICE OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

The Public Printer is authorized to furnish to subscribers the daily RECORD at $1.50 per month, payable in advance.

Remit by money order payable to Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C.

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is located in Statuary Hall, House wing, where Mr. Frank Brodie is in attendance during the sessions of Congress to receive orders for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month, and where single copies may also be purchased. Orders are also accepted for the printing of speeches in pamphlet form.

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

Appendix

Resolutions Adopted by the National Rivers and Harbors Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL G. ROGERS
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 13, 1956

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, under authority granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to submit the report of the resolutions committee which was unanimously adopted by the 43d convention of the National Rivers and Harbors Congress held in Washington, D. C., recently.

The resolutions committee, of which I had the honor and pleasure of serving as chairman for the first time, consisted of one delegate from each State, Territory, island possession, and the District of Columbia. The members gave careful and painstaking consideration to the matters before them, suggested numerous changes in the draft of the resolutions presented to them, and reached agreement thereon. An amendment to the committee's report was offered from the convention floor and was adopted without objection.

The convention was attended by 358 registered delegates from 43 States, Hawaii, Puerto Rico, the District of Columbia, and Colombia, South America, in addition to several hundred who failed to register, guests, visitors, representatives of the press, and so forth. Louisiana sent the largest delegation, 41, being the home State of our president; North Carolina was next with 30; while Ohio and Texas were tied for third place with 22 each.

These delegates were from all sections of the country, representing both legislative and executive branches of the Federal Government; State, city, county, and other local governmental agencies and interested groups; commercial, waterway, flood control, and reclamation associations; agricultural, labor, industrial, and trade organizations, and transportation interests; with memberships totaling several million.

We believe this unanimous expression of representatives of such different interests and pursuits is strong evidence of the general sentiment of the people of the United States concerning the matters dealt with in these resolutions:

REPORT OF THE RESOLUTIONS COMMITTEE TO THE 43D NATIONAL CONVENTION OF THE NATIONAL RIVERS AND HARBORS CONGRESS, MAY 12, 1956

FOREWORD

Migrations of varying degrees have historically played a most important role in the settlement and development of our yet young country. Beginning on our eastern seaboard, people moved our frontiers northward, westward, and southward over the years and expanded our young Nation. Today migrations are still taking place through the movement of humans and industry to the water courses throughout the land. These movements have intensified the need for additional flood protection, navigation, and water resources development in general as a national problem. These newly developing frontiers and those already developed in our river valleys need the Nation's help to its utmost ability. Anything less may well endanger our economy and future security. The National Rivers and Harbors Congress can and will continue to devote its best efforts to methods of developing our Nation and benefiting all its people through an active program of resource development consistent with the changing times.

THE PRESIDENT'S MESSAGES

President Eisenhower on January 5 of this year reemphasized, in his state of the Union message, the critical importance of the wise use and conservation of our great natural resources and pointed out that their development cannot be accomplished overnight. His message acknowledged that the need is such that much faster progress must be made without delay. The President's 1957 budget message on January 16 reflects this view. He recommends that work be started on 36 authorized Corps of Engineers and Bureau of Reclamation projects; recommends the authorization and start of other improvements at Federal expense and participation in others. Other projects have since been recommended. Moreover, the President's Economic Report on January 24, 1956, pointed out that a great backlog of public works remain largely as a consequence of heavy expenditures for our national security during and since World War II and unexpected population gains. The message further states that outlays should be large enough to contribute decisively toward removing this backlog.

From these messages we have received encouragement, and we hope that these and similar future messages, and the actions by Congress on the recommendations and policies therein, will result in development of our resources in keeping with the needs of our people and the stature our Nation enjoys in the world.

APPROPRIATIONS

There is no denial in any quarter that a great backlog of resource projects exists. The President's Economic Report recognizes it; and statements appearing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD make reference to it. The President recommends that outlays be large enough to contribute decisively to its removal, and Members of Congress are alert to the desirability of its reduction. In considering the elements entering into an increase in appropriations to accelerate the resource program it is interesting to note that our country, as a generous gesture, has granted billions in specific aid to foreign nations and at the present time there remains of the appropriated funds for that purpose some $10 billion of unobligated funds. Ten billion dollars approximates, at the present rate, the total appropriations that will be made for natural-resource development in our own country in the next 10-year period.

Accordingly, we believe that a reconciliation of the two appropriations will provide adequately for our own welfare and permit our generosity throughout the world to remain substantial.

FLOOD AND DISASTER INSURANCE

The recent hurricanes and floods on the east coast and floods on the west coast have caused considerable thought to be given to insurance against such devastation. This Congress must insist that any method by which victims of these unfortunate events are made whole cannot become a replacement for a sound program of prevention. Whether the losses are paid out of private funds, a combination of private and Federal funds or solely from Federal funds the losses are not reduced and suffering is not compensated for. It is our hope that by the adoption of a disaster insurance program our leaders are not lulled into complacency respecting a sound program of prevention but rather that they realize such insurance to be a stop-gap measure pending the completion of protective projects or as a substitute for control measures where such measures are impracticable.

MAINTENANCE OF WATERWAYS AND PORTS

This Congress is sympathetic to the proposition that obsolete and little used waterways should not be a burden on the Federal Treasury by the expenditure of funds for their unjustified maintenance. By the same token waterways that have carried sufficient traffic to justify their maintenance but are not now carrying such traffic because of lack of maintenance should by all means be restored to usefulness. New waterways are justified on prospective traffic and there is no reason why lack of maintenance should operate to take a waterway out of existence. The actual and potential traffic for existing and proposed waterways is of sufficient proportion to warrant a concurrent program of adequate maintenance of the one and immediate construction of the other.

COMMISSIONS AND REPORTS

It is evident from published reports that considerable time and effort have been applied to the study of natural resource development, among other things, by the President's Advisory Committees on Water Resources Policy and on Transport Policy and Organization; the Second Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government headed by former President Hoover; and the Commission on Intergovernmental Relations headed by Mr. Meyer Kestnbaum from industry. These related studies of a common broad subject have resulted in some instances in similar recommendations. We concur in some of these recommendations. However, it may well be that, unless the proper combinations from the several reports are put into effect with proper timing, the overall program of resource development will suffer a setback. The echelons of review and coordination; the interagency studies, the State organizations; the partnership arrangements; all contemplated in one or more of the studies would be time-consuming in the beginning at least. These coupled with the checks and balances already required of the appropriate Federal agencies by law and regulation should not be permitted to delay the already lagging programs.

We urge the President and the Congress to afford those of us interested in an accelerated and orderly program of resource development the opportunity to be heard further when the several recommendations are considered for aodption.

WATER SUPPLY

Our insufficient supply of water for domestic, municipal, and industrial uses has been increasingly apparent to the National Rivers and Harbors Congress for several years. The current supply weighed against projections into the future with increased population, expanding industry, and the conversion to irrigation even in the humid areas indicates that the problem is compatible with that of controlling floods—it is also serious.

We urge the Congress of the United States to consider the need for conserving and increasing our water supply concurrent with their consideration of the flood problem and related resources problems, and legislate a Federal policy on water supply. Now is the appropriate time.

SHORE PROTECTION

The National Rivers and Harbors Congress hereby reaffirms its support of H. R. 4470, a bill to amend the act entitled "An act authorizing Federal participation in the cost of protecting the shores of publicly owned property," approved August 13, 1946. The need for shore protection with Federal participation on the water borders and lake areas of our Nation is parallel with the need for flood control in our river valleys.

MERCHANT MARINE

World tension today keeps us mindful of the frantic conditions under which ships were constructed for use in World War II. Many of the ships constructed under those conditions are now obsolete for even an appropriate contribution to our peacetime economy. Others in our active maritime fleet are approaching obsolescence. The deterioration of our merchant marine must not be allowed to come about. We reaffirm our support of a vigorous program by the Maritime Administration which will insure orderly replacement of those vessels which do not contribute to our peacetime economy and our national security.

We support also the efforts of the Maritime Administration in providing merchant-marine officers from the United States and State maritime academies as replacements and additions to the maritime service of our country.

WATERSHED PROTECTION AND BASIN PLANS

This Congress notes that a number of bills have been introduced to amend the Watershed Protection Act to include, under the Secretary of Agriculture, engineering structural programs for flood control, water supply, drainage, irrigation, and other phases of resource development. A lot has been said and is still being said about duplication and overlapping of functions in the Federal Government. These proposed amendments on the surface would appear to duplicate functions of the Departments of the Interior and the Army. Soil conservation, forestry, and other land-treatment measures are favored by this Congress, but we do advise caution to the extent that conflicting laws do not operate to the detriment of sound basin development by all agencies concerned through the imposition of conflicting policies as to partnerships, project economics, and related problems.

TOLLS ON WATERWAYS

This Congress believes that the imposition of tolls or user charges on our inland waterways is incompatible with the historic free use of these waterways for the flow of commerce by which an extensive economy on, along, and off them has been developed. Moreover, the complexities of any equitable imposition of such charges on waterways improved over a period of a century are aggravated by the varying amounts of local contributions heretofore made. Tolls or user charges in lieu of some form of non-Federal participation in projects will have an adverse effect on water transportation perhaps to the extent of eliminating a number of carriers; increasing rate structures for the remainder; and even the elimination of important links in this vast transportation network. The Nation cannot afford such deterioration of a valuable asset by experiment. We cannot remain idle and permit it to take place.

THE CABINET COMMITTEE BILLS

Where our national transportation policy of 1940 now recognizes and would preserve the inherent advantages of each means of transportation and foster sound economic conditions among the several carriers, the President's Cabinet Committee on Transport Policy has recommended a change which would encourage and promote full competition between modes of transportation subject only to certain vague provisions intended to prevent the charging of rates less than out-of-pocket cost.

Our present system of regulation of railroads was designed for the purpose of restraining their practices of selective rate-cutting which in the past have been so successful in stifling competition by water carriers. Inland water for-hire transportation owes its very existence and its encouraging current growth to the fact that this system of regulation has at last become partially effective. We recognize that it is in the public interest to protect small carriers who render efficient services from the destructive rate practices of large carriers who, by virtue of their size alone and regardless of efficiency, have historically been capable of putting their small competitors out of business unless a proper restraint is exerted by Government.

These transportation amendments, while purporting to reduce economic regulation of transportation, would do so only for the railroads and with respect to water transportation would actually increase the scope of regulation in such a way as to restrain competition. To place artificial restrictions upon water carriers while relaxing the restraints upon rail carriers will relegate inland water transportation to the field of private carriage where its benefits are limited only to those shippers large enough to afford their own fleets.

We are impressed with the prosperity of the railroads and wish them continued success. We recognize the need for maintaining an efficient and sound railroad system in the United States, but we are convinced that the proper method is to improve the outworn administrative and operating practices of the railroads and not to cripple their small competitors. Let Congress continue the policy of survival of the fittest in transportation and not be tempted to substitute survival of the biggest.

PROPOSED REPEAL OF THE DRY BULK EXEMPTION

Current efforts by special interests to induce Congress to impose Interstate Commerce Commission regulation upon the transportation of dry bulk materials on our waterways would have the effect of replacing free enterprise with a regulated cartel. On our waterways there are over 1,700 carriers, of whom roughly 1,000 are contract carriers engaged in vigorous competition among themselves in the transportation of bulk commodities basic to our national economy. This competition under our system of free enterprise has produced rapid technological progress and effective transportation to the benefit and satisfaction of shippers and carriers, as well as to the public who ultimately derive these benefits. Legislation which would impose the devitalizing influence of government regulation in this field, and virtually preclude the entry of new carriers into the business, and place small carriers at the mercy of large carriers would benefit no one other than a handful of prosperous major barge lines.

We urge Congress to reject such legislation and to remember that the benefits of our God-given rivers, improved by the Government for the benefit of the public, must not be delivered into the hands of a few for their own exploitation.

HURRICANES AND FRESH WATER DEVELOPMENT

The Federal Government should intensify its efforts in three important areas:

1. Observation and possible control of hurricanes. The Weather Bureau and the armed services are to be commended for recent improvements in reporting hurricanes and warning people in threatened areas.

2. Artificial rainmaking has shown enough promise to warrant the use of public funds for further experimentation. Thought should also be given to the control of and use of such artificially produced water, if the cloud-seeding technique is perfected in the future.

3. More Federal funds should be allocated for study of projects to convert saline water into fresh water. This has been proven feasible, but the cost is still too high for practical application to agricultural and industrial needs. As the water-table continues to drop and as municipalities, industry and agriculture increase their demands for more water, the sea becomes a promising source.

We commend Congress for recognizing this problem and recommend that the program be expedited.

COMMENDATIONS

The 43d National Convention of the National Rivers and Harbors Congress held in the Mayflower Hotel, Washington, D. C., May 10–12, 1956, was well attended by delegates from all parts of the United States. The press, TV, and radio very ably and correctly reported the proceedings of the convention. The arrangements and program committee made an outstanding effort for a successful convention. The Mayflower and other hotels in Washington made available their facilities and accommodations for the comfort and convenience of the delegates. Visitors and other persons interested in the welfare and development of our resources cooperated heartily.

The National Rivers and Harbors Congress and its members express their appreciation and gratitude to all those named above.

Another Democrat Looks at His Party

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY FLOOD BYRD

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, July 13, 1956

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "In the Nation: Another Democrat Looks at His Party," by Arthur Krock, and published in today's New York Times.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IN THE NATION: ANOTHER DEMOCRAT LOOKS AT HIS PARTY

(By Arthur Krock)

WASHINGTON, July 12.—"Moderation" is a word that Adlai E. Stevenson, its principal distributor in the political community, has never had an opportunity to demonstrate in practice by acts in national elective office. But LYNDON B. JOHNSON, the Senate majority leader, has had ample occasion to do that. And a memorandum on the subject which he drew up as a mental exercise not only states explicitly his principle of moderate party leadership, but suggests it may become a

point of basic conflict at the Democratic national convention.

Certainly it will if Gov. Averell Harriman makes a determined attempt to lead the majority of the convention over a trampled minority into the aggressive path he already is treading. And certainly the Johnson formula will come into basic conflict with former President Truman's if the record is a reliable guide. A Harriman challenge of the Johnson concept would seem the greater probability because Mr. Truman has told friends he is going to Chicago in August to "heal the party's wounds" and that on this errand he has "a complete understanding" with JOHNSON and Speaker RAYBURN. However, in view of the former President's intra-party fighting record, and the comment of JOHNSON and RAYBURN that they aren't sure what he means by "a complete understanding," a Truman challenge of the JOHNSON thesis also may appear.

"The function of leadership in an American political party is too often misunderstood," wrote JOHNSON to himself as he began his memorandum. "The general concept is that leadership is composed of fighting the opposition party and that therefore the best leader is a man with leather lungs, a choice store of epithets and an inexhaustible willingness to do anything and everything to join battle at any time."

The Texas Senator must have had some fellow Democrats in mind whose names will readily occur to many readers. But since he did not give them, they must remain his secret for the time being.

THE COUNTRY IS SO HUGE

"If all leaders were of this type," JOHNSON went on to confide to himself, "the American landscape would soon be littered with political parties—none with any real following and none able to command a majority. The country is so huge that there are bound to be regional differences which must be reconciled lest Government grind to a halt and the Nation be paralyzed."

The majority leader has followed this view with great success in legislation, and with constructive results so far as restoring long-absent Democratic unity in the Senate is concerned. The memorandum continues:

"With a few rare exceptions the great political leaders of our country have been men of reconciliation—men who could hold their parties together. Lincoln never permitted the radical Republicans to drive more moderate elements out of the party. Woodrow Wilson appealed to elements throughout the Nation and only went down to failure when he became too doctrinaire and too arbitrary. F. D. Roosevelt successfully maintained a coalition that ranged all the way from Jimmy Byrnes to Leon Henderson. Theodore Roosevelt was a great political figure up to the point that he split his own party."

The next passage fortifies the conclusion that other names were in the Senator's mind, though he mentioned but one. "About the only 'rock 'em, sock 'em, damn the opposition' leader who was continuously successful," he mused, "was Andrew Jackson, and this can be attributed to a special circumstance—the fact that he was representing a group of Americans who were in the actual majority but who had been disfranchised up to the point that he came along.

"A true leader," so ends the memorandum, "consists of a man who can get people to work together on the points on which they agree and who can persuade them that when they disagree there are peaceful methods of settling their differences. This is the kind of leadership that can build a party that will win the election this November or any other November. The kind of leadership that would split the party because of differences in doctrine is the kind that will guarantee defeat."

It is obvious that the Senator, when he wrote this aide memoire, was thinking of party leadership in the legislative arena, of the record therein made as the claim of the party for office from the people. But the formal political platform is the product of the national convention; the candidates for President, for Vice President and for other offices stand on this. Hence the Johnson formula necessarily extends to compromises on differences of doctrine at the convention as a required sequel to compromises on legislation if a party is to win this November or any other November.

The Senator will have a balance of power at Chicago considerably beyond that supplied by the Texas delegation. He will have more or less difficulty with his concept there, but it probably won't be with Stevenson.

The Fallacy of United States Foreign Aid Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM LANGER
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, July 13, 1956

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "The Fallacy of United States Foreign Aid Policy," written by Thurman Sensing, and published in the Lima (Ohio) News of July 8, 1956.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE FALLACY OF UNITED STATES FOREIGN AID POLICY

(By Thurman Sensing)

It would seem that bureaucracy of foreign aid has become well entrenched in our Nation's Capitol, and that a large percentage of the representatives of the American people in the Congress have been brainwashed on the subject.

How else can one explain the giving away of $55 billion of the American taxpayers' dollars since the end of the Second World War? How else can one explain that we shall give away $4.4 billion more during the next fiscal year? How else can one explain the request of the administration for an appropriation of $4.9 billion for the next fiscal year? How else can one explain that, after an attempt by the House to reduce this appropriation, it has now been voted by the Senate Foreign Relations Committee to restore the appropriation of $4.5 billion? How else can one explain the continuation of foreign aid at all?

All this in face of the fact that no one can prove that the world would not have been better off if we had never given away $1 of foreign aid.

The whole origin of the foreign-aid concept was that it would buy friends and stop communism. The blunt truth is that you cannot buy friends, and that you must stop communism with ideas and not with dollars.

There has been a very popular fallacy prevalent in the world and particularly right here in our own country since the end of the Second World War; namely, that hardship makes Communists.

Shortly after the end of World War II one of our distinguished public leaders came back from a trip to Europe and in one of his speeches made this statement: "An empty stomach is a Communist workshop."

That was a very catchy statement and it got a lot of attention. But it would be a much truer statement to say that, "An empty head is a Communist workshop."

If any people of any nation think communism—or socialism, which is only a half-way step to communism—will solve their problems, let them search history from beginning to end and see where it has ever helped any nation. It has been tried time and again, in one form or another, and has always failed.

The spirit of a limited government does not need material wealth to make it thrive. The Colonies were poor and struggling when America was founded as a nation. This free Nation of ours was founded on principles and ideals—not on dollars.

If hardship and empty stomachs made Communists, the people of the South would have quickly gone Communist after the end of the War Between the States, because after that war the South was left as poor and impoverished and destitute as any region anywhere after any war. The people of the South had to make their comeback the best way they could—by the hard work, the thrift, the energy, and the determination of the people. Yet the philosophy of the South has consistently adhered to those fundamental principles of democracy—individual freedom, and local self-government.

It is hard to understand the reasoning of those nations who say, "If you don't give us so many billions of your dollars we are going Communist." It is even harder to understand our reasoning in accepting such a statement and acting upon it.

We should very bluntly tell such nations, "If you think communism will solve your problems, go ahead and go Communist. As for us, we are going to stick with the ideals of freedom, with the system of private enterprise and individual initiative, the system that has brought the American people the highest standard of living the world has ever known, and has brought more benefits to more people than any other ever devised by man. We suggest you try the same system."

The plain fact of the matter is that the best way to destroy friends—and nations are no different in this respect than individuals—is to start supporting them with gifts. The more you give a man, the more he wants—and the effect of continued gifts is to completely destroy the independence and self-reliance and initiative and incentive that anyone must have if he is to succeed.

Yeoman Service by the Vice President

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. BRICKER
OF OHIO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, July 13, 1956

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entiled "Vice President's Yeoman Service," published in the Columbus Evening Dispatch of July 11, 1956.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

VICE PRESIDENT'S YEOMAN SERVICE

Will Vice President NIXON return from his tour of the Far East the hero he deserves to be?

Will the backbiters in the Eisenhower administration who have tried to discredit him accept his stimulating and inspiring per-

formances in Manila, Formosa, Bangkok, and Karachi for what they are and desist in their efforts to dump him from the Eisenhower ticket?

We shall see.

What Vice President NIXON has done on this tour, which he took at the request of the President, is to prove to the world—and especially to the so-called neutrals who have given Moscow so much support—that the Communists are bunglers.

Even as he was pointing out the certain risks that must be taken by the neutrals who play Moscow's game, accept Moscow's favors and make business deals with the Kremlin, the world was seeing what had happened to another once neutral nation when the Polish steel workers went on strike in Poznan to better their living conditions.

Marxism there turned out to be the cruel suppressor of human rights and labor prerogatives which it has always said the capitalists were. At the time the Reds were demonstrating how wrong Marx was, Mr. NIXON was telling the world how wrong he was.

As he was commending Thailand's faith in western ideas of freedom, Russia's new Foreign Minister Shepilov was saying that under communism there is no room for other political parties, and this, of course, the people of Poland, Czechoslovakia, Eastern Germany, and others had already learned when they tried to express economic and political sentiments opposed to communism.

Under communism there is only room for one party—and the guns necessary to maintain it in power.

As the Vice President was celebrating the 10th anniversary of independence in Manila, the captive satellites of Europe and Asia were learning anew—at gunpoint—that there is no hope of independence from communism.

Mr. NIXON told the peoples of Asia and through them the peoples of the world—the indifferent, the free, the neutral, the captives, and the undecided alike—the simple truths of freedom and the dangers of communism.

The truth, of course, shall prevail. What Mr. NIXON said was true yesterday. It is true today and it will remain true tomorrow. The Communists recognize no such continuity of truth. Only that is true for them which is expedient. What may have been true yesterday is not necessarily true today. Nor is it likely to be true tomorrow.

In time, the neutrals who have compromised truth or who have accepted the political or economic thinking of communism must learn the dramatic differences between slavery and freedom which the Vice President so ably presented for their consideration.

He has done a magnificent job for the United States and freedom in an area where it is most needed. And he has added great meaning to the foreign policies of the United States for all of the beleaguered people of the world.

Abandon Hope All Ye Who Enter Here

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MIKE MANSFIELD

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, July 13, 1956

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, a very interesting editorial was published in the Washington Post of July 8 entitled "Art For No Sake."

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, under the heading "Abandon Hope All Ye Who Enter Here."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ART FOR NO SAKE

Three totally undressed, impressively muscular but, alas, sadly agonized young men have, it seems, been ignominously expelled from the Republican Party; but since all three are foreigners—presumably French—and therefore ineligible to vote next November, their expulsion should have no effect on the issue of the Presidential election.

By one of those embarrassing gaffes this sculptured trio by the late and eminent Auguste Rodin was to symbolize peace, progress, and prosperity on the cover of the official program of the Republican National Convention which is to meet next month at the San Francisco Cow Palace for the formality of renominating the Messrs. Eisenhower and NIXON. Leo Manheimer, the artist who designed the cover, said that he chose these figures strictly for art, which only seems to prove that his esthetic sensibilities are more highly developed than his political discretion. Anyway most of the Republican bigwigs promptly agreed with Mayor Christopher, of San Francisco, that, politically speaking, the cover design is "not a very healthful picture"; and accordingly the program, of which 13,000 copies had already been printed in 2 of the 4 specified colors, has been scrapped, a new program, containing a fully clothed portrait of President Eisenhower on the cover, will be substituted.

The objection to the Rodin figures, we gather, was not a matter of prudery. Nude though they undoubtedly are, there seems to have been a bit of confusion for a time about whether the figures are male or female. This interesting question was not definitely settled until somebody identified the group as having been entitled by the sculptor himself as Les Tres Hommes, which of course pretty well clinched the matter. What really distressed the Republican arrangements committee was the suggestion of utter despair in the attitudes of the marble trio; and the alarm proved to be well founded when it was learned that the sculpture—now apparently on loan exhibition at San Francisco—is part of a sequence illustrating the famous passage from Dante: Lasciati ogni speranza, voi ch-entrate (Abandon hope, O ye who enter here). This, as you can readily see for yourself, is hardly the sort of sentiment to inculcate among the delegates who are soon to assemble in the Cow Palace.

The moral, it seems to us, is that art and politics are rarely if ever compatible; and this doubtless explains why politically inspired statuary and painting are almost invariably mediocre, and why nearly all efforts to improve them have been disastrous. We recall, for example, how the late George B. McClellan, Jr., who was something of an amateur in these matters, undertook while mayor of New York to elevate the quality of public sculpture in that metropolis. Among other things he commissioned the late Frederick MacMonnies to design a fountain for the City Hall Park, giving the sculptor an entirely free hand (which is what these artists always prefer) in the choice and execution of the subject. Eventually MacMonnies produced a statue consisting of a muscular male figure—not unlike those in the Rodin group, only much bolder and more cheerful—designated Civic Virtue who had one of his massive feet planted firmly on the neck of a prostrate lady who was said to symbolize civic corruption. This outrageous inversion of the natural genders of vice and virtue occasioned a tremendous uproar and eventually the statue had to be relegated (like the Discobolos at Montreal) to the decent obscurity of the Borough of Queens, where—as we understand it—it was accepted by the populace after the false but ingenious rumor had been circulated among them that the trimphant male figure actually represented the beloved Dodgers and the prostrate female the sissified and detested Giants.

Then there was St. Gaudens' equestrian bronze of General Sherman near the lower Fifth Avenue entrance to Central Park, generally considered—after the Adams Memorial in Rock Creek Cemetery here—his finest work. In front of the general, as you may remember, is a Nike, or Winged Victory, leading his horse by the bridle, thus provoking the late Col. Henry Watterson to exclaim: "Well, if that isn't just like the old —— —— —— to make the lady walk!" The Sherman statue has been permitted to remain at its original site; but to this day no really chivalrous New Yorker passes it by without sheepishly averting his eyes in the manner of a seated male rider in a crowded subway car.

Brownell's Sell-Out

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES M. QUIGLEY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 6, 1956

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Speaker, one of the more cogent commentaries on the huckstering technique of Attorney General Herbert Brownell, who withheld pertinent public information in order to promote the sales of a specific private business, has been voiced by the Carlisle (Pa.) Evening Sentinel in an editorial published on July 10.

The Sentinel's editorial writer points up the fact that Mr. Brownell has not conducted a news conference since last October with the comment, "Silence speaks for itself."

This same observation could be used to characterize the actions—or lack of them—of Mr. Brownell and the administration from the President on down in relation to civil rights and civil liberties. Mr. Eisenhower long ago promised the American people a civil-rights program. None was forthcoming until late this year, when, after months of silence, Mr. Brownell submitted a civil-rights program which was no more than a limited borrowing from programs which had long been made.

Mr. Brownell was also strangely and lengthily silent when a committee of the other body requested that he present his views relating to civil liberties. According to press reports, and published hearings, the Attorney General cavalierly ignored requests to testify on this important inquiry into possible abuses of our basic freedoms.

Silence, Mr. Speaker, speaks for itself. The editorial follows:

SELLING OUT NEWS

News ought to be made available when it becomes news, not withheld for a commercial TV program, as was done recently by the Department of Justice with the sanction of Attorney General Brownell.

Corn Products Refining Co. sponsors the TV show Press Conference. To appear on Press Conference, the person invited to be interviewed must have a news story to break—one which the producers consider worthwhile.

And, in that way on last Wednesday night the public learned that the Government had filed an antitrust suit against General Motors Corp.

The revelation of something new on TV may not in itself necessarily be of any consequence. But, when news which the public is entitled to when it happens is bottled up or saved by Federal or other officials to meet the condition of a TV sponsor—until the sponsor is ready to let it leak—that is another matter, a matter of concern to the public, the press, TV and radio. If continued, the integrity of the administration will be questioned even more by the public than it is today.

We doubt that Mr. Brownell intentionally aided the sponsor of a news leak. We would rather believe that, as in some of his other questionable actions, he failed to study the result of postponing a big story. But the Justice Department head and all others connected with the Government should stand forewarned that news must not only be made available when it becomes news, but it must be dispensed simultaneously to all reporters of all media.

The Attorney General, as the Washington Post said, in delaying the news of the action against GMC, "to present it under select conditions on a sponsored program," manipulated "public property to serve a private interest."

Mr. Brownell, by the way, has not held a press conference in Washington since last October. Silence speaks for itself.

Agriculture, Labor, and Business United for Private Power Development at Niagara

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM E. MILLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 13, 1956

Mr. MILLER of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a copy of a letter forwarded to the Honorable DENNIS CHAVEZ, chairman of the Senate Committee on Public Works signed by Mr. H. M. Stanley of the New York State Grange, Mr. Harold C. Hanover of the New York State Federation of Labor, and Mr. William A. Mills of the Empire State Chamber of Commerce attesting to the fact that agriculture, labor and business organizations in the State of New York are united in their appeal for the further development of hydroelectric power from the Niagara Falls and river by private, regulated, tax-paying enterprise.

The letter follows:

INTER-ORGANIZATION CONFERENCE
ON POWER RESOURCES,
Albany, N. Y., January 9, 1956.

Hon. DENNIS CHAVEZ,
Chairman, Senate Committee
on Public Works,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR CHAVEZ: One of the characteristics of what we call "the American Way" is the manner in which we organize for the purpose of acting collectively to solve mutual problems and attain desirable objectives. Much of our social and economic progress in New York has been achieved through the collective action of volunteer citizen groups.

One matter of mutual concern to a majority of these citizen groups is the development of the power resources at Niagara Falls. After careful consideration of all aspects of the problem and through the democratic process of group discussion and action, the members of an overwhelming majority of these organizations have declared it to be contrary to the public interest to construct and operate power-generating facilities under Government auspices. These are not isolated selfish groups which have reached this conclusion. They represent the very best of our citizens from every walk of life—agriculture, labor, business, as well as political, educational, professional, and civic groups.

At previous sessions of the Congress these individual groups have made known their views to the members of your committee. Because we believe this may be the year of decision, we are making this united appeal for favorable consideration of legislation which will authorize the development of the water resources at Niagara by public utility companies which are regulated by the State of New York, for the benefit of all of the people. The controversy already generated by the New York Power Authority in its development of power resources at the St. Lawrence has further convinced us that their management of economic resources is not in the public interest.

We ask you to favorably report legislation incorporated in S. 6 by Senator CAPEHART and H. R. 142 by Congressman MILLER.

Respectfully yours,

H. M. STANLEY,
New York State Grange.
HAROLD C. HANOVER,
New York State Federation of Labor.
WILLIAM A. MILLS,
Empire State Chamber of Commerce.

Coal Against Government Subsidy for Atomic Energy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EUGENE SILER
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 13, 1956

Mr. SILER. Mr. Speaker, there used to be a rhyme that went something like this:

Old King Cole was a merry old soul
And a merry old soul was he.
He called for his pipe and he
Called for his bowl and he
Called for his fiddlers three.

Now, we have had another king by the name of Old King Bituminous-Anthracite Coal that used to be quite merry and gay down in Kentucky, West Virginia, Pennsylvania, Ohio, Illinois, and other places. But in recent years his gaiety has changed to certain deadly seriousness for the mere survival of King Coal. This has been caused by an incursion of his domain by two powerful enemies, known as natural gas and fuel oil. These enemies have already robbed thousands of honest, hard-working, patriotic Americans out of their jobs in the once great coal industry. These enemies have put 1 day or 2 days of mining work on the company's weekly bulletin boards in many places where there might have been 4 days or 5 days had these un-American usurpers not intruded with their brazen robbery against the wives and children of some of our very best citizens. I refer to them as un-American because that is exactly what they are in large measure. They are considerably foreign born—coming in from Venezuela, Canada, and other places that pay no American taxes in time of peace and bear no American arms in time of war.

But just at present we are about to witness still another potential enemy of Old King Coal, namely, the proposed atomic-energy legislation that has already had complete success in the Senate, and will soon come up in the House, asking you for $400 million of tax money to have our Government do these diabolical things:

First. Help destroy a great taxpaying industry like the coal industry.

Second. Put on the idle shelf of unemployment hundreds of thousands of useful, self-sustaining, family-rearing coal miners.

Third. Push our country still further into chaotic socialism by doing things through Government that could better be done by private enterprise.

Atomic development is already going forward at a very rapid and satisfactory pace through the activities of some of our great industrial giants like General Electric Co. and Westinghouse Electric Corp. and at least a dozen others that have previously entered competitively into this great field of science and engineering.

Make no mistake about it, we Americans are going to destroy ourselves completely by further socialization if we persist in that direction in the future as we have in the past. This atomic-development scheme at a cost of $400 million from the taxpayers' purse is socialistic from stem to stern. It will destroy jobs and private industry and taxable property and will attempt to do something by Government that is already being satisfactorily accomplished by private business concerns.

The vote in the Senate was close. It carried by a margin of nine votes in that body. I hope it will fail by a margin of 99 votes in the House. It will if all of us will wake up, especially all the red-blooded Americans interested in Americanism.

Nixon Annoys Izvestia and Nehru

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH F. HOLT
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 28, 1956

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Speaker, I should like to call attention to the following editorial from the Los Angeles Times of Tuesday morning, July 10, 1956:

NIXON ANNOYS IZVESTIA AND NEHRU

Vice President NIXON, in his goodwill tour of Asia, has succeeded in annoying both

the Russian newspaper Izvestia and the Indian Prime Minister Nehru. Perhaps that is not enough in itself to mark the tour as a success, but it is a good start.

The Vice President has touched at the Philippines, Formosa, Thailand, Pakistan, and then Turkey, everywhere proclaiming American friendship for free peoples and criticizing those who seek to be neutral in the worldwide struggle between freedom and totalitarianism.

Prime Minister Nehru commented that Mr. NIXON'S views are not democratic. But Nehru's own government has many elements of totalitarianism and it may be questioned how much a Socialist knows about democracy.

Izvestia says the Vice President takes "outdated cold war positions" which might be a valid criticism if cold war positions are really outdated. The expression assumes the Russians are sincere in their new attitude, something they have yet to prove by "deeds, not words."

The Vice President himself intimated as much when he said Asian leaders are wise in waiting to see whether Khrushchev, Bulganin & Co. have "quit acting like Stalin." They have, he said, quit talking like Stalin, but that alone is not enough.

The omission of India from the Vice President's trip is regarded as an unnecessary affront by the admirers of Nehru. But in view of the numerous unnecessary affronts Nehru has given the American Government and people we can see no impropriety in it.

Truth Must Prevail

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JAMES M. QUIGLEY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 6, 1956

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks, I include the text of an address delivered by the Honorable George M. Leader, Governor of Pennsylvania, at a regional convention of the Committee on Political Education of AFL–CIO in Pittsburgh on July 12.

I recommend it to all those who seek the truth:

ADDRESS OF HON. GEORGE M. LEADER, GOVERNOR OF PENNSYLVANIA AT THE CONVENTION OF THE COMMITTEE ON POLITICAL EDUCATION OF AFL–CIO, WILLIAM PENN HOTEL, PITTSBURGH, JULY 12, 1956

People are always telling newspapermen that their jobs must be fascinating because they get to meet such interesting people.

They're right—newspapermen do. But a Governor doesn't do so badly himself. Since I took office 18 months ago—as Pennsylvania's third Democratic Governor since the Civil War—I've met more important people than you can shake a stick at.

Being Governor must have something to do with it, because I'm doggoned if I met half as many important people when I was a chicken farmer.

For instance, I've met a good many labor leaders—some at the National, others at the State level.

So I have friends here today—friends who fought shoulder to shoulder with my administration in a common effort to bring back simple humanity to Pennsylvania government.

Now one of the privileges of being a governor is the opportunities you get of making speeches before friendly groups willing to put up with a little modest bragging: and I'm going to avail myself of that privilege right now.

We have a Democratic house and a Republican senate in this State, and, as you might expect, a situation like that doesn't usually lead to political harmony. As a result, we recently concluded the longest, bitterest legislative session on record.

We were trying to put across a humanitarian program; the Republican senate was trying to obstruct it. Getting humane legislation through that GOP senate was like tunneling through granite. We invariably had to blast.

Yet surprisingly enough this was the most successful session for people in Pennsylvania's history.

We passed FEPC. We liberalized unemployment compensation. We rammed through one of the best workmen's compensation laws in the Nation. We upgraded our occupational disease law.

Our plan to attract new industry and ease unemployment got through. We passed a wide-ranging mental health program; and another program to help the State's handicapped, crippled, and retarded children.

These are only a few of our accomplishments, but they'll give you some idea of how much long-overdue legislation was made law.

Let me make this clear, however; we could not have done the job without the responsible support of Pennsylvania labor. They fought not only for decent labor laws, but for every humanitarian measure we introduced.

They have earned the lasting gratitude of this administration and, more important, of their fellow Pennsylvanians.

Accordingly, I'd like to ask that you delegates from West Virginia, Maryland, Delaware, Ohio, and New Jersey join me in a standing tribute to Pennsylvania's men and women of labor.

And as long as I'm in a boasting mood, I might just as well tell you one more thing: Pennsylvania has not passed a right-to-work law, nor will Pennsylvania pass one as long as I am Governor.

The first day I took office I served notice on that. Don't bother to pass one, I advised the Republican leadership; because if you do, I'll veto it before the ink has dried.

However, I know you don't want to hear me talk Keystone politics all afternoon. The Pennsylvania delegates will hear more than enough on that subject between now and election, and I think the rest of you are more interested in the coming campaign as it will affect your own States and the Nation.

So let's talk about the national scene.

History tends to repeat itself, as does the Republican Party. So let's take a look at the 1952 election and see if it casts any light on the events of this November.

Now the Republican Party used its usual campaign techniques 4 years ago. All of them are designed to confuse the voter and obscure the issues. But they added one new and devastating element: Highly skilled propaganda.

For the first time, the GOP placed itself unreservedly in the hands of Madison Avenue. And Madison Avenue, plus Wall Street, is a frightening and unholy alliance.

Notice, first of all, the selection of the candidate. General Eisenhower was typical of the New Look in GOP candidates. He is cut from the same cloth as Tom Dewey and Wendell Willkie, seemingly a middle-of-the-roader with liberal tendencies.

Note, too, that the real Republicans—the conservatives like Taft, Knowland, and George Humphrey—couldn't have gotten the Presidential nomination if they tried. And the reason for that is simpe enough: They couldn't have won, and even their own party knew it.

This was how a citizen-for-Eisenhower leaflet stated the case just before the Republican convention:

"The Republican Party must not take a chance. With Eisenhower, the victory will be sweeping. Without Eisenhower, the outcome is doubtful. If you are seeking Republican office, would you rather add to your strength the surging wave of Ike Eisenhower, or have a doubtful candidate ride in on your coattails? The odds against a Republican victory are huge."

According to a Roper poll in March of 1952, General Eisenhower was the most-admired living American. A war hero, he needed no buildup and his personal popularity was immense.

The Republican Party could no more have resisted the impulse to capitalize on his popularity than alley cats could resist cream. At the convention, you'll remember that Ike won on the first ballot.

Senator Taft, who thought the New Deal and Fair Deal threatened the country with creeping socialism, never had a chance—even though he was Mr. Republican to his party and a frank and able spokesman for its true views.

And although Taft left the convention a bitter and disgruntled man, he and Eisenhower quickly made it up at Morningside Heights, where the general declared himself in agreement with the principles of the Taft-Hartley Act and a firm opponent of creeping socialism.

The breach in the GOP mended, the time had come to page the men in the gray-flannel suits—the boys from Madison Avenue. Pay them well enough and they can merchandise anything—soap, shoe polish, or supermen.

Chosen to head the Republican National Committee's Public Relations Division was Robert Humphreys, at a modest $2,044 a month. RICHARD NIXON brought along an expert named Murray Chotiner, whose name you may have read lately in the papers. Chotiner had not only handled NIXON'S campaign for Congress and the Senate, but had acted as campaign manager for Earl Warren and Senator KNOWLAND.

Also on the team was the former director of public relations at General Mills; the firm of Whitaker and Baxter, which had handled the campaign to kill the Democrats' national health insurance plan; the Kudner Agency; Ted Bates and Co.; and Batten, Barton, Durstine, and Osborne—better known along Madison Avenue as B. B. D. & O.

This is only a partial list; for there were many, many others.

All of them had one belief in common: You can merchandise a candidate just like you merchandise a tin of Spam. And they knew the techniques—all the techniques of press-agentry ever to spring from the larcenous mind of man.

Moving into the smoke-filled room, the boys from Madison Avenue took over—and relegated Wall Street's representatives to the secondary duty of digging up the cash.

Now 1952 was the first year that television had a large enough audience to make it important in a presidential campaign. So the Eisenhower tub-thumpers budgeted close to $2 million for radio and television and turned the admen loose.

B. B. D. & O.'s team bought their time on this basis; political telecasts, they reasoned, couldn't compete successfully for mass audiences if faced with competition like Arthur Godfrey. Many political shows would be tuned in by accident, said B. B. D. & O., and one of their spokesmen added "We knew that people were more interested in Godfrey than a political speech."

They solved this knotty problem by purchasing outright the time periods which already had the largest established audiences—thus keeping the entertainers off the airwaves and out of competition.

The other tub-thumpers were also busy. They were turning out cartoon film strips—

six of them—and invading the domain of Mickey Mouse. Listen to the titles:

"Korea—The Price of Appeasement;" "America's Creeping Socialism;" "Inflation, or Our 50 Cent Dollar;" "Taxes;" "Ticket to Freedom;" and, last but not least, "Scandals."

"None of us are critics of cartoons," remarked one huckster. "You make a cartoon of a Chinaman and a sword dripping blood and it hits you with your hardly knowing it. The same thing in a movie would be ridiculous."

Some three million people saw those cartoons. This is known as the idiot approach to issues, or, politics made simple.

That's only the beginning. The boy wizards were also producing speech kits; background material; political manuals for party workers; special appeals for farmers, Negroes, laborers, veterans, and housewives. They were turning out pamphlets, leaflets, posters, streamers, buttons, badges, gimmicks, and even comic books.

One comic book, called From Yalta to Korea, openly implied that Democratic officials had conspired against their own country. The main victim of this particular piece was Dean Acheson, who will go down in history as one of America's great Secretaries of State.

A large percentage of this campaign material was devoted to smear, sneer, and innuendo. Much of it stated openly that a vote for the Democrats was a vote for "corrupt government," "higher taxes," "more and wilder spending," or "more socialism-communism."

Nor is that all. Borrowing from the techniques of Hollywood and the circus, advance men went forth like a plague of locusts. NIXON'S advance agents, under the expert tutelage of Murray Chotiner, received instructions so detailed that they are hard to believe. Typical was the item in the advance man's manual instructing him always to get a Korean war veteran to lead the Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag of the United States.

The Eisenhower campaign opened formally in Philadelphia's Convention Hall. Thanks to an unrelenting telephone campaign, a hand-tailored rally of 18,000 people was turned out. The press agents' blueprint for that august occasion filled 39 pages. As the throng enters convention hall, the blueprint read, the following will be provided for them: 25,000 fresh-cut red roses; 3,000 noisemakers; 5,000 flags; 25,000 programs.

Candidate Eisenhower was even instructed to arrange himself with one hand on the Liberty Bell.

No, they didn't forget anything. Except, perhaps, the issues.

Adlai Stevenson, meanwhile, was telling the truth. He was telling the American Legion that he intended to resist any excessive demands from veterans' groups. He was telling a Virginia audience that he adhered wholeheartedly to the civil-rights plank of the Democratic Party. He was telling a Louisiana audience that he opposed giving the oil-rich tidelands to the individual States.

But General Eisenhower was coming out four-square for full parity to farmers, social security, balanced budgets, more and better housing, workmen's compensation, unemployment insurance, the liberation of "captive" nations, or anything else that seemed to promise a vote.

And the Madison Avenue experts were right at his elbow to tell him what the people wanted promised.

Mostly, though, Ike talked about the mess in Washington, and the "scandal-a-day administration," gradually moving in on the Communist issue, and the Democrats' responsibility for the war in Korea.

DICK NIXON got caught with his secret fund showing, and bought $75,000 worth of television time to explain it. As usual, Madison Avenue was represented in the affair. Edward A. Rogers, who produced "The Lone Ranger" and "Double or Nothing" was NIXON'S television adviser, and, presumably, we are indebted to him for the soapiest soap opera on record.

And where had NIXON'S $18,000 secret fund gone?

To "political expenses," he said, "of getting my message to the American people; and the speeches I made—the speeches I had printed, for the most part concerned this one message of exposing this administration, the communism in it, the corruption in it."

His wife, Pat, didn't even have a mink coat, he said, and had to make do with an ordinary cloth coat like everybody else. As for the charges made against him, they were simply an attempt to frighten him into silence on the issue of communism in American government. And that's when his anti-Communist dog—name of Checkers—was dragged in by the scruff of his neck.

Over 9 million sets were tuned in on that nauseating but expert performance. And after those 9 million sets had been turned off, NIXON was officially as clean as a hound's tooth in the dedicated eyes of the Republican Party.

He was clean enough at any rate to participate in the dirtiest assignment of a dirty campaign—the mudslinging.

That was the campaign in essence. The Republicans promised what needed promising; avoided issues where possible; double-talked when cornered; smeared on every possible occasion, and smothered the voters in sound and fury signifying nothing.

They spent $1,500,000 on radio spots the day before election in the greatest mass saturation effort in history. And this was the kind of responsible effort it was:

A voice would say: It was extra tough paying my income tax when I read about the internal revenue tax collectors being fired for dishonesty.

And Eisenhower would answer: Well—how many taxpayers were shaken down, I don't know. How many crooks escaped, I don't know. But I'll find out after next January.

The final stroke of huckstering genius was the famous Eisenhower speech of October 24, when he said: "I shall go to Korea. That is my pledge to the American people."

He never got around to explaining what he would do when he got there, but he seemed to fool a lot of people.

I wish I had time to talk more about that campaign—about the "Kids for Ike," and the organized cheering specially set up for Republican rallies.

But I think I've made my point, except for one last thing:

According to a Roper survey, Communists in government was a major issue by the time the campaign ended. A majority of Americans believed Communist infiltration in Government agencies to be one of the Nation's most serious problems; and they also believed, by a 4-to-1 count, that only the Republicans could successfully drive the Reds out of Washington.

The pitchmen of Madison Avenue have always believed that the claim is quicker than the eye and that truth is a professional handicap. Their attitude is hardly surprising, for the huckster's job is done once he gets sales acceptance for his product. And if the product does not live up to the claim he's made for it? That's somebody else's headache.

Ever since the Eisenhower administration took office, its one consistent policy has been hucksterism; has been government by handout; government by slogan; government by snow-job. The revolutionary new theory in Washington is to hide each of the Nation's problems under a ton of press releases.

So if a person wants to find out what's happening to the United States at home and abroad, his only hope is to duck the confetti, sidestep the slogans, ignore the pollsters and turn the harsh spotlight of truth on the issues themselves.

The State Department's fatuous utterances? There is no truth there. As the Christian Science Monitor remarked, a Dulles account of an international conference sounds like a Hollywood blurb for the latest Cecil B. DeMille supercolossal.

"Trade, not aid?" Then why put a high-tariff man on the Tariff Commission?

"Unleash Chiang?" You might just as well unleash NIXON'S dog, Checkers.

"More bang for a buck?" Ask Charley Wilson how he cut down the number of our Air Force wings, reduced atomic research, and still managed to improve American defense.

Is it any wonder the voters' heads are reeling?

Yes, Presidential Aid C. D. Jackson described the process perfectly when he said: "We are merchandising the living hell out of the Eisenhower program."

This is the type of campaign we face in the coming election. We in America are being bombarded with lies, ballyhoo, and slogans. Already confronted with a Juggernaut of propaganda, the voter will find this campaign far worse than the campaign of 1952.

Remember this: the Republican Party is as frightened of an informed electorate as the Devil is of holy water. The GOP doesn't want people to think—it wants them to react. It doesn't want them to understand, it wants them dizzied and confused.

It isn't that this is a new Republican attitude, because it isn't. The frightening thing about it, however, is the amount of confusion and muddle you can buy if you spend enough money and spend it cynically and expertly enough.

When I ran for Governor I ran on a positive program—just as Democrats usually do. I had a program for unemployment; mental health; handicapped children. But during that entire campaign no Republican opposed me on those constructive issues.

Instead, they took full page ads in the newspapers, questioning my patriotism and my loyalty to this country because I once voted against a loyalty oath bill.

So I speak from personal experience when I say that I know something of Republican campaign techniques. And I predict that 1956 will be twice as bad as 1952. The smear technique is already back.

Just last week the Senate Republican policy committee issued a memorandum proclaiming that the Communist Party wants "the Republicans defeated" and hopes for "a Democratic victory" this fall.

And not long ago DICK NIXON announced that the Supreme Court segregation ruling was made because Chief Justice Warren is a Republican.

Yet the campaign has hardly started.

Let us always remember that no matter how thing you slice it, the huckster technique is still baloney. Let's try to teach the American voter to recognize baloney when he sees it, too. That's your job in COPE. And that's my job as a party leader.

Our big guns in this campaign must be the heavy artillery of truth, fired in a tireless barrage.

I like Harry Truman's remark. "I never give 'em hell," he said. "I just tell 'em the truth and they think it's hell."

The Democratic Party does not want Democrats who are Democrats because of tradition. We want Democrats who are Democrats because of conviction.

We do not want men and women to stick to this party through sheer loyalty. We want them—always—to choose the Democratic Party on its merits.

That goes for labor.

It is too frequently said that labor must stick to the Democratic Party because it has no other place to go. I don't buy that theory. I think labor sticks with this party because it gets results.

Labor stayed with the Democratic Party because it got results under the leadership of Franklin Roosevelt and Harry Truman.

And labor will back the Democratic Party again, because it knows it will get results under Adlai Stevenson.

But the day our party fails to get results, fails to be responsive to the people's will, is the day when it no longer deserves the support of labor or any other group representing the people.

I, for one, want to see the party of Jefferson and Jackson continue to deserve your support. And we will continue to deserve your support so long as the Democratic Party believes in special privileges for all Americans.

The Bible quotes Jesus Christ as saying: "Know ye the truth and the truth shall make you free."

To you men and women of COPE I say only this final word:

Without truth democracy is lost. Without truth the democratic process is fettered and helpless. Without truth no man, no party, no nation can survive.

This is the task that awaits you, as indeed it always awaits you. But at this moment in our Nation's history the forces of truth are being menaced as never before.

I know what the letters COPE stand for. But let's make them also stand for the Committee on the People's Emancipation. And let that emancipation proceed, as it must, from our trust in the voters of America and their ability to tell the counterfeit from the real.

You who have done so much in six great industrial States to win economic freedom for millions of our people must face the equally important task that lies before you.

That task is to regain for those millions of men and women full political and social freedom, free access to the truth. For when the truth prevails, the truth will make them free, and keep them free.

In this you must not, you dare not, fail them.

The Housing Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM A. BARRETT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 13, 1956

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Speaker, "unrealistic, excessive and ill conceived" were the terms applied by the administration's housing spokesman to a housing bill reported out by the House Banking and Currency Committee. These were the uncomplimentary adjectives chosen by a man who once served in this House to characterize a measure that represented many months of honest toil and deliberation. This was how he chose to identify a bill that differed in some respects from an administration-sponsored measure. I do not contest his right to free speech, but I do object to the looseness of his language. Webster's International is full of words that he might have used.

Be that as it may, the Housing and Home Finance Administrator tars H. R. 11742 with a sweeping brush. He found nothing good in the bill, and the House Rules Committee echoed him with a resounding "Amen." I do not propose to discuss the obvious merits of the bill at this time. That will come when the Rules Committee reverses itself and grants a rule for the debate of the bill by this Chamber.

It seems strange that the Housing Administrator is willing to submit to us the question of appropriations with which to operate his Agency, yet balks at having us debate the housing bill of 1956.

Washington has a few treasured customs, among which are the Potomac Regatta, the Cherry Blossom Festival, and the Retreat Parade at Fort Myers. Are we to add to this catalog the annual contest over public housing? Maybe so, but it seems to me that the Rules Committee should give public housing a fair chance, and not bottle it up in star chamber proceedings. I believe, and many of you agree, that we have sufficient acumen to evaluate the merit of bills. We have been in the lawmaking business for a long time, and I do not believe we would permit something to become law that was not in the best interests of the country. At least we should be given the opportunity to demonstrate our lawmaking ability.

Time is running out. The Rules Committee must not disregard the fact that the housing bill of 1956 is vital to the homebuilding industry. The committee, with regard for the democratic process we all cherish, must give this body a chance to debate H. R. 11752. We assure the committee that we will act in the best interests of our constituents, and that our deliberations will not endanger the welfare of the Nation. All we want is the chance.

Community Cooperation at Griffiss Air Force Base

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM R. WILLIAMS
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 13, 1956

Mr. WILLIAMS of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to insert in the RECORD a copy of resolutions by the chamber of commerce and the Common Council of the City of Rome, N. Y., as well as a copy of an editorial which appeared in the Rome Daily Sentinel on July 9, 1956. To these inserts, I wish to add my personal appreciation for the service of Col. Benjamin H. Shiffrin who completes his tour of duty as commander of Griffiss Air Force Base this month. These statements are evidence of the fine relationships which have existed between this military base and the surrounding communities during the period of his command.

The resolutions and editorial follow:

RESOLUTION OF ROME CHAMBER OF COMMERCE, ROME, N. Y.

To Whom These Presents Shall Come Be It Known That:

Whereas Col. Benjamin H. Shiffrin has completed his tour of duty as commanding officer of Griffiss Air Force Base at Rome, N. Y., and is about to assume his new duties as chief of the Air Force Section of the Military Assistance Advisory Group in London, England; and

Whereas Colonel Shiffrin has made this tour of duty an occasion to contribute significantly to the progress of the community of Rome, and to building the fine relationships which exist between the community and the Military Establishment for which he has been responsible, through his honest, forthright recognition of the mutual problems inherent in such relationships; and

Whereas his dedication to improving the environment for both military and civilian is evidenced by the devotion of his energy and experience and resources to such essential and worthy projects as more adequate housing, extended community education, consistent and useful public information, cooperative support of the community social service, the common safety and his own personal service to civic betterment: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Rome Chamber of Commerce serve upon Col. Benjamin H. Shiffrin this dictum of the esteem in which he is held as a military officer and as a citizen of our community; and of our regret that the community of Rome will no longer have his valued counsel and assistance; and be it further

Resolved, That this dictum be made a part of the records of the Rome Chamber of Commerce; that it be published for the attention of the community he has served; and that it be read into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by our appropriate representative to the Congress of the United States of America.

RESOLUTION EXPRESSING THE COUNCIL'S APPRECIATION TO COLONEL SHIFFRIN, COMMANDER GRIFFISS AIR FORCE BASE, BY COUNCILMAN HERBST

Whereas Col. Benjamin H. Shiffrin, commander of the Griffiss Air Force Base, has given unselfishly and unceasingly of his time and energy for the betterment of life in our community; and

Whereas the common council of the city of Rome, N. Y., would like to make known its respect and appreciation for Colonel Shiffrin's frank and fair representation of the position of the United States Air Force in his relations with the city of Rome, and for his truly democratic spirit and his unswerving devotion to his duty as former commander of the Griffiss Air Force Base: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the common council of the city of Rome, N. Y., hereby conveys the community's gratefulness to Colonel Shiffrin for the meritorious civic service rendered by him during his stay in Rome and wishes him every success in his future endeavors; and be it further

Resolved, That the city clerk be requested to send an appropriate copy of this resolution to Colonel Shiffrin.

[From the Rome (N. Y.) Daily Sentinel of July 9, 1956]

COLONEL SHIFFRIN: GOOD CITIZEN OF ROME

We share with others in the community the wish that Ben Shiffrin was not going to leave us. He is a good citizen.

Colonel Shiffrin, who has been commander of Griffiss AFB since July 1954, is going to London to be chief of the Air Force section of the United States Military Assistance Advisory Group.

This is a combination military-diplomatic job. Ben Shiffrin is well qualified for it. He has shown himself to be an excellent officer and an expert diplomat in his responsibility of maintaining good relations between the community and Griffiss AFB in this important preexpansion period.

The Rome Common Council has officially commended him for his frank and fair representation of the position of the United States Air Force in his relations with the city of Rome, and for his truly democratic

spirit and his unswerving devotion to his duty as commander of Griffiss AFB. The Common Council formally expressed the community's gratefulness to him for the meritorious service rendered by him during his stay in Rome.

The Rome Chamber of Commerce will honor Colonel Shiffrin tonight at a dinner in appreciation of his community service. These two formal actions by our leading municipal and civic bodies speak for the high regard in which Colonel Shiffrin is held.

The Air Force would have to look far to find a man better suited to represent the service in community relations than Colonel Shiffrin. He has a deep sense of responsibility and an understanding of the civilian viewpoint in the community's relation with the military. His record in Rome in this respect reflects credit upon the Air Force.

We will miss Colonel Shiffrin and his gracious wife. We join with many others in wishing them happiness in their new assignment.

Mutual Assistance Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. T. MILLET HAND
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 13, 1956

Mr. HAND. Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday in the course of my speech on the appropriations bill for Mutual Assistance, I referred to the present legal impossibility of setting up military forces in Japan. I then said that the results of the Japanese elections were not yet clear. It is now apparent that the Hatoyama government has not elected sufficient delegates to change that Constitution.

The Washington Star of Thursday, July 12, refers to this in an editorial called "Setback in Japan." The Star says that votes are needed "to speed up the country's rearmament." It is worse than that. They need it to rearm at all, at least legally and constitutionally.

I am appending the editorial referred to:

SETBACK IN JAPAN

The chief effect of Sunday's parliamentary elections in Japan is that Premier Hatoyama and his conservative Liberal-Democratic government have run into a serious new roadblock in their effort to push through the constitutional changes needed to speed up the country's rearmament. The setback is one that is especially welcome to the Moscow-Peiping axis.

Although it is true that the Liberal-Democratic Party still retains majority control of the Diet by a wide margin, it has fallen short of what it sought in Sunday's vote—namely, more than two-thirds of the seats in the House of Councillors, which corresponds roughly to our Senate. If that goal had been attained, then the Hatoyama government would today be in a position to bring about an early constitutional amendment to build up Japan's inadequate defenses to the degree obviously demanded by the times. But the antirearmament forces, predominantly the Socialists, have won a sufficient increase in their parliamentary strength to block any real progress toward that objective for months to come.

In fact, as a result of Sunday's vote, it is now felt in Japan that no substantial advances are likely to be made in this field until new Diet elections are held in 1959, at which time the returns conceivably may be no better than those just recorded. Interestingly enough, of course, the root of all this uncertainty can be found in the occupation policy enforced by our country after the Japanese surrender in 1945. For it was under that policy, as carried out by General MacArthur, without dissent, that Hirohito's shattered empire adopted a constitution in which the once-belligerent Land of the Rising Sun forever renounced the right to maintain an army, navy, or air force.

This unwise and unrealistic renunciation—the first of its kind in the history of nations—has been a constant obstacle to Japan's postwar rearmament. Presumably, one of these days, the people of the country will take the necessary constitutional action to rectify the situation, but apparently they prefer to procrastinate and let the matter drift at present. Meanwhile, still depending primarily on American power to keep them safe from aggression, they are gambling with their own national defense.

ASWAN DAM FOR EGYPT

I also referred in that statement to the continued likelihood of the United States throwing in a great many millions to help a very unfriendly Egypt with a billion-dollar dam construction. It now appears that Egypt has very kindly consented to deal with us on this proposal. According to the Washington Post of July 13, 1956:

High Egyptian sources said Nasser had personally given Hussein a clear-cut go-ahead to complete the Western package deal. It involves an immediate $70 million grant from the United States and Britain, followed by a $200 million World Bank loan.

Thus, Egypt is finally willing to consent to take $70 million dollars more of our money as a starter. Undoubtedly, we will be relieved that this gift has not been turned down as had been feared.

How Not To Improve Foreign Relations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 13, 1956

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith an editorial which appeared in the July 11, 1956, issue of the East St. Louis (Ill.) Journal. The editorial, entitled "Relations Damaged," follows:

RELATIONS DAMAGED

Vice President NIXON seems determined to make himself as unpopular with India as he is with the Democratic Party.

The running argument which Mr. NIXON conducted with Prime Minister Nehru of India over the weekend can do nothing except damage still further American relations with India, the world's second most populous country and the key democratic nation in Asia.

The Nixon-Nehru disagreement began when the Vice President echoed in a Fourth of July speech at Manila a recent statement by Secretary of State Dulles equating neutralism with immorality.

Two days later, in London, where he was attending a meeting of the Prime Ministers of the British Commonwealth, Mr. Nehru said: "I submit for consideration that Mr. NIXON and Mr. Dulles are saying something that is opposed to the democratic way of life." The Indian Prime Minister said further that the very basis of democracy is tolerance for differing points of view.

Monday in Karachi, capital of Pakistan, India's rival for the control of the disputed Kashmir and a country of which India is as apprehensive as the United States is of the Soviet Union, Mr. NIXON, in the words of an Associated Press dispatch, "fired a return salvo at India and Prime Minister Nehru."

Not only did Mr. NIXON prolong an argument that Mr. Dulles should never have started, but he did so from the capital of Pakistan after flying over India without stopping there on his way to Karachi from Thailand.

The Eisenhower administration has had a fondness for injecting morals into public issues. But to say that India and Nehru are immoral because they wish to pursue a policy of what Nehru prefers to call noninvolvement rather than neutralism is an almost insulting way of referring to a man and a country of incalculable importance to Asia.

The Nixon-Nehru name-calling comes precisely when Mr. Nehru was scheduled, before President Eisenhower's latest illness, to be in the United States conferring with the President over the questions which divide India and the United States.

The events of the weekend make it all the more imperative that Mr. Eisenhower reschedule his President-to-Prime Minister talks with Mr. Nehru for as early a date as can be mutually agreed upon.

Uprising in Poland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SAMUEL N. FRIEDEL
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 13, 1956

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, a little over a week ago, the Polish workers of Poznan rose in mass protests against their country's Communist regime. They besieged the local secret police headquarters, burned its records and battled the troops sent to put down the revolt. Like their fellow workers in Berlin 3 years ago, they fought tanks and infantry until, by government admission, at least 38 lay dead and 270 injured.

These brave Polish people were driven to this desperate action because they have been ruled by the minions of a foreign power and the fruit of their factories and farms taken to strengthen that power. A revolt such as this in Poznan is a desperate way of calling the world's attention to the plight of those under Communist oppression.

The Poznan outbreak is the most spectacular of a thousand signs of crises in world communism. The rioters were clamoring for food in order to keep body and soul together and they expressed their hatred for their godless Communist overlords.

Mr. Speaker, all of us in America owe a great debt to a very great and revered patriot who fought and died in order to help and assist our own beloved country. I refer, of course, to none other than Casimir Pulaski, who was born in Podolia, Poland, in 1748. In 1777 he

came to America in order to give his all on behalf of our then new Republic. It was for his exemplary conduct at the Battle of Brandywine that he was given a brigade of cavalry which he commanded until March 1778. This great soldier entered Charleston during May 1779, and held it until that city was relieved. During the siege of Savannah he was wounded and died 2 days later. For what he did for us, we shall be eternally grateful. I am proud, indeed, that my State—the Free State of Maryland—has not forgotten this great hero's sacred memory, for a modern dual highway, a part of what is now designated as U. S. 40, leading from the great city of Baltimore to the northeast, has been named after this brilliant son of Poland.

All of us are fully appreciative of the brilliant and courageous record of the Polish people over the centuries. And all Americans are cognizant of the many contributions that people of Polish descent have made to America's wealth and culture.

Although we all are confident that the indomitable spirit of Poland and its brave people will ultimately triumph over the evil forces of darkness, I urge that the Government of the United States repay its debt to Poland by its immediate protest of such action in order to prevent the further slaughter of hungry and innocent people at the merciless hands of the Communist Polish puppet government of Soviet Russia.

Why Spend $34 Million When Friendship Airport Is Available?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD E. LANKFORD
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 13, 1956

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD a timely editorial which appeared in the Evening Capital, Annapolis, Md., July 11, 1956.

Recently on the floor of the House we have heard of the need for relief of air traffic congestion at the Washington National Airport. I believe that every one of us here is cognizant of the fact that this relief is badly needed. I believe that each one of us is equally cognizant of the duty we owe the taxpayers of the Nation to spend our taxes wisely. It would seem to me that we would be derelict in our duty in spending added millions for the construction of a second airport at Burke, Va., which in my opinion, would not only not relieve the congestion at National Airport but would add to it. With this in mind, I have asked for permission to insert the following editorial:

WHY SPEND $34 MILLION WHEN FRIENDSHIP AIRPORT IS AVAILABLE?

Once gain the controversial problem of relieving congestion at the Washington National Airport, which involves a proposed new airport at Burke, Va., and the use of the Friendship International Airport in northern Anne Arundel County, is before Congress.

But this time there is a new twist. President Eisenhower has asked Congress for a $34,700,000 appropriation to start construction of the Burke Airport. Then, following his request, Sinclair Weeks, Secretary of Commerce, has asked the Civil Aeronautics Board to designate the Friendship Airport as an alternate field to the Washington Airport until the problem of the airport at Burke is solved.

It has been pointed out that even if the Congress would make the funds for the Burke Airport available now, the field there will not be ready for traffic until June, 1959.

So, apparently, during this 3-year period, the plan is to use the Friendship Airport to relieve the pressure on Washington. This plan brings up an obvious question—if the Friendship Airport is satisfactory to use for this purpose for a 3-year period, why not continue to use it? Why spend $34,700,000 and more with the Friendship field available and with its use being requested?

No wonder the Maryland Senators and Representatives in the Congress are opposing the Burke project. They should. In these days when it is essential that the Federal Government save every dollar of tax money it can, why spend money on construction of a new airport, when the existing Friendship Airport is planned to be used during the construction?

If the Congress appropriates the $34,700,000, which may not happen, it will not complete the Burke Airport. It will only be a start. The money requested does not include funds for construction of hangars, and it is estimated that an additional $10 million would be needed to complete the full development at Burke.

This controversy over the Burke Airport has been going on since 1949. Congress had already authorized construction of a supplemental airport there and appropriated $1 million which allowed the Civil Aeronautics Administration to acquire some 1,000 acres of the 5,540 acres needed at Burke.

But then citizen opposition that developed to the Burke site caused Congress to refuse further funds and the project lay dormant until revived last fall by the Senate Commerce Committee. Then the committee directed the Commerce Department to develop a plan to relieve congestion at the Washington Airport. This action was taken despite department indications that no more airports should be financed wholly with Federal funds.

Representative JOEL T. BROYHILL, Republican of Virginia, has stated he would oppose the request for the Burke funds because he does not want the Alexandria, Fairfax, Falls Church, and Arlington areas in Virginia in the crossfire of two major airports. He has contended that the airports now in the Washintgon area would be sufficient with proper rearrangement of traffic.

Senator J. GLENN BEALL, Republican of Maryland, has branded the Burke proposal as a complete waste of funds and unfair to the people of Virginia who have opposed the location. Senator JOHN MARSHALL BUTLER, Republican of Maryland, predicts that every Congressman from the Washington metropolitan area will fight the appropriation.

Frank McHugh, aviation director for the Baltimore Association of Commerce, has pointed out that second airport in the Washington metropolitan area, instead of using the available Friendship facilities, would be an inconvenience to 1,600,000 people in the Greater Baltimore area.

The plans of the Civil Aeronautics Administration based on the $34,700,000 request in Congress, for the Burke Airport, call for the acquisition of remaining land needed, construction of 2 north-south runways and 1 east-west runway, a large terminal building and an access highway to the airport.

Included in the request are $2,500,000 for land acquisition, $8 million for grading the site, $10,500,000 for paving, $4 million for the terminal building and $1,700,000 for the access road. The second stage of the proposed development, requiring an additional $10 million would be largely to extend the 2 north-south runways.

But one wonders why it is necessary to pour out all this money if the Secretary of Commerce feels that the Friendship International Airport is adequate to handle the excess traffic from Washington for a 3-year period, until the new site is built.

Idea for an Icebox Latch

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH A. ROBERTS
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 13, 1956

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I include the editorial Idea for an Icebox Latch which appeared in the Electric Appliance Service News. This editorial proposes a latch which in the future could help save the lives of innocent children who may become trapped in a refrigerator while playing and suffocate to death:

IDEA FOR AN ICEBOX LATCH

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—Electric Appliance Service News has been waging a prolonged campaign for voluntary action by the manufacturers or a Federal law that would provide for safety devices on refrigerator doors. During the past few years attempts by Congress to get refrigerator manufacturers to incorporate safety features on the doors of their products, have been futile, with many promises and little progress. Finally, in utter disgust, a congressional committee has seen fit to recommend passage of a bill which would make it national Federal law for refrigerator manufacturers to incorporate safety devices that would allow the doors of their products to be pushed open from the inside. See front page story this issue. We are therefore taking advantage of this timely opportunity to reprint herewith an editorial which was written by editor and publisher J. J. Charous in the August 1954 issue of EASN.)

There have been all kinds of ideas for making a lock on a refrigerator so that when it is discarded, a child cannot lock himself in, leading to tragedy.

In the news (this issue) is a story of an inventor who offered a magnetic means of holding a door shut on a refrigerator in such a manner that if the center shelf was removed, the door could not be held closed, thus removing the possibility of a child entering the box and being locked in. The idea was condemned by a popular manufacturer who stated that the magnetic lock was not strong enough to seal the door and that contamination of food could cause more deaths than that of suffocation.

We have an idea we believe can be worked out very practically and with little expense. Why not make a lock that has a magnetic trigger which would make a mechanical lock inoperative by means of a trip? As long as the refrigerator is plugged in, the magnet is energized and the mechanical lock holds the door shut in the conventional way * * * no contamination of food here. However, once the refrigerator is discarded and the current shut off, the mechanical lock be-

comes completely inoperative, and the door can be pushed open without any effort, since the catch will not hold.

The magnetic lock is not new. There are many locks of this kind on the market used on doors of cashiers' cages, etc. The idea is the same; all it needs is slight revision to apply to a refrigerator latch. It can be done, and we urge the manufacturers of refrigerators to give this idea some thought. Perhaps it won't be the immediate answer to those boxes now on the market, but the millions of potential deathtraps must be considered. There has to be a starting point to end—once and for all—any possibility of child deaths by suffocation in discraded refrigerators.

Tito and American Foreign Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, July 7, 1956

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am including an address by Mr. George E. Stringfellow, senior vice president of the Thomas A. Edison Co., of West Orange, N. J., before the Kiwanis Club of Detroit, Mich., on Tuesday, July 10.

The address follows:

WHO MAKES AMERICA'S FOREIGN POLICY?

Mr. Chairman, fellow Kiwanians, distinguished guests, I feel highly honored to have been invited to take part in your program today.

Your club was the first Kiwanis Club to be established in the country. Chronologically, you are the No. 1 club. In the minds of many people, you are also the No. 1 club in influence and prestige as a result of your 41-year history of constructive accomplishment.

I accepted your invitation enthusiastically, for I remember most pleasantly my visit with you about 8 years ago, and I welcomed the opportunity to renew my acquaintance with those whom I met at that time and to meet the newer members of your fine club.

Eight years ago I spoke to you about Thomas Alva Edison—a symbol of free enterprise. Today I shall speak to you about an entirely different type of individual whose philosophy is inimical to our way of life. Let me tell you about Dictator Tito and our foreign policy.

Who is Dictator Tito? Here in part is his record for the last 37 years:

From 1919 to 1923 he was a Communist organizer in Russia.

From 1923 to 1935 he was an active underground Yugoslavian agitator.

From 1935 to 1939 he represented Dictator Stalin as a traveling member of the Communist Internationale.

From 1941 to 1945 he led the Communist guerrilla war against Germany.

From 1945 to 1948 he ran Yugoslavia as a Stalin satellite.

In 1948 he broke with Stalin.

In 1953, following Stalin's death, he proclaimed his neutrality.

In 1956 he was received in Moscow as a hero, and several days ago this Communist dictator was quoted in the press as having said, "Nothing of the kind [split between Moscow and Tito] will ever happen again. Our two countries will march along the path of Marx, Engels, and Lenin."

There you have a thumbnail sketch of Dictator Tito whom our Government has propped up for many years at great cost to the American taxpayers.

Let's see how he has shown his gratitude.

In 1946, an unarmed American transport plane, en route from Austria to Italy was forced off its regular course by bad weather and inadvertently flew over Yugoslavian territory. The plane was shot down without warning and 5 gallant American soldiers met their death.

A couple of days later another unarmed American transport plane was forced down and American soldiers were thrown into jail.

On October 19, 1946, our State Department charged that this Communist dictator had been holding 165 American citizens in one of his concentration camps and that because of mistreatment some of the citizens had died and others had been sent to the Soviet Union to serve as slave labor.

A storm of protest forced Dictator Tito to release the American soldiers whose unarmed plane had been forced down and the occupants thrown into jail, and to pay an indemnity for those who had been killed when their unarmed plane was shot down. No report, so far as I know, has been made by the State Department or the Pentagon on the whereabouts of the 165 American citizens whom Tito had thrown into his concentration camp and then hired out to private individuals or sent to Soviet Union slave-labor camps.

There has been much criticism in Congress and in the press of our subsidizing this Communist dictator, but that criticism hasn't deterred the pro-Communist and anti-Americans in the State Department and in the Pentagon.

Even after the Communist dictator shot down and forced down the unarmed American transport planes and threw 165 Americans in concentration camps and hired them out like animals, we have given him more than a billion dollars.

Our Federal Government has in the budget for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, more than $30 million for economic aid for this Communist dictator. The dollar value of the military aid we are told, is classified information and we Americans, who are putting up the money, cannot be trusted with that information. However, this is not classified information to the Communist dictator and his comrades in the Kremlin. Isn't it about time we told the administrators of our national affairs that we must know as much about our affairs as the Communist dictator or his comrades in the Kremlin?

We are told that Tito's army today has so much United States military equipment given it by our Government that it costs $50 million per year for parts and supplies to keep this dictator's army going, and we American taxpayers foot that bill, too.

This leads me to ask this penetrating question. It is a question which should be in the mind of every loyal American. The question is "Who makes America's foreign policy?"

Is it made by men who think first of America or is it made by men who would promote Communist rule in America?

Let me call as my only witness: Dr. WALTER H. JUDD, of Minneapolis, Minn., to answer that question. I qualify Dr. JUDD as an expert witness by giving you a brief excerpt of his biography.

Dr. JUDD enlisted in the United States Army in 1918. He received a fellowship in surgery from Mayo Clinic, Rochester, Minn. After firsthand observation of the Communist movement in China, beginning in 1927 until after the invasion of China by Japan in 1937, he returned from China in 1938 and spent the next 2 years speaking throughout the United States in an attempt to arouse Americans to the menace of Japan's military expansion and the threat of world peace by the Communist subversion in China. Dr. JUDD was elected to Congress in 1942 and has served continuously and well in that capacity for the last 14 years.

Appearing on May 31, 1956, before the Senate Subcommittee on Internal Security, Congressman JUDD was asked some penetrating questions by Senator JAMES O. EASTLAND, chairman of the committee. Here are a few of them:

Question: "Do you think there are still pro-Communists in the State Department and the Pentagon?"

Answer: "Why, yes. There are employees in both the State Department and the Pentagon who advocate policies that work out to the good of the Communist Party."

Question: "Do you think * * * that committees * * * should look into who has been writing * * * the directives that make policies?"

Answer: "I think that is where pay dirt will be found, sir."

Question: "Do you think today that * * * high officials in the State Department and Pentagon are subject to pro-Communist influence?"

Answer: "Yes; I do. I don't see how they could come to the conclusion they do if that weren't the case."

Question: "What is the trouble; can't they fire them?"

Answer: "Well, it seems to me that they could if there was the will to be really tough in policing an organization and tightening it up."

Question: "You say that the men at the top (in the State Department and Pentagon) are being influenced by pro-Communists in these departments?"

Answer: "Yes."

Congressman JUDD is one of the ablest, one of the most forthright, and one of the most loyal men in America and I think he knows what he is talking about. Appearing before the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate on June 26, John Foster Dulles, Secretary of State, said he was vitally concerned that we do nothing that would drive Yugoslavia back into the Russian camp and that we should therefore continue to subsidize this Communist dictator.

What does the Secretary of State mean when he says, "If we do not continue to subsidize Communist Dictator Tito he will take Yugoslavia back into the Russian camp." Can't the Secretary read? If he reads, can't he understand. Didn't he see in the papers recently that Tito had in effect proclaimed to the world that he is back in the Russian camp?

While pledging his allegiance to Soviet Russia, Communist Dictator Tito stated: "Our (Yugoslavia) relationship with the United States will not suffer" as a result of lining up with his comrades in the Kremlin, and if we are to judge by what Mr. Dulles said, Tito is right—it won't. It seems we'll keep right on subsidizing this Communist dictator.

Again I ask the question that must be uppermost in your minds, as it is in mine: "Who Makes America's Foreign Policy?"

Resolution by Alabama Historical Society

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH A. ROBERTS
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 13, 1956

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CON-

GRESSIONAL RECORD I include the text of a resolution adopted by the historical society devoted to the memory of Gen. John H. Forney, a great Civil War hero. The resolution was adopted by the society on June 15, 1956, at their annual meeting in Jacksonville, Ala.:

The society approved unanimously a resolution offered by T. Weller Smith, of Jacksonville, declaring:

"We reaffirm our allegiance to the constitution of the State of Alabama and the laws enacted thereunder for preserving the southern way of life. We believe that the system of government thus established was the work of statesmen who by actual experience understood and understand the peculiar needs of our people and what is best socially and morally for our total population and we deplore any effort, legal or otherwise, to destroy that heritage and that wisdom."

Excerpts From Address by Hon. Alexander Wiley, of Wisconsin, at Harris Memorial Foundation, University of Chicago

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, July 13, 1956

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, America and the rest of the free world were appalled at the bitter and completely unjustified attack made by Soviet Representative, Andrei Gromyko, at the United Nations Disarmament Commission against the suggestions, made in good faith, by our United States delegation.

Ambassador Henry Cabot Lodge, Jr., in replying to Mr. Gromyko, termed the Soviet delegate's unwarranted attack as "a scurrilous attack on my country in the worst traditions of Stalinism."

If the nations are to prove adequate to the challenge of the atomic bomb and the hydrogen bomb, then the world must expect something more from Soviet spokesmen than vitriol. The world has a right to expect that the Soviet Union will at least make an effort to respond to free world proposals in the spirit in which they are offered—a spirit of good faith and of genuine desire to find a common meeting ground.

We are now awaiting the new comments of the able leader who has been spearheading our disarmament efforts, the Honorable Harold Stassen.

I believe that Governor Stassen is to be commended for the great job he has been performing patiently, industriously, and with imagination and initiative.

On Saturday night, June 30, it was my own privilege to comment on the future of the United Nations, and to touch briefly upon the atomic problem. At that time, I delivered an address before the Norman Wait Harris Memorial Foundation, at the University of Chicago. I ask unanimous consent that excerpts from that address be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the excerpts from the address were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SENATOR WILEY SAYS ATOMIC CLOUD OVER WORLD IMPELS FURTHER ALL-OUT EFFORT FOR U. N. EFFECTIVENESS—STATES U. N. CHARTER CONFERENCE CAN BE VALUABLE FORUM

I am delighted to be here with you this evening, to contribute, if only in a small way, to your most significant deliberations.

The foundation's annual symposiums in the field of international relations have been outstanding, and have proven, I am sure, invaluable in stimulating an increased public awareness of today's major world problems.

Nineteen hundred and fifty-six marks, as you so well know, the 11th anniversary of the founding of the United Nations. Thus, we are now into the second decade of its existence.

What more appropriate time to consider all aspects of the organization and some of the major issues it poses for American foreign policy?

Earlier this week you have, indeed, heard from an imposing array of experts in the overall field of United States foreign policy and international organization.

I feel particularly honored to participate in these lectures and to discuss with you one of my very special subjects—the Future of the United Nations and Charter Review.

MY WORK ON SENATE SUBCOMMITTEE

As a member of our Senate Subcommittee on Charter Review and its first chairman, I have closely studied charter problems, particularly during the past 3 years of our committee's operations.

And this spring, with the prospect of a review conference in sight, we submitted our final recommendations covering this subject.

Moreover, now that the U. N. General Assembly has approved in principle the calling of a charter review conference, and a special committee has been set up to undertake the preliminary planning, it is especially timely for a public examination such as this, of ways and means by which the United Nations can, indeed, be improved.

CAUTIOUS OPTIMISM IN U. N. JUSTIFIED

The basic theme of my comments tonight is one of optimism—cautious but definite optimism. I have faith in the U. N., justified faith, and in our ability to help make it achieve the objectives which are dead to the hearts of mankind.

I have particular faith that some of the recent achievements of the U. N. will, in the future, emerge to still larger proportions.

I refer, for example, to the outstanding contribution which has been made to the cause of peace by the successful visit of the Secretary General Dag Hammarsjkold to the explosive Middle East.

I refer, too, to the formation of the International Atomic Agency.

The actual harnessing of atoms for peace in accordance with President Eisenhower's historic address of December 1953, will represent one of the most magnificent landmarks of this 20th century, if it can reach fruition, as we earnestly hope it will.

THE ATOMIC CLOUD OVER THE WORLD

The mighty atom symbolizes both hope and danger:

Hope in the form of a world of greater plenty.

Danger through the dread heat, blast, and radiation effects of nuclear explosives. The latter problem—radiation—provides a particularly ominous background of our deliberations. I refer, for example to possible radioactive contamination of the waters of the oceans, of plant and animal life, and most important of all, of human beings—not only in the present generation but in the genetic traits of future generations.

With scientific developments accelerating, we may expect our problems of this nature in the jet-atomic age to multiply further. And our margin for error, our area of leeway, of possible mistakes—becomes narrower and narrower.

Man is still simply at the threshhold of still more dramatic phases of the Atomic Age—dramatic for good or for evil.

In the light of this and other clouds over the world, the U. N. simply has to succeed.

Dwight D. Eisenhower has said that there "is no alternative to peace." That means that there is no alternative but to work through the U. N. on behalf of these most priceless of all goals—the preservation of human freedom and the preservation of a just and durable peace.

Let us look now for a brief moment—backward—into the world of 1945, as compared with 1956.

EAST-WEST STRUGGLE IMPAIRED CHARTER HOPES

We quickly see that the great aspiration, born during World War II, the hoped-for-agreement among the Big Four soon deteriorated into a chronic East-West struggle.

That epic clash was symbolized by 33,000 heroic American dead, 110,000 United States wounded in the Korean war, plus 14,000 casualties from other gallant United Nations forces and a half-million brave South Korean casualties.

But the East-West clash is symbolized as well in virtually every geographic area of the world—a political, economic, social, cultural, propaganda contest—sometimes smooth, sometimes crude, but always there.

Inevitably, the U. N., conceived in the high hopes of San Francisco, the hopes of Big 4 unanimity, was jarred again and again by bitter dispute and by consequent stalemate and frustration.

U. N. HAS BEEN MATURING

This not to play down the organization.

Quite the contrary, it is to point out that we have learned a lot—the hard way—since 1945.

At that time, we tended to look upon the U. N. in a kind of aura of perfection. Many Americans didn't actually expect to have much to do in caring for the U. N. or in guiding it toward maturity. At that time, they felt we had helped give birth to something new and perfect, and we were rightly proud of our part.

Yet, we soon thought that the United Nations had a mind of its own. It didn't always do our bidding.

Too, it started things without seeing completion. And we saw that member nations, over the Western member group, like members of a family, didn't always see eye to eye.

Simply put, the organization was still too young to face all the most acute world problems successfully. To ask a 3, or 4, or 11-year-old child to perform all the family duties is sheer folly.

It took us a while to realize the significance of this analogy, and to proceed to let the U. N. handle those functions, commensurate with its development.

But the international organization did learn through experience what it could do. Today, the U. N. is stil not ready to meet every problem troubling the family of nations.

But it can be called on increasingly for constructive assistance. I believe that American foreign policy toward the U. N. must take this objective realistic point of view.

PHASES OF U. N. ACHIEVEMENTS

Other speakers this week have no doubt touched on a number of major issues where the Organization has come to the forefront:

The Korean conflict proved the historic force of collective security against outright aggression.

The continued meetings of the U. N. Disarmament Commission have been long and tedious. But the work of this group has proved that the Soviets can definitely be moved. Comparison of their 1946 position on reduction of armaments with their policy papers of today confirms this fact.

The world forum function of the U. N. has also shown us that moral forces and public opinon can, indeed, be successfully aroused.

The evolution of U. N. Technical Assistance and the work of auxiliary agencies—UNICEF, WHO, FAO—have proven most salutary.

ADAPTATION OF THE U. N.

As we proceed into the 11th year of the U. N., we see that a new look must be taken at its methods of operation and certain governing laws. For this reason, great importance is rightly attached to review or possible amendment of the U. N. Charter.

However, we must carefully weigh several factors in discussing this problem.

Chief Justice Marshall referring to our Constitution said that "it was intended to endure for ages to come, and consequently to be adapted to the various crises of human affairs." The Constitution has, in fact proved to be a flexible document, and it had adjusted to the growth of our country.

Similarly, the charter has often adjusted to new situations without the necessity for rigid amendment. U. N. legal powers, as such, are now, no more or no less; principles and goals have not changed. Indeed, the adjustments have brought end-goals close to fulfillment, by experimenting and avoiding futility and overcoming stalemate.

SOME CHARTER PROVISIONS HAVE FALLEN INTO DISUSE

The evolution of the charter is most interesting to note. In some cases, we have seen specific provisions fall into disuse, while others have been applied in a way that the charter framers perhaps never contemplated.

For instance, we have seen Security Council enforcement powers under article VII set aside, with the impossibility of great power unanimity. Similarly article 106 on interim enforcement measures has settled into disuse.

IMPRESSIVE NEW FUNCTIONING

On the other hand, new functions and interpretations have taken form. The General Assembly has become the leading forum for consideration of political issues. New activities in the colonial field have grown out of interpretations of article 73 regarding responsibilities with respect to non-self-governing territories. The emerging role of the Secretary General has opened another major outlet in the peaceful settlement of disputes.

All of these illustrations are not to presume that the charter is so flexible that we can change it at will, merely by interpretation. Certainly a member that supports a broad interpreation in one instance might find such a precedent against its interests in another situation. And a General Assembly which might seek to enlarge its area of power by narrow voting margins would no doubt find its influence weakened in a short time.

The point is that we must strike a happy medium between the extreme positions of loose as against strict construction.

We must also bear in mind the fact that we cannot stage a review conference, until the most thorough preparations have been undertaken by other member states, as well as by the U. N. Secretariat.

THE IMPORTANCE OF MEMBER NATIONS' SPIRIT

Whether or not the review conference will serve a lastingly constructive purpose depends largely on the attitudes with which members approach this conference.

We must have some kind of true spirit of accord, if this meeting is really to work out. This means that a number of agreements definitely have to be reached between the Soviet Union and the United States.

Of course, we have learned through experience the pitfalls of our dealings with zig-zagging Russia. So we must not be deluded by her latest tactical shifts—the new Bulganin-Khrushchev soft line.

We would nonetheless hope that the Soviet Union could join in the planning of a review conference, in cooperation with the community of nations. We should pledge ourselves to do everything consistent with out national security to bring it about. But we must not wear rose-colored glasses.

And we must remember that not all the problems complicating charter review are based solely on Soviet-American postwar relations.

Differences, as you are all aware, exist between large and small nations, between the developed and less-advanced countries, between states with colonial holdings and the newly independent countries.

However much we may be interested in some specific change, it must be remembered that 75 other nations at the coming conference will each have their proper vote.

The highly articulate Asia-African bloc, now stronger than ever in numbers, truly will play a particularly significant role. We welcome the enlarged role of the newly independent nations, although we recognize that the problem of securing agreement inevitably becomes more complex.

Unless we understand all the above considerations prior to the calling of a review conference, we are almost certain to become disillusioned when events occur which cannot be foreseen or planned.

SENATE HAS VITAL RESPONSIBILITY

Now, the responsibilities of the Senate with regard to the United Nations and other peace and security organizations are, of course, obvious.

First of all, we have the basic obligation of being a well-informed body. Likewise, we have dual constitutional responsibility. No amendments to the charter proposed at any future conference can become effective without the advice and consent of the Senate.

Secondly, the Senate has the continuing function of advice in foreign affairs. We need not and would not stand apart from a review conference and wait to see what may be produced in the way of amendments to the charter. We may work with the President and the Secretary of State on what changes, if any, are believed desirable or acceptable.

In turn, our subcommittee, in its study of charter review, has been guided by certain basic principles.

First of all we did not try to draw up precise proposals for specific changes in the language of the charter. Any international agreement involves negotiation and compromise. And these functions are, under the Constitution, essentially within the responsibility of the executive branch. Instead, we have attempted to suggest areas which we believe might be profitably explored by the Chief Executive in conference with other United Nations members.

And in our report recommendations, we have not intended to speak for the Senate as a whole, or to make any advance commitments as a group of individuals regarding future responses to specific proposals. If the President submits recommendations, it will then be time for the Senate to give them careful and thorough consideration, bearing in mind not only the subcommitee's study, but, of course, the existing international and domestic conditions.

IMPORTANT SENATE COMMITTEE WORK

Again the importance of an informed public on this subject becomes obvious. The President and Senate cannot formulate an effective foreign policy without the backing of the people. Consequently, one of the chief aims of our Senate Subcommittee on Charter Review has been to foster an intelligent American public opinion.

We have done this in several ways. During the 3 years of intensive study and research into all problems of Charter Review, we have accumulated a wealth of documentary materials—materials which have been published and subjected to careful analysis. Not only are these intended to educate the interested citizen, but we have strongly urged the Department of State to scrutinize the many specific proposals and recommendations for Charter revision.

At the same time, we have held public hearings at which we received testimony from top officials in the executive branch. And our 18 days of public hearings outside of Washington represent the first trial in taking a major issue of foreign policy directly to the people for testimony and discussion.

Witnesses were drawn from all walks of life, and their observations served to enrich our own understanding of the problems before us. Thus, we were able to tap new sources of wisdom throughout the country on this subject—sources which might have otherwise remained dormant.

PRINCIPAL SUBCOMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

Let me, for a moment, focus attention on a few of the chief recommendations incorporated in our final subcommittee report.

Few aspects of the U. N. have been more widely debated than the veto problem. There is no doubt but that it has long hampered the operation of the Security Council.

Yet, more is involved here than a simple mechanical device. We cannot ignore the fact that we have insisted on the rule of unanimity in the Charter, and certainly for valid reasons.

The criticism thus really lies in misuse of the veto by Russia.

How can we now best approach this problem?

We might look for clearer distinctions between the more procedural, as against substantive questions. This is difficult, although in several minor instances, we have seen issues successfully listed as procedural through voluntary agreement.

Admittedly, the major scope of Security Council work still requires Great Power unanimity. The increase in the number of issues which can be considered as procedural will in turn depend on East-West relations.

The Vandenberg resolution of 1948 certainly remains a valid objective of policy. But except, possibly, in cases of pacific settlement and the admission of new members, it is obvious that present circumstances do not permit further restriction of the veto power.

NEW THINKING ON ADMISSION OF MEMBERS

The membership provisions of the Charter have undergone change in view of recent package developments in admission of new members. It would seem that article 4 of the Charter deserves reevaluation.

We have long wearied of the arbitrary Soviet veto on admission of western-sponsored nations. Some way had to be found within the purview of the Charter to allow qualified, peace-loving nations to become members.

The so-called package arrangement last December signified several developments and new interpretations. The practice of abstention in this case prevented total paralysis of the Security Council, in an instance where an outright veto could be sidestepped. Thus, the principle of the Vandenberg resolution was reaffirmed in removing the veto on memrebship questions through protocol agreement.

At the same time, it was felt that the admission of a majority of qualified applicants would strengthen the United Nations morally and materially. And their participation would outweigh the obvious disadvantages, incurred by membership of the four satellites—which are, of course, hardly independent nations.

OTHER CHANGES BECAUSE OF ENLARGED MEMBERSHIP

The admission of new members will, no doubt, require future review of the seat allocations with in the various bodies.

This, in turn, will affect the voting requirements in decisionmaking which may require Charter amendment.

We can also expect new and important political problems brought before the General Assembly with the increased membership. The United Nations will speak with wider authority. It will more accurately reflect underlying conditions as they are in the world, and call our attention more decisively to the crucial problems of our age.

But a greater sense of responsibility must be assumed by all members, if the enlarged organization is to develop further in a sound and practical way, and if problems are to be solved and not aggravated.

ADVANCING CRUCIAL GOAL OF SECURITY

Another central issue is, of course, the matter of collective security under the Charter. We have learned that the original premises of universal collective security under the charter have not been attainable.

Consequently, to fight aggression, alternative methods of collective defense had to be developed.

The Uniting-for-Peace resolution and our sound regional defense pact with 42 nations have answered Russia's abuse of the veto. They have given us free world security inside the Charter, but outside the veto.

These indispensable security arrangements have definitely not impaired the United Nations machinery which can still operate in those areas not at issue among the permanent powers.

And if further machinery is necessary for the defense of the Nation, a logical step might be to explore the possibilities of linking together the various regional and other defense treaties in which we now participate.

They represent fairly close to the maximum strength which we could actually hope to mobilize in the present period, for defense against Communist aggression.

This approach could leave unimpaired the peaceful settlement and other useful machinery of the United Nations itself. It could leave intact the enforcement machinery of the U. N., available whenever some agreement among the Great Powers would permit its use.

OTHER ISSUES FOR REVIEW

These, then, are but a few of the questions which must be thoroughly though out by the Senate, the President, and by the American people, in preparation for a truly successful review conference on the U. N. Charter.

Member countries will want to take a fresh look at a good many other issues which were considered at San Francisco in 1945.

These include the impact of the United Nations on domestic jurisdiction.

The status of the specialized agencies.

And the progress of the trusteeships and dependent territories.

The alternatives on all of these are numerous, and surrounding factors highly complex.

Yet, the problem of formulating policy on these questions is not as serious as it might at first seem. These are problems which have recurred before the United Nations in one form or another during the past 10 years. The American Government has taken positions on many of these before.

The issues have been aired, and opposing points of view made known. Within reason, then, it would be possible to predict what alternatives are likely to be acceptable to a majority of the members taking part in the review conference.

There will undoubtedly be wide room for negotiation and accommodation. And if we can eventually have a sincere and thoroughgoing exchange of ideas on some of these matters, as they relate to the charter, we may hope for useful results from the review conference.

ACCENT ON THE SPIRIT, NOT JUST THE FORM

There will be trial and error, therefore, as there has been in the past. No absolutely set plan for review and revision, no rigid formula, few hard and fast overall commitments on our part will be feasible.

We must always act by honor and principle, but still, at least partly, play by ear—adjusting, adapting, we must seek constantly, not basically a perfected form, but rather, basically, an improved spirit—an improved attitude, a more dynamic will toward agreement on the part of all nations.

CONCLUSION

In 1945, when the Senate ratified the U. N. Charter, our Foreign Relations Committee expressed the belief that United States "participation in the United Nations is in accord with our national interests, and * * * our contributions to the United Nations will be repaid many times."

Membership in the U. N. is still absolutely in our national interest.

President Eisenhower, in his latest state of the Union message, stressed the central aim of our foreign policy: "The waging of peace, with as much resourcefulnes, with as great a sense of dedication and urgency, as we have ever mustered in defense of our country in time of war."

We know that the U. N. is a vital instrument in setting the tone for international harmony. We rightly took the lead in forming this international organization. It is our continuing responsibility to utilize it to the fullest extent, aware of its limitations, yet inspired over its potential.

Peace takes practice.

The charter has set forth some very important rules of the game. Within this framework, whether there is formal amendment or not, the nations of the world can practice until peace and security are genuinely accomplished.

God grant, we hope and pray, that there will be sufficient time, a genuine spirit, in which to succeed.

Educational TV in Maryland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DeWITT S. HYDE

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 13, 1956

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I insert in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article from the July 8, 1956, issue of the New York Times entitled "Maryland Project":

MARYLAND PROJECT—SCHOOL NETWORK TO TEST EDUCATIONAL TV

(By Jack Gould)

An experiment of potentially great importance is to be undertaken in the months ahead at Hagerstown, Md. Under a 3-year plan, to be started next week, all 45 public schools under the jurisdiction of the Washington County board of education are to be linked by a closed-circuit television network.

This project promises to be much the most comprehensive test of television usefulness within a school system. Programs will not actually be broadcast for reception in the home; they will be limited to the school buildings.

The fund for the advancement of education is going to assume the substantial cost of making a study and evaluating the effectiveness of TV as a teaching tool. The Radio-Electronics Television Manufacturers Association is donating all the necessary equipment. The Washington County school system will meet the operating costs.

GOAL

The purpose of the experiment will be to find what exactly may be television's role in the formal educational process.

William Brish, superintendent of schools in Washington County, says the test should provide an opportunity to learn to what extent the television screen may supplement the textbook.

One primary concern, of course, is the shortage everywhere of qualified teachers. Will TV enable one gifted teacher to serve many communities rather than only a single classroom? Which courses lend themselves to TV and which may not?

Eight schools in Hagerstown will be equipped this fall to try TV. The others will be joined by September 1958.

Starting next week, a group of 40 teachers is scheduled to participate in a TV workshop at Hagerstown. Among the matters to be covered is the instruction of teachers in the use of TV. Direct instruction and supplemental instruction by means of plays, films, and talks will be examined.

The Hagerstown experiment is both the latest and most dramatic evidence of the growing importance of closed-circuit television in the educational sphere. Unquestionably, there is and should be a place for educational television that can be received on present sets in the home. But the cost of such an operation is extremely high in terms of the budgets of the education world. The self-contained closed-circuit operation by comparison is much more feasible.

In this connection a most interesting and challenging study of closed-circuit TV has just been made by Sir George Barnes, who later this month formally resigns as director of television for the British Broadcasting Corporation. On Sept. 1 he becomes principal, or, in American terms, president, of the University College of North Staffordshire.

At the invitation of the Fund for the Advancement of Education, Sir George recently visited a number of American universities and closed-circuit video was one of his special interests.

It is Sir George's belief that the educational use of TV must be most carefully and thoroughly developed, that it is not a glamorous cure-all for all the problems that may beset education.

POTENTIAL

But Sir George fundamentally believes that with skill, experience, and understanding television can become a most important educational tool. To learn to use that tool, to know its possibilities and limitations, can be of aid not only in coping with rising student enrollments in the western world, but in assisting backward nations to acquire the skills and dignity that are the rewards of knowledge.

What is to be the American role in international TV? Is it to be a mere commercial repetition of the Hollywood motion-picture past? Just more export of the same type of escapist entertainment that so often gave a distorted concept of American values and interests?

Or this time are we as a nation more mature and more prepared to recognize that the screen has a higher usefulness and purpose? Might we not employ television to teach the poorer peoples of the world how to read and write, how to drive a truck? Is this constructive and positive education not really the most basic of defenses against communism?

But the maximum and most beneficial use of the exciting medium of television cannot come before we ourselves know much more about its capabilities. Every person working in educational TV, often against discouraging odds, should take heart and recognize the way of the pioneer is seldom easy.

In comparison with the costly and spectacular doings of the commercial entertainment world, the Hagerstown experiment—and others like it—are bound to attract less notice for the moment. But for future generations over the world the type of television being advanced by the Hagerstown community could have a far more lasting and significant influence.

Need for Low Income Public Housing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ELMER J. HOLLAND
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 13, 1956

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include in the RECORD a statement pertaining to the need for low income public housing.

Mr. Speaker, the recent action of the Rules Committee tabling H. R. 11742, the general housing bill, is a body blow to the families most in need of Government housing support, namely, our families in the lowest income brackets. It is my understanding that the primary objection to the bill on the part of those Members voting to deny a rule was against the bill's public-housing provisions. For those of us who understand the urgent housing needs of our lowest income families, this type of reasoning is absolutely incomprehensible. Frankly, what some members of the Rules Committee regard as a vice is in fact the chief virtue of the bill.

The inescapable fact is that most of the unfortunate people now forced to live in slum areas do not have sufficient income to enable them to afford decent, safe, and sanitary private housing. Unless the Government provides decent housing at a rent which they can afford to pay, these poor unfortunate people are doomed to live in slums with all their attendant social evils.

Take the subject of slum clearance as a single example. Here is where the opponents of public housing fall flat on their face. Now when you clear slums people have to move. The best available data shows that approximately half of the families who live in slum areas cannot afford adequate private housing. And remember that under the law displaced families must be housed in safe and sanitary accommodations which they can afford. For these families the only answer is low-rent public housing.

Actually, H. R. 11742 proposes only a rock-bottom minimum public housing program. It would provide 50,000 units a year for a 3-year period, and an additional 10,000 units a year for a 3-year period for elderly families.

This total will barely take care of the public housing needs of families displaced by slum clearance operations, let alone fulfill the overall need for public housing.

I would like to see the House pass legislation authorizing a public housing program of much greater magnitude. But I think that it would be a national calamity to run the risk of losing even the minimum number of public housing units proposed by H. R. 11742.

Mr. Speaker, somebody once wrote a book called Progress and Poverty in describing an earlier stage of our American history. Despite our great economic strides forward we still have a distressing amount of poverty and want, and most of it is concentrated in our slums. We cannot in conscience ignore the vicious social evils which arise from slums and slum housing. We must have a sizable public housing program because that is the only answer for our lowest-income families.

Mr. Speaker, I hope and pray those members of the Rules Committee who voted to table the general housing bill will reconsider and let us have the housing legislation the national welfare demands.

Social Security Benefits at the Age of 60

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EUGENE SILER
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 13, 1956

Mr. SILER. Mr. Speaker, some people may consider Friday, the thirteenth, an unlucky day, but I consider this as a very lucky day when I am permitted to speak for millions of Americans who have been earning bread in the sweat of the human face over the productive years and who now only hope for a few declining years ahead that will permit them to have a little peace of mind and well-earned rest without constant worry over grocery bills and other similar charges upon everyday living as the old-age period of life overtakes them.

On February 28, 1955, I introduced H. R. 4489 seeking to reduce social-security retirement age to 60 years and to provide total and permanent disability benefits for those who have been working and covered under the law for a period of 12 quarters. I thought mine was a good bill then and I think it is a good bill now, although the House Ways and Means Committee has never seen fit to report my bill favorably up to the present time. If my mind does not change, I expect to introduce this same bill or one similar to it as long as I stay in Congress, or until ultimate success is assured on this proposition.

What is social security? Well, it is something that does not cost the taxpayers or the Government anything whatever for the payment of any of its benefits, strangely enough. It is insurance pure and simple. And insurance benefits always come from insurance premiums. If the risk is high, the premium must be high. If you take fire insurance on a paperboard house 2 miles from a fireplug, the policy cost, or the premium fixed, is necessarily high. But the fellow that wants to protect his house is always willing to pay the cost of protection and always wants his insurer to have actuarial soundness at all times. So, all that is now needed for safe social security benefits at 60 and sound disability benefits as mentioned is for a provision of a suitable premium to be paid by employers and employees that will be commensurate with the added benefits. From all my conversations with various people that would be affected, there is practically no objection among them for the added cost in view of the happy prospect of the added benefits.

We have heard much talk about our annual foreign aid that has already cost taxpayers $55 billion. So now, what about a discussion of some American aid that will cost taxpayers nothing whatever?

In one of the great newspapers of the country, in its issue of July 11, 1956, there was a front page article emphasizing the impossibility of a person over 45 years of age ever getting a job. A Labor Department survey shows, according to this article, that 3 out of every 4 employers ban middle-aged people. We all know this is true. Today, according to the news article, there are 47,400,000 people in America over the age of 45 years. But if we should provide social security benefits for workers at the age of 60 years, there would be many millions less people applying for these jobs and facing that vicious ban against the hiring of persons 45 years of age and over. Many would not seek or need these jobs at all since they would be able to live plain and simple lives in their little homes on the hills and up the hollows with some social security benefits coming in each month to keep the wolves of want away from their doors.

Moreover, if social security retirement at 60 years should become a general practice, there would be millions of job opportunities added for our young people all over America who are constantly coming out of the schools of the land. Every time a 60-year-old employee would retire, another job would be open for some willing youth of 18 or 20 years of age.

So, these are the stanch arguments for my bill or one similar, briefly summarized:

First. No cost to our taxpayers.

Second. Helping hand to our aging population.

Third. Additional job opportunities for our young people.

It is also worthwhile to observe that added social security benefits such as I have mentioned would inure to thousands of butchers, bakers and candlestick makers throughout the country. Now money is a medium of exchange. So, added money is just added exchange that eventually finds its way into the hands of all who have anything to sell. Once upon a time, a man said he had loaned a football player a dollar. His friend asked if he ever got it back. "No," said the lender, "I only got a 'halfback' on my books." Well, if we should in-

crease social security benefits, many tradesmen and taxpayers could expect to get many real "halfbacks" in their cash registers through channels of trade and commerce. And I am not talking about football players—just plain old "e pluribus unum," is what I mean.

Senator GEORGE, of Georgia, just recently stated, in talking about social security amendments now pending, "If we can get this through, then I am ready to go away from the Senate." So, perhaps it is proper for me to say, "If I can get my own social security amendment enacted into law to help our ordinary people, then I will be ready to go away from the House and close my own career in that great body."

A Threat to Free Enterprise

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE A. DONDERO
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 13, 1956

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD just granted by the House of Representatives, I include an editorial which appeared in the Pontiac Press of Pontiac, Mich., on Monday, July 9, 1956.

There are people in the United States who would like to see so-called big business destroyed. They believe it is harmful to our country. I remind them that whenever the United States gets into trouble or is threatened with war, the Government of the United States immediately contacts and appeals to big business to produce the sinews of war to defend ourselves.

Threatening to harass General Motors or any other big business in the United States is nothing more nor less than a threat to destroy the free competitive enterprise system which built our country, and it is also a threat to kill the very source of production and employment under our system of government.

The editorial follows:

GM BUS ANTITRUST SUIT FREE ENTERPRISE THREAT

So long as certain governmental bureaucrats regard size as a sin, General Motors can probably reconcile itself to further harassments.

Big targets are easier to hit than little ones and the Attorney General can anticipate greater applause when he trains his artillery on the champion.

Mr. Brownell is threatening to wave his big stick directly at the bus industry, and that strikes the Pontiac area amidships.

Much is at stake.

The Government learns that GM is making 80 percent of the Nation's buses and is wondering whether that's illegal or unfair or something. Certainly it appears to be indiscreet. There's nothing wrong with these buses, you understand. GM simply makes them so well they're in high demand.

Is the United States Government trying to decide whether it's permissible for one firm to do perceptibly better than another? Buyers are still actuated by the curious and ancient motive of wanting the most for their money. Obviously, that means a lot of them will buy the same product from the same producer if they are convinced that he excels perceptibly.

In a democracy, the people are free to trade where they please. They don't have to consult Mr. Brownell, Alice in Wonderland or Williams purple cow. If 9 out of 10 happen to like a GM bus, they have the right to buy one. That was the concept on which this Nation was founded. When GM has sold a certain number or a certain percent, can the Government tell them to cease or desist?

If GM diesel engines are better than others and GM proposes to equip only GM buses with GM diesel engines, does the Government figure that's a sin in itself?

Would Washington compel GM to refuse to sell when the buyers entered the showrooms? Would they have them tack up placards declaring:

"Closed for 2 months or until our competitors sell you some of their buses whether you prefer them or not."

Free competition would cease.

This would send all varieties of Pontiac area wage earners home by the thousands.

Ultimately, the Government would have to decide when GM competitors had sold enough trucks to allow GM to reopen—for a while.

They're going to rewrite sections of a lot of history books and redo the definitions of "democracy" and "republic" if ths conceit becomes a reality.

Hammarskjold Says Red China Should Be in the U. N.—People of the United States Think Otherwise

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, July 7, 1956

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I am including an article by that outstanding commentator, Mr. Constantine Brown, which appeared in the Evening Star for July 11. He points out that Dag Hammarskjold, Secretary General of the United Nations on a recent visit to Moscow declared emphatically that it was abnormal that the Chinese Peoples Republic was not a member of the United Nations.

Mr. Speaker, the overwhelming sentiment of the people of the United States is that the Secretary General is 1,000 percent wrong. They believe that until Red China redeems itself before the bar of world opinion for the atrocities it has committed against humanity that it must be excluded from entry into the United Nations.

Mr. Brown's timely article follows:

HAMMARSKJOLD AND RED CHINA—HE CALLS IT ABNORMAL THAT PEIPING, DECLARED OUTLAW, IS NOT IN U. N.

(By Constantine Brown)

During his visit to Moscow, Dag Hammarskjold, Secretary General of the United Nations, declared emphatically that it was abnormal that the Chinese Peoples' Republic was not a member of the U. N.

There have been many statements to that effect from the Soviet leaders, Prime Ministers Eden and Nehru, Marshal Tito, France's Foreign Minister Pineau, and many liberal groups in this country.

But the statement of the U. N. official is truly remarkable. He represents no particular country and should have no other policy than that of the world organization whose charter is based primarily on international morality.

The U. N. declared Communist China an outlaw by an overwhelming vote in 1951. At no time since has the People's Republic purged or attempted to purge itself of that censure. Many individual countries have changed their views for the sake of political expediency in the 5 years that have followed that censure. But the U. N. as an international body has not reversed itself in its denunciation of the Peiping regime as an international outlaw. Yet the head of that organization took it upon himself during his visit to Moscow to vindicate Communist China by stating that, the existing censure not withstanding, she should be admitted to the ranks of the so-called peace-loving nations.

It may be that international morality is a thing of the past—like the horse and buggy or mustache cups. It may be that expediency has now become the main guidepost in international affairs. However, even expediency, which we ourselves have practiced since the end of World War II, has its limitations—not necessarily because it is more than often immoral but because in the long-run it does not pay dividends.

What would our people have said if the FBI, having trouble catching up with Dillinger, had sent J. Edgar Hoover to talk things over with the gangster and, accepting his word that he would behave himself, suspended prosecution efforts. The parallel is not as far-fetched as it may appear. The gang headed by Mao Tse-tung, Chou En-lai and Chu Teh is guilty of even greater crimes toward the civilized world and the U. N. than was the late American public enemy No. 1.

Since the condemnation of the so-called Chinese People's Republic, its leaders have been guilty of wanton murders and unbelievable cruelties against prisoners from the U. N. armies. Yet the chief of that world organization, whose charter is based on the highest humanitarian principles, said on July 5 in Moscow that he considers abnormal the fact that Communist China is not one of the members.

That our close ally, Britain, should have taken a path away from interntional morality is understandable in this day and age. The London government was prompted in its recognition of Red China less by the desire to pick up a few hundred millions in trade than by the anxiety to keep the Commonwealth together. And the Indian subcontinent appears to Sir Anthony Eden far more important in this scheme than Australia, New Zealand, and South Africa which share our point of view on the Peiping regime. Hence, the British Prime Minister's concurrence with Nehru's policy of accepting Communist China into the U. N. at the earliest moment after our elections are over.

What is surprising is that some prominent persons and groups in this country should espouse the Peiping cause. We have suffered at the hands of the Chinese Communists far more than the rest of our associates in the war in Korea.

As a result of the summit meeting, we have begun diplomatic discussion with the Chinese Communists for the sole purpose (so the official version says) of freeing the remainder of our prisoners still kept in dungeons in China. The conversations between Ambassador Johnson and Red China's Wang have gone on for nearly a year. And even these talks, intended to bring the Chinese Communists within the international law on the matter of prisoners of war, have proved their bad faith. They liberated some but kept the rest with the intention of blackmailing Secretary Dulles into meeting for-

mally with Chou En-lai. Such high-level talks would further raise the prestige of the Peiping regime and help open the doors to Red China's admission to the U. N.

Despite the crimes of the Chinese Communists against their people and ours, Dulles is frequently criticized in inner circles of the administration for his subbornness. It appears that an epidemic of expediency in the remaining free countries has contaminated some of our own political thinkers.

Increasing Rates of Compensation for Service-Connected Disabilities

SPEECH
OF
HON. JOHN E. HENDERSON
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 12, 1956

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Speaker, it has long been recognized that this Government, as an expression of a grateful Nation, has a responsibility to look after the welfare of the disabled veterans who have incurred their disabilities by reason of valiant and loyal service in our Armed Forces. I am happy and proud that our National Government has always recognized this responsibility with sufficient flexibility so that as the needs of those disabled veterans change, the contribution of the Federal Government can also be changed. And so it is with the bill H. R. 12038, which is before the House for passage.

Times have changed and the status of our disabled veterans has also changed. The cost of living has increased and the present compensation which service-connected disabled veterans are now receiving, is insufficient to meet the daily needs and the necessary reserves for emergencies which the veteran faces. Consequently, the Congress, this year, giving due recognition to the needs of the veterans, will vote to increase the disability payments as follows:

For a 10 percent disability, the payment is increased from $17 to $19; for 20 percent disability the payment is increased from $33 to $36; for 30 percent disability, the payment is increased from $50 to $55; for 40 percent disability, the payment is increased from $66 to $73; for 50 percent disability, the payment is increased from $91 to $100; for 60 percent disability, the payment is increased from $109 to $120; for 70 percent disability, the payment is increased from $127 to $140; for 80 percent disability, the payment is increased from $145 to $160; for 90 percent disability, the payment is increased from $163 to $179. If the disability is rated as total, the monthly compensation is raised from $181 to $225.

All additional payments for disabilities such as those which require additional aid and attendance through the loss of both limbs and the like, are increased by $30. There has been a further liberalization with regard to veterans with service-connected disabilities who have dependents. Formerly, the law read that the veteran must be, at least, 60 percent disabled in order to receive compensation for his dependents. This provision has now been amended to read 50 percent.

Mr. Speaker, since I feel that those of our veterans who have service-connected disabilities and whose disabilities have been rated as genuinely disabling are entitled to increased compensation in order to meet the needs of life for themselves and their dependents, I am pleased to vote in favor of this legislation, H. R. 12038.

Address by Representative Francis E. Walter, at the Annual Banquet of the Department of Pennsylvania Encampment, Veterans of Foreign Wars, Benjamin Franklin Hotel, Philadelphia, Pa.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. B. W. (PAT) KEARNEY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 13, 1956

Mr. KEARNEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by Hon. FRANCIS E. WALTER:

ADDRESS BY REPRESENTATIVE FRANCIS E. WALTER, AT THE ANNUAL BANQUET OF THE DEPARTMENT OF PENNSYLVANIA ENCAMPMENT, VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS, BENJAMIN FRANKLIN HOTEL, PHILADELPHIA, PA.

During the past few months, the people of the free world have been subjected to a new propaganda barrage of dazzling size and intensity.

Most of you have become aware of it in one form or another. It originates in Moscow. In essence it seeks to persuade us that communism has suddenly transformed itself into a sweet, reasonable way of life and that we can collaborate, in fact should collaborate, with Soviet Russia with a calm and untroubled conscience.

As part of this campaign, the new rulers of Russia are making some startling disclosures. Joseph Stalin, who carried the banner of Soviet communism to nearly half the world, has been unmasked by his successors as a mad criminal who is guilty of the most horrible excesses against the Russian people and against the people of the other countries upon whom he imposed his tyranny.

The men who have made these disclosures profess to be deeply shocked by these facts, although they themselves participated in the very crimes for which they now lay all the blame on Stalin. Throughout the Communist world, these supposed disclosures are being received in a wild orgy of apology and self-abasement.

Now, for all of us who have had any contact with communism and who have not kept our eyes closed during the past years, Mr. Khrushchev isn't saying anything new at all. We have long been aware of what Stalin, with the very eager help of Mr. Khrushchev, achieved while he was in command of the Soviet empire. We have not been fooled before and there is no chance of our being fooled now.

If this were just another one of the many propaganda assaults that this world has been subjected to with varying degrees of success for the past several decades it wouldn't present any problem. The knowledge of the essential character of the Soviet Union and the global apparatus would make it easy to dispose of such new overtures. Unfortunately, this new campaign cannot be written off so simply. The new course that Stalin's successors are taking is having a tremendous impact in the free nations, in the so-called neutralists nations, and even regrettably in the United States itself.

From many sides, even from people whom we would expect to know better, we are urged to believe that a new era of peaceful coexistence has now begun. We should enter the embrace of Soviet friendship. We are even asked to believe that the despots who have ruled Russia since the revolution of 1917 have now vanished and that they have been replaced with a new breed of men, men intoxicated with the distilled milk of human kindness.

Yet fraudulent as this campaign may appear to everyone of us here tonight, the success that it is having is almost beyond conception. In Western Europe the defense structure which we have built during the past years at such great labor is crumbling. In Asia one nation after another is anchoring itself ever more firmly to Moscow. Even in countries with which we were once stanchly allied, whose traditions and aspirations we once thought were linked closely to our own, there is an unprecedented crest of anti-American hatred. And Tito, upon whom we have poured so many millions in the delusive hope that he would stand with us, has once more slipped on the Kremlin harness and has been designated to lead other countries into the Soviet grasp.

Here at home we are fast losing sight of the menace that communism embodies. The long chronicle of Communist subversion and conspiracy and deceit is being blurred until it is almost unrecognizable. The once "clear and present danger" of communism is coming to be regarded now as a danger remote and indistinct. The achievements of the Committee on Non-American Activities and other agencies, which have worked so long to expose the character of communism and the conspirators who serve it, are in danger of being swept aside.

The entire pattern permits only one conclusion: There is more possibility of the success of the international Communist movement now than at any time in the past—not by sudden revolution in our major cities but by the slow erosion of the strength that has enabled us to withstand the onslaughts of other enemies throughout our history.

I am sure that this must be a profoundly disturbing realization for you who are listening to me tonight. You have an especially acute grasp of the meaning of freedom and the way of life which we cherish. You are dedicated to the great traditions and institutions of America. You have tested your faith in armed combat. Many whom you have known and who are not here tonight have made the greatest possible contribution to the purchase of our liberty. Because you have been so directly involved with the issue of freedom, the forces that oppose that freedom today, are more than a threat to the Nation's security. They are a personal affront to everyone of you.

Times change and concepts change, science advances and so do other aspects of our society. The horseless carriage becomes the sleek, high-powered Cadillac. The technology of industry progresses—and so does the technology of treason.

Today's revolutionaries are no longer raucous, frenzied fanatics. They no longer shout openly for a blood-bath in which to drown the world. Their voices have become softer and their language more polished. They are no longer the "prisoners of starvation" beyond the pale of respectable life. Today they walk surely in the once restricted provinces of the university, the church and even finance and industry. Where once the threat they represented was an isolated and

easily definable one, today it has become diffused throughout the tissue of the Nation until even the most astute diagnosis has difficulty detecting its presence. The struggle today is lo longer one between reputable citizens and outcasts. It is a conflict over the basic values which this country embodies, over the very definition of men and of life itself.

Just this week in Washington, the Committee on Un-American Activities has been examining one phase of this problem, a phase which, in many respects, represents the whole. The thing that we have been concerned with is a "Report on Blacklisting" published by the Fund for the Republic, a tax-exempt institution endowed with some $15 million from the Ford Foundation. The report was prepared under the direction of John Cagley, formerly executive editor of Commonweal magazine. Mr. Cogley told the committee that he and his staff had spent more than 2 years studying cases of "blacklisting" in Hollywood and in the radio and television industry in New York.

Now, everyone with any decency deplores blacklisting, at least in the sense that we usually use the term. Blacklisting, as we ordinarily understand it, is a vicious and despicable practice. You know the kind of blacklisting I am talking about—firing someone or refusing to hire him because he has been engaged in some legitimate and morally defensible activity or because he is a Democrat or Republican, or a Negro or a Catholic or a Jew. Nobody would condemn that kind of blacklisting more than I would.

But the Fund for the Republic talks about another kind of blacklisting—one that has nothing to do with being a Democrat or a Republican or a union man or a member of some minority group. Strangely enough, it has to do only with one kind of people—Communists. This kind of blacklisting means taking action against the Communist conspiracy, and the report draws upon the revulsion we feel about blacklisting in the usual sense to arouse our condemnation of employment practices directed against Communists and against Communists only.

The report pretends to be completely objective and impartial. Actually it is about as partisan and prejudiced as it is possible to be. By the omission of some material and by the selection of other, by repeated emphasis on some facts and suppression of others, it makes an indictment of everyone who has been active in opposing the employment of Communists and Communist sympathizers in the entertainment industry. Moreover, several of the staff were already committed to a specific viewpoint before they began their work on the report and had backgrounds that made it difficult, if not impossible, for them to be anything approaching objectivity or impartiality. Witnesses who testified before the committee confirmed that the report just isn't worth the paper it's written on.

The report considers membership in the Communist conspiracy as a "political belief." It holds that anyone who refuses to hire a Communist and anyone who hires a Communist—because he is a Communist—is engaged in "political discrimination." It tries to create the impression that people are being penalized for their beliefs and that the innocent as well as the guilty are being destroyed by a vast machinery of persecution which has a bunch of extremists and crackpots at the controls. Its total effect is to blacken the name of every organization and every individual who has sincerely and patriotically been engaged in trying to get rid of Communist conspirators in the movies and on radio and television.

This report is of tremendous concern to all of you here. For one thing, when it deals with television and radio, and with the movies and the theater, it deals with something that is very familiar to everyone of us, something that plays a very big part in our lives. Right now in Philadelphia, an actress is appearing who is identified as having participated actively in the Communist movement. This actress, Gale Sondergaard, has been named by a half dozen people before the Committee on Un-American Activities as a member of the Communist Party. Hers is one of the cases discussed in the fund report but no mention was made of her background.

Further, this report is made possible by the money which all of us pay in taxes. The millions of dollars which the Fund for the Republic has to work with are beyond the reach of the Internal Revenue Service. The fund, unlike you and me, doesn't have to pay its own way with the Government. It is allowed to enjoy all the privileges of any organization or citizen who contributes to the support of the country but it escapes all the financial obligations which customarily accompany those privileges. So, inasmuch as we are in a way paying for the conclusions which Mr. Cogley and his staff have reached, we should at least get our money's worth to the extent of seeing precisely what they have to say.

If the charges which the report makes are true, then we are faced, indeed, with a very grave menace to the traditions of civil liberty and fair play upon which this country is founded. If innocent people are being thrown out of their jobs simply because of what they believe, if fanatics have established some kind of Ku Klux Klan of the air and screen which deprives good citizens of the right to work, for no justifiable reasons, then the report and the people who prepared that report are to be congratulated for having alerted us in such a fashion.

If, on the other hand, the report is not accurate and if the charges it makes are not true, then the report can be considered of value only to those people whose interests it would further—the participants in the Communist conspiracy.

The Committee on Un-American Activities has studied the problem of Communist infiltration in the entertainment industry in very great detail over a period of years. The conclusions that we have reached after hearing hundreds of witnesses and after extensive investigations are totally different from those of the Fund for the Republic.

We have not found any evidence of a blacklist of the kind that the report describes. We have found no lists which are used to banish people from jobs. We have found no clearance men who, as the report so eloquently puts it, have the power to wound and the power to heal. Nor, as the report seems to imply, anybody who wounds in order to heal—and for considerations which have nothing to do with patriotism.

I can tell you what we have found.

We have found a very serious infiltration of the entertainment industry by Communists and Communist sympathizers. We have found that increased infiltration of the entertainment industry is one of the foremost objectives of the Communists at this very moment. We have found that a number of persons who have cooperated loyally in exposing the Communist conspiracy in the entertainment industry have been denied work. I have in my desk at this very moment a letter from a prominent New Yorker containing the names of a number of people who have been denied employment because they dared to testify before the Committee on Un-American Activities. On the other hand, many persons who have been identified as Communists are still finding employment in the entertainment field.

The Communists know that movie screens and television channels are weapons of far greater potential power than any of the nuclear devices whose secrets we guard so jealously. Control of the media of communication and information means the control of the mind, and for the Communists this would mean a victory of far greater importance than victory on a dozen battlefields of war. The Communists know that before they can ever hope to win they must first destroy the freedom of the mind. They must undermine our reason and cripple our spirit. They must debase our standards and values and reduce them to rubble before the Communist tide can inundate our civilization.

Now, it is my feeling that the Fund's report proceeds from one basic error. It fails to recognize that the deprivation of employment of Communists and Communist sympathizers is possible not because of some self-appointed censors, but because—and only because—the American people themselves do not want Communists on their movie screens and on their radio and television programs. Without this repugnance of the American people to Communists and Communist sympathizers, there could be no successful action against Communists in the entertainment industry or anywhere else for that matter. When the report condemns denial of employment to Communists or Communist sympathizers, it is not just condemning some so-called pressure group or extremists. It is condemning all the people of the country who are exercising one of the most fundamental of the rights guaranteed them under the very system of government which communism seeks to destroy.

The American people realize that action against Communists is not a persecution for beliefs. Communists are being penalized, not for their beliefs, but for their actions—not for thinking something but for doing something, and doing something to further the objectives of communism. In the last analysis, the question of whether Communists and their sympathizers shall be permitted in the entertainment industry or in any other area is one for the American people to determine. The Fund for the Republic apparently does not believe that the American people have the competence or the right to express their disapproval of subversion. Nor does it believe that an employer has the right to pay or to withhold jobs from persons whom he believes are opposed to the very system from which they derive their income. It is peculiar that the report deals at great length with the rights of Communists but never with the rights of loyal patriotic citizens.

In California, where the report says much of this so-called blacklisting is taking place, there is a law that prohibits any employer from discharging or threatening to discharge anyone for political activities. But the California Supreme Court has ruled that this does not prohibit an employer from discharging anyone whose loyalty to the Nation has not been established to the employer's satisfaction. The reason for this, the court declared, is that disloyalty and subversive activity cannot be regarded as a protected political activity.

The Communists, and many who join them in their thinking, have always tried to encourage the belief that for some peculiar reason they have rights beyond those accorded to the ordinary citizen. The Communists, in this view, should not be prosecuted for any crime because this would be political retaliation—yielding to hysteria—though a Democrat or a Republican can be prosecuted for the same crime without arousing any protest on that score. Communists can't be fired from jobs in industry or from a university no matter how much they attempt to poison the atmosphere because, we are told, this would be political discrimination. As a matter of fact, if this view would prevail it would be advisable for everyone to become a Communist because he would no longer be subject to any of the normal difficulties or risks of everyday life. Being a Communist would automatically make him exempt from all social, moral, and political responsibility.

Fortunately, it does not seem as if this point of view will prevail. Treason and subversion have not yet become higher forms of patriotism. The American people are still able to think clearly on this subject and I am certain that they are not going to throw away the Constitution and the other guarantees of liberty which they have in order to establish other rights for those whom they can regard only as inflexible enemies. The structure of freedom and of liberty in America is a well-defined one. It was erected with great prudence and with great foresight. It was not designed to engineer its own collapse. It can be toppled only if we close our eyes and ears to the rules of commonsense and reason and stand aside for those who seek our ruin.

Report of the Attorney General's Committee on the Antitrust Laws

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ESTES KEFAUVER
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, July 13, 1956

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article which I wrote for the Mercer Law Review, of the Walter F. George School of Law, of Mercer University, at Macon, Ga. The article deals with the report of the Attorney General's Committee on the Antitrust Laws.

I think the article is a timely one, Mr. President, in view of the fact that a few days ago the House passed by an overwhelming vote House bill 1840, which amends the Robinson-Patman Act so as to prevent selling at discriminatory prices where the result would be to create a monopoly or to lessen competition. The bill has received extensive hearings in the Senate committee, over a period of 7 or 8 days; and the report on the bill has been printed. The bill is now on the agenda of the committee. I can think of no measure which would give more needed protection to small business and to merchants. They have had a very difficult time in meeting discriminatory prices. They have had a difficult time in surviving in the face of increased monopolistic influences.

Enactment of the bill is very greatly needed. I hope very much that the bill will be approved by the Judiciary Committee at its next meeting, and will be placed on the calendar of the Senate, and will be considered by the Senate and passed.

Mr. President, we talk a great deal about wanting to help small businessmen and small entrepreneurs, but very few measures for that purpose are passed. This bill will give them some relief. The bill is backed by small business associations, retail grocers, wholesale grocers, and druggists' associations. Throughout the country there is tremendous interest in the bill.

The article which I had the privilige of preparing, and which appeared in the Mercer Law Review, issued by the law school which is named after the distinguished senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], deals with this problem. For that reason, I feel that it will be of interest to the Members of the Senate; and I ask that the article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL'S COMMITTEE REPORT IN PERSPECTIVE

(By ESTES KEFAUVER, United States Senator from the State of Tennessee; A. B., University of Tennessee, 1924; LL. B., Yale University, 1927; Member of Congress, 1939–48; member of firm Kefauver, Duggan & McDonald, Chattanooga, Tenn.)

In a statement which I made before the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives on May 9, 1955, shortly after the issuance of the report of the Attorney General's Committee on the Antitrust Laws, I stated:

"It (the report) is a gigantic brief for the nonenforcement of the antitrust laws. It is a massive sedative designed to be absorbed by the enforcement agencies and the courts in the prosecution and trial of antimonopoly cases. The result can only be complete immobility on the monopoly front. To paraphrase General Sherman, if a complaint is received it won't be investigated. If it is investigated, it won't be brought to trial, and if it is brought to trial it won't be won."

Six months later in hearings before the House Small Business Committee, Prof. S. Chesterfield Oppenheim, the co-chairman of the Attorney General's Committee testified that the office of the Administrator of Federal Courts had sent a copy of the report of the Attorney General's Committee to every Federal judge in the United States. According to that testimony, Professor Oppenheim had suggested such action to the attorney general.

Quite apart from questions as to its propriety, the action is significant in that it illustrates the real and ultimate purpose of the report, which is to provide for every judge a complete guide or handbook on how to intepret the antitrust laws. It is handy; it is well-organized for the purpose; it has the appearance of being authoritative, enlightened and sophisticated; and it will save our overworked Federal judges, harassed as they are by overcrowded dockets, a great deal of time and labor which would otherwise have to be spent in looking up previous cases, analyzing legislative history, and carrying on the multitude of tasks required in the writing of a reasoned, well-considered opinion.

What was the special occasion for the report's appearance? Why was it felt that at this time a report of this type should be prepared? Certainly it could not have been the desire to obtain "clarification" of the antitrust laws, since the report warmly endorses the application and extension of the Rule of Reason in place of what are somewhat improperly termed "per se" rules. One can embrace either the need for clarification or the rule of reason but not both at the same time. As Prof. Louis B. Schwartz said in his dissent, "One can have more uncertainty and fewer per se rules, or less uncertainty and more per se rules. Antitrust critics will have to make a choice."

As one who has had the opportunity to observe firsthand the play of forces, the development of issues, and the activities of affected interests, my personal impression is that basically the report is merely the latest in a series of efforts to modify antitrust law enforcements. These efforts were touched off by four major decisions during the middle and late forties. Had the reasoning of this report been followed, those decisions would never have been handed down. And today, although the latter two decisions are still the law of the land, there is, I am sure, the hope on the part of the report's sponsors that, guided by its precepts and logic, the courts in the future will see the error of their ways and reverse these unfortunate mandates. What are these four cases?

They are, first: *Corn Products Refining Co.* v. *F. T. C.*;[1] second: *F. T. C.* v. *A. E. Staley Manufacturing Co.*;[2] third: *F. T. C.* v. *Cement Institute*;[3] and fourth: *Triangle Conduit Co., Inc.* v. *F. T. C.*[4]

The first two of these cases, the *Corn Products Co.* case and the *Staley Co.* case were brought under section 2 of the Clayton Act as amended by the Robinson-Patman Act.[5]

The significant facts in the *Corn Products* case were these: The Corn Products Refining Co. has two plants for the manufacture of glucose or corn sirup—one at Argo, Ill., within the Chicago switching district, and the other at Kansas City, Mo. In selling glucose, the Corn Products Co. used its Chicago plant as a basing point, charging the Chicago base price plus freight from Chicago on all sales, whether they were made from the Chicago plant or from the Kansas City, Mo., plant.

Under this practice buyers of glucose in Kansas City paid a fictitious or phantom freight of 40 cents on every 100 pounds of glucose they bought. On all deliveries from the Kansas City plant to points freightwise nearer to Kansas City than to Chicago, buyers paid phantom freight of varying amounts. On all deliveries from the Kansas City plant freightwise more remote from Kansas City than to Chicago, the Kansas City plant absorbed freight. Under this practice purchasers were denied the transportation savings that normally would accrue to them by reason of their proximity to Kansas City, and the Kansas City plant realized varying mill nets depending on the point of delivery.

It is an interesting part of the record that 2 or 3 candy plants in Kansas City buying glucose from the Kansas City plant, in order to avoid having to absorb the freight charge from Chicago to Kansas City—although the product was never actually transferred—moved their plants from Kansas City to Chicago. The Federal Trade Commission found that the practice constituted a price discrimination within the meaning of section 2 (a) of the Clayton Act—i. e. the Robinson-Patman Act—and that it had injured competition among candy manufacturers. The Supreme Court upheld the Commission's order that the Corn Products Refining Co. stop such price discrimination.

The Staley case, which was decided on the same day, is a companion case to the Corn Products Co. case. The Staley Manufacturing Co. had its glucose plant at Decatur, Ill. In selling glucose it used the Corn Products Co.'s Chicago price as a base price. Under this practice, the Staley Co. charged buyers of glucose at Decatur the Corn Product Co.'s Chicago base price plus freight from Chicago to Decatur, although glucose was bought from Staley's Decatur plant.

On all sales freightwise nearer to Decatur than to Chicago, the Staley Co. charged phantom freight. On all sales freightwise nearer to Chicago than to Decatur, the Staley plant absorbed freight. The result was price differences depending on the location of the buyer. The Commission found this to be price discrimination within the meaning of section 2 (a) of the Clayton Act and that it injured competition among the buyers of glucose. The Supreme Court affirmed the Federal Trade Commission's cease-and-desist order and in doing so rejected the defendant's pleas that its prices were made in good

Footnotes at end of speech.

faith to meet equally low prices of its competitors.

The proceedings in the Cement case were under both the Federal Trade Commission Act and the Clayton Act. The Federal Trade Commission charged, first, that cement manufacturers had conspired to use the basing-point system to eliminate price competition among themselves in violation of section 5 of the Federal Trade Commission Act; and, second, that this had resulted in price discrimination that substantially lessened competition among the sellers of cement. The Federal Trade Commission's record in this case—50,000 pages of testimony and 50,000 pages of exhibits—reveals concerted action among cement manufacturers extending intermittently over almost half a century designed to eliminate competition in the sale of cement. The basing-point system had become the principal instrument in this program, but it had been supplemented by the standardization of trade practices and the use of freight rate books to make easy the calculation of identical delivered prices at all points of delivery. While the system did not work equally well through good times and bad, it worked well enough so that throughout the 1930's cement manufacturers persistently offered to supply cement on Government projects at prices identical to the fourth decimal place, although the prices were presumably submitted independently under secret and competitive bidding.

The Supreme Court, in reversing the lower court, affirmed the Commission's orders to cement manufacturers that they cease and desist from perpetuating the use of the basing-point system through any planned common course of action.

The Conduit Co. case involved an appeal to the Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit from the finding by the Federal Trade Commission that 14 corporate manufacturers of rigid-steel conduit had violated section 5 of the Federal Trade Commission Act[6] in the sale of their products. Section 5, of course, gives the Federal Trade Commission the right to prevent unfair methods of competition. The Commission's complaints charged violation of the law on two counts.

Count one alleged that the respondents had conspired to use the basing-point system of pricing and thereby had substantially lessened competition in the sale of rigid-steel conduit, and that that was an unfair trade practice within the meaning of section 5 of the Federal Trade Commission Act.

Count two charged that each corporate respondent had violated section 5 of the Federal Trade Commission Act through the concurrent use of a formula method of making delivered-price quotations. The Commission found that for any seller to quote prices under a basing-point system with the knowledge that his rivals are doing the same thing and with the result that such practices eliminate competition among them is an unfair trade practice. The decision of the Seventh Circuit Court of Appeals on May 12, 1948, upholding the Commission is today the law of the land, as it was in effect sustained by a 4-to-4 vote of the Supreme Court.[7]

These four cases were directed at a type of pricing method which is inherently discriminatory in character and is particularly injurious to the normal growth of underdeveloped areas. In a speech which I gave on the floor of the United States Senate on June 1, 1950, I described at some length the manner in which these pricing systems have retarded the normal economic development of the South and the West.

The effect of the 4 decisions was to give the Federal Trade Commission 3 weapons with which to attack basing-point systems. Where the circumstances were similar to those which obtained under the Staley and Corn Products cases, the Commission could attack the systems under the Robinson-Patman Act as discriminatory. Where proof of agreement could be found, as in the Cement case, they could be attacked as instruments of unlawful conspiracies. But, perhaps most important, where each seller individually followed the same system knowing that every other seller was doing the same and where the result was to substantially lessen competition, the system would be attacked under count 2 of the Conduit Co. decision as an unfair method of competition in violation of the Federal Trade Commission Act. This was a formidable armory, and it is little wonder that on April 28, 1948, the day after the Supreme Court's decision in the Cement case was handed down, Mr. Irving S. Olds, then chairman of the board of the United States Steel Corp., stated that industry was faced with two alternatives—either it must seek remedial legislation or it must educate the Supreme Court.

For 7 years big industry has labored in the legislative vineyard without avail. The Attorney General's Committee report represents an attempted "massive education."

When the Supreme Court in the subsequent Standard Oil[8] case held that good faith is a complete defense to a charge of price discrimination, it virtually rendered useless the first of these weapons. As long as good faith remains a complete defense, it is difficult to envisage the successful use of the Robinson-Patman Act against a basing-point pricing system. But the phrase "as long as" is important. The decision in the Standard Oil case was, in effect, by a 5 to 4 vote; the actual vote was 5 to 3 but Justice Minton abstained as he had written the decision in the Circuit Court of Appeals upholding the Commission. Thus, with the shift of one vote, this potentially powerful weapon could once more be made effective. It is because of apprehension on this very point that such determined efforts have been made to secure the enactment of legislation which would in effect cement the Standard Oil decision into statutory law.

Perhaps after 7 years of unsuccessful effort on the legislative front it was thought that nothing would be lost and perhaps much might be gained by issuing a document which among other things, would reaffirm to the jurists the correctness of their original views, as expressed in the Standard Oil decision, moreover, such a document might provide the opportunity of extending the Court's decision beyond the province which the Court itself had established.

Personally, I disagree strongly with the Court's interpretation of the law in this case. The Court, I believe, was guilty of substituting for congressional intent its own views, misguided in my opinion, as to what is economically desirable. But the Court at least set certain limitations as to the extent to which the "good faith" defense could be used. Now the Attorney General's Committee would wipe out these limitations and thus go beyond the Supreme Court's decision.

In the Standard Oil decision the "good faith" defense was limited to the meeting of "lawful" prices; the Attorney General's Committee would in effect extend it to the meeting of "unlawful" prices as well. The report says that "* * * a seller should be deemed to have met a lawful price unless he knew or had good reason to believe otherwise" (p. 182). The report does not describe how the Federal Trade Commission is going to establish the state of knowledge on the part of the discriminator as to the lawfulness of the price which he is meeting. This is not the lawfulness of his own price, about which he might be expected to know a little, although even here there might be room for doubt. It is the lawfulness of someone else's price. One can hardly imagine a more impossible burden of proof to impose upon the enforcement agency.

The decision limited the "good faith" defense to discriminations made to meet competitors' prices; the Attorney General's Committee would extend it to discriminations made to beat competitors' prices as well. The report says, "An incidental undercutting of the prices quoted by others, when in the course of genuinely meeting one particular competitor's equally low-price offer, hence should not invalidate a seller's defense" (p. 183). The report does not describe the circumstances under which an undercutting of price is only incidental.

In the Standard Oil decision the "good faith" defense was limited to defensive price discriminations made to retain an existing customer. The Attorney General's Committee would extend the defense to aggressive discriminations made to obtain new customers. The rationalization for this position consists of mere assertion. The report says that the Court "merely employed language describing the case at bar" and that a limitation of the defense to defensive price discriminations "would not be in keeping with elementary principles of competition * * *" (p. 184). The principle is to say the least unique. Just disregard what the Court clearly says, if it "* * * would not be in keeping with the elementary principles of competition."

The Attorney General's Committee certainly has the right to its opinion that the Supreme Court's decision does not go far enough. One can, however, question the propriety of the Committee's efforts to create the impression that what it regards as right and proper has already been accepted by the Court and is today the law of the land. But what is really astounding in its implications is the Committee's bland statement that what it considers the law should be, not what the law is, now governs the enforcement of the law. The report states, "Since the statute may be presently interpreted as we propose, we do not consider legislative amendment necessary now" (p. 184).

The Attorney General's Committee would also immobilize the other two weapons, except where overt evidence of conspiracy was found. It must be remembered that such evidence was present in the Cement case. But its appearance in concentrated industries is becoming more and more of a rarity. The large corporations have long ago learned the importance of not keeping in their files letters, minutes, memoranda, or documents of any kind which would constitute direct evidence of conspiracy. One of the functions of the corporation lawyer is to keep his client from making precisely this type of mistake.

Now the manner in which the Attorney-General's committee sought to cope with this issue represents, whether intended or not, an interesting case example of how to create a misleading impression without actually making a misstatement. After citing the decisions in recent FTC cases, the report says, "Such developments fostered the notion that conspiracy necessarily followed from identical conduct by competitors—provided each knew what the other was doing." (p. 38). Assuming the unstated justification, i. e. that the effect of the practice substantially lessens competition the question arises as to whether this is the law of the land? The report says no, because, "The Supreme Court laid this notion to rest in *Theatre Enterprises, Inc.* v. *Paramount Film Distributing Corp.*" (p. 38). The report then goes on to quote the following passage from that decision:

"The crucial question is whether respondents' conduct toward petitioner stemmed from independent decision or from an agreement, tacit or express. To be sure, business

Footnotes at end of speech.

Footnotes at end of speech.

behavior is admissible circumstantial evidence from which the factfinder may infer agreement. * * * But this Court has never held that proof of parallel business behavior itself constitutes a Sherman Act offense. Circumstantial evidence of consciously parallel behavior may have made heavy inroads into the traditional judicial attitude toward conspiracy; but conscious parallelism has not yet read conspiracy out of the Sherman Act entirely." (P. 39.)

The report then draws this conclusion:

"This committee is in full accord with that Supreme Court reasoning. 'Conscious parallelism' is not a blanket equivalent of conspiracy. Its probative value in establishing the ultimate fact of conspiracy will vary case by case. Proof of agreement, express or implied, is still indispensable to the establishment of conspiracy under the antitrust laws." (p. 39.)

The crucial phrase in this interpretation is "under the antitrust laws." The Theatre Enterprises [9] case was a Sherman Act case. The notion of conscious parallelism to which the committee was objecting and which the report says had been laid to rest by the Theatre Enterprises case developed from Federal Trade Commission Act cases. The principal cases cited by the report in its reference to development which "fostered the notion that conspiracy necessarily followed from identical conduct by competitors" are the Cement case and the Conduit Co. case, both of course FTC Act cases. The Theatre Enterprises case is obviously not relevant to the issue which the report is here discussing. It is possible that the authors of the report might attempt to defend themselves on the grounds that technically the Federal Trade Commission Act is not considered to be an antitrust law. But such a defense would be specious, since the whole point of the argument is to use the force of the Theatre Enterprises decision against those cases which gave rise to the conscious parallelism doctrine.

The distinction is of course fundamental. Since the Federal Trade Commission Act was intended to go beyond the Sherman Act and prevent in their incipiency practices which if not arrested would ripen into Sherman Act violations, what is not a violation of the Sherman Act may well be a violation of the Federal Trade Commission Act. In this connection it is interesting to note an often overlooked observation of the Court to be found in the Cement decision:

"While we hold that the Commission's findings of combinations were supported by evidence, that does not mean that existence of a 'combination' is an indispensable ingredient of an 'unfair method of competition' under the Federal Trade Commission Act."

Incidentally, I agree with Prof. Eugene Rostow that even insofar as the Sherman Act itself is concerned, "The emphasis given to the limited decision of the Supreme Court in the Theatre Enterprises cases should not be misinterpreted" and that it "in no way weakens the authority" of such earlier Sherman Act cases as Interstate Circuit,[10] Paramount Pictures [11] and American Tobacco Co.[12]

There are many other aspects of the report with which I thoroughly disagree. Among other things, I disagree with the evidentiary requirements it has advanced as necessary to prove a violation of the Celler-Kefauver Anti-merger Act, with its attempt to read the rule of reason into the Clayton and Federal Trade Commission Acts which Congress enacted for the specific purpose of placing on the statute books antitrust laws to which the rule of reason would not be applicable, with its recommendation for an increase in penalties as being unduly and almost ridiculously modest, with its recommendation for the extension of consent decrees, with its direct attack on private triple-damage suits and with its almost complete disregard of the problem posed by the existence of monopolistic size and power.

But in this article I have endeavored to stress what I consider to be the key issue which precipitated the far-reaching and continuing attack on the antitrust laws, of which the report is merely the latest manifestation. For the reasons which I have endeavored to set forth, the committee's interpretation of the law on this issue is in manifest error. I am confident that the courts of the land will recognize the error and will enforce the law in accordance with the intent of Congress—assuming, of course, that cases involving the issue are ever brought forward.

---

[1] 324 U. S. 726, 65 S. Ct. 961, 89 L. Ed. 1320 (1945).

[2] 324 U. S. 746, 65 S. Ct. 971, 89 L. Ed. 567 (1945).

[3] 333 U. S. 683, 68 S. Ct. 793, 92 L. Ed. 1010 (1948).

[4] 168 F. 2d 175 (7th Cir. 1948).

[5] 38 Stat. 730 (1914), 15 U. S. C., sec. 13 (1952).

[6] 66 Stat. 632. ——, 15 U. S. C., sec. 45 (1952).

[7] *Clayton Mark & Co.* v. *F. T. C.* (336 U. S. 956, 69 S. Ct. 888, 93 L. Ed. 1110 (1949)).

[8] *Standard Oil Co.* v. *F. T. C.* (340 U. S. 231, 71 S. Ct. 240, 95 L. Ed. 239 (1951)).

[9] *Theatre Enterprises, Inc.*, v. *Paramount Film Distributing Corp.* (346 U. S. 537, 74 S. Ct. 257, 98 L. Ed. 273 (1954)).

[10] *Interstate Circuit, Inc.*, v. *United States* (306 U. S. 208, 59 S. Ct. 467, 83 L. Ed. 610 (1939)).

[11] *United States* v. *Paramount Pictures, Inc.* (334 U. S. 131, 68 S. Ct. 915, 92 L. Ed. 1260 (1948)).

[12] *American Tobacco Co.* v. *United States* (328 U. S. 781, 66 S. Ct. 1125, 90 L. Ed. 1575 (1946)).

Footnotes at end of speech.

Airport Meanderings

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 13, 1956

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial which appeared in the Washington Star on Thursday, July 12, which discusses and comments on Washington's airport problem:

The meanderings of the Commerce Department with respect to Washington's critical airport problem resemble those of a rudderless airplane whose pilot is lost in a fog. The record of the department's varied airport recommendations in recent years shows an amazing amount of indecision, course-changing and acrobatics of the Immelmann turn sort. And the end is not yet. What the next policy decision of Secretary Weeks or his advisers will be is something to wonder about.

Latest of the department's moves is a recommendation that Baltimore's Friendship Airport be designated as an "interim" supplemental Washington air terminal, pending action on the Burke project. Secretary Weeks keeps steering back to Friendship, despite all the expert testimony and reports rejecting the Baltimore field as unsuitable for Washington air passengers. It is no secret, of course, that Maryland legislators, worried about the lagging business at Friendship, have sought to twist the Secretary's arm. The trouble with Mr. Weeks' Friendship gestures, past and present, is that they apparently have been dictated by political pressures, not by objective advice from aviation authorities. In fact, the first official study by the Civil Aeronautics Board of the proposal that Friendship serve as an alternate Washington airport is just being made. The logical procedure for the Secretary to have followed would have been to await completion of the study. But logic seems to have played little part in departmental peregrinations.

Is there any logic in the confusing and conflicting airport suggestions that have emanated from the Department of Commerce since it first recommended the Burke airport plan? When political pressures began to build up on both sides of the Potomac over the Burke site, with resultant cutting off of further appropriations, the Department began to back away from Burke. But as traffic congestion at the National Airport grew more dangerous, the department's Civil Aeronautics Authority urged action on a second airport. So did the Senate Commerce Committee. So did President Eisenhower, in naming the Secretary of Commerce, the Budget Director, and the Secretary of the Air Force as a special committee to review the situation and bring him a report. The report was something of a classic in the realm of muddled advice. It proposed in effect that the Government do an outside loop on the Washington airport matter. The Government's nearly $1 million investment in land at Burke was to be forgotten and primary responsibility for building an auxiliary airport here was to be shifted to the District, Maryland, and Virginia. Meanwhile, runways and other facilities at the present airport would be improved and Friendship could be used as a "supplemental airport" if desired.

This report was so absurd that it soon was filed away and, presumably, its authors would prefer to have it forgotten. In the meantime the Senate Commerce Committee demanded prompt action on Burke or some other appropriate auxiliary airport. So Secretary Weeks came up with a new report. This time he revived an old plan for joint use of Andrews Air Force Base by commercial and military aircraft, with Burke as the best alternative and Friendship as a third possibility. However, he overlooked checking with the Air Force first about the Andrews proposal. Air Force opposition blasted the Andrews idea. That left Burke once more the leading contender. As a result, the President has urged Congress to appropriate $34.7 million to complete the airport at Burke. But political pressures are building up once more against this logical recommendation. It is anybody's guess whether political expediency will win out against public safety in the long-drawn-out airport controversy.

Events in Poznan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN R. PILLION
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 13, 1956

Mr. PILLION. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to insert the following resolution adopted at the meeting of the Central Council of Polish Organizations, Inc., of Buffalo, N. Y., held on Tuestday, July 10, expressing the feeling of American citizens of Polish descent in connection with the events in Poznan:

CENTRAL COUNCIL OF POLISH ORGANIZATIONS, CLUBS AND SOCIETIES, INC.,
Buffalo N. Y., July 12, 1956.

At the regular meeting of the Central Council of Polish Organizations, Inc., of Buffalo, N. Y., representing over 180,000

Poles, held on Tuesday, July 10, the following resolution was adopted, for the purpose of expressing the feeling of American citizens of Polish descent in connection with the tragic events in Poznan, resolves:

"We salute the heroic spirit of the people of Poznan who have voiced the legitimate right of the Nation to ask for bread and freedom. Their rightful demands were met with bullets.

"The Communist agents of Moscow, who are responsible for the murder of Polish workers on the streets of Poznan, must be warned that the day will come when they will be brought to account for their crimes.

"At the cost of hundreds of dead and wounded, the people of Poznan have unmasked the Communist lies about the worker's paradise in the so-called people's democracies. The Poznan events prove that there is no change in the Communist system which is based on armed terror and that any talk of liberalization of conditions in the captive countries is a dangerous illusion.

"The whole free world will follow with utmost attention further developments in the situation of Poznan. Any reprisals, undertaken under the cloak of judicial procedure, will meet with indignation of the public opinion of the free world.

"Americans of Polish descent, together with the free Poles residing in America, assure the people of Poland that they will continue their efforts to bring about the realization of those ideals for which the workers of Poznan gave their lives.

"We appeal to the American Government and the United States Congress as well as to the other governments and parliaments of the free world to initiate an international action to condemn the crimes perpetrated by the Communists in Poznan, to employ all peaceful means to effect really free elections in Poland under international supervision and to restore freedom and independence to Poland and other captive countries."

Yours truly,

JOHN F. ASZKLER,
President Central Council of Polish Organizations, Inc.

United States Highways

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 11, 1956

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the following article by Thomas Furey, from the New York World Telegram of July 11, 1956, is interesting reading:

JAVITS IMPERILS UNITED STATES ROAD PLAN, MOSES ASSERTS

(By Thomas Furey)

Robert Moses today forecast the doom of the nationwide $33 billion Federal roadbuilding program if the courts uphold the opinion of Attorney General Jacob K. Javits that the State was not responsible for the deaths of six children in Brooklyn's expressway cavein.

The city construction coordinator, in a hard-hitting report to Mayor Robert F. Wagner, characterizes the attorney general's thinking as "irresponsible" and "a legal hodgepodge."

REFERS TO REPORT

Mr. Moses was referring to a report issued July 2 by Mr. Javits on the cavein of the Brooklyn-Queens Expressway in which the attorney general said the State had no obligation to supervise the manner or method of the work performed. Mr. Javits added that it was incumbent upon the city to provide for adequate safety regulations on construction projects.

In his report today to the mayor, Mr. Moses declared:

"The only way to characterize the opinion issued by the attorney general is to say that it is irresponsible."

Mr. Moses said that if the Javits opinion is upheld, the effect will be "to completely destroy the $33 billion Federal roadbuilding program just passed by the Congress and authorized and approved by the President of the United States."

POINTS TO UNITED STATES LAW

He pointed out that Federal law places responsibility directly on the States and prohibits assignment of responsibility to localities or cities. He added:

"There is not a single municipality in the country that would or could operate a system for building these roads under the Federal bill if responsibility for the work done through State contracts is evaded by the State as is done by this opinion."

The city's construction chief declared "it was incomprehensible" how any State could make a decision that it has no responsibility for highway construction. He asserted that the effect of Mr. Javitz' opinion "would be to sabotage the program."

"Obviously," he said, "what the attorney general had in mind in writing this report was to find a way for the State of New York to evade claims for damages in the case of the Brooklyn accident."

SUITS THREATENED

Already actions have been threatened by the parents of children who lost their lives in the June 12 tragedy.

Mr. Moses pointed out in his seven-page memorandum that the Federal legislation and State laws completely regulate the national expressway. He cited the New York law under which, he said, the State makes the plans and specifications, lets the contracts, supervises the contracts and the work performed and pays the contractors and those who do the supervision for the State.

He went on to say that the attorney general's assertion that the State was not responsible is invalid "in the face of the plain language of section 40 of the State law which provides that 'the performance of every contract for the construction or improvement of a State highway shall be under the supervision and control of the superintendent of public works'."

Mr. Moses asked in his report how the State could "evade responsibility through tortured reasoning as that of the attorney general?" He termed Mr. Javits' opinion "a legal hodgepodge which ignores laws, contracts and precedents established and in force for many years in the State Department of Public Works."

Hats Off to Congressman Morano

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 13, 1956

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to insert in the RECORD an editorial from the Springfield (Mass.) Union under date of July 11, 1956. It tips its editorial hat to our colleague from Connecticut [Mr. MORANO] for turning down a bid to dinner from the Polish Embassy in Washington. Mr. MORANO's action, I am sure, was irksome to the embassy but will be applauded by the millions who were shocked at the answer that the Polish Communist Government gave to the workers who asked for more bread. That answer was written in bullets, blood, and death. If any proof was needed of the patent fraud of the so-called Polish People's Republic, the massacre of Poznan furnishes it. For Poznan clearly showed that the Red government is neither Polish nor a republic.

The editorial follows:

GOOD FOR HIM

As a member of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, Representative MORANO, a Connecticut Republican, has turned down an invitation to the party at the Polish Embassy in Washington which has been arranged to observe the founding of the Polish People's Republic. Mr. MORANO probably violated the canons of diplomacy when he informed Polish Ambassador Romuald Spaskowski that he could not accept the offerings of the festive table and bar while people in Poland are starving.

The Congressman from the neighboring State to the south does not represent United States diplomacy, of course, and United States diplomacy, however reluctantly, embraces the pragmatic recognition of the Polish People's Republic. But we say, "Good for Mr. MORANO." We think he represents the people of this country in his forthright stand against hobnobbing with the Red oppressors of the Polish people. And that's a Congressman's job—representing the people

A New Surface but the Old Substance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD D. DONOHUE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 13, 1956

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, I should like to include a very timely editorial entitled "Russia's New Look," which appeared in the June 4, 1956, issue of the Worcester (Mass.) Telegram.

The article follows:

RUSSIA'S NEW LOOK

Soviet Russia moved swiftly over the weekend to erase further traces of the Stalin era when the ruthless dictator held the Soviet in a grip of totalitarian terror.

Sweeping Soviet Government changes underscore the new Bulganin-Khrushchev policy of trying to win friends and influence people by a softening of the Moscow attitude toward both Russian citizens, and the world generally.

In a decisive governmental shakeup, the Soviet Union yesterday granted much greater power to its various Republics. It was a move toward decentralizing the huge power bureaucracy built in the Kremlin by the late dictator. The Soviet abolished its centralized ministries of justice, inland waterways and road transport—an action calculated in itself to show the world how different is the look in Moscow today.

These changes came on the heels of the resignation of V. M. Molotov, and his replacement as Foreign Minister by D. T. Shepilov, former Pravda editor and a skilled propagandist.

The inscrutable Molotov personified the ruthless intransigeance of the Stalin dictatorship. The younger and affable Shepilov personifies the new Soviet plan to try to win support by less harsh methods.

Shepilov is adept in the use of propaganda words; he is, nonetheless, a dedicated Communist convinced of the ultimate triumph of world communism.

Slowly the face of Russia is changing, as these moves pull the nation further away from Stalinsm. A correspondent recently back from Moscow said the change in atmosphere has been amazing. Muscovites are actually joking about the former terrors of a police state, the forced-labor camps in Siberia, and the censorship imposed by Stalin.

The Bulganin-Khrushchev team has turned a smiling face to the world, emphasizing better relations in foreign policy, more mutual trade, and peaceful coexistence. The return to the Soviet orb of President Tito, of Yugoslavia, is one of the positive accomplishments of the new regime.

The changes are so profound and dramatic that the Western alliance is actually embarrassed in knowing how to cope with them. Americans recognize, of course, that the Soviet is not changing because of any sudden love for its fellow men around the world. The Soviet is changing because Bulganin-Khrushchev apparently believe in the old saw that more flies can be caught with sugar than with vinegar.

The West has, indeed, been caught off base without positive policies to meet effectively the new conditions. It is trite, and positively foolhardy, to dismiss all of Russia's overtures with dire warnings that "you can't trust those Russians, anyway." Some more positive approach than that must be taken, if the world is to take full advantage of the changing political climate in Russia. It is possible that Russia will soon be in the mood to make the United Nations the instrument for peace and progress that it should be. This is the hope.

Not Guilty—By Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 13, 1956

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the following column by Drew Pearson, which appeared in newspapers throughout the country on July 13, 1956, makes very interesting reading.

If the facts he tells about were told about a Democrat during a Democratic administration, front page headlines would declare guilty every Government official directly or indirectly involved. Since it refers to Republicans, it is merely of passing interest to most editors.

The article follows:

ROLE OF IKE'S KIN IN CTC DEAL TOLD

(By Drew Pearson)

EDITOR'S NOTE.—The brass ring, good for one free ride on the Washington-Merry-Go-Round, today goes to President Eisenhower's brother-in-law, a quiet but potent personage in the Capital.

The least publicized relative of President Eisenhower, his brother-in-law, Col. Gordon Moore, is a soft-spoken mild-mannered, retired Army officer who sits in a well-appointed but not overly ornate office in Washington's Walker Building.

All around him on the walls are mute reminders of his relationship to the First Family—an oil painting of Ike as a five-star general, photos of Ike and Mamie, pictorial highlights of the President's career.

Officially Colonel Moore is an expediter of airline business and a lender of money to nonsked airlines.

"I'm just an old soldier trying to make a living," he explains self-deprecatingly.

When you examine his business and compare it with his pecuniary status shortly before his brother-in-law entered the White House, the conclusion is inescapable that he has done well.

STREETCAR SALE

Colonel Moore's name was potently passed around Washington financial circles last week as a result of the biggest transportation deal in District of Columbia history—the $13,540,000 sale of the Capital Transit Co. which supplies the streetcars and buses for the Capital's ambulatory population.

For months, various groups had made offers to buy Washington's bus and streetcar system. Then suddenly, at a surprise midnight meeting, an offer was accepted from O. Roy Chalk, millionaire owner of Trans-Caribbean Airways. Similar or better offers were rejected.

In putting across his sudden deal to run the transit system, Chalk had the assistance of both Colonel Moore and his attorney, Edward F. Colladay, close to the Republican National Committee.

Chalk, however, went out of his way to conceal Moore's connection.

For 2 weeks he ducked inquiries from this column. He even instructed the Willard Hotel to deny he was registered there, though staying in room 601. His business partner, Morris Fox, blandly denied that Ike's brother-in-law had anything to do with the deal.

It has now been definitely established, however, the Colonel Moore introduced Chalk to Robert C. Baker, an executive director of the American Security and Trust and also a Capital Transit director; that he telephoned Harry McDonald, a rival bidder, and urged him to get together with Chalk, not compete with him; and Colonel Moore, franker than his associates, acknowledged to this column that he had helped put the deal across "in a small way."

FORTUNE'S RISE

The careers of Roy Chalk and the President's brother-in-law have been inextricably intertwined ever since the spring of 1952 when Chalk took a longshot gamble that Gen. Eisenhower would be the next President of the United States. At that time Col. Moore's economic fortunes were at a low ebb, so low that he and his wife had offered to sell their house.

At this point Chalk hired Moore for $6,500 to handle public relations for the independent Military Air Transport Association.

Moore was hired three times and fired twice before the Republican Convention in 1952. He was fired and rehired as Ike's fortunes ebbed and flowed. The last time he was fired by the Military Transport Association Chalk stepped in and hired him directly for Trans-Caribbean. They went to the GOP Convention together, and a week after Ike was nominated, Col. Moore was promoted to vice president of Trans-Caribbean.

BUSINESS BOOMS

Almost overnight, Moore blossomed out with his own business. He lent money, as a broker to small airlines and trucking companies.

What he does is borrow money from American Security and Trust, then turn around and lend the money to the small companies as an advance on payments they have coming from the Government. As his commission, he taks out 1.5 percent.

Two airlines executives told this column they could get the same service for half Moore's commission, but they pay Moore extra for his political influence. Moore also arranges direct loans for small airlines through American Security and Trust, charging a middleman's profit.

How a man of Moore's 1952 income of $6,500 could suddenly start doing a million-dollar business with American Security and Trust is a mystery. The bank's president, Daniel W. Bell, former Under Secretary of the Treasury, told this column he could not discuss a client's business.

There's nothing wrong with the business Col. Moore conducts. He merely benefits from having friends in high places.

Study Mission Trips by Members of Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDNA F. KELLY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 13, 1956

Mrs. KELLY of New York. Mr. Speaker, recent coments in periodicals and in arguments in the Congress against the authorization and appropriation for foreign aid—mutual security bill—have strengthened my belief that study mission trips by Members of Congress are essential. I do not believe the opposition to foreign aid is a question of dollars. I believe the objections that exist are directed at the willingness of the leaders of the free world to accept and to appease the new Soviet leaders. Soviet objectives have not changed but their method of attaining world domination has veered to a new course. The apathy of the peoples of the free world is an expression of hope that the Soviet will now cooperate.

The leaders of the free world must implement their beliefs in bold new policies. The program is mutual. United States policy has vacillated in leading the free world to this objective. NATO must be strengthened by the mutual action of the free nations. NATO was a military deterrent. To weaken and to destroy NATO are the aims of the Soviet. The failure of NATO to reach and to maintain the goals established has weakened NATO. The United States should not waiver in enforcing mutual security.

The United States is accepting the ideas of the agreeing nations to make the former military pacts into economic pacts. They must be both; not one or the other.

The House Foreign Affairs Study Mission to Europe last fall, of which I was chairman, wrote the following observation in its report to the House:

The meeting of the Foreign Ministers at Geneva began on October 27, 1955, and continued until November 16. The study mission arrived in Geneva on October 31 and left the afternoon of November 2. The contact of the study mission with the conference was entirely through the Secretary of State and

members of his staff. The study mission was convinced when it left Geneva that nothing would be accomplished at the meeting. This situation confirmed the judgment of all the foreign officials with whom the study mission discussed this matter that they expected nothing to come of the conference.

The two meetings during 1955 at Geneva (July and October) focused attention on one of the critical aspects of United States foreign policy. It was apparent everywhere the study mission went during its 2 months of travel that there had been a great relaxation of tension, apathy, a decided let-down in the NATO defense effort, and an alarming rise in neutralism. Most nations were giving a higher priority to their domestic problems and their conflicts of interest with their neighbors than to the Soviet threat.

Our representatives at Geneva acknowledged that, in general, this relaxation had occurred. They pointed out, however, that the objective of United States foreign policy was to promote world peace and security. They said that the United States should not, therefore, consider a course of action to be a failure which has led nations to feel that the prospects of peace were brighter than they had been previously and to believe that they were more secure than they had been for 7 or 8 years. The United States representatives at Geneva argued that a foreign policy which required continuous fear and tension to make it effective defeated its own purpose.

The study mission had noted, nevertheless, in nearly every country a conviction on the part of government leaders that the Russian smiles did not indicate a change in Soviet objectives and that the Communist danger had not diminished. The typical attitude appeared to be "We have not been fooled by the Russians; we fear that other nations may have been; there is no question but that public opinion within our country has shown an unjustified optimism." While all of the foreign officials talked to were sufficiently restrained as to avoid direct statements to this effect, there were frequent implications that statements of United States leaders last summer had been too optimistic and that the opinion of their own people toward Russia tended to be influenced more by the prevailing opinion in the United States than anything else.

There can be little doubt that serious damage was done to the NATO defense effort by the flareup of national rivalries which has occurred between Greece and Turkey. This flareup might have been prevented if the attention of the western nations had not been permitted to waiver from the necessity of meeting the common danger.

It is clear that the only good out of Geneva was to again alert the world that Russia is insincere in its objective for world peace. The study mission regrets that a setback to the free world must continually take place in order to reconfirm this fact to the people of the world. Allied unity, the NATO alliance, and the pacts in Europe have been weakened to such a degree by the Geneva atmosphere that bold, new, dynamic programs must be devised on a crash basis to overcome the gains made by the Soviet during this period. The U. S. S. R., encouraged by the acceptance of their smiles, of their new approach and their new look, again abrogated the trust of the free world and in this environment, established a foothold in the Middle East to further obstruct and divide the free world by igniting historical issues which were at the stage where solution was in sight.

The free world must always be ready to negotiate with the U. S. S. R. to obtain a just and lasting peace, but must always bear in mind that the first objective of the Communists is to conquer and enslave the world. We must never permit ourselves to be caught in that which is described in the direct quote used so ably by Congressman ROBERT C. BYRD, of West Virginia.

"War to the hilt between communism and capitalism is inevitable. Today, of course, we are not strong enough to attack. Our time will come in 20 or 30 years. To win, we shall need the element of surprise. The bourgeoise will have to be put to sleep.

"So we shall begin by launching the most spectacular peace movement on record. There will be electrifying overtures and unheard of concessions. The capitalist countries, stupid and decadent, will rejoice to cooperate in their own destruction. They will leap at another chance to be friends. As soon as their guard is down, we shall smash them with our clenched fists." (The words of Dmitry Manuilsky, about 25 or 30 years ago, in a lecture at the Lenin School of Political Warfare in Moscow.)

It is clear that a program designed to meet danger will have to be adjusted from time to time when and if the danger diminishes. It is also clear that if such adjustments are made by those participating in the program when the danger hasn't diminished the effort is weakened and the enemy has won a round.

The following article by Constantine Brown as it appeared in the Washington Evening Star of July 12, 1956, substantiates the observations of the study mission.

TWO MAJOR THREATS IN EUROPE—CHURCHILL REPORTED CONCERNED OVER NATO'S WEAKNESS AND CYPRUS WAR

The publisher of a large metropolitan paper last week had an unusually long conversation with the world's foremost elder statesman, Sir Winston Churchill. Despite the fatigue and discomforts inherent in his advancing years, Sir Winston appears still to have a better and more realistic understanding of world conditions than the younger men to whom he has handed over the leadership of Great Britain in these trying days.

The former British Prime Minister seems to be particularly concerned over two important problems confronting Europe—outside, of course, the perennial threat from communism. One is the increasing weakness of NATO and the second, the tension between Greece and Turkey.

Despite official statements to the contrary, NATO has at present neither brawn nor a moral determination. The announcement last month that two of its top commanders (the supreme commander, Gen. Alfred Gruenther, and the commander of the NATO ground forces, France's Marshal Juin) will retire this fall is a significant indication. It is more than a safe speculation that the two distinguished soldiers do not want to remain identified with what so many describe as a moribund organization. It is true that both have given other reasons for their quitting. General Gruenther, who is in his late fifties, is said to be leaving because he has been offered a highly remunerative job in industry in this country. This explanation is not quite plausible. Many of our distinguished commanders such as Generals MacArthur, Bradley, Ridgway, Bedell Smith and Admirals Halsey, Denfeld, and Carney obtained well-paid positions with business firms after they retired at the statutory age of 62 or later. The explanation that Marshal Juin has given up his NATO command because he did not want to serve under Gen. Lauris Norstad—a much younger man—does not hold water either. He had served in the past under Generals Ridgway and Gruenther, both his junior in age and rank.

Sir Winston did not elaborate on these staff changes when he took a dim view concerning the future of NATO, but pointed out that the enthusiasm for the coalition has waned in most European countries where coexistence and neutralism have taken deep roots. The attitudes of the Scandinavian members, Iceland, France, and even Germany, where the rank and file is opposed to a military force of 500,000 men, are clear indications of the shape of things to come. The allied combat forces at the western borders of the Red curtain are now composed almost exclusively of Americans and British. And Britain, in the throes of another economic crisis, soon may be compelled to withdraw at least 1 of her 4 divisions.

Sir Winston is said to be more disturbed than any other European or American statesman about the growing danger of a Turkish-Greek conflict over any settlement of the Cyprus issue. The Turks are determined that there shall be no union of Cyprus with Greece. The former Prime Minister observed that the strengthening of the forces of both countries in eastern and western Thrace is disturbing. The Balkans, like the Middle East, are dangerous powder kegs. A minor incident easily could bring about an explosion, the United Nations notwithstanding.

There is no question that the Greek Government headed by Prime Minister Karamanlis will do its utmost to prevent anything as serious as a Greek-Turkish clash. But Karamanlis must reckon with a highly emotional and explosive public opinion. Some of the Athens newspapers are violent in their denunciation. The Greek press is more free than that in any other country in the eastern Mediterranean in saying that Turkey is provocative. The rank and file of the Greek people are avid newspaper readers and pay much more attention to editorials (particularly those of an inflammatory character) than to sports, financial news, or comic strips. Hence, public opinion is formulated by newspapers more than in the West.

Diplomats may dismiss such editorials as poppycock, written for the purpose of increasing the paper's circulation. But those who know Greece and the Greek people do not take such writings lightly. Greece is militarily in better shape than she has ever been before. And the Greeks are being told that, under certain circumstances, they could find support from Marshal Tito, the Arab States, and even from the U. S. S. R.

On the other hand, the Turks are not people to be easily scared or pushed around. Last year's anti-Greek demonstrations in Istanbul have shown that underneath, the Turkish masses still hate the Greeks and that the present Turkish-Greece alliance is nothing more than a marriage of convenience which easily could end in a spectacular divorce.

Socialism—Republican Style

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 11, 1956

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, whenever a Democrat suggests Federal aid to any part of our economy or to a large segment thereof, most of our Republican friends immediately label it "socialism" and "a step toward communism."

When our Republican friends make such suggestions, it is not socialism nor communism, it then is "conservatism where property is concerned" or "liberalism" where human rights are concerned."

I direct our colleague's attention to the article by Joseph L. S. Terrell, as it appeared on the front page of the Wall Street Journal of July 9, 1956, and sug-

gest that the matters discussed therein are worthy of the attention of the appropriate congressional committees.

The article referred to was placed in the Appendix of the RECORD of July 12, 1956 by Senator JOHN J. WILLIAMS and appears at page A5487.

United States and Western Policy Failure in the Near East

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD D. DONOHUE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 13, 1956

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, I should like to include a very lucid editorial, entitled "A Long Way to Go," which appeared in the June 6, 1956 issue of the Worcester (Mass.) Telegram.

It is axiomatic that a sound foreign policy must deal with basic issues of contention if it is to be both morally and diplomatically successful. This editorial sharply points up the vital need of such a policy, spearheaded by our own State Department, if any stable peace settlements is to be achieved in the Near East.

Let us pray that our responsible executive department officials will prove equal to the challenge before it is too late.

The article follows:

A LONG WAY TO GO

When U. N. Secretary General Dag Hammarskjold returned from the Middle East 4 weeks ago, he warned that a final settlement between the Arab states and Israel is probably still far off.

He has good reason to be pessimistic. That fact was underlined the other day when the Security Council voted on a British resolution to have Mr. Hammarskjold continue his good offices.

The resolution made official what already had been made clear in the debates leading up to Monday's vote. There is no inclination on the part of the Western powers to dig into the basic issues which have kept the Middle East in turmoil.

The Security Council praised the Secretary General's work in obtaining a cease fire. And it authorized him to continue his efforts to obtain compliance with the 7-year-old armistice terms. But beyond that, the council resolution did not go. Even a phrase expressing the council's hope for a settlement on a "mutually acceptable basis" was stricken out at the insistence of the Arab bloc, backed up by the Soviet Union.

The Western powers, in short, have recognized that there can be no "mutually acceptable" settlement so long as both sides cling to their present positions—and neither side has shown any willingness to retreat from those positions.

The Arab states, backed by Soviet power, are demanding that any settlement must be made on the basis of the United Nation's 1947 partition resolution. This resolution led to the Arab-Israeli war which ended with Israel's acquisition of more territory than the 1947 partition had provided. To go back to that partition scheme would force Israel to give up a third of her territory. This she will not do. Since the 1949 armistice, Israel has argued that the Arab states, by going to war to block the 1947 partition plan, have lost the right to invoke that plan now.

Even should some way be found to establish the 1947 partition, there are signs that the Arab states may not really go along on that basis. Syria has declared that the very existence of Israel must be done away with. With their new-found ally in Moscow, the Arabs are raising their demands.

Thus far, the West has evolved no policy to cope with this difficult and explosive situation. That was made abundantly clear when the West accepted the watered-down resolution the week relating to Mr. Hammarskjold's role. The West may have good reasons for not wishing to stir up the basic issue at this particular juncture. And it can take some small encouragement that Mr. Hammarskjold did succeed in obtaining a cease fire, however unstable it may be. But the issue of peace or war in the Middle East has not been settled—it has merely been postponed.

Balancing the Budget With Deficits

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 12, 1956

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the following article from the Wall Street Journal of July 12, 1956, speaks volumes:

GOVERNMENT FARM SURPLUS DISPOSAL AND LOSSES INCREASED IN FIRST HALF—EISENHOWER SAYS $1.2 BILLION OF GOODS WERE SOLD AT A DEFICIT OF $471 MILLION

WASHINGTON.—President Eisenhower told Congress Federal farm surplus disposal soared during the first half of this year. Losses mounted, too.

In his fourth semiannual report on operations under the key surplus disposal law, the President said the Government arranged to unload $1,264,800,000 of farm commodities at a loss of about $471,000,000. That compares with $491,000,000 of unloading during the previous 6 months. In that period losses came to $297,000,000.

January–June commitments raised the total to $2,953,000,000 since the program started late in 1954. Clear losses have reached $1,324,000,000.

RETURN IS SMALLER

Actually, the Government's return is even smaller than the loss figures indicate. Besides his outright giveaways, Uncle Sam sells farm produce for foreign currency, most of which is pumped back into the purchasing country as foreign aid. Barter deals account for another chunk of disposal totals, with the Government receiving minerals and other goods instead of cash.

Foreign currency sales moved the most surpluses, according to the report. In the first half of this year, the Government signed agreements to sell $801.2 million of farm commodities by this route. When the sales are completed the equivalent of $537.8 million in foreign currency will be deposited to the United States account.

Of this total, the United States will loan to foreign countries $273.2 million for trade and economic development projects, will use $157.7 million to pay American expenses abroad, will contribute $87.3 million to "common defense," and will devote the balance to development of markets for United States farm produce, purchase of strategic materials, purchase of goods by third countries, and international educational exchanges.

Foreign currency sales during the last 6 months of 1955 totaled $211 million, for which the United States is due $143 million in foreign currency.

SALES FOR FOREIGN CURRENCY

Since this phase of the program started, the Government has arranged to sell farm commodities which cost $1,466,900,000 for $1,041,900,000 in foreign currency. Sales include $526.1 million of wheat and flour, $367.9 million of cotton, $165.7 million of fats and oils, $123.8 million of rice and $109.2 million of feed grains. Figures also include $87.4 million for ocean-shipping costs.

Another $218 million of farm commodities will be given away for overseas famine relief and similar assistance, the President reported. Grain accounts for $150 million, fats and oils $31 million, dairy products $27 million, cotton $7 million, and dry beans $3 million. About $78 million of the total was authorized during the January–June period, compared with $32 million in the previous 6 months.

Outright donations in the United States and abroad through voluntary agencies and intergovernmental organizations declined to $129.4 million from $197 million in the previous half year, the President said. These donations total $681 million through the life of the program. Dry milk accounted for $33.2 million of the January–June donations, cheese $21.3 million, butter $20.1 million, and butter oil $19.7 million.

Barter contracts were signed during the first half of 1956 to trade $256.2 million of farm commodities for a like value of stockpile materials. That compares with $51 million in the prior 6 months, and raises the total to $587.1 million. No figures are available on how much bartered farm produce costs the Government to acquire and handle.

Need for Air Safety

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OVERTON BROOKS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, July 7, 1956

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I present an editorial which appeared in the Shreveport Journal of Wednesday, July 11, 1956. This editorial strikes me as being peculiarly forceful at this time. The Civil Aeronautics Administration, composed of experts in the field of aviation and engineers of outstanding ability, should be using its time and its talents in making our commercial aviation program more efficient and safe. To tinker around with social reform programs when millions of our people who are using the skyways of America depend upon this agency for safety and life, is holding CAA up to public censure.

One-hundred and twenty-eight American citizens have lost their lives due to inefficient regulations and faulty handling of our skyways. The American people have a right to expect more serious consideration of their aviation problems. There can be no doubt but that CAA today stands before the bar of public opinion confronted by most serious charges.

The editorial follows:

CAA BACKS INTEGRATION, NEGLECTS SAFETY

Recently, we observed in these columns that the Civil Aeronautics Administration

has shown itself more concerned with the problem of racial integration than with its primary mission of providing adequate facilities and regulations for the Nation's air traffic.

Our remarks were occasioned by the CAA's announcement that "no Federal aid airport program funds will be made available for the development of separate facilities or space in an airport building * * * for use now or in the future for separate racial groups." In other words, the CAA had taken it upon itself to assume judicial and law-enforcement authority to uphold the United States Supreme Court's ruling against segregation, although separate Federal channels are available for this purpose.

In a letter to Congressman OVERTON BROOKS, who brought our editorial to the CAA's attention, Administrator C. J. Lowen took issue with our views and declared he could not agree that his agency was giving more attention to the segregation issue than to traffic safety. But now it has been brought out that inadequate air safety rules—the responsibility of the CAA—were the cause of the recent collision of two airliners in which 128 persons lost their lives. Out of conflicting testimony given by Civil Aeronautics Board officials at an investigation of this greatest air tragedy of all times, the implication is plain: Had the two airliners been operating under proper safeguards established by the CAA, the passengers aboard them would not have been plunged to their deaths in the Grand Canyon. According to the International News Service, it was indicated at the hearings that "rules will be changed to keep airliners in flight farther apart, both horizontally and vertically, in an attempt to prevent another such disaster in the future."

We repeat our observation: The CAA improperly has shown itself concerned with a purely social issue—the issue af segregation—when it should have been serving this Nation by devoting its time to its primary mission of providing adequate facilities and regulations for the Nation's air traffic.

And we repeat another of our observations, too: Congress should take away from the CAA both the power and the funds with which it makes appropriations to help build rest rooms, waiting rooms, and restaurants in municipal airports throughout the Nation. Perhaps if Congress will relieve the CAA of its self-assumed duty of enforcing the Supreme Court's anti-segregation ruling, it can get back to the important task of trying to protect the lives of American air travelers.

Mission Accomplished

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON CANFIELD
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 20, 1956

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the New York Times of July 6, 1956:

MISSION ACCOMPLISHED

With the closing of the books of the United States Treasury last week for the fiscal year 1955–56 the Eisenhower administration might have been forgiven if it contemplated the final estimates on income and outgo with justifiable pride. For they constituted unimpeachable arithmetical evidence that the administration had successfully carried out one of the most important of all the promises Mr. Eisenhower made to the American people in his election campaign of 1952—namely, the promise to balance the Federal budget.

The budget inherited by the present administration from its predecessor—the budget for fiscal 1952–53—was trimmed substantially in the 5 months that remained to work on it, but still ended up in the red by roughly $9.5 billion. How far we have come since then is revealed with the termination of fiscal 1956. The totals for that period show a surplus amounting in round figures to about $2 billion. Some unofficial estimates, however, place it as high as $2.4 billion.

The 1955–56 fiscal year will go into the records as the first time the budget had been balanced since 1951 and only the fourth time in the last quarter of a century. And it will represent the first fiscal 12 months in which the public debt has been reduced since 1948.

But merely to say that this is the first balanced budget in 5 years does not tell the whole story. The real significance of this year 1955–56 in the history of the Nation's financial affairs is that it was the culmination of a program that President Eisenhower set in motion as soon as he took office—a program which had a balanced budget and a return to debt reduction as its twin objectives. This program, in turn, was part of a broader program for ending the steadily spiraling inflation that has characterized the war and post-war years. The balanced budget of 1951, by contrast, was brought about largely by a huge, unexpected and unanticipated rise in revenues of that year, a "windfall" produced by the Korea boom. What makes the balancing of the budget in 1955–56 a solid achievement is the fact that it has been done the hard way, and the only way that is consonant with wise and courageous fiscal policy.

Revenues for 1956, at $67.7 billion, are only $2.9 billion above the revenues for 1953, in Mr. Eisenhower's "inherited" budget. The big difference in the two budgets will be found on the spending side, with expenditures for 1956 at $65.9 billion, as against the $74.2 billion in the budget of 3 years earlier.

Fear and Security

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 13, 1956

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following editorial from the Washington Post of July 13, 1956.

FEAR AND SECURITY

It is scarcely conceivable that President Eisenhower has considered the full implications of the effort in Congress, with administration support, to nullify a major Supreme Court decision on the Federal security program. The Court's decision in the case of Kendrick M. Cole was compatible with sentiments often applauded by the President. It said in effect that the security program ought to be limited to genuinely sensitive positions in the Government rather than applied as a blanket to all positions in the civil service. This is also one of the recommendations of a group of some of the country's best lawyers in the admirable study of the security program conducted by the Association of the Bar of the City of New York.

That the President may not have had an opportunity to review the Supreme Court decision and the subsequent actions of his subordinates is understandable. Mr. Eisenhower was stricken with ileitis the morning of June 8. The Supreme Court decision was not handed down until June 11, when Mr. Eisenhower was in the hospital. Introduction of the Walter bill classifying all Federal jobs as involving "national security," and the indorsement of it by Attorney General Brownell and Chairman Young of the Civil Service Commission, all occurred during the President's absence. As far as can be ascertained, he has not talked to either Mr. Brownell or Mr. Young. Yet as Mr. Eisenhower completes his convalescence he is confronted by a full-blown effort to reimpose one of the worst facets of a system for which the administration has been repeatedly criticized.

Mr. Eisenhower has often spoken of his desire to safeguard the security program against unfairness and abuse. In his 1955 state of the Union message he pledged: "We shall, in the process, fully preserve our traditions and the basic rights of our citizens." Previously he had extolled the traditional right of Americans to meet their accusers "face to face." Just before his recent illness he reportedly asked former Sen. Harry Cain to prepare a memorandum on the operations of the security system after the latter had given him case histories of some of the most flagrant abuses. These are the comments and actions of a man of conscience who is seeking to do the right thing.

Should the President not then take a careful look at what his subordinates are attempting to do through the Walter bill to negate the Supreme Court decision? Is it not time to place genuine security requirements in perspective, to face up to the fact that a fear psychosis has been dominating the program? The report of the New York bar recommends that the program be delimited to cover some 1.5 million persons in really sensitive posts instead of the 6 million persons who have been covered by this and allied programs. This is the advice of disinterested top-notch legal experts who have studied the problem with no partisan purpose but with the view of evolving a program that will really protect both national security and individual security.

Does the President not sense the opportunity now to revise the program and make procedural improvements that will relate to real needs, instead of ritualistically accepting the plea of fearful men who have learned nothing from the excesses and insecurity of the past? Will not Mr. Eisenhower, if he reads the New York bar report and heeds his own sensible instincts, conclude that the Walter bill is a monstrosity and that the security program ought to be limited and refined, not expanded?

We Also Need More Teachers of Science

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRIS B. McDOWELL, JR.
OF DELAWARE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 10, 1956

Mr. McDOWELL. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial from the Saturday Evening Post, June 30, 1956, clearly depicts the problem our great Nation faces with regard to the lack of science teachers. My resolution, House Joint Resolution 654, is designed to institute an investigation into this and many other important matters concerning lack of facilities and proper educational programs that seriously endanger the edu-

cational, technological, and scientific future of America.

The editorial follows:

WE ALSO NEED MORE TEACHERS OF SCIENCE

It is too late to prevent Soviet spies from stealing our industrial and military secrets, but it is not too late to do something about an even more important matter, the alarming lag in the training of scientists and engineers.

A few months ago in Oklahoma, a series of aptitude tests was conducted by the Oklahoma Curricular Improvement Commission, in the hope of picking up students who might be encouraged to take courses in the natural sciences. The commission is sponsored by Oklahoma's Frontiers of Science Foundation, which has been set up to do something about the shortage of scientists in that area.

Even if young people with scientific aptitudes could be persuaded or enabled by scholarships to pursue their studies further, many of them would have a hard time finding qualified teachers. On this matter Dean Robert MacVicar, of the Graduate School of Oklahoma A. & M. College, has some discouraging figures. For the 2 years 1955 and 1956, colleges in Oklahoma graduated about 250 bachelors of science majoring in physics or chemistry. Of these, only 13 indicated their intention to teach, and up to now, none of the 13 is actually teaching. The figure does, however, include 7 of the 1956 class who may or may not stay with their present intention.

One explanation, of course, is that young bachelors of science are now being offered by industries starting salaries twice as high as the highest salary they could ever expect to earn in teaching. Teaching salaries cannot be completely competitive with industry, but surely we should value our survival sufficiently to make the inducements more attractive than they are now.

Another important factor is the attitude of Selective Service toward young scientists. At present the requirements for recruits are not great, but the official attitude is pretty much that of the Michigan draft board which recommended deferring an outstanding science student for 4 years, but added that "he should be willing to submit himself for military service at the completion of his fourth academic year." In other words, just when promising scientists become essential in their jobs, they are expected to take 2 years out in close-order drill and allied subjects.

The U. S. S. R. has no such inhibitions. During the Battle of Stalingrad, when the very existence of the U. S. S. R. was at stake, not a single scientist of any age was drafted for military service.

In a democracy this selective process is not so easily carried out. It is undeniably wrong to set off science students as an untouchable class apart. And Mrs. Jones, who has 3 boys in the Army and 1 dead in Korea, naturally wants to know why Mrs. Smith's son across the street is living the life of Riley at the university. The obvious answer, of course, is that the things Mrs. Smith's son is working on at the university might make possible a weapon which would have the effect of releasing Mrs. Jones' boys from having to slog it out in the infantry.

What to do? For one thing, an Executive order could lay it on the line that no promising scientist working on an essential project, or a topnotch student in the scientific field, should be drafted. For another, our rich foundations could finance nationwide aptitude tests and scholarships for promising science students. But very little is likely to be done by anybody until the public becomes sufficiently aware of the urgency of the problem and determined to solve it.

Leadership

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 13, 1956

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, we in Pennsylvania who know the benefits of the progressive, dynamic administration provided by its youthful chief executive, Gov. George Leader, are most happy to find his achievements hailed in other parts of the Nation.

I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Ray of Hope," from the Omaha (Nebr.) Public Ledger, acclaiming Governor Leader and Secretary of Welfare Harry Shapiro for their aggressiveness and determination, and the attainment of results, in the mental health program in Pennsylvania.

As the editorial states, "Pennsylvania emerges as a bright spot in an otherwise gloomy picture in the mental health program." The editor of the Omaha Public Ledger declares that Pennsylvania is fortunate, indeed, to have a "crusading Governor," and a dedicated man like Harry Shapiro as secretary of welfare. We of Pennsylvania concur.

The editorial follows:

RAY OF HOPE

Probably no aspect of our national life is as dismal and as discouraging as our thus-far losing battle against mental illness. Half of all our hospital beds, 700,000, are in mental institutions, yet thousands of mental patients are turned away. Some are in jails, some sleeping on floors and some in triple-decker beds in State hospitals. One authority estimates the mental cases are increasing by 16,000 a year, that our present tax burden for their care is a billion dollars a year and will increase by 100 millions as each year passes.

But out of this gloomy picture looms one bright spot, the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, where Governor George Leader has fought with determination and dogged persistence for enlarged appropriations for the State's mental institutions and, perhaps equally significant, to keep their administration free from politics.

The Pennsylvania Legislature, which has just wound up a 17 months session notable for a bitter running fight between the Governor and the solons on revenue-raising plans, came through with a heartening $26 million increase in the biennial appropriation for mental health.

Sharing honors with Governor Leader in this resounding victory for the mental-health program is State Secretary of Welfare Harry Shapiro, who went to work at 10 in a Philadelphia paper-box factory, made a fortune in the Horatio Alger tradition, studied law, practiced the profession and served in the State senate. In his present post, Secretary Shapiro is achieving a boyhood ambition inspired by the life of Dorothea Dix, the nurse who made the world realize that insanity is sickness and not a visitation of the wrath of God.

Harry Shapiro has two guiding principles. He will not yield to political tradition or to party pressures. He is firm in the belief that sick minds, as well as sick bodies, can be largely cured, and operates the institutions in his charge on that premise. On both points he has the aggressive support of Governor Leader, who has seen to it that political spoilsmen no longer use the welfare department as a refuge for party hacks or its employment rolls as patronage for "the faithful." And he has made it clear that there must be no interference with the truly noble task of making human kindness and modern medical science the handmaidens of the mentally ill.

Not every State, of course, has a Harry Shapiro, or a crusading governor to fight for his views. But Pennsylvania's example is one that any State might well follow.

Is Racial Integration the Answer?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. FLYNT, JR.
OF GEORGIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 13, 1956

Mr. FLYNT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix, I include, verbatim, a sermon preached by Dr. Roy O. McClain, pastor of the First Baptist Church, of Atlanta, Ga., on Sunday, June 17, 1956.

This sermon was televised in addition to being heard by a large congregation in the First Baptist Church, of Atlanta, Ga. It was heard and the pastor was seen as he delivered it by thousands of people in television audiences. Dr. McClain is an outstanding minister in the Baptist denomination of the Christian faith. He is respected and admired for his commonsense, sound judgment, brilliant intellect, and sterling character. He is a man devoted to the service of his God and also to the service of his fellow man. There is not one scintilla of bigotry, bias, prejudice, malice, or hatred in his makeup, and I am quite confident that this sermon, which is printed below, came as the result of soul-searching thought and prayer. This sermon has come from his heart, his mind, and his lips, not in an effort to influence any individual or groups but it comes as a specific and mature answer to those who say we must mix all races in order to be truly Christian. In order that as many persons as possible who desire to read this masterful sermon may do so, it is included below:

IS RACIAL INTEGRATION THE ANSWER?—A SERMON PREACHED AT THE FIRST BAPTIST CHURCH, ATLANTA, GA., JUNE 24, 1956, BY DR. ROY O. MCCLAIN, PASTOR

Today we stand at the crossroads of decisive action; the direction taken can determine the ultimate destiny of civilization. Masses are on the march, the oppressed and downtrodden are making a decisive bid for their place under the sun. To ignore this march of men is to forfeit one's right in the struggle that decency, fairness, honesty, and equality might win.

Five reasons have led me to speak on the racial issue today. The fact that some politicians have used the issue to traffic in human life is reason enough. Often this traffic has provided an effective smokescreen behind which the politician covered his own lack of qualifications for office. Human life is not a pawn for political chessplayers, nor is

it a football to be kicked around by toes of sectional expediencies. The subject is timely in that during the past 24 months more strife and hatred have been engendered among various races than in any other decade of normal progress. There is much heat and little light. Where there exists a noxious, emotional miasma, one fires from the hip in all directions. Where reaction to the question at stake is deepseated to the point of being reflexive, there is more inflammation than inspiration. All the talk of integration without commensurate integrity is vain semantics. I speak on the subject because silence is no defense against social evil. "Freedom is placed in jeopardy more by those who refuse to exercise it than by than by those who will not permit it." We cannot find our safety in the dark. There are times when silence is golden, and there are times when silence is yellow.

Moreover I speak on the subject because it affects the lives of millions and therefore is not too big for the church. "This is a day of glad tidings and we hold or peace. We do not well." The church must face forthrightly all that appears in the human equation, bringing to bear the relevance of the message of Jesus without fear, indecision, or consequence. Courage ever is in close proximity to a cross. Not the least of reasons is an admission of the ease of dwelling in ivory towers of idealism, dreaming of utopias, extolling the virtues of ethical presuppositions, and never facing the ugly facts of today's realism. There are feelings of unity and understanding which exist only in the imagination of many without commensurate effort to translate the imaginary into practical reality. The idealism of eternity must be brought to bear on the realism of time. Contact must be made if man, as he is, shall ever be as he ought to be in God's sight. There is no place along the firing line where immunity is assured those who would volunteer to fire. Nor is it a time when leaders are to disenfranchise their right to lead by ostentation of their own unique visions. A train engine, disconnected from freight cars, is not pulling the load, merely demonstrating its own speed. Christian idealism is not compensatory fiction—it is relevant redemption.

Admittedly there is great variance in opinion. This sermon makes no bid for finality or exhaustiveness: It pleads for a plateau on which the majority of indigenous Christians can stand without being stampeded into the camps of radical on either extremity. The author speaks as a native Southerner, who has no ulterior motives in this endeavor, who fought side-by-side with men of variant colors and cultures, and who has dedicated his life to the proclamation of the basic tenets of the Christian faith. As Christians on this, as well as all issues, we can disagree, but we cannot be disagreeable. The sermon is intended to be a part of the solution—not a part of the problem. Though the way through the woods is not know by detailed analysis, at least we can begin on the right track basing our thoughts and deeds on two major premises: The spirit of Jesus Christ and the will of God.

THE HISTORICAL PERSPECTIVE

The resurgence of racial tension must be seen first in the light of historical perspective; 1956 must be seen in the context of 1856 and A. D. 56. This is an old problem as any student of anthropology readily will admit. The Egyptians segregated the Israelites when they were taken into bondage. Greeks, in their heyday, regarded all non-Greeks as barbarians. The Romans looked upon the Syrians as fit for nothing more than menial tasks, whereas the Chinese voiced their walled-in exclusiveness by calling all outsiders foreign devils. In India a caste system exists despite all the piety of many prayers. Despite the monotheism of Palestinian Jews, they regarded Samaritans as halfbreeds and refused to walk through their country; instead, they would go down to Jericho, cross the Jordan, journey up the east bank, and cross over into Galilee. Hitler used the racial superiority myth as a whip to intimidate, misrepresent, and murder.

And now today in South Africa with a self-appointed arbiter to voice his Calvinistic determinism, Johannes G. Strijdom is sowing the seed of racial bitterness. I am trying to represent the fact that racial prejudice, heat, and strife are not exclusive birthrights of southerners. In many nonsouthern communities of our Nation, though not finding "white only" signs over drinking fountains, one will find a functioning policy of apartheid as much as in other parts of the world. Psychological ghettoes are as damaging as shanties on dark alleys. Recounting these facts of history never justifies the cruelty of man's inhumanity to man, but it takes a step in the direction of explanation.

What is the origin of the Negro? The human race is divided into three major human groups: Caucasoids, Negroids, and Mongoloids with several redivisions of these major categories. One erroneous guess as to the Negro's origin is that Noah placed a curse upon Ham and the latter became black. This, like many other violences done the Scriptures, simply is not true. The Bible does not so state. Noah was in no frame of mind nor disposition of soul to pronounce a curse on anyone; the first thing he did after his waterlogged experience was to get drunk.

The Negro race originated in climactic and environmental conditions under the aegis of God. He is black for the reason some men are not black: God made him that way. There are two chemicals in the body determining the color of one's skin: carotene and melanin. When carotene predominates, the skin is white; a lesser amount results in yellow skin, and dominance of melanin produces darker skin.

This being the case, let it be known to those of lighter colors that being dark is no crime. My favorite color is green but to insist that green is superior to blue involves an indefensible position in the philosophy of color.

There is no case on record where an Indian, another minority group, was ever ashamed of the color of his skin. There is nothing basically wrong in being a Negro—not a "nigger" for that word means stingy and miserly, whereas most Negroes are usually generous and affable. Racial pride is at stake and one should never be ashamed of being himself. The Genesis account recalls, "And God looked upon all that He had made and saw that it was good."

Slavery and the modern dilemma

How did the Negro come to the American scene? Ah, too many are poor students of history here. Not one of them elected to come to this New World; instead, he was forcibly transported by scheming men. The Duke of York through his connections with the "wild new country" bargained with Yankee buccaneers to provide a pool of manual laborers for the riverboats, factory handlers, and kitchens of the wealthy. To unload the booty from the Far East required big muscles and the black man was so equipped. But the extreme winters of the North and East proved too much for the man from Equatorial Africa; then a bargain was struck with southern plantation owners to employ the slaves in the fields of rice, indigo, and cotton. Once again the economic interpretation of history is brought to light as any objective historian knows quite well. The Negro flourished under the hot sun of the South, and the prospering southerner became a source of envy and, later, contempt. Only then did the rank and file above the Mason-Dixon Line make slavery a moral issue—after it had become financially unprofitable. The point is: Slavery was totally wrong from start to finish, but let never be believed that it was the exclusive sin of the Deep South, as many currently believe.

Then the Civil War—and the consequent ugly scab which has not healed to this day. Sudden freeing of 4 million slaves among 12 million whites gave rise to counter-intimidation, domination, carpetbaggers, scalawags, Union soldiers pulling up the last turnip, disenfranchisement, and crystallization of sectional antipathies.

EVOLUTION OR REVOLUTION

Two antinatural techniques are being employed to produce growth: One is illustrated by the culture of Ming trees where the tree is pulled up at certain intervals and the tap roots are pinched off. This process stunts the growth. The other technique is that of the hothouse where plants are forced to unnatural growth only to wilt when they are placed out in the hot sunlight. The analogy is apparent: One can no more legislate righteousness than education can be legislated. Natural growth is evolutionary—not revolutionary. Violent unheavals of thought or deed usually retard instead of promote progress. Yet, let one not mistake evolution as a substitute for faiure to grow. The snail's pace is not worthy of human emulation. But to coerce, foment and strain growth is to give rise to a gangly plant that will not survive the heat of realism. Imposition of one culture upon another speaks not of wisdom nor Christian charity. Jesus never forced his affections upon anyone. In each case it was elective. Forced integration is as much an assault on freedom of action as forced silence is an assault on freedom of speech. Physical closeness without psychological and spiritual nearness means nothing! The magnitude of the problem is such that it is not solved by those who step promptly, confidently, angrily forward with ruthless remedies. Overplaying one's hand is bad judgment—this induces the strongest kind of resistance.

It is a little known fact that prior to the Civil War there were hundreds of manumission societies which were dedicated to the task of liberating the slaves by compulsion of enlightened conscience. One year prior to the outbreak, over 3,000 slaves were set free without a shot fired. Slavery was not right; yet the attendant, subsequent evil of ten thousands of killings—often among brothers—repeated history's old effort to state that two evils equal one right. Yet, eager beavers and hotheads had their say and the shots were fired and human progress thrown into reverse. Now, will it be revolution or evolution? Every Christian citizen should know the difference.

The colored people in America have made phenomenal progress despite the forces to hold them back. Ninety years of freedom have witnessed the march of men and women, boys and girls of their race to achievements beyond compare. Marion Anderson made the Metropolitan Opera not because she is a Negress but because she has a good voice. Merit still opens more doors than crowbars. A part of the great hope lies not in agitation but in qualitative discipleship.

Schools have come in for more than their share of this controversy. Litigation began on the academic level. Since I have tried to be fair throughout this treatment, let our whole nation be told the truth. Southern Negroes are not being taught in one-room log houses with a pot-bellied stove in the center of the room, where the teachers are paid in sasafras and sow belly. I will be the first to admit that our facilities are far from what we want them to be and what they shall be, but the last 10 years have transformed the physical scene in the majority of cases. Georgia has come in for more than its share of national disdain on this issue. But let it be known that there

are 8,500 Negro teachers who are paid $15 million annually for their services. North Carolina pays $22 million annually and in two Southern States the average Negro teacher's salary is higher than white teachers. No invidious comparisons here—just let the facts be known.

In the whole gamut of education I do not propose the answers, yet in the South it is commonly believed that human nature being what it is—not what it ought to be—shall result in wealthy whites sending their children to private schools, wealthy Negroes sending their children to private schools and the poor whites and poor Negroes having to fend for themselves with, in some cases, the rise of a cruel caste system which belongs to no real democracy. Equality of opportunity does not mean wholesale amalgamation of the races, but no cruelty is quite so cutting as bringing life into the world which has no social status. "The greater the aspiration, the greater the humiliation, when denied." I saw the children fathered by American servicemen and Japanese mothers. The children did not belong to Japan or to America. This is an inexcusable tragedy.

AGENTS OF CONFUSION—PROFESSIONAL REFORMERS

Let me not be misunderstood; our yards in the deep South are not as clean as they should be, not as clean as we want them to be, but we stedfastly resent those who would come to sweep our yards for us. Time is judgment enough upon us and with the patience and guidance of God, we will sweep.

Not the least among the forces to cloud the issue is the unfair representation the South has received from some nonsouthern sources. In far too many cases the press has represented this section as a trilogy: moss, magnolias, and moonshine. Many a nonsouthern graduate student has been assigned as a thesis for doctoral dissertations, "the poor, unfortunate South." Prejudice is just as ugly a specter if it poses its head in one section of a country as in another. Geography is hardly the decisive factor. We can receive little inspiration from the nonsouthern church which recently debated the merits of sending missionaries to the South since they were sending missionaries to Africa but who, when their benediction was pronounced, stumbled over poorly clothed children in the slums of their own city on the way home. A less-charitable mood than the present would have called to mind those timeless words of Holy Writ, "Physician, heal theyself." One thing the Negro adamantly and justifiably resents is the fact that some sections accept him with a flamboyant public display of self-righteousness by professional reformers, unwillingly tolerate him by many of the middle classes and despise him by the poor. The efforts of professional reformers often run roughshod over the fact that the South is educating one-third of the Nation's children on one-sixth of the Nation's income, that a disproportionate load of national tariffs has been standing operating procedure and that discriminatory regional freight rates still speak of the necessity that when a nonsouthern cries "prejudice" one needs only to say, "look who is talking."

No doubt many of the personnel in the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People are able leaders and are financed by many whose gifts are sincere contributions to help a cause. The digit of time is too brief to assess the value of any such association, but if one succeeds by tightening tensions and deepening the rivers of distrust, then this association has succeeded indeed. Zeal needs the stable temporizer of judgment if its gains are to be of lasting value.

To speak of plurality in society must not speak of a first- and second-class citizenry. There must be equality of opportunity. However, to force one culture upon another, to take from those who have made gains and, without individual merit or consideration, thrust upon another is not Christian ethics but communistic manifestoes. The old Communist line goes, "from each according to his ability to each according to his need." All the grandiose palaver notwithstanding, this line vitiates the very promise on which Jesus told the parable of the talents. He concluded by saying, "to him who has (gets) shall be given and he shall have abundance, but to him who has (gets) not shall be taken even that which he has." Closer physical contact without spiritual and psychological nearness means nothing. Were the Communists to infiltrate any of the agencies championing minority causes, it would not be for humanitarian reasons, instead, to set one race against another for easy Communist exploitation.

THE CONCLUSION

What is the conclusion of the matter? "The wrath of man does not work the righteousness of God." There is sin on both sides. Too many times the white man's sin is dominance, economic greed, mulattoes, and cruel impatience. The Negro's sin, in some individual cases, is hatred engendered by the long historical process, immorality—common-law marriage and sensuality. These sins are on both sides and their presence speaks of continuing tension and racial animosity.

Seventy years ago one of the great southerners—Henry Grady—used the term "the new South." Once again we are praying and working for a new South—one free of our many weaknesses and sins. Admission of much guilt is the first step in forgiveness. There would be no new South without Negroes—whose lot is constantly being improved, though not as fast as many of us would like. We dream of a new South where a free society does not have to pay for its convictions by intimidation or economic strictures. The solution is not in law or ethical presuppositions; these will not lessen the tension. Prohibition taught us that just to pass a law did not stop men from drinking. Though law is necessary to regulate man's rights and wrongs, ultimately law is not the basic solution. If social progress is measured solely in legal equations, grace and love will never play the field. This is neither the time nor the place for discussing the philosophy of law, but if the freedom accrued by law violates the objectives of the law, then law becomes man's burden, not his blessing.

Peaceful and harmonious relations will come only when each member of each race becomes a reconciler in the spirit of Jesus Christ. The prevailing disenchantment calls for full commitment to God knowing that He must be God of all or he will not be God at all. The answer is not in compulsion but in conversion—it is too much to expect changed living from unchanged lives.

One of the noblest Negroes of all times conceived of the white and colored races in terms of the white and black keys on a piano. Said he, "The whites are for the expressed purpose of naturals—the blacks for sharps and flats giving musical color to harmonies. If each lost its distinct identity, the principle of music would be lost."

This is the hour to prove to a world in turmoil that America can solve her own problems in the spirit of the One who died for all.

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is located in Statuary Hall, House wing, where Mr. Frank Brodie is in attendance during the sessions of Congress to receive orders for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month, and where single copies may also be purchased. Orders are also accepted for the printing of speeches in pamphlet form.

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

PRICE OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

The Public Printer is authorized to furnish to subscribers the daily RECORD at $1.50 per month, payable in advance.

Remit by money order payable to Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C.

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

Daily Digest

HIGHLIGHTS

Both Houses acted on strategic minerals bill.

Senate passed judges' dependents' benefit bill and 17 sundry measures and took up social security bill.

House passed miscellaneous bills.

Senate committee approved mutual security appropriations bill.

Conferees agreed to file report on foreign travel tax bill.

See Congressional Program Ahead.

Senate

Chamber Action

Routine Proceedings, pages 11427–11434

Bills Introduced: 6 bills and 1 resolution were introduced, as follows: S. 4211–S. 4216; and S. J. Res. 196.

Page 11431

Bills Reported: Reports were made as follows:

H. R. 10670, to extend coverage of D. C. Unemployment Act to employees of District municipal government employed in D. C. (S. Rept. 2559);

H. R. 6040, to amend certain administrative provisions of the Tariff Act of 1930 and to repeal obsolete provisions of the customs laws, with amendments and with minority views (S. Rept. 2560);

S. 3619, to amend the D. C. Public School Food Services Act (S. Rept. 2561);

H. R. 5853, to regulate the practice of veterinary medicine in the D. C. (S. Rept. 2562);

H. R. 10375, relating to recognition for meritorious service by members of the D. C. Police and Fire Departments (S. Rept. 2563);

H. R. 2603, to increase the area within which officers and members of the Metropolitan Police force and the Fire Department of the D. C. may reside, with amendments (S. Rept. 2564);

S. 2578, to amend law relating to residence of assistant assessors for D. C. (S. Rept. 2565);

S. 3887, to amend act providing that cabs for hire in D. C. be compelled to carry insurance for protection of passengers (S. Rept. 2566);

S. 3889, to amend the act granting additional powers to the Commissioners of D. C. (S. Rept. 2567);

H. R. 11002, to regulate and license pawnbrokers in the D. C. (S. Rept. 2568);

H. R. 11488, to amend the D. C. Traffic Act of 1925 relative to motor-vehicle excise tax (S. Rept. 2569);

H. R. 4993, to permit certain improvements to business property in D. C., with amendments (S. Rept. 2570);

H. R. 10947, to designate the highway bridge over the Potomac River at 14th Street in the D. C. as the Rochambeau Memorial Bridge, with amendments (S. Rept. 2571);

H. R. 8149, relating to transfer of certain actions from the U. S. District Court for the D. C. to the municipal court for the D. C., with amendments (S. Rept. 2572);

S. 3465, relating to effective dates of increases in compensation granted to wage-board employees, with amendments (S. Rept. 2573);

S. J. Res. 179, to quitclaim certain property in Coahoma County, Miss. (S. Rept. 2574);

S. 4058, to extend for 10 years lease of tract of land to Chicago, Milwaukee, St. Paul & Pacific Railroad Co. (S. Rept. 2575);

H. R. 11375, extension of special school milk program (S. Rept. 2576); and

H. R. 11010, authorizing acquisition, maintenance, and operation of a bridge across the Mississippi River at Muscatine, Iowa, and Drury, Ill., with amendment (S. Rept. 2577).

Pages 11429–11430

Bills Referred: Five House-passed bills were referred to appropriate committees.

Page 11460

Sundry Bills Passed: Senate took from calendar and passed, as indicated, the following 17 measures:

Without amendment and cleared for President:

Life-insurance tax: H. R. 11995, to provide that the 1955 formula for taxing income of life-insurance companies shall also apply to taxable years beginning in 1956;

Cotton contracts: H. R. 9333, to give to certain consuming processors of cotton the privilege of buying cotton futures contracts in certain cases;

Appendix

Development and Utilization of the Water Resources of the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EARLE C. CLEMENTS

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, July 16, 1956

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, a most excellent presentation of sound views on the development and utilization of the water resources of our Nation was made on Saturday, July 14, by Maj. Gen. Charles G. Holle, Acting Chief of the United States Army Corps of Engineers.

In an address at the dedication of new locks and dams on the Green River, Kentucky, General Holle painted a graphic picture of the value of water as a natural resource. He summed up his views in this statement: "Today we find water taking its place as the most valuable single industrial raw material—the one resource which, more than any other, probably will influence the locations of factories and the economic growth of communities in the future."

As the sponsor in the Senate of legislation to increase Federal attention to benefits from low flow control, water storage, and reimbursement to those whose properties are adversely affected by government projects, it is quite natural that I was favorably impressed by comments which General Holle made on these subjects.

The full text of his address is such a worth document, Mr. President, that I now ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE VALUE OF WATER—REMARKS BY MAJ. GEN. CHARLES G. HOLLE, ACTING CHIEF OF ENGINEERS, AT DEDICATION OF GREEN RIVER, KY. LOCKS NOS. 1 AND 2, JULY 14, 1956

I sincerely appreciate the honor of being invited to participate in this dedication as a representative of the Chief of Engineers. Before saying anything else, I want to point out that it would be impossible to properly dedicate Green River Locks 1 and 2 without acknowledging the vital part played by the Green River Valley Citizens League in bringing about their construction. Thanks largely to the league, these facilities have been built in what must be near record time. The first funds for this work were appropriated in May 1954. For the money to be appropriated and the construction completed on a project within 2 years and 2 months is quite unusual.

This achievement is, of course, a real triumph for the Kentucky congressional delegation and their colleagues from other parts of the Ohio Valley. But I am sure that Senator Clements, Ambassador Cooper and Congressman Natcher will bear me out when I say that legislators can do most when backed by a vigorous body of citizens, united behind a sound and worthwhile proposal.

Many a development which we in the corps consider eminently sound from the standpoint of river-basin engineering has remained unbuilt because the local people were divided or not visibly interested. Hence activities of groups like the Green River Valley Citizens League in unifying and focusing regional opinion are an indispensable part of the process of resource development.

As you know, these locks have been completed none too soon. Coal is already coming through them at a rate of better than 2 million tons a year, bound for the great powerplants at Madison and Joppa and in the Tennessee Valley. There is every prospect that this tonnage will quickly increase, that more coal deposits will be developed, and that new industrial potentialities in this area will be opened. That is one reason why navigation facilities have had first priority in the development of the Green River. But even while the locks were being finished, the Congress and the Corps of Engineers have been proceeding with consideration of the orderly development of other aspects of the water resources of this valley.

Last year the first $500,000 was provided to commence construction of the Rough River Reservoir. This year, in the appropriation bill recently signed by President Eisenhower, $1,500,000 is provided for the continuation of that work, and $100,000 is appropriated for the planning of Nolin (NoLIN) Reservoir. Other developments may be expected to follow in turn as problems affecting their design are ironed out.

Thus, the completion of these locks is but the first step in a well-rounded, comprehensive program for developing the water resources of the Green River Valley. Low-cost transportation by waterway and water storage in reservoirs for flood control and flow regulation are both fundamental requisites of industrial development in this area. You may be sure that the Corps of Engineers will continue to cooperate with you toward the full development of the water resources of this river basin.

For many years, in this part of the country, water was considered as free as air. Everybody realized it was a necessity of life, but nobody thought much about its dollars-and-cents value. But soon the increase of raft and keelboat and, later, steamboat traffic, proved that it was worthwhile to spend money on navigation improvements. Then the positive value of flood control was realized. Today we find water taking its place as the most valuable single industrial raw material—the one resource which, more than any other, probably will influence the locations of factories and the economic growth of communities in the future. And the programs of local, State, and national governments for developing and utilizing the water resources of our river valleys rank among the Nation's most basic and necessary undertakings.

Though the full implications of the value of our river and water resources are only now being borne in upon us, the national benefits of full, comprehensive development of the Nation's river basins have been recognized since early in this century when they were highlighted in a series of historic conferences on conservation. The President, Theodore Roosevelt, in a message to Congress, resulting from those conferences, said: "Every stream should be used to the utmost. * * * One use can often be made to assist another. Each river system, from its headwaters in the forest to its mouth on the coast, is a single unit and should be treated as such."

These principles underlie the Federal water-resources effort to this day. They form the basis of our approach not only to the Green River Valley, but to the great Ohio Valley of which it is a part. But even this sound analysis could not have foreseen the almost expotential increase in water use that has accompanied our growing population and increased standard of living.

As you know, the modernization of the whole Ohio River navigable waterway is now under way. The program will take some 20 years and will include construction or major remodeling of 19 locks and dams on the Ohio and 9 on the Monongahela. Backstopping this navigation development is a plan for a system of 81 flood-control reservoirs and 134 local flood-protection projects. Once completed, these works will not only greatly reduce the ever-present danger of flood disaster, but will substantially improve low-flow conditions on the Ohio and the affected tributaries, with indirect but worthwhile benefits to municipal and industrial water supply, pollution abatement, and the general usefulness of the river.

The only trouble with this program is that not enough of it has been translated into finished construction. Only 33 of the 81 reservoirs have ben built, with 5 more, including Rough River, under construction; and only 43 of the 134 local-protection projects have been completed, with 11 more underway.

The high degree of industrial and urban development on the riverbanks, and the capacity of the Ohio River to generate terrible floods, both make it imperative, in my opinion, to intensify the flood-control program in the Ohio Valley. That valley is an integrated economic community, and a great disaster in any part of it would lead to costly economic dislocations throughout its whole length and breadth.

At the same time, interest is being renewed in some aspects of river development that have been largely ignored in the Federal water resource development program. Among these, perhaps the most important is water supply. The historic National Conservation Commission of 1909 declared that "In considering the uses and benefits to be derived from the waters, the paramount use should be water supply." And there was considerable concern in that day over the problems of municipal and industrial water supply and low-flow regulation, and many proposals were advanced at the highest levels for a Federal program aimed at meeting these problems. Today in many parts of the country, including parts of the Ohio Valley, there are signs that such problems are becoming acute, and that water supply threatens to impose a ceiling upon further economic development.

It is perhaps not generally recognized that the water supply problem has two aspects. On one hand, there is what we might call the local aspect—the problem of individual communities and industries in finding sufficient water to continue to live and grow. Such problems have been considered primarily to be matters of State and local responsibility, and we in the Corps of Engineers believe that they should continue to be so considered. At the same time, we realize that these local or individual problems have become so widespread and serious as to

constitute in the aggregate a national problem, and officials of the Corps of Engineers have repeatedly expressed their belief that the Federal Government should cooperate with State and local agencies in the solution of these problems. In particular, we believe that water supply should be considered in all future investigations.

But there is another aspect of the water-supply problem, and that is the matter of maintaining minimum flow in regulated streams. When adequate flow is assured at all times, navigation stages can be more economically maintained; local pollution-abatement measures are made simpler and more effective; fishing and recreational values are conserved; water temperature, which has an important effect on industrial and recreational use and on bacterial pollution, can be better controlled; and many other valuable benefits ensue.

Basically these benefits are widespread and general. They extend throughout the entire length of the affected stream, and are interstate in character.

Too little water in a watercourse is as undesirable as too much water, and in many cases, both evils can be prevented through the same regulatory engineering works. Hence the relationship between low-flow regulation and flood control has been recognized for many decades. Way back in 1908, the Inland Waterways Commission, in its great pioneering report, said: "Engineering works * * * affect favorably the regimen of the streams, including floods and low waters. The annual floods of the United States occasion loss of property reaching many millions of dollars with considerable loss of life, while the low water of late summer involves large loss in diminished water supply, in reduced power, and in the fouling of streams with consequent disease and death." Thus in this, as in many subsequent documents, flood-control and low-flow regulation are treated as two aspects of the same function—the beneficial regulation of the amount of water flowing in a watercourse.

We in the corps are interested to note that Congress is now taking an increased interest in this aspect of the water-supply problem, and that your Senator CLEMENTS is playing a leading part in the effort.

Just what sort of activities are warranted, and how far the Federal interest should go, are of course matters for the Congress to determine. Reservoirs built by the Army engineers on the headwaters of the Ohio and other rivers are already providing substantial, though incidental, benefits in the abatement of low flows. It may well be that the time has come for Federal legislation, including perhaps an appropriate declaration of policy, giving Federal engineering and construction agencies wider latitude in the consideration of water supply problems in the planning, construction, and operation of their projects.

The increasing concern being manifested, not only in Congress but in all segments of our American community, over water-resource problems is one symptom of the dynamic growth of our country—the same growth that has led to the construction of these two new locks on the Green River. The locks will be valuable in enhancing the economic and industrial development of the Green River Valley, the Ohio Valley, and the Nation. This growth in turn may raise more problems, and may require still more construction. For in developing the Nation's water resources, we serve the continued and expanding development of America—a process that will never stop.

The united, cooperative, alert, and democratic action of the Nation's citizens, which has been exemplified so successfully here in the Green River Valley, will always be needed to guide and inspire our progress into the future. It is needed no less in helping determine the policies with which we meet our problems, than in advancing project proposals for construction.

It gives me great pleasure to dedicate these locks to your service and that of the Nation.

A Theory of Ice Ages

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CARL HINSHAW

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 11, 1956

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article entitled "A Theory of Ice Ages," by M. Ewing and W. L. Donn, a very interesting and unique approach to a very difficult subject. I hesitate to offer a scientific article of this length, but believe it is of sufficient importance and interest to warrant a place in the RECORD.

The article follows:

[From Science Magazine of June 15, 1956]

A THEORY OF ICE AGES

(By Maurice Ewing and William L. Donn)

This article is a preliminary report of new ideas related to the origin of glacial climates; it is based largely on observations made during the last 20 years. Glacial climates pose two problems: (i) the striking alternations during the Pleistocene epoch of glacial and interglacial stages and (ii) the even more striking change from the warm nonglacial climate, which prevailed generally from the Permian to the Pleistocene, to the cold and glacial conditions of the Pleistocene and Recent.

If it is difficult to answer the second question, it is even more difficult to solve both problems on the basis of a single theory. The present study [1] offers an explanation for the alternations in climate during the Pleistocene and proposes an explanation for the change from nonglacial to glacial climates.

PLEISTOCENE GLACIAL AND INTERGLACIAL STAGES

First we wish to develop the following principal points of the glacial-interglacial theory.

1. The melting of an Arctic ice sheet (such as exists at present) would increase the interchange of water between the Atlantic and Arctic Oceans, cooling the North Atlantic and warming the Arctic and making it ice-free, thus providing an increased source of moisture for the polar atmosphere.

2. Two factors would then favor the growth of glaciers: (i) increased precipitation over Arctic and subarctic lands and (ii) changes in atmospheric circulation, the latter also resulting from the warmer Arctic and cooler Atlantic Oceans.

3. The lowering of sea level would greatly decrease the interchange of water between the Atlantic and Arctic Oceans, which, together with the cooling effect of surrounding glaciers, would reduce Arctic surface temperatures until abrupt freezing occurred. The fairly sudden reversal of conditions favorable to glacial development would terminate the growth of glaciers abruptly.

4. As continental glaciers waned, the sea level would rise, causing an increased transport of surface waters northward until the Arctic ice sheet melted once again, completing the cycle.

Footnotes at end of speech.

5. Temperature changes in the surface waters of the Arctic and Atlantic Oceans are thus the causes of, rather than the consequences of, the waxing and waning of continental glaciers.

Abrupt change in Atlantic deep-sea sediments: Using radiocarbon measurements, Ericson et al.[2] and Rubin and Suess [3] have established dates as far back as 30,000 years ago for cores of deep-sea sediments. Using paleotemperature measurements based on the oxygen isotope ratio, Emiliani [4] determined the temperature of the water in which pelagic Foraminifera lived; his findings covered a time interval represented by the longest cores available. Suess [5] then combined these two sets of results by plotting the radiocarbon ages for three deep-sea cores from the equatorial Atlantic and Carribean against the paleotemperatures of Formaminifera tests. The resulting graph may be interpreted as showing a temperature decline of 1° C. per 11,000 years for the interval from 90,000 to 11,000 years before the present. Temperatures then began an abrupt increase at a rate of about 1° C. per 1,000 years from 11,000 years ago to a few thousand years ago. For the last few thousand years, temperatures have remained about as high as the maximum value that was reached during all Pleistocene interglacial stages (see Emiliani,[4] figs. 2 and 3).

The curve given by Suess for Core A 172–6 shows the abrupt temperature change beginning about 16,000 years ago as compared with the change shown at 11,000 years in the other cores. Since the time scale for this core depends on only three points, considerable interpolation is required, and since Emiliani shows that a strong solution of carbonates occurred in a number of places, linear interpretation is likely to be unreliable.

In addition, faunal studies by many investigators show that a well-marked change in most cores indicates the termination of the Wisconsin age. In 1935, Schott [6] described the faunal break in many equatorial Atlantic cores, which was later noted in more recent longer cores—for example, by Bramlette and Bradley in 1940 [7], Phleger, Parker and Pierson,[8] Ovey,[9] and Schott.[10 11] Most recently, radiocarbon measurements on a number of cores described by Ericson and Wollin [12] from the Atlantic Ocean and Caribbean Sea show that this characteristic break,[13] marking a change from cold to warm pelagic fauna, occurred 11,000 years ago.[2] Cores taken in the Gulf of Mexico show a similar faunal break,[14] although as yet no quantitative temperature or time measurements have been made. However, on the basis of the fauna change, it is possible to correlate the break in the Gulf of Mexico with that described in the Atlantic Ocean.

Cores from the Gulf of Mexico. Many sediment cores 30 to 40 feet long have been taken on the Mississippi cone,[15] which spreads over most of the deeper part of the Gulf of Mexico from a vertex just off the Mississippi Delta. These cores, which show a layer up to 2 feet thick of foraminiferal lutite, indicating warm water, overlie with a sharp transition a layer of essentially unfossiliferous lutite and silt, the bottom of which was never reached .Pending radiocarbon measurements, it seems reasonable to extrapolate the date of 11,000 years ago for the bottom of the foraminiferal layer. In cores taken on the nearby Sigsbee Knolls, which rise 20 fathoms above the cone and above the reach of turbidity currents, Foraminifers of the cold-water type are abundant throughout the silty layers.[14] It is concluded that the extreme scarcity of Foraminifera in the silty layer of the Mississippi cone is due to dilution from a great influx of clastics

Footnotes at end of speech.

in Wisconsin time. The sediments give no evidence of any climatic change except that 11,000 years ago.

Further, the beginning of rapid postglacial rise in sea level is indicated by the abrupt decrease in clastic deposition on the Mississippi cone about 11,000 years ago, when the drowned rivers retained their clastic sediments instead of discharging them into the gulf.[15]

The result of a very recent investigation of turbidity current deposits made by Heezen and Ewing[16] shows that an abrupt rise in sea level must have taken place about 11,000 years ago; this event is also taken to mark the close of the Wisconsin glacial stage.

Conclusions from Atlantic and gulf data: On the basis of these data, we regard 11,000 years ago as the date of the most recent significent temperature change in the Atlantic Ocean, and also as marking the end of the Wisconsin glacial stage. Additional breaks in isotopic temperatures[4] and faunal types[7 9 11 12] occur in many of the Atlantic cores which penetrate most of the Pleistocene. We regard these as marking the transition from earlier glacial to interglacial stages.

The data show that this fairly abrupt increase in temperature in the surface layers of the Atlantic Ocean about 11,000 years ago was the most significant temperature change of the past 60,000 to 80,000 years, although similar changes occurred earlier in the Pleistocene. Because the beginning of glacial retreat which closed the last Wisconsin substage (Mankato) occurred about 11,000 years ago—for example, Flint[17]—it appears that the oceans became warm abruptly at the time retreat commenced and remained warm during retreat of the ice.

We propose to show that the temperature of the surface layer of the ocean, rather than external conditions, regulated the climate of the land. Specifically, we suggest that the alternating warm and cold stages of Pleistocene climate are the effects of fairly abrupt alternations between warm and cold conditions of the upper layer of the Atlantic and Arctic Oceans. We are thus led to consider the cause of the pronounced fluctuations of the temperature of the Atlantic and Arctic Oceans.

Arctic Ocean cores and the influence of the Arctic. Three short cores (9, 14, and 16 centimeters long) and 1 long core (81 centimeters long) were taken in the deeper part of the Arctic Ocean by A. P. Crary and studied by D. B. Ericson. The upper 20 centimeters of the 81-centimeter core contain abundant Foraminifera (Globigerina), which decrease in the next underlying 10 centimeters. The long section below 30 centimeters consists of lutite, with granules and pebbles distributed sparingly throughout, and shows no Globigerina except for a few near the bottom. Several radiocarbon measurements on the Foraminifera of the 16-centimeter core[18] gave an age from 18,000 to 23,000 years. Other cores, collected elsewhere in the Arctic by Crary, show thin sediment zones above the foraminiferal layer. The presence of this upper foraminiferal zone, with no or only thin overlying sediment, indicates an abrupt end of conditions favorable to the growth of Foraminifera and suggests that the Arctic Ocean was open during the Wisconsin glacial stage. Further, the coarse fragments in the long lower section of the core are attributable to ice rafting under conditions that provided numerous icebergs free to move in open water. This condition would be met by an ice-free Arctic during Wisconsin time. The absence of Globigerina in the lower section of the core, except for the very bottom, can be explained by dilution by clastic sediments; and the presence of Foraminifera in the upper portion can be explained by a decrease in the amount of clastics. This is analogous to the similar, well-founded observations on cores from the Gulf of Mexico that were described in a preceding paragraph.

Based on the possibility that the Arctic Ocean can undergo both ice-free and ice-covered stages, we propose the following assumption: When the Arctic Ocean is ice-covered, surface temperatures in the Atlantic increase and continental glaciers decline; when the Arctic is open, surface temperatures in the Atlantic decrease, and continental glaciers develop. With this assumption in mind, let us examine the process by which an ice-free Arctic can bring about a glacial stage.

Consequences of an ice-free Arctic Ocean: Given an open Arctic Ocean, the resulting large increase in absorption of insolation is well known. The present circulation of water within the Arctic Ocean would be greatly increased[19] since the wind stresses would then be applied directly to the water. It is postulated that a marked increase in the interchange of water between the Arctic and Atlantic Oceans would occur which would tend toward equalization of temperatures, cooling the Atlantic and warming the Arctic. With the added effect of greater absorption of insolation, the ice-free condition of the Arctic Ocean could be maintained against the cooling effect of increased evaporation.

The present mean temperature of the surface of the Arctic Ocean in January is −35° C., and in July about 0° C. The vapor pressure of water (or ice) at 0° C. is 4.6 millimeters of mercury; at 3° C., 5.7 millimeters; and for ice at −30° C., 0.3 millimeter. The change to an ice-free condition would necessarily require an increase of winter ocean surface temperatures by at least 35° C. By extrapolating from the aforementioned data, it can be seen that the vapor pressure would increase by a factor of about 50 in the winter season, while the summer ocean surface temperature and vapor pressure would be only a little increased. The principal effect of an open Arctic is thus the providing of greater moisture during the long polar winter.

Although it is difficult to make a detailed analysis of the consequent changes in atmospheric and oceanic circulations and the results thereof, the following general conclusions seem reasonable.

1. The increased evaporation from an open Arctic Ocean, particularly in winter, would increase the precipitation over adjacent cold land areas, where lack of precipitation, rather than high temperatures, at present prevents the growth of glaciers (for example, Stokes).[20]

2. The present polar high, with clockwise circulation, would be replaced by a low-pressure area with counterclockwise circulation because of the contrast between the warm water and the surrounding colder land. The resulting reinforced counterclockwise circulation of the Arctic Ocean would tend to increase further the interchange of Atlantic and Arctic waters, judging from the present North Atlantic circulation.

3. The semipermanent North Atlantic low would be displaced roughly 10° to 20° southward. Increased zonal flow of air around the northern portions of this low would transport cool, moist air over eastern North America. At the same time, the presence of relatively warm water on all sides of the continents would promote the development of cool continental highs.

4. Winter and summer conditions over the continents would become more similar as a permanent continental ice sheet developed, with a resulting migration of the present polar front southward.

5. The contrast between the cold northern land areas and the warmer open Arctic Ocean would result in a second, although weaker, polar frontal zone surrounding the polar low.

6. A second belt of storms would therefore be present, providing some nourishment for growing glaciers at the northern margin, in addition to the stronger nourishment at the southern margin.

7. The Atlantic Ocean would be cooled by lowered air temperatures induced by continental glaciers and by the abrupt cooling effect of increased interchange with the Arctic Ocean already mentioned.

J. Chase has given a general confirmation of these views in an analysis (see fig. 1) that followed a presentation of the ideas of this paper at a colloquium at the Woods Hole Oceanographic Institution.[21] His analysis is based on a study of extreme conditions shown on historical weather maps and represents hypothetical mean isobars during a glacial stage having an open Arctic Ocean.

Termination of a glacial stage. The glacial tage would be brought to an abrupt close by the development of a new Arctic Ocean ice sheet. Along most of an Atlantic Ocean profile, through either Iceland or Spitzbergen, the sill depth between the Arctic and Atlantic Oceans is between 200 and 300 fathoms, and much of this is less than 50 fathoms, a depth generally accepted as the probable value for maximum Wisconsin decrease in sea level. When the lowering of sea level reached about 50 fathoms, a serious reduction in the interchange of water between these oceans would occur. The reduced inflow of warm Atlantic water, together with the cooling effect of the continental glaciers, would eventually allow a new Arctic Ocean ice sheet to form. The interchange of water would then be reduced to even less than its present-day value, owning to the reduced sea level. Thus, with the present radiation balance and the slow return to the current atmospheric circulation pattern, there would be no tendency to remove the Arctic Ocean ice sheet until sea level returned to at least its present position. A reversal of the phenomena described as consequences of an ice-free Arctic Ocean would consequently occur. Although gradual wastage of the continental glaciers would follow, the warming of the Atlantic surface water would be more rapid because of an abruptly diminished interchange with the Arctic.

If we consider the last glacial stage, we find that the studies of deep-sea cores indicate that 11,000 years ago is the date of the end of Wisconsin time. Furthermore, the end of Wisconsin glacial conditions in the ocean corresponds with, and according to our theory, caused the end of the Mankato substage on the continents. The glacial retreat between the Tazewell and Mankato glacial substage maxima (for example, Flint[17]) is only a minor fluctuation.

The interglacial stage: The transition from glacial to interglacial conditions in the Atlantic Ocean would be simultaneous with the time of maximum continental glaciation (neglecting minor fluctuations). As the continental glaciers wasted, their cooling effects would diminish. The consequent rise in sea level would slowly enlarge the cross section of the channel between the Atlantic and Arctic Oceans, providing an increase in the northward transport of warm water as is occurring at present. Eventually a condition would be reached where the Arctic ice sheet would disappear.

Considerable evidence has been given by Berezkin[19] and by Crary, Kulp, and Marshall[22] which indicates that the Arctic Ocean has been warming recently. If that trend continues, open water over the entire Arctic Ocean might occur within a few centuries, with consequent glaciation in northern latitudes.

Footnotes at end of speech.

Footnotes at end of speech.

Footnotes at end of speech.

The presence of five temperature maxima, marking past interglacial stages, all at about the same temperature as the present [4] is strong evidence that an internal, self-regulating mechanism controlled the climate during the Pleistocene. Emiliani's graph of temperature versus time (fig. 3 [4]) gives compelling evidence of oscillations of the system between two quasi-stable states, with the significant external conditions remaining constant throughout. This implies that present temperature is at the maximum value expected for an interglacial stage and that a decrease in temperature marking the onset of the next glacial stage may be expected within some few thousands of years.

In describing Pacific cores, Emiliani notes (p. 561 [4]) far less conspicuous temperature variations than in cores from the Atlantic. He explains this on the basis of greater vertical circulation in the Pacific, which seems to be a rather ad hoc solution. The observed uniformity in Pacific temperatures, however, is an expected consequence of the theory proposed here, in which strong temperature changes should be limited to the Atlantic and Arctic Oceans. These observations also imply that some mechanism, involving only the Atlantic and Arctic Oceans, is the most reasonable solution for the Pleistocene climatic variations.

Interpretation of Wisconsin glaciers. Our theory provides a new explanation for the Scandinavian and Siberian ice sheets. According to Flint,[23] this sheet had a maximum thickness of about 10,000 feet, tapering off strongly to the north and east, and less strongly to the south. The combined lateral extent was from about 5° W. at the British Isles to about 110° E. at the Taimyr Peninsula. In view of the long continental path and the prominent mountain barriers to the south and west, it seems difficult to imagine nourishment from storms arriving from these directions. However, nourishment from the north would be provided by an ice-free Arctic Ocean, but would be almost impossible with the ice-covered ocean usually assumed for the glacial age. The steep north slope of this ice sheet further supports the theory that the source of precipitation was to the north.

The Laurentide ice sheet, which covered nearly 5 million square miles at the Wisconsin maximum,[23] extended westward to meet the Cordilleran glaciers, and eastward to a line seaward of the present Atlantic coast, with its southern boundary along the Missouri and Ohio Rivers. The maximum thickness has been estimated by Flint [23] to be about 10,000 feet. Although the northern boundary is not well known, it has been assumed to be thin, but recent observations by G. Hattersly-Smith [24] give evidence of very severe glaciation on Ward Island and northern Ellesmere Land at about 83° N. Here again, as with the northern and western margins, it is difficult to explain the sources of nourishment on the basis of present-day circulation and an ice-covered Arctic Ocean. However, the modified circulation described here provides for sources of precipitation from the Atlantic and the Arctic Oceans, in addition to that coming from the south.

Finally, it is well known that the areas of the northern hemisphere covered by Pleistocene glaciers are centered roughly at the northeastern coast of Greenland, near the strait through which Atlantic and Arctic waters interchange (see, for example, Flint, plate 3 [25]). For the most part, glaciation in other areas was minor and was controlled directly by mountains. The distribution of Pleistocene glaciers again indicates the strong influence of both the Arctic and North Atlantic Oceans on Pleistocene continental glaciers.

Climatic optimum. Evidence for open water in the Arctic Ocean in post-Wisconsin time has been accepted by many writers for example, Brooks,[25] and attributed to the "climatic optimum" or "thermal maximum" which many climatologists believe prevailed during the long interval from about 7,000 to 2,500 years before the present. The evidence is found in part on islands and remote shores where correlation with established chronology is difficult. We suggest that this evidence for an ice-free Arctic pertains to the open Arctic we have postulated for Wisconsin time rather than to the climatic optimum.

Other evidence for a climatic optimum is found further south on the continents where it is correlated reliably with post-Wisconsin chronology. Although the climatic optimum is correctly dated here, we believe that it is a minor climatic fluctuation because it left no conspicuous evidence in marine sediments.[4 12] Also, according to Fisk,[26] there is no evidence of higher sea level than the present in the Gulf of Mexico during all of post-Pleistocene time.

Early man in the Americas. The facts about early man in the Americas support the idea of an ice-free Arctic during Wisconsin time and hence during earlier glacial stages. According to recent prevailing opinion—for example, Eiseley,[27]—early man reached Alaska from Siberia in great numbers during late Wisconsin time. The usefulness of the accepted land bridge between Siberia and Alaska would have been very limited if the Arctic Ocean had been ice-covered and the climate far colder than at present. The Denbigh flint complex (northwestern Alaska) has been estimated from geologic correlations to correspond to warm periods either earlier than 12,000 years ago or about 8,500 years ago.[28 29] Based on direct observations of the Denbigh flint work, Giddings [29] concludes: "The Bering Strait region was already a culture center at the time of deposit of the Denbigh flint layer." Giddings further notes "that most of the early flint techniques were distributed primarily on a broad band centering at the Arctic Circle; they seldom strayed south."

We believe that these observations refer to the time of the relatively warm and open Arctic Ocean prior to 11,000 years ago. The implication of a long-established culture in the arctic region conflicts strongly with the conventional concept of a Wisconsin ice sheet continuous from the North Pole to the Ohio River. If the Arctic Ocean were open in Wisconsin time, we should expect evidence of settlements along most of the shores of the Arctic, contemporaneous with those in Alaska. Giddings [29] has already pointed out a similarity between cultures for the Denbigh complex and settlements in northern Siberia.

About 11,000 years ago, the break-up of the ice permitted such rapid migration of Arctic population southward that the southern tip of South America was reached in a few thousand years.[27 30] The initial avenue from Alaska was the high plains east of the Rocky Mountains,[27 31] which would have no mountain barrier if it commenced in the low unglaciated area north of the Brooks Range and fronting on the Arctic Ocean. Following glacial retreat at the close of the Wisconsin stage, the route along the high plain east of the Rockies would have opened, while that from northern Siberia would have closed as sea level rose and ice formed in the Arctic Ocean. Thus, as early man migrated southward, continued migration from northern Siberia was cut off.

INITIATION OF PLEISTOCENE GLACIAL CLIMATE

Although the theory we have presented attempts to provide an explanation for the alternations of climate during the Pleistocene epoch, it cannot give an explanation for the initiation of cold Pleistocene climate. A solution to this problem is offered now.

Reconsideration of the hypothesis of polewandering. Following the recognition of the extent and distribution of Pleistocene glaciers, many scientists sought an explanation of glacial climates in terms of major shifts in the positions of the poles. Much of the early work was summarized in 1883 by Hann,[32] who believed that great secular changes in climate could only be accomplished by changes in the earth's axis of rotation. Kelvin and other physicists demonstrated that significant pole shifts would be impossible in view of the accepted evidence for high rigidity of the earth, thereby directing most subsequent studies toward alternative explanations. However, although they used different bases for their hypotheses, Köppen and Wegener [33 34] and Milankovitch [35] never abandoned this idea.

In recent years attention has again been directed toward this hypothesis as it became clear that the earth could not be considered as a completely rigid body. Thus, Vening Meinesz [36] concluded that, "The forces causing tectonic orogeny which are probably exerted by sub-crustal currents must have been amply sufficient for a shift of the poles," and he assumed a pole shift of many degrees as the basis of his explanation of the major fracture pattern of the earth's crust. Runcorn [37] indicated that the earth's surface could undergo large displacements relative to the interior as a result of convection currents. In considering the direction of magnetic fields indicated by studies of paleomagnetism, Runcorn [38] believes that the variation in these fields could be fully explained by pole wandering.

Using a different approach, Jardetzky [39] recently reevaluated the work of Milankovich, concluding "• • • there was possible a slow secular displacement of the crust in space, which was progressive during all geologic periods. The cause of the rotation of the crust is the existence of a moment of centrifugal forces acting on the crust and due to the asymmetry of the distribution of masses in the outer shell."

The possibility that adequate forces exist to produce relative movement between the earth's surface and the interior has led us to reopen the question of the effects of pole wandering on secular changes in climate. It should be noted that the poles wander, according to present conception, in a relative sense. The differential movement between an outer shell and the interior results in different points on the surface assuming the positions of the poles.

Climatic consequences of pole migration. The poles are presently located in positions of extreme thermal isolation, in marked contrast to the conditions that would prevail if both were in the open ocean. If the North Pole were located in the North Pacific (for example, 35°N and 180°W) and the South Pole at the antipodes of this, in the South Atlantic Ocean, the free interchange of water with the polar regions would preclude formation of polar ice caps. The free interchange would further tend to equalize temperature extremes both geographically and seasonally. A resulting weak and uniform latitudinal temperature gradient would occur, in contrast to the present zonality. This kind of climate must have prevailed between the Permian and Pleistocene glaciations (and probably during the long intervals between other glacial periods), according to inferences made from the geologic record by all authorities.

Based on different investigations, Kreichgauer,[40] Köppen and Wegener,[33] Milankovich,[35] Köppen [34] and Creer et al.,[41] have placed the North Pole in the North Pacific Ocean for a long interval beginning with the Cambrian. Although Milankovich gave no dating, the other investgators estimated that the pole arrived in the Arctic Ocean during the Tertiary. On the basis of the worldwide distribution of corals of various

Footnotes at end of speech.

Footnotes at end of speech.

Footnotes at end of speech.

ages, T. H. Y. Ma [42] concluded that sudden displacements of the solid earth shell with respect to the interior occurred. He also located pre-Cretaceous pole positions at distances of more than 90 degrees from their present positions in order to reconcile the fossil record with the appropriate climate, and concluded that abrupt shifts of the earth's crust during the Tertiary then carried the poles to their present locations. From studies of rock magnetization, Hospers [43] concluded that pole migration since Eocene time could have amounted to 10 degrees. It is proposed here that the migration of the poles from an open-ocean environment to the thermally isolated Arctic and Antarctic regions resulted in the change from the warm equable climate to the glacial climates of the Pleistocene.

Assuming that the North Pole migrated into the Arctic Ocean, the cooling effects of high latitudes would have become concentrated in this region owing to the isolation of the Arctic from the other oceans. In the same way, the migration of the South Pole from the freely circulating southern oceans to the Antarctic Continent would have concentrated cooling effects over the land. Both polar regions became sources of cold "polar" air that contrasted strongly with the warm air from equatorial regions. The Pleistocene and Recent climates, characterized by marked zonality, were thus established. Growth of glaciers requiring for the most part only ample precipitation on cold continental regions (for example, Haurwitz [44]) was greatly favored by this climate. The Pleistocene type of climate may thus be expected to continue as long as the poles remain near their present thermally isolated positions.

The motion of the poles was probably somewhat intermittent. If we consider convection to be the mechanism producing this motion, orogenies would be good indicators of convectional activity. The beginning of rapid polar motion would coincide with the major orogenies at the end of the Tertiary, and possibly also at the end of the Cretaceous. The climate oscillations within the Pleistocene were far too rapid to be related to movements of the pole in and out of the Arctic region.

As a consequence of the theories proposed, the principal alternations between glacial and nonglacial stages would occur in the Arctic. Relatively minor changes would be expected in the Antarctic, resulting primarily from the slight warming and cooling of the Atlantic Ocean. Despite these minor changes, such as the present decrease in Ancarctic ice, the theory requires a secular increase from zero thickness at the beginning of the Pleistocene glacial epoch. There is some evidence that this has occurred. In many parts of the world, phases of high sea level are recorded by elevated beaches. Although there is some disagreement about correlations, many authors—for example, Zeuner [45]—identify 5 or 6 such beaches, at elevations up to about 100 meters. Zeuner showed that a graph of beach elevation against time is approximately linear. He recognized that "it seems probable that this straight line represents a more or less continuous drop of sea level in the course of the Pleistocene on which the oscillations due to glacial eustasy were superimposed." It is now suggested that this apparently secular decrease in sea level, with attendant preservation of the beaches showing successive decreasing sea level maxima, can be accounted for by the secular growth of an Antarctic ice cap. Numerous estimates that the total decrease in sea level due to present ice caps is about 60 meters have been made; an additional decrease of about 50 meters can be attributed to thermal contraction of the sea water, if the present mean ocean temperature is taken as about 10° centigrade below the Tertiary mean. We can thus provide for a secular decrease in sea level of about 100 meters, which seems to account for the highest of the elevated beaches.

CONCLUSIONS

The theories of the origin of the Pleistocene glacial climate and of the glacial and interglacial stages proposed here are in complete harmony with the doctrine of uniformitarianism. No external influences or catastrophic events are required to initiate or maintain these conditions. It is postulated that some mechanical process has caused the poles to migrate to positions very favorable for the development of glacial climates. The major changes within the Pleistocene are considered here to have resulted primarily from the alternations of ice-covered and ice-free states of the surface of the Arctic Ocean.

For the most part, this article pertains to the Pleistocene glacial epoch and the warm interval between the Permian and the Pleistocene. Although little is known about possible glacial and interglacial stages during the Permian and Proterozoic glacial intervals, the initiation of such intervals could have been a consequence of the same mechanism as that proposed here for the initiation of the Pleistocene. The warm periods prevailing during the long intervals between the times of glaciations before, as well as after, the Permian could also be explained, according to the theory proposed, as a consequence of the location of the poles in regions of freely circulating oceans.

The consequences of the ideas presented are that the Pleistocene climate will continue while the poles maintain their present locations and that the Recent epoch can be considered as another interglacial stage.

---

[1] This research was sponsored in part by the Research Corporation and the Engineering Foundation. This article is Lamont Geological Observatory contribution No. 187.

[2] D. Ericson et al., in preparation.

[3] M. Rubin and H. E. Suess, Science 121, 481 (1955); 123, 442 (1956).

[4] C. Emiliani, J. Geol. 63, 538 (1955).

[5] H. E. Suess, Science 123, 355 (1956).

[6] W. Schott, Wiss. Ergeb, deut. atlantischen Expedition, Meteor 3, 3 (1935).

[7] N. M. Bramlette and W. H. Bradley, U. S. Geol. Survey Profess. Paper 196 (1940).

[8] F. Phleger, F. Parker, J. Pierson, "North Atlantic Foraminifera," Rept. Swedish Deep-Sea Expedition 1947–48.

[9] C. D. Ovey, Roy. Meteorol. Soc. Centennial Proc. (1950).

[10] W. Schott, Göteborgs Kgl. Vetenskaps.-Vitterhets-Samhäll Handl. Sjätte Följden Ser. B 6 (1952).

[11] ———, Heidelberger Beitr. Mineral. Petrog. 4 (1954).

[12] D. Ericson and G. Wollin, Deep-Sea Research 3, 2 (1956).

[13] In many of the deep-sea basin areas, continuity in deposition is destroyed by the erosional or depositional action of turbidity currents; hence the chronology of the past cannot be determined with precision. However, when it became possible to take, or select for study, cores undisturbed by such action [D. B. Ericson et al., Geol. Soc. Amer. Spec. Paper No. 62 (1955), pp. 205–220], the pattern of deposition where a layer with warm-water fauna overlies a layer with cold-water fauna was unmistakable. A second complicating factor is introduced by animals, whose filled burrows frequently disturb sediment contacts. Allowance must be made for this effect in estimating the rate of change of sediment type.

[14] M. Ewing and D. Ericson, "Studies of cores from the Gulf of Mexico," Progr. Rept. Lamont Geol. Observatory (1955).

[15] ———, Topography and Sediments in the Gulf of Mexico (American Assoc. Petroleum Geol., in press).

[16] B. Heezen and M. Ewing, Bull. Am. Assoc. Petroleum Geol., in press.

[17] R. F. Flint, Am. J. Sci. 253, 5 (1955).

[18] W. Broecker and J. L. Kulp, unpublished.

[19] V. A. Berezkin, Morskoi sbornik 4, 105 (1937).

[20] W. L. Stokes, Science 122, 815 (1955).

[21] We are grateful to J. Chase for this general confirmation, which was sent in a personal communication on June 28, 1955.

[22] A. P. Crary, J. L. Kulp, E. W. Marshall, Science 122, 1171 (1955).

[23] R. F. Flint, Glacial Geology and the Pleistocene Epoch (Wiley, New York, 1947).

[24] G. Hattersly-Smith, Arctic 8, 1 (1955).

[25] C. E. P. Brooks, Climate Through the Ages (McGraw-Hill, New York, 1949).

[26] H. N. Fisk, personal communication.

[27] L. C. Eiseley, Anthropol. Soc. Washington 75 (1955).

[28] D. Hopkins and J. Giddings ,Jr., Smithsonian Institution Misc. Collections 121, 11 (1953).

[29] J. Giddings, Jr., Sci. American 190, 6 (1954).

[30] W. R. Hurt, Jr., Am. Antiquity 18, 3 (1955).

[31] E. Antevs, "The Quarternary of North America," in Regionale Geologie der Erde (Akademische Verlagsgesellschaft, Leipzig, 1941).

[32] J. Hann, Handbuch der Klimatologie (1883).

[33] W. Köppen and A. Wegener, Die Klimat der geologischen Vorveit (Berlin, 1924).

[34] W. Köppen, Meterol. Z. 106–110 (1940).

[35] M. Milankovitch, Handbuch der Geophysik (Gebr. Bornträger, Berlin, 1938), vol. 9, pp. 593–693.

[36] F. A. Vening Meinesz, Trans. Am. Geophys. Union 28, 1 (1947).

[37] S. K. Runcorn, Advances in Physics 4, 4 (1955).

[38] ———, Endeavour 14, 55 (1955).

[39] W. S. Jardetzky, Trans. Am. Geophys. Union 30, 6 (1949).

[40] D. Kreichgauer, Die Aquatorfrage in der Geologie (Steyl Kaldenkirchen, 1902).

[41] K. M. Greer, E. Irving, S. K. Runcorn, J. Geomagn. Geoelect. Kyoto, in press.

[42] T. Y. H. Ma, Bull. Geol. Soc. China 20, 343 (1940); Research on the Past Climate and Continental Drift (Privately published, Taiwan, 1952).

[43] J. Hospers, J. Geol. 63, 1 (1953).

[44] B. Haurwitz and J. Austin, Climatology (McGraw-Hill, New York, 1949).

[45] F. Zeuner, Dating the Past (Methuen, London, 1950).

Footnotes at end of speech.

Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. HARRY McGREGOR

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 16, 1956

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, I have made many trips to my district during the last year and I firmly believe that the people it is my honor to represent have confidence in President Eisenhower's judgment as to what constitutes adequate strength. I sincerely believe, Mr. Speaker, that the President knows more about military affairs than many of his citizens. Our ground forces, air defense squadrons, surface ships, and guided missiles are completely modern and ready for

immediate service at any time. I am sure that this administration's defense policy has achieved the greatest efficiency, economy, preparedness, and adaptability in peacetime history. A prosperous economy easily convertible to war has been maintained, while cutting defense costs by $10 billion. Research in weapons has permitted shift from manpower to weapon power. I am sure that all will agree, regardless of politics, that this is an excellent record.

Friendliness of Rotarian Is Being Felt Around the World

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK E. SMITH
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 14, 1956

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, a private citizen of Inverness, Miss., is doing outstanding work in developing the person-to-person contacts which can do more than anything else to improve relations between the nations of the world. Under unanimous consent, I include the following article from the Memphis Commercial Appeal, in regard to the activities of Mr. Will Price:

FRIENDLINESS OF ROTARIAN IS BEING FELT AROUND WORLD

(By Marie Hemphill)

INVERNESS, MISS., July 7.—The enforced idleness that followed a serious heart attack led Will Price of Inverness into a hobby that is practically a one-man campaign to improve international relations.

During the past 3 years he has carried on a voluminous correspondence with Rotary Clubs and Rotarians in 27 countries on 5 continents.

After his second bout with a heart ailment, Mr. Price's doctor informed him he would have to give up all his activities and take life easy. But taking life easy was a hard job for a man who had always been busy, and Mr. Price dreaded the long days ahead with nothing to do.

For 9 years he had been secretary of the Inverness Rotary Club, but after his illness the president appointed him international service chairman. This was a position that had meant practically no work in the past, but the new chairman made it one of far-reaching importance.

It began the day he noticed, in looking over the official register, that there is a Rotary Club in Inverness, Scotland. Having plenty of time on his hands, he wrote to the club president, explaining his own delta town was named for the Scotland's Inverness and telling him about life in this part of the world.

PROMPT, WARM REPLY

After this letter brought a prompt and warm reply, Mr. Price selected other clubs that appealed to his interest. In all, he has written 157 letters—long letters full of friendliness and good will, as well as information about the Mississippi Delta and the United States.

Eighty-five of these have been answered in the same friendly spirit, some containing the promise of a visit. The Prices are looking forward to a visit in December from one of their Rotary friends, Bertil Salfors, from Boras, Sweden, who is associated with the International Olympic Games.

A number of Inverness residents living abroad have felt the influence of this Rotary correspondence. For instance, Mr. Price wrote to the Osaka, Japan, club, telling them about a fellow townsman and cotton man, James Baird, who was living there. The results of this communication practically overwhelmed the surprised Mr. Baird.

Not only was he invited as a highly honored guest to a club meeting, but a half holiday was declared in his honor in this city of 500,000 people, and for 2 weeks he was wined and dined quite sumptuously by prominent officials and dignitaries.

SPECIAL COURTESIES

Miss Eloise Bowles, of Inverness, who is with Civil Service in Wiesbaden, Germany, was visited by a delegation of Rotary Annes, and other Deltans were contacted by Rotary clubs and shown special courtesies.

Mr. Price does a good bit of research on the countries where his letters are going, and he receives all sorts of brochures, booklets, pictures, and pamphlets. These he gives to the local school library for reference, but he keeps all the letters and the copies of the ones he writes.

There are such interesting addresses in his file as Akranes, Iceland; Palembrang, Indonesia; Kilcaldy, Scotland; Habro, Denmark, Drogheda, Ireland; Jesselton, North Borneo; Kowloon, Hong Kong; Port Elizabeth, South Africa; and Pusan, Korea.

A former Berlin resident now living near Isola assists him with his German correspondence and the others he sends to the language department of Mississippi Southern College for translation.

A rather puzzling coincidence is that not a single answer has ever been received from a South American country, although at least 25 letters have been sent there.

One of the most unsual replies came from a young German lawyer who had spent a year at the University of Chicago. He said he heard and read much of the problem of segregation from a Northern viewpoint, and he would like to hear the Southerners' side of the question. He especially wanted to know what really happened in the Emmett Till case.

Mr. Price's theory is that world peace will come about only through a better understanding between people. He's doing his bit to promote this situation and taking good care of his health at the same time.

Communism and Security

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. HARRY McGREGOR
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 16, 1956

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, in checking the records I am pleased to note that we have new anti-Communist laws which will protect our country and our people. Among these new laws is one revoking citizenship of Communist conspirators convicted in the future. Second. Increase penalties for harboring Communist fugitives from justice. Third. Extend sabotage definition to include biological warfare items. Fourth. Require registration of Communist-action and Communist-front printing equipment. These new laws and others of similar nature will go a long way toward stamping out communism in our country. Certainly our loyal citizens will appreciate this added protection.

Rededication of the Nation to the Ideals of Patriotic Americanism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD MARTIN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, July 16, 1956

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address which I delivered at the annual convention of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, Department of Pennsylvania, in Philadelphia, on Friday, July 13, 1956.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS OF UNITED STATES SENATOR EDWARD MARTIN, OF PENNSYLVANIA, AT THE ANNUAL CONVENTION OF THE VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS, DEPARTMENT OF PENNSYLVANIA, IN PHILADELPHIA, JULY 13, 1956

It is a great honor to address this convention of American veterans who have served in all parts of the world to uphold the honor of the United States and the glory of our flag.

We meet again in rededication to the sacred ideals of patriotic Americanism.

We are assembled to commemorate the valor of the American fighting man and to honor the memory of our comrades who gave their lives on the altar of freedom.

Here, in this convention, we renew our sacred obligation to care for the widows and orphans of our fallen heroes and to advance the welfare of those who are disabled by wounds suffered in our Nation's defense.

One of the outstanding purposes of our convention is to consider how we can best contribute to the great task of keeping our Republic free, strong, prosperous, and at peace.

There is a patriotic inspiration for every American in the historic city of Philadelphia. Here the courageous patriots of 1776 defied the power of the world's greatest empire when they drafted and adopted the Declaration of Independence.

The men who signed that immortal document pledged their lives, their fortunes, and their sacred honor in support of their belief that freedom—the right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness—are inalienable, and that these rights are a divine endowment from the Creator of the universe.

The pledge they gave was not an empty gesture. It was just as real as their love of liberty. They were fully aware of the risks involved. They knew that they would pay with their lives if disaster overtook their fight for freedom. Each was a marked man with a price on his head.

Their way was not easy. Some of them sacrificed all they possessed in the cause of independence. Some suffered the destruction of their homes at the hands of the British. Some were driven into exile and their families exposed to severe hardships. Others fought gallantly in the Continental Army.

The patriotism and sacrifice of the signers should be an everlasting inspiration for every loyal American. Their example should be a constant reminder that freedom is won on the field of battle and retained by the people through their attention to their Government.

The United States was established on the proposition that "we, the people" are the Government. The American system placed upon every citizen an equal share of responsibility for good government.

It is therefore an obligation of citizenship to take an active interest in public affairs.

That means taking part in politics. It means working for the election of men of honor and integrity to public office. It means helping to develop an atmosphere of civic responsibility to protect and promote the principles on which our Nation grew great and strong.

Yes, my fellow Americans, under the two-party system by which we reach political decisions, the battleground for good government is in the arena of politics.

We need a deeper understanding of practical, patriotic politics—the kind of political activity that is based on the highest standards of morality, honesty, sincerity, and love of country.

Just as we hold sacred the principles of our religious faith, so must we hold fast to the highest ideals of political action.

One of the tragic siuations in our country their civic duties by so many of our people.

So many of our good citizens who are sound, honest, and sincere, fail to realize that the course of their lives may be affected by politics. Such people fail to understand the real meaning of America—and many, I regret to say, do not even take the trouble to vote on election day.

It should be a matter of deep concern to all of us that more than 40 percent of our eligible citizens never bother to go to the polls.

I call this to your attention because this year we are in another Presidential campaign. I recognize that the VFW, as an organization, makes no attempt to influence the political thinking of its members. I support that policy—but nevertheless I think it is patriotism—not politics—to go out and urge your fellow citizens to vote. No one should neglect this paramount duty of citizenship. It will make us a stronger Nation if decisions are made by a majority, with all the citizens participating.

I am not suggesting that you join one party or another. This is not a political speech. But I do say that you can serve you city, county, State, and Nation by joining the team that best represents your hope for a better America.

Unless we pay more attention to the kind of government we have, we will not enjoy the full benefit of the great advances being made in science and production.

The wonders that lie ahead cannot be imagined by any one of us here today.

Who knows what greatness is around the corner? Who knows what mysteries of nature will be revealed in the atomic age? Who can visualize the new frontiers to be explored in industry, science, and research?

The course of world progress may be completely transformed by scientific discoveries, new inventions and technological advances in the near future. We must be prepared to meet the challenge of a changing world.

That means we must arouse more widespread interest in public affairs at all levels of government. We must support constructive legislation that will place the long-range benefit of the American people above temporary expedients.

As an example of how legislative action bears upon the future of our country and the everyday lives of our people, I would point to the road bill just enacted by Congress.

As the ranking Republican member of the Senate Committee on Public Works, I had a great deal to do with bringing the road bill to final passage.

I have been very much interested in our highways and other transportation systems for many years. Much of this interest grew out of my military experience in the movement of troops across the country. In this duty I found our highways and bridges grossly inadequate to serve our defense needs.

The new road program is the biggest public works project ever undertaken by any nation in world history. It involves more people, more area, and more money than any previous project except for war.

We must keep in mind that all the great expenditures for war purposes are wasted. Their principal purpose is destruction while the funds invested in a modern, adequate, and safe highway system will add in so many constructive ways to the welfare of our country.

The new highways will be designed to serve the national defense as well as our civilian needs for commerce and industry. They will serve our social and political needs by bringing the different sections of our country closer together for the interchange of ideas and opinions. They will be engineered for safety and thus cut down the tragic toll of death and injury on our highways.

The combined Federal and State expenditures under this program will reach a total of $51 billion over a 13-year period. And it is to the credit of Congress that the Federal Government share of the cost will be financed on a pay-as-we-build basis.

Outstanding in the new program is the plan for a 41,000-mile network of roads designated as the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways. These will be built to the highest engineering standards. They will connect 42 of the 48 State Capitals and 90 percent of all the cities in America having more than 50,000 population.

The overall program makes substantial increases in funds to bring the other highway systems up to modern standards, including primary, secondary and urban roads.

I have sketched over lightly the magnitude of this great undertaking, but what it really means to the economic strength of the Nation can be illustrated by a few figures.

It has been estimated that the highway program will create at least 300,000 new jobs on direct highway construction alone and twice as many in related industries. It will take many thousands of additional workers to produce the steel, cement, asphalt, stone, sand and gravel that will be required. The production of roadbuilding machinery and equipment will have to be greatly expanded.

Each billion dollars' worth of new highway means an additional 16 million barrels of cement, 76 million tons of sand and gravel, 510,000 tons of steel, 100,000 tons of asphalt, and a $500 million outlay in new construction equipment. In a single year, the Federal highway program will require over 5 million tons of steel and 112 milion barrels of cement.

These figures are most impressive, but of equal importance is the fact that the whole plan will be carried out in each State of the Union under the authority of the State and in accordance with the American plan of free enterprise.

I am proud of this magnificent peacetime achievement. It is a courageous forward step in American progress. It reflects the amazing growth of our country in population and economic development.

At this time I have a suggestion to make which I hope will appeal to many of you.

You have come from all parts of Pennsylvania to attend this convention. I hope that while you are here you will visit Independence Hall, the Betsy Ross House, Christ Church and Valley Forge. These sacred shrines of American Independence are always inspiring. They remind us that the true American can defend our country in two ways—on the battlefield and by participation in government.

Good government is the bulwark of our liberties.

If we pay closer attention to our Government we can preserve for all time the precious freedoms won by the loyalty and sacrifice of heroes and patriots in every generation of our history.

Atom to the Fore

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBERT GORE

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, July 16, 1956

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Atom to the Fore," which was published in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of July 13, 1956.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ATOM TO THE FORE

A lot is happening just now on the atomic energy front. The Senate has just passed, 49 to 40, the Gore bill for the construction of 6 public atomic powerplants for peaceful uses. Coincidentally comes the news of the new plan of Soviet Russia for nuclear-power development in Europe. Moscow has made another "new look" move by proposing that European nations, plus the United States, join in a new international agency for the control of atomic power for peaceful uses.

That the Eisenhower administration needs to do more in this field than it is doing is made clear by the reaction of Japan to the atomic performance in the United States. Japanese Atom Chairman Matsutaro Shoriki has talked with atomic delegations from both the United States and Britain. As a result he is convinced that the British are 5 years ahead of us in the development of the atom for peace.

So although he is in general a supporter of United States policies, he is looking to England for leadership in the development of atomic electric power. "The British maintain," he says, "that they will be producing electrical power at a feasible cost at Calder Hall," which the English put into operation May 22. "American experts have at least six similar projects in the works but they could not tell me when they would be able to match Calder Hall."

Adm. Lewis L. Strauss, chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission, presumably still believes the United States is in the lead in the development of the peaceful atom.

But it is plain that the Senate does not share the Strauss optimism. This became clear when the upper chamber put its approval on the forward-looking bill of Senator GORE, of Tennessee.

And it now becomes evident also that the Japanese do not believe Chairman Strauss' protestations of leadership.

What, after all, do these protestations mean if the AEC can neither show the Japanese a commercial-scale atomic power plant in operation nor give them any idea at what time one will be in operation?

If the Japanese turn elsewhere than to the United States for atomic leadership today, other countries which this Nation hopes to lead into freedom through prosperity may do the same.

Americans may, of course, take a cousinly pride in the accomplishments of the British. if the men of Tokyo go to London rather than Washington for atomic leadership, all is not lost. Both countries are of the free world.

But the outstripping of both England and the United States by the Soviet Union would be a serious matter for the entire West, and it has become a serious matter to be contended with because of the United States' wordy inactivity thus far in putting the atom to the service of people in their homes and places of business.

The Senate serves the best interest not only of the country but of peace in the world by passing the Gore bill and sending it to the House. Speaker RAYBURN and the House leaders, we trust, will see that it comes to a vote as soon as possible. Here is an opportunity too good to miss.

Explanation of Vote on Federal School Aid Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERBERT H. LEHMAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, July 16, 1956

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, Mr. Irving Engel, a distinguished citizen of New York, and one of our most prominent attorneys, who is also president of the American Jewish Committee, has recently written a letter to the editor of the Port Jefferson Record, a newspaper published in Port Jefferson, Long Island, N. Y. This letter deals with the recent vote of Congressman Stuyvesant Wainwright, in whose district Mr. Engel resides, on the Federal school aid bill and his explanation of that vote.

It is a self-explanatory letter. It is also a most lucid critique of the contradictory position taken by some Members of the House when they voted for the Powell amendment but against the school-aid bill.

This letter illustrates a point that I have been making, namely that a very large number of those who voted against the school-aid bill in the House were not moved by opposition to the antisegregation amendment, but to the school aid program itself. Their opposition, moreover, was based on a completely mistaken premise—that the school-aid bill would bring about Federal interference in education. This premise is completely without foundation, as shown by the language of the bill itself. The language in question is quoted in Mr. Engel's excellent letter to the editor of the Port Jefferson Record.

I ask unanimous consent that this thoughtful letter be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ENGEL, JUDGE, MILLER & STERLING,
NEW YORK, N. Y., *July 13, 1956.*
EDITOR, PORT JEFFERSON RECORD,
Port Jefferson, Long Island.
To the Editor:

One of the truly regrettable events of the current session of Congress was the defeat of Federal aid for public school construction. The result flies in the face of the overwhelmingly supported recommendation of the White House Conference on Education. In his "Weekly Report from Washington," in your issue of July 5, Congressman WAINWRIGHT explains why he voted in opposition to such a measure.

Federal aid, according to Mr. WAINWRIGHT, "* * * would allow the tentacles of Federal interference to enter every classroom, to reach all the young children of our Republic."

The Kelley bill (I am not here implying a preference for it over the administration-sponsored measure), against which the Congressman voted, actually establishes that such fears are unfounded. In section 405, headed "Assurance Against Federal Interference in the Schools," there appears the following language: "In the administration of this act, no department, agency, officer, or employee of the United States shall exercise and direction, supervision, or control over the personnel, curriculum, or program of instruction of any school or school system." Here, in words so clear and unequivocal that their meaning is unmistakable, is effective refutation of Mr. WAINWRIGHT's expressed alarm.

But, even if the Kelley bill carried no such explicit injunction against Federal interference in local school affairs, there is ample precedent to prove that Mr. WAINWRIGHT's fears are unfounded. For there is a long history—170 years—of Federal aid to education. Over this extended period of time the Congress has enacted numerous measures in the form of both land and monetary grants to the States in aid of education; yet at no time has there appeared a semblance of Federal interference in or control of State or local school systems. To this day, there is no more deeply imbedded American tradition than the inviolability of State and local control of our schools.

In sum, throughout a century and a quarter of Federal aid to education there remains strictly reserved to the States and local communities: (a) the certification and selection of administrative and instructional school personnel, as well as the determination of standards of their employment; (b) the selection of subject matter to be taught; (c) the selection of textbooks and other instructional materials; (d) the planning and development of school plant and equipment; (e) methods of pupil grading and promotion; and (f) requirements for graduation.

It follows that Mr. WAINWRIGHT's irrelevant references to what happened in Hitler's Germany and Lenin's Russia, allegedly because of the centralization of education, cited by him as examples of what could happen if the Kelley bill were passed, are decidedly unfair and unwarranted. It may very well be that Mr. WAINWRIGHT simply has not read the Kelley bill carefully.

Parenthetically, the Congressman did vote for Federal aid for school construction in areas affected by the military, evidently because he believed the need in these sections of the country is acute. But the needs of the public schools elsewhere in the Nation are equally pressing. How, then, does the Congressman square his opposition to the Kelley bill with his support for Federal assistance to military and other federally impacted areas? If I may suggest it, Mr. WAINWRIGHT has apparently lost sight of the fact that we are dealing in both cases with the needs of children; that when children are deprived of educational opportunity—whether because of overcrowded classrooms or double and triple sessions—it is next to impossible to make up that loss.

Congressman WAINWRIGHT is on firm ground when he inveighs against those States which flout the Supreme Court's decision on segregation. But he is opposed to Federal aid to education in any form—with or without the Powell amendment, which would deny, Federal funds to those States and school districts which defy the Court's ruling. Indeed, he voted against the Kelley bill with the Powell amendment. Therefore, his injection of the segregation issue into his discussion of Federal aid is really in the nature of a nonsequitur.

I should like to suggest to Congressman WAINWRIGHT that education is our first line of defense. By delaying Federal aid to education our children are being shamefully short-changed. Ought not the Congressman reassess his opposition on this extremely important problem?

Cordially yours,

IRVING M. ENGEL.

Government Takes Important Role in Ohio Valley Industrial Boom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARL ALBERT
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 16, 1956

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I recently had the privilege of touring a portion of the Fourth Congressional District of West Virginia with our distinguished colleague, the Honorable M. G. BURNSIDE. The amazing revolution that is taking place in the Ohio Valley in that area is one of the most spectacular phenomena I have ever seen. In New Haven, W. Va., Congressman BURNSIDE and I visited the Philip Sporn plant of the Appalachian Electric Power Co. and we also visited the Kyger Creek plant of the Ohio Valley Electric Corp., and the new Kaiser aluminum plant, of Ravenswood, W. Va. These neat establishments symbolize the mechanical genius and industrial might of our country. The Kyger Creek and Philp Sporn plants are fueled by slack coal and represent a new hope for the coal industry in this country. The Kaiser aluminum plant will undoubtedly spearhead the unparalleled industrialization of that portion of the Ohio Valley as satellite and related plants start competing for locations in the area.

The keen interest among both management and labor in the development of this Ruhr of America reflects the tireless efforts of our colleague, Congressman BURNSIDE. He has devoted himself to the development of his district, which heretofore has suffered a serious labor depression. In a guest editorial which he wrote for the Huntington Advertiser July 9, 1956, Congressman BURNSIDE explained the important role which the Government has taken in the Ohio Valley industrial boom. This editorial follows:

GOVERNMENT TAKES IMPORTANT ROLE IN OHIO VALLEY INDUSTRIAL BOOM—A GUEST EDITORIAL BY CONGRESSMAN M. G. BURNSIDE

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—This is another in a series of guest editorials giving suggestions of prominent men on means of speeding industrialization of the Ohio Valley.)

Huntington, pivotal point of the Central Ohio Valley, at the threshold of an industrial and population development that stggers the imagination. Seven billion dollars of Government and private funds are now committed to the expansion of industry throughout the sweep of the valley, with the Fourth Congressional District of West Virginia, which I represent in Congress, participating to an extent undreamed of a few years ago. The detailed story of this industrial colossus has been told and pictured in the nationally circulated magazine, Fortune.

Happily, I had a part in this ranaissance of modern civilization while sitting in the 81st and 82d Congresses. From that same vantage point now in the 84th Congress I have the pleasure of working daily with the busy people of Huntington and the Fourth District as they plan and strive to make our dream of prosperity come true.

National defense, the dispersement of industry, coal—the black diamonds of the hills of West Virginia, vast quantities of cheap electricity, are subjects constantly before committees of Congress.

The Ohio Valley has beckoned. Finally Government and Industry are responding.

Congress has moved slowly, but the wheels have been turning and they now grind exceedingly well.

The new canalization of the Ohio River will provide an inland waterway unsurpassed for its tonnage capacity. Enabling legislation for this project includes byproducts of almost equal importance—flood control, storage of water for industrial use, and pollution of streams safeguards.

The production of cheap electric power from readily accessible coal, as encouraged by Congress, is a magnet to industry from the production to the fabrication stages. Our free-enterprise system, from small to big business, has been quick to move in on the ground floor.

Transportation augmenting the greatly expanded river traffic, is on the march. I am working daily with committees preparing legislation to help the development of roads, rail, and air transportation to keep the pace. Plans for Federal highway systems will provide new superhighways, thus releasing State funds for more and better State roads. Railroads are being helped to extend all of their facilities. New roadbeds and new rolling stock. We are constantly building new airports and enlarging those already in operation. I am impressed with the forward looking, fearless planning of airline management, railroad executives, and highway engineers. No stone will be left unturned to provide all ways and means for the steadily increasing movement of men and materials.

As this cycle of prosperity gains in momentum, we in West Virginia must be on the alert to do our parts and gain our rewards.

Education, from schools of the small villages to the technical courses of Marshall College, must be prepared to double and triple services.

Farmers will be called upon to produce as they never produced before. Labor has been alerted, because as factories are built and production gets underway, there may soon be more jobs than there will be people to fill them.

I can assure you that Congress is well aware of this bustling expansion, and as your representative I am voicing your needs at every opportutnly. New and greatly enlarged Federal Buildings are being built in Huntington and Parkersburg. Others are in the offing. For the safeguard of public health, new hospitals are even now being built with the help of Congress, and more are to come. Adult education, old-age insurance, and the cultural atmosphere of the valley are getting their share of congressional attention.

It is my unfaltering belief that the time is here, the die has been cast, and the Ohio Valley will be to the United States what the Nile is to Egypt, the Thames is to England, the Saar is to Europe, and the Amazon to South America. We in West Virginia have truly arrived at a wonderful age.

Budget and Savings: Public Debt

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. HARRY McGREGOR
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 16, 1956

Mr. McGREGOR, Mr. Speaker, I am most happy to note that in the final report of the fiscal year we finally have arrived at a place where we again have a balanced budget. The records will show, Mr. Speaker, that Government spending has been cut from $10 billion to $14 billion below the level of the previous administration, despite the continued heavy demands of the cold war. The record shows that Government spending is taking only 19 percent of the national income, which is a 6 percent cut from the 25 percent share of the previous administration.

I repeat, the 1956 budget has been balanced and we will have approximately $2 billion surplus. Mr. Speaker, this is a good record but I firmly believe that with the continuation of our existing practices we will be able to again lower our national debt and give the people of our Nation another tax reduction.

Diplomacy of the Heart

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD J. THYE
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, July 16, 1956

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Diplomacy of the Heart," which appeared in the Washington Post and Times Herald of this morning. It is an excellent editorial. The young doctor who is the subject of the editorial is to be commended. He will do much in furthering the relations of America with the Asiatic people.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DIPLOMACY OF THE HEART

One American, a young former Navy doctor, has just set out on what seems to be the ultimate example of effective person-to-person contact with a foreign people. Dr. Thomas A. Dooley and his personally recruited unit of former Navy corpsmen will spend 8 months among the mountain tribes of Laos in southeast Asia setting up a pilot project for treatment of yaws, trachoma, malaria, malnutrition, other diseases. The aim of this mission is to demonstrate American good will in a practical manner, to show that this Nation is not ignoring the Asian's physical needs while, as Dr. Dooley puts it, "we hand him pious platitudes."

This 29-year-old doctor, who did heroic work treating Vietnamese refugees from communism following the fall of Dien Bien Phu, and later wrote a book about his experiences, has already demonstrated what a single individual can do toward becoming a grassroots diplomat. After resigning from the Navy, he singlehandedly recruited manpower, supplies, transportation for his mission (he is also giving the proceeds from sale of his book to its support) and got approval for it from the State Department, the International Cooperation Administration, and the Laotian Government. It is sponsored by the International Rescue Committee and it will work through the Ministry of Health of the Kingdom of Laos—thus avoiding, as Dr. Dooley point out, "the impression of meddlesomeness and/or neocolonialism."

Dr. Dooley's project is being undertaken at a time when there is tendency both in this country and abroad to deride traditional American idealism, which has been one of this Nation's greatest sources of strength. By his personal example the young doctor affords assurance that this idealism is still alive and kicking.

Tribute to Hon. James P. Richards

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. RILEY
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 16, 1956

Mr. RILEY. Mr. Speaker, the distinguished gentleman from South Carolina, the chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee, the Honorable JAMES P. RICHARDS, of the Fifth South Carolina District, is an alumnus of the University of South Carolina. Because of the eminence of his position, the bipartisan approach which he has used in all matters pertaining to foreign affairs, and the high regard in which he is held not only by the alumni of the University of South Carolina but by all the leaders of my State, the librarian of the University of South Carolina is preserving for posterity the record of the historic debate on the Mutual Security Act of 1956 in the library of this old and honored institution. This tribute to our distinguished Representative from South Carolina was proposed by Mr. James A. Hoyt, himself a distinguished resident of my State and a great American. I enclose herewith his letter of proposal and the acknowledgment by Dr. R. L. Meriwether, who is president of the South Caroliniana Association:

COLUMBIA, S. C., *June 20, 1956.*

Dr. R. L. MERIWETHER,
South Caroliniana Library,
University of South Carolina.

DEAR DR. MERIWETHER: The debate in the House of Representatives on the Mutual Security Act of 1956 will go down in the annals of Congress as one of the historic debates of this era. The central figure in that discussion was a Representative in Congress from South Carolina, Hon. JAMES PRIOLEAU RICHARDS, of the Fifth District, an alumnus of the University of South Carolina.

During the debate, lasting more than 3 days, remarkable tributes to Mr. RICHARDS were spoken by many of his colleagues, Republicans and Democrats. These tributes were truthful and sincere. As chairman of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs in the 84th Congress, and a member of the committee since 1935, Mr. RICHARDS has been a diligent student of foreign affairs. His knowledge and experience are recognized by all Members of the House.

In this recent debate the House sustained its committee chairman over the opposition of President Eisenhower and of Speaker RAYBURN; Representative JOE MARTIN, the Republican leader; and Representative JOHN MCCORMACK, the Democratic leader of the House. That was a very remarkable thing.

The many expressions of respect for Mr. RICHARDS were in line with what was said in the debate by one of the ranking Republican members of the Foreign Affairs Committee, Mr. VORYS, of Ohio. He said:

"DICK RICHARDS is a great American and a good fellow and my very dear friend. I have fought with him toe-to-toe and shoulder-to-shoulder, and I might say that I would rather be shoulder-to-shoulder with him than toe-to-toe. But wherever he stands in a fight you will find he is a fair fighter, a fast friend, and a true American."

Because Mr. RICHARDS is retiring voluntarily from Congress at the close of the 84th Congress, and because his part in this debate is so remarkable, I am presenting to the South Caroliniana Library for preservation such portions of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD,

June 6, 7, 8, and 11, 1956, which contain the discussion and action of the House of Representatives on the Mutual Security Act of 1956, H. R. 11356.

Respectfully,

JAMES A. HOYT.

THE UNIVERSITY
SOUTH CAROLINIANA SOCIETY,
Columbia, June 25, 1956.

Mr. JAMES A. HOYT,
Columbia, S. C.

DEAR MR. HOYT: We are greatly obliged to you for the pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD with the record of Congressman RICHARDS' speeches and remarks on the foreign-aid bill. These will be bound, with your letter on the front, and will be on exhibit at the 1957 meeting of the society.

Sincerely yours,

R. L. MERIWETHER.

GTA Daily Radio Roundup

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM LANGER
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, July 16, 1956

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the GTA Daily Radio Roundup broadcast by the Farmers Union Grange Terminal Association of St. Paul, Minn., on Wednesday, June 27, 1956.

There being no objection, the text of the broadcast was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GTA DAILY RADIO ROUNDUP, WEDNESDAY, JUNE 27, 1956

Announcer: Senator MILTON R. YOUNG'S statement urging a "Yes" vote by farmers in the July 20 wheat referendum is another in a series of broadcasts by public officials on this important question. Here, speaking over the GTA radio network, by transcription for his Washington office, is the North Dakota Senator:

Senator YOUNG: The wheat-referendum election, to be held on July 20, is a tremendously important one. An adverse vote by farmers would mean that price supports for wheat next year would drop to $1.20 a bushel. Secretary Benson has not, as yet, set price supports for next year's wheat crop. I am urging him to do so immediately. The lowest price he could set would be $1.79. The highest would be $2.14 per bushel.

If the so-called modernized parity formula has been permitted to go fully into effect, the minimum support this year would have been $1.64, rather than $1.79 which is now the case. It was prevented from going into effect by an amendment to the farm bill proposed by M. W. Thatcher, of GTA, and sponsored by me in the Senate.

Simply stated, this amendment prevents the so-called modernized parity formula from going into effect for next year's crop, and holds parity at the present level for another year, or until Congress can enact a new and much fairer parity formula. It means 15 cents a bushel more for wheat farmers.

I know the low wheat acreage farmers receive under quotas is hard to take—and especially for the small farmer. The alternative of an adverse vote and $1.20 wheat supports would be much worse.

I think it is tremendously important that farmers cast a heavy vote for wheat quotas on July 20.

The Honorable William R. Bradford, a Great South Carolinian and American

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES P. RICHARDS
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 16, 1956

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Speaker, the greatest men in public life are not always in the highest positions. Many serve their State and country as members of the legislative bodies of the several States. The Honorable William R. Bradford, of Fort Mill, S. C., is one of the greatest of these. He would have served with equal distinction in the Congress of the United States.

Unlike Members of Congress, members of State legislatures seldom serve more than 10 or 12 years, at most. Different reasons may be attributed for the more rapid turnover in the membership of the legislatures. One of these reasons, perhaps the most potent one, is the low salaries paid the members. In my own State, South Carolina, the salary is $1,000 annually.

Another reason for the rapid turnover in the membership of the legislatures is the fortune of politics. Not infrequently it happens that the electorate becomes dissatisfied with particular legislation, or the absence of legislation regarding what is considered an important matter. This brings changes in the personnel of the legislature.

Now and then it comes about, however, that members of the legislature are returned session after session for long periods. Such an exception has happened this year in the district I have the honor to represent in this body. When I was first elected in 1932, and for years prior thereto, one of the four house members representing York County in my district was William R. Bradford, who is still a member of the legislature. Only recently he was renominated for another 2-year term, which is equivalent to election. In the recent campaign, and 2 years ago, he broke all records in accumulating votes, and that without putting on the usual glad-handing adjunct.

In his legislative work Mr. Bradford is always serious minded. He has been a member of the Ways and Means Committee longer than any other member in the history of the State and has represented his county a greater number of years than any other member it has heretofore sent to the State capitol in Columbia. He is a former chairman of the Ways and Means Committee and has been a member of the committee since he first entered the legislature.

Mr. Bradford has served in the House of Representatives with 16 Governors of South Carolina. He was there when United States Senators were elected by the legislatures. He was there when the ballot was placed in the hands of women, and was likewise there when the national prohibition resolution was passed and when it was repealed. He saw the troops marching down Main Street in Columbia on the way to the Mexican border to curb Villa's bandits in 1916.

One of the units of the 30th Division which passed before him in mental review as it left for service overseas in World War I was Company G, 1st South Carolina Infantry, which he had organized and which was to cover itself with glory for the part it played in breaking the Hindenberg line. That engagement brought the Congressional Medal of Honor to two of its members, Sgt. Tom Hall—posthumously—and Lt. James C. Dozier, who for many years has been Adjutant General of South Carolina. In World War II, Mr. Bradford's contribution to the cause of the country was a son, S. Sgt. Morrow Bradford, who lost his life as a member of the 8th Air Force, United States Army, over Cologne, Germany, on December 29, 1944.

As a member of the South Carolina House of Representatives, Mr. Bradford heard the announcement in the statehouse of the deaths of Woodrow Wilson, William Jennings Bryan, Franklin D. Roosevelt and numerous other American statesmen of worldwide renown.

The esteem in which he is held in his home county was attested by the unveiling some months ago of an oil portrait of him in the auditorium of the courthouse at York.

I am pleased to thus pay tribute to Mr. Bradford before I retire from this House in January, next. He has always been a loyal, consistent friend of mine, and my father, who served in the legislature with him, as he was of my uncle, John G. Richards, who served South Carolina as chief executive from 1927 to 1931.

North Dakota Electric Co-Op Opposes Interest Rates by Hoover Commission

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. USHER L. BURDICK
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 16, 1956

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, I have just received a copy of the resolution passed by the members of the James Valley Electric Cooperative, Inc., at Edgeley, N. Dak. This resolution will indicate the attitude of the folks out there toward the interest rates proposed by the Hoover Commission. The resolution follows:

INTEREST RATES

Whereas the interest paid by Rural Electrification Administration cooperatives is an important item in the cost of electricity sold by an REA cooperative; and

Whereas the Hoover report made recommendations that would result in an increase in the rate of interest paid on future loans: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the members of the James Valley Electric Cooperative, Inc., go on record opposing the interest recommendations of the Hoover Commission and that copies of this resolution be sent to members of the North Dakota delegation in Congress.

Needed: A Workable Policy for the Technical Assistance Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 12, 1956

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, in the course of the hearings before the House Committee on Foreign Affairs when the mutual security bill was under consideration, one of the most interesting witnesses to appear was a Mr. G. Corson Ellis, of Chicago. At that time Mr. Ellis testified that the greatest need, if the technical assistance program is to achieve its objective, is a workable policy; that at the present time there is none.

Mr. Ellis testified that he was requested by the administrators of the foreign-aid program to investigate the possibilities of developing an industrial program for India. He is a leading authority on management problems and is a partner with the well-known management consultant firm of A. T. Kearney & Company of Chicago, and he is also the vice president and director of the Association of Consulting Management Engineers in the United States.

Recently Mr. Ellis wrote a paper entitled "Needed: A policy." Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I am including his complete statement:

NEEDED: A POLICY

(By G. Corson Ellis)

The underdeveloped countries of the world are engaged in a determined effort to raise the standard of living of their people. Most of the plans for so doing involve the industrialization of their economies to a greater or lesser degree. Unfortunately industrialization has come to be thought of as a touchstone by which, in a relatively short time, the sufferings and poverty of the people can be alleviated. Little thought has been given to the difficulties which will be encountered on the road or of the time it will take to attain the objectives. We, through our foreign-aid program, have contributed to this thinking or rather to the lack of it.

That our technical-assistance program has met with some success is evidenced by the fact that the Russians are currently embarking on something of a similar nature. Since we may anticipate an expansion of this effort it would seem to be the part of wisdom to examine our own program to determine whether or not it is based on sound principles and policy.

That the industrial segment of our technical-assistance program is meeting with something considerably less than complete success is apparent to anyone who has had the opportunity to observe it in action and who has any understanding of what makes an industrialized economy work. This failure is largely due to the fact that we have no stated policy under which the program operates and but little comprehension of our objectives and of the essentials needed to meet them.

If we have any policy in regard to industrial technical assistance, it merely states that we are prepared to assist less favored nations in their efforts to raise their standard of living. How to do this is not stated and certainly not understood either by the State Department, by the International Cooperation Administration, by its representatives in the field, or certainly not by those foreign nations that are the recipients of this assistance. The policy, such as it is, is largely opportunistic and hence makeshift.

Since there exists no statement setting out clearly what we are and what we are not prepared to do, and since there is but little understanding of what the objectives of the program should be, we are placed in the position of having foreign governments asking for practically anything and everything they can think of. This they proceed to do with the most fertile of imaginations.

As a result, we are inevitably placed in a position, either of undertaking projects which we believe to be unsound or of being diplomatically embarrassed by turning them down. Thus we are on the defensive with respect to such projects instead of placing the requesting nation in a similar position when it requests assistance outside the purview of our stated policy. This alone places us in an embarrassing if not an untenable position.

As a result of our lack of policy, such programs as we have been undertaking have had but the vaguest of objectives and unfortunately for the most part, have derived from certain basic misconceptions as to the essentials of an industrial economy. These misconceptions must be corrected and the facts understood before we can state what our policies should be.

The first of these misconceptions is that capital is the principal need of such an economy. This misconception is widely held not only in foreign countries but also by our own people. It is a trap into which many supposedly intelligent men have fallen. It is an obvious oversimplification and one which has done a substantial amount of harm. The proponents of this concept are responsible for many of the unsound demands which are made. They seem to ignore the need for a country to put its financial house in order and to make itself financially worthy.

Capital is not the key to industrialization. It is but one number in the combination.

Proponents of this concept ignore the fundamental principle that trained management, trained technicians, and trained labor are the indispensable element to success. Capital without management is sterile. Management and technical know-how follow capital. Foreign capital brings trained managers and trained technicians and these man can train their successors. Trained men alone can create the environment under which others can be trained and under which an economy can develop.

Unfortunately, it has only been recently realized by those responsible for the implementation of industrial technical assistance, that the building of power stations, dams, irrigation projects, steel mills, and other industries is futile unless men are available to manage them. The building of an irrigation dam in Afghanistan with no thought of the men to run it or of training the people in the use of irrigated land is a classic example of the blunders that a lack of sound thinking can produce.

The principal lack of underdeveloped countries is trained men. Those countries which will make the most rapid progress toward industrialization and thereby toward the improvement of the lot of their people are those which encourage foreign capital and thereby encourage the importation of foreign managerial and technical know-how. On well managed foreign corporation will have a greater impact on the economy of a country than all the so-called industrial assistance of the kind which we have been sending.

If foreign capital is to be attracted, in turn attracting managerial and technical skills, the country in question must evidence a favorable attitude toward capital, a sound government fiscal policy and a reasonable stability and integrity in the government. Undue emphasis upon socialism or unsound government fiscal policies are the quickest way to discourage the investment of this capital and its companion—management.

The overemphasis on the importance of capital and the failure to realize the importance of trained men to the industrial economy leads logically and inexorably to the second misconception, namely, to an underestimation of the difficulties of training men, of the time required to do so, and of what skills that should be taught.

The underestimation of these difficulties derive from the beliefs that education alone will create managerial and technical know-how, from the widely held belief that techniques and technicians are management or that management can be created in the universities, technical schools, or schools of business administration, if these exist.

Education is obviously the foundation upon which trained men are built but educated men are by no means trained men. Educated men must be forged in the fire of experience and tempered in an environment sympathetic to their development before they are fit to take the reins. That environment does not exist in underdeveloped countries. Further, this development takes time.

The concept that techniques such as cost accounting, job evaluation, or material handling are management displays an ignorance of the nature of management which is tragic. Yet, this is what we are teaching. We are giving the carpenter tools without being sure he knows how to use them, without a plan of the house we wish built. This is obviously fallacious, yet we make but little effort to dispel this fallacy.

Techniques and technicians are but the tools and servants of management. They are by no means the essential ingredient. Management is leadership, marshaling the resources, human and material, of an enterprise to attain a common objective. Management is not learned out of books; it is not developed over a long period of time through exposure in a favorable environment to the hard school of experience. The understanding of human motivations is the key to management leadership, getting people to work together in a team action and making them like it.

The overemphasis of the importance of capital in industrial development, the failure to understand the much greater importance of properly trained men, and the lack of understanding of human motivations the world over lead very logically to the third basic misconception, namely, that competition is evil.

We have reason to know that competition is the only force which makes for constantly improved quality at constantly improved prices to the people as a whole. It is the only automatic governing force which imposes upon capital, upon management, and upon labor alike the need for constant improvement. It further acts both as a check upon the abuses of an unbridled capitalism and as a stimulant to constant improvement no matter what economic philosophy prevails. What is more important, perhaps, is that without competition whatever is done to improve the operations of industry will serve only to fatten the already fat pockets of the owners and will not be passed on to the people as a whole.

The fourth basic misconception arises from this one. In almost every country in the world today there exists the belief that the profit motive is somehow or other to be deplored and that there is something above reproach in the supposed devotion of the Socialist industrial manager to the public interest. This is their substitute for competition; in fact it is to be noted that the Socialist does not permit competition.

This belief ignores the stultifying influence of the bureaucracy of socialism, of the part played by the initiative, risk taking, and hard work of the individual in the economy inspired by the desire to improve his financial and social lot. Above all it ignores the

fact that men do not change, do not improve their ways unless there is an incentive or a positive force to goad them into so doing. The most effective forces in this respect so far known are competition and individual incentive.

Finally, deriving from the overemphasis on capital and on technical processes there exists an overemphasis as to the importance of productive facilities and as to production techniques, tending to ignore or at least to minimize the important fact that distribution or, if you will, marketing is at least as important if not a more important factor in an industrial economy than is production.

When we consider that in our own country the consumer usually pays in excess of twice the manufacturer's price for the latter's product and that in countries where the distrbution system is less well developed this factor is multiplied many times, we begin to recognize the importance of adequate distribution.

One has only to observe the impact of the entrance of Sears Roebuck & Co. on the economies of Latin America to appreciate that one of their stores in a country, operating on the typical American philosophy of more goods for more people, of better quality at lower prices and exerting pressure toward these ends on thousands of suppliers, can have a greater impact on the economy of a country than all the technical assistance we can possibly offer. Adequate distribution will not only train men in merchandising but it will force the manufacturer to do an even better job. Distribution creates markets. Markets create jobs. Jobs create a better standard of living. This, above all, needs to be understood. It is not understood by our own people nor by those they assist.

While these misconceptions are by no means the sole obstacles to industrialization, we can do little about such others as the religious and social moves of the people. We can and should, however, do what we can to see that the true nature of a successful industrial economy is better understood. Yet, in our effort there is little if any attempt so to do either because those charged with its execution do not understand these essentials or because they do not have the courage of their convictions.

Few will argue against the premise that trained management and trained technicians are the key to raising living standards. Obviously, in less privileged countries, for at least some time to come, until nationals can be trained, management must either come to manage foreign controlled institutions or must be hired from more favored countries to supplement the pitifully small numbers of nationals available to do the job.

However, the task is so vast that even with the greatest encouragement of foreign capital and even with the greatest of incentives for foreign managerial talent, these sources cannot begin to supply the managerial needs of the underdeveloped world. Our Government certainly cannot begin to attract either the quantity, much less the quality, of personnel required. Adequate personnel is the weakest part of our program.

It follows then that the only long-range solution of the problem lies in the development of nationals within the limits imposed by the abilities of its people to a point where they can run their own show. The argument that this will take too long is specious; there is no other way. This, then, must be our long-range objective, the essence of our policy. We can only help those who help themselves.

In somewhat more detail:

First, we should preach these basic principles in an endeavor to create an understanding of the true needs of an industrial economy. However, it must be remembered that any such preachment should not be done in the spirit of selling our way of life per se, but should be rather in the spirit of assisting in the creation of an atmosphere in which men can grow and can contribute increasingly to the well-being of their countries.

Second, we should encourage the flow of investment capital to these countries, first: by endeavoring to create in them atmospheres favorable to foreign capital and, secondly: by providing incentives to American capital and to its companion management, to invest in these countries. In most underdeveloped countries the opportunities for profit substantially exceed those available in this country. The American businessman needs education in these opportunities, provided always, of course, that favorable atmospheres exist.

Third, our policy should state that we are not in the business of giving money away. Our policy should state that we stand ready to participate in loaning money for those projects which are economically sound. We must remember that we cannot buy friendship. Our gifts in the past have not improved our relationships. They have created suspicion. A hardheaded businesslike approach will gain us more respect and more friends than an attempt to bribe any country to our side of the fence. Above all, we should not attempt to compete with the Russians who, with practically no outlay at all, often force us to the position of underbidding them. This is a humiliating experience for a great Nation. We should stand on the truth.

Fourth, we should state that we will not extend assistance, financial, material, or technical unless the recipient country is willing to participate not only in the financing of the program but also, to the extent possible, in developing the people to administer the project upon its completion.

We should state that we will assist these countries in a program which will develop the leadership, the managerial and technical competence which will permit them ultimately to run their own industries though it may take a generation. Such a program must of necessity include assistance and advice in bringing their undergraduate institutions, colleges, universities, and technical schools, as well as their graduate institutions, to a point where they can provide the basic raw material of industry—educated men.

An extremely important aspect of such a program will relate to adult education. This can be fostered partially through the universities but in its essence the demand must spring from the people themselves and their desire to improve their skills. One of the most effective mediums for doing this is the professional society. One of the most encouraging symptoms in underdeveloped countries is the interest which has been displayed on the local level by managers, prospective managers, technicians, and prospective technicians, in the enlargement of their knowledge through participating in the work of managerial and technical associations.

In India, for instance, about a dozen of these organizations have sprung up within the past 2 years and others are being formed. This is a movement which is spreading throughout the world. Its very existence is proof that there exists, in most of the countries of the civilized world, a body of men who, of themselves, are willing to study and work and give of their time that they may improve their knowledge and thereby their position in life.

This desire is an essential ingredient. It must be encouraged and nurtured for without it nothing can be done. We cannot help people who do not have the fundamental desire to be helped.

However, education or discussion groups are not enough to develop the managers and technicians of the future. Some means must be provided for on-the-job training, for the accumulation of experience by doing. Some means must be found by which the quality and quantity of trained men can be multiplied sufficiently so that they have a real impact upon the economy of the country and so that men who are trained by our missions can in turn train others. This need can be supplied by the managerial or technical consulting organization.

If each member of the mission sent to a foreign land could be supplemented by as many as five nationals as counterpart consultants the efforts of our people would be multiplied accordingly. These in turn could train other consultants who would train others until there would be developed a corps of sufficient size to make the necessary and lasting impact upon the economy.

There are certain essentials to such a program. It should be independent of the government of the recipient country although it might have to be subsidized, until it can be made self-supporting, through fees paid by the institutions served. The counterparts should be of the highest caliber, trained or partially trained personnel resources of the country should be used to the fullest extent possible; the caliber of personnel sent from this country should be the very best and broadest that can be found and, finally, the engagements undertaken should be selected to give the greatest possible breadth to the training program.

Finally, we should continue and encourage the interchange of educators, managers, and technicians through the so-called productivity teams. The emphasis should be placed less on the narrow technician than in giving these people the opportunity to see broad gage management at work and to participate in training their countrymen. It is indeed rare to encounter anyone who has been a member of one of these teams who has not returned to his native land with a vastly improved understanding of, and friendship for, the United States.

In formulating any policy, it must always be remembered that a program which is suitable for one country may not be suitable for another. The advanced economies of Western Europe need but little assistance although the interchange of ideas should be continued.

The primitive economies of some of the countries of the Far East are not proper subjects for industrialization except of the most elementary kind. There are no trained men to run the institutions. In fact, there are practically no educated men to train.

It is principally in the semideveloped economies of Central and South America, the Philippines, India, Pakistan, and some of the countries of the Near East that the greatest opportunities exist.

Each country must be made the subject of a study to determine what, in our view, are its needs and its abilities. No program can be evolved without such a study. The recommendations derived from these studies should coincide with our policy.

We, therefore, need a statement of our policy, not only to guide our effort but to protect us against unsound and unrealistic requests for assistance. We need a statement of where we stand. We need to be courageous in this statement, to stand for what we believe is right. We need to have the courage to say "No" but at the same time we need to know when to change or modify our policy. Policies are, after all, guideposts, not straitjackets.

The success or failure of our effort will depend largely on the attitude which we adopt in offering it. To expect that another country will change its views, or its politics, as a result of aid which we offer is unrealistic. It has not worked in the past and it will not work in the future. If we approach this problem with the conviction that improving the living conditions of other countries is good business, that it will create markets for us in the future, that what adds to the well-being of the world will add to our well-being and will enhance the chance

of peace, we can be assured that the respect of those we aid will be ours. We are rapidly losing the respect of others with unrealistic "giveaway" programs.

What is more important, we undermine the self-respect of the recipients by making them the objects of charity. We need to bolster this self-respect by basing our policy on helping others to help themselves.

We have no policy. We need one.

Resolutions Adopted at the 15th Annual Meeting of Dairyland Power Cooperative Held in La Crosse, Wis., on June 6, 1956

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LESTER R. JOHNSON
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 2, 1956

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to put in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the resolutions adopted at the 15th Annual Meeting of Dairyland Power Cooperative held in La Crosse, Wis., on June 6, 1956.

I am glad to call to the attention of my colleagues the following resolutions:

RESOLUTION NO. 1—EXPEDITE DEVELOPMENT OF NUCLEAR ENERGY FOR POWER PRODUCTION

Whereas our Federal Government has created an invaluable national resource after investing $15 billion in the development of atomic energy to the point that a relatively smaller effort remains necessary to find practical application to peacetime use of the atom; and

Whereas no substantial progress to date has been realized as a result of passage of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 wherein it was the intention of the Congress to achieve through private enterprise the rapid development of the use of the atom, and we are falling behind nations which started later, and such progress we have thus far achieved has resulted primarily from further taxpayer subsidy of costs; and

Whereas the Congress is now considering the Gore bill, which makes clear the intent of Congress that a Federal Atomic Power program shall be undertaken as one of the major objectives of Government policy and directs the Atomic Energy Commission to pursue the only feasible program for the practical application of atomic power by constructing six large experimental demonstration plants of different types, and to be geographically located to greatest advantage to power hungry areas; and

Whereas nuclear fuel generation can prove particularly advantageous to rural power cooperatives such as Dairyland Power Cooperative in its efforts to reduce the cost of power on the farm in order that electric power may contribute more fully as a tool of production: Now, therefore be it

Resolved, That in addition to whatever may be done by private enterprise, that we urge the Congress to take all practical steps in support of legislation which will keep the Atomic Energy Commission pushing ahead as rapidly as possible in the development of nuclear fuel generation for peacetime uses.

RESOLUTION NO. 2—FEDERAL PUBLIC POWER POLICY

Whereas the Federal public power policy adopted a half century ago and pursued in some instances with vigor has proven a sound method of developing those national resources historically recognized by the Constitution as belonging to all of the people in such manner as to develop economically large geographical areas which in turn have contributed to the welfare of the whole country, particularly in times of national defense; and

Whereas the Federal public power policy has, in addition to providing power as the economic lifeblood of large areas, also provided a fair and equitable yardstick of the true cost of power production, thereby creating a relatively small (12½ percent) but nevertheless effective element of competition by comparison in the critical field of power production which is inherently monopolistic, and extremely difficult, if not impossible, to effectively regulate; and

Whereas there are only a few remaining power sites available which could and should be developed by and for the people as an absolute necessity to our continually expanding economy under the sound Federal power policy of first availability of power to public agencies and other nonprofit organizations for the wholesome overall benefit of the entire public: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we urge the Congress of the United States to take immediate action to pass the Hells Canyon bill, and the Niagara bill for the development by the New York Authority.

RESOLUTION NO. 3—TRANSPORTATION AMENDMENTS ACT OF 1955 (H. R. 6141)

Whereas during 1956 Dairyland Power Cooperative will purchase one-third of a million tons of coal to fuel its steam powerplants, and whereas our projected load growth studies show that within a decade these purchases will triple, and whereas because of these purchases Dairyland has a vital stake and interest in any new proposed national transportation policy, particularly when it affects the transportation of coal on the Mississippi Waterway; and

Whereas the Congress of the United States is now considering H. R. 6141 entitled "Transportation Amendments Act of 1955" which, among other provisions, would extend the full regulatory powers, including ratemaking, of the Interstate Commerce Commission to inland waterway transportation of bulk commodities, and which we believe would result in undesirable restrictions of competition and unhealthy limitations on the ability of small operators to enter and operate successfully in the transportation field with a consequent growth in monopolistic control of transportation and undesirable and unnecessary increase in costs to the detriment of commerce in the United States; and

Whereas if this legislation should become law it would result in an unnecessary extension of Federal authority and an attempt to legislate higher transportation costs to evade our traditional free enterprise concept of competition to provide the greatest service at the lowest cost by forcing a Federal agency into the role of guaranteeing a profit to operators regardless of whether they operate with efficiency; and

Whereas the effect of this legislation would result in an increase in Dairyland Power Cooperative's price of coal from 25 to 40 cents per ton when fuel is already the largest factor in our production costs: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we the delegates, at this 15th annual meeting of Dairyland Power Cooperative, representing 93,000 farm families in Wisconsin, Illinois, Iowa, and Minnesota do respectfully urge our United States Senators and Congressmen to oppose H. R. 6141 in the Congress as an unnecessary extension of Federal authority, deleterious to healthy competition in our free-enterprise economy and which can only result in unfair and discriminatory increases in operating costs to American industry in general and to Dairyland Power Cooperative specifically.

RESOLUTION NO. 4

Be it resolved, That the secretary be instructed to bring these resolutions to the attention of our Senators and Congressmen if and when the matters contained in each are current.

I hereby certify that each of the foregoing resolutions was unanimously adopted at the 15th annual meeting of Dairyland Power Cooperative, held at the vocational and adult school at La Crosse, Wis., on June 6, 1956.

Respectfully submitted,
DAIRYLAND POWER COOPERATIVE,
WILLIAM E. RABE,
Secretary, Board of Directors.

The Insane Asylum Business

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. USHER L. BURDICK
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 13, 1956

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, inasmuch as the mental health bill is in conference, I would like to insert the following article in the RECORD. It appeared in the Colorado Springs Gazette Telegraph of May 12, 1956, and contains information that is vital to every citizen of these United States. It was sent to me by Mr. Robert Donner, of Colorado Springs, Colo., who for years had been an earnest and persistent leader in the fight to preserve the traditions, ideals, principles, and constitutional freedoms on which our Nation was founded. If we are to preserve any vestige of our liberties, the constant pressures and misrepresentations to which we are being subjected must be understood and resisted.

The article follows:

THE INSANE ASYLUM BUSINESS

This business of the Government getting into the insane asylum operation on a large scale is increasingly intriguing.

The Alaska mental-health bill is the most vicious and pernicious of all of the attempts being made, both at national and at State level. It is pending in the Congress, and, if passed, will set aside a million acres of terrain, more or less, to serve as a sort of American Siberia for persons who are declared insane.

Who are these persons? Of course there is an extremely small segment of the human race who are incurably deranged. But a million acres in Alaska seems like a pretty large back yard for a bedlam. That is, of course, unless there are a great many more insane people than we have been led to believe.

Ah, perhaps this is it.

A glance in the publication in the World Health Organization library called "The Psychiatry of Enduring Peace and Social Progress," gives us a clue. This booklet was published in 1946 and contains some remarks by G. B. Chisholm, C. B. E., M. D.

Chisholm is a general in the Canadian Army and a celebrated psychiatriist.

In his first speech, General Chisholm sets the record straight. He reveals that the "basic psychological distortion" of persons is "morality, the concept of right and wrong." Obviously, the general goes on, people must be cured of this malady. He assures us that "most psychiatrists and psychologists and

many other respectable people have escaped from these moral chains."

The job of the psychiatrist is to free the race from "its crippling burden of good and evil." To this end, General Chisholm bends his second lecture. He says: "Psychiatry, thus far, has remained almost exclusively in the treatment field, and it is clear that its present resources are grossly inadequate for any attack on the problem of prevention" (of war, caused by a belief in morality). "The United States now needs some nineteen or twenty thousand psychiatrists" (1945).

"Some help may well be found in possible developments of shorter, more effective techniques of treatment. Shock, chemotherapy, group therapy, hypno- and narco-analyis, psychodrama, even surgery, can all be used and some of these methods may be employed by other than trained psychiatrists. There is no indication, however, that any developments in these fields will be able to meet the volume of needs previously suggested."

We should think not. With virtually everyone in the United States who believes in good old-fashioned morality now listed as having a "basic psychological distortion," the size of the problem facing these remolders of humanity is large indeed. A million acres doesn't seem like such a large amount of territory when you consider the millions who believe in right and wrong and, according to Chisholm, are in need of treatment.

Here is the nub of the argument: "Should attempts be made by the profession to induce governments to institute compulsory treatment for the neuroses as for other infectious diseases? If we believe in our wares, if more and more psychotherapy is what is needed, then surely it is legitimate and sound to do everything possible to educate the public to an appreciation of the need and to use all modern inducements which are getting results * * *. I believe there is an affirmative answer."

Of course the general isn't too confident of the effectiveness of all this. But then, since he has obviously cured himself of any belief in right, this doesn't deter him. He says: "True, we might suffer some embarrassment from our failures * * * but some martyrs had to be sacrificed to the cause of humanity, because reactionary forces fought back."

It is clear that this thinking, expressed in 1945 at the close of World War II, is what is behind the great agitation for Government to get into the insane asylum business.

We object. We object strenuously. We shall continue to object with all vigor.

We do not believe that people who hold to morality are mentally ill. Instead, we are of the opinion that any man like General Chisholm who holds to views of this type is in need of treatment by a nonpsychiatrist.

If the Government is granted the power to send the American people into madhouses simply because they maintain a belief in right and wrong, then we have, at one stroke, become as completely slave as the Russian people. What would become of religion? What would become of our civilization which is founded on morality?

This is a most serious threat to our individual freedom. And when you realize that most of the mental health bills pending provide for the decision of one or perhaps two psychiatrists to determine whether or not you are deranged, you should realize the danger of granting the Government this power.

Something must be done about this and with all speed.

Last year, a bill along this line was defeated in the Colorado Legislature.

Locally, moves are now being made which would result in pushing both statewide and national legislation. These moves must be defeated. Letters should be addressed to your Congressmen in Washington and to your representatives at Denver.

Vice President Nixon's Views on Asian Neutrality

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GLENARD P. LIPSCOMB
OF CALIFORNIA

Tuesday, July 10, 1956

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Speaker, I should like to call attention to the following editorial from the Washington (D. C.) Evening Star of Friday, July 13, 1956:

OFFENDING MR. NEHRU

Vice President NIXON is under the guns again—this time because he has said some things that are supposed to have offended India's Prime Minister Nehru.

Mr. NIXON'S first comment was made in a speech at Manila on July 4. He said that Asia's neutral countries had "far more to gain by standing together with the free nations than by remaining aloof." Mr. Nehru, replying in London, said he thought this was "undemocratic" because it implied that Mr. NIXON wanted all people to think as he does. A few days later, in Pakistan, Mr. NIXON spoke again. He said that anyone "who suggests that Red assistance is not inconsistent with freedom is reading history incorrectly." And he added that Soviet aid is offered, not with strings, but with a rope attached, and "the recipient runs the almost certain risk of having the rope tied around his neck."

That is the substance of the exchange which set the handwringers to work in this country. Senator KEFAUVER said it is an incredible fact that Mr. NIXON is engaging in what appears to be an open feud with Prime Minister Nehru. Representative CELLER said he thought it was deplorable that Mr. NIXON had "gone out of his way to give needless offense to the Government of India." And others have made similar contributions to this teapot tempest.

Mr. NIXON, it seems to us, was merely stating what he believes to be true, and what probably is true. There is no good reason why he should not have said precisely what he did say. The notion that a spokesman for the United States should guard his tongue and say nothing, even though what he says is true, lest it might offend someone, is strange, to say the least.

We do not know whether Mr. Nehru really was offended or not. But if he was, he had little right to be. For it is doubtful that anyone alive today has been more outspoken and more blunt in his criticisms of others than the Indian Prime Minister.

He has said, for instance, that "communism, for all its triumphs in many fields, crushes the free spirit of man," which sounds pretty much like what Mr. NIXON was saying. He has denounced the Atlantic pact and the United Nations. He has accused the United States of a design to dominate Asia for an indefinite period. He has attacked Britain for its policies in the Middle East, and South Africa for its racial policies. The Baghdad and SEATO pacts have come under the lash of the Indian leader's sharp tongue. In fact, if there has been any occasion on which Mr. Nehru has maintained a discreet silence for fear of wounding someone's sensibilities it does not come readily to mind.

We do not say this in any spirit of criticism of Mr. Nehru. He is a man with an enormously difficult problem on his hands in his own country. He is trying to work it out in his own way. If he thinks India's best interests are served by remaining aloof from both the West and the Communist bloc, he ought to remain aloof. And he has every right, as he has done on many occasions, to attack both blocs and set forth the reasons why he wants no ties with either.

It seems to us, however, that Mr. NIXON is entitled to at least as much freedom of speech as Mr. Nehru. If he thinks the Asian nations would be better off by standing with the West than by remaining aloof, why shouldn't he say so? Because Mr. Nehru might take offense? We doubt very much that that is the case. In any event, Mr. Nehru certainly would resist any attempt to curb his freewheeling comments on the policies of other nations. And our guess is that he must be slightly amused by the current efforts in this country to gag Mr. NIXON.

The Workers of Poznan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. T. JAMES TUMULTY
OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 16, 1956

Mr. TUMULTY. Mr. Speaker, the uprising of the workers of Poland constitutes a challenge to the sincerity of the United States. The objection to the Soviet occupation of Poland has been demonstrated by all phases of Poland citizenry.

The uprising of the workers and youth of Poznan electrified the world. The following statement by Mr. Adam Ciolkosz certainly should be read by every freedom-loving person. The statement follows:

THE WORKERS OF POZNAN

Speaking of Poland, Czechoslovakia, Rumania, Bulgaria, and Hungary, Sir Winston Churchill told the Commons some 2 years ago that "no solution is in sight for those subjugated states, but time may find remedies which this generation cannot command." Thus, the liberation of central and eastern Europe was left to future generations. Former Ambassador George F. Kennan went even further when, a few weeks ago, he expressed the view that "there is a finality, for better or for worse, about what has now occurred in Eastern Europe." Now, the workers of Poznan have refused to subscribe to Sir Winston's and Mr. Kennan's pessimistic words and, for better or worse, took their own fate into their own hands. In a single day they destroyed the myth of a finality about Communist dictatorship and Soviet enslavement in central and eastern Europe.

They destroyed many other myths. They destroyed the myth of a possibility, or even desirability, of a gradual transformation from the Russian brand of communism via the Yugoslav brand of communism toward a full-fledged democracy. There are no shortcuts of this kind. The workers of Poznan stood up against both the Communist economic exploitation and the Communist political oppression. They demanded both: bread and freedom.

They destroyed the myth of a second revolution, a new spring or a thaw occurring in Poland. There is no thaw where the workers are forbidden to air their industrial grievances. There is no new spring where streams of blood of innocent people are flowing in the streets. There is no revolution where machineguns, tanks, and jets are thrown against defenseless workers; rather it is a counterrevolution. The first one was staged in August 1944 when Marshal Rokossowski looked while German bombers and artillery razed Warsaw to the ground; the second one was staged in June 1956 when Marshal Rokossowski's

armed forces got orders to crush the workers of Poznan.

They destroyed the myth that the emigrees from Poland and adjacent countries have lost touch with realities and ceased to understand what has been going on behind the Iron Curtain, whereas foreign journalists who spend a couple of days in Poland went on describing at length and with gusto (as did, e. g., Mr. Flora Lewis in the New York Times magazine of June 24, 1956) that on the part of the Communists in Poland "the direction now is clear enough: it is toward a greater freedom of speech, more contact with the West, an easier life." Which, a few days later, was demonstrated ad oculos in Poznan.

They destroyed, first of all, the myth that the dictatorship of the Communist Party has been based on and backed by the industrial workers. The most striking and politically the most important feature of the events in Poznan was that the whole of the industrial workers of Poznan (not a section of them, not even a majority of them, but 100 percent of them) was against the Communist Party. The usual cliché of the Communist Party being the organized expression of the minorite consciente of the nation, i. e., of the proletariat, was torn to pieces. The Communist Party, as unmasked in Poznan, is an organized and armed conspiracy against the workers. If it was not the Communist militia and the army, which is commanded by a Russian marshal and where every officer from the grade of a captain up is a Russian—nothing would be left from the "proletarian dictatorship" of Ochab and Cyrankiewicz in Poland.

Day after day the Communist government repeated that it has the situation "firm in hand." Nothing is farther from the truth, inspite the wave of Communist terror in Poznan which followed the workers demonstrations. Day after day the Communist government repeated charges against "agents of foreign powers" as responsible for events in Poznan. However, agents from abroad, should there ever be any, would never succeeed in leading the workers of a city like Poznan to a general strike. Day after day the Communist government repeated charges against the "reactionary underground." However, there is no organized underground movement in present-day Poland. Or, if there is any, the whole nation belongs to it. How else could one explain 50,000 people taking part in an anti-Communist demonstration (this figure was given by the New York Daily Worker of July 3, 1956) in a city of 365,000 inhabitants?

Again and again in the past people of Poland looked in vain to the West for help in their ordeals. In vain they asked for help during the siege of Warsaw in September 1939. In vain they asked for help during the battle of Warsaw ghetto in April 1943. In vain they asked for help during the Warsaw insurrection in August 1944. This time they shouldn't be left in lurch.

The primordial task is to protect and defend the heroic people of Poznan who are now falling victims to Communist vengeance. Their case should be taken up by noble souls, writers and artists, political and humanitarian movements, churches and religious leaders. Time is running short, immediate and forceful action is essential

Then, the wider political issue should be dealt with. Communist terror in Poland spells a danger to general security and peace, and therefore the events in Poland should be a matter of concern for the United Nations' Security Council. Would the Soviet Union dare to make use of the veto right in a period when Moscow assures of her will to coexist peacefully? Do Ochab and Cyrankiewicz and Rekossowski talk peace in Poznan?

Since September 1, 1939, Poland is essentially an international problem and would never cease to be one unless she is free and independent again. Hence the idea of an international conference, to be convened jointly by the United States of America, Great Britain, and France in order to restore Poland's independence and to ensure a free expression of Polish nation's will in conditions guaranteeing the freedom of such an expression. It goes without saying that Polish genuine representatives both from Poland and from exile shall participate in such a conference.

It is untrue that the Communists are an invincible force. They are not, and events in Poznan testify to that. It is unrealistic that the Communists cannot be driven out from power in Poland. They can, if the democrats in the West have the same courage and vision as the workers of Poznan. Anyhow, this time mere words of admiration and compassion would not do, only a resolute political action undertaken by Western capitals would be equal to the determination of the workers of Poznan.

The Eisenhower Administration Is Destroying the Nation's Capital Because of Hunt Country Leanings

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 29, 1956

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, if all of the current proposals for Federal agency exodus from Washington, D. C., to the suburbs are adopted, some 50,000 residents of the Nation's Capital will move out. This number is in addition to those Federal agencies that have moved to the suburbs during recent years such as the Pentagon, the National Institutes of Health, and the Census Bureau.

The New York Times of July 15, 1956, carried a very important article by Alvin Shuster which said of the present flight to the suburbs of Washington:

> There is a suspicion among some Members of Congress that agency officials, who generally have had free rein in selecting their sites, simply want hunt country to work in with plenty of free parking space and plenty of lawn.

The largest Federal construction program in years is underway with proposed and approved projects involving more than $400 million in the suburbs of Washington alone. The flight to Washington's suburbs is causing the greatest concern. "Homeowners in the countryside are complaining. Businessmen in the city are protesting that the trend could be disastrous to Washington's economy," the New York Times reports.

The Times says the agency officials responsible explain the exodus from Washington is due to the following reasons:

> It is Government policy to disperse for defense reasons, there are few suitable sites left in Washington, and the modern buildings they want to build would run into trouble with the Fine Arts Commission.

Not a single one of these reasons is valid.

I include the New York Times article for the information of my colleagues:

UNITED STATES AGENCIES JOIN RUSH TO SUBURBS—WASHINGTON BUSINESSMEN VIEW WITH ALARM REMOVAL OF THOUSANDS OF EMPLOYEES

(By Alvin Shuster)

WASHINGTON, July 14.—It won't be long now before a host of construction workers invade the scenic banks of the Potomac, the uninhabited woods of Virginia, and the gently rolling hillsides of nearby Maryland.

The largest Federal construction program is underway with proposed and approved projects involving more than $400 million in the Washington area alone. And, like many citizens of this town, more of the Federal agencies are turning to the suburbs for their new homes.

The trend is causing some concern. Homeowners in the countryside are complaining. Businessmen in the city are protesting that the trend could be "disastrous" to Washington's economy.

PLANS TO MOVE

This is what is happening:

The Central Intelligence Agency, which now has headquarters in a group of temporary buildings not for from Lincoln Memorial, wants to build a $56 million "Little Pentagon" on 700 acres near Langley, Va., over the vehement protests of area property owners.

The Atomic Energy Commission has started construction of its new headquarters, estimated to cost about $10 million, on 109 acres near Germantown, Md.

The National Bureau of Standards just this week filed condemnation proceedings for about 550 acres of property near Gaithersburg, Md. Its new home will cost roughly $40 million.

The Weather Bureau and the Coast and Geodetic Survey are planning a joint $31 million building near the Standards Bureau site.

And the Geological Survey wants to build another $23 million building on a site yet to be selected somewhere on the Potomac River in Maryland.

FARTHER AWAY

For some agencies, though, no place in neighboring Maryland and Virginia is far enough away. The Federal Civil Defense Administration, aiming to set a good example for its "dispersal" program, already has moved to Grand Rapids, Mich.

Congress is also studying a proposal to create the National Library of Medicine in Chicago. There is some very serious talk at the Navy Department about moving eventually to some landlocked State in the Midwest.

One estimate is that if all the proposals for Federal agency exodus were adopted, some 50,000 residents of Washington would move out. Washington over recent years has lost a number of Federal employees to outlying areas, what with the Pentagon in Virginia and the National Institutes of Health and the Census Bureau in Maryland.

All this, agency officials will explain, is because it is Government policy to "disperse" for defense reasons, there are few suitable sites left in Washington, and the modern buildings they want to build would run into trouble with the Fine Arts Commission.

But there is a suspicion among some Members of Congress that agency officials, who generally have had free rein in selecting their sites, simply want "hunt country" to work in with plenty of free parking space and plenty of lawn.

IN WASHINGTON, TOO

The exodus plans of some agencies do not mean of course that there is no new Federal construction within the city's limits. The new Senate Office Building is being built on Capitol Hill. And the State Department, at a cost of about $50 million, is expanding its present quarters over 4 city blocks.

In the planning stage are a new Civil Service Commission building downtown, a new Court of Claims on Capitol Hill, and another office building for Members of the House.

There are several explanations why all this happens to be going on now. For one reason, Congress in 1954 approved legislation providing for "lease-purchase" arrangements between the Government and private interests. The program is just getting underway.

Still another reason is this: Government, being Government, is not getting any smaller.

Leadership—Where Art Thou?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ELMER J. HOLLAND
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 16, 1956

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. Speaker, during the past week I heard the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK], and the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN], praise and laud the Eisenhower program.

I heard them plead with their fellow Republican Members to support this program, and, failing to persuade them, I heard them harangue the Members of this body in an effort to place the blame of their failure on the Democratic Members of this House.

I must admit they made two good political speeches that might go over at a political mass meeting where the listeners were ignorant of the facts in the case.

But, to make such a speech before Members of Congress, who have witnessed the performance of Ike's alleged leadership, is a brazen affront to the intelligence of the Members of this House.

Where is this great leadership they spoke about?

In the dictionary we find "leadership" defined as a quality possessed by a "chief, a commander, or the head of a group."

An individual, having these qualities, inspires others to follow.

A leader is expected to give orders and furnish guidance—and in order to become a leader, he must have followers to carry out his instructions.

The President of the United States should have the ability to do all these things.

I have served in both wars and have had an opportunity at close hand to study the work and the minds of the "big brass."

In the Army you will always find that the "big brass" shines in the glory of the successes, but very quickly passes the buck in the reverses, and looks for some whipping boy to be the goat.

This is so true in this administration as lately shown by the Members of this House who follow Ike, and who try to cover up the failure of the Republican Members of this House to follow the President's leadership.

We have just considered two administration "must" bills. One was the school construction bill and the other—mutual security.

The leadership in the White House told the Republicans in this House that these bills must be passed as they are part of the administration program.

On the school construction bill, let us turn to the record.

This bill was defeated by a vote of 224 to 194.

Of the 194 Republicans voting on this bill, 119 or more than 61 percent of the Republicans present in this House voted against the President of the United States.

Now to show how a little bit of hypocrisy works.

There were 148 Republicans in this House who voted for the Powell amendment. You would surmise when the Powell amendment was placed in the bill that in all sincerity they would be for the bill.

But, oh, no—as the record shows—96 of these 148 who voted for the Powell amendment switched entirely around and voted against the bill in its final form.

Is this following the leadership of Ike?

Of course, we know that all of the Republicans will be on his coattails on election day.

Now the second administration-sponsored "must" bill to get the "business" from the House Republicans was the mutual security or foreign aid bill.

This bill had been cut in committee and the word had come in from the White House to restore it in its original form.

No member of the Republican Party offered amendments—nor did the Republican leadership or the gentleman from Indiana make that effort.

The President failed utterly to sell his program to the people—merely uttering a few pious platitudes regarding the need for the higher amount.

And, they were afraid to make the RECORD for the RECORD would show more Republicans voting against the increase than the Democrats.

The RECORD shows that 36 percent of the Republicans voted against this measure.

Thirty-six percent of Ike's followers turned thumbs down on the administration request for any foreign aid.

Again, the Democrats fought to protect the best interests of the Nation.

I believe that the lack of leadership in the White House is nowhere more apparent than in the behavior of the Republican Members in the House of Representatives.

In these two specific cases—House Republicans have turned deaf ears to the "too late and too little" recommendations from the White House to support so-called administration bills.

The leadership of the Republican Party states it is well satisfied with the performance of the President since 1952.

If it was a figurehead they wanted, they have had just that.

Apparently, a lot of grins can hide a lot of sins.

The action of the Republican Party and the leaders of the Republican Members of the House, by their actions, have proven that today there is no leadership coming from the White House.

Ike's Fight Harder Than GOP Realizes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 16, 1956

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, one of the best political analysts and writers throughout the country is James G. Colbert of the Boston Post, Boston, Mass. For years his evaluations of political campaigns have been correct to a marked degree.

On July 12, 1956, Mr. Colbert stated his opinions of the coming campaign for President and on the national level, which article I include in my remarks:

POPULARITY HAS DIPPED—IKE'S FIGHT HARDER THAN GOP REALIZES

(By James G. Colbert)

President Eisenhower's announcement that he will stand for reelection caused neither any great outburst of elation in the Republican Party nor any wave of dismay among the Democrats.

Democratic politicians in Washington took Ike's statement in a surprisingly matter-of-fact manner. After comparing notes on the sentiment in their respective States and districts, they came to the conclusion that at this stage he is far from certain of winning another term.

Republican candidates, hoping to ride into office on Mr. Eisenhower's coattails, obviously are beset with some doubts as to just how sturdy those coattails will prove to be.

To be sure, they greeted the President's statement with enthusiasm, but that enthusiasm was tempered by the feeling that Ike may be in for a much harder fight than many members of his party now realize.

There is little question but that Ike is no longer the overpowering vote-getter he was in the 1952 election. In fact, he is not political bugaboo, casting his shadow over the Democratic Party that he was even a year ago.

POPULARITY LESSENED

Four years in the White House, in the opinion of Democratic Congressmen, have made a heavy impact on the tremendous popularity that enabled Mr. Eisenhower to carry 39 States with 422 electoral votes in the 1952 election as compared to 9 States and 89 electoral votes in Aldai Stevenson's column.

Democratic politicos are not making any out-on-a-limb forecasts that Ike will be defeated next November. They concede privately that he undoubtedly will be a favorite to win. But they do predict that he will not make any runaway of the coming race.

That belief is not based solely on the President's health, although they feel that will cost him some votes. Nor does it stem from the fact that he will not wage as extensive and energetic a campaign as he did 4 years ago. That, too, will be a factor, and it also will reduce the help he will be able to give to lesser candidates.

The appraisals of Ike's prospects, as he prepares for his bid for reelection, have been founded principally on reports from sound politicians. They make it a practice to keep a sensitive finger on the public pulse and have found that his stock has dropped noticeably in some sections of the country.

SOLID SOUTH AGAIN

The South, with the possible exception of Florida, is now expected to be solidly behind the Democratic nominee for President. It is considered highly improbable that President Eisenhower could again carry Tennessee and Texas, as he did in 1952.

It is believed he will lose the border State of Missouri, which was in his column 4 years ago, and that he will have trouble holding such States as Arizona and New Mexico in the Southwest.

Despite Republican claims, Democratic Congressmen predict that he will suffer terrific losses in the Middle Western farm belt and that he will lose some States on which the GOP usually can count.

Two surprising forecasts are now being made in Washington on the basis of careful checks of voter sentiment. They are (1) the Democratic nominee for President will carry California and Indiana and (2) veteran GOP Senator HOMER E. CAPEHART of Indiana is in serious trouble.

HUGE VOTE SPLIT

That would represent a tremendous shift in votes. In 1952, President Eisenhower polled 2,897,310 votes in California to 2,197,548 for Adli Stevenson. In Indiana, Ike drew 1,136,259 votes to 891,530 for Adlai.

Two factors apparently are responsible for the tremendous turnover in Indiana. One is the feeling of the farmers over price parity. The other is the steel strike. Indiana is considered a part of the farm belt, but it also is a big steel-producing State.

One New England State which Ike almost certainly will not carry this year is Rhode Island.

California, Texas, Tennessee, Indiana, Missouri, Arizona, New Mexico, and Rhode Island between them have 105 electoral votes. Their loss wouldn't mean Ike's defeat. But it would be a very tidy pickup and a spectacular start for the Democrats.

It would place them in a position where they might make a real fight for the election, particularly since there are other farm belt States, in addition to Indiana, which may swing away from Ike.

Taxes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. HARRY McGREGOR
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 16, 1956

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, I am one who firmly believes that a heavy tax burden weakens the economy of our country. A tax increase means lower wages because of the decrease of our purchasing power. A tax reduction means an increase in wages because we have more money to spend. I am happy to note that this administration has given Americans the biggest tax break in history—starting in 1954. Each taxpaying family has received an average tax cut of $100 per year. Here is how this administration helped everybody:

First. Reduced personal income taxes 10 percent for most taxpayers—saving $3 billion.

Second. Cut excise taxes on handbags, cosmetics, movies, household appliances, and so forth—saving $1 billion.

Third. Revised the whole tax structure, reducing taxes by giving bigger medical deductions, special aid for working mothers, retired people, parents with working dependents, partial relief against double taxation of dividends, liberalized depreciation rules, and so forth—saving $1.4 billion.

Fourth. Working widow can now deduct $600 paid for care of her children under 12 years—saving $120 on $3,000 income.

Fifth. Parents can now deduct $600 for minor child as dependent even if he earns over $600—saving $120 on $3,300 income, $132 on $6,000 income.

Sixth. Retirement income of persons over 65 not drawing nontaxable social security benefits—schoolteachers, policemen, firemen, et cetera—is now exempt up to $1,200—saving up to $240 a year.

Seventh. Excise tax cuts on luggage, jewelry, telephone bills, movies, cosmetics, et cetera, gives Americans $1 billion more spending money a year.

Increasing Rates of Compensation for Service-Connected Disabilities

SPEECH
OF
HON. CLIFFORD G. McINTIRE
OF MAINE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 12, 1956

Mr. McINTIRE. Mr. Speaker, I am of the firm belief that the veteran affected with a service-connected disability merits the highest degree of consideration relative to compensation.

Such a compensation should reflect an equitable allowance that permits the veteran suffering such a disability to perform in our highly active society in a manner that preserves his dignity as an individual. Such a compensation should mirror our country's recognition of his great sacrifice.

Much has been said about the cost-of-living index in determining a fair form of compensation. It should be recognized, however, that although this index is, in effect, a reliable instrument for measuring the financial outlays required for everyday living, it is merely a statististic, cold and calculating. It fails to measure the expenditure of energy and will required of those suffering service-incurred incapacities in overcoming those disadvantages associated with physical handicap, or in coping with the problems and adjustments so peculiar to our dynamic American complex.

Certainly we have no conceivable way of designing a factor that will blend with a cost-of-living calculation to give us a fair figure of compensation for the veterans here affected. However, we do know that our compensation solutions should—while we are using a human equation—be embellished with a plus rather than diminished with a minus; that if we are to err, it must—in instances where human principles are concerned—be on the side of mild leniency rather than on the side of severe stringency.

H. R. 12038, in my mind, meets all the requirements of a fair compensation for an unselfish sacrifice. It is not so generous as to reflect fiscal tomfoolery, and it is not so restrictive as to indict the freedom-loving conscience or the great American heart.

As a piece of legislation, H. R. 12038 strikes an ideal balance, and hence, in my opinion, poses as an ideal bill.

A Tidal Drift Toward Monopoly Has Set in Under Eisenhower Administration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 16, 1956

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I submit herewith an address by the Honorable Adlai E. Stevenson, made in Pemaquid, Maine, on July 14, 1956:

ADDRESS BY ADLAI E. STEVENSON AT DEMOCRATIC CLAMBAKE, PEMAQUID, MAINE, JULY 14, 1956

I'm delighted to be here and I've had a marvelous time all day. I've been wanting for a long time, longer, frankly, than I like to admit, to make this visit to Maine. Of course, there was a time when it wasn't considered safe for a Democratic politician to venture into this State. But that's all changed now, thanks to the good judgment of the people of Maine 2 years ago when they elected Ed Muskie.

It already seems strange to recall the disbelief there was at first, and then the consternation when the 1954 Maine election returns flashed across the country. The rest of us didn't know Ed Muskie then. And I suppose we had forgotten a little this State's older tradition for great independence of political judgment and action.

And now, today, I count it a very real privilege to be able to come here and to pay my respects to your Governor for a record of accomplishment which has won for him in 2 short years great stature in the counsels of his party and his Nation.

We know throughout the country of the work the new department of development of industry and commerce has done and is doing to bring new industry to Maine. We know of Governor Muskie's programs to revitalize State government and chart its future course, of his approach toward meeting the problems of old age which are so much on the minds of responsible public administrators everywhere these days, and of his programs for better education in Maine.

I would not for a moment presume to intrude an outsider's judgment upon that of the voters of Maine, and I know it wouldn't do me—or anyone else—a bid of good if I did. But surely, none will misunderstand a visitor, proud of his host, saluting him as one who stands in the vanguard today of the progressive young leaders who symbolize by their ideals of good government, by their faith in people and by their capacity for vigorous action the essential spirit of the Democratic Party.

Democrats the country over will be proud to see Gov. Ed Muskie returned again by the people of Maine to Augusta in the coming elections.

We will be equally gratified to have in Washington, next year, in our common council there, three other fine Democrats—Frank Coffin, Jim Oliver, and Ken Colbath.

I want to add one other personal note. To all who believe as an article of political faith that "good politics is good government, and good government is good politics" the

loss of Paul Fullam was more than a personal one. Speaking for the party to which he contributed so much of honor and respect may I just say how grateful we are, will always be, and how much we feel his loss.

To speak of these leaders of today's renaissance of the Democratic Party in Maine is not for a moment to disregard the much broader base of contribution there has been to it, a contribution in which I know many of you have taken part.

It is a cinch but it is true and it cannot be said too often, that democracy can be defined as that system of government which depends for its very survival upon the full participation of every one of its citizens. This is, really, what we mean by good government. Good government means clean government, yes, and it means forward-looking progressive government, and it means government in the interests of all the people, and it means several other things besides. But perhaps above all it means a government rooted in the hearts and minds and devotion of ordinary everyday citizens. For us in America, who love freedom and independence and who value the individual above all else, that government is good which comes from the people.

Sometimes people have wondered whether in this complex and massive society of ours it is any longer possible for government to rise from the people themselves. All too often we have heard the good citizen proud of his enlightenment dismiss politics as a shabby art unworthy of his attention, forgetting that in a democracy politics is the highest art.

And so it seemed to me of special significance the when the Democratic Party of Maine set out to draft its platform in 1954, it began by building from the ground up—by soliciting the opinions of a thousand citizens, by threshing out then in public debate what became in truth a people's platform, a living document which the legislature then enacted into law in major part last year.

I hope we can find ways in the Nation to increase the degree of people's participation in the affairs of government. This has always been a basic purpose and a guiding principle of the Democratic Party. But I think it is probably more important today than ever before. For we are moving ever faster into the age of bigness—always bigger business, bigger farms, bigger factories, bigger schools, bigger labor unions, bigger government, bigger everything.

And when we look at our most serious problems today we realize that a surprising number of them are the result of bigness, or at least that they have to do with the protection of the individual, of the small businessman, the small farmer. We're doing mighty well "on the average," but more and more this is an average between bigger and bigger units on the one hand and an ever-increasing number of weaker little units on the other.

Take for example this matter of small business. There isn't much about it in the newspapers. Yet I heard a very great deal about it as I traveled around the country this spring. Small business is in trouble. The difficulties I know your machine shops and small industries and retailers here in Maine are facing are only part of what is fast becoming a serious nationwide problem.

Today corporation profits are at an all-time high, yet the man who owns a small business, the man who's staying up nights trying to make enough money out of his retail store or his mill or shop—a lot of those men are today being pushed to the wall.

A tidal drift toward monopoly has set in, and the Federal Government has done very little to arrest it.

The trouble here is not a lack of remedies. There have been specific and constructive proposals made for supplying the readier access to capital and long-term credit that small business needs, for giving it a fairer share of defense contracts and other government contracts, for tax relief and for fuller protection against monopoly.

But what is lacking is any real heartfelt concern in the present administration for the smaller, weaker economic units. Much is said but little is done. And now, after 4 years of this do-nothingism, the Attorney General has the gall to put himself on a Sunday afternoon commercial television program and make a campaign announcement about the General Motors monopoly on making buses.

Perhaps we should be used to this sort of cynicism by this time. In the last few months the administration has suddenly become concerned with the school problem, the health situation, even the plight of the farmers, etc. As someone said, they're kissing the New Deal they've denounced and fought for so long—and with a straight face.

Small farmers are in equal trouble too.

Last week out in Iowa and Missouri many livestock farmer told me that he was worse off now than he was in the depression 20 years ago.

I'm told that in 1 county here in Maine 1 farm in every 3 has disappeared in the last 3 years. And I'm told that the average cash labor income equivalent for farmers here is as low as 10 cents an hour. These facts would be cause for concern at any time; they are shocking at a time when we are told that the rest of the country is wallowing in prosperity.

The farmer needs many things—better credit arrangements than those currently provided by the Farmers' Home Administration, to mention but one—for there are as many farm problems as there are farm products. But here again the chief difficulty common to all is governmental indifference—indifference to the human values of something like the family farm so long as the gross national product keeps on going up.

Here again, of course, we are getting election-year gestures. Yet I recall that when the Democrats in Congress tried to raise support levels for dairy products, they were assailed by the Department of Agriculture and many newspapers. Yet when President Eisenhower announced the identical support levels, it suddenly became an act of nobility. I was reminded that when the Democrats came out for 90 percent of parity that was called demagogery; but when Eisenhower proclaimed supports at 86 percent of parity, that was principle. Evidently the difference between principle and demagoguery is 4 percent, and the President who was applauded as a man of firm principles and flexible prices has got around to flexible principles and firm prices—in an election year.

We aren't going to solve the problems created by the surplus production of milk, for example, until we recognize the much broader form of the problem, its social and humanitarian aspects, and that productive capacity has to be viewed not as a curse but as a great opportunity.

Today only about a fourth of all the schools in the United States participate in the school-lunch program. How can we talk of a milk surplus when we know that millions of American children aren't drinking enough milk? If every school child in the country were given a pint of milk each day the so-called surplus would disappear within 12 months. I think we might properly suggest that consideration be given the idea that what's good for American children is good for American farmers, too.

There is so much to be done it seems to me in reasserting the idea of the individual, the human being, the family farm, the little-business man—yes, the little anything if you will—as the central idea in this democracy of ours. We must remember even as we become an inevitably more and more highly organized economy and society that the only legitimate goal of an organized life is the emancipation of individual energies.

I find myself thinking more and more often these days of Robert Browning's prayer: "Oh, Lord, make no more giants but elevate the human race." And it seems to me, returning to my earlier thought, that this depends today, as a practical political matter on people reasserting themselves as both the objects and the active governors of the democracy.

Driving down here today from Belfast I saw at firsthand the beauties and riches of the State of Maine. I saw forests and farms, fishing villages and resort towns and centers of small industrial enterprise. This lovely State has ready to hand everything man needs to fashion the good life for himself and his children.

Here in Maine things are not massive, man is not the plaything of blind forces, the individual is still supremely important. Maine today has its problems. But it has its own heaven-sent resources, and it has its tremendous tradition that elevates the individual above all else; here in Maine the wind in the pine blows free, and in sum it seems to me that Maine has no problems that free-men—and down-east Yankees—can't solve—with the help of Ed Muskie and the Democratic Party.

Resolution by National Committee of Americans of Polish Descent

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 16, 1956

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter and resolution:

NATIONAL COMMITTEE OF AMERICANS OF POLISH DESCENT, INC.,
New York, N. Y.

DEAR SIR: We are enclosing the resolution adopted by the governing body of the National Committee of Americans of Polish Descent at its meeting held at the headquarters in New York City on July 5, 1956.

We sincerely hope that you will give this resolution serious consideration.

Respectfully yours,

GEORGE BRAYNACK,
President.

RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY THE NATIONAL COMMITTEE OF AMERICANS OF POLISH DESCENT

The recent tragic events in Poznan, which took the lives of scores of victims, have revealed to the whole world the intolerable conditions which are prevailing in Poland.

The Communist system forcibly imposed on the homeland of our fathers is the result of the Yalta agreement which sanctioned the division of the world and delivered Poland to Soviet Russia. The President of the United States took part in the Yalta Conference with Stalin and became a party to that agreement. This country, therefore, shares the responsibility for the present state of affairs in Poland.

If the present international situation does not permit the administration to take the initiative of fully liberating Poland, it is, nevertheless, its elementary moral duty to resort to diplomatic action whenever the Communist rulers of Poland flagrantly violate fundamental human rights, as has been

recently done in the Poznan massacre of workers claiming for a betterment of their living conditions. No government has the right to shoot its citizens when they demand bread, as did the strikers in Poznan.

We believe it to be our duty to appeal to you, Mr. Congressman, asking you to undertake an energetic action in cooperation with other Members of Congress, in order to bring about at least a diplomatic intervention of our administration with the Communist government in Warsaw, asking them for:

1. A full public explanation of the tragic events in Poznan, their origin and causes.

2. Severe punishment of those responsible for the shooting of the workers and civilian populations of Poznan.

3. The prevention of retaliatory measures, executions, and other reprisals.

4. A guaranteeing to the citizens of Poland, and particularly the workers, of the right to put forward their justified political and economic demands.

5. An increase of the wages and an improvement of working and livink conditions of the workers so as to bring them to a decent level, such as they enjoy in western democracies, and particularly in the United States.

6. The granting of full political rights to the people of Poland in accordance with basic democratic principles and the traditions of Poland's history and culture.

S. 2875

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 16, 1956

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I include a press release made on July 6, 1956, by William C. Doherty, national president of the National Association of Letter Carriers, in opposition to amendments proposed by the United States Civil Service Commission to S. 2875.

The views of President Doherty, whom I greatly admire, are worthy of deep considerations:

President William C. Doherty of the National Association of Letter Carriers today charged that the amendments proposed by the Civil Service Commission to S. 2875 would completely emasculate the bill. Mr. Doherty further charged that the Commission amendments would favor the higher paid employees, pointing out that an employee with an average salary of $4,000 under present law receives a percentage equal to 1.62 percent of salary multiplied by years of service; an employee having an average of $5,000 or more receives 1.50 percent of salary multiplied by years of service. The Commission proposal would provide 1.75 percent for both those receiving $4,000 and those receiving $5,000 or more. The increase for those with salaries of $4,000 is a mere .13 percent per year, or 3.9 percent for 30 years' service, while the increase for those with salaries of $5,000 or more is .25 percent, or 7.5 percent for 30 years.

The majority of the employees in the lower salary brackets cannot afford to provide survivorship benefits under the present law. As a matter of fact, 1 out of every 3 retiring in the entire Government fails to make survivorship selection because of the severe reduction in annuities required; they simply cannot afford the reduction. S. 2875 would make it possible for survivors to receive up to $1,200 without prior reduction; the Civil Service Commission favors eliminating this most necessary provision.

The Commission's proposal would do away with the 30-year optional retirement provision in the Senate bill.

The employees are willing to pay an additional $90 million a year for these benefits. "We are not willing to pay this extra 1 percent if the bill is emasculated," Mr. Doherty declared. The estimated cost figures sent up by the Commission are inflated away out of reason. In 1955 all benefits, including survivorship benefits, cost a total of $345 million; yet the Commission has the effrontery to declare that the amendments will cost $454 million per year.

Mr. Doherty stated: "I appeal to the congress on behalf of the 105,000 members of the National Association of Letter Carriers to vote out S. 2875, the much needed Johnston liberalized retirement bill, exactly as it was passed by the Senate."

The Fallacy That Foreign Aid Is Good Business for the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 12, 1956

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, recently my attention was directed to a book written by Henry Hazlitt entitled "Will Dollars Save the World?" It was published in 1947, yet today it is important and timely as we consider the impact of foreign aid upon our domestic economy.

In the recent debates on the bill to authorize the expenditure of more than $4 billion the argument was made that it is good business for the United States to engage in this program because 80 percent or more of the money is spent in the United States. The argument is based on a false premise, to wit: that we can prosper by giving our money and goods away. It is not true that the United States needs foreign loans to keep full production and employment at home.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I am inserting a short statement by Mr. Hazlitt on this very important matter and I commend it to the attention of all Members of the Congress:

WILL FOREIGN LOANS MAKE US RICH?

It is not true that the United States needs foreign loans to keep full production and employment at home. It is not true that we can get rich by giving our goods away.

More and more the strange idea is being put forward that America must make loans or gifts to foreign countries, not primarily to save them, but to save itself. We are told that our Government must make these gifts or loans not as a humane or charitable duty but out of shrewd self-interest. Newspaper commentators in the recipient countries have more and more been interpreting our Government's generosity to them on this theory. As early as June 25, 1947, Pravda declared that the Marshall plan was influenced by a desire to prolong a postwar boom in the United States and to lessen the ropening economic crisis here.

That Communist Russia should hold such a view is not surprising. It fits in perfectly with all the other claptrap that Communists have long preached about capitalism. But the theory is just as eagerly embraced elsewhere.

In its issue of July 12, 1946, the Eastern Economist of New Delhi put it forward in its most naked form:

"The United States lend-lease plan of helping the allies in the recent war has been acclaimed as an act of unparalleled generosity," (it said). "But it was also a brilliant and ingenious way of solving what would otherwise have been an intractable problem. * * * The productive power of America has multiplied itself so fast that it is now admitted that she cannot continue to give 60 million jobs unless she is able to have a large export trade. * * * In such circumstances it would not be such a foolish thing (as some might imagine) to give away goods to other countries, for on balance it would be better to part with surplus goods than to create unemployment. * * * Machinery would be set up by America whose purpose would be to provide gifts of loans to countries. * * * The United States Government will buy the goods, give them as gifts and reimburse itself by additional internal taxation. * * * If this is to play the world's Santa Claus, the United States of America is both rich enough and should have sense enough to fill the role."

This idea, in both crude and sophisticated guise, has been endlessly repeated in the French and British press.

That this idea should exist so strongly in the countries that wish to get more American loans and gifts is not surprising. What is much more strange is to find it endorsed by some American businessmen and even by some American economists.

Yet it is unadulterated nonsense.

If it were true that we could create prosperity merely by making goods to give away, then we would not have to give them to foreign countries. We could accomplish the same results by making the goods to dump into the sea. Or the Federal Government could order the goods made to be given away to the poor in our own country. It could furnish them with free overcoats, free lunches and free automobiles; order any amounts of new housing built, turn it over to them, and finance it by inflation or add it to the American taxpayer's bill. Simplest of all, it could turn over directly to American lower-income groups additional money taken from the taxpayers and let them buy with it whatever they themselves wanted. The goods, at least, would then remain in this country. Why confuse the issue by bringing in foreign nations and foreign trade?

It ought to be clear to the poorest intelligence that nobody can get rich by giving his goods away. What seems to confuse otherwise intelligent people when this proposition is applied to a nation instead of an individual, however, is the fact that it is possible for particular firms and persons within the Nation to profit by such a transaction at the expense of all the rest. It is true, for example, that persons engaged exclusively or chiefly in export business might gain on net balance as a result of bad loans made abroad. The exporter might profit at first by additional foreign sales. But if the foreign loan is not repaid, then those who make it lose the money. If it is a Government loan, then the loss must be made good out of increased taxes on every American. American consumers will then have just that much less money left with which to buy American goods. For every extra dollar that the foreign buyers have been given to buy such goods, in other words, domestic buyers would ultimately have one dollar less. Businesses that depend on domestic trade would therefore be hurt in the long run at least as much as those engaged primarily in export business had been helped. Considered individually, American consumers would be impoverished by higher

taxes. And considered collectively, the country would be poorer by the amount of goods it had given away.

So many confusions exist about foreign trade that it is possible here to call attention only to 1 or 2 of them that bear immediately upon the present issue. One frequent fallacy, for example, which is implied in the foregoing quotation from the Eastern Economist, is that the United States produces a surplus above its own needs and must find an outlet for this surplus. Nothing, of course, would be more foolish than for a country continually to produce more than it needed. From the standpoint of the nation as a whole, exports are produced to pay for imports. A nation with a permanent surplus of exports (including both visible and invisible items) would be merely a nation that was giving its goods away.

Wherever the most effective division of labor exists, wherever a nation devotes itself to producing what it can produce better, cheaper, or more efficiently than other nations, and is content to buy from others in turn the things that they can make cheaper, foreign trade follows as a matter of course. But it is a fallacy to suppose that a large export trade is in itself necessary to provide employment or to give 60 million jobs. If some of these jobs make exports that are not ultimately balanced by imports, then the labor is merely being thrown away. It is like a huge WPA project, with the added disadvantage that whatever is produced by the work goes to foreign countries instead of remaining at home. If, on the other hand, the exports are balanced either immediately or ultimately by imports, then as many American jobs are lost, or kept from coming into existence, by buying the imports (instead of home-produced goods) as were created in the first place by the exports. In an autarkic economy, the jobs that are lost by lack of exports are offset by the jobs provided to make substitutes for the goods that would otherwise be imported. It is not employment that suffers, but efficiency and consumer satisfaction. A sound two-way foreign trade is important from the standpoint of the efficient world division of labor and the maximum creation of wealth; but it is in the long run irrelevant from the standpoint of providing employment.

It is true, however, that changes in foreign trade, and temporary export or import surpluses (using exports and imports broadly, to include all goods and services) are important from the standpoint of employment and business acivity. An excess of exports, other things being equal is inflationary; and an excess of imports is deflationary. That is to say, an excess of exports, by making goods at home scarcer than otherwise, tends to raise home prices, while an excess of imports, by making goods more plentiful than otherwise, tends to lower home prices.

In a speech on May 8, 1947, Dean Acheson, Under Secretary of State, estimated that our annual exports of goods and services to the rest of the world during 1947 would total $16 billion, an all-time peacetime high, compared with annual exports of about $4 billion before the war. Against this, he said, we were expected to import only about $8 billion of goods and services. A later estimate, in the Midyear Economic Report of the President, published on July 21, gave a much larger figure of the export surplus: "The goods and services we provided to other countries (during the first half of 1947) ran ahead of what they provided to us at the rate of $12.7 billion a year."

Now except for that part of it which is financed out of immediate taxation, this export surplus of $12 billion a year is inflationary. It means that we are paying out $12 billion a year in wages, salaries, and profits for goods and services that we do not get. It adds $12 billion to the excess purchasing power competing for the goods that are left. We are increasing the volume of money incomes in relation to the goods produced for domestic consumption.

The Chickens Come Home

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 16, 1956

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, the confusion in Washington in the conduct of our Government by the Republican administration under the leadership of President Eisenhower, upon whom responsibility rests, is becoming more and more evident to our people.

The American people are deeply concerned with the uncertainty of leadership in the field of foreign affairs, and with our military and defense strength.

They know we are on the defensive throughout the world. They sense that our national defense is connected with a balanced budget, and that this is a dangerous calculated risk to take.

The people well know that our military strength is the main avenue or weapon by which our national objectives are attained in the field of foreign affairs.

In my remarks I include a well-considered article, The Chickens Come Home, written by Joseph and Stewart Alsop, appearing in the Washington Post and Times Herald of July 16, 1956:

MATTER OF FACT

(By Joseph and Stewart Alsop)

THE CHICKENS COME HOME

All sorts of elaborate theories have been put forward to justify the very heavy reductions in the Armed Forces which have been proposed by Secretary of Defense Charles Wilson and Adm. Arthur Radford, chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. But there is hardly an informed man in the Pentagon who has the slightest private doubt that the theories are just so much camouflage for the following simple facts:

The Eisenhower administration came to power committed to lower taxes and balance the budget. Both laudable objectives have been achieved, largely thanks to the New Look at defense policy, which has permitted very sharp reductions in previously planned defense levels.

Even the New Look, however, would not have permitted a balanced budget for the current fiscal year if it had not been for an artificial process of one-shot defense reductions. For the current fiscal year the Armed Forces were told, in effect, to live off their capital in order to permit a balanced budget.

But it is not possible to live off capital forever. On the contrary, artificially low-defense spending for 1 fiscal year spells artificially high-defense spending for the next. Moreover, certain military hardware—like the B–52 heavy bomber—is reaching the stage where it must be bought and paid for. Thus the administration's fiscal chickens are suddenly coming home to roost.

The powers that be in the administration have been horrified by the size of these unwelcome birds. For example, in order to maintain the agreed-upon force levels for the Air Force (which many air officers, like Gen. Curtis LeMay, consider already grossly inadequate) it will be necessary to up Air Force spending a cool $6 billion in the next fiscal year.

Similarly, the artificial savings for the other two services must also be made up in the next fiscal year. Preliminary estimates by the services have put the overall increase in the neighborhood of $12 billion. Final and official estimates must be submitted to Secretary Wilson by October 1.

Any such increase would of course knock the budget for the next fiscal year into a cocked hat. It would also knock into a cocked hat the administration's budget-balancing boasts, which are counted on heavily as campaign material for this election year.

Secretary Wilson has thus ordered that defense estimates for the next fiscal year be held down to about the current level, or at most only a billion or so more. Because the current level is artificial, there is only one way that this can be done other than by abandoning the 137-wing Air Force program, to which the administration is absolutely committed.

It can only be done by the kind of very sharp reduction in military manpower which Wilson and Radford have been proposing to the dismayed Joint Chiefs. It is well to understand what a cut in manpower of 500,000 to 800,000 men would mean.

It would mean a large-scale withdrawal of American forces from Europe, which would drive the last nail into NATO's coffin. In a large sense, it would also mean that the United States had passed the point of no return in total dependence on the Strategic Air Command's ability to deliver hydrogen bombs to enemy targets.

No sensible man disputes that SAC must have the power to deliver its hydrogen bombs if the worst comes to the worst. But it is highly significant that Gen. Nathan Twining, Air Force Chief of Staff, has joined the Army and Navy chiefs in protesting the proposed cuts. As one high Air Force official has remarked, "We don't want to be left all alone with SAC."

The meaning of being left all alone with SAC was spelled out in Lt. Gen. James Gavin's recent testimony before the Senate Air Power Subcommittee. A hydrogen attack on the Soviet empire would result, Gavin said, in several hundred million deaths from radioactive fallout. The deaths would extend well back into Western Europe, or deep into Asia, depending on which way the wind blew.

Thus, in case of future local Communist aggression, the United States would be left with the choice of killing several hundred million people, including our friends, or doing nothing at all. The administration's much-vaunted New Look, in short, threatens to leave this country in the hopeless situation of a policeman armed only with a weapon which, if used, will destroy not only the criminal at which it is aimed but several city blocks round about.

Labor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. HARRY McGREGOR
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 16, 1956

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, I have just received a series of various reports relative to our economy, which of course included the labor field. I am indeed happy to note that employment is highest in history. An average of 63.2

million had jobs, which smashed all previous records. This record shows, Mr. Speaker, that approximately 3 million more held peacetime jobs than were held previously, even in war. We are in a sound economy, Mr. Speaker, when it is possible for our people to have jobs without war.

Both hourly and weekly wages are at an all-time record high averaging nearly 13 percent higher in peacetime 1955 than in wartime 1952.

Strategy on the Cheap

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 16, 1956

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial which appeared in the Washington Post and Times Herald on Sunday, July 15, 1956, on the subject of proposed reductions in military manpower:

STRATEGY ON THE CHEAP

It is good to have Admiral Radford's denial of the proposal attributed to him for sweeping slashes in military manpower. The Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff says that the eventual 800,000-man cut mentioned in new stories is a distortion of a staff study recommendation, and that he personally has reached no such decision. Adoption of any such plan, of course, would be clear evidence that the budget was determining American strategy rather than the reverse. There have been many quips in the past about civilians in Government having the real military minds. This is the first suggestion that the military should preempt the civilian role of the budgeteers.

Despite Admiral Radford's disavowal, however, there have been enough indications of a trend toward more exlusive reliance on air-atomic strategy to warrant discusson. This is the strategy of the big war. It proceeds on the assumption that any war would be "a general one, short, violent, and involving nuclear weapons." A consequent reduction in conventional weapons would face the country with the horrible dilemma, in any war that might break out, of meeting it with nuclear weapons that would invite an all-out war of annihilation, or of sitting by impotent. The "limited war" would become a near impossibility.

Now, a concern for the welfare of the economy on the part of military men, is within limits, commendable. But the major assignment of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and the officers working under them, is to devise the startegy that is best suited to the defense of American interests, and then to ask for what they need. Budgetary requirements certainly figure in the ultimate determination of strategy, but it is the job of civilians rather than of the militarry to say what the economy will stand.

In point of fact, the economy will stand almost any military expenditure it has to stand; the limit has never been tested. Before Korea there was an assumption that $15 billion or even $12 billion was all we could possibly afford. Today the national budget is balanced with a military expenditure of nearly three times the latter amount. It is far cheaper—and safer—to undergo some budgetary stress than to find to our sorrow that the Military Establishment has prepared to fight the wrong kind of war.

The doctrine suggested by the reports of the Staff paper would complete the "New Look" by enshrining the atom as the determinant of military policy. Yet, if the current standoff with the Russians means anything, means that there is less and less likelihood of deliberate nuclear war. The point on which there is no assurance is the continued danger of small wars—over Quemoy and Matsu, in Indochina, in the Middle East. Would the American people really want to adopt a strategy which, far from providing more flexibility, would automatically transform small wars into big wars for want of any other means of response?

This newspaper hopes that the issue will be widely debated before there is any attempt to advance such a concept further including the implications for an essentially isolationist, Fortress American type of strategy and its bearing no questions of disarmament and nuclear control. It smacks of the idea that there is a cheap way to defense; and this is a proposition which has never yet worked.

They Knew It All the Time

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. ROONEY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 16, 1956

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the New York Post of July 15, 1956:

THEY KNEW IT ALL THE TIME

Remember Dixon-Yates, also known as the 1954 mess in Washington?

Have a quick refresher course: President Eisenhower ordered the Atomic Energy Commission to sign up to buy power from Mr. Dixon and Mr. Yates to give to the Tennessee Valley Authority because the AEC was drawing so heavily on TVA's supplies.

That way TVA, cradle of public power and another of the Franklin Delano Roosevelt monuments, wouldn't have to grow any bigger. If TVA needed more power TVA could get it, in a roundabout way, from Mr. Dixon and Mr. Yates. The two southern entrepreneurs liked the idea so much they cheerfully agreed to put up a $107,000,000 plant to help Uncle Sam in his hour of need.

Naturally, there were raised eyebrows in many places.

The AEC members themselves couldn't get together on whether the deal could be made sweet enough to stand.

There were even some people in Washington, mostly Democrats, who questioned whether it was legal.

Attorney General Brownell took care of the spoilsports. He said the thing was legal as anything.

Then the ghost of a mysterious gentleman named Adolphe E. Wenzell got pried out of the secret files. It turned out that Mr. Wenzell had served as a consultant to the Bureau of the Budget on Dixon-Yates while at the same time functioning as an adviser to the investment outfit that was bankrolling Dixon-Yates.

The lid, of course, blew off.

The President quick like a flash threw out the contract.

Now comes the payoff:

Dixon-Yates sued the United States for $3,534,778.45 on account of the combine had put so much sweat, toil and money into the thing before it got killed.

Defending the suit, Attorney General Brownell argued in court this week that the whole contract was illegal in the first place. What's more, he said that Mr. Wenzell's dual role on both sides of the backdoor negotiation violated the "conflict of interest" statute, so all bets were off.

This is the same Herbert Brownell who defended the contract when it was being aired on Capitol Hill last year.

We're not saying that the Dixon-Yates crowd ought to get any money. We can't even figure out what the extra 45 cents is for. And we never knew how much the combine stood to make in the first place; nobody ever said.

All we wanted to do here, you see, was to bring the mess in Washington up to date. The Republicans harped on it so much when the crusade was rolling through the hinterlands in the 1952 campaign that we hate to see it neglected in 1956.

America and the International Atom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT GORE
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, July 16, 1956

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the text of an address on the subject America and the International Atom, delivered by Gordon Dean, former Chairman of the United States Atomic Energy Commission, at a dinner forum on Atoms for Peace, the occasion being the 90th anniversary of the Nation on Sunday, June 19, 1955.

The address delivered by Mr. Dean is timely apropos the bill passed by the Senate last week.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AMERICA AND THE INTERNATIONAL ATOM

(Address delivered by Gordon Dean, former Chairman of the United States Atomic Energy Commission, at a dinner forum on Atoms for Peace on the occasion of the 90th anniversary of the Nation, June 19, 1955, at the Waldorf-Astoria Hotel)

Sixteen years ago several scientists, including the late Dr. Enrico Fermi, approached Albert Einstein and advised him that certain experiments with nuclear fission had approached a point where they felt the highest authority should know it. They asked the professor to go to Washington to see the President. But the modest professor said, "I really don't feel that I could disturb so busy a man." He was induced, however, to write a letter to the President. A friend sat down at a portable typewriter on the back porch of a home where Einstein was visiting. He might have used a better typewriter ribbon for one of the most important documents in human history. However, the simplicity and lucidity of Einstein's style were so effective that upon receiving the letter the President, on a little memorandum to General Watson wrote, "See that this is done." With that authorization $5,000 was appropriated and the atomic energy program of this country was begun.

Sixteen years after this event the United States had spent in excess of $10 billion on its atomic energy program; huge stockpiles of bombs had been accumulated; atomic en-

ergy programs had developed in a score of countries around the world; a submarine called the *Nautilus* was sailing the Atlantic, propelled by a nuclear reactor; another submarine, also nuclear propelled but of quite different design, was soon to be on its way; large public utilities both in this country and abroad are designing reactors to produce electricity from the heat produced by the fission of uranium atoms; industry, medicine, and agriculture are examining the effects of radiation to understand its dangers and to harness it to useful purposes. Reactors, that is nuclear furnaces, exist today in the United Kingdom, Canada, Sweden, Norway, and France, and will soon be building in many other countries including Holland, Denmark, Belgium, Australia, Italy, Turkey, Switzerland, India, and Brazil. Much has happened.

I have been asked this evening to talk briefly on the capacity of the United States to revolutionize the world through the fullest development of peacetime uses of atomic energy. That the atom has already had a terrific impact on the world is quite obvious; that its impact to date is only a fraction of its potential is equally clear. That the world will be revolutionized is clear. That the United States has the capacity to bring about this revolution is also clear. But that the United States will play the leading part it could have played, is today a very serious question.

The United States had remained, except in public pronouncement and speeches, significantly aloof from the world atomic picture. At the same time countries all over the globe are probing the nucleus of the atom.

We forget sometimes that the atom is international; that it knows no nationality, race, or ideology. It will go about its sometimes productive, sometimes destructive work just as loyally for a Russian, a Pole, or a Chinese as it will for an American, a Briton, or a Frenchman.

The atom obeys only one set of laws—the laws of physics. And man's mastery over the atom is directly proportional to his comprehension of these laws. The real top secrets in atomic energy are those that are still held by nature. Those which nature has released are generally known. Every now and then the scientists of one nation or another wrest a new secret from nature, either by accident or by dint of great effort. When this occurs, the nation that discovers the new information my lock it in a safe and disclose it only to those it considers to be loyal and trustworthy. But nature herself remains a security risk that cannot be controlled. The secret that has been learned by one may be and usually is quickly learned by another. It takes brains, knowledge, experience, skill, and resources, but these are not the exclusive possession of any one nation or any one group of nations.

The blunt fact is that while the United States has the capacity to revolutionize the world through the development of peacetime uses of atomic energy, in all probability the United States will play but a part in this revoluntionary process. We have no monopoly.

A little history is perhaps in order at this point.

Until a year ago the Atomic Energy Act of the United States prohibited interchange of information with other countries dealing with commercial applications of nuclear energy except in the field of radioactive isotopes. One reason for this legislative prohibition was that if any country which should build a reactor for the generation of heat—it would be manufacturing in the course of the process plutonium; that plutonium being fissionable or explodable could readily be fashioned into bombs. The reasoning was just that simple—and, I might add that up to a certain point of time quite valid. Seventy percent of the United States effort goes into making fissionable material. This is therefore the largest single effort of the United States program. Fashioning a bomb out of this material is comparatively simple and today the general theory is well known. Consequently we did not interchange information on the making of fissionable material because we did not wish to hasten the day when other countries could secure a bomb.

But many things have happened since the act was written. Canada has built reactors. England has built reactors and bombs. France has built reactors. All, therefore, produce plutonium. And within the past several years other countries have built them—not, I should add, to get bomb material but to find a way to get heat and eventually electricity from these reactors.

Furthermore in 1949 something very significant happened, something we sometimes forget when we make security policy. Russia exploded an atomic bomb and has since exploded many others. It followed that Russia had built reactors, and separated out plutonium. Since that date she has accumulated an imposing stockpile of bombs to which she has more recently added the much more destructive hydrogen bomb.

Almost a year ago Congress fully aware of these developments amended the Atomic Energy Act to permit transfer of information touching upon peaceful uses of atomic energy to friendly countries and set up a machinery for bilateral agreements whereby any atomic information could be interchanged except information dealing with the fabrication of atomic weapons.

Even prior to this the President had spoken eloquently for a sharing of the blessings of the atom. He painted a picture of the tremendous strides which mankind could make if all the scientists and engineers of the world could turn their inventiveness to exploiting the peaceful atom. The message stirred the people's imagination particularly in those countries which saw in the peaceful atom a new fuel, a new source of power.

Both before the President's speech of 1953 and since we have taken some steps which have been highly useful. Actually the atoms-for-peace program of the United States Atomic Energy Commission goes back to September 1947, when we first began the international distribution of radioisotopes. Such distribution was permitted even under the original Atomic Energy Act. Since then 46 countries have received in all many thousands of shipments from the United States. Nearly 5,000 individuals and organizations today throughout the world are employing radioisotopes in the fields of medicine, agriculture, and in their industrial processes.

In the more recent past we have made other notable strides in the field of international cooperation. A conference has been called under the aegis of the United Nations for this summer in Geneva where over 1,000 technical papers will be presented by various countries around the world, over 100 by the U. S. S. R. This is the first time at which the atom will literally be placed on an international stage. I hope the results will be significant.

In recent months, the United States has negotiated agreements with Turkey, Colombia, and Brazil and some 10 other countries whereby these countries will receive enough nuclear fuel and the necessary design material to build a research reactor. We can expect that many such agreements will be signed in the months ahead. There is, however, remaining one great area in which the United States has been deficient and that is in the field of making available information concerning power reactors. It was to this area and this great need that the President again addressed himself last week at Pennsylvania State College.

Again let me say that his proposal deserves quick implementation by the people in the Atomic Energy Commission, State, and Defense Departments.

Today in many parts of Europe, Asia, Africa, and the Western Hemisphere the lack of power is holding back economic and social developments. As one high placed observer recently said of Europe, "Next to peace, electric power is the primary interest of many governments. Unless something is done about it, the lights will grow dim over much of Europe."

People everywhere want cheap power. The atom gives great promise of supplying it. And the United States has many times in the past 2 years promised assistance in this field but we are not delivering on our promises. Our Government is still not quite willing to give the information necessary for friendly foreign countries to build modern power reactors, and we are not yet even willing to permit an American industrial concern to sell a power reactor to a foreign country—at least to countries which don't have them. This is not the fault of Congress, for Congress last year amended the Atomic Energy Act and set up simple procedures to accomplish the result. What then is holding us back? I very much fear that we are still operating on the theory that someday the Russians will be able to build a reactor, make plutonium, and fabricate a bomb.

Let me illustrate:

We are today building in this country two reactors optimized so as to produce power. One is a large central station powerplant being designed by Westinghouse and which will be operated by the Duquesne Power and Light Co. We are also building, at the request of the Army, a smaller, so-called package powerplant. But both bear the secret label. The design of neither is available to other countries nor for that matter to American industry except under security conditions. Today, foreign countries may have, as for years they have had, all the information they wish on the uses of radioactive isotopes. They may have the design of a research reactor and the unclassified literature and know-how necessary to build and operate a research reactor. But let's face it—what they want is atomic power, and American industry would like to supply the reactors to produce it.

We are simply not implementing the President's "atoms for peace" proposal. I submit that if we do not soon change our policy and take the secrecy wraps completely off these power reactors, our pretention that we are spreading blessings will have a very hollow ring.

The most significant and most dramatic item which America has to sell to the underdeveloped areas of the world is its latest knowledge on power reactors.

If we do not move soon, our friendly competitor, England, will surely do so. American abstinence from this area is even today causing many of the European countries to turn not to us but to other countries for assistance in solving their power crisis. Let me illustrate:

Sweden, intent upon building a research reactor and later a power reactor, knew that it would be useless to come to the United States. She therefore extracted uranium from her own shales, turned to France to bring the uranium oxide to the metal stage, to the United Kingdom for help in fuel fabrication, and to Norway for heavy water. Sweden built her research reactor and is building her power reactor. Less well developed countries such as India and Brazil have turned to France. In fact, practically every country in Europe has turned for atomic assistance to England or France and received it—assistance frequently refused by the United States.

Argentina recently perfected a process for producing pure uranium metal but she did this with the assistance of a German company. Illustrations of this are legion.

If we do not move soon, our unfriendly competitor—the U. S. S. R.—might even beat us to the golden opportunity. She has promised to supply information on her own power reactor at the Geneva Conference.

But the policy of secrecy on nonweapons uses has other effects which will soon be felt.

American industrial concerns which today are anxious to supply this potentially tremendous demand for equipment for reactors are not free to develop the market. At the same time England has a sharp eye on this attractive market and is today placing her know-how and machinery where her eye now is.

How does one engage in a full interchange of information and materials dealing with power reactors? There are two ways.

The first is to keep the secrecy label on these reactors and pick very carefully only those countries for interchange which we trust to keep the secrecy label on them by setting up security procedures satisfactory to this country.

I submit that this is completely unrealistic and that we are both tying our own hands and making for ourselves a few enemies rather than friends if we adopt this course. For every country we approve we will make an enemy of countries we turn down. Foreign countries are interested ultimately in the best and latest information on reactor design; certainly they will not secure cheap power if they do not have the best and the latest. But I am sure it will be completely unworkable if we try to police the security systems of all the countries with which we deal. I can visualize someone in a foreign country, friendly to the United States, expressing a point of view in a public speech which would make him suspect by our security standards, this followed with congressional investigations here into the arrangements made with that country, and finally charges, countercharges, and much ill will. And there is no reason for all of this if we face up to a few facts of life. One of those facts is that the only reason we have a security system is that we do not want to add to the Russian stockpile. Another fact is that the Russians have a stockpile, a sizable one; and within a matter of a few years will have enough of a stockpile perhaps to cancel out, for all practical purposes, the much larger United States stockpile. Since it would take the Russians about 3 years to take the latest reactor information and with it build a modern reactor; and since perhaps the most they could expect to add to their stockpile because of it would be a small increase in the amount of plutonium manufactured; and since this would be but a drop in the bucket compared to what they have already produced, and could have no effect on the canceling-out situation, I submit that if we operate on the assumption that there are real security considerations in the reactor field, we are tying our hands and the hands of the other countries of the West.

The notion that we can share atomic blessings with one and all and at the same time place the secrecy label upon them does violence to all concepts of security. Not security, but the appearance of security is all that will be achieved. This much is quite clear to me. But the point I really wish to leave with you is that in the field of peacetime uses there is no need and no room for secret labels.

An atom-for-peace ship plastered with secret labels had best not leave port.

The second way to implement power reactor interchange is for the Atomic Energy Commission to declassify with one bold stroke all power reactor technology, face up to the fact that the Russians long long ago perfected the bomb, face up to the fact that wihout such action we will make enemies out of three-quarters of the Western World whose security systems don't match ours, face up to the fact that what we are talking about here is nothing more than a new source of heat for power and that the world wants what comes from cheap power.

This is what is needed.

If we take this step, and it must be seen, in 1955 (and remember we need no new laws to do it) America can again assume her leadership position in the atomic field.

American industrial concerns will be freed to compete in the world markets. They will be able to sell power reactors to mining countries in the far north, the high Andes, and the jungles of Africa. They will be able to install large central-station powerplants in countries which now desperately need them. They will be able to supply the power to convert salt water to fresh, irrigate the deserts and alter the entire face of the globe. They will be able to make good friends and good will for America.

Antitrust Enforcement Under Assistant Attorney General Stanley N. Barnes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM S. HILL
OF COLORADO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 16, 1956

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, Attorney General Brownell today issued a release highlighting the enforcement of our antitrust laws through the first 6 months of 1956. As we all know, Judge Stanley N. Barnes, recently elevated as a judge of the Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, has been one of the outstanding heads of the Antitrust Division in our lifetime. Such minor criticism as has come Judge Barnes' way as the Assistant Attorney General in charge of the Antitrust Division, has been based more on honest differences of opinion rather than on anything else.

Even those who have differed with Judge Barnes in some of his official acts nevertheless have not questioned Judge Barnes' studious and vigorous approach in his efforts to protect our free-enterprise system through the administration of our antitrust laws. Judge Barnes' particular emphasis on the small business aspects of antitrust enforcement, I know, has given all Members of Congress truly interested in small business great satisfaction. I am sure that the statement of his successor, the Honorable Victor R. Hansen, that Judge Barnes' policies will be continued will also be a source of satisfaction not only to Members of Congress but to all small-business men everywhere in the United States.

The release follows:

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Attorney General Brownell announced today that actions charging price-fixing highlighted the enforcement of the antitrust laws during the first 6 months of 1956.

The Attorney General referred to a report made by Judge Stanley N. Barnes on the activities of the Antitrust Division since January 1, 1956. The report was Judge Barnes' final official act as Assistant Attorney General in charge of the Antitrust Division, before being sworn in as a judge of the Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit on July 3, 1956. It stated:

"Among criminal actions filed in the first 6 months of this year were cases involving charges that 2 major oil companies, Shell Oil Co. and Socony Mobil Oil Co., Inc., have each entered into illegal price-fixing agreements with independent service-station operators. It was alleged that, in these agreements, the filling-station operators gave up their right, as independent businessmen, to determine their own prices and agreed to post prices prearranged with the oil company.

"One of these cases is against an official of Socony Mobil Oil Co. This is the first case the division has brought under section 14 of the Clayton Act which makes a criminal offense an act by a corporate officer or agent which constitutes in whole or in part a violation by the corporation of any penal provision of the antitrust laws.

"In another of the cases, the defendant Shell has already been sentenced to pay a fine of $5,000, the maximum permissible under the Sherman Act. While the maximum penalty has just recently been increased to $50,000, this defendant's action occurred at a time when the highest fine was $5,000.

"The Antitrust Division has filed 29 antitrust cases since January 1, 1956. Thirteen of these are civil actions and 16 are criminal.

"One monopoly case filed charges, among other things, the monopolization of thermostatic temperature controls used to regulate heat in gas-cooking ranges. The defendants in this case are charged with agreeing to pool patents to acquire and maintain a dominant industry position, and with agreeing to restrict the licensing of these patents. The division is seeking to secure injunctive orders which will free this line of commerce from such restraints.

"Two cases filed this year involve alleged practices which impair the operation of the Government's cotton-disposal program. A part of the cotton acquired through the price-support program is offered for sale generally on a competitive-bid basis in which the bidder submits sealed bids. A group of cotton merchants was indicted on the charge that they had used a common purchasing agent who was permitted to fix the prices bid by them and allocate among them lots of cotton offered for sale by the Government. A companion civil action was filed to enjoin such restrictive practices.

"The Antitrust Division has continued its vigilant investigation of current mergers. A sixth important merger action was filed and consent judgments were secured in two other merger actions. These judgments against the Hilton Hotel Corp. and the General Shoe Corp. will prevent these defendants from making future acquisitions which may substantially lessen competition or trend to create monopoly and they also require divestiture of certain of defendants' holdings.

"Other cases filed this year include an action against several large rubber companies on the charge that they agreed to fix prices on rubber belts used in power-transmission units in the textile, railroad, oil, and machinery and other industries, as well as on home appliances.

"Many of the cases filed charged such well-recognized violations as price-fixing, boycotting and customer and territorial allocation. One such case charged the International Boxing Guild with conspiring with various of its affiliated local guilds to boycott nonmember managers of boxers, and promoters disapproved by the international or its affiliates. The indictment charged that the conspirators also boycotted professional boxing shows promoted for television audiences, known as studio boxing shows.

"Thirty-six cases have been terminated in the 6-month period ending June 30, 1956. This represents an increase of more than 71 percent over the number of cases closed in the corresponding period last year, in which 21 cases were closed. Of the 36 cases closed this year, 24 were civil and 12 criminal.

"The Division closed 12 civil antitrust cases by negotiated consent judgments.

Two of the most important of these related to cases charging monopolization of commerce in telephone equipment and of the tabulating industry. Both judgments contain extensive compulsory patent licensing provisions and divestiture provisions designed to establish freedom in which competition may develop.

"An important matter involving the participation of a labor union in a trade restraint was settled by consent judgment this spring. In this case, the union owned and managed a corporation engaged in the business of selling supplies for ships' stores. The union was charged in this action with using its power as a labor organization to compel vessel owners to obtain these supplies, known as 'slop chest' supplies, from the union's corporation and to compel ship owners to refuse to purchase such supplies from other dealers. A district court had held that these particular activities were not immunized from the antitrust laws by the Norris LaGuardia and Clayton Acts labor union exemption. Among other things, the judgment requires cancellation of provisions in collective bargaining contracts requiring vessel owners to purchase slop chest supplies from only the corporation.

"Other significant cases settled by consent judgments involved restraints on newspaper and periodical advertising, gear cutting and finishing machines and tools, booking and presentation of legitimate theater attractions, milk, linen supply and books.

"Nine criminal cases were terminated by entry of pleas of nolo contendere by the defendants. The Division has consistently opposed entry of such pleas. In some instances where nolo pleas have been accepted, the courts have indicated that defendants will not thereby be permitted to avoid or lighten the penalty for antitrust violations. In 1 case the court imposed suspended jail sentences against 7 individual defendants and in several instances fined defendants the maximum amount permitted by the Sherman Act.

"Two major decisions were handed down by the Supreme Court. These were in the McKesson & Robbins case and in the duPont cellophane case. The first one is an important victory for the Government and the second one a loss. The McKesson decision held that the 'fair trade' exemption from the Sherman Act, given to certain limited price-fixing agreements, does not include price-fixing agreements with independent wholesalers when made by a manufacturer who competes with them in selling its own products at wholesale.

"In its decision in the duPont case that commerce in cellophane has not been monopolized, the Supreme Court adopted a theory of 'the relevant market' which may require litigation before its meaning is clear. The Court recognized that cellophane is a part of commerce capable of being monopolized but ruled that 'cross-elasticity' of consumer demand for other products must be considered to determine the existence and effect of competition on that part of commerce alleged to have been monopolized."

The report noted finally that 99 Government antitrust cases are presently pending on the dockets of the Federal courts.

Attorney General Brownell further commented:

"Pursuant to new duties assigned by the 84th Congress, the Antitrust Division has prepared several reports to the President and Congress on special aspects of competitive enterprise. Two reports, as well as 1 supplemental report, have dealt with the economic effects of certain activities under the Defense Production Act; 1 report has been made on the competitive effects of the disposal of Government-owned synthetic rubber-producing facilities and 1 report has been made under the Small Business Act concerning problems of small business."

The Kind of Democrat I Am

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRADY GENTRY
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 16, 1956

Mr. GENTRY. Mr. Speaker, a statesman and Member of this House, the Honorable HOWARD W. SMITH, of Virginia, delivered a notable address at the New York Herald Tribune Forum in October 1949. His subject was The Kind of Democrat I Am. This address is so timely even today that it should be read by every American who loves his country. It is as follows:

I am what may be termed a conservative Democrat. It is one whose normal habitat is south of the Mason and Dixon's line. I represent that congressional district in Virginia that was the home of George Washington, who conceived the idea of a Constitution; of George Mason, the great exponent of Democratic government who wrote the Bill of Rights; Thomas Jefferson, who wrote the Declaration of Independence and founded the Democratic Party; James Madison, the Father of the Constitution; James Monroe, author of the Monroe Doctrine, and John Marshall, Chief Justice of the Supreme Court who, by his decisions, breathed life and vitality into the Constitution.

We conservative Democrats adhere to the underlying and fundamental principles of government that guided the thinking of these and other statesmen who wrote our Constitution.

We conservative Democrats believe in certain fundamental principles embedded in the Bill of Rights.

We are unwilling to surrender our convictions to meet every real or fancied emergency that may arise in a modern world, distressed and torn by the swarms of strange ideologies sweeping over the earth.

These conservative Democrats refuse to either marry, betroth, court, or flirt with any of these foreign innovations in government.

Our convictions can be tersely stated by quoting the language of the 10th amendment to the Constitution. "The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people."

We therefore hold with the long-accepted theory that Congress has no power to enact legislation or expend the people's money on any subject that it is not given authority to deal with under the Constitution. These limitations of the constitutional powers are not more academic theories. In practice, they are vital to the welfare, the personal liberties, the rights of private property, and even to the social freedom to select one's associates and business affiliates.

I shall cite with necessary brevity some instances and some consequences of the failure of Congress to confine its functions to the power granted it under the Constitution.

In the field of social welfare, we have enacted the minimum wage law, forbidding the private citizen from working for a lesser wage or for longer hours than the Congress, in its wisdom, deems appropriate to his welfare; ignoring the obvious sequel that if Congress can fix a minimum wage, it can with equal power fix the maximum compensation that our supposedly free citizens may be permitted to earn.

The House of Representatives has repeatedly passed the antilynching bill, under which the Federal Government proposes to inject itself into the enforcement of the criminal laws and the police powers of the sovereign States.

The House of Representatives has, in each recent Congress, passed an anti-poll-tax bill, which undertakes to fix the qualifications of voters in the States in the face of the Constitutional provision reserving to the respective States exclusive authority to fix the qualifications of their voters.

For several terms past, we have had pending in both Houses of Congress, and enthusiastically endorsed by the platforms of both major parties, the so-called Fair Employment Practices Act, under which the Federal Government proposes, through the establishment of a hord of national investigators and enforcement officers, to dictate to the free American citizen whom he shall employ and to compel him to engage as his business associates persons with whom he prefers not to associate.

Time does not permit a detailed discussion of all the altruistic activities of the Federal Government that account in a large measure for the nearly bankrupt condition of the Federal Treasury.

Constantly rising over the past two decades, the Government debt has reached the appalling figure of $250,000,000,000—more money than any country has ever owed in all history.

The bulk of this debt comes from the necessary large expenditures of the recent war. While sound policy requires large expenditures and mounting debt during wartime, equally sound policy requires in peacetime rigid economy and reduction of the debt.

Today, in time of peace and unprecedented prosperity, our national budget is unbalanced, our debt is increasing.

In the first years following the war, our revenues were increasing and our expenditures decreasing so that in the fiscal year 1947 there was a surplus of approximately $2 billion, and in the year of 1948 a surplus of $8 billion.

But the year 1949 showed an alarming trend. There was a reduction in receipts and an increase in expenditures over the previous year, resulting in a deficit of around $2 billion, and in the present fiscal year the most optimistic predictions forecast a deficit of $5 billion.

This presents a picture that should alarm even the most unwary.

Our revenues are on the decrease, while our expenditures increase. No private business could long survive the fiscal policies of the Federal Government.

I do not believe we can continue these policies of irresponsible and reckless expenditures without ultimate disastrous results.

A few examples must suffice to indicate the trend of congressional thinking. The Congress recently passed a Federal housing bill which authorized appropriations to the extent of $18 billion, the bulk of which is to help pay house rent for one element of the people so that they may live in the kind of houses to which they would like to become accustomed. Thus, Congress takes the money of one taxpaying citizen to pay the house rent of another.

The Senate has passed, and the House almost passed, a bill to pay subsidies to those miners of certain minerals whose cost of production does not permit the profits to which they would like to be accustomed.

Last year we paid $225 million to subsidize the potato growers who, with a tempting subsidy in sight, raised more potatoes than the market could consume.

Housing subsidies, agricultural subsidies, shipping subsidies, mining subsidies, mail subsidies, and a score of other subsidies that drain the substance of our taxpayers to meet the demands of minority groups of all types.

We rob taxpayer Peter to pay supplicant Paul, if he can marshal a sufficiently potent amount of political pressure.

These briefly present some of the tendencies in Federal Government that go far beyong the functions delegated to Congress.

This Nation has been hewed out of the initiative, the ambition, sweat, and toil of our citizens, seeking by their own efforts to better their social and economic status. When we whittle away, bit by bit, the initiative and the fundamental freedoms of the people; when we teach them more and more, day by day, to depend upon handouts from the Federal Treasury to meet every actual or artificial emergency, we take away that initiative, that ambition, and the self-reliance that has made our country great.

This is the insidious way of the welfare state.

The hand that passes out the grants from the taxpayers' money becomes, in the natural course of events, the mailed fist of dictatorship. As more and more largess is distributed, so more and more restrictions and limitations are being imposed upon the liberties of the people.

Such has been the history of the growth of dictatorship.

I deeply resent these tendencies and policies, by whatever political party they are advocated. They are undermining too rapidly the freedom, the initiative, and the independence of our citizens.

Unless there is a swing back to the normal American way of life, I have grave fears for the future of our country.

I have been in Congress nearly 20 years, and watched with increasing alarm the growth of demands from pressure groups of all kinds that Congress enact legislation so foreign to the constitutional concepts of our legitimate functions that there seems no limit to the encroachment on personal liberties or the rights of the sovereign States.

What is the remedy?

There is only one.

Congress reflects the will of the people. The will of the people is transmitted to Congress by those who make the loudest noise and the most convincing threats of political reprisal.

Until and unless the great mass and majority of our thinking people awaken to their responsibility and assert their demands for sound business in Government and a return to the constitutional limits upon the functions of Congress, we shall continue the present policy until some time, some said day, we find that we have gone too far to retrace our steps.

In a democracy a people get the kind of government that they deserve.

If they think little, they deserve little. If they do little about it, they get little results.

If the present trend of Government is wrong, as I believe it is, it will continue wrong as long as a slothful and indifferent people remain impervious to, and neglectful of, the danger signals flying all about them.

Communist World Versus Free World

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. H. R. GROSS
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 12, 1956

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I call attention to an editorial published recently in the Waterloo, Iowa, Daily Courier. It follows:

DOES AMERICA HAVE SYMPATHY FOR TITO?

Vice President NIXON, in an address in the Philippines, declares that the United States has "no sympathy" for nations which make "no moral distinction between the Communist world and the free world."

This clarification of the American position is to be welcomed, particularly in view of some recent indications that this country had no objections to "neutralism."

But we would also like to see this policy enforced. Secretary of States Dulles recently went before a congressional committee to plead for continuation of aid to Yugoslavia.

How can NIXON'S statement be reconciled with the stand taken by Dulles?

Mr. Speaker, the question posed by this editorial is a proper one and it ought to be answered promptly and publicly for the benefit of all our people.

The Man Who Taught Beavers To Be Eager

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 16, 1956

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following column written by James Reston which appeared in the New York Times, Sunday, July 15, 1956, on the subject of proposed reductions in military manpower:

THE MAN WHO TAUGHT BEAVERS TO BE EAGER
(By James Reston)

WASHINGTON, July 14.—Tony Leviero of the Times, the man who taught beavers to be eager, dug out of the Pentagon this week a plan by Adm. Arthur W. Radford, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, to cut the Armed Forces of the United States by 800,000 in the next 4 years.

Leviero said the rest of the Joint Chiefs were in "revolt" against Radford on this point, and the admiral issued a statement saying in effect, that nothing had been decided, but that there would probably be cuts and the Joint Chiefs might be divided in their recommendations.

It's a pity to raise thumping problems like this in the midle of July, but the official tendency to rely more and more on atomic an hydrogn weapons raises the two most serious and most ignored questions in Washington:

How can the United States fight a limited Korea-type war if it steadily reduces the Army and the Marine Corps to the point where they cannot fight effectively without using atomic and hydrogen weapons?

How can the United States avoid drifting into a kind of atomic isolation—specifically, how can it avoid a massive withdrawal of its troops from Europe—if the trend toward smaller conventional forces and larger atomic forces is carried on for 4 more years?

The official answer to these questions is that the administration does not intend to repudiate its commitments to its allies in Europe or elsewhere and that it does not plan to abandon its conventional, or nonatomic, forces.

LITTLE WARS AND BIG WARS

Nevertheless, the United States is already in a position where it could not block a major assault by Communist China on Formosa, Quemoy and Matsu without using atomic weapons, and it is conceded privately, but not officially, that Admiral Radford's proposals would inevitably mean withdrawing some, if not most, of the five United States divisions now in Europe.

Political Washington is not indifferent to the proposed cuts. The Democrats have been protesting loudly enough about them for months, but they are concerned primarily with the effect of the cuts on the Air Force.

Senator STUART SYMINGTON of Missouri and HENRY M. JACKSON of Washington have been concerned primarily about how to win the big atomic war, if it comes; therefore, they have been opposing the Administration's cuts because they want more atomic weapons and more intercontinental aircraft.

This is an important aspect of the problem, but it is only one aspect. There are two major problems here: How to win the big atomic war if it starts, and how to deal with the more likely prospect of a small Communist war. It is this latter problem that is largely ignored in the current public debate.

Yet it is the little war that is most likely to break out in the next decade. Almost everybody here agrees on that.

THREE HUNDRED MILLION CASUALTIES

If such a war starts over secondary territories whose loss does not jeopardize the security of the United States, the problem obviously is to try to limit those wars and fight them with conventional weapons, for even a defeat in a secondary war may be preferable to massive atomic retaliation which the Congress has been told may cost "several hundred million lives."

How a war is to be limited after the first atomic bomb is dropped nobody here has figured out. Yet the means to fight a limited war are gradually being whittled away by those who are prepared to gamble on a smaller, cheaper, modern atomic military establishment.

The military posture of the United States several years from now will be determined by the outcome of the clash of ideas. Issues could be raised on the basis of precise information about the exact nature of Admiral Radford's proposals, but by the time such precise information is available the chances are that the policy will be set and public criticism then will do little good.

It may be, of course, that the advocates of almost total reliance on massive atomic retaliation are right. Maybe the fear of being hit by our strategic Air Force will be so great that it will deter not only the big war but little wars as well.

We know, however, that our atomic supremacy and our threats of massive atomic retaliation did not keep the Communists from fighting limited wars in Korea and Indochina. We may not have covered ourselves with glory in those conflicts, but we were able to limit them.

Whether we could do so in a few years without sustantial conventional ground forces is the question now being settled behind closed doors in Washington.

Avoid Nuclear Hysteria

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 16, 1956

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein an article entitled "Study Shows Atom-Cattle Escaped Ills."

This timely, interesting article relates to a herd of 47 cattle, which was exposed to the first atomic tests in southern New Mexico about 11 years ago.

It shows that, while these cattle were relatively close to the blast, none of them

suffered permanent injury or unusual after effects and no genetic defects were apparent in any of the cattle's offsprings.

We all know the terrible nature of nuclear weapons. But it is of vital importance that we do not succumb to hysteria in appraising the danger and possible effects of nuclear substances. We are living in the nuclear age. We must resign ourselves as individuals and as a nation to facing up to its problems with courage and fortitude. Under no circumstance can we permit unreasoning fear and apprehension to possess the thinking of the American people and divest us of our customary ability to consider all our problems in a rational way without undue emotion and without permitting terror to upset our judgment.

Come what may, America will live if its people remain strong and courageous and fearlessly face the problems of the hour and place reliance in the Almighty and faith in ourselves. Meanwhile, let us not allow the people to be indoctrinated with fear concerning nuclear substances. Let us use them to benefit America and mankind rather than as an instrument of futile terror.

The article follows:

STUDY SHOWS ATOM-CATTLE ESCAPED ILLS

OAK RIDGE, TENN., July 15.—Eleven years ago a herd of 47 cattle was unwittingly left within about 25 miles of history's first atomic test site in southern New Mexico.

When the United States dropped the first nuclear bomb near White Sands National Monument, the frightened cattle were burned.

"Fallout" from that historic blast dusted them, leaving sores on their skin. Later the hair of these first living victims of the atomic age began to turn white, and in December 1945, they were shipped to Oak Ridge.

Scientists wanted to know how the cattle had been subjected to radiation and whether atomic radiation would have harmful genetic effects on their offspring.

Merrill Bird, of the University of Tennessee-Atomic Energy Commission Experimental Farm, who has been in charge of studying the cattle since they arrived here, now has the answer. All but 7 of the original 47 cattle have died, some of old age, some of disease not connected with the atom, and some by sacrifice to scientific study.

Bird says the answers to the two questions are:

The cattle received only surface burns from beta rays. "When an animal's skin heals the hair comes back white," Bird explained. He added that this is true of farm horses and skin broken by saddles, harness, or halters.

No genetic defects were apparent in any of the cattle's offspring. The one bull of the herd, nicknamed Atom, was mated with cows in the herd and with cows from another herd used for comparison. Inbreeding also was tried to see if a bad strain might result. So far, none has.

"There's always a possibility (of a bad strain), Bird said, "but it is far from likely."

Reconsidering Power Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT GORE
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, July 16, 1956

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Reconsidering Power Policy," published in the Memphis Commercial Appeal of July 14, 1956.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RECONSIDERING POWER POLICY

A year and a day after the administration admitted defeat in the Dixon-Yates deal, it has gone into court with an all-out attack on the proposal.

The Dixon-Yates contract, we are now told, was unlawful, null and void. In brief, the Department of Justice has done a complete about-face from defending the deal against all attacks to saying the document was so faulty that it never became a contract.

When President Eisenhower announced the cancellation last July, the administration attitude was that when Memphis undertook to build a municipal generating plant the Dixon-Yates method became unnecessary.

That the Memphis plant killed Dixon-Yates was true enough, in a limited way. But the full truth is that Dixon-Yates was deathly ill and the administration was delighted to have it killed. How delighted becomes apparent a year later, when the administration adopts as its own most of the serious charges made against the deal during the long fight.

For the Government to join the attack on the Dixon-Yates shenanigans just before the party conventions and Presidential campaign is added indication of how far out of line this deal was.

The specifications are that Adolph Wenzell undertook to work for both sides at the same time during contract negotiations; that the Holding Company Act would have been violated by the contract, and that action on the contract by the Securities and Exchange Commission and the Atomic Energy Committee representing both houses of Congress was faulty.

These are the specifications, but in the face of these details it may still be that justice will require the Government to repay some of the cash expenses of the Dixon and Yates companies, because this money was spent only on the insistence of high Government officials.

Behind these details is the original case against Dixon-Yates—the secrecy of the first deal—the arrangement for the Government to pay $518,000,000 for electricity from a specific company—the awkwardness of buying at Memphis power needed at Paducah—the strangeness of buying power with the Government's experienced TVA experts in big power shut out of the bargaining room—and so on at length.

The President himself urged this contract after the exposure of the deal was well under way, and some Members of Congress were beginning to hold their noses for the very reasons now adopted by the Government.

It was the President in person who introduced the Dixon-Yates plan, then without a name, in his budget address of January 21, 1954. The conferences leading to the Dixon-Yates fiasco already had been under way several weeks. The President said plans were under consideration for private power to provide 500,000 or 600,000 kilowatts more of power for the Paducah AEC plant. That would release that much TVA power for other buyers.

But if the private power for Paducah was "not consummated as contemplated * * * the question of starting additional generating units by the TVA will be reconsidered."

The President said there would be reconsideration under conditions which now have arrived. This would be a most excellent time to announce results of the reconsideration.

Health Research Bill of 1956

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 16, 1956

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to thank and commend the committee for bringing this very desirable and needed legislation to the floor for House action. I think there can be little disagreement concerning the objectives of this bill. It will enable us to step up our medical research and to increase the number of doctors and specialists in many important fields. Of great importance is that it will provide for a much broader and more effective attack upon crippling and killing diseases.

Private agencies have long been working to combat these diseases but Government help is essential, if we are to mount a broad, determined assault upon certain diseases, which are taking a great toll among young and old people alike and which are particularly destructive and deadly. There is no question that the leadership of the Government has provided great incentive to private individuals and agencies interested in strengthening and intensifying the campaign against these diseases. Anything that the Congress can do to promote the general health and to fight against the terrible killers, which take such a toll of human life in this Nation, will be a great contribution to the permanent well-being of the Nation.

I was very glad to learn that the committee also proposes to bring in S. 849, which provides for Federal grants to institutions for research into such afflictions as cancer, polio, heart disease, multiple sclerosis, epilepsy, muscular dystrophy, nervous disorders, mental illness, arthritis and rheumatism, blindness, cerebral palsy, tuberculosis, cystic fibrosis, diabetes, and other great enemies of the public health.

This great Nation cannot afford to fall behind in the fight against disease. We owe it to this generation and to posterity to make a determined drive to eliminate the great killers, which are daily destroying the lives of our people. We must continue this work so as to develop facilities to tackle these diseases and deliver their human victims of untold suffering, and in time we shall hope to accomplish their complete obliteration.

I personally believe that the Federal Government is at last on the right track in moving with speed to control these frightful menaces to our people. We should, not only adopt this program, but we should broaden the program so that much larger sums may become available for the general objectives of promoting public health, providing more effective research, more medical, nursing care and hospitalization at reasonable cost and generally stepping up the entire tenor and tone of our public health activities, which will raise the level of health throughout the Nation and in time throughout the world.

With all my heart, I urge the Congress, not only to pass this bill, but to continue our work in this vital field, and it is a vital field, because it deals with the lives of our people. This work will result in saving a great many lives, in restoring many to good health and useful citizenry. There is a humane significance to this type of legislation, which should put it right at the top of the list of our "must" legislative objectives. Health is life itself and, if we would keep our America strong, we must vigorously combat disease, adequately treat the sick with all the resources of modern science and the Government and thus make our Nation stronger, better, and happier in every way.

Dixie Leaders Draw Up Plea for Party Accord

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 16, 1956

Mr. DORN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, Gov. George B. Timmerman of South Carolina recently called for southern unity before the Democratic National Convention meets in Chicago. His remarks and suggestions were misinterpreted by several high political leaders here in Washington and by the press generally. As a result of his timely advice 7 State Democratic chairmen representing 7 States met in Atlanta last week. They unanimously adopted the following statement, which appeared in the Washington Sunday Star. This statement and the good work of Governor Timmerman will contribute much toward harmony and unity of the Democratic Party in Chicago.

The statement follows:

DIXIE LEADERS DRAW UP PLEA FOR PARTY ACCORD

ATLANTA, July 14.—Here is the text of the statement unanimously adopted today by the seven Democratic State chairmen meeting here:

"We, the State Democratic chairmen, respectively, of Alabama, Florida, Georgia, North Carolina, South Carolina, Tennessee, and Virginia make the following joint and unanimous declaration:

"1. We believe in the Democratic Party as the party which has most consistently and effectively promoted and protected the welfare of the people of the United States. As officials of State Democratic parties of Southern States, we represent the section which traditionally is the most loyal of all in the Nation to the Democratic Party. It is our firm desire and sincere expectation that this situation shall continue.

"2. We do not favor any bolts, walkouts, or third parties. We believe in the two-party system.

"3. Nearly 4 years of a Republican administration with its record of broken promises to farmers and others, indifference to other domestic problems, its failure to keep up with the demands of national security, and its favoritism to big business, coupled with its total lack of interest in small business, affords the Democratic Party an opportunity for victory in the coming November election. We expect to work loyally toward that victory.

"4. We believe that the South should wield strong influence in establishing a program which can be supported unanimously at the national convention.

"5. Those who would defeat us, would first seek to divide our Democratic Party. With this in mind, we have met to consider the elements of possible division within the party, hoping to contribute toward harmony in the national convention. The difficulties arising from our differences are not insurmountable; on our part we recognize the problems and political necessities of other States; we insist that they in turn recognize ours. We urge responsible Democratic leadership everywhere to work toward this end.

"6. The Southern States are gravely disturbed over the invasion of the sovereign rights of the States and the departures from the constitutional guaranties upon which our country was founded and became great. The people of the Southern States look to and expect the Democratic Party leadership in our respective States to stand firmly, calmly, intelligently and with determined resolve to protect these rights. We believe in and endorse the proposal for southern solidarity at the Democratic National Convention. We believe that the South should work together to protect itself and to preserve the rights of the States and of the people as guaranteed by the Constitution and as contemplated by its framers. Toward this end we recommend to the proper authorities in our respective States that there be held a joint pre-convention caucus of our Governors, delegation chairmen, delegation vice chairmen and the members of the convention platform and resolutions committee.

"7. All the foregoing we propose to accomplish within the framework of the Democratic Party. We believe that party unity is important to every section of the country and is essential and necessary for Democratic victory in November. We believe that a Democratic victory is a necessity for the Nation, and that the inept Republican administration should be removed from the White House."

Bill To Provide for the Appointment of Two Additional District Judges for the Eastern District of Michigan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN D. DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 16, 1956

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill to amend title 28 of the United States Code, so as to provide for the appointment of two additional district judges for the eastern district of Michigan. The situation in the eastern district has been growing steadily worse since 1950 in spite of all efforts to improve it. In 1954 an additional judge was authorized—68 Statute 8—and appointed in this district; nevertheless the large increase in pending cases which started in 1950 has continued. In 1949 the total civil cases pending were 702; in 1950 they were 1,110; in 1951, 1,023; in 1952, 1,219; in 1953, 1,001; in 1954, 1,029; and in 1955, 1,159. The backlog of private civil cases has been building since 1945, when they were 246. Now they amount to 719 cases.

Statistics are dry things and I will not burden you with a recital of all of them respecting the workload in the eastern district of Michigan. I, therefore, present seven statistical tables, prepared by the Administrative Office of the United States Courts, and request that they be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks, as an appendix thereto.

There are now six judges in this district. These judges cannot reasonably be expected to carry the heavy burdens they have been forced to carry. There is such a thing as working a willing horse to death.

The purpose of all judicial proceedings, whether involving private litigants or the Government, is to secure justice. The Government may perhaps be in a position to wait indefinitely, but for private litigants, justice, to be adequate, must be reasonably prompt. I recognize that in many instances, considerable time must elapse before a complicated case can be duly terminated. But the failure to provide the necessary personnel for the speedy trial of a case constitutes in actuality a failure of justice: Witnesses die or move away; evidence is lost; facts are forgotten or become hazy. Justice, after a time, ceases to be justice and becomes mere chance. One might as well spin a wheel or flip a coin. The situation in the eastern district is deplorable. Litigants have to wait, in some cases almost 2 years, for their justice. The median time for cases tried in 1955, from filing to disposition, is 19.2 months per judge; the median time ranges from 6.8 months to 23.5 months, with more than half the cases falling in the upper half of this range.

The district has had its share of long and time-consuming cases. In 1954, Judge Picard tried United States against Wellman, which included 6 Communist defendants and lasted for 61 trial days. In 1955 one personal-injury case lasted 20 trial days; a criminal suit ran 22 days, while a stockholders' suit ran 80 trial days. Some of the most time-consuming cases are Government antitrust suits. The following were pending as of the first of the year: United States against Associated Patents, Inc., filed June 22, 1951; United States against General Mills, Inc., filed June 26, 1951; United States against Michigan Tool Co., filed April 14, 1953—criminal; United States against Michigan Tool Co., filed April 14, 1953—civil; United States against Wholesale Produce Buyers Association, filed September 2, 1953—criminal; and United States against Wholesale Produce Buyers Association, filed September 2, 1953—civil.

I know that this may sound sentimental but I cannot help it. A phrase from the Pledge of Allegiance keeps running through my mind in this connection: "With liberty and justice for all." I cannot help remembering the pride and determination with which I repeated that pledge in the classroom as a child and I am sure that I, in common with all of you, have repeated that pledge a thousand times, with the same determination and pride, since reaching manhood. I appeal to you, let us keep the Republic a Nation with liberty and justice for all. Do not let justice in the Eastern District of Michigan become injustice through delay. Give me your support in the passage of this bill to the end that there will continue to be justice for all.

The tables follow:

TABLE 1.—*Eastern district of Michigan—Civil cases commenced and terminated, by fiscal year, and pending at the end of each year, beginning with 1941*

Fiscal year	Total civil cases			Private civil cases		
	Commenced	Terminated	Pending June 30	Commenced	Terminated	Pending June 30
1941	989	1,254	838	695	1,006	613
1942	844	1,085	597	705	845	473
1943	504	664	437	253	499	227
1944	459	475	421	195	212	210
1945	949	687	683	206	170	246
1946	883	1,017	549	276	272	250
1947	1,069	907	711	506	349	407
1948	760	752	719	457	348	516
1949	868	915	702	485	545	456
1950	1,470	1,062	1,110	503	473	486
1951	1,250	1,337	1,023	526	479	533
1952	1,370	1,174	1,219	560	527	566
1953	980	1,198	1,001	535	508	593
1954	978	950	1,029	611	520	684
1955	1,147	1,017	1,159	651	616	719

TABLE 2.—*Eastern district of Michigan—United States civil cases and criminal cases commenced and terminated, by fiscal year, and pending at the end of each year, beginning with 1941*

Fiscal year	United States civil cases (United States a party) price and rent control cases are in parentheses [1]			Criminal cases—cases transferred are not included in "Commenced" and "Terminated" columns		
	Commenced	Terminated	Pending June 30	Commenced	Terminated	Pending June 30
1941	294	248	225	362	360	143
1942	139	240	124	574	471	246
1943	251 (64)	165	210	567	564	249
1944	264 (73)	263	211	664	590	323
1945	743(559)	517	437	722	767	278
1946	607(480)	745	299	496	568	206
1947	563(388)	558	304	498	566	154
1948	303(138)	404	203	676	615	229
1949	413(257)	370	246	990	887	334
1950	967(285)	589	624	692	814	184
1951	724(278)	858	490	715	651	239
1952	810(452)	647	653	594	583	245
1953	445(130)	690	408	667	705	224
1954	367	430	345	581	625	197
1955	496	401	440	613	556	268

[1] Price and rent control cases are separately listed from 1943 to 1953. In many of these years they constituted a large proportion of all civil cases commenced, although they required on the average a relatively small proportion of court time per case for disposition. They are included in the figure which they follow.

TABLE 3.—*Eastern district of Michigan—Cases commenced per judgeship*

Fiscal year	Number of judgeships	Total civil cases		Private civil cases		Criminal cases (less immigration) [1]	
		Michigan, Eastern	National average [2]	Michigan, Eastern	National average [2]	Michigan, Eastern	National average [2]
1941	5	198	164	139	82	----	153
1942	5	169	168	141	77	107	161
1943	5	101	158	51	58	108	174
1944	5	92	169	39	56	124	184
1945	5	190	295	41	57	135	176
1946	5	177	321	55	70	91	142
1947	5	214	271	101	109	91	134
1948	5	152	295	91	117	125	123
1949	5	180	238	97	121	187	123
1950	5	294	222	101	113	129	116
1951	5	250	204	105	111	132	106
1952	5	274	236	112	126	111	112
1953	5	196	261	107	146	106	114
1954	6	163	210	102	127	88	103
1955	6	191	212	109	126	98	104

[1] Immigration cases have been eliminated from this table because they occur in volume in only 5 districts on the Mexican border and because the average judicial time per case for their disposition is small.

[2] This column includes 86 districts for 1949 and thereafter; 84 districts before 1949.

TABLE 4.—*Eastern district of Michigan—Time elapsing in civil cases tried* [1]

Fiscal year	Number of cases tried	Median interval in months from filing to disposition		Median interval in months from issue to trial	
		Michigan, eastern	National median	Michigan, eastern	National median
1945	43	13.0	9.0	8.9	5.3
1946	56	8.3	8.9	5.4	5.0
1947	57	10.4	9.0	7.1	5.1
1948	79	8.8	9.9	5.9	5.8
1949	102	10.3	10.4	7.3	5.9
1950	114	11.7	11.2	7.7	6.7
1951	109	10.8	12.2	7.1	7.3
1952	99	14.2	12.1	8.9	7.0
1953	112	15.3	12.4	7.9	7.4
1954	90	16.9	13.5	10.7	8.1
1955	89	19.2	14.6	14.9	9.1

[1] The median time interval in months is computed for the civil cases in which a trial was held, which were terminated during the year, excluding land condemnation, habeas corpus, and forfeiture proceedings. No median interval is shown for the years 1945 through 1952 where less than 25 cases were terminated after trial. For the year 1953 and subsequent years, where there were less than 25 cases terminated after trial, a median is listed with an asterisk (*) on the basis of the number of cases terminated after trial for the last 2 years, provided there were 25 such cases for the 2 years.

TABLE 5.—*Eastern district of Michigan—Cases commenced per judgeship in this district and in 86 districts, by nature of suit, fiscal year 1955*

CIVIL CASES

	Eastern Michigan	86 districts
Total cases	191	212
United States cases	83	86
Private cases	109	126

TABLE 5.—*Eastern district of Michigan—Cases commenced per judgeship in this district and in 86 districts, by nature of suit, fiscal year 1955*—Continued

UNITED STATES CASES

	Eastern Michigan	86 districts
United States plaintiff	72	68
Land condemnation	1	3
Fair Labor Standards Act	2	2
Other enforcement suits	6	3
Food and Drug Act	2	5
Liquor laws	2	2
Other forfeitures and penalties	2	4
Negotiable instruments	34	25
Other contracts	20	16
Other United States plaintiff	3	8
United States defendant	11	17
Enjoin Federal agencies	1	3
Habeas corpus	6	4
Tort Claims Act	1	4
Tax suits	3	4
Other United States defendant	1	3

PRIVATE CASES

Federal question	32	31
Copyright	1	1
Employers' Liability Act	4	6
Fair Labor Standards Act	1	1
Habeas corpus	10	3
Jones Act	3	9
Miller Act	1	1
Patent	3	3
Other Federal question	11	7
Diversity of citizenship	74	84
Insurance	7	14
Other contracts	20	15
Real property	----	3
Personal injury (motor vehicle)	30	32
Personal injury (other)	9	15
Other diversity	7	5
Admiralty	3	11

CRIMINAL CASES LESS IMMIGRATION

Total cases	98	104

TABLE 6.—*Eastern district of Michigan—Civil and criminal trials commenced*

BY FISCAL YEAR

Fiscal year	Total trials commenced	Civil			Criminal		
		Total	Non-jury	Jury	Total	Non-jury	Jury
1951	160	113	74	39	47	13	34
1952	177	112	75	37	65	32	33
1953	237	136	99	37	101	37	64
1954	161	84	47	37	77	43	34
1955	176	106	46	60	70	31	39

PER JUDGESHIP

Fiscal year	Number of judgeships	Total trials		Civil		Criminal	
		Michigan, Eastern	National average [1]	Michigan, Eastern	National average [1]	Michigan, Eastern	National average [1]
1951	5	32	39	23	28	9	11
1952	5	35	40	22	27	13	13
1953	5	47	44	27	29	20	15
1954	6	27	40	14	25	13	13
1955	6	29	41	18	26	12	15

[1] This column includes 86 districts.

TABLE 7.—*Eastern District of Michigan*

CIVIL CASES PENDING PER JUDGESHIP ON JUNE 30, 1955

Nature of suit	Cases pending per judgeship	
	Michigan, eastern	National average
Total civil cases	193	258
United States civil cases	73	89
Private civil cases	120	169
United States plaintiff	57	58
Land condemnation	2	13
Antitrust	1	
Other enforcement suits	9	8
Forfeitures and penalties	2	4
Negotiable instruments	24	13
Other contracts	16	13
Other United States plaintiff	5	7
United States defendant	16	31
Tort Claims Act	1	7
Tax suits	9	8
Other United States defendant	6	16
Federal question	29	47
Antitrust	1	2
Copyright	1	2
Federal Employers Liability Act	3	8
Jones Act	6	18
Patent	5	5
Other Federal question	13	12
Diversity of citizenship	88	98
Insurance	6	10
Other contracts	20	20
Real property		2
Personal injury (motor vehicle)	37	34
Personal injury (other)	14	21
Other diversity	11	11
Admiralty	3	24

AGE OF CIVIL CASES PENDING ON JUNE 30, 1955

Jurisdiction	Total pending	Age of civil cases pending						
		Less than 6 months	6 months to 1 year	1 to 2 years	2 to 3 years	3 to 4 years	4 to 5 years	5 years and over
Total civil cases	1,159	491	244	255	101	34	18	16
United States civil	440	238	60	64	52	14	10	2
United States plaintiff	344	219	45	35	33	3	7	2
United States defendant	96	19	15	29	19	11	3	
Private civil	719	253	184	191	49	20	8	14
Federal question	173	56	44	54	7	4	1	7
Diversity	526	188	137	133	40	16	5	7
Admiralty	20	9	3	4	2		2	

Donald B. Gillies: Rich Retirement

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM E. MINSHALL

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 16, 1956

Mr. MINSHALL. Mr. Speaker, a great friend of the Cleveland community has hung up his pickax and seven-league prospector's boots.

After almost 50 years of continuous service with Republic Steel Corp. and Corrigan, McKinney Steel Co., a Republic predecessor organization, Donald B. Gillies has fully retired from active service.

Mr. Gillies was a vice president of Republic Steel until his 75th birthday in 1947 when he was relieved of his responsibilities as an officer of the company but continued a full and active business life as a mining consultant for Republic.

In announcing Mr. Gillies' retirement, C. M. White, Republic president, hailed the service Mr. Gillies has rendered to the company in recent years.

"His work has been of tremendous value to Republic in its mining and exploration ventures," Mr. White said. "In addition, he has been a great booster of the company, a true friend of the stockholders and management, and has been a great worker for the good of the communities in which Republic's properties are located."

Mr. Gillies, who will celebrate his 84th birthday on November 4 was born in Bruce Mines, Ontario. He received his university education at the Michigan College of Mining and Technology at Houghton, Mich., from which he graduated in 1893 with the degree of B. S. and E. M. In college he was a crack football player and trackman.

Following his graduation he went to Butte, Mont., where he got a job pushing a slag pot.

For a number of years he was mining engineer for the W. A. Clark properties in Butte and also worked in the gold-silver field of Tonopah and Goldfield.

In 1906 he became associated with Corrigan, McKinney & Co. as manager of the company's Mexican mining properties.

In 1916 he came to Cleveland as vice president in charge of the Corrigan-McKinney operations in the United States and Mexico. He was made president of the company in 1932 and held that position when Corrigan-McKinney and Republic merged in 1936.

His most important contributions to Republic have had to do with raw material reserves. In 1937, he interested Republic in the iron ore possibilities of the northern Adirondacks, and revived the almost dead iron ore industry in that area. In 1938 Republic acquired and still operates both properties at Port Henry and Lyon Mountain, N. Y. They are the largest underground iron ore producers in the United States.

In the late forties he investigated and recommended to Republic the rich iron ore deposits in Liberia in which the company has acquired a majority interest and which is now in full operation. Ore from this deposit is regarded as possibly the finest in the world, yielding 68 to 69 percent iron.

Within the past 2-years, he has been instrumental in exploring an important deposit of rutile, a titanium-bearing ore in southern Mexico. Through a Mexican subsidiary, Republic has acquired this deposit and is developing it now and will have mining and concentrating equipment in operation in 1957. The Mexican Government is now building roads and installing docks.

In addition to having served as president of Corrigan, McKinney Steel Co., Mr. Gillies has also been president of the American Institute of Mining, Metallurgical and Petroleum Engineers and of the Lake Superior Iron Ore Association. He is a member of the Mining & Metallurgical Society of America and of the Cleveland Engineering Society, and honorary member of the Montana Society of Engineers, and has been for many years chairman of the river and harbor com-

mittee of the Cleveland Chamber of Commerce. For 12 years he was captain of team No. 13 of the Cleveland community fund and is a retired treasurer of the Greater Cleveland Chapter of the American Red Cross.

In 1931 his alma mater gave him the degree of doctor of engineering, and the Montana School of Mines the degree of doctor of science in 1939.

As a result of his work in Liberia he was made a Commander of the Order of the Star, Republic of Liberia.

Mr. Gillies was the second honorary member of the Cleveland Junior Chamber of Commerce, has received the distinguished service award from the Cleveland Technical Societies' Council, and was recently made an honorary member of the Cleveland Engineering Society.

A brief and fitting tribute to this great American appeared in the Cleveland News editorial of July 12, 1956.

The editorial follows:

DONALD B. GILLIES: RICH RETIREMENT

One of this city's most colorful industrialists—and one of the most gracious men to stuff feet into high boots and lead exploring parties for ore—has announced his retirement. He's Donald B. Gillies, mining consultant for Republic Steel Corp., and a rare individual who mixed into an eminently useful career the ingredients of sound business, adventure, and civic cooperation.

The age of 83 is a respectable age at which to retire but, typically, Mr. Gillies left open the door for productive activity by saying he did not expect to "take on any serious responsibilities" henceforth unless Republic needed his further services.

Behind this stocky, shrewd executive will be 50 years of giant service to steel and to Republic. Behind him will be pacesetting for engineers and lesser-geared experts on explorations in Labrador and Mexico. Behind him will be a long history of rugged jobs to help him through college, and still more rugged jobs to carry him to his stature in a hardcase industry. We wish him affectionate good luck, and never will forget his determinated remark at the age of 80, when he said he'd never played polo but he "was going to." Maybe the leisure days ahead will permit him that new achievement.

Communist World Population Increases—While Free World Population Declines

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 2, 1956

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I am inserting at this point interesting information upon the world population showing in the first instance that Communist populations are on the increase and in the free world they are declining:

To show how the population of the Communist world has increased since 1939 while the population of the free world has decreased, we have compiled the following statistical information.

The total population of the Communist world in 1939 was 170,467,000—this figure was the population of Russia in 1939—while the total population of the free world was 2,329,533,000.

Since 1939 the following annexations have been made by the Soviet Union:

Country	Date of effective takeover	Population
Polish territory	1939	11,800,000
Finnish territory	1940	450,000
Estonia	1940	1,122,000
Latvia	1940	1,951,000
Lithuania	1940	2,957,000
Tannu Tuva	1944	65,000
German territory (Koenigsberg)	1945	731,000
Japanese territory	1945	433,000
Rumanian territory	1945	3,200,000
Total		23,896,000

In addition, the following countries are considered to be under Communist control:

Country	Date of effective takeover	Population
Poland	1949	26,750,000
Albania	1945	1,200,000
Bulgaria	1945	7,350,000
Rumania	1945	17,300,000
Hungary	1947	9,691,000
Czechoslovakia	1948	12,952,000
Yugoslavia	1945	[1] 17,267,000
East Germany	1948	16,582,000
China	1949	582,603,000
North Korea	1953	9,313,000
Mongolian Republic	1945	920,000
Democratic Republic of Vietnam	1954	12,000,000
Total		713,988,000

[1] Yugoslavia broke with the Soviet Union in 1948. Recently there have been indications of at least a partial reapprochement between the 2 countries. In any case, however, the governing party of Yugoslavia is Communist.

The total population of Russia today is 214,500,000. This total combined with the 713,988,000 under Communist control gives a total of 928,488,000 in the Communist world today as compared to 170,467,000 in 1939. This amounts to an increase of 758,021,000.

The total population of the free world has decreased from 2,229,533,000 in 1938 to 1,726,512,000 today. This amounts to a loss of 603,021,000.

Therefore in 1939, Red world, 170,467,000; free world, 2,329,533,000. Free world superiority of 14 to 1.

In 1956, Red world, 928,488,000; free world, 1,726,512,000. Free world superiority of 2 to 1.

In 17 years, free world ratio slipped from 14 to 1 to 2 to 1.

Sources: Information Please Almanac, 1956; World Almanac, 1956; the Statesman's Yearbook, 1955; United Nations Population and Vital Statistics Reports, April 1956.

Also as part of my remarks I am including population statistics on the so-called uncommitted or neutral nations of the world.

The question of which is or which is not an uncommitted or neutral nation is a delicate one. The problem is easy in regard to states that openly declare their neutrality, such as Sweden, Switzerland, Indian, Indonesia, and Burma. The problem gets more difficult when one considers Austria, which is legally neutral but completely pro-West. It gets even more complicated when one considers some of the Arab states—for example, Saudi Arabia, which has signed a base agreement with the United States but which is closely associated with Egypt in her current dealings with the Soviet Union.

Apparently on the basis of whether or not they have joined an alliance the New York Times lists (populations supplied by Legislative Refence Service) the following nations as uncommitted:

Afghanistan	12,000,000
Bhutan	300,000
Burma	19,242,000
Cambodia	4,100,000
Ceylon	8,385,000
Egypt	22,651,000
Eritrea	1,104,000
Ethiopia	15,000,000
India	377,000,000
Indonesia	81,000,000
Israel	1,688,000
Kashmir	4,410,000
Laos	1,360,000
Lebanon	1,383,000
Nepal	8,432,000
Saudi Arabia	7,000,000
Sudan	8,900,000
Syria	3,670,000
Trust Territory of Somaliland	1,269,000
Yemen	4,500,000
Total	583,394,000

On this basis, that of not having signed a treaty of alliance, the following (off the map) could be added:

Austria	6,969,000
Finland	4,190,000
Ireland	2,933,000
Sweden	7,240,000
Switzerland	4,923,000
Yugoslavia	17,267,000
Spain	28,751,000
Total	72,730,000
Grand total	656,124,000

It should be added, however, that Spain has signed extensive base agreements with the United States, that sentiment in Austria is pro-West, and so on.

This information has been furnished me by the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress.

Administrative Costs of Selected Federal Grant-in-Aid Programs, Fiscal Year 1955

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 2, 1956

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am inserting a statement on the administrative costs of the Federal grant-in-aid programs for fiscal year 1955. This information was furnished by Mr. Ernest S. Griffith, Director of the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress:

Administrative costs of selected Federal grant-in-aid programs, fiscal year 1955

	Expenditures for grants	Expenditures for administration	Administrative costs as a percent of grant payments
Federal grants to the State and local units:			
Department of Agriculture:			
Agricultural experiment stations	$18,570,076	[1] $479,291	2.6
Cooperative agricultural extension work	38,395,006	[2] 1,529,284	4.0
School-lunch program	81,642,074	1,130,789	1.4
Cooperative projects in marketing	2,199,548	[3] 35,985	1.6
State and private forestry cooperation	9,781,953	534,964	5.5
Commodity Credit Corporation, value of commodities donated	110,526,388	187,941	.2
Special school milk program	22,225,009	193,237	.9
Removal of surplus agricultural commodities, value of commodities distributed within States	56,403,564	825,000	1.5
Department of Commerce:			
Federal airport program	8,353,021	[4] 1,420,000	17.0
Highway construction	596,698,509	11,246,571	1.9
State marine schools	254,781	[5] 7,000	2.7
Department of Health, Education, and Welfare:			
A. and M. colleges	5,051,500	5,800	.1
Cooperative vocational education	30,522,885	137,187	.4
School construction and survey	120,932,499	969,007	.8
Venereal disease control	630,861	14,111	2.2
Tuberculosis control	4,490,652	26,560	.6
General health assistance	9,724,462	135,664	1.4
Mental health activities	2,317,073	9,434	.4
Cancer control	2,229,950	10,614	.5
Heart disease control	1,066,335	4,966	.5
Hospital construction, survey and planning	73,158,834	94,141	.1
Construction of community facilities	1,430,568	21,734	1.5
Maternal and child welfare services	[6] 20,256,773	928,390	3.2
Public assistance	[7] 1,426,599,101	1,483,583	.1
Office of Vocational Rehabilitation	25,599,938	791,000	3.1
Department of the Interior: Wildlife restoration	16,354,098	565,850	3.5
Federal grants to the State and local units—Con.			
Department of Labor: Unemployment Compensation and Employment Service Administration	$188,898,030	$3,768,106	2.0
Federal Civil Defense Administration: Disaster relief	8,882,223	223,378	2.5
Federal Power Commission: Payments under Federal Power Act	32,775	[8] 6,030	18.4
Housing and Home Finance Agency:			
Public Housing Administration, annual contributions	60,902,966	7,413,400	12.2
Defense Community Facilities and Services	2,436,644	[8] 50,000	2.1
Urban renewal fund	33,516,114	2,213,000	6.6
Federal-aid payments to individuals, etc., within States:			
Department of Agriculture:			
Agricultural conservation program	189,148,769	22,530,580	11.9
Administration of Sugar Act program	68,109,239	1,514,184	2.2
Commodity Credit Corporation, value of dealers' certificates issued incident to supplying feed to farmers in drought-stricken areas	51,131,424	[9] 1,160,172	2.3
Department of Commerce: State marine schools (subsistence of cadets)	216,415	7,000	3.2
Department of Health, Education, and Welfare: Research and training grants:			
National Cancer Institute	8,967,410	117,325	1.3
National Institute of Mental Health	5,303,059	124,135	2.3
National Heart Institute	8,378,406	116,187	1.4
National Institute of Dental Research	431,083	13,168	3.1
National Arthritis and Metabolic Diseases Institute	4,334,228	46,766	1.1
National Microbiological Institute	2,269,722	24,176	1.1
National Neurological Diseases and Blindness Institute	4,010,807	56,882	1.4
Itemized total or average	3,331,384,762	62,172,592	1.9

[1] Includes undetermined amount of administrative costs related to $500,000 or 23 percent of payments for cooperative projects in marketing.
[2] Includes undetermined amount of administrative costs related to $800,000 or 36 percent of payments for cooperative projects in marketing.
[3] Represents costs related to $900,000 or 41 percent of total grants for this program.
[4] Includes planning and surveys of airport projects.
[5] Estimated.
[6] Includes $11,919,292 for maternal and child health services, $10,613,059 for services for crippled children, and $6,724,422 for child welfare services.
[7] Includes $920,357,772 for old-age assistance, $82,225,748 for aid to permanently and totally disabled, $387,599,650 for aid to dependent children, and $36,415,931 for aid to the blind.
[8] Represents the annual salary of 1.2 persons.
[9] Includes a small amount of administrative costs for payments to assist States in furnishing hay in drought-stricken areas.

Sources: Statistics on expenditures for the various grant-in-aid programs was obtained from the Annual Report of the Secretary of the Treasury on the State of the Finances, Fiscal Year 1955, Washington, U. S. Government Printing Office, 1956, pp. 626–640. Data on administrative costs of these programs was obtained from the budget offices of the respective Departments of Government.

Russia: Expert Testimony

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT H. BOSCH
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 11, 1956

Mr. BOSCH. Mr. Speaker, it has become increasingly evident that the rising tide of discontent is becoming harder to swallow for the rulers in the Kremlin. It behooves us to ever be alert and not misled by so-called new looks or gracious smiles. The recent uprising at Poznan, Poland, should give heart to those who speak sincerely and hopefully of shaking off the yoke of communism. Let us by our actions and deeds give encouragement to these subjected peoples in their fight for freedom.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include an editorial from the Daily News of July 16, 1956:

RUSSIA: EXPERT TESTIMONY

The West has numerous experts on communism, and several times as many persons who think they are experts. If you're looking for a topflight expert on the subject, and on dictatorship in general, you can do a lot worse than to consult Generalissimo Francisco Franco, ruler of Spain.

In the bitter 1936–39 Spanish civil war, Franco fought Communists who had been trained and were largely directed by Red fighting men from Russia.

He learned a great deal about Red strategists, tactics, and tricks. Since his victory in 1939, the Gissimo has managed Spain largely by dictatorial methods, and has kept the Communist conspiracy pinned down.

Franco, then, should have some pretty useful ideas on the meaning of the Kremlin's new look—the smiles, the trips abroad by Red big shots, the endless chatter about peace and aid for backward countries, and the yells of "Stalin was a ring-tailed so-and-so" which go to make up present-day Soviet foreign policy.

These thoughts occurred recently to Harry F. Byrd, Jr., son of the eminent Virginia Senator and publisher of a couple of Virginia newspapers. Mr. Byrd wrote to Franco and asked his opinion on the new Soviet look. In reply, he got an impressive letter setting forth the Spanish dictator's views in detail. Byrd printed the letter in his newspapers.

Briefly, General Franco is not convinced that the new Kremlin policy is sincere, peaceable, or anything else Khrushchev, Bulganin, and their cronies say it is.

Franco says that if all had been serene in Russia, Khrushchev and his pals needn't have cut loose with their campaign to make a devil out of Josef Stalin, whom they had helped make a demigod while he lived. They could have gone along doing reverence to his memory, thereby keeping Communists inside and outside Russia quiet and as happy as these people who live on hate can ever be.

AFRAID OF THE SLAVES

Instead, the present Kremlin bosses turned on Stalin's name and fame, and are currently describing him as a heel in spades plus. By so doing, they have set Communists in a frenzy everywhere, and have weakened the party in all countries except possibly Russia itself. Why did they do it?

They felt forced to do it, says Franco, "because somebody is attacking and attacking strongly." Nobody is attacking Russia from the outside. Therefore, this attack must be coming from inside the Red slave empire.

The recent uprising in Poznan, Poland, and the persistent reports of widespread unrest in Czechoslovakia, Hungary, and East Germany bear out this theory.

As Franco sees it, the Kremlin Reds are fighting for time to save their own hides from the wrath of their slaves. If they can do that, they will later renew their drive to enslave the entire world.

If Franco is right (and he is by no means the only Westerner who sees the new Kremlin look this way), then it follows that here is a golden opportunity for the West to score heavily in the cold war, if not to win it. The obvious strategy would be to let the enemy stew in his own juice.

Instead of expanding trade with the Red Empire, our side could tighten its embargoes and enlarge its no-sales lists of specific goods.

WHAT WE COULD BUT DO NOT DO

We could refuse to receive delegations of Russian farm or building experts, or Russian musicians and actors, or Russian anything else.

Conversely, we could decline to let the Kremlin murderers build prestige at home and abroad by entertaining or having their pictures taken with prominent Westerners, such as President Eisenhower, British Prime Minister Eden, French Premier Guy Mollet, et al.

If the United States wanted to get really tough, it could withdraw its recognition of Soviet Russia, extended by F. D. Roosevelt in a fit of idiocy in 1933.

Up to now, the West is using none of these devices for letting outraged human nature take its course inside the Red Empire. On the contrary, Western leaders in the main seem bent on helping the Kremlin gang save itself.

All of which leads some people on this side of the Iron Curtain to wonder uneasily what's going to happen to the West in this cold war, after all.

Katyn Massacre

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RAY J. MADDEN
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 16, 1956

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I submit the following item from this morning's Washington Post and Times Herald.

Millions throughout the world are asking why the Kremlin leaders in condemning Stalin did not include or mention the Katyn Forest Massacre.

The item follows:

KATYN MASSACRE

Since the Washington Post and Times Herald has always been among those American newspapers very much interested in the Katyn Forest massacre and its investigation through Congress, your readers might be interested in the following letter which this writer just sent to the editor of Moscow's Pravda:

"As the founder and former executive secretary of the now defunct American Committee for the Investigtaion of the Katyn Massacre, Inc. (chairman: Ambassador Arthur Bliss Lane) which laid the groundwork for the great American congressional investigation of the massacre of 4,243 Polish officers in the spring of 1940 at Katyn, U. S. S. R., I want to ask you why the Soviet Government and the Communist Party have not yet admitted Stalin's and Beria's guilt in this greatest military crime in history.

"The printed record of the investigation, carried out by the Select Committee To Conduct an Investigation of the Facts, Evidence, and Circumstances of the Katyn Forest Massacre (chairman: Congressman Ray J. Madden) comprises 2,437 pages, the testimony of 103 witnesses, and 229 exhibits.

"No other crime in history has ever been the object of such long and thorough parliamentary investigation as the Katyn Forest massacre. The result of this investigation was the establishment beyond the shadow of any doubt of the fact that the Katyn massacre as well as the murder of another 11,000 Polish officers on Soviet soil was the work of the NKVD.

"You would render a great service to the cause of the truth if you would admit what the non-Soviet world has already known for a considerable time.

"Mr. Nikita S. Khrushchev has already blamed Stalin and Beria for so many crimes that the non-Soviet world cannot understand why he did not include the Katyn Forest massacre in his list of crimes committed by Stalin and Beria.

"I trust and hope—and with me the whole non-Soviet world—that you will no longer deprive the Soviet people of the truth which can easily be found in the 7 volumes and 2 special reports, published by the American congressional Select Committee To Investigate the Katyn Forest Massacre in 1952."

JULIUS EPSTEIN.

NEW YORK.

Minshall Will Hold Office Conferences Throughout District

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM E. MINSHALL
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 16, 1956

Mr. MINSHALL. Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege and honor to represent the people of the 23d Congressional District of Ohio in the Congress of the United States. This district is of great national importance because of the outstanding contribution of our fine citizens to the general welfare of our Nation. The social, cultural, and industrial wealth of this district is unexcelled, and even the most casual glance through Census Bureau statistics will give ready evidence of the high educational and personal income levels of these true Americans.

As the Representative of this great district in the Congress, I have considered it my duty not only to be well informed of their opinions through personal contact and use of opinion polls, but also to be of the greatest possible service to persons having problems dealing with Federal agencies or departments by prompt response to individual requests and personal handling of their problems.

I also have a full-time congressional office in downtown Cleveland where I can meet with people personally at any time during frequent trips back to the district when my official duties so permit. During the time I am in Washington attending to legislative and official duties, a competent secretary is in charge of my Cleveland office to assist callers and to help them with requests for aid in dealing with the Federal Government so that I can be of every proper assistance to them.

A further service to the people of the 23d congressional district in addition to radio and television programs is my Washington Report which, in newsletter form, periodically presents a concise accounting of events and opinions on Capitol Hill and encourages its readers to correspond with me to let me know their views on these happenings and issues.

Last year, I initiated the idea of holding zone conference meetings in various suburban communities in the 23d district. The attendance was most encouraging, and it gives a wonderful opportunity to serve and learn at firsthand the individual needs of the people I am privileged to represent in the Congress.

With the understanding that Congress will not be in session during the latter part of September and early October, I will again this year from September 24 through October 11 follow the same procedure and have a series of conference meetings so that every resident of this suburban district can conveniently meet with me.

I am most appreciative of the fine cooperation of the many officials who have made these meeting places available as an aid in rendering this public service.

This is the schedule:

Lakewood: Monday, September 24, 1:30 to 4 p. m., Lakewood City Hall, mayor's office, 14532 Lake Avenue.

Rocky River: Monday, September 24, 6:30 to 9 p. m., Rocky River City Hall, 21012 Hilliard Road.

Pepper Pike and Hunting Valley: Tuesday, September 25, 1:30 to 4 p. m., Pepper Pike Town Hall, 28000 Shaker Boulevard.

Chagrin Falls, Chagrin Falls Township, Bentleyville, and Moreland Hills: Tuesday, September 25, 6:30 to 9 p. m., Chagrin Falls Council Chambers, 21 West Washington Street.

Independence and Seven Hills: Wednesday, September 26, 1:30 to 4 p. m., Independence Town Hall, 6675 Brecksville Road.

Brecksville: Wednesday, September 26, 6:30 to 9 p. m., Brecksville Town Hall, 49 Public Square.

Bedford, Bedford Heights, Oakwood, and Walton Hills: Thursday, September 27, 1:30 to 4 p. m., Bedford Police Station, 683 Broadway.

Maple Heights: Thursday, September 27, 6:30 to 9 p. m., Maple Heights City Hall, Mayor's Office, 5353 Lee Road.

Broadview Heights and North Royalton: Monday, October 1, 1:30 to 4 p. m., Broadview Heights Town Hall, 8938 Broadview Road.

Parma Heights: Monday, October 1, 6:30 to 9 p. m., Parma Heights Town Hall—new one, if completed.

Beachwood and Woodmere: Tuesday, October 2, 1:30 to 4 p. m., Beachwood Town Hall, 25511 Fairmount Boulevard.

Shaker Heights: Tuesday, October 2, 6:30 to 9 p. m., Shaker Heights City Hall, Mayor's Office, 3400 Lee Road.

Westlake: Wednesday, October 3, 1:30 to 4 p. m., Westlake Town Hall, Dover Center and Hilliard Road.

Bay Village: Wednesday, October 3, 6:30 to 9 p. m., Bay Village Town Hall, 350 Dover Center Road.

Berea: Thursday, October 4, 1:30 to 4 p. m., Berea City Hall, Mayor's Office, 47 East Bridge Street.

Fairview Park and Parkview: Thursday, October 4, 6:30 to 9 p. m., Fairview Park Town Hall, 20785 Lorain Road.

Brook Park: Monday, October 8, 1:30 to 4 p. m., Brook Park Village Hall, Council Room, 5950 Eastland Road.

Middleburg Heights: Monday, October 8, 6:30 to 9 p. m., Middleburg Heights Town Hall, 15700 East Bagley Road.

Warrensville Heights, Warrensville Township, North Randall, and Orange: Tuesday, October 9, 1:30 to 4 p. m., Warrensville Heights Village Hall, mayor's office, 4770 Warrensville Center Road.

University Heights: Tuesday, October 9, 6:30 to 9 p. m., University Heights Police Department, 2304 Warrensville Center Road.

Olmsted Falls, Olmsted Township, and Westview: Wednesday, October 10, 1:30 to 4 p. m., Olmsted Falls Village Hall, 7987 Columbia Road.

North Olmsted: Wednesday, October 10, 6:30 to 9 p. m., North Olmsted City Hall, mayor's office, Dover Center Road.

Cuyahoga Heights, Brooklyn Heights, and Valley View: Thursday, October 11, 1:30 to 4 p. m., Cuyahoga Heights Village Hall, 4863 East 71st Street.

Solon: Thursday, October 11, 6:30 to 9 p. m., Solon Village Hall, council chambers, 6315 S. O. M. Center Road.

No appointments are necessary for these conferences, and I urge individuals or groups to meet with me on the date and at the place most convenient to them. Every resident of the 23d district is cordially invited to talk over problems of national concern, to discuss personal problems with the Federal Government, or to just chat and get better acquainted. With the knowledge thus obtained, I know it will better enable me to represent the residents of the 23d district in the Congress of the United States.

Hells Canyon Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE M. RHODES

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 11, 1956

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, the Hells Canyon Dam project is of vital importance because of the need for maximum use of our natural resources for the benefit of all our citizens. Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following statement by Mr. Leo Goodman, secretary of the CIO National Committee on Atomic Energy, Power, and Resources Development, which he presented last year to the Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee in support of the Hells Canyon project:

STATEMENT OF LEO GOODMAN, SECRETARY, CIO NATIONAL COMMITTEE ON ATOMIC ENERGY, POWER, AND RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT, TESTIFYING IN BEHALF OF S. 1333, PASCO, WASH., HEARINGS OF THE SENATE INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS COMMITTEE, APRIL 5, 1955

My name is Leo Goodman, Washington, D. C. I am secretary of the CIO National Committee on Atomic Energy, Power, and Resources Development. I am here in support of S. 1333, which will authorize the construction, operation, and maintenance of the Hells Canyon project by the Bureau of Reclamation.

My union has not only endorsed Hells Canyon Dam and the principles of full development it embodies, but has been one of the most active supporters of the gallant fight the people of this region have engaged in since 1953 to protect this tremendous river resource from being handed over to the Idaho Power Co.

A region, a Nation, or an entire civilization may forget it, but land and water condition the material limits of that civilization, and the extent of its ability to provide a best possible existence for the people who live there. Neither land nor water are limitless. Therefore, the responsibility of people is to plan, use, and conserve, so that what has been provided by nature is not only brought to full production but is not wasted or depleted in the process.

Here in the Pacific Northwest is a young region with a vast and still largely untouched natural resource that is poured out in prodigal waste into the Pacific Ocean every year. I am speaking of the Columbia River system, which holds nearly 40 percent of the hydroelectric resources of the United States.

From the standpoint of feasible projects, this river and its tributaries contain more than 60 percent of the Nation's hydro potential.

But to the present only 13 percent of the more than 30 million kilowatts on the Columbia have been harnessed. Eighty-seven percent of its falling waters are still wasted.

At the same time, the projects which have been built by the Federal Government to generate hydroelectric energy, control floods, aid in navigation, and irrigation of lands have demonstrated what can be accomplished for the welfare of both region and Nation, by what has already been accomplished.

Here in the State of Washington the industrial development has been phenomenal since the early days of World War II, when Grand Coulee and Bonneville Dams, bitterly opposed by the same private power companies which now oppose Hells Canyon, came on the line with the low-cost power that aided so formidably in our fight to save democracy.

The communities in this very area where we meet today are in the main the net results of this kind of development. The population increases which have taken place, the new industries, the thriving towns and cities, the great atomic plant at Hanford, are all monuments to the wisdom of a policy of resource development which must be continued and accelerated.

Perhaps some of you do not understand fully the relationship between Hells Canyon and your own area downstream. In the debate that has raged so long on this issue, it may have been lost to sight.

I am talking about the importance of upstream storage to downstream progress. I am talking about the vital role that the upstream storage at Hells Canyon will play in aiding the downstream areas in obtaining a firm supply of year-around power from their run-of-river dams like Bonneville and McNary, the Dalles, and, hopefully, John Day and the four lower Snake projects of the Corps of Army Engineers.

Right now I have learned that the Bonneville Power Administration has been forced to curtail interruptible power deliveries to industrial customers. This has been brought about by extremely low flows on Columbia River for the most part, and to some degree by unseasonable cold.

I recall the reports of the winter of 1952, where the water carried by the Columbia, dropped to a point where it was necessary to resort to a power brownout, suspension of interruptible power deliveries, and standby steam generation at excessive rates. I have read that this forced aluminum plants to shut down, threw hundreds of people out of work including members of CIO unions, reduced production of products essential to both defense and peacetime uses.

My question is this: Why is this necessary? Because there is a lack of up-stream storage which will fill in these periods of low flow—Hungry Horse Dam in Montana is already alleviatingg this situation to a degree. Upstream on Snake River is another project which, except for the obstruction of the Idaho Power Co., could have been under construction 3 years ago, preparing to store nearly 4 million acre-feet of water from the Snake River during the heavy spring and early summer runoffs when the Columbia is likewise at its peak. Then in the fall and early winter months, the gates would open at Hells Canyon Dam, and the wheels on the downstream generators would continue to turn out additional amounts of power instead of being obliged to lessen production, or even be turned off.

If the lower Columbia area is every to escape this threat, which as your liberal and distinguished senior Senator, Mr. MAGNUSON, described on the floor of the Senate when he spoke out for Hells Canyon, as a sword of Damacles hanging over the entire region, then it is only by going upstream that it can be done.

I am well aware of the interest of Washington and Oregon in the John Day project. I am well aware of the interest of Washington and northern Idaho in the four lower Snake River dams—Ice Harbor, Lower Monumental, Lower Granite, and Little Goose. All these have been authorized by the Congress.

But unless there is substantial storage such as is provided by Hells Canyon project to release through the turbines of these run-of-river projects, their power production will be substantially reduced. In the case of the four lower Snake projects, testimony by a representative of the Corps of Army Engineers in hearings last year, threw a grave shadow on their economic feasibility without large upstream storage releases to firm up their power output.

Of the 1,124,000 kilowatts of prime power which Bonneville Power Administration experts estimate would be added to the Federal Columbia River Power System by the construction of Hells Canyon, 436,000 kilowatts, or about 39 percent, come from the release of impounded waters through 8 downstream dams, in operation, under construction or authorized.

BPA estimates, for example that the four authorized Lower Snake dams without Hells Canyon storage would produce 520,000 kilowatts of prime power. With Hells Canyon this power production would be increased to 769,000 kilowatts, or about 48 percent. John Day project, authorized, would gain 56,000 kilowatts from Hells Canyon storage.

With this in mind why should this kind of storage represented by Hells Canyon 3,880,000 acre-feet, be sacrificed to the plan proposed by the Idaho Power Co. to provide only 1 million acre-feet of storage? How do you think the lower Columbia regions will benefit substantially from this? One million acre-feet of storage is not as effective as nearly 4 million.

Are you convinced that the Idaho Power Co. will operate its projects the way the Federal Government does, as part of a region-wide power system, a single integrated unit of many projects interconnected by a region-wide transmission gridback system? There is no assurance that it will do so, as it serves just one service area—its own, and will send you only its surplus dump power.

Do you think that what power you may receive as surplus to Idaho Power's needs will be the kind of 2 mill power as sold from the Bonneville system, and that it will not provide a tendency to raise the general power rate in the region? Not only that, 5, 6, and 7 mill power will not attract new industries into this region and stimulate existing industries to expand. Do you assume that Idaho Power will not ask for financial payment from the Federal Government for additional downstream power generated by release from its storage dam, and that this will not have some effect on Federal power rates?

We are facing an issue that cuts to the heart of the economy of the Pacific Northwest. We shall grow out here on an accelerated program of new starts, like Hells Canyon to control the river, to generate abundant supplies of cheap electric energy, and to provide the only basis now existing by which major industries can be persuaded to locate here.

We have tried the private power approach of scarcity at high rates. It doesn't work

when there are great sites along our river like that at Hells Canyon which demand the utmost in engineering skills and vision to turn the river to work for the maximum, not a partial development, inefficient, wasteful, at high cost to the consumers of energy, and with the other benefits, such as reclamation and recreation entirely or almost entirely ignored.

Through the Federal Government in pursuance of its lawful powers of developing our navigable streams which belong to all of us, the Pacific Northwest has taken a first major step forward in overcoming the blind greed and obstruction of the power lobby in throwing dams across the Columbia and its tributaries at Hungry Horse, Grand Coulee, Bonneville, Chief Joseph, McNary, and The Dalles.

We in the labor movement stand solidly with the farmers in desiring to protect and best utilize the State's water resources. We have looked behind this propaganda attack of the Idaho Power Co. which is raising the specter of the loss of Idaho's water in downstream power purposes. We believe this charge is absurd and without foundation. We have yet to find any instance of a public power development depriving upstream water users of water for consumptive purposes. We believe that the provisions as incorporated in S. 1333 adequately protect Idaho's right to upstream depletion for future expansion.

But the job is only in its beginning. The Northwest is within the space of a few years to pass into a power shortage. By the mid-1960's it will reach such proportions that it will constitute a major block to its continued expansion. It is irresponsible to await the shortage to develop before doing anything about it.

We must plan now, and the situation is such in the Northwest that the major utility responsibility should be assumed by the Federal Government. It has a responsibility to the REA's, the public utility districts, the industrial customers, yes, even to the private power companies which depend in large measure downstream upon low-cost Federal power for their ultimate customers.

Since 1949 there has been a joint comprehensive plan to bring new major projects into being. This is the plan agreed upon by the Bureau of Reclamation and the Corps of Army Engineers in 1949. It is probably the most exhaustive engineering and economic study of land water and people that has ever been drawn together in one whole. Hells Canyon was and is a most important upstream storage element of that plan.

I am aware of no such study or approach to the problem of developing the people's resources in this great river basin undertaken by any power company nor combination of power companies. They are just not constituted to do such a thing. This is a matter for the people and their Government to decide upon in the best interests of the region and the Nation. They must never allow such a power to pass from them and into the hands of private monopoly by default, by being blinded by self-serving propaganda, or by being stampeded into accepting under the duress of expediency anything less than the maximum development of the water resources of the Columbia.

The stake we of the CIO hold in this is great, both as working people and as citizens. The labor movement is interested in jobs, high wages, good working conditions. It is also interested in working to its utmost to help achieve a continually expanding economy whereby a growing labor force will always find opportunity for employment, buy goods from merchants and farmers, educate its children, and pay its share of taxes to maintain Government.

The Employment Act of 1946 established the policy of the Federal Government as being that of using all of its resources, in cooperation with those of farmers, labor and business, to achieve maximum employment at high wages.

Here is one dramatic instance of the need for the Federal Government to act in the full spirit of that policy and under the powers of the Congress derived from the Constitution and the various statutes establishing over-all programs to carry forward the 50-year policy of Federal leadership and responsible action in developing our rivers.

On behalf of the CIO, I once more urge that S. 1333 be enacted into law with the utmost speed, and the great Hells Canyon project authorized for immediate construction.

Coattail Riding

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. S. MIKE MONRONEY
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, July 16, 1956

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, a humorous article entitled "Getting in Practice for Coattail Riding," written by Malvina Lindsay, and published in the Washington Post and Times Herald of July 14, 1956.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GETTING IN PRACTICE FOR COATTAIL RIDING
(By Malvina Lindsay)

I wasn't surprised to see that Senator Whoof had added an "I Like Ike" hatband to his "I Like Ike" necktie, lapel button, and sun glasses.

"How's your campaign coming?" I asked.

"We're in. It's a landslide."

"But you still have strong opposition."

"So what? Just as soon as Ike shows up on my circuit it's—poof." He gestured into the air.

"You're counting on his coming into your State?"

"Sure. Didn't he say he'd make a vigorous campaign? He's in better shape than ever before—can lick his weight in wildcats. You'll see. He'll go out and get a Congress to back him up."

"By the way, what's the Senate going to do about foreign aid?"

"You mean that globaloney stuff? Nothing, if I can help it. Why should Uncle Sam be a Santa Claus, a sucker, pour his money down a rathole, give away his shirt to foreigners who don't like him, sell the American taxpayer down the river——?"

"Please, just a minute. Isn't the President asking the Senate to restore the cut in foreign aid? Hasn't he put that first on the things he wants this Congress to do? Are you going to oppose him?"

"Me oppose President Eisenhower? Look at this." Senator Whoof opened his brief case and handed me a sheet of paper. "That's the statement I sent to every newspaper, radio, and TV station in my State."

It began: "Now that Dwight D. Eisenhower, that great American, that God-fearing leader, that immortal war hero, that peerless man of peace, will again lead his party——"

I stopped. "I'm a little confused," I said.

"All this confusion will be cleared up once we get a new Congress."

"But what's this one going to do about the President's program? Any chance in the Senate for a new school construction bill?"

"Not a ghost. It's pure unadulterated socialism."

"But the President wants something done."

"You mean they do." Senator Whoof gave me a significant look. "I'm not saying the President himself isn't trying to do the right thing but——" He stopped, compressing his lips tightly. "Now don't misunderstand me," he went on, "I think President Eisenhower is the ablest man in this country, the greatest leader in the world. Look at this."

The Senator drew from his briefcase a book of I Love Ike seals. "I send 'em to my women constituents," he said.

"Do you think anything will be done to modify the McCarren-Walter Act?"

"Why should anything be done? We have too many people with accents in this country already."

"But the President has asked that its inequities be removed—especially the fingerprinting provision."

"Dangerous. Ridic—I mean the President is a great man, a great personality, but—well, he sometimes gets unsound advice. You see they——" The Senator stopped again and tightened his lips. "Here, let me give you a present," he said, handing me an I Like Ike pencil. "Just ordered a big batch to hand out in my campaign."

"Any chance for any civil-rights legislation in this Congress?"

"Not an iota, if you ask me. People in this country have too many rights already. What they need is more direction. Look at youth. Women."

"But I understand the President has said he is asking very little on civil rights and that what he is asking he expects to get."

"Just let him try—no; I mean that of course we all want to back up the President, but Congress is just going to be too busy to get around to everything."

"You think this Congress will pass any bills?"

"Sure. It'll pass the pork—I mean the rivers and harbors appropriation and—well let's see * * * Say, this is off the record, but some of us are trying to get the Bricker amendment up again."

"So you can limit the President's treaty making powers?"

"No. No. We've just got to call a halt on all these foreign entanglements, this United Nations stuff."

"But I hear the President's going to campaign on world cooperation——"

"That doesn't mean a thing—what I mean is, that as far as I'm concerned, there's only one issue in this campaign. It's that the future of this country, the destiny of mankind, the fate of the universe depends on the election of Dwight D. Eisenhower."

Radio Address by Guy O. Stone, National Vice Commander of the American Legion, at Managua, Nicaragua

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER F. GEORGE
OF GEORGIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, July 16, 1956

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD a radio address by Hon. Guy O. Stone, of my State, who is national vice commander of the American Legion, delivered on July 4, 1956, at Managua, Nicaragua. I think it is an address of some considerable interest, though brief. Mr. Stone was, at the time, on an official tour of the American

Legion posts in Central and South American States.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RADIO ADDRESS BY GUY O. STONE, NATIONAL VICE COMMANDER OF THE AMERICAN LEGION, ON JULY 4, 1956, OVER RADIO MANAGUA, MANAGUA, NICARAGUA

Thank you Mr. Ambassador (and Mr. Foreign Minister).

It is truly a great honor and genuine pleasure for me to be in this beautiful country and a particular honor to be asked to speak a few minutes here today in the company of such distinguished persons as his Excellency Oscar Sevilla Sacasa, Minister of Foreign Affairs of Nicaragua, and the Ambassador of the United States, the Honorable Thomas E. Whelan, of whom we in the United States are very proud.

Many people who have visited your country have told me that it is among the most hospitable of all the countries in Latin America and even my short visit has certainly justified this statement. The friendship of this country is more than a superficial one, as it is well-known in the United States that Nicaragua was one of the first countries in Latin America to declare itself on the side of the United States and its allies following the entry of the United States into World War II.

I would also like to pay personal tribute and that of the American Legion to those Nicaraguans who served in the Armed Forces of our country during World War I, World War II, and in Korea. These Nicaraguans gave the utmost proof of their firm belief in the principles so clearly enunciated in the Declaration of Independence, of which we celebrate the 180th anniversary, today. They joined with the young men of our country and other freedom-loving nations of the world in defense of the principles of individual liberty.

We are believers of firm cooperation among the Americas. On an occasion such as this, when we pay tribute to our great leaders, we also have in mind the magnificent work done by the great men of Latin America—Bolivar and the others—who led the fight for the freedom of their countries.

We in the American Legion are carrying out a great program which we term a program of Americanism. The principles which we endeavor to have the youth and citizens of our country believe in and support are of such a universal nature that they can be applied to any free and democratic nation if that nation has a firm belief in God.

There are several cardinal principles which underlie our whole Americanism program which is intended to develop more patriotic citizens and civic responsibilities.

Americanism is founded upon faith in, and devotion to God and country; upon the principles that right makes men; upon the value and dignity of the individual; upon the recognition of the importance and value of his spiritual, cultural, and material well-being and pursuit of happiness. In the historic document that laid the foundation for our liberty it is stated that man is entitled to life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness.

Communism is a Godless philosophy of life; it denies the existence of a supreme creator; it seeks to instill the mind of men over the will of God; it seeks to degrade the human being by making him a puppet of the state.

Communism denies the dignity of the individual; it glorifies a police state; to keep our countries strong in their belief in God we must defeat the evil influences of the Godlessness and materialism of communism; we must go back to God; go back to the Bible, back to prayer for understanding for ourselves and our families.

We believe that a true demoracy must be based on a firm concept of moral values or it is doomed to fail.

Before we will have universal peace, there must be a big change in the hearts of men everywhere—they must stop thinking in terms of fear and hate, and greed; they must begin to think in terms of love and trust and charity.

The whole world will have to learn to accept the concept that love and friendship makes life more worth living than the jungle law of survival.

All human beings must accept the importance of the rights of the individual as a basis of the free way of life.

S. 3116

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. TORBERT H. MACDONALD
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 11, 1956

Mr. MACDONALD. Mr. Speaker, it is my understanding that within the next few days the House will consider S. 3116, the International Cultural Exchange and Trade Fair Participation Act of 1956.

I am particularly interested in the fact that S. 3116 will help us to continue to send our top athletes and athletic teams overseas. The very favorable impact that has been made on foreign public opinion as a result of the appearances by these outstanding American athletic groups attests to the success of the program.

Reports from the foreign press and from our Embassies overseas constantly refer to the warm reception accorded American athletes and the value of their visits abroad in winning friends, respect, and understanding for the United States. An American track and field team recently toured African cities. Our consul general from Lagos, Nigeria, reported that he could recall no other event which resulted in such spontaneous outburst of good will as the visit of these young people to Lagos. A report from our consul general at Accra in the Gold Coast states that in less than 24 hours our young athletes had made more friends than any ordinary man can have in a lifetime. Never before has there been such a mad rush for autographs and addresses than there was at the Accra Sports Stadium when the Americans defied the burning heat to train before a packed crowd. From the Embassy at Liberia the report states that this was perhaps the most popular visit of Americans to Liberia. Not even during the President's inauguration did as many pictures appear in the press in a single week as appeared on the American athletes. The genuine friendliness, sincerity, and willingness to help displayed by the Americans won the hearts of all with whom they came in contact.

The American Embassy at Colombo, Ceylon, reported that the American tennis team which participated in the All-Asian Tennis Tournament in India last winter and toured neighboring countries captivated the crowds and drew literally pages of publicity in all of Colombo's nine daily newspapers. The Ceylon Sunday observer put it this way, "The American tennis stars came, conquered, and left Ceylon." As for the local assessment of their impact, the press, as cited above, gave them superb treatment and coverage while their personalities and friendliness charmed literally hundreds of people from all walks of life.

Comments on the visit of an American swimming team to Guatemala City stated that the team members without exception proved to be the finest of sports ambassadors, and the impression they left with Guatemalan athletes and the public in general will be a lasting one. The visit of a touring American swimming team in Vienna, Austria, was a complete and unqualified success which resulted in a considerable amount of favorable publicity for the United States among parts of the population which usually are not reached by other activities. Coverage was extensive in the press, including Communist newspapers, on the radio and television, both before and after the events.

I wholeheartedly support this legislation and urge the House to take favorable action on S. 3116.

Polish Revolt

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 13, 1956

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to call the attention of our colleagues to the following excerpts from Drew Pearson's column of July 12, 1956, as it appeared in the Washington Post and other papers:

POLISH REVOLT

Here is some unwritten history regarding a previous revolt behind the Iron Curtain which may point to ways of helping the people of Poland today.

In June 1953, immediately after East Berlin workers tackled Red tanks with bottles and bare hands, crying for food, I suggested to Jimmie Riddleberger, then in charge of the State Department's German desk, now Ambassador to Yugoslavia, and to Gen. "Beetle" Smith, then Under Secretary of State, that United States food surpluses be given to the hungry rioters by priavte American service groups.

The Lions, Kiwanis, Rotary Clubs, I suggested, together with the American Legion, VFW, AMVETS, junior chambers of commerce, would probably be delighted to help finance the purchase and distribution of surplus food. If the offer was turned down, then East Berliners, with no boundary to worry about, could come across to West Berlin and pick up the food themselves.

I also figured this proposal would be right down the Eisenhower administration alley because it had been talking so much about private enterprise and keeping the Government out of private enterprise.

LIONS CLUBS READY

It so happened that te International Lions Clubs were holding their annual convention in Chicago at that time and they authorized

me to make a concrete proposal for the purchase of surplus wheat and butter which Secretary Benson had running out of his ears.

So I went down to see Secretary Benson. We brought in five of his top executives. They were polite, cordial, noncommittal.

"The executives of the Lions International," I explained, "are ready to buy your wheat at the same support price you paid for it—$2.60 a bushel—and butter for the support price you paid—60 cents a pound. They would like to take delivery immediately—this week in West Berlin. The State Department informs me that you already have a large supply there so that all you need do is to send a cable to release it there."

I stressed the need for speed, the fact that now was the psychological time to show that individual Americans were eager to help individual rebels against communism. I suggested that it was much better to have groups of Americans operate than the Government, because East Germans distrusted governments. They did not distrust people.

"Will you write me a letter about this?" requested Secretary Benson.

"I have already written one," I said, and pulled it out of my pocket.

Days passed—a total of 3 weeks. No word from Benson. Finally, Riddleberger phoned to say that he had taken $15 million out of the State Department budget to offer food to the East Berliners.

The State Department drafted an official announcement and President Eisenhower signed it. It was a fine gesture, and good politics here at home. But part of the bloom was off the rose. By that time it was July. The riots were over. And the official announcement by the United States Government was interpreted abroad as a pure propaganda gesture. It won us no friends.

BALLOONS TO POLAND

This unwritten history is told now for one reason only—the recent revolt in Poznan, Poland.

This time the State Department, acting more wisely, had the American Red Cross offer to send food to the Poles. The Red Cross, though organized under the wing of the United States Government, is not the Government. The offer was turned down.

However, it is still not too late for groups of patriotic Americans to offer food to the Poles. If the offer is turned down, it is still not too late to send the food in small packages by balloon. The Crusade for Freedom has been sending balloon messages into Poland ever since we inaugurated the idea from West Berlin in the summer of 1951.

Ohio GOP To Raise $5 Million for Campaigns

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES A. VANIK
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 16, 1956

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, please permit me to call the attention of the House of Representatives to the high cost of political campaigns. The Republicans in Ohio are reportedly raising $5 million to conduct the 1956 national, State, and local campaigns. The Ohio Republican finance committee reportedly has a goal of $4½ million while another half million is being raised by the Republican senatorial finance committee to aid in the reelection of a Republican Senator.

How can this much money be contributed for the purpose of the current political campaign without the contributors' receiving something of value in return? Under these circumstances, it is almost impossible for a person of modest means to consider a political career unless he wishes to ally himself to the interests and the causes sponsored by those who make large contributions to the political campaign effort. If something is not done soon to limit campaign contributions and campaign expenditures, democracy may be on the way out in America.

The following is the newspaper article on the subject prepared by Richard L. Maher, politics editor of the Cleveland Press, under date of Friday, July 13, 1956:

OHIO GOP TO RAISE $5 MILLION FOR CAMPAIGNS

(By Richard L. Maher)

Ohio Republicans will kick in nearly $5 million for the 1956 national, State and local campaigns.

About 25 percent of the huge war chest to reelect President Eisenhower, to elect C. William O'Neill as governor and to win elections on the county level will come from 3 northern Ohio areas—Cleveland, Toledo and Akron.

The Ohio Republican finance committee reportedly has a goal of close to $4½ million. Another half million is being raised by the Republican senatorial finance committee to aid in the reelection of United States Senator GEORGE H. BENDER.

It is reported that the Bender campaign will cost $650,000, with the senatorial finance committee raising $500,000 and the Republican State committee dropping in the other $150,000.

Republican headquarters has allocated about $150,000 for O'Neill's campaign. This is in addition to money raised by O'Neill and his backers on a State and county level.

The Ohio Republican finance committee, through which passes all money for local, State and national campaigns, operates through a series of local committees, such as, the Cuyahoga-Lake finance committee.

The Cuyahoga-Lake committee has a quota of $700,000. The Lucas-Wood committee (Toledo) has been told to pick up $335,000. The committee for Summit (Akron) and surrounding counties must raise more than $300,000.

About $500,000 is to be raised in the Cincinnati area.

Money raised by the committees and sent to the State finance committee is divided 3 ways; one-third to local campaigns, one-third to State campaigns and one-third to national. Out of the latter is paid cost of operating the local level finance committees, and some expenses of the local party committees.

Outside of the senatorial committee, it is understood that about $1½ million will be allocated for the State campaign, and $1½ million for local campaigns in the 88 counties.

The money is being raised by a professional fund raising group on a solicitation basis. Quotas are being assigned selected areas, and teams of workers within those areas are contacting business and professional men, industrialists and others who have given to GOP campaigns in the past.

A "suggested" gift for the campaign is mentioned to each person contacted.

In addition a plan is being worked out whereby small givers—those who put in $5 to $25—will be approached to help out in the fund raising.

The Beginning of Life Insurance in America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK CARLSON
OF KANSAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, July 16, 1956

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, January 11, 1959, will be the 200th anniversary of the beginning of life insurance in America. During this 200-year period, life insurance has become a part of our American way of life. It gives peace of mind in the form of security to millions of our people and it gives stability to our entire economic picture.

I urge that the Post Office Department begin planning at the present time for the issuance of a stamp commemorating the 200th anniversary of the beginning of life insurance in America.

It is interesting to note that the life insurance business began in America when on January 11, 1759, Thomas and Richard Penn, successors to their father, the distinguished Quaker, William Penn, granted a charter for a company sponsored by the colonial Presbyterian Synod.

It was from this humble beginning that life insurance has grown to a program where we have billions of dollars of individual protection in the Nation.

The real purpose of the incorporation of the first life insurance business was to provide definite financial benefits, on the death of a clergyman, to his widow and children. The first company was sponsored by the Colonial Presbyterian Synod.

Dr. Alexander Mackie, who is president of the Presbyterian Minister's Fund for Life Insurance, has prepared a memorandum on the early history of life insurance, and I ask unanimous consent that his statement be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the memorandum was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE BEGINNING OF LIFE INSURANCE IN AMERICA

The life insurance business began in America when on January 11, 1759, Thomas and Richard Penn, successors to their father, the distinguished Quaker, William Penn, granted a charter for a company sponsored by the colonial Presbyterian Synod. The object of the corporation was to provide definite financial benefits, payable on the death of a clergyman, to his widow and children. These benefits were in proportion to the annual contribution (or premium, to use modern terminology) paid by the clergyman during his lifetime. These benefits were payable only to the families of such clergymen as participated in the plan by making an approved application and by paying the fixed annual premium. At first the premium was the same for ministers of all ages with the exception that if and when the insured married a second time, he would pay in the year of his remarriage alone, a double premium. About 1792, changes were made in the plan and premiums were stipulated according to the age at which a minister was insured. These premiums, effective in 1792, were calculated according to a mathematical formula de-

vised by Dr. Robert Patterson, vice-provost of the University of Pennsylvania and a mathematician of note. Dr. Patterson succeeded Elias Boudinot as Director of the United States Mint in Philadelphia. Patterson's leadership as an authority on mathematics and in the general area of the physical sciences, was recognized by his election to the Presidency of the American Philosophical Society. The formula used by Patterson to compute his life insurance premiums was based on an assumption of interest at 6 percent and on the expectancy of life at a given age.

In his calculations, Patterson had the benefit of what is generally regarded as the pioneer modern actuarial research of Richard Price, a dissenting English clergyman and a friend of Priestley, the discoverer of oxygen. Price had written several articles for the Royal Society which appeared from time to time in the published "Philosophical Transactions" of the Society.

He summarized his studies in life insurance in his epoch-making book on Reversionary Payments which went through several editions. Price was in correspondence with the American Philosophical Society.

While Patterson's table of premium rates represented an advance on the original rates charged by the American corporation, these original rates also represented a careful study in mortality and the scholarly application of mathematical principles.

The charter for the corporation was secured largely through the efforts of the Honorable William Allen, chief justice of Pennsylvania and a member of the committee appointed by the Presbyterian Synod. Allen was a man of great standing and influence in Pennsylvania and colonial affairs in general. He was on terms of particular social and political intimacy with the Penns.

Associated with him in obtaining the charter were the pastors of the First Presbyterian Church in Philadelphia, the Reverend Robert Cross, and the Reverend Francis Alison. Cross who was growing old, took only a passive part in the effort. The whole plan for the insurance company was evolved by Dr. Alison, his associate. Alison was an educator of considerable fame throughout the colonies. He had founded the New London Academy which later grew into the University of Delaware. In 1759, at the time of the granting of the insurance charter, he was in addition to his duties as copastor of the First Presbyterian Church, vice provost of the College of Philadelphia, and rector of the academy and charitable school connected with the college. This college is now the University of Pennsylvania.

In 1717 the Pennsylvania Synod had established a plan for the relief of the widows of clergymen. This plan was called the fund for pious uses and was administered by a committee appointed by the Synod. The unsatisfactory nature of the plan became soon apparent to Alison when he became a member of the committee. It neither paid guaranteed or fixed benefits, nor were those who hoped to make their families beneficiaries of the fund, compelled to make regular or definite payments toward its support. Payments were urged but were voluntary. Benefits were paid according to the amount of money which happened to be on hand.

Meantime, the Church of Scotland had evolved from a similar experiment a plan of fixed mandatory contributions and fixed benefits. Under the leadership of the Reverend Alexander Webster, a mathematician of unquestionable ability, a study had been made of the age at death over a period of years of the Scotch Presbyterian clergy, and the number of widows and children who survived them. Using these facts as a basis, Webster reached conclusions as to the rates which should be charged and the benefits which could be guaranteed—conclusions which received, at a later date, the enthusiastic commendation of Richard Price, the pioneer actuary. Webster's conclusions were amply justified by a period of 30 years' experience with his rates.

Webster's premium rates and death benefits were adopted almost bodily by Alison in setting up the original plan for the American Life Insurance Corp. Under Alison's plan, a minister could select as his annual rate 2, 3, 4, 5, or 6 pounds Pennsylvania currency. His family would receive an annunity 5 times the amount of his annual premium. The annuity would be paid to the widow as long as she lived but if there were children, part of it would be paid to them for a period not to exceed 13 years after the insured's death. If the widow remarried, her annuity was reduced to one-half. The capital for the corporation was raised by outright gifts secured from friends interested in the project both in America and Great Britain.

The original corporation consisted of 5 clergymen and 7 laymen. In addition to Alison and Cross, the clergy included Gilbert Tennent, a fiery evangelist known throughout the colonies as an associate of George Whitefield, Samuel Finley, later president of the College of New Jersey now Princeton University, and Richard Treat, a famous New Light divine. The list of laymen in addition to Allen was made up of a group of prominent Philadelphia merchants some of whom played important parts in the struggle for American freedom. At a later date, the corporation numbered in its membership such men as Elias Boudinot, president of the Continental Congress at the time of the signing of the treaty with Great Britain, Joseph Reid second president of Pennsylvania, Jared Ingersoll, member of the constitutional convention, Ebenezer Hazard, second Postmaster General of the United States, John Ewing, provost of the University of Pennsylvania and a host of others prominent in the early history of the American Republic.

This first American Life Insurance Co. was designated in the charter granted by the Penns as The Corporation for Relief of Poor and Distressed Presbyterian Ministers and of the Poor and Distressed Widows and Children of Presbyterian Ministers. It is still in business with its name changed to Presbyterian ministers' fund. Originally it was under the control of the church and insured only Presbyterian ministers. It is no longer under church control and has no corporate relation to any church. Its relation is purely one of sentiment and of history. It presently issues insurance to clergymen of all Protestant denominations. As of May 31, 1956, it had assets in excess of $63 million and outstanding insurance in excess of $158 million. Its principal office has always been in Philadelphia. The corporation meets regularly in May of each year. Special meetings were held throughout the year as the need for them arose. Insurance was granted without a medical examination but ministers known to be in bad health were refused admission. For the first year or two all Presbyterian ministers resident within a given area were invited to become contributors. After the lapse of a designated period, only men newly admitted to the ministry were given an opportunity to become policyholders. This automatically limited admission to men about 28 years of age.

The incorporation of the Presbyterian Ministers' Fund was followed by other efforts to establish life-insurance organizations. In 1769, the Church of England set up a corporation similar to that sponsored by the Presbyterians. The advent of the Revolutionary War interfered, however, seriously with its success. After the cessation of hostilities and the reorganizing of the Church of England in America as the Protestant Episcopal Church, the plan was put on a firm foundation. In New England a plan for a society by the Reverend William Gordon, a Massachusetts Congregational clergyman, seemingly came to nothing. A mortality table compiled by the Reverend Edward Wigglesworth and published in the Memoirs of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences indicated a trend toward investigation along actuarial lines and in 1786 bore fruit in a charter for the Massachusetts Charitable Corp. This corporation was intended by its founders as an insurance company for Congregational ministers. It became, instead, a dispenser of charity. In like manner, the Massachusetts Hospital Life Insurance Co. failed to follow its original plan and became in the course of time a mutual fund.

Several other efforts were made in America to establish the business of life insurance but it was not until the decade 1835–45 that the great commercial companies of today began ot make their appearance. In Philadelphia the Insurance Company of North America, incorporated in 1794, discontinued, after a brief experience, the writing of life policies. The Pennsylvania Company for Insurance on Lives and Granting Annuities, incorporated in 1812, wrote its last policy in 1872. It continues in the banking and trust business as the First Pennsylvania Banking & Trust Co. The Girard Life Insurance, Annuity, & Trust Company of Philadelphia incorporated in 1936 and now known as the Girard Trust Corn Exchange Bank, reinsured its life insurance contracts with the Equitable in 1900.

Testimonials to Mr. Max Abelman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDNA F. KELLY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 16, 1956

Mrs. KELLY of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include several testimonials to Brooklyn's ambassador of good will, Mr. Max Abelman. I join my colleagues from Brooklyn who have paid tribute to Mr. Abelman in placing in the RECORD the various honors that have been bestowed on this great humanitarian. Brooklyn is proud of this outstanding citizen whose life is dedicated to helping his fellowman.

The Jewish Hospital of Brooklyn cordially invites you to a reception and tea in honor of Max Abelman who will be presented by the University of Manila with a special diploma of honor for his humanitarian activities. His Excellency General Carlos P. Romulo, Philippine Ambassador to the United States and past president of the United Nations General Assembly will make the presentation on Sunday afternoon, March 4, 1956, at 3 p. m. in the Nurses Residence Hall, 565 Prospect Place, Brooklyn, N. Y.

ISIDOR LEVITON,
President.
MAXIMILIAN MOSS,
Chairman of the Reception Committee.

BROOKLYN COLLEGE LIBRARY,
Brooklyn, N. Y., February 28, 1956.

Mr. MAX ABELMAN,
Brooklyn, N. Y.

DEAR MAX: An unexpected matter has arisen which will make it impossible for me to get to Brooklyn on Sunday afternoon, March 4. I had hoped that I could be present to witness the signal honor that will be conferred upon you. I shall be thinking of you on the occasion and, believe me, I never forget all you did for the library and the good

friends you made for the college while you were president of the Library Associates.

Most cordially.

H. G. BOUSFIELD,
Chief Librarian.

MALACAÑANG, MANILA, *May 15, 1956.*

Mr. MAX ABELMAN,
New York City, United States of America.

DEAR MR. ABELMAN: This is to acknowledge your letter of April 20 and the clippings from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which you enclosed containing the extension of remarks of Congressman EUGENE J. KEOGH. It is heartening to note that the ceremony conferring upon you a special diploma of honor at the instance of President M. V. de los Santos of the University of Manila was successfully held at the Jewish Hospital in Brooklyn in the presence of ranking officials of the Philippine Government. That should be a memorable day for you and I would like to reiterate here may congratulations.

Assuring you of my cordial good wishes, I remain,

Sincerely yours,

R. MAGSAYSAY.

WASHINGTON, D. C., *March 3, 1956.*

MAX ABELMAN,
The Jewish Hospital of Brooklyn,
Brooklyn, N. Y.:

Congratulations and best wishes to you on the occasion of your receiving the University of Manila award in recognition of your humanitarian activities.

RICHARD NIXON.

NEW YORK, N. Y.

MAX ABELMAN,
The Jewish Hospital Nurses Residence Hall:

Congratulations on great and much-deserved honor. Your contribution direct and indirect to countless thousands, not only Filipinos but people of all nationalities, is well known to me. Only illness prevents my attendance at ceremonies. My compliments to General Romulo, also a great friend to humanity.

GEORGE E. ARMSTRONG,
Former Surgeon General, United States Army, currently Director New York University Bellevue Medical.

RUSHVILLE NATIONAL BANK,
Rushville, Ind., March 17, 1956.

Mr. MAX ABELMAN,
Brooklyn, N. Y.

DEAR MAX: I received the invitation to the reception honoring you for your humanitarian activities which was held on March 4, 1956. I wished I could have been present. There is no one else I would have rather honored than you. With best wishes and kindest regards.

Sincerely yours,

PHILIP H. WILLKIE,
President and Attorney.

SUPREME COURT OF THE
STATE OF NEW YORK,
APPELLATE DIVISION SECOND DEPARTMENT,
Brooklyn, N. Y., March 9, 1956.

Mr. MAX ABELMAN,
Brooklyn, N. Y.

DEAR MAX: I regret that I was out of town on the occasion of the presentation of the "Special Diploma of Honor" by General Romulo on Sunday, March 4.

I did not wish the occasion to pass without extending my sincere congratulations to you as the recipient of this distinguished award.

Take care of yourself. Warm regards.

Sincerely,

GEORGE.

NEW YORK, N. Y., *March 6, 1956.*

Hon. MAX ABELMAN.

DEAR MAX: Mrs. Lockwood and I made a trip to Louisville last week and were not at home Sunday, so that we were denied the privilege of attending the presentation to you of the "Special Diploma of Honor" issued by the University of Manila.

This is a distinguished honor, but is well deserved, and we trust you will have many more years in which to continue your work for humanity.

Sincerely yours,

CHARLES.

BROOKLYN, N. Y., *March 4, 1956.*

MAX ABELMAN:

Illness confining me to bed prevents my extending personal congratulations on well deserved signal honor, please extend my personal greetings to General Romulo.

Sincerely,

EMIL BAAR.

BROOKLYN, N. Y.

Hon. MAXIMILIAN MOSS,
Chairman Reception Committee,
Nurses Residence Hall of Jewish Hospital:

Because of a family party this afternoon to celebrate the engagement of my son Jack I cannot attend the reception and tea in honor of our mutual and dear friend, Max Abelman. Please convey to Max my heartiest congratulations at this richly deserved tribute to him.

COUNCILMAN EDWARD VOGEL.

THE AMERICAN SOCIETY
OF ANESTHESIOLOGISTS, INC.,
Chicago, Ill., February 28, 1956.

Mr. MAX ABELMAN,
Brooklyn, N. Y.

DEAR MAX: I regret very much my inability to attend the reception and tea in your honor on March 4, 1956. I shall be in Miami as an examiner for the American Board of Anesthesiology at that time.

The presentation of special diploma of honor to you by His Excellency, Gen. Carlos P. Romulo, is only a small indication of your great value to this community, our State and our country.

Having worked closely with you during your affiliation with the hospital, I am in a position to realize your greatness and your deep humanitarian instinct.

To miss this presentation leaves me with a sense of loss which is difficult to compensate. I know that you will have many more presentations of this kind, and I can assure you that nothing will keep me away.

With best wishes for your future endeavors, I remain,

Sincerely yours,

IRVING M. PALLIN, M. D.,
Secretary to Medical Board.

JEWISH CHRONIC DISEASE HOSPITAL,
Brooklyn, N. Y., March 5, 1956.

Mr. MAX ABELMAN,
Brooklyn, N. Y.

DEAR MAX: I was very happy to be one of the guests yesterday at the presentation that was made to you by the University of Manila, and want you to know how deeply impressed I was in the recognition given to you by His Excellency General Carlos P. Romulo.

I listened with great interest to what he said, and knowing you for the many years I do, and knowing of your wonderful accomplishments, I want to say "Amen" to everything that was said, and wish for you many more years of good health and contentment, so that you may continue the humanitarian activities you have been interested in most of your adult life.

With kindest personal regards,

Sincerely yours,

IKE.

IRVING J. SANDS, M. D., F. A. C. P.,
Brooklyn, N. Y., March 6, 1956.

Mr. MAX ABELMAN,
Brooklyn, N. Y.

DEAR MAX: Cele and I congratulate you on the honor bestowed upon you last Sunday on being given a special diploma of merit by the University of Manila. We were delighted to be present at the happy occasion because we feel that you had deserved all the nice things that were said about you.

It was quite appropriate that the honors were given to you at the Brooklyn Jewish Hospital, for you have done so much in behalf of that institution and for so many people associated with it. I was also delighted to hear you mention the names of the late Mr. Jonas, Dr. Leon Louria, and Dr. William Linder. They certainly were the real builders of the Jewish hospital.

With best wishes for continued success and happiness, I am as ever,

Cordially yours,

IRVING J. SANDS, M. D.

THE CHESHIRE ACADEMY,
Cheshire, Conn., March 3, 1956.

Mr. MAX ABELMAN,
Brooklyn, N. Y.

DEAR MR. ABELMAN: What a pleasure it is to me today to have an invitation from the Jewish Hospital of Brooklyn to be present at a reception and tea in your honor. I note that you will be presented by the University of Manila with a special diploma of honor for your humanitarian activities and that General Romulo will make the presentation. Since I remember so very clearly the work you did in the past in the hospital I am not surprised by this news and I must say that I am highly gratified because of our personal acquaintance. I only wish that I could be present on Sunday. I should like nothing better but unfortunately I cannot make the trip for several reasons, the main one, unfortunately, being that my present state of health militates against any unnecessary exertion. This is a temporary situation only.

May you have great gratification from the presentation which I know you so highly merit. I shall be thinking of you and I am grateful to you for your suggestion to the hospital.

With my cordial regards, I am

Sincerely yours,

ARTHUR SHERIFF.

Brooklyn, N. Y., March 6, 1956.

Mr. MAX ABELMAN,
Brooklyn, N. Y.

DEAR MAX: Upon my return from Miami I found an invitation to a reception and tea given in your honor by the Jewish Hospital of Brooklyn.

I was sorry that I was unable to attend, but at the same time, I was most delighted to read of the honors bestowed upon you, honors that you so richly deserve.

May the Lord bless you with good health so that you may continue to enjoy the affection and esteem of your innumerable friends, among whom I beg to be counted.

Sincerely yours,

RABBI JOSEPH MILLER.

WASHINGTON, D. C., *March 2, 1956.*

MAX ABELMAN,
Care Jewish Hospital,
Brooklyn, N. Y.:

Heartiest congratulations and best wishes upon your latest and well-deserved honor with kindest regards.

ABE MULTER.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., March 1, 1956.

Mr. MAX ABELMAN,
Brooklyn, N. Y.

DEAR MAX: Thank you for sending me notice of the dinner which will be given in your honor by the Jewish Hospital of Brooklyn. I certainly am very happy for you and feel that this is a great distinction of which you should be extremely proud.

I regret that I cannot be physically present to see you presented with this "Special Diploma of Honor," but a commitment of long standing will prevent my doing so.

With heartiest congratulations and every good wish.

Sincerely,

IRWIN D. DAVIDSON,
Member of Congress.

WASHINGTON, D. C., *March 2, 1956.*

MAX ABELMAN,
Care Jewish Hospital,
Brooklyn, N. Y.:

Heartiest congratulations and best wishes upon your latest and well deserved honor. With kindest regards.

ABE MULTER.

JACKSON HEIGHTS, N. Y., *March 4, 1956.*

MAX ABELMAN,
Jewish Hospital Nurses Residence Hall:

Congratulations on your well-deserved award. We from Middlesex salute you.

Dr. and Mrs. GIDDEON DRIMER.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., March 1, 1956.

Mr. MAX ABELMAN,
Brooklyn, N. Y.

DEAR MAX: Because of a previous engagement, I will not be able to join you on Sunday afternoon.

I am very happy to hear of the honor that will be accorded you, and Stella and I extend our best greetings.

With kindest personal regards, I am,

Sincerely yours,

EMANUEL CELLER.

Peaceful Settlement of Labor-Management Contracts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS M. PELLY
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 11, 1956

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, the steel industry strike is bringing economic distress into the homes of thousands and thousands of American workers. Everyone including the public will lose by this tragic lack of ability of management and labor to reach an agreement. Public opinion is an important factor in achieving a fair adjustment of wages affecting the lives of so many human beings. But in this case, newspapers and other means of getting the facts to the public unfortunately have failed to prevent a stalemate.

Recently, two Seattle newspapers editorially called attention to the importance of the peaceful settlement of negotiations between the management and employees of the Boeing Airplane Co. The article from the International Association of Machinists weekly paper acknowledging these Seattle editorials is worthy of being reprinted so I include it hereinafter:

THANKS

This is to thank both big daily newspapers in Seattle, Wash., for the fine recognition they have given editorially to the settlement between IAM District 751 and the Boeing Airplane Co.

Both newspapers published editorials congratulating both the IAM members and the management at Boeing for their recent agreement bringing $8 million in new benefits to 22,000 employees over the next 2 years.

Said the Seattle Times:

"There's a solid, reinforced 'floor' to support the economy of Seattle and its surrounding area for the next 2 years. It rests securely on the new contract between the Boeing Airplane Co. and IAM District 751."

Said the Seattle Post-Intelligencer:

"The people of Seattle may well rejoice in the new contract between IAM District 751 and the Boeing Airplane Co., thus assuring for another 2 years the harmonious relations between workers and management in this vital Seattle industry. The Post-Intelligencer congratulates both the union and the company in arriving at an equitable agreement in a spirit of good will and fair bargaining." We could wish that the newspapers in Los Angeles, San Diego, Fort Worth, Atlanta, St. Louis, Hartford, and Newark had said a good word editorially on the recent successes of IAM aircraft negotiations in their communities. All of them, you can bet published full stories of our only aircraft strike this year, at Republic Aviation.

In their eagerness to print only the sensational news of strikes and trouble, the newspapers are—knowingly or unknowingly—responsible for some of the trouble between labor and management in this country. Their headlines are certainly responsible for exaggerating the trouble in the minds of both management and union members as well as the public. Actually, of course, almost 99 out of every 100 union-management agreements are signed without any interruption of work.

Sometimes, it seems almost as though some newspapers regret the headlines they lose through peaceful settlements. If their editors look on peaceful settlements as real achievements benefiting the entire community, they haven't bothered to say so in their editorial columns.

We can only hope that the editorial courage of the Seattle Times and the Seattle Post-Intelligencer in breaking the old pattern will inspire other editors.

The Quiz of John Cogley

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, July 16, 1956

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, an editorial entitled "Cogley Quiz," published in the New York Times of July 13, 1956.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COGLEY QUIZ

If the House Committee on Un-American Activities were really interested in examining all un-American activities it might long ago have used its great powers as an investigative arm of Congress to look into the thoroughly un-American area of blacklisting in the entertainment industry. Instead, it left that thankless job to the Fund for the Republic, but it has now suddenly raised its hackles because it didn't like what the fund's independent inquiry produced.

Exactly 3 days after the fund had made public its two-volume report on blacklisting, the House committee preemptorily subpenaed—did not invite—John Cogley, director of the study, to appear before it in Washington. The intention, according to Chairman FRANCIS E. WALTER, was to determine among other things "what the purposes of the fund and of Mr. Cogley truly are." Mr. WALTER'S strict objectivity may be considered against the background of his earlier query in announcing a forthcoming investigation of the fund itself: "Is this foundation * * * a friend or a foe in our Nation's death struggle against the Communist conspiracy?" Paul G. Hoffman, President George N. Shuster of Hunter College, Chester Bowles, Dean Erwin N. Griswold of the Harvard Law School and other noted Americans on the fund's board of directors must have deeply appreciated that comment by the Democratic statesman from Pennsylvania.

Be that as it may, the context and tone of questions put by the committee counsel to Mr. Cogley on the subject of his blacklisting report raise the strongest suspicions that here was an obvious effort to harass a writer for what he had written. Mr. Cogley himself is former executive editor of the highly respected liberal Roman Catholic weekly, the Commonweal, and he is capable of defending his own works. But we are concerned over any and every effort, no matter how it may be disguised, to intimidate a man for writing what he believes; and when a committee of the House of Representatives skates perilously close to doing that, we think it comes equally close to violating the first amendment.

Amateur Athletes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRED SCHWENGEL
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 16, 1956

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, because I was a former athlete and coach, I have a great interest in the problems that amateur athletes face, and because I feel that the amateur athlete is not wholly at fault for some of the charges that have been made, I ask permission to extend the following remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and commend it to the study of my colleagues:

In response to the continued nationwide reaction to the suspension of Wes Santee, the National Amateur Athletic Union announced on March 24, 1956, that it planned further investigations of abuses of the amateur code. An AAU committee will start interviewing various sports leaders in the near future. Pincus Sober, member of the committee said:

To get a good cross section of opinion, we (the committee) intend to consult with meet directors, college athletic officials, athletes and newspapermen. The committee's report will be presented at the November annual meeting.

But in the midst of the Wes Santee controversy, a pertinent question was brought forward: "What about the promoters who offered checks to the boy—Wes Santee?" asked Phog Allen. "What do they get, a reprimand?" Johnny Fulton, a champion of 1946, expressed the same idea when he told a Life reporter:

I don't condone any athlete's going to meet a promoter and saying he won't run unless he's paid. But any meet official or promoter who pays him is even more guilty.

The guilty persons, more often than not remaining nameless, have paid

amateurs and have gone unpunished before this latest suspension was invoked against Santee. Two other well remembered situations and consequent losses of amateur ratings occurred in the careers of Jim Thorpe and Paavo Nurmi. Jim Thorpe, an all-round athlete, lost his amateur standing for playing bush league baseball during two summers. Although he was paid only $25 each week, it cost him his amateur rating. Finland's great miler Paavo Nurmi was also suspended for accepting money. Nurmi was certified as an entrant into the Olympics and made the trip to Los Angeles in 1932. But the counsel of the International Amateur Athletic Federation received evidence from Germany that money had been paid to Nurmi and ruled him ineligible to compete. Santee, Thorpe, and Nurmi will long be remembered as being guilty of dishonesty and cheating while those who offered them the way of guilt go on untainted personally and professionally.

An amateur's acceptance of money is not unusual. Many critics of the AAU's decree against Santee have declared that "he only did what many other amateur athletes have done before him, and his worst sin was getting caught." An amateur's acceptance of money has become an almost standard practice simply because he cannot afford to do otherwise. It is a full-time job being a competing amateur. However, the AAU still affirms its belief in the lofty ideal that an amateur is an athlete "who engages in a sport solely for the pleasure and physical, mental or social benefits he derives therefrom and to whom a sport is nothing more than an avocation." Joe Nowicki, a former collegiate track star and later an AAU official made the following statement to writer Jack Newcombe:

> It was the practice (while competing) to talk with other runners and find out what they were getting. If the man you were beating got more than you did, you asked for more the next time. When the Santee case broke, I thought it was unfair to start enforcing rules that have been waived for years. I know AAU officials who, when they were competing, took just as much as Santee did.

With such circumstances being a part of amateur athletics, it is difficult to say that the athlete alone should be branded guilty. Care should be taken that the punishment should not exceed the guilt, and the agency brandishing the punishment be completely blameless.

Although a few have suffered extreme penalties, many amateur athletes have accepted money and have come through unscathed. Life recently featured an article entitled "Athletes Tell How Illicit Payoffs Destroy the Amateur Code." Very candidly, former amateur athletes told how like Santee, Thorpe and Nurmi, they, too, accepted money. Elmore Harris, famous on the track between 1945 and 1947, was always paid, because he never ran unless the promoter met his price. Yet he nor the promoter were punished. In another instance, Johnny Fulton, the national 800-meter champion of 1946, was given an all-expense trip to Canada to encourage him to appear in one more meet of the season. This trip was financed by the AAU itself. Fulton once planned to take a job to earn $600 for his next semester at college, but on the condition that he run in their meet, Madison Square Garden promoters supplied Fulton with the money without his having to work. Another national magazine related an incident regarding the paying of amateur athletes: "This stuff's been going on for years," laughed a baseball man in New York. "We had a miler run an exhibition race once. He was in town for a big meet, and all he had to do was take a subway to our ball park. The fare was a nickel then. He made us pay him $750 for his 'expenses.'" Frank Sedgman, Australian tennis star, was offered $89,200 to turn professional. He turned down the offer. Meanwhile, Australian newspapers began a campaign for a cash wedding gift for the future Mrs. Sedgman. In 1952, this collection, a wedding present of $12,000, was given to the newly married couple, and Sedgman was able, financially, to remain an amateur. Russell Kingman, speaking for the United States Lawn Tennis Association, said if Sedgman were a United States player, the gift would have meant the loss of his amateur rating. Bryan Fuller, Australian official, replied:

> Amateurs must live. If they are not paid wages by sports-goods manufacturers, they must be paid by someone else.

Is it any more guilty to receive compensations than it is to give them?

Why does the issue of paying the amateur create controversy? Why do amateurs accept money, and why is it offered to them? There are many causes for cheating in amateurism. Most of the reasons, or excuses, offered by critics and amateurs reverberate to the AAU. Many critics of today's amateur athletic programs say that the AAU has taken action only on flagrant cases that could not possibly be overlooked, but little has been done to alleviate the cause of the cheating. The cause, as seen by the critics, is the meager $15 per day expense account. Under the current AAU rules an amateur can accept only $15 per day for expenses and a transportation allotment; their prize can be valued at no more than $35. Charles P. Grimes, representing Santee, contended that the AAU rule limiting athletes to the $15 daily over transportation was dead-letter stuff. He went on to say that he could prove these rules were waived by AAU officials on numerous occasions. While many are guilty of violating the rules, the guilt is not wholly the amateur athletes'. Yet theirs are the only names brought to the foreground of the news. The nameless promoters remain in obscurity.

Often, the equally or actual guilty person slips through the maze of redtape and intricacies of amateur sports controls. There is no single control agency governing all amateur sports. The Amateur Athletic Union claims jurisdiction over 19 sporting events. Other events are supervised by the National Collegiate Athletic Association, and some are controlled by still other organizations. On occasion, however, the usually unpunished persons involved in a sports scandal do receive their share of the penalties. The Pacific Coast Conference met recently at Vancouver, British Columbia, and dealt with amateur violations in the field of college sports. All of last year's University of California at Los Angeles' football players, freshmen and sophomores alike, lost a year of eligibility unless they can prove that they have not accepted "money under the table." However, the PCC did not stop with chastising the players, but the school, too, received a share of the punishment. UCLA was put on 3 years' probation, forbidden to take part in NCAA championships, deprived of Rose Bowl receipts, and Chancelor Raymond B. Allen caused the school to receive an additional $15,000 fine for his refusal to cooperate. The Universities of Southern California, Idaho, Oregon, Oregon State, and Stanford were also fined. The guilty, in this particular case, did not go entirely free but received their just share of the penalties.

In other cases punishments have been meted out to those who have deserved them. Bradley University, University of Kentucky, and Drake University are remembered as examples of the basketball scandals of the early 1950's. Gene Melchiorre, an ex-Bradley University basketball star, and six alleged gamblers were indicted in Peoria, Ill., September 14, 1951, on game-fixing charges. On September 25, 1951, New York District Attorney Frank S. Hogan revealed that 8 Bradley University and 3 Toledo University basketball stars were involved in 5 basketball fixes in New York City. Arrested as the fixers were Anthony Englisis and his brother Nicholas, both of whom were employed by the master gambler, Eli Klufofsky. Judge Saul S. Streit, of New York, on December 7, 1951, suspended the sentences and freed three ex-Bradley University players who pleaded guilty to game fixing. They were granted leniency because they helped identify the gamblers involved in the gambling ring. However, Judge Streit went on to point an accusing finger toward President David Blair Owen of Bradley University for overemphasizing basketball at his school.

Again, on April 29, 1952, Judge Streit suspended sentence on three ex-University of Kentucky basketball stars in a "fix" case. But he denounced their college as "the acme of commercialism and overemphasis" and their former coach Adolph Rupp, for having associated with Ed Kurd. As a result of the scandals, the University of Kentucky canceled its 1952–53 basketball schedule in accordance with the NCAA council's recommendation that Kentucky be put on probation for all sports in 1952–53 for violating NCAA rules. The council also rules that Bradley would be ineligible for 1953 NCAA basketball tourneys. The attempted bribery case at Drake University was perhaps the most noteworthy because of the Iowa law dealing with athletic briberies. This act was sponsored in the 1953 legislature by State Representatives Riggenberg, Burrows, Robinson, Weiss and Schwengel. Under the Iowa law, attempting to influence an athletic contest by bribing carries a possible penalty of up to $10,000 fine and as much as 10 years in the penitentiary. Floren DiPaglia, a Des Moines businessman, was the first per-

son to be tried and convicted under the new law. Ben Bumbry, Drake's leading scorer, was approached by DiPaglia in December 1953. Bumbry reported the incident to officials who indicted, tried and convicted DiPaglia of attempted bribery. DiPaglia was sentenced on April 19, 1954, to 10 years in a State reformatory.

It is not justice when the equally guilty, the promoters and others who pay the athletes, go unpunished. It is not justice when they are punished only infrequently and inconsistently. Public criticism has grown so loud that AAU officials have been busy defending themselves. "We will get around to those promoters" Pincus Sober promised. "There are some complications, though. The situation will have to wait until next winter." If such offenses remain permissible, it will encourage many others; however, one day will, if an effort is put forth, bring about the punishment which many days demand.

East and West Woo Neutral Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH HARVEY
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 16, 1956

Mr. HARVEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an editorial from a recent issue of the Courier-Times, of New Castle, Ind.

This excellent editorial by the editor, Scott Chambers, came as the result of his participation recently in the Indiana University Conference on Problems of American Foreign Policy.

The editorial follows:

EAST AND WEST WOO NEUTRAL NATIONS—IT BECOMES INCREASINGLY CLEAR THEY WILL CAST THE DECIDING VOTE FOR A COMMUNIST WORLD OR A FREE WORLD

As the military contest betwen the East and the West goes into an atomic stalemate and the struggle for survival between communism and freedom enters other fields, it becomes increasingly clear that victory will go to that side which wins the uncommitted world.

These nations which still have not chosen between communism and freedom are the neutrals, mostly new nations that formerly were the colonies of European powers; most of them located in Asia or Africa.

In a sense the Communist world, under the leadership of Russia, and the free world, under the leadership of the United States, are in a competition of courtship for the hand of these countries. Each side is wooing these neutral countries, and hoping to get the nod. We are greatly irked when one of these neutral countries tries to play one rival suitor off against the other, but that has been done before.

Whether we're selling merchandise or selling ourselves, it's always a good idea to get the customer's point of view.

The people in these countries have lived—some of them for centuries—as the subjects of colonies governed by some distant, impersonal power. They've been fought over and exploited in some cases, and have died young—thousands from starvation.

In short, they've been kicked around, and now they want to be treated like human beings; to eat at the first table. They want to be loved.

That's the customer—the girl we're wooing.

THE FLASHY YOUNG BUCK WHO'S NEW IN TOWN

How about our rival?

Russia is very much like a flashy young buck who's new in town. He has no record of spats in colonial days to live down. His line consists of a lot of lovey-dovey comrade stuff and telling the gal that we're trying to marry her for her money. There are no limits to what this boy, Russia, will promise, regardless of his intention or ability to deliver. He is always ready to go us one better. If we will build the dam in Egypt for 4 percent interest, he will build it for 2 percent. There are no strings on aid money—"Why, I trust you." (The strings come later.)

Such a guy has his attractions, and it's well to see how we stack up.

WE DO THE DANGDEST THINGS TO WOO A GIRL

How do we woo these countries who are going to cast the deciding vote on whether this is to be a Communist or a free world?

1. We might as well admit that we have one strike against us before we start. Rightly or not, these new countries blame their adversity on the European powers that owned and governed them for years. As an ally of these powers, we suffer a certain guilt by association. Our record in the Philippines, our only colonial experience, is as clean as a hound's tooth however, and we ought to tell that story often.

2. There are some little things we do that put us in a bad light. Our immigration policy seems to say, "Keep out. We're made of some sort of superior stuff, and don't want to be contaminated." Then there's the business of fingerprinting visitors to this country; decent people don't like to have their integrity questioned without cause. From time to time we make other mistakes. There's the Klan, and our lunatic uncle in Chicago who is still fighting George III. The heat of our campaigns brings on loose talk that sometimes gives the wrong impression abroad.

3. What is our record on aid to these countries? Senator GEORGE said recently:

"We talk of equality and the independence of nations and of economic opportunity, but we are niggardly in helping so-called neutral nations unless they accept the ties of our apron strings."

What stupid ass, attempting to woo a girl, would begin by talking about her obligations under the marriage contract?

4. We have not escaped the responsibility for the racial prejudice which the whole world knows to exist in America. This is important, because nearly all of these people who are choosing between freedom and communism are either black, brown, or yellow. The Supreme Court decision regarding segregation has been a godsend in helping us to allay the fears of an American attitude that is not good and a reputation that is worse.

5. If we seek the great desire of these peoples, as a suitor studies the heart's desire of his intended, we come inevitably to the fact that they want a higher standard of living. They want to eat like we do, drive some of our cars, and have refrigerators in which to keep their food. They want better medical care, hospitals, and a clean water supply. They want an opportunity to educate their children.

To do these things they need to trade either with us or with Russia. Russia is actively seeking their trade, but we are paralyzed by an evil, stupid tariff that limits our markets and closes opportunity to ourselves and others alike.

WE NEED TO DARE TO BELIEVE IN THE IDEALS WE PROFESS

To win the hand of these uncommitted peoples, we need above everything else a change in our attitudes—both official and unofficial.

We must get over any notions of superiority. They are both false and self-defeating.

We must get over doing the right thing in the wrong way. A friend who held Federal appointment once said to us: "I was hired by Herbert Hoover and fired by Franklin Roosevelt. When Mr. Hoover hired me you would have thought he was firing me, and when Mr. Roosevelt fired me you would have thought he was hiring me."

We must get wise to the fact that the surest way to lose our prosperity is to hoard it. That is both bad business and bad morals. We need a prosperous world in which to sell, and from which to secure our needs.

Lastly, we need to be honest with ourselves. We need to dare to believe in the ideals we profess:

And he answered, "You shall love the Lord your God with all your heart, and with all your soul, and with all your strength, and your neighbor as yourself."

But he said to Jesus, "And who is my neighbor?"

Jesus replied: "A man was going down to Jericho, and fell among robbers * * * who left him half dead. Now a priest * * * passed by on one side, and a Levite * * * passed by on the other, but a Samaritan * * * saw him and had compassion * * * bound his wounds * * * and brought him to an inn, and took care of him."

Is it barely possible that the ultimate weapon in the battle for freedom and the dignity of man is not the intercontinental missile—but love?

Niagara Power

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD C. OSTERTAG
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 16, 1956

Mr. OSTERTAG. Mr. Speaker, the struggle to cram an unwanted public power project down the throats of western New Yorkers bids fair to reach a climax in these dying days of the 84th Congress. In the fact of overwhelming opposition to such a step, the public power advocates are set to steamroller the Lehman-Buckley bill through this House, giving the State of New York the right to redevelop power at Niagara Falls.

Mr. Speaker, the people who will be served by Niagara power do not want public development of this resource. They do not want Federal development, and they do not want State development. They have put the mathematics to the phony claim that public power is cheap power, and they are not deluded. It is merely power that is subsidized by the taxpayers at large for the benefit of selected users.

Last winter, Mr. Speaker, I canvassed the people of my district for their views on this issue, asking them if they preferred to see Niagara power redeveloped by the Federal Government, the State government, or private enterprise. Almost 76 percent said they wanted to see private enterprise do the job.

These views are strongly underscored in the mail that has poured into my office in the last 48 hours, as the threat of public redevelopment has reached major proportions.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include in the RECORD a sample of this correspondence:

ROCHESTER, N. Y., *July 11, 1956.*

CONGRESSMAN OSTERTAG: Please do what you can to prevent the Lehman-Buckley bill from passing. The private enterprise bill should be approved.

Thanking you.

Mrs. M. C. BENJAMIN.

ROCHESTER, N. Y., *July 11, 1956.*

Congressman HAROLD C. OSTERTAG,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN OSTERTAG: Will you kindly vote against the Buckley-Lehman bill and for Miller-Dondero bill. Thanking you for this favor.

Mrs. ROSE M. CRAGE.

JULY 11, 1956.

Congressman HAROLD C. OSTERTAG,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN OSTERTAG: I am opposed to the Buckley-Lehman bill, and I am asking you to vote against this bill.

I am in favor of the Miller-Dondero bill, and trust you will vote accordingly. Thank you.

MARGARET R. SMITH.

ROCHESTER, N. Y.

To: Congressman OSTERTAG.

From: Mr. and Mrs. L. H. DeKing, Rochester, N. Y.

We hope that you will vote "No" on the Buckley Niagara power bill. Government must be kept out of any further private business. If approved, the bill would be like a permanent millstone around the neck of the taxpayer.

SPENCERPORT, N. Y., *July 11, 1956.*

HAROLD C. OSTERTAG,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: We are in agreement with our private enterprise system, therefore we are for the approval of the free enterprise bill sponsored by Congressmen MILLER and DONDERO.

Very truly yours,

EDWARD S. DREXLER.
MABEL B. DREXLER.

JULY 11.

DEAR MR. OSTERTAG: I am emphatically against the Buckley-Lehman bill now before Congress and hope you will vote against it.

Respectfully,

ALICE F. STEWART (Mrs. D. A.).

ROCHESTER, N. Y.

A. L. SWETT IRON WORKS,
Medina, N. Y., July 11, 1956.

Congressman HAROLD C. OSTERTAG,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: We are violently opposed to the Lehman-Buckley power bill for Government control of Niagara power.

We have dealt with the Niagara-Mohawk Power Co. and their predecessors for over 50 years. They have always given good service at reasonable rates and have helped us in every way possible.

God help us if we ever are obliged to deal with a Government-operated power company.

Yours very truly,

A. L. SWETT IRON WORKS,
R. F. SWETT, *President.*

ROCHESTER, N. Y., *July 10, 1956.*

Hon. HAROLD C. OSTERTAG,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: On the radio last Sunday, Fred A. Seaton said the Niagara question is one for the people in the area to solve. President Eisenhower said precisely the same thing. I would like to know how I, as a resident of that area, can help to do this. I strongly oppose the Lehman bill and so does everyone I have talked to who has studied the issue. In addition I think the personal income taxes of New York State, even now unreasonably high, will reach catastrophic heights once the electric industry in our State is placed in the hands of a "mythical" organization known as the New York State Power Authority.

Sincerely,

EDWARD J. MASON.

ROCHESTER, N. Y., *July 11, 1956.*

Congressman HAROLD C. OSTERTAG,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Of the several bills now before you dealing with the Niagara power development, I feel that any giving the Federal Government or the State the right to build should be defeated. This is not a field for either to be involved in. If the State of New York is so interested in our welfare so that they feel they must give us cheap (?) power, let them have the residents of this State decide for themselves if they want it. Apparently they are somewhat afraid if they do their dreams of a new and powerful political plum will be defeated.

I request you vote "no" to all public-power bills and "yes" to private development.

Very truly yours,

GEORGE M. LYND, Jr.

ROCHESTER, N. Y., *July 11, 1956.*

Hon. HAROLD C. OSTERTAG,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I am firmly opposed to the Federal Government taking over development of the Niagara power in this State and therefore am asking you to vote against the Lehman-Buckley bill, and for the private-enterprise bill sponsored by Congressmen MILLER and DONDERO.

Yours respectfully,

R. WALTER DEVERELL.

ROCHESTER, N. Y., *July 11, 1956.*

Representative HAROLD C. OSTERTAG,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I am writing to respectfully request you to vote against the Lehman-Buckley bill and instead support the private enterprise bill sponsored by Congressmen MILLER and DONDERO.

I am opposed to Government competing with private enterprise.

Wishing you success and thanking you for your efforts, I am

Very truly yours,

ALONZO B. WING.
GENEVIEVE A. WING.

ROCHESTER, N. Y., *July 11, 1956.*

The Honorable HAROLD C. OSTERTAG,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I am writing you on the matter of the Niagara power bill now before Congress. I am bitterly opposed to any further Government dabbling in the citizen's business no matter how noble the motivation might be. On the other hand, I am not in favor of the citizen going hogwild for his own selfish purpose. But here is an undertaking where Government is sticking its big nose right into the citizen's area. This citizen who wishes to undertake the job is already closely restricted and regulated and he only should do the job. And I fail to see what the recent disaster at the falls has to do with it except to make the job more urgent.

I am disturbed about the personal motives of the sponsor of the bill reported out of committee. Votes yes but what else? These Government projects, such as the one proposed, are financed by tax-free securities and due to their magnitude the taxes so represented run into large sums which of course must be paid by the rest of us so the few that get the gravy reap huge unearned rewards. These securities are risk free. They are equivalent to 10 to 15 percent return on taxable industrials. They are issued in large denominations obviously to make them attractive to the favored few. Where do Lehman Bros. and the Harriman interests fit into this picture? Why can't I buy tax-free securities in the denominations I can handle? Why should I pay 20 percent of the electric bills in Tennessee and other parts of the country such for instance the State of Nebraska?

If these so-called saving the natural resources of the country are to continue then the taxes should be exactly the same to those people as to the others. It is my belief that if the Government projects and I mean all Government, not just Federal or State, had to be financed by taxable bonds and other taxes were paid as they are by the stockholder-owned utilities, there would be no Government projects at all.

I understand Mr. Moses could not borrow the money for the St. Lawrence project as and when he nedeed it but had to take the full amount at once—a matter of 50 million in interest, tax free before a wheel turns—and who pays that bill besides me?

The bill covering the Niagara job regardless of who does it should carry provisions for the same 21-percent total tax now paid by Niagara-Mohawk and the securities should be no more tax free than those of the stockholder-owned companies of this or any other State.

We need power in our State and all I am asking is a bill which puts the cost burdens on the people who benefit and this very definitely includes the financing.

Very truly yours,

HARVEY J. KLUMB.

JULY 10, 1956.

Mr. OSTERTAG: After careful study, I feel very strongly that the private enterprise bill sponsored by Congressmen MILLER and DONDERO should be approved.

I believe that the Lehman-Buckley bill should be opposed.

Sincerely yours,

Mrs. EDWARD R. SHAW.

ROCHESTER, N. Y., *July 11, 1956.*

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: Many of my neighbors and friends in the 39th District agree with me that the Lehman-Buckley bill should be opposed. The development of Niagara should be carried out by private enterprise.

I strongly feel that we will better the interests of the people of New York State by approving the private enterprise bill sponsored by Congressmen MILLER and DONDERO.

Respectfully,

IRVING A. PEERS.

THE FIXIT SHOP,
Rochester, N. Y., July 11.

Mr. HAROLD C. OSTERTAG.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: Our Ike has voiced his opinion on "Get Government out of business" many times. What people of what country do LEHMAN and BUCKLEY represent?

I believe that you, Ken and the other honest representatives who play on Ike's team wearing the American uniform can pull the props out from under the L–B bill if you work together.

We, the working and voting people can't match the dough that is backing L–B. But we offer our support and confidence in you men. That can't be bought.

Past experience has proven that you and KEN have what it takes. Won't you please come through again and kill this un-American bill?

Thanking you for past considerations.

Respectfully,

FRED F. WARD.

ASSOCIATED INDUSTRIES
OF NEW YORK STATE, INC.
Albany, N. Y., July 10, 1956.

Hon. HAROLD C. OSTERTAG,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR HAROLD: If the Buckley-Lehman bill for power development of Niagara by the State reaches the floor for vote in its present form, we urge your help in defeating this measure which will be so disastrous for private enterprise in our State.

It has been clearly demonstrated time after time that this measure is not in the public interest and is primarily favored by those in political life who wish to see the Government get ever greater control over the economy of the country.

We sincerely hope that the action of the House will be against the creation of additional tax-avoiding privileges and will support the principle of equality in taxation and equality in opportunity.

Sincerely,

JOSEPH R. SHAW,
President.

NEW YORK STATE CONFERENCE
BOARD OF FARM ORGANIZATIONS,
Ithaca, N. Y., July 10, 1956.

To All New York Members in Congress.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVES: The New York State Conference Board of Farm Organizations is thoroughly convinced that Niagara power should be developed by private enterprise in contrast with development by Government, either by the New York Power Authority or otherwise.

Sincerely yours,

E. S. FOSTER, *Secretary.*

ROCHESTER, N. Y., *July 11, 1956.*

Representative HAROLD C. OSTERTAG,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. OSTERTAG: I urge you to support the Buckley-Lehman bill, providing for State construction and operation of the Niagara River project.

Respectfully yours,

FRANCIS G. WARWIN.

ROCHESTER, N. Y., *July 11, 1956.*

HAROLD C. OSTERTAG,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Your vote expected to be cast favor private development and operation Niagara Power issue. Please also do all in your power to prevent development and operation of public plan. Issue kicked around for years. Government not set up for business, only regulate. Get out and keep out business.

Mr. and Mrs. B. S. RAPLEE.

ROCHESTER, N. Y., *July 11, 1956.*

Hon. HAROLD C. OSTERTAG,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I do not recall what your position is on the Lehman-Buckley bill but I wish to go on record as asking you to vote against it as I believe the Niagara power should be developed by private enterprise as there are several concerns equipped and willing to do it.

I don't think that the Federal Government should get into any more power developments than necessary. It is all right in the wilderness where there is nothing to start from but here in New York State it is not necessary for them to take over. Therefore I am asking you to vote for the bill sponsored by Congressmen MILLER and DONDERO.

Yours respectfully,

Miss BLANCHE M. KELLEY,
ROCHESTER, N. Y.

The Honorable HAROLD C. OSTERTAG,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. OSTERTAG: I wish to take this opportunity to express my opposition to the Lehman-Buckley bill for State construction of the Niagara River project.

I see no point in the Government operating a business where private enterprise is willing and able to do so.

Sincerely yours,

Mrs. MARGERY LEACH.

JULY 10, 1956.

DEAR SIR: I should like to urge you to aid in getting our Government out of private business by voting against public power development at Niagara Falls. The alternate bill permitting private power at Niagara Falls should be passed with haste.

Sincerely,

F. C. KIESLING.

ROCHESTER, N. Y.

JULY 11, 1956.

Representative HAROLD C. OSTERTAG,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: To uphold the American tradition of private enterprise, I would urge that you vote against the Lehman-Buckley bill.

The Government has no place in business, particularly when private enterprise is ready, able, and willing to do the job.

Please do not let this bill be rushed through before Congress adjourns since there is not time for adequate study.

Sincerely,

JEAN DIMOND,
Department of Medicine, Strong Memorial Hospital.
ROCHESTER, N. Y.

EMPIRE STATE CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,
Albany, N. Y., July 11, 1956.

Hon. HAROLD C. OSTERTAG,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN OSTERTAG: Efforts are being made to impress Members of Congress that the people of New York are willing to accept the principle of public ownership of power-generating facilities as provided in the Lehman-Buckley bill (H. R. 11477).

Nothing is less true than this. The organizations that truly represent the views of the residents of New York have signed a joint letter which was prepared and sent to Senator CHAVEZ and his committee associates when the Lehman bill was before the Senate Committee on Public Works. A reproduction of that joint letter is enclosed. More than 200 agricultural, business, civic, labor, and political organizations are on record as opposing public construction and operation of the power-generating facilities at Niagara Falls.

If the Lehman-Buckley bill is enacted, it will be the first time in American history that Congress has authorized public ownership of power-generating facilities without collateral flood control, navigation, irrigation, or other similar and necessary public purposes. I hope that you will not abandon this longtime concept of public power as a byproduct rather than the primary function of a governmental agency.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM A. MILLS,
Executive Vice President.

DEAR SIR: Kindly add my "No" to those who oppose Public Power for Niagara. I do not believe that it would be in the best interest of the citizens of the State of New York.

BRUCE A. YOST.

ROCHESTER, N. Y.

ROCHESTER, N. Y.

DEAR SIR: I am writing that I am directly opposed to this Lehman-Buckley bill and very much in favor of the private enterprise bill sponsored by Congressmen MILLER and DONDERO. Hoping this will receive your attention, I am

Yours truly,

ALFRED H. BEST.

ROCHESTER, N. Y.
July 11, 1956.

The Honorable HAROLD C. OSTERTAG,
House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. OSTERTAG: I should like to urge your opposition to the Buckley bill concerning the electric power system proposed for the New York area. In its place I feel that the private-enterprise bill sponsored by Congressmen DONDERO and MILLER should be approved.

Since there is basically no power shortage in the area, and no flood-control or navigational aspects to justify Federal intervention or control, I can see no valid reason why the taxpayers in general should be forced to pay part of the electric bill of a select group. Can we anticipate your vote against the Buckley bill and your support of the Miller-Dondero bill?

Sincerely,

GEORGE M. HOERNER, Jr.

JUNE 24, 1956.

HAROLD C. OSTERTAG,
House Office Building, Washington, D. C.:

The New York State Federation of Labor representing 1,300,000 members of organized labor in the State of New York reaffirm its position in favor of the development of Niagara River power potential by utilities companies of our State.

We respectfully request the House Public Works Committee to favorably report out Dondero-Miller bill and against the Buckley bill.

NEW YORK STATE FEDERATION OF LABOR.
HAROLD C. HANOVER, *Secretary-Treasurer.*

H. R. 6626, a Bill To Provide for a Federal Lottery

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL A. FINO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 16, 1956

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, as the Members of this House well know, for the past 4 years I have repeatedly urged this Congress and the previous Congress to adopt my bill, H. R. 6626, to provide for a Federal lottery. I have tried to convince this House of the great need and importance of this type of legislation.

I have said it before and I'll say it again: A national lottery will accomplish the following:

First. It will bring into the United States Treasury an estimated $10 billion.

Second. It will mean a tax cut for every taxpayer in this country.

Third. It will reduce our national debt.

Fourth. It will give us a balanced budget.

Fifth. It will eliminate the professional gambler who currently reaps the benefits and returns little to the Government in taxes.

Sixth. It will banish hypocrisy and channel people's gaming instincts into a legal path.

In my fight to convince the Members of Congress that a tremendous revenue is within our grasp but for hypocrisy, I am happy to have had the support of America's largest and greater newspaper, the New York Times.

An editorial appears in the July 15 issue of the New York Sunday News which further substantiates my contention, that a national lottery will help solve and lift the heavy tax burden from the shoulders of the American people. I urge each Member to read this editorial which follows and then sign my discharge petition which is on the Speaker's desk:

ROUND AND ROUND SHE GOES; OR, THE WHEEL OF FORTUNE

To Americans increasingly worried about the income tax (remember Sydney Mirkin's illuminating and infuriating news articles on the subject these last few days?) the proceedings of the recent Lottery Congress at Zurich, Switzerland, should be of considerable interest.

Assembled at this 2-day get-together to discuss their achievements and problems were the managers of 20-some government lotteries from most of the countries of Western Europe.

From a recent Wall Street Journal feature article, we borrow some of the more appetizing facts of life in countries where lotteries are legal and governments harvest fat and painless revenues from them.

The Spanish National Lottery is the most generous of all those in Europe. A $50 ticket gets you a chance on a grand prize of $375,000. In the Christmas lottery, tickets run up to $400 apiece, and the grand prize is $3,000,000. Smaller gamblers aren't neglected, by any means.

From this 63-year-old enterprise, Generalissimo Francisco Franco's government makes about $20,000,000 a year—a huge sum in not-so-rich Spain.

There are many other examples of what goes on in countries which tie the gambling instinct of most human beings to the need for revenue.

Italy's Ente Nazionale Lotterie, and various other government-sponsored gambling games, bring in around $60,000,000 a year for the Government, and a horde of prizes, large and small, to lucky ticket holders.

The Swedish Money Lottery Co. (previously mentioned in this space) was founded as a private concern in 1897, and taken over by the Government in 1939. Its manager, Harold Rooth, has recently hiked ticket prices from $2.60 to $3 and doubled the grand prize, to $40,000.

Business is looking up—so much so that the Swedish treasury this year expects substantially more lottery money than the $23 million it collected in 1955. Sweden's Government football pool and Government-controlled horse betting this year will most likely kick in another $30 million.

PLEASURE FOR PEOPLE; MONEY FOR GOVERNMENT

The French Loterie Nationale ($114,000 top prize; 400,000 tickets sold a week) should contribute $43 million this year, as against $37 million last, to the hard-pressed French treasury.

So it goes, with equally encouraging reports on the prosperity of public lotteries from Belgium, Denmark, Holland, Ireland, Finland, Norway, Portugal, Greece.

If there are any countries where national lotteries are failures, word of them didn't come out at Zurich.

We'd like to remind the readers that all the nations listed above are small and poor by comparison with the United States, though this is not written with intent to hurt the feelings of any of them. It's just another fact of 20th century life.

This fact has an important bearing on the frequent suggestions that a national lottery be given a tryout in the United States.

Our Federal income tax currently gouges an estimated $52 billion a year out of our blood, sweat, and toil—$21 billion from corporations, $31 billion from individuals.

How much revenue a national lottery would produce is anybody's guess.

PURITAN HANGOVER

The best-educated guess we know of is offered by Representative PAUL A. FINO, Republican, of New York, Congress' leading student of the whole subject of legalized gambling and longtime battler for a Government lottery.

Judging from other nations' lottery statistics, and reflecting that huge numbers of Americans will gamble on anything, Mr. FINO estimates that a national lottery in this country would yield $10 billion a year to the Treasury after payment of generous prizes and ample overhead. That would be a little short of one-fifth of the total raised by the Federal income tax, which could be reduced in proportion.

What are we waiting for? Answer: We're waiting for the hangover from Puritan times to pass off. How long must we wait? Answer: You tell us, or, far better, tell your Congressman and Senators you're damn tired of waiting.

PRICE OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

The Public Printer is authorized to furnish to subscribers the daily RECORD at $1.50 per month, payable in advance.

Remit by money order payable to Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C.

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is located in Statuary Hall, House wing, where Mr. Frank Brodie is in attendance during the sessions of Congress to receive orders for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month, and where single copies may also be purchased. Orders are also accepted for the printing of speeches in pamphlet form.

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

SENATORS WITH RESIDENCES IN WASHINGTON

OFFICE ADDRESS: Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

[Streets northwest unless otherwise stated]

Vice President, Richard Nixon

Aiken, George D., *Vt*.....Carroll Arms.
Allott, Gordon, *Colo*.....
Anderson, Clinton P., *N. Mex.*.....6 Wesley Circle.
Barrett, Frank A., *Wyo*.....The Woodner.
Beall, J. Glenn, *Md*.....
Bender, George H., *Ohio*.....120 Schotts Court NE.
Bennett, Wallace F., *Utah*.....
Bible, Alan, *Nev*.....
Bricker, John W., *Ohio*.....The Mayflower.
Bridges, Styles, *N. H*.....
Bush, Prescott, *Conn*.....
Butler, John Marshall, *Md*.....
Byrd, Harry Flood, *Va*.....The Shoreham.
Capehart, Homer E., *Ind*.....The Westchester.
Carlson, Frank, *Kans*.....Sheraton-Park
Case, Clifford P., *N. J*.....
Case, Francis, *S. Dak*.....4635 Mass. Ave.
Chavez, Dennis, *N. Mex*.....3327 Cleveland Ave.
Clements, Earle C., *Ky*.....The Congressional
Cotton, Norris, *N. H*.....
Curtis, Carl T., *Nebr*.....
Daniel, Price, *Tex*.....
Dirksen, Everett M., *Ill*.....
Douglas, Paul H., *Ill*.....
Duff, James H., *Pa*.....
Dworshak, Henry C., *Idaho*.....
Eastland, James O., *Miss*.....5101 Macomb St.
Ellender, Allen J., *La*.....
Ervin, Samuel J., Jr., *N. C*.....
Flanders, Ralph E., *Vt*.....
Frear, J. Allen, Jr., *Del*.....
Fulbright, J. William, *Ark*.....
George, Walter F., *Ga*.....The Mayflower.
Goldwater, Barry M., *Ariz*.....
Gore, Albert, *Tenn*.....
Green, Theodore Francis, *R. I.*.....University Club.
Hayden, Carl, *Ariz*.....
Hennings, Thomas C., Jr., *Mo.*.....
Hickenlooper, Bourke B., *Iowa*.....5511 Cedar Parkway, Chevy Chase, Md.
Hill, Lister, *Ala*.....
Holland, Spessard L., *Fla*.....Sheraton-Park
Hruska, Roman L., *Nebr*.....
Humphrey, Hubert H., *Minn.*.....
Humphreys, Robert, *Ky*.....
Ives, Irving M., *N. Y*.....
Jackson, Henry M., *Wash*.....
Jenner, William E., *Ind*.....
Johnson, Lyndon B., *Tex*.....
Johnston, Olin D., *S. C*.....
Kefauver, Estes, *Tenn*.....4848 Upton St.
Kennedy, John F., *Mass*.....
Kerr, Robert S., *Okla*.....
Knowland, William F., *Calif.*.....
Kuchel, Thomas H., *Calif*.....
Laird, William R. III, *W. Va*.....
Langer, William, *N. Dak*.....2101 Conn. Ave.
Lehman, Herbert H., *N. Y*.....Sheraton-Park
Long, Russell B., *La*.....
McCarthy, Joseph R., *Wis*.....
McClellan, John L., *Ark*.....
McNamara, Pat, *Mich*.....
Magnuson, Warren G., *Wash.*.....The Shoreham.
Malone, George W., *Nev*.....The Mayflower.
Mansfield, Mike, *Mont*.....
Martin, Edward, *Pa*.....
Martin, Thos. E., *Iowa*.....4545 Conn. Ave.
Millikin, Eugene D., *Colo*.....
Monroney, A. S. Mike, *Okla.*.....
Morse, Wayne, *Oreg*.....5020 Lowell St.
Mundt, Karl E., *S. Dak*.....122 Schotts Court NE.
Murray, James E., *Mont*.....The Shoreham.
Neely, Matthew M., *W. Va*.....
Neuberger, Richard L., *Oreg.*.....
O'Mahoney, Joseph C., *Wyo.*.....Sheraton-Park
Pastore, John O., *R. I*.....
Payne, Frederick G., *Maine*.....
Potter, Charles E., *Mich*.....
Purtell, William A., *Conn*.....
Robertson, A. Willis, *Va*.....
Russell, Richard B., *Ga*.....
Saltonstall, Leverett, *Mass*.....2320 Tracy Pl.
Schoeppel, Andrew F., *Kans.*.....
Scott, W. Kerr, *N. C*.....
Smathers, George A., *Fla*.....
Smith, H. Alexander, *N. J*.....Sheraton-Park
Smith, Margaret Chase, (Mrs.), *Maine.*.....
Sparkman, John J., *Ala*.....4928 Indian Lane
Stennis, John, *Miss*.....
Symington, Stuart, *Mo*.....
Thye, Edward J., *Minn*.....
Watkins, Arthur V., *Utah*.....
Welker, Herman, *Idaho*.....4823 Tilden St.
Wiley, Alexander, *Wis*.....2122 Mass. Ave.
Williams, John J., *Del*.....
Wofford, Thomas A., *S. C*.....
Young, Milton R., *N. Dak*.....Quebec House So.

OFFICERS OF THE SENATE

Secretary—Felton M. Johnston.
Chief Clerk—Emery L. Frazier.
Sergeant at Arms—Joseph C. Duke.
Secretary for the Majority—Robert G. Baker.
Secretary for the Minority—J. Mark Trice.
Chaplain—Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D.

STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE SENATE

Committee on Agriculture and Forestry

Messrs. Ellender (chairman), Johnston of South Carolina, Holland, Eastland, Clements, Humphrey, Scott, Symington, Aiken, Young, Thye, Hickenlooper, Mundt, Williams, and Schoeppel.

Committee on Appropriations

Messrs. Hayden (chairman), Russell, Chavez, Ellender, Hill, McClellan, Robertson, Magnuson, Holland, Stennis, Clements, Johnson of Texas, Bridges, Saltonstall, Young, Knowland, Thye, McCarthy, Mundt, Mrs. Smith of Maine, Messrs. Dworshak, Dirksen, and Potter.

Committee on Armed Services

Messrs. Russell (chairman), Byrd, Johnson of Texas, Kefauver, Stennis, Symington, Jackson, Ervin, Saltonstall, Bridges, Flanders, Mrs. Smith of Maine, Messrs. Case of South Dakota, Duff, and Welker.

Committee on Banking and Currency

Messrs. Fulbright (chairman), Robertson, Sparkman, Frear, Douglas, Lehman, Monroney, Morse, Capehart, Bricker, Ives, Bennett, Bush, Beall, and Payne.

Committee on the District of Columbia

Messrs. Neely (chairman), Bible, McNamara, Morse, Frear, Beall, Hruska, Case of New Jersey, and Allott.

Committee on Finance

Messrs. Byrd (chairman), George, Kerr, Frear, Long, Smathers, Anderson, Douglas, Millikin, Martin of Pennsylvania, Williams, Flanders, Malone, Carlson, and Bennett.

Committee on Foreign Relations

Messrs. George (chairman), Green, Fulbright, Sparkman, Humphrey, Mansfield, Morse, Long, Wiley, Smith of New Jersey, Hickenlooper, Langer, Knowland, Aiken, and Capehart.

Committee on Government Operations

Messrs. McClellan (chairman), Jackson, Kennedy, Symington, Ervin, Humphrey, Wofford, McCarthy, Mundt, Mrs. Smith of Maine, Messrs. Cotton, Bender, and Martin of Iowa.

Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs

Messrs. Murray (chairman), Anderson, Jackson, O'Mahoney, Bible, Neuberger, Laird, Scott, Millikin, Malone, Watkins, Dworshak, Kuchel, Barrett, and Goldwater.

Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce

Messrs. Magnuson (chairman), Pastore, Monroney, Smathers, Daniel, Ervin, Bible, Wofford, Bricker, Schoeppel, Butler, Potter, Duff, Purtell, and Payne.

Committee on the Judiciary

Messrs. Eastland (chairman), Kefauver, Johnston of South Carolina, Hennings, McClellan, Daniel, O'Mahoney, Neely, Wiley, Langer, Jenner, Watkins, Dirksen, Welker, and Butler.

Committee on Labor and Public Welfare

Messrs. Hill (chairman), Murray, Neely, Lehman, Kennedy, McNamara, ———, Smith of New Jersey, Ives, Purtell, Goldwater, Bender, and Aliott.

Committee on Post Office and Civil Service

Messrs. Johnston of South Carolina (chairman), Pastore, Monroney, Hennings, Scott, Neuberger, Laird, Carlson, Jenner, Langer, Curtis, Martin of Iowa, and Case of New Jersey.

Committee on Public Works

Messrs. Chavez (chairman), Kerr, Gore, McNamara, Neuberger, Wofford, ———, Martin of Pennsylvania, Case of South Dakota, Bush, Kuchel, Cotton, and Hruska.

Committee on Rules and Administration

Messrs. Green (chairman), Hayden, Hennings, Gore, Mansfield, Jenner, Barrett, McCarthy, and Curtis.

UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT

Mr. Chief Justice Warren, of California, Hotel Sheraton-Park, Washington, D. C.
Mr. Justice Black, of Alabama, 619 S. Lee St., Alexandria, Va.
Mr. Justice Reed, of Kentucky, the Mayflower.
Mr. Justice Frankfurter, of Massachusetts, 3018 Dumbarton Ave.
Mr. Justice Douglas, of Washington, 3701 Connecticut Ave.
Mr. Justice Burton, of Ohio, the Dodge.
Mr. Justice Clark, of Texas, 2101 Connecticut Ave.
Mr. Justice Minton, of Indiana, the Methodist Building.
Mr. Justice Harlan, of New York, 1677 31st St.

OFFICERS OF THE SUPREME COURT

Clerk—Harold B. Willey, 3214 N. Wakefield St., Arlington, Va.
Deputy Clerk—Reginald C. Dilli, 1329 Hemlock St.
Deputy Clerk—Hugh W. Barr, 4701 Connecticut Ave.
Marshal—T. Perry Lippitt, 6004 Corbin Road.
Reporter—Walter Wyatt, 1702 Kalmia Rd.
Librarian—Helen Newman, 126 3d St. SE.

UNITED STATES JUDICIAL CIRCUITS

JUSTICES ASSIGNED
TERRITORY EMBRACED

District of Columbia: Mr. Chief Justice Warren. District of Columbia.

First judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Frankfurter. Maine, New Hampshire, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Puerto Rico.

Second judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Harlan. Vermont, Connecticut, New York.

Third judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Burton, Pennsylvania, New Jersey, Delaware, Virgin Islands.

Fourth judicial circuit: Mr. Chief Justice Warren. Maryland, Virginia, West Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina.

Fifth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Black. Georgia, Florida, Alabama, Mississippi, Louisiana, Texas, Canal Zone.

Sixth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Reed. Ohio, Michigan, Kentucky, Tennessee.

Seventh judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Minton. Indiana, Illinois, Wisconsin.

Eighth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Clark. Minnesota, North Dakota, South Dakota, Iowa, Nebraska, Missouri, Arkansas.

Ninth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Douglas. Washington, Oregon, Montana, Idaho, California, Nevada, Arizona, Alaska, Hawaii.

Tenth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Clark. Colorado, Wyoming, Utah, Kansas, Oklahoma, New Mexico.

Appendix

So You're Going Into Business

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. EDWARD J. THYE

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, July 17, 1956

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, today, each Senator received an advance copy of a booklet published by the United States Chamber of Commerce entitled "So You're Going Into Business."

Because of my interest in the problems facing the small businessman, I was naturally attracted by the title of the booklet.

I recommend it to each Senator for his careful consideration, and I should like to compliment the Chamber of Commerce for this public service publication.

We hear a great deal about business failures increasing, but not much is said about the reasons for failure. I was surprised to learn from this booklet that in 9 out of 10 cases, failure is the result of a lack of "management know how". This booklet realistically helps the prospective businessman face the problems of management. This booklet is also an excellent vocational guidance tool for our schools.

I, of course, feel strongly about the importance of our Small Business Administration and the work they are doing, but we must realize that government, no matter how effective, cannot prevent all cases of business failure. If the figures in this booklet are correct, and they come from Dun and Bradstreet, then by far the biggest cause of business failure is lack of "management know-how" and more must be done along the lines of this booklet to help the small businessman and especially those just beginning a business venture.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the pamphlet to which I have referred, entitled "So You're Going Into Business," printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

I am informed by the Public Printer that it is estimated that the cost of printing this pamphlet in the RECORD will be $173.25, and that it will occupy about 2¼ pages in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. However, I think the pamphlet is so informative that it is well worth the cost.

There being no objection, the pamphlet was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SO YOU'RE GOING INTO BUSINESS—DOMESTIC DISTRIBUTION DEPARTMENT, CHAMBER OF COMMERCE OF THE UNITED STATES, WASHINGTON, D. C.

So you're going into business—that's wonderful—and we wish you every success. You will be successful, too, if you have carefully studied all the pros and cons about your business, your financing program is properly planned, you're the right type of person for such a venture, you have sufficient—and appropriate—experience, you stay alert to new ideas and new trends in your field.

CAPITAL? HOW MUCH IS NECESSARY?

A perfect place to make your biggest mistake is in estimating how much capital you will need. A lot of people spend all their money to get their doors open for business and then find they do not have the reserve necessary to keep them in business for the year or 2 necessary to build up a clientele.

Another point: do you remember "Mr. Blandings' Dream House"? Originally it was going to cost a moderate sum. But it wound up putting Blandings in the hole for much more than he expected because he couldn't anticipate all the costs and problems. Same problem exactly in setting up a new store.

One of the best things you can do is take advantage of the worksheets and operating ratios which are available from the United States Department of Commerce. The figures and ratios are generally gathered by trade associations and business organizations for their members or customers, but the Commerce Department regularly compiles these studies. They are useful aids in estimating costs.

RUNNING THE STORE

All right, once you get your groundwork dug and your foundation laid—and assuming your personal aptitudes look pretty good—what are the actual jobs you have to do in running a business? What jobs will have to be done for you? What jobs will you have to supervise others in doing? What kind of knowledge will you need, what kind of skills?

You might divide up the work of running a store like this:

1. Controls or record keeping: Accounting, inventories, estimating financial position, pricing your goods or services so that markups will cover your expenses, plus some profit, and still be low enough to be competitive and attract customers.

2. Selling, promotion, merchandising, advertising, display: Those activities which move the goods toward the customer, the customer toward the store, at the right time and price—and making the sales. You can't be passive about this part if you want to do business.

3. Buying: "Goods well bought are half sold." Where to buy your stock or equipment. How much to pay. Determining quality of goods. Arranging appropriate credit terms and promotional support from suppliers.

4. Handling employees: Selecting them, training them, particularly sales-training. Keeping their morale high. The staff reflects the attitude of the boss, and the success of the store is involved.

5. Planning ahead: Too many small operators, and big ones, too, get so involved in just "doing the next thing" that they neglect to do the long- and short-range planning which pays the big dividends.

6. Community participation: Some call it civic duty. Others think it is "good will" or useful contacts. Actually, it is long-range guaranteeing of your future. Participation in your chamber and in your local political processes is the way you help shape the future of your town and your country. Your work in this field can mean the difference in handling the traffic and parking problems, the education your children get or don't get, the taxes you pay, and finally, whether you will be allowed to continue to own your own store under a private property-free enterprise system. Some fellows just chase the dollar and leave this other stuff to "George."

7. Taxes, auditing, finance and insurance: You will probably get professional advice and counsel.

Well, there are quite a few rings to this circus, but a good man or woman can handle them all right and make a good living. It's all in developing the skills and knowledge that are needed and relying on help or outside services for the rest.

Incidentally, a lot of people plan to make their business a partnership, and they are careful to choose a partner who has experience and skills in those parts of the business where they are weak. One fellow may be skilled in accounting, inventories, record keeping and financial management. He will go out and get himself a partner with a lot of selling experience and, if possible, some experience in buying. Together, they make a fine team. Separately, they would have troubles.

JUST ONE MORE THING

Maybe it goes without saying * * * but the people this book is for are the people who wish to establish a substantial business which will earn them a living, serve their customers, and be a lasting credit to the community.

This book is not for the "fast buck" artist. That's why we talk about community participation as being a part of the business. It is also why we pass on this helpful hint: The successful merchant is the man who gives good value for the dollar and plays fair with everybody.

Customers don't come back if they are not treated well, if goods are not up to snuff or if they feel they haven't gotten their money's worth.

Chambers of commerce have long been aware that there is a connection between good, honest values and success in business. The opening statement of a code drawn up by the national chamber is significant: "The foundation of business is confidence, which springs from integrity, fair dealing, efficient service, and mutual benefit."

So * * * if you want a basic principle to guide you as you steer your business toward success, you can't find anything better than one you already know: The Golden Rule.

If you have to look it up to find out what it is * * * you'd better not go into business.

Operating a business is much more complex and difficult than is generally realized. There's nothing simple about it. You'll work hard * * * and long. That is, you will if you make a go of it.

But the rewards are worth it. You'll be the head man. Nobody can fire you. Your opportunity for income will be greater. You'll have more pride in your own abilities. And you'll experience a satisfaction that words can't describe.

This booklet suggests several important questions you should consider before you decide to go into business for yourself. These questions are important whether your business will be concerned with drugs or dry goods, hats or hardware, groceries or gasoline. The same basic factors must be considered in beginning virtually every type of business.

Don't expect this brief booklet to give you a foolproof formula for starting and operating a successful business. It doesn't.

But—if you'll heed the advice the book offers and follow through with some of the reference suggestions it contains for more specific information—you can find your own formula for success.

Good luck. (Domestic Distribution Department, Chamber of Commerce of the United States.)

WHAT ARE THE CHANCES OF SUCCESS—OR FAILURE?

Operating a business is tough, but not impossible. Let's look at some figures on business entries, discontinuances and failures.

What is the rate of business discontinuance? A business discontinuance is a case of a firm ceasing operation. Probably about half of all business discontinuances take place because of, or to avoid, failure. About 1,000 firms go out of business every working day. Roughly 600 of them are retail, service, or wholesale firms. About 70 out of every thousand retail businesses went out of operation in 1955. (United States Department of Commerce figures.)

2. How many new businesses start each year? Figures vary slightly from year to year. In 1955, for example, there were 374,200 new businesses started. One hundred forty-nine thousand and eight hundred of these were retail businesses. Over the years, starts and discontinuances just about balance out. (United States Department of Commerce figures.)

3. What chance does a business have to survive? The median age of all operating businesses is 7 years—that is, half of the businesses are older and half are younger than 7 years. Since World War II, a new firm has had a 50–50 chance of lasting 2 years under the same management. Chances are 3 to 1 against it living to age 4, and only 1 out of 5 businesses lasts 10 years. (December 1955 Survey of Current Business, United States Department of Commerce.)

4. What are the causes of failure? The actual reasons which have been carefully researched by Dun & Bradstreet do not always receive as much attention as they should. Dun & Bradstreet studies show that the causes of failure in the retail field in the year 1955, were as follows:

Lack of management know-how, 91.3 percent.

Neglect of business, 4.8 percent.

Fraud, 2.1 percent.

Disaster, 1.4 percent.

Other, 0.4 percent.

Chances are that a very large number of those that failed would have succeeded if they had just prepared themselves adequately for the job.

ARE YOU THE TYPE?

People are different. Some people can run a hundred yards in 10 seconds. Others couldn't do it under 15. A few people have the iron nerves, steady hands, and training necessary to be a surgeon; others don't, but maybe they can work 8 hours a day on girders 200 feet in the air putting up a building.

To do any job, a person needs certain aptitudes, certain knowledge and certain skills. What kind of people make good as owner and manager of their own store? Authorities say they rate high in most of these character traits:

Initiative: Self starters; don't wait for directions.

Positiveness: Optimistic, self-confident, willing to take risks.

Leadership: Forceful, inspire confidence and loyalty.

Responsibility: Accept it—don't duck it.

Organizing ability: Able to see what should be done and get it done in a logical order.

Industriousness: Willing, capable of working hard for long hours.

Decisiveness: Quick and accurate, not hesitant.

Sincerity: Square shooters, on the level, honest.

Perseverance: Stick-to-itiveness, particularly when hours are long and business seems slow.

Physical energy: Highly energetic at all times.

Friendly: Ability to get along with people, even when they try one's patience.

You may wish to try rating yourself as being "very high," "high," "fair" or "low" on these points. In addition, having a couple of friends rate you will probably prove helpful, since it is hard for any of us to be completely accurate in appraising ourselves.

WHAT KIND OF BUSINESS?

Nobody can decide what kind of business you should go into but you. Here are a few things that may help you in deciding:

1. Experience in a particular kind of business. If you have worked in a shoe store, you will already have some of the knowledge you need to run a shoe store and will be that much better equipped to do it well. The more experience and training you have which can be put to use in operating a particular kind of business, the more likely you are to succeed in it.

You've heard the old story, one fellow says to another, "Can you play the piano?"

The other fellow replies, "I don't know; I never tried."

Well, until you've gotten some experience in a business, it's hard to know what it's like, whether you could do well in it. One of the best pieces of advice that can be given is: Get experience in a line working for somebody else before you try it yourself. This way, you don't risk losing your own savings while learning the fundamentals, but actually get steady pay until you are ready for the big plunge on your own.

2. In a given area, what kind of business is needed? Best way to find this out is to go around and ask a lot of questions of the people who live in the area, wholesalers who service the area, the local chamber of commerce, local businessmen. Ask enough people and you'll get a pretty good idea of what's needed.

WHAT ABOUT LOCATION?

The location of your business is very important.

1. The proper town or city.

2. The choice of specific area within the town.

3. The exact site within the specific area.

The proper town or city is, of course, largely a matter of your personal likes or dislikes. You want to live where you and your family will be happy. But, you will want to be sure the town in which you locate can support your business profitably enough to meet your needs.

The area where you locate may be decided for you if there is only one business district in your town. But often, today, a question comes up concerning what looks like a good location in a shopping center on the outskirts. Don't forget that downtown is still a central location which can be more easily reached by more people than can a spot out on the edge of town. Depending on what type of business you are opening, you must be sure there are enough people in your shopping area to support your store.

The exact site in a given area is often determined by the rent you can pay. Bear in mind that a higher rent often means a better, more productive location. And, what about customer conveniences? Are parking facilities adequate? Is the site well located with regard to public transit?

Well, these are just some of the problems on location. The right location sometimes saves a poorly run business; the wrong location can wreck an otherwise superbly managed store.

BUY? RENT? START FROM SCRATCH?

There are three choices you may have in getting started: buying a business, renting a business, or starting from scratch. Each has its own advantages and risks.

If you buy an existing business, you inherit the goodwill and customers of your predecessor. He may also leave you some experienced employees who will be either a great help or resentful of new ownership, depending on how you handle them. But how much should you pay? Is the business going up, or has it been going downhill? Can you get all arrangements such as rent, credit, and so forth on as favorable terms as your predecessor?

On the other hand, if you start a brandnew business, you have several other advantages, and handicaps. You make your own goodwill and are not saddled with any hung-over ill will from a previous operator. You will be buying a lot of new fixtures and setting up your own store layout, and the result may be more modern and efficient than if you took over a going concern. But everything will have to be done from scratch. You may even need more capital since it will take months, or perhaps years, before you can build a substantial clientele.

Leasing or renting a business is an interesting possibility. This is often done with gas stations, for instance. Here you take on much less of the risk involved, but inevitably must pay something extra to the lessor for assuming part of your risk. Negotiation of the contract is very important. Always make certain that the contract means an advantage to both you and the firm or person you make it with; otherwise there will be difficulties.

REFERENCES FOR ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

There are various sources that you can—and should—use to secure detailed information concerning the problems involved in setting up your own business. Some of these sources are located in your own community, and you should establish personal contact with them. Others are out of town and will require correspondence.

Here are some of the sources that you should consider utilizing:

1. Your wholesalers or suppliers and their salesmen. They know a lot about your line of business.

2. Your banker. Cultivate him, too. He has seen a lot of businesses come and go and can really be of help.

3. Your local chamber of commerce manager.

4. The people you rely on for expert service—your lawyer, your insurance man, your tax man or CPA.

5. The trade association that represents your type of business.

6. The Small Business Administration, Washington 25, D. C. It has field offices in your area. It works in the fields of loans and technical advice. It has published scores of bulletins and releases on all kinds of businesses and most phases of business. It's a Federal service. Use it. Here are some of its free bulletins:

Advertising, Retail Store, BSB No. 2.

Arrangement and Display, Store, BSB No. 5.

Buying for Retail Stores, BSB No. 100.

Credit, Consumer, BSB No. 12.

Credit and Collections, Retail, BSB No. 72.

Home Businesses, BSB No. 95.

Operating Costs and Ratios—Retail Trades and Service Establishments, BSB No. 50.

Recordkeeping Systems for Small Stores and Service Trades Establishments, BSB No. 116.

Retailing, BSB No. 43.

Training Retail Salespeople, BSB No. 4.

Attracting Customers to Your Small Store. (Small Marketers Aid No. 3.) April, 1955.

7. United States Department of Commerce, Washington 25, D. C. Has published "Establishing and Operating Your Own Business," an excellent and comprehensive guide for the new business proprietor. Also cooperates with the Small Business Administration in rendering technical advice and services to business.

8. Distribution Data Guide—monthly. Subscription $2 per year; 15 cents a copy. A selective, annotated listing of significant literature on distribution. Deals with market research, merchandising, sales promotion, advertising, etc. United States Department of Commerce. Order from Superintendent of Documents, United States Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C.

9. Operating Results and Ratios. These are figures telling how much is spent for different items of expense in individual business lines. Good for comparisons. Sources are:

(A) Dun and Bradstreet, Inc., 99 Church Street, New York 8, N. Y.

(B) National Cash Register Co., Merchants Service, Dayton 9, Ohio.

(C) Accounting Corporation of America, 1929 First Avenue, San Diego, Calif.

(D) United States Department of Commerce and Small Business Administration.

10. Your State department of commerce at your State capital.

11. How to Establish and Operate a Retail Store. Second edition. Kenneth B. Haas and O. Preston Robinson. 1952. 379 pp., $6.65. Sketches many types of enterprise as possibilities and gives pointers in analyzing a prospective venture. Prentice-Hall, Inc., 70 Fifth Avenue, New York 11, N. Y.

12. Retailing—Principles and Practices. Paul L. Brown and W. R. Davidson; 1953; 726 pages; with 51 illustrations and 29 tables. Discusses all retailing functions and problems from management point of view. Ronald Press Co., 15 East 26th Street, New York 10, N. Y., $6.

13. Retailing—Principles and Methods. Debert Duncan and Charles Phillips; 1955; about 700 pages. A complete text on all phases of retail store operation. Richard D. Irwin Co., Homewood, Ill., $6.

SELECTED CHAMBER PUBLICATIONS

Special Days, Weeks and Months. Annual; 44-page booklet listing over 300 special observances, legal and religious holidays complete with date or dates, purposes, name, and address of sponsor for each event. Lists observances alphabetically and chronologically. 50 cents.

Trade Promotion Planning Calendar. Annual. Companion piece to Special Days, Weeks and Months; 26-page calendar with ample space for notes in calendar date blocks. Lists special days, weeks, etc., for each month. 50 cents.

Distribution Trends. Annual. Statistics, news, and informed observations highlighting events of past year and indicating major trends in retailing, wholesaling, advertising, and service industries. Useful for planning ahead; 30 cents.

What's the Answer? A guidebook to sources of business and economic statistics, facts, and general information. Handy and useful for businessmen as well as chambers of commerce and trade associations; 50 cents.

Small Business: Its Role and Its Problems. A 34-page booklet analyzing the problems and the importance of small businesses in the American economic system; 50 cents.

Quantity prices for publications on request.

In ordering, make checks payable to Chamber of Commerce of the United States.

Complete list of chamber publications available on request.

THE AIMS OF BUSINESS AND THE WORK OF THE NATIONAL CHAMBER

As the Chamber of Commerce of the United States becomes more widely known as a national institution, more people, it seems, want to know: "Precisely what does the National Chamber do—what is its purpose?"

That is a question we are glad to answer.

The National Chamber is the voice of business. It is the organization through which business as a whole expresses itself—to let the public and the Government know where business stands on controversial national issues, and the reasons.

The National Chamber is the channel through which the businessmen of America, as an organized group, exercise their leadership in national affairs.

It is the means by which the businessmen of America fulfill their responsibility for helping solve national problems.

The primary concern of business is not how to get something for nothing or how to wangle an unfair advantage for itself. The primary concern of business is how to maintain an atmosphere in which business can operate at a profit and without unnecessary Government restraint.

That means: how to maintain and improve the competitive free enterprise system.

Along with this, business has another concern. It is how to meet the human needs of a growing population, how to provide good paying jobs for a growing labor force, how to keep the economy dynamic and expanding.

That means: How to keep the future of America bright. In looking ahead, business sees six basic jobs that need to be done—by businessmen working together—to keep the country strong, productive and free. Here they are:

1. Cut taxes: Promote economy in Government, make sound tax cuts, and devise a fair and equitable tax system.

2. Improve labor relations: Create greater harmony between labor and management, America's productive team.

3. Lift living standards: Increase production, develop new markets, provide more jobs, keep the economy expanding.

4. Improve education: Raise educational standards, and build a better public understanding of free enterprise.

5. Build better cities: Combat urban blight and build better cities and communities for tomorrow.

6. Strengthen organized business: Keep local, State and national organizations of businessmen strong, forward-looking and increasingly effective.

Everything the chamber does is directed toward these six objectives. The job is a continuing one. It involves many activities. It involves the creative thought of many individuals. It involves the serious effort of many organizations. It involves teamwork—and every businessman should be on the team.

The Contribution of Oil to Illinois and the Nation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES W. VURSELL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 5, 1956

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, today I want to discuss the oil industry which has made such a great contribution to the defense and to the economy of our Nation, and to southern Illinois and the Congresisonal District I have the honor to represent.

First, I want to tell you why, for the 14 years I have been in Congress, I have constantly supported the oil industry.

I have supported the oil industry because of the tremendous and constant flow of wealth it has brought to the citizens of most of the counties of my congressional district, and to the State as well for the past several years.

To give you an idea of the great wealth the oil industry brings to Illinois, may I point out that Illinois in 1954 produced 81,130,000 barrels of crude oil, the value of which was $242,500,000, and, mind you, that was for just 1 year.

It is important to note that in the 23d District I represent, we produce about two-thirds of all the oil produced in the State, or 60,849,000 barrels in 1954—an income to this area for that year in the amount of $181,875,000, and millions of dollars from oil will keep coming in for many years in the future.

Now to emphasize the tremendous value of oil production to the 23d Congressional District, if you would multiply the production in 1954 of $181,875,000, by 14 years I have been in Congress, it would amount to $2,546,250,000. This does not take into account the early production for the first 5 years, from 1937 to 1942, which would amount to many more hundreds of millions of dollars.

In addition to the income from oil that is actually produced, in Illinois there is now more than 1 million acres of land, not now producing oil, under lease. From this source, the farmers of Illinois have at least another million dollars annual income.

I have been alert and active in protecting the legitimate interest of the oil industry because I want to continue, as long as possible, this great source of wealth and prosperity for our people.

By protecting the rights of the oil industry, I am representing the best interests of many thousands of farmers who have oil on their land, or who have sold royalties, or leases, upon which land they hope some day oil will be found.

BENEFITS BUSINESS AND LABOR

I am also representing the best interests of all of the businessmen who benefit from the millions of dollars of prosperity that has been brought to the farmers, and countless thousands of people who are employed, at good wages, in the various fields of the oil industry.

Back in 1936, before the Clay City and Salem-Centralia oil fields were discovered, the economic conditions throughout this area, as you will remember, were at a low level; in fact, in 1936 thousands of farms in this entire area were mortgaged for about all they could stand. Within a few years after the discovery of oil, thousands of farmers were able to sell their oil leases, oil, and royalties, thereby paying off their mortgages. In other words, the oil industry is of particular interest to practically every citizen in our entire area. This great production of wealth furnishes thousands of jobs, and the necessities and luxuries of life for our citizens. It pays a big tax to the State, to our local subdivisions of

government, which helps pay the running expense of government, and the building of schools for the education of our children. The industry makes its full contribution to the civic welfare of our communities, and the support of our churches.

To give you an idea of the wealth it has brought to the counties in the 23d Congressional District in 1 year, 1954, I am inserting a table containing this information, as follows:

Report from Illinois Geological Survey

County	Amount of barrels	Volume in dollars
Bond	79,000	$237,000
Clay	4,895,000	14,685,000
Clinton	1,735,000	5,205,000
Edwards	1,440,000	4,320,000
Fayette	6,693,000	20,079,000
Hamilton	3,326,000	9,978,000
Jefferson	2,281,000	6,843,000
Lawrence	3,258,000	9,774,000
Marion	6,525,000	19,575,000
Montgomery	6,000	18,000
Richland	3,515,000	10,545,000
Wabash	3,638,000	10,914,000
Washington	940,000	2,820,000
Wayne	7,067,000	21,201,000
White	8,010,000	24,030,000
Total	53,408,000	160,224,000

This great wealth that has come to the communities in my section of Illinois—not only in 1 year, but it has been repeated each year since the discovery of oil, in major quantities, in 1937. In total it runs into several billions of dollars. The good that it has done for all of our people is generally known throughout this area.

WHY PROTECTION OF OIL INDUSTRY?

You may ask why and how oil needs protection. The answer is very plain and understandable. The independent oil operators in particular, and at times the large operators need protection against the effort that has been made a number of times in the 14 years I have been in Congress to reduce, or wipe out, the 27½-percent depletion deduction. The demagogues in the Congress and those socialistically inclined, and the leftwingers of the Nation will tell you it should be wiped out, and they have tried to do it. This crowd generally is against the free enterprise system, and all legitimate business. They prefer Government controls, which are the forerunners of socialism.

WHAT IS DEPLETION DEDUCTION?

Let me explain it. Back in 1926 a group of the ablest tax attorneys in the Internal Revenue Department in Washington, and the Congress agreed upon allowing a 27½-percent tax depletion deduction on the sale of oil. They did it because under the Constitution the Government could not tax capital of any kind. After a year's study by the Government's tax experts and the Members of Congress, they determined that 27½ percent of the value of a barrel of oil represented the capital of the owner, and could not be taxed. They provided that the profit made on a barrel of oil should be taxed. From that date until this, the capital, or the oil under the ground that belonged to the farmer, or to the farmer and producer when they made a contract, represented 27½ percent of the value, and all above the 27½ percent, less operating cost, is profit, and is taxed as income the same as all other income. This principle has been made applicable to substantially all minerals, including coal, zinc, and so forth.

Several times in the 14 years I have been in the Congress a fight has been made to reduce this depletion allowance; however, so far, we have been able to defeat each attempt, and I will help to defeat every attempt in the future as long as I am in Congress.

If the depletion deduction was wiped out, it would hurt the farmers and the oilmen because it would slow down their drilling and exploration for more oil. That would strike a hard blow at the economy of southern Illinois and the Nation; two-thirds of the oil rigs in southern Illinois would be stacked in lots, or the operators would move away. Thousands of wage earners would be out of jobs, and the millions of dollars that come from the ground in southern Illinois, to enrich our communities, would be left underground because new fields would not be explored and developed. This is an undeniable fact.

OIL IMPORTS

Now, there is another threat that has been developing rapidly over the past few years to the independent oil producers, like most of them operating here in southern Illinois. That threat comes from a few big oil companies, about seven in all, which have developed a great deal of oil in the rich oilfields of the Middle East in particular, which produce unlimited millions of barrels of oil each year, at a very low cost.

Because of the abundant production, it is being imported into this country in such great amounts that the smaller oil producers of our entire Nation have been forced to cut back their production further than it should be. In the interest of defense, we must maintain production at a high level, and keep exploring and bringing in new fields and new oil reserves if we are to make certain that if another world war came we would be able to produce enough oil to keep industry in this Nation going at a high level. And enough oil to supply our Army, our great Air Force—so necessary to the protection of our country—and to keep our thousands of ships in position to transport our men and military supplies to any nations which would become our allies.

The Office of Defense Mobilization, the President of the United States, and all of those from the highest level in Government, realize that we must make certain that our production of oil and gas in this country must always be kept at a high enough level to sustain ourselves for many months if we are to assure the defense of this country.

May I point out in the last world war the submarine menace cut off, to a very large extent, the importation of oil from Venezuela and South America, and from the Far East.

Fortunately, even though the submarines cut off a large part of our import oil for several months before we were able to get them under control, our oil industry had been kept in such high production that we were able to increase our industry for war, and to supply our Army, Navy, and thousands of airplanes during this great crisis.

Since peace came, in 1945, oil imports have continued to increase year after year, and as they increased, our production of wells in the United States has been cut back and cut back until the Congress, and later the President, for the first time in our history recognized that excessive imports of oil had become a problem that must be dealt with.

In 1954, I introduced a bill that would not permit imports to reach the level of more than 10 percent of our national consumption, and after a major fight on the floor of the House, the bill failed to be passed by only a few votes.

We continued our fight against excessive imports in the Congress until in 1955 the President appointed a Cabinet-level committee, headed by Dr. Flemming, Director of the Office of Defense Mobilization, to study energy supplies and resources including oil. That committee, after making a thorough study, rendered a decision that in the future the proportion of oil imports to domestic production be held at the 1954 level. Since that time, Dr. Flemming, acting for the executive department, and the Congress have been making every effort to get the seven major oil importing oil companies to voluntarily reduce their imports and comply with the expressed will of the Congress and the executive department.

Some of them have shown an inclination to comply to a greater extent than others. Some few have not. Dr. Flemming recently issued his third letter to all of the major companies urging compliance, and asking for specific information as to their program of imports in the future. The oil people, generally, agree that it would be better to limit excess imports on a voluntary basis rather than to pass legislation if it is possible to get them to do it.

My information is that the executive department hopes that third quarter imports this year may be substantially reduced based on recent reports to the Office of Defense Mobilization, in reply to the recent letter he sent out and the personal conferences Dr. Flemming has had with some of these importers.

This is a problem that must be met in the interest of our economy, and in the defense of our country if legislation is to be avoided.

Unless voluntary compliance is met which will result in the proportion of oil imports to domestic production being held at the 1954 level, as recommended by the President's Cabinet Committee at the close of their study, I shall join with other Members of the Congress in introducing and supporting legislation which I predict will be passed by the Congress in the next session to accomplish this.

I would like to make a comparison between the attitude of President Eisenhower and his administration with the attitude of the two past Presidents, Mr. Roosevelt and Mr. Truman, with reference to the oil industry.

COMPARISON

President Eisenhower has shown by his friendly attitude toward the oil industry that he understands and appreciates the great contribution it has made to the economy of our Nation, and the necessity for keeping it strong as one of the first lines of defense of the Nation. For instance, one of his first acts was to support legislation to turn the oil tidelands back to the States, which had been in possession of them for over 100 years before the Supreme Court in a split decision brought the tidelands under the control of the Federal Government.

By comparison, President Truman had previously vetoed a tidelands bill, overriding the will of the Congress that had passed it by a substantial majority.

DEPLETION DEDUCTION

The late President Roosevelt, upon the recommendation of Mr. Henry Morgenthau, Jr., and others, made more than one attempt to reduce, or wipe out the oil industry's 27½-percent tax depletion deduction, but was prevented from doing so by the Congress.

Then again, after Mr. Truman became President, he made the same attempt to wipe out, or reduce, the 27½-percent tax depletion deduction, but was also prevented from doing so by us in the Congress.

By comparison in the 3½ years President Eisenhower has made no attempt or suggestion to do so.

IMPORTS

Because of the rapid increase in imports since World War II, President Eisenhower was the first Chief Executive to recognize the danger of excessive imports as a problem that had to be dealt with. He thereby brought into being the Cabinet-level study committee, which, under the chairmanship of Dr. Arthur S. Flemming, rendered a decision that in the future the proportion of oil imports to domestic production be held at the 1954 level. Furthermore, the President showed his interest in this problem by authorizing the Director of Defense Mobilization to follow up on the recommendations of the Committee, and to make recommendations to the oil importing companies designed to bring about substantial compliance with the Committee's recommendations.

I would also like to point out that in the veto of the gas bill the President said, in substance, that he reluctantly vetoed the bill because he thought that legislation should be enacted to prohibit Federal control of the price and gathering of gas at the wellhead, but that certain lobbying activities had been engaged in that caused him to feel he should take such action. He, in a manner, left the door open for the consideration of such legislation by a subsequent Congress.

I would also like to point out that the Cabinet-level committee, in making their report recommended against the Government's control of the price and gathering of gas at the wellhead.

By comparison, again, when the Kerr bill in 1950 was passed by the Congress to remove Federal control of the price and gathering of gas at the wellhead President Truman vetoed it.

The above comparison of records plainly shows the difference in the attitude of the Eisenhower Administration toward the Oil and Gas Industry. The Eisenhower administration has been favorable to the oil industry. The past administrations were unfavorable.

Controlling Narcotics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERBERT H. LEHMAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, July 17, 1956

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, on July 11, 1956, there appeared in the New York Times an editorial entitled, "Controlling Narcotics." The editorial deals with the Narcotics Control Act recently enacted by Congress, and points out that there is much work ahead for Congress in doing something constructive about the nub of the narcotics problem—namely, the rehabilitation of the addict. As I stated in my remarks when the Senate was considering the Narcotics bill, the need lies in providing more facilities and services for the addicts, to assure the rehabilitation of as many of these unfortunates as possible. I do not think there can be any sound ground for doubt when the alternatives are between prisons and hospitals, between penitentiaries and aftercare, between locking up a sick man or giving him the services he needs to make him well.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the editorial on "Controlling Narcotics," as published in the New York Times of July 11, 1956, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CONTROLLING NARCOTICS

Now that Congress has passed and sent to the President a bill drastically increasing penalties for illegal sale and possession of narcotics—even up to and including the death penalty—we urge that it devote equal attention to the other side of the coin: medical treatment and rehabilitation procedures.

Severe punishment of the drug peddler is necessary as a deterrent, but punishment alone is not the answer to the drug problem. For 40 years the emphasis in combating illicit narcotics in this country has been on punishment; and today we are believed to have more dope addicts than all the other nations of the West combined. From a ratio of 1 addict to every 10,000 persons only a decade ago the United States now has 1 for every 3,000, of whom it is estimated that 13 percent are less than 21 years of age. These are truly appalling figures. The economic rewards of this traffic are so great (an ounce of heroin that costs $5 in Communist China may be sold for several thousand dollars in New York City) that it should be clear that even the most stringent penalties, necessary as they are, will not abolish the purchase and sale of illegal drugs. This is especially true because in many cases the seller is himself an addict who pushes the sale to provide funds to keep himself supplied.

Addicts are sick, as sick as alcoholics or the mentally ill or people afflicted with dread diseases. Some excellent work is being done by the Federal Government, and by State and private agencies, to cope with the problem in medical terms, with efforts directed toward rehabilitation. But a great deal more is needed, in terms of money and effort and psychological approach. In a letter to this newspaper a month ago the Attorney General of the State of New York, while supporting the punitive legislation then pending in Congress, urged enormous expansion and development of research projects and of facilities for clinical treatment, a suitable program for after-care and out-patient surveillance, and even an experiment in restricted legal distribution of narcotics. The latter method is used in the United Kingdom, where, according to the president of the New York City Medical Society, writing in the Times magazine last Sunday, there are only 279 known drug addicts "and probably very few unknown ones."

There is still plenty of work left for Congress to do in the field of narcotics control, even more important than that which has just been done. The problem has by no means been solved by the bill that is now awaiting the President's signature.

Slum Clearance Authorization Adequate

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDGAR W. HIESTAND
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 5, 1956

Mr. HIESTAND. Mr. Speaker, on July 13, 1956, there appeared in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a statement by the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Hon. ELMER J. HOLLAND, which deplored the action of the House Rules Committee in tabling the housing bill, H. R. 11742. The statement attempts to point out the allegedly serious effects on the Federal slum clearance program should the housing bill not be enacted.

The statement points up one of the great fallacies concerning the pending housing bill and that is its purported relationship to slum clearance.

Actually if the pending housing bill is not enacted, it will in no way affect the program of Federal grants for slum clearance and urban redevelopment. The Congress has appropriated $1 billion for this purpose and, since 1949, $700 million has been earmarked for Federal grants for slum clearance, leaving $300 million remaining in this fund.

The statement of the gentleman from Pennsylvania contends that if the housing bill is not enacted that slum clearance will be set back because there will be no public housing available for displaced persons. Actually it is the omission from the pending bill of this important relationship between public housing and slum clearance that prompted the Administrator of the Housing and Home Finance Agency, Albert M. Cole, recently to criticize the measure as "excessive, unrealistic, and ill conceived," and has influenced the House Rules Commitee to table an application for a rule.

The Administration in its endorsement of a modest public-housing program seeks to make public housing one of the instruments in the fight to clear the Na-

tion's slums. The other body and the House Banking and Currency Committee rejected such a use for public housing and approved an unrealistic program which seeks to project public housing on the Nation's communities as an end in itself and not as one of the instruments in the Nation's fight against slum clearance.

The proponents of public housing for years sought to justify public housing as necessary in the fight to clear slums. Yet when the administration sought to tie in public housing with slum clearance this was rejected. The administration believes that any community in order to qualify for public housing must have a workable program for the prevention of slums. This requirement was rejected by the other body and the House Committee on Banking and Currency.

I have here a letter from Frank P. Ziedler, mayor of the city of Milwaukee, Wis., dated May 25, 1956, and addressed to the regional director of the Housing and Home Finance Agency in Chicago, Ill. Mayor Zeidler points out that originally he opposed the whole concept of the workable program because he saw it to be a maneuver on the part of those opposed to public housing to put another stumbling block in the way of obtaining Federal funds for public housing or for slum clearance.

Now in this letter which I am inserting as part of this statement the mayor endorses the workable program requirement as something that is long overdue.

If the champions of public housing were sincere in their efforts to clear slums, they would accept the workable program requirement and insist that all units be earmarked for slum dwellers who are displaced by code enforcement, slum clearance, or other governmental action. By so doing they would remove the principal roadblock to the consideration of the pending housing bill.

The letter follows:

OFFICE OF THE MAYOR,
Milwaukee, Wis., May 25, 1956.

Mr. IVAN D. CARSON,
Regional Director of Urban Renewal Housing and Home Finance Agency, Chicago, Ill.

DEAR MR. CARLSON: When I discussed with you at East Lansing the effects of the workable program of urban renewal, I said I would express in writing some of the experiences which Milwaukee has had with the program in order that you might have some material for analysis of the course and direction of the program.

I was orginally opposed to the whole concept of the workable program because I conceived it to be a maneuver on the part of the real estate interests, who are hostile to public housing, to put another stumbing block in the way of obtaining Federal funds for public housing, or for slum clearance. I still believe that this was partly the reason for the creation of the workable urban renewal program.

However, I also recognized at the time that there were other persons interested in the workable program who had a genuine concern about slum clearance and felt that cities could and should do more on their own in order to accomplish the objectives of city restoration. I think that those who conceived the workable renewal program as being a means of forcing cities onward in their housing standards are being justified now to a considerable extent.

The necessity of having a workable urban renewal program certified by the Federal Government permited the forces for better housing conditions in Milwaukee to pass a housing code which is somewhat stiffer than the one that we have had in the past. I note that this code is not what the URA felt to be ultimately desirable, but, nevertheless, this code is much more than we could have obtained without the Federal spur to create such a program. At the present time the staff of the health commissioner, who administers the program, has gone over a considerable portion of the rooming house district and has come forward with many orders for improvement. Of course, there is a considerable amount of protest against the orders but I believe that they are desirable from the public point of view.

Secondly, the necessity of having a certified workable urban renewal program has brought about the passage of a resolution by the Milwaukee Common Council which permits the creation of the post of an urban renewal coordinator. Coordination is absolutely necessary for urban renewal, and the task is so great that the responsibility for it must be centered.

A citizen urban renewal committee, established to comply with the urban renewal law, is a strong force for improving standards of the community, because the citizens appointed are, in the main, completely interested in their work.

The workable urban renewal program also sorted out some planning difficulties that existed in the city. It was decided that the board of public-land commissioners should have the major responsibility for improving the master plan and for selecting planning sites and areas to be demolished, rehabilitated, or conserved. In my opinion, this was an important step forward, because the staff of the land commission did not concentrate on urban renewal until the Federal demand for a workable program came through.

Perhaps the principal way in which the workable program is having a good effect is through the office of the building inspector. The building inspector was able to secure additional assistance for inspection resulting in demolition. He has already caused to be demolished this year hundreds of substandard buildings. If the city had to pay for the razed buildings under a land-purchase plan, or under a forceable condemnation, the city simply could not have afforded a program of this type.

It would appear now that, on the basis of his present experience, the building inspector is taking down enough buildings every 4 months to amount in total to the number of buildings that would be taken down in a major clearance project in the city. This work is done at very little cost to the city government. It does not disturb communities and does not upset landownership. As a result of this experience, I am thinking of asking the State legislature to give us a stronger condemnation law.

The necessity of qualifying in 1957 for a recertification of having a workable urban renewal program has caused work to move forward on the creation of a civic center. This work is long overdue.

The workable program is also spurring the completion of the Milwaukee Building Code. I believe that the Milwaukee Common Council will hire a special consultant to complete the last six chapters of the code, which has been in the making a long time.

On the basis of our current experience, I think the workable program for urban renewal should be given several years of additional life in order to see what further advantages it will bring to the cities who have been compelled to meet its standards.

Yours truly,

FRANK P. ZEIDLER, *Mayor.*

A Workable Program for Fighting Slums

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDGAR W. HIESTAND
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 5, 1956

Mr. HIESTAND. Mr. Speaker, under existing law a local community may not receive Federal loans or capital grants for urban renewal projects, nor may it receive special FHA mortgage insurance aids for urban renewal housing unless the community has an approved workable program for the prevention and elimination of slums and blight. This provision was enacted by the Housing Act of 1954. The purpose of the provision in the 1954 act is to achieve maximum results in slum elimination and prevention by requiring localities assisted by Federal funds to utilize their own local facilities and powers in the prevention and elimination of slums. As originally enacted by the Housing Act of 1954, this requirement was applicable to Federal assistance to low-rent public housing. Its applicability to public housing was removed by the Housing Amendments of 1955. In his legislative program for this year President Eisenhower proposed that the law be amended so as to restore the applicability of the workable program requirement to future low-rent public housing.

H. R. 11742, the bill reported by the Committee on Banking and Currency, and referred to as the Housing Act of 1956, fails to restore the workable program provision. That is one of the reasons why a bipartisan Committee on Rules voted to table it. The bill is defective in that it presents public housing as an end in itself. That is certainly not the basis on which public housing was originally presented to the Congress. It was offered as a means of ridding our cities of slums. I believe, as does Albert M. Cole, the Housing Administrator, that public housing should be a part of an integrated attack on slums and blight and that communities undertaking public housing with the assistance of Federal funds should develop their own plans for meeting their overall problems of slums and blight and make their public housing projects a part of those plans.

That is what a workable program is—a community's plans for meeting its overall problems of slums and blight. It is in no sense an onerous or impossible requirement. Basically, it consists of the following seven elements:

First. Codes and ordinances: The objective is to assure adequate minimum standards of health, sanitation, and safety through a comprehensive system of codes and ordinances which state the minimum conditions under which dwellings may be lawfully occupied.

Second. A comprehensive community plan: The objective is the formulation and official recognition of a comprehensive general plan for the community as a whole. A general plan should be developed under procedures provided by State and local legislation, and should be supervised and administered by an offi-

cial local planning body with adequate resources and authority to insure continuity of planning.

Third. Neighborhood analyses: The objective is the identification of the extent and intensity of blight and logical patterns of specific neighborhoods for purposes of developing a basis for planning of healthy neighborhoods of decent homes and suitable living environment.

Fourth. Administrative organization: The objective is a firmly established administrative responsibility and capacity for enforcement of codes and ordinances, and for carrying out renewal programs and projects.

Fifth. Financing: The objective is the development of means for meeting the financial obligation involved in carrying out urban renewal activities.

Sixth. Housing for displaced families: The objective is to facilitate the rehousing, in decent, safe, and sanitary accommodations, of families displaced by governmental action.

Seventh. Citizen participation: The objective is communitywide participation on the part of individuals and representative citizens' organizations which will help to provide, both in the community generally and in selected areas the understanding and support which is necessary to insure success.

There are many reasons why the adoption by the community of a workable program for dealing with slums and blight should again be made a prerequisite for Federal aid to public housing, just as it is a requirement for Federal aid to urban renewal and special FHA mortgage insurance assistance for urban renewal housing. Among them are the following:

First. Federal aid to public housing should be given only where the community has an overall plan to prevent and eliminate slums. Public housing is only one of several instruments to be used in fighting slums and blight. A workable program is essential to assure that other available instruments which are appropriate under local conditions will be used by the community for this purpose and will be coordinated with public housing.

Second. The removal of this requirement resulted from a misunderstanding. The workable program requirement was repealed last year when it was confused with other provisions which required detailed calculations by the communities concerning displaced families, their incomes, existing low-rent public housing, and the timing of the construction of public housing in relation to the progress of urban-renewal projects. The workable program requirement never caused any difficulty or confusion in public housing, and the Housing Agency never asked that it be removed.

Third. The requirement for a workable program is not burdensome for either large or small communities. Communities are not expected to undertake protracted and unrealistic slum-prevention planning and other activities. Rather, they are merely expected to adopt sensible, long-range programs within their capabilities and suitable to their local conditions. Proof is that, as of June 1, workable programs had been approved for over 100 communities. More than half of them have populations of less than 50,000. About 45 percent have populations of less than 25,000. Twenty-two communities have populations of less than 10,000, 5 communities have populations of less than 5,000, and 2 have less than 2,000 population.

Fourth. The workable program does not have to be carried out before a public housing contract can be entered into. What is required is demonstration by the community that it is serious about carrying out its own program for dealing with slums and blight. It is recognized that it takes time to enact and put into operation housing codes and other actions contemplated by the workable program, and that it would be unreasonable to withhold Federal assistance to public housing until the program is carried out. The program looks only to future action.

Fifth. The workable program requirement would not preclude communities which do not have urban renewal powers from obtaining public housing. Requiring a workable program means merely that the community must have a plan of action for removing and preventing slums and blight. In some communities a program utilizing the city's normal police powers for rehabilitation and conservation would be sufficient. In other communities the program would be adequate if it coupled police powers with the usual exercise of eminent domain powers to acquire land for public improvement, such as parks, playgrounds, or other public facilities. Even in cities where extensive slum conditions cannot be eliminated without the use of eminent domain under urban renewal powers, this does not preclude such cities without those powers from having approved workable programs. It is only necessary that the city recognize its problems and have a plan for working toward this solution, even if this includes a reasonable plan of action for obtaining necessary State legislation or other legal action.

Mr. Speaker, the workable program requirement for the prevention and elimination of slums and blight is sound and desirable. The Congress should have no hesitancy in making it applicable to public housing in order that the public housing program may better serve its primary objective of helping to solve the slum problem.

Fear and the Security Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT H. LEHMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, July 17, 1956

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, the Washington Post of Friday, July 13, published what I consider to be a very incisive editorial highly critical of the recent endorsement by the administration of the proposal to place all Federal employees under the strictures and disabilities of the security program. It is an excellent editorial, commenting as it does on the recent report on this subject by the Association of the Bar of New York. I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FEAR AND SECURITY

It is scarcely conceivable that President Eisenhower has considered the full implications of the effort in Congress, with administration support, to nullify a major Supreme Court decision on the Federal security program. The Court's decision in the case of Kendrick M. Cole was compatible with sentiments often applauded by the President. It said in effect that the security program ought to be limited to genuinely sensitive positions in the Government rather than applied as a blanket to all positions in the civil service. This is also one of the recommendations of a group of some of the country's best lawyers in the admirable study of the security program conducted by the Association of the Bar of the City of New York.

That the President may not have had an opportunity to review the Supreme Court decision and the subsequent actions of his subordinates is understandable. Mr. Eisenhower was stricken with ileitis the morning of June 8. The Supreme Court decision was not handed down until June 11, when Mr. Eisenhower was in the hospital. Introduction of the Walter bill classifying all Federal jobs as involving "national security," and the indorsement of it by Attorney General Brownell and Chairman Young of the Civil Service Commission, all occurred during the President's absence. As far as can be ascertained, he has not talked to either Mr. Brownell or Mr. Young. Yet as Mr. Eisenhower completes his convalescence he is confronted by a full-blown effort to reimpose one of the worst facets of a system for which the administration has been repeatedly criticized.

Mr. Eisenhower has often spoken of his desire to safeguard the security program against unfairness and abuse. In his 1955 state of the Union message he pledged: "We shall, in the process, fully preserve our traditions and the basic rights of our citizens." Previously he had extolled the traditional right of Americans to meet their accusers "face to face." Just before his recent illness he reportedly asked former Sen. Harry Cain to prepare a memorandum on the operations of the security system after the latter had given him case histories of some of the most flagrant abuses. These are the comments and actions of a man of conscience who is seeking to do the right thing.

Should the President not then take a careful look at what his subordinates are attempting to do through the Walter bill to negate the Supreme Court decision? Is it not time to place genuine security requirements in perspective, to face up to the fact that a fear psychosis has been dominating the program? The report of the New York bar recommends that the program be delimited to cover some 1.5 million persons in really sensitive posts instead of the 6 million persons who have been covered by this and allied programs. This is the advice of disinterested top-notch legal experts who have studied the problem with no partisan purpose but with the view of evolving a program that will really protect both national security and individual security.

Does the President not sense the opportunity now to revise the program and make procedural improvements that will relate to real needs, instead of ritualistically accepting the plea of fearful men who have learned nothing from the excesses and insecurity of

the past? Will not Mr. Eisenhower, if he reads the New York bar report and heeds his own sensible instincts, conclude that the Walter bill is a monstrosity and that the security program ought to be limited and refined, not expanded?

Probable Closing of Picnic Areas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALLACE F. BENNETT
OF UTAH
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, July 17, 1956

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Alternative May Be Closing Picnic Areas," published in the Salt Lake Tribune of Wednesday, July 11, 1956.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ALTERNATIVE MAY BE CLOSING PICNIC AREAS

Congress is pushing toward adjournment before the end of July. Lawmakers from the 39 States favored with national forests within their boundaries would do well to visit these woodlands this summer. They would find there many of their voting constituents and they could see for themselves how every man's playgrounds are being trampled to dust and how facilities are deteriorating.

Use of national forests in the intermountain region likely is typical. In 1953 recreational visits to the 19 national forests in the region totaled 4,964,600, not counting trips through. This was an increase of 41.8 percent on improved areas and 124 percent on unimproved areas in 5 years. The number rose to 6,106,300 in 1955 and, at the current rate of increase, will total between 7,500,000 and 9 million by 1960.

With water contamination already a serious problem and most popular areas suffering greatly from overuse, the Forest Service will not be able to safely accommodate such large numbers of recreation seekers unless the repair and maintenance program is vastly accelerated. Due in part to efforts of intermountain region congressional members, the 1956–57 appropriation for national forest sanitation and public camping facilities was set at $3,097,250. This is an increase of $1,372,750 over last year but still grossly inadequate to meet the growing demands and to safeguard public health. At least $24 million will be required to rehabilitate and expand existing public-use facilities on the national forests.

To make up for the decades of neglect, to provide necessary improvements to accommodate the visitor load (growing at the annual rate of 10½ percent) repeated proposals have been made that 10 percent of forest receipts be allocated for campground, wildlife habitat, and sanitation improvements. Utah's Senator WATKINS has cosponsored the program in the past. Several such measures are now in Congress. They place a ceiling on the annual allocation ranging from $5½ million to $7½ million, which is conservative considering that recreational visits for the Nation now total more than 40 million yearly.

The bills have failed in the past mainly because of opposition to earmarking funds. This remains a powerful factor. Though professing to support the objectives of the bill, the Agriculture Department opposes earmarking although this is fairly common with Forest Service receipts.

The House Interior and Insular Affairs Committee recently introduced a bill which would provide essentially the same benefits to the public domain woodlands under the Interior Department jurisdiction. The strategy is to amend the bill during the legislative process so that it would apply also to the 180 million acres of national forest lands. The circuitous legislative maneuver is called necessary by conservation-minded legislators and interested sportsmen's organizations in view of the urgency of the need and a possible roadblock in the Agriculture Committee.

These spokesmen point to the 3,200,000 big game animals—one-third of the national total—now living on publicly owned forests. They include 2,820,000 deer, 246,000 elk (90 percent of the elk in the country), and many thousands of bear, mountain goats, bighorn sheep, moose, antelope, and peccary. A harvest of 473,000 big game animals was taken from national forests during the 1954 hunting season under State game regulations. If all current Forest Service wildlife funds went for big game management—which they do not—the investment would be less than a dollar a year for each animal taken home.

Sportsmen, who made over 12 million visits to national forests last year, are making known their dissatisfaction over the pittance appropriations for Forest Service wildlife and recreational improvements. They are speaking through the National Wildlife Federation, the Izaak Walton League, and other organizations on behalf of more funds. Utah's Senator BENNETT, pleading for increased moneys for this purpose, a few weeks ago pointed out that total receipts from the national forests greatly exceeded the expenditures.

It would be both good business and good sense to reinvest more of these receipts in the maintenance and improvement of the growingly popular national forest playgrounds.

Vice President Nixon's Poise and Dignity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CRAIG HOSMER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, July 7, 1956

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, it is a practically effortless task to criticize someone, and apparently a pleasurable one for some people. Particularly if the one criticized happens to be an especially able and active member of the opposing poltical party. It is a fair thing to give credit where credit is due, as in the following editorial which appeared recently in the Long Beach Press Telegram:

SHOW GOES AS BILLED

President Eisenhower's announcement that he will seek reelection surprised no one. He had never said anything to indicate any change of plan. He had permitted Republican strategists to proceed on the asumption that he would be the candidate. He had done nothing to prevent Press Secretary Haggerty from smiling broadly when asked about the possibility of Mr. Eisenhower's candidacy.

So the show will go on as billed.

It is good to hear from the President himself that he feels well enough to run. He says he feels better than before. Quite clearly, the seriousness of his recent illness was exaggerated.

The intestinal operation didn't merely hold the line in a physical crisis; nor did it signal a progressive deterioration. Rather it was rehabilitative, regenerative. The President, who knows his own feelings best, is a practical testimony to this theory, offered on the best of medical authority.

The assurance that Mr. Eisenhower will run leaves the Republican National Convention a cut and dried affair. Ike has been pledged the ballots necessary to hand him the nomination—which no one has doubted he could have for the asking.

If there is a shadow of doubt about the story the GOP convention will write, it surrounds the question of the Vice Presidency.

Mr. Eisenhower has not come out and said pointblank that he and RICHARD NIXON are a team seeking reelection. But for most political observers his statement expressing delight over NIXON'S decision to run was a conclusive sign that NIXON is again the choice for second place.

And why shouldn't he be? Mr. NIXON has done nothing to disqualify himself, but has conducted himself with poise and dignity through hailstorms of partisan abuse. He has handled all his assignments expertly and shown real genius in the field of diplomacy. He has demonstrated his ability to grow. It would be a sad injustice for the Republicans to reject such a man.

Again, NIXON has proved that he's no political liability, as some Republican leaders whispered previous to the spring primaries. He received strong, spontaneous support in several State primaries in which his name did not appear and in which he did no campaigning.

The Ike and DICK combination still has the look of a winner. By all logic, that will be the combination offered by the Republicans in November.

Costly Foreign Aid Funds Feed United States Industry First

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT B. CHIPERFIELD
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 16, 1956

Mr. CHIPERFIELD. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by James M. Haswell, of the Chicago Daily News:

WASHINGTON, June 18.—Congressional talk about foreign aid sounds as though it were all going out and none coming in.

Some people speak of it as taking dollars away from Americans to give to Europeans and Asiatics.

Such talk overlooks the fact that foreign-aid dollars make business in this country before they ever leave these shores.

Harry W. Arnold, president of the Ohio Chamber of Commerce, recently circulated in Congress a statement that President Dwight D. Eisenhower's 1956–57 foreign-aid request would cost Ohio taxpayers $292 million.

Figures from the International Cooperation Administration and the Census Bureau indicate this same foreign-aid request would bring $408 million worth of business into Ohio.

Using the same premises:

Michigan taxpayers would pay $368 million and Michigan farmers and manufacturers would get $393.5 million business.

Illinois taxpayers would pay $81 million and Illinois would get $345,600,000 business.

People talk about foreign aid in terms of dollars but foreign aid actually is goods and services.

Some of the goods and services are produced in the countries to which the foreign aid goes.

But the great bulk is produced in this country.

The International Cooperation Administration reports that 91 percent of the foreign-aid funds spent on agricultural commodities last year was spent right in this country for American farm products.

Seventy-one percent of the money spent on industrial goods went to American manufacturers, and 88 percent of the money spent on military goods furnished wages for American workers and profits for American corporations.

Ohio is one of the great centers of American industry. Ohio accounts for 9 percent of the value added by American manufacturing. Ohio also furnishes 3.1 percent of the Nation's farm products.

Michigan does 12.2 percent of defense-type manufacturing, 8 percent of general manufacturing, and raises 2.1 percent of the farm goods.

Working out all these percentages, it appears that postwar foreign-aid spending already has brought Ohio about $2,900,000,000 business, Michigan $2,300,000,000, and Illinois $3,100,000,000.

Compensation for Service-Disabled Veterans

SPEECH
OF
HON. GEORGE A. SHUFORD
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 12, 1956

Mr. SHUFORD. Mr. Speaker, I am privileged to be a member of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs. Throughout my service on this committee, I believe I have made it abundantly clear that I consider our first obligation is to those disabled in service and to the surviving widows, children, and dependent parents of those who die from service-connected causes. This Congress has already provided generous increases for survivors by the approval of H. R. 7089. The House has also approved pension increases for veterans whose disabilities are not connected with service by the passage of H. R. 7886 on June 27, 1956. In fact, H. R. 7886 authorizes pensions for veterans of World War I at age 65 even though they are not disabled, if they can meet the income limitations. In view of this action, it seems clear that it is our obligation to promptly increase the rates of compensation for those disabled in service as provided by H. R. 12038.

Pensions for the nonservice disabled are usually justified on the basis that the veteran has made a personal sacrifice for the defense of his country that entitles him to assistance if subsequently disabled and in need. The veteran disabled in service is certainly entitled to no less than equal consideration on the basis of his contribution to the defense of the Nation and clearly he has made more personal sacrifice than one who was not disabled during his period of service. The service-disabled man would not have incurred his disability if he had not been in service and logically, our obligation to one whose disabilities resulted from his defense of the Nation is greater than our obligation to those who were not so disabled.

Approximately 2 million veterans will receive compensation increases under the provisions of H. R. 12038. Its estimated cost is not excessive and will decline rather than increase in future years.

For these reasons, I ask the full support of the House for this meritorious bill.

Are Large Numbers of Military Personnel Needed for Future Wars?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. TIMOTHY P. SHEEHAN
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 17, 1956

Mr. SHEEHAN. Mr. Speaker, many of us have spent much time in trying to figure out what should be the future military policy of our country, in view of the fact that the nuclear weapons seem to indicate that future wars will be of an entirely different nature than past wars.

The Chicago Daily Tribune, in their editorial of Tuesday, July 17, points out the fact that it seems most likely that future wars will be on the basis of a quick destruction of the industrial potential of the enemy and therefore calls for a revised concept of our usual thinking about military preparedness.

The editorial is as follows:

RADFORD'S BOMBSHELL

Adm. Arthur W. Radford, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, dismisses as a mixture of fact and pure speculation a drastic plan credited to him for reorganizing the Nation's Military Establishment and cutting existing forces by 800,000 men. Nevertheless, he concedes that the joint chiefs have a continuing duty to restudy the Nation's military needs and that the introduction of new weapons might make possible a reduction in manpower.

Admiral Radford's reported thesis is that the next war will be fought with nuclear weapons, that it will be short and violent, that the burden will be carried by the strategic Air Force, that it would be over before ground forces could ever be committed, and that, therefore, there is no need for a big army and no utility in maintaining substantial Army forces on the continent of Europe.

The admiral is said to believe the United States will be the main base in launching attacks upon the enemy through intercontinental bombers and guided missiles. Under this concept of fortress America, the United States would be less dependent on overseas bases and consequently would have less need to curry favor with other nations through foreign aid. Some bases, however, would be required to refuel the big B–52 jet bombers on missions into the heart of Eurasia, and some would also be needed for the takeoff of B–47 medium bombers, which don't have the range of the bigger plane.

Inasmuch as M- [for mobilization] day and D-day, marking the start of hostilities, are expected to coincide, the Radford plan, as outlined, is predicated on the belief that action would be over before an army could be shipped overseas. Accordingly, the admiral proposes to cut the Army by 450,000 men between now and 1960, reducing it from its present size of 1,030,000 men to 580,000.

Because the tactical Air Force is organized for close support of ground troops in battle, this arm of the Air Force would be cut by 150,000 men. Projected Air Force strength would then be 820,000 men.

The Navy, with 662,774 men at present, and its amphibious arm, the Marine Corps, now at a strength of 201,000, would be called upon, in combination, to give up 200,000 men, so that their combined strength, after reorganization, would be 663,774 men. The Navy's primary mission would be to provide antisubmarine defense. The principal strength of the Soviet Union afloat is a huge fleet of submersibles.

The National Guard and Army Reserve would be employed on civil defense and home guard duties. The Army forces now stationed overseas would be reduced to token forces which "would wave the flag." Five divisions are now in Europe under the North Atlantic Treaty Organization Command, 2 in South Korea, and 1 is in Japan.

The entire plan is said to have been drafted in support of the view that in a period of watchful waiting of indefinite duration, the principal preoccupation of the United States should be to maintain a sound and solvent economy. Instead of huge allocations of defense dollars to standing forces, the emphasis will be on research and the development of new weapons.

Now, what, in reality, is this plan? Where have you heard it before? It is, in all essential particulars, the plan that has long been advocated by such men as former President Herbert Hoover, the late Senator Robert A. Taft, Brig. Gen. Bonner Fellers and the Chicago Tribune. It made sense to us long before it seems to have occurred to the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs, who, in adopting it, has brought down upon himself the inevitable wrath of the Joint Chiefs, who know that its terms will cost them part of the manpower they so jealously hoard.

Another consequence of the plan is that it will lead, in all likelihood, to the end of conscription, which can only be justified so long as masses of men are called for in the scheme of defense. The draft will died of disuse as the services come more and more to be manned by professional career specialists.

We can find not the slightest logical objection to such changes, except, perhaps, that they still leave the Military Establishment loaded with 600,000 more men than it had before the Korean war. Why delay in putting in execution a project which will save the country money, maintain and improve its security, relieve it of the risk of exposing garrisons overseas, curtail the racket in foreign aid, release 800,000 men for useful civilian work, and relieve the Nation of the curse of conscription?

Pressure From the Left

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARENCE J. BROWN
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 17, 1956

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following excerpt from the National Whirligig column which appeared in the Muncie press of July 9, 1956:

Ellis, public power lobbyist and big spending advocate, virtually ran the Rural Electrification Administration when Claude Wickard of Indiana and Charles F. Brannan, of

Colorado, headed Agriculture. In fact, Wickard and Ellis employed the same ghost writer for recent speeches pro public power. Unfortunately, the ghost writer plagiarized himself, writing virtually the same words for each.

Wickard and Brannan are the Democratic nominees from their respective States. Both are strong Stevenson supporters. The Chicagoan will owe them, as well as Reuther, Patton, Rauh, Harriman, and Truman, a great debt, if they should help to land him in the White House. Will he be able to withstand these pressures from the left, if—

Immigration Quotas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL F. SCHENCK
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 17, 1956

Mr. SCHENCK. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I am inserting in the RECORD a resolution adopted by the American citizens of Greek descent of Dayton, Ohio, relating to immigration quotas, as follows:

RESOLUTION OF AMERICAN CITIZENS OF GREEK DESCENT RESIDING IN DAYTON, OHIO, RELATING TO IMMIGRATION QUOTAS

Whereas over 300 citizens of Greek descent residing in Dayton, Ohio, and suburbs are familiar with the privations and hardships of the people of Greece resulting from warfare and occupation and from communistic depredations of the last decade and from the two destructive earthquakes within the last 2 years and these 300 Americans and their friends are cognizant of the inequities resulting from the national origins system of immigration and of the Refugee Relief Act of 1953, as amended; and

Whereas the prevailing United States immigration laws and regulations are clearly discriminatory inasmuch as they assign to the nations of northern and western Europe five-sixths of the migration quotas and to the southern and eastern nations only one-sixth and, as aptly stated by Secretary Dulles, this system "draws distinction between the blood of one person and the blood of another (which) cannot be reconciled with the fundamental concepts of our Declaration of Independence"; and

Whereas the State Department reports show that there are over 16,000 Greek assurances still pending and without visas; and

Whereas the economy of Greece is in an increasingly precarious state as a result of overpopulation and of depletion through her recurrent wars for liberation, for freedom, and for democracy from 1911 until 1947; and

Whereas immigrants from Greece, within the last 50 years, have been assimilated with unrivaled rapidity and thoroughness in the United States and now with their children and grandchildren, aggregating over 1,250,000 citizens, are amongst the most respected, most prominent, law abiding, home loving, loyal, and progressive Americans and American patriots, having proven themselves as such in every endeavor, civil and military; and

Whereas the historic friendship, existing between the United States and Greece, is predicated upon their mutual devotion to the tenets of democracy and liberty, to the principles of the dignity and the freedom of the individual, and to the culture of the western civilization which was founded in ancient Greece and is now flowering intensively and illuminatively in the United States; and

Whereas these two countries fought side by side in two great world wars since the days when each gained its independence; and

Whereas within the last decade, evidencing its interest in Greece the United States, through the Marshall plan and the Truman doctrine, aided decisively in the preservation of Greece within the orbit of the western nations, for which the Greek people are most grateful; and

Whereas the Greeks have demonstrated repeatedly their loyalty as allies of the western nations and their exemplary courage as a freedom-loving people by resisting heroically the mighty axis forces in 1940–41 and by exterminating the vile communistic forces in 1944–47; and

Whereas Greece, lying athwart the eastern terminus of the Mediterranean Basin, is strategically the controlling gateway of the sea, air, land, and fuel oil routes among three continents, Europe, Asia, and Africa, and because of its geographical location, Greece is the master hinge of the NATO, Balkan, Baghdad, and SEATO defensive systems and as such an indispensable bastion for the security of the western democracies.

It is resolved by the undersigned, personally and collectively, that our Representatives in Congress, namely, the Honorable PAUL F. SCHENCK, the Honorable JOHN W. BRICKER, and the Honorable GEORGE H. BENDER be and hereby are respectfully urged and appealed to, to take timely and appropriate action in urging vigorously the Honorable WILLIAM LANGER, chairman, Subcommittee on Refugee Relief Program, Hon. JAMES O. EASTLAND, chairman, Senate Judiciary Committee, Hon. EMANUEL CELLER, chairman, House Judiciary Committee, Hon. FRANCIS WALTER, chairman, House Immigration Subcommittee, (A) to expedite and support legislation for additional Greek refugee relief quotas by transferring an additional 10,000 visas for Greece from the unused and undersubscribed quotas (of the Northern and Western Europe 5/6 visas) and 10,000 or more for Italy; but not to increase the overall total of 209,000 under the entire refugee relief program, such transfer being within the humanitarian spirit and true purposes of the prevailing immigration laws, and further, (B) to support actively the effectuation of amendments of the present immigration law beneficially to the people of Greece and of Italy, both members of NATO, and particularly to support the enactment of legislation within the contemplation of pending bills S. 3570, S. 3571, S. 3572, S. 3573, and S. 3574, (C) this resolution signed by the members of this community be transmitted to the Honorable PAUL F. SCHENCK, Congressman, Third District, Ohio, for transmittal to his fellow Congressmen.

Respectfully submitted.

JUNE 8, 1956.

Nixon and Nehru

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PATRICK J. HILLINGS
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 17, 1956

Mr. HILLINGS. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call attention to an editorial from the Washington Daily News of Tuesday, July 10, 1956, discussing Vice President NIXON's successful global tour. The editorial follows:

NIXON AND NEHRU

Moscow's mouthpiece, Izvestia, and India's neutral Premier Nehru appear to be in agreement on one thing: They don't like what Vice President NIXON has been saying on his current trip. For instance—

In Manila, he said neutralism in the cold war is a fearful risk.

In Formosa, he said President Eisenhower stands by Chiang Kai-shek and still is firmly opposed to recognition of Red China.

In Bangkok, he commended the pro-westernism of Thailand.

And in Karachi he reminded Mr. Nehru that any country which takes Russian aid runs the risk of becoming a satellite. India, of course, is benefiting from very favorable trade and credit deals with the Soviets, as well as direct American aid.

Izvestia says Mr. NIXON is clinging to "outdated cold-war positions." Why shouldn't he—or we—is there the slightest reason for believing the cold war is over?

And Mr. Nehru says it isn't democratic to want all people to think the same as you do. Well, it isn't so much that we want the Indian Premier to think the way we do—we'd settle for it if he'd just quit thinking the way Moscow does.

H. R. 11122

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERBERT ZELENKO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 17, 1956

Mr. ZELENKO. Mr. Speaker, on July 16, there appeared on the Consent Calendar of the House, H. R. 11122, a bill dealing with the charter of tankers under certain conditions.

Had I been present when this bill was called up, I would have objected. I have vigorously opposed this bill at all times, in the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee and on the floor of the House.

It was my personal understanding, and that of many other Members, perhaps naively, that this measure would not be brought up at that time by its proponents.

On July 2, 1956, it first appeared on the Consent Calendar of the House. At that time, the following took place:

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 11122) to promote the development and rehabilitation of the coastwise trade, to encourage the construction of new vessels, and for other purposes.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I understand that this bill is programed to be called up under suspension of the rules. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that it be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Later, on the same day, under suspension, debate was had on the bill. At that time it was opposed not only by myself but by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. VAN ZANDT], who had demanded a second under the suspension of rules. Other Members also indicated their opposition. At the conclusion of the debate, on a division, a vote was taken. The ayes were 101 and the nayes 90. It appeared

from the vote that the measure was defeated under the suspension of rules. At this point, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BONNER], the proponent of the bill, objected on the ground that there was no quorum and asked unanimous consent that further proceedings on the bill be postponed until Friday, July 6. On page 10546 of the July 2 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, his verbatim statement appears as follows:

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, as I stated before, I object to the vote on the ground that there is no quorum, but I am not going to ask for a rollcall vote now. I ask unanimous consent that further proceedings on this bill be postponed until Friday.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

On July 6, 1956, the bill was called up again and the following took place, and I quote:

The SPEAKER. The unfinished business is on suspension of the rules and passage of the bill (H. R. 11122) to promote the development and rehabilitation of the coastwise trade, to encourage the construction of new vessels, and for other purposes, which the Clerk will report by title.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, I think the Members of the House would like an explanation as to what this suspension is.

The SPEAKER. This is a bill, the consideration of which was carried over from last Monday until today.

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw further consideration of this bill, as I have requested a rule from the Rules Committee.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, if the gentleman's request is granted, does that mean it may be called up at any time between now and the adjournment of Congress?

Mr. BONNER. No. I will bring it up under a rule.

Many Members of the House, including myself, relying upon the foregoing statement of the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BONNER], the chairman of the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee, the author of the bill, assumed, and I believe correctly, that this bill would not be brought out again unless it was done so under a rule.

It appeared clear to me that the bill had been withdrawn for all purposes and consideration from the floor of the House and would not reappear unless a rule was obtained.

On July 9 and 10, the Rules Committee held protracted hearings on this bill and, as of today, no rule has as yet been obtained, and to all intents and purposes the matter is still before the Rules Committee.

Yesterday, July 16, 1956, the bill again appeared on the Consent Calendar and was passed. The House convened at 12 noon. The passage of this bill took place sometime before 12:20 p. m.

My absence from the floor at the convening of the House yesterday was due to the following facts. At 10 a. m., an open meeting of the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee, of which the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BONNER], is chairman, was held for the resumption of labor hearings held in Los Angeles and Long Beach, Calif. The witnesses appearing before the committee were Paul St. Sure, president of the Pacific Maritime Association; Harry Bridges, president, International Longshoremen and Warehousemen's Union; and Ben McDonald, local 13, ILWU, San Pedro, Calif.

I arrived at the committee room at about 10:30 a. m. In the absence of the chairman, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BONNER], and in the absence of the next ranking majority member, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BOYKIN], the meeting was being conducted by the acting chairman, the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. GARMATZ]. The committee was in session until just before noon.

I left the committee hearing several minutes before its recess. At no time during my attendance there was the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BONNER], nor the ranking majority member, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BOYKIN], present. Thereupon, I went to a meeting of a large group of Members to discuss the civil rights bill, which was to be brought up on the floor.

The foregoing statement of my official congressional activities yesterday morning contains the reasons for my failing to be present at the opening of the House.

Sometime between 12:15 and 12:20 p. m., I entered the House Chamber and walked over to the committee table where I sat down next to the chairman of the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee, the gentleman from North Carolina, who was already there. Upon inquiry, he informed me that H. R. 11122 had been passed.

Thereafter, in order to indicate my further opposition to the measure, I requested unanimous consent to return H. R. 11122 to the floor for immediate consideration. The sole objection was made by the chairman of the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BONNER], the author of the bill. The following is a verbatim extract from the House RECORD, page 11745:

Mr. ZELENKO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to return for immediate consideration to Consent Calendar No. 626, the bill (H. R. 11122) to promote the development and rehabilitation of the coastwise trade, to encourage the construction of new vessels, and for other purposes.

Mr. BONNER. I object, Mr. Speaker.

Several hours later, almost at the conclusion of the session, I renewed the request. Objection was then made by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. ROBESON]. The gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BONNER], the author of the bill, was present in the House at the time and sitting alongside the gentleman from Virginia, who made the objection.

In conclusion, I direct your attention to the title page of Cannon's Procedure in the House of Representatives, House Document 562. On the lower portion of the page appears the following quotation:

BASSANIO. And I beseech you wrest once the law to your authority; to do a great right, do a little wrong.

PORTIA. It must not be; * * * 'twill be recorded for a precedent, and many an error by the same example will rush into the state.

A Year Since Geneva

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. DODD
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 10, 1956

Mr. DODD. Mr. Speaker, just a year ago the so-called summit conference was held in Geneva.

At that time, there were high hopes and great expectations in the United States and elsewhere in the free world that this meeting would lay a foundation for the easing of tensions and the beginnings of peace in the world.

In the year that has elapsed, none of these hopes or expectations has been realized; and instead, the forces of aggressive communism have made frightening progress while the forces of freedom and justice in the world have lost ground.

Mr. R. H. Shackford of the Scripps-Howard papers has written a scholarly and informative analysis of developments since the Geneva meeting, which appears in today's issue of the Washington News.

Mr. Shackford's article reads as follows, and I commend it to the attention of my colleagues:

A MINUS FOR THE WEST—A YEAR SINCE GENEVA
(By R. H. Shackford)

A year ago this week the leaders of the four great powers met for the first time in 10 years at Geneva in a mood of optimism. One year later that optimism is badly tarnished.

But the debate over who gained or lost from that summit conference still goes on.

Some argue it was a major setback for the West—that the Bolsheviks accomplished a major objective by encouraging the Western World to relax—which it has—and thus become easier prey.

Others argue that the Geneva meeting was a major gain for the West—that it relaxed internal tensions and diminished the danger of war.

The record supports the claim that the Geneva Conference was a plus for the Soviets and a minus for the West:

The Reds have made alarming headway with expanded influence in south Asia and the Middle East, and have increased the danger of an Arab-Israeli war.

Western alliances have been creaking and the West in general, basking in the afterglow of the phony Geneva spirit, is letting down its guard and indulging in the luxury of intra-family squabbles.

The new Soviet leaders have managed—by changing only their manners—to mislead many people into believing that the Kremlin is sanctioning fundamental changes though the Soviet leaders themselves have stated that their fundamentals will not change.

On specific subjects discussed at Geneva, the conference and all subsequent negotiations have proved complete flops. The East and West are just as divided as they were at Geneva.

The Foreign Ministers' Conference which followed the summit meeting was, according to the President, to be the "acid test" of Soviet intentions. It was a greater flop.

Mr. Eisenhower suggested that the test of Soviet cooperation pledges to him at Geneva would come "in the language and terminology in which we will find speeches and diplomatic exchanges couched."

Last week Soviet delegate Andrei Gromyko bitterly denounced the United States

before the United Nations, provoking the American delegate to describe the speech as "in the worst traditions of Stalinism."

A few days earlier a Soviet note absurdly accused the United States Air Force of espionage in flights over Soviet cities.

Pravda's "new spirit of conciliation and cooperation" is displayed by blaming Secretary of State John Foster Dulles wholly for Poland's bread riots.

The easy answer is the one used by President Eisenhower in his recent letter to Chiang Kai-shek:

"International communism alters its tactics from time to time but we have as yet no evidence of any change in its objectives."

Nevertheless, it has been the change in Soviet tactics—looked at uncritically by much of the world—which has given the Soviet Union the advantages it has reaped in the past year by merely playing on world gullibility.

How superficial those changes are is evident in a summary of the year's highlights:

The Soviets keep at high tempo their pious professions of peace, but they leapfrogged into the Middle East with a Czech-Egyptian arms deal, provoking an arms race which could lead to war.

West Germany established diplomatic relations with Russia after a Soviet promise to return prisoners of war held more than 10 years. All the POW's were not returned and now the Soviet leaders have recalled their ambassador in Bonn.

Khrushchev and Bulganin toured India, Burma, Afghanistan, and Pakistan, indulging in international demogoguery on a grand scale and promising the moon to all who would believe them.

Russia vetoed Japan's admission to the United Nations.

The East German army formally was incorporated in the Soviet-Warsaw Pact, but the Kremlin still demands dissolution of all Western military alliances.

The Soviet leaders painted Stalin as a maniacal despot so far as most of internal evils are concerned, but haven't mentioned any of his international crimes except his blunder with Tito.

There is much talk about a better deal for the Soviet people, but the new 5-year plan is just Stalin's old forced industrialization policy. Emphasis is overwhelmingly on heavy and military industry—only crumbs for the consumer.

The Kremlin's anti-Stalin and kiss-and-make-up-with-Tito campaigns seemed to encourage the satellites to be more independent. But when Polish workers demanded more bread and freedom they were shot down by the army.

The Cominform was "dissolved" and foreign Communist parties enjoyed a couple of weeks of criticizing the Kremlin's handling of the anti-Stalin campaign. But the foreign Reds have now all swung into line—and are no longer asking Khrushchev what he was doing when Stalin was rampaging.

The U. S. S. R. claims it cut its armed formes by 640,000 men last year and will make another reduction of 1.2 million this year—and demands the West do the same. But it steadfastly refuses to accept any arms-reduction plan which would provide inspection. The same is true of Soviet atomic armaments proposals.

The unhappy facts are that on the really important issues—Germany, the satellites, disarmament, the Far East, etc.—the new Soviet regime's policy has hardened.

Changes may be occurring inside the Soviet empire. It is probably true that the Soviet leaders would like to avoid a major war—as did Stalin—if objectives can be attained by other means.

But nothing has happened since the Geneva Conference to encourage hope for even a change of tactics—except for the worse—on the issues that could spell the difference between war and peace.

Commonwealth Club of California Vote on U. N. Membership

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEROY JOHNSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 17, 1956

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I include the results of the vote taken on July 16, 1956, by the Commonwealth which is the official publication of Commonwealth Club of California.

This vote concerns the advantages and disadvantages of the United Nations which it is believed by the members are useful or nonuseful to our own national policies, to our independence of action and to our constitutional rights.

I am certain that the Members would be interested in reading the results of the vote of the Commonwealth Club members. The Commonwealth Club has been studying public problems, both local, State and national, as well as international problems that affect us, for half a century. Consequently their backlog of experience in handling public problems is listened to with great respect. I believe that the Members of the House will be interested in looking at the results of this poll or vote taken by the Commonwealth Club.

The results of the vote follow:

COMMONWEALTH CLUB OF CALIFORNIA VOTE ON UNITED NATIONS MEMBERSHIP—BALLOT OF ENTIRE CLUB FOLLOWING STUDY BY INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS SECTION

I. Do the advantages of United States membership in the U. N. outweigh the disadvantages? Yes, 1,574.

Do the disadvantages of United States membership in the U. N. outweight the advantages? Yes, 324.

II. (A) Does our membership in the U. N. endanger our national sovereignty? Yes, 564; no, 1,308.

(B) Because of our membership in the U. N. does our Constitution need to be amended to give greater assurance that the American people, through constitutional processes, retain national sovereignty? Yes, 664; no, 1,054.

III. Should the U. N. have any control over:

(a) Our constitutional rights and traditional safeguards? Yes, 56; no, 1,847.

(b) Our immigration laws? Yes, 114, no, 1,780.

(c) Our tariff laws? Yes, 185; no, 1,699.

IV. Should the supreme law of the United States be:

(a) The U. N. Charter Yes, 79.

(b) United States Federal Constitution? Yes, 1,805.

V. (A) Should the United States continue its membership in the U. N. as now organized and functioning? Yes, 1,584; no, 304.

(B) Should the U. N. be asked to remove its headquarters from the United States? Yes, 255, no, 1,585.

VI. Should the United States Government support a pro-U. N. publicity campaign in the United States? Yes, 913; no, 906.

VII. (a) Can the U. N. prevent war? Yes, 686; no, 1,086.

(B) Is the U. N. useful to the United States in our policy of helping to prevent war? Yes, 1,614; no, 268.

VIII. Regardless of our membership in the U. N., must we rely for our security principally on our own strength and our defensive alliances? Yes, 1,803; no, 100.

IX. Was U. N. participation in connection with the Korean war:

(a) An advantage to the United States? Yes, 1156.

(b) A disadvantage to the United States? Yes, 586.

X. (A) Should United States foreign aid:

(a) Be channeled only through the U. N.? Yes, 89.

(b) Be handled only directly with individual nations? Yes, 757.

(c) Be handled by both methods? Yes, 934.

(B) Should United States foreign aid be limited to nations which cooperate with policies supported by the United States? Yes, 1,200; no, 535.

XI. Has the activity of the United Nations:

(a) Encouraged upheavals in the colonial areas? Yes, 527.

(b) Discouraged upheavals in the colonial areas? Yes, 185.

(c) Had little effect either way? Yes, 986.

XII. Should we withdraw our support from:

(a) UNESCO (United Nations Scientific and Cultural Organization)? Yes, 491; no, 1,219.

(b) ILO (International Labor Organization)? Yes, 692; no, 960.

XIII. Have American Communists employed by the U. N. given help to the U. S. S. R. in the cold war? Yes, 1,198; no, 242.

XIV. Does the United States need to strengthen and perfect its defense against subversion by Communists operating in the U. N.? Yes, 1,361; no, 263.

XV. Has the U. N. helped Communist expansion throughout the world in the past 10 years? Yes, 536; no, 1,039.

XVI. Should the United States continue to pay the proportion of the costs of the U. N. heretofore allocated to it in the form of:

(a) Cash? Yes, 1,065; no, 444.

(b) Technical assistance? Yes, 1,248; no, 249.

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

PRICE OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

The Public Printer is authorized to furnish to subscribers the daily RECORD at $1.50 per month, payable in advance.

Remit by money order payable to Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C.

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

Appendix

Not the South's Fight Alone

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM M. TUCK
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 13, 1956

Mr. TUCK. Mr. Speaker, under leave heretofore granted me to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I enclose an editorial from the Richmond News Leader of Richmond, Va., of Monday, July 16, 1956. Mr. James Jackson Kilpatrick, the able exponent of the Doctrine of Interposition, is the editor of the Richmond News Leader.

This editorial points out very forcefully, as I undertook to do yesterday in my speech in opposition to the so-called civil rights bill, H. R. 627, that the bill may prove—and most likely will—as dangerous to the Northern and Western States as to the Southern States.

The editorial is as follows:

NOT THE SOUTH'S FIGHT ALONE

If there is anything good to be said of the "civil rights" bill now before the House of Representatives, a close reading of the proponents' statements fails to disclose it. The bill seeks to cure certain evils which already are susceptible to remedy by existing law; but in order to attack these evils, the bill creates far greater ones. If the measure drew its greatest support from people who are sincere, if misguided, at least their good intentions would merit some respect; but this bill draws its chief support from a band of shamelessly cynical politicians bidding for the Negro vote. They know the bill will be killed in the Senate; their irresponsible aim is solely to create a voting record in the House.

Yet the most regrettable aspect of this whole affair is the apparent inability of the press and the public outside the South to comprehend the invitation to bureaucratic tyranny concealed in the scheme. The bill is understood as another conflict between North and South, between white man and black man; it drives the wedge of sectional misunderstanding still deeper.

Should these vindictive proposals ever become law, a terrible weapon of vengeance and harassment will have been placed in Federal hands, to be levied against public officials and private individuals throughout the country. The sweeping powers of summons and subpena provided in this bill, and the wholly unwarranted powers relating to civil suits in Federal courts, would serve utterly to degrade State judicial authority.

Back in March of 1833, if we may recall a little recent history, the Congress vengefully adopted a force bill aimed at South Carolina. But the bill never was used against South Carolina. To the intense chagrin of the northern interests that had compelled its adoption, the bill first was employed against the sovereign State of Ohio some 10 or 15 years later. What had seemed a desirable weapon against the rebellious Carolinians then was seen clearly as a detestable instrument of Federal power against all States.

The current civil rights bill, we are reliably advised, will die in the Senate Judiciary Committee, but the Federalist spirit behind it will survive. And so long as the apostles of tyranny can cloak their intentions in a spurious, eye-rolling effort to protect the Negro, it will prove difficult indeed to convince our northern brothers that it is not the Negro's liberties that are endangered: It is their own.

Mr. Senator, Mr. Congressman, Before You Go Home You Have Unfinished Business

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 17, 1956

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein a splendid statement that appeared today in the Washington Post and Times Herald regarding the present desperate plight of the textile industry. It contains much of the basic data, which I have included from time to time in my various speeches and statements in the House about this subject.

How anyone can read it without being deeply impressed concerning the dangers would seem incomprehensible to me and surely one would not have to possess great foresight in order to realize that the same unfair competitive conditions now so seriously undermining the textile industry are developing with respect to other American industries, and that the time will come in the not too distant future when the whole economy is bound to be threatened by a deluge of cheap foreign imports that will shatter our present high living standards, wages and full employment, and general prosperity.

I again urge the indulgence and consideration of my colleagues respecting the very serious problems presented to this country by these substandard competitive imports:

MR. SENATOR, MR. CONGRESSMAN, BEFORE YOU GO HOME, YOU HAVE UNFINISHED BUSINESS

You are leaving one of the most vital segments of the American economy in a position of danger.

You are exposing the second greatest industry in the United States to the imminent risk of serious and permanent impairment.

And this is an industry essential to our national defense.

The jobs and livelihood of a large percentage of the more than a million workers directly employed in this industry, and their families; of hundreds of thousands of others in allied and related industries; and of countless more tradesmen and merchants who serve them and whose businesses are dependent upon them, are at stake.

This is the textile industry which makes the fabric for the clothing that you and your own families and friends as well as some 167 million other American men, women, children and infants must wear—the sheets and pillowcases on which we all sleep—the towels and washcloths to keep us clean—the household and automobile upholstery upon which we sit—the carpets, curtains and draperies that make our homes attractive and liveable—the industrial fabrics without which almost no other American products could be produced—the uniforms that clothe and protect our Armed Forces, and fabrics that are indispensable to the construction and performance of our planes, ships, tanks and other military requirements.

It is an industry threatened today by a mounting invasion of cheap fabrics and garments from Japan, Italy, France, and England produced by low wage-earners with which many American mills are unable to cope without adequate Government protection.

Forty-four of you who are members of the United States Senate seemed to realize on the afternoon of June 28 the importance to our economy of America's textile industry, but by that same evening one of you changed your mind. It is not for me to question why. It is enough to note that, as a result, the imposition of mandatory quotas on the importation of cotton fabrics and apparel was finally defeated by the close vote of 45 to 43.

Do you Senators who opposed import quotas—and you Representatives of the people in the House—fully appreciate how serious the situation really is?

Here are some facts that are on the public records: American raw cotton is being sold to Japanese textile mills at prices more than 20 percent lower than our own mills must pay for it. Japanese mills pay their workers one-tenth as much as the wages earned by American textile employees. So even after the payment of custom duties, Japanese goods are being sold in this country well below what it costs American mills to make the same goods.

In the first 4 months of 1955, less than 21 million square yards of Japanese cotton cloths came into the United States. In the same 4 months this year over 64 million yards were shipped here. In the whole year of 1955 the Japanese shipped about 33 million yards of ginghams to this country. In just 4 months this year, they sold us almost 54 million yards of ginghams. Less than 200,000 yards of Japanese velveteens were imported in the first 4 months of last year, more than a million and a half yards came in from January through April this year. In the same 4 months, close to 375,000 dozen Japanese shirts were imported this year, compared with less than 63,000 dozen in 1955.

What have been the consequences?

Our cotton mills have been obliged to curtail production and cut down on hours of employment. Some gingham and velveteen mills in particular have closed down or continue operating only at a loss in the hope that the Government may finally provide some relief.

The head of one of the Nation's greatest cotton mills was recently quoted as saying, "I must retrench. I must go on a 5-day

week. I must give up any plans for expansion. I can't compete with Japanese imports when the Japanese buy cotton for 10 cents a pound less than I am forced to pay for it."

Other mills, with smaller resources than this one, have had to cut down to 4- and 3-day work weeks, or cease operations altogether.

And cotton is not alone in feeling the squeeze. The woolen and worsted industry, which was already staggering because of domestic conditions, is facing the possibility of almost fatal blows from imports.

British woolen imports the first 5 months of this year were over 6 million yards compared with slightly more than 4½ million yards in 1955. Japanese woolen imports in the first quarter of this year were 3 times as great as last year. Italian and French woolen imports also are rising.

These foreign woolen goods, like cotton, are selling in our own American market, duty-paid, for less than the cost of manufacturing them in the United States, and 20 percent under what American mills would have to charge for the same goods just to break even. They have completely taken over the American domestic worsted market in critical price categories and leaders in the industry agree that unless woolens are granted higher tariff protection the few worsted mills remaining in this country may soon have to go out of business.

Let's grant the Japanese have voluntarily imposed some quotas on their own textile exports to the United States. The fact is those quotas are only on some classes of goods, some of them permit as much or larger quantities than are coming in already, and they can be terminated or abandoned any time the Japanese see fit. Only mandatory quotas and higher duties imposed by our own Government can protect our own textile and apparel industries.

The textile industry has been in a prolonged slump while the rest of the Nation's economy has been prospering since the end of World War II. And the figures issued by the Federal Trade and Securities and Exchange Commissions just this 10th of July ought to be positive proof of the unhealthy condition of the textile industry today.

Those figures show that textile profits are 40 percent below the average in all industries; textile earnings on sales after taxes are little over 3 cents per dollar compared with about 5½ for all manufacturing corporations; and profits after taxes are some 7 percent against over 12 percent for all manufactures.

Is this an industry that should be left to the mercy of impossible-to-meet salary competition from foreign imports? Do you Senators and Congressmen realize that your vote of June 28 was tantamount to telling the American people that our textile industry is expendable? Do you think America can get along with this industry crippled and impotent?

There is still time before Congress adjourns, for you to reverse the action of the Senate on June 28th and provide not only the textile industry but the whole American economy the protection it rightfully must have.

I appeal to you Senators and Congressmen to give some relief to the American textile community of manufacturers. This basic industry must be preserved if it is to continue to serve the best interest of the American people.

RELIABLE SAMPLE CARD CO.
IRVING WARSOFF.

NEW YORK CITY, *July 16, 1956.*

(Published in the interest of the American Textile Industry)

Congressman Dawson Reports

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. WILLIAM A. DAWSON

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 17, 1956

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I have had many, many requests for information concerning the Central Utah project, one of the major participating projects of the upper Colorado River storage program, which was approved by this session of Congress. For that reason I am inserting in the RECORD a series of weekly newsletter outlining the details of this tremendous undertaking.

CONGRESSMAN DAWSON REPORTS

(By Representative WILLIAM A. DAWSON)

CENTRAL UTAH

Now that the fight for the upper Colorado River project is over—and won—it is possible for me to examine some of the details of the project, rather than viewing it as a whole. Most of the attention and publicity has centered around the large storage dams—Glen Canyon and Flaming Gorge. Publicity on these dams, and Echo Park, has focused attention away from some of the other important structures authorized by the legislation, including the vitally important central Utah project.

Details impress

Even the central Utah project is so complex that it is hard to comprehend its vastness without a more detailed examination. After examining these details, one begins to realize how the construction of central Utah is going to affect the State not only economically, industrially, and agriculturally, but in recreational resources as well. The addition that Glen Canyon—with its 181-mile long reservoir—will make to Utah's recreational resources is generally well-known. But we should not overlook the impact of some of the smaller structures.

Small reservoirs

Thirteen new reservoirs will be built as part of the central Utah project. All of them will be in Utah and several of them will be of a size to add greatly to the State's swimming, boating, and fishing pleasures. In addition, Strawberry Reservoir's present 283,000 acre-feet capacity will be increased 5 times by the construction of the 268-foot high, quarter-mile-long Soldier Creek Dam.

One example

Let us examine in detail one of the small reservoirs in its relationship to recreation. Starvation Reservoir will be created by a 160-foot high, one-third mile long earth filled dam 4 miles northwest of Duchesne. The reservoir will cover the present U. S. 40 highway and be slightly larger than Deer Creek. The reservoir will be about 3 miles long and a little over a mile wide. It will cover what is at present a sage and juniper bush flat.

Things to come

The construction of this minor unit of the overall project will cost $18.7 million. This expenditure, of course, is to store water for domestic, industrial and agricultural users who will pay for the cost of the project. But boating, swimming, and fishing will be additional assets readily available to the residents of all Utah. With the construction of boat docks, picnic areas, and camping facilities, Starvation Reservoir should become as popular a play area as Deer Creek is now.

Lots more

The story of Starvation Reservoir will be repeated many times as the other reservoirs in the central Utah project are constructed. There will be a new lake at Round Knoll near Wallsburg in Wasatch County. Situated in an attractive upland valley, the lake will be a haven for fishermen, boatmen, and swimmers. Each new reservoir will create another delightful place for Utahans to spend an afternoon, a weekend, or an entire vacation. These benefits are incidental to the overall purpose of the project—water for Utah's future.

CONGRESSMAN DAWSON REPORTS

(By Representative WILLIAM A. DAWSON)

BIG BORE

The attention that has been focused on the two large storage dams of the upper Colorado River project—Flaming Gorge and Glen Canyon—has somewhat obscured the fact that the central Utah project is the project that will make the changes in Utah's water picture. For it is central Utah that will bring the water over the Wasatch Mountains to thirsty farmlands and household water taps in the Bonneville Basin. One of the major features of the central Utah will be Utah's biggest bore—a 28.3 mile tunnel through the top of the Wasatch Range.

Collection system

This tunnel—plus 7.5 miles of pipe and 1 mile of siphon—will collect water high in the Uintah Mountains. This water makes up 80 percent of the present flow of Rock Creek, Hades Creek, Wolf Creek, Currant Creek, and the West Fork of the Duchesne River. Instead of flowing to waste in the Green River, these waters would be transported through the mountains to the Strawberry Reservoir which will be enlarged to five times its present capacity. The Strawberry aqueduct tunnel will carry 137,600 acre-feet of water annually—four times as much as the Duchesne tunnel—now Utah's largest underground water conduit.

Engineering feat

The tunnel will be an engineering feat of the first magnitude. It will be the single, most costly feature—$33 million—of the overall $208 million price of the entire central Utah project. Of this $33 million, $29 million will be spent for actual construction, $2.7 million for engineering, and one and three-tenths million-plus dollars for temporary construction facilities. Since the aqueduct travels through national forest lands, no expenditure is necessary for acquiring rights-of-way.

Recreation use

In reviewing the construction plan of the Strawberry aqueduct, I was concerned about its possible effect on the Uintah National Forest. I need not have been. The Forest Service welcomes the construction of the tunnel. Tunnel waste will be placed where it will not be detrimental to the beauty of the area and the debris will be screened from view to the maximum extent possible.

New roads

New roads into the high forest site of the aqueduct would increase access to this primitive area for the average visitor. Construction-camp facilities could be used by tourists and after the construction period is over they could be taken and administered by the Forest Service as campsites.

New fishing

Thus, the tunnel which gathers the water for Utah's future will, as an incidental benefit, open new areas for our citizens who want to enjoy Utah's primitive areas. Next week I will describe how other individual features

of the central Utah project will add to the wealth of Utah's recreational resources.

CONGRESSMAN DAWSON REPORTS

(By Representative WILLIAM A. DAWSON)

STRAWBERRY RESERVOIR

One of the major features of the central Utah project—the project that will furnish water for Utah's future—will be the enlargement of Strawberry Reservoir. The enlarged reservoir will store water gathered high in the Uintah Mountains for later use in the water-thirsty areas in Utah and Salt Lake valleys. The water—137,600 acre-feet per year—now runs to waste in the Pacific Ocean.

Major undertaking

The present capacity of the Strawberry is 283,000 acre-feet. This will be increased to 1,370,000 acre-feet under the central Utah project, making the Strawberry Utah's largest artificial lake. Major construction at Strawberry will be the building of Soldier Creek dam—a 268-foot high, 1,370-foot long, earth-filled dam 9 miles downstream from the present Strawberry Dam. Overall cost of the unit will be $12,620,000 of which $500,000 would be spent for temporary construction headquarters.

Face changing

The proposed enlargement of Strawberry to five times its present size will make major changes in the use and appearance of the area. The new reservoir will be 7 to 8 miles wide and 8 to 9 miles long in addition to a 4-mile arm behind Soldier Spring at the new damsite. The new reservoir will inundate several miles of United States Highway 40 which now skirts the north margin of the present reservoir area.

Recreation use

Being only 70 miles from Salt Lake City, Strawberry now is a major fishing and recreation area. The proposed enlargement will only increase this incidental benefit to the State. Present fishing villages will be flooded out, but new ones will spring into being along the shores of the enlarged reservoir. In addition construction camps will be available for recreation use after the project is completed.

Park plan

The National Park Service, at the request of the Bureau of Reclamation, has already made preliminary recommendations concerning development of recreation facilities around the new reservoir. They include the development of a major tourist cabin area on Windy Ridge just west of Soldier Creek. The Park Service also points out that the reservoir will make several cabin sites available for development for summer homes. It is recommended that $275,000 be spent developing boating and fishing facilities.

Isaak Walton

Isaak Walton once said: "God doubtless could have made a better berry than the strawberry. But, doubtless, He never did." I think the time-honored spokesman for the angler would be pleased with the fishing prospects of the reservoir coincidently named after his favorite fruit. Next week I will discuss other details of the vital central Utah project authorized as a part of the upper Colorado storage project approved this session of Congress.

CONGRESSMAN DAWSON REPORTS

(By Representative WILLIAM A. DAWSON)

NEW TUNNEL

The $208 million Central Utah project—a unit of the Upper Colorado River project—will make many changes in the face of Utah as it transports and stores 137,600 acre-feet of water now going to waste in the Pacific Ocean. Many new reservoirs and other structures will come into being as the project gathers water in the high Uintahs, transports it over, around, and through the mountains to an enlarged Strawberry Reservoir where it will be stored for later use by farms, cities, and industries along the west side of the Wasatch Mountains.

New tunnel

In order to transport this new water through the Wasatch Divide and into the valleys below, the present 8.6-foot, horseshoe Strawberry Tunnel will be enlarged to a 9.6-foot circular structure at a cost of more than $5 million. From there, the water will pass down Diamond Fork and Spanish Fork Canyons, passing through 4 powerplants with a combined capacity of 61,000 kilowatts on the way. Money from the sale of this power—estimated at nearly $2 million per year—will help repay the cost of the project.

New aqueduct

In its journey through the powerplants and out over the benchlands south of Spanish Fork and Payson, the water will be transported through the Wasatch Aqueduct—a 20 mile stretch of canal, pipe and siphon. Two smaller storage reservoirs will be built to regulate the flow—a $4.1 million structure at Monk's Hollow, 14 miles up Spanish Fork Canyon, and a $360,000 reservoir at Goosenest, 3 miles south of Payson. From the aqueduct, the water would empty into the 17-mile long Mona-Nephi Canal and be used on lands between Santaquin and Nephi and as far west as Elberta in Utah County.

New lakeshore

Another major feature of the Central Utah project will make a notable change in the outline of Utah Lake. Construction of the $1 million Provo Bay Dike, 6.7 miles long and 20 feet high, will cut off the eastern arm of the lake making 9,340 acres of rich bottom land available for farming. In addition to conserving water, the new dike would make an excellent route for a new highway and its use as such might save a good deal of money.

Jordan River

The project includes improving the channel and increasing the capacity of the Jordan River from Utah Lake through the Jordan narrows. Additional water made available would go into the new West Valley Canal, which would run from the Utah-Salt Lake County line along the west side of the Jordan River to Magna-Garfield, a distance of 18 miles.

City water

The water supply for Salt Lake City would be increased by construction of Bates Reservoir on the Provo River above Deer Creek. This additional storage, plus water now being used in South Utah County, should be sufficient to meet all anticipated needs of Salt Lake Valley until the year 2000 according to experts. Next week, I will discuss how the Central Utah project benefits the Uinta Basin area.

CONGRESSMAN DAWSON REPORTS

(By Representative WILLIAM A. DAWSON)

UINTA BASIN

The central Utah project, which will furnish the water for Utah's future, has two major units—Bonneville Basin and Uinta Basin. The Bonneville Basin unit is a series of reservoirs, aqueducts, tunnels, and canals that will bring 137,600 acre-feet of water annually through the mountains to the communities and farms along the west slope of the Wasatch Mountains. This water currently is running to waste in the Pacific Ocean. The central Utah project also provides new storage reservoirs to expand irrigation, industrial, and domestic water supplies for cities and towns in the Uinta Basin.

New reservoirs

This week I would like to discuss the Uinta Basin phase of the central Utah. The Uinta Basin currently has a surplus of water. But due to lack of storage, most of this surplus runs to waste down the Colorado River system during the spring runoff. To store this water for later use, the central Utah project includes the construction of five new reservoirs to serve the Uinta Basin area.

Most costly

By far the largest and most costly reservoir serving the Uinta Basin will be the Starvation. Slightly larger than Deer Creek, this reservoir and dam will be located about 4 miles northwest of Duchesne, right across the present route of U. S. Highway 40. The dam will be 160 feet high and the overall cost will be $18.6 million. The reservoir will impound water in the Strawberry River and be fed additional water through a 7-mile feeder canal from the Duchesne River.

Other structures

The four other reservoirs in the Uinta Basin area are: Tyzack, on Brush Creek, 10 miles northeast of Vernal; Hanna, on Duchesne River, 29 miles northwest of Duchesne; Upalco, on Big Sand Wash, about 1 mile northwest of Upalco, Utah; and Stanaker, an offstream reservoir 3.5 miles north of Vernal, which will store water from Ashley Creek. The total cost of these four reservoirs and canals and laterals serving them will be about $22 million.

More water

The Uinta Basin portion of the central Utah project will furnish water for an additional 6,890 acres of new land and supplemental water for 34,490 acres already under irrigation. It is estimated that it will satisfy the municipal and industrial growth demands of the basin until at least the year 2000.

Recreation features

According to the National Park Service, Tyzack and Stanaker Reservoirs will be fine for swimming and boating and the Service recommends expenditure of $100,000 for development of recreation facilities. Hanna Reservoir, high in the Uintas, should be good for camping and fishing. Next week I will discuss the Emery County project, which, like the central Utah project, has been authorized by Congress as a part of the upper Colorado River storage project.

CONGRESSMAN DAWSON REPORTS

(By Representative WILLIAM A. DAWSON)

EMERY PROJECT

In addition to Flaming Gorge and Glen Canyon dams and reservoirs, and the Central Utah project, the upper Colorado River legislation also provides for the construction of another project important to Utah's economy and growth. This is the $9.8 million Emery County project which will bring additional water to farms in the vicinity of Orangeville, Castledale, Huntington, and Cleveland, Emery County.

Benefits told

The project will capture and put to use 32,400 acre-feet of water now running to waste in the Colorado River system. This water will irrigate 3,630 new acres of land and benefit an additional 20,450 acres of farmland now having inadequate water supplies. Of the total cost of the project, all but $229,000 will be repaired by water and power users.

New reservoir

Major unit of the project will be a dam and reservoir on Cottonwood Creek about 12 miles northwest of Orangeville in Joes Valley. The dam will be 185 feet high and will create a reservoir about the size of Fish Lake. Cost of the dam is estimated at $5.5 million. The project also contemplates construction of a $120,000 diversion dam 8 miles downstream from Joes Valley.

Long canal

From the diversion dam at Swasey, water would be transported 17 miles through the Cottonwood-Huntington Canal which will be built at a cost of nearly $4 million. Laterals

from the terminal point near Huntington would carry the new water supply to thirsty farms in the area. The project will require the relocation of Utah Highway 10, part of which will be flooded out by Joes Valley Reservoir.

Recreation use

The National Park Service has surveyed the area and reports that the project will greatly increase its recreational value. Noting that Utahans drive many miles to fish at Fish Lake and Scofield Reservoir, the Service remarks that Joes Valley Reservoir will be similar in size and setting. The Service predicts that the area will become popular for summer homes and high altitude summer vacations.

Vast benefits

During the past few weeks, I have tried to give you some of the details of the overall $1 billion Upper Colorado River project as they affect Utah. Certainly construction of this vast project—the largest single reclamation project ever approved by Congress—is going to make great changes, not only in the prospects for the future of the State and its citizens, but in the appearance of many of our recreation areas.

Allwood Kids Can't Resist Postman's Smiles—and Gum

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON CANFIELD
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 17, 1956

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, Uncle Sam's homefront ambassadors are the postmen, and most of them perform a valuable public relations job as they make their daily appointed rounds.

Such an ambassador of good will is Charles Conte, mail carrier, whose story is told in the following article by Marie Hugo, staff correspondent for the Passaic, N. J., Herald-News:

ALLWOOD KIDS CAN'T RESIST POSTMAN'S SMILES—AND GUM

(By Marie Hugo)

Like the legendary Pied Piper of Hamelin, Charles Conte, Allwood's oldest mailman in years of service, attracts small children who follow him on his daily route.

However, they follow Conte for a different reason. Charlie not only has a winning personality but also has supplied the kiddies with chewing gum for 32 years. Some of the youngsters who tag along with him are the offspring of other Allwood children—to whom Conte was like an idol, a generation ago.

When Charlie first delivered mail in Allwood 32 years ago, he had only 5 or 6 streets to cover. They were Chelsea, Lyall, Peru, Morris, and Brighton Roads. That's all the streets there then and Charlie was the only mailman in the section. At present, nine carriers serve Allwood daily.

During World War II and the Korean conflict, Charlie was a harbinger of the boys all across the world. He laughed and cried with the mothers of all the boys and listened to the glad tidings of promotions or any sad news. Some of the boys to whom he had given gum did not come back. Charlie always had a special sound to his whistle when he carried a serviceman's letter to some Allwood family.

Charlie starts out with full packs of gum, but every once in a while, he is compelled to break each piece in half so his supply would last the length of his route. Over the years, Charlie estimates he has spent a considerable sum of money for the children.

He and Mrs. Conte, who live at 47 Morris Road, have three children, Mrs. Arthur Di Salvo, of Paterson; Charles, Jr., and George. Both sons have seen service—as their father did in World War I.

When Charlie retires from the postal service, the new mailman will wonder why little children follow him asking for a piece of gum. For some of the youngsters, it was almost their first word.

A Record Campaign

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WAYNE N. ASPINALL
OF COLORADO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 17, 1956

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, we often find ourselves in the situation of being too close to events to give them proper evaluation. We all long, on occasion, to take a bit of time and stand back for a moment and sort out the events that pass each day, assigning to each its place of real importance. In that we seldom find this time, it is rewarding to find an example of this type of reflection. Just such an example recently came to my attention and I wish to call it to the attention of the Members.

It is an article from the Roundup section of the Denver Post for July 8 of this year on the campaign of Adlai Stevenson. Most of us have some opinion of Governor Stevenson, but it is my thought that this article by Lawrence Martin, an associate editor of the Denver Post, is important not because it is about Governor Stevenson but rather because it covers an important part of the political history of the present, and covers it more in the tenor of the long run than of the harried present. I recommend this article as an important bit of what will one day be history, but written for the present.

The article follows:

A RECORD CAMPAIGN

(By Lawrence Martin)

No man in American political history—not even William Jennings Bryan—has ever conducted so long a full-speed campaign for the Presidency as Adlai Stevenson. For, after a brief interlude to let the bruises heal, he began his second run only a few weeks after the first one ended in November 1952.

It has been one of the most notable performances in American politics, and in its earliest stages at least, it was keyed to obligation rather than ambition—to the proposition that no one man is indispensable to the Democrat Party's success. But inevitably the laborer felt worthy of his hire, and on that basis, if on no other, Mr. Stevenson appears at this time to have a strong claim to reimbursement by the party for his large labors through the last 3½ years.

He has repeatedly stated his reasons for bouncing back so briskly from the 1952 knockdown. Early in February 1953 he sounded this rallying call to Democrats: "While we may be a defeated party, we are not a beaten party."

That bit of semantics was small comfort, at that time, to many of his party colleagues. Their ears twitched with more interest, however, when a bit later he said that "the determining fact in my mind after the election of 1952 was that I remained—and would remain for some time—the titular head of the party." That, he added, imposed on him an obligation "to help wipe out the inevitable deficit accumulated during a losing campaign, and also to revive, reorganize, and rebuild the party."

Proving he meant it, Stevenson has ever since been working on the deficit—in money, in votes, and in party spirit. He refused to take bankruptcy in any of those categories. Putting that into baseball terms, he told a moaning friend that "one strikeout should never be an excuse for losing the whole ball game."

While his unsparing efforts have won him generous applause from his party generally, some Democrats are still unconvinced he has thereby earned another presidential nomination. They advance various reasons. Stevenson took note of one such criticism in a speech before a Democratic organization, when he said: "Perhaps you will say that I am making not a Democratic but a Republican speech; that I am counseling unity and courage in the Republican Party and administration. You bet I am. For as Democrats, we don't believe in political extermination of Republicans, nor do we believe in political fratricide, in the extermination of one another."

That sort of talk is considerably above the usual partisan level, and especially when appraised outside of context, is disquieting to party stalwarts, to whom every Republican vote is painful.

At any rate, as the climax of his long campaign approaches, Stevenson has fully asserted his leadership, his spokesmanship and his devotion, and has set down, in terms both broad and explicit, the kind of Democrat platform with which he believes his party can win, and on which he can be elected. He has done this in more than 100 speeches—over and above those made during his recent presidential primary tours—in dozens of articles, and in many conferences with Democrat groups.

A perusal of those speeches and writings does disclose many similarities, in words, at least, with Republican Party philosophy. But when Stevenson used the familiar Eisenhower word "partnership" to describe the ideal relation between government and people, he always drew a sharp distinction between the word and its application. "It is not only what we do, but how we do it," he has said many times.

The evolution of the 1956 Stevenson platform can best be sketched in his own words, from his speeches and writings, in the examples that follow.

Talking on the subject, "Giving the Government Back to the People," before the Democrat national committee in Chicago last November, he said: "We propose not to make issues where there are none, nor to be critical without being constructive. Our disagreement with the central principles of Republican policy runs deep, but it does not diminish our respect for those who sincerely hold that political faith. Let us be very clear that Republicans want a safe and sane world every bit as much as Democrats."

That does not change the facts, however, he went on, "that the cold war is still in the deep freeze, that our security system is deteriorating, and that a safe and orderly world is still a distant goal. Certainly we must have learned by now that peace and security cannot be had for the asking, or by slogans and tough talk, or by blowing alternately hot and cold, rash and prudent. * * * We must have learned that sound foreign policies cannot be devised with one eye fixed only on the budget, and the other on divisions in the Republican Party. We must have learned that in the fluctuating market of world affairs there is no bargain basement where peace is for sale cheap."

Stevenson has throughout been earnest in counseling his party against the temptation to say, "Elect the Democracts and the farm problem will be solved overnight," or to promise instant magic on any other issue. "Let us leave that sort of talk to Republicans," he has said.

Further delineating his views on platform issues, Stevenson said: "I agree that this is a time for catching our breath; I agree that moderation is the spirit of the times. But we best take care lest we confuse moderation with mediocrity, or settle for half answers to hard problems. Moderation, yes; stagnation, no."

In his oft repeated treatment of specific problems and issues, Stevenson has covered a wide range. Here are examples:

Agriculture: "We are committed to restoring farm income to fair levels by a many-pronged attack. Democrats do not contend that price supports are the whole answer. * * * Price supports must be employed in conjunction with a whole series of both supplementary and complementary measures. * * * The real key to the farmer's welfare is an intelligent, sensitive, and responsive administration on a day-to-day basis."

Foreign policy: "In these last 3 years, the United States has come dangerously close to losing its leadership in the world—economically, militarily, and worst of all, morally. At a time when the new leadership in Russia has been successfully playing on the universal desire of people elsewhere for an end of cold-war tensions, the (Eisenhower) administration has clung stubbornly to its military emphasis in pacts, foreign aid, trade and international exchanges of all kinds. * * * While the Soviet policy has become more flexible, we have become more rigid."

Asia: "The fall of China, the war in Korea, the disaster in Indochina all have been accompanied by discord and disunity and by some of the worst demagoguery in the history of the Republic. The first step in the development of a sensible Asian policy is to take Asia out of American politics."

Middle East: "Steps should be taken to make it unequivocally clear that Israel is here to stay; that we will not tolerate armed aggression by either side; that an equitable balance of armed strength should be preserved between Israel and her neighbors."

Foreign aid: "If we propose to make economic aid most effective, we will have to stop demanding that recipient nations pass loyalty tests, and stop using our money to bribe feeble governments and set up rubber check military pacts which will bounce as soon as we try to cash them."

Segregation: "As President, I would work ceaselessly and with a sense of crucial urgency, with public officials, private groups and educators, to meet this challenge in our life as a nation, and this threat to our national reputation."

Public power against private power: "One of the first things I propose to do is to stop the Republican giveaway of our great power resources, and to begin again the big and vital job of development that was symbolized under Democratic administrations by the TVA, Bonneville Power Administration and the rural electrification program."

Labor and business: "The Eisenhower administration has completely denied the essential role played in this society and Government by free labor unions and free collective bargaining. * * * Let us be quite clear about this; there is no conflict between the Democratic Party and business. What we criticize is not business, but the virtual exclusion of everybody else. Eight of the ten members of the Cabinet, and almost three-quarters of the men appointed to high executive office come from big business. * * * We will seek to protect the place of small business. At the rate smaller businesses are going bankrupt or being swallowed up by bigger businesses, you can't help but be anxious about the future of enterprise."

Education: "We Democrats are for a country in which the schools are worthy of the children, and adequately staffed by teachers supported as their honored profession merits."

Housing: "We are for a country where no man's home is blighted by smoke, dirt, and noise, and cut off from sunlight, trees, and air. * * * I am convinced that government and private enterprise must work closely together if we are to clear our slums and house our people."

Taxes: Stevenson has consistently favored debt reduction before tax cuts, and then tax reduction for the little fellow.

Security and civil rights: "A political party divided against itself, half McCarthy and half Eisenhower cannot produce national unity. * * * Everyone hopes the administration will find and remove all the real subversives from government. * * * But out of 2 million Federal employees, only 1 alleged active Communist has been found."

Role of the President: "The American presidency is the greatest temporal office in our planet. When the President leads, billions follow. When the President falters, the world trembles. When the President speaks, the world takes heed. When he is silent, or when he is absent, chaos threatens. We cannot do things by drift, complacency, advertising, mottoes, slogans, and fine moral sentiments."

"This is what I think," Stevenson wrote in the introduction to 1 of the 3 published volumes of his speeches. To anyone familiar with the phrasing of party platforms, much of what Stevenson thinks—and says—is couched in the language of platform planks. And that, very likely, was not accidental on the part of this man who confidently expects that his long labors, his trip around the world to study foreign affairs, and his very substantial fund raising for the party's depleted coffers will be suitably rewarded at Chicago in August.

If that is done, he will say many of the same things again during the campaign, but as a fully seasoned and probably more realistic campaigner, he is likely to be less gentle than in the past toward all Republicans, because of the hard necessity of getting votes—Democrat votes.

Katyn Massacre

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 17, 1956

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article which appeared in the Letters to the Editor column in the Washington Post and Times Herald of Monday, July 16, 1956, written by Mr. Julius Epstein, of New York City, which includes a letter that Mr. Epstein wrote to the editor of Moscow's Pravda on the subject of the Katyn Forest Massacre of 1940:

Since the Washington Post and Times Herald has always been among those American newspapers very much interested in the Katyn Massacre and its investigation through Congress, your readers might be interested in the following letter which this writer just sent to the editor of Moscow's Pravda:

"As the founder and former executive secretary of the now defunct American Committee for the Investigation of the Katyn Massacre, Inc. (chairman, Ambassador Arthus Bliss Lane) which laid the groundwork for the great American congressional investigation of the massacre of 4,243 Polish officers in the spring of 1940 at Katyn, U. S. S. R., I want to ask you why the Soviet Government and the Communist Party have not yet admitted Stalin's and Beria's guilt in this greatest military crime in history.

"The printed record of the investigation, carried out by the Select Committee To Conduct an Investigation of the Facts, Evidence, and Circumstances of the Katyn Forest Massacre (chairman, Congressman Ray J. Madden) comprises 2,437 pages, the testimony of 103 witnesses, and 229 exhibits.

"No other crime in history has ever been the object of such long and thorough parliamentary investigation as the Katyn Forest Massacre. The result of this investigation was the establishment beyond the shadow of any doubt of the fact that the Katyn massacre as well as the murder of another 11,000 Polish officers on Soviet soil was the work of the NKVD.

"You would render a great service to the cause of the truth if you would admit what the non-Soviet world has already known for a considerable time.

"Mr. Nikita S. Khrushchev has already blamed Stalin and Beria for so many crimes that the non-Soviet world cannot understand why he did not include the Katyn Forest Massacre in his list of crimes committed by Stalin and Beria.

"I trust and hope—and with me the whole non-Soviet world—that you will no longer deprive the Soviet people of the truth which can easily be found in the 7 volumes and 2 special reports, published by the American Congressional Select Committee To Investigate the Katyn Forest Massacre in 1952."

JULIUS EPSTEIN.

NEW YORK.

Should Stick to Facts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. HARRY McGREGOR
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 17, 1956

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I include an editorial appearing in the Mount Vernon, Ohio, News entitled "Should Stick to Facts." I sincerely hope that all Members and all candidates read this editorial.

SHOULD STICK TO FACTS

Adlai Stevenson, foremost candidate for the Democratic presidential nomination, recently said in a speech that the plight of the farmers is as bad as it was during the depression.

One wonders where Stevenson got the information upon which to base such a statement.

Official statistics, based on careful study of the farm situation, certainly don't provide material for such a statement.

Take, for instance, the information contained in Business Trends, a publication issued by the research department of the Federal Reserve Bank of Cleveland, which serves the Fourth Federal Reserve District.

"Farm prices," says this publication, "in June were above year-ago levels for the first time in nearly 4 years, having climbed nearly 11 percent from the 9-year low of last Decem-

ber. During June prices received by farmers averaged 2 percent higher than a month earlier and better than 2 percent above a year ago.

"The price rise which started early this year has extended to many commodities. Prices of both crops and livestock have shown improvement since December, but the recovery has been somewhat stronger in crops than in livestock products. The all-crops index of prices received advanced nearly 16 percent from December to mid-June, to a level 8 percent above the corresponding month of last year. Meanwhile the index of prices of livestock and products rose about 6 percent, but the current level is moderately below a year earlier."

Those are facts, Mr. Stevenson, not political hooey.

Industrial Concentration Accelerated by Mergers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMANUEL CELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 16, 1956

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I insert herewith a letter I received from the Textile Workers of America, dated July 11, 1956:

TEXTILE WORKERS UNION OF AMERICA,
New York, N. Y., July 11, 1956.

Hon. EMANUEL CELLER,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. CELLER: We have called your attention to the process of integration and mergers in the textile industry which has advanced the importance of the corporate giants in this industry. Whatever justification there may be for such consolidations in other industries and whatever benefits may have flown from such mergers in other sections of the economy, none has become evident in the textile industry. These mergers are designed to capitalize on opportunities for immediate speculative profit or to eliminate competitive forces within the industry.

Two developments observable in former years have become particularly evident in the current one. The cannibalization process has been proceeding apace. The giants have bought large corporations and then have broken them up. In previous years they closed individual properties; they have continued to do so in 1956. This year, in addition, they have broken up the mill chains which they acquired. The Amerotron Corp. sold 2 plans to Burlington Industries, Inc., and 1 plant to Deering, Milliken & Co. Burlington sold the Pacific Mills' cotton division to the M. Lowenstein Corp. Visking Corp. sold its fabric division to Johnson & Johnson. J. P. Stevens & Co., which last year bought the Cheney Bros. Co., and forthwith proceeded to close down many of its operations, has now sold the remainder to the Gerli interests, which control La France Industries .

The second development is the increasing tendency for textile mills to invest larger and larger sums in nontextile properties, thereby diverting talent, skills, and funds to nontextile industrial areas. The most glaring example is Textron, Inc., which now has about 40 nontextile properties with sales of approximately $200 million. Botany Mills, Inc., which closed its large woolen mill in Passaic, N. J., has followed suit by acquiring Rolley, Inc. (cosmetic producer) and Marksson Bros., Inc. (retail clothing chain). Chadbourn Gotham Hosiery has recently announced the proposed acquisition of Riverton Lime & Stone Co., Inc. Plymouth Cordage Co. has bought two subsidiaries from the United States Shoe Machinery Co., which manufactures shoe nails and shoe eyelets. Similar moves are being reported for other corporations in the industry.

The largest single merger during recent months has added to the Dan River Mills, already one of the largest organizations in the industry, employing more than 10,000 workers, the properties of Woodside Mills, with 7 mills in South Carolina, employing 3,000 workers; the 8 mills of the Alabama Mills, with 3,000 employees in Alabama and Georgia; and the Iselin-Jefferson Co., one of the largest selling agents and factors in the industry, together with their mill properties—besides Woodside Mills—including 2 mills with 1,400 employees. This new giant, moreover, is dominated by a group of financial interests headed by Julius Abernethy and A. Alex Shuford, which already controls 18 mills employing 3,700 workers, and has recently bought another large organization, the Fulton Bab Cotton Mills, with 4,000 employees in 8 plants, primarily located in Georgia. Several financial interests associated with the latter group are in control of other textile interests. The full result of these transactions will be to bring this group up to the first five companies within the industry. We are attaching herewith an analysis of the interrelated interests involved in these mergers.

The older industrial giants have not been idle, for they have also moved ahead in the expansion of their facilities. The Burlington Industries has acquired two blended fabric plants of the Amerotron Corp. primarily to eliminate a low-cost and low-price competitor. It has also added the Hess, Goldsmith organization, with plants in Pennsylvania and California. These 2 groups of mills have added some 3,500 new employees to the 50,000 already employed by the No. 1 giant of the textile industry.

Deering, Milliken & Co. has added a plant of the Amerotron Corp. in Maine and a worsted plant in Kinsgtree, S. C. United Merchants & Manufacturers, Inc., has added woolen interests to its other operations by acquiring the Virginia Woolen Co. Johnson & Johnson has acquired the Le Page Corp., with four plants, and the fabric division of the Visking Corp. The Kendall Co. has expanded its organizations by adding the Julia Cade Mills, of Albertville, Ala.

In 1956, our record shows, 73 textile mills employing 25,000 workers have been absorbed or are in the process of being absorbed by the giants in their process of growth through mergers. These developments warrant a thorough study and investigation.

We know that the bill before the Congress, which will require filing of notice of such mergers, will bring more of these cases to the public's attention. But that is only a first step in the development of an adequate public test of the propriety of such mergers and the growth of large corporations.

We cannot wait until these giants assume the proportions of a General Motors and then force them to spin off subsidiaries. We must proceed apace to develop criteria by which to judge whether such large corporations are in the public interest; determine what their maximum size shall be; how they shall be forced to contract; what their administrative policies shall be.

The recent General Motors hearings have focused on one phase of these problems. The Congress and the administration have to insure that these mergers are more closely examined in terms of the public interest. May we urge that steps be taken to examine closely the merger and big business problem in the light of these developments.

Very sincerely yours,

SOLOMON BARKIN.

Textile Workers Union of America, research department, New York, N. Y.—Textile mergers and acquisitions in 1956

Purchasing company or interest	Company or plant acquired	Plant location	Product	Number of plants	Employees	Date
Abernethy-Shuford and Berdon-Levine interests.	Fulton Bag & Cotton Mills	Atlanta, Ga.; St. Louis, Mo.; New Orleans, La.; Kansas City, Kans.; Minneapolis, Minn., Denver, Colo.; Savannah, Ga.; Los Angeles, Calif.	Cotton fabrics and bags	8	4,000	June 1956.
Ames Textile Corp	Buresh Non-Wovens, Inc	Northampton, Mass. (being transferred to Westfield, Mass.).	Nonwoven fabrics	1		January 1956.
American Builtrite Rubber Co	Boston Woven Hose & Rubber Co.	Cambridge, Mass	Industrial hose and belting.	1	1,000	February 1956
Bemis Bros. Bag Co	Transomatic Corp. plant	Flemington, N. J	For bags	1		Do.
Berkshire Hathaway, Inc	Bourne Mills	Fall River, Mass	Cotton fabric	1	760	May 1956.
	Swansea Print works	Swansea, Mass	Dye and finish	1	200	
Bigelow-Sanford Carpet Co	Belton Bagging Co	Belton, S. C	Bagging and interlining	1		Do.
Burlington Industries, Inc	Hess, Goldsmith & Co., Inc	Philadelphia, Wilkes-Barre, and Taylor, Pa.; Cedar Grove, N. J.; Pomona, Calif.	Glass fabric, synthetic yarns; narrow fabrics.	7	1,500	February 1956.
	Amerotron Corp. plants	Raeford, N. C	Worsteds	2	1,350	June 1956.
		Clarksville, Va	Dye and finishing		750	
Cannon Mills Co	Brown Manufacturing Co	Concord, N. C	Cotton fabric	1	750	April 1956.
Robert Cline	Southern Elastic Corp	Hickory, N. C	Elastic yarn	1	60	May 1956.
Dan River Mills, Inc.[1]	Alabama Mills, Inc	Aliceville, Fayette, Winfield, Clanton, Wetumpka, Greenville, Dadeville, Ala.; Rome, Ga.	Cotton fabric	8	3,000	In process.
	Woodside Mills	Greenville, Fountain Inn, Simpsonville, Easley, Liberty, Anderson, S. C.	Cotton and synthetic fabrics.	7	2,700	Do.
	Iselin-Jefferson Co. (selling agents and factors).[2]					

Footnotes at end of speech.

Textile Workers Union of America, research department, New York, N. Y.—Textile mergers and acquisitions in 1956—Continued

Purchasing company or interest	Company or plant acquired	Plant location	Product	Number of plants	Employees	Date
Deering Milliken & Co	Amerotron Corp. plant	Machias, Maine	Synthetic fabrics	1	120	February 1956.
	Princeton Wd. plant	Kingstree, S. C	Dacron fabrics	1	100	April 1956.
Duro Finishing Co	Sovelco Mills, Inc	Winston-Salem, N. C	Dye and finishing	1		June 1956.
Flagg-Utica Corp	Faith Mills, Inc	Averill Park, N. Y	Underwear	1	200	April 1956.
General Textile Processors (new name for merged concern).	Cliffside Dyeing Co	Paterson, N. J	Dye and finishing	7	157	In process.
	Ardsley Dye & Finishing	do	do		78	Do.
	American Textile Processors	do	do		181	Do.
	Duchess Dyeing Corp	do	do		74	Do.
	Colonial Piece Dye Works	N. Bergen, N. J	do		65	Do.
	Forest Piece Dye Works	Easton, Pa	do			Do.
	Capital Piece Dye Works	Garnerville, N. Y	do		86	Do.
Gerli interests (LaFrance Industries).	Bennat Weavers	Paterson, N. J	Jacquard fabrics	1	450	Early 1956.
	Cheney Bros	Manchester, Conn	Pile fabrics	1		June 1956.
W. R. Guthrie & York & Co	Lehigh Spinning Co	Allentown, Pa	Carpet yarns	1		May 1956.
Horvath interests	E. Richard Meinig	Reading, Pa	Warp knit fabrics	1	400	March 1956.
	Hope Webbing Co	Pawtucket, R. I	Narrow fabrics	1		June 1956.
Johnson & Johnson:						
Chicopee	Visking Corp. Fabric Division	North Little Rock, Ark	Nonwoven fabric	1	200	February 1956.
Permacel	LePage's Inc	Gloucester, Mass.; Baltimore, Md.; Decatur, Ill.; Toronto, Ont.	Glues, adhesives	4		June 1956.
Kendall Co	Julia Cade Mills	Albertsville, Ala	Cotton print cloth	1	300	April 1956.
Lebanon Knitting Co	South Pacific Textile Mills	Los Angeles, Calif	Knit jersey fabric	1		March 1956.
Linen Thread Co	Dolphin Jute Mills	Paterson, N. J	Jute	1	175	January 1956.
Ludlow Manufacturing & Sales Co.	Orrco Industries, Inc	Vernon, Calif	Padding and cushioning	1		April 1956.
Marriner & Co	Hale Manufacturing Co	East Killingly, Conn	Silk and synthetic yarns	1	60	Do.
Lester Martin	Mojud, Inc.[3]					Do.
Morrison Brass Corp	L. B. Lockwood Co	Cleveland, Ohio	Wool shoddy	1	125	June 1956.
Mount Vernon Mills, Inc	Newnan Cotton Mills	Newnan, Ga	Cotton and wool fabrics	1	1,000	In process.
Robert A. Patterson	Triangle Finishing Corp	Johnstown, N. Y	Dye and finishing	1	150	Early 1956.
Plymouth Cordage Co	W. W. Cross & Co	Jeffrey, N. H	Shoe tacks and nails	1	345	June 1956.
	J. C. Rhodes Co	New Bedford, Mass	Shoe eyelets	1	178	Do.
Robertson Factories, Inc	Queens Valley Fabric Finishing Unit.	Valley Falls, R. I	Finish	1		March 1956.
Chester H. Roth Co	Mojud, Inc.[3]	Long Island City, N. Y., Decatur, Ala.; Greensboro, N. C.; Wilmington, N. C.	Hosiery and lingerie	4	2,000	Do.
S. Scott Stewart	Philadelphia Penn Winding Co	Philadelphia, Pa	Winding yarn	1	120	January 1956.
Textron Inc. (Burkart division)[4]	Carolina Bagging Co	Henderson, N. C	Cotton fabric	1	700	April 1956.
Union Underwear Co	Profile Cotton Mills	Jacksonville, Ala	Cotton yarn and fabric	1	600	Do.
United Merchants & Manufacturers, Inc.	Virginia Woolen Co	Winchester, Va	Woolens	2	500	February 1956.
		Middleway, W. Va	Dye woolens		100	

[1] Dominated by Abernethy-Shuford group.
[2] Iselin-Jefferson also controls New Braunfels Textile Mills (New Braunfels, Tex.) and Fitzgerald Mills Corp. (Fitzgerald, Ga.).
[3] Various Mojud plants are understood to be liquidating. These include the Long Island City and Decatur mills.
[4] Textron also acquired Brandon Veneer & Plywood Co. (June 1956), Campbell Wyant & Cannon Foundry Co. (April 1956), Myrtle Point Veneer Co. (April 1956), The Liner La Guardia (April 1956), Benada Aluminum Products Co. (April 1956) and General Cement Manufacturing Co. (March 1956).

The Demands Aren't Cricket?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN PHILLIPS
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 17, 1956

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Speaker, in view of present discussions on the subject of security regulations and the desires of those Americans who still think we ought to keep Communists out of the Government, I have asked unanimous consent to include the accompanying editorial in this extension of my remarks. It is from the Date Palm, a newspaper published in Indio, Calif., in my district. The editor is Mr. Ole J. Nordland. It is a timely editorial from the July 12 issue:

THE DEMANDS AREN'T CRICKET?

On the day after the Pearl Harbor attack, Secretary of the Treasury Morgenthau made a momentous decision.

He informed his staff that Harry Dexter White, the Treasury's Director of Monetary Research, would have the status of "Assistant Secretary of the Treasury in charge of foreign affairs."

According to new excerpts found in the voluminous Morgenthau diaries, the Secretary said:

"I want it in one brain and I want it in Harry White's brain. He will handle China."

White has since been identified as a member of a Russian spy ring. He "handled" China, sure enough—and without doubt to the complete satisfaction of the Kremlin. America's China policy eventually gave the Communists control of the world's most populous nation.

White and a number of other Government officials of that era have been identified as Soviet agents. Almost certainly there were others, in equally high places, and who may still be in a position to influence American foreign policy.

Yet there are some "liberals" who say it isn't cricket to demand that former Communists now identify their one-time associates in treason, and tell what they did in one of the blackest conspiracies in all history.

Training of Personnel for the Fishing Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WARREN G. MAGNUSON
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, July 17, 1956

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter which I received recently from Mr. G. P. Halferty, chairman of the Stream Conservation Coordinating Council, relating to a proposed training course for fishermen at the School of Fisheries of the University of Washington. The letter refers to the benefits derived some years ago from a somewhat similar training effort in connection with the halibut fishery.

The bill (S. 2379) which recently passed the Senate recognizes the continuing need for the training of personnel in the field of commercial fisheries, and is designed to provide such training. I hope that final action will be taken on the bill at this session of the Congress.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STREAM CONSERVATION
COORDINATING COUNCIL,
DIVISION OF THE ASSOCIATION
OF PACIFIC FISHERIES,
Seattle, Wash., June 26, 1956.

Senator WARREN G. MAGNUSON,
In Care of Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: Our attention is called to S. 2379.

For your information, the council has taken up with Dr. Van Cleve, who is in charge of the school of fisheries at the University of Washington, the matter of setting up a course for approximately 50 fishermen to be held next February or March.

When Dr. W. F. Thompson was first delegated to check the halibut fishery situation, men were sent out on the halibut boats to collect specimens, make observations, etc., and it was not long until the fishermen themselves began to realize that if the industry was to be revived so that it was profitable to them to carry on their occupations and make use of their boats and equipment, that they must understand the fundamentals that were necessary for the revival of a fishery and its preservation for the future.

This undertaking was very successful, and an industry that was on its last legs, so to speak, has been revived and, in joint management with Canada, the resource has been continued from year to year.

The thought of setting up a course at the school of fisheries is that these men would be selected by, say the Alaska Fishermen's Union and other organizations so as to get a fair representation in Oregon, Washington, and Alaska, and that these men would be taught the fundamentals necessary for the continuation of the salmon industry and that they would pass this information on to salmon fishermen that operate within their area through their unions or otherwise. This would be a worthwhile undertaking and doubtless would do much good to an industry that needs more public understanding, and this certainly includes other members of the industry who have been complacent and not vigilant in the protection of its future.

I trust this will be interesting to you, and the council would be most grateful for your cooperation.

Yours sincerely,

G. P. HALFERTY, *Chairman.*

Peaceful Coexistence for Free and Slave Worlds?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. GLENN BEALL

OF MARYLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, July 17, 1956

Mr. BEALL. Mr. President, recent actions by various Communist leaders have made quite a few persons wonder whether there can be peaceful coexistence for the free and slave worlds. A thoughtful and timely editorial on the subject was published in the July 13, 1956, edition of the Catholic Review, the the official organ of the Archdiocese of Baltimore, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DE-STALINIZING FOR RECOGNITION

The de-Stalinizing propaganda machine of world communism is having a field day with its cry of coexistence and "live and let live." So much so, that it appears quite a few responsible persons in this country are seriously considering the possibility of recognizing Red China and accepting its admission to the United Nations.

Of course, the consideration is being made mainly in the privacy of the "smoke filled rooms," which are noted hotbeds of political intrigue and policymaking. The people concerned are made up of elements of both major political parties and the Government. They appear to be prepared to pay lip service to the idea of nonrecognition, at least until after the November elections. Once they are over, the drive will be underway to soften up the people for the shameful betrayal of our basic principals of freedom and justice.

It is, therefore, time for all good citizens to again speak out against any possibility of welcoming the brigands of Peiping as members of decent world society. The facts prove otherwise. Indeed, one has to go no further back than last Saturday—a day when two American priests arrived in Hong Kong after suffering for several years in Communist Chinese jails. These two priests give the lie to those who would say that the de-Stalinized world of communism has changed its ways.

The same barbaric doctrine which stilled the breath of freedom in countless lives in Europe has been imposed on China and its people live under the threat of brute force. The most elementary rules of morality are trampled underfoot. The most hateful, violent persecution has been perpetrated on innocent people. The people of China are suffering under the most frightful barbarity the world has ever known. And this new phase of brute force has no respect for supernatural values and attempts to destroy in its path all hope.

Let us not join those who would appease for political expediency. Let us not accept assurances of reformed despots until we have witnessed the reforms. It is not sufficient to release 11 more Americans who languish in Chinese dungeons. Only when the people of China are freed from bondage can we deal honorably with their rulers.

Texas City Tin Smelter

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH A. GAMBLE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 27, 1956

Mr. GAMBLE. Mr. Speaker, the continued operation of the Texas City tin smelter has been the subject of numerous editorials in the publications specializing in the metal trades.

More than a year ago on Friday, March 25, 1955, the American Metal Market predicted that we would continue the operation of the Texas City smelter for another year. This prediction was fulfilled when we passed Senate Concurrent Resolution 26 on April 21, 1955. The American Metal Market on April 29, 1955, commented editorially on this action.

I ask unanimous consent that these two editorials from the American Metal Market, which review the history of the tin smelter, may be reprinted in the RECORD.

The two editorials follow:

[From the American Metal Market of March 25, 1955]

SPRING, AND THE TEXAS SMELTER

With the fidelity of robin redbreast, as harbinger of the returning spring, the issue of the Texas City tin smelter may be counted to occupy the attention of the national Congress. It is true that, owing to the vagaries of the weather, the eastern robins cannot boast the punctuality of the swallows of Capistrano, but they always show up. In 1954, the continued operation of the Texas smelter was the subject of discussion as early as the beginning of March. Not forgotten but merely a trifle delayed, as the robins sometimes are, it is now back with us again, as full of vim, vigor, and vitality as if it had not added another year to its old age.

A year ago we suggested that the smelter would continue in operation for another year. It was not our view that this was because the plant was needed by the tin-consuming industry or in the interest of the national defense. It involved other factors, with which Washington is well acquainted and, whatever the deciding reason, the smelter continued to function, as was anticipated.

It was contended then that time was required for a congressional investigation into the need for the smelter. Although the closing of the smelter had been recommended by the administration, and although no provision has been made in the budget for the continued operation of the smelter after June 30 of this year, the report on this investigation is still awaited. It may become available in a few days, but whatever it may conclude, friends of the operation are already urging its being continued for another year, as, among other things, it would have greater value as a going concern than as an abandoned project.

One must concede that there is considerable validity to such reasoning. Admittedly, the continuing operation of the plant in private hands would appear to depend on the granting of a protective tariff on pig tin (something which has not yet occurred in all our history), but the reason mentioned does constitute a good basis for urging the continued operation of the plant—with the incidental employment it provides for a couple of hundred persons in a community of moderate size. The surprising thing is that such resourceful advocates appear to think it necessary to supplement so ingenious an argument (readily understandable to all political realists) with the rehashing of old chestnuts that time has demonstrated have no merit at all.

One of these old standbys is, of course, the need of the smelter for defense purposes, as it is the only tin smelter in the Western Hemisphere. This argument grows out of the conditions of the last war, when Hitler took over all the European smelters on the Continent and threatened from the air (but never stopped) those in the British Isles, and when Japanese sea power disrupted all contact with Malaya and Indonesia. Falling into the old failure of "fighting the next war by preparing for the last," it overlooks that there is no longer any Japenese sea power to disrupt communications with southeast Asia, and that the Eastern frontier of the Western World is now in Eastern Germany.

It ignores also the fact that we met all tin requirements with a backlog of only about 50,000 tons of reserve stock, whereas today it is pretty well established that the Government can command control of nearly 6 years' consumption at the rate of last years' industrial absorption of primary tin. In short, without any more tin, our accumulated stocks would see us through 6 years' severance of new supplies, and the talk now is that with atomic weapons, a decision could eventuate within a few months.

Next only to our supposed need of the smelter for defense, is the claim that it is essential to the Bolivian economy. This ignores, of course, the fact that about half the Bolivian production has been going to Britain for smelting for a number of years and that all of it went to Europe before the opening of the Texas City smelter in 1942. It can be smelted in Europe today, through private companies, just as it was in the past. There is no need for the United States Government to subsidize the smelter, at a cost of a couple of millions a year, for this purpose.

Indeed, instead of a blessing for Bolivia, the smelter remains something of a curse, since it continues to be an excuse for the disastrous economic policies of the Bolivian Government since it "nationalized" the mines. As private operations, the mines were the main support of the country, and its principal source of foreign exchange. Whatever the faults of the private operations, they were not a drain on the very limited resources of that unfortunate land. They were the main prop of the Nation, even though the Government obliged them to accept only 60 Bolivianos for their dollars, to meet operating expenses and pay taxes, when the free rate would have yielded them as much as 160 Bolivianos.

Since then, nationalization of the mines has benefited the country by turning a source of income into a millstone of deficits. Precise figures are lacking, but it is reasonably well established that, although the number of miners has been vastly increased (some say doubled) costs have so mounted that every pound of tin concentrates pro-

duced results in a loss of possibly as much as 35 cents per pound, which an impoverished Government must make good. The result has been the fall of the Boliviano to about 2,400 to the dollar from 160. It is eloquent testimony that the continued operation of the Texas City smelter has not halted deterioration of the Bolivian economy, let alone sustained it.

As for the smelter being an anchor to windward against the machinations of the international tin cartel, it is worth noting that there has been a world surplus production of tin over the last half dozen years. This has proved to be of manageable proportions only because the output of the Texas City smelter has been impounded in the national stockpiles, instead of overhanging the world's markets.

However, all this may be, let us not be surprised if, in the interest of preserving a supposedly salable piece of merchandise, we continue to hold off some 30,000 tons of tin a year from the world markets, provide a dollar refuge for uneconomical operations in Bolivia and give orators continuing excuse for denouncing cartels. Nor let it cause surprise if we again hear some other reason for continuing the operation of the smelter, for just another year, about the time the robins fly north in March of 1956.

[From the American Metal Market of April 29, 1955]

TEXAS CITY WILL CONTINUE TO SMELT

The Senate, acting on the report and recommendation of its Committees on Armed Services and Banking and Currency, has passed without dissent a resolution favoring the continued operation of the Texas City tin smelter during the fiscal year 1955–56. If this action occasioned surprise in any quarter, it was certainly not in the tin trade, which has grown accustomed to this procedure and recognizes that the realities of politics are pretty much as established a part of our daily life as the merits or demerits of a proposition.

The trade, too, has become quite inured to indulgence by political figures in campaign oratory and would have been greatly surprised if such considerations did not continue to feature reports on this subject. Nevertheless, on this occasion the report rather surpasses all previous efforts and, if it has occasioned any surprise whatsoever, it is because the committees still feel constrained to resort to such deviations from fact to buttress their recommendations.

As a report of the committees points out, tin is produced outside the territory of the United States. Also, there is only one tin smelter on American territory and that is owned and operated by the Government. Consequently, tin is in a most unusual position. It has no constituency, except the staff of the smelter, and therefore is fair and safe game for hunting, since it cannot talk back at the polls. Therefore, once again, tin producers everywhere—except for the highest-cost mines in the world, which are presently operating only with the support of United States subsidies—are made the whipping boy for continuing an operation which the trade is virtually unanimous in regarding as an unnecessary and costly drain on the Public Treasury.

It is asserted that the maintenance and operation of the Government smelter "decreases the risk of the country's being at the mercy of price gouging by those controlling foreign tin supplies." If this were the case, why did the Government consider it safe to divest itself of the control and operation of the much more extensive artificial rubber plants, as natural rubber is wholly a product of foreign areas, identical in respect to two of the most important producers, as the two most important tin-producing areas?

If there existed a "tin cartel" of the character so frequently denounced by certain of our public figures, why is it that business and governments in the tin producing and tin consuming nations of the world have considered it desirable (in the interest of relative price stability and dependable supply) to set up an international tin agreement? If a cartel existed, would not such an agreement be entirely a superfluous duplication? And if such an agreement is regarded as desirable for all concerned—producers and consumers alike—why is it that after 7 years of effort, the required number of assents is still lacking? Can it be that some nations prefer to continue uncommitted, confident in the belief that the Congress itself will assure a tight and constant market for all the production the world's mines can turn out? It could very well be, for the Congress, deliberately or otherwise is contributing to the creation and maintenance of the very condition it denounces.

In 1952, world production of tin exceeded consumption by some 40,000 tons; in 1953 by some 45,000 tons; and in 1954 by nearly 37,000 tons. In free markets, the law of supply and demand still functions. That explained the temporary aberrations of virtually all primary markets—not only that of tin—during the hectic months following the outbreak of hostilities in Korea. Why hasn't it operated, then, on the reverse side, now that there is a persistent excess of supply over commercial demand for tin? Can it be that continuing operation of the Texas City smelter and the stockpiling of its output (37,651 tons in 1953) is contributing to the maintenance of the existing price of tin, without requiring any effort whatsoever on the part of the cartel. Heaven forbid.

It is interesting, nonetheless, to speculate on what the present price of tin would be if the subsidized Texas City output were not being taken out of current consumption, and considerable uneconomic foreign production were not being subsidized out of our public Treasury. Naturally whatever Texas City produces must be isolated, since the administration is opposed to Government competition with private, taxpaying enterprise. One wonders if the committee really intends to denounce others for creating—by unproved attribution only—a condition of which it, itself, is quite undisputably responsible.

Of course it is fantastic to assert that Bolivian concentrates can be smelted in quantity only in the Government smelter." Before the Texas City smelter existed all Bolivian concentrates were smelted in private smelters. Around half the Bolivian output continued to be smelted abroad all through the war and up to this moment. It is nonsense to infer that all Bolivian concentrates could not now be handled in private smelters.

The assertion that our consumption in the war years was as much as the total world production during peacetime is pure, ignorant nonsense. Our consumption was nearer one-third of normal peacetime production. Other similar deviations from reality could be cited, but why go on. Everybody knows the Texas City smelter will continue in operation, but hardly for the reasons cited by our august legislators.

Mr. Speaker, the reports of the Hoover Commission show that the Federal Government is still engaged in numerous operations of a commercial nature which cannot be justified as essential to any legitimate governmental function. The Hoover Commission and President Eisenhower have both stated that Government operation of the tin smelter was not necessary for our national interest. It was because of this that I introduced House Joint Resolution 285 on April 21 to authorize the immediate termination of this venture into socialism.

Mr. Speaker, I realize that the House has passed Senate Concurrent Resolution 26 to authorize the operation of this facility for another year. So that the RECORD may be complete, I wish to explain fully my opposition to the resolution we adopted last week.

The 83d Congress conducted extensive studies of Government operations of a commercial nature and recommended the discontinuance of many such activities with no detriment to any proper Government function and with substantial savings to our taxpayers. The Hoover Commission has also covered this area thoroughly. Unfortunately, when we recently passed the appropriation bill for the Defense Department for the fiscal year 1956, we included a provision requiring congressional sanction to terminate commercial-type activities which the Secretary of Defense believes should be eliminated with no loss to our fighting effectiveness and with benefit to our taxpayers. This act is regrettable and will hamper President Eisenhower in carrying out his basic philosophy which is to limit the intrusion of the Federal Government into fields normally served by private enterprise. His policy is designed to afford the greatest possible opportunity for the exercise of individual initiative by our private citizens consistent with our security and the welfare of our people.

The activities of the Federal Government in areas which we normally do not regard as governmental are so vast that they defy description. When President Eisenhower was inaugurated, the Federal Government was engaged in more than 100 different ventures including bread baking, coffee making, scrap-metal bailing, rope making, clothing manufacture, furniture repairing, the operation of sawmills, laundries and dry-cleaning establishments, paint manufacture, tire retreading, the making of ice cream and motion pictures, operating railroads and ships, and writing life insurance.

The Federal Government, in addition to its proper governmental activities, is the largest single electric power producer in the country, it operates the largest insurance business, it is our greatest banker, it is the largest tenant and the largest landlord, it owns more grain than anyone else, it operates more warehouses, more ships, and more trucks.

Mr. Speaker, some Members of the Congress have been devoting long hours to a study of monopoly and the concentration of economic power. There has never been such a concentration as exists within our Federal Government.

In the comparatively short time since President Eisenhower has been in office great progress has been made in better defining the proper scope of governmental activities. One of the first acts of the administration was to sell the Inland Waterways Corporation to private enterprise for $9 million. It operated barge lines for many years.

The Federal Government is now out of the hotel business. The Department of the Interior no longer operates Bluebeard's Castle in the Virgin Islands. It has been sold with the proceeds going into the general funds of the Treasury

and the property is now on the tax rolls.

The Congress recently authorized the sale of our synthetic rubber producing facilities to private industry. This is probably the largest and most important transfer of activities by the Federal Government to private enterprise.

However, the Federal Government is still operating a tin smelter. Mr. Speaker, I have investigated this operation and I am completely convinced that it is unnecessary for the defense and security of this country which is the only reason that we embarked on this activity in the first place.

Prior to World War II we depended upon the Far East for almost all of our commercial tin supplies. Indonesia and the Malay Peninsula supplied tin concentrates which were smelted in Western Europe. Access to the tin producing areas was denied by the Japanese and to the European tin smelters by the Germans. The only available source of tin concentrates was the Bolivian ores. Steps were taken to erect a tin smelter at Texas City, Tex., to refine these concentrates. This was the proper step for our Government to take as a war measure.

Mr. Speaker, let us contrast this situation with the picture which now confronts us. When the Texas City smelter was built our reserves of tin were most inadequate and industry had given little thought to conservation and substitution. The lack of availability of tin stimulated industry to use its ingenuity and get along with far less tin. For example, prior to World War II most of our tin plate was produced by the "hot dip process." Steel sheets were dipped into molten tin and thus coated with a protective covering necessary for can making so as to ensure the preservation of the contents.

Today, most of our tin plate is produced by an electrolytic process which uses far less tin and produces an even better protective coating. Furthermore, substitutes for tin have been developed so that it can be dispensed with entirely in many applications.

The 79th Congress enacted Public Law 520 providing a realistic stockpiling program. Strategic stockpiles of tin have been accumulating now for many years. The Office of Defense Mobilization has recently raised our stockpiling goals so that today a very substantial stockpile of tin is available. The amount now on hand exceeds the expanded present minimum requirements which adequately meet our immediate needs. Furthermore, tin is once again available from the Far East and can be procured in refined form at prices more advantageous to the taxpayer than through the operation of the Texas City smelter to complete our long range stockpiling program. This very large stockpile goal is quite close to attainment.

Mr. Speaker, if we are to follow President Eisenhower's program of encouraging private enterprise wherever possible, there can be no justification for continuing governmental operation of a tin smelter under these conditions unless we deliberately wish to foster Government operation of industry which, frankly, is nothing but socialism.

A year ago, Charles W. Merrill, the Assistant Chief of the Minerals Division of the Bureau of Mines, Department of the Interior, testified on this subject before the Special Subcommittee on Minerals, Materials, and Fuels Economics, of the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. He said:

It is believed however first, that the United States Government should get out of the tin-smelting business. Second, it is believed that it is desirable to have a tin smelter in the United States operated privately, but that that desirability is not sufficient to justify a direct subsidy or tariff protection.

And third the security angle is considered of sufficient importance so that, if it were possible to find some private operator to take over the smelter and agree to run it at some minimum output, the Government would be justified in a lease or sale arrangement which would give only a nominal return of the capital investment that the Government has in the smelter.

That is a general outline of the Interior's approach to this thing (hearings, pt. 10, p. 845).

This statement by Mr. Merrill which I know is supported by the Assistant Secretary of the Interior for Mineral Resources, Felix E. Wormser, a man who has devoted his entire life to the mining industry, represents in my opinion, a sound and proper solution to this problem.

The report of the Hoover Commission on Business Enterprises, page 90, reaffirms this statement. The Commission said:

The Texas City tin smelter was a necessary enterprise begun during World War II. The tin sources in the East had been captured by the Japanese and there was no smelting for South American tin ores in the Western Hemisphere. South America was the only source of tin in this hemisphere, as there are no substantial deposits known in North America. The Texas City smelter property, plant, and equipment cost about $13,200,000 and the current depreciated book value is $6,500,000.

The smelter has produced about 33,000 tons of tin annually. In recent years the metal has been added to the strategic stockpile. The stockpile is now estimated at a 5-year war supply.

The smelter is uneconomical for many reasons and the loss in 1954 was $1,504,233. As there is no reason for continued operation, President Eisenhower on January 2, 1954, recommended that it be closed on June 30 of that year (pp. 90 and 91).

The time has come for us to permit normal economic forces to be operative in this situation and Government operation of the smelter should be terminated as soon as possible.

A Political Standard for Art?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, July 17, 1956

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "A Political Standard for Art?" published in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A POLITICAL STANDARD FOR ART?—THE MIRROR OF PUBLIC OPINION

Federal Information Agency canceled American art tour in Australia because of charges that some of the artists represented had had Communist-front associations; 2 editorials denounce this timidity; as if we want totalitarian political tests for art?

The New York Times:

"The United States Information Agency, which is supposed to help foreigners understand what America is all about, seems once again to have been bullied into a position that gives a false and distorted picture of our country that could rejoice only the hearts of our enemies.

"A few weeks ago it was revealed that the USIA had canceled plans to send to Australia an exhibition of American paintings on the subject of sports, because one group of fanatic extremists had claimed that some of the artists represented had had Communists-front associations.

"This time a much more comprehensive exhibition is involved. A collection of close to 100 paintings covering all styles of contemporary American art was being assembled for display under USIA auspices in several European countries next fall and winter. The USIA has indicated it may withdraw its sponsorship because some of the artists do not pass its political test.

"The American Federation of Arts, which is gathering the show together, refuses to exclude their work on such grounds. 'Art,' says the federation's trustees, 'should be judged on its merits * * * and not by the political or social views of the artist.'

"AFRAID OF CONGRESSMEN?

"Presumably what the USIA is afraid of is not the subversive effect of the paintings, because there is none, but the inflammatory effect on a few Congressmen that official American sponsorship of these paintings might induce. Since the USIA is dependent on Congress for the more than $100 million it will expend in the coming year, it doesn't want to alienate anybody. But it is paying a stiff price.

"In the instances cited, and they are not the only ones, the USIA is implying that art must undergo a test of the political legitimacy of the artist. The State Department has on occasion acted similarly.

"This is uncomfortably close to the Nazi and the Communist concept, which is diametrically opposed to the basic philosophy of free American culture."

The Des Moines Register:

"How do you judge a work of art? Do you judge it on its merits or on the basis of the artist's politics?

"In a freedom-loving country the answer would seem obvious. The very idea is barbarous that a work of art is unacceptable because someone says the artist had wrong ideas about politics.

"Yet that is what the United States Information Agency is insisting upon.

"Theodore Streibert, the information agency director, felt it necessary to make concessions to this distorted standard of art and literature during the brief reign of terror by Senator JOSEPH MCCARTHY, Republican, Wisconsin.

"When McCarthyism became a wasm Streibert made fine new resolutions and a good start in practice. Yet in several recent instances he has slipped back into the jellyfish role.

"The worst instance involves the proposed traveling exhibit of major paintings of 100 American artists of the 20th century. The United States agency turned over selection of the paintings (very sensibly) to the respected private American Federation of Arts, which has a standing policy that art should

be judged on its merits and not on the social views of the artist.

"The federaiton picked two distinguished museum officials to make the actual selections. They went to a lot of trouble and picked noted artists of many different styles.

"ART IS WHAT COUNTS

"It would be very surprising if such a collection did not include the work of artists with unorthodox political ideas or associations. We should expect, for example, that some of them might have flirted with communism, some with anarchism. Some might think the whole machine age was a mistake, some that anything pre-machine-age was corny.

"So what? A painting is not a discourse on politics or economics. The painting is what counts. The painter won't travel with the show.

"But no, the USIA found 10 of the 100 artists politically unacceptable. The federation's trustees voted unanimously not to take part in the show if the Government imposed political tests.

"Thus what might have been a dignified and interesting demonstration that America does after all have some culture becomes another weapon for propagandists that culture doesn't have a chance here. It also provides proof to foreigners that we don't live up to our own principles of cultural freedom."

A Catholic or a Candidate?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. GLENN BEALL
OF MARYLAND
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, July 17, 1956

Mr. BEALL. Mr. President, in this election year, it is important for all of us to remember which items should be considered in our evaluation of the qualifications of the various candidates. Whether a man's religion should enter into our thinking was discussed in the Catholic Review, the official organ of the archdiocese of Baltimore, on July 13, 1956, and I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A CATHOLIC OR A CANDIDATE?

Just recently Mr. Adlai Stevenson, or one of his campaign team, let it be known that he is "very friendly to the idea of nominating a Catholic for second place on the ticket."

Just what prompted the release of this information we do not know. However, such an announcement, whether it be made by a Democrat or Republican candidate, is a serious misstep. It is based on an entirely false presumption, and this presumption partakes of the character of an insult.

If the man who makes such a statement were asked, what reason could he give to justify it?

Would he be forced to admit that he is making a play for the millions of Catholic votes that will be available in November? If so, he would be questioning the intelligence of all Catholics, who should be presumed to have commonsense enough to cast their votes to the man best qualified for office, regardless of his religious affiliation.

Or would he say that only a Catholic could possess the eloquence, honesty, knowledge, practical skill, experience, disposition, judgment, and wisdom that the office requires? This nobody could buy, because it is simply not true.

Or would the explanation be that he is attempting to demonstrate a true democratic spirit of fair play? This would be an honorable motive for the act of nominating a Catholic at the convention. But it is the kind of thing that would have to be done without any comment at all, either before or after.

It seems that any candidate might as well make a statement to the effect that he is very friendly to the idea of nominating a baldheaded man for second place on the ticket. Then he can look forward to getting the votes of all baldheaded men, who are far more numerous than Catholics. Or perhaps it should be a left-handed man, or a Rotarian, or a vegetarian, or an antivivisectionist. Once the basic qualifications for office are set aside anything makes sense.

But Catholics will not forget the basic qualifications for office, nor, we hope, will any other citizens of our country. Religious affiliation is not one of those qualifications and it will not be a factor in the casting of any honest ballot.

Eisenhower Will Run

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT W. CRETELLA
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 17, 1956

Mr. CRETELLA. Mr. Speaker, I wish to include for the RECORD an editorial from the July 11 New Haven (Conn.) Register. It mentions the complete candor with which the President and his medical advisers have informed the American people of his illnesses and it calls on the Democratic Party to provide the people with the vital issues and programs which are important to them rather than diverting attention to the so-called health issue of President Eisenhower.

EISENHOWER WILL RUN

For a second time President Eisenhower has let it be known that he considers his health sufficiently robust to stand for election to a second term.

And, as with his initial such announcement last February 29 following his recovery from a heart attack, the overwhelming public reaction has been one of gratification.

For over and above and apart from all political considerations, the President is an unusually popular, respected and admired man. There is thus great joy that his recovery from his recent surgery has been so swift and so complete that, in his own opinion, as well as in that of his top medical advisers, it offers no barrier to his seeking office, or in carrying on the full duties and responsibilities of that office if reelected next November.

As with the first such decision made as February ended and March began, it must again be said that it is expressive of the President's patriotism, his regard for his fellow citizens, and his desire to carry to completion his administration objectives, particularly those relating to the establishment of world peace.

These, without doubt, are compelling reasons. Yet behind them lies knowledge of the sacrifices of self and of family and private life that must be made if the President goes through another campaign and if he should be selected to go on from there to a second term.

It can thus be appreciated, alike by the President's supporters and his opponents, that decision could not have come easily, or without considerable soul searching.

Once again, too, it must be stressed that the President, and his aids and medical advisers as well, have been entirely frank with the American people. They, and he, have concealed nothing. Rather they have been fair and forward in bringing every known item of the President's physical condition into the open for the American people to look at and consider.

From the political standpoint this rather pulls the rugs from under any of those Democrats who would wish to make the President's health a major campaign issue. They, and their ultimate candidates, should go before the voters with specific issues and programs, and trust the November results to their popularity, or lack thereof.

This is as it should be—and as the intelligent voter would want it.

Now, if the President and his party candidates will do the same, by going before the electroate with a clear-cut, acceptable, and sound program directed toward the highest common interest of all of our citizens, the independent voter, who in the immediate past has had little base upon which to rest a choice of party, may yet find that choice made easier—by establishing definite and clear-cut lines of demarcation between the aims and ideals of the opposing major parties.

Soviet Challenge: Russia Needs 30 Years To Catch Up

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, July 17, 1956

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Soviet Challenge—Russia Needs 30 Years To Catch Up," written by J. A. Livingston, and published in the Washington Post and Times Herald of July 17, 1956.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SOVIET CHALLENGE

(By J. A. Livingston)

RUSSIA NEEDS 30 YEARS TO CATCH UP

Let's not kid ourselves. We can't draw exact mathematical curves of the Soviet Union's economic progress. We can't say within a year or even 5 years how long it will take Russia, at recent rates of industrial growth, to catch up with this country.

We don't know whether the Russians can maintain their recent pace. We don't know whether America's rate of growth, which also has been high in postwar years, is permanently higher or will gradually recede to prewar levels.

But we can say this much with some assurance: It will take the Russians about 30 years to catch up—if they can catch up at all. And 30 years is a long, long time. In which much can happen.

We know what the Soviet leaders are doing, and why. They're concentrating on military devices and industrial equipment; this to enable them to impose communism, the Soviet system, the Russian will, on the world—either by force or persuasion, which means unused force or the threat of force.

Let's not underrate Soviet accomplishments. United States nuclear physicists who have met Russian physicists report they have know-how, learn-how, and plenty of money to pursue their research. Gen. Nathan F. Twining, Chief of Staff for the United States Air Force, warned Congress that Russia could procure a "scientific breakthrough and consequent technological surprise in new weapons." Russian scientists, engineers, and industrialists "know their way around" hydrogen explosions and jet planes.

And yet we daren't underestimate our own strength either. In the battle for industrial leadership, a battle in which we start with a productive capacity 2½ to 3 times that of the Soviet Union, we can count these comparative blessings:

1. Technological and industrial depth. American manufacturing, mining, and transportation equipment and methods are generally the most advanced in the world. In the Soviet Union, engineers, technologists, and technicians are constantly studying and copying American methods. The libraries are full of American business and technical magazines—photostated and distributed by the U. S. S. R. Academy of Sciences.

2. Excellent agriculture. Of this, the American crop surpluses are the best evidence. In the Soviet Union, on the other hand, hunger and famine are always knocking on the door. About 550 million Soviet acres are arable. But adjusted to climatic hazards—cold, short growing seasons, and light rainfall—production efficiency is rated only 70 percent of America's 400 million arable acres. Yet there are 20 percent more mouths to feed in Russia than in the United States.

3. A population accustomed to initiative, to decision-making. In elections, Americans are expected to choose officers to run the Government; in labor unions and clubs, they speak out and again elect officers. In business, men change jobs, invest in machinery, start businesses.

Russia's long history of dictatorship, under czarism and communism, has developed a nation of disciplinarians and disciples. In industry, workers are told what to do. On collective farms, what to plant and how much is determined from on high.

In the present struggle for power Russia now relies on "competitive coexistence." Soviet leaders are shouting "Miroo mir"—"peace to the world." For the moment, force is too risky, too expensive. Instead, Soviet leaders are trying to beat us in industrial knowhow. They've picked our sport.

Soon the Soviet Union will submit its methods, techniques, and industrial boasts to objective tests in a world arena. Will Soviet engineers and technicians who go abroad give as good advice, develop as durable and workable products as Western engineers? It will be significant how the Soviet steel mill in India compares with the steel plant being built by the Kaiser Co. and the plant being built by an English group.

This is an economic contest for men's minds and hearts. To win it, these are 5 do's and 1 don't for Americans. We must:

1. Avoid a depression. For years, Soviet economists have been telling the world that an American collapse is just around the corner; that capitalism is unstable. We are proving, and must continue to prove, "it ain't so." In this, we'd be merely carrying out the mandate in the Employment Act of 1946.

2. Cut tariffs and act the part of a country which is both a great creditor and a great industrial nation. The Russians seem to have a trade advantage. A few men at the top make decisions. If they feel it helps them politically, they'll barter for Egyptian cotton or Burmese rice. Soviet labor or materials can be given away.

3. Maintain a strong Army, Air Force, and Navy, and the research necessary thereto. This has been a double purpose: It prevents Soviet aggression. And it puts pressure on the Soviet leaders. If they insist on an arms race plus an industrial race, let's let them have it. I, personally, believe that the Soviet Union wants a respite from armament production; that eventually, because of domestic pressures for improved living, the Soviet oligarchy will make a move toward realistic reduction in armaments. But, until that happens, we cannot afford to relax, peace talk isn't peace action.

4. Open the doors to an exchange of intellectuals with the Soviet Union. This doesn't mean inviting Soviet engineers and scientists to come to the United States to inspect all secret installations or new processes. We can give them the welcome-mat, hand-on-the-door treatment they gave General Twining and give all westerners. But I do think it would be advantageous to try to send United States students to Russian universities and permit Russian students to come here; also permit an exchange of professors.

5. Not pooh-pooh everything the Russians do. When Khrushchev and Marshal Zhukov announce a reduction in the armed forces, let's act pleased, call it a step in the right direction, rather than criticize and say it's nothing and long overdue. A dog-in-the-manger attitude doesn't help our status with undecided nations, nations that are trying to make up their minds.

6. Finally, we've got to examine our own social order in this age of competitive coexistence. In our society, we may not be paying sufficient attention to the management side—not the management side of business but the management side of the system itself. We don't give financial encouragement to people who want to go into Government—the State Department, the Army, the Air Force—into teaching, into research; to people who have to be as keen, as brilliant, as self-respectful as their counterparts in the Soviet Union, where the greatest rewards go to the commissars, engineers, doctors, professors, industrialists, and intellectuals. By paying the Government, industrial, and cultural elite in relation to their importance to the state, Soviet leaders not only take care of themselves, but also they help to develop and perpetuate the class of men who will make the system flourish.

The Soviet leaders have taken on the industrial champ, the United States. To win, they must regenerate and expand an industrial plant largely outmoded; they must overcome a harsh climate to increase agricultural output; they must increase output of consumer goods; and they must prove to Egypt, India, and other countries of Asia, that their engineering and industrial knowledge is on a par with ours.

In this contest, America starts off rich and well fed—with better plants, better equipment, better-trained technologists and workers, and a better standard of living. The Soviet Union starts as a hungry fighter who has to knock out the champ to eat. Yet, if we can't make the necessary adjustments in our system, in capitalism, to remain the champ, we don't deserve world leadership. That's our problem.

The problem of the Soviet leaders is different. To fulfill their promises, they have to widen responsibility and power—decentralize, a process which has already begun. They have to educate more and more people. As more and more persons get positions of responsibility—a sense of what's going on, as educated persons must—they will want, and eventually get, a say in what's decided. In a 30-year war for industrial supremacy, leaders will change; policies can change; systems might change. Even the Soviet system. Even dictatorship.

Snarling Our Neutrality Line

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, July 17, 1956

Mr. HUMPHREY of Minnesota. Mr. President, earlier today I introduced into the RECORD a number of editorials and articles relating to the so-called snarl on neutrality by President Eisenhower, Mr. Nixon, and Secretary Dulles. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "It's Time To Unsnarl Our Neutrality Line," written by Robert Hewett, Minneapolis Star and Tribune foreign correspondent, and published in the Minneapolis Star and Tribune of recent date.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IT'S TIME TO UNSNARL OUR NEUTRALITY LINE

(By Robert Hewett)

Critics of India's sad-eyed Prime Minister, Jawaharlal Nehru, call him erratic. But when it comes to neutralism, our own statesmen are winning the booby prize for dizzy diplomacy.

Let's figure out a policy before we do any more talking about this touchy problem of the so-called neutral or uncommitted nations.

There already has been too much confusing talk from the very top—President Eisenhower, Vice President NIXON, and Secretary of State Dulles.

Within 5 weeks we have given the neutrals a friendly pat on the back, brushed them off as immoral, scolded them and indulged in a needless argument with Nehru. And now Dulles implies there aren't really any bad neutrals at all.

These contradictory comments have made our world leadership look somewhat ridiculous, at the very least.

It's worse than ridiculous, however, when we upset our nervous allies and unnecessarily offend such neutralist countries as India, countries which we hope eventually to convince of the dangers of communism.

It's time we curb the moralistic finger shaking and show the advantages of our free world society by deeds and examples, instead of by words which only create resentment. But first some thoughtful statement is needed from the President to tell exactly where we stand with our allies, with the neutrals and even with the Communists.

The diplomatic merry-go-round started June 6 when the President told his news conference many of the young neutral nations were justified in professing neutrality, pointing out that the United States was neutral in its younger days.

This naturally heartened such neutrals as India, Burma, Indonesia, and others. But it caused intense disquiet among leaders of such nations as the Philippines, Pakistan, and Turkey, which have military pacts with us.

The next day, therefore, the White House issued a clarifying statement saying the President did not mean to imply that neutrality would bring more security than mutual-defense alliances.

On June 9, at Ames, Iowa, Dulles went even further in emphasizing American support of mutual defense pacts, saying:

"These treaties abolish, as between the parties, the principle of neutrality, which pretends that a nation can best gain safety for itself by being indifferent to the fate of others. This has increasingly become an obsolete conception and, except under very exception circumstances, is an immoral and short-sighted conception."

This attack on neutrality as immoral upset India's Nehru, who thought the President had defended his position only 3 days before. Last week Indian-American relations were strained further by exchanges between Nehru and NIXON over the Vice President's comments on neutralism in his Philippine speech.

Dulles obviously was trying to steer clear of further brushes with Nehru and other neutrals when he was asked last Wednesday about his attack on neutrality as immoral. Dulles replied he was talking only of neutralism which had no concern for others.

A reporter then asked how a country could express concern for others and Dulles replied that could be done by membership in the United Nations, which commits members to standing together against aggression.

The reporter, obviously puzzled, commented, "I now have the impression that hardly any country would be considered to be immoral in its neutrality policy (under Dulles' definition)."

"I think there are very few, if any," Dulles replied, "although I do believe this: I believe that countries which denounce genuine collective security pacts are seeking to promote a somewhat wrong view of neutrality."

John Hightower, veteran Associated Press State Department correspondent, reported the switch thus:

"Secretary Dulles took United States policy on neutrality around another vast turn today and it wound up going in the opposite direction from that which he had last set for it."

How about straightening out the line, Mr. President?

Prediction

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE A. SHUFORD
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 16, 1956

Mr. SHUFORD. Mr. Speaker, the Franklin Press and the Highlands Maconian, published at Franklin, N. C., in Macon County, is one of the outstanding weekly papers of the Southeast. Its able editor, Mr. Weimar Jones, has written the attached editorial which appeared in the July 12 issue. This timely and interesting prediction reflects his area's thinking on the President's health as a campaign issue.

The editorial follows:

POLITICAL PREDICTION

Here we go, 'way out on a limb, to make a political prediction—two of 'em, in fact.

Prediction No. 1 (and it takes little courage to make this one): Barring early and unexpected physical complications, Ike's latest illness will not change his decision to run for reelection.

No. 2 (and here's where we take our life as a political prophet in our hands): Before November, Ike will be conducting something closely approaching a whistle-stop campaign. The reason? Ike's health.

We figure it this way: The Democrats are going to make the most of the health issue. Here is a man, they'll argue, who'll be 70 before the end of the next administration, and who has had two critical illnesses, and of a different nature, in less than a year.

The President's health, of course, should be an issue. The people have a right to know, before they vote, how good or bad it is. Mr. Eisenhower, himself, in fact, was honest enough to make it an issue, even before the ileitis operation.

And as the issue becomes hotter and hotter, the people are going to want physical evidence of Ike's fitness; they are going to demand to see him in person—and they're going to be doubtful, if they can't. Thus the Republican high command, which has been assuring both Ike and the Nation that a few television appearances will be enough to assure his reelection, will more and more tend to shuttle the President from one end of the Nation to the other.

What will that do to the President's health?

We, of course, don't know the answer; not even the doctors do.

What we do know is we'd hate to have the responsibility somebody's going to have to shoulder, should the strain prove too great.

Rising Young Politicians

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUGH J. ADDONIZIO
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 17, 1956

Mr. ADDONIZIO. Mr. Speaker, I am proud that a young resident of the 11th Congressional District, Anthony De Miro, 150 North Park Street, East Orange, N. J., was elected governor at the American Legion's recent Boys' State Convention at New Brunswick. As the East Orange Record pointed out in a recent editorial, it is wise to encourage interest in political affairs among our young people so that they will develop into responsible citizens. I commend to the attention of my colleagues the editorial from the East Orange Record of July 12:

RISING YOUNG POLITICIANS?

In this presidential election year, we'll see a number of advertising and publicity campaigns to "Get Out the Vote." Thinking persons have long been disturbed by the small percentage of citizens who exercise their franchise. Either they don't value their freedom or they take it very much for granted. Good government needs the close attention of the electorate in a number of ways: By voting in all elections, in following the work of those elected while in office, and in participating in party activities. We need to attract more good men and women to governmental jobs, both elected and appointive.

In the democracies of Europe a far higher percentage of the voters turn out on election day and more good men seek political office. This is partly because of a longer tradition of public service and partly because there are fewer good jobs in private industry to compete with government positions. Moreover, we suspect that many Americans do not really understand much about the democratic system. There are not enough courses in civics in the public schools and college courses too often are purely theoretical, explaining the outline of our governmental systems but not how they are really operated by the political parties starting down in the local districts where a handful of votes, if compounded in a majority of other local districts will decide the outcome of a statewide election.

So we commend the additional efforts along these lines being made in many schools, and by private educational efforts, such as the DAR essay contests on citizenship, and the American Legion's annual Boys' State and Girls' State held at New Brunswick for several days each summer young people from all over New Jersey study government, hold party conventions to nominate candidates for state offices and elect officials from the governor down. This seems like the very best way to show the next generation just how it is done and to arouse a lively interest in a political career.

It looks as though some able future politicians are right here in our suburbs. Anthony De Miro, of East Orange, only an alternate delegate to Boys' State, ended up by getting himself elected governor. Sue Marcotte, of Bloomfield, not only was elected a state senator, but then president of the senate, the next position to that of the governor.

The Boys' Towns of Italy and Monsignor Carroll-Abbing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 17, 1956

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, a heartbreaking and alarming aftermath of the Second World War in Europe was the sudden appearance of homeless and orphaned boys—boys who were forced to beg, steal, and "make deals" merely to keep alive. The immediate problem of getting these children off the streets was not easy. Harder still was the problem of providing them with food, clothing, and shelter.

In Italy, the first serious attempt to tackle this problem was made by Monsignor John Patrick Carroll-Abbing (an Irish priest) when in November 1945 he founded the first Boys' Town of Italy at Santa Marinella. The Boys' Town was conceived of as a practicing self-government democracy run by the children themselves. The administration of the town was and continues to be controlled by a mayor and his councilors who are elected by secret ballot. An assembly of elected members constitutes the legislature which makes rules and laws to guide the behavior of the boy citizens. A judicial committee sees to the proper application of these laws. In this manner the aim of self-government, that is, to make the boys responsible citizens and to increase their understanding of a democratic way of life, was achieved in a remarkably short period of time.

Hard work and training in a particular art, trade or craft—woodcarving, carpentry, painting, shoemaking, and so forth—provides the boys with an opportunity to make a living. A small market

system run by the boys themselves enables them to understand the exchange of money and goods. In the field of education the Italian Government and the American Relief for Italy have helped to provide elementary education by placing teachers in the schools in the Boys' Town. For the young citizens who show ability for higher study, scholarships in private schools are made available. Throughout the whole system great emphasis is placed on individual responsibility and cooperation, both of which aid a great deal toward character building and respect for one's fellow.

Today the Boys' Towns of Italy consist of nine citizens' republics with more than 2,400 youngsters. It is gratifying to see that the dedicated efforts of Monsignor Carroll-Abbing and the generous help of the American Relief for Italy have led to such excellent results. The formerly homeless street boys have found a new hope and a secure home in these Boys' Town republics. Although deprived of their own homes and parental care they respond readily to the help and guidance they are able to receive from their counselor, Monsignor Abbing, and also their fellow citizens.

Texas City Tin Smelter

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH A. GAMBLE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 27, 1956

Mr. GAMBLE. Mr. Speaker, the disposal of the Government-owned tin smelter at Texas City, Tex., will constitute an important step in removing Government from fields which should be left to private enterprise.

In the past, the Congress hesitated in taking action on a disposal program which was recommended by the President, the Hoover Commission, and almost the entire business community.

As we consider House Joint Resolution 607, which provides for the disposal of this facility, it is helpful to review past informed editorial opinion dealing with Government operation of the tin smelter. Barron's in its issue of May 23, 1955, had a lead editorial entitled "Mischief in Tin—the United States Is Punishing Its Friends, Rewarding Its Foes."

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this editorial be reprinted in the RECORD.

The editorial follows:

[From Barron's of May 23, 1955]

MISCHIEF IN TIN—THE UNITED STATES IS PUNISHING ITS FRIENDS, REWARDING ITS FOES

"Patriotism is the last refuge of a scoundrel," wise old Samuel Johnson once remarked. True perhaps of 18th century London, the good doctor's words also happen to have an uncomfortable relevance to the city of Washington in the mid-20th. For in recent years, in the fair name of defense, an astonishing number of dubious ventures have been sanctioned by lawmakers and executive agencies. Despite the change in administration, the habit has proved hard to break. Admittedly, under Engine Charlie Wilson, the military have abandoned their bootless efforts to equip the B–36, an obsolete piston-engine craft, with jets; similarly, they no longer encourage marginal auto makers to turn our flying boxcars. Yet, even today, if it is wrapped diligently enough in the American flag, the most barefaced raid on the Treasury is still all too likely to succeed.

In this connection, consider the strange case of the Government-owned tin smelter at Texas City, Tex. Some week ago, contrary to White House recommendation, the Senate voted unanimously to continue its operations for another year; the House is expected to soon to follow suit. The drive was led by Senator LYNDON JOHNSON, Democrat, of Texas, hundreds of whose constituents are gainfully employed at Texas City, but the case for the smelter was put on other grounds. In particular, Senator JOHNSON stressed its contribution to the national security, as well as to the welfare of a strategic good neighbor, the tin-rich Republic of Bolivia. The fact is, however, that the tin operation, far from furthering United States interests, is a purposeful drain on the taxpayer. At the same time, it is helping to support a revolutionary South American regime, which has as little respect for liberty as it has for property or law.

The smelter at Texas City, then, should become the object of a controversy as hot as anything in its furnaces. But its beginnings were rather different. The plant was constructed in 1941, when the rapid conquest of the Continent by the Nazis, and the imminent danger to the British Isles and Eastern Asia, threatened to cut off this country from its vital supply of tin. The metal, of course, is the indispensable ingredient of many chemical and metal products, most notably the tin can, without which the civilian economy would grind to a halt and no army could take the field. Completed in the spring of 1942, the Texas City smelter was, and is, the only one of its kind in the Western Hemisphere; it undoubtedly played a valuable role in World War II. Since then, however, with the gradual reopening of the normal channels of trade, its usefulness has been steadily dwindling. It has, besides, been running up a regular deficit of some millions of dollars annually and it has kept Washington, willy-nilly, in the metal business. Hence, for the past 2 years the Eisenhower administration has urged Congress to liquidate the wartime tin program.

These efforts have aroused the wrath of a small but determined group of local politicos who, while not shooting quite as straight as Davy Crockett at the Alamo, have defended their smelter with no less zeal. Their arguments, while rarely on target, nonetheless have been varied and far ranging. To illustrate, the Texans and such out-of-State supporters as Senator STUART SYMINGTON, Democrat, Missouri, lately have concentrated their fire on what they like to call the international tin cartel. This rapacious group, which comprises the tin mines of Malaya and Indonesia as well as the British smelting firms, apparently knows just one business tactic—gouging. Without the Texas City smelter, it is said, the American consumer would be fair game.

While perhaps persuasive in some circles, this line of reasoning overlooks 1 or 2 cardinal points. First, the wide fluctuations of the tin price in the postwar years, so costly at times to producers, suggest that the cartel, if in truth it does exist, is more properly an object of pity than terror. More to the point, the Texas City smelter and the United States stockpile it supplies, far from protecting domestic users, actually tend to raise prices by keeping metal off the market. It's no accident that after every Congressional vote against abolishing the Texas City works, tin quotations have firmed in London and Singapore.

From the angle of defense, the Texans' shots seem equally wild. For one thing, the trade estimates that the United States already has piled up enough tin to last for at least 6 years and possibly 10—longer than any war in its history. But even if more of the metal were genuinely needed, the Republic of Bolivia, which ships concentrates to Texas City, is a dubious source to depend on. The present regime came to power a few years ago through a leftist revolution, and ever since, by word and deed alike, it has shown an alarming resemblance to a dictatorship of the proletariat. It has burned newspapers, suspended civil liberties, and imprisoned thousands of its citizens. In addition, it has expropriated the private tin mines. As a consequence, output has dropped off shortly, inflation is rampant and the people are in growing want. In fact, but for the massive financial aid which Washington foolishly provides, the Government at La Paz in all likelihood would not long survive.

In regard to tin, then, this country has been following the absurd policy of punishing its friends and rewarding its enemies. Other South American countries, which have litle liking for Communist or racist revolts, cannot help but wonder at United States generosity to a fundamentally hostile and anti-Yanqui Bolivia. By the same token, the British are growing restive at what they rightly consider unwarranted senatorial sniping. Just last week the head of one of the biggest tin firms in the United Kingdom protested several "glaring inaccuracies" in a report recently issued by a committee of the upper House, and requested a rertaction. All this suggests that the issues go far beyong the confines of Texas City; more than a local industry is at stake. It's up to Congress as a whole to overrule the Senate and to set things to rights in tin.

Mr. Speaker, I take great satisfaction in supporting House Joint Resolution 607 which will finally authorize the disposal of the Government-owned tin smelter at Texas City, Tex.

More than a year ago on April 21, 1955, I introduced House Joint Resolution 285 to authorize the immediate disposal of the smelter. The Congress, in its wisdom, adopted Senate Concurrent Resolution 26, which authorized the operation of the Texas City Tin Smelter by the Government for another year. It also requested the President "to have conducted a study and investigation for the purpose of recommending the most feasible methods of maintaining a permanent domestic tin smelting industry in the United States."

The President asked the Office of Defense Mobilization and an interagency group comprised of representatives of the Departments of State, the Treasury, Defense, the Interior, and Commerce, the General Services Administration, and the United States Tariff Commission, to make this study for him. The President presented the study to the Congress on March 29, 1956. It has been given careful consideration by the Committee on Banking and Currency, and I heartily endorse its conclusions.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the conclusions of this committee may be reprinted in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

CONCLUSIONS

Major conclusions are: that the determination as to the practicability of establishing a permanent tin-smelting industry in this

country should be left to private enterprise; that Government participation in the tin business should terminate and Government operation of the Texas City Smelter should cease not later than June 30, 1956; and that announcement of the termination of Government activities in this field should provide the impetus for serious consideration by private enterprise of the feasibility of establishing such an industry independently. More specifically:

1. Neither the United States defense nor the national economy nor relations with other friendly countries requires the Government's continued participation in a domestic tin-smelting industry in the United States:

(a) The minimum stockpile objective for primary tin metal has been fulfilled, and the long-term objective is expected to be fulfilled by June 30, 1956. These will more than adequately offset the currently estimated deficit in a wartime emergency.

(b) Should a wartime demand arise for domestic smelting facilities as a result of unforeseen developments, an up-to-date and efficient smelter could be built quickly, as in World War II. Ores and concentrates could be contracted for and held in readiness for the smelter, and stockpile metal could supply industry until the new flow of domestic production began.

(c) The national economy has not been dependent upon a domestic tin-smelting industry. Industrial requirements for primary tin are now being met through imports alone.

(d) Countries that have supplied material to the Texas City Smelter and to the stockpile have been apprised of the probable discontinuance of the smelter and the impending cessation of stockpile purchases in ample time to find other markets. Their dependence upon the United States as a market has been a relatively recent development and should not be considered unalterable. However, should a tin-smelting industry be established in this country by private enterprise, obviously there would continue to be a market for foreign ores and concentrates since the domestic raw material supply is negligible.

(e) Some advantages would accrue to relations between the United States and countries supplying ores and concentrates if the smelter were to remain in operation. However, these are not of such significance that the decision concerning its future operation should hinge on them.

2. The establishment of a domestic tin-smelting industry should be left to private enterprise on a free enterprise basis.

(a) Government participation in the tin business should be terminated and the operation of the Texas City Tin Smelter by the Government should cease not later than June 30, 1956. An announcement to this effect and the terms of disposal of the Texas City Smelter should be made promptly, while the smelter is still in operation. Continued Government operation discourages interest of private enterprise in operating a domestic tin smelter.

(b) Government assistance, other than aid to a private operator in negotiations with foreign governments, should not be depended upon for maintenance of a domestic tin-smelting industry. Government subsidy in any form, for other than national defense, national economy, or foreign relations reasons, would be considered unwarranted competition with friendly foreign suppliers and with domestic importers, would be burdensome to taxpayers, and might result in additional expense to domestic tin consumers.

3. Government maintenance of a smelter in standby status is not practicable.

4. A domestic tin-smelting industry does not contribute fundamentally to this country's independence of foreign supplies; there are no known appreciable tin deposits in the United States or in contiguous countries.

5. A domestic tin-smelting industry would not remove the vulnerability of this country to restrictive actions on the part of producers of ores, concentrates, or metal acting in concert (pp. 1–3).

Mr. Speaker, I am not unmindful of the necessity of maintaining adequate supplies of tin to meet any war emergency. Let me contrast the conditions which prevail today with those in existence when our Government decided to construct the tin smelter. At that time Indoneisia and the Malay Peninsula supplied tin concentrates which were smelted in Western Europe. Access to the tin producing areas in the Far East was denied by the Japanese, and to the European tin smelters by the Germans. Our only available source of tin concentrates was from Bolivian ore. These concentrates could not be smelted in the Western Hemisphere. Steps were accordingly taken to erect the tin smelter at Texas City to refine these concentrates. This was a proper step for our Government to take as a war measure.

The 79th Congress enacted Public Law 520 which provided for a realistic stockpiling program. President Eisenhower has implemented this law by establishing two stockpile objectives, a minimum stockpile objective which has been fulfilled for tin, and a long-term objective which is expected to be fulfilled by June 30, of this year. The long-range stockpile objective represents this country's total foreseeable wartime requirements for primary tin, based on an assumption that neither tin in ores or concentrates nor tin metal will be imported from overseas sources in time of war. With the fulfillment of this long-range stockpile objective, there can be no justification on the ground of national security for continued operation of a Government facility of this type.

In the past it has been argued that this facility would lessen this country's dependence upon foreign sources for tin. I am referring to peacetime requirements, as the stockpile meets our needs in time of war. The report of the interagency committee to the President clearly showed that this dependence would not be lessened by the presence of a tin smelter as long as we still require imports of tin concentrates. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the chapter of the report to the President reviewing this subject may be reprinted at this point in my remarks:

1. Dependence of the United States on other countries: Since the United States has no appreciable tin deposits, she must import practically all her supplies of tin from other countries, some of which are substantially underdeveloped and often subjected to political disturbances. She is not a substantial exporter of primary tin, but does export a large quantity of manufactured products containing tin, principally tinplate, canned goods, and machinery.

Before the construction of the Texas City tin smelter, commercial supplies of metal were imported primarily from Malaya, with lesser amounts from Indonesia, the Netherlands, and the United Kingdom. After the smelter was established, Bolivia, Indonesia, the Belgian Congo, and Thailand became important sources of concentrates for the United States.

With the advent of war in Europe in 1939, the United States had no significant stockpile of tin, neither was she adequately prepared to offset the possible loss of access to the major tin-producing areas in the Far East. Germany's assault on Belgium, the Netherlands, and France in 1940 provided the incentive for a greatly intensified national defense effort, and the Department of the Treasury began acquiring a stockpile under Public Law 117 (76th Cong.). As the quantity of tin available for purchase was limited by quotas, the United States Government negotiated with the International Tin Committee for removal of restrictions in exchange for a guaranty that the United States would purchase all supplies at a stipulated price. As a result of these negotiations, production was permitted at the rate of 130 percent of a predetermined quota for the year beginning July 1, 1940, as compared with 80 percent level in force during the second quarter of 1940. This represented virtually unrestricted production. The United States Government contracted to purchase all supplies of tin offered, up to 75,000 tons, at not less than 50 cents a pound, cost, insurance, and freight, domestic ports, which enabled industry to build up inventories far above normal needs and the Government to add to the stockpile of tin.

Smelting facilities in the United States cannot in time of peace of war lessen this country's dependence upon foreign sources, nor can they remove vulnerability to restrictive actions by producers of ores, concentrates, or metal, acting in concert. An assumption that domestic smelting facilities could remove this vulnerability would be valid only if it could be assured that some major seller of concentrates would pursue a policy different from that of those producers acting in concert. There is nothing in the record of previous actions by any seller to substantiate this point of view. An effective safeguard in the event of a war emergency is the United States stockpile of tin metal. In normal times, the satisfaction of United States industrial needs is dependent upon international trade under which this country's industry can acquire supplies from abroad in adequate quantities and at reasonable prices (pp. 9–10).

Mr. Speaker, I know of no subject which has been more carefully reviewed over the years than the problem of insuring adequate tin supplies.

In 1954, a Special Subcommittee on Minerals, Materials, and Fuels Economics of the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs received testimony on the operation of the Texas City Smelter from Charles W. Merrill, the assistant chief of the Minerals Division of the Bureau of Mines, Department of the Interior. Mr. Merrill said:

It is believed however first, that the United States Government should get out of the tin-smelting business. Second, it is believed that it is desirable to have a tin smelter in the United States operated privately, but that that desirability is not sufficient to justify a direct subsidy or tariff protection.

And third, the security angle is considered of sufficient importance so that, if it were possible to find some private operator to take over the smelter and agree to run it at some minimum output, the Government would be justified in a lease or sale arrangement which would give only a nominal return of the capital investment that the Government has in the smelter.

That is a general outline of the Interior's approach to this thing (hearings, part 10, p. 845).

Mr. Merrill's statement has been supported by the Assistant Secretary of the Interior for Mineral Resources, Felix E. Wormser, who happens to be one of my constituents. He is a man who has de-

voted his entire life to the mining industry.

The Report of the Hoover Commission on Business Enterprises, page 90, reaffirms Mr. Merrill's statement. The Commission stated:

The Texas City tin smelter was a necessary enterprise begun during World War II. The tin sources in the East had been captured by the Japanese and there was no smelting for South American tin ores in the Western Hemisphere. South America was the only source of tin in this hemisphere as there are no substantial deposits known in North America. The Texas City smelter property, plant, and equipment cost about $13,200,000 and the current depreciated book value is $6.500,000.

The smelter has produced about 33,000 tons of tin annually. In recent years the metal has been added to the strategic stockpile. The stockpile is now estimated at a 5-year war supply.

The smelter is uneconomical for many reasons and the loss in 1954 was $1,504,233. As there is no reason for continued operation, President Eisenhower on January 2, 1954, recommended that it be closed on June 30 of that year (pp. 90 and 91).

Mr. Speaker, the time has come for us to permit normal economic forces to be operative in this situation. Government operations of the smelter should be terminated as soon as possible.

The resolution reported by the Committee on Banking and Currency, House Joint Resolution 607, provides for operation of the smelter to no later than January 31, 1957. In other words, we are extending the authority for Government operation of the smelter for an additional 7 months from its expiration under present law on June 30, 1956. This is a wise provision as it will promote the sale of the smelter as a going concern if private enterprise can be induced to take over the facility.

The 83d Congress conducted extensive studies of Government operations of a commercial nature and recommended the discontinuance of many such activities with no detriment to any proper Government function and with substantial savings to our taxpayers. The Hoover Commission has also covered this area thoroughly. Fortunately, when we passed the appropriation bill for the Defense Department for the fiscal year 1957, we removed the provision requiring congressional sanction to terminate commercial-type activities which the Secretary of Defense believes should be eliminated with no loss to our fighting effectiveness and with benefit to our taxpayers.

President Eisenhower's policies are designed to afford the greatest possible opportunity for the exercise of individual initiative of our private citizens consistent with our security and the welfare of all of our people.

The activities of the Federal Government in areas which we normally do not regard as governmental are so vast that they defy description. When President Eisenhower was inaugurated the Federal Government was engaged in more than 100 different ventures, including bread baking, coffee roasting, scrap metal baling, rope making, clothing manufacture, furniture repairing, the operation of sawmills, laundries, and dry-cleaning establishments, paint manufacture, tire retreading, the making of ice cream and motion pictures, operating railroads and ships, and writing life insurance.

The Federal Government, in addition to its proper governmental activities, is the largest single electric-power producer in the country, it operates the largest insurance business, it is our greatest banker, it is the largest tenant and the largest landlord, it owns more grain than anyone else, it operates more warehouses, more ships, and more trucks.

Mr. Speaker, some members of the Congress have been devoting long hours to a study of monopoly and the concentration of economic power. There has never been such a concentration as exits within our Federal Government.

In the comparatively short time since President Eisenhower has been in office great progress has been made in better defining the proper scope of governmental activities. One of the first acts of this administraiton was to sell the Inland Waterways Corporation to private enterprise for $9 million. It operated barge lines for many years.

President Eisenhower has taken the Federal Government out of the hotel business. The Department of the Interior no longer operates Bluebeard's Castle in the Virgin Islands. It has been sold with the proceeds going into the general funds of the Treasury and the property is now on the tax rolls.

Our synthetic rubber producing facilities have now been sold to private industry. This is probably the largest and most important transfer of activities by the Federal Government to private enterprise. President Eisenhower on April 30, 1956, submitted his report to the Congress concerning the Nation's rubber requirements and resources, pursuant to section 10 of the Rubber Producing Facilities Disposal Act of 1953. He recommended the disposal of the Akron laboratories to private industry. I voice my approval of this further step in getting Government out of business.

Mr. Speaker, passage of House Joint Resolution 607 will save the taxpayers millions of dollars. It will promote private enterprise, and it will be done without, in any way, jeopardizing our national security, as the attainment of the long-range stockpile objective for tin assures us of ample supplies of this vital material to meet any contingency. We must get the Federal Government out of the tin-smelting business and continue our efforts to promote private enterprise in essentially commercial fields.

Increasing Rates of Service-Connected Compensation for Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN P. SAYLOR
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 12, 1956

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, it is my fervent hope that the Senate will give early and favorable consideration to H. R. 12038, the bill to increase rates of service-connected compensation for veterans. I voted for this legislation, which was enacted by the House last week, because I feel that it is of monumental importance to both veterans and their dependents.

To reject cost-of-living increases to men who were disabled in the cause of their country would be a repudiation of a legal and moral contract. Original rates were based upon the purchasing power of the dollar at the time of enactment of the original legislation. Certainly the compensation decided upon was not in excess of actual need. Now a dollar buys less food, less household equipment and fewer clothes. We would be delinquent in our sworn obligation as Members of Congress if we did not remedy that disparity.

No disabled veteran wants eternal expressions of sympathy for the loss of limb or other maiming sustained in the battle in behalf of the Stars and Stripes. But every veteran whose ability to provide for himself and family was impaired during military service rightfully expects an opportunity to enjoy the necessities, if not the conveniencies and comforts of life.

I feel that the increase in compensation, while still not providing more conveniences and comforts, will at least allow for necessities. Perhaps the pittances have not been increased to the extent they should, but at least the legislation is a move in the right direction.

Despite the tributes delivered on Memorial Day to those who have died in action, the widows and orphans of our heroes are still being neglected. I hope, therefore, that it will be not too long until the proper legislation has been adopted.

What Do We Know of the Signers of the Declaration of Independence?

SPEECH
OF
HON. ALFRED D. SIEMINSKI
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 17, 1956

Mr. SIEMINSKI. Mr. Speaker, many fine things have been said of the 56 giants who signed the Declaration of Independence.

Their signature on the document meant death had we lost the war that led to the creation of the United States.

It is fitting in this month in which we rededicate our independence to ask, "What do we know of the signers of the Declaration of Independence?"

That question is answered with a brief sketch on the life of each of the signers in a booklet compiled by Mr. Harvey Thomas, and published over 33 years ago in Newark, N. J., by the Prudential Insurance Company of America.

Under unanimous consent, I ask that the booklet be reproduced in the RECORD. I trust that it will be of interest to all:

THE SIGNERS OF THE DECLARATION OF INDEPENDENCE

(By Harry Thomas)

A FOREWORD

For a generation after the battle of Thermopylae the Spartan children were required to repeat daily the names of the heroic 300 who held the pass with Leonidas. The youth who was taught grew into the father who told, and so on and on down through the years. But what of us in America? How many of our early-day immortals can we mention? The 56 patriots who gave us our Charter of Freedom—a declaration that blazed the ascending trial of civilization and that opened the great human highway to intellectual improvement and moral culture—what of them? To be sure we know of Hancock, of Adams, of Jefferson, of Franklin, of Morris. Their memory is secure from the injuries of time. But what of Williams, of Guinett, of Rodney, of Gerry, of Lee, of Paine, and the rest of their associates? They also laid their all upon the altar of life, liberty, and happiness, withholding nothing. And they knew their peril. Not carelessly, but reverently, they signed, and by their action ushered in a new era for humanity. When in their dreams and ideals they recognized and established our form of government, these God-endowed, deliberate men gave to the people and to posterity a towering, permanent monument of splendid service; a shaft of wisdom upon which all nations of the earth may gaze with repsect and admiration. No crash of cannon echoes through the ages to sound the valor of their act, but we do well to remember it and something of their lives. They are an eternal illustration of the truth that courage is not a monopoly of the battlefield and that every man who does his duty fearlessly, disregarding the cost, strikes his own blow for a better day. In the light of their wonderful work each and every signer of the Declaration should be better known; their endurance, enterprise and resolute faith should be briefly recorded so that Americans may reacquaint themselves with these heroes and thus awaken more of the fire of patriotism.

In preparing these sketches an effort has been made to see only the human side of the signers, to find if possible the particular sacrifice they made, and to effect an intimate, personal contact between the reader and the subject. In exhibiting, in this way, so numerous a combination of contemporary statesmen engaged in the same transaction and confined to uniformity of scenery and occasion, there may have frequently been unavoidable repetition. And of some but little has been left to us. In such instances it has been thought more prudent to offend by brevity than fatigue by monotonous enumeration. No adopted American will read of these true men and their volunteered sufferings without a richer reward of conscientious appreciation. No son of liberty shall think of these men without thanks for every drop of blood that links him to the heoric ancestry of America. Offered, therefore, as a pause in this boastful, rushing, forward-looking age, when history and tradition seem to be of small concern to us, this little booklet goes forth.

H. T.

NEWARK, N. J., 1923.

THE JOURNAL HISTORY OF THE DECLARATION OF INDEPENDENCE

1776

June 7: Richard Henry Lee, of Virginia, introduces famous resolution—"Resolved, that these united colonies are, and of right ought to be, free and independent states."

June 8: Congress resolved itself into a committee of the whole to formally consider Lee's proposal.

June 10: Benjamin Harrison, as chairman of the committee, reported that the matter be laid over for a full Congress on July 1, and that a special committee be appointed to draft a declaration dissolving allegiance with the mother country.

June 11: Congress appointed Thomas Jefferson, John Adams, Benjamin Franklin, Roger Sherman and R. R. Livingston to draft the immortal document of freedom.

June 25: Pennsylvania presented resolutions expressing a willingness to concur in independence.

June 28: New Jersey delegates reported their State had directed them to hurry with their concurrence.

July 1: Benjamin Harrison reads draft of Declaration and offers this resolution—"Resolved, that this Congress will, tomorrow, take into consideration the Declaration respecting Independence." In the debate that followed, charges of treason were shouted against William Zubly, the German member of the Georgia delegation, and he was expelled from Congress.

July 2: Formal Declaration corrected and agreed to.

July 3: Debate on revised draft.

July 4: With the exception of three members of Pennsylvania delegation the entire Congress formally ratified the immortal paper. Declaration signed by John Hancock as President of Congress.

July 19: Engrossed copy of Declaration on parchment ordered for all signatures.

August 2: Declaration signed by 50 Members of Congress. Dickinson, of Pennsylvania, refused to sign, and never did so.

August 27: Signed by George Wythe.

September 4: Signed by Richard Henry Lee, Elbridge Gerry, and Oliver Wolcott.

November 19: Signed by Matthew Thornton.

1781: Signed by Thomas McKean.

The Declaration was signed in this order: Hancock, Bartlett, Livingston, aPine, Floyd, John Adams, Lewis, Walton, Samuel Adams, Stockton, Huntington, Hopkins, Hart, Clark, Lewis, Morris, Morton, Francis Lightfoot, Lee, Penn, Sherman, Whipple, Witherspoon, Ellery, Hooper, Robert Morris, Harrison, Williams, Franklin, Paca, Hopkinson, Stone, Carroll, Jefferson, Taylor, Rutledge, Hewes, Smith, Ross, Clymer, Heyward, Gwinnett, Read, Wilson, Lynch, Chase, Braxton, Rush, Hall, Rodney, Nelson, Middleton, Wythe, R. H. Lee, Gerry, Wolcott, Thornton, McKean.

The youngest signer was Edward Rutledge, age 27 years.

Delegates Clinton, Alsop, R. R. Livingston, Wisner, Humphreys, and Rogers never did sign the Declaration.

Although delegates Thornton, Rush, Taylor, Clymer, Smith, and Ross signed the Declaration, they were not Members of Congress when it was adopted on July 2 nor when it was ratified on July 4.

Those who voted steadfastly against the adoption of the Declaration were delegates Dickinson, Humphreys, and Willing, all of Pennsylvania.

The longevity of the signers is remarkable. Three lived to be over 90, 10 over 80, 11 over 70, 14 over 60, 11 over 50, 6 over 40, and 1 died at 30.

The signers represented many vocations. Twenty-four were lawyers, 14 were farmers, 4 were doctors, 1 was a minister, 3 prepared for the ministry, 1 was a manufacturer, and 9 were merchants.

The original signed copy of the Declaration was in the hands of the President of the United States until after the War of 1812. When Washington was invaded during that struggle and after President Madison had fled the White House, the President's wife, Dolly Madison, who had stayed behind to the last minute, saved the Declaration by carrying it away with her. Subsequently she returned it, and it was placed under the charge of the State Department. It was hermetically sealed in 1894 and is only exhibited now on very rare occasions.

THOMAS JEFFERSON (1743–1826), VIRGINIA

Thomas Jefferson chose the risk of fighting for his fellowmen. His entire life was an exemplification of service to mankind. As third President of the United States and writer of the immortal Declaration, his name shines with further brilliancy in the great galaxy of American patriots. His pre-Revolutionary fervor in the Virginia House of Burgesses stamped him as a coming man and his election to Congress forced him into a position of eminence at once. Offered the seductive emoluments of a crown, he might have passed his life in soft and uneventful paths, but he chose instead the roadway of freedom. He was chairman of the committee that was appointed to report the Declaration, and has always been credited with the authorship of that famous document. Recent historians claim, however, that Jefferson was chosen more for his beauty of penmanship, and that to Adams should go the glory for the words. Be that as it may, Jefferson's advice was listened to and went far toward starting the United States on its prosperous career. He retired early from Congress, and after serving as Governor of Virginia was Secretary of State under Washington, and succeeded Adams to the presidency. His life was of no common character. He died at Monticello on the 50th anniversary of the adoption of the Declaration at almost the same hour his great contemporary, John Adams, was dying in Massachusetts.

JOHN ADAMS (1735–1826), MASSACHUSETTS

To have signed such a document as the Declaration of Independence was of itself a rare felicity; to have been a powerful agent in producing the event which that Declaration signalized was a glory still more distinguished; to have won the commendation of a Nation through election to its presidency was an additional honor; to have brought into the world a son who later succeeded to the Chief Magistracy of the land his father had helped establish; and to have lived besides to see, at the expiration of half a century, the prosperous condition of the new Nation, seems a consummation almost beyond possibility. Yet noble old John Adams signed and gave and saw and died, and with his last breath those near his bedside heard him utter the words "Independence forever." Sturdy veteran of the Revolution, he knew his duty and he measured up to the responsibility. He risked all for freedom, and he won. Such men forever teach the grandeur of service. As a leader in the early Boston Massacre days, he wrote Patrick Henry, "I am of your mind." In Congress he was termed "the colossus of debate." His broad and courageous intellect gave to Jefferson aid in the writing of the great Declaration, and in later years he was sent to Holland to raise money for America, then to England as America's first ambassador, and then back home to be chosen Vice President under Washington. In 1796 Washington took leave of public life and the people were obliged to look for a successor in the presidency. The choice lay between Adams and Jefferson, and the former was selected, the second Chief Magistrate of the United States. He served but one term, and retired to the home of his boyhood, at Quincy, Mass., where he died on the 50th anniversary of the signing of the great charter to which he had given his name, a glorious inspiration to all mankind. Jefferson had died but a few hours before him. Each departed cheered by the benedictions of his country.

BUTTON GWINNETT (1732–77), GEORGIA

Political impatience and irritability over failure to regain the confidence of his State cost Button Gwinnett his life. His fate affords a melancholy example of the pernicious

consequence of dueling and a striking illustration of the triumph of the fashion of his day over reason. The memory of Gwinnett cannot be sullied, however. He was the most steadfast of patriots and one of the most faithful and ardent supporters of independence. His fondness for popularity and an earnest desire not only to command the admiration of his fellows but to use that command in a dictatorial way involved him in a controversy with a political adversary who killed him. Gwinnett was of English birth and emigrated to South Carolina in 1770, being chosen 5 years later to represent its sister State of Georgia in Congress. At first he showed an indifferent interest in the Revolution, but once his sympathies had been aroused he took an enthusiastic part in all the proceedings of the Colonial Government. One of his Georgia colleagues was Zubly, the traitor, who temporarily exerted an influence over Gwinnett. After Zubly had been accused of betraying the secret sessions of the Congress and had been obliged to flee aboard one of the enemy's ships, Gwinnett suffered somewhat from his association. He returned to Georgia, however, and to test out his popularity ran for governor, to meet with defeat. Subsequently he organized a company of militia and insisted that a friend be placed in command of it. This request was likewise scorned, and futile efforts to force his way to the political heights from which he felt he had fallen so exasperated him that the duel resulted. But his memory, stamped as it is upon the charter of our independence, must be coeval with the duration of America. He lived in a time of public excitement, and ever braved the storm for liberty and freedom.

BENJAMIN FRANKLIN (1706–90), PENNSYLVANIA

Benjamin Franklin! His devotion to his country, his sobriety, his extraordinary perseverance and resolution, his candor, his scrupulous veracity, his fidelity to all civil and moral obligations, his wisdom as a man of science, his wit as a man of letters, his writing of an Autobiography that will last forever, make, perhaps, any more particular notice of his life superfluous and impertinent. From the day he strolled up Market Street in Philadelphia with a loaf of bread under his arm his name became unseparably interwoven into the history of his native land. He began life as a soapmaker, and by rigid economy and industry made himself one of the great men of the whole world. A printer, the first publisher of the Saturday Evening Post, of Poor Richard's Almanack, the founder of the vegetarian cult, the discoverer of the use of electricity, the first to utilize that new power to fire gunpowder and give magnetism to steel as well as to use the same force with which to kill, he early informed the Adamses and the Jeffersons and the Henrys and the Washingtons that "it is right we should be free, but let us understand that it will mean our country will be ravaged and our towns laid in ashes; as for myself, my chief wealth is in little properties, and of these, indeed, they may make bonfires and reduce to dust, but the fear of losing them will never alter my resolution to resist tyranny to the last." In Congress he was selected with Adams and Jefferson to draft the Declaration, and once it had been presented and ratified he signed unafraid. Afterward, at the ripe old age of 71, he was sent to France and formed a friendship with Lafayette, to whom he gave a letter of introduction to Washington. After concluding an alliance with France he interested himself anew in colonial affairs and continued in Congress long enough to give assent and signature to the Federal Constitution. Above his grave is a small marble slab bearing the sole inscription, "Benjamin Franklin." It is enough. No monument, however great, could express the obligations of posterity.

JOHN HANCOCK (1737–93), MASSACHUSETTS

As president of the Congress and by the fervor of his inspiration, John Hancock led the way and gave immortality to his name as one one of the chief patriots. "My name shall be written large enough for the king to see for all time," he said, as he boldly inscribed his signature, thus giving courage to the more tremulous as they faced the parchment. Hancock lived amidst great wealth, earning the early contempt of his heroic associate, Samuel Adams, who scorned riches and admired the poor. But when the time came for action, soon after the Boston Massacre, Adams gave his heart to Hancock and they became inseparable in their affections for each other and their country. A commission in the enemy's army was offered Hancock would he declare allegiance to the king, but he replied, "Tell your majesty I would rather be a private against tyranny than a field marshal for the king." The battle of Lexington and Concord was prefaced by a desire to capture Hancock and Adams, and immunity was later promised all Continentals if the two leaders were given up. To the glory of the Nation the proffer was spurned and the heroes went on their illustrious way, leaving to posterity the glory of sacred service and steadfast Americanism. Hancock was elected and reelected Governor of Massachusetts until he died.

THOMAS STONE (1743–87), MARYLAND

The patriots of the Revolution, notwithstanding the greatness of their deeds, were in general men of impressing modesty. Several are distinguishable from their colleagues by little that is individual or peculiar There could scarcely be any leaders were it different. Such was Thomas Stone, a lawyer, who early espoused his country's cause, but whose retiring disposition and evident desire to keep in the background have left little biographical material to posterity. Let it be recorded, however, that he left the reputation of a disinterested patriot, a useful citizen and a worthy man.

PHILIP LIVINGSTON (1716–78), NEW YORK

As one of the founders of American independence Philip Livingstone foresaw the difficulties, perplexities, and sacrifices that were to be encountered in drawing the sword and severing the empire. At no time, however, did he hesitate to assume the highest responsibilities and put in jeopardy his life and his fortune. When it became known, through the perfidy of a traitorous member of Congress, that Livingston had been selected as an important committeeman, his family was informed of the consequences that would be its share in this act. Livingston sent for his wife and children, and for 4 years they were in exile, separated from their home and living on the bounty of sympathetic friends. After the war Livingston sold all he possessed and turned the proceeds over to his Government to help maintain the public credit. Livingston saw into the souls of men and proved peculiarly useful in the important drama that stamped his name upon the pages of American history.

GEORGE WALTON (1740–1804), GEORGIA

In his youth George Walton was apprenticed to a carpenter and for 4 year plied the hammer and the saw. His ambition led him into the study of law at nights, and before he was 30 he was considered one of the leading barristers of his State. History refers to him as a brave and able man. He is not known to have taken any particular part in the proceedings of the Congress except to be a vigorous proponent of independence. He was one of the very last to sign the Declaration, and later engaged in army service under Washington. He was twice elected Governor of Georgia and was that State's first United States Senator. His marked patriotism is a lasting monument to his worth and a rich legacy to his country.

SAMUEL ADAMS (1722–1803), MASSACHUSETTS

With the names of Washington and Jefferson and Franklin stands inseparably united that of Adams, and together they form the brightest constellation which illumines the Revolutionary sky of our country. Samuel Adams, "The Father of the Revolution," failed as a businessman but won as a patriot. He was the most remarkable of all the signers. An early writer of protests to the king, a great and fiery speaker in the debates against kingly rule, courageous and ardent, he knew how to bend the passions of others to his purpose and keep the fires of freedom brightly burning. In all those days of peril, while the hearts of others were ready to faint, Samuel Adams remained firm. Even when General Gage placed a bounty on his head, he sent this message: "Tell your king it is the advice of Samuel Adams to no longer insult the feelings of an exasperated people." In Congress he rendered most important service, engaging in the cause with all the zeal of a reformer, the confidence of an enthusiast, and the cheerfulness of a voluntary martyr. His resolute decision, his increasing watchfulness, and his heroic perseverance saved the day for his country on several occasions. Samuel Adams will always live in the hearts of Americans.

WILLIAM PACA (1740–99), MARYLAND

William Paca gave to his country the example of a superior mind devoted with pure disinterestedness to the establishment of her liberties. His State embarrased him at the outset of his career by opposing any severance of relations with the mother country, and it was not until Carrol of Carrollton had engaged with him that they were enabled to lift this restriction. In Congress Paca served on a number of important committees and was otherwise instrumental in making himself felt in the cause to which he had given his heart. He was Chief Justice and Governor of Maryland, and left to his country the inheritance of an illustrious name.

CAESAR RODNEY (1728–84), DELAWARE

Sheridan's ride of 20 miles to save the day at Cedar Creek has its place in history, and rightly so, but what of the ride Caesar Rodney took through 80 miles of storm in the early morning of July 2, 1776, to reach Philadelphia in time to save his State from the humiliation of not approving the glorious document of freedom. Rodney took it, rising from what his physicians considered his death bed. He arrived in the halls of Congress just as the name "Delaware" was being called. "I vote 'yes,'" said Rodney, as he sank into his seat exhausted. He was a soldier in every sense, but had been obliged temporarily to quit Congress, owing to a cancerous growth that had destroyed one side of his face. The malady eventually killed him, and though he yearned to return and keep his Deleware colleagues in line, permission was refused him. Then came July 1, 1776. His conferee, McKean, had learned that the Delaware delegation was split, and he sent a secret messenger to Rodney's home with instructions to carry the message personally to the sick man. It was delivered, and Rodney, suffering from the fever of his complaint, dashed off into the mud and rain. Delaware had been saved and the Colonies declared as a unit.

EDWARD RUTLEDGE (1749–1800), SOUTH CAROLINA

The name of Rutledge may never be eclipsed in the history of South Carolina. That grand old colonial State gave to her country two immortal sons, Edward Rutledge, signer of the Declaration, and John Rutledge, active Revolutionary worker, Governor, Chief Justice of the State and a Justice of the United States Supreme Court. Brothers in the flesh, they became brothers in the common cause, companions through sacrifice and suffering, at all times devoted in their affections for themselves and their country, and dying within a short time of each other

in 1800. Edward was only 25 when he was sent to the Congress and but 2 years older when he affixed his name to the document of freedom, the youngest of all the signers. Would there be likelihood today of a youth of 27 being chosen to pass judgment upon a governmental project so serious and grave in its consequences? Yet the talents of Edward Rutledge were considered so mature as to result in the added honor of his being selected with Adams and Lee to draw a preamble to the original resolution. At the siege of Charleston he was captured and imprisoned by the enemy in St. Augustine. His release was soon effected, however, and he returned to South Carolina in time to succeed his brother John as Governor. Long live the memory of Edward and John Rutledge.

SAMUEL CHASE (1741–1811), MARYLAND

Samuel Chase seems to have been one of the patriotic radicals of his day. None appears more actively engaged in his country's service and few were more distinguished. Chase was a man of vigor and individuality. He was outspoken in his criticism of those who differed with him and his frankness kept him in difficulties. He early was an illustrious lawyer and statesman and was a member of his State legislature for 20 years before entering Congress. When Maryland rebelled against approving the Lee resolution for independence, Chase served notice he would quit the commonwealth. Through his instrumentality and the assistance of Paca and Carroll, Maryland fell into line. And when the Pennsylvania Quakers of the time voiced their disapproval of war, Chase offered a resolution providing for the arrest and imprisonment of every one taking that position. After serving as Chief Justice of Maryland he was advanced to the Supreme Court of the United States. While a member he became involved in a controversy with John Randolph of Roanoke, who sought his impeachment. His age, his Revolutionary services and his pure judicial character all pleaded in his favor and he was acquitted, to finish his course in universal respect and peace.

CHARLES CARROLL OF CARROLLTON (1737–1832), MARYLAND

When it came time for Charles Carroll to sign the Declaration, John Hancock is said to have facetiously remarked, "Carroll, this shouldn't disturb you, as there are so many Carrolls you'll not be suspected." The Maryland signer poised his pen a moment, then wrote boldly "Charles Carroll of Carrollton," and as he finished he turned to Hancock and said, "Let there be no doubt; there is only one Carrollton." Brave old hero, who lived to see his country firmly established, the last survivor of all the signers. Another of the wealthy delegates, Carroll knew he was sacrificing a fortune for freedom when he inscribed his name. "There go a few millions," said a little group of patriots standing nearby as Carroll signed, and Carroll heard. "What are millions!" he exclaimed. "Neither my millions nor my writing will settle this just cause, but the bayonet will." And he returned to his State to help organize the Army. Carroll was not a Member of Congress when the Declaration was ratified. He did not take his seat until July 18, but gave immediate assent. He was the first United States Senator from Maryland. At an age of past 90 he laid the cornerstone of the first Baltimore and Ohio Railroad. His descendants and his estate still survive in Maryland.

THOMAS HEYWARD, JR. (1746–1809), SOUTH CAROLINA

Along with the mellow wisdom of Franklin, the independent eloquence of Adams, and the aspiring genius of Jefferson, we have the unselfish devotion and enlightened foresight of Thomas Heyward, Jr. His judgment was sound and his disposition ardent. He conscientiously and fearlessly embarked in the Revolution at the youthful age of 28, and was neither blind to its dangers nor indifferent to its morality. His life, his estate, and his reputation he cast upon the waters of strife, and gladness was in his young heart. He was a lawyer and judge before he went to Congress, and after the signing returned to his native State to join the Army. At the fall of Charleston he was captured and imprisoned by the enemy. It was a period that tested the best qualities of manhood, and his spirit never faltered nor his courage failed.

BENJAMIN HARRISON (1740–91), VIRGINIA

Two presidents of the United States and a signer of the Declaration of Independence would seem a reasonably fair contribution from the Harrison family to the history of their country. Yet we find that in 1640 their first ancestor settled in this country and immediately became embroiled with local crown authorities over individual rights. A band of enthusiasts joined him and a little revolution of their own was begun. They were all hanged upon the scaffold. The next Harrison descendant seemed to have inherited the independence of his grandfather, and for voicing his views against tyranny and treason was imprisoned for 6 years. Then came the first Benjamin Harrison, tall and corpulent—a big man both physically and intelectually—the friend and coworker of Jefferson, and Lee, and Henry. In 1764 he wrote the correspondence which welded the sister Colonies into a congressional unit and was chosen as a Virginia representative therein. It was he who introduced the original Lee resolution and it was he who reported the finally drafted Declaration. Never was there any doubt where Benjamin Harrison stood. He had talents to precise the right and firmness enough to pursue it. Upon his retirement he was three times elected Governor of Virginia. His son, William Henry Harrison, was the 9th President of the United States, and his great-grandson, Benjamin Harrison, the 23d President.

ROBERT MORRIS (1734–1806), PENNSYLVANIA

To speak of the Declaration of Independence is to recall the name of Robert Morris, the financier of the American Revolution. Washington won the war with his armies, but Morris saved the day with his money. At all times he was the sunshine behind the clouds of strife. No matter what the financial predicament, it was attended to and with satisfaction. Private interest possessed little influence over the mind of Robert Morris when it clashed with his high notions of liberty and freedom. Among the first to feel the encroachments of kingly power, he never wavered in his allegiance. He breasted every difficulty with daring and devotion, and though his life ended amidst disaster his memory cannot be lost. Born in England, he came to America early and became the head of an important banking house in Philadelphia. The account of this firm and his own personal fortune and what he could borrow from his friends were at all times at the disposal of his country. His credit never was shattered, but the end of his resources was many times reached in his desire to meet the pressing demands made upon him for funds for the Army. It is recorded that Washington made particular appeal for $50,000 a few days before the battle of Trenton. Unable to grant the request, Morris met a Quaker acquaintance who owned much property but who was not sympathetic to the cause. Observing from his look of depression that Morris was evidently in trouble, the passer-by inquired, "What's the matter, friend Robert?" "Washington is in need of $50,000 and you must furnish it," was the response. And he added, "I am at the end. Your security shall be my note and my honor." There was a moment's pause and then the encouraging reply, "Robert, thee shalt have it," and once more brightness illumined the day. And so the multiplied services of Morris are deeply engraved upon the tablets of all our hearts. He loved his country and gave to it all he had, in service, in fortune, and in life.

FRANCIS HOPKINSON (1737–91), NEW JERSEY

The character, intellectual attainments and patriotism of Francis Hopkinson won him the confidence of his countrymen in the most trying exigencies of their affairs. He had a well-earned reputation as a moral man and gentleman long before he entered Congress, and was, also, not without some conspicuity as a writer. The meager records do not indicate that he took any prominent part in the congressional proceedings, but they are clear that his mind was well stored with the grave and important knowledge necessary to the accomplishment of the act of freedom of which his name and signature are a part. Above all else he was a patriot and gave the best there was in him to his country and its cause.

WILLIAM WHIPPLE (1730–85), NEW HAMPSHIRE

Among all the nurseries of early society that of the sailor appeared least likely to qualify an individual for the duties of statesmanship. A knowledge of nevigation was all that was required in an educational way. The ocean was his home; the beauties of philosophy and the art of government were little known and deemed unnecessary of acquirement. Yet we find William Whipple the exception to the rule. Brought up a cabin boy on his father's boat, we see him with but one ambition in youth—to inscribe his name as commander of a ship's crew. Reaching this eminence, he was not satisfied. He became a patriot and later on forsook the water to be a general under Washington, and afterward varied his life by officiating as judge of the supreme court of his State. As a delegate to Congress he was one of the very first to lend aid to the movement for independence. Few men climbed the scale of society more rapidly or worthily, and the memory of none should be longer cherished than that of William Whipple.

GEORGE CLYMER (1739–1813), PENNSYLVANIA

The spirit of patriotism is never circumscribed in its operations. It honors and elevates its object no matter what his situation in society. This little booklet will show that the merchant abandoned his interests, the physician his practice, the shoemaker his last, the lawyer his profession, and the sailor his ship, so that their time and their talents might be devoted to the country's common interests. And so it was with George Clymer, who quit merchandising and joined the faithful band of heroes in Philadelphia. In his youth he ran a coffee house near where Independence Hall now stands. George Washington dropped in one day. Clymer did not know him, but showed him marked courtesy and service. A friendship developed that lasted until their death. Later Clymer acquired much wealth, which he gave freely to Washington during the worrisome financial times at Valley Forge. He died poor. The original Pennsylvania delegation to the Congress was not inclined to ratify the Declaration, and Clymer was one of those chosen to save the day. He signed the document but was not present when it was adopted. Immediately afterward his home was sacked and destroyed by an infuriated mob displeased with his action. He was also a signer of the Federal Constitution. He can truly be termed one of the fathers of this country.

JOHN PENN (1741–88), NORTH CAROLINA

John Penn affords a further illustration of the natural power of mind rising in triumph over the deficiencies of education and marching perseveringly toward honors and distinction. Penn was born poor and his education was sadly defective. Although the veil of oblivion is thrown over the particulars of his life and but little exists for the biogra-

pher, it is known he became a lawyer and soldier. He served his State faithfully in Congress, but after the war, when North Carolina refused to help maintain the Union with taxes, Penn resigned and declined to act further for his State.

JOHN MORTON (1724–77), PENNSYLVANIA

John Morton was among those primitive laborers in the vineyard of independence, the fruits of whose toil so gloriously ripened but of whom few memorials have descended to our time. No authentic portrait of him is in existence, the one shown being a copy made in later years from recollection and not from life. But little space is given to his name in history, yet the brevity of what has been written is replete with evidence of sterling patriotism and steadfast devotion. As Rodney left his sickbed to save the day for Delaware, so John Morton rode 40 miles on the night of July 3 to be on hand in the morning to break the Pennsylvania tie and vote that State for freedom and liberty. At first questioning the expediency of the Declaration, Morton was eventually won over by Franklin and Adams, and when it seemed determined that Pennsylvania might be recorded against ratification, his signature was given for approval. Long live the name of John Morton for that one act alone. Blamed by his Quaker friends at home he sent them this message: "I am proud of your criticism. It was the most glorious service I ever rendered my country." And on his deathbed his last words were: "It shall be acknowledged; it shall be acknowledged." Let it be acknowledged again here.

ROGER SHERMAN (1721–93), CONNECTICUT

Among the illustrious characters whose names are inscribed upon the brightest record that adorns the annals of our country few possessed more solid attainments than Rober Sherman. It is a remarkable fact that this man, who stood among the foremost in the ranks of patriots and statesmen and served his country in various high and honorable offices during a period of 40 years, began life as an apprentice to a shoemaker and pursued that occupation until after he was 22 years of age. Surmounting difficulties which to common minds might have been insuperable, he gradually ascended from his humble life to eminence among men. While he worked at his last he studied, and like Lincoln and Franklin succeeded by reason of industry, study, and frugality. Becoming a lawyer, his brilliancy as such soon promoted him to a State judgeship, and in 1774 he was sent to Congress. When Richard Henry Lee offered his famous resolution for independence, Sherman was named with Adams, Jefferson, Franklin, and Livingston to draft the glorious act. In the debate he displayed superior ability. Upon his retirement he became mayor of New Haven and first Senator from Connecticut. He was a member of the general convention to prepare the Federal Constitution. It need only be said that he served his country with fidelity and honor, and was a true, faithful, and firm patriot.

JOHN WITHERSPOON (1722–94), NEW JERSEY

No combination in the mind of man forms a more certain foundation for useful virtue than that of piety and patriotism. When love of country is guided by such principles, then the universe is safe. Among those who united the Gospel ministry with the labors of the patriot was John Witherspoon, no less distinguished in the church than in the record of his country. Born in Scotland, he came to the presidency of Princeton College in 1766. Casting aside his European prejudices he became an American the moment he landed on our shores, and no more enthusiastic American lived in that period. Always firm in the most gloomy aspects of public affairs, his formidable presence, his indomitable industry, and his intelligent foresight made him one of the most important advocates of freedom. A southern delegate, during the debate on the Declaration, was opposing ratification because "we are not ripe for revolution." Drawing himself up to his great height, John Witherspoon interrupted to say, "Not ripe, sir, we are not only ripe but rotting." It was Witherspoon who joined with Morris in making stable the finances of the country. His services were untiring, and his memory can perish only with the liberty of the Nation he so ardently strove to establish.

WILLIAM FLOYD (1734–1821), NEW YORK

Early in the Revolution William Floyd became conspicuous for the energy with which he championed the popular cause, and he remained a delegate in Congress for 8 years. He was a Long Island landowner and farmer, and suffered bitterly at the hands of the enemy because of his course in signing the Declaration. At one time his beautiful home was used as a cavalry barracks, his estate seized, and his family driven into captivity. For 7 years he never saw his property, and though offered its return if he would enroll against his country he became more active than ever in the pursuit of liberty and freedom for the people he loved and for the young Nation he was helping to start. The name of William Floyd will always be held in veneration so long as independence has a friend.

ROBERT TREAT PAINE (1731–1814), MASSACHUSETTS

In the character of the early Pilgrims there was much to approve and venerate. Never were men animated with a more ardent zeal for patriotic and religious freedom. Such was the attitude of Robert Treat Paine, who traced his ancestry to the Mayflower days. Boston gave him to his country. At an early age he became a lawyer. Long before he was called to act in Congress he was a firm believer in liberty and an earnest advocate of freedom. A stanch admirer of Washington, he was selected as the great general's chief cannon buyer during the entire Revolution, and was also largely instrumental in providing the Continentals with powder and ball. It may be said of him, as of all the noble 56, that he hazarded ease, property, and life to his country's cause, and never hesitated how to act.

BENJAMIN RUSH (1745–1813), PENNSYLVANIA

To his fame as another of the noble patriots who signed the immortal document, Benjamin Rush has added the distinction of being the foremost American surgeon of his day. He was born in poverty in 1745, his father dying when he was a boy. By prudent management and painstaking study he worked his way through Princeton and later studied medicine and surgery in Edinburgh, London, and Paris. At 25 years of age he was reckoned a physician and surgeon of international reputation, and the service he rendered gratuitously in saving the lives of more than 4,000 soldiers during a yellow-fever epidemic that threatened to wipe out Washington's army couples with the glory that is his as a signer. Dr. Rush was among the younger of the signers, being 31 years old when he subscribed his name.

JOSIAH BARTLETT (1729–95), NEW HAMPSHIRE

Josiah Barlett was the second signer of the Declaration. "My name shall be signed next," he said to Hancock, the Congress President. To Bartlett goes also the distinction of having been the first to vote "Yes" when the question came up as to whether the Declaration should be approved or condemned. The scant biography we have of the New Hampshire patriot says, in referring to his vote, "He made the rafters shake with the loudness of his approval." Bartlett was a physician and achieved early local fame by curing fever cases with cider. Other doctors accused him of malpractice, "but he stuck to his dose, and his cures quickly established him as a leader in his profession." So it was written in 1808. Dr. Bartlett was celebrated as a wit and by reason of his great height. Upon his retirement he became chief justice of New Hampshire and later Governor of the same State.

STEPHEN HOPKINS (1707–85), RHODE ISLAND

Of all the signatures to the Declaration, that of Stephen Hopkins shows the most sign of tremulousness. Yet to his glory, let it be said, the hand that wrote was afflicted with palsy and not with fear. A courageous spirit was willing if the flesh was weak. Hopkins was the first Abolitionist of his country. Long before the Revolution he expressed himself vigorously against slavery and carried his protests into the Halls of Congress. The more important cause of freedom for the Nation, however, offered him scant opportunity to force the question, and it was abandoned, to be resurrected by that other great patriot, Lincoln. Hopkins was chief justice of Rhode Island and Governor of the same State before he went to Congress. He was one of the fighting Quakers of his time, and was a zealous friend of his country.

MATTHEW THORNTON (1714–1803), NEW HAMPSHIRE

Above the grave of Matthew Thornton is a simple white slab bearing the modest but noble epitaph "Matthew Thornton, an honest man." And so we have another glorious reference to one of the distinguished heroes of the days of independence. Thornton was too busy with a military life to permit of his selection as a Member of Congress prior to the adoption of the Declaration. He was sent as a delegate on November 4, 1776, and immediately acceded to the great paper and signed it. He began life as a doctor, but took up warfare as a business, serving with much distinction. Later he was appointed to the supreme court of his State. He was invariably steadfast in favor of national freedom and at all times supported with his property and his life the Declaration to which he subscribed his name. Matthew Thornton deserved to the full the tribute "An honest man."

THOMAS LYNCH, JR. (1749–79), SOUTH CAROLINA

It was a close race between Thomas Lynch, Jr., and Edward Rutledge, both of the same State, as to who should have the distinction of being the youngest signer of the everlasting Declaration, and the honor goes to Rutledge. The latter was born in November 1749, and Lynch in August of the same year. Each was 27 years of age when he affixed his name. Lynch was a lawyer, and after serving in the Army succeeded his father in Congress. He was a chronic invalid at the time, but showed his patriotism by expressing the hope he would live long enough to sign. Providence granted his request, and soon afterward Lynch and his wife started on a short voyage for his health. They were never heard of afterward and it is assumed their lives were lost at sea. His earnestness, his eloquence, and his public character have been perpetuated to posterity as a pure and instructive model of true Americanism.

LYMAN HALL (1747–90), GEORGIA

At the age of 28, Lyman Hall was elected to the Continental Congress. Prior to that time he had been zealous and influential in promoting the Revolution. He was a doctor, and history records that with his physical cures went lectures on partiotism. He was another of the giants who signed, being 6 feet 4 inches in height. Sought by the enemy under Cornwallis, he was obliged to flee with his family into Virginia, but later returned to be elected Governor of Georgia. He was a gentleman of courage and an enthusiastic champion of religion, education, and freedom.

RICHARD STOCKTON (1730–81), NEW JERSEY

"An enemy of vice and a friend of virtue" is one of the brief eulogies bestowed upon Richard Stockton by the biographer of the

early days from whose writings most of the memoranda used in this little booklet have been secured. It might also be said of him that he was a generous and intrepid patriot and a Christian gentleman, who suffered much, sacrificed everything he had, and died. His high character and distinguished abilities made him one of the leading spirits in the sessions of the Continental Congress. Graduating in the first class of Princeton, Stockton became a lawyer, and in 1774 chief justice of New Jersey. Two years later he was sent to Congress, and soon after signing the Declaration was appointed on a committee to inspect the Army under Washington. While on this detail he stopped one night at his Princeton home. A messenger brought word that the enemy was approaching. Fleeing, he sought refuge at the dwelling of a friend a few miles away. There he was captured and dragged from his bed, carried away in his night clothes and thrown heartlessly into jail. His estate was plundered, his great library destroyed, and two paintings of himself and wife were ruthlessly bayoneted to show the animus of his oppressors. While imprisoned Stockton was treated with most unusual severity. Special proceedings in Congress resulted and a demand was made by Washington for Stockton's release and exchange. This was accomplished, but Stockton never recovered, his health being undermined by the hardships inflicted upon him. History may give more space to other of the Revolutionary heroes, but none deserved greater honor. Conscientious, upright, just and wise, Richard Stockton survives. His fair fame and his active and varied life have been a conspicuous mark for those who seek evidence of honored patriotism and sterling Americanism. His name will always attract the love and affection of his countrymen, and his example will ever wield over them a powerful influence.

THOMAS MC KEAN (1734–1817), DELAWARE

Representing Delaware in the Continental Congress, Thomas McKean was at the same time chief justice of Pennsylvania. He served both States and his country for the long term of 50 years and maintained the well-merited confidence of his associates. History deals peculiarly with McKean. It is said he was present, voted for and signed the immortal Declaration at the time of its passage, yet no record of this act shows on the journals of Congress, and the formal signature of McKean does not seem to have been inscribed until 1781. However there is no question as to where McKean stood. He was an advocate of "Stop talking and act," and was one of the best tried and firmest fellows of the Revolution. His State associates were Read and Rodney. With the latter seriously ill at home, Read split the State vote by at first disapproving of the Declaration. That the Colonies might be a unit, McKean brought Rodney from his sick bed and the two obliged Read to join with them. McKean was a trusted officer under Washington and after the war resided again in Pennsylvania, being Governor of that State. He was one of the most useful, able, and patriotic fathers of a mighty Republic.

LEWIS MORRIS (1726–98), NEW YORK

As Lewis Morris was about to lend his name to the document of freedom, word reached him that the enemy's army was at the gates of his Long Island home and that his property would be spared on his promise to withhold his vote for liberty. "There are plenty of homes but only one country," was Morris' reply, and he signed. Everything Morris possessed, property and fortune, was sacrificed, and his family was diven into exile. But Morris remained faithful and steadfast in his loyalty. While the Revolution was still on, he gave up his seat in Congress to his great brother, Gouverneur Morris, and became a general under Washington. He brought to his country the pride of genealogy and gave to it the glory of his fearless courage.

FRANCIS LIGHTFOOT LEE (1734–97), VIRGINIA

Francis lightfoot Lee differed from his more strenuous brother, Richard Henry Lee. The latter was all action, fire, and resolution. The former was one of the dandies of his day, much admired for his pleasure-loving ways, and content with the easy life of a country squire. Yet he was a fighter when the occasion required, and few surpassed him in depth of thought, strength of argument, and force of conclusion. Like his cousin, "Lighthorse Harry" Lee, he was a great favorite of Washington, and continued through life a steadfast friend and supporter of the great general. His part in Congress was more toward the cause of the army than toward any written declarations of freedom. It was his proud and justifiable boast, however, that he supported and signed the act of liberty and that he considered it more a deed of wisdom than of courage. He was a generous-hearted, much-beloved soldier of fortune.

OLIVER WOLCOTT (1726–97), CONNECTICUT

Of the Revolutional actors perhaps none had a broader acquaintance nor was more universally esteemed than Oliver Wolcott. Of inflexible integrity and stern resolution, he rose to the highest of militaryand civil honors, and long before the act of independence had been proposed he was outspoken in his protest against royal subjugation. The Revolution was recommended, commenced, conducted, and terminated under the auspices of men who enjoyed the public confidence during every vicissitude of fortune, and Wolcott shone glorious in this heaven. Returning to Connecticut, he entered the army under Washington and moved to New York. His popularity had preceded him, and within a year after he had take up his new residence he was chosen Governor of New York, filling that position until his death. Oliver Wolcott was another of America's tall men in a day when tall men were needed to meet conditions of stress.

CARTER BRAXTON (1736–97), VIRGINIA

Carter Braxton was the richest of all the signers, but he died in debt. Affluence came to Braxton through inheritance and he had the opportunity of rich youth to lead a life of dissipation and conviviality. But he formed a warm fondness for Patrick Henry and Jefferson, and at their suggestion entered the Virginia Assembly in 1761. The famous "Liberty or death" speech of Henry's quickened the patriotism of Braxton and he organized a local military company, determined to array himself and his little army against the enemy. The cool-headedness of Washington overcame his ardor, however, and he accepted a seat in Congress. There he was one of the most outspoken critics of kingly power. Soon after the Declaration had been approved he entered upon commercial life. His first move was to place his entire fortune in ships with which he hoped to engage in exporting and importing relations with France. History says the vessels were all captured or destroyed and Braxton found himself in poverty. His lands were seized by the sheriff, his slaves were sold, lawsuits galore were directed at him, and he became so involved in debt he died, a brokenhearted man. His life was a lesson of the uncertainty of all earthly things.

JAMES SMITH (1720–1806), PENNSYLVANIA

The plain and wholesome name of Smith also has its place in the catalog of great men who had the happiness and strength of purpose to affix their signatures to the glorious Declaration. James Smith was considered the most eccentric of all the signers. He was the wit of Congress, and carried to its serious proceedings the humor of his Irish ancestry. He was a lawyer and played an important role in the Pennsylvania conventions and conferences which prepared the way for that State's endorsement of the document of freedom. Although not chosen a delegate until after the Declaration had been passed, he signed it with fervor the day he took his seat.

ARTHUR MIDDLETON (1742–87), SOUTH CAROLINA

Impartiality may require admission that the signers of the Declaration had, in some respects, their equals. But justice compels the assertion they had no superiors in zeal and devotion. Such were Arthur Middleton and his father, Henry Middleton. The latter represented South Carolina ahead of the son and rendered excellent service in the preliminary work of organization and preparation. But important local governmental affairs obliged him to return to his native State just prior to the ratification. His son, Arthur, succeeded him, reaching Philadelphia in time to give his vote and his name to immortality. To the enemy the offense was heinous, and, in common with all the patriots, the penalty was paid. The Middleton estates, the finest in South Carolina, were utterly destroyed by Cornwallis' men, and scores of old Flemish and Italian paintings were cast into a heap and burned. Young Middleton himself, a year later, was arrested and thrown into jail. After the war he was returned to Congress. He became a writer of national fame. The wreck of property and fortune never lessened his ardor or enthusiasm.

SAMUEL HUNTINGTON (1732–96), CONNECTICUT

Samuel Huntington is another of the phalanx of patriots who rose from the humble walks of life, and by the vigor of their intellect and unwearied perseverance compensated the deficiencies of early education and enrolled themselves with honor and capacity among the champions of Colonial freedom. He began life a poor farmer's boy who worked up and on through Yale and a lawyer's office into prominence in his profession. Pious Christian, and at one time a professor of religion, he was one of the early few to sign the Declaration and upon Hancock's retirement became president of Congress for 2 years, later serving as Chief Justice of Connecticut and Governor of that State. Such, briefly, was Samuel Huntington, the friend of man and liberty.

JOHN HART (1708–80), NEW JERSEY

One of the Revolutionary patriots who voluntarily incurred the greatest degree of suffering without any possibility of individual gain was John Hart. He was a farmer, known throughout his State as "Honest John Hart." He served with distinction in the pre-Revolutionary legislatures of New Jersey, and in 1765 was one of the first to recognize the tyrannical character of the iniquitous Stamp Act. During the enemy invasion of New Jersey, Hart was besieged in his farmhouse. His wife lay dying at the time, and he refused to leave her. After her death he managed to make his escape, and for a year was hunted through the woods, where he existed as a common exile and fugitive, eluding every effort of his pursuers. An old man at the time, he never lost his spirit, and joined Washington's army as a private after the battle of Princeton.

GEORGE ROSS (1730–79), PENNSYLVANIA

When Governor Penn, of Pennsylvania, in 1775, saw how warmly the sister Colonies were facing independence, he addressed a letter to his legislature urging it to conclude that the time was not propitious to engage in strife with the mother country. The message did not appeal to George Ross, one of the lawmakers, and he couched this brief reply: "We are sincerely obliged to Your Honor for your attention to the true interests of the people over whom you preside, and would assure you that we shall always pursue such measures as shall appear necessary to secure the liberty and independence of

America." Penn never forgave Ross, and for a time was instrumental in keeping him out of Congress. After the Declaration had been ratified, however, Ross was elected a delegate and signed the illustrious paper for his constituency. He was the last Pennsylvania man to sign. He was a lawyer and jurist, and well deserved the confidence that was bestowed upon him.

FRANCIS LEWIS (1713–1803), NEW YORK

In 1765 an association called the Sons of Liberty was formed, with the determination to resist force by force. One of its founders was Francis Lewis, who at that time retired from business to give his whole attention to the furtherance of this patriotic organization. A native of England, he had served with faithful loyalty in the army of his king, and in the French-Canadian war of 1753–56 had especially distinguished himself on the northern frontier. Taxation without representation aroused his ire, however, and over night he changed from a subject of the crown to a leader in the Revolution. His firmness and integrity marked him as a fit representative in Congress. While there his Long Island home was rifled by the enemy, his books and papers were destroyed, and his family was obliged to flee. His wife was soon after captured and imprisoned in a filthy barrack for months. She refused a release contingent on her husband's quitting the Revolution, and remained a prisoner until General Washington appealed for her liberation because of her failing health. Two years later her life fell a sacrifice to this act of vandalism. It might, therefore, be said that in addition to his property Lewis lost his wife in the cause of freedom. The veteran statesman and patriot of today may well look with mingled emotions of rivalry and admiration upon the name of Francis Lewis.

GEORGE TAYLOR (1716–81), PENNSYLVANIA

George Taylor came to America almost as a slave under bond and apprenticeship to a Pennsylvania iron merchant who had paid his passage over. He landed in New York with three English pennies. In 20 years he was a partner in the business to which he had been apprenticed and afterward acquired full ownership through his marraige to the widow of his former employer. His life was rich not only in memory but in kindly service.

WILLIAM HOOPER (1742–90), NORTH CAROLINA

New England added to its army of patriots by furnishing William Hooper, although he was credited as a delegate from the South. Hooper was born in Boston, and after graduating at Harvard became a law student with that grand Revolutionary statesman, James Otis. Inspired by Otis' firm Americanism and thrilled by his eloquence, Hooper took his advice and carried the gospel of freedom into North Carolina, opening a law office in Wilmington and at once identifiling himself with the politics of his new State. In 1774 he was sent to Congress, and while no particular reference can be found relative to the part he played, it is an accepted fact that he was always on the side of independence. His enthusiasm never abated and he maintained with intrepidity the ground he had assumed.

GEORGE WYTHE (1726–1806), VIRGINIA

The name of George Wythe is another of the Colonial patriots so conjoined with his associates as to admit of very little distinct or particular detail. It is known that he was born poor, that his early education was defective, but that he struggled against adversity and became a prominent lawyer of his State. Perhaps his first acquaintance with political life came through a close association with Patrick Henry and Thomas Jefferson. He was their disciple, their pupil, and joined with each in opposing strenuously the iniquitous stamp tax of pre-Revolutionary days. He sacrificed a small fortune during the war, and was hunted like a wild animal after he had given his name to the Declaration. However, he survived the efforts made to capture him, and returned to Congress in time to take a part in drafting the Federal Constitution and in signing it. No man left behind him a character more venerated than George Wythe, and no man was more devoted to liberty and the natural and equal rights of others.

RICHARD HENRY LEE (1732–1794), VIRGINIA

But few of the signers shone with greater brightness or have left a more desirable name than Richard Henry Lee. One of the famous "Lees of Virginia," his just pride of ancestry did not lessen his ardor or his patriotism. He and his four brothers were all enthusiasts in the Revolutionary struggle and each looked upon Richard Henry as the personification of wisdom and strength. While in the Virginia House of Burgesses, Lee stood with Patrick Henry in his advocacy of freedom. All of his personal fortune went into the coffers of his country, and in addition "he raised nearly one millon dollars through note endorsement." In Congress his spirit was ruffled by the waste of words. "Why do we argue? Why do we delay?" he asked, and the next day he put an end to the debate by introducing the famous Lee resolution, declaring the Colonies to be "free and independent States." As the introducer, he would have been chosen to draft the Declaration, but sudden illness at home called him away. Jefferson received the honor in his stead. Lee returned to Congress in time to sign the following September. He was a fearless, fervid, eloquent patriot.

JAMES WILSON (1742–1798), PENNSYYLVANIA

On the immortal second of July, 1776, the vote of Pennsylvania was recorded against the Declaration. The delegation from the Keystone State was made up of James Wilson, Benjamin Franklin, Robert Morris, Charles Humphreys, John Dickinson, Thomas Willing, and John Morton. The report was postponed until July fourth. It was a rainy day, and Morris and Dickinson were absent; some say the former, who was an enthusiast, had detained the latter, who was always timid and hesitating. Be that as it may, Wilson, Franklin, and Morton voted affirmatively and Humphreys and Willing, to their shame, in the negative. The day was saved, and Pennsylvania ratified. James Wilson was selected for this purpose. Studying law in the office of the very Dickinson with whom he was associated to his honor on the Pennsylvania delegation, Wilson early marked himself an opponent of tyranny and an advocate of liberty. His name slandered and his life threatened for the act that gave him immortality, he was honored in later life by being raised to the United States Supreme Court. He helped draft the Federal Constitution.

ELBRIDGE GERRY (1744–1814), MASSACHUSETTS

"It is the duty of every citizen, though he may have but 1 day to live, to devote that day to the service of his country." So spoke Elbridge Gerry as he signed the Declaration of Independence in September, 1776. It was the occasion about which he spoke, but the records indicate that from his youth Gerry devoted every day to the land of his birth and love. A graduate of Harvard, he early became one of the zealous political leaders of of his State. When Samuel Adams proposed a committee to enter protest against the occupancy of Boston by General Gage, Gerry was chosen as its head. When John Adams formed his celebrated committee to carry this protest further, Gerry was again picked. And when the enemy made its early morning march toward Lexington and Concord, in April, 1775, it was Gerry, hidden as he had been in a tavern on the way, who waited until the last minute before he fled to carry the tidings of the approach of war to the surrounding neighborhood. And, again, the night before the battle of Bunker Hill, Gerry occupied the same bed with General Joseph Warren. "Give them plenty of ball, doctor," he said in the morning, as Warren went off to his command and death. Gerry did not reach Congress in time to sign the Declaration with the others, but he did get there in time to be appointed with Robert Morris as a committee on finances. In 1787 he refused to vote for or sign the Federal Constitution, and tested his action later by running for Governor of his State. He was elected, and was afterward made Vice President of the United States. Gerry had a sacred regard for the firm establishment of his country and was a patriot above all else.

THOMAS NELSON, JR. (1738–89), VIRGINIA

Another of the southerners possessing great wealth was Thomas Nelson, Jr. To his honor let it be noticed that he gave his entire fortune to his country when its need became urgent, and died penniless. At one time the issuance of a $2-million loan was necessary to repel the enemy from Virginia soil. This full amount Nelson raised over night by mortgaging his estates. The next day his own home was occupied by the personal staff of Cornwallis. It was at Yorktown, and the Revolutionary forces were on the offensive. Nelson, who was Governor at the time, visited the firing line. Nothing that the entire neighborhood was being razed by the artillery, he inquired why it was the fire was not directed at his own dwelling. "We are sparing it out of respect to you, Governor," replied one of the young Lees. "Give me the cannon," retorted Nelson. "Do this," he added, and he fired a ball through the house. Subsequent shots destroyed the place and forced the enemy to flee. And so it was always with Nelson—America first.

JOSEPH HEWES (1730–79), NORTH CAROLINA

Joseph Hewes was a signer who discarded his religion to give his voice and signature to his country. Born a member of the Society of Friends, he was steadfast in his religious devotions until it became apparent to him that he must sever these or be less loyal to the cause of freedom. Urged by his church to relinquish his seat in Congress he refused, and became instead a warm and enthusiastic patriot. At first he was opposed to ratification in the form the original resolution was introduced, but after listening to a speech of Samuel Adams he is said to have "started suddenly, and lifting both hands to heaven as if in a trance, exclaimed 'It is done, and I abide'." He died at the height of his usefulness, but not before he had earned the enduring and grateful recognition of the country he served.

ABRAHAM CLARK (1726–94), NEW JERSEY

"Firm and decided as a patriot, zealous and faithful as a friend to the public, he loved his country, and adhered to her cause in the darkest hours of her struggle against oppression." Such is the inscription above the Rahway churchyard grave of Abraham Clark. It presents a concise view of the character of this New Jersey hero. Unambitious of wealth, this sterling old Revolutionary chiftain early acquired local fame as "the poor man's lawyer." It is said of him that "he persistently refused fees for his services, and when fees were offered seemed more inclined to accept produce or merchandise." Starting his political life as the sheriff of Newark, Clark soon was distinguished for official assiduity. When war began to agitate the land he had passed the meridian of life. It was, therefore, under a well settled and mature conviction of the justice of independence that he devoted his remaining years to his country's servie. Two of Clark's sons were captured and locked up. They were treated with the utmost severity. Their father scrupulously refrained from interfering in their behalf, as he felt any movement for them meant a lessening of his influence for his country.

Clark met the test as only a true patriot should.

WILLIAM WILLIAMS (1731–1811), CONNECTICUT

William Williams has been referred to as the tallest signer of the Declaration. His ardent patriotism and his outspoken approval of every move for liberty and justice add to his distinction in the gallery of immortals of which he was a member. First a soldier, then a lawyer, then a judge, and next a merchant, he was taken from these spheres and carried into the Congressional halls, where he at once made his presence felt. One of the Pennsylvania members who had not signed the document bragged of that fact to Williams, who sternly replied, "Then, sir, you ought to be hanged for not doing your duty." Williams did his duty at all times and against all hazards.

GEORGE READ (1733–98), DELAWARE

George Read was a fearless patriot and an able man. Almost alone he openly and vigorously opposed the adoption of the Declaration, maintaining that the time had not come for such action, and when the vote was first secretly taken his was recorded in the negative. Later he changed his mind, became one of the most strenuous advocates of independence and affixed his signature. Samuel Adams laughingly informed him he had signed with a halter about his neck, and Read, who was of serious mien, replied, "So be it; I am prepared to meet all consequences of this just act." Pleased with his course he subsequently introduced this resolution: *Resolved*, That any one who shall wilfully break this agreement shall have his name published in the Public Newspapers as a betrayer of the civil rights of America and forever after be deemed infamous and a traitor." During the war Read's home was confiscated by the enemy, his wife taken captive and he driven from place to place for 6 years. Later he became Chief Justice of Delaware and that State's first United States Senator.

WILLIAM ELLERY (1727–1820), RHODE ISLAND

The mind of William Ellery kept pace with the world. He was a lawyer who had graduated from Harvard, and while in Congress served in a conspicuous way on many important committees. The fine bold signature he placed on the Declaration is somewhat in contrast to the handwriting of a few of his more anxious colleagues. He spoke of this great event as one "which many regarded with awe, some with uncertainty, but none with fear," and added, "I watched every one sign, as I was determined to see how they looked as they gave their names to what might be their death warrant. There was undaunted resolution in every countenance." Ellery returned to his home to find it destroyed and his personal treasures stolen. He died when 93.

Excerpts From Address by Hon. Alexander Wiley, of Wisconsin, Before Order of Ahepa

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, July 17, 1956

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, last Sunday night it was my privilege to address one of the outstanding groups of my State and of the Nation. I refer to the Order of Ahepa.

It was a great joy to meet with these patriotic Americans. I am grateful to them for a wonderful evening, and, in particular, for their gracious expressions of personal commendation and support.

My subject was, of course, Greek-American relations and the need for constant improvement of them. We of the United States have always had the warmest affection for Greece, and it is my hope that by this address I may have, perhaps, contributed in some small part to further improvement in our relations.

I ask unanimous consent that excerpts from the address be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SENATOR WILEY URGES UNITED STATES TO CONTINUE TO SEEK JUST SOLUTION ON CYPRUS; ISSUES NEW WARNING AGAINST SOVIET TRICKERY IN ITS OFFERS TO GREECE AND OTHER LANDS

(Excerpts from address by Senator WILEY at Order of AHEPA district meeting, Racine, Wis., July 15, 1956.)

I always feel very happy and honored to be the guest of your great organization, the AHEPA, and especially on the occasion of this district convention.

The American Hellanic & International Progressive Association has proved to be one of our most vital national groups. It is unique in not only serving the major interests of Greek-American relations but in promoting a more abundant life for all and the preservation of our dearly prized freedom.

It is a well-known fact that the Order of AHEPA has provided and continues to provide outstanding services to our fine citizens of Greek extraction—folks who make up the membership of the more than 350 devout Greek Orthodox communities throughout the United States.

From AHEPA's ranks has come expanded leadership, and into its ranks have come the flower of Greek-American talent.

Uppermost among them is, of course, the issue of democracy and true self-determination on embattled Cyprus. Yes, an end to the tragic bloodshed on that island, including, of course, the earliest possible return of exiled Archbishop Makarios to his people.

I feel that I speak the sentiments of all America when I say that we are deeply saddened by what has transpired on Cyprus.

TRADITION OF NONMEDDLING, BUT TRADITION OF SPEAKING OUR CONSCIENCE

Now, as you know, we Americans are not meddlers. We don't like to take any action which could be construed as interference in other people's affairs, whether in Great Britain's affairs, Greece's, Turkey's, or anybody else's affairs.

At the same time, wholly consistent with our tradition of noninterference and nonmeddling, there is another tradition.

It is the tradition tha America will no be silent, America will not shirk and be motionless, when injustice is done before her eyes and the world's eyes. The conscience of America is too keen, the humanitarianism of our people too deep for us to fail to try to lend our good offices to end injustice and discord. We are glad to do so, particularly when we might be of help to solve a dispute which is not between enemies, which is not between an enemy and a friend, but rather between friend and friend, as between Great Britain and Greece today.

NO BASE CAN BE HELD AGAINST PEOPLE'S WILL

We cannot fail to note to our British friends that the whole history of the 20th century confirm this fact: No base is really much good, unless it is surrounded by native people friendly to the maintenance of that base.

No interior or port area can be successfully held or successfully used unless the local population is, by and large, agreeable. If it is not agreeable, then acts of sabotage may occur, transportation and communications may be cut and all the other tragic complex of guerrilla warfare may occur.

To us, the thought of Cypriot children—young boys and girls—fighting against British Tommies, or for that matter any other Cypriot citizen doing so, is distasteful. But it is distasteful not only to us but, we know, to the Tommies themselves and to the people of the United Kingdom, as well.

When we think of England, we think of her magnificent tradition of freedom and liberty. We recall how, in our own colonial times, the conscience of Britain spoke from within the Parliament of Britain itself in the cause of American colonists' freedom.

We have a high respect today, as well, for the British Government and for the British people.

Surely, from British statesmanship and yes, from Greek and Turkish statesmanship can come a solution to this problem—a solution compatible with the interests of the United Kingdom, of Greece, and Turkey. It must be a solution fully compatible with the crucial strategic needs of NATO, and of the Balkan Pact, as well.

Surely, we should be able to see living vitality put back into NATO and put back into the Balkan Pact, by having this dispute among friends settled.

Without meddling, therefore, without interference, we shall speak our conscience on this matter.

And tonight, I shall refer to other problems as well: To Greece's stalwart tradition against communism—including its latest crafty forms; to Greece's emigration problem and her economic problem.

I have, as you know, enjoyed talking both with the distinguished King and Queen of Greece, and I know from first-hand experience what a warm regard the Greek Government and the Greek people have for our own land.

CONTRIBUTIONS BY AMERICANS OF GREEK ANCESTRY

This genuine mutual affection is certainly understandable. And it is a real "light," worthy of being followed, as a wonderful symbol.

From the earliest days of their arrival here, Americans of Greek descent in this country rapidly became an integral part of our Nation. In war and in peace they have done much to bolster the American way of life. Over the past century, we have seen Greek immigrants emerge—basically from humblest origins, as a group of people who proved the heights to which free men and women can rise, as did your noble forebearers of the golden ages.

Today, some of our most prominent business, professional, and civic leaders in public life are of Hellenic origin. We in Wisconsin are particularly proud of our fellow-citizens of Greek ancestry and of your many fine contributions to our State and Nation.

THE LEGACY OF GREECE

Of course, the influence of ancient and modern Greece on our civilization and life, can hardly be overestimated. There is perhaps no other country that has left to future generations as many legacies as she.

Our religion, philosophy, science, literature, education, and politics—indeed, every phase of our institutional life—all have their roots in Greek culture and tradition.

Above all, as the "cradle of democracy," Greece taught her lessons of democratic government to the world. While forms and methods have changed to fit the times and needs, the basic principles of liberty, freedom, and individual dignity remain forever the core of our way of life.

No one can stand on the Acropolis, as I have, and as you no doubt have, without a feeling of awe and reverence and yes, eternal gratitude for "the glory that was Greece."

UNITED STATES TIES WITH GREECE

The bonds between the United States and Greece have been ever strong. Her people, as ours, have always remained devoted to democratic principles. And it was, of course, in this country that Greek political forms were applied to their peak and that real government of, by, and for the people reached its greatest triumph.

Because of our common heritage then, it was not unusual that, as far back as 1821—the beginning of the Greek struggle for independence—the United States became one of Greece's staunchest supporters. Daniel Webster and Henry Clay, greatest figures in the Congress, spoke eloquently on behalf of the Greek cause. President Monroe, in a message to Congress, paid special tribute to the revolutionaries.

Our own young country naturally felt warm ties of sympathy with the Greek patriots seeking freedom, just as we ourselves had achieved it a short time before—with blood and sacrifice.

GREECE'S LATEST TRAVAIL: NATURE'S RAVAGE

Unfortunately, Greece, over the centuries, has known many dreadful times. The present moment is not a happy one from several standpoints.

This week we were deeply saddened to observe how the fury of the elements had once again ravaged the land of your fathers. Earthquakes, volcanic outbreaks, and tidal waves have as we all know, rocked the Aegean Sea, causing death and destruction on a dozen of the Greek Islands.

Our sympathy goes out to the injured and homeless in these areas. But sympathy is not enough. Quick action is and was imperative to treat the injured, house and feed the homeless, and help the stricken repair the damages to home and property.

American relief experts are now surveying the disaster scene. The American Government and International Red Cross, among other agencies, will take whatever measures may be asked for so as to help bring relief. Greece, is as you know, relying basically on itself to meet this tragedy.

But it is in tragedies of this kind that the brotherhood of man rises above all political friction. Thus, the Greek people do not stand alone in their grief.

GREECE'S SUFFERING AT THE HANDS OF THE INVADER

The Greek people have also suffered much under the iron hand of alien tyranny. Since their independence from Turkey, they have faced three particularly formidable alien assaults.

Twice their territory has been invaded in brutal, outright aggression. And more recently, we have seen Greek freedom endangered by the now hard—now soft, zig-zag tactics of Kremlin treachery.

Greece has stood up grandly to the task of meeting each of these adversities, but not without suffering a heavy toll in human lives and property.

Against the Communist onslaught in particular, we saw how bravely Greece fought to preserve her independnce. We were glad to do what we could to provide this brave land (with its meager physical resources) to provide it with military and economic assistance to hurl back the Red foes—from within and from without.

OUR AID PROGRAM SAVED OUR STRATEGIC INTEREST

The world will not soon forget Greece's triumph over communism, a triumph achieved by the gallantry of her own forces in the true Evzone tradition. Nor will the world forget that it was America's enlightened program—a bipartisan program, of aid, administered by our great Gen. James Van Fleet—which enabled Greek valor to prevail.

Today, we bear occasional criticisms—unwarranted abuse—of the United States aid program from people who tend to forget the past. They tend to forget that it was the free world's own strategic interest which was saved by our enabling Greek courage to smash the Red enemy. The whole history of the crucial Mediterranean and of the Middle East would have been altered for the worst had Greece been permitted to perish under the Red attack.

The money we spent in Greece was repaid to us manyfold by the preservation of Greece's independence.

LATEST SLY SOVIET OVERTURES

Today, Greece continues here efforts against Communism—from without and from within. She remembers full well the tragic plight of the some 28,000 Greek children and 3,000 Greek soldiers carried behind the Iron Curtain 9 years ago, and not heard from since.

She still finds the Communist craftily maneuvering for advantage in her political life. But increased economic and political stability within the country will serve to reduce this threat.

Of course, the Kremlin is, as usual, trying to exploit the current Cyprus dispute to Moscow's own advantage. Pravda within the past few weeks offered new technical and economic assistance to Greece, just a week after the visit of Soviet Foreign Minister Dmitri T. Shepilov. However, neither the King or Queen, nor Premier Karamanlis, nor his Government and people, are naive or unsuspecting, in the face of Soviet cunning.

Greece has firmly confirmed her steadfast stand with the West.

As one of our most resolute allies in the free world resistance to Communist aggression, Greece has rightly come to be one of the most trusted members of NATO. She has accepted the full responsibilities of her membership in the organization. This has been proved on many occasions, notably her contribution to the Korean war effort.

Greece knows well, from experience, her strategic importance in the Atlantic-Mediterranean community and she knows her vulnerable position in the gateway to the Middle East. She will not be found wanting when the free world calls upon her.

But she asks: Will the free world fail her over the all-important Cyprus issue?

It must not. Surely, the voice of reason will prevail among the three NATO allies, surely the voice of patience and understanding and reasonable compromise.

As I indicated at the outset, this is a time for statesmanship on the part of all concerned—not for blind extremism, not for unyielding harshness and inflexibility, but for the spirit which Athens itself demonstrated in the golden times—the spirt of enlightenment and belief in the supremacy of intelligence in conquering any problem.

The needs are plain: a mighty base for the free world must obviously be maintained on Cyprus, with a population around it that supports it enthusiastically.

The United Kingdom's interest, Turkey's interest in an area but 40 miles from her shores and an area with people one-fifth of Turkish origin must be carefully reconciled with Greece's natural interest—in a land and a people which is Greek in its very essence.

Self-rule for Cyprus, security for the West, assurances for Britain, Greece, and Turkey—these are not incompatible objectives.

And so, we hope and pray for a just solution and soon.

JUSTICE FOR OUR YOUNGSTERS

But justice is an ideal for which we should strive—not simply in foreign parts but in our own land as well.

I refer to justice for young and old; justice in meeting a domestic problem such as that posed by our own often wayward youngsters.

As many of you know, I am privileged to serve as ranking member of the Senate Judiciary Committee, in addition to being a member of its Juvenile Delinquency Subcommittee.

BISHOP EZEKIEL'S SPLENDID TESTIMONY

I am pleased therefore, to acknowledge the fine contribution made to our subcommittee, particularly by Bishop Ezekiel of the Greek Othodox diocese of Chicago, in his testimony before us. His comments on behalf of spiritual rededication struck a respondent chord in our hearts, and I was happy to compliment him on his presentation.

MY WORK ON BEHALF OF RELIGIOUS DESIGNATION BILL

I mentioned at the hearing incidentally, that I had been pleased to work on behalf of an important bill, since enacted.

By this legislation, Greek Americans of the Orthodox faith as well as other groups of the Eastern Orthodox faith, can designate their religious preference in the Armed Forces, a privilege previously denied members of our armed services of your faith.

This measure was long overdue. For surely, freedom of religion in every manner and form is one of our most sacred constitutional rights.

Two of our able staff experts, I might mention, on the Juvenile Delinquency Subcommittee itself are themselves of Greek Orthodox faith. And I am pleased to recognize their fine work.

It was only natural, of course, that among the outstanding civic groups invited to testify before the subcommittee was the Order of AHEPA, Supreme Gov. Louis G. Manesiotis added significantly to our understanding. He reported at our hearing in Pittsburgh on the background of AHEPA's interest:

"The Order of AHEPA at its national convention in August of 1954 held here in the city of Pittsburgh, upon learning of your program to coordinate the efforts of service groups throughout the country, unanimously approved the resolution endorsing this most worth while project. We again reaffirmed this resolution at our San Francisco conclave last August, and pledged all our facilities and resources in promoting this important program."

That pledge is being faithfully fulfilled.

LIBERALIZING UNITED STATES IMMIGRATION LAW

In the few minutes remaining to me, I should like to refer to the need for fulfilling a further pledge, on all our parts. It is in the field of liberalized immigration law.

Your Refugee Relief Committee is continuously working to remedy the unfair immigration quota still set on Greek aliens. As you know, the present quota set at 308 per year is grossly discriminating. This is only one two-hundredth of the quota of several other countries in Europe.

Certainly this rate is completely incompatible with the American concept of justice and fair dealing for our fellow man. And so, quick consideration in the closing days of Congress' session must be given to immigration reforms, including increasing the number of refugees coming to America from Greece, as well as abolishing the mortgaging of future quotas.

As you probably know, a measure has just recently been introduced by Senator CAPEHART, of Indiana, to provide additional visas for certain aliens of Greek ethnic origin living in Greece. S. 4088, which amends the Refugee Relief Act of 1953, is still pending before the Senate Judiciary Committee of which I am a member. Needless to say, I will urge its sympathetic review as soon as possible.

ECONOMIC JUSTICE FOR GREECE

I shall continue to urge, as well, efforts toward economic justice for Greece and other free nations.

We are naturally interested in maintaining the most fruitful trade agreements, under which Greek and American commerce may benefit. Greek prosperity in large part depends on the availability of markets for her export produce. How can a small country, drained through repeated wars (not of her choosing) and sudden catastrophes, expect to get back on her feet if she is faced with unwarranted quotas and restrictions on her exports?

This is especially serious for Greece which is so heavily dependent on a relatively few major products.

Likewise, we will give continued attention to our economic and technical assistance programs in Greece. Our interest is, of course, not only in the needed building up of the capital structure of the Greek economy—long-range engineering projects and the like, but the uplifting of the living standards of the average Greek and his family—living standards which are still unfortunately low, despite the recovery progress that has been made.

These are just a few of the questions which Congress must look into carefully. Too often, in weighing the general issues of immigration, foreign trade, and assistance we might otherwise tend to forget our debt to democratic nations of the world. And what greater debt do we owe than to the real "cradle of democracy?"

CONCLUSION

It is in this spirit that I should like to conclude my remarks.

I want you to know what a great privilege it has been to be with you tonight.

Had time permitted, I would have liked to have commented upon certain other phases of Greek-American relations which well command our interest.

I am interested, for example, in the ever-expanded program of exchange of Greek and American leaders. Why? So that we may benefit from the informative presence here of representative Greek leaders from all walks of Greek life, and so that Greece, in turn, may benefit from their having visited our shores and learned from us.

And there are other phases which I would like to have commented upon as well—phases which I have been pleased to discuss on many pleasant occasions with Greece's able Ambassador to the United States, His Excellency, George V. Melas—a most eloquent spokesman, not simply for his country, but for the free world.

With these thoughts, therefore, I conclude. But you, in turn, will not conclude your own constructive work here in Racine and throughout this district—your work on behalf of ever-improved Greek-American relations and on behalf of a brighter future for ourselves, for our children, and for those who will follow after them.

The Anti-Italian McCarran Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WARREN G. MAGNUSON

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, July 17, 1956

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled, "The Anti-Italian McCarran Act," written by John J. Navone, S. J., and published in the Catholic World for July 1956.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE ANTI-ITALIAN MCCARRAN ACT

(By John J. Navone, S. J.)

"Italy's greatest export? Why bambini, of course." This humorous reply once greeted the question of my American tourist friend in Italy. However, to hundreds of thousands of unemployed Italians, overpopulation is far from funny.

Why emigrate? A friend's description of his train ride from Bologna to Rome gives the answer: "When dawn broke, we were 3 hours north of Rome, around Arezzo. More forbidding country you have never seen, though they tell me it does exist in southern Italy and Spain. Everything you lay your eyes on is poor, the people, the hovels, the livestock, the farms—if you can call them such. Even the earth seems tired of existing. How those people manage to eke out an existence from the wornout soil between the rocks is a mystery. Every hilltop is crowned with ancient decrepit towns. Poverty is embedded everywhere and hope seems a long way off."

My Florentine cousin's story was the same. Last December, when three civil-service positions were open in Florence, 5,000 applicants queued up for the civil-service exams. Thousands of Italian youth seriously overcrowd the universities, pursuing an academic life for years, merely to keep off the streets.

The effects are obvious. The intense Italian affection for the home and family, though still strong, shows signs of decrease. From the results of an inquiry conducted among thousands of Italian women by Prof. Luzzato Fegiz of the Doxa Institute, Milan, one can see this decline in the religious and social structure of the family. Among the causes mentioned are infidelity, lack of moral preparation for marriage, and birth control. The present birthrate is lower than before the war. In 1936, the birthrate was about 23.3 per 1,000 population and today it is near 17.6.

Realta Sociale D'Oggi, publishing the results of a recent parliamentary inquest, revealed that an average of 35 percent of the lower classes attend Sunday Mass, whereas 60 percent of the middle and upper classes regularly attend. These facts graphically corroborate the papal pronouncement that men must be able to live as men before they can be expected to live as Christians.

While people in the United States are encouraged by the bright side of the Italian situation—the agrarian reform in southern Italy—they must not fail to consider the large pools of unemployment which are still everywhere in southern Italy. There are many areas untouched by the agrarian reforms. But the extension of the agrarian reform and the new industrial development will not solve Italy's overpopulation problems. People will refer to the 300 families who have received parcels of land, and to those employed in new industries; but what of the 2,000 people in a town of 15,000 for whom there is no employment, and the 2,000 who are employed less than 6 months a year?

Italians are very sensitive to the situation. Argentina, Australia, Canada, Brazil, and Venezuela have generously assisted them in providing outlets for the surplus population, but the United States has called for a closing of applications for visas under the Refugee Relief Act. Emigration is still a necessity for the southern Italian economy.

All these social and economic troubles, added up, are grist for the political mills of both Communists and Fascists. The Fascist leaders Marsanich and Borghese, encouraging the discontent, urged Italians to vote both anti-Communist and anti-Christian Democrat by electing Fascists to office in the Italian national elections last May. Colonies for Italy stood high on the list of Fascist demands. As their price for cooperating with the United States and its allies in a defensive alliance against Russia, they demanded the return of Italy's African colonies. To landless or unemployed Italians, the idea of getting their own farms in Africa still has a real appeal. This appeal would be negated by a more positive American immigration policy.

It should not be forgotten that in the last national elections (1952) the Fascists and their monarchist cronies made the largest gains of any coalition, captured Naples (Italy's third city), Bari, Foggia, Salerno, 12 out of 31 southern provincial councils and 21 percent of the total southern Italian vote—and emerged as the third party in Italy.

They had picked up votes from the disillusioned and impatient who abound in Italy's uneven economy. To these unhappy Italians they sold nostalgia, a promise to resurrect the old days when Italy strutted before the world as a first-class power, when decisions were made for, not by, the people, and when the Duce took care of everyone. Most important of all, the M. S. I. won backing from among the same group that financed Mussolini's rise—rich landowners and industrialists who fear even the mild Christian Democrat reforms and want insurance against change.

The American policy of discriminatory immigration laws is always capitalized on by the leftist parties. If a free or liberal immigration policy were pursued by the United States the economic pressures caused by overpopulation and unemployment would be greatly ameliorated and consequently the Communists would lose much of their support. These problems are far too great for Italy alone to solve.

The Italian Government has done its utmost to relieve the overpopulation-unemployment problem by entering into bilateral agreements with Latin American countries. Many Italians have emigrated under "controlled emigration" schemes planned and financially supported by the Italian Government. Yet, despite Italy's best efforts, the problem persists, for those who are the most poverty stricken cannot emigrate because of their inability to pay the transportation costs. Consequently, the poor are always with her.

Redtape also prevents much Italian emigration. Formalities which must be settled before embarkation are often too expensive for any but the well-to-do. Italian villagers must appear before officials whose offices are at great distances. The result is tragic. Because of the villager's inexperience with the complexities of modern bureaucracy, he frequently falls prey to unscrupulous adventurers or abandons the attempt.

Though two of postwar Italy's greatest achievements have been the overthrow of fascism and the successful rebuff of communism, nevertheless these forces are still a potent threat. The failure of Italian democracy to solve these problems will destroy it. The Italian situation shows that even a nation with the ideal forms of democratic government may succumb to eventual ruin unless modifying economic and material conditions are adequate for the survival of these forms.

Although democratic Italy has done much on its own territory to remedy the overpopulation-unemployment problem, the ultimate solution rests in other hands. Unfortunately, territories with great labor power are not always those with sufficient industrial resources to employ this manpower.

If some 7 million Americans—or 10 percent of the labor force—were regularly without

work or hope of finding it, they undoubtedly would be forced to consider emigration. This is exactly Italy's problem. More than 10 percent of its "active population," or labor force, has been unemployed for more than 3 years, despite the billions spent to develop jobs and spread the work.

Looking to the future, Deputy Director General of Emigration Franco Bounous sees 1,900,000 newcomers entering the labor market in the next 10 years at the present rate of entry. Yet Italian officials foresee the prospect of no more than 1 million new jobs in that period. Thus, counting the 2 million for whom there are no jobs now, Mr. Bounous estimates that at the end of the next 10 years, Italy would still have 2.9 million unemployed. Italian officials believe it will be possible to work off this backlog in the next 10 years provided that between 2.5 or 3 million persons can emigrate over that period.

In 1950 the Italian Government presented an estimate to the International Labor Office that 1.5 million persons were available for immediate emigration in family groups. This figure included workers and their dependents and would have been raised by 2 million if an opportunity to emigrate had been given to persons who were unemployed.

What have other nations done to help? Italian Affairs for November 1955 reported that other nations, between the years 1946 to 1954 have received 1.2 million permanent Italian settlers. The United States received only one-twelfth. In the light of the foregoing facts, this has not been enough.

Realizing the inadequacy of the United States immigration policy, a Senate subcommittee under Senator Kilgore of West Virginia held hearings last December on the present policy as found in the McCarran-Walter Act. Senator LEHMAN of New York, the foremost proponent of more liberal immigration, denounced the present act. Victor Reuther of the CIO pointed out that the quota system now in effect favors Great Britain and Ireland which do not complete their quotas, while it unjustly discriminates against the surplus manpower of Italy and Greece.

At the same hearing other distinguished Americans urged a more just balance of quotas. Senator Clifford P. Case, of New Jersey, the Reverend Eugene Blake, president of the National Council of the Churches of Christ, Father William Gibbons, S. J., and Senator John F. Kennedy, of Massachusetts, all advocated measures which make it possible for thousands of Italians to find better lives on American shores. However, there is little real hope that anything can come of it at all. All realize how hard it is to interest Americans in changing their immigration policies.

The frustration of such efforts for a change in policy helped me to understand why one Italian wrote, "America is our dream." Because of the McCarran-Walter Act it is impossible for America to be more than a dream for those Italians who look to our shores for a new life. This act, more than psychological adjustment problems, explains why most Italians go and must go to Latin countries. A recent popular Italian survey revealed that 60 percent of the Italians prefer Americans to all other foreigners. Ironically this is a one-sided love affair.

It is also ironical that the Nation which leads the free world should deny freedom of migration to its free allies. Italians are good enough to work for us in a common defense; they are not good enough to live with us. Failure to provide for Italian immigration represents a failure to provide a positive program against communism. John Foster Dulles, in War or Peace scored such a lack of positive thinking and planning:

"We can talk eloquently about liberty and freedom, and about human rights and fundamental freedoms, and about the dignity and worth of the human personality; but most of our vocabularly derives from a period when our society was individualistic. There is no use having more and louder Voices of America unless we have something to say that is more persuasive than anything yet said."

Many Italians want to come to America to escape the predetermining poverty of their Italian environment. America offers them the best opportunity of becoming their better selves because it offers them the freedom in which their personal dignity and greatness may be realized. America offers them a chance to live.

A Review of the Reclamation Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. A. L. MILLER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 17, 1956

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, last September in Lincoln, Nebr., at the anuual convention of the National Reclamation Association, Mr. Guy C. Jackson, Jr., was elected President of this organization to succeed Mr. C. Petrus Peterson, an eminent Nebraskan, who had served that association as its president for many years. Mr. Jackson, an outstanding citizen of Texas, is well qualified to carry on the work that devolves upon the President of such a sound and worthwhile organization.

I should like to include the remarks made by Mr. Jackson at the 43d National Convention of the National Rivers and Harbors Congress held in Washington, D. C. on May 12, 1956 in the Appendix of the RECORD, and recommend their reading by my colleagues:

RECLAMATION

(By Guy C. Jackson, Jr., president, National Reclamation Association, Anahuac, Tex., delivered at the 43d National Convention of the National Rivers and Harbors Congress, the Mayflower Hotel, Washington, D. C., May 12, 1956)

Wise men of ancient Babylonia wrote that, before man had been taught to irrigate his fields and to control floods with dikes, life could not exist in Babylonia. The land was crossed and recrossed by ditches and canals which carried life-giving waters of the great Tigris and Euphrates Rivers. Gardens and fields had been made to blossom in profusion of beauty and abundance in contrast to the ageless desert.

Yes, inscriptions hewn in tablets of stone, recording events of a long-dead civilization, buried for hundreds of years, and then uncovered and transplanted by modern archeologists, pieced together with the crumbling canals, marking the routes of those ancient water arteries, truly marked an era of agricultural abundance of an ingenious people, an era which could only have been built with a knowledge of hydraulic engineering and the science of irrigation.

Listen to one of those ancient uncovered recordings: "I have digged out the river Euphrates * * * and I have set up a wall of safety for it—I dug out the Hammerabi Canal which brings abundance of water to the land * * * both the banks thereon I changed to fields for cultivation, and I garnered piles of grain."

Yet, that ancient era of civilization was to be destroyed, then rebuilt again in the days of Alexander the Great. One historian records that "It was a place of extravagance beyond ordinary computation and of wicked luxury, the pride and undoing of an arrogant and conquering race."

Here great rulers were to live, conspire, carouse, conquer, and die—but, the common man tended the dikes, watered the fields, and practiced, even then, the art of irrigation.

Here the famous Hanging Gardens of Babylon were built on terraces of stone in a country where there was no stone; they were kept green in a country where there was no rain. Here, almost a thousand years before the birth of Christ, was the first recorded account of a hydraulic device which raised water to the high level of the gardens. In fact, historians point to the fact that remains of the water-lifting machine, found in an ancient well, provide the only surviving proof that hanging gardens actually "existed in all the glory with which legend has invested them."

The alluvial plain between the Tigris and Euphrates Rivers has been called the Cradle of Civilization. At one time it was crisscrossed by a complicated network of irrigation canals that carried agricultural prosperity to every part of the land.

Then a less civilized people overran the wonders of that ancient world some 2,500 years ago, neglected the intricate irrigation system, and plunged the land, once densely populated and studded with many towns, back into its original uninhabited state.

Today canals, long since silted in, and parts of the area crusted with salt, stand only as fallen monuments to that ancient era of reclamation development which had turned a vast desert into the most fertile country of the world. Is it any less demonstrative in our modern day?

In ancient Egypt are also found early traces of the science of irrigation. The paintings and sculptures of about 2000 B. C. show peasantry using vessels of skin to lift the water. Remains of early irrigation structures have been found in the Nile Valley, and some authorities say the likelihood is strong that the practice of irrigation actually originated there.

In Emil Ludwig's book, The Nile, that a Pharaoh built the dam on Lake Moeris in the 19th century B. C., which stored almost as much water as a dam designed in the 19th century A. D. A considerable portion of the cultivated land in the lower valley of the Nile is still irrigated through the old basin system.

The advent of Biblical times saw the science and practice of irrigation well established. In II Kings, 3: 16–17 we read, "And he said, thus saith the Lord, make the valley full of ditches for Ye shall not see wind, neither shall Ye see rains; yet, that valley shall be filled with water, that Ye may drink, both Ye and your cattle and your beasts."

The British Society of Anthropology accepts as fundamental the doctrine that, historically, civilization followed the invention of irrigation.

Prehistoric Indians of the Southwest practiced irrigation. Within the boundaries of the Casa Grande National Monument in New Mexico can be seen traces of the ditches they constructed to irrigate their fields. The first Spanish explorers of the Rio Grande Valley found the Indians watering the thirsty soil as their forefathers had done for unnumbered generations before them. In southern Colorado, northern Arizona, and New Mexico are remains of irrigation works of whose origin even tradition is silent.

It is well for us to review and remember these historic examples.

In viewing the problem of reclamation in the 17 Western States of this Union, we should take a look at the accomplishments of the past, the problems of today, and anticipate the needs of tomorrow.

The Federal reclamation program which was activated by the Reclamation Act of June 17, 1902, was a natural outgrowth of the previous land disposal program of the Federal Government. The policies which had been adequate for land settlement in humid areas, such as the 160-acre homestead under the act of 1862, was of little value in the arid western part of these United States. Other programs were tried and were helpful. The important thing to remember is that this Nation was founded primarily by those who wished to acquire their own land, a hope denied them in their homeland on the Old Continent. Land policy on this continent over the years, was a struggle between the speculators and the land monopolist on one hand, and the individual enterpriser on the other. Freedom loving and rugged pioneers compelled the Nation to accept the principle that he, who first reclaimed the land from the forest and the Indian, had the first right to its possession. This Nation owes much to the determined men who made farms in the wilderness and then insisted upon the ownership of same.

The first attempt to meet the needs of the West in land disposal policies was the Desert Act of 1877 permitting entry on 640 acres. There were many abuses under this act and modifications were necessary in view of increased settlement requirements, which reduced allowable acreage to 320 acres and the settlers were encouraged to provide their own irrigation systems. Some 10 million acres were entered and patented under this act and this land formed the basis of the private enterprise development of irrigated lands in the West.

The Carey Act of 1894 anticipated the development of arid lands by the States. It permitted grants up to 1 million acres for settlement under State supervision and on terms very similar to those of the Desert Act. Many of the States endeavored to establish policies for development under this act. However, the accomplishments were not as great as expected, except for certain limited areas; approximately 1 million acres were settled under this program. This act is still in operation.

As the West was settled under the Desert Act and the Carey Act, many of the easily developed projects were put in operation and the more expensive ones were bypassed, as the cost was too great to be borne by the individual or by the State. This brought about the Reclamation Act of 1902, under which we now operate and under which the wealth of the Nation has been tremendously increased.

While there was a vast amount of water in the western rivers the erratic flow from season to season and from year to year was the big problem to be met and overcome. By 1900 the firm flow of nearly every stream was overappropriated and in the later part of the growing season many crops starved for water and guns were brought into play as a method of enforcing rights. It became increasingly evident that the off-season flow of these rivers had to be impounded so that these lifegiving waters could be used during the season of need.

While there have been numerous amendments and modifications of the Reclamation Act of 1902, the basic principles of this act have been retained, including the family-size farm. The entire Nation has gained a substantial value from the more than 125,000 family-size farms, receiving water from this program. This is exemplified by the fact that to date taxes to the Federal Government paid by these units total more than $3 billion, a substantial amount in excess of the total reclamation expenditures of $2.4 billion. These values will continue for generations to come and will pour money into all of the States of the Union in payment for the variety of goods produced by plants, large and small, in all of the United States.

All of the people of this Nation are dependent upon the soil and water resources for their daily existence. A great portion of our food, clothing, shelter, and industrial raw materials come from these resources. Certainly this will continue in the future, and it is now established that by 1960, our 166 million people will increase to 178 million and by the year of 1975, we will have reached 225 million people. Certainly the critics of the reclamation program do not realize the demand on agriculture which is being brought about by the ever-increasing population. These critics talk long and loud about surpluses, when in truth and fact, these are reserves, and are needed by us to keep our dominant position in this world of nations the same as a reserve of airplanes, guns, ammunition, tanks, etc.

During the past 35 years, there has been no material increase in our total crop land acreage in the United States. Lands brought into production during that period through reclamation, drainage, and clearing have been approximately offset by lands that have gone out of production due to withdrawal to nonagricultural uses, erosions, and deterioration.

In the continental United States there are approximately 1,904,000,000 acres of land. Some is good and some is not good and, of course, some is almost worthless to agriculture. Approximately 409 million acres are now being used to grow cultivated crops. Approximately 600 million acres are classed as forest or woodlands, and approximately 189 million acres are nonagricultural.

At present more than 115 million acres is being occupied by cities, roads, highways, railroad right-of-way, defense establishments, factories, mines, parks, airports, etc. Approximately 80 million acres of this was originally good farming land. The withdrawal of agricultural lands for nonagricultural purposes is accelerating each year. In fact, over 1 million acres of farmable land is annually going to homesites, industrial, and commercial developments, highways, airports, and other nonagricultural uses.

Good land is being taken out of agricultural production at the rate of about 1,800,000 acres per year for the following reasons:

	Acres
Municipal expansion, suburban development, airports, industrial and military establishments, highways, etc	1,100,000
Tree planting	200,000
Soil erosion	400,000
Water logging, salting, sediment deposition, etc	100,000
Total	1,800,000

If such withdrawals of land from agricultural uses continue at the present rate for another 15 years, a total of more than 100 million acres of land suitable for agriculture will be retired to nonagricultural purposes. During the past 15 years enough land has been made unavailable for farm use to represent the equivalent of 225,000 average size American farms.

Even with the improved seeds, farming methods and fertilizers together with the substitution of motor power in lieu of horse and mule power, we are still facing a complete balance of supply and demand by 1962, and all of this in face of the fact that, since 1920 to the present time, the number of crop acres has been reduced from 3.9 acres to 2.5 acres per person.

Reclamation development has added very little to the so-called surpluses and, in fact, has contributed more to the improvement of the diet of the American people by the production of more vegetables, fresh fruits, and nuts, and we are now eating 3 times as much citrus fruits as we did 20 years ago, 4 times as much carrots, etc. This means a stronger people; the boy of today at 16 is 6 inches taller and 31 pounds heavier than his grandfather was at the same age. Grandpa, in 1877, when he was 14 weighed 87 pounds and was 4½ feet tall. His grandson today is 5 feet 3 inches tall and weighs 118 pounds. A better diet has materially contributed to this improvement of the American people.

In addition to the increased agricultural requirements for water, it is anticipated that within the next 20 years, our industrial and domestic need for water will increase by 145 billion gallons a day. This is equivalent to the flow of 11 Colorado Rivers, and, of course, the Colorado is one of the largest streams of the West. There will also be a great increase in the use of electric power. Part of this will be by steam generation, yet much of it can be obtained by harnessing the flow of our rivers, all of which will again contribute to the national wealth.

In conclusion, those of us who have a real desire for a strong and healthy Nation for generations to come must look and plan many years into the future for the conservation of our soil and water resources and we well know that it takes from 5 to 25 years to develop a reclamation project from its inception to its completion, so, without adequate planning in advance, we can well be caught short on food supplies before we realize it.

Federal reclamation produces only a small percentage of surplus crops: Wheat, less than 2 percent; upland cotton, about 6.5 percent; corn, about one-third of 1 percent; tobacco, none; rice, less than 1 percent.

Our population is increasing at the rate of 2,800,000 annually and that rate is accelerating each year. Present estimates for 1975 are from 214 to 221 million. Thus, it is evident that agricultural surpluses will disappear long before most reclamation projects now being authorized are brought into agricultural production.

It is the program of NRA to assist in the continuing development of our natural resources through irrigation, so we will not be in the position of having too little too late.

In keeping our Nation strong, it is not a question of guns or groceries, but it is a question of guns and groceries.

I have no time for the critics of the reclamation program. Their chirping reminds me of an old preacher who, in one of his prayers, said, "Lord, we can take care of the big things, but deliver us from the gnats."

The Problem of Water in India

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. THYE

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, July 17, 1956

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Water!" published in the Lutheran magazine for July 18, 1956. The article deals with the problem of water in India. It is timely and very informative.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WATER—THERE'S A DEEP WELL NOW IN THIS DROUGHT STRICKEN VILLAGE IN INDIA

(By Arne Souik)

"There is no denying it," wrote a Swedish missionary in mid-1953, "it has been terribly difficult these last 5 or 6 years to be a missionary in South India."

His problem was the lack of water. The church had been trying to build congrega-

tional work among the simple people of rural India. They had helped them build little village chapels. They had opened schools. They had employed catechists and teachers. The toil of many years seemed to be bearing fruit.

But when, year after year, the monsoons failed, and even the wells of the richest landowners went dry, when the seed grain never sprouted in the fields, and the people began to eat roots and the leaves of jungle cactus, then life came to an end in the villages. The highways to cities were filled with migrants trying to find some way of maintaining life. The village work of years was at a standstill.

The hardest thing to face was that there seemed to be no way of moving that towering mountain of human suffering. For what solution, after all, was there in the limited distribution of food relief that had come from Christian people in America? Or what help would it be if the missionaries or the mission should share all they had?

This was the situation which inspired the well-drilling project of the church of Sweden Mission—a program which, in the past 3 years, has brought hope and new life to village after drought-stricken village.

The Government of India had placed high on the list of priorities for the 5-year plan the search for sources of a dependable and hygienic water supply. But its program must be limited to the larger cities and towns.

Smaller places, even if they were able to make the required pledge to pay part of the cost, were still faced with the prospect of almost endless waiting for their turn, and in the meantime, more years of barren fields, and death.

The Swedish church "Action for Wells" in South India has been filling the gap. The first well-drilling machine, accompanied by a Swedish technician, arrived from Sweden late in 1953. Another was added in 1954, and now there is a third. By the end of the first year's work the light and efficient machines had brought water to 46 villages, including among them places located in Palladam, a district of almost constant drought.

The work is being carried on under the leadership of Pastor Yngve Frykholm. Engineer Ragnar Edervall headed Indian crews whose increasing efficiency and spirit have impressed government engineers. But not only officials are impressed.

"Our well-driller," reads one report, "is a huge success. For Indians it is an unparalleled sight to see a white man working with his hands all day long, smearing himself with sweat and oil, strong as a bear.

"As he lifts one end of a heavy drill shaft and throws it aside, a murmur of fearful wonder passes through the throng of onlookers. Without having had time to learn the language, he makes himself understood by his crew, and he has become a friend of the big and small in the villages and mission stations."

Last month there were a hundred hand-operated deep-well pumps in use in the villages of the Coimbatore and Madurai districts. Three teams of Indian drillers and assistants were carefully trained to continue the work after the Swedish engineer, Mr. Edervall, returned to his homeland last year. A full-time mechanic with an assistant makes regular tours of the installations for checkup and overhauls.

In Kosumadai (one of the early projects), a 100-meter-deep well, drilled with much difficulty and considerable damage to the equipment, failed to find water. Months passed before a second deep well was successful. The whole village gathered before the little chapel for a thanksgiving service that has since become traditional—with singing and prayer and garlands of flowers and a talk about the one who told his disciples of the blessedness of offering, to "even the least of these my brethren," a cup of water.

Wells are drilled on the common lands of the villages, thus assuring that the water will be available to all. No payment is required either for drilling the well or for the water drawn. But one rigid requirement is laid down—that caste and outcaste shall receive water without discrimination.

Missionary Frykholm tells the story of the first pumping from the well in Santhipuram:

"Just 10 days after beginning we were ready to undertake the anxiously awaited test pumping. We had gone 37 meters deep, and we could hear the splash of water from the black depths of the hole. The long sections of pipe were coupled together and sunk into the well.

"The report of our work had gone throughout South India, and it happened that that very morning we were receiving a visiting group of journalists and officials. They stood with the villagers in a close-packed ring watching in suspense as the pumping began.

"And water came, full splashing flood. Muddy at first—and some villagers looked a bit disappointed. But the distinguished onlookers walked away satisfied, for it was calculated that the well could pump 1,000 gallons an hour.

"You should have been there to witness the scene that followed, as the flow of mud turned to clear, fresh water. Two old men crept forward, each with his jar. Might they ask to have them filled? Certainly, take all you want, that's what its for. Those two bent, wizened laborers, who had to work an hour to pay for every jar of water they used, filled them now with the finest water they had ever seen—free.

"All at once the place was crowded with people. From every house in the village they came rushing with their jars, some of them newly polished and shiny, others worn and dented, some simple earthen jars whose holes had been plugged with cloth—a collection of every kind of receptacle, got hold of hastily anywhere, as many as they could carry.

"Old women and little girls with their brothers on their hips and jars on their heads, crouching outcasts and landed farmers, all came running like mad, all afraid that the water might cease to flow.

"We shouted until we were hoarse, trying in vain to form a line. We threatened to stop the pump. Finally we forced our way through and filled the jars ourselves. There was shouting and laughing, but there was also a sense of panic—'Don't let the water stop until I've got some.'

"History was made, too, that day as the old-age prejudices broke down before this streaming water. It is unheard of for a caste Hindu to take water from the same well as an outcaste. It is equally unthinkable for an outcaste to dare to take water where a caste Hindu has been with his jar. We watched carefully to see what would happen. Would the caste Hindus stay away if we permitted the outcastes to take water?

"Resolutely we filled the jars in turn, one for a caste Hindu, one for an outcaste. There was embarrassment at first, but in the joy of having enough water in the village the people overlooked their prejudices. It was when Ragnar Edervall and I got too tired to fill any more jars that the real revolution took place in Sinthipuram.

"Two of the leading Hindus took our places and filled jar after jar. As the first woman of the timid crowd of outcastes got her filled jar from the hand of her high-caste master she nearly fell backward in astonishment. A murmur of surprise went through the crowd. But soon this, too, was taken as natural.

"There seems now to be a surplus of water in spite of the size of the village and the apparently immense need for fresh water. Perhaps this can be used to cultivate the land nearby.

"We hope that a new spirit of understanding and collaboration between rich and poor, high and low, Christian and Hindu, will grow out of their newly discovered sense of solidarity.

"Tomorrow we move the machine to another village. Then we install the permanent pump here. And next week we shall bring another well-drilling machine from Madras. What a glorious life."

Small wonder that the missionary to whom life in South India had been so hard could end his report. "Hvor haerligt liv—What glorious life."

Excerpts From Speeches on Various Subjects

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. HARRY McGREGOR
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 17, 1956

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, as long as it has been my honor to represent the 17th Ohio District in the House of Representatives, I have endeavored to keep the people of my district familiar with my activities and my position on various issues.

On July 2, I inserted in the RECORD excerpts of speeches that I have made on farm problems. Today, Mr. Speaker, under consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include excerpts of various speeches I have made on other subjects in order that the people may be familiar with the true record and my position on national issues.

If anyone desires to find these remarks in full, they are printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on the dates indicated:

WOMEN OF 60 SHOULD RECEIVE SOCIAL SECURITY

(March 18, 1955)

Mr. Speaker, I have introduced a bill in the House of Representatives to amend the Social Security Act to lower from 65 to 60 the age at which women may become entitled to benefits thereunder.

Mr. Speaker, 221,242 American women between 46 to 64 have applied for jobs in State employment offices.

The married woman under 65 does not have enough to get along on even though her husband is receiving social-security benefits. If she becomes a widow before reaching the age of 65 she receives a lump sum of $255 from social security. She must seek employment.

Reducing the age to 60 at which women may become entitled to benefits will cost 1 percent of the payroll costs. Compared to the sum of moneys sent to help other women throughout the world, is 1 percent too much to ask?

I believe this bill to be an economic necessity as the bulk of employers close the doors to women in this age bracket. According to the questionnaire sent to the 17th Ohio District, 68 percent of my constituents favor lowering the age so that women could receive benefits at 60.

TRUTH ABOUT TAX REDUCTION

(March 18, 1955)

Mr. Speaker, some New Deal orators have been exhorting the public with the usual extravagant political claims of being the party of the little man in tax-reduction measures.

Let us look at the record. It will speak for itself and it will show that under New Deal philosophies the so-called little fellow

has had to pay higher taxes. It has been the Republican Party which has cut taxes for the lower-income groups. Since the first income tax law was passed by a Democratic Congress in 1913, there have been 15 income tax increases. Democratic Congresses voted all but one of these increases.

The New Dealers put low-income people and wage earners on the tax roll. In 1932 there were 1,900,000 taxable Federal returns. In 1952 there were 46,800,000 such returns. Republicans did the cutting 7 out of the 10 times that income taxes have been reduced since 1913.

In 1954, Republicans reduced taxes by a total of $7.4 billion * * * the largest cut in any 1 year in history. The Republicans reduced taxes on electric-light bulbs, stoves, refrigerators, electric toasters, telephone and telegraph bills, pharmaceutical supplies, and many other excise taxes. This cut benefited all taxpayers.

Sixty-two cents out of each dollar in the tax reduction went to individuals with approximately 25 cents of this going to taxpayers with incomes under $5,000.

The New Dealers have been endeavoring to play politics with tax legislation claiming that they want to decrease income tax exemptions. Again, I say, let's look at the record. The following chart shows the exemptions from 1931 to 1954:

	Republican 1925–31	Democratic					Republican 1948
		1932–39	1940	1941	1942	1944	
Single	$1,500	$1,000	$800	$750	$500	$500	$600
Married	3,500	2,500	1,500	1,500	1,200	1,000	1,200
Dependent	400	400	400	400	350	500	600

Farm Problems—Controls

(May 4, 1955)

Mr. Speaker, my farmers are of the definite opinion they want a minimum of Federal controls and are looking forward to the time when they can live as free citizens without Government interference.

Why not establish a program that will ultimately allow us to get rid of controls, Mr. Speaker, so that the farmers of today will be able to make an honest living and not be dictated to by some bureaucrat who, in many instances, knows nothing about farm problems.

Social Security

(August 4, 1955)

Mr. Speaker, now that the First Session of the 84th Congress has adjourned and I cannot be accused of playing politics, I want to take this opportunity to thank the Democratic Majority Leadership, as well as the Republican Minority Leadership, and the Majority Members, as well as the Minority Members, for their assistance in making it possible to give the aged people the relief I asked for when I introduced H. R. 5064 on March 18, 1955.

Especially do I appreciate the thoughtful consideration given to the subject by the members of the Ways and Means Committee. I am also grateful for the many telegrams and letters I have received from people all over the country complimenting me on the introduction of this legislation. I am certain their recommendations and suggestions to me, as well as to their Congressmen, played an important part in having the House of Representatives pass social-security legislation granting age reduction from 65 to 60 years to women who desire to receive social-security benefits.

Permit All Farmers to Vote on Wheat Referendum

(January 23, 1956)

Mr. Speaker, I think we have become a great Nation because of the many freedoms it is our privilege to enjoy. That freedom has been protected at the ballot box by an expression of the views of the majority. With this thought in mind, I have introduced a bill, H. R. 8697, to permit wheat farmers, including those who plant less than 15 acres of wheat, to vote in any wheat marketing referendum conducted by the Secretary of Agriculture.

Regardless of the "pros" and "cons" of a marketing program, the majority of the people should determine whether it should be in effect or not in effect.

Permit Farmers to Grow What They Need

(January 23, 1956)

Mr. Speaker, I have introduced a bill, H. R. 8698, which will exempt from marketing quotas farmers who raise grain entirely for their own use on their farms either as feed or seed. I feel this legislation will give freedom from a program to that group of farmers who now do not derive benefit. Certainly in this great Republic responsible farmers should have the right to grow the crops that are necessary to sustain their own farms without Federal control or interference.

Give Rural Mail Service to All

(January 26, 1956)

Mr. Speaker, I have introduced a bill, H. R. 8845, which gives authority to the Postmaster General, subject to the postal laws and regulations, the right to extend rural mail routes. This bill, if it becomes a law, would give rural mail delivery, as nearly as practicable, to the entire rural population of the United States.

After all, Mr. Speaker, we are all citizens and we are entitled to equitable service and treatment regardless of where we live.

Editorial on President Eisenhower

(January 30, 1956)

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I am enclosing an editorial appearing in one of the outstanding newspapers of my district, the Mount Vernon (Ohio) News. In well-chosen words, it clearly defines the position of our President and recognizes that his performance in office confirms the feeling of trust and confidence that the people of our Nation have for him. The records will show, Mr. Speaker, that President Eisenhower has dedicated himself to the preservation of peace. The people trust him, Mr. Speaker, regardless of his politics. He has given us full employment without war. He has balanced the budget without jeopardizing defense or any other segment of our economy. He has cut waste and unnecessary expenditures and has given dignity to his office.

Farmers—Social Security

(February 22, 1956)

Mr. Speaker, I am today inserting in the Congressional Record petitions signed by many of my constituents of the 17th Congressional District of Ohio. You will note, Mr. Speaker, that these citizens are asking for the repeal of that portion of Public Law 761, or any other social-security law which contains compulsion for farmers, farmer-employer, or the farm owner.

Regardless of the merits or demerits of this subject, I am one who firmly believes that all should be given an opportunity to be heard and their views brought to the attention of this Congress. I respectfully ask that the proper authorities, or committee, of this Congress give every consideration to the request contained in these petitions.

The Truth About Taxes

(May 2, 1956)

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to put into the Record "The Truth About Taxes." The records are available for anyone to see and the publication of these records, Mr. Speaker, certainly should stop some of the wild remarks and statements that are being made relative to the tax program which we all admit is high. The record will show that unnecessary expenditures are being cut and that for the first time in many years, we have a balanced budget. We hope, with the continuation of these efficiencies that at an early date we will again be able to cut taxes and reduce our national debt. A reduction in taxes means an increase in buying power or an increase in wages for all. I insert herewith an article entitled "The Truth About Taxes."

"THE TRUTH ABOUT TAXES

"Democrats parroting the Truman fabrication that, of the '$7 billion tax cut put across in 1953' by the Republicans, 'corporations and people with incomes over $5,000 a year got 91 percent of the cut and all the millions of taxpayers with incomes of less than $5,000 a year got only 9 percent of the cut,' should be corrected as follows:

"1. Of the total $7½ billion annual tax cut made possible by Republicans in 1954, 62 percent of the cuts went to individuals, only 38 percent to corporations.

"2. Not 9 percent, but 23 percent went to people in the under-$5,000 category.

"3. Most people got a 10–11 percent income tax cut; but for those in the highest brackets the cuts scaled downward to only 1 percent at the top.

"4. The under-$5,000 group received more than its fair share of the income tax cuts, because the people who paid 33 percent of the total income taxes collected under the Democrats got 37 percent of the tax reductions made possible by the Republicans in 1954.

"(The above figures are official Treasury Department computations.)

"5. The real 'High Tax Party' is the Democratic Party, because 14 of the 15 income-tax increases (but only 3 of the 10 reductions) since 1913 were enacted by Democrats.

"Little fellow gets break

"6. The average $5,000 family man (with wife and two children) in 1932 paid only $12 in Federal income taxes—but he paid $266 in 1952—22 times as much. Republicans made it possible to give the $4,000 man a 10 percent income tax cut. At the same time, the millionaire was given only a 1 percent cut in the 1954 Republican tax reduction, proving that, proportionately, the little fellow received a much bigger tax break than the big fellow.

"7. The Roosevelt-Truman administrations in 20 years increased the Federal tax burden on everyone by 31 times—from $2 billion to $63 billion. Hidden taxes that were unknown in 1932 mushroomed under the Democrats to the point where by 1950 they exceeded $700 a year per family."

Tariff Program

(June 18, 1956)

Mr. Speaker, I am today in receipt of a chart showing what our so-called reciprocal trade and low tariff program is doing to one of our great industries, who for years has

given employment to many, many people. The chart that I am inserting shows a steady decrease in earnings, in total wages and total man hours worked.

Mr. Speaker, for many years I have been calling to the attention of the Congress this situation and others of similar nature as it affects industries in my district. It is disgraceful that we are asking our American labor, manufacturers, and farmers to compete with a product produced in other countries by low wage rate labor. I say it is time to stop such a procedure.

Farm-to-Market Roads

(June 26, 1956)

The bill, H. R. 10660, Federal Highway Act of 1956, retains the provision which I sponsored in 1954 that gives permission to the State Highway Departments and the local authorities to use Federal funds on farm-to-market roads. The specifications covering these roads can be drawn by local county engineers with the approval of the Highway Department and need only to meet the needs of the local communities. This means that Federal Highway funds can be used on farm-to-market roads without rigid adherence to Federal specifications which often in the past, because of the exorbitant cost, has prevented the construction of needed roads in many sections of rural areas.

Relocation of Utility Facilities

(June 26, 1956)

Section 113 of H. R. 10660 makes it permissable for Federal funds to be used to reimburse a State for additional relocation costs which the State had paid for under its own laws. Section 113 is the same as the bill as passed by the House. This section has been recommended and accepted by the conferees recognizing the equity of reimbursing utilities for the cost of relocating facilities when required for Federal Aid Highway projects.

After lengthy discussion, the conferees have endeavored that this section makes it clear that it is the intention of the Federal Government to assume its apportionate share of utility relocation costs whenever a State allows such costs. Under the existing practice, Mr. Speaker, of the Bureau of Public Roads, Federal funds may participate in utility relocation costs to the same extent as other construction costs without percentage limitations based on the State's apportionment. This legislation encourages the States to review their contemporary status and take objective action in accordance with such review. Mr. Speaker, this section will be of great assistance to small utilities, both public and private, especially including the REA, small telephone companies and small villages through which highway systems run and now have storm sewers, water sewage and lighting utilities which do not bring in the revenue necessary to relocate if compelled to do so by new highway alinement.

Budget and Savings—Public Debt

(July 16, 1956)

Mr. Speaker, I am most happy to note that in the final report of the fiscal year we finally have arrived at a place where we again have a balanced budget. The records will show, Mr. Speaker, that Government spending has been cut from $10 billion to $14 billion below the level of the previous administration, despite the continued heavy demands of the cold war. The record shows that Government spending is taking only 19 percent of the national income, which is a 6 percent cut from the 25 percent share of the previous administration.

I repeat, the 1956 budget has been balanced and we will have approximately $2 billion surplus. Mr. Speaker, this is a good record but I firmly believe that with the continuation of our existing practies we will be able to again lower our national debt and give the people of our Nation another tax reduction.

Communism and Security

(July 16, 1956)

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to note that we have new anti-Communist laws which will protect our country and our people. Among these new laws is one revoking citizenship of Communist conspirators convicted in the future. (2) Increase penalities for harboring Communist fugitives from justice. (3) Extend sabotage definition to include biological warfare items. (4) Require registration of Communist-action and Communist-front printing equipment. These new laws and others of similar nature will go a long ways toward stamping out Communism in our country. Certainly our loyal citizens will appreciate this added protection.

Defense

(July 16, 1956)

Mr. Speaker, I have made many trips to my district during the last year and I firmly believe that the people it is my honor to represent have confidence in President Eisenhower's judgment as to what constitutes adequate strength. I sincerely believe, Mr. Speaker, that the President knows more about military affairs than many of his citizens. Our ground forces, air defense squadrons, surface ships and guided missiles are completely modern and ready for immediate service at any time. I am sure that this administration's defense policy has achieved the greatest efficiency, economy, preparedness, and adaptability in peacetime history. A prosperous economy easily convertible to war has been maintained while cutting defense costs by $10 billion. Research in weapons has permitted shift from manpower to weapon power. I am sure that all will agree, regardless of politics, that this is an excellent record.

Labor

(July 16, 1956)

Mr. Speaker, I have just received a series of various reports relative to our economy, which of course included the labor field. I am indeed happy to note that employment is highest in history. An average of 63.2 million had jobs, which smashed all previous records. This record shows, Mr. Speaker, that approximately 3 million more held peacetime job than were held previously, even in war. We are in a sound economy, Mr. Speaker, when it is possible for our people to have jobs without war.

Both hourly and weekly wages are at an all-time record high averaging nearly 13 percent higher in peactime 1955 than in wartime 1952.

Taxes

(July 16, 1956)

Mr. Speaker, I am one who firmly believes that a heavy tax burden weakens the economy of our country. A tax increase means lower wages because of the decrease of our purchasing power. A tax reduction means an increase in wages because we have more money to spend. I am happy to note that this administration has given Americans the biggest tax break in history—starting in 1954. Each taxpaying family has received an average tax cut of $100 per year. Here's how this administration helped everybody:

First. Reduced personal income taxes 10 percent for most taxpayers—saving $3 billion.

Second. Cut excise taxes on handbags, cosmetics, movies, household appliances, etc.—saving $1 billion.

Third. Revised the whole tax structure, reducing taxes by giving bigger medical deductions, special aid for working mothers, retired people, parents with working dependents, partial relief against double taxation of dividends, liberalized depreciation rules, etc.—saving $1.4 billion.

Fourth. Working widow can now deduct $600 paid for care of her children under 12 years—saving $120 on $3,000 income.

Fifth. Parents can now deduct $600 for minor child as dependent even if he earns over $600—saving $120 on $3,300 income, $132 on $6,000 income.

Sixth. Retirement income of persons over 65 not drawing nontaxable social security benefits (school teachers, policemen, firemen, etc.) is now exempt up to $1,200—saving up to $240 a year.

Seventh. Excise tax cuts on luggage, jewelry, telephone bills, movies, cosmetics, etc. give Americans $1 billion more spending money a year.

Be Sure To Vote

Mr. Speaker, a day of decision will be election day, November 6, 1956. We have become a great Nation because our citizens are interested, and each and every one play an important part in our Government. We can continue to be a great Nation only if every qualified voter regards it as his duty to exercise his franchise and prove to the world that Americans value their right to take part directly in the election of Government officials and in the management and control of our Republic. The number of ballots cast will demonstrate to the world how much we value that privilege and will emphasize that the American form of government marches forward with determination, vigor, and strength. Everyone should carefully analyze the candidates to determine whether or not they believe in the philosophy of government that has made America a great Nation. Every candidate should make known his position on the issues confronting us, and also make known his record. My record is public and I invite your investigation. The record will show that we are winning the greatest battle of all time in preserving our form of Government, restoring real stability in our domestic and foreign affairs, and giving us all what we hope and pray for, "a lasting peace." The continuation of this program calls for outstanding leadership, honesty, integrity, careful planning and judicial administration of the law. You will be assuming your proportionate share of this responsibility when you go to the polls on Tuesday, November 6, and vote for the candidate of your choice.

Be sure and vote Tuesday, November 6.

Advice From Jim Farley

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 17, 1956

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following editorial which appeared in the Daily News, of Tarrytown, N. Y., on Friday, July 6, 1956:

Advice From Jim Farley

We know James A. Farley pretty well in Westchester. And although this is a pre-

dominantly Republican county and Mr. Farley is an all-out Democrat, we usually get along just fine.

Consequently, it should interest a lot of us to read what Jim Farley says about the Hoover Commission, on which he served, and its report.

"My friends on Capitol Hill tell me they are much impressed with the report as a whole even though they may as individuals differ with certain provisions," says Mr. Farley.

"But when I ask them why the Hoover report legislation isn't moving faster they tell me in effect that they just simply aren't being asked enough."

So Mr. Farley advises that anybody who wants the recommendations of the Hoover Commission on Government Reorganization put into effect should write his Congressman.

Jim Farley should know what he's talking about. He has been close to the Washington scene ever since he entered FDR's first Cabinet back there in 1933.

At that time, it is interesting to recall, the Federal budget was $4 billion. Now it's around $66 billion.

In that year of 1933 there were 450 Federal agencies. There are now 1,900.

This Hoover Commission report shows how action by Congress and the executive branch could save between $5 billion and $6 billion and bring substantial cuts in taxes.

President Eisenhower favors the report. But Congress hasn't done much about it because "they just simply aren't being asked enough."

It's your turn, then, Westchester taxpayer. How about writing that letter to your Congressman?

Rivers and Harbors

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OVERTON BROOKS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 3, 1956

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I include the address made by the Honorable CHARLES A. HALLECK, Congressman from Indiana, assistant minority leader of the House of Representatives, before the 43d Annual Convention of the National Rivers and Harbors Congress in Washington, D. C., on May 11, 1956. It is as follows:

REMARKS BY HON. CHARLES A. HALLECK, MEMBER OF CONGRESS

Mr. President, my colleagues, and members of the National Rivers and Harbors Congress, if the distinguished gentlemen who have preceded me in welcoming you to these parts haven't convinced you that we are glad to have you in town, I don't know what I might add as a clincher.

It's good to have another "Congress" in town.

Misery loves company.

Maybe you folks can take some of the heat off us for the next few days.

As a matter of fact, I suppose some of the folks back in my district would say that I ought to take advantage of my appearance here this morning to put a little heat on you for support of our own harbor project.

You know, I've been trying ever since I came to Congress to help sell the idea that Indiana ought to have a public harbor at the mouth of Burns Waterway on Lake Michigan.

I've been in pretty distinguished company, too: Republicans and Democrats. Governors from the time of the late Paul McNutt to George Craig, and Senators down the line, including one who is now a Supreme Court Justice—Sherman Minton—have all lent their support.

We've been working at it for more than 20 years and we haven't got past the survey stage yet.

We've had so many studies made that probably if we took all the documents that have been compiled and dumped them in Lake Michigan, we'd have a a good start on a breakwater.

I guess it's a good thing I didn't try to make a living as a lobbyist. I'd have starved to death a long time ago.

But I must say that my experience with the Indiana Burns Harbor plan and the troubles that crop up from time to time along the Wabash, Kankakee, and Iroquois Rivers, which run through my district, have made me realize that there aren't many subjects more complex, more frustrating, and, I might add, more prone to controversy, than this whole business of the sound and orderly development of our national water and land resources.

Quite naturally, it would be difficult to find anyone who would admit that he wasn't for the orderly development of these resources.

Everybody is for economy, too—if you take the "me" out of it.

Well, in any event, I suspect your experience in this field of resources development has been an education to you as it has to me.

In the activities of your congress, as in the activities of the Congress of the United States, broad public understanding of the problems involved is a continuing necessity.

In your field of endeavor, you come face to face with two pretty tough customers—Mother Nature and human nature.

With this in mind, I say sincerely that anything you may accomplish—and your accomplishments have been considerable—is nothing short of heroic.

So, we welcome you to Washington as fellow workers in the vineyard—as allies in a great cause.

Only the most short-sighted of citizens would deny the vital importance of the program to which your organization is dedicated.

But whereas you, by choice, confined your efforts to one field, wide though it may be, the responsibilities of the Congress of the United States are of necessity far more diverse.

I think I can safely say there is none among us, in the House and in the Senate, who would not wish that far more attention could be given not only to this matter of resources development, but to the many other vital areas of national importance which come before us for consideration.

But we get spread pretty thin.

At the same time, I think it is safe to say that all of us wish more money could be appropriated for these projects in which you are interested so that progress could be speeded.

But the taxpayer's dollar is spread pretty thin these days, too.

Thus, as you must compromise in your studies, bringing together somehow the many interests that are affected by projects involving rivers and harbors, we in the Congress must also weigh values and reconcile conflicts as best we can.

It is our obligation to strike such balances as we can between what we would like to do and what we can do.

It is our complicated job to reach decisions on pleas for more attention to, and more money for, the defense needs of the country—for more aid to schools, more aid for highways, for health, for old-age assistance, and many other things, having in mind, at the same time, the capacity of our great domestic economy to shoulder the burdens of public spending.

By your past actions, you have demonstrated a gratifying understanding of the Government's role in this great work of resources development.

You have proved yourselves to be unselfish friends, patient and anxious to be helpful.

I assure you, your attitudes and your diligence have been deeply appreciated by those of us in Government who know of your work.

I hope, for your part, that you have found, and will continue to find, that we in the Government recognize fully the profound importance of the cause for which you labor—without reward, may I say, other than the personal satisfaction of knowing that you are performing a service to your Nation.

So welcome, indeed, to the Capital.

We are happy to have you here, to meet with you and to discuss with you our mutual interests, our mutual problems, and our mutual aspirations for America.

Inflation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHESTER E. MERROW
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 17, 1956

Mr. MERROW. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein an editorial from the Carroll County Independent, Center Ossipee, N. H., Friday, July 6, 1956, entitled "Inflation."

The editorial follows:

INFLATION

All too many people who hear the term "inflation" on television and radio, or read the word "inflation" in the papers, think that it is an abstract term that does not concern them, and is simply another sonerous earfilling phrase used by politicians. We New Hampshire folks, being thrifty and saving, have the laudable habit of playing squirrel with every available dollar and salting it away in bank or bonds for the rainy day to come.

But inflation steals constantly from the value of such savings. Hard money and the hard dollar is long gone and will probably never return. We now use paper money.

And that paper money, or that paper dollar, has value only in the goods and services which it will command.

According to reasonably accurate statistics, the purchasing power of the dollar has shrunk about 45 percent since 1946. This means that the man with $1,000 in the bank in 1946 now has only $550, as far as commanding goods and services are concerned.

He may still have the same $1,000 sitting safely in the same bank, but for all practical purposes, $450 has been drawn from the account.

There are no signs of any long term deflation, or return of the purchasing power of the dollar. Deflation means less money in circulation, a lowering of wages and prices and obviously less employment.

We cannot visualize either political party permitting such an event. When the inevitable down swing comes in the business cycle, the moment it begins to cut deep enough so that people are beginning to get hurt, there will be a rush for Washington by town, county, city and State political leaders who will demand quick pump priming and the appropriation of billions of dollars for make work projects.

Only a Congressman with a sincre desire to commit quick political suicide would vote against such projects. Economic forecasters are all in disagreement as to when

the economic downturn will come and what its duration will be. But they are all in agreement that in the long run, over a term of years, the dollar will buy less and less and that inflation will slowly continue.

Of course there will be down turns in business. There will be gluts of cars and television sets and washing machines. There will be short periods when the dollar will buy more than it does today. But averaged through the years the buying power of the dollar will slowly be eaten away. The process will be noticeable only when viewed over the perspective of the years. History shows that once the currency of a nation begins to depreciate, it does not recover.

This situation puts the average man in a hard place. Obviously he must have a savings account to cover emergencies. Obviously he should have some life insurance. Obviously he should pay for his home.

But after that what?

The well-to-do employ investment counsel and diversify their holdings between real estate, cash, bonds, preferred stocks and various types of common stocks.

The average thrifty man simply cannot do this. He has neither the time nor the skill to diversify his holdings between a few bonds, a few preferred stocks and a few shares of the best companies in the oil, building, automotive, chemical, steel, electrical, coal, public utility, railroad, office appliance, food, paper, tobacco, machinery, rubber and communications industries.

This objective can be accomplished easily however by purchasing shares in one or several of the many trust funds that have been available for the last third of a century.

Of course this is no royal road to riches. But the trust fund probably gives the best hedge against inflation that the average man can find. Giving wider diversification and far better management than the ordinary citizen can secure anywhere else, they can be used to fight a long delaying action against the deterioration of the dollar.

A Combination Hard To Beat

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PATRICK J. HILLINGS
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 17, 1956

Mr. HILLINGS, Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an article by Mr. Kyle Palmer, political editor of the Los Angeles Times, which appeared in that newspaper on Sunday, July 8, 1956. This article outlines the fine service rendered by Vice President NIXON.

The article follows:

A COMBINATION HARD TO BEAT

(By Kyle Palmer)

Assuming, as most of us are, that President Eisenhower will be a candidate for reelection and will be renominated by acclamation a little more than a month hence, the only remaining doubt to be resolved is the GOP choice for Vice President.

If we are to judge by the President's own attitude, his assumption is that RICHARD NIXON will again be selected as his running mate. Obviously, when at his request the Vice President embarks upon a vitally important international speechmaking tour in sensitive areas on the eve of the Republican national convention, there is more to it than a routine goodwill tour.

Mr. Eisenhower clearly feels that Mr. NIXON is a tremendous asset to the United States and as clearly wants all concerned to share his feeling.

Why, then, is there a question concerning the Republican vice presidential nomination?

The answer to that one is that a group of GOP irreconcilables—many remaining unidentified and undiscovered—have never given up a plan to ditch NIXON when convention time rolls around.

Will this project succeed? Probably not, but the existence of such an undertaking despite the President's plainly indicated desire to have NIXON on the ticket with him is worthy of examination.

Numerous political observers, including those with a proclivity for expressing themselves in print, have in recent weeks given some attention to the NIXON situation.

One of the most interesting and perceptive approaches was made recently by our own Bill Henry, now gallivanting around the world with the Vice Presidential party.

Bill made the point that even NIXON'S severest critics admit his remarkably able service as Vice President.

Bill also, with no foreknowledge of NIXON'S present international assignment, pointed up the significant difference between such chores when handed out, for instance, to other Vice Presidents.

NIXON has in every respect been not only an official representative of the United States but in full reality the representative of national policy as determined by President Eisenhower.

Contrary to the inferences of political detractors, Mr. Eisenhower would not send into critical international situations a man who, for any reason, could not be expected to do and say the right thing.

John S. Knight, in the Editor's Notebook of the Chicago Daily News, treats the NIXON issue frankly and bluntly, asking, "Why Do GOP Strategists Dodge the Issue of NIXON?"

His question, seemingly, was prompted by action of the GOP governors recently in ignoring NIXON in their petition urging Eisenhower to run again.

Knight failed to name the strategists he had in mind and, as by no means any considerable number of GOP strategists are actually ignoring "the issue of NIXON," he may have given the anti-Nixon wing a little more importance than it deserves.

But he did hit most of the high and familiar spots, especially the "I just don't like NIXON" contingent.

On that score I feel competent to say a word or two, having tried on many an occasion to get a satisfactory answer from the man or woman taking refuge in the comment.

Those pressed for an explanation of their feelings have dodged about in their own thinking without coming forth with a sensible or satisfactory reply.

"He is too young" certainly holds no meaning; this country has never had a Vice President who has faced more tests of his ability and none who has acquitted himself more commendably.

"NIXON is too rough in his campaign tactics" is a valid criticism from the standpoint of those who have felt the impact of his campaigning. But when all the facts are assembled and considered in their true relationship, NIXON emerges more as a tough than a rough campaigner.

Harry Truman, evidently persuaded by his own ire, has done his level best to keep alive the false charge that NIXON accused him and the Democratic Party of being pro-Communist.

Even NIXON'S friends must concede that there are a few rare occasions when he has made a remark not to be cataloged as the quintessence of pure tact and sound judgment. Where exists a public man against whom a like fault cannot be charged?

Faithful friend, loyal supporter, able subordinate are descriptions of the Vice President heard oftener than any other comment.

Why, then, the "I don't like NIXON" element, which so many recognize, but which so few can explain?

Any reasonably diligent searcher for the truth, I believe, will eventually conclude that, aside from the inescapable number of individuals who have some identifiable reason for not liking NIXON, the chief body of dislikers doesn't itself know the reason.

In the main, those who say they don't like him are the victims of ramifying influences put in motion by American Communists and their collaborators or dupes. First undertaken as a campaign of derogation, and to some extent doubtless still carried as such, the word-of-mouth attack on the Vice-President has caught many unthinking and uninformed persons in its wake.

One of the most frequently repeated and least deserved of all attacks made on NIXON embodies a charge that he is anti-Semetic. Origin of this charge is partly political, partly just plain, old-fashioned reckless gossip.

It is false and vicious. By temperament as well as by the circumstances of his birth and rearing DICK NIXON is a man tolerant of his fellows, their religions, their racial and national origins, and their ways of life.

You may say with some reason that Republican leaders who, for their own purposes, may oppose NIXON for responsible political office are not misled by such rumors, gossip, and reports.

True, but some have not been above the artifice of utilizing the same when opportunity offered.

Hence you may be reasonably sure that the anti-Nixon group in the Republican Party will endeavor to discover a way to accomplish its purpose—possibly without actuallly showing its hand—at the Republican National Convention in San Francisco come next August 20.

There is one group not heretofore mentioned here and which is seldom given the recognition it deserves—that very large, representative and effective band of Americans that could without too much difficulty become known as the "I Like NIXON" society.

Once you get it alert, on the job and in motion the true position of the young Vice President may assume the proportions with which the President of the United States evidently regards it.

Despite all the planning and the plotting, the best bet for the GPO ticket in 1956 still stands: Eisenhower and NIXON. It has been, will be, a combination hard to beat.

Shadows of Coming Spectaculars

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES M. QUIGLEY
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 17, 1956

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Speaker, on page A5513 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, under my extension, appears the text of an address given on July 12 by the Honorable George M. Leader, Governor of Pennsylvania.

Governor Leader, in his remarks, cited the record of the 1952 campaign, when the Eisenhower forces drowned the issues—the sense talking of Adlai Stevenson—under a deluge of Madison Avenue huckstering.

Quoting C. D. Jackson, who, in a sudden burst of candor, stated bluntly that the mission of the Republicans was to "merchandise the hell out of" Mr. Eisenhower, the Governor predicted that "the voter will find this campaign far worse than the campaign of 1952."

It was something of a coincidence that on the very date Governor Leader was making this prediction, the Associated Press wires were carrying a dispatch from New York, quoting one of the leading Republican hucksters as announcing that every visual, physical and emotional means known to Madison Avenue would be used.

According to the Associated Press there will be press releases, saturation announcements on radio, music, movies, bicycles, balloons, banners, floodlights, streamers, helium gas—and it goes without saying, plenty of the other variety—and pretty girls in special costumes.

There is little room for issues in all this.

Instead of going to the unemployed with a program, there will be rock and roll.

Instead of telling the farmer the truth about his falling income, they will give him a barrage of balloons.

Instead of coming to the depressed pockets with a program for development, there will be a bevy of well-developed girls.

The theme of the forthcoming Republican campaign promises to be a modern version on those famous words of the grandmother of all Tories: "Let them have cheesecake."

The Associated Press article follows:

NEW YORK.—A supercharged blockbuster of color, sounds and spectacle was being readied today to stir up fervor for President Eisenhower along the main streets of America.

"We're going to use every physical, emotional and visual means of getting the message across," said C. Langhorne Washburn, director of special activities for the National Citizens for Eisenhower organization.

There'll be huge floating balloons, parades, blaring loudspeakers, moving pictures, reams of press releases, television quickies, music, rallies, pretty girls in Ike dresses and campaign buttons galore.

All this is part of a high-powered task force getting set to invade cities and towns across the country, beating campaign drums for the reelection of Eisenhower.

It's called the Eisenhower Bandwagon operation, and it's got everything from floodlights, costumes and streamer-bedecked vehicles to specially schooled crews and helium gas.

The mission, as Washburn put it: "Selling and telling."

Altogether, there'll be 6 bandwagon outfits each, including 30-ton trailer-trucks loaded with equipment, a jeep, 2 station wagons, two 40-foot, dirigible-shaped balloons and 4 bicyles.

The rolling stock is all painted in brilliant white, with red-and-blue slogans on it. Among other things the cargo includes outdoor movie units, amplifiers, power generators and campaign leaflets.

The team will hit the road Labor Day, shortly after the GOP convention August 20, and keep going 9 weeks, with plans to uncork their fanfare in about 150 communities by election day.

As part of the crowd-luring devices, each unit will have 8 pink and fancy Ike dresses, sizes 10 and 12, to be worn by locally recruited girls (the requirement: young and pretty) in parades and rallies.

The Democratic Party and the Catholic Vote

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS L. ASHLEY
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 18, 1956

Mr. ASHLEY. Mr. Speaker, with the conventions of our two political parties less than a month distant, keen interest and attention is currently focused upon those who may emerge as the Democratic and Republican standard-bearers.

Most would agree, I believe, that there is considerably more interest and doubt with respect to the Democratic selections. This is true not only with respect to the Presidential nominee, but also to his running mate. Throughout the country in recent months, there has been mounting enthusiasm and speculation over the possible nomination of Senator JOHN F. KENNEDY as the vice presidential candidate on the Democratic ticket.

Few would disagree that the basis of this enthusiasm and speculation rests mainly with the outstanding attributes which Senator KENNEDY has brought to the Congress. The courage which he demonstrated during World War II as a PT commander in the Pacific has been demonstrated both in the House of Representatives and in the Senate. In a relatively short span of years, his legislative abilities have been recognized not only by his colleagues but by citizens in every part of the country.

Speculation as to Senator KENNEDY'S selection as the Democratic candidate for Vice President goes in part, at least, to the political desirability of having a Catholic at the top of a national party ticket. This subject, Mr. Speaker, was the topic of an excellent article by Mr. Arthur Krock, which appeared in the July 5 edition of the New York Times, and which reads as follows:

THE DEMOCRATIC PARTY AND THE "CATHOLIC VOTE"

(By Arthur Krock)

WASHINGTON, July 4.—A privately financed survey of the so-called Catholic vote in the United States has just been completed at the request of a few Democrats. Their purpose was to evaluate the proposition that the nomination of a Catholic on the Democratic national ticket in 1956 would operate powerfully to reverse the 1952 vote for President Eisenhower in communities with heavy Catholic populations and turn the scales toward Democratic victory.

Since Governor Lausche of Ohio is the only Catholic with important backing for the Democratic Presidential nomination, and the consensus is that his chances are slight, the emphasis of the survey is on second place. With special mention of Senator JOHN F. KENNEDY of Massachusetts, whom prominent Democrats, North and South, Catholic, President, and Jewish, have endorsed for that position, the conclusion of the survey is:

"While a Catholic Democratic Vice Presidential nominee could not recapture all of those Catholics who voted Republican in 1952, inasmuch as some had been solidly Republican for years * * * it is apparent * * * that he could regain most of them. Assume he could get no more than those "normally Democratic" Catholics who voted for Ike in 1952 * * * he would still add 132 electors to the Democratic column. When combined with the electors of the solid South this would provide a majority.

Bloc voting, for economic, racial or religious reasons, has always been a subject of dispute. That is because large voting percentages of identifiable blocs are frequently cast against candidates supposed to have special appeals to them. Thus in 1952, in communities where members of union labor and of the Catholic Church were preponderant, and large Democratic majorities in national elections had been constant, the voting statistics revealed strong support for the Eisenhower-Nixon ticket.

KENNEDY AS THE TYPE

It is this deviation which, the study concludes, would in all likelihood be corrected by the choice of a Catholic with acknowledged high standing among citizens generally. The survey most frequently uses KENNEDY to illustrate a Catholic of this caliber, but some Democrats also cite Mayor Wagner of New York City.

Many tables were compiled to support the main thesis and two are especially interesting. One comparies the estimated Catholic vote for Eisenhower in 14 States with 261 electorial votes (5 short of the required majority) with the percentage margin by which he carried these States. These comparisons follow, the first figures being the estimated Catholic vote for Eisenhower, the second his winning margin (both in percentages):

New York, 35 and 11; Pennsylvania, 36 and 6; Illinois, 31 and 9; New Jersey, 40 and 13; Massachusetts, 51 and 8; Connecticut, 48 and 11; Rhode Island, 63 and 15; California, 23 and 12; Michigan, 27 and 10; Minnesota, 23 and 10; Ohio, 21 and 12; Wisconsin, 30 and 18; Maryland, 27 and 10; Montana, 21 and 16.

(The point is that if these Catholics vote Democratic in 1956 by 1 percentage point more than Ike's winning margin in 1952 the Democrats conceivably would carry these States; furthermore, that a Catholic nominee for Vice President on the Democratic ticket would probably recapture the bulk of the Catholic percentage for Ike 4 years ago.)

The other table, credited to a University of Michigan survey, purports to give the following percentages of 1952 party voting in eight Catholic groups, "S" standing for Stevenson and "E" for Eisenhower:

Irish Catholics, S. 59 and E 41; Italian, S 56 and E 44; Polish, S 49 and E 51; first generation American Catholics, S 47 and E 53; second generation, S 58 and E 42; third generation, S 36 and E 64; fourth generation, S 54 and E 46. (The percentage division among Irish Protestants is estimated at 27 for Stevenson and 73 for the President.)

A MINIMUM OF BIAS

The fundamental concept of the survey is that Catholics generally have "voted not as union members or farmers or women or old people, but as Catholics," and that they constitute 1 plus of every 5 eligible voters, in some States 1 plus of every 2. It is estimated that this group is concentrated in big cities in populous States, and that the majorities in these cities swing enough States to decide the national election. The survey reports that tests of anti-Catholic bias in key States indicate this would be insignificant in voting percentages against a ticket with a vice presidential candidate of Kennedy's type among voters who normally would support that ticket, and expresses this conclusion:

"If Al Smith had been the Republican nominee and a dry," and "not a Tammany product" who was misrepresented as "the sterotype of the cigar-smoking, immigrant-base political boss," he would have "won the election of 1928 regardless of his religion."

The Fourth of July is an appropriate day to implant the hope that the findings as to bias and the true cause of Smith's defeat are sound.

Appropriations for Public Works

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OVERTON BROOKS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 3, 1956

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I present herewith the address of the Honorable LOUIS C. RABAUT, Congressman from Michigan, delivered to the 43d annual convention of the National Rivers and Harbors Congress held in Washington, D. C., on May 11–12, 1956. Congressman RABAUT, as an able member of the House Appropriations Committee, has studied carefully and thoroughly the projects brought before his committee, and I feel his comments on the processing of these projects have far more than the usual interest to the Members of Congress as well as to the Nation as a whole.

The address follows:

APPROPRIATIONS FOR PUBLIC WORKS

(By LOUIS C. RABAUT, Member of Congress)

It is a pleasure to accept the invitation of your president and my colleague, the Honorable OVERTON BROOKS, to come here today and discuss the scope and responsibility of the Public Works Subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations, of which I am acting chairman.

I suppose the appropriate point at which to begin would be a listing of the Government agencies seeking funds from my group. The Public Works Subcommittee has jurisdiction over the Army Corps of Engineers, the Bureau of Reclamation, Southeastern and Southwestern Power Administration, TVA, and last, but certainly not least, the Atomic Energy Commission.

It is rather difficult to tell you, in the time allotted to me, of the amount of work the subcommittee is called upon to perform in the course of one session of Congress.

The Corps of Engineers alone has over 700 projects that must be scrutinized by the subcommittee. Some of these projects are in the earliest planning stage, others are under construction. Still others are completed and must be maintained and repaired at tremendous expense. The Bureau of Reclamation also has over 200 projects either under construction or being operated. The 43 Bonneville Power Administration transmission lines and facilities are but one small phase of the subcommittee's responsibility. The thousands of pages of testimony give ample evidence of the hours spent discussing and justifying financial commitments. Since our committee started holding hearings in March, we have heard 668 outside witnesses. These witnesses consumed the better part of 160 hours.

In addition to hearing the opinions of hundreds of witnesses, the members and committee staff perused a 3-foot high stack of correspondence and telegrams from other interested parties. Exhibits and visual aids supporting testimony and correspondence stood 5 feet high, tightly compacted.

The thought probably occurs to many as you hear of the voluminous testimony taken by the subcommittee—what primarily does a witness talk about. To make a pun, he talks about an hour. In all seriousness, however, the witness must justify to the satisfaction of the committee the expenditure of all money requested. Many times a Government agency will request a certain sum of money for a given project and be turned down cold because the subcommittee did not feel the proposed endeavor was sound or in the best interest of the American taxpayer.

We do not just sit there and give blanket endorsement to anything the executive branch might see fit to suggest. We take the attitude of I'm from Missouri—show me. I have seen some cases where Congressmen on the panel suggested an alternative that was superior to the plan proposed by a particular agency. This is the purpose of a congressional committee—to safeguard the national interest while preventing a waste of the taxpayers' hard-earned dollar. Sometimes, as I sit on the panel and listen to a proposal I consider to be ill-advised, I cannot help but think—how many Americans earning $60 to $70 a week will Congress have to tax indefinitely to pay for this project. I tell you, gentlemen, asking yourself a question like that returns you to the fundamental of representative government.

I feel that I am sent here by the people of Detroit to protect the principles of Federal Government and give the American people, all of the American people, the best possible deal for every dollar they are required to spend.

When the subcommittee is first approached regarding a project, certain basic questions must be asked—is the project actually needed? Can we get along without it? Is it momentarily sound? Is the proposed location the best possible site? How about the purchase of acreage? In other words, is the taxpayer being protected?

In the construction of a dam, for instance, there is a multitude of legal, financial, and mechanical ramifications. Dams are of many types and for various purposes. Some are multipurpose, that is, flood control, power, irrigation, and possibly navigation and recreation.

Quite often local organizations and interests desire to cooperate, with the intent of repaying a portion of the cost in return for certain rights, such as, use of water for irrigation. An equitable settlement must then be worked out with these local residents. The loaded question soon follows—what must be moved before the dam can be built. Perhaps entire towns must be relocated, miles of railroads, highways, and bridges moved at great expense. Incidentally, in the movement of railroad bridges, the Government now has a standard rate of amortization concurred in by the utilities that somewhat reduces expenditures.

I am not going to dwell further on the dislocations resulting from the construction of a dam. When the job is finished, we have power, navigation, inundation, irrigation, and irritation. It's impossible to please everyone—we do the best we can.

In closing, I would like to touch lightly on a number of other matters.

The all-important St. Lawrence seaway, a 50-year dream that will unite inland ports with world commerce, requires a great deal of planning and construction. Disastrous floods, such as we have experienced in recent months in New England and the Far West must not be allowed to recur. The Mississippi, where $60 million a year is spent just to live with the river, is a constant worry. The Tennessee Valley Authority has informed us that a serious power shortage is anticipated by 1958 unless swift remedial action is taken. The solution to the problem seems to lie in thermopower, several units of which have already been installed. Public power, with all of its pros and cons, is constantly being debated.

In the field of atomic energy, we stand on the threshold of a new era which could radically alter our mode of living.

True, we do not yet fully understand this new source of energy, but we are making giant strides. The only thing holding us back is a shortage of highly trained technicians and scientists. Much thought is being given to the possibility of granting Federal scholarships to promising young men and women interested in engineering and the sciences. Something must be done—and soon—if we are to keep abreast of other nations in technological fields.

Well, there you have—in a rather sketchy form—some idea of the Government functions our subcommittee is charged by Congress to supervise. I enjoyed addressing your group and wish the Rivers and Harbors Congress a most pleasant stay in the Nation's Capital. Thank you.

Democrats' Hopes Dashed Again

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUGH SCOTT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 16, 1956

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am inserting in the RECORD Gould Lincoln's column of July 14, 1956, as it appeared in the Washington Evening Star:

DEMOCRATS' HOPES DASHED AGAIN

(By Gould Lincoln)

HYANNIS, MASS., July 14.—The dust finally has been laid on the suggestion there will be any change in the Republican 1956 national ticket. It's Eisenhower and NIXON—just as it was in 1952. The Democrats, as well as all the rest of the country, are on notice. Twice the hopes of the Democrats rose that Eisenhower, the Republican who swept the country 4 years ago, would not be the GOP candidate, and twice these hopes were dashed.

Because of the President's two illnesses, the Democrats maintain he will be easier to defeat this time. They add that NIXON's renomination also will takes votes away from the Republican ticket. The President, however, has said he feels as well as ever—even better than before his recent abdominal operation. And the country is inclined to believe Eisenhower. Also, great numbers of people want to believe him.

NIXON ANSWERED CHARGES

The talk of Eisenhower's being handicapped by NIXON's presence on the ticket has been inspired by Democrats—who dislike NIXON intensely. It was NIXON, as a member of the House Un-American Activities Committee, who brought to light the evidence which finally convicted Alger Hiss. It has made him anathema to some of the Democrats. It was NIXON who, in his campaigns against the Democrats, has charged over and over again they were stupid in their appraisal of and dealings with the Communists. Their leaders have charged he called the Democrats "treasonable." Search his speeches as they will, they have never been able to prove this charge. So they now claim that his criticisms can be construed as meaning they were traitorous. Yet the Vice President on several occasions specifically said he did not charge the Democrats with being traitors.

Early this year, the Democrats indicated they would make their campaign against NIXON—after the President's heart attack, or rather because of it.

They will find, however, that they are running against Eisenhower, a President who has won the confidence of the great mass of Americans. Further, the people like Eisenhower—and the most difficult candidate to defeat is one who is liked. As for NIXON, he has made an excellent record in the many tasks assigned him by the President, both at home and abroad. In addition, the Vice

President is a hard-driving campaigner. When he takes to the stump, as he will, he will be free to answer the charges and the innuendoes which have been made against him.

MANY CHANGE VIEWS

Those Republicans who were made fearful by the Democratic charge brought against NIXON—and there were a number of them—have caught their second wind. They have come to realize that dumping NIXON would be more harmful to the Republican chances. It would have been tantamount to saying they did not expect the President to last through a second term in the White House. They know, too, that NIXON, by reason of his many assignments abroad, is thoroughly cognizant of the problems of foreign policy, and that he has been kept in close touch with the needs of national defense, and with the domestic issues.

In his campaigning through the country, in 1952 and in 1954, NIXON won many friends. It has been evident for months that the Vice President has the support of Republican leaders throughout the 48 States. If the decision were left to them, it would be the same as that of the President—that NIXON was acceptable for renomination. At one time it was suggested in some quarters that a fight against the renomination of NIXON would be launched when the Republican National Convention meets in San Francisco August 20. With the President's sign of approval, all chance of such a row seems to have disappeared.

Republican National Chairman Leonard W. Hall stands today as a political prophet without equal. Not long after President Eisenhower's heart attack, September 24, 1955, Chairman Hall declared his belief that Eisenhower would run "if he is able"—at a time when many believed that Eisenhower would step aside. He has never deviated from that prediction.

Bloody Hands

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PATRICK J. HILLINGS
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 17, 1956

Mr. HILLINGS. Mr. Speaker, I wish to place in the RECORD an editorial from the Los Angeles Examiner on Monday, July 9, 1956, discussing the Vice President's speech in Manila.

The editorial follows:

BLOODY HANDS

Vice President NIXON was needled by reporters at his Manila press conference on American aloofness toward Russia's purportedly peaceful overtures, and he threaded the needle very neatly.

Mr. NIXON was asked why America is not more conciliatory since Russia has adopted its "softer" policy.

The reference was to the current repudiation of Stalin.

His reply was that those who denounce Stalin belie their own words by continuing to do the same things for which he is denounced.

"Is the world changed simply because those who worked with Stalin now say that they disapproved of Stalin's tactics?" he asked.

"Not until they discontinue being what Stalin was."

Mr. NIXON said the peaceful professions of the Communists would have more substance if there was a higher degree of fulfillment.

"As soon as Khrushchev and the other leaders stop acting like Stalin we will have hope for peace in the world."

Even as Mr. NIXON spoke the bloody scenes in Poland offered confirmation.

Stalin himself never put down the natural aspirations of normal human beings more ruthlessly, callously, and barbarically than the Communists have done in their Polish orgy of slaughter.

Khrushchev, who dissociates himself from the crimes of Stalin, has written his own book of new crimes.

Why should it not be taken seriously, as Mr. NIXON says, that the Communist hands now being held out in the gestures of peace are bloody hands?

When those who had the guilt of Stalin persist in the old patterns, they do not offer the prospect, but merely the illusion of peace when they speak of softer policies.

Recognizing Red China

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEONOR K. SULLIVAN
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 17, 1956

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, from time to time we have been hearing rumors to the effect that Great Britain intends to seek admission of Red China to the United Nations in place of the present Republic of China delegation, and that our own Nation, following the next election, might acquiesce in such a move.

Certainly that is not the sense of Congress or the desire of the American people. Congress itself has gone on record on this matter on numerous occasions, and our Government has also made it clear from time to time that we are not inclined to recognize the Red regime as representing the people of China.

Last night, in the Washington Evening Star, Columnist David Lawrence wrote an article on this subject entitled "Congress' Stand on Red China" which I submit for inclusion in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. It tells how strongly many of us feel on this subject, also quoting at some length the position of the Truman administration on this same matter.

Following the article by Mr. Lawrence, I include for printing in the RECORD my own proposed congressional resolution on this subject, House Concurrent Resolution 264, which I introduced on July 12. First, Mr. Lawrence's article follows:

[From the Washington Evening Star of July 16, 1956]

CONGRESS' STAND ON RED CHINA—PRESS LARGELY IGNORES ITS OPPOSITION TO ADMISSION OF PEIPING REGIME TO U. N.

(By David Lawrence)

When the Congress of the United States by virtually unanimous vote writes into a law as important a pronouncement as the statement that it does not favor admission of the Red China Government into the United Nations, one would think this news would be widely printed in this country as well as abroad.

For some strange reason it wasn't. It's a mystery right on the doorstep of the "right to know" crusaders in the House Subcommittee on Government Operations which has lately become solicitous about the suppression—intentional or otherwise—of official news in other parts of the Government.

Here is the exact wording of section 110 in Public Law 603 as signed by the President on June 20, 1956:

"It is the sense of the Congress that the Communist China Government should not be admitted to membership in the United Nations as the representative of China."

This is an important warning to the world that both political parties in the United States have taken a firm posiion on the matter of refusing to seat Red China's government in the United Nations. Yet in London where the prime ministers of the British Commonwealth were meeting in the last week of June and the first week in July, the conference was reported by the United Press on July 2 as having decided that admission of Red China could be achieved after the November elections in the United States.

No such conclusion could possibly have been reached if the London newspapers had told the story of the action of the United States Congress earlier in June. Nothing is more calculated to produce friction between friendly nations than suppression of important news affecting their relations. But the British newspapers may have a good alibi—they probably didn't get the item from any of their American news services. So far as this correspondent can determine by a review of a few newspapers in this country, it wasn't printed here either.

The desires of Congress were expressed in the appropriation law for the Department of State for the fiscal year that began on July 1, 1956. Because it's in an appropriation act, this can be taken to mean that it is advice to the Department of State which has the responsibility of sending instructions to the representatives of this country at the United Nations Assembly.

Congress, therefore, has put the world on notice that while it may not direct foreign policy it does control the purse strings. It may well be that American appropriations for the United Nations would be cut off if despite American protests, the Red China Government were voted into the United Nations.

Opposition to the admission of Red China to the U. N. never has been a political or partisan question in this country. Perhaps the most forceful and explicit declaration on the subject that has ever been made came from the pen of Dean Rusk, Assistant Secretary of State for Far Eastern Affairs, in a speech delivered before the China Institute banquet in New York City on May 18, 1951. Mr. Rusk was at the time a subordinate of Dean Acheson who was then Secretary of State under the Truman administration. What was said then can be said to be the American policy today under the Eisenhower-Dulles administration. Mr. Rusk said:

"We cannot provide a formula to engage the unity of effort among all Chinese who love their country. But one thing we can say—as the Chinese people move to assert their freedom and to work out their destiny in accordance with their own historical purposes, they can count upon tremendous support from free peoples in other parts of the world.

"It is not my purpose, in these few moments this evening, to go into specific elements of our own national policy in the present situation. But we can tell our friends in China that the United States will not acquiesce in the degradation which is being forced upon them.

"We do not recognize the authorities in Peiping for what they pretend to be. The Peiping regime may be a colonial Russian government—a Slavic Manchukuo on a larger scale. It is not the Government of China.

It does not pass the first test. It is not Chinese. It is not entitled to speak for China in the community of nations. It is entitled only to the fruits of its own conduct—the fruits of aggression upon which it is now willfully, openly, and senselessly embarked.

"We recognize the National Government of the Republic of China, even though the territory under its control is severely restricted. We believe it more authentically represents the views of the great body of the people of China, particularly their historic demand for independence from foreign control. That government will continue to receive important aid and assistance from the United States. Under the circumstances, however, such aid in itself cannot be decisive to the future of China. The decision and the effort are for the Chinese people, pooling their efforts, wherever they are, in behalf of China.

"If the Chinese people decide for freedom, they shall find friends among all the peoples of the earth who have known and love freedom. They shall find added strength from those who refuse to believe that China is fated to become a land of tyranny and aggression and who expect China to fulfill the promise of the great past."

Nothing has been said since that expresses more eloquently or more exactly the American position, which is that admission of Red China into the U. N. means a discouragement to freedom and an encouragement to aggression and tyranny in the world.

Mr. Speaker, following Mr. Lawrence's article, I submit my resolution, House Concurrent Resolution 264, as follows:

[84th Cong. 2d Sess.]

House Concurrent Resolution 264

In the House of Representatives, July 12, 1956, Mrs. SULLIVAN submitted the following concurrent resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs:

"Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That it is the sense of the Congress that the Chinese Communists are not entitled to and should not be recognized to represent China in the United Nations."

Mount Carmel Guild Restores Victims of Alcoholism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON CANFIELD
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 17, 1956

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to insert the following feature article, from the Sunday July 15 edition of the Paterson (N. J.) Sunday Eagle. In it, Staff Writer Norm Mates has told the story of the triple-barreled attack on alcoholism, through faith, medical care, and rehabilitation, that is being carried out by the Mount Carmel Guild of the Paterson, N. J., Diocese, and Father William Wall, the dedicated priest who administers the program.

JUST GIVEN A CHANCE—MOUNT CARMEL GUILD RESTORING VICTIMS OF ALCOHOLISM

(By Norm Mates)

Alcoholism is responsible for the majority of cases on the calendars of every municipal court. It sets some men in an emotional state where they commit serious crimes, but on a larger scale it makes men drunk and incapable, even vagrants—bringing them before a judge who is helpless to cure them. This has been shown by the hundreds upon hundreds of victims of the disease who have been sent to county jail only to return on similar charges, in some cases as soon as 1 or 2 hours later.

On January 10, 1955, through the concern of Bishop James A. McNulty, of the Paterson diocese of the Roman Catholic Church, Mount Carmel Guild was established on Straight and Oak Streets for the treatment and rehabilitation or what might be termed rebirth of the helpless victims of the alcohol habit. November 7 of last year the Mount Carmel Guild Hospital was also created and equipped for a similar purpose.

Father William Wall, who had had considerable experience with alcoholic cases previously was asked to serve as director by the bishop. A more devoted man could never be found.

A large 4-story factory at the Straight Street site was acquired by the diocese and after rehabilitation by Father Wall and some of the early patients, the looms, grease, and other factory dirt was removed and the building renovated. Safety devices were installed and precautions taken and there was cast the seed which is destined to rescue the lives of thousands of broken and lonely souls, most without homes and jobs.

The Mount Carmel Guild is entirely self-supporting. It is not aided by any other public or private agency. Father Wall has declared, "It is the American tradition to be self-supporting and we only ask the chance."

Alcoholics come from New York State, Connecticut, Pennsylvania, Massachusetts, and even North Carolina to the center. It is the only such unit in the country possessing a hospital and rehabilitation center under a single roof. Father Wall's and the Guild's only interest is that those patients accepted be alcoholics—alcoholics sincerely interested in breaking the habit of drinking intoxicants. There is no restriction on from where the man may come or of what religion he is.

In conducting its self-supporting program through the contributions of no longer desired household items, clothing, or actually most any product, including waste paper, rags, and waste metal, the Mount Carmel Guild also serves a second purpose—that of placing the men in jobs for which they are responsible. This work aids them to feel useful once again and regain their self-respect.

There are no hired personnel in the Mount Carmel Guild center, although in the hospital there are Miss Theresa M. Rohan, R. N., supervisor; Miss Beatrice Gillen, R. N., assistant supervisor, and three other nurses, as well as Drs. David Canaban, William Morracco, and Carmen O'Orio, consultants.

The hospital and center together has set a national pattern and is being studied and copied by alcoholics groups throughout the country.

Patients at the hospital are those with homes who admit themselves for a 5-day treatment, for which they are assessed $75, if they can afford to pay. The alcoholic is permitted no visitors, except members of Alcoholics Anonymous. Neither is he permitted to return a second time if he began drinking after he left.

The average time recommended for treatment of homeless men at the center is 3 months, although they are free to come and go when they like.

While it is not possible to tell exactly how successful the program has been in curing in the short time it has been in operation, Father Wall points with pride to the number which attend the Alcoholics Anonymous Alumni meetings on the last Saturday of each month. These are all former guests at the center and at the hospital.

Meetings open to the public are held each Tuesday evening by the AA chapter, while on Thursday evenings it is held for the men of the center only.

While 92 men are presently under treatment at the center, a number around 1,000 have probably been treated during the 18-month period. A total of 387 have undergone treatment at the hospital since its opening in November.

Father Wall notes, humorously, that the Mount Carmel Guild Building stands on the original Graham Brewery site, as a successor, and further that the unit devoted to making men go straight after overindulging in alcohol through their lives is located on Straight Street.

He points out that the project would not be possible without Bishop McNulty, his understanding and love for his fellow man, which prompted establishment of Mount Carmel Guild.

Father Wall notes that he loves his work in behalf of his fellow man and is thankful for the privilege of serving at Mount Carmel.

Mount Carmel today stands as a bulwark against alcoholism, in the face of failure of penal courts to aid confirmed alcoholics.

Compulsory Inspection of Poultry for Wholesomeness

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEONOR K. SULLIVAN
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 17, 1956

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, the Poultry Subcommittee of the House Committee on Agriculture today opened hearings on legislation to require Federal inspection of poultry and poultry products for wholesomeness, and it was my great privilege to appear as the first witness.

As sponsor of H. R. 11800, which would amend the 50-year-old Meat Inspection Act to provide compulsory inspection of poultry in the same manner as we require inspection of the red meats, I am anxious to see legislation on this subject enacted this year. As I told the House on June 18, at the time I introduced H. R. 11800, diseased and unwholesome poultry has been a major source of food infection and has caused a number of deaths in the poultry processing plants.

Under unanimous consent, I submit the statement which I delivered before Chairman POLK and the other members of the Poultry Subcommittee today, followed by the text of the Sullivan bill, H. R. 11800, as follows:

COMPULSORY INSPECTION OF POULTRY FOR WHOLESOMENESS

TESTIMONY BY CONGRESSWOMAN LEONOR K. SULLIVAN, OF MISSOURI, BEFORE POULTRY SUBCOMMITTEE OF HOUSE COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE ON H. R. 11800, BY MRS. SULLIVAN, TO REQUIRE COMPULSORY INSPECTION FOR WHOLESOMENESS OF POULTRY AND POULTRY PRODUCTS, TUESDAY, JULY 17, 1956

Chairman POLK and members of the subcommittee, I appreciate very much this opportunity to appear as your first witness on the various bills before you to require Federal inspection of poultry and poultry products for wholesomeness. It is extremely encouraging to me that you are taking up this issue with the intention of recommending legislation in this session, and I sincerely hope we can get a good bill through. I understand the Senate Committee on Agriculture intends to meet tomorrow in executive session to con-

sider bills on this same subject, so it is conceivable we can enact legislation before adjournment. I certainly hope so.

Let me say first that I know how busy all of the members of this subcommittee are in these closing days of the session. I am similarly pressed for time, with so much to do in such a short period yet remaining of this session, and so I have no intention of taking up unnecessary time here today. I do not think I have to tell you in great detail why we must have compulsory inspection of poultry. The members of the subcommittee are as familiar with the problem as I am. What concerns us all is finding the most practical and effective solution.

RESEARCH MATERIAL APPEARED IN JUNE 18 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

As the members of the subcommittee know, I went into great detail in the remarks I made in the House on June 18, at the time I introduced H. R. 11800, explaining why legislation was necessary, and I do not want to take time to repeat that material this afternoon. I do think it should be made part of the record of this hearing, however, and so I ask that it be included at the conclusion of my oral testimony—that is, the remarks I made in the House on June 18, along with the research material presented at that time and inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. If it is done in that way, it will save us much time and still provide a complete record for those interested and concerned in this important issue.

What I want to do in the time here this afternoon is to explain, then, not why we must have poultry inspection—for I believe that everyone connected with the poultry industry will now acknowledge that we must have additional consumer protections or the poultry industry will suffer from serious consumer resistance—but rather, what I want to do is to discuss the various proposals for providing an inspection program and to explain why I think my bill, H. R. 11800 is the best approach.

Let me give you briefly, the high points of H. R. 11800. To put it as concisely as possible, my bill would amend the Meat Inspection Act in every relevant provision to require that poultry and poultry products be inspected in exactly the same manner in which—for 50 years—we have been inspecting the red meats.

NO LEGAL PITFALLS IN USE OF MEAT INSPECTION ACT

It does not set up any new rules, regulations, definitions, procedures, or other legal pitfalls. By "pitfalls," I mean provisions which would set off endless litigation and thus prevent prompt and effective application of the new law.

The Meat Inspection Act is exactly 50 years old. It grew out of the same circumstances a half century ago as the demand today for poultry inspection laws—that is, the practices of unscrupulous operators who defied the public good and sent diseased and unwholesome meats into the channels of commerce.

Some of the information now available on the kind of diseased and unwholesome poultry products which have been shipped in interstate commerce is so sickening and revolting I do not want to go into it here. I think you are all familiar with this problem. I know you join me in wanting to see the public protected. As members of the Agriculture Committee, you also want to make sure that the legitimate poultry raisers and processors are protected from the poison-peddlers in the trade.

I have given much thought to this problem ever since officials of the Meat Cutters Union first called my attention to the health hazards many of their members were experiencing in the poultry plants. The more I went into this problem, the more it became my conviction that poultry should be inspected in exactly the same way as the red meats. The meat inspection program has been remarkably successful—one of the most successful of all Government programs—and has been a great thing both for the consumer and the livestock and packing industries.

While it is true that meat can be spoiled in transit, or in improper handling after it leaves the packinghouse, nevertheless we know that when it left the plant—with the Government stamp on it—it was pure and wholesome and not diseased and dangerous to eat.

PURPOSE IS PRIMARILY TO PROTECT CONSUMING PUBLIC

I want to see us enact a law which will give us the same assurance on poultry.

As my bill states, its purpose is "to protect the general consuming public."

I think that is first and foremost, but there are additional factors also, and they are:

"To protect the health of persons engaged in the processing and distribtuion of poultry and poultry products, to prevent the spread of disease through shipments in interstate and foreign commerce of unwholesome poultry and poultry products, and to promote the wider use of poultry through assurance to the consuming public of its wholesomeness and freedom from disease, thus assisting agriculture and the food marketing industries in expanding their sales and augmenting their important contributions to our economic system."

I hope the members of this subcommittee will agree with me on the objectives I have cited, and also on their relative order—that is, that the health of the public comes first. I say that because I know that some of the other bills before you, while aimed at protecting the public, of course, nevertheless seem to stem primarily from the desire to protect the industry from unscrupulous competitors. I want to do that, too; but the first thing, as I said, is to protect the public. If we can agree on that, then I believe my bill, H. R. 11800, best suits the purpose.

It provides for compulsory inspection of all poultry and poultry products in interstate commerce, and also in intrastate commerce if it burdens or affects interstate commerce. I think the industry itself is anxious to see both covered. Now as I understand it, the intrastate inspection could be carried out under working relationships between the Federal service and State or local authorities.

ANTE-MORTEM INPECTION MADE MANDATORY

My bill makes ante-mortem inspection compulsory—that is, inspection before slaughter as well as after. This is the only way, according to information which I have received, that we can assure the health and wholesomeness of the poultry involved. I know that many of the industry spokesmen oppose this on the grounds that it would make processing slower or more costly. But believe me, if we are going to have an inspection system, let's not have half a system. All red meat animals are inspected both before and after slaughter. Under the meat-inspection law this is discretionary with the Secretary of Agriculture, but for years it has been mandatory by regulation. My bill amends the basic law to make it mandatory for the red meats and for poultry.

Otherwise, in every particular, H. R. 11800 adopts exactly the existing provisions of the meat inspection law. For 50 years, with only occasional amendment, this law has held up remarkably well. It can apply equally well to poultry.

The Department of Agriculture has made comments on this legislation in connection with the so-called poultry industry bill which is also before you. That bill would delay enforcement of poultry inspection for 2 years, and then permit other exemptions and delays for 2 additional years. That would mean we would not have general compulsory inspection until 1960. That is too long a wait—too late. My bill would provide 6 months to bring about conformance. I do not think that is too soon.

If you will note the Department's comments on the industry bill, it has in instance after instance suggested changes to bring the bill more generally into conformance with the Meat Inspection Act. I say, rather than set up an entirely new law and procedure for poultry, let us use the perfectly good law we now have for meat inspection, and let it be extended logically to include poultry. The Department, in effect, endorses just about all the proposals in my bill, by its criticism of the industry bill. In other words, we can solve this whole problem just by adapting the meat-inspection law to include poultry.

POULTRY INDUSTRY BILLS FAIL TO MEET NEED

The poultry industry says that poultry competes with the red meats and therefore should not be placed under the meat-inspection branch. My bill does not require that poultry inspection be in the meat-inspection branch, although I certainly think that is the logical place for it, rather than in a sales promotion branch of the Department. But I do provide the Secretary with discretion on this. However, there is no discretion to provide different standards for poultry than for the red meats. They should be treated alike. After all, beef and pork compete for business, and so does lamb. The meat inspectors are not promoting one type of meat over another; they are only seeking to make sure that the meat we serve in our homes, or which is served to us in restaurants, is wholesome and not diseased and insanitary.

My criticism of the poultry industry bill is that while it seeks to show a desire to conform to good inspection laws, it provides so many delays, so many modifications and so many relaxations and exemptions that I am afraid it would do us little good for a long time to come. For the immediate future it would merely shift to the Federal Government the cost of the voluntary program which is presently paid by industry. We should pay for the inspection service—but we should get our money's worth—and have real and effective and full inspection—in the immediate future, rather than 4 years from now.

I urge you to study my bill from this standpoint.

THE SULLIVAN BILL, H. R. 11800

And now, Mr. Speaker, I submit a copy of my bill, H. R. 11800, as introduced June 18, as follows:

[84th Cong., 2d sess.]

H. R. 11800

In the House of Representatives, June 18, 1956, Mrs. SULLIVAN introduced the following bill; which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture:

"A bill to amend the Meat Inspection Act (34 Stat. 1260, as amended) and the Tariff Act of 1930 (46 Stat. 689, sec. 306) to require compulsory inspection for wholesomeness of poultry and poultry products.

"Be it enacted, etc., That the Congress of the United States finds that poultry and poultry products are being marketed through the channels of interstate and foreign commerce without adequate inspection to protect the public against poultry and poultry products which are diseased, unsound, unhealthful, unwholesome, or otherwise unfit for human food.

"To protect the general consuming public, to protect the health of persons engaged in the processing and distribution of poultry and poultry products, to prevent the spread of disease through shipments in interstate and foreign commerce of unwholesome poultry and poultry products, and to promote the wider use of poultry through assurance to the consuming public of its wholesomeness

and freedom from disease, thus assisting agriculture and the food-marketing industries in expanding their sales and augmenting their important contributions to our economic system, the following amendments are made to the Meat Inspection Act (34 Stat. 1260), as amended, and the Tariff Act of 1930 (46 Stat. 689, sec. 306) giving the Secretary of Agriculture power to inspect, condemn, or regulate any shipments of poultry in interstate or foreign commerce, or any shipment thereof which directly burdens, obstructs, or affects interstate or foreign commerce in such commodity.

"SEC. 2. The first paragraph of the act of March 4, 1907 (34 Stat. 1260; 21 U. S. C. 71), authorizing inspection of cattle, sheep, swine, and goats before slaughter is amended to require such ante mortem inspection of cattle, sheep, swine, goats, and poultry, as follows:

"(a) By striking out the phrase 'meat or meat products' and inserting 'meat or poultry, and meat or poultry products';

"(b) By striking out the words 'at his discretion may' following the words 'Secretary of Agriculture' and inserting the word 'shall';

"(c) By striking out the phrase 'cattle, sheep, swine, and goats' wherever it appears, and inserting 'cattle, sheep, swine, goats, and poultry';

"(d) By adding to the phrase 'any slaughtering, packing, meat-canning, rendering, or similar establishment' the words 'or poultry-processing plant';

"(e) By striking out the phrase 'the meat and meat-food products thereof are to be used in interstate or foreign commerce' and inserting 'the meat or poultry or poultry pieces, and meat or poultry food products thereof are to be used in interstate and foreign commerce';

"(f) By adding at the end of said paragraph '*Provided*, That at his discretion the Secretary of Agriculture may also regulate any shipments of poultry or poultry products which directly burden, obstruct, or affect interstate or foreign commerce.'

"SEC. 3. The second paragraph of the act of March 4, 1907 (34 Stat. 1260; 21 U. S. C. 72), dealing with post mortem inspection of carcasses, labeling and marking, destruction of condemned carcasses, and reinspection, is amended:

"(a) By striking out the phrase 'cattle, sheep, swine, and goats', wherever it appears, and inserting 'cattle, sheep, swine, goats, and poultry';

"(b) By adding to the phrase 'any slaughtering, meat-canning, salting, packing, rendering, or similar establishment' the words 'or poultry processing plant';

"(c) By adding after the words 'and carcasses and parts thereof of all such animals', wherever they appear, the words 'or poultry';

"(d) By adding 'or poultry-processing plant' after the words 'any such establishment' and 'any establishment' in the clauses dealing with removal of inspectors from establishments failing to comply with requirements hereunder.

"SEC. 4. The third paragraph of the act of March 4, 1907 (34 Stat. 1261; 21 U. S. C. 73), dealing with the examination of carcasses brought into slaughtering or processing establishments, and of meat food products issued from and returned thereto, is amended:

"(a) By striking out the phrase 'cattle, sheep, swine, and goats' and inserting 'cattle, sheep, swine, goats, and poultry';

"(b) By striking out the phrase 'meat or meat products' and inserting 'meat or poultry, or meat or poultry products';

"(c) By adding to the phrase 'any slaughtering, meat-canning, salting, packing, rendering, or similar establishment' the words 'or poultry processing plant';

"(d) By striking out the phrase 'treated and prepared for meat food products' and inserting 'treated and prepared for meat or poultry food products.'

"SEC. 5. The fourth paragraph of the act of March 4, 1907 (34 Stat. 261; 21 U. S. C. 74), dealing with the powers of meat inspectors in approving sound, healthful, and wholesome products and in condemning and causing the destruction of unsound, unhealthful, and unwholesome products, is amended:

"(a) By striking out the phrase 'meat food products' wherever it appears and inserting 'meat or poultry food products';

"(b) By adding to the phrase 'any slaughtering, meat-canning, salting, packing, rendering, or similar establishment' the words 'or poultry processing plant';

"(c) By striking out the phrase 'meat or meat food products' and inserting 'meat or poultry, or meat or poultry food products';

"(d) By striking out the phrase 'condemned meat food products' and inserting 'condemned meat or poultry food products.'

"SEC. 6. The fifth paragraph of the act of March 4, 1907 (34 Stat. 1261; 21 U. S. C. 75), dealing with labeling requirements, is amended:

"(a) By striking out the phrase 'meat or meat food products' in the four instances where it appears, and inserting 'meat or poultry, or meat or poultry food products.'

"SEC. 7. The sixth paragraph of the act of March 4, 1907 (34 Stat. 1262; 21 U. S. C. 76), governing sanitary inspection and regulation of the premises of slaughtering and packing establishments, and rejection of products of unsanitary establishments, is amended:

"(a) By adding to the phrase 'any slaughtering, meat-canning, salting, packing, rendering, or similar establishment' the words 'or poultry processing plant';

"(b) By striking out the phrase 'cattle, sheep, swine, and goats' and inserting 'cattle, sheep, swine, goats, and poultry';

"(c) By striking out the phrases 'meat and meat products' and 'meat or meat products' and inserting 'meat or poultry, or meat or poultry food products.'

"SEC. 8. The seventh paragraph of the act of March 4, 1907 (34 Stat. 1262; 21 U. S. C. 77), permitting inspections during the nighttime as well as during the daytime, when slaughtering is conducted during the nighttime, is amended: by striking out the phrase 'cattle, sheep, swine, and goats' and inserting 'cattle, sheep, swine, goats, and poultry.'

"SEC. 9. The eighth paragraph of the act of March 4, 1907 (34 Stat. 1262; 21 U. S. C. 78) dealing with transportation of carcasses, meat or meat food products not properly inspected and marked, is amended:

"(a) By striking out the phrase 'meat or meat food products' and inserting 'meat or poultry, or meat or poultry food products';

"(b) By adding at the end of said paragraph '*Provided*, That nothing in this section shall preclude the Secretary of Agriculture from regulating shipments of poultry or poultry products which directly burden, obstruct, or affect interstate or foreign commerce.'

"SEC. 10. The 17th paragraph of the act of March 4, 1907 (34 Stat. 1264; 21 U. S. C. 87) dealing with transportation or sale of meat or meat food products not complying with the inspection laws, is amended:

"(a) By striking out the phrase 'meat or meat food products' wherever it appears, and inserting 'meat or poultry, or meat or poultry food products';

"(b) By adding to the phrase 'any slaughtering, meat-canning, salting, packing, rendering, or similar establishment' the words 'or poultry processing plant.'

"SEC. 11. The 19th paragraph of the act of March 4, 1907 (34 Stat. 1264; 21 U. S. C. 89), dealing with the appointment, duties, and regulations governing inspectors, is amended:

"(a) By striking out the phrase 'cattle, sheep, swine, and goats' and inserting 'cattle, sheep, swine, goats, and poultry';

"(b) By striking out the phrases 'meat and meat food products' and 'meat and meat food products' and inserting 'meat or poultry, or meat or poultry food products';

"(c) By striking out the words 'meat food products' wherever they appear and inserting 'meat or poultry food products.'

"SEC. 12. The 21st paragraph of the act of March 4, 1907, as amended (34 Stat. 1265, as amended by 52 Stat. 1235; 21 U. S. C. 91) exempting certain farmers, retail butchers and retail dealers from the inspection provisions of the Meat Inspection Act, is further amended by adding the following subsection thereto:

"'(d) the Secretary of Agriculture is hereby authorized to establish the basis on which certain categories of poultry raisers, retail poultry butchers, and retail poultry dealers are exempted from the inspection requirements of this act: *Provided*, That these exemptions shall be based on maximum volume limitations which are fair and reasonable in relation to other exemptions in this section: *And provided further*, That such exempt poultry raisers, retail poultry butchers and retail poultry dealers shall be subject to the provisions of the second paragraph of subsection (c) above for violations of the requirements of this act.'

"SEC. 13. The authorization included in the act of June 30, 1906 (34 Stat. 679, as amended by 48 Stat. 1225; 21 U. S. C. 95) is amended:

"(a) By striking out the phrase 'cattle, sheep, swine, and goats' and inserting 'cattle, sheep, swine, goats, and poultry';

"(b) By striking out the phrase 'meat and meat food products' and inserting 'meat or poultry, and meat or poultry food products.'

"SEC. 14. The act of June 5, 1948 (62 Stat. 344; 21 U. S. C. 98) providing for payment of costs of the inspection service by the United States, is amended by striking out the phrase 'meat and meat food products' and inserting 'meat and poultry, and meat and poultry food products.'

"SEC. 15. Section 306 of the Tariff Act of 1930 (46 Stat. 689; 19 U. S. C. 1306) dealing with the importation of meat and meat products is amended:

"(a) By inserting the words 'or poultry' in subsection (b) thereof after the words 'meat' or 'meats' wherever they appear;

"(b) By striking out the phrase 'cattle, sheep, and other domestic ruminants, and swine' in subsection (c) thereof, and inserting 'cattle, sheep, and other domestic ruminants, poultry and swine'; and in the same subsection (c) thereof, inserting after the word 'meats' the words 'or poultry.'

"SEC. 16. The compulsory poultry inspection provided for by this act shall commence on the first day of the 6th month after enactment hereof."

Military Potential of Communist Poland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 13, 1956

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD I include therein an article entitled "Military Potential of Communist Poland," by Richard F. Starr, Ph. D., professor of political science at Harding College, Arkansas, which outlines the efforts of the Soviet to indoctrinate the Polish Army with Marxist principles.

It shows the extent to which the Soviet has gone to enslave the entire Polish na-

tion by brutal military controls. Ironically enough, the controls were effected in large measure by forcing native Poles into the armed services.

The recent outbreak in Poznan indicates that the results have not been favorable for the Communists. The Poles are unalterably and bitterly opposed to everything Communist. With few exceptions, they will not cooperate with their Marxist rulers. They are committed to the cause of freedom and liberation and they will never willingly wear the yoke that has been placed around their necks, and will ever seek to cast it off.

In the not too distant future, we hope and pray that the Poles will find the means to remove their puppet government and reclaim their cherished independence, or that this Government, leading the free world, as it should in this and other instances affecting oppressed peoples, will secure an agreement from the Soviet to liberate the gallant Poles and other peoples similarly situated as the result of modern tyranny.

Liberation of the oppressed is one of the greatest issues confronting us in the world today. It is the duty of all true Americans, not only to support liberation, but to urge this Government to take such measures as may be necessary to insure it and, thus, free millions of enslaved peoples from the shackles of despotic communism.

The article follows:

MILITARY POTENTIAL OF COMMUNIST POLAND

(By Richard F. Staar, Ph. D.)

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—The views expressed in this article are the author's and are not necessarily those of the Department of the Army or the Command and General Staff College.)

The importance of contemporary Poland stems perhaps less from the size of her territory and population than from her geographic location, athwart the historical invasion route across northern continental Europe. In this latter capacity the country will play a key role in any future conflict or settlement between East and West. Therefore, Communist Poland should be known. However, this article will cover only a narrow portion of this vast subject field, namely the dominant influence of the U. S. S. R. on the Polish Army and the application of the Soviet political pattern to Poland.

The principal policies of the Polish Communists in the field of national defense in 1955 were rearmament and the political education of the soliders in the armed forces. Polish popular reactions to these policies cannot be ascertained but are probably negative. Since the puppet government's intention is to stand side by side with the Soviet Union, the attitude of the population would probably hinge upon its feelings regarding the U. S. S. R. The fact that officers are being recruited from among the working and peasant classes provides considerable social opportunities for individuals from these strata. This could contribute to bringing about a feeling of gratitude and allegiance to the present Polish Communist Government on the part of these individuals themselves as well as thier friends and relatives.

The law on the current 6-year plan (1950–55) specifically provides for a considerable expansion in the defensive power of Poland by means of an increase in the general productive potential and the development of a special defense industry. This same law expresses its preoccupation with improving military indoctrination and supplies:

"In order to raise the ideological level of our mililitary cadres, it is necessary to train them in the principles of Marxism and Leninism, [encourage them to] read and study the teachings of Stalin, and assimilate the Soviet sciences and art of warfare.

It is necessary for the [army] command to strengthen the dictorate of the army's supply organization and for the [Communist] Party to strengthen the army's political indoctrination program [with better personnel]."

The individual responsible for the political education in all military units is the deputy commander. He directs the activities of both the Polish United Workers' Communist Party and the Union of Polish Communist Youth Organizations in the army. Party members are considered to be the real center of party-political work among the enlisted men. A special military-political academy has been established to train officers for political indoctrination work in the armed forces.

The basic duties of a Polish soldier are incorporated in his oath of allegiance. In the middle of 1950 the legislature passed a law introducing a new version of the military oath which is notable for its lack of any reference to God. The new text speaks only of allegiance to people's Poland and the preservation of peace by standing indomitably beside the Soviet Army and the other allied armies. The basic training manual entitled "Regulations for Internal Service in the Polish Army" was announced by National Defense Minister (former U. S. S. R. Marshal until he was loaned to Poland in 1949) Konstantin Rokossovski in early 1950. It is admittedly copied from that in use by the Soviet armed forces.

POLITICAL EDUCATION

Political education of the youth is also conducted in preparation for military service by means of a paramilitary organization called Service to Poland. Established by law, membership in this organization is compulsory for boys and girls above the age of 16. Despite the emphasis on political indoctrination, no real evidence has been uncovered to indicate that U. S. S. R. authorities in 1955 considered the Polish armed forces reliable in a war with the West. The Soviets may, however, possibly feel that control over the Polish Army is sufficiently tight to ensure its useability as rear echelon units.

SOVIET-SPONSORED FORCES

The original Soviet-sponsored Polish Army was recruited from among those Poles taken to the Soviet Union during the period of the Hitler-Stalin pact of 1939–41 (estimated at almost 1.7 million persons). While these Poles survived forced labor and the genocide of certain elements, especially Polish officers, they were not able to join the Polish units organized by Lt. Gen. Wladyslaw Anders. The Anders' army was evacuated from the southern part of the Soviet Union in early 1943 by the British to fight Axis forces in North Africa and later in Italy.

The Polish troops which fought the Germans on the eastern front were commanded by Col. Zygmunt Berling who had served as a regular Polish Army officer prior to 1939. He led these Soviet-sponsored forces from their inception in May 1943 until the time when the Communist-controlled Polish Committee of National Liberation installed itself at Lublin in July 1944. At this time command passed into the hands of Michal Rola-Zymierski, a former Polish general removed from the army in 1927 and sentenced to prison for embezzlement. Rola-Zymierski was subsequently made a marshal and head of the national defense department in the Communist government of Poland. He was in turn replaced early in November 1949 in both positions by the U. S. S. R.'s Rokossovski.

The latter is not the first Soviet officer to have held a high position in the Soviet-sponsored Polish armed forces. In order to give a semblance of legality to the infiltration of Russians into the Polish Army during World War II, the Presidium of the U. S. S. R. Supreme Soviet in the middle of 1944 granted by decree to Soviet citizens the privilege of formally renouncing their U. S. S. R. allegiance and applying for Polish citizenship. At one time there are reported to have been up to 40 generals and 15,000 other Soviet officers in the Polish Army.

THREE PERCENT OF POPULATION

The people's army of Poland is based upon compulsory military service and reportedly numbers approximately 750,000 men in time of peace, which is almost 3 percent of the total population. Only a small fraction of this number is probably in the regular army, while the remainder consists of security forces and quasi-military units. About 235,000 youths reach military age each year.

The chairman of the State Council is supreme commander of the national armed forces, according to the 1952 constitution. In time of war he appoints a commander in chief who is nominated by the National Defense Minister. In reality, this is only a facade, and there is no civilian control exercised over the Polish Army, not even by the Communist government. The de facto power in military affairs most certainly is wielded not by Aleksander Zawadzki (chairman of the State Council since 1952) but by National Defense Minister, Marshal Rokossovski, who in turn receives directives from Moscow.

RESPONSIBILITIES

The Ministry of National Defense in Poland is nominally responsible for all problems connected with the defense of the state. These are in general concerned with planning, organization, and disposition of troops during peace and war. Included are universal military training and reserve training as well as planning and supervision over military schooling and political education work for all officers, noncommissioned officers, and enlisted men. Other aspects involve training in tactics, research toward improving weapons and technical equipment, and also exploitation of scientific and technological achievements for national defense. No less important are the supervision over the sanitary and veterinary services, supply and equipment for troops, and the preparation of reserves in personnel.

The top echelon organization of the National Defense Ministry includes a minister, four deputies, a General Staff, and a Main Political-Education Board. The National Defense Minister issues all orders and directives. The First Deputy directs the general activities connected with education in citizenship and politics as well as morale of troops. He is also Chief of the General Staff. The latter body is responsible for all problems concerned with planning for defense, schooling higher level commanders and staffs, and preparation of adequately trained scientific and research personnel. It coordinates the work of different categories of troops, establishes and transmits operational and tactical fundamentals of doctrine to those preparing military literature, and studies the exploitation of scientific and technological achievements for the needs of the armed forces.

The responsibilities of the Second Deputy Minister are in the fields of organization and training. The Third Deputy heads the Main Political-Education Board and directs the entire political education system in all branches of the armed forces. The Fourth Deputy Minister for rear services holds the position of quartermaster general. His work pertains to supplies of food, uniforms, and finances, sanitary and veterinary

problems, and quarters and military construction.

As already indicated, the Third Deputy Minister for National Defense is concurrently chief of the Main Political-Education Board of the Polish armed forces (GZPWP). Principal directives for the activities of GZPWP are formulated by the Communist Party, and the board functions as the military section of the party's secretariat. Liaison between the army and the party is effected through Brig. Gen. Kazimierz Witaszewski who is currently the Third Deputy Defense Minister and a member of the party central committee.

POLITIAL ADMINISTRATIONS

Subordinate to the Main Political-Education Board are the political administrations for the various branches of the armed services and the military district commanders. These in turn are superior to party commissions in each armed forces division. The latter were established in early 1951 upon the demand of division conferences.

The next level in the organization of the political education system comprises the primary party organizations in the individual regiments. Such cells are directed by trained party secretaries, who are also officers, with the military rank of deputy regimental commander. Each secretary is assisted by a party committee, subdivided into sections and staffed with propaganda instructors. These men participate in maneuvers, give lectures, and their task is to set an example in discipline and training.

Still lower organizational units for political indoctrination are to be found on the battalion and company levels. Officers in charge of this work, especially on the company level, have closer contact with their men than is true of the higher echelons. They perform their activities in person, having as aides noncommissioned officers who are trained in special courses as agitators.

The agitator is supposed to approach the rank and file soldiers as a comrade and not as a superior. The political education he attempts to instill is supposed to be conducted in the form of persuasion and not by means of military commands. Special dossiers are maintained by the political officer in charge of each company, and they are a repository for reports on all enlisted men and officers. These reports are periodically brought up to date by the agitators. Thus each soldier undergoes individual molding in the required form and framework.

The training of political officers takes place in three different types of schools: basic, advanced, and academic. The lowest level of political training is provided by the main school for political officers at Lodz. This course lasts 2 full years, and graduates are qualified to work at company levels. They receive military training together with the political schooling. Advanced training takes place at the higher school for political officers in Rembertów near Warsaw. Graduating classes are assigned to battalions.

MILITARY-POLITICAL ACADEMY

The Military-Political Academy, named after Feliks Dzerzhinski (a Polish nobleman by birth, he was founder and first head of the Bolshevik secret police, the Cheka, now called the Soviet Ministry of Internal Affairs (MVD)) was established in Warsaw by the Polish Communist Party's central committee and is avowedly patterned after the Lenin Military-Political Academy in Moscow. The statute of the Dzerzhinski Academy in Poland defines its tasks as being:

"The training and preparation of officers for posts in the armed forces, which require higher military and political studies, and for scientific work in the field of Marxist-Leninist military and political knowledge."

The academy in Warsaw is under the overall supervision of the Ministry for National Defense but is directly administered by the Main Political-Education Board of the Polish Armed Forces.

In addition to having the prerequisites for entrance to a university, candidates for admission to the "Dzerzhinski" Military-Political Academy must be regular commissioned army officers who have been graduated from an officer candidates' school. In some cases of an exceptional nature, individuals undergoing universal military training are permitted to enter the academy. However, such candidates must pledge to enter the regular army as a career upon graduation from the academy.

The tasks of political officers, schooled at the academy, were made plain by Brig. Gen. Marian Naszkowski (at the time head of the Main Political-Education Board) in a speech to trainees at the academy:

"Basing ourselves on the experience of the Soviet Army * * * we should constantly be perfecting methods for shaping the political consciousness of our troops, deepening patriotism and internationalism * * * arousing hatred for the enemy forces of imperialism, arousing revolutionary vigilance."

The aim is obviously to transform the Polish soldier ideologically into a being similar to the Soviet soldier, to whom the Pole is bound by a network of military alliances.

"Grave injustices are still uncorrected. We must not, by any sanction of ours, help to perpetuate these wrongs. I have particularly in mind the oppressive division of the German people, the bondage of millions elsewhere, and the exclusion of Japan from United Nations membership. We shall keep these injustices in the forefront of human consciousness and seek to maintain the pressure of world opinion to right these vast wrongs in the interest both of justice and secure peace." (President Dwight D. Eisenhower.)

Work of American Community Chests

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, July 18, 1956

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, Fred M. Lange, executive vice president of the Dallas County Community Chest in Texas, is one of the outstanding community chest executives of the United States. Mr. Lange through the years has raised many millions of dollars for charitable purposes.

Recently Mr. Lange, now touring Europe, was invited to speak in Stockholm, Sweden, on the work of American community chests. His address was given before a national committee representing 16 private business associations of Sweden. These associations contribute to voluntary philanthropy throughout Sweden through this committee.

I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Lang's informative address be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS GIVEN BY FRED M. LANGE, L. H. D., L. L. D., EXECUTIVE VICE PRESIDINT, DALLAS COUNTY COMMUNITY CHEST, BEFORE NARINGSLIVETS GRANSKNINGSNAMND FOR GAVOR OCH UNDERSTODSANNONSER STOCKHOLM, SWEDEN, JULY 16, 1956

To understand the way American Community Chests work, let me very briefly review some general facts about the financing of welfare work in America. Although voluntary agencies always played a very large and important part in the welfare work in my country, the activities of private welfare organizations and the Community Chest idea of financing those private agencies were greatly accelerated at the time of the First World War.

At that time, because of wartime needs, there was a very great expansion of voluntary organizations. This was the era of the establishment of Community Chests and, as private organizations increased rapidly, Community Chests increased with equal rapidity. The Community Chests have as their purpose the combining of many private organizations into a single campaign for funds. This makes it unnecessary for each organization to put on its own campaign and has many advantages. It enables the fund raising to be conducted more efficiently and with less cost in terms of money and also in terms of manpower of citizens who must go out and collect the funds. It also enables the community to better understand how the work of these many agencies is interrelated, and the need for their working together as a team.

The second big change in the financing of American welfare activities came about in the 1930's during the depression. The needs of the great numbers of persons thrown out of work amounted so rapidly that it was impossible for local governmental units and private organizations to finance all necessary help. This situation forced the entry of the Federal or National Government into the picture. Since 1930 we have voluntary agencies and Government agencies cooperating and complementing each other.

At the present time there is a renewed push in most American cities to bring more and more private welfare organizations into a single fund-raising plan. Most of these more inclusive campaigns are called "United Funds." These joint fund-raising drives reduce the irritation created when many private organizations individually go to the same contributors. Even more important, however, these joint drives capture the interest and gain the support of the top leadership in the community. Interested citizens become volunteer solicitors, making them aware of, and creating in them an interest in social problems and in their community. This project enables people as well as agencies of different religious faiths and backgrounds to work together.

One of our leading educators, Dean Vasey of Rutgers University, speaking about this subject, recently said that the many board members and campaign workers interested in voluntary agencies are the "enlightened conscience" of our American communities. He noted that it is usually these people with knowledge and conviction about social problems who most often "speak out" when there is danger of losing essential welfare services, or when there is need to increase or improve essential welfare services. These same people follow closely legislation affecting governmental programs. He said that these are the people "who are making our American communities better and more attractive places in which to live."

Even though Sweden and Texas are very far apart and life in Sweden is different from what it is in Texas, there are some similarities; for instance, the population of Sweden and the population of Texas are about the same. I read that you have about 7 million people. Texas is much larger in size, having 263,000 square miles, while Sweden contains about 173,000 square miles. Texas is divided into 254 counties. For welfare purposes, in my State, programs are usually on a county basis. The population of Dallas County, the area covered by the Community Chest which I direct, is about 750,000 persons.

The Dallas Community Chest has made significant strides in recent years. For instance, in 1948 we raised $1,470,000. In 1955 we raised $2,395,000. This is an increase of 63 percent. In 1948 about 106,000 persons

contributed to the chest campaign. In 1955, with 311,000 persons employed in Dallas County, 192,000 persons contributed to the chest. This is an increase of 82 percent.

Community Chests and United Funds in Texas last year raised about $15 million. It is my rough guess that perhaps an additional $15 million was raised by voluntary agencies not in a Community Chest or United Fund. I would roughly estimate then that about $30 million was raised in Texas for private welfare purposes through voluntary giving.

The financing of voluntary services through a Community Chest such as we have in Dallas has many important aspects. We have an overall board of directors composed of 105 men and women. These people come from all walks of life. They are really a cross section of the entire community. The board of directors sets the general policies of the Community Chest, while many of the important day-by-day decisions are made by a 16-member executive committee. The paid staff of 15 members of the Community Chest carries out the policies and decisions of the board and executive committee. The composition of the board and executive committee is extremely important. As representatives of the overall community, these people vouch for the efficiency and integrity of the Community Chest organization. They increase the confidence which the community has in the chest because the community knows that outstanding men and women of exceptional competence are making the policies and important decisions. I cannot overemphasize the fact that all significant community groups should be represented.

This citizen control is further strengthened by the fact that each of the 37 agencies, operating a total of 103 centers, has a board of directors of its own. There is a total of 670 board members serving with the member agencies. Agency board members are expected to work in the chest campaign. This broad citizen participation is further strengthened by about 6,000 citizens who volunteer to work in the drive. Each of these volunteer workers learns a great deal about the work of the chest agencies and becomes a spokesman for them to the general community. It is truly a broad citizen effort, which means that it is a product of the people and for the people. It is their Community Chest and the agencies are their agencies.

This whole project is carried on with the philosophy that "Everybody gives and everybody benefits." Put in another way, when we help people who need us, we are helping everyone, and what hurts the general welfare effort hurts everyone.

To some degree our success depends upon our year-round public relations program. The Community Chest, with its small paid staff, and each of the 37 member agencies are ever alert to bring their story before the public in as many ways as possible. All publicity media are used. Television is being used more and more in Dallas. Agencies are encouraged to use constructive human interest stories for publicity and interpretation purposes. Each agency always states in its publicity that it is a Chest agency. The public relations director of the Chest assists these agencies in preparing material. Periodically, we have public relations clinics, when agencies are given ideas of how better to interpret their services to the general public. The Chest public relations department receives invaluable help from a publicity committee made up of outstanding public relations people in Dallas who contribute their time. We also get much help from such civic groups as the advertising league and the junior league. People who help in these various ways become partners in this enterprise. This further spreads the base of participation and strengthens the feeling that this is everybody's project.

In the actual solicitation of contributions every encouragement is given to make the giving convenient and fair. The total campaign organization is divided into divisions according to the major grouping of contributors, based on their type of business and ability to give. In this we have the cooperation of many businesses and unions; for instance, the worker can pledge an annual amount of money and have this amount deducted from his regular pay checks in monthly installments. At the employee's request the firm he works for will handle the deduction and send it to the chest. Most salaried workers are encouraged to give one day's pay as a fair share. People in higher income brackets are encouraged to give on a more generous basis.

A speakers bureau composed of informed volunteers gives talks before civic, professional, and employee groups explaining these matters.

In all of this we have the encouragement of the National Government, since under our income tax regulations a corporation may make tax-free gifts for charitable purposes up to 5 percent of profits. Individuals can make tax-free gifts of 20 to 30 percent.

Another of the many important aspects of our work is the way in which we determine the annual over-all amount which is needed for the combined agencies of the chest.

This is the amount which we call our annual campaign goal, and the amount solicited by the 6,000 volunteers. The paid staff of the Community Chest receives monthly financial reports and monthly activities reports from each agency. This makes possible year-round budget control.

Early in the spring outstanding local citizens are appointed to serve on what we call the Citizens Budget Committee. It would be impossible for one committee to review the budgets of all 37 agencies. Therefore, the committee is divided into 4 groups and each agency is assigned to one of the four budget groups, depending on its field of service. The four budget groups are: Public Health and Medical Services, Group Work and Recreation Services, Family Services, and Children Services.

Each board of directors every year studies its program in view of future needs. In April every year each board of directors draws up a proposed budget which it believes its agency will need during the next fiscal year beginning November 1. In June, a committee from each agency personally appears before its budget committee to explain and justify the request for future funds.

During these conferences between the chest budget committee and representatives of the agency, staff of the Community Chest and also of the Council of Social Agencies are present. The chest staff has at its fingertips data concerning previous expenditures of each agency, for each of the many items which comprise the total budget.

Staff members of the Council of Social Agencies, whose overall job is to help coordinate the many welfare activities in Dallas, are available during the discussion for consultation. The Council of Social Agencies, who work is financed by the Community Chest, includes in its membership all major health, welfare, and recreation agencies, regardless of how they are supported. The council is responsible for working with all agencies and for gathering information so that the community knows (1) which welfare problems need most attention, (2) which problems are changing, (3) which agencies can best give the needed services, and (4) how the needed services can be given most effectively and efficiently with the least amount of unnecessary duplication. The chest finances the council program as a service to the entire community.

Each chest agency is required to be a member and to cooperate with the council. While the Dallas chest and council are organizationally separate, each with its own board, there is interlocking of directors. While the chest raises funds for chest agencies, the council strives to guarantee to the public that the most urgent welfare needs are being met as effectively and efficiently as current resources permit. As you can understand, in a very rapidly expanding community such as Dallas, the welfare situation is constantly changing and requires constant study.

Complete information about expenditures and changing needs is essential since the chest budget committee carefully reviews every agency's total budget, which is broken down into about 20 separate items. This enables the chest budget committee to know specifically which of the agency's expenditures and income will be going up or down and why.

This same procedure is used with all Chest agencies, regardless of how much or how little of the agency's total income comes from the Chest, and how much is derived from charging fees for its services, or from other sources. Several Chest agencies in Dallas receive a small proportion of their total income from the Chest. On the other hand, some agencies receive all of their funds from the Community Chest. This is so because, depending on the nature of service, some agencies can charge fees while others cannot. Some agencies have been able to supplement their Chest income by receiving grants from foundations and trusts; still other agencies receive part of their funds from the Community Chest and part from the local or National Government. The scrutiny of each budget item is the same regardless of the sources of the funds.

A good example of an agency which receives funds from a variety of sources is the Dallas Child Guidance Clinic, which provides psychological testing and psychiatric service for emotionally troubled children. That agency is currently receiving support from seven sources: the Community Chest, fees from clients, the Texas State Department of Health, the Dallas Public Schools, a local private foundation, and a private statewide foundation, and the Dallas Mental Health Society. The budget of this agency is handled in the same way, item by item, as the budget of the Neighborhood Recreation Association, a small community center which receives all of its operating funds from the Community Chest.

After each agency's budget has been reviewed, the four budget groups total up the sum of all the funds they have approved. This sum and a complete report is given to the Chest executive committee. After further discussion and study, the Chest executive committee sets the campaign goal for that year, based upon the information provided by the budget committee and upon several additional factors. An additional amount must be added and earmarked as a reserve for necessary unforeseen expansions during the coming year. Also an amount must be added as a reserve for emergencies and an amount for uncollectible pledges and shrinkage.

Each agency is immediately notified of the action taken on its particular request. Should the agency feel that its request was not given proper consideration, that agency can return to the budget committee for a rehearing. Also, in some exceptional cases where the budget committee had denied some items, the agency can make another request after the annual campaign, provided the campaign has been a success. In this way, some additional adjustment may be made.

The various programs of the agencies serve people in all income groups. There are some services which can be obtained only from a Chest agency. Examples of this are Boy Scouts, Girl Scouts, services for unmarried

mothers, marriage counseling, and certain types of nursing, medical services, and day care for children. For this reason, agencies which serve all income groups are encouraged to charge fees based on a sliding scale, depending upon the ability of the family to pay. Some families pay the full cost of service; some families pay part of the cost, while others pay nothing at all. Although in Dallas the Chest raises about $2½ million, the total expenditures of the Chest agencies is close to $6 million. It really means that for an investment from voluntary contributions of $2½ million the Chest agencies are providing $6 million worth of service to the community.

The budgeting process is an important part of not only financing, but planning for American welfare services. The Chest Budget Committee made up of outstanding local citizens represents the persons who use the agencies' services and who contribute to the cost of the services. It includes Negroes, whites, Protestants, Catholics, Jews, housewives, salaried workers, union officials, professional men, career Government men, and leaders of business and industry. It is important to clarify that although these people are identified with these groups, they do not come as official delegates. They come as citizens and are free to act as individuals. For instance, the man from industry does not speak officially for industry, nor does he commit industry. He acts without needing to have his decisions approved by his group. This is consistent with our democratic way of life. However, the benefits of this budgeting system are greater than giving representation to people who use and pay for the services. Through this close review of each agency's budget, citizen leaders get to know a great deal about problems in their community. They review the relationship and the division of responsibility between private agencies and governmental agencies. They help to keep a proper balance among the many agencies and help to prevent the agency with the strong board and dramatic appeal from getting more than its fair share of the available funds. They learn that each community needs an orderly and balanced set of social services and that if an agency gets out of line, the balance is upset and the total effort will be less effective.

The budgeting process pledges to the community that the funds which the Community Chest collects for the agencies are vitally needed and are being spent wisely. Also, the budget committees learn very quickly that the various agencies could provide more good services than current funds can support. This means that the budget committees must choose and approve only those expenditures which they feel are the most important. Because of this they can interpret to the general public the necessity for, not only attaining the current goal, but the need to raise more money in future years, so that additional services can be given. It is democracy at work through public education and voluntary commitment.

Because the budget committee strives to approve requests for which they believe funds will be available, they can guarantee to the community that the amount of money being asked is a realistic amount.

I believe you will agree with me that the process which I tried to outline contributes much to our community life. It is far more than merely a check on the validity of the agencies' requests. It not only keeps fund-raising costs low, it not only makes for greater efficiency, it not only reduces irritation on the part of the givers, it not only helps to keep balance among the many various types of social service agencies, but it has educational, social, and spiritual values.

Many of our people say that the byproducts of the Community Chest drive are just as important as the direct results in terms of money; for instance, our business firms tell us that working in the chest campaign is excellent leadership training for their young executives. The fact that people from all walks of life and from all income groups, regardless of faith, color, or nationality, work side by side, has great value. It encourages tolerance and decreases prejudice. This working together for a common unselfish goal is basically a spiritual experience which cuts across all religious and denominational lines. It lowers barriers between groups of people. We never lose sight of this fact. Participation by clergy of all faiths is emphasized. Many of the campaign meeting are led by outstanding spiritual leaders. The efforts of the volunteers and the significance of the money raised is constantly translated into spiritual values based on religious convictions.

In Dallas we are convinced that the democratic way of life is best of all. We are convinced that the quality of our democracy depends upon our standard of values, which in turn depends upon the quality of our spiritual life. We know that our Community Chest effort gives our people an opportunity to put their religion to work. Through this work they dedicate themselves to the finest and most precious aspects of our way of life. There is no question in our minds but that this program, hand in hand with the church, strengthens the foundations of the American system.

Recent Student Demonstrations in Guatemala

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SPESSARD L. HOLLAND
OF FLORIDA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, July 18, 1956

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, a few days ago a representative of the Republic of Guatemala came by my office to discuss with me matters of interest to his Government. During the course of our conversation I expressed to him my deep concern over the manner in which the recent student demonstrations in Guatemala were handled. I deplored the use of firearms by the police during those demonstrations, and expressed regret that the matter could not be handled without firing into the groups of students.

On July 16 I received a letter dated July 14 and a detailed memorandum, from Mr. Julio Asensio-Wunderlich, chargé d'affaires, Embassy of Guatemala, setting out the facts regarding this situation, as viewed by the Guatemalan Government. I know many other Senators are as concerned about this particular incident as I am, and in order that all Senators may have an opportunity to read the information supplied by the Embassy of Guatemala, I obtained the consent of the writer that the letter to me dated July 14, and the accompanying memorandum, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD. I ask unanimous consent that such course be followed.

There being no objection, the letter and memorandum were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EMBASSY OF GUATEMALA,
Washington, D. C., July 14, 1956.

The Honorable SPESSARD L. HOLLAND,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: I was informed by Mr. Patrick McMahon of his conversation with you on Tuesday and of the concern you expressed, regarding the recent student demonstrations in Guatemala.

Please be assured, Senator, that my Government appreciates most deeply the interest you have shown in Guatemala and the assistance you have rendered to our cause. We value most deeply your sympathetic understanding.

For that reason, I venture to enclose a memorandum that sets forth some of the facts regarding the student demonstrations, which were not included in the press dispatches.

Please accept, Senator, the renewed assurances of my highest consideration.

JULIO ASENSIO-WUNDERLICH,
Chargé d'Affaires ad Interim.

MEMORANDUM TO SENATOR SPESSARD L. HOLLAND FROM THE EMBASSY OF GUATEMALA

1. The June 24 student demonstration in Guatemala was a culmination of a long series of incidents provoked by different groups, clearly at the instigation of Communists. The first student demands were moderate, the President himself met with their representatives several times and granted them. This resulted in an increased arbitrary attitude by student groups, which finally dropped all pretense at disguise and publicly adopted outright Communist tactics. The attached list of their "demands" clearly shows the character of the movement.

2. Although the demonstrations were instigated by certain student groups, only a portion of the rioters were actually students. The attached photograph, taken immediately before the outbreak of violence, clearly shows that many of the demonstrators are not of student age.

3. A substantial number of demonstrators were armed with knives and revolvers.

4. The Government is firmly convinced that the instigators of the demonstration intended to provoke violence.

5. The police kept their guns holstered when they ordered the demonstrators to disperse, and used only nightsticks at the first outbreak of violence.

6. The first shots were fired by the demonstrators. Not until a policeman was shot was their fire returned.

7. The actual casualties were 4 dead (including a policeman) and 17 wounded.

8. The attached photostat of one of the leaflets, circulated by the demonstrators, clearly proves the Communist nature of the incident. Among demands listed are the abrogation of our anti-Communist laws, the return of political exiles (all Communist), the confiscation of property owned by United States firms, and the denunciation of the "Yanki-Guatemalan" military treaty. This phraseology will be immediately recognized by anyone familiar with Communist propaganda.

9. The Government has positive proof that the student groups responsible for the demonstration have been in constant contact with the Prague headquarters of the International Union of Students. Correspondence between the Guatemalan group and the Prague headquarters was intercepted and has been published in the Guatemalan newspapers. Shortly before the demonstration, the Prague radio beamed a broadcast to Guatemala, urging the people to overthrow the "Fascist Yanki-dominated" Government.

10. The June 24 incident was timed to coincide with several other outbreaks in Latin American countries, all Communist directed, prepared for the date in which the

Presidents of America were to meet in Panama.

From a letter addressed by the International Union of Students, of Prague, Czechoslovakia, to the Frente Universitario Democrático of Guatemala:

"The anniversary of the suppression of the Democratic Government of Guatemala." It refers to the overthrow of the Arbenz regime.

"The response of the students of the world when Guatemala was attacked, gave them strength and hope."

This letter instructs students all over the world to circulate the declaration made by the Guatemalan students, also photographed in this newspaper, and from which declaration are the following phrases:

"The wealth that we Guatemalans zealously defended, have been delivered to foreign corporations. While the land that was given to the peasants under the Agrarian Reform are snatched from them with violence and returned to the great foreign landowners (the United Fruit Co.) and petroleum and mining zones are given to well known international trusts (meaning the 29 U. S. oil corporations and several mining companies now exploring in Guatemala)."

The pamphlets and leaflets that circulated in Guatemala just before June 24, calling for the people to meet in a public square and to march through the streets of Guatemala City to demonstrate for: the immediate return of political exiles, the immediate freedom of political prisoners, the suppression of repressive organizations (anticommunist bloc), the abrogation of Law No. 59 (anticommunist law given by the Guatemalan Junta August 24, 1954), the defense of human rights, the abrogation of laws No. 570 and 584 (reforms to labor laws), the abrogation of article 6 of the Constitution (anticommunist), the termination of concessions to United Fruit Co. and American Power Co., the termination of foreign loans and purchase of arms, the construction and administration of new electric power plants of Jurún-Marinalá by the State, the abrogation of article 154 of the Criminal Code (right to persecute criminals), the denunciation of the Yanki-Guatemalan military treaty, and for our national sovereignty.

It is to be noted that in paragraph 3, the leaflet stated that in 1954 (when Arbenz was overthrown) "Constitutional order was broken, foreign intervention ended the legal state and imposed an antidemocratic government that supports and stimulates foreign interests" and this because all this propaganda tends to show the present Government as "imposed by the United States State Department, pro-American and sold to United States interests," as mentioned in other propaganda.

Mr. President, I may say the memorandum refers to certain pictures, which, of course, cannot go into the RECORD. I shall leave them on my desk, in the event any Senators wish to see what those pictures show—namely, that people of middle age participated in the disorderly assembly at the time of the student demonstrations.

States' Rights and the Supreme Court

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. SPARKMAN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, July 17, 1956

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, in the May 1956 issue of the Masonic Monthly appeared part I of an article entitled "States Rights and the Supreme Court," written by Dr. James A. Chandler, a 32d-degree Mason and a Knight Templar. He is also a Methodist preacher. Part II of the same article was published in the June 1956 issue of the same publication. I ask unanimous consent that the two parts of the article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

I am advised by the Public Printer that the article will make approximately 2⅓ pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at a cost of $179.67.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATES RIGHTS AND THE SUPREME COURT

(By Dr. James A. Chandler, 32d Degree Knights Templar)

("We owe it to our ancestors to preserve entire those rights, which they have delivered to our care: we owe it to our posterity, not to suffer their dearest inheritance to be destroyed."—Junius.)

Norman Thomas ran six times for the Presidency of the United States upon the platform of the Socialist Party. Franklin D. Roosevelt took over that platform, called it the "New Deal," and won. For that reason it is reported that Thomas said he would not run again.

For long years the Negro vote was strictly Republican, but in 1936 it was captured by the New Deal. The Negroes "joined hands with the newly organized CIO and other minority groups to seek leftwing legislation from the New Deal." Together they sought a restoration of the civil rights legislation that had been enacted during the Reconstruction Period, which repeatedly had been declared unconstitutional by the Supreme Court. (See "Race Integration Cases," p. 1, by Charles Wallace Collins.)

Despite that fact along came Harry Truman with his so-called "Fair Deal." He appointed a special committee from whose report was evolved "The Truman Civil Rights Program," socialized medicine, the FEPC, etc. It is traceable from Truman to Roosevelt, from Roosevelt to Thomas, from Thomas to Russia.

That program was espoused by the Negro leaders in the North, who have never ceased their agitations, aided and abetted by Communistic organizations. It could very appropriately be called "The Negro's Civil Rights Program." Ostensibly, the primary purpose of that program was desegregation of the races, but more recently the ultimate purpose has become apparent—not only the integration of Negroes into all white schools but by use of that instrumentality to procure racial integration in the South, intermarriage, mongrelization, amalgamation, i. e., to produce one race where the two had existed, a Negroid South! It seems to be a basic dream and purpose of the leading Negro agitators. Why?

The recent decree of the Supreme Court lends itself to that program of the Negro and the subversive organizations in this country but of Russia.

Mr. Edward Scott, columnist of the Habana (Cuba) Post says that "in the Negro Republic of Liberia, discrimination against the white race is established under its constitution, which provides that no person shall have the power to own property or to vote, unless he is a Negro." That seems strange, and it raises many questions, but stranger still is the fact that, though we find in the history of nations and governments every kind of slavery, injustice and cruelty, "there will not be found one single instance where a government has forced one race against its will to be integrated with another"—Charles Wallace Collins.

It was recently declared by certain distinguished Members of the United States House of Representatives that a former President of the American Bar Association says that 98 percent of the good lawyers of America have no respect for the legal talent of the present members of the Supreme Court; that they sometime ago asserted that there are no restraints whatsoever upon them except those that they impose upon themselves; that not a single self-respecting lawyer in this country has written an opinion justifying the segregation decision; and that the American Bar Association has an outstanding offer now to any lawyer who can justify that decision, but that there are no takers. Furthermore, Representative LANHAM pointed out the lamentable fact that "there are absolutely no requirements, no qualifications, other than age, in the law or the Constitution, for members of the Supreme Court." (See CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Apr. 16, 1956, pp. 5710–5713.)

It is the common opinion of the good lawyers of this country that the Supreme Court has overstepped its powers and usurped a right reserved by the Constitution solely to the States, when it decreed the integration of Negroes into our schools, which really means all white relations; that the function of the Court is not to enact law but to interpret the laws that already exist; and that the reason why the Court gave no contutional exposition of its radical decree is that it simply could find none to give. That being true, the States must win their fight, not upon racial grounds, but upon a constitutional basis, the return of those rights reserved to the States by the Constitution.

The Supreme Court has no functions of a Soviet Republic, nor the authority of an oligarchy, or a judicial dictatorship—a usurpation to which it has been moving for 20 years. Its powers are listed, limited, and delegated to it by the Constitution of the United States, which every justice swears to uphold. Each State is a unit of power that has delegated certain powers to a one government called Federal, which simply means united by compact. It is also called a republic, a sort of a one State in which the States have united for the good of all. But before those States were united, each State was a sovereign political unit within its own rights. The very foundation of that republic is home rule, or self-government. It has no right through the Supreme Court or any other court to lord it over the units of power, the States, that created it. Else, the created would be greater than its creators. What freak of Frankenstein is this that rises up to crush those who made him?

We, as southerners, should like to believe that we still live in the Republic of the United States of America; that the powers we, as sovereign States, delegated to that Republic shall not be betrayed by 9 politically appointed justices, 8 New Deal and 1 Republican, none of whom is noted for his legal talent; and that that Republic, or the Supreme Court, shall not feel itself so mighty or strongly grown that it can, without remedy, defy the powers that gave it birth. It is a dangerous decree. It could mean the disruption of all constitutional government. President John Adams once said, "There was never a democracy that did not destroy itself."

George Washington in his Farewell Address, September 17, 1796, warned us against this day—

"Let the Constitution be changed by constitutional means, but let it not be changed by usurpation. The spirit of encroachment tends to consolidate the powers of all the departments in one, and thus to create, whatever the form of government, a real despotism."

Thomas Jefferson time and again warned us against this day, the encroachment of "the Judiciary Branch * * * which may some day press us into tyranny" by a whittling away of the rights reserved to the

States by the States by common consent. Those rights were not handed down by favor to the States by the Republic, or the Federal Government, and they cannot be lawfully deprived of them.

Thomas Jefferson said:

"The great object of my fear is the judiciary * * *. It is a very dangerous doctrine to consider the judges as the ultimate arbiters of all constitution questions. It is one which could place us under the despotism of an oligarchy * * *. The Constitution has erected no such single tribunal, knowing that to whatever hands confided, with the corruption of time and party, its members can become despots." (See CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, April 16, 1956, p. 5712.)

Dean Clarence E. Manion, one of the greatest constitutional authorities in the United States, said:

"For many years it has ben painfully obvious that the Federal executive and the Federal courts are in an effective combination to destroy the constitutional integrity of the States by the centralization of power in the Washington bureaucracy. Only a strong, self-conscious Congress and a vigilant sacrificial self-reliance on the part of the States can now save our Republic." (See CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, April 17, 1956, p. A-3081.)

The Southland cannot forever endure the usurpation of her rights. The Supreme Court can never abolish segregation and its contomitant mores, because segregation is inherent and conforms to the divine purpose and pattern of God Himself. The courts can only create by their decrees a condition that will become intolerable.

Now once again along comes Harry Truman's so-called program of civil rights, about which there was much discussion but no legislation. President Eisenhower has done much to further that program. Mr. Brownell appealed to the Supreme Court for a decision favoring desegregation and the integration of Negroes into white relations. The Court after a review of certain books on sociology, psychology, and anthropology brought forth the notorious decision that is so repulsive to the ablest legal talent in this country and to the vast majority of our southern people.

We need not less respect for sociology but more respect for law and the Founding Fathers of our country. We need fewer opportunists and fewer worshippers at the shrine of expediency. We need more men to whom the smell of powder is sweet in the cause of right. We need fewer stooges and less yes-yes. We need more Patrick Henrys to spit the fires of patriotism and justice into the face of demagogery and cowardice. We hear much these days about the fear of change. Change. From what to what? We need a change back to the first principles of law and government from socialism—a creeping paralysis upon the body politic—that is threatening the very existence of our Republic.

It seems that the present administration is fast winning back the Negroes to the Republican Party. Our World, a Negro magazine, New York, published an article, titled, "Eisenhower's Black Cabinet," in which it is said that some 15 Negroes have been appointed to key Republican positions, and that an increasing number of persons who determine and carry out Federal policies are Negroes. That magazine is listed by the House Un-American Activities Committee as being "among publications which the committee found to be Communist infiltrated and controlled." (See Doc. No. 137, May 14, 1951.) It is also a well-authenticated fact that President Eisenhower has ruled against any segregation or discrimination in veteran hospitals among patients or nurses, that white nurses must serve Negro men patients though there are Negro nurses there to wait upon their own kind.

Now the Democrats and the Republicans this election year are quarreling among themselves as to which shall have the greater credit, or has done the more, for the so-called program of civil rights, the purpose of which is the furtherance and fulfillment of the Negro's Communist inspired, sponsored, and supported purpose and plan—not just for the integrated education of the races but racial integration itself. If a two-party system is healthy for our country, more than likely a third party in the Southland to hold the balance of power would make it more so. Why not? Have not the rights of the Southern States been ignored and kicked around long enough?

When the 14th amendment came along, the radical Republicans planned to enact legislation to weaken the States and to establish a strong Central Government in Washington that would dominate the South through carpet-bagger-Negro rule. When it was quite lawfully submitted to the States for ratification, it was defeated. The rejection infuriated the Republican Congress. It took over the Southern States at the point of the bayonet, disfranchised the white voters and put the ballot into the hands of the Negro. When the 14th amendment was again submitted to the States (1868), it was ratified almost unanimously by the Southern States—"the United States Army attended to the details"—but the ratification was in violation of the Constitution because it was forced "into the Constitution at the point of the bayonet." The Congress forthwith (1870) enacted legislation to enforce the 14th amendment, and (1875) it enacted the Civil Rights Act.

That act occasioned some violence in Louisiana. Certain white men broke up a Negro political meeting. They were convicted by a Federal court of violating the Enforcement Act of 1876. When the case was appealed to the United States Supreme Court in 1877 it decided that the Congress had no power from the 14th amendment to legislate in respect to acts of individual persons, that the punishment of any crime committed within a State is reserved to and becomes the responsibility of the State in which the crime was committed. The Supreme Court said: "The very highest duty of the States, when they entered into the Union under the Constitution, was to protect all persons within their boundaries in the enjoyment of those unalienable rights." That opinion was confirmed absolutely by the Supreme Court, October 15, 1883. From 1876 to 1936, 60 years, there was peace in the Southland between the two races because of that and subsequent decisions of the Court. But in 1936, the NAACP and its subsidiaries and its affiliates, and the Negro as a voting bloc, forsook the Republicans and joined the Democrats, as aforesaid.

The South lost its veto (a NAACP victory) over the nomination of candidates, when the national convention abolished the two-thirds rule, which was a blow to the South. Then the NAACP began its agitation for a reversal of the Supreme Court's position on civil rights, as embodied in the Louisiana appeal case of 1876, which had held sway from 1876 to 1936. Here again enters the Truman civil-rights program, which was reintroduced in the 83d Congress.

The Supreme Court by unanimous decree on Monday, May 17, 1954, reversed the former decision of the Supreme Court, which in the year 1896 held that segregation was not a violation of the equal protection clause of the 14th amendment when "separate but equal" facilities were offered, a decision that had been confirmed by six decisions of the Court in years subsequent to 1896.

The strangest of all things, in the opinion of the best legal talent in this country, is not only that the Supreme Court gave no "constitutional exposition of its radical change" from the position the Court had so long held in honor and gave no opinion of any jurist or any previous decision of the Court, but confessedly based its decision upon seven psychologists and sociologists, Dr. Gunnar Myrdal's "An American Dilemma" being cited as the leading authority. Who is Gunnar Myrdal?

The Supreme Court by unanimous decree on Monday, May 17, 1954, reversed the Supreme Court, which in the year 1896 held that segregation was not a violation of the equal-protection clause of the 14th amendment, when "separate but equal" facilities were offered, a decision that had been confirmed by six decisions of the Supreme Court subsequent to 1896.

The strangest of all things, in the opinion of the best legal talent of this country, is, not only that the Supreme Court of 1954 gave no constitutional exposition of its radical change" from the position the Court had so long held in honor, and gave no opinion of any jurist or any previous decision of the Court, but, confessedly, based its decision upon seven psychologists and sociologists, Dr. Gunnar Myrdal's An American Dilemma being cited as the leading authority.

Who is Dr. Gunnar Myrdal? He is a Socialist.

(The most dangerous of all Reds have never been members of the Communist Party. They call themselves "liberals" or "humanitarians." Hitler was a "liberal," and his Nazism was "National Socialism." The U. S. S. R. is the "United Socialist Soviet Republics." Russia does not use the word "communism" when it can be avoided. We should not be deceived by those who loudly denounce communism but whose purposes are Red.)

Dr. Myrdal is a professor in the University of Stockholm, Sweden. He calls himself a "social engineer." He was an economical adviser to the Swedish Government and a member of the Swedish senate. He was brought over (1937) to this country by the Carnegie Corp. of New York to study race relations, particularly in the South, of which he, confessedly, had known nothing. Dr. Myrdal was much in the company and support of Negro leaders while here.

In 1944 Harpers published Dr. Myrdal's 1,500-page, 2-volume book, An American Dilemma. His solution of the dilemma and of all segregation problems is integration, based upon the theory that there is no such thing as race. Where does he get this solution? Not from history or nature, and certainly not from the word of God, but from a pseudoscience built upon hypothetical, fine-spun theories and ipsi dixits.

Dr. Myrdal asserts under "Reflections in Science," page 92, "It (social research) is constantly disproving inherent differences and explaining apparent ones in cultural and social terms. By inventing and applying ingenious specialized research methods, the popular race dogma is being victoriously pursued into every corner and effectively exposed as fallacious or at least unsubstantiated." Under "Race and Ancestry," (p. 115), he says, "In modern biological or ethnological research, 'race' as a scientific concept has lost its sharpness of meaning and the term is disappearing in sober writings. * * * From the beginning Negro writers took the stand that the American dogma of racial inequality was a scientific fake (p. 94). * * * The 'white American race' is gradually beginning to be a joke even among the populace, except in the South. * * * The fundamental unity and similarity of mankind * * * is becoming scientifically established. * * * When we sometimes, for the sake of convenience, talk about 'race,' 'racial' characteristics, or 'racial' relations, we should be understood to refer to the popular conception of the word, not the scientific one," that is, that all people, biologically speaking, are one and the same. The doctor makes many assertions

that seem to be incapable of proof. He only pleads that the Negro, scientifically or biologically considered, is one in and with all other humans, or the equal of any other people, and that all he needs to prove it is better environment and an equal chance. According to Dr. Myrdal, "The social sciences in America, particularly sociology, anthropology, and psychology, have come through a conspicuous development, increasingly giving the preponderance to environment instead of heredity" (p. 89). Heredity has been with us a long time, and it is far from being ruled out of court. The Bible has something to say about that.

Whatever the researches and findings of science may be, or claim to be, there is a fundamental law that science can never disprove, or change, and that is that like begets like and that like naturally seeks like, and it requires no laboratory tests to prove it, because it is self-evident that white begets white, black begets black, yellow begets yellow, red begets red. It is equally evident that the Supreme Court has decreed the Negro race into all relations with the white race—a decree that is as bereft of legality as Dr. Myrdal's thesis is of scientific proof and moral value. That is the crux of the whole matter.

After Dr. Myrdal has written much very assertively about what science has discovered for the Negro, he finally concedes, under "Race and Ancestry," chapter 5, page 136: "This chapter has mainly been a review of a great number of questions upon which science does not as yet provide precise and definite answers." Yet, he holds that there is no such thing as race, that scientifically or biologically we are all one and the same, with only minor individual or group differences that matter not at all (p. 115). With a snap of the finger, just like that, he settles everything. Yet, Dr. Myrdal was brought over from Sweden to this country to study for 6 long years the Negro problem, especially in the South, freely conceding that "he has never been subject to the strains involved in a black-white society and has never had to become adjusted to such a situation," to make the discovery, supposedly, that we all are biologically one and the same, a conclusion built upon premises confessedly hypothetical and arbitrarily chosen by him. Yet this man, Dr. Myrdal, a foreigner, has the audacity to say in his book (p. 13), written for the American Negro, "The Constitution of the United States is impractical and unsuited to modern conditions" and that its adoption was "nearly a plot against the common people"; but, more horribly still, this is the book the Supreme Court cites as its leading authority! The Honorable Charles Wallace Collins, one of America's most brilliant constitutional lawyers, says: "the book An American Dilemma has no scientific validity. But as propaganda it has become the bible of the educated Negro. * * * But neither the Carnegie Corp. nor Myrdal dreamed that the book would be cited by the Supreme Court as the principal authority for Federal enforcement of racial integration in the public schools. * * * What have we come to when a fund corporation can hire a foreigner to write a phony book about the Negro and then see the Supreme Court put its recommendations into effect!"

God created the races. God meant that the races should maintain their racial purity, because history and nature show that the strongest and the best come from nations that preserve their racial purity and that those who do not do so suffer disastrous consequences. The same law holds good in the breed of horses. How many races are won by mongrelized breeds?

According to Dr. Myrdal, scientifically or biologically we are all one and the same! But, socially, we are two races, but what Dr. Myrdal would advise and what the Negroes want and what the Supreme Court decrees is racial integration, the merging or consolidation of the two races so as to make one race where there had been two. That is the ultimate purpose of all this integration business—all merged into one. When the white man's blood merges with the blood of a Negro woman's, the offspring is Negro. If Dr. Myrdal's solution should be accepted and carried into effect, in time nothing would exist but the Negro race. "The American Negro is the most race-conscious of any minority group in this country, yet his leaders deny the existence of races of man and brand as 'racism' or 'racist' anyone who asserts to the contrary" (Charles Wallace Collins).

When Dr. Myrdal began his study of the Negro question in this country, he very frankly acknowledged his total ignorance of it. No wonder his book is colored by the colored leaders with whom he held so many interviews. No wonder his book contains certain conclusions that are untenable. It is a well-known fact that if you let someone get by you with false premises, he can prove that black is white.

Dr. Myrdal concedes that his "value premises" are only of "an hypothetical character." He says, "The scientific basis for constructing our 'field of valuations' is poor. Public opinion in respect to the Negro problem has not been studied much, and the studies made do not meet our requirements. For the most part we have been forced to base our generalization on impressionistic observation of the values held by different groups and individuals." (See pp. 1061–1062, sec. 4a to 4g.)

The fact is that Dr. Myrdal, strictly speaking, is not the author of the book that bears his name, though he claims full responsibility for it. He is the compiler. During the 6 years this book was being prepared, between 75 and 100 writers were busy writing their anti-South propaganda. Many of them were Negroes, such as Ralph Bunche, Walter White, and Dr. Du Bois. Thirty-five research manuscripts were deposited in the Schomberg Collection in the New York Library, and Dr. Myrdal and his assistants compiled An American Dilemma from that mass of material. Yet, from that mass of material, the Supreme Court quotes and bases upon it what may prove to be one of the most tragic decisions ever rendered in this country. It threatens the very existence of the Union because it destroys local self-government reserved to the States by and in the creation of a coercive centralized government in Washington, the despotic oligarchy that Washington, Jefferson, Madison, and others foresaw and warned our country against.

School children soon learn that there are three branches of Government, the legislative, the executive, and the judicial. Congress is the only branch that has the power to make our laws, but when the Supreme Court issues a decree that applies to the whole country, it is tantamount to an act of Congress, and it thereby trespasses upon the legislative branch and assumes a dictatorial authority that finds no justification in the Constitution of the United States.

The Honorable Charles Wallace Collins, who for 40 years was a member of the bar of the Supreme Court of the United States, also director of the Federal Legislative Reference Service, Law Librarian of Congress, Librarian of the Supreme Court of the United States, the author of several authoritative books on constitutional law, and is honored far and near as being one of America's ablest constitutional lawyers, says in his brochure, The Race Integration Cases, page 7, "The Supreme Court itself at the head of the judicial branch of the Federal Government has rushed in where neither of the other two branches can go and is attempting to set up a new unheard of national policy in this field which is designed to revolutionalize and coerce the human behavior of about 40 million white people and 10 million Negroes with the dictum that Negroes and whites are not only equal but are racially identical. If the Supreme Court succeeds in this effort the constitutional Republic is dead and the Consitution itself becomes a tattered scrap of paper. The implication and potentialities of this action by the Court staggers the imagination. If the Court can thus take possession of the lives of the people of the whole Southern region and doom them to racial oblivion, there is no limit to which the Court can go in any direction."

BIBLIOGRAHPY

An American Dilemma, Dr. Gunnar Myrdal.

The Race Integration Cases, the Honorable Charles Wallace Collins.

The Constitution of the United States, Thomas James Norton.

Address before Alabama Association of Circuit Judges, the Honorable Sam M. Johnston, Sr.

An Appeal to the State Democratic Executive Committee, the Honorable Gessner T. McCorvey.

Militant Truth, Dr. Sherman A. Patterson.

Address by Hon. Alexander Wiley, of Wisconsin, at Arpin Farmers Union Picnic

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, July 18, 1956

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, last Sunday afternoon, it was my pleasure to journey to Arpin, in my State, to address a picnic of the Arpin Farmers Union at Powers Bluff.

It was a pleasure to meet with grassroots farmers, their families, local officials, and State legislators.

I met, for example, with William Stanton, president of the Farm Union local; Floyd Sparks, organizer of the local; State Senator W. W. Clark, of Vesper; and Assemblyman John Crawford, of Marshfield.

I have in my hand the text of the address which I was pleased to deliver on this fine occasion.

I referred in the course of this address to various efforts which I have made down through the years, and which I am now making on behalf of our farmers and all other segments of our population.

I think that it might be of interest to point out citations from the public record down through the years, documenting some of my efforts.

So I assembled some of the newspaper clippings which show what I have done for farmers on such issues as farm parity, school milk, Dairy Day, dairy research, cheese support.

I have also assembled items from the press with regard to my past efforts for the St. Lawrence seaway.

I ask unanimous consent that these various articles from the press be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, to be followed by the text of a letter which President Eisenhower sent me following the victory of the St. Lawrence seaway—a crucial plank in my farm platform.

There being no objection, the address and articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PAST CLIPPINGS FROM WISCONSIN NEWSPAPERS DEMONSTRATING SENATOR WILEY'S EFFORTS FOR FARMERS

WILEY ADVOCATES AID FOR FARMERS

SILVER LAKE.—Adequate distribution and temporary Government aid were recommended as a solution to the dairy farmers' problems by Senator ALEXANDER WILEY (Republican, of Wisconsin) Friday night at the 13th annual meeting of the Manitowoc County Farm Bureau.

WILEY firm in stand for high farm prices.

GOP to give farmers fair supports—WILEY.

WILEY'S 90 PERCENT PARITY FOR DAIRYMEN

Senator WILEY, as senior Senator from a senior dairy State of the Nation, has introduced in the Senate a bill for milk price support at 90 percent of parity.

Senator WILEY's proposal, companion bill to a House measure sponsored by Representative Reid Murray, of Wisconsin, is Wisconsin's way of saying that it will insist on being "taken care of" in its own leading agricultural industry if other types of farming are to be benefited in a distribution of Government largess. After all, milk is one of the most important foods, and it obviously will be impossible for dairymen to stay in business unless they obtain the same treatment as those in other lines of the farming business.

If the Government has the answer—as many farmers apparently believe it has—Senator WILEY's bill probably comes as close as any other yet devised.

WILEY PRAISES CO-OPS

"Cooperatives have become an indispensable part of the American scene," Senator ALEXANDER WILEY, Republican, of Wisconsin, told the Senate. This is particularly true in agriculture, he said.

Co-ops of all kinds—local, regional, national—"have become invaluable aids to farmer and consumer alike," WILEY said January 6.

He praised National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, the Cooperative League of the United States of America, American Institute of Cooperation, National Milk Producers Federation, National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, and National Livestock Producers Association.

WILEY to back cheese trade.

Washington background—WILEY rates as top Ike man in Senate—by Roscoe Drummond.

WILEY protests lack of butter in diet of veteran hospitals.

WILEY says dairy industry is being taken for a ride.

National Dairy Day proposed by WILEY.

SENATOR WILEY PROPOSES MORE MILK FOR SCHOOL PROGRAM

WASHINGTON, D. C.—Senator ALEXANDER WILEY, Republican, of Wisconsin, on January 9 introduced legislation which would expand by one-third the special school milk program. He urged immediate action by Congress on legislation that would maintain the flow of milk to schoolchildren during the rest of this school year.

WILEY seeks United States dairy research laboratory to be built in Madison.

[From the Wisconsin Agriculturist and Farmer of April 2, 1955]

BILL GROVE'S NOTEBOOK—WILEY WANTS MILK RESEARCH CENTER

"Research center such as the one provided for in the bill introduced by Senator WILEY is definitely needed," says Bill Groves. "Constructive research is necessary for an industry to expand or even for survival."

Dairy plight in Wisconsin held critical—WILEY gets report of University of Wisconsin dean, recovery found only hope.

[From Hoard's Dairyman]

WASHINGTON DAIRY LEADER

Although burdened with many pressing administrative responsibilities, Senator WILEY in recent years has been one of the United States Senate's most vigorous defenders of the dairy farmer. His work in the 80th Congress last year was primarily responsible for the failure of pro-oleo legislation to pass prior to adjournment.

At the present time he is leading a bipartisan coalition of 27 United States Senators in a hard-fought effort to prevent the passage of the House approved pro-oleo measure. He hopes to substitute the dairy compromise legislation on the Senate floor and secure approval from both Houses of Congress.

[From the River Falls, Wisconsin, Journal of June 28, 1956]

"17½ YEARS OF SERVING WISCONSIN FARMERS"—"THAT'S MY RECORD," SAYS ALEX WILEY

Farmers entitled to fair return

"I am proud to campaign on my record which includes 17½ years of what, most folks say, are solid achievements for our farmers," said the senior Senator who has owned and operated a dairy farm in Barron County for more than 40 years. "But I am sincerely humble. The farmer has had a lot of bad breaks and is truly entitled to everything that I or any other legislator can do in his behalf and in the public interest."

Wiley said that this basically requires "making absolutely sure that our people in America's dairyland get their fair cost of production, plus a reasonable profit. They must get a fair return on their heavy investment—their investment in their own and their family's hard work, their buildings, their machinery and livestock. Too often, our dairymen have been discriminated against in relation to the so-called 6 'basic' crops (which are really not one bit more basic than nature's first food, milk). Too often, our dairymen have been caught in the squeeze of higher costs of feed, machinery and of everything else."

Major Wiley achievements for farmers

Among major past accomplishments listed by Wiley are:

The Wiley St. Lawrence seaway law—generally regarded as the greatest single piece of legislation affecting Wisconsin enacted in the 20th century. The seaway, he said means "low cost transporting of the farmers' products to all the ports of the world."

Wiley antibrucellosis funds legislation.

Wiley school-milk legislation.

Wiley soil bank bill.

Wiley gasoline tax refund bill.

"Every one of the latter bills represent legislation which I personally introduced or cosponsored. Others and I fought hard for this legislation, and together we succeeded in getting it enacted."

Battles currently being fought by Wiley

"Additional legislation which I am at this very minute advancing includes: Provision to distribute surplus food to America's needy; protection of American farmers from the flood of cheap foreign farm imports; establishment of a new dairy-research laboratory at Madison; liberalized credit for farm building repair and improvement.

"Still other objectives for which I am now striving include: Raising of price support for manufactured milk; greater security for elderly, retired farmers by liberalized social security for themselves and their wives; securing greater freedom for Wisconsin's milk to be sold in other States."

Past Wiley battles for milk, cheese, butter

The Chippewa Falls legislator looked back at his 17½ years of past service and recalled these battles:

The struggle for the Wiley dairy amendment to the antioleo bill (an amendment to curb oleo misrepresentation or falsification).

The Wiley efforts against OPA's infamous Plymouth plus—Wisconsin minus order (which almost crucified Wisconsin cheesemaking in favor of production in other States).

The struggle to keep the limited amount of young manpower on our farms and to prevent arbitrary drafting.

Many Wiley efforts for Wisconsin's various foods and its great canning industry—for Badger corn, peas, sauerkraut, as well as for cranberries. (These efforts ranged from getting emergency manpower for harvesting, to getting sufficient steel for tin cans, when they were in desperately short supply.)

Efforts for improving rural health and reducing farm accidents.

Advancing of REA and rural phone legislation.

Defense of vital producing and marketing cooperatives against unfair attacks.

Battles to cut down on the high cost of distribution and thus help raise the farmer's relatively small share of the consumer's dollar.

Senator WILEY also stressed his efforts to get Americans to eat and drink more dairy products.

Boosting Wisconsin dairy products

"In June, Dairy Month, and in all 11 other months of the year, I have been constantly in the forefront of boosting Wisconsin's vitamin-rich, nutritious dairy products. I am proud to be known as the No. 1 booster of Wisconsin cheese in the Nation, and the No. 1 dairyland publicist. I have constantly promoted increased sales of Wisconsin cheese, milk, butter, ice cream, and nonfat dry-milk solids. Dozens of photos in the Nation's newspapers and magazines have shown me helping to spread the Wisconsin dairy habit—to get 167 million Americans to eat, drink, and appreciate our unexcelled dairy products. I started this dairy promotion way back in 1939 when the world's largest cheese, 2,000 pounds, was sent to Washington from our State. It became the focus of nationwide publicity, through which I helped increase consumption of Wisconsin cheese."

Farm groups have praised record

"This then," WILEY concluded, "is my constructive record. It includes solid deeds, not mere words or promises or lip service. It is a record whose achievements have been praised on many occasions by every single major farm organization in our country.

"I feel confident, therefore, that once more, our farmers will overwhelmingly support me."

[From the Juneau County Chronicle]

HONORABLE? THE TITLE FITS THE SENATOR

Senator ALEXANDER WILEY of Wisconsin was the speaker of the evening at a testimonial dinner in Lake Delton Saturday evening. It was given in honor of Miss Isabelle Drumb who is retiring after 20 years as publisher and editor of the Wisconsin Dells Events.

Decorum dictates that the word "Honorable" be used as a prefix to the title of a United States Senator. The conduct of some is such that it raises grave question as to whether the prefix is deserving.

This is not true of Senator WILEY.

In a 20-minute speech he gave glowing tribute to a retiring weekly newspaper publisher without speaking an unkind word about even those few among the newspaper fraternity who have been his critics.

He could have taken credit for steering the St. Lawrence Seaway bill through to passage. He could have taken credit for his opposition to unregulated natural gas rates, and his record on farm legislation; few others under similar circumstances would have failed to preen their feathers just a little bit. But the Senator exercised an admirable degree of restraint, rare indeed among officeholders facing a fight for reelection.

He spoke about the expanding American economy which has grown from $70 billion 17 years ago when Senator WILEY first went to Washington, to nearly $400 billion today.

Yes, the word "honorable" is a befitting prefix to the title of Senator as it is worn by ALEXANDER WILEY. There was more "wheat" in his message and less political "chaff" than any of his audiences had heard from a Senator or Congressman in a long, long time.

The Senator is running for reelection this year, and he will probably have opposition from within his own party. It is particularly refreshing to hear a candidate for office discuss the issues of the day with frankness, dignity, and credit to himself and his party.

[From the Superior (Wis.) Evening Telegram of August 8, 1952]

SENATOR WILEY MEASURES UP

Many important legislative posts have come to him, and he has acquitted himself ably on all of them. He is a former chairman of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary and is now the highest Republican member. Wisconsin citizens will recall the vigorous prosecution he directed as a member of the Senate Special Committee to Investigate Organized Crime in Interstate Commerce.

Always ahead of him was the knowledge that he was responsible to his electors back in his home State. With that in mind he began a long series of services—and they stretched on into an endless chain—with the idea of helping the Nation as a whole and Wisconsin in particular. Seldom did people from his home State arrive in Washington but that the Senator made himself and his office facilities available to them.

Yes, students of government can find in Senator WILEY much to praise. His tenure in office is marked by a long series of outstanding achievements.

LETTER FROM THE WHITE HOUSE, WASHINGTON, MAY 14, 1954

DEAR SENATOR WILEY: Now that the St. Lawrence Seaway struggle is over, I want to thank you for your informed and aggressive leadership in this historic effort. This kind of legislative-executive teamwork in areas vital to all of our citizens is, in my opinion, essential to a sound government and to the welfare of the Nation.

I am very pleased that you were able to move so effectively in helping to make the Seaway at last a reality.

Sincerely,

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

[From the Milwaukee Journal of June 11, 1954]

TRIBUTE PAID TO WILEY FOR SEAWAY LEADERSHIP—SENATOR IS HONORED AT A TESTIMONIAL DINNER FOR SUCCESSFUL BATTLE FOR LEGISLATION

(By Rod Van Every)

Nearly 400 Milwaukee and Wisconsin leaders in industry, civics and Government—Republicans, Democrats and even some Socialists—paid tribute Thursday night to the one man who, more than any other in Congress, worked harder and longer for St. Lawrence Seaway legislation.

The man was Senator ALEXANDER WILEY (Republican, Wisconsin), chairman of the powerful Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

The testimonial dinner, sponsored by the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Association, the Milwaukee Association of Commerce, and the Governor's Committee for the St. Lawrence Seaway, jammed the Pfister Hotel's fern room.

FROM THE PRESIDENT

There were telegrams of greetings and congratulations. One of them came from President Eisenhower:

"Senator WILEY's leadership in the historic St. Lawrence seaway effort was vital and was deeply appreciated by all in the administration and in the Congress who were identified with it. I am happy that you pay him this honor and thank you for affording me this public opportunity to say so."

From a competing port city, Duluth, Minn., came banker Lewis G. Castle, executive committee chairman of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Association. He said:

"Senator WILEY's patience, loyalty, and understanding, his willingness to work at all times and at all hours for this important project has won him many friends and great admiration."

CALLED GREAT CITIZEN

Castle quoted from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the senatorial speeches from seaway friend and foe, all praising WILEY's work in the seaway fight.

"Senator WILEY is a great citizen, a great American, a great Senator," he said. "I salute him with personal pride and admiration for all that he has done."

I. R. Witthuhn, president of the Association of Commerce and master of ceremonies, added his praise. So did Dr. N. R. Danielian, president of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Association, himself in the front lines of the seaway battle for many years.

"We have gone through a great struggle," said Danielian. "It has taken considerable ingenuity to bring matters to this happy pass. In great measure, Senator WILEY is the man responsible for this happy result.

"Both sides fought hard. The game is over. The issue is settled. It took faith and fortitude to hold to the common cause. Senator WILEY had that faith and fortitude.

"His motivations were love of his country and compassion and sympathy for his fellow men. Our country is grateful for giving us the chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee so he could remold the earth to our desires."

CREDIT FOR EISENHOWER

WILEY pushed the seaway bill out of committee and onto the Senate floor.

"Then we went to work on the personnel of that Senate, and the job was done," he said.

"But without President Eisenhower's inspired leadership the seaway bill never would have passed. Dwight D. Eisenhower is a man of forthright honesty. He frankly wanted the facts on the seaway. We gave him the facts. He promptly made his decision with firmest resolution and gave us the fullest and finest cooperation. His achievement in attaining what no president before him could attain will, I am certain, be one of the great landmarks of his outstanding tenure of office."

WILEY also praised Wisconsin people who "at the grass roots" adopted resolutions for the seaway, wrote letters, visited him and appealed to other Congressmen.

"Many members of that team are here tonight," he said. "Each of them gave of himself selflessly and untiringly. Through years of setbacks, years of disappointments, years of facing what appeared to be hopeless odds, none of you ever gave in.

"What triumphed last May 13 was a great cause, not just a group of individuals; what triumphed were the forces of right, truth, justice and reason over wrong, falsehood, unfairness and illogic."

WILEY said the seaway would be a "shot in the arm" of the Midwest and would form a firmer bond between the United States and Canada.

"But most important of all," he said, "the seaway is a great psychological spur. It is a life to the morale of men. It demonstrates anew that there is no such thing as an end to the economic horizons of America. People say that the frontier is gone. It is not gone. There is a whole new frontier on the Great Lakes.

Lower Tariffs Without Pain

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DON HAYWORTH
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 18, 1956

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an article by Otto R. Reischer, formerly of Michigan State University and now with American University. This article appeared in the May 1956 issue of Michigan State University Business Topics:

LOWER TARIFFS WITHOUT PAIN

(By Otto R. Reischer)

One of the thorniest conflict-of-interest problems of our time has been that of giving the consumer the benefit of freer trade without seriously hurting domestic industry. Fear of increased imports and inability to adjust to them have created a major obstacle to economic progress both at home and abroad, and the doctrine of comparative advantage has been turned into something only a litle short of mockery.

It is evident that losses to a small group of business concerns inflicted by increased imports are both a real objection and a political obstacle to steps that might be taken in the direction of liberalizing trade. A method that would remove these obstacles, and at the same time vouchsafe to us the benefits of freer trade and lessen resistance to such liberalization, would thus be doubly welcome.

One real possibility of achieving this desirable state of things would be the granting of temporary relief and assistance to those enterprises which in spite of efficient operations have suffered serious injury from increased imports. This article deals chiefly with assistance to industrial enterprises injured by industrial imports only. Assistance to other segments of our economy are briefly considered at the end.

The rationale underlying such a program is briefly this: on the surface, dislocations brought about by increased imports resemble the traditional disturbances created in our economy by the forces of economic progress and technological advancement. But there is a difference, and it is this difference which allows us to argue in support of a Federal readjustment assistance program. Displacement of the horse-drawn buggy by the gasoline-driven automobile is an example of attrition of industry which has its roots in economic and scientific progress. The damage, on the other hand, which is caused by

more imports to certain import-competing industries is thrust upon them by policy decisions taken by the Federal Government. Granted that these policy decisions are taken in the national interest, they are inequitable just the same.

It would of course be unwise to grant companies dispensation from having to adjust their operations to the continuous change in their economic environment; doing that would allow them to sit back and wait for assistance from whatever source it may be forthcoming. But the Government over the years has in fact provided various protective devices for all manners of enterprises, not the least important of which are high tariffs safeguarding domestic industries from harmful competition from abroad. As these safeguards are removed, it behooves the Federal Government to consider what assistance it might provide to these firms in lieu of erstwhile tariff protection to keep them from being pushed to the wall by increased imports and help them to weather this deliberately brought-on emergency.

PROTECTION FOR OUR INDUSTRIES

* * * * *

Three main protective devices are written into existing United States tariff legislation. If these were revoked and abolished, their termination would expose a number of the industries to the vicissitudes of unmitigated competition from abroad. Following are the devices in rising order of importance:

(1) The so-called "flexible tariff provision" (sec. 336 of the Tariff Act of 1930).

(2) The "peril points" provision (secs. 3 and 4 of the Trade Agreement Extension Act of 1951), and

(3) The "escape clause" provision (sec. 7 of the Trade Agreement Extension Act of 1951).

(1) The flexible tariff provision is designed to permit adjustment of tariff rates so as to equalize any differences there might be in costs of production of a commodity in this country and abroad. Essentially the expression of a pious wish, this provision has never helped domestic producers much. Because of lack of ascertainable differences in costs of prodution it is difficult to administer, but even the idea underlying this provision is fallacious, for if foreign and domestic costs were really equalized there wouldn't be any imports at all.

(2) The peril points provision is designed to prevent tariff reductions that would injure domestic producers. This is more realistic than the preceding safeguard in that it sets certain limits to concessions and reductions of rates of duty, but does not aim to exclude imports entirely. The agencies of the executive branch cooperate closely in considering proposed concessions under new trade agreements and exercise caution in determining what concessions can be undertaken.

(3) The escape clause finally remains to be considered. This provision has become the principal means whereby existing United States tariff duties are being raised or kept effectively protective despite reciprocal trade agreements. In order to curtail concessions granted other countries on a certain article, the United States Tariff Commission has to investigate whether the concession to be withdrawn has increased imports to an extent causing or threatening serious injury to the domestic industry. If the Commission finds that injury or the threat thereof exists, it has to recommend to the administration measures with a view to mitigate or forestall such injury: This generally means increasing duties or establishing import quotas.

There have in fact been very few withdrawals of concessions since the escape clause was written into law—six in all, to be exact: Women's fur felt hat bodies, hatters' furs, dried figs, watches and watch movements, bicycles, and alsike clover seed. But escape-clause proceedings have afforded considerable indirect protection for domestic industry. They have discouraged potential imports. They have dampened incentives to develop export industries abroad. And foreign producers as well as American importers are justifiably afraid that any change in the composition of the bipartisan six-man Tariff Commission could encourage new investigations. * * *

Although the devices provided by existing legislation are not so watertight as to keep out all imports, they afford a good deal of protection, and any loosening-up would mean uncovering a number of sensitive import-competing industries, to their detriment. Thus a change in American policy bringing about such a loosening-up patently calls for the Federal Government to intercede and provide assistance toward readaptation.

Accelerated readjustment: An added reason for governmental action in this field is that assisted readjustment will facilitate the transition to freer trade. A carefully designed and efficiently administered program of systematic assistance (not subsidization) would be of great help in inducing business affected by increased imports to carry out necessary readaptation and diversification of production processes more quickly than otherwise. This accelerated tempo of readjustment also would tend to cut down the losses suffered by import-competing industries without impairing a freer exchange of goods.

* * * * *

A WORKABLE PROGRAM

Such a program must be centered in the individual business firms directly injured by increased imports. Workers employed by the firms and communities in which the firms are located, are affected by increased imports only indirectly. The immediate cause of distress of both workers and communities, if attributable to foreign competition at all, will be found in the failure of business firms to adjust to increased imports. In times of relative prosperity, displaced employees can usually be shifted rather speedily to similar lines of work. This leaves the entrepreneur to be looked after. The American businessman who bears the brunt of intensified imports competition would wish for a program consistent with a free-enterprise system: financial assistance, expert advice, and the like. The program discussed here would fill the bill.

In this connection, another consideration has to be kept in mind. The more closely a readjustment assistance program is focused on the individual firm, the less costly it is likely to be in money terms, and the more easily it can be administered. In making liberal allowances to enterprises for assistance toward making such readjustment, no additional burden for the taxpayer must be created, or the value of the entire program would be nullified. Application of readjustment measures becomes essentially a problem of how to create the appropriate incentives for businessmen to make necessary changes in their operations as fast as possible.

In drawing up such a program one will have to decide between gradual and accelerated readjustment. It will of course be extremely difficult to find a generally acceptable formula for an optimal rate of adjustment. With deserved attention to the technical and economic features of enterprises and industries being helped, a proper solution must take account of the requirements of organic growth of those particular segments of the economy.

* * * * *

Aid to individual firms: There need be no programs of area development nor assistance specifically directed toward communities. Not only is this type of support in existence already, but it is being fully implemented by the United States Department of Commerce and Labor, by the Office of Defense Mobilization, and by State and local economic development bodies. Nor ought readjustment assistance to workers as such to be programed, except in cases where firms are forced into liquidation because of injurious import competition. Existing facilities of social security and unemployment benefits and old-age and survivor insurance could be made more liberal to help workers in distress generally, but any such broadening of benefits should include all other persons entitled to these services.

* * * * *

A prime advantage of concentrating readjustment assistance on the individual enterprise is that the administrative problem of ascribing injury to competitive imports, rather than to other factors, will already have been solved by the Tariff Commission in the course of its investigation in connection with applications for relief under the escape clause. In omitting communities as direct-aid recipients, a further administrative simplification is achieved. Even in a depressed one-industry community there always are many lines of causation leading to economic dislocation; and these lines often are not even remotely connected with intensified import competition. If, therefore, no Federal special-purpose assistance for communities is programed (other, that is, than aid granted business firms which happen to be located there), there is no point for neatly separating causes underlying economic distress with a view to determining eligibility for assistance of prospective recipients.

The task of untangling the skein of diverse harmful influences may actually prove even simpler than that. It can be shown, for instance, that the traditional distinction between interregional and international competition ceases to have any useful meaning under certain conditions, and that these conditions happen to prevail right now.

THE PROBLEM OF INTERREGIONAL COMPETITION

In current discussions the term interregional competition has come to have a rather special meaning. It connotes a trend of industry moving south, especially from the Northeast, in response to various locational stimuli. Included in these inducements are availability of sites and buildings, tax concessions, and lower labor costs owing to the prevalence of right-to-work (antiunionization) laws in a number of Southern States.

Leaving aside the question of whether these stimuli are natural or merely contrived to cloak real disadvantages of location, what concerns us here is the alleged difficulty of distinguishing between the incidence of interregional and international competition. The distinction is of course admissible in theory. From a practical standpoint, however, the two diverse influences need not be separated at all. The Tariff Commission, in finding injury in any particular escape clause investigation, has had to consider the entire respective domestic industry. Therefore the losses to any old segments of such industry could be offset by gains made by new segments. A finding of injury is thus based on averages, and marginal producers still are obligated to improve their efficiency if tariffs are gradually to cease equalizing the imported and the domestic price of a given commodity.

Interregional adjustments moreover take place in response to temporal regional differences, many of which are self-liquidating. (In this connection it is worth noting that interregional movements can be influenced more easily in a constructive manner than international movements; all that can be done to influence the latter is to raise or lower trade restrictions.) The objection to a readjustment assistance program based on the impossibility of differentiating between the effects of interregional competition as

contrasted with those of international competition thus is in fact invalid.

* * * * *

THE FORUM OF THE READJUSTMENT ASSISTANCE PROGRAM

What would be the actual shape of the program? A program of readjustment assistance devoted primarily to relieving individual business enterprises of distress caused by increased imports would provide assistance mainly in the form of loans designed to ease transition to more efficient and profitable operations.

For a variety of reasons, the Export-Import Bank appears to be the most appropriate instrument for handling credit needs of firms requiring medium-term financial assistance (from 3 to 5 years) where credits are not available from private sources. The bank's activities and experience would appear to fit it well for this new assignment. At present the Export-Import Bank makes loans primarily with a view toward enabling purchases abroad of United States machinery, equipment, materials, and services for some specified project or use abroad. Where projects are involved they must provide both an immediate market for United States goods and assist in developing the borrowing country into a greater market for United States products, or a supplier for United States import needs. As trade is further liberalized, more foreign producers would become suppliers for United States import needs. In assisting such a development through the medium of a readjustment assistance program, the Export-Import Bank would pursue one of the functions assigned to it by law in an enlarged frame of reference. The Export-Import Bank also has been traditionlly concerned with foreign economic operations and increased trade. And of the latter a readjustment assistance program, if adopted, would tend to become an inescapable corollary. Furthermore, the law setting up the Export-Import Bank specifically states that the bank is "to aid in financing and to facilitate exports and imports." Imports in this connection are not legally limited to strategic raw materials and related types of products. Therefore, and in view of the fact that readjustment assistance would facilitate imports indirectly, the Export-Import Bank, in helping to finance the program, would only be performing its original function.[1]

The Small Business Administration too would have a part in the program, albeit of a somewhat more subsidiary nature: Chiefly for liquidation loans, the activity to be patterned on SBA activities in disaster and catastrophe lending operations. The Department of Commerce would have an opportunity of administering Regulation V type loans and accelerated amortization of enterprises investments necessitated by readaptation. Technical services as provided by the Departments of Commerce and Labor, where such services would have to be expanded from their current level, would be financed by customs revenues earmarked on the model of funds set aside under section 32 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1935.

Where use in a readjustment assistance program of the technique of loan guaranties under regulation V is indicated, needed funds would also be earmarked from customs revenues. Loans actually made would be guaranteed by the Department of Commerce and the Export-Import Bank would act as fiscal agent.[2]

* * * * *

At the center of the program would stand the United States Tariff Commission. A finding of injury by the Commission would trigger the mechanism of readjustment assistance. The Commission would be authorized to recommend such a program as an alternative to restoring tariff concessions under an escape clause or peril-point action. To permit product diversification and other necessary adaptations which require time to become effective, the Commission's finding of injury and recommendation of assistance in some cases could also be accompanied by a restoration of the concession for a limited period of time (say 2 or 3 years), perhaps on a sliding scale downward.

Putting the Tariff Commission into the center of this program with corresponding additional responsibilities may require more personnel for the Commission. Such added staff would be grouped into a Readjustment Section newly to be created. Officials in that Section could draw upon professional talent in the other divisions of the Commission as well as on the appropriate specialists of other Government departments and agencies. The functions of the new Section would be purely advisory and it would service a standing committee, to which recommendations concerning readjustment assistance originating with the Tariff Commission would be submitted. On the standing committee would serve, in addition to representatives of the Tariff Commission (one acting as chairman), representatives of agencies most familiar and most directly concerned with the problems of the particular industry to be assisted. Three elements of primary responsibility would be involved in the operation of this standing committee. These would be delegated among the departments and agencies of the executive branch as follows:

1. Determination of need for and extent of assistance and referral: Tariff Commission.

2. Rendering of technical assistance: Departments of Commerce and Labor.

3. Financing of loans and technical services:

(a) Treasury Department: Earmarking of customs revenue.

(b) Export-Import Bank: Medium term readjustment loans.

(c) Small Business Administration: Readjustment loans for small business and liquidation loans for marginal producers.

Agencies of secondary responsibility in this connection would be the State Department (through its International Cooperation Administration), and the Departments of Defense; Agriculture; Interior; Health, Education, and Welfare; and the Executive Office (through the International Division of the Bureau of the Budget).

Within the standing committee, a steering group consisting of representatives of the Tariff Commission, the Department of Commerce, and the Export-Import Bank would be established to expedite proceedings of the committee. The steering group would have powers to coordinate agency functions and force action to be taken if necessary.

For several of the agencies involved in the administration of the proposed program, some modification in normal functions would be required. These are: the Tariff Commission whose activities would be widened in a manner already noted; the Export-Import Bank which receives one additional function in addition to those already carried on aside from the primary functions assigned under the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945; and the Small Business Administration, in connection with liquidation loans to marginal producers. Since aid to marginal producers in most instances will also require assistance to workers employed by them, the Department of Labor, in addition to its consultative responsibility for the entire program area, would enter the picture in making effective aid available to such workers. These workers would receive priority treatment under existing social security and unemployment benefit regulations. No additional administrative machinery would be required, however.

* * * * *

Once assistance has been granted, it would be desirable to require assisted enterprises to submit to annual reviews during the transition period. The readjustment section of the Tariff Commission would be responsible for such audits. These would parallel the annual reviews now conducted by the Tariff Commission on commodities on which duties have been raised under the escape-clause provision of the Trade Agreements Act of 1951.

* * * * *

One important feature of the readjustment-assistance program discussed in this article remains yet to be mentioned. It is versatility. The program here outlined would in essence be applicable to all types of imported commodities, industrial, agricultural, mineral. The only variation necessary, in the case of agricultural and mineral imports, would be a change in the guaranteeing agency and in the type of earmarked funds. For agricultural imports, funds from the Department of Agriculture set aside under section 32 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1935 would be utilized, and the same department would act as guarantor of the loan. For a program relating to mineral imports, the Department of Interior through the Bureau of Mines would have jurisdiction over the financial aspects of the program, arrange for earmarked funds, and act as guarantor. The rest of the apparatus would remain unchanged.

[1] If legislation were introduced in Congress with a view to setting up the financial portion of a program of readjustment assistance, the intent of Congress underlying the setting up of the Export-Import Bank in the first place would have to be reexamined. However, a parallel problem of reexamination or reinterpretation of congressional intent would have to be faced if SEA were to fulfill the functions here assigned the Export-Import Bank.

[2] Under the Defense Production Act, the Federal Reserve banks act as fiscal agents for V loans.

Alaska Mental Health Facts and Fantasies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDITH GREEN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 18, 1956

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, so much nonsense and absurdity has been peddled about the Alaska mental health bill that it seems necessary, once again, patiently to state the facts that are obscured by all this fantasy. I know no better or more objective statement of the facts than the article by A. Robert Smith in the June 28 Reporter magazine. Mr. Smith has followed this legislation closely from the beginning and is thoroughly familiar with the entire story. Under unanimous consent, I include his article in the RECORD:

SIBERIA, U. S. A.

(By A. Robert Smith)

Of all the areas under the United States flag, Alaska has unquestionably been the most neglected in the field of mental-health reforms. Under its archaic insanity laws laid down by Congress more than half a century ago, any Alaskan who becomes mentally ill can be admitted for treatment only after (a) being taken before a lay jury and tried in a criminal proceeding, in which he is adjudged guilty or innocent of insanity; (b) clapped into the local jail if found in-

sane; and (c) subsequently taken in the custody of a United States marshal to a private mental hospital at Portland, Oreg. Many patients never see a doctor until they reach Portland. Frequently they are transported along with criminals the marshal is delivering to the nearest Federal prison at Tacoma.

As time and civilization moved forward in Alaska, and mental-health reforms began to win adoption in their States, Alaskans began to petition Congress to institute hospital facilities for patients in the Territory.

For the past 7 years, Alaska's Delegate in the House, E. L. (BOB) BARTLETT, had tried to bring this hope to reality, only to be thwarted for various reasons. He came close in 1952, but the bill was sidetracked by the objection of the Congressman from the Oregon district in which the Portland hospital is located. Alaska got the break it was seeking last year when two newly elected Democrats from Oregon, Senator RICHARD L. NEUBERGER and Representative EDITH GREEN, announced their support for BARTLETT's long-standing proposal.

Then the Department of the Interior, which administers much of Alaska's affairs, and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare jointly recommended a 10-year plan to provide Alaska with its own mental-care facilities, reform the procedures for admitting patients for treatment, and authorize Federal grants-in-aid to get the program going until Alaska could carry it.

Vigorously backing the administration's more far-reaching plan, Mrs. GREEN and BARTLETT pushed it through committee with the cooperation of Congressman LEO O'BRIEN, Democrat, New York, chairman of the House Territories subcommittee. Its only opponents were people acting on behalf of the Portland hospital. They contended "Alaska isn't ready" to take over the program. Alaska's Gov. B. Frank Heintzleman said the Territory was ready and waiting. The House passed the bill without a dissenting vote and the outlook was for clear sailing through the Senate.

TO ARMS

There is in Burbank, Calif., a group of a hundred or so housewives organized as the American Public Relations Forum, Inc. It so happened that APRF received from an Alaskan friend a copy of the Alaska bill. As the group's president, Mrs. Stephanie Williams, later told a Senate committee, her ladies were dedicated to studying bills that Congressmen are too busy to analyze for themselves—a kind of home guard in the legislative wars.

The field of mental-health legislation was a familiar battleground to the Forum. Mrs. Williams claimed major credit for a campaign last year that defeated a bill in the California Legislature to establish State mental clinics in local communities. She had plenty of help—from an old political associate, ex-State Senator Jack Tenney; from pro-America; and from other lesser-known groups. Apparently feeling the impact of this blast from the extreme right against the mental-health bill, Gov. Goodwin Knight came out against it.

The issue became a battle cry. Tenny, in his newsletter, shoved those who advocate mental-health reforms into a class with Communists. Another newsletter publisher, Robert H. Williams, of Santa Ana, headlined one of his editions as follows: "Mental Health Propaganda Preparing Way for Jailing Anti-Communists as Mental Cases." Williams told his readers:

"For many years the revolutionaries, especially those in the Zionist power movement, have made clear, either by direct statement or by their obvious buildup to this end, that they want to make anti-Semitism a crime and intend to brand all opponents (bigots and anti-Semites, as they call their opponents) as mental cases and send them to insane asylums."

SPREADING THE WORD

So the forum housewives sniffed through the 43-page Alaska bill like bloodhounds. They found that:

The governor of Alaska may enter into reciprocal arrangements with the governors of the States for treatment or transfer of patients. (This is to provide for immediate care of Alaskans who may be taken ill when outside the Territory until they can be returned to Alaska, or vice versa for residents of the States who might happen to fall sick in Alaska. It also provides for reciprocity payment pacts between the Territory and the States of the type that is common today between many States for meeting the cost of temporarily treating nonresidents.)

Alaska would be given a Federal land grant of a million acres from the 375 million acres of Federal lands in the Territory. This would be similar to land grants given Utah, Oklahoma, Idaho, Wyoming, and South Dakota, when they obtained statehood, to provide revenue for State mental hospitals. The same idea was applied to most western States, which received public land grants to provide school revenues.

But to Mrs. Williams and other ladies of the forum, this combination of provisions had only one interpretation: The governor of any State could dispatch anyone found to be mentally ill to Alaska, where he would be confined on a vast reservation that would be in effect a concentration camp.

Last January, the forum spread the alarm. Its bulletin said the bill "could apply to all Americans, especially those who have been active against the New Dealers and their schemes to make this country into a member of world government and reduce us to slavery."

The Santa Ana Register picked up the theme with an editorial entitled "Now—Siberia, U. S. A." printed just a few days after the House passed the bill on to the Senate.

"Under the terms of the bill," the newspaper said, "a fair question to ask would be this: 'Is it the purpose of H. R. 6376 to establish a concentration camp for political prisoners under the guise of care and treatment of mental cases?' The answer, based on a study of the bill, indicates that it is entirely within the realm of possibility that we may be establishing in Alaska our own version of the Siberia slave camps run by the Russian Government."

Soon Siberia, U. S. A. was being printed all over the country in various extreme right-wing publications, among them Gerald L. K. Smith's The Cross and the Flag, The Dan Smoot Report, The Green Mountain Rifleman, and The Greater Nebraskan. Such groups as the For America League, Women for God and Country, and the Women's Patriotic Conference on National Defense took up the cry. Dan Smoot warned that mental-health reforms "would permit seizure, incarceration, and treatment of mentally ill people without trial by jury and without due process of law prescribed by our Constitution," though even a casual reading of the bill would have shown that it provided the right of habeas corpus and the right of trial by jury for anyone believing himself to have been wrongfully committed. And every patient wishing to fight his commitment is guaranteed an attorney, who can appeal the jury's decision if need be all the way to the Supreme Court.

MARCH ON WASHINGTON

Strange allies were lined up together. Flailing away against the bill shoulder to shoulder with the Tablet, a Catholic weekly newspaper published in Brooklyn, was the perennial Vice Presidential candidate of the Prohibition Party, Gen. Herbert C. Holdridge, who pinned the "plot of wickedness" behind the bill on the "black forces of the Jesuits who dominate the Vatican." In the same alliance were others who blamed it all on the Zionists.

Quite an expeditionary force turned up in Washington last February when the Senate Subcommittee on Territories and Insular Affairs held hearings on the bill. Before a standing-room-only crowd, the committee heard out the protesters, Senator ALAN BIBLE, Democrat, Nevada, who presided, concluded at length: "It is abundantly clear * * * that no one possibly could be sent out of any State to Alaska and committed to a mental hospital there."

Mr. Williams, the Santa Ana publisher, pulled out a book by Dr. Harry A. Overstreet, entitled "The Great Enterprise," and claimed that the author said that anyone who is "angrily against race equality, public housing, the TVA, financial and technical aid to backward countries, organized labor, is well along the road toward mental illness." Williams' analysis may have triggered his attack, for, according to the Santa Ana Independent, he is a "purveyor of hate" and a "baiter of Jews and seller of maligning words for dollars [who] is busy in Santa Ana planting seeds of hate." The Los Angeles Daily Mirror once described him as "a homegrown hatemonger" whose specialty is "fraudulent" charges against our Jewish citizens.

Williams was by no means alone in trying to convince the lawmakers that there was a Jewish plot behind the mental-health movement. John Kasper of Merchantville, N. J., noting that Sigmund Freud was a Jew, testified that "I think it is important to realize that about 80 percent of * * * the psychiatrists are Jewish." To this reporter, Kasper, owner of a bookstore in Washington, D. C., later added the observation that relatively few Jews wind up in mental institutions.

THE AAPS

Groups that took the trouble to examine the bill came out in its favor, including the American Medical Association, the American Psychiatric Association, and the National Association for Mental Health. Indeed, one conservative newsletter, Challenge to Socialism, published in Washington by Dr. Marjorie Shearon, undertook to buck the entire propaganda campaign against the bill by circulating factual accounts of its provisions. Her main effort was directed toward trying to convince the Association of American Physicians and Surgeons (AAPS) for which she had been the adviser on congressional affairs for a number of years, that it had made a mistake in joining the other attackers.

Of all the organizations that joined the attacking forces, AAPS was probably the most notable. Formed 13 years ago to fight socialized medicine, it now has doctor committees in 45 States and a membership of 10,000 physicians and surgeons. From the outset its Chicago headquarters issued repeated bulletins denouncing this incredible bill, saying "it is impossible to describe all [its] horrendous provisions."

In spite of the explanations that Dr. Shearon sent along from Washington, AAPS refused to retreat and admit it had been hoodwinked on the Siberia charge. Dr. Shearon, who then quit AAPS in disgust, put it this way:

"AAPS appears to have been the largest professional group to be sucked in. Neither the AMA nor any State or county medical society fell for the Siberia line. The American Academy of General Practice, second largest medical society in the country, did not get on the Siberia bandwagon. AAPS was wholly irresponsible in misleading the public. It refused to retract when the Alaska Territorial Medical Association asked it to do so."

AND THE LUNATIC FRINGE

AAPS's refusal to retract appears to go well beyond the plain embarrassment of admitting a blunder. A top AAPS official, in a letter to an associate, explained the organization's dilemma as follows:

"When you are espousing a rightwing cause you are apt to attract a fairly sizable lunatic fringe which has to be kindly dealt with, if for no other reason than to keep them from going over to the enemy. This is just simple realism.

"There isn't any use denying it, a great many people who are on our side aren't there because of any sound and sincere belief in our principles, but rather because they conceive our side of the argument to be the one that is to their personal and often pecuniary advantage. Nonetheless, when you are in a war you have to take what allies you can find."

GOLDWATER TO THE RESCUE

After hearing all the witnesses with judicial patience, the committee received 2 substitute bills from 2 of its members. One of them, sponsored by Senator GEORGE W. MALONE, Republican, Nevada, was purportedly written by Kasper, the embattled bookstore owner, who claimed authorship of "every word of it." The second, sponsored by Senator BARRY GOLDWATER, Republican, Arizona, was designed to placate the opponents of the original bill.

Although none of the Senators had expressed any misgivings about the original bill, Goldwater's bill turned out to be a workable compromise. It would authorize mental hospitals for Alaska but do nothing about modernizing commitment procedures. This latter responsibility would be tossed to the Territorial legislature.

The heaviest opposition died away. The AAPS, which had refused to retract its attacks on the original bill, came out in support of the Goldwater measure. In a letter to the committee, the president of AAPS, Dr. Charles W. Pavey, of Columbus, Ohio, said that "it was extremely unfortunate that there was so much intemperate expression on both sides of this matter."

John Kasper, the bookseller, had embarked on another mission and could devote little time to the Alaska bill. He had formed, he was pleased to announce, the first white citizens' council in the Nation's Capital, with the objective of reversing progress toward racial integration (schools, restaurants, hotels, and playgrounds are all integrated in Washington now), getting the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People on the Attorney General's list of subversive organizations, publicizing commercial contributors to NAACP and the Urban League, and wiping out "rock 'n' roll" music.

And so in mid-June, no longer hampered by sensationalized opposition, the Senate passed the Alaska mental-health bill without dissent after a 10-minute debate.

The National Rivers and Harbors Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OVERTON BROOKS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 5, 1956

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend and revise my remarks, I present the following report which I made as president of the National Rivers and Harbors Congress at the 43d annual convention held at the Mayflower Hotel, Washington, D. C., on May 11–12, 1956:

REPORT OF THE PRESIDENT, REPRESENTATIVE OVERTON BROOKS, OF THE NATIONAL RIVERS AND HARBORS CONGRESS, TO THE 43D ANNUAL CONVENTION, AT THE MAYFLOWER HOTEL, WASHINGTON, D. C., MAY 1956

Ladies and gentlemen of the convention, it now becomes my duty to make a report concerning the activities of the congress during the year since we last met on May 31 and June 1, 1955, for our 42d national convention. I am happy to report that we have had a fine year marked by progress in every direction toward our goals.

Our 42d annual convention achieved a new high in enthusiasm for conservation of water resources. An outstanding event in the organization's long history of accomplishment, the gathering attracted 346 registered delegates from 44 States, Alaska, Hawaii, Puerto Rico, and the District of Columbia. There were many additional unregistered guests and representatives of press and radio. Louisiana led the States in number of delegates, with 57; North Carolina was second, with 28; and Michigan was third, with 20.

During consideration at the Capitol of the public works appropriation bill for fiscal year 1956, a delegation from our organization appeared at the hearings to present its recommendations to the House committee. The delegation included your president, the projects committee chairman, Representative SID SIMPSON, and vice chairman, H. H. Buckman, of Florida; the resolutions committee chairman, Representative FRANK E. SMITH, of Mississippi, and vice chairman, E. W. Rising, of Idaho; and the executive vice president, William H. Webb.

When the bill was reported to the House by the Appropriations Committee on June 10, reducing the budget estimates of President Eisenhower by 28 percent, the largest cut made in any appropriations bill to that date, Representative SIMPSON and I joined in an invitation to all Members of the House of Representatives to a meeting in the Old House Office Building caucus room to take action toward restoring the budget figures.

This meeting was very largely attended by both Republicans and Democrats. After a full discussion, four resolutions were adopted unanimously, pledging support to amendments to increase the amounts in the bill for construction and planning of flood control, navigation, and irrigation projects.

Such amendments were accordingly prepared in consultation with the House legislative counsel, and when the bill came to the House floor the following day, all four amendments were adopted by very large majorities, increasing the amounts by more than $88 million. They provided the full amounts requested in the President's budget message, and also the full amounts recommended by the House Appropriations Committee for 12 projects not included in the budget estimates.

Shortly thereafter a delegation from our organization called on the Chairman of the Public Works Appropriations Subcommittee of the Senate, the senior Senator from Louisiana, Senator ALLEN J. ELLENDER, to present the reports of our projects and resolutions committees which had been recently adopted at our 42d annual convention. Senator ELLENDER gave us a very fine reception and assured us that he and his committee would give sympathetic consideration to our recommendations.

Subsequently the Senate, following the recommendations of its appropirations committee, increased the amounts for fiscal year 1956 by more than $100 million over the amounts recommended by the budget and the House Appropriations Committee. Finally, the conference committee reached an agreement on an amount slightly less, viz, $590,251,500 for the civil functions of the Army engineers, or for rivers and harbors and flood control projects, as compared with $560 million recommended by the budget and $500 million recommended by the House Appropriations Committee.

This was a splendid victory after a long and arduous campaign, and one for which our organization may rightfully take a large share of the credit.

In November of last year when the budget estimates for the year 1957 were under consideration, a delegation from the National Rivers and Harbors Congress called at the Budget Bureau to present our recommendations to officials of the bureau. These recommendations embodied as a goal a long-term program of internal water development in the United States of $1 billion per annum.

The delegation recommended that $750 million be included in the budget figure for 1957 for rivers and harbors improvement and flood control and $250 million for irrigation and reclamation. It urged that there be a continuation of the administration's policy of new starts and that an adequate amount be included for planning and general investigations, and maintenance of completed projects. I took occasion to point out the action of the Congress last year in increasing the budget recommendations and stressed the general feeling throughout the country that there should be provided additional sums for general internal improvement, including the development of our water resources.

The President's budget message to Congress in January of this year recommended $583,997,000 for the civil-works program of the Corps of Engineers in fiscal year 1957. In the general construction program, funds were requested for 39 new starts and 3 resumptions of construction, in addition to 30 small authorized projects, and continuing projects, and 1 new start in the requested funds for the Mississippi River and tributaries flood-control project.

The first test of the sentiment in Congress toward our program came early in this year when the Appropriations Committee of the House reported out an urgent deficiency appropriations bill for fiscal year 1956, and slashed $3,046,000 from the amount requested by President Eisenhower for flood control in the New England States, New York, and Pennsylvania. The committee also knocked out $330,000 recommended by the President for a complete review of existing flood-control plans in the Northeastern States.

The Capitol Hill battle for flood-control appropriations found the National Rivers and Harbors Congress stanchly supporting the stricken New England areas, and when the vote was taken in the House, the action of the Appropriations Committee was reversed and the amounts recommended by the President were restored to the bill. This action was subsequently approved by the Senate and the bill was approved by the President on February 14 appropriating the full amount requested by the Army engineers and recommended by the Budget Bureau.

So we have started this session of Congress with another splendid victory, and shall hope for continued success in the weeks to come.

A special meeting of your board of directors was called by me for January 21 in this city, and was attended by a majority of the members of the board. The board studied copies of the President's report on water resources policy, recently submitted to Congress, and took especial note of the comments on user charges on water transportation, which our organization has consistently opposed for many years. The board meeting received reports from various officers which showed gains in membership and the treasury, and found encouragement in many directions of its overall program. During the board's meeting, a proposal for the establishment in Washington of a permanent headquarters building was laid before the directors by Mr. H. H. Buckman,

consulting engineer of Jacksonville, Fla., and one of our oldest directors in point of service. A special committee appointed by me has been studying this matter and may be ready to report to the meeting of the board of directors scheduled to follow our adjournment today.

During the past year, two regional conferences were held in the New England region, one in Hartford, Conn., in October of 1955 and one in Boston, Mass., in April of this year. A regional conference was also held in the South Atlantic region at Raleigh, N. C., in February of this year. Our regional directors for the New England and South Atlantic regions will report to us later in the day concerning these conferences and the splendid work which has been carried on in their areas.

Our projects committee has also been at work during the past year on a method of procedure to be followed by it and by the organization in following up its recommendations and rendering assistance to the proponents of the many hundreds of projects which have been processed by that committee. We shall anticipate the recommendations of that committee with keen interest and hope that we shall be able to work out a procedure and policy which will contribute to advancing the interests of the various projects and speeding their construction.

A membership certificate was designed and has now been furnished to every individual and organization maintaining an active membership in the congress, as evidence of their active participation in the work of the organization. It is hoped that these certificates will be found suitable for framing and displaying in the offices, or other suitable place, of the members. Additional new members are constantly being added to the rolls so that we will soon reach an all-time high in number of members as well as in total membership dues. During the calendar year 1955 our total receipts were nearly $27,000, and the indications are that this will be exceeded during the present year. We still have quite a ways to go to reach the goal of $50,000 per annum set by our board of directors some time ago, but we shall continue our efforts in this respect.

And now in closing, may I say just a word about our congress. As most of you know, it is the oldest and most influential organization in its field. Originally organized at Johns Hopkins University in Baltimore, Md., in October, 1901, it is now entering upon its 54th year of service to the Nation. It is generally agreed by those who know of its work that America owes her present system of improved harbors and waterways directly to the efforts of the congress. Through the years, the organization has cooperated closely with the United States Congress which has always received its recommendations and advice and gives a ready ear to its counsel.

The congress is dedicated to the sound and orderly development of our water and land resources for all beneficial purposes, and the approval of worthy and meritorious projects throughout the country. It provides a forum for discussion of all problems relating to land and water development and use, serves as a clearinghouse for coordinating the activities of local and sectional organizations, and affords a means for securing united action by all the interests concerned with the various phases of land and water conservation. Its work has been endorsed by every President of the United States from Theodore Roosevelt to Dwight Eisenhower. Its members are located in every State in the Union.

At the last session of Congress, it was successful in increasing the appropriation for flood control, navigation, and reclamation by nearly $100 million, and it will continue its efforts in the present session to see that an adequate amount is provided in view of the recent devastating floods and the continuing need for improved navigational facilities.

Members of the National River and Harbors Congress, we are now in a new age, when scientific progress and development have almost outstripped the human imagination. New problems have arisen and new methods of approach which would solve the old problems have been worked out, often scientifically. Almost every speaker who has addressed this convention of the National Rivers and Harbors Congress has referred to the increasing water shortage throughout the United States. This naturally leads to speculation as to how such shortages might be relieved. Of course, you may apprach this problem from the viewpoint of reclamation and irrigation. I, however, have been convinced that further scientific studies regarding artificial rainmaking, hurricane control, and conversion of sea water into fresh water may be of great scientific benefit to this country. I do not necessarily believe that any one of these matters has yet been brought to the point that it is practicable and feasible at the present time.

More attention, however, should be given by Congress and by the executive branch of Government to these matters, and with increased experimental effort it is entirely possible that water shortages may be relieved through the development of these types of projects.

We all know with what devastating effect Hurricane Hazel and other hurricanes struck the Atlantic seaboard. We know that these turbulent conditions, through use of proper experiments, might be reduced in devastation and perhaps in some way used for the benefit of mankind. In a like manner, projects for water conversion have reached a point where the important question is the cost of taking the saline content out of salt water and thereby making it fresh water and fit for human consumption and industrial purposes.

The tremendous development of the H-bomb and the A-bomb bring forth other problems which may affect our weather and disturb rainfall over wide areas. It is yet too early to draw conclusions from scientific findings in this respect, but it is known that contamination may cover great areas and the upset condition of the atmosphere may result in tremendous precipitation. It is even suggested that a contamination of water reservoirs in farflung areas might result from these explosions. All of these problems are new and tax the brains of the best scientists which we have available. They present challenge to the Government for proper solution.

We have now crossed the threshold of the last half of the 20th century. There are 20th-century, or even 21st-century, problems. They are problems to which we may close our eyes temporarily but they are not problems which in the long run can be sidestepped or evaded by Congress, by the executive branch of Government or by our population. Survival of a nation and normal methods of living throughout the world are going to be affected by these matters until scientific solutions, backed up with proper governmental guidance, give our people the support to which they will be entitled.

Social Security

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEON H. GAVIN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 18, 1956

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to make a few observations on social security as we find it operating in our country today. I have watched its growth and progress since the first social-security bill was enacted into law in 1935—21 years ago.

Yes; we have come a long way in that short time. The immensity of the program is staggering to the average mind. Of the some 62 million employed citizens in our country some 52 million are under coverage by some phase of our social-security system, and others are continually being added.

The social-security reserve fund now totals approximately $21 billion, the largest reserve fund in the history of all time. Just what do these astronomic figures mean in terms of our individual and collective well-being?

First, I believe it is an attempt and to some extent a remedy to alleviate the fear of destitution and dependency in old age.

Second, generally speaking, it is a form of insurance where the premiums are paid by both employer and employee. They are paid willingly and rather painlessly.

Third, it has been accepted by the American people and is now a part of our American way of life.

Mr. Speaker, we may not agree with all the provisions of the Social Security Act, as amended, but whether we like it or not, it is here to stay. For many years to come any new features, changes, or alterations will, in my opinion, come within the framework of the Social Security Act of 1935.

One phase of the social-security program which I have been especially interested in is that of old-age assistance. This involves that group of our elder citizens who are in the declining years of their lives are destitute and needy. In most cases through no fault of their own they find themselves without funds or means of living. They have no insurance, no social security, and because of age and disability unable to work or hold a job. When and if they declare themselves paupers, they may receive what is known as old-age assistance. This small pittance only helps to keep body and soul together. There are slightly more than 2½ millions of these senior folks who are getting an average throughout the country of $54.07 a month.

The State matching system under which old-age assistance operates poses some flagrant inequities which I feel should be corrected. For instance, I find that in my own State of Pennsylvania the average payment to those on old-age assistance is $46.40 a month. New York pays $82.66 a month; while West Virginia—the lowest—pays $28.48 a month.

Certainly, Mr. Speaker, no one would agree that a person could live in common decency on these meager pittances. Inasmuch as their needs grow greater as they advance in age and because of the increased cost of living, I feel that the plight of this group presents an emergency. I appeal to the proper committee of the House and to the Congress to give this situation their careful attention. If at this late day in the present Congress we find it impossible to correct this glaring inadequacy, let us determine now to make it one of the first orders of business in the next Congress.

In conclusion, I want to call attention to the fact that America has lead all nations in many fields of progress. In science, invention, and modern industrialism we have been outstanding but in some of the humanitarian aspects of life we have been only average. There are about 50 countries in the world that have general old-age pension programs. Some are generous, some are scant. Twelve countries retire men at 65 years and women at 60, and 11 countries retire both men and women at 60. I am glad to note that the social security amendments before the Congress now would retire our American women at 62 years of age.

Our national social security together with our many special industrial pensions and other benefits of a public nature has given old age some measure of protection in contrast to 21 years ago. Let us all be thankful for what has been accomplished in this great humanitarian field.

Two Million Acres Cropland Signed Under 1956 Acreage Reserve Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM S. HILL
OF COLORADO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 18, 1956

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following news release from the United States Department of Agriculture:

TWO MILLION ACRES CROPLAND SIGNED UNDER 1956 ACREAGE RESERVE PROGRAM AS OF JULY 6

Nearly 2 million acres of cropland had been signed up by farmers under the 1956 acreage reserve program of the soil bank by the end of the first week in July, according to preliminary reports which have been sent to the United States Department of Agriculture by State Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation offices.

"We have rapidly made this program available in every agricultural county of the United States," said Acting Secretary True D. Morse. "This report indicates widespread interest in the soil bank and makes it clear that farmer-committeemen have moved rapidly to put the program into operation. Complete regulations covering the acreage reserve for 1956 are in the hands of the State and county committees."

Payments farmers can earn for compliance with acreage reserve provisions for the acreage included in the agreements signed through the first week in July total a little more than $37 million.

Only farms with corn base acreages or allotments for wheat, cotton, rice, peanuts, or tobacco are eligible to participate in the acreage reserve program, which is designed primarily to reduce current production of these six basic crops. Because the program did not become available until so late in the planting season, participation for 1956 is expected to be much lower than the goals which will be established for 1957 and later years of full operation.

More complete reports will be issued as further information is received from the State committees. Final date for signup under the 1956 acreage reserve is July 20.

A summary of preliminary and incomplete information from those State ASC committees which have reported, for the period from the start of signup in late June through July 6, follows:

Commodity	Number of acres	Payments
Corn	693,433.3	$27,089,932.43
Wheat	1,120,817.6	6,964,056.25
Peanuts	1,596.1	19,536.40
Rice	1,112.4	53,999.48
Cotton	86,681.4	2,011,875.39
Tobacco (total)	4,368.38	889,012.24
Flue cured	2,251.07	475,239.22
Burley	141.62	17,784.87
Maryland	528.04	74,182.84
Dark air cured		
Virginia sun cured	535.67	67,444.00
Fire cured	135.63	21,386.00
Types 51–52	658.85	216,318.31
Types 54–55	118.00	16,657.00
Total	1,908,009.18	37,028,412.19

Loyalty of Persons Holding Nonsensitive Government Positions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD MARTIN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, July 18, 1956

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Bad Company," published in the Pittsburgh Sun-Telegraph of July 14, 1956. The article relates to a position taken by the Bar Association of New York City supporting the theory that no inquiry should be made concerning the loyalty of persons holding so-called nonsensitive positions in Government.

The Sun-Telegraph editorial, commenting on this theory, said:

There is no such thing as a nonsensitive job for a real Communist in Government.

I commend the reading of the editorial to all Senators.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BAD COMPANY

The Bar Association of New York City, by supporting the theory that no inquiry should be made concerning the loyalty of persons holding so-called nonsensitive positions in Government, has lent itself to an utter absurdity and a dangerous one.

It has put itself into a ridiculous and indefensible position.

The whole matter becomes incomprehensible in the light of the fact that the study upon which the recommendation is made by the association was financed by the Fund for the Republic, Inc., which has failed before and often in its efforts to persuade the American people to the same belief.

Why should any American hold Government employment with immunity to inquiry concerning his loyalty to the United States?

Why should any loyal American ask that immunity for himself, or defend or excuse it when sought by others?

It is true that the Supreme Court of the United States has held it to be the intent of Congress that freedom from loyalty inquiry is the right of the nonsensitive.

But the Congress already is moving swiftly to negate that untenable opinion, and the whole weight of the Eisenhower administration is behind the movement.

If loyalty to America cannot be made a condition of Federal employment, what safeguards are left against our enemies?

It is blindness to our greatest national danger that suggests that the enemies of America have the right to a foothold in the structure of Government.

As W. R. Hearst, Jr., said in his Editor's Report in the Sun-Telegraph, the differentiation between those capable of harm and those incapable of it in Government employment is self-deceit at best and deliberate fraud at its worst, and:

"There is no such thing as a nonsensitive job for a real Communist in Government."

Communists do not have to be in the highest ranks of Government to achieve their evil purposes.

The most menial places in Government may serve them very well.

But even if it should be possible to isolate the disloyal, what right in patriotism or morals or plain commonsense have they to sustain themselves at the expense, if not the actual peril, of the people of the United States?

The basic two conditions of acceptance into the ranks of public service must always be the capacity to do the job well and the utter incapacity to betray the Nation to its enemies.

It is a turning of backs upon these essential facts in which the Supreme Court and the New York Bar Association have joined, and in very bad company.

Pension Program for Veterans of World War I

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN E. HENDERSON
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 18, 1956

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Speaker, I have filed today under clause 1 of rule XXII a petition signed by 600 residents of Muskingum County, Ohio, situated in the 15th District which I have the honor to represent. This petition was forwarded to me urging immediate enactment of a separate and liberal pension program for veterans of World War I and their widows and orphans. The members of the Muskingum County Barracks 454, World War I Veterans have been instrumental in presenting this petition. It is the program of this organization that World War I veterans have reached the position in life where they are deserving of consideration and treatment on an equal basis with the aging veterans of previous wars in our Nation's history and in line with established American traditions. It is the expressed feeling of this organization that the time has come when the needs of the veterans of World War I require treatment different from that accorded veterans of the more recent wars. It is my sincere hope that the appropriate committee and the Congress continue to acquaint itself with the needs of this group of patriotic Americans which will result in the enactment of appropriate legislation.

Daily Digest

HIGHLIGHTS

Senate passed measures on customs simplification and atomic energy, and debated Hells Canyon project.

House unanimously adopted resolution opposing Red China's admission to U. N. and passed bill on agricultural trade development.

Senate committees approved numerous bills and nominations.

House committee approved liberalized civil-service retirement bill.

Conferees agreed to file reports on medical research and CCC borrowing power bills.

Senate

Chamber Action

Routine Proceedings, pages 12031–12059, 12235

Bills Introduced: 8 bills and 1 resolution were introduced, as follows: S. 4237–S. 4244; and S. Res. 316.

Page 12044

Bills Reported: Reports were made as follows:

H. R. 9918, authorizing negotiation and execution of a contract with Riverside Irrigation District, Idaho, relating to the rehabilitation of the district's works (S. Rept. 2618);

H. R. 8474, to quiet title regarding certain property in Alabama (S. Rept. 2619);

H. R. 9591, relating to acquisition of non-Federal land within existing boundaries of any national park (S. Rept. 2620);

Report of Committee on Government Operations on East-West trade, with minority views (S. Rept. 2621);

S. 4243, relating to compulsory inspection of poultry and poultry products (S. Rept. 2622);

S. 4221, to amend the International Wheat Agreement Act of 1949 (S. Rept. 2623);

H. R. 11947, to amend and extend for 2 years the Renegotiation Act of 1951, with amendments (S. Rept. 2624);

S. 4215, authorizing sale of certain vessels to Brazil (S. Rept. 2625);

S. 3831, to provide for the establishment of a fish hatchery in West Virginia, with amendment (S. Rept. 2626);

H. J. Res. 613, relating to expenses in connection with chartering of merchant ships under jurisdiction of the Secretary of Commerce (S. Rept. 2627);

H. R. 9801, authorizing construction of bridge over Panama Canal at Balboa, C. Z. (S. Rept. 2628);

Report of Joint Economic Committee entitled "Defense Essentiality and Foreign Economic Policy—Case Study—Watch Industry and Precision Skills" (S. Rept. 2629);

S. 3827, to authorize the construction of a shellfish research laboratory and experiment station in the Chesapeake Bay area, with amendment (S. Rept. 2630);

S. 4012, conveyance of certain public lands in Nevada to Colorado River Commission of Nevada acting for State of Nevada, with amendments (S. Rept. 2631);

H. R. 11554, to facilitate private financing of passenger vessels (S. Rept. 2632);

S. 1256, to provide for the appointment of additional circuit and district judges, with amendments (S. Rept. 2633);

S. Res. 73, referring to Court of Claims, S. 542, private bill (S. Rept. 2634);

S. 3593, relating to recognition of organizations of postal and Federal employees, with amendments (S. Rept. 2635);

S. J. Res. 177, authorizing Secretary of Commerce to sell certain war-built tankers, with amendments (S. Rept. 2636);

H. R. 604, to provide port-of-entry and related facilities on the Alaska Highway at the Alaska-Canadian border (S. Rept. 2637);

H. R. 8226, to amend act of March 4, 1915, so as to reserve certain lands in Alaska for public-school purposes (S. Rept. 2638);

H. R. 10946, relating to disposition of surplus personal property to Territorial government of Alaska (S. Rept. 2639);

H. R. 11024, relating to fees of certain commissioners for Territory of Alaska (S. Rept. 2640);

H. R. 4096, to provide for the disposal of public lands within highway, telephone, and pipeline withdrawals in

Appendix

Report of National Projects Committee to the Rivers and Harbors Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SID SIMPSON
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 18, 1956

Mr. SIMPSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include in the Appendix of the RECORD the report of the National Projects Committee, which was unanimously adopted by the recent 43d national convention of the National Rivers and Harbors Congress held in Washington on May 10–12, 1956.

The permanent National Projects Committee of the congress consists of an outstanding expert on water-resource problems from each of the major drainage basins of the United States. They serve without compensation of any kind whatsoever and bear all of their own expenses when coming to Washington and while here serving on this committee.

The committee's purpose is to assist the sponsors of projects in preparing and presenting their data, so that they may be placed in line for approval. The projects recommended by the committee and endorsed by the congress are vigorously pressed for inclusion in the Government's public-works program, and appropriations or allocation of funds sought therefor.

We are grateful to the members of this committee for their public-spirited service in an effort to assist the Congress of the United States and the governmental agencies charged with the responsibility for these public works, as well as the people in the areas to be served thereby.

The members of the committee who served at its recent session follow:

NATIONAL RIVERS AND HARBORS CONGRESS

National Projects Committee: Representative SID SIMPSON, of Illinois, chairman.

New England Division: Fred E. Bergfors, president and general manager, Quincy Oil Co., Quincy, Mass.

North Atlantic Division: Brig. Gen. James H. Stratton, United States Army (retired), consulting engineer, New York, N. Y.

South Atlantic Division: H. H. Buckman, consulting engineer, Jacksonville, Fla., vice chairman.

Southwestern Division: Dale Miller, executive vice president, Intracoastal Canal Association of Louisiana and Texas, Houston, Tex.

Lower Mississippi Valley Division: Hu B. Myers, chief engineer, department of public works, State of Louisiana, Baton Rouge, La.

North Central Division: Al Hansen, comptroller, city of Minneapolis, Minneapolis, Minn.

Missouri River Division: John B. Quinn, executive vice chairman, National Resources Development Association, Inc., Lincoln, Nebr.

Ohio River Division: J. I. Perrey, chief engineer, Indiana Flood Control and Water Resources Commission, Indianapolis, Ind.

North Pacific Division: Harold B. Say, manager, Washington office, Portland, Oreg., Chamber of Commerce.

South Pacific Division: Col. Thomas J. Weed, transportation counsel, city and county of San Francisco, San Francisco, Calif.

Western Inter-Mountain Region: E. W. Rising, Washington representative, State Water Conservation Board of Montana, Helena, Mont.

REPORT OF THE NATIONAL PROJECTS COMMITTEE TO THE 43D NATIONAL CONVENTION OF THE NATIONAL RIVERS AND HARBORS CONGRESS, MAY 12, 1956

Hon. OVERTON BROOKS,
President, National Rivers and Harbors Congress, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: In pursuance of the call of the president, your projects committee met on May 10, 1956, to consider the projects submitted since the last session of the National Rivers and Harbors Congress. Hearings were afforded all who made appearance.

The committee at this session has examined 14 proposals embracing all resource improvements with which this Congress is concerned, including navigable waterways, harbors, flood control, soil conservation, reclamation, and water conservation.

Of the proposals examined, this committee is convinced that 17 constitute projects sound in conception, needful, and sufficiently advanced in status to warrant endorsement, involving a total estimated cost of $249,416,998. Ten proposals appear to be without sufficiently advanced development to warrant project endorsement at this time, but are believed to be meritorious and entitled to further consideration by this committee, if and when additional information may be adequate to warrant an endorsed status. We find that on six proposals, surveys have been authorized but the reports on such surveys have not been completed and we therefore recommend in these cases that the Congress request the appropriate authority to complete reports of its investigations and surveys as soon as practicable in order that action may be taken toward classification by this congress. We find six proposals, which on preliminary examination appear to be desirable and needful, and we accordingly recommend that engineering and economic investigations of survey scope be made in these cases with a view to developing projects for subsequent authorization. Of the proposals investigated, we find two are without necessary data or sponsorship to enable the committee to reach a reasonable conclusion on their worth. However, we desire to give the applications sympathetic consideration, and, if possible, offer to the proponents the services of this Congress in reaching a solution to their problems. We have, therefore, not classified these but have suggested that the secretary communicate with the applicants concerned and request additional data upon the receipt of which further consideration will be given to their proposals.

Appendix A of this report sets forth in detail a list of all proposals and projects examined and the action taken thereon.

As the members of this congress know, the Committee on Public Works of the House of Representatives is currently holding hearings on navigation, flood control, beach erosion control and multiple-purpose survey reports which have been submitted to the Congress by the Secretary of the Army since enactment of the 1954 river and harbor flood-control bill. These reports contain proposals for the construction of water resource development projects throughout the Nation. Formulation of these proposals into an omnibus rivers and harbors and flood-control authorization bill, and ultimate enactment into law will be a valuable addition and supplement to the presently authorized program. Some of the pending recommendations are of high importance to the Nation's expanding economy, and should be provided as soon as possible.

Your projects committee recommends that the Congress and the President of the United States be requested to give every consideration to early approval of this highly important legislation and to the appropriations of the necessary funds for the planning and construction of these projects. Since passage of the last act, Congress has considered 2 navigation projects and 1 flood control project estimated to cost $320 million which have been authorized. Funds have been included in the President's budget for fiscal year 1957 for initiation of planning and construction on two of these projects. A total of 42 reports are now under consideration by the House Public Works Committee in the formulation of the bill; 20 are flood control projects estimated to cost $475 million; 16 are navigation projects estimated to cost $20 million and 6 are shore protection projects costing an estimated $4½ million. In addition there are about 42 favorable reports of all types in various stages of processing to Congress having a total estimated cost of about $250 million.

During the intervening time since our last meeting there has been much activity in connection with Federal civil works construction and investigation program and in the field of water resources policy. Destructive floods have occurred in the Northeastern States and west coast States which have emphasized the fact that the controlling of floodwaters and putting them to beneficial use is far from complete. The damages from these unprecedented floods and hurricanes in the Northeastern States far exceeded those of record, being estimated at more than $700 million with more than 200 lives being lost. These damages would have been much larger had not some of the authorized flood control projects been constructed. The floods in California, Oregon, and Nevada of last December caused an estimated damage of $150 million. Some of the constructed flood control projects in these areas prevented more extensive damages. Much remains to be done in the field of flood control, particularly in the determination of the feasibility of projects for the prevention of flood damages. In recognition of these problems and the need for an adequate flood control program for the areas damaged, the 84th Congress has passed legislation authorizing and directing that survey investigations be made to determine practical means of reducing the loss of human lives

and damages to property. Investigations have also been authorized to study hurricanes, to include methods for forecasting their paths and improving warning services and types of structures at coastal locations to prevent damages and loss of lives. It is evident, therefore, that the development of plans for the control of floods and minimizing the destructive force of hurricanes are of paramount importance. In this connection we must never for one moment lose sight of the objectives of the National Rivers and Harbors Congress in supporting this great program of water resource development.

Although much work remains to be done in the field of water resource development throughout the country, we feel that the problem is being expertly handled by the Federal agencies in cooperation with the States concerned. The need for full scale development of our water resource program is greater today than ever before. The projects committee, therefore, considers it highly important that sufficient funds be provided in order that the Federal agencies can carry out their respective water resources program in an orderly fashion. Your committee is concerned over the large backlog of investigations authorized by Congress to be carried out by the various Federal agencies and recommends that appropriations be increased at this time in order that the backlog be reduced and that a reserve of projects may be built up for activation at such time as the economy of the Nation demands.

The committee renews its previous observations with respect to the essentiality of recognizing the strategic values of our waterways. The basic importance of transport in time of war increases steadily with the integration of the civil and military war effort. The transportation resources of the United States, rail, water, highway, air, and pipeline, are not adequate in time of war, and become dangerously inadequate when coastwise shipping is curtailed.

To remedy this situation, there is necessary a peacetime growth of the transportation network. There does not appear any probability of the economical expansion of the rail network. All other forms of transport are subject to economical peacetime expansion in greater or lesser degree. Of all these, inland water transport affords the most important opportunity for achieving a system (including all forms) that will be adequate in wartime.

There are two Websterian definitions of the term "strategy." The more narrow of these is "the science and art of military command, exercised to meet the enemy in combat under advantageous conditions." The broader meaning is "the science and art of employing the armed strength of a belligerent to secure the objects of a war." It is in this latter sense that the committee applies the term "strategic" to our inland waterways, and their increase and improvement.

The committee is convinced that legislation that will make mandatory the inclusion of such strategic value, wherever it is found to exist, in all appraisals of waterways and proposed improvements thereof, is a need of the first importance. We are not unaware of the difficulty of drafting such legislation, nor of the fact that, as in certain other legislative fields, intangible values cannot be reduced to dollars and cents without recourse to arbitrary criteria. However, it is the opinion of the committee that such difficulties are not insurmountable, and they stand ready to assist Members of the Congress of the United States in drafting provisions that will rationally and equitably accomplish the desired end.

Respectfully submitted.

SID SIMPSON,
Chairman.

NOTE A.—A project which has been placed in class II, III, IV, or V by the committee may be reexamined from time to time upon due application and the submission of material supplementary information, with a view to advancing its classification; but no project will be reported upon by the committee more than once in each year.

NOTE B.—Attention is called to the fact that when a project is once put in class I—endorsed, such status continues and it is unnecessary to follow up at subsequent sessions with new applications. All projects endorsed by the Congress, upon the recommendation of the committee, retain their status until finally constructed, unless such action is rescinded by the Congress, and the Congress stands pledged to do everything possible to assist in reaching that goal.

APPENDIX A

APPLICATIONS FOR APPROVAL OF PROJECTS RECEIVED BY THE PROJECTS COMMITTEE

[Letter "R" following the project number indicates revision of a previous application]

CLASS I.—*Projects endorsed*

Endorsed: This means that the committee is convinced that the project is sound, needful and sufficiently advanced in status, and should be promptly constructed in the public interest.

Docket No.	Name of project	State	Division	Docket No.	Name of project	State	Division
119-R	Lake Charles-Calcasieu River and Pass Ship Channel.	Louisiana	Lower Mississippi Valley.	1036C	Lower Cumberland	Kentucky and Tennessee.	Ohio River.
843-R-3	Levees East of Chandlerville (Sangamon River).	Illinois	North Central.	1037	Jamaica Bay	New York	North Atlantic.
852-AR3	Norfolk Harbor	Virginia	North Atlantic.	1038	New Jersey Pierhead Line Channel; New York Harbor: Entrance channels and anchorage areas.	New Jersey	Do.
852-BR3	Thimble Shoal Channel	do	Do.				
860-R2	South Channel: New York Harbor entrance channels and anchorage areas.	New York and New Jersey.	Do.	1041	Dillon Dam	Ohio	Ohio River.
				1042	Oscoda Harbor of Refuge	Michigan	North Central.
875-R4	Whitewater River East Fork at Brookville.	Indiana	Ohio River.	1043	Whitefish Point Harbor of Refuge	do	Do.
1036A	Lower Cumberland	Kentucky and Tennessee.	Do.	1044	Harrisville Harbor of Refuge	do	Do.
				1049	Removal and control of sedimentation, St. Lucie River.	Florida	South Atlantic.
1036B	do	do	Do.	1050	New York State barge canal	New York	North Atlantic.

CLASS II.—*Projects classified as meritorious*

Meritorious: This means that the committee believes that although the project is not sufficiently advanced in status to warrant its present endorsement, it is meritorious and open for further consideration by the committee.

Docket No.	Name of project	State	Division	Docket No.	Name of project	State	Division
508-R	Salem Harbor	Massachusetts	Northeast.	890-R2	Kahului Harbor improvements	Territory of Hawaii.	South Pacific.
770-R2	Saginaw River	Michigan	North Central.				
793-R3	Cleves flood-protection project	Ohio	Ohio River.	932-R	Pepperell Cove, Kittery, dredging of Chauncy Creek.	Maine	Northeast.
883-R2	Improvements to channels and turning basins of San Juan Harbor.	Puerto Rico	South Atlantic.	1036	Connecticut River basin flood control (Littleville Dam).	Massachusetts and Connecticut.	Do.
888-R2	Long Beach, Plymouth Harbor	Massachusetts	Northeast.	1045	Beaufort Harbor	North Carolina	South Atlantic.
				1048	Grand River at Lansing	Michigan	North Central.

CLASS III.—*Expeditious Report on authorized survey requested*

Expeditious report on authorized survey requested: This means that the committee believes the Congress should request the engineering authority to expedite the report of its investigation and survey of the project to the end that appropriate further action may be had thereon in regard to classification by the Congress.

Docket No.	Name of project	State	Division	Docket No.	Name of project	State	Division
978-R	Preliminary examination of southern branch of Elizabeth River, Norfolk Harbor.	Virginia	North Atlantic.	1046	Channel from Pamlico Sound through Core Sound to Beaufort Harbor (wide channel at sea level).	North Carolina	South Atlantic.
979-R2	Ocracoke Inlet	North Carolina	South Atlantic.	1047	Thoroughfare Bay from Core Sound to Cedar Bay near the mouth of Neuse River.	do	Do.
1008-R	Calcasieu low-water dam	Louisiana	Lower Mississippi Valley.	1051	Port Mansfield	Texas	Southwest.

CLASS IV.—*Projects recommended for survey*

Recommended for survey: This means that the committee believes that sufficient showing on behalf of the project has been made to warrant further examination in the form of an adequate survey by an appropriate agency of the Federal Government.

Docket No.	Name of project	State	Division	Docket No.	Name of project	State	Division
671-R	New River dredging	Florida	South Atlantic.	1035	Intracoastal Waterway (Boston-Long Island Sound).	Massachusetts and Rhode Island.	Northeast.
1033	Drum Inlet (deepening and stabilization).	North Carolina	Do.	1039	New York and New Jersey Channels.	New York and New Jersey.	North Atlantic.
1034	Saw Mill River, Bronx River, and tributaries flood control.	New York	North Atlantic.	1040	Hudson River Channel	do	Do.

Bayonne Naval Supply Depot Doing More Work With Less Men—An Outstanding, Efficient, and Competent Command

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALFRED D. SIEMINSKI
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 11, 1956

Mr. SIEMINSKI. Mr. Speaker, Capt. Ignatius N. Tripi, United States Navy, will soon leave the United States Naval Supply Depot at Bayonne, N. J., as its commanding officer. We in the 13th Congressional District are losing a most efficient, capable, and outstanding officer.

During the past quarter, the depot was designated as the eastern area alternate emergency load list supply point for medical and dental materials and for special shipboard electrical fittings and fixtures. This command also was assigned to provide additional supply support and transshipping services to Naval Station, Bermuda, for ships store stock available in and around the New York area.

In the coming quarter, the depot will assume responsibilities as a supply distribution point for forms and publications to vessels and activities in the Third Naval District and as a processing point for electronic repair parts allowance lists to naval shipyards, New York, Boston, and Philadelphia and to industrial managers in the First, Third, Fourth, and Ninth Naval Districts. This command also will assume supply support of naval activities in Puerto Rico for freeze and chill subsistence stores. It is anticipated that an average of 120 measurement tons of such stores will be shipped monthly in furnishing this support.

Under terms of the transshipping agreement with the Department of the Army, it is anticipated that approximately 33,000 measurement tons of chill and reefer-type cargo will be loaded at the depot for delivery to Army commands overseas. In addition, it is estimated that the depot, as eastern area buildup activity for ordnance fire control repair parts sets, will effect the buildup of approximately 50 sets as requested by the Ordnance Supply Office.

Despite assumption of the new responsibilities, no significant increase in personnel is anticipated. As of July 1, 1956, the depot authorized ceiling for civilian personnel was 2,687. The on board count as of that date was 2,669.

Both the Captain and Mrs. Tripi have immeasurably contributed to the betterment of our community. They have been most active in our Community Chest, in our Red Cross, and in those various programs that mean so much to small municipalities. Mrs. Tripi's great interest in civilian defense, and the classes that were arranged by the women in this program, has been most gratifying. We, in the 13th district, will miss the Captain and Mrs. Tripi. They made it easy for the civilian population to understand the Navy Department and its problems.

Mr. Speaker, as you know, there has been great labor unrest in the Port of New York. Sometimes there were strikes, but through all of this labor difficulty, not once did the union men working at the Bayonne Naval Supply Depot ever leave their jobs. The Depot remained open and was operated at full capacity when the entire Port of New York was closed by a paralyzing port strike. Captain Tripi kept the base humming through all of this. He saw to it that food and material continued to go overseas to our troops.

We have had some great commanders at this base: Rainey, Boundry, Haynsworth, and Captain Tripi joins this illustrious group. We are thankful to Rear Admiral R. J. Arnold, Chief of the Bureau of Supplies and Accounts, Department of the Navy, for sending Captain Tripi to us. We feel badly that he has to leave us, but that is the way of the Navy and we can only accept it. The inspiring leadership that Admiral Arnold gives to the Bureau of Supplies and Accounts is exemplified by Captain Tripi's work at the base.

We join with all his friends from the Thirteenth Congressional District of New Jersey in wishing Captain Tripi well. May his future endeavors keep Captain Tripi climbing, as have his past.

We wish him godspeed.

Eighty-fourth Congress Record in Behalf of Farmers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD D. COOLEY
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 18, 1956

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I report proudly to the House that our Committee on Agriculture has handled in the 84th Congress the heaviest legislative workload ever undertaken in any Congress in behalf of the farmers of America.

With this Congress not yet ended, more than 800 bills have been referred to our committee. The content as well as the number of these bills reflects great concern in the Nation over the recession in agriculture that again has brought hard times to our farms, at the very time when the rest of our economy enjoys great prosperity.

The number of bills handled is about double the 423 referred to us in the 83d Congress, and compares with the total of agricultural measures in previous Congresses as follows: 82d, 175 bills; 81st, 396 bills; 80th, 208 bills; 79th, 208 bills; and 78th, 200 bills.

Our committee has had 19 subcommittees at work studying and refining this record number of agricultural bills, and these subcommittees as well as the full committee have conducted many special studies into ways of improving our agri-

cultural economy. These committees have held almost 300 hearings, and the full committee has reported 103 bills, of which 52 already have become public laws. We have disposed of virtually all of the 800-plus bills referred to us, approving the best, consolidating the good points of others, and rejecting or passing over others. In the latter category there were a number of good bills that require further study, before Congress can act upon them.

Mr. Speaker, while for each of the 11 years—1942–52 inclusive—our farmers had received average prices at 100 percent of parity or better, by the beginning of 1955, when this Congress convened, these prices had fallen far below a full parity relationship with the rest of the economy and farm income continued in a downward and devastating spiral. The average of farm prices had dropped 22 percent below the level of February 1951. Net farm income in 1954 had dipped about 30 percent under the income of 1947. The parity ratio was at the lowest level since 1941. Farm operating costs remained near record highs, and farm debt was increasing. Farmers' purchasing power had declined to the lowest level since 1940.

Our Committee on Agriculture, which it is my honor and privilege to serve as chairman, immediately set to work, in January 1955, to stem this new recession in agriculture, with the firm and resolute purpose of putting our farmers and their families again on the road toward income parity with our nonfarm population.

The most apparent and the most effective action open to this Congress, for quick relief of the farm distress, was to undo the damage of the Agricultural Act of 1954 which required that flexible—lower—price supports should be applied to the major crops.

This Congress approved H. R. 12, calling for an end to the downward flexing of prices; but we were thwarted and defeated by a Presidential veto. The will of the Congress did not prevail, as the President exercised his constitutional powers to reject H. R. 12. This will mean a loss of many millions of dollars to our farm families this year and it is my judgment thta the veto has delayed a recovery of the farm economy.

Mr. Speaker, our fight was not in vain. Notwithstanding the veto, the Members should feel great pride in the record of this Congress in its accomplishments for agriculture. Our fight for 90 percent of parity forced Mr. Ezra Taft Benson, the Secretary of Agriculture, to raise the low prices he had set for the 1956 crops. As example, the Secretary had announced the support for wheat at $1.81 a bushel—76 percent of parity. This price was raised to $2 a bushel, or 84 percent of parity. The corn support was increased from $1.40 a bushel to $1.50, rice from $4.04 per hundredweight, to $4.50. The dairy supports were increased. Supports for oats, rye, barley, and grain sorghum were lifted from 70 to 76 percent of parity. I believe our effort also brought about better supports for cotton and peanuts than Mr. Benson otherwise would have proclaimed.

This record of the 84th Congress bespeaks a deep interest in the people who till the soil.

The Congress established a $1,200,000,000 soil bank.

It enacted various legislation to protect the interests of small farmers and the rights of tenants and sharecroppers.

It improved the agricultural credit system, with special emphasis on the well-being of family-operated farms.

It improved the machinery for disposal of our farm products abroad.

It opened wider the doors of our warehouses to provide food for needy people in our own country.

It advanced research in agriculture.

It enacted legislation and appropriations to expand and improve rural electrical and telephone service.

It expanded the program to provide milk for millions of schoolchildren.

It improved and extended the Sugar Act, in a way to give our own cane and beet producers a larger share of the American sugar market.

It made great advances for the improvement and conservation of our soil and water resources.

It authorized the greatest appropriation of funds of any Congress in our history for agriculture.

It repealed the Federal tax on gasoline used in farming.

Mr. Speaker, through all our efforts you will find one purpose overshadowing all others—that is: To perpetuate and strengthen the family farm and the rural community economic and social order that is indispensable as a source of spiritual, social, and political vitality in our growing Nation.

And, Mr. Speaker, I want to assure my colleagues here, and the farmers and, indeed, all the American people, that the fight for fair treatment of our farm families will go on. Of necessity, it must go on. The interests of all our citizens requires that this fight continue.

Following is a review of enactments thus far in the 2d session of the 84th Congress relating to agriculture:

THE AGRICULTURAL ACT OF 1956—PUBLIC LAW 540

1. SOIL BANK

This act sets up a $1,200,000,000-a-year soil bank, in two parts:

(a) Acreage reserve. This program is designed to reduce acreages of wheat, cotton, corn, peanuts, rice, and tobacco. Payments to farmers are made to reduce their acreages of these crops below their acreage allotments, and these payments may be made as soon as the acreage is measured. Under this authority, the Department of Agriculture has set up 1956 rates of payment per acre, on a national average, as follows: Corn, $40.05; cotton, $45; wheat, $19.80; rice, $59.22; peanuts, $27; flue-cured tobacco, $255.42; and burley tobacco, $295.74. A maximum of $750 million a year could be expended on the acreage reserve for the next 4 years.

(b) Conservation reserve. This program is designed to remove acreage from crop production on a semipermanent basis, for which payments approximately equivalent to the rental value of the land would be made, with an annual national limit of $450 million.

Compulsory features, proposed in other soil-bank legislation, were not included in H. R. 12—vetoed—or in H. R. 10875 which became Public Law 540. Limit is placed on the amounts that can be spent on specific crops, thus assuring an equitable distribution of funds. Provision is made for the protection of tenants and sharecroppers. Procedures are provided for appeal by producers whose soil-bank contracts have been canceled because of alleged violations.

The act directs that the soil bank be commenced with 1956 crops, with a clear Congressional intent that the fact that some crops had been planted at the time of enactment is not to stand in the way of starting the program this year.

Many Members of Congress are disappointed with the manner in which this program is being administered. The Secretary has discriminated against those farmers who need the benefits of this program most: namely, those farmers whose crops have been ruined or damaged by drought or flood. It was the clear intent of the Congress to pay farmers who plowed up their crops on a basis of the average yield of the land, but the Secretary has adopted an "appraised" yield payment plan, knocking down the level of payment to take into account any weather or other natural damage to the crops on the land put into the acreage reserve. Thus, where the average yield base might mean a payment of $45 an acre in cotton the Secretary actually is paying as low as $6 under his improvised "appraised" yield. Similar trimming down of payments has occurred in wheat and other crops.

The major objective of the soil bank and other provisions of the act, relating to surplus disposal and to marketing quotas and acreage allotments, is the adjustment of production to market needs, reduction of the surpluses, conservation of soil and water, and the general improvement in farm income.

2. CORN

The act authorizes four different programs under which corn farmers may receive price supports in 1956, as follows:

(a) Producers in the commercial area who elect to comply with the acreage allotments previously announced by the Secretary—at the rate of approximately 43 million acres—are eligible for price supports at $1.50 per bushel—86.2 percent of parity—under that program, without putting land into the soil bank.

(b) For the operation of the soil bank the bill increases the corn acreage allotment for 1956 by 9 million acres to a total of 51 million acres. Corn producers in the commercial producing area may qualify for price supports at $1.50 per bushel—86.2 percent of parity—by planting within their allotment from the 51 million-acre base acreage, provided they put into the soil bank an amount of cropland equal to 15 percent of their base acreage of corn.

(c) Producers in the commercial corn area who do not comply with the regular acreage allotments previously announced nor with the base acreage setup for soil

bank purposes will still be eligible for price supports, under the noncompliance program newly announced by the Secretary, at the rate of $1.25 per bushel—about 83 percent of the support level of compliance corn in the commercial area.

(d) Producers outside the commercial area will receive a support at 82½ percent of the level of the support for compliance corn in the commercial area—or about $1.24 a bushel.

(e) The Secretary is directed, not later than December 15, 1956, to conduct a referendum of producers in the commercial corn area to determine whether they favor the present acreage allotment and price support program or would prefer to do away with acreage allotments completely and then let the Secretary fix the corn price support at such a level as he determines "will assist producers in marketing corn in the normal channels of trade but not encourage the uneconomic production of corn." If two-thirds or more of producers voting approved the change, corn then would be removed from the list of basic crops for price support purposes, and the support level thenceforward would be at the discretion of the Secretary, as has been the case in the small feed grains and in other crops.

3. FEED GRAINS

The act sets the price support for the 1956 crop of grain sorghums, barley, rye, and oats at 76 percent of the parity price for each commodity as of May 1, 1956. Thus, the 1956 supports are: Barley $1.02 per bushel; oats 65 cents per bushel; rye $1.27 per bushel, and grain sorghums $1.97 per hundredweight. These higher level supports thus supersede the 70 percent supports announced by the Secretary, which were 93 cents for barley, 59 cents for oats, $1.16 for rye, and $1.80 for grain sorghums.

4. COTTON

(a) A freeze of 1957 and 1958 national acreage allotments at no less than the 1956 allotment; (b) a provision that no State acreage allotment can be cut in 1957 and 1958 by more than 1 percent; (c) a special 100,000-acre national reserve is created to add to the allotments of small farmers; and (d) the Secretary of Agriculture is directed to sell Government cotton for export at the price necessary to regain America's traditional world market at around 5 million bales annually.

A program has been put into effect to make cash payments on the export of cotton textiles and cotton waste, to equalize the competitive position of our own cotton textile mills with foreign mills in the use of American cotton.

The act requires that whenever the price of either cottonseed or soybeans is supported, the price of the other shall be supported at a level which will cause them to compete on equal terms in the market.

Solution of our market problems, particularly in cotton textiles, will be substantially assisted by authority clearly given the President in this act to negotiate voluntary agreements with representatives of other countries with respect to importations into the United States of competing agricultural commodities or products made therefrom.

5. RICE

The act provides that the State acreage allotments for rice for 1956 shall not be less than 85 percent of the final State allotment for 1955; and that the national acreage allotments of rice for 1957 and 1958 shall not be less than the final national allotment for 1956, and shall be apportioned among the States in the same manner as the 1956 final allotment. The act provides a certificate program for rice, at the discretion of the Secretary. The certificate program will not be substituted for the present program unless the Secretary determines and proclaims that the initiation of the problem is "administratively feasible and in the best interests of rice producers in the United States."

6. TRANSITIONAL PARITY

The act freezes transitional parity for the basic commodities for 1957. This will mean that the parity price of corn, wheat, and peanuts—the only 3 basic commodities currently affected by the transitional parity formula—will be 5 percent higher in 1957 than they otherwise would have been. The bill also requires the Secretary of Agriculture to make a thorough study of possible methods of improving the parity formula and to report to Congress thereon not later than January 31, 1957, and to include drafts of any legislation needed to carry out this recommendation.

7. GOVERNMENT-OWNED LANDS

The President is directed to restrict insofar as practicable the leasing of Government-owned lands for the production of price-supported crops in surplus supply.

8. SECTION 32 EXPANSION

Appropriation of an additional $500 million annually is authorized for section 32 funds, for use in surplus removal and disposal operations, particularly for perishable commodities. The section 32 program previously has operated on funds derived from an allocation of 30 percent of duties collected under the customs laws, amounting to approximately $200 million annually. The authorization of a $500-million appropriation, in addition to the amount available from a share of the customs collections, will bring to about $700 million annually the funds available for this program which acts as a substantial price stabilization mechanism for various crops, as well as serving the needs of the school lunch program, making food available for low-income persons and generally aiding in the disposal of surpluses.

9. FORESTRY

The act authorizes broad expansion of cooperative activity between the Federal Government and the States in reforestation. Upon presentation by the proper State official the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to approve a plan for tree planting within the State and thereafter to cooperate technically and financially in such program. With respect to parts of the program carried out on non-Federal lands, the Federal financial contribution cannot exceed that of the State toward the same program. The secretary is directed to cooperate with other Federal agencies and with the appropriate State forester in approving and carrying out such plans.

10. OTHER IMPORTANT PROVISIONS

The act embraces various improvements in the disposal of surplus commodities and other significant provisions.

To facilitate surplus disposal in the United States, the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to process food commodities, such as grain, into a form—meal or flour—which can be used in the home and is also given authority long sought by both the State and the Federal Government to denote food commodities to certain penal institutions.

To facilitate surplus disposal abroad, the President is given authority to pay ocean freight on surplus commodities donated for use in other countries and to step up disposal under title II of Public Law 480 from $300 million to $500 million.

The act authorizes the appointment of a Surplus Disposal Administrator in the Department of Agriculture.

Provision is made for the appointment of a commission to study and make recommendations to Congress on increased industrial use of agricultural products.

In addition to these specific new authorizations to deal with the surplus problem, the Secretary is directed to make a study of proposals for disposing food domestically through some kind of food-stamp plan; he is directed to report to Congress within 90 days on this important matter; he is directed to make a similar study and report on the matter of establishing strategic stockpiles of agricultural commodities both in the United States and abroad for use in the event of war or similar emergency; he is directed to use existing authority of the Commodity Credit Corporation to dispose of surpluses generally and long-staple cotton specifically.

An attack is made upon the surplus problem affecting long staple cotton by again placing extra long staple cotton, now exempt from quotas, within the quota set up for all cotton longer than 1⅛ inches.

In order to encourage further the underplanting of acreage allotments, the act authorizes a producer, for the first time, to plant only a part or even none of an acreage allotment for three successive years without losing his history and the right to future allotments. This could eliminate the practice of planting merely to retain history for allotment purposes, which is now required.

To make present production adjustment laws more effective, the bill increases to 75 percent of the support price the penalty for exceeding peanut-marketing quotas.

SUGAR

Public Law 545, H. R. 7030, reenacts and extends for 4 years, to December 31, 1960, the Sugar Act of 1948, as amended, with further amendments to, first, give domestic cane and sugarbeet producers a fair share of the growth of the United States sugar market; second, bring about a more equitable participation by foreign suppliers in this market; and third, maintain stability of sugar supplies and prices in the United States.

The Sugar Act is one of the most successful of our farm programs, in terms of benefits to producers and dependable supplies at stabilized prices for consumers. Sugar consumption continues to soar under this program. The United States now consumes over 8,500,000 tons of the approximately 40 million tons annual world production, and the consumption is increasing by more than 135,000 tons a year.

This is because the Sugar Act maintains a fair price to housewives, while giving a fair return to producers.

Public Law 545 provides that domestic producers may supply 55 percent of the growth in the American market, in addition to the approximately 4,500,000 tons annually already allotted to them.

This participation by the United States sugar producers in the future market growth restores to them the status they had under sugar-quota legislation prior to World War II. In the Sugar Act of 1948, quotas for the domestic areas were limited to fixed quantities, with all the growth of our market going to foreign suppliers, 96 percent to Cuba. This was done to assist Cuba in making the transition from wartime to peacetime conditions, since Cuba's production has been greatly expanded to meet America's wartime needs. However, it was recognized at the time that the change was of temporary nature and that at the appropriate time the domestic areas should resume participation in market growth.

Cuba, under Public Law 545, retains its status as our largest foreign supplier. The actual tonnage which Cuba will market in the United States is expected to increase from year to year because of her participation in our market growth. Additional quotas granted to other foreign suppliers, as provided in this act, are in line with our national policy of broadening our trade relations.

It should be emphasized here that the sugar program, supported by a small excise on sugar, actually has shown a profit of about $312 million since it became effective in 1937, and American housewives, under this program, pay less for sugar than is the case in many other areas of the world.

SCHOOL MILK PROGRAM

Public Law 465, H.R. 8320: This act, first, extended the special school milk program 2 years to June 30, 1958, increased the amount authorized for it from $50 million annually to $60 million annually for the current fiscal year and to $75 million for each of the next 2 fiscal years, and made certain nonprofit institutions devoted to the care of underprivileged children eligible for the benefits of the program; second, extended the accelerated burcellosis program 2 years to June 30, 1958, and increased the amount authorized for it from $15 million annually to $17 million for the current fiscal year and to $20 million for each of the next 2 fiscal years; and third, extended the veterans and Armed Forces milk program 2 years to December 31, 1958.

CONSERVATION

Public Law 483, H. R. 7236: This act means that in establishing the national standards for the Agricultural Conservation Program, the Secretary of Agriculture will have the authority, if he chooses to exercise it, of applying water conservation measures as ACP practices in any State. This act struck out the words "in arid or semiarid sections" which previously had limited the area of operation of this program as it relates to water conservation measures.

Public Law 473, H. R. 1855, enacted into permanent legislation authority which has been contained in the most recent several appropriation acts for the Department of Agriculture and which has been exercised, pursuant to those acts, by the Forest Service. The act consists essentially of authority for the Secretary of Agriculture to advance Federal funds in the furtherance of cooperative research projects.

TOBACCO

Public Law 425, House Joint Resolution ____, adjusted the burley tobacco allotment for 1956 upward, to conform with acreage justified by accurate data on 1955 production which was not available when the original allotment for 1956 was determined. The effect of Public Law 425 was to make most farm allotments the same as they were in 1955.

Public Law 427, House Joint Resolution 521, readjusts the acreage allotment of Maryland tobacco to conform with acreage justified by data on production of the previous year not available when the original allotment for 1956 was determined. The effect of this act was to eliminate an acreage reduction of approximately 15 percent for 1956.

Public Law 426, House Joint Resolution 518, adjusts upward the acreage allotments of fire-cured and dark air-cured tobacco to conform with acreage justified by data on production of the previous year which was not available when the original allotments for 1956 were determined.

Public Law 609, H. R. 9475: This act changed the statutory deadline from December 1 to the following February 1, for the announcement by the Secretary of Agriculture of tobacco marketing quotas with respect to all kinds of tobacco except flue-cured. The law had required that the Secretary make the announcement of tobacco marketing quotas not later than December 1 of the year preceding the year for which such quotas are established. On December 1 most kinds of tobacco have not yet been marketed. Therefore, instead of the accurate measurement of the quantity of tobacco produced during the current year which the Secretary possesses as soon as the current crop has passed through the markets, he has on December 1 only the estimates made as of November 1. In a number of recent years these estimates have varied sufficiently from actual outturn of crops to have created a situation where the marketing quota announced by the Secretary was substantially different from the quota he would have determined had the actual weight of the crop been known to him. Under Public Law 609, the Secretary now may make the quota announcements at any time prior to February 1 and it is presumed that he will do so with respect to the various types of tobacco at such time as sufficient production and other data are available.

Prior to this enactment, this Congress had approved separate bills to adjust allotments to conform to data that was not available when the allotments were announced—a condition that may be avoided in the future by the use of the authority in Public Law 609.

OTHER ENACTMENTS

Public Law 431, S. 2884: This act made possible the planting in 1956 of an expanded acreage of durum wheat in counties known to be capable of producing this wheat, in order to alleviate the serious shortage of this particular type of wheat, which is preferred in the manufacture of macaroni.

Public Law 607, S. 2967, first, increased by 15,000 acres the lands within the roadless area of the Superior National Forest which may be acquired under the act of June 22, 1948; second, increased to $2,500,000 (from $500,000) the amount authorized to be appropriated for the acquisition of lands under such act; and third, made section 5 of such act applicable to the additional lands described by the bill of June 30. Section 5 provides for payment to the State of Minnesota of amounts based on the appraised value of national-forest lands in the roadless area rather than forest receipts, as provided by title 16, United States Code, section 500.

Public Law 471, House Joint Resolution 122, directed the Secretary of Agriculture to release to the Orangeburg School District reversionary interests in improvements on a 3-acre tract in Orangeburg County, S. C.

Public Law 472, H. R. 374, authorized the adjustment and clarification of ownership to certain lands within the Stanislaus National Forest, Tuolumne County, Calif.

APPROPRIATIONS FOR AGRICULTURE

Mr. Speaker, the 84th Congress, in its two sessions, has approved appropriations and loan authorizations aggregating $3,907,268,000 for the Department of Agriculture, exclusive of the actions restoring the capital of the Commodity Credit Corporation and not including funds which will be carried in the first and second supplemental 1957 appropriations yet to be enacted in the present session. Th previous Congress authorized $2,778,400,000 for the Department.

Liberal appropriations and authorizations were approved for conservation, education, research, school lunch, and all the various action programs.

A compilation of the House Committee on Appropriations figures shows specific appropriations and authorizations of the 84th Congress and the comparative figures for the previous Congress as follows: Research, 84th, $179,044,000; 83d, $129,600,000. REA electric and telephone facilities, 84th, $549 million; 83d, $420 million. Farmers Home Administration loan authorizations, 84th, $367,500,000; 83d, $330 million. Extension Service, 84th, $101,175,000; 83d, $78,800,000. Soil Conservation Service and watershed and flood prevention, 84th, $182,268,000; 83d, $145,011,000.

School lunch, 84th, $183,235,000; 83d, $166,601,000.

Mr. Speaker, other bills vital to agriculture will become law, as the work of this Congress. Thirteen bills, handled by our committee and approved by the Congress, now are at the White House awaiting action of the President.

These bills include:

H. R. 10285, to increase farmer ownership and control of the Farm Credit System and to promote the efficiency and growth of the credit system. This important bill also will merge production credit corporations in Federal intermediate credit banks.

H. R. 11375, to further extend the special school-milk program to certain institutions for the care and training of children.

H. R. 8321, to extend for 2 years the agricultural conservation program (ACP).

H. R. 11873, to amend the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act so as to eliminate delay in the start of projects. This would reduce from 45 to 15 the number of days plans are held for review in Congress.

H. R. 9333, to amend the Commodity Exchange Act to provide for hedging anticipated requirements of processors and manufacturers.

S. 1915, to provide for the exchange of employees of the United States Department of Agriculture and employees of State political subdivisions or educational institutions.

S. 3032 grants the consent and approval of Congress to the Middle Atlantic Interstate Forest Fire Protection Compact.

A number of other bills approved by our committee are now awaiting final action by the Congress. They include:

IMPROVED CREDIT

H. R. 11544 which further improves and simplifies the credit facilities available to farmers. It provides additional funds for emergency loan programs, authorizes loans specifically for the refinancing of existing farm debts, provides assistance to part-time farmers, permits extension of loans when natural disasters result in crop losses, and provides other measures complementing the special programs for low-income farmers and the Great Plains program.

PUBLIC LAW 480

H. R. 11708 amends the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954—Public Law 480. This is the law which authorizes the sale of agricultural surpluses for foreign currencies, where such sales are in addition to the usual purchases of such commodity by the foreign country. H. R. 11708 increases from $1.5 billion to $3 billion the total amount of the foreign currency transactions which may be carried out under the law.

GREAT PLAINS

H. R. 11833—the Great Plains Conservation bill—proposes a broad program, in cooperation with farmers, to restore and conserve cultivated and grazing lands of a wide area in the 10 Great Plains States that often are ravaged by high winds and dry weather. A $150 million program, over a 10-year period, is provided in this legislation.

SOIL-BANK PAYMENTS

H. R. 11958 proposes full soil-bank payments on allotted acreages not planted or not harvested because of adverse weather or other natural causes. Under this measure, if a farmer does not plant his full allotment or plants and does not harvest it, because of weather or other adverse conditions, he would be given the opportunity to place such land in the soil bank and be paid the regular acreage-reserve rate, provided he does not use the acreage for other production purposes.

MARKETING FACILITIES

H. R. 4054 seeks to reduce the cost of food to consumers and to improve the income of farmers through more efficient marketing of perishable agricultural commodities. The bill authorizes the Secretary of Agriculture to insure loans by private lending institutions for the improvement and development of wholesale marketing facilities, designed to lessen the uneconomic practices in antiquated facilities that now cause greatly increased costs, undue losses, excessive waste, spoilage, and deterioration in the handling of these perishable foods.

PERISHABLE COMMODITIES

H. R. 5337 would—without broadening the scope or original intent of the Perishable Agricultural Commodities Act of 1930, as amended—correct certain deficiencies which have become apparent in the administration of the act, thereby lending greater strength and more effectiveness to the basic legislation.

WATERSHEDS

H. R. 8750 amends the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act, so as to provide a program that will be consistent with other Federal programs for the conservation, control, and utilization of water. The bill broadens the general scope of the act and makes a number of specific amendments.

Among other bills awaiting final action are:

H. R. 10108 which amends the penalty provisions of the tobacco marketing quota law to provide that penalties for exceeding the farm quota shall be assessed on the basis of the harvested acreage of tobacco rather than on the basis of the quantity of tobacco sent to market. The bill also amends the measurement provisions of the 1938 act to clear up any doubt which might arise as to the authority of the Secretary of Agriculture to measure tobacco acreage for compliance purposes.

H. R. 8384 which would include cranberries in the Agricultural Marketing Act of 1947.

Mr. Speaker, the recession in agriculture is reflected particularly in the volume of inquiries coming to Members of Congress and the House Committee on Agriculture concerning farm legislation.

These inquiries, from farm people and from people interested in farm problems, deserve thoughtful response, sometimes in considerable detail. I have inserted the foregoing preliminary and incomplete material to assist in furnishing the facts about agricultural legislation. Those who may be interested in reviewing all the farm legislation passed during the 84th Congress, to this date, should refer to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of August 25, 1955, where, beginning on page A4642, I presented a summary of enactments relating to agriculture during the first session of this Congress.

Section 22: Its Origin, Evolution, and Intent

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL HINSHAW

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 18, 1956

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by William J. Burns, managing director, Munitions Carriers Conference, Inc., contained in the May–June 1956 issue of National Defense Transportation Journal:

SETCION 28: ITS ORIGIN, EVOLUTION, AND INTENT

(By William J. Burns, managing director, Munitions Carriers Conference, Inc.)

Although section 22 was part of the orignay Act To Regulate Commerce of 1887, it has only been within recent years that controversies have raged over the equity or inequity of its provisions for the movement of Government property at free or reduced rates. What is this mysterious section around which so much discussion has taken place Why was it included in the Act To Regulate Commerce and what was its intent?

BACKGROUND OF GOVERNMENT RATE CONCESSION

In our early transportation history we can see where the seed was sown for the growth of section 22, for in the act of June 1, 1796, regulating grants of land appropriated for military service, Congress indicated an early intent to receive some concessions by requiring:

"That all navigable streams or rivers within the territory to be disposed of, by virtue of the act, shall be deemed to be and remain public highways."

The roots of the rate concession Congress expected the Government should receive in exchange for grants of aid, could be seen as early as 1824 when, in an act authorizing the State of Illinois to open a canal thorugh public lands, it was stated:

"That the said canal, when completed shall be, and foreover remain, a public highway, for the use of the Government of the United States, free from any toll or charge whatever, for any property of the United States or persons in their service, on public business, passing through the same."

Then, 10 years later, in an act which provided aid for the repair of a military road, military shipments were exempted from the payment of tolls by the following:

"*Provided*, That no toll shall be received or collected for the passage of any wagon or carriage, laden with property of the United States, or any cannon or military stores belonging to the United States, or to any of the States composing the Union."

Moving on a few years we find that during the period 1850–71 the Federal and State Governments granted 176,220,656 acres of land to the railroads to aid in railroad construction. And it is interesting to note that the majority of these land-grant acts, as they

became known, provided some type of rate concession to the Government in exchange for the grants of land. The acts varied, however, as to the magnitude of these rate concessions. Some of the acts provided that:

"The said railroad and branches shall be and remain a public highway, for the use of the Government of the United States, free from toll or other charge upon the transportation of any property or troops of the United States."

These railroads were referred to as free-toll lines. Others were called congressional-rate lines since the provisions in their acts required:

"That said railroad shall be a post route and military road, subject to the use of the United States for postal, military, naval, and all other governmental service and also subject to such regulations as Congress may impose restricting the charge for such governmental transporation."

Up to the Civil War, little controversy existed with regard to these provisions, since military shipments were small in number and volume. When it became a great sacrifice, however, for the railroads to transport the great Civil War traffic in troops and supplies, many requests were made for interpretations of the land-grant rate concession provisions. An early interpretation, in August 1861, confined the concession to the United States to a free use of the mere roadway, but did allow a deduction of one-third of the usual price of transportation. In the same year the Secretary of War, Simon Cameron, wrote to Mr. W. H. Osborne, president of the Illinois Central Railroad, stating that:

"Payment for transportation of freights, stores, munitions of war, and other public property will be made at such reasonable rates as may be allowed to other railroad companies, subject, however, to the abatement of 33⅓ percent."

In 1862 the House passed a provision requiring free transportation, but the Senate rejected it and induced the House to accept. And again, in 1865, a movement was started in the House to force the Illinois Central to transport property for the Government free of charge, but no action was taken.

Since the free-transportation provisions of the early land-grant acts were subject to varying interpretations, the later acts, beginning in 1866, began to specify in more definite terms the intent of the free transportation. In the act of July 13, 1866, for example, new phraseology was included:

"And the same shall be transported over said road at the cost, charge, and expense of the corporation or company owning or operating the same, when required by the United States to do so."

Or consider the following language in the act of July 26, 1866:

"That said company, after the construction of the road, shall keep it in repair and in use, and shall at all times transport troops, munitions of war, supplies, and public stores upon its road, for the Government of the United States, free from all cost or charge therefor to the Government."

A crisis finally arose in 1874 when, in the Army Appropriation Act of that year, Congress provided that no payments should be made for the transportation of troops or property over free-toll railroads, or any other land-grant railroads, where the land-grant act contained any condition whatsoever relating to the transportation of Federal troops and property. This act, however, permitted the railroads to institute suit against the Government, which they did, in order that the free-toll provisions of the act might be interpreted by the courts. And, in 1877, in *Lake Superior & M. R. Co.* v. *United States*, the court handed down the following opinion:

"We are of the opinion that the reservation in question secures to the Government only a free use of the railroads concerned, and that it does not entitle the Government to have troops or property transported by the companies over their respective roads free of charge for transporting the same."

During this period of land-grant aid there were many railroads which received no assistance, and found themselves unable to compete with the reduced-rate lines for Government traffic. These railroads, therefore, began entering into equalization agreements with the Government whereby they agreed to meet the rates of the reduced-rate lines, other than those which could make no charges.

CLAMOR FOR RATE REGULATIONS BEGINS

To turn now for a moment to the regulation of rates, we find that relatively little was said in Congress about this subject until 1868, when evidence began to appear of a definite movement to regulate rates. In that year three different resolutions were introduced which looked toward the control of rates. The object of rate regulation in this early period, L. W. Haney reported in his Congressional History of the Railways, was predominantly cheap transportation. Three bills introduced in 1870, in fact, were entitled "To promote commerce and cheapen the transportation of mails." And in 1872 the Senate appointed a special committee to investigate the possibility of securing cheaper transportation between the interior and seaboard.

A few years later, in 1877, Congressman Regan, of Texas, introduced a bill to regulate commerce, and Congressman Watson, of Pennsylvania, introduced one in 1878, both of which were referred to the House Committee on Commerce. Congressman Reagan, however, happened to be chairman of this committee, and his substitute bill, H. R. 3547, was reported out and passed the House in December 1878. This bill of Reagan's incorporated much of the rate concession philosophy inherent in the early Federal aid to the States, and later in the land-grant acts, and by the following language laid the foundation for the inclusion of section 22 in the act to regulate commerce:

"That nothing in this act shall apply to the carriage, receiving, storage, handling, or forwarding of property less than the ordinary carload, or wholly within one State or Territory, going to or coming from some foreign country, or to property carried for the United States at lower rates of freight and charges than for the general public, or to the transportation of articles free or at reduced rates of freight for charitable purposes, or to or from public fairs and expositions for exhibition."

Reagan's bill was referred to the Committee on Commerce in the Senate but no further action was taken. He introduced his bill again in 1879 and 1880, but made no progress.

The beginning of the final stage in the evolution of section 22 arrived in December 1884 when the House passed Reagan's bill H. R. 5461. As contrasted with Reagan's 1877 bill, which provided for the movement of Government property at lower rates than charged the general public, the 1884 bill contained the following complete exemption:

"That nothing in this act shall apply, to property carried for the United States."

While the House was passing Reagan's bill, the Senate had been considering a similar bill of Senator Cullom of Illinois, and when the Reagan bill came up from the House the Cullom bill was passed by the Senate as a substitute for it on January 30, 1885. At this juncture a select committee of five Senators was appointed, with Senator Cullom as chairman, to investigate and report upon the regulations of railways and water carriers, the findings of which resulted in the famous Cullom report. Based to a large extent on the findings of his committee, Senator Cullom reported Senate bill 1532 from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce on February 16, 1886, and it was passed by the Senate. Upon receipt in the House, however, the Reagan bill was passed as a substitute. And when the Senate disagreed with the Reagan substitute, conferees were appointed to resolve the differences. While these differences were basically concerned with the long-and-short-haul provision, an antipooling clause, and enforcement procedures, it should be noted that differences in wording existed with relation to the transportation of Government freight as reduced rates. Since the Land Grants Acts had placed reduced rates to the Government on a fait accompli basis, the differences in the two bills revolved around wording which would make the reduced rates to the Government lawful in an act which was otherwise designed to prevent the very thing reduced rates to the Government imply, discrimination.

The Reagan bill provided that nothing shall apply to property carried for the United States at lower rates of freight and charges than for the general public, while the Cullom bill stated that nothing shall apply to the carriage, storage, or handling of property free or at reduced rates for the United States, State, or municipal governments.

Early in 1887 the committee of conference reported a bill which was passed by the Senate on January 14, and by the House on January 21, 1887. This bill, which was a compromise insofar as the free transportation provisions of the Reagan and Cullom bills were concerned, was signed by President Cleveland on February 4, 1887, and became the Act to Regulate Commerce. Thus section 22 was born.

EARLY EXPERIENCE UNDER SECTION 22

From the enactment of the act of 1887 up to and including World War II, predominantly all of the Government traffic was moved by the railroads under land-grant and rate equalization concessions. Section 22 was the medium that made these rate concessions lawful.

During this period there were attempts made to clarify to some extent the general haziness which surrounded this anomalous section.

In its first year of operation the Commission, for example, held in a case involving the issuance of mileage tickets:

"That while the issuance of mileage tickets is authorized by section 22 of the act, that section does not relieve the carriers from the requirements of reasonableness and impartiality as to rates charged for such tickets."

And in its First Annual Report, the Commission stated with regard to section 22:

"These provisions, it will be seen, are not intended to qualify to any injurious extent the general rules of fairness and equality which the act has been so careful to prescribe and the exceptions may all be said to be authorized on public considerations."

In 1892, in a Section 22 proceeding before the Commission concerning unjust discrimination in the movement of passengers, the Commission said that:

"Indeed, many, if not all, the excepted classes named in section 22 are those which, in the absence of this section, would not necessarily be held the subjects of unjust discrimination. Such, for instance, are property of the United States * * * in favor of whom a reduction of rates had been made for many years before the passage of the act."

We can see in this early Commission opinion the rationalization of rate concessions to the Government.

In 1913, however, the Commission took a somewhat different position with regard to unjust discrimination, stating in *Dairymen's Supply* v. *Pennsylvania Railroad* that while portions of section 22 allow the carrier to transport property at free or reduced rates to fairs, it does not require that the carriers

do so, adding that it was permissive of the carriers to furnish reduced rate transportation provided that it does not result in unjust discrimination under section 2 or undue preference or prejudice under section 3 of the act.

Ten years later, in *Nashville, C. & St. L. Ry. et al.* v. *State of Tennessee et al.*, the court took a more definite position stating:

"Congress did not intend, by this provision (sec. 22) concerning reduced rates and free transportation, to create an instrument, by which the carrier was authorized, in its discretion, to subject interstate commerce to undue prejudice."

REPEAL OF LAND-GRANT RATES URGED

With the outbreak of war in Europe in the late thirties, our military shipments began to increase sharply and strong requests were made to repeal the land-grant rate concessions to the Government. The Transportation Act of 1940 finally relieved the railroads from their obligation to transport mail and Government traffic, but did not release them from their obligation to continue to transport military property and personnel at reduced rates. This awkward situation prompted the Interstate Commerce Commission to state in its annual report for 1941:

"The confusion incident to present land-grant legislation is impeding desirable changes in rates and is bringing about transportation in some instances that appears to be highly uneconomic."

The Association of American Railroads, in a booklet entitled "End Government Discrimination Against and Among Shippers—Repeal the Land-Grant Rates," quoted Joseph B. Eastman's 1942 statement before the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee:

"It seems to me that the Government ought to pay the same rates for carriage of traffic as are paid by its own citizens, who really make up the country."

Then, in 1943, the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, in a report accompanying H. R. 6156, stated:

"The enactment of this legislation will increase the freight bill of the Federal Government, but take little, if any, more from the people of this country. The shippers and consuming public must pay the Nation's freight bill. Where the Government transports its freight for less than the cost to the carriers somebody must pay proportionally more than costs. The only alternative is unjust rates to carriers."

Congress finally relieved the land-grant railroads from any further obligation to transport persons and property for the military at reduced rates, with these rates ceasing on October 1, 1946.

GOVERNMENT VERSUS COMMERCIAL SHIPPERS

Today the Government is the largest single shipper in the country. The Department of Defense alone has a transportation bill running around $1 billion annually.

Clearly the Congress in 1887 never envisaged a situation where the movement of Government traffic could have a disrupting effect on our national transportation system, or where discrimination could be practiced between commercial and Government shippers. In 1887, when section 22 was included in the act to regulate commerce, there were only 27,791 men in the Army, while today we have over a million in the Army and an additional 2 million in the other services.

With the land-grant rate concessions out of the way, section 22 remains the only medium through which the Government can secure lower rates than are available to commercial shippers. Since it follows, then, that the same arguments can be used to justify the revision of this section that were used in the land-grant hearings, it should be no surprise that the people in favor of repealing section 22 are substantially the same as those who favored land-grant repeal—the commercial shippers, receivers, and carriers being discriminated against by lower rates to the Government. The Government, on the other hand, which benefits most by the section 22 rate concessions, argues against the revision of this section.

CONCLUSION

Rate concessions to the Government had their origin in the early grants of aid to the States, and later were continued in the land-grant acts and rail-equalization agreements. Since the act to regulate commerce of 1887 had as its prevailing principle equality for all persons and communities under substantially similar circumstances and conditions, it was necessary to include in the act a section which would make lawful the rate concessions which had been in existence for many years prior to 1887, and which would continue subsequent to 1887 in the form of the land-grant acts and rail-equalization agreements.

With the repeal of the land-grant acts in 1946, however, much of the early Government rate concession philosophy was vitiated. There would appear to be no reason, therefore, why the Government today should be offered lower rates than are available to commercial shippers.

Democratic Processes Threatened by Civil Rights Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER ROGERS
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 18, 1956

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, under the so-called civil rights bill there is a very real threat to the rights of the individual regardless of his color, his creed, or his race. In proposing to set up another commission and another bureau to direct the conduct of the people, we ought to be careful that, under the guise of protecting the rights of a minority, we do not create the machinery which will destroy the rights of everybody. This threat to our individual liberty is analyzed clearly in the following editorial from the Amarillo Globe-Times of Amarillo, Tex.:

APPLY THE BRAKES

If we had no other reason for gagging over the civil rights commission that the administration is proposing, it would be that what this Nation needs is a Congress that would repeal one law each day and disband one Federal commission or agency each month.

We are becoming so over-governed that there's no time for making a living and little time for recreation. If you can spare an hour from the daily grind, it has to be used filling out some form. The daily grind consists mainly in checking up to see if you are breaking a law before making a decision or taking an action.

But our acute discomfort about so-called civil rights legislation is that we are scared plumb to death of its consequences. If a man can appeal directly to the Federal courts for any minor problem that he dreams up, and the wide, large phrases of the proposed legislation leave such problems as purely cerebral dreamings, not bounded by the exactitudes of law, not only will our entire system of local government disappear, but individual rights will be lost in a mad scramble.

Boy, what we can do our neighbors under that civil rights law! But our joys is overbalanced by full recognition of what our neighbors can do to us!

Let us stop scourging ourselves by whips. Let us stop doing this phony public confessional that this country is full of oppressed, downtrodden people. As Representative WALTER ROGERS said in Washington last week "look at the propaganda that is being spread on the foreign front to the effect that there are no oppressed people in the United States and compare it with the domestic propaganda that is being generated (for vote-getting purpose) in support of this bill." Let us get the record straight.

We've got all the civil rights we need. We've had a Constitution for nearly 200 years that assures us of them. We've given every minority its day in court. Generally each minority gets along with the majority, which is made up of all the other minorities, about as well as human nature allows. All the laws in the world won't change human nature, so let's stop passing laws and get back to doing what we've been doing for 200 years, educating human nature to live up to basic law in the Constitution.

In the next few months when all of that civil rights legislation is being pushed forward to your approval, remember well a concise sentence of ROGERS which sums it well:

A civil rights commission would have powers that "no good man would want and no bad man should have."

Gardotherapy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT P. MORANO
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 18, 1956

Mr. MORANO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the text of a release which was issued this week by the Veterans' Administration, dealing with the efforts of a Bridgeport, Conn., man to rehabilitate mental patients in veterans' hospitals.

For this work, Edward B. Moddell, chief gardener at the veterans' hospital in Northport, Long Island, has received the Veterans' Administration's highest award—the exceptional service award.

Following is the text of the VA news release:

A kindly, white-haired gardener who has devoted much of his life helping mental patients regain their interest in living by working among flowers, has received the Veterans' Administration's highest honor—the exceptional service award.

This recognition of Edward B. Moddell, chief gardener at the VA hospital in Northport, Long Island, resulted from his years of voluntary assistance to the medical staff in developing gardening and flower cultivation into an important rehabilitation tool for mental patients.

Dr. Jesse F. Casey, VA's director of psychiatry and neurology, presented the award to Mr. Moddell "for his exceptional contribution to the rehabilitation of patients at the Northport Hospital."

"Over a period of 5 years," according to the citation, "he has developed and operated a program of gardening for mentally ill patients that has been a significant factor in restoring many patients to happy, normal lives."

Gardotherapy, the name given to this rehabilitation program, has been so successful, VA said, that it is being adopted in several State and Federal institutions.

Gardotherapy reinstills in mental patients their interest in living which so often they have lost, VA said.

Mr. Moddell's unique program also has prepared many patients for a vocation when they finally are discharged from the hospital.

The program got underway shortly after World War II. Mr. Moddell worked officially for VA by day, and, in cooperation with the medical staff, as a volunteer at night.

Patiently he taught disinterested, emotionally disturbed veterans to grow vegetables and flowers and gradually the Patients Garden Club came into being.

Back in 1947 the club held the first of its annual flower shows at the hospital. Since then club members have entered outside competition and three times have won silver cups at the International Dahlia Show and on two occasions have won prizes at the International Flower Show held annually in New York City.

Dr. Arnold A. Schillinger, manager of the Northport VA hospital, explained that the flower show's activity serves a dual purpose.

"The staff never could have demonstrated the high value of gardotherapy in helping emotionally and mentally disturbed men without the unselfish assistance of Mr. Moddell. In the last 9 years, I am sure he has given as much of his time as a volunteer as he has served with the VA for pay."

Dr. Schillinger added that the rehabilitation study has received the active support of the Oyster Bay and Westchester Herb Societies which have furnished additional volunteers. As a result, gardotherapy now has been extended to other VA hospitals.

But that isn't the whole picture for behind the award is another story—that of a World War I veteran who overcame his own disability to make horticulture his profession.

Mr. Moddell served as a machinist's mate aboard a naval transport. He took advantage of the Government's vocational rehabilitation program for disabled veterans after World War I and studied horticulture at Connecticut University.

A native of Bridgeport, Conn., Mr. Moddell has been with VA and the Northport hospital since 1938.

Special Prayers for Public Servants

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GRACIE PFOST
OF IDAHO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 18, 1956

Mrs. PFOST. Mr. Speaker, at a recent meeting of the Presbyterian Synod of Idaho, special prayers were offered for public servants—particularly those in the Congress and the executive branch of the Federal Government.

In apprizing me of this action, the Reverend Robert C. Shupe of Caldwell, the stated clerk of the synod and a resident of my home county wrote:

We want you to know we appreciate the arduous duties of the office you hold, and the struggles of conscience you must often have as you vote. We trust that you may always be led by the Spirit of God, and that you will be voting for the generations to come, as well as what seems to be politically best for the present moment.

Because of the beauty and inspiration of one of the prayers he sent me, under unanimous consent, I insert it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

We pray for all who sit in high places of authority in the Government of our Nation, in the House, the Senate, the Cabinet, and the Presidency. Make them humble before Thee, fearless before men, dedicated to the way of Jesus Christ. Give to all of these Thy wisdom, prosper their counsels and their efforts. Give them that favor and following from the people, which good and able men deserve; and unite all citizens and publice servants in gratitude to Thee and in the service of Jesus Christ, our Master and Saviour. Amen.

Textiles Suffering From Foreign Imports

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 18, 1956

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, the fallacious arguments of proponents of free trade have been directed toward developments in the textile industry.

It is stated, for example, that new synthetic fabrics have been responsible for the present conditions. There is no factual basis for this claim.

Production of all Broadwoven cotton goods increased 3 percent during 1955 over 1954 while imports from Japan increased 108 percent. Although production of synthetic textile fabrics has been increasing during the past few years, this section of the industry has suffered reverses during the past several months and has not been placing cotton goods at a competitive disadvantage.

During the first quarter of 1956, production of synthetic textile fabrics declined 4 percent from the preceding quarter and 3 percent from the first quarter of 1955. As far as cotton fabrics are concerned, first quarter 1956 production was 4 percent over the preceding quarter and 5 percent over first quarter 1955. In contrast, imports of cotton fabrics from Japan during the first quarter of 1956 were at an annual rate of 243,756,000 square yards, an increase of 410 percent over 1955.

The price structure of the industry is such that the prices of cotton and synthetic textile fabrics are interrelated. The importation of low-cost Japanese cotton textiles affects not only the price of the same fabrics made in the United States but they affect the price of all competitive fabrics—including synthetic textiles. The Japanese fabrics, low-priced because of cheap labor and cheap cotton, depress the price of American fabrics and also create tremendous market uncertainty.

It is also stated that "an exceedingly small part of domestic consumption of cotton manufacturers is supplied by imports—and Japan accounts for only a part of such imports." This is another misstatement of fact.

To measure total United States production of cotton fabrics against imports is a distorted and unfair measure because of the nature of the industry. The cotton textile industry has several major components, such as manufacturers of fine goods, print cloth, duck, sheeting and others. Even within these broad categories there are important subdivisions.

The key to our present problem is the quantity of fabrics of specific types which are being imported from Japan. For example, cotton velveteens—imports from Japan during 1955 totaled 5,754,000—or 71 percent of total United States production. Imports of cotton velveteens from all countries amounted to 92 percent of total United States production during 1955.

The gingham imports situation further proves the inaccuracies of the free traders.

During 1955—imports from Japan equaled 12.7 percent of United States production of ginghams and other box loom goods.

The annual rate of imports of Japanese gingham is now at 121 million square yards or equal to 46 percent of 1955 domestic production—an increase of 266 percent in the quantity of Japanese ginghams being imported over 1955 and an increase of 262 percent in the ratio of imports from Japan to United States production of ginghams and other box loom goods.

Just as important, if not more so, than the actual imports now coming into the United States from Japan is the increasing rate of these imports. During 1954 imports from Japan were 56 percent greater than during 1953, but by 1956 the annual rate has increased 695 percent over 1953—an increase of 1,141 percent in the rate of increase.

There are other examples of the fantastic rate by which Japan is increasing her share of the American market for cotton textiles:

First. Velveteens: Imports during 1954 declined 77 percent from 1953 but during 1955 imports from Japan were 1,977 percent over 1953 and 9,890 percent over 1954.

Second. Cotton sheets and pillowcases: During 1955 increased 787 percent over 1954 and the annual rate during 1956 is 792 percent over 1954.

Third. Ginghams: During 1955 exports from Japan to United States increased 663 percent over 1954 and the annual rate of imports from Japan during 1956 is 1,977 percent higher than during 1954.

Fourth. Cotton wearing apparel—bulk are blouses and shirts: Imports during 1955 were 2,497 percent over average annual imports during 1954 and the pace has become accelerated in 1956 with the current annual rate of imports at $44 million—or 6,605 percent over the annual average during 1954.

As to Japan's share of total United States imports of cotton cloth, during 1953, 48 percent was from Japan; 1954, 65 percent was from Japan; 1955, 75 percent was from Japan.

The textile profit picture, as we know it, also disproves certain inaccurate assertions.

So far as we know there are no sales and profit data available for the cotton textile industry as such. In all probability the minority report in referring to "Sales, profits, and profit margins for the industry were substantially higher in 1955 than in 1954" refers to the textile mill products industry. It is quite correct that profits after taxes for the textile mill products industry increased considerably during 1955. According to the SEC, profits increased from $114 million to $346 million, a percentage increase of 204 percent. These figures are, however, completely meaningless in any discussion concerning the cotton textile industry. They are data for the textile mill products industry which includes the cotton textile industry, the synthetic textile industry, the woolen and worsted industry, the knitting industry, the hosiery industry, the knit underwear industry, the dyeing and finishing industry, the felt hat industry, carpets, rugs, and other floor coverings. There is no way of allocating any proportion of the profits for the textile mill products industry to any of the component industries.

The Northern Textile Association has surveyed sales and profits for 12 southern companies and 4 New England companies manufacturing the same kinds of fabrics which are being imported from Japan. These companies make both cotton and synthetic textiles but concentration is on cotton fabrics. Total sales for these companies during 1955 amounted to $1,594,892,000; net profit, after taxes, for these companies amounted to $48,490,000, a ratio of 3 percent—profits to sales. This represents some improvement over the ratio of 2 percent during 1954 but is less than the ratio of net profits to sales during 1953, which amounted to 3.2 percent.

The 1955 profit ratio of 3 percent is considerably less than the ratio of net profits to sales for all manufacturing corporations in the United States, which during 1955 amounted to 5.4 percent. Many individual industries during 1955 had profit ratios far in excess of those reported for the 16 representative cotton textile mills. For example, profit ratio in primary iron and steel industry was 7.2 percent, 5.1 percent in the machinery industry, 6.1 percent in the paper and allied products industry, 8.2 percent in the chemical industry, and 11.1 percent in the petroleum industry. As compared with the profit ratio for all industries and with the specific industries mentioned above, the profit ratio of the cotton and textile mills is below average despite claims to the contrary made by proponents of free trade.

Congress must act soon to check devitalizing imports if we are to retain the vitality of our great free-enterprise system. More industries every day are affected by cheap, substandard imports from foreign nations. If this trend continues, irreparable damage will ensue to the American economy. The question of tariffs and cut-throat imports is a major national issue. As greater impact on American industry and employment occurs, this question will present an increasing challenge. It must be met now.

Manifesto No. 2 Has a Better Point

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK CHELF
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 18, 1956

Mr. CHELF. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following outstanding, cogent, and common sense editorial that appeared in the Louisville Courier Journal on Sunday, July 15, 1956, on the question of so-called civil rights.

MANIFESTO NO. 2 HAS A BETTER POINT

Four months ago practically to the day after their flaming manifesto on school segregation, Members of Congress from the Old South once again invoke this old southern custom. They put their case in writing. This time the manifesto No. 2, current series, sets forth opposition to the pending so-called civil-rights legislation.

We say it is an old custom because there are striking parallels between the latest manifestos and Southern declarations of a century and more ago. The most famous of previous statements of southern attitude probably were Calhoun's resolutions of 1833. Both these and the South Carolina declaration of 1860, accompanying that State's ordinance of secession, contain passages almost identical with some of those in today's statement.

South Carolinians, for example, deplored that Northern States "have assumed the right of deciding upon the propriety of our domestic institutions." The same complaint was voiced in the manifesto last March, the only practical difference being that the word was "segregation" then, where in 1860 it was "slavery" (* * * "they have denounced as sinful the institution of slavery").

It must be said, however, that the most recent manifesto declaring opposition to the civil-rights bill has a sounder basis than the other. It undertakes to dissect the bill which comes up for debate in the House in a few days. This bill, bearing the blessing of President Eisenhower, would create a bipartisan commission on civil rights and set up a division of civil rights in the Department of Justice.

The southerners call the bill "vague," and they are right. They suggest that it is a pious gesture, and it is. They are mindful of the bill's timing in a political year, which is obviously the truth of the matter. To be sure, they themselves have political axes to grind, being subject to election by voters who hold generally to the views which they express—or echo. But the fact is that there has been a civil-rights unit in the Department of Justice for 17 years, or since Robert H. Jackson was Attorney General.

Another fact is that Federal courts have mandates to enforce civil-rights guarantees, imposed by United States statutes and a long series of Supreme Court decisions. A presidential commission on civil rights would almost certainly head toward one of two destinies. It would become another extrajudicial bureau or it would be an empty fount of platitudes and good (or not so good) intentions. President Truman's 1946 Committee on Civil Rights was an excellent example of righteousness petering out into futility.

One good question might well be: What's the manifesto for in the first place, and why a second one so closely on the heels of the thunderous statement last March? The answer is that a manifesto, which is a declaration in concert, is a right handy device. In the House of Representatives debate is limited. Few Members have a chance to arise and get their views on record to show their constituents that their hearts are in the right place. Attached to a manifesto, a signature speaks for itself.

A fellow can state a view, he can take a stand with full credit. At the same time a manifesto presented in well-chosen words that incline to oratorical fulsomeness is the best of ways to let off steam. It breathes defiance of a political majority that is going to pass the bill in any case. It averts the necessity of whipping up a third party as a medium for expression of principles and passions.

For this purpose it's as good as a filibuster any day, though not nearly so effective. It is for Senators to talk a bill to death by grace of their unique rules. The House Member must be satisfied with getting himself on the imperishable record. The main thing for the manifesto writers to watch is that they don't run it into the ground.

The President's Health

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. B. W. (PAT) KEARNEY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 18, 1956

Mr. KEARNEY. Mr. Speaker, nerves are always jumpy in a campaign year and the affliction seems more contagious than ever this year. The current tempest over the President's health is a case in point. There was a front-page headline in one of the Washington newspapers the other day that read "Democrats Agree To Go All Out on the Health Issue."

The news story justifying this headline went on to say that the Democratic high command was not going to let anyone in America forget President Eisenhower's heart attack and recent operation. In other words, the President is being put on guard that if he runs again he will be subjected to a bitter, all-out attack. The implication is that he had better get out of the race.

The obvious strategy behind all this is that the Democratic high command has no other issue to use against the President, so it has been decided to keep hammering at his health, even though the best doctors in the country have assured us that the President is in no danger.

Mr. Speaker, I respectfully submit that to malign a man's health for political purposes—to use this sort of a scare attack to undermine public confidence in our leader and agitate the nervous system of the body politic—is as wrong as it is to malign a man's character.

My Democratic friends are quick to protest against anything they think will reflect unfairly upon themselves in this campaign year. Among other things, they are riled about a forthcoming

Hollywood movie called "The Boss," which is said to be patterned after the old Prendergast political machine. This movie has been described as an attack on former President Truman, but it is my understanding, and I have been so advised, that the film does no dishonor to the former President. If it did, I would protest its release.

Mr. Speaker, I am for a clean campaign on both sides.

A Civilian Atomic Power Acceleration Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ELIZABETH KEE
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 18, 1956

Mrs. KEE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I should like to include the follow thoughts on the subject of S. 4146, which would provide for a civilian atomic power acceleration program.

Mr. Speaker, I am disturbed at the thought of the proposal to build atomic powerplants as specified in S. 4146. I have opposed the unnecessary subsidization of electric powerplants on the grounds that it would be unfair to our coal people and to our private electric companies. As you know, coal is responsible for the employment of many thousands of persons in my congressional district. We are also proud of the Appalachian Power Co., whose 5 generating plants consume well over 3 million tons of coal per year and which has always provided southern West Virginia with excellent service. I have been especially pleased with the cooperation which the Appalachian Electric Power Co. has always offered when the cause of the coal industry was at stake.. I recall that only recently, when the West Cirginia State Society arranged for the first Coal Festival to be held in Washington, two of Appalachian's executives come here to participate in the program. The company's attractive display—which explained factually and simply how electricity is geenrated through the use of coal—was placed in a prominent part of the Sheraton-Park Hotel Lobby and thus was seen by scores of persons who otherwise would have no knowledge of coal's role in the production of electricity.

What excuse is there for the Federal Government to invest $400 million in the creation of atomic power plants that would be competitive with our electric power industry? When the need for greater supply of electricity becomes evident, our electric companies immediately undertake to provide the needed capacity. There is no shortage of electricity at our atomic energy installations. If these reactors were to be built as stipulated, the electric utilities industries would be threatened with a loss of market for which they have invested millions of dollars. At the same time the coal industry would be confronted with serious losses. In my opinion the coal industry and its working force have already been subjected to enough injury and indignities through unwise policies on the part of the Federal Government.

Aside from the interest of these industries in the proposed program, there is another factor which should definitely cause Congress to hesitate before proceeding with legislation. I am sure that every American mother, in particular, will protest any furtherance of the reactor proposal under present conditions in the light of the report that has been made available to us by the National Academy of Sciences.

As the National Academy explains it:

Man has been dealing with an enormous new force whose potential effects he has only dimly understood.

The amount of radiation absorbed by the human body in a lifetime is usually infinitesimal; it is the cumulative effect that is to be feared. We presumably can safely take more radiation than we are now receiving, but the scientists cannot say precisely how much more. They do explain, however, that when a worldwide power industry is fully developed, the accumulated waste would send out more deadly rays than bombs in an atomic war. Mr. Speaker, I would think that this one item in the Academy's report is enough to defeat S. 4146.

The Voluntary Relocation Program for the American Indian

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES A. HALEY
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 18, 1956

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Speaker, many Members of the Congress, I am sure, have had requests from their constituents relative to the voluntary relocation program for the American Indian which is being carried on by the United States Bureau of Indian Affairs.

Many misleading articles concerning this program have appeared in magazines and other publications. In an effort to be of assistance to the people who have the interests of the American Indian at heart and in order to dispel some of the misinformation that has been written about this program, I asked the Commissioner of Indian Affairs, the Honorable Glenn F. Emmons, to prepare a report on this program so that I could make it available to my colleagues of the House.

Commissioner Emmons, who in my opinion is doing an outstanding job in all phases of Indian affairs, has submitted the report to me.

I have asked permission to include this report in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD today so that each of the Members of the House would have the opportunity to know the facts about the voluntary relocation program for the American Indian. The report follows:

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
BUREAU OF INDIAN AFFAIRS,
Washington, D. C., July 12, 1956.

Hon. JAMES A. HALEY,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Indian Affairs, Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. HALEY: Some time ago you requested this Bureau to supply you with a brief statement giving the history, the reasons for, and the workings of our Relocation Program. I appreciate this opportunity to supply you with such information and am enclosing such a statement which I hope will be helpful to you.

In my opinion this is a program which is extremely important to the future of many Indians. There has been a great deal of misinformation on this program and I am delighted to have this opportunity to provide you with a full statement of the facts.

If your subcommittee could find time to examine this program in detail I think it would be very helpful.

Sincerely yours,

GLENN F. EMMONS,
Commissioner.

A BRIEF HISTORY OF THE BUREAU OF INDIAN AFFAIRS PROGRAM OF RELOCATION SERVICES FOR AMERICAN INDIANS

Relocation: One of several dynamic approaches to the overall needs of the Indian people.

For many years the Indian people have lived a life of isolation on reservations. The free movement of Indians away from the reservations has been hampered by economic, social and political factors involved in their status as Indians. This isolation and segregation from the mainstream of American life has been experienced by no other racial or nationality group in the United States. As wave after wave of newcomers to the United States took their places in American society, the Indians remained isolated in places where they had little or no opportunity to share in the benefits of this society.

1. NEED FOR OFF-RESERVATION OPPORTUNITIES LONG RECOGNIZED

From the very earliest days of the history of this country, small numbers of Indians have been moving out to areas of broader opportunity. Over the years congressional investigations, surveys by private organizations concerned with the welfare of the Indian, and officials of the Bureau have pointed out the need for opening up ways in which Indians could move out and take their places in the larger community forming around them. While the Bureau through its school system has pursued with vigor efforts to find opportunities away from the reservations for graduates of Bureau training schools, no broad effort was ever undertaken on behalf of the adult population as a whole until the inauguration of the Bureau's program of voluntary relocation services in 1952.

During the 1930's in following out one of the recommendations made in the Meriam Survey, the Bureau undertook a program of obtaining employment for Indians. While this might have developed into a broader service under more favorable circumstances, it failed to do so and the Indians benefiting from this program were for the most part young people who were graduating from the Bureau's training schools. But this activity did set in motion an outward migration of younger people, many of whom today, 20 years later, are well established in Chicago, Detroit, Los Angeles, and the Pacific Northwest.

Three major factors worked against the growth of this early program: (a) the depression of the 1930's, which greatly reduced available job opportunities; (b) the Federal

work relief projects which were undertaken on the reservations as part of the national work-relief program and which provided a subsistence income at home; (c) the change of Federal policy in Indian affairs which during this period was directed to revival of local tribal self-government and enlargement and development of reservation economies. The off-reservation employment program, which was serving for the most part younger Indians with some training, was believed to be running counter to the broader objective of building up reservation communities which would be needing the leadership available in younger age groups. This program was abandoned in 1940, unfortunately, just before the great expansion in the Nation's industrial economy, which was required by the United States' participation in World War II.

2. OFF-RESERVATION MIGRATION DURING WORLD WAR II

Although the Bureau provided no assistance to Indians seeking to make their contribution to the war effort and to share in the benefits of such employment, there was a great wave of outward migration of Indians into the war industries. With a similarly large number of Indian young people, women as well as men, entering various branches of the armed services, there was a noticeable reduction in the population of many of the reservations during the first 5 years of the 1940's.

3. WORSENING ECONOMIC SITUATION ON RESERVATIONS AFTER WORLD WAR II

With the end of World War II a movement back to the reservations commenced—first the service men and women, and then the men and women who were losing their jobs in the contracting war industries. During the 1930's, because of the Federal work programs and, during the first half of the 1940's, because of the demands of the war effort for manpower, the Bureau of Indian Affairs and the States with Indian reservation populations had been lulled into a sense of complacency about the worsening economic situation on the reservations. Basic subsistence needs of the reservation populations were being met during the 1930's with Federal work-relief projects. During the early 1940's reservation resources were less sorely tried due to the absence of people in the armed services and in war industry and many families on the reservations were being materially assisted by allotments from the service pay of members of the family away in military service. The serious economic needs on Indian reservations began to be recognized increasingly from 1945 on. Reservation resources were either static or in a process of depletion and reservation populations were increasing steadily.

4. INAUGURATION OF PLACEMENT SERVICES ON THE NAVAHO

The whole problem of growing population pressure on Indian reservations was dramatized for the American public by the plight of the Navaho in Arizona and New Mexico. While Bureau officials were in the process of assembling data to justify a long-range rehabilitation program on the Navaho, articles on the extremely serious situation of this tribe began to appear in national magazines, Sunday editions of metropolitan newspapers and on national radio programs. Public opinion was aroused and Congress took cognizance of the needs of the Navaho by authorizing a 10-year rehabilitation program for the Navaho in April 1950.

Comprehensive as this program was for the economic development of the reservation-range improvement, irrigation, development of timber and mineral resources and so on, it was estimated at the time that only 6,950 of the reservation's 7,500 families could be accommodated through the proposed extensive development of the reservation resources. Accordingly the program included a provision for the establishment of a service to assist those who would be interested in seeking a livelihood away from the reservation to do so.

In 1948 a program of job-placement services was established. Many Navaho were already engaged in seasonal farm work and railroad track work. Through close cooperation with the Arizona and New Mexico State Employment Services and the United States Railroad Retirement Board placements of Navaho in both types of employment increased steadily. Placement offices were opened in Denver, Salt Lake City and Los Angeles and a very modest number of Navaho men (for the most part without their families) began to move to these locations for seasonal work.

5. INAUGURATION OF RELOCATION PROGRAM

In the fall of 1950 the Bureau decided that it should launch a full-scale relocation program for those Indians who wished to seek permanent opportunities away from reservations. It requested an appropriation for this purpose for the fiscal year 1952 (beginning July 1, 1951) and in the midsummer of 1951 it appointed staff to work in the States mentioned and also in Oklahoma, Arizona, and New Mexico.

In November 1951, a Field Relocation Office was opened in Chicago; the placement staff on the Navaho was incorporated into the relocation program and the Navaho placement offices in Denver, Salt Lake City and Los Angeles were converted to Field Relocation Offices to serve not only Navaho but members of tribes in all of the States mentioned. Included in the appropriation for this fiscal year were funds to underwrite the costs of transportation, shipping household effects, subsistence en route to the relocation destination and subsistence during the first few weeks at the new location for relocatees.

In February, 1952, the first relocatees began to move and a steady flow of people seeking the opportunities available in off-reservation locations has continued and grown in numbers from year to year. A tabulation of relocations by fiscal year from the inception of the program to date follows:

6. RELOCATIONS FROM INCEPTION OF PROGRAM TO DATE

	Singles		Families		Total	
	Units	Persons	Units	Persons	Units	Persons
Fiscal year:						
1952	227	227	215	641	442	868
1953	377	377	320	1,093	697	1,470
1954	752	752	470	1,801	1,222	2,553
1955	804	804	696	2,655	1,500	3,459
1956 [1]	899	899	843	3,376	1,742	4,275
Total to date	3,059	3,059	2,544	9,566	5,603	12,625

[1] Through Apr. 30, 1956.

7. OPENING ADDITIONAL FIELD RELOCATION OFFICES

In July 1954, because of limited relocation opportunities in Salt Lake City, the Field Relocation Office there was closed and a new office was established in San Francisco to develop relocation opportunities in the San Francisco-Oakland Bay Area. In July 1956, additional offices will be established in St. Louis, Mo., and San Jose, Calif.

8. DEVELOPING AND IMPROVING RELOCATION SERVICE TECHNIQUES

The tabulation of relocations given above represents an impressive accomplishment on the part of the Indians involved and on the part of the Bureau staff who have assisted these people to find economic security and an opportunity for a richer, fuller life in off-reservation locations. This accomplishment is not to be measured simply by number of individuals and families assisted in relocation, however; it indicates the development and continuing improvement of effective techniques in preparing people for relocation, in interpreting their background to employers and the communities they are moving into, in developing employment opportunities and locating housing, in orientation to urban living and the industrial work situation and in followup community adjustment counseling. The job has been and continues to be a challenging one since so little existed in the way of precedents on how to provide these services. The greatest credit for the success realized to date, however, rests with the Indian relocatees themselves who in a very real sense are courageous pioneers, and with employers and the communities where the Indians are establishing new homes for the warm welcome they are affording the newcomers.

The question sometimes arises as to how well the Indian people who choose to relocate are able to adjust to the requirements and broader opportunities found in the urban situation. A recent study, covering relocations during the fiscal year 1955, reveals that 71 percent of the persons who relocated that year remained in their new environment, evidently having decided that their new life offered more promise than the reservation. These people moved from 14 different reservation areas to the four city locations. The percentage of successful relocations ranges from a high of 94 percent from one Indian agency jurisdiction to a low of 53 percent from another jurisdiction. Seventy-eight percent of the family units, 74 percent of the single women, and 68 percent of the single men were successful. This is not to say that those who returned to the reservation after their first relocation were not successful. It is well known that many of these try again and make a good adjustment.

The program is well received by employers, who generally express commendation of Indian workers. The Indian people also view the program favorably. This is evidenced by a sizable backlog of applications for this service on hand at the end of each fiscal year.

The relocation services are designed to help people help themselves. It deals with men and women who do not want to be dependent on the Federal Government, but who are eager to find their place in the free-enterprise system and to provide security for themselves and their children. As the program of relocation services progresses, the citizen of Indian ancestry is becoming a component part of the urban community scene. The time may come when those who prefer city life will have left the reservations in sufficient numbers to permit those who prefer to remain in the rural life to make a better living on the land from which the great pressure of population will have been alleviated.

Federal Support of Our Public Schools

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LESTER R. JOHNSON

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 18, 1956

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to put into the RECORD, a letter I received from G. E. Watson, State superintendent of the de-

partment of public instruction, Madison, Wis., under date of July 3.

Although it appears that the school-construction bill is completely dead for this session, I believe Mr. Watson has stated the case for Federal support of our public schools so well that I would like to call his communication to the attention of my colleagues. Mr. Watson's letter follows:

STATE OF WISCONSIN,
DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC INSTRUCTION,
Madison, July 3, 1956.

Hon. LESTER R. JOHNSON,
Member of House of Representatives,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. JOHNSON: I realize that this identical letter addressed to each of our Wisconsin Members of the House of Representatives may arrive too late for any consideration prior to a final vote in the House on the Kelley school construction bill. I appreciate also that there is a decided difference of opinion within our Wisconsin representation which will make some of these letters futile and some unnecessary. But further realizing that I have not communicated with the entire representation since January 30, 1956 and knowing that some questions have arisen, I felt it advisable to write to each of you.

First of all, I wish to reiterate my stand in favor of some Federal support of our public schools. There is much of national significance in the educational process of any one community for our American population is a mobile population. There is much of national significance in a strong system of public education as a bulwark of national defense. A literate, trained citizenry is a more capable citizenry. There is much of the production of our national wealth that is not localized, wealth that is created out of a variety of elements from a variety of places and sold and distributed all over America. Every phase of the whole discussion convinces me that Federal support of education is defensible and desirable.

Secondly, we are not discussing a new Federal activity. So-called Federal dollars have been flowing and are now flowing into every level of education. Two hundred fifty high schools in Wisconsin are now getting Federal aid in instruction through the federally subsidized agriculture and home economics programs. Our State colleges and universities are borrowing money on a loan basis and at a rate that spells out to me a degree of Federal aid in a much needed student housing program. Our own university is receiving millions of dollars annually in direct service support and in literally dozens of research programs and contracts. Not only do I believe that Federal support of our public schools is proper, but I reiterate my belief that the present Federal support program should be extended to elementary and secondary school construction in those districts in any or all States facing extreme difficulty in such construction requirements.

Third, I do not believe any antisegregation amendment has any place in the current consideration. The Supreme Court has rendered a decision in that matter and has provided, within that decision, for enforcement within the several States in accordance with the judgment of the Federal judiciary. To me, it would be extremely unfortunate if Congress were to improperly reenter the field of enforcement of the Supreme Court decision and by so doing inflame unnecessary animosities in the field of public education. The South has a tremendous problem.

The Supreme Court has charted a way of solution. I sincerely trust that Wisconsin will back the Supreme Court and will allow the South the needed time to work out its destiny. I urge you to vote against the Powell amendment or any similar amendment.

Fourth, there is much concern about the possibility that Federal aid received in Wisconsin might go to school districts that don't need it. To put it conversely, there is much concern that Federal aid should go only to those States and those districts that need it. May I suggest two facts? First of all, based upon local district statements as further analyzed by people in our office, there are many school districts in Wisconsin presently unable to provide adequate school facilities. Secondly, I can assure you that any plan submitted by the present State superintendent of Wisconsin to the United States Commissioner of Education will certainly place heavy stress upon the needs for buildings of properly formed school districts and the effort and ability of those districts. The only way the presently contemplated amounts of Federal participation could be at all significant in Wisconsin is to distribute them on a need basis. If we could look forward to the kind of money provided in the new highway program, we could visualize a flat grant program. But such would not be feasible in any education bill that has come to my attention.

Fifth and finally, I can see no "control of education" in this school construction bill. Surely, the bill provides that there shall be none. But, in addition, our present experience with the United States Office of Education and other agencies in our present program of Federal aid to school construction in federally impacted areas convinces us that the Federal Government and the local district can be brought into a proper cooperative posture through the State department of public instruction without any unwise use of Federal dollars or any unwise or improper control of local decisions.

Thank you for your indulgence in this too-long communication. I trust that in your final decisions you will be mindful of the needs within Wisconsin, needs that cannot be met within our present State laws. They must be met either by State and/or Federal support programs for needed modern, adequate, decent, safe school buildings. I wanted you to know I still believe Federal participation in that program is proper.

Respectfully,

G. E. WATSON,
State Superintendent.

Mental Health Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DONALD L. JACKSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 18, 1956

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Santa Monica Evening Outlook of June 5, 1956:

THE OUTLOOK
(By Louise Randall Pierson)

There's been a lot of yacking about mental health lately. And a whole flock of mental health bills have been tossed gaily into Federal and State hoppers.

In talking with people, I find they're pretty confused about the whole thing and my guess is that confusion worse confounded is just what the authors and boosters of these bills are hoping for.

If folks knew what the real score was they might blow their tops and insist the whole mess be dragged right out in the open.

But if any of these bills pass in their present form, you better think twice before you blow your top. This would show that you were emotionally immature and you could be whisked off to the boobyhatch in a plain envelope without previous notification.

Now, we are all aware of the sad fact that what with one thing and another, more people are going batty than ever before.

Our overcrowded hospitals are full of the mentally ill and short on doctors who are capable of helping these troubled patients to get well again.

So when the average citizen is urged to be for mental health, he naturally thinks he's being asked to support bills which would provide much-needed funds for better care for the mentally ill.

He couldn't be more wrong. These bills are not designed to get people out of hospitals and insane asylums but put more in.

How? Why the UNESCO "kids" who are behind these bills just redefined insanity. If you disagree with them, you have paranoid delusions, otherwise known as bats in your belfry.

Listen to Dr. Brock Chisholm, of the U. N. World Health Organization:

"We have swallowed all manner of poisonous certainties fed to us by our parents, our Sunday and day school teachers." He calls for "reinterpretation and eventually eradication of the concept of right and wrong."

Now take it easy. We better keep our traps buttoned. The bogyman will get us if we don't watch out.

Now, Mr. Carl Mote, Jr., of Hollywood doesn't like Senate bill 2937 or H. R. 6376, the Alaska mental-health bill (there are several identical bills with different numbers).

He believes—rightly or wrongly—that the bill is so carelessly drawn that it might conceivably lay a predicate of legislation which would someday enable politicians in power to send their outspoken critics off to an insane asylum under the guise that those critics are abnormal and therefore in need of mental care.

Mote wrote to quite a few of the politicians now in power, pointing out why he didn't like the bill and urging its defeat.

He received the following reply from Hon. ABRAHAM J. MULTER, United States Congressman from the 13th District, New York:

"DEAR MR. MOTE: Your post card of March 14, 1956, has been received.

"As soon as the mental-health bill is signed into law by our Republican President, after it has been passed by a Democratic Congress, I will make a special request that the first bed be reserved for you.

"Yours very truly,
"ABRAHAM J. MULTER."

Bye now. See you-all in Camarillo.

LOUISE RANDALL PIERSON.

Flood Control on Upper Wabash River

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN V. BEAMER
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 18, 1956

Mr. BEAMER. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include in the appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD reports on the flood control program for the supper Wabash River.

The three-reservoir plan for the upper Wabash River flood control is of special interest to 5 of the 10 counties in the Fifth Indiana District—Jay, Blackford, Grant, Huntington, and Wabash;

to 3 counties in the Fourth Indiana District—Wells, Allen, and Witley; and to Cass County in the Second Indiana District.

In accordance with a resolution adopted by the House of Representatives, May 23, 1946, 73d Congress, 1st session, relative to flood protection at or near Logansport, Ind., the Corps of Engineers, United States Army, made extensive studies and surveys of the Wabash River and its tributaries.

Their report has been filed but I include a copy of their interim and final recomemndations in order that this portion of the record may be complete.

I also include an article by Mr. Robert Kellum, executive secretary, Indiana Flood Control and Water Resources Commission which appeared in the July 15, 1956, issue of the Indiana Farmers Guide.

The various approvals prior to presentation to the Congress have been secured. These include approvals by the Governors of Indiana and Illinois; the Indiana Flood Control and Water Resources Commission; the United States Departments of Defense, Agriculture, Commerce and Interior and the Bureau of the Budget. The Indiana State Legislature gave its approval in the 1955 session with an appropriation authorization of $50,000, as that State's estimated share of a total of $425,000.

This flood control program has been referred to the Agricultural Conservation Service of the United States Department of Agriculture for its consideration of the flood control with a series of small dams on the watershed program. For numerous reasons, some of which are explained in Mr. Kellum's article, this proposal was not considered feasible by that agency.

The matters follow:

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY,
Washington, D. C., May 1, 1956.

Subject: Wabash River and Tributaries, at and above the mouth of White River, Indiana

To the SECRETARY OF THE ARMY:

1. I submit herewith for transmission to Congress the interim report of the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors in partial response to resolution of the Committee on Public Works of the United States Senate, adopted May 9, 1949, requesting the Board to review the report published in House Document No. 100, 73d Congress, 1st session, and subsequent reports on Wabash River and tributaries, Ohio, Indiana, and Illinois, with a view to determining whether improvement of the Wabash River and tributaries at and above the mouth of White River, Indiana, in the interest of flood-control and allied purposes is advisable at this time; and in complete response to the following resolution of the Committee on Flood Control of the House of Representatives, adopted May 23, 1946, requesting the Board to review the recommendations contained in House Document No. 100, 73d Congress, 1st session, relative to flood protection at or near Logansport, Ind., with a view to providing protection in that locality by headwater reservoirs or other means. This report is primarily concerned with flood protection for the urban and rural areas along the reach of Wabash River extending from the downstream limits of Logansport, Ind., mile 352, to Huntington, Ind, mile 408.

2. After full consideration of the reports secured from the district and division engineers, the Board recommends the improvement of Wabash River and tributaries, Indiana, for flood control and allied purposes by the construction of Salamonie Dam and Reservoir at mile 3.5 on the Salamonie River, Mississinewa Dam and Reservoir at mile 7.1 on the Mississinewa River, and Huntington Dam and Reservoir at mile 411.4 on the Wabash River; generally in accordance with the plans of the district enginer and with such modifications thereof as in the discretion of the Chief of Engineers may be advisable; at an estimated cost to the United States of $42,010,000 for construction and $105,000 annually for maintenance and operation; provided local interests furnish assurances satisfactory to the Secretary of the Army that they will contribute in cash 1 percent of the first cost of the improvements, a contribution currently estimated at $425,000, and provided further that any one of the improvements may be undertaken independently of the others whenever funds for that purpose are available and the prescribed local cooperation for that reservoir has been provided. The Board further recommends that the presently authorized local protection projects for Logansport, Peru, and Wabash, Ind., at a currently estimated Federal first cost of $9,572,000 be abrogated upon authorization of the improvements recommended herein.

3. After due consideration of these reports, I concur in the views and recommendations of the Board.

S. D. STURGIS, Jr.,
Lieutenant General, United States Army, Chief of Engineers.

CORPS OF ENGINEERS,
UNITED STATES ARMY,
BOARD OF ENGINEERS
FOR RIVERS AND HARBORS,
Washington, D. C., November 29, 1955.

824.02 (Wabash River and Tributaries—The mouth of White River, Ind.).

Subject: Wabash River and Tributaries, at and above the mouth of White River, Ind.

To: The Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army:

1. This interim report is submitted in partial response to the following resolution adopted May 9, 1949:

"Resolved by the Committee on Public Works of the United States Senate, That the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors, created under Section 3 of the River and Harbor Act, approved June 13, 1902, be, and is hereby, requested to review the report published in House Document No. 100, 73d Congress, 1st session, and subsequent reports on Wabash River and tributaries, Ohio, Indiana, and Illinois, with a view to determining whether improvement of the Wabash River and tributaries at and above the mouth of White River, Ind., in the interest of flood control and allied purposes is advisable at this time."

And in complete response to the following resolution adopted May 23, 1946:

"Resolved by the Committee on Flood Control, House of Representatives, That the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors created under Section 3 of the River and Harbor Act approved June 13, 1902, be and is hereby requested to review the recommendations contained in House Document No. 100, 73d Congress, 1st session, relative to flood protection at or near Logansport, Ind., with a view to providing protection in that locality by headwater reservoirs or other means."

This report is primarily concerned with flood protection for the urban and rural areas along the reach of Wabash River extending from the downstream limits of Logansport, Ind., mile 352, to Huntington, Ind., mile 408.

2. Wabash River rises near Celina, Ohio, flows northwesterly 67 miles to Huntington, Ind., thence southwesterly 312 miles to the confluence with White River, its principal tributary, and continues southwesterly 96 miles to join the Ohio River 133 miles above its mouth. It drains a total area of 33,100 square miles, of which 16,440 square miles are above the mouth of White River, and 3,760 square miles are above the downstream limits of Logansport. The more important tributaries entering Wabash River above the downstream limits of Logansport and their respective drainage areas are: Eel River, 860 square miles; Mississinewa River, 810 square miles; Salamonie River, 557 square miles; and Little Wabash River, 290 square miles.

3. The Wabash River Basin above the mouth of White River consists of industrialized urban areas located principally along major streams and large areas of rich farmland interspersed with small rural communities. The larger cities on or near the main stem of Wabash River, and their populations in 1950, are Vincennes, 18,831; Terre Haute, 64,214; Lafayette, 35,568; Logansport, 21,031; Peru, 13,308; Wabash, 10,621; and Huntington, 15,079; all in Indiana. Industrial activities consist of the manufacture or processing of lumber and lumber products, foods, chemicals, ceramics, machinery, apparel, and munitions. Agriculture is also an important activity with corn as the principal crop. Natural resources include coal, clay, and limestone. Rail, highway, and air transportation facilities serve the region. Normal annual precipitation in the upper basin is 38 inches, uniformly distributed throughout the year. Authorized Federal flood-control projects within that part of the basin above the White River consist of 23 local protection projects and 1 reservoir. Four of the local protection projects, Delphi, Lyford, Gill Township, and Brevoort, are either completed or essentially completed; one at Vincennes is under construction; and funds for preconstruction planning of the Niblack project have recently been appropriated by Congress. Of the 17 local protection projects which have been authorized but not started, three—Logansport, Peru, and Wabash—are within the reach extending from Logansport to the headwaters. Levees for protection of both urban and rural areas have been constructed by non-Federal interests at various points within the basin.

4. The Wabash River Basin is subject to frequent and destructive floods. Although they may occur during any season of the year, the more severe floods usually occur during the winter and spring as a result of widespread storms. Conditions causing high runoff, such as snow-covered or frozen ground, prevalent during these seasons add to the severity of the floods. Fifteen major floods have occurred since 1875. The flood of March-April 1913 is the maximum of record, followed by those of May 1943, and January-March 1950. The flood plain investigated in connection with this report comprises an area along the main stem of Wabash River from the White River to mile 411.4 near Huntington, Ind.; Mississinewa River from its confluence with the Wabash to mile 7.1 at Peoria, Ind.; and Salamonie River to mile 3.1 near Dora, Ind. It is estimated that recurrence of the stages experienced during the 1913, 1943, and 1950 floods would cause damages, within the limits of the described area on a current price basis, of $29,658,000, $21,154,000, and $5,689,000, respectively. Average annual damages are estimated at $5,393,400 of which $4,544,600 is agricultural damage; $665,400, urban damage; and $183,400, damage to railroads and highways. In addition, loss of life is not uncommon. Six persons were drowned during the 1943 flood and 4 during the 1950 flood.

5. Local interests desire flood protection for urban and rural areas in the upper Wabash Basin. They suggest various solutions including channel rectification, local protection works, and retarding reservoirs. The

State of Indiana emphasizes the high priority for reservoirs above Logansport and has recently enacted legislation pledging $50,000 toward its share of required local cooperation.

6. The district engineer considers various solutions of the flood problem including local protection works alone, reservoirs alone, and a combination of local protection works and reservoirs. He finds that local protection at Logansport and Peru, either alone or in combination with reservoirs is not economically justified. At Wabash, only a limited local protection plan, which would exclude protection to some of the existing buildings, could be economically justified. Local protection at Wabash in combination with reservoirs is not economically justified. The district engineer concludes that the best plan is the construction of three upstream dams and reservoirs. Pertinent data concerning the proposed improvements are given in the following table:

Name	Dam site	Storage capacities (acre-feet)			First cost (summer of 1954 prices)	Annual charges	Annual maintenance and operation
		Flood control	Permanent pool	Total			
Mississinewa	Mile 7.1 on Mississinewa River	342,400	23,000	365,400	$17,000,000	$677,000	$35,000
Salamonie	Mile 3.5 on Salamonie River	226,700	12,000	238,700	12,610,000	485,000	35,000
Huntington	Mile 411.4 on main stem of Wabash River.	154,170	.....	154,170	11,835,000	468,000	35,000
Total		723,360	35,000	758,360	42,435,000	1,630,000	105,000

The district engineer estimates the total average annual benefits from provision of the three reservoirs at $2,210,700, of which $2,165,000 is due to prevention of flood damage and $45,700 is due to higher utilization of land. Substantial benefits accrue not only in the problem area but also downstream from Logansport to the White River. Some benefits accrue below the White River but they are minor in extent. In computing the benefits the district engineer takes into account all existing protection works but considers for the purpose of this interim report that the local protection works which have been authorized by the Government but not constructed, are ineffective. The resulting benefit-cost ratio for the three-reservoir system is 1.4. Analysis of each reservoir on an incremental basis shows that the benefits exceed the cost regardless of the order of construction. The district engineer considers that in accordance with current policy local interests should bear a percentage of the first cost of the improvement, equivalent to one-half the proportion that higher land utilization benefits bear to total benefits. He estimates this to be 1 percent. The district engineer recommends improvement in accordance with his described plan provided that prior to initiation of construction, local interests furnish assurances satisfactory to the Secretary of the Army that they will reimburse the Federal Government 1 percent of the total first cost, presently estimated at $425,000. He further recommends that the existing authority for the flood protection projects at Logansport, Peru, and Wabash, Ind., be withdrawn upon authorization of the three recommended reservoirs. The division engineer concurs.

7. Local interests were informed of the recommendations of the reporting officers and given an opportunity to present additional information to the Board. Careful consideration has been given to the communications received.

8. The proposed plan is acceptable to local interests and they have indicated their willingness and ability to cooperate in the improvements. The Department of Commerce has informed the Corps of Engineers that Federal-aid highway funds are not available to defray any part of the cost of altering Federal-aid highways for proposed flood-control projects where local interests are required to assume the cost of such adjustments as a part of the local cooperation. In this instance local interests are not required to make any adjustments of highways.

VIEWS AND RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE BOARD OF ENGINEERS FOR RIVERS AND HARBORS

9. The Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors concurs in general in the views of the reporting officers. A need exists for the control of floods in the Wabash Basin. The three reservoirs proposed for construction by the district engineer are suitable as the basic elements in a new and revised plan for the upper Wabash Basin. Substantial reductions in flood stages would result at Logansport, Peru, and Wabash. Flooding of extensive rural areas will also be alleviated. The authorized local protection projects at Logansport and Peru are not economically justified either with or without the reservoirs. The authorized local protection projects for Wabash is ecomonically justified without the reservoirs but not with the reservoirs. The Board therefore concurs with the reporting officers that the authorized local protection projects for Logansport, Peru, and Wabash be abrogated upon approval of the reservoir plan. In view of the interim nature of this report complete reanalyses have not been made as to the effect of the reservoirs on the economic justification of local protection projects which have been authorized but not started downstream from Logansport. The Board has been informed that this question will be given full consideration in the comprehensive report which will be submitted in final response to the authorizing resolution for the study of Wabash Basin above the mouth of White River. With this understanding the Board concurs in the recommendation of the reporting officers for construction of the three reservoirs at this time.

10. The Board accordingly recommends the improvement of Wabash River and tributaries, Indiana, for flood control and allied purposes by the construction of Salamonie Dam and Reservoir at mile 3.5 on the Salamonie River, Mississinewa Dam and Reservoir at mile 7.1 on the Mississinewa River, and Huntington Dam and Reservoir at mile 411.4 on the Wabash River; generally in accordance with the plans of the district engineer and with such modifications thereof as in the discretion of the Chief of Engineers may be advisable; at an estimated cost to the United States of $42,010,000 for construction and $105,000 annually for maintenance and operation; provided local interests furnish assurance satisfactory to the Secretary of the Army that they will contribute in cash 1 percent of the first cost of the improvements, a contribution currently estimated at $425,000, and provided further that any one of the improvements may be undertaken independently of the others whenever funds for that purpose are available and the prescribed local cooperation for that reservoir has been provided. The Board further recommends that the presently authorized local protection projects for Logansport, Peru, and Wabash, Ind., at a currently estimated Federal first cost of $9,572,000, be abrogated upon authorization of the improvements recommended herein.

CHARLES G. HOLLIE,
Major General, United States Army,
Chairman
(For the Board).

[From the Indiana Farmers Guide of July 15, 1956]

THREE-RESERVOIR PLAN FOR UPPER WABASH

(By Robert W. Kellum, executive secretary, Indiana Flood Control and Water Resources Commission)

The three-reservoir flood-control plan for the upper Wabash River Valley, of Indiana, is based on principles which have proven their worth during the last 25 years in many parts of the United States. The plan is to provide storage areas in tributaries, and on the main Wabash where feasible, that will hold back rain runoff from carefully computed up-valley regions. Then the extra amount of water is released through conduits in the base of each dam when the river has fallen.

Only by preparing painstaking engineering studies, to determine the amount of storage needed, can the projects be justified.

The upper Wabash three-reservoir project stands on its merits because it has undergone one of the most complete surveys of this kind ever made by the Corps of Engineers, United States Army. The Indiana Flood Control and Water Resources Commission engineers joined in assisting the Corps of Engineers to compile basic information in early parts of the study. The work included the determining of exact measurements for the valley areas involved.

The Corps of Engineers finally determined that the three reservoirs should be placed as follows to obtain the utmost in benefits for the valley:

1. A dam at Peoria on the Mississinewa River.

2. A dam at Dora on the Salamonie River.

3. A dam near State Road 5, south of Huntington, on the Wabash River.

The first two are designed to contain permanent pools, with flood-control storage to be on a temporary basis, when needed, above the permanent pool elevation.

The engineers find that annual average flood losses in the Wabash Valley amount to more than $7 million. They find that the 3 reservoirs would hold back floods as great as that of 1913, worst of record. Thus, all smaller floods would be eliminated, too. They report that the costs of these reservoirs, placed at a total of $42,400,000, would be justified in view of such benefits.

SIMILAR TO MIAMI RIVER PROJECT

The system of 3 reservoirs is similar to the 5-reservoir flood-control project in the Miami River Valley, north of Dayton, Ohio. These five have prevented any flood danger whatsoever from threatening Dayton. They form the main reason why Dayton is the important manufacturing and trading center that it is today.

Also, a reservoir of far greater size in California prevented serious damage to Sacramento during the most recent floods, although other cities in that State suffered severely.

Eight such reservoirs above Pittsburgh saved that city and others from losses that would have amounted to $140 million in floods of recent years because they reduced the crest of the Allegheny and Monongahela Rivers that join to form the Ohio at Pittsburgh. The Muskingum reservoirs, 14 of them, have performed similar valuable operations in eastern Ohio. Fifteen reservoirs of this type are now planned in New England.

It is recognized that certain relocations of residents in the immediate areas of the reservoirs are necessary. Every precaution is taken to assure full payment in such cases.

The question of relocation is a serious one. Many important phases of community life are involved. The choice finally comes on whether development of water resources and the safeguarding of much larger regions should be advanced as population increases, or whether continued threats to transportation, roads, farmlands, and key trading centers should be permitted.

FARMERS' INTEREST PARAMOUNT

Farmers have the most important interests, as a usual thing, in such projects. They are the ones who most often must face the problem of relocation so that storage areas for water may be obtained.

There is no easy answer. Various methods of payment are provided. In the case of the upper Wabash project, if it reaches construction stage, each property owner will have the right of appealing to the courts if not satisfied with terms offered after the appraisals are completed.

Some discussion has been heard of the prospect for many small dams to do the job of the three reservoirs. They could not do the job because there is no way of obtaining exact measurements of water stored in such small ponds. Also, area involved would take far more farmland out of cultivation if the same benefits are to be attained. Farm ponds lack the depth of reservoirs.

The effect of the three reservoirs can be computed exactly because the retention of the water is at strategic locations—something it would not be with many small dams.

The present plan for the upper Wabash has passed many tests already, and others are still ahead. One point is certain—if ever such a system of flood control has been subjected to complete engineering inspection, this one has.

THREE RESERVOIRS PROPOSED

Some details of the plan are:

1. Mississinewa Reservoir, to be situated in Miami, Wabash, and Grant Counties, Ind., would be formed by an earth dam located on Mississinewa River, 7.1 miles above its mouth. It would control a drainage area of 801 square miles.

Outlet works would include a broad-crested, ungated, saddle spillway through the divide between the Mississinewa and Wabash Valleys, and controlled sluices through the dam. The dam would rise about 137 feet above stream bed to top elevation 797 feet above mean sea level. The spillway crest would be at elevation 779 and, under maximum storage conditions, the flood-control pool would reach elevation 790. At the latter elevation the reservoir pool would have an area of 17,170 acres, and would extend upstream to above river mile 35.

A permanent pool would be provided with surface area of 1,300 acres at elevation 712. The estimated first cost of Mississinewa Reservoir is $17,990,000 at current prices.

2. Salamonie Reservoir, to be situated in Wabash and Huntington Counties, Ind., would be formed by an earth dam located on Salamonie River, 3.5 miles above its mouth. It would control a drainge area of 552 square miles.

Outlet works would include a broad-crested, ungated, saddle spillway through the divide between the Salamonie and Wabash Valleys, and controlled sluices through the dam. The dam would rise about 128 feet above stream bed to top elevation 812 feet above mean sea level. The spillway crest would be at elevation 791 and, under maximum storage conditions, the flood-control pool would reach elevation 806. At the latter elevation the reservoir pool would have an area of 19,230 acres, and would extend upstream to about river mile 30.

A permanent pool would be provided with surface area of 950 acres at elevation 730. The estimated first cost of Salamonie Reservoir is $12,610,000 at current prices.

3. Huntington Reservoir, to be situated in Huntington and Wells Counties, Ind., would be formed by a dam located on Wabash River above Huntington. The structure would consist of an earth embankment with gated concrete spillway section, and would control a drainage area of 708 square miles. Controlled sluices would be provided through the concrete section of the dam which would rise about 90 feet above stream bed to top elevation 805 feet above mean sea level.

Under maximum storage conditions, the flood-control pool would reach elevation 797, at which level it would have an area of 7,840 acres and would extend upstream about 23 miles to Bluffton. A permanent pool is not contemplated. The estimated first cost of Huntington Reservoir is $11,835,000 at current prices.

WOULD REDUCE FLOOD CRESTS

Functioning as a system, the proposed reservoirs would effect reductions of the following order in the crest stages of such great floods as those experienced in 1913, 1943, and 1950:

Reduction in flood-crest stages

[In feet]

Location along Wabash River	March 1913	May 1943	January 1950
Huntington	1.7	4.6	3.2
Wabash	6.3	4.0	4.0
Peru	8.1	7.4	9.0
Logansport	7.3	5.7	4.5
Lafayette	4.3	2.7	2.7
Terre Haute	1.0	.3	.3
Vincennes	.6	.3	.3

It is well to point out that recreational developments may be made by State or local units around the permanent pools, but that buildings must be kept back of an elevation marked by the top of the flood storage area. This usage has proved satisfactory in other similar projects if the supervision is kept on a high quality basis.

Also, in some instances, sales of raw water from such flood-control reservoirs are permitted to adjacent communities and this may be valuable in future years in Indiana—even if present underground supplies seem fairly adequate in most sections of the upper Wabash Basin.

For the long-range view, the reservoirs appear justified and the engineers have so recommended. Final decision on whether they will be constructed rests with Congress, which appropriates all funds used by the Corps of Engineers.

The Poznan Uprisings

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 18, 1956

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter from the Honorable Henry Cabot Lodge, Jr.:

UNITED STATES
REPRESENTATIVE
TO THE UNITED NATIONS,
New York, N. Y., July 17, 1956.

Hon. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MRS. ROGERS: Thank you for your letter of July 10. I am glad to have a copy of the resolution adopted by the Polish citizens of Lowell and can assure you of my deep interest in the recent Poznan uprisings.

The State Department is following developments in Poland and the satellite countries with great concern and is considering what further action can be taken either in or out of the United Nations to help the unfortunate people in these areas.

At the United Nations the countries which deny basic human rights to their people are constantly being challeneged. I have repeatedly called attention, in private talks with representatives of other nations, and in public debate, to the miserable conditions prevailing in countries under Soviet domination. In fact, last week in the Disarmament Commission I said to Mr. Gromyko that he is in no position to pass judgment on United States policy "as long as the people of the satellite states are held in an iron bondage, from which the heroic Poles in the last few weeks have been trying to escape, with the applause, I might say, of lovers of freedom all over the world."

You can count on my best efforts to bring the day nearer when freedom will be restored to all those who hate oppression and resist tyranny.

With best wishes,

Sincerely,

HENRY CABOT LODGE, JR.

Transcript of Vice President Nixon's Press Conference, Karachi, July 9, 1956

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD L. JACKSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 18, 1956

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to place in the RECORD a transcript of Vice President RICHARD M. NIXON's press conference in Karachi, Pakistan, on July 9, 1956.

This transcript shows clearly the depth of understanding displayed by the Vice President, and his effectiveness in his recent tour in the Far East, in handling the problems in that area.

I call your special attention to Mr. NIXON's answer to the question of whether we should recognize the Government of Red China. He says, in part:

It certainly does not appear likely because the Communist government of China continues to persist in engaging in the type of activity which, as far as we are concerned, would make recognition morally wrong and, we believe, as far as the free world is concerned, disastrous.

This press conference transcript shows, far more clearly than I can describe, the concise opinions of our Government on many problems confronting the people of that area of the world.

The transcript is as follows:

TRANSCRIPT OF VICE PRESIDENT NIXON'S PRESS CONFERENCE, KARACHI, JULY 9, 1956

Question: "Can you tell us what you discussed with the President this morning?"

Answer: "Of course, as you know, the custom and proper practice is not to disclose what is said by the Chief of State in conversations we have. He, of course, has the option in that respect. We discussed economic problems—that was the major part of our discussion. We discussed the military ties which our two countries have. Also, it was very helpful for me to get from the

President and members of his staff their view of new developments that have taken place in the past few months with regard to the new line being following by the leaders in Moscow and Peking—particularly in Moscow, to a lesser extent, Peking—and to get their views as to the effect that line was having and would have in this part of the world. What I will do when I return to Washington is to report to President Eisenhower and to the National Security Council the substance of our conversations and the views that have been expressed. Beyond that, I don't think there was anything in the conversation I could disclose, but I will be glad to answer any general questions any person may ask me."

Question: "Do you find any change in the attitude of the Asian countries after Russia has started this economic offensive?"

Answer: "First of all, in answering that question, I must limit it to the countries I have visited. I have visited the Philippines, Vietnam, the Chinese Republic, Thailand, and, of course, Pakistan. Those visits have been relatively brief, and I emphasize that I am not one of those who thinks he can become an expert on problems simply by stopping and having a 2- or 3-hour chat with the heads of the government. On the other hand, you do get some impressions that are worthwhile passing on. In the countries I have visited I have not found that the leaders of those countries have changed their thinking as a result of these tactics. I would say that in all of these countries the attitude of the leaders is pretty much the same. And it is this—they are watching with interest and listening with interest to what the men of Moscow are saying, but they are still waiting for them to do something. In other words, they are waiting for them to act as they talk, and, until they act as they talk, the leaders of these countries believe it is important that the free world countries—countries that want to retain their independence—continue those policies that they have adopted in the past. That is a general summary of a very complicated question."

Question: "Sir, would you like to comment on the Peking Radio broadcast?"

Answer: "That is the one accusing the United States of exploiting the Philippines, and, apparenly, ties my visit into it. That, of course, is not a new charge. As a matter of fact, the United States is accused of exploiting every country in the world with which we have friendly relations, and every country which the United States may find that it is to the mutual interest of the two countries to assist, for example, in economic development. Speaking specifically of the Philippines, I would say the record shows that what the Peking radio claims is completely false, because the Philippines have had remarkable economic progress during the first 10 years of their independence. Their progress in the 3 years since I last visited there was very encouraging to me, and greater even than I had expected. I would simply sum it up by saying that the United States in its various assistance programs, as distinguished from the Communist government in their assistance programs, is not interested in creating economic satellites. However, what we are interested in doing is to help these countries where they themselves believe it is in their self-interest to gain the strength—economically, politically, and militarily—to maintain their independence of any foreign domination. Now, that, of course, sounds altruistic—but we believe it is also self-interest as far as we are concerned, because we believe the best guaranty of our independence and the liberties that we want to retain is to have nations around the world strong enough to be independent and to maintain their own freedoms."

Question: "Do you believe the countries that accept economic assistance from Communist countries run the danger of becoming satellites, and, secondly, is that the purpose of offers of economic aid by Communist countries?"

Answer: "My answer to both questions is yes. That, however, is not an opinion of mine. It is simply an analysis of what I believe is history. The history of the situation has always been this: That economic aid and military aid, when offered by Communist countries, always has as its purpose creating satellites—military, political, or economical, or all three. I think it was pretty well summed up by a friend on this trip last night in Bangkok. He said there had been some criticism that, insofar as United States aid was concerned, it took too long to get it expedited and that there were too many strings attached. I gave the same answer, of course, that I gave here to your question regarding the purpose of our aid. He also said the claim was made, as far as Soviet countries are concerned, that they offered their aid without any conditions or strings attached; but he added this—he said they have no strings, that is true—they offer aid with a rope. I believe that is the best way to answer it. Any country that will accept military aid or economic aid from a Communist country runs certain risks of having a rope tied around its neck."

Question: "Is the United States still opposed to the admission of Red China to the U. N.?"

Answer: "The answer, of course, is categorically yes. We base that position on the U. N. Charter. The U. N. Charter states specifically and clearly that new membership is open to all peace-loving nations who agree to abide by the principles of the U. N. And, at the present time, the Communist government of China is acting in open defiance to the U. N. in maintaining the division of Korea, for example, in maintaining internal subversions in all the independent countries in Asia, and in continuing to threaten and use force and violence in regard to its claims to Quemoy and Matsu and areas in that part of the world."

Question: "Do you think that the United States at any time might recognize the government of China?"

Answer: "The answer is that we in the United States believe that a question of that type should be answered when we have the situation presented, rather than on a hypothetical basis—a situation which would enable us to change our position. And, in the foreseeable future, it certainly does not appear likely because the Communist government of China continues to persist in engaging in the type of activity which, as far as we are concerned, would make recognition morally wrong and, we believe, as far as the free world is concerned, disastrous."

Question: "Since you were here last has the United States been able to make any contribution toward the solution of Kashmir issue?"

Answer: "I am personally aware of the great difficulty of that issue, as all of you are in this area. The position of the United States is well known. And that is—first, we think the issue should be settled just as quickly as possible and second, we believe that the way it should be settled is, if possible, through direct negotiations between the two countries. If that will not work out—then, through U. N. action. We do not feel the United States should properly intervene and attempt to dictate a settlement one way or the other. But certainly the moral support of the United States is on the side of the settlement of the issue because we feel it is a constant source of irritation between two great nations—India on the one side, and Pakistan on the other side."

Question: "Should the Pakistanis conclude that all the big nations like the United States and other powers express their views like this on the important issues like Kashmir, what will be the fate of the smaller nations in the world?"

Answer: "I am not sure I understand the question. If the United States takes this position on Kashmir, what will be the position of the smaller nations of the world?"

Question: "I make it clear a bit more. There is general impression in Pakistan that United States and other big powers, they are not prepared to annoy Nehru and, therefore, they are expressing their moral support to the issue. If that is correct position, I do not know whether it is correct officially or not, and if that is the correct position what will be the fate of the smaller nations?"

Answer: "I think I understand now. Let me make one thing clear. The United States in its relation to other countries constantly at least tries to take a position which recognizes the sovereignty, the equality, and the independence of all countries, regardless of their population, regardless of their military strength, and of their economic strength—and as far as this issue is concerned, that is our position. The only thing, however, that we do also say is that we do not think it would be appropriate for the United States unilaterally to intervene in this issue until the traditional methods for settling the issue have been exhausted: (1) Direct negotiation, and then (2) through the U. N. That we think is the only proper position to take."

Question: "When you say you think that countries which receive" * * * (tape missing.) (This question was covered correctly by A. M. Rosenthal in his New York Times article, July 10, 1956, datelined Karachi, July 9.)

Answer:[1] "Economic aid is one that will make a country stronger economically. Even though that country might have received some aid from a Communist country, we think, in the long run, that where a country is strong enough economically, it then becomes strong enough to maintain its independence of foreign domination and runs less risk of becoming a Communist satellite."

Question: "Said he thought your views were not democratic on neutrality."

Answer: "Mr. Nehru?"

Questioner: "Yes."

Answer: "I, of course, for reasons that are apparent, would be very hesitant to comment on what somebody said Mr. Nehru's views were. Obviously, in this world we believe—and our friends of Pakistan believe this as well as we in the United States—there will be disagreement among friends as to what is the proper course for a nation to chart in its international relations. Mr. Nehru, of course, is entitled to his opinion. But I think that if Mr. Nehru would read my speech carefully and, not with any false pride of authorship I trust, that if others would read it carefully, they would find that my speech is the

---

[1] [Excerpt taken from the New York Times of July 10, 1956, by A. M. Rosenthal.]

KARACHI, PAKISTAN, July 9.—Vice President RICHARD M. NIXON warned the countries of the free world today against accepting any form of economic or military assistance from the Soviet Union.

The price of aid from the Communists would be a "rope around the neck," Mr. NIXON said. He said the Soviet Union's purpose in its current offers of economic aid was to make the recipient countries satellites—economic, political, or military satellites or all three.

But the Vice President turned down the idea that the United States should automatically refuse to help countries taking assistance from the Communists.

He said the purpose of United States aid was to help countries maintain freedom. And he declared that United States assistance might help countries taking aid from the Communists to keep their independence.

very antithesis of undemocratic procedures. Because what I constantly emphasize in that speech is this theme—the theme that all through Asia people want a better way of life; that all through Asia people want to retain their newly won independence; and that in my opinion there were dangers to that independence—dangers that I indicated—particularly the danger of Communist domination, and I cited case by case where it happened in other areas of the world in which previously independent countries had come under Communist domination. In view of that fact, I then reached the conclusion that communism was out of step with the real desires of the Asian peoples—to have independence and freedom—because international communism of the Peking and Soviet variety is completely inconsistent with independence. It is completely inconsistent with freedom and my answer to Mr. Nehru would be that anyone who suggests that Communist assistance, for example, is not inconsistent with independence and freedom is not reading correctly the lessons of history."

Question: "Do you feel that in the case of the Kashmir issue the U. N. should act as vigorously as in the case of Korea?"

Answer: "Unfortunately, I think we have chosen the example there that isn't perhaps the best because Korea is still unsettled as well. I will go back to my original theme that the settlement of the Kashmir issue at as early a date as possible is in the best interests of international peace and harmony, and that in both the case of Korea and Kashmir, the U. N., interested as it is in maintaining the peace, should act vigorously, provided the two countries are unable to work out the disagreement between themselves."

Question: "The recent bilateral talks between the two countries have reached an impasse; therefore, shouldn't the United States intervene?"

Answer: "My answer again is that we believe, assuming that should happen—and understand, I am not commenting on whether it has reached an impasse yet because I have not studied this as much as you have—but, assuming that has heppened, we still say that the other step must also be exhausted; and that is the U. N. step, because we must get away from unilateral action in the world if we can and we must use wherever we can the world organization that is set up specifically to deal with that problem where all of the weight of world public opinion can be brought to bear toward its solution."

H. R. 12298, a Bill To Improve Provisions of the Federal Excise Tax System

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. AIME J. FORAND

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 18, 1956

Mr. FORAND. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing today a bill, H. R. 12298, which is the result of the work of the subcommittee on excise tax technical and administrative problems which began in October of 1955. This bill incorporates the more than eighty-odd recommendations made by the subcommittee for the improvement of administrative and technical provisions of our Federal excise tax system. The bill reflects the policy changes made in the subcommittee recommendations by the Committee on Ways and Means during the course of the committee's consideration of the subcommittee's report. I will discuss these changes below.

The status of this bill is somewhat different than the ordinary introduced bill. It has been considered by the full committee and in general, I believe the bill meets with the approval of the ful committee. I have not asked the committee to report out the bill, however, because there is no prospect of its final enactment this year.

Nevertheless, I believe that an important function will be served by the introduction of this bill at this time. It is my hope that all taxpayers and taxpayer groups who are affected by the operation and effects of the Federal excise tax system will devote their full attention to the bill from the point of view of determining its technical adequacy and substantive sufficiency in carrying out the recommendations of the subcommittee and the Committee on Ways and Means. It is also my hope that interested groups and persons will immediately begin to prepare overall studies of the excise tax field as it affects them. This is important because the Subcommittee on Excise Tax Technical and Adminitsrative Problems has been reconstituted by the Committee on Ways and Means and given a much broader jurisdiction which will enable us to consider not only technical and administrative problems but the underlying substantive policy of our Federal excise tax laws and the level of excise tax rates as well.

While the subcommittee will have to meet to determine specific plans, it is my expectation that interested parties will be given an opportunity to be heard by the subcommittee, not only on the provisions of the bill but also on questions of Federal excise tax policy, the level of rates, and other technical and administrative problems in the excise tax field not covered by the bill.

I want to take this opportunity to express my sincere appreciation to the members of the subcommittee for their diligent work and cooperation in the preparation of the subcommittee's recommendations.

I also would like to publicly thank the staffs of the Treasury Department, the Internal Revenue Service, the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation, and the Committee on Ways and Means who have helped make this bill possible. Were it not for the full cooperation of these people and the all-important contribution of the House Legislative Counsel's office, it would not have been possible to draft the bill for public inspection and comment in the relatively short period of time which has been available since the report of the subcommittee was first considered by the Committee on Ways and Means.

As soon as our legislative schedule permits, I plan to call a meeting of the subcommittee to formulate the plans of the subcommittee for the balance of this session of Congress.

The Honorable JERE COOPER, Democrat, of Tennessee, chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, will announce the membership of the subcommittee as soon as the members are named. I expect this announcement in the next day or two.

The name of our subcommittee has been redesignated as the "Subcommittee on Excise Taxes."

There follows a description of the changes made by the Committee on Ways and Means in the recommendations of the subcommittee. These changes are incorporated in the bill.

The principal action taken by the Committee on Ways and Means which differs from the subcommittee's recommendation are:

First. Section 111 amends the tax on automotive parts and accessories to exclude from tax those which are sold for ultimate use or used as repair or replacement parts or as accessories for farm equipment.

Second. The bill does not increase the tax on tubeless tires by 1 cent a pound over the rate imposed on tires requiring inner tubes.

Third. Section 115 relating to the tax on radio and television sets, phonographs and records does not impose a tax on transistors. In other respects, however, it does follow the subcommittee recommendation; that is, it imposes a tax with respect to record players and tape and wire recorders.

Fourth. The bill does not delete curling stones, deck tennis equipment, lacrosse equipment, and sleds from the tax on sporting goods.

Fifth. Section 132 (b) of the bill amends section 4243 to exclude from the application of the club dues tax assessments paid for the construction or reconstruction of any social, athletic, or sporting facility.

Sixth. Section 132 (b) also adds a new exemption from the club-dues tax for due or fees paid to nonprofit organizations primarily for the purpose of providing swimming facilities for its members. In order to qualify children must be permitted to use the swimming facilities, no alcoholic beverages may be served or be permitted to be consumed on the premises, no dining facilities—other than for light refreshments—and no dancing facilities may be provided and the organization must not be controlled by or under common control with any other organization.

Seventh. The subcommittee had proposed that amounts paid to a club for replacement of facilities destroyed by a casualty under certain conditions should not be subject to the club-dues tax. This has been omitted as no longer necessary since capital improvements will not be subject to tax under the introduced bill.

Eighth. The subcommittee recommended that it be made clear that in the case of transportation of oil by pipeline, the tax does not apply to movements which constitute an integral part of the operation of a refinery, a bulk plant, a terminal, or a gasoline plant. The bill, in section 136, in more specific terms than the subcommittee report, carries out the intent of this recommendation but provides that in no case are movements located on two or more premises to be free of tax if the distance covered is more than 25 miles.

Ninth. Section 141 of the bill in the new code section 4302, provides as recommended by the subcommittee for an exclusion from the documentary transfer tax in the case of amounts transferred to capital account from earned surplus. It also provides an exclusion for other amounts transferred to capital account to the extent such amounts were taken into account in determining value in an earlier transaction.

Section numbers refer to section of the bill.

Tenth. Section 152 of the bill carries out the full committee's action with respect to pinball machines.

Eleventh. No attempt has been made in this bill to carry out specifically the subcommittee's recommendations with respect to the timing of floor stock refunds although in general terms the subcommittee's recommendations were followed in the floor stock refunds provided by the Highway Revenue Act of 1956, H. R. 10660.

Twelfth. Section 164 of the bill provides for refunds with respect to gasoline lost in a disaster as declared by the President. The subcommittee had in addition recommended that refunds be made available in the case of gasoline lost in a fire. This part of the subcommittee recommendation has been omitted from the introduced bill.

Thirteenth. The bill does not include the subcommittee recommendation for a semimonthly rate system beginning August 1, 1956, or for a monthly rate system beginning August 1, 1958, for the collection of alcohol and tobacco taxes.

Fourteenth. In section 201 of the bill—sections 5006 (a) (2) and 5173 (c) (1) (A) of the code—the 8-year bonding period for distilled spirits is extended to 20 years.

Fifteenth. Section 207 of the bill authorizes refunds for beer lost by reason of the flood of 1951 and the hurricane of 1954. Only the first of these changes was recommended by the subcommittee.

Sixteenth. Section 201 of the bill—section 5415 of the code—permits transfers of beer between breweries owned by the same brewer and allows such transfers where the controlling interest in the shipping and receiving brewery is owned by the same person or where shipments are between breweries owned by parent and subsidiary corporation. The subcommittee had recommended against allowing these transfers.

Seventeenth. Section 201 of the bill—section 5561 of the code—limits the authority of the Secretary or his delegate regarding waiver of the provisions of the distilled spirits laws to meet the requirements of the national defense to 3 years. The subcommittee would have extended this waiver provisions indefinitely.

Eighteenth. Section 201 of the bill also makes certain amendments relating to wine. These include: (a) a revision of the definition of the winemaker's own product to cover multiple plant operations and affiliated persons located within the same State—section 3592 (f) of the code; (b) a clarification of permitted activities on bonded wine cellar premises—sections 5361 and 5364 of the code; (c) provision for a slight increase in the amount of dry sugar which may be used in fermenting wines from low sugar fruits such as apples and a clarification of the manner in which such sugar may be added—section 5384 (b) (2) of the code.

The Crisis of Klamath

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDITH GREEN
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 18, 1956

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, the Honorable Charles Sprague, editor and publisher of the Oregon Statesman of Salem, Oreg., and former Republican Governor of Oregon, is one of our most respected and wisest elder statesmen. Like the overwhelming majority of Oregonians, he is concerned about the problems now confronting the Klamath Indian Tribe in the proposed termination of Federal control under Public Law 587. I place in the RECORD, his analysis of the need for revision of the present law:

[From the Oregon Statesman of July 12, 1956]

IT SEEMS TO ME

(By Charles A. Sprague)

In 1953 Congress passed a bill, now Public Law 587, setting up machinery for termination of the Klamath Indian Reservation. The Klamaths are among the richest of the Indian tribes, their large reservation containing one of the biggest stands of pine timber in the country. Some members have been desirous of dissolving the tribe and distributing its assets to members, but there has been sharp division of opinion within the tribe, however, over procedures. Public Law 587 set up a program for distribution by requiring the Secretary of the Interior, after the appraisal of tribal property is made to "give each adult member of the tribe * * * an opportunity to elect * * * to withdraw from the tribe and have his interests in tribal property converted into money and paid to him." The management specialists appointed were Tom Waters of Klamath Falls, J. E. Flavel of Lakeview, and W. L. Phillips, Sr., of Salem. Phillips resigned several months ago to head the campaign of Douglas McKay for the Senate.

As the specialists got into the Klamath problem they became aware that to carry out the law as it was written would be a catastrophe. For the Indians to get their individual shares all at once would probably result in the early impoverishment of those who made that choice, because the majority are not accustomed to handling large sums of money on their own. Also to offer for sale the big blocks of timberland required to raise the necessary funds would mean a dumping of this valuable asset. Only a few companies would be big enough to bid on it. There might follow an orgy of cutting that would impair the economy of the Klamath Basin. Tom Waters, as spokesman for the management team has made this clear to congressional committees.

Mrs. EDITH GREEN, Member from the Third District of Oregon, has introduced 2 bills, one to transfer the cost of administering the act from the tribal treasury to the United States Treasury, the other to provide for postponement of the action by the management team. Her bill, H. R. 11660, would have the managers transmit the property appraisal to the Secretary of the Interior for his consideration and transmit also a written report of their action and offer their recommendations as to future procedure. These reports would then be forwarded to Congress with such recommendations as the Secretary of the Interior may desire to make. No further action could be taken by the management team prior to 9 months following submission of this report.

Mrs. GREEN's bill is primarily a delaying action. It does not amend the law in the way that it should be amended in the best interest of the Indians and of the community. It would give Congress an additional 9 months in which to make such amendment.

It seems doubtful that Mrs. GREEN can get her bill enacted at this session of Congress, but it does focus attention on the urgency of action lest the binding requirement of the present law get in its bite, which would be disastrous.

I understand the management team will recommend a definite program which will give the protection desired (though it probably will be fought hard by those Indians who want their full share right now). The Interior Department and Congress must be ready to act promptly on such recommendations, particularly so if H. R. 11660 is not enacted to extend the time by 9 months.

It is gratifying to see that Mrs. GREEN is taking hold of this problem (though the reservation is outside her district) and seems disposed to cooperate with the management specialists in developing a sound program for Klamath termination. I hope this may continue. Politics should be cast aside, and self-interest, and a program developed which will not encourage early pauperization of the Indians or dump their rich lands onto the market. The Government itself must provide the helping hand to effect a sensible transition of the Klamaths from tribal to free status.

A Subversive Thumbs His Nose

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DONALD L. JACKSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 18, 1956

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Topanga, Calif., Journal of July 5, 1956:

A SUBVERSIVE THUMBS HIS NOSE

The Government of the United States is simply the creature of "we the people." We operate it as an instrument for our own self-government. Government has no rights save such as we the people endow it with in our own interest.

Therefore action of the Supreme Court by majority decision, in ruling that a Government employee, who was discharged as a security risk, has a right to his job because the job isn't in a sensitive category, must astound millions of Americans. A nonsensitive job, it would seem, is one offering less than ordinary chance for stealing a defense secret or blowing up the Capitol.

As to that angle, the three dissenters to the ruling pointed out that "the janitor might prove to be as important security-wise as the top employee in the building," and that the "ruling might leave the Government honeycombed with subversive employees." To our nonlegal thinking, that dissent makes sense unassailable. So does President Eisenhower, whose Executive order the Court decision overruled in this instance,

when he declares insistence upon complete and unswerving loyalty to the Constitution from every individual who is employed by the Government in any job of any nature.

This judicial event is disturbing because the overwhelming majority of the American people fear and detest the Communist world conspiracy as a menace to our freedom and our way of life. We burden our economy to arm against that conspiracy; we place our sons under arms; we form alliances with other free peoples. We the people effect this defense and safeguard through our servant, our Government.

Can it be justice that any known or suspected subversive has a right to a job in a Government that is of the people, by the people, and for the people? That he can thumb his nose at an Executive order of the President of the United States—an order executed under provisions of law passed by Congress? It is hard to believe so.

Great Plains Conservation Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM S. HILL
OF COLORADO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 18, 1956

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement of E. L. Peterson, Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, before the House Agricultural Committee relative to H. R. 11831 and H. R. 11833, the Great Plains conservation program:

GREAT PLAINS CONSERVATION PROGRAM

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I appreciate the opportunity of appearing before your committee to present information about amendments to the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act and the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 that provide for furthering a conservation program in the Great Plains.

President Dwight D. Eisenhower on January 11, 1956 sent a message to both Houses of the Congress calling attention to the special problems that have long existed throughout the Great Plains region. He urged the Congress to consider and act on these problems during this session.

I quote from the President's message:

"The Great Plains region, a vast agricultural empire peopled by 17 million of our citizens, is an area of severe climatic variations which periodically produce widespread suffering and heavy economic losses. In this region farm families have a continuous struggle to protect their best cultivated and grazing lands against soil erosion during seasons of high winds and frequent periods of extremely dry weather. Some of the most critical problems of the area are the outgrowth of war when farmers and ranchers in the Great Plains States patriotically and energetically responded to their Government's call for greatly increased production to meet wartime demands by converting grasslands to cultivation.

"Because these problems directly concern the lives and prosperity of millions of American citizens, the Nation as a whole is directly concerned. Because all Americans are concerned with the maintenance and improvement of our soil and water resources, every citizen in the land has an interest in the solution of agricultural difficulties in the vast Great Plains areas."

EARLY HISTORY

Those early travelers who ventured across the plains called it an ocean of lush grass if their trip was during wet periods, but it was labeled "The Great American Desert" on maps of the region made before 1860. A prolonged drought occurred in the southern plains in the early 1890's. Some of the early settlers left the region at that time. Another long drought began in 1910 and lasted through 1913 over most of the plains. The drought of the thirties during which the area became known as the Dust Bowl persisted for 7 years in the southern plains and for 5 years in the northern plains. Most of you are familiar with the fact that thousands of farmers abandoned their farms and left the plains during this period. Rainfall was normal or above from 1940 through 1949.

Many new settlers came to the Great Plains in the 1940's, some to occupy farms that had been abandoned in the 1930's. They plowed up some 4 million acres of the remaining grasslands. Most of this plow-up was in the southern plains. The farmers and ranchers in the Great Plains States responded splendidly to the call of their Government for greatly increased production during World War II. This region is now suffering some of the results of continuing in effect wartime production incentives long after the emergency demand has ended.

THE PRESENT DROUGHT

The present drought returned to the southern plains in the early 1950's. In 1952 it had spread to all the plains region. Over most of the northern plains the drought lasted only 1 year. But it has persisted in the southern plains. According to local estimates nearly 16 million acres of land were damaged by wind erosion in the spring and early summer of 1955, and about 10 million acres have been damaged during the same period this year. It is reported that eastern Colorado has the poorest wheat crop of recent years. It is less than half of the average for the past 10 years.

In February 1954 the Department of Agriculture began intensive studies of the damage from drought in the southern plains. This study which as it developed became cooperative with the Great Plains Council led to the development of a program for the Great Plains (USDA Miscellaneous Publication No. 709, January 1956).

SOIL CONSERVATION

Early in the 1930's a soil conservation project was established near Dalhart, Tex., to determine what practices and measures might be applicable in proper use and management of land, to holding the soil in place, and to demonstrate to farmers how these measures could be applied. In 1938, farmers and ranchers stated to organize soil conservation districts to cope with the problem. There are nearly 200 districts organized and in operation in the wind erosion area of the Great Plains now. More than half of the farmers and ranchers in this area are cooperators with their soil conservation district. With assistance from the Agricultural Conservation Program farmers and ranchers have treated 12 percent of the cropland and 22 percent of the range land in the affected area.

A phase of Federal assistance in the Great Plains during the 1930's was the land utilization program. Projects established under that program involved the purchase of 1,100,000 acres of private land almost all of which has since been converted to grazing land. These projects are now managed by the Forest Service.

SOME OF THE PROBLEMS

Estimates made from scattered soil surveys indicate that not quite one-third of the affected area in the southern plains is suitable for continuous cropping under proper management. Unfortunately, there is somewhere between 11 and 14 million acres now being cultivated that should not be. This is the land on which wheat and cotton crops have failed year after year and, even in favorable seasons, rarely makes satisfactory yields. This acreage constitutes one of the major problems of the area.

In addition to the problem of proper land use, flexible cropping systems are recommended for the area in order to take advantage of the weather cycle. Stubble mulching and proper management of residues is needed in order to retain residues on the land. Strip cropping is needed in most areas, and contouring and level-terracing are recommended as water conservation measures. Good grass management to retain sufficient ground cover is needed on grazing lands. Also involved is sufficient water and salting places to permit even grazing. Contouring, water-spreading, and reseeding are needed on range land locally.

Another major problem is that of the size of both farm and ranch units. The units in the drier portions of the Great Plains should include sufficient acreage of cropland, at least 300 or more acres, so as to be efficient from the standpoint of inputs of labor, machinery and equipment. Experience has indicated that ranches of less than 125 animal units are seldom successful. Provision needs to be made for at least a 2-year forage supply to be continuously on hand.

EMERGENCY PROGRAMS

A short-term or emergency program for plowing cropland has been in effect for the last two seasons. This program is directed toward (a) emergency tillage and (b) establishing emergency cover. It is estimated that nearly 10 million acres were chiseled or listed by farmers this spring. Some of these fields were tilled twice or three times to protect the soil from blowing. However, such tillage has been effective in achieving only partial stabilization. Emergency cover of some kind should be established at the first opportunity on blowing fields, that is as soon as enough rainfall comes to permit growing of cover crops.

LONG RANGE PROGRAM

The objective of the program

The goal to be achieved is a more stable agriculture, more dependable sources of income, and progressively satisfactory livelihood for the people of the region. To achieve this goal, there must be widespread use of good soil management and water conservation practices and adjustments in sizes and types of farms which will enable farmers and ranchers to effectively cope with the climatic hazards of the region.

There must also be complete understanding of the objective and coordinated teamwork on the part of all concerned, farmers, landowners, civic and agricultural groups, private industry, local, State, and Federal agencies and governments, in order to translate this program into action to create a more stable economy and for maximum benefits to all the residents of the Great Plains.

ACTION BEING TAKEN BY THE UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

The following actions have been taken by the United States Department of Agriculture to assist farm and ranch operators of the region in the solution of their problems.

1. Land classification intensified

The Soil Conservation Service has moved ahead its soil survey work to be able to make available, farm by farm, this basic information for the proper use and management of the land in the Great Plains. This survey work is being concentrated first on the remainder of the cropland in the critical wind erosion areas.

This inventory of the soil will provide a basis for the land capability classification, which is a very useful tool in making adjustments for a more stable agriculture. Additional experienced personnel have been added to the present staff to complete the survey in the critical wind-erosion areas of the Great Plains area as rapidly as possible.

2. Technical assistance for conservation measures

The program of on-the-farm technical assistance in soil and water conservation is being accelerated by the Soil Conservation Service. Additional technicians are being provided in those districts of the Great Plains where farmers and ranchers have made requests, and where such help is necessary to accelerate other State and Federal programs.

3. Cost sharing for conservation

The policy of the Agricultural Conservation Program Service continues to be one of sharing with farmers and ranchers the cost of installing and establishing those practices which are most enduring and most needed but which are not now a part of their normal farm and ranch operations.

The ACP cost-sharing program on those practices that are intended to bring about those land use adjustments required for a long-range program are being accelerated and rates of payment have been made more flexible.

4. Credit for the area

Private and cooperative lenders, historically the chief source of agricultural credit will continue to be encouraged to provide maximum sound credit assistance to the majority of farmers, ranchers and their cooperative organizations.

A review of the need for and the possibility of modifying regulations, supervisory requirements, and Federal banking laws to enable bankers to meet the problems of carrying good risks through an emergency period such as a drought disaster and making more intermediate term loans, is now in progress.

All lenders, cooperative, private, and governmental, should take into consideration, in their credit policies, proper land use and sound management practices, as well as the size and type of the operation.

All lenders are being encouraged to meet the need for intermediate and long-term credit to permit the enlargement and adaptation of farm units that are now too small or improperly organized to make the best use of resources.

5. Credit program of Farmers' Home Administration

The Farmers' Home Administration has developed and placed in operation in a great many counties a credit program designed especially for landowners and operators. In substance, its provisions are as follows:

(a) Loans for reseeding and the establishment of grasslands and other approved conservation and land-use practices.

(b) Loans for soil and water erosion control measures.

(c) Loans for the improvement and development of domestic and irrigation water supplies, for the repair and improvement of existing farm buildings, and for the purchase of such additional land as may be necessary to enlarge a farm into a family-type size unit.

(d) Loans for the purchase of livestock, farm equipment, seed, fertilizer, feed for livestock, insecticides, farm supplies, and for farm equipment repairs, the payment of interest, insurance, and taxes, including the refinancing of existing chattel debts, where necessary.

(e) Assistance to both creditors and debtors in effecting voluntary debt adjustments so that the debt load on the farmer or rancher will be held to a point within his ability to repay.

(f) Loans are predicated on farming operations that are consistent with recommended land use and farm management practices for the area.

(g) Terms in all instances are geared to the expected repayment ability of the borrower.

Additional field personnel have been added to the staff in the Great Plains region to assure proper attention to the making and servicing of these and other loans handled by the Farmers' Home Administration. This new special loan program supplements the regular programs of the agency and the credit now available from private, cooperative and other governmental sources. Loans are made only to farmers and ranchers who are unable to obtain necessary credit at reasonable rates and terms from other lenders.

6. Federal crop insurance strengthened

Crop insurance is being further developed and strengthened to eventually serve as a major protective measure against crop losses in all areas suitable for arable farming. It may be necessary to extend the contract of insurance over more than one crop year in order to equalize premiums and losses. Standards of performance in carrying out risk-reducing practices are required in the insurance contract.

Changes are being developed in the contract provisions for the wind erosion counties designed to encourage insured farmers to plant cover crops early and to refrain from summer fallowing the same land more than 1 year when the winter wheat crop is lost early in the season.

Crop insurance is not available on land unsuited for the long-time production of the insured crop. Crop insurance most eventually operate on a sound actuarial basis. In the interest of developing and maintaining a sound insurance program, local leaders and agencies are being encouraged to assist the Federal Crop Insurance Corporation in screening out land use and farming practices which should not be insured, and to determine if there are farming practices which should be an eligibility requirement.

Where crop insurance is available, farmers are encouraged to join in building a sound and lasting crop insurance program to stabilize the agricultural economy of the individual and the area. All department agencies have been instructed to encourage eligible producers to carry crop insurance.

7. Weather reports and research

There is great need for determining the incidence and range of weather variation and its relationship to crop yields, and the mapping of climatic patterns by major climatic and soil areas of the plains as a means of clarfying weather risk. The Weather Bureau and the Department have developed additional types of weather research which will achieve this result. Arrangements are being made for cooperative weather projects with land-grant colleges in the region.

8. Research

In order to provide a continuing basis for intelligent action on problems facing farmers and ranchers in the Great Plains, an expanded, sustained, cooperative, and coordinated program of research is being developed and will be vigorously conducted by the Agricultural Research Service in cooperation with State experiment stations. Arrangements are being made through the Great Plains Agricultural Council to inventory and summarize the results of research which are now available. Full use will be made of available research in the guidance of this program.

In the areas which are physically adapted for continuous crop production, further research will be directed toward controlling wind and water erosion and improving the soil, crop yields, livestock production, and the income expectancy, and toward the creation of cash and commodity reserves which are essential to carry farmers and ranchers through any drought years.

In the areas with soil which is not suitable for arable farming, intensified research is being inaugurated to guide an orderly and economically sound transition into grazing and livestock, and to prevent a recurrence of the distress caused by the cultivation of unsuitable land in high rainfall years. Research is being intensified to determine methods and costs of establishing a satisfactory stand and growth of grass and the rate of stocking on regrassed lands.

Farm and ranch marketing and production supply procurement problems, that will grow out of the proposed land-use adjustments, are being given consideration and study.

9. Extension education

Following the initiation of the Great Plains program, the stepped-up work of extension has reached varying degrees of intensity in the 10 States.

In Montana, extension has expaneded its program in range management and is working closely with soil conservation districts and the agricultural conservation program on soil and water conservation. Nebraska has employed one full-time man on wind-erosion problems who is conducting demonstrations with stubble mulch for erosion control. In Colorado, the program projection effort is concentrated in the 17 southeastern counties where the wind-erosion problem is most severe. Farm and home development work in these same 17 counties is already resulting in significant production adjustments on many farm and ranch units. Oklahoma and Texas have likewise made special efforts in stepping up their long-time planning in the Great Plains areas. In North Dakota the emphasis has been on soil surveys, soil testing, soil and water seminars, and irrigation. Most of the States have held statewide meetings of all the agencies to discuss the problems of the region. The Great Plains film project has under way seven films applicable to wind-erosion areas and part of these films will be available early next year.

Some of the most intensive work has been done in Kansas where two full-time men were employed in 1955 to work with the 31 counties in the western part of the State. In February of 1956, with the initiation of the State Committee of Agricultural Agencies, two meetings were held in that area, which were attended by county delegates of State agencies, farm organization leaders, and county planning committees of farmers. Each county was presented a table of 25-year trends in land use, size of farms, incomes, type of farming, tenure, and wheat abandonment and crop yields. They were also presented results of the 1936–40 land use planning tables for each county, together with 1954 land use.

The county farmer committees were asked to discuss problems now facing them; what has been the contribution of price supports and wheat allotments to the changes; what changes in allotments and price support programs would contribute to stability; what land use adjustments are now needed?

Adjustments suggested by county committees involved a net reduction of 206,000 acres of wheat, a larger reduction in grain sorghums (below 1954) and 1,034,000 acres to be returned to grass.

A summary of the county committee meeting reports was presented and the group discussed their problems under six headings: (1) Land use, (2) wheat problems, (3) livestock and feed reserves, (4) erosion, (5) fluctuating income and credit, and (6) new proposals. Typical of the new proposals made is:

"Locally administered regulations on hazardous farming operations are needed. Those farming practices that contribute to wind erosion are a community problem as well as an individual problem. The penal-

ties for following such practices should include the loss of ASC benefits administered by subject to the discretion of local county committees. It was recommended that wind erosion payments be directed at encouraging preventative wind erosion practices or measures (cover crops, water conservation measures, etc.) rather than operated on an emergency basis."

In county meetings some decisions were made for positive action in 1956. Where items of emphasis were agreed upon, the responsibility of each agency in the county was spelled out and they are all now engaged in trying to make their maximum contribution under present programs.

The Federal Extension Service is continuing to assist land-grant colleges and their extension services in further strengthening their educational programs by placing special emphasis on practical ways and means of making major adjustments in land use and good farm and ranch management to better assure a stable agricultural economy over a sustained period.

DIVISION OF RESPONSIBILITIES

Landowners and operators and local leaders

The ownership and operation of land carries with it the primary responsibility for maintaining its productive capacity by following proper land use practices.

Landowners and operators are responsible, especially when using publicly supported programs or facilities, to so apply their benefits as to preserve and enhance the value of their land. They should also assume the responsibility for participating in, and contributing to, the formation and development of policies and programs which are adapted to the needs of their area.

Civic, farm, and business interests in the area should assume local leadership. To be successful, any program will require recognition of problems locally, and a willingness on the part of all concerned to accept their full share of the responsibility and leadership for the solution of the problem.

County and State governments

The provisions of the bill involve a contract between the producer and the Secretary of Agriculture. Some protection is afforded to the Government in that the producer must develop and agree to a conservation plan and that he forfeits all rights to payments or grants and must refund to the United States upon his violation of the contract. However, to be successful the Great Plains program will require recognition of problems locally and at the State level and a willingness on the part of all concerned to accept their full share of the responsibility and leadership for the solution of the problem.

County governments can help in such activities as land classification, tax adjustment procedures and stimulating community action. State governments can facilitate the program by assuming the responsibility for meeting the problems of proper land use; providing funds for research, education, regulatory, and action programs needed to assist landowners and operators in achieving recognized standards of proper land use; by reviewing water resource programs in their State and by the enactment of legislation for the implementation of these and other segments of needed programs.

PROVIDING FOR A GREAT PLAINS CONSERVATION PROGRAM

Most of the programs which have been described have been put into operation by the agencies of the Department of Agriculture under existing authority. However, because of the nature of the problem some additional authority is requested. It pertains primarily to helping a farmer or rancher to complete the application of a conservation plan once he has agreed to it.

The bills now under consideration would accomplish the purpose of assuring the producers in the area of continuing assistance over a period of years. This will enable them to install the conservation measures and make the changes in land use which they agree are needed for their unit. This program would be in addition to other programs offered by the Department to the farm and ranch operators in the area.

The agricultural conservation program is an annual offer to farmers and ranchers practice by practice. Under it costs are shared with the producers who carry out certain conservation measures to the extent which they are able with their own financial resources plus the cost-shares offered under the ACP, augmented by the technical, educational, and research efforts of the Department.

The recently enacted soil-bank program will likewise be available to farm and ranch operators in the area. This is essentially a device to adjust production of surplus crops to effective demand. It approaches the problem commodity by commodity. Naturally we expect certain conservation measures to be carried out under the acreage reserve. We also anticipate substantial conservation accomplishments under the conservation reserve phase of the program. However, that is not the main purpose of the soil-bank legislation. It is directed toward immediate shifts in land use rather than those to be made under a long-range program such as provided in the legislation under consideration here.

Under the program proposed in this legislation the conservation problem would be taken up for a farm or ranch in its entirety. A long-time program of conservation and land-use adjustment would be worked out with the producer in accordance with the capabilities of each farm or ranch. This would include a schedule of land-use adjustments and conservation measures considered essential for the most efficient operation of the farm or ranch unit. Assistance would be given for the installation of the necessary conservation measures. Under the terms of the long-time contract proposed the operators would be assured of continuing assistance as they move forward in the installation or inauguration of the various segments of the plan developed for their operating unit.

In the 10 Great Plains States there are estimated to be between 11 and 14 million acres of cropland in the area unsuited for continuous crop production which should be seeded to permanent vegetative cover. The Department has estimated that approximately 10 million acres of this erosive land would eventially come under the terms of this program. On the basis of sharing 80 percent of the cost of seeding it has been estimated that program costs of about $112 million would be incurred for this purpose. We have also estimated that about 6 million acres of range land needs to be reseeded. On the same basis of cost sharing we have estimated a program cost of $30 million. Related conservation range practices such as livestock watering facilities may need to be installed on the area shifted into grazing use. We estimated the cost of these facilitating measures at about $8 million.

The amendment proposed to section 334 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, would maintain the wheat history on the farms and ranches participating in the program. It is essentially the same provision as that contained in section 307 of the Soil Bank Act except that it would continue for the life of the contract and will serve the same purpose—That is, give farmers more assurance that their acreage allotments will be protected while the land use adjustments are being made.

All agencies of the Department will continue to work at the problems in the Great Plains under their existing authorities. Projects will be carried out on farms and ranches moving as fast and as far as the operators are able to do with their financial resources.

Because of the nature of the problem in the Great Plains area we, in the Department, feel that to adequately meet the situation a long-term approach must be taken and assurance of continuing assistance be offered if the desired accomplishments are to be achieved.

In order to fully implement a long-range program we need authority for long-term commitments on ACP cost-sharing which these bills would provide.

We will appreciate your favorable action on the proposed legislation.

Thank you.

Eisenhower Has Never Understood Necessity for Continuous Policy Leadership

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MELVIN PRICE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 16, 1956

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, it is not a partisan statement to suggest that the basic weakness of this administration arises from the fact that the President himself—before his illnesses, even—has never understood the necessity for continuous policy leadership.

In this connection, I offer for insertion in the RECORD an editorial from the St. Louis Post-Dispatch pointing out that the "translation of policy into action is a political task which cannot be delegated to anybody" by the Chief Executive:

RANDALL FOR DODGE

To appreciate the full flavor of President Eisenhower's appointment of C. B. Randall as a special assistant on foreign economic policy, one has to go back to the appointment of Mr. Randall's predecessor.

It was more than a year and a half ago—in December, 1954—that the President called in Joseph M. Dodge, the Detroit banker who had been his first budget director, and gave him the job of framing a coherent policy for the employment of American economic power overseas.

Those were the days when Harold E. Stassen and Secretary of the Treasury Humphrey were quarreling over a big versus little economic aid program. Mr. Dodge was supposed to reconcile the conflicting points of view and "organize this country's world-wide economic struggle against the spread of communism," as the news dispatches said at the time.

Some of the more excitable correspondents wrote that his assignment "paralleled in some respects the unification of the military services." The Council of Foreign Economic Policy which he set up would "be comparable to the top-level National Security Council." Here, the Nation was told, would be America's answer to the shifting of cold war emphasis from military to economic competition, then already under way.

Such was the prospectus. Now, 19 months later, Mr. Dodge is stepping out in favor of Mr. Randall. He leaves behind him no visible effect whatever on foreign economic policy. His great task has been scarcely heard of from that day to this. Foreign aid is still overwhelmingly military in character. The administration still goes through a catch-as-catch-can fight with Congress for a hastily improvised economic-aid program every year. The same old slogans and same old

formulas are still being bandied about, with steadily diminishing effect. There is still talk of—but little appreciable movement toward—reorienting American policy to the new Soviet emphasis on political and economic competition.

If Mr. Randall can do in Mr. Dodge's job what the White House 19 months ago intimated would be done, he will perform a valuable service. Yet he himself is a veteran, with battle scars, of another presidential commission, the one that was supposed to wave the wand of "trade not aid," and settle the tariff-reciprocal-trade problem once and for all. Needless to say, it didn't.

Presidential commissions and councils, in fact, seldom succeed in solving problems. They can be useful in helping decide what line policy should take, but the translation of policy into action is a political task which cannot be delegated to anybody. That is a responsibility which only the President, by continuous and effective political leadership, can discharge.

Threat to Klamath Assets

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDITH GREEN
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 18, 1956

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, I ask permission to place in the RECORD an editorial of July 3, 1956, from one of our two leading newspapers in Portland, the Oregon Journal, which expresses concern over the jeopardy in which the nearly $100 million of assets and the welfare of the over 2,000 Klamath tribal members are placed by the shortcomings of the proposed termination of Federal control under Public Law 587. I feel this editorial speaks for informed and responsible Oregonians who are disturbed by this situation, regardless of party.

THREAT TO KLAMATH TRIBAL ASSETS

The Klamath Indian Reservation contains what has been described as one of the finest timber stands in the Nation. Its value has been estimated as high as $75 million.

It includes more than 600,000 acres in tribal ownership and about 150,000 acres owned by individual Indians under allotment.

Under terms of the Klamath Indian Reservation Termination Act, all the reservation's assets, including the timber, must be sold and the proceeds distributed to the Indians by August 13, 1958.

Under the Bureau of Indian Affairs, the Klamath timber has been ably managed on a sustained yield basis.

Many of those close to the picture now fear that disposal of the timber to private operators will mean the end of sustained yield management and a destruction of the stand by clear cutting. This would deal a great economic blow to Klamath County.

One of those expressing this fear is T. B. Watters, of Klamath Falls, one of the management specialists appointed to carry out liquidation and distribution of reservation assets. Recommendation of Government purchase of the timber is under consideration, according to Watters.

The management group also is concerned with some of the human problems relating to termination. It recommends that if Congress makes possible purchase of the reservation, certain rights be retained by tribal members, particularly having to do with hunting and fishing.

Another lesser known reservation asset which could be threatened by termination is the 70,000-acre upper Klamath marsh, which the Journal's outdoor editor, Tom McAllister, considers the finest breeding ground for waterfowl in this region. Drainage of the marsh for agricultural use is a distinct possibility, though the land would be relatively poor for this purpose, and McAllister believes its greatest value is in its present state.

For the purpose of permitting a more orderly disposition of reservation property and assets, Representative EDITH GREEN, Democrat, of Oregon, has introduced an amendment calling for a 9-month waiting period after completion of the appraisal of tribal assets and the submission of a termination plan to the Secretary of the Interior before any further action could be taken. Under the present law, piecemeal sales could be made immediately upon completion of appraisal. Senator RICHARD L. NEUBERGER, Democrat, of Oregon, member of the Indian Affairs Subcommittee, has voiced similar concern over the dangers of piecemeal liquidation.

The Journal does not pretend to know what should be the final disposition of the reservation, but it believes these assets should be preserved and managed. To permit the working out of an orderly plan, more time is needed, and Mrs. Green's amendment is a sensible step.

Today's Heritage From 1776 Spark

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT B. CHIPERFIELD
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 16, 1956

Mr. CHIPERFIELD. Mr. Speaker, about the 4th of July I placed in the RECORD the story of how the Honorable William Tyler Page came to write the American's Creed. This was commented on favorably by a number of people who happened to read it and several Members of the Sons of the American Revolution have suggested that I place the following article by George Todt in the RECORD. It calls attention to the patriots who signed the Declaration of Independence which was one of the documents that inspired the writing of the American's Creed.

THE AMERICAN'S CREED

"I believe in the United States of America as a Government of the people, by the people, for the people; whose just powers are derived from the consent of the governed; a democracy in a republic; a sovereign Nation of many sovereign States; a perfect Union, one and inseparable; established upon those principles of freedom, equality, justice, and humanity for which American patriots sacrificed their lives and fortunes.

"I therefore believe it is my duty to my country to love it; to support its Constitution; to obey its laws; to respect its Flag; and to defend it against all enemies."

(William Tyler Page, Handbook, Sons of the American Revolution.)

Just 180 years ago to the day, 56 of the bravest men in history signed what many consider to have been the greatest libertarian document in the upward struggle of mankind—The Declaration of Independence in Congress, July 4, 1776: The Unanimous Declaration of the Thirteen United States of America.

These noble patriots risked their lives, their fortunes, and their sacred honor—than which it is impossible to risk more—but they parlayed their freedom sweepstakes into what was destined to become the mightiest nation on the world stage less than 200 years later. How many of us today would do what they did then? Are we still possessed with that kind of transcendant courage? Do we have the same full measure of devotion to America as did our ancestors?

Whatever our sympathies now, none of us should fail to feel a deep sense of gratitude to the patriotic American nationalists of a bygone day who overthrew the oppressive European system of despotism and tyranny which shackled them and made it possible for us, their inheritors, to live as our own masters in an enlightened and progressive libertarian Republic. They sparked the world's greatest experiment in human self-government witnessed to date; the idea that the masses of mankind were to be considered fit to rule themselves through representatives elected by the free will of the governed was—and still is—the most revolutionary political concept known to the world in more than 5,000 years of recorded history.

Those who decry our traditional form of constitutional Government as reactionary and out of date are usually, ideologically speaking, nothing less than totalitarian wolves in the clothing of Marxist propaganda sheep. These are the people who wear psychological blinders when it comes to finding the least bit of fault with overly centralized government, bureaucracy, or collectivism of any kind. While few, if any, would desire a king in the United States—nevertheless there are many who would welcome a dictator. What's the difference? Isn't it un-American to want either variety of despot? Wouldn't we gain for ourselves a tyrant in each case? And if we ever should—here's a final question: How would we go about getting a tyrant out of office if we didn't like him?

While we sweat out the answers to these simple questions, let's pay tribute in our hearts to some real American patriots who struck a major blow for freedom everywhere when they placed their signatures upon the Declaration of Independence. Here is the roster, by States:

Connecticut—Samuel Huntington, Roger Sherman, William Williams, and Oliver Wolcott; Delaware—Thomas McKean, George Read, and Caesar Rodney; Georgia—Button Gwinnet, Lyman Hall, and George Walton; Maryland—Charles Carroll, Samuel Chase, William Paca, and Thomas Stone; Massachusetts—John Adams, Samuel Adams, Elbridge Gerry, and Robert Treat Paine; New Hampshire—Josiah Bartlett, Matthew Thornton, and William Whipple; New Jersey—Abraham Clark, John Hart, Fraser Hopkinson, Richard Stockton, and John Witherspoon; New York—William Floyd, John Hancock, Francis Lewis, Phillip Livingston, and Lewis Morris; North Carolina—Joseph Hewes, William Hooper and John Penn; Pennsylvania—George Clymer, Benjamin Franklin, Robert Morris, John Morton, George Ross, Benjamin Rush, James Smith, George Taylor, and James Wilson; Rhode Island—William Ellery and Stephen Hopkins; South Carolina—Thomas Heyward, Jr., Thomas Lynch, Jr., Arthur Middleton and Edward Rutledge; Virginia—Carter Braxton, Benjamin Harrison, Thomas Jefferson, Francis Lightfoot Lee, Richard Henry Lee, Thomas Nelson, Jr., and George Wythe.

Let's hang out our flags at home today with pride and joy in our hearts. Have we ever stopped to consider what it might be like to have another besides Old Glory over us?

Address of Welcome by Brig. Gen. Thomas A. Lane, National Rivers and Harbors Congress, May 11, 1956

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DeWITT S. HYDE
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 18, 1956

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include an address of welcome given by Brig. Gen. Thomas A. Lane to the National Rivers and Harbors Congress on May 11, 1956:

On behalf of the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia, it gives me great pleasure to welcome you to your national capital for your 43d Annual Convention. We who live and work here are proud of this beautiful city which is our home and your home. We know that you have come not only to attend to your serious business, but also to have fun. I can only assure you that this is the way we want it.

Annually, your Congress serves to focus attention on the wise development and utilization of our water resources. Each year we can review the progress made and look ahead to new aims for the coming year. As you do this, on a national scale, we do it here for our own river basin.

When we look at our own river basin, the beautiful Potomac, we are filled with dismay. We have one of the few great river basins of the country which does not have on authorized comprehensive plan.

We have a channel project to the city of Washington which sorely needs a new planned development. Our neighbors in Alexandria have recently taken the lead in planning for the rebuilding of their ancient port to meet the potential of modern water traffic for this great and rapidly growing metropolitan area. We need not merely a navigation improvement, but a comprehensive plan for developing the potential of water transport for the area. Our citizens have work cut out for them.

We have a local flood-control project for the city of Washington which is incomplete and inadequate. We are perfectly safe as long as we don't have floods. But we ask ourselves. "What would we have done if the storms which burst over New England and California in the past year had struck us?" Could we have muddled through somehow? Not without severe damage to our city and especially to our Federal buildings in the lower areas of the city.

We used to think that the flow of our river was enough to meet all demands of the foreseeable future. In the past year, however, we have taken another look at this problem and found that the demands for water have grown so rapidly that we are facing the prospect of water shortage in about 25 years unless we provide storage in our river basin.

During the year we have labored to reduce pollution in the Potomac River. All of our communities are cooperating. The District of Columbia program for secondary treatment of sewage has been accelerated in this year to move our plant-completion date from 1960 forward to 1958. Our prospects for the cleanup of the Potomac are the best we have had in 20 years. Yet, this improvement will come none too soon. In recent years we have had a great increase in the popularity of water sports. Through the work of our Washington Rowing Association and our President's Cup Regatta Committee we have attracted major national races to this National Capital area. We hope that you will see the intercollegiate eastern sprint championship races tomorrow off Hains Point. Yet the real potential of our great river for sports has hardly been tapped.

We have added a million persons to our population of the Washington metropolitan area in the past 15 years. We shall probably add another million in the next 25 years. This population pressure places a tremendous demand on us for the conservation of our water resources. It opens up new prospects for transportation to serve the area. It places a great responsibility on all of us to plan wisely and prepare in time for both the disasters which may befall us and the great benefits which challenge us.

We are pleased that the Senate Public Works Committee has authorized the Chief of Engineers to review prior comprehensive surveys of the Potomac River Basin. We expect from this review to develop a program worthy of the National Capital and the great river which flows through it.

If we all have a growing concern about water resources, this is because water resources are of vital importance to the well-being of our country. Our technical magazines have long acquainted us with the inadequate water resources of many sections of the country. The recent interview of the Chief of Engineers by a national news magazine, U. S. News & World Report, however, reflects the growing interest of every citizen of our country in this matter.

Yes, the responsibilities which you have carried so admirably in the past assume greater importance as we look ahead. Your task is growing every year. As you assemble once more for your annual convention, Washington not only welcomes you, but salutes you for your notable service in the development and use of our national water resources. Our best wishes for your success here today and in the year ahead.

Schedule of Conferences and Visits With Residents of the Fourth Ohio District

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM M. McCULLOCH
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 18, 1956

Mr. McCULLOCH. Mr. Speaker, I believe that a Congressman should be in his district to confer and visit with his constituents whenever official duties do not require him to be in Washington.

When Congress adjourns in a few weeks, I expect to return home and to be available for conferences and visits with residents of the fourth district in the courthouse of each county seat between 8 a. m. and 4 p. m., in accordance with the following schedule:

Lima, Allen County: Tuesday, August 14.

Wapakoneta, Auglaize County: Wednesday, August 15.

Greenville, Darke County: Thursday, August 16.

Eaton, Preble County: Monday, August 20.

Celina, Mercer County: Wednesday, August 22.

Troy, Miami County: Thursday, August 23.

Sidney, Shelby County: Tuesday, August 28.

No appointments will be necessary. Any problem with, or opinion concerning, the Federal Government will be proper subject for conference.

Of course, I will be glad to see residents of the district, in my Piqua office, any time that the Congress is not in session, except on the days scheduled above.

Approval of H. R. 12061 Vital to American Leadership in Atomic Power

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 16, 1956

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, I include herewith a statement from the Honorable Walter P. Reuther, president of the United Auto Workers, urging need for H. R. 12061 to maintain United States leadership in development of atomic power:

INTERNATIONAL UNION, UNITED AUTOMOBILE, AIRCRAFT, AND AGRICULTURAL IMPLEMENT WORKERS OF AMERICA, UAW,
Washington, D. C., July 17, 1956.

Hon. C. MELVIN PRICE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN PRICE: The Senate has passed the Gore bill (S. 1333) authorizing and directing the Atomic Energy Commission to construct large-scale prototype demonstration power reactors to be located at, and supply power to, AEC production facilities.

It also makes AEC responsible for a vigorous program of cooperation and assistance abroad with respect to the design, construction, and operation of atomc power reactors.

UAW President Walter P. Reuther, as a member of the panel on the peaceful uses of atomic energy, urged the need for such legislation in the separate views which he filed last January with the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy. Excerpts from his statement are enclosed herewith.

We ask you to examine our reasons for believing that this legislation is of vital importance to the interests of the United States, both at home and abroad, and should be enacted at this session of Congress.

We recommend also that you read the two concise statements explaining the need for this legislation filed by Senator ANDERSON during the Senate debate and reprinted on pages 11284 and 11285 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for July 12.

Sincerely yours,

PAUL SIFTON,
National Legislative Representative.

EXCERPTS FROM SEPARATE OPINION BY WALTER P. REUTHER ON CERTAIN ASPECTS OF THE REPORT OF THE PANEL ON THE PEACEFUL USES OF ATOMIC ENERGY TO THE JOINT CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEE ON ATOMIC ENERGY, JANUARY 1956

* * * * *

In the cold war—in freedom's struggle against the forces of Communist tyranny—in the struggle for the hearts and minds of men—speed, all possible speed, in harnessing the atom to man's peacetime needs can be decisive.

* * * * *

We shall not give leadership to other peoples if we refuse to exercise it in our own behalf. The fact is that the United States is

failing to demonstrate the outstanding leadership in releasing atomic energy for peaceful purposes which it demonstrated in putting the atom to work for war.

We are not moving with speed and determination to convert atomic energy into an instrument of peaceful progress. Our program for developing atomic energy as a source of electric power is moving much too slowly.

* * * * *

The need to develop atomic energy as a practical source of power for use in the United States is urgent. There are power-hungry areas in our country today. There are other areas where the high cost of power retards economic progress and is encouraging the flight of industry to other parts of the country.

* * * * *

To meet the challenge and to realize the opportunity of the peaceful uses of atomic energy, we must mobilize all our forces and enlist the active participation of every segment of our economy. We must make full use of the capabilities both of government and of private enterprise. Only by drawing upon the special contributions of each can we make satisfactory progress toward our objectives—fortifying the strength of our Nation, advancing the welfare of our people and discharging our world responsibilities.

* * * * *

As to the next stage of the program, I question whether the present AEC policy of placing prime responsibility on private utility companies to provide risk capital for the construction and testing of full-scale demonstration reactors is sound. I share the point of view that the productive know-how and managerial skill of American private enterprise can make an important contribution to this phase of development, providing, however, the Government takes the initiative and assumes the financial risks involved in the construction and testing of these full-scale reactors. Building these first full-scale power reactors is an extension of the research and experimental work which only the Government is capable of performing under present circumstances. Accordingly, I suggest that the AEC policy of placing primary reliance on private enterprise at this stage of development be subjected to early review and reappraisal by the Joint Committee.

* * * * *

The AEC program for getting us through this development phase is to turn the primary responsibility over to electric utility companies, or groups of them, who in turn call upon manufacturers to contribute designs and build the components. While AEC will furnish information, assist in research and development, make nuclear fuel available at low rentals, reprocess spent fuel, and lend considerable financial assistance, it still requires private participants to take the basic risk and gives priority to proposals which impose least financial burden upon the Government.

AEC policy thus seeks to achieve two purposes at once: To promote the development of nuclear power, and to transfer to private enterprise a major part of the initiative and responsibility.

The Panel Report recognizes that it may not prove possible to achieve these two purposes simultaneously. It recommends that in the event industry does not take on the full risks and burdens which AEC has assigned to it, the AEC should construct a full-scale demonstration reactor of each major type and bring atomic power to a point where it can be used effectively and widely on a competitive basis.

In support of the Panel's recommendations, I urge the Joint Committee to institute early inquiry in order to determine how far and how fast private enterprise can and will assume the full risks and burdens of getting us over the hump and on to the highroad of practical nuclear power.

* * * * *

Manufacturers of equipment in this field have shown a great interest and undoubtedly have a vital contribution to make, but their experience and inventive qualities are brought into play only as they are engaged to join in the actual construction of a full-scale demonstration reactor. If the initiative in such construction is left in the hands of the private utilities at this stage of the program, the manufacturers' creative contribution will not be fully realized.

* * * * *

The attempt by AEC to transfer prime responsibility to private enterprise at this time appears to be premature. If, as a result, we continue to encounter serious delay in nuclear power development, we shall be guilty of pursuing a doctrinaire "free enterprise" approach to a problem which, at least for the present, is essentially national in purpose and scope and involves risks and losses of a magnitude which only Government can reasonably be expected to incur.

The development of large-scale reactors is, essentially, an experimental operation—as fully experimental as the construction of the small research reactors for which AEC is assuming the full responsibility and cost. If it is economically sound and proper for the Government to bear the burden of primary research in building the small experimental reactors, it would appear to be equally sound and proper for the Government to carry the major responsibility and risk in the second phase of experimentation—the building of full-scale demonstration reactors.

* * * * *

We do the utility companies no service by asking them to accept burdens which in view of all the unknowns in the present state of atomic technology they cannot finance as sound or normal business venture. We do them no disservice when we ask the Government to recognize the national importance and scope of the task at hand, to carry the basic risk of this full-scale reactor development, while affording the designing and manufacturing segments of private enterprise full opportunity to make their valuable contributions to the program.

The ingredients of the present situation do not add up to a formula for progress. If we want useful civilian atomic energy as soon as we can get it, both for domestic use and for international purposes, something must be done, starting immediately, to solve and overcome the many important technological problems that stand in the way.

Only bold initiative by Government can accelerate needed progress and get full-scale reactors in operation so that the time lag between theory and practice can be minimized. Only when the Government has completed both phases of this basic research work of completing and getting into operation both the model reactors and the full-scale demonstration reactors, can we expect to get the influx of private risk capital and the resulting full impact of the dynamic qualities of individual initiative essential to carry the program to higher levels of development.

I hope that the ideological barrier will not be raised against my recommendation that the joint committee examine AEC development policy with a view to putting AEC to work building demonstration reactors, as the 1954 act already authorizes it to do.

Neither Government nor industry can do this job alone. It was the blending of the special contributions of each that provided the genius which gave America the atomic know-how to produce the first bomb. At this stage of our national atomic effort, nothing could be more tragic than to split our forces by engaging in a sterile and senseless fighting of ideological windmills. Our free-enterprise system is not being challenged in America. If it were, less than 1 percent of the American people would support such a challenge, for the American people understand clearly that our free economy motivated by individual initiative and enterprise has given them a higher standard of living than any other people enjoy. We must approach this problem free from preconceived prejudices or fixed theoretical or ideological positions. We need to make judgments on a sane and sensible basis as to how best we can, as a free nation and a free people, get the job done.

Personalities in Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM E. HESS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 18, 1956

Mr. HESS. Mr. Speaker, the powerful radio station at Cincinnati, WLW, long has been highly popular with the people in a 100-mile radius of Cincinnati because of its unceasing effort to be of genuine public service. One of WLW's best-known features has been a weekly Sunday broadcast titled "Personalities in Your Government." Some months ago the program was devoted to Indiana Congressman EARL WILSON, a veteran of 16 years' service in this Chamber. I have worked with Mr. WILSON on several projects of mutual interest and benefit to our constituencies in southern Ohio, and southern Indiana, and I know that he is deserving of the fine tribute paid him on WLW's program.

Excerpts from that broadcast follow:

ANNOUNCER. The following is a special broadcast service presentation of the Nation's station. Each Sunday at this time WLW's world now presents this program, Personalities in Your Government, in order to bring the authentic background of prominent men and women who today are filling important positions with your national Government.

EARL WILSON, Member of Congress from Indiana.

Congress is many men. Some are tall, some are short, some are eloquent and some rarely make a formal, full dress speech; some are thin and some are fat, some are interested most in international affairs and others give all their effort to domestic problems. EARL WILSON, the man from Bedford, Ind., thinks that one of the best ways to be a good Member of Congress is to keep the folks back home informed as to what is happening in Congress and in Washington. WILSON has served the Ninth Indiana District for 15 consecutive years—now in his 16th year. He ranks among his colleagues in Congress as one of the most experienced and effective Members in the art of maintaining close and direct contacts with his people. People today are paying closer attention to issues in Congress; closer attention, in fact, than ever before. Proof of this can be found in the thousands of letters which the average Members of Congress receives every year. These letters from the people back home cover almost every conceivable subject.

A Congressman, if he is alert and experienced in serving his people, can accurately gage the sentiments of his constituents by a careful analysis of the mail. To Congressman EARL WILSON the daily mail is as

important to his work as the human pulse is to a doctor's diagnosis. To a visitor the mail on Congressman WILSON'S desk may only mean the expression of a few thoughts, ideas and complaints from a section of Indiana. To Congressman WILSON the mail throbs with the sentiments of the men and women he represents. That he profits from this hand on the peoples' pulse may be found in such testimonials as the one recently from the former Speaker of the House, Massachusetts' JOSEPH MARTIN. Said MARTIN, "EARL WILSON is ample proof of the fact that there is no substitute for experience. His lengthy tenure in Washington not only has equipped him to render quick and direct service to his constituency but it has given him a seniority and a parliamentary knowledge that makes him a valuable Member of Congress in behalf of the country at large."

Reviewing his work in Congress during 1955, Congressman WILSON says he is especially pleased with the progress that has been made in pushing the construction of the great Markland Dam project on the Ohio River. For many years an advocate of improvement of the Ohio, Mr. WILSON has steadily contended that this great river is destined to become the Rhur Valley of America.

As a high ranking member of the important House Appropriations Committee, Congressman WILSON was a key figure in 1955 in getting an appropriation of more than $2 million for start of the Markland project. Survey work and other preliminary projects now are under way and actual ground breaking is scheduled for early spring. "This Markland project, though authorized some years ago, was in a congressional log-jam that threatened to delay the work for another year or so," Mr. WILSON recalled. "It is fortunate and most encouraging that we were able to get it moving. Henceforth, if we keep pushing for the necessary appropriations, the job will progress rapidly and in a relatively short time the people of the Ohio Valley will see that great river transformed into one of the most important commercial arteries of the land."

Mr. WILSON'S many years as a Congressman—there are few who have been in Congress as long as he—have made him a master in the art of circumventing tedious and time-consuming official routines and redtape. During 1955 the people in his ninth district saw him single-handedly get a $30,000 appropriation for preliminary work aimed at constructing a long-needed reservoir on Salt Creek, a tributary of the White River.

An example of Mr. WILSON'S direct service to his people—and one, incidentally, which focused national attention on a little country graveyard down near Madison, Ind.—came last year when he learned that Maj. Samuel Woodfill, described by Gen. John J. Pershing as "the outstanding soldier of World War I," lay in an unmarked grave there in Jefferson County, Ind. Mr. WILSON went to the highest executives of the United States Army, and arrangements were immediately made to transfer the remains of this hero to Arlington National Cemetery. The reburial at Arlington included full military services attended by relatives of Major Woodfill, Secretary of the Army Wilber Brucker, and civic leaders of Madison. Later the people of that town erected a Woodfill monument in their courthouse yard. Though Congressman WILSON gives major attention to the wants of his folks back home and prides himself in the policy that, if necessary, everything else is sidetracked in order to expedite work in their behalf, he also is one of the hardest-working members of the Subcommittee on the District of Columbia and takes a leading part in deciding the spending policies of the city of Washington. The importance of committee work in the making of legislation in Congress is particularly well known to Mr. WILSON, as it is to other veterans of Capitol Hill. A typical congressional session will find him busy in committee hearings, rather than participating in inconsequential debates on the House floor. He makes it his business to stay informed of the issues coming up on the House floor and the extent of their progress. Thus he can leave his committee work when an important floor vote seems to merit it.

When we visited Mr. WILSON recently we found him sitting at a table in his outer office reading his morning mail, making notes on the margins for his replies which were to be dictated later on in the day. He regards this mail as the most important link between his office and the taxpayer back in his district. During 1955, Congressman WILSON has put added emphasis on the need of a stronger national education program. A former teacher and high-school principal himself, he declares that America's schools are her strongest weapon against communism and a number of his weekly newsletters for readers back home have dwelt on that topic. He is determined, he says, to do all in his power to raise the status and salary level of the teaching profession so that the finest and best qualified of young people seeking a lifetime profession will be attracted to teaching. He is indeed the teacher's friend, and he is so labeled by his colleagues. WILSON, himself, is rather unusual in politics. He isn't the type one thinks of as a "politician." He is quiet, serious, and not given to making speeches on the floor of the House merely to impress.

When he takes the floor it's because he has something to say and he says it simply clearly and forcibly. Actually WILSON had never been in active politics until he ran for Congress in 1940. Prior to that he had worked for other Republican candidates, but had never sought an elective office for himself. The amazing thing about his political career is that he jumped into politics as a Republican in a Democratic district. Even during the heavily Republican days of Harding, Coolidge, and Hoover, his district stayed Democratic. In 1932 the district went Democratic by a 20-thousand vote margin. Yet, 20 years later, in 1952, WILSON was carrying the district by 18 thousand votes as a Republican. In 1922, the Democratic candidate won 10 of the 15 counties; in 1952, WILSON won all the counties except Switzerland.

Hard work, perhaps, is one of the main contributing factors in WILSON'S successs. Hard work and a deep interest in the people and the problems of his district. "Most of my district is general farming," WILSON explains. "I try to know as much about the problems of the farmers and the others in the district as I possibly can." When it comes campaign time and other Members of Congress are making speeches dealing with world problems, WILSON is going about his district talking to as many people as he can. "I go to the stores, the garages, the filling stations, and any other place I may be able to talk to voters. If they have something bothering them I make a note of it and if it's something a congressional office can take care of, I'll try to get it done."

WILSON thinks that more and more people are becoming interested in politics, but there are still many more who should be showing an awareness in public service. After all, he sums up, politics is becoming a very important part of the lives of everyone. If we want to view it one way, a hard practical way, it affects the budget of every household. The income tax rate eats up a good share of a weekly paycheck and when something hits a person in the pocketbook they usually feel it. "The more active and interest more people take in their government, the better government we'll have."

WILSON is understandably proud of his own district. He points out that there are no pressure groups among his constituency. "I think that no other Member of Congress has a district where the people judge each issue on its merit. My people, after studying an issue, write me. They don't send in form letters prepared by some organization."

Actually, WILSON was born to politics. That is, if we hold to the tradition that our statesmen must come from log cabins. He was born in a log cabin in Huron, Lawrence County, Ind., in 1906. He lived on a farm during his early school years and after high school set out to earn enough money to pay his way through college. He worked for the Western Union Telegraph Co. as an electrician and as a brakeman on the New York Central and the Baltimore and Ohio Railroads. When he had $1,600 saved he entered the University of Indiana, completing his college work in 3 years. During his time in college he worked as an usher at football games, a cloakroom attendant at the library, tended furnaces during the winter and delivered the Indiana Daily Student in the early hours of the morning. Like every other successful man who has had to work his way through school, he now looks back on those days with no regret. He believes they were actually a part of his education.

Today he is married and has two children, Phillip Earl and Linda Sue. When Congress adjourns he'll be heading back to the 9th District, spending all his time visiting his 14 counties and meeting and talking to his constituents. "EARL WILSON," an oldtimer in Washington said recently, "is about the hardest working man in Congress—but he seems to love it." And EARL WILSON does—he loves every minute of it.

Divorcees Anonymous: The Organization Devoted to Rehabilitating Foundering Marriages

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. TIMOTHY P. SHEEHAN
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 18, 1956

Mr. SHEEHAN. Mr. Speaker, I should like to pay tribute to a fellow Chicagoan—Attorney Samuel M. Starr. After many years as a practicing lawyer specializing in divorce and thus having the opportunity to observe firsthand the often inconsequential reasons therefor, he decided to attempt to establish a remedial organization with the idea of preventing unnecessary divorces and hence Divorcees Anonymous was born. As the result of his efforts toward the organization of this group, he has had national publicity through radio and television and articles have appeared in the American magazine, Reader's Digest, Catholic Digest, and Good Housekeeping magazine, in addition to many articles which have appeared in many of the metropolitan and country newspapers. Mr. Starr's long and varied experience has placed him in an excellent position to be of inestimable service in assisting people to cope with the many aspects of this serious social problem and his organization has thus spread throughout much of our Nation, with the resultant high praise of our social workers. Strictly unselfish, he has brought happiness to many lives which were seemingly hopelessly involved and his case history file is full of dramatic ex-

periences and solutions of marriage difficulties by sharing experiences.

Mr. Starr, himself, has been happily married for 20 years and is the father of 3 children.

I quote a portion of the material which appeared in the Reader's Digest:

Divorcees Anonymous charges no fees; anyone can have the members' unstinted help simply for the asking. From a nucleus of five determined young women, membership reached the hundred mark the first month and has been mushrooming ever since.

Each member operates in her own fashion and pays any expenses incurred. No one has ever refused instant response to a call, day or night. The DA's usually operate in teams of two. However, one woman may work alone or a dozen be called in to buttress an argument. Members whose own past experiences most nearly match the case at hand take over; a member whose marriage broke up over money troubles, for example, is best equipped to advise a couple quarreling over finances.

Where possible, the DA's get husband and wife together for a joint discussion of their differences. Often, simply bringing an emotional problem out into the light makes the whole thing look pretty silly to the combatants.

"You'd be surprised," one DA told me, "what trivial arguments are carried into court. Getting couples to talk things over sensibly will check many divorces before they start. But once a husband or wife actually begins proceedings, a barrier is raised between them that may never be broken down.

"When one mate refuses to cooperate, the DA's work on the other. They lean heavily on their own unhappy experiences and show how different their lives might have been if they could only have had the kind of counsel they are giving now."

The Choice for Neutralists

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM S. MAILLIARD
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 18, 1956

Mr. MAILLIARD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an editorial appearing in the San Francisco Call-Bulletin on July 9, 1956. As our Ambassador of Goodwill, Vice President NIXON has spoken firmly and accurately about America's role in Asia.

The editorial follows:

THE CHOICE FOR NEUTRALISTS

The more one reflects on Vice President NIXON's speech at Manila, the more it emerges as one of the most significant expositions of American policy in this cold-war era.

Scorning needless diplomatic pussyfooting or expediency, NIXON clearly sketched the benevolent nature of American relations with smaller, weaker nations and contrasted it with the brutal policy of duplicity and tyranny of Communist imperialism.

Speaking as the personal representative of President Eisenhower, NIXON, citing chapter and verse from current history, warned the Asian countries they were balancing on the edge of disaster by relying on a self-deluding policy of neutralism.

While understanding the Asian yearning to be uncommitted to alliances, he said there can be no excuse for failing to recognize the reality of what the free world and the Communist world each has to offer.

On the one hand, there stands the United States and its allies dedicated to the dignity of man and the basic rights of all men.

On the other, there is the certainty of force and terror plus a record of oppression unparalleled in history.

Hurling the lie into the teeth of Red spokesmen who are trying to represent our offers of help to the Asian countries as a form of imperialism, NIXON pointed to the example of the Philippine Republic.

The Philippines are free, he said. They are independent and equal in their relations with the United States. That is what it means, he said, "to walk side by side with the United States of America."

Then NIXON read, name by name, the tragic list of Russia's victims ranging from Latvia to Tibet.

This is the kind of forthright talk needed in the struggle against Russian efforts to poison our relations with uncommitted nations.

These are the hard, indisputable facts that cannot be argued away, or twisted and perverted by the Communist rewritting of truth and history.

The so-called neutralist nations cannot continue to work both sides of the street by accepting American dollars and resources and at the same time cozying up to the Communists.

It will be a good thing if the NIXON speech signalizes a reappraisal of our attitude toward the neutralists and serves notice that we expect them to take a hard look at what the score is.

Address by Attorney Joseph G. Tomascik, of Wilkes-Barre

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 18, 1956

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address delivered by Attorney Joseph G. Tomascik, of Wilkes-Barre, on the occasion of the fifth annual SS. Cyril-Methodius Pilgrimage at Scranton on July 8, 1956, which was sponsored by the eastern district of the Slovak Catholic Federation of America:

Your Excellency, Bishop Hannan, Reverend Chairman, Right Reverend and Very Reverend Monsignori, Reverend Fathers, ladies and gentlemen, Pilgrims and friends, I have noted with interest what Father Polcha said about Slovakia and how one of the highlights of the week for Slovak people in the old country was to make a visit to the market place in the town square. Well, I have never been to Slovakia let alone to a Slovak market place, so that gives me cause to wonder why your committee invited me to deliver an address in the Slovak language. I am all the more amazed when I realize they could have selected one of the outstanding Slovak editors sitting at the press table in front of me. These men who are attending the annual convention of the Slovak Newspapermen's Association have a great many contacts with Slovakia and the Slovaks, and I'm sure they could speak to you in the Slovak language much more effectively than I. But on second thought, we do have something in common; they write the Slovak language newspapers and I read them. In fact, I believe I'm safe in saying that I'm probably the only fourth generation American who is a faithful subscriber and reader of Slovak language publications. In the folklore of advertising, that is considered a real "plug," and I hope that next year these editors send me free subscriptions, because buying so many newspapers does run into money.

But seriously, ladies and gentlemen, it is a great privilege for me to be asked to attend this banquet and to underscore in the mellifluous Slovak language the significance of this fifth annual SS. Cyril-Methodius Pilgrimage, sponsored by the Eastern District of the Slovak Catholic Federation of America.

I'm pleased to be here particularly because I come from Sacred Heart Parish in Wilkes-Barre where the first pastor was Rev. Joseph Murgas, that outstanding American-Slovak who was the organizer and first president of the organization sponsoring this pilgrimage. I'm proud to have been his altar boy as my father was before me, and I deem it an honor to pay tribute to his illustrious memory.

We in Wilkes-Barre and Luzerne County are proud indeed that the roots of the Slovak Catholic Federation of America were firmly planted by some of the outstanding Slovak pioneers in northeastern Pennsylvania. Father Murgas first organized the Federation in 1911 and Judge Seligman J. Strauss of the Luzerne County Court of Common Please approved the charter of your organization on December 30, 1912.

I took the trouble recently to look up the petition for incorporation of this society, and I find that the eight men who signed as the petitioners for incorporation were some of the outstanding Slovak leaders of a prior generation. Besides Father Murgas, who achieved international fame by his inventions in wireless telegraphy, there was Andrew V. Kozak one of the first Slovak undertakers in Wilkes-Barre and former president and treasurer of the First Catholic Slovak Union. Another signatory was Edmund Ujfallusy, a former deputy sheriff and interpreter of Luzerne County and founder of the Pennsylvania Slovak Union. The late Right Reverend Monsignor John S. Sobota, successor to Father Murgas at Sacred Heart Parish and former pastor of St. Joseph's Church, Nanticoke was also a petitioner, as was Michael Lapchak of Hazleton, former president of the Pennsylvania Slovak Union. Mr. Lapchak's tenure coincided with that of my late father, George Tomascik, who for 12 years served as president of the board of trustees of that organization. Another signatory was John Shigo, well known banker, industrialist and fraternalist from Freeland. Michael Vasil of Wilkes-Barre also signed the petition for incorporation as did Rev. Andrew Jurica, the sole survivor of this group, who was former pastor of St. John the Baptist Church, Pittston, and who last month celebrated the 50th anniversary of his ordination to the sacred priesthood.

These 8 men were the type of Slovak leaders in America more than 45 years ago who laid the foundation for the Slovak Catholic Federation, and they were among the prime movers for maintaining unsullied the magnificent Slovak record of accomplishment in the New World. To them and their colleagues must go the lion's share of the credit for enabling Catholic immigrants of Slovak extraction to evoke the favorable attention and notice of their fellow Americans.

It is significant indeed, that in this secular age when in public and private life the accent seems to be almost exclusively on materialism, more than 2,000 members of the Slovak Catholic Foundation have come long distance to attend this SS. Cyril-Methodius Pilgrimage at St. Anne's Monastery in Scranton. You have indicated that you know the value of spiritual exercises and your attendance at this pilgrimage testifies to your religious zeal. What a magnificent way to pay

tribute to the apostles of the Slovaks, SS. Cyril and Methodius. In fact, looking over this vast audience I am constrained to proclaim that you indeed are worthy successors of those intrepid saints and that you serve as remarkable prototypes of Cyril and Methodius in the United States of America. Just as Cyril and Methodius left their home in Thessalonica, Macedonia, and journeyed to the mountain homes along the Carpathian range to bring the word of God to your ancestors in old Slovakia, so you here in America, by participating in this pilgrimage, are the modern counterparts of these two intrepid apostles. America should be grateful that it has citizens of your stripe who in their private and public lives give such an appropriate consideration to matters of a spiritual nature.

Driving up to Scranton this afternoon with my good friend and prominent Slovak fraternalist, John J. Baloga, I was thinking about the motives that prompted the late Father Murgas and his colleagues to organize the Slovak Catholic Federation of America. The thought occurred to me that the prime motivating factor on the part of these early pioneers and Slovak leaders, was the realization of the importance of preserving the Catholic faith among Slovak immigrants in the United States. This idea was recently expressed very cogently by our Congressman from Luzerne County, the Honorable DANIEL J. FLOOD, who was the principal speaker at the 34th annual Slovak Day sponsored by the Slovaks of Wyoming Valley at Sans Souci Park last Wednesday, July 4.

Mr. FLOOD's address, I'm told, has been published in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD under date of July 5 and it would be worth while for every American of Slovak blood to read it and renew his pride in the Slovak contributions to America. Mr. FLOOD stated in his address, that when Slovak immigrants disembarked at Ellis Island by the thousands in the period between 1860 and 1895, "it was not just chance that saw them endowed with solid potentials for American citizenship." "One quality they had in abundance," said Mr. FLOOD, "and that was faith." Mr. FLOOD continued: "Religion for them was not an isolated phenomenon; their devotion to God was an integral part of their lives and the more than 300 parishes in America founded by Slovaks and their descendants serve as eloquent testimony to a rich spiritual heritage."

What a neat and concise delineation of the prime attributes of Slovak character. And it is the preservation of this faith that moved Father Murgas and the founders of this federation to lay the ground work for an organization that was destined to develop and flower into one of the illustrious ornaments on the tree of Slovak life in America. These men knew that in the tradition of SS. Cyril and Methodius a man to be called a good Slovak had first of all to be a real Christian—his first consideration must be for the preservation and development of the faith. And your presence here, ladies and gentlemen, in such large numbers and from such diverse sections of this great country of ours, constitutes shining proof that the organizers of this federation builded on sound foundations nearly half a century ago.

The second motive that Father Murgas and his coworkers had in founding this federation, was the preservation of Slovak national consciousness in the New World. They knew that after faith, it was consonant with Slovak character to preserve an honorable pride in, and a just regard for, Slovak national traditions. They were not jingoists, these early pioneers; they were not rabble rousers intent only on obtaining advantages for themselves and their own people at the expense of other ethnic groups. Far from it. They were Christian gentlemen who sought to inculcate in their followers in America a love of the Slovak character and loyalty to a proud Slovakian heritage. Just as the Irish are proud of St. Patrick, the Welsh pay honor to St. David and the Poles venerate St. Stanislaus, so did your illustrious leaders encourage their followers to proclaim with pride their high regard for their patron saints, Cyril and Methodius. Father Murgas and his coworkers realized that America was composed of many national strains, races and ethnic groups, and they honored them all for their contributions to the saga that is America. But they were concerned too, that the fine and magnificent thread of Slovak history in the United States should constitute an important stand in the tapestry of the land of Columbus.

And speaking of America brings to mind the third reason that Father Murgas and his followers had in organizing the Slovak Catholic Federation. They wanted to shape its members into the highest types of American citizens. They knew that a Slovak who was religious was bound to be a good American, a lover of freedom and proclaimer of liberty. They knew that faith and freedom were inseparable partners, and they were determined that this splendid Slovak heritage should be focused sharply in the United States through the instrumentality of the Slovak Catholic Federation of America.

And so, my dear pilgrims, you may justly hold your heads high and in humble pride be aware of the splendid tradition of faith and liberty contributed by your ancestors on their arrival in the United States. They have set an example worthy of emulation, and I pray that all of you may continue in your personal and public lives to merit the bountiful harvest which they so prodigally and tenderly sowed.

Grand Canyon Air Tragedy Not Caused by Congestion in Airspace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLAIR ENGLE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 18, 1956

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I insert in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial which will appear in the September issue of the monthly publication of the Aircraft Owners & Pilots Association, the AOPA Pilot. The Aircraft Owners & Pilots Association is the most active and effective organization speaking for the private, business, and pleasure pilot. This organization maintains a constant vigilance with respect to air safety and has tried to keep some semblance of good sense in the recommendations made by the special pleaders such as the Airline Pilots Association and the commercial airlines. Their comment, therefore, on the recent collision between the TWA and United airliners over Grand Canyon is especially meaningful.

This editorial clearly points out several things:

First, that there was no congestion in the airspace where this collision occurred.

Second, that the airline pilots and the airlines are trying to blame this wreck on the deficiencies of the air traffic control system, which they deliberately chose not to use, because these airplanes were not on a regular airway.

Third, that this collision did not result from the 2 airliners closing in on each other at 300 or 400 miles an hour, since both airliners were going in the same direction.

Fourth, that conceding that there can be improvement in the air traffic control system, this crash cannot be urged as very pertinent evidence in the case.

The editorial is as follows:

ANOTHER COLLISION

It has finally happened. Ironically, it has happened to two airline aircraft. Also ironically, the collision between that United Air Lines DC–7 and TWA Super Constellation happened under circumstances that has brought frowns to the faces of even the most pro-airline Government and congressional officials.

Unfortunately, it probably never will be known precisely what weather conditions were being flown in by each of these ill-fated airliners at the time of the collision. One or both might actually have been flying on instruments. One was known to be on an IFR flight plan, although the flight plan itself was meaningless, because the airplane was not on an airway or under the control of the air traffic control system. Or both might very well have been completely VFR, and just didn't see each other. In that miraculous collision between two airline convairs over Michigan City, Ind., in near-perfect weather not many months ago, by the greatest stroke of good luck both airplanes got down safely. And all four pilots involved testified they didn't see each other—although several passengers testified they saw the other plane in plenty of time to have avoided the collision.

This Grand Canyon tragedy, of course, is the worst to be expected from such circumstances. The chances are that, when the investigation has been completed, no one will every really know what actually happened. The best we'll have to go on will be educated guesses and deduction.

While AOPA has nothing but the greatest sympathy for all the dead and their families, and for the airlines involved themselves, we cannot sit idly by and ignore the irresponsible and grossly exaggerated public statements that hit the front pages within hours of the collision. Some of these came from Members of Congress who—unfortunately—were poorly informed.

But most came from the very people who know better—the airline pilots themselves. Spokesmen for the Air Line Pilots Association were quoted at length to the effect that this accident now proves beyond question that (1) airline pilots obviously no longer can be expected to look where they're going because the speeds of modern aircraft are so great, (2) that the amount of congestion has reached the critical stage, and (3) the air traffic control system, as they've been pointing out for so long, is so archaic, so decrepit that it somehow should have prevented this accident, but failed.

This kind of ax grinding, dishonest as it is, cannot go unanswered.

1. The facts indicate that both these airliners were going in the same general direction. Hence, "modern" as they were, their relative speeds were undoubtedly very low, and could hardly be used as an excuse for not looking where you're going.

2. If there ever was a part of the airspace that's uncongested, it's the airspace at 21,000 feet over the Grand Canyon. Frankly, this one baffled us too; AOPA had been waiting apprehensively for two airliners to tangle, but in some busy terminal area like Chicago, New York, or Los Angeles, where they tear around through space at excessive speeds, with the pilots frequently so busy inside the cockpit that nobody's looking out the windows.

3. While the air traffic control system is archaic, decrepit and whatever else the airline people want to brand it, the simple fact is that both these airliners over the Grand Canyon had deliberately chosen not to use the maximum safety of even that system, readily available to them. Both airliners were flying completely outside the control and jurisdiction of the ATC system—a fact the airline-pilot spokesman carefully chose to avoid. Backward as the ATC system may be, the fact is that it is precisely the system that is handling the world's heaviest volume of instrument traffic today, and doing it with a startling level of safety. It is this system that actually makes it possible for the very airlines that condemn it to survive and prosper.

And it is this very system that was working efficiently and available to both these airliners just a few miles to either side of their ill-fated course. Yet, the pilots of both airliners chose to fly outside that system, in uncontrolled airspace, and with no radio navigation aids on the course they chose to fly. Furthermore, one of these airliners apparently had been clearly warned of the presence of the other ship—and this warning was given by ATC controllers who did so only in an effort to be helpful, because they had no legal jurisdiction over those airliners flying off airways.

These unpleasant facts, then, would hardly seem to support the public statements of airline-pilot representatives. Nor do some others, about which AOPA has been concerned for years: Dangerously deficient cockpit visibility, an inexplicable lack of concern for a whole set of minimum safe standards of cockpit visibility drawn up by a group of airline and plane-manufacturing experts in 1952, but never adopted by the Civil Aeronautics Board (which also professes to be seriously concerned with the problem); the fact that the majority of airline aircraft cockpits in the air today do not even meet this minimum standard.

Nor can we ignore the fact that, only recently, the airlines' Washington representatives strongly opposed a CAB proposal to make flight recorders mandatory for public carrier aircraft. Such recorders, in these two airliners, probably would have "solved" this collision to a much greater degree than it can be solved.

AOPA feels the time has long passed for a careful, factual look at the causes behind near-misses and collisions involving airline aircraft. The causes of these hazards are well known. The action that should be taken is known; with a little guts we could get some prompt remedies. This is what it will take to solve these problems, not distorted irrelevant or untrue public statements.

Hon. Thurmond Chatham

SPEECH
OF
HON. WOODROW W. JONES
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 17, 1956

Mr. JONES of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I join with my colleagues of the House of Representatives in paying a tribute to the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina, Hon. THURMOND CHATHAM, who is leaving the Congress at the end of this session. He has without doubt, during his service here, established himself in the confidence and esteem of all the Members of this body. I regard him as an outstanding American who has rendered magnificent service to the people of our State and the Nation.

It has been a genuine pleasure to know Mr. CHATHAM personally and to have served with him in the Congress. As he retires to private life, I extend to him my very best wishes for continued happiness and success.

Bank Mergers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY J. LATHAM
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 18, 1956

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Speaker, I would like to set forth in the Appendix of the RECORD, for the benefit of my colleagues, a very able discussion of the problem of bank mergers by Mr. Arthur T. Roth.

Mr. Roth is president of the Franklin National Bank and an active civic leader of his community. He is a director of Long Island University, Abilities, Inc., which is a rehabilitation center for the handicapped, a director of the Mercy Hospital, Rockville Centre, and of the Long Island Rail Road.

The discussion by Mr. Roth follows:

FACTS BEHIND THE URGE TO MERGE

(By Arthur T. Roth)

How much government regulation should there be in banking? Who should do that regulating?

These 2 questions have been asked by 2 congressional committees and many lawyers, economists, bankers, and businessmen in the past few months. Let me discuss them in terms of a specific bank.

Banks are, I believe, as closely supervised by public authority as any other segment of regulated private enterprise. With this I have no quarrel because, as you well know, our banking institutions in large measure furnish the lifeblood of commerce and their operations, both nationally and locally, touch every community.

Being so closely supervised, however, banks fall outside of the sphere of the ordinary business corporation which has little or no government supervision. Thus it seems to me that agencies charged with the supervision of banks, with their long years of experience, are best able to cope with the problems which may arise concerning the banks, whether it be the matter of making loans or the matter of consolidations, rather than any other agency of the Federal Government.

The economic forces which are embraced within the banking sphere are of delicate adjustment and must be handled with the utmost care in order that they not become unbalanced. The banking agencies are the most unlikely, in the weighing of the principles governing the antitrust laws, to upset the balance in the economic picture.

Certainly, the application of the rigid percentage of the market rule developed by the courts and the Department of Justice as the test of illegality under section 3 of the Clayton Act, if applied by an agency not experienced in the field of banking, could well bring about results inconsistent with a sound and efficient banking system.

This percentage of the market rule, in my opinion, does not take into consideration the economic necessities which govern banking mergers. These include the consolidation of a weak bank with a strong bank to protect the depositors of a community; the consolidation of small banks in order to form an institution capable of meeting the banking demands of a rapidly expanding community; the consolidation of two small banks to meet the competition of a large third bank, etc.

In gaging these situations, the banking agencies with their far-flung network of examiners and supervisors and their experience are more able and more fully equipped to pass upon the consolidations of banks than would be the Department of Justice.

I certainly think that mere market share or percentage of the market in a purely quantitative sense cannot be reasonably said to be determinative of whether there should be a merger in the banking field. Any lessening of competition in the quantitative sense must, I submit, be weighed against (1) the increased effectiveness of the remaining competition, and (2) the strengthening of the banking system in the way of the diversification of services that are rendered to the public. If the latter two considerations outweigh the first, then the merger should be permitted. Whether these considerations in a given case would be controlling is within the particular competence of the banking agencies charged by law with the maintaining of an efficient banking system.

My conclusion on this point is supported by a staff report made to a subcommittee of the House Judiciary Committee in September of 1952. As a result of their study, they suggested remedial legislation which would place jurisdiction of mergers and consolidations of banks as well as the acquisition of the assets of one bank by another in the Federal agencies having jurisdiction over banks, that is, the Comptroller of the Currency, the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, and the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation. I think their conclusion is sound and that the policy underlying it should be adopted.

Any of the bills pending before the Judiciary Committee of the Senate on this subject, if enacted into law, could cause great danger in the case of an individual bank which might spread to others. I have in mind the consolidation of two banks, the depositors of the two banks becoming the depositors of one. Subsequently, some action by the Department of Justice, not understood by the average depositor, ultimately leads to rumors and a run on the bank and on other banks. We certainly do not wish to cause a repetition of any of the runs which occurred in the 1930's. In this connection, it must be remembered that banks are handling the money of depositors. They are not like the ordinary corporations which, in the last analysis, are principally involved with stockholders' interests.

I understand it is said that one of the chief evils resulting from bank mergers is that the larger banks resulting from mergers are not interested in making loans to small businessmen. The experience of my bank shows it was its mergers that in large part enabled it to furnish local financing to small businessmen in the rapidly expanding community that it serves.

I joined the Franklin National Bank in 1934. At that time Nassau County, in which my bank is located, was largely a farming or residential area of large estates and was known as the bedroom of New York. There was practically no industry. Nassau County was gradually growing and between 1940 and 1950 became the fastest growing of the larger counties of the Nation. It has continued to grow and now has a population of 1,100,000. Industry moved into the county or new industry started. As this tremendous growth took place, the demand for banking service also grew and the small banks were not equipped to meet the situation.

Franklin National Bank today is 61st in size, among the commercial banks of the

Nation. In comparison, it ranked 1,423 in 1939, 643 in 1947, and 200 in 1951. We now have deposits of almost $400 million, as compared with about $400,000 when I joined the bank in 1934. At that time we had 1 office in Franklin Square; today we have 20 offices, all in Nassau County, with 2 more expected soon.

We anticipated the demand for adequate banking facilities and partly through mergers attempted to meet the demands.

One of the demands was the borrowing requirements caused by the tremendous business and industrial growth, a growth in which small business played a significant part. By 1947 there were approximately 11,800 business firms in the county. In 1955 there were 25,000 business firms in the county—an increase of 111 percent. The great majority of these firms are small.

Most of all, a dynamic, growing bank provides the small-business man with working capital when he needs it. His money is not tied up in accounts receivable but is available for expansion or other business purposes when needed.

It is our policy that the officers of the merged banks remain as officers of Franklin, operating the branch offices, thus giving the community the benefit of their local experience. Their powers have been expanded enabling them to use a broader discretion than they have previously.

The facilities of the merged banks have been modernized and improved which, in turn, has caused many of the other banks competing with our branches to improve their banking methods and facilities. The result is that where prior to the merger there were several banks in a community operating in rather lackadaisical fashion, they are now actively competing for business.

Franklin's loans from 1950 to the end of 1955 increased 286.2 percent. This great growth in loans is due to the fact that many of the banks merged with it were limited as the amount of loans they could make because of their small capital and because of former managements' reluctance to enter actively into the loan field. A few specific instances illustrate the contrast between small bank and the combined bank credit extension situations. Whereas only three of the banks merged with Franklin National could, at the time of consolidation, have made loans in excess of $100,000—and none could loan $200,000—the combined organization now has outstanding many substantial loans of more than $100,000.

I do not think that the number of competing institutions is necessarily the only criterion for gaging the competition in a field. It is my firm belief that despite the drop in the actual number of banks which might be considered to be in competition in Nassau County, competition among banks within that county and with banks outside of the county has become much more keen and active, with consequent benefits to the residents of Nassau and surrounding counties.

I would further say that competition cannot be properly judged by considering only competition between banks. Franklin competes not only with three types of banks—giant commercial and savings banks in New York City, large commercial and savings banks on Long Island, and the small commercial banks on Long Island, but it also faces serious competition from savings and loan associations in and around Nassau County—with competition for savings accounts coming from as far as California. And we are also in competition with the large insurance companies and the many credit organizations that operate throughout the country.

From the foregoing, I can only conclude that Franklin's mergers have helped to strengthen competition in the banking field in Nassau County and have immeasurably benefited the community—especially the small-business man. I also conclude that the case of Franklin furnishes adequate proof of the proposition that mergers in the banking field should be left within the province of those bank regulatory agencies that, through long experience gained in the administration of their governing statutes, are best equipped to properly evaluate conditions under which mergers should be permitted in banking.

Certainly, on the basis of the recent history of banking in Nassau County, no argument can be made that a nonbanking agency should have jurisdiction over mergers of banks for the purpose of preserving sound competition.

The public interest in competition in the banking field, commensurate with a sound and efficient banking system, can adequately be protected by the bank regulatory agencies under appropriate statutory standards.

A Mission for Nixon

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHIL WEAVER
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 18, 1956

Mr. WEAVER. Mr. Speaker, may I call to the attention of my colleagues two fine editorials from the New York Times under date of June 24 and July 9, 1956, entitled "A Mission for NIXON," and "Our Taiwan Pledge Stands."

These comments confirm again that Vice President NIXON has the ability and prestige to act as the personal emissary of the President on missions of good will throughout the world. I commend them to you for reading:

[From the New York Times of June 24, 1956]

A MISSION FOR NIXON

Vice President NIXON has several times been called upon to undertake missions of what is called good will. The newest call is from the Philippines, and Mr. NIXON and his wife will go there to represent the United States at the July 4 celebrations of the 10th anniversary of the establishment of the independent Philippine Republic. This mission can be of great importance, and Americans will wish the Vice President the highest possible degree of success.

It must be confessed, with deep regret, that our relationships with the Philippines in recent months have been less satisfactory than we want them to be. Philippine President Ramon Magsaysay is a stanch friend of this country, and that very fact has helped to inspire a sort of anti-American campaign in Manila whose object, in part certainly, is to embarrass the President.

The United States has contributed to the discontent in the Philippines through the failure to take more prompt and decisive action on the matter of American bases in the archipelago, and also through the failure, in some congressional quarters, to understand some of the more sensitive aspects of the Philippine-American trade relationship. Recently there has also been the complaint voiced in Manila that the United States has neglected or bypassed the Philippines in its eagerness to aid or to woo some other Asian states such as Thailand, India, and Indonesia.

This last charge will not bear scrutiny when the entire Asian picture is put into focus. Our assistance has been large and will, we confidently hope, continue to be so.

But relatively minor irritants can have an unfortunate effect on the attitudes of peoples where there is inadequate intercommunication and possibly an inadequate basis of understanding. That seems to have been the case in respect to the Philippines.

It seems appropriate that the United States should be represented by its highest available public officer at this celebration. The Filipinos will be the first to appreciate the propriety of this international gesture, and it was wise and right to make it. From that vantage point Mr. NIXON has a chance to do a solid job in representing his country and contributing to the solution of vexatious problems. He should do it well.

[From the New York Times of July 9, 1956]

OUR TAIWAN PLEDGE STANDS

The high spot of Vice President NIXON'S visit to Taiwan was his delivery of a letter from President Eisenhower to President Chiang Kai-shek. The timing was good and the contents were right.

There has been loose talk lately about a "modified" or "more flexible" American position in respect to Red China. President Eisenhower made it plain that this cannot involve any violation of our pledge to support Free China. We are not underwriting any sort of adventuring in the Far East, but we will not betray our friends and allies.

This is significant, not only on Taiwan but elsewhere in Asia. The recent propaganda move of Red Chinese Foreign Minister Chou En-lai was more than a bland offer to Taiwan to surrender. All through it, directed at the overseas Chinese and at other Asians, was the suggestion that the United States was a worthless and faithless friend.

The Eisenhower letter is a direct answer to those implications. We have made our Formosan commitment and we propose to stand by it. In the limited sense this is part of our strategic defense planning in the western Pacific. It is also part of our commitment to human freedom. We do not propose to retreat on either front.

Mr. NIXON also made it plain at his Taiwan press conference that we are not bemused by a spate of Communist soft words from Moscow or Peiping. Deeds are what count and the deeds have not been forthcoming. There has been no Communist move to permit the free unification of the divided countries. There has been no halt to subversion and infiltration. Chou En-lai's own utterances represent an intensification, rather than an abatement, of the cold war against liberty.

If the people of Taiwan, who are doing a splendid job of building a free state, take heart and comfort from the President's words the message will have served an admirable purpose. And if other Asians are led to understand that we do not propose to make a compromise between what we consider to be right and wrong our own position will have been enhanced.

Mr. NIXON said the right things in Manila and Saigon. He did the right thing in Taiwan. His mission should redound to the honor of his country and to the cause of free men in Asia.

Polish Patriots Battle for Freedom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 16, 1956

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, Polish patriots in their zeal for free-

dom risk death. The Communist slaughter of Polish workmen at Poznan has fired the imagination of free people everywhere. It has hastened the day when Poland will again be free. Right must eventually prevail even though at this time it seems remote.

A just God rules the universe and right will conquor the evil forces of might.

Mr. Speaker, it is obvious to the whole world that the people of Poland are living under intolerable conditions. The Communist system which has been forcibly imposed on those gallant people is the result, as I see it, of the nefarious Yalta Agreement which sanctioned the division of the world and delivered Poland to Godless Communist Russia. The United States cannot shirk its responsibility for its part in that agreement. History is bound to indicate that our leaders who made our beloved country a part of the Yalta Pact failed dismally to protect the good name of our country and the unfortunate people who are now behind the Iron Curtain.

We have a moral duty to resort to diplomatic action in support of the Polish patriots to the end that they may live under a government which is based upon Christian principles.

Mr. Speaker, the Department of State has been slow to recognize the moral issue involved in the battle for freedom in Poland. The time has come for this Congress likewise to speak out in support of a people who demand their freedom.

Agricultural Chemicals Reduce Insect Damage to Crops

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT D. HARRISON
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 18, 1956

Mr. HARRISON of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, because of a recent infestation of grasshoppers in Nebraska, I am intensely interested in an article from the Wall Street Journal. From the beginning of time, man in his struggle for survival has been forced to fight the weather and insects. While there has been little he can do about the weather, he now has many new tools, in the form of agricultural chemicals, to combat his arch competitor for food supplies—insects.

Until recently, we have had hardly more than our hands to swat the mischievous mosquito or aggravating and germ-carrying housefly. For our crops we could only stand by helplessly as the armies of various insects rendered them unproductive or systematically devoured them acre by acre.

Dr. Leonard A. Scheele, United States Surgeon General, has stated:

> Some 5 million lives have been saved and 100 million illnesses prevented since 1942 in this country by the uses of insecticides.

While no similar statement has been made on a world basis, one can imagine the benefits which have been derived from the use of insecticides in public health.

In the agricultural field, where bugs had been taking a multibillion-dollar toll annually, new chemicals are now being used to control infestations and reduce the unit cost of production. The efficient farmer is finding these tools invaluable.

As you know, I am a member of the Agriculture Committee and represent a State which is predominantly dependent on agriculture. We have had testimony before the committee telling of infestations throughout the United States which are threatening some of our major crops.

In the July 17 issue of the Wall Street Journal, Mr. Robert Selleck has written an excellent, thought-provoking article about crop-destroying insects and what is being done to reduce the amount of damages caused by them.

Under permission to revise and extend my remarks in the Appendix, I want to include the article written by Mr. Selleck. I am sure this will be of interest to all of us who represent agricultural areas.

The article follows:

BUG BATTLE—INSECT ARMIES, SWOLLEN BY WET WEATHER, CHEW UP $4 BILLION OF CROPS—APHIDS, BORERS, GRASSHOPPERS INCREASE IN MANY STATES; INSECTICIDE MAKERS PROFIT—HITCHHIKING VIA BIG BOMBER

(By Robert Selleck)

It looks like a good year for bugs—not so good, perhaps, for man, the insects' arch competitor for food supplies.

Staccato slapping at mosquitoes is aggravating suburbanites from Long Island to Los Angeles. Dallas homeowners are plagued by a lawn-destroying grubworm. Considerably more serious are infestations of various kinds of insect pests that this year threaten crops and livestock in many parts of the country. Even if the bugs do no more than normal damage, their chewing, sucking, and biting will cause more than $4 billion damage by the end of the year. Chances are, though, this year's losses will be heavier than usual, partly because of the wet, cool weather in many parts of the Nation.

The bug battle isn't limited to any one section. Fruit and vegetable growers in Florida are fretting about the reappearance of the Mediterranean fruitfly for the first time in a quarter century. Grasshoppers are threatening fields in California, Texas, and Oklahoma. Boll weevils are crawling through some parts of the Cotton Belt in increasing numbers. And sugarcane and corn borers are attacking cane and corn in Louisiana, Illinois, and Iowa.

SEVEREST ATTACK IN YEARS

Final extent of this year's insect damage will depend on weather and the success of control measures. But Agriculture Department officials say signs during the spring and early summer indicate 1956 will see the severest attack by a variety of insects in recent years.

The man-bug relationship has been a close, generally unhappy, one throughout recorded history. Accounts of ravages by grasshoppers or locusts, biologically the same insect, are found in the Bible. The Old Testament book of Joel, for instance, gives a vivid description of a locust plague. "The land is as the Garden of Eden before them and behind them a desolate wilderness; yea, and nothing shall escape them." Bugs often have been grimly fascinating to man; many a science-fiction tale has been constructed on a theory that the insect kingdom might someday oust man from his dominant role on the globe.

Nobody knows, of course, how many insects there are in the world or how much damage they do. But were the bug population figures available, they would be staggering. University of Illinois surveys have turned up 65 million insects, on the average, per acre of forest soil in the State. The Department of Agriculture figures insect damage in the United States averages more than $4 billion a year, roughly divided between actual crop losses by farmers of $3.6 billion and control measure costs of $400 million.

Actually, nobody even knows precisely how many different kinds of insects are hopping, flying and crawling about in the world. More than 686,000 species have been described and named, but the classification work goes right on at the rate of 6,000 to 7,000 more insect species a year. In addition there are some 9,000 species of ticks and mites, which aren't true insects. (Spiders aren't true insects, either. They have eight legs; true insects have only six.)

HOUSEFLY GENERATIONS

Insects' tremendous reproductivity is one reason for the havoc they can cause. If all descendants of one pair of common houseflies lived and reproduced normally throughout one summer season, the total would be 191,000,000,000,000,000,000 flies. The cabbage aphid, averaging 41 young per female, has 16 generations between March 31 and October in New York State. If all lived, the descendants of one female aphid would total 1,560,000,000,000,000,000,000,000.

Entomologists estimate that some 10,000 species of insects in the United States do important enough damage, mostly to crops and gardens, to be called enemies of man. By this standard, many of the others are neutrals, although a good many are beneficial—by preying on other pests, helping pollinate plants and the like.

Main weapons in the constant battle against bugs are sprays or dusting compounds, parasites and breeding of plant strains more resistant to insect damage. Weather probably is man's biggest helper in keeping down insect populations because it affects their life cycles. Wet, cool weather generally boosts insect population—but not always—while hot, dry weather pares bug numbers.

But weather and insects' natural enemies—birds, other insects and some animals—would never keep bug populations in check, especially in agricultural areas. "Man's problem has been to find means of holding (insect) invasions in check," explains Dr. J. C. Gaines, extension entomologist at Texas A. & M. "Where natural controls are not able to do this, man must seek what might be properly termed emergency measures."

ONE MAN ENTHUSIASTIC

Controlling insects this year will mean brisk business for makers of agricultural chemicals and insecticides, about the only folks who benefit from bug ravages. In 1955, farmers bought $350 million of agricultural chemicals, 12 percent more than in 1954, says Lea S. Hitchner, executive secretary of the National Agricultural Chemicals Association. This is by no means the total spent on bug killers, as it does not include spending for such diverse things as insect repellants bought by fishermen and rose sprays used by backyard gardeners.

"Our sales are running at a terrific clip: last year's sales were up 25 percent over 1954 and this year promises to be even better," says C. M. Meadows, sales manager for Southwest Sprayer & Chemical Co. and one man who can get enthusiastic about insect hordes.

This should be one of the best years in history for the insecticide industry, adds A. C. Gunter, Dallas sales manager for Hercules Powder Co., which makes chemicals used by insecticide manufacturers. "Based on insect surveys for this year, I don't see how we can help but do well."

Even an insect infestation isn't an unmixed blessing for insecticide makers, if the bug happens to be a new one. Finding new chemicals, or perhaps adapting existing pesticides to new uses, is a costly, continuing problem for makers of bug killers. In addition, some bugs develop an immunity to insecticides used on them for several seasons.

The spotted alfalfa aphid now damaging crops in several States is a good example of a bug that popped up suddenly in this country. According to Agriculture Department officials, the aphid hitchhiked to the United States 2 years ago from the Mediterranean Sea aboard an Air Force bomber. It was first discovered in central New Mexico. Since then it has caused major damage to alfalfa crops in California, Utah, Texas, Oklahoma, and Kansas, with lesser infestations reported in Nebraska, Louisiana, and Missouri. At the latest check, the pest had skipped into Florida.

Oklahoma stands to lose half or more of this year's alfalfa crop because of the aphid. Cotton County, first in the State to detect the spotted pest last year, reports 100 percent destruction of a 10,000-acre alfalfa crop. Between 25 percent and 30 percent of the entire State's crop had to be plowed up this year, while another 25 percent has been damaged enough to affect the yield and life of the crop. Aphids attack alfalfa by sucking out the sap, thus killing lower leaves and damaging other foliage.

SMALL BUT HARDY

Aphids are tiny but hardy. They're smaller than a gnat and multiply rapidly in temperatures of 100° or more. They also can withstand temperatures as low as 5°. Many chemicals will kill aphids but only three—parathion, malathion, and dometon—can be applied to alfalfa that is to be used for feed, since other chemicals injure livestock. These insecticides are relatively expensive, costing from $2.20 to $3 an acre to spray.

This year, as at many times in the past, the familiar grasshopper is plaguing farmers. John C. White, Texas commissioner of agriculture, says State and Federal entomologists will supervise spraying of 4 million acres of land found heavily infested during a 'hopper egg count. Grasshopper damage totaled $31 million annually from 1925 to 1949 in the 23 Western States, estimates John Durkin, extension entomologist at New Mexico A. & M. College. Estimates of this year's probable damage run as high as $35 million.

Among the most spectacular examples of insect invasion in United States history were the migrating swarms of Rocky Mountain grasshoppers that blackened the Great Plains States in the 1870's. Witnesses said the hoppers left fields as bare as if they had been burned. Only holes in the ground showed where plants had been. Trees were stripped of leaves and the hungry insects even devoured green bark. One observer in Nebraska said one of the swarms averaged half a mile in height and was 100 miles wide and 300 miles long. It has been estimated that 124 billion hoppers were migrating in that one destructive swarm.

WEEVILS AND BORERS

In the corn and cotton country, farmers are battling ravenous weevils and borers. North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia, and Louisiana report twice as many weevils attacking their cotton as last year, while several other States show smaller increases in the weevil population. Predicted damage figures for this year run as high as $300 million.

Boll weevils take a big bite out of the cotton crop every year. Damage totaled $245 million in 1954 and even more last year, according to the National Cotton Council in Memphis. In some years the loss has run as high as $700 million.

In the Midwest, corn borers are gnawing busily, and destructively, in waist-high corn. "The situation looks serious now, particularly in eastern Illinois," reports Dr. H. B. Petty, extension entomologist at the University of Illinois. "Corn borer damage this year may total $60 million, about the same as last year," he adds. "The borer population was large to start with this year," Dr. Petty explains. "And they've had good weather. The moths and the larvae (which actually do the damage) like calm, warm, moist weather, and they've had it so far."

A second generation of corn borers will emerge next fall, to attack mature corn. The only chemical weapon effective against the borers is DDT; hot, dry winds also are fatal to the larvae, but in many places such weather didn't come in time this summer, farm officials report.

FRUITFLY IN FLORIDA

In Florida, the reappearance of the dreaded Mediterranean fruitfly is tabbed "dangerous but not disastrous." Because the fly appeared late in the citrus season, Agriculture Department officials feel sure they can control the pest. The fly was discovered April 21 in a grove near Miami's International Airport. More recently, the fly turned up 170 miles away in the heart of the State's rich citrus fruit belt in Polk County.

Florida fruit growers also are worried about a burrowing nematode, a small worm that damages tree roots. Scientists are looking for a cure, but so far the only treatment is destroying infected trees, in hopes the worm won't spread.

In addition to the common sprays and dusts, bug battlers sometimes turn to biological controls—introducing harmless insects to prey on harmful ones. The ladybird beetle, for example, is the natural enemy of every spotted alfalfa aphid that crawls.

Recently some parasitic wasps, whose only hosts are the spotted aphids, were obtained from the Mediterranean region. The parasites are being tested to see if they will destroy aphids in this country. Three other species of parasite wasps are being bred at the University of California for aphid control and experiment are underway aimed at breeding a parasite called trichogramma that will help control the cane borer in Louisiana.

Wheel Club of Wilkes-Barre Performing Commendable Public Relations Job

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 18, 1956

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial which appeared in the Wilkes-Barre Record on Monday, July 16, which commends the Wheel Club of Wilkes-Barre for its outstanding promotion of the Giants' Despair Hill Climb as well as the Brynfan Tyddyn Road Race which will take place during a 3-day period this month:

The Wheel Club, in making possible a "bigger and better" annual Giants' Despair Hill Climb and Brynfan Tyddyn Road Race, is doing a commendable public relations job of importance for the community.

This is illustrated by the announcement that among "name" participants in this year's 3-day sportscar event, Thursday, Friday, and Saturday, will be two of America's foremost drivers. They are Jack McAfee, Manhattan Beach, Calif., and Carroll Shelby, of Texas. The two are coming here direct from California to drive cars of the "bombshell" variety entered by west coast industrialist John Edgar, Encino, Calif.

Entry of cars from the coast is noteworthy in itself. Of additional significance is the fact that Wilkes-Barre's annual sportscar attraction draws the favorable attention of industrialists. Year to year, names like Du Pont, Fageol, and others can be found on the entry list. As the hill climb and road races grow, even more can be expected to visit Wilkes-Barre.

As a major moral and financial supporter of the annual event, the Wheel Club, therefore, is to be congratulated. Membership in this booster organization is open to the general public, and is being welcomed. In addition to receiving a number of privileges in connection with the hill climb and races, members will have the satisfaction of knowing they are doing an important job for the community.

Huge GI Education Program Was a Sound and Solid Idea

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES A. VANIK
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 18, 1956

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, the GI bill of rights which soon will expire has constituted one of the finest investments this Government has made to increase the productivity and the quality of its citizens. By reason of this legislation, millions of young men were permitted to receive an education which has undoubtedly qualified them for better positions and more useful citizenship. It is regrettable that this fine program should be coming to a close.

This Congress might very well consider the gap that will occur in educational training upon the completion of this GI bill of rights program. Are we sure that the private training program remaining will be adequate to do the task that lies ahead? Are we equipped to keep pace with the development of education and training in other parts of the world, particularly those in the Soviet orbit? With the struggle between communism and democracy now shifting to the educational front, are we certain that we can stay ahead?

Mr. Speaker, I commend the attention of the House to the editorial in the Cleveland Press of July 12, 1956, entitled "Huge GI Education Program Was a Sound and Solid Idea.":

HUGE GI EDUCATION PROGRAM WAS A SOUND AND SOLID IDEA

The largest educational program of its kind a government ever has undertaken expires this month. It is the GI bill of rights, under which nearly half the millions who served in the Armed Forces in World War II will have had some kind of schooling or on-the-job training at Government expense.

It has cost $14,500,000,000 all told. But the Government probably never spent that much to better advantage.

The benefits to the veterans are obvious. They have had training a large majority probably could not have got on their own. That training has enabled them to make a better living.

But the benefits to the Nation also have been important. The skills these veterans have learned have made them more productive, more useful citizens, at a time when their country has needed trained men more than ever before. And their skills will be contributing to the national economy for a long time to come; the average World War II veteran still is under 40.

There was some sentiment at war's end for large cash handouts. The movement for large-scale pensions arises periodically, as it did only recently. But neither of these methods of assistance to veterans could have helped either the veterans or the Nation anywhere near as much as has the GI bill, which was based on the eminently sound concept of helping people to help themselves.

The Success of Any Small-Business Enterprise Is Absolutely Dependent Upon the Vigorous Enforcement of the Antitrust Laws

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 29, 1956

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, there are about 4 million small-business men in our country today. They are the backbone of our economy. I was very interested, therefore, when I received a letter from George J. Burger, vice president, National Federation of Independent Business, questioning the accuracy of some of the arguments put forward in a booklet being distributed by the United States Chamber of Commerce. This booklet is titled "So You're Going Into Business." Mr. Burger says:

The part that interests us in the subject matters outlined in the booklet is the statement that the contributing reason for the failure of 8 out of 10 small businesses is the result of "lack of management know-how."

It doesn't make much difference how efficient small business may be, or how well financed they may be—if these (antitrust) laws are ignored, or there is weakness in the enforcement, it then means certain destruction to small business of this Nation.

I am going to include here for the information of my colleagues the letter by Mr. Burger because of the interesting comments he makes on the booklet being distributed by the chamber of commerce.

When one reads the publications of the United States Chamber of Commerce it becomes clear why the small-business men of the country have felt it necessary to establish a great organization like the National Federation of Independent Business to represent them nationally.

The letter follows:

NATIONAL FEDERATION
OF INDEPENDENT BUSINESS,
Washington, D. C., July 18, 1956.

Hon. FRANK THOMPSON, Jr.,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: Knowing of your sincere interest in the welfare of independent and small business, I noted with considerable interest the statement that appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of July 17, Appendix, page A5581, that the United States Chamber of Commerce has distributed a booklet to all Members of the United States Senate titled, "So You're Going Into Business."

The part that interests us in the subject matters outlined in the booklet is the statement that the contributing eason for the failure of 8 out of 10 small businesses is the result of lack of management knowhow.

Those of us in small business—by that I mean actively owning and operating independent businesses—and then again, those of us who are accredited representatives of independent small business very often have heard the same comment made in opposition to legislation that would protect the business life of independent business—those who are already in their own businesses.

In reviewing the subject matters enumerated in the booklet I find little or no attention given to the principal and main subject matter that is most important for those already in business or for those who are going into their own businesses. I am referring to antitrust laws as to their enforcement, both at the national and local level.

I am calling to your attention a conference that I held with Dr. Arthur Burns, head of the President's Cabinet Committee on Small Business, and also, I understand, economic adviser to the President, as outlined in my letter which appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD July 6, 1956, Appendix, page A5309. I think it is well to note that part of the letter as it applies to the No. 1 subject—the heart of success or failure for small business, and particularly for those who are entering their own business:

"ANTITRUST

"We know from practical experience of owning and operating an independent business establishment that the key to success or failure of a small-business enterprise, whether at the production or distribution level, rests largely in the enforcement of these major laws to protect the free-enterprise system.

"We believe there is need for strengthening amendments to these laws, such as is proposed in the present Congress, which will curb deliberate and continual violations of antitrust laws. We find that fines are no deterrent.

"It doesn't make much difference how efficient small business may be, or how well financed they may be—if these laws are ignored, or there is weakness in the enforcement, it then means certain destruction to small business of this Nation.

"As a help also in this direction, the local United States Government attorneys should be utilized in detecting violations at the local level.

"To bring about impartial, sincere, and vigorous enforcement of the antitrust laws it is our belief that the Antitrust Division of the Department of Justice should receive increased appropriations, earmarked for antitrust enforcement. Through this competent personnel would be attracted, which would result in the department continuously being staffed with well-informed personnel having full knowledge of our economic situation.

"The procedure in the Federal Trade Commission should be reviewed, and the agency should confine itself to major economic cases or questions before the Commission, so that relief could be secured at the local level for small business through the free-enterprise system. This agency, too, should receive increased appropriations, which would attract competent personnel, resulting in the agency continuously being staffed with well-informed personnel having full knowledge of our economic situation."

The other subjects, in order, which were brought to the attention of Dr. Burns at the confefence were: the Congressional Small Business Committees, Small Business Administration, Taxes, Government in Business, Tariffs, Government Forms, and Labor.

In the booklet of the United States Chamber it states as a recommendation, item No. 3: "Buying. Goods well bought are half sold." Well, there can't be any argument on that. That is the reason why you and 392 other Members of the House recently voted for the needed amendment to the Robinson-Patman Act, which would bring about that condition that is recommended, so as to protect present small business and those going into business, to see that they get a fair and equal price from their supplier.

Another comment in the booklet is: "The successful merchant is the man who gives good value for the dollar and plays fair with everybody." We will go along with that 100 percent provided the supplier plays fair with all his customers, and not just a favored few.

I think it is most necessary that the correct information be conveyed and made a matter of public record in the way of guidance for those already in the business world, and more important—for those we are vitally interested in who may be going into their own business.

I trust that you can find it convenient to place this letter in the RECORD.

Sincerely yours,

GEORGE J. BURGER,
Vice President.

Culture and the Classics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD D. DONOHUE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 13, 1956

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to include a very timely, and indeed challenging, editorial entitled "Habits of Study and the Classics," which appeared in the June 6, 1956, issue of the Worcester (Mass.) Evening Gazette.

This very interesting article graphically reminds us that true intellectual growth and depth is fostered by study of the old classics which is a wise lesson that could be profitably learned by modern students and inspired by our educational institutions.

This is a scientific age, but its productivity will be lost unless it is continuously governed and directed by a people endowed with and appreciative of the truth of Christian culture. All hail to Dr. Joslin.

The article follows:

HABITS OF STUDY AND THE CLASSICS

A fine old gentleman speaker at Leicester Junior College's commencement exercises the other day, had some things to say about studies and studying which today's students could profitably heed.

He is Dr. Elliott P. Joslin, of Boston, the noted diabetes specialist, who got his own diploma from Leicester Academy just 70 years ago.

In his student days, Dr. Joslin was taught the value of memory and habit in the learning process. Every weekend he reviewed all the Latin and Greek he had studied that week.

It wasn't enough either, merely to do each daily lesson. He found that another 15 minutes spent in reviewing it often resulted in raising his mark from a C to a B. He discovered, too, that giving just another 5 minutes to a lesson almost guaranteed a B or an A. So he used to make that time

under the flickering arc lights of the old Worcester Station on his way home to Oxford from Leicester.

Habits of study are important, of course, as today's students, surrounded by endless distractions, are discovering. But what you study is significant, too.

In this regard, Dr. Joslin was a student of the classics. He surprised his audience by quoting at length, from memory, passages of Cicero's famous Cataline oration.

Men like Dr. Joslin, who have made important contributions to society, are refreshing reminders of the importance of the classics. It is deplorable that today these studies have fallen into disfavor.

Ours is a scientific age. But what is science and what are scientists without the broadened intellectual horizons opened by a study of the classics? What will American culture be 50 or 100 years hence without the influence of classical studies, which foster affection for humanity, skill in the use of language, and more than passing appreciation of art, literature, philosophy, and government?

Airport Meanderings

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PETER F. MACK, JR.
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 18, 1956

Mr. MACK of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial which appeared in the Washington Evening Star, Thursday, July 12, 1956, concerning sorely needed airport facilities for the Nation's Capital. The article follows:

AIRPORT MEANDERINGS

The meanderings of the Commerce Department with respect to Washington's critical airport problems resemble those of a rudderless airplane whose pilot is lost in a fog. The record of the Department's varied airport recommendations in recent years shows an amazing amount of indecision, course changing, and acrobatics of the Immelmann turn sort. And the end is not yet. What the next policy decision of Secretary Weeks or his advisers will be is something to wonder about.

Latest of the Department's moves is a recommendation that Baltimore's Friendship Airport be designated as an interim supplemental Washington air terminal, pending action on the Burke project. Secretary Weeks keeps steering back to Friendship, despite all the expert testimony and reports rejecting the Baltimore field as unsuitable for Washington air passengers. It is no secret, of course, that Maryland legislators, worried about the lagging business at Friendship, have sought to twist the Secretary's arm. The trouble with Mr. Weeks' Friendship gestures, past and present, is that they apparently have been dictated by political pressures, not by objective advice from aviation authorities. In fact, the first official study by the Civil Aeronautics Board of the proposal that Friendship serve as an alternate Washington airport is just being made. The logical procedure for the Secretary to have followed would have been to await completion of the study. But logic seems to have played little part in departmental peregrinations.

Is there any logic in the confusing and conflicting airport suggestions that have emanated from the Department of Commerce since it first recommended the Burke Airport plan? When political pressures began to build up on both sides of the Potomac over the Burke site, with resultant cutting off of further appropriations, the Department began to back away from Burke. But as traffic congestion at the National Airport grew more dangerous, the Department's Civil Aeronautics Authority urged action on a second airport. So did the Senate Commerce Committee. So did President Eisenhower, in naming the Secretary of Commerce, the Budget Director, and the Secretary of the Air Force as a special committee to review the situation and bring him a report. The report was something of a classic in the realm of muddled advice. It proposed in effect that the Government do an outside loop on the Washington airport matter. The Government's nearly $1 million investment in land at Burke was to be forgotten and primary responsibility for building an auxiliary airport here was to be shifted to the District, Maryland, and Virginia. Meanwhile, runways and other facilities at the present airport would be improved and Friendship could be used as a supplemental airport if desired.

This report was so absurd that it soon was filed away and, presumably, its authors would prefer to have it forgotten. In the meantime the Senate Commerce Committee demanded prompt action on Burke or some other appropriate auxiliary airport. So Secretary Weeks came up with a new report. This time he revived an old plan for joint use of Andrews Air Force Base by commercial and military aircraft, with Burke as the best alternative and Friendship as a third possibility. However, he overlooked checking with the Air Force first about the Andrews proposal. Air Force opposition blasted the Andrews idea. That left Burke once more the leading contender. As a result, the President has urged Congress to appropriate $34.7 million to complete the airport at Burke. But political pressures are building up once more against this logical recommendation. It is anybody's guess whether political expediency will win out against public safety in the long-drawn-out airport controversy.

Hells Canyon Dam Vital To Farmers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LESTER R. JOHNSON
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 18, 1956

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, as I have stated on a previous occasion, farmers in the Ninth Wisconsin District have more than ordinary interest in the development of the Hells Canyon Dam project on the Snake River.

The farmers in my area favor a federally owned high dam instead of the three low dams proposed by a private utility company. The reason for this interest in Hells Canyon Dam is very well expressed in part of a Farmers Union radio broadcast over 12 Wisconsin stations on July 9.

Following is the text of a news release on the Farmers Union radio broadcast pertaining to Hells Canyon Dam:

In the final weeks before the United States Congress adjourns, one of the major pieces of legislation which will come to a showdown is the long-sought measure to authorize Federal construction of a high multipurpose dam on the Hells Canyon in Idaho.

Last month, both the Senate Interior Committee and the House Interior Committee approved the Hells Canyon Dam measure which, if passed by both Houses and signed into law, would eventually put to use one of this country's last great untapped natural resources. This Hells Canyon fight has been going on for several years, and supporters of the legislation have run into one roadblock after another.

It was just a year ago in August, shortly after the 1955 session of Congress had adjourned, that the Federal Power Commission gave authority to the Idaho Power Co. to build three small dams on the Snake River of Idaho—dams which would completely blot out the great 1-mile deep Snake River chasm at the Hells Canyon. The utility is pushing construction of one of these dams so that if its license is canceled, either by Congress or by the courts, it can force the American taxpayers to pay the firm for its trouble, a throwback to the efforts of the Dixon-Yates combine 1 and 2 years ago.

The Farmers Union, the Farmers Union Central Exchange, the rural electric cooperatives and other co-ops have a vital interest in the Hells Canyon Dam. Wisconsin Farmers Union president, K. W. Hones, has sent letters to each of the 10 Wisconsin Congressmen and both Senators, urging them to support the Hells Canyon Dam legislation approved by the House and Senate Interior Committees. The Farmers Union president also urged the 400 Farmers Union locals in Wisconsin to write or wire the Congressmen and Senators asking their support of the Hells Canyon bill.

On July 9 Farmers Union president K. W. Hones made the following broadcast over the 12-station radio network:

"At this time I want to appeal to every member of a farm organization, whether he be Farmers Union or not, every manager of a farm-supply cooperative, and all interested farmers to write or wire the two Wisconsin Senators and the Congressman from their district to vote for the bill authorizing the construction of the Hells Canyon Dam.

"There is no more vital legislation than this bill. The development of the Hells Canyon Dam project is vital to Wisconsin because of the large deposits of phosphate rock in the area. This phosphate rock is of the highest quality, but only with cheap electricity comparable to that of the Tennessee Valley Dam can it be used to process these millions of tons of high-grade phosphate rock.

"Triple superphosphate is one of the important ingredients in commercial fertilizer and, besides that, superphosphate is needed on most Wisconsin farms in large quantities. It has been estimated that the current from the Hells Canyon can process this rock into triple phosphate and save Wisconsin farmers up to $6 a ton.

"The Hells Canyon is one of the last such sites left in the United States, and it is the only site anywhere near the rock deposits that is of sufficient size to furnish the enormous power needed for the furnaces.

"In the past some of our Wisconsin Senators and Congressmen have voted against this project, and the only chance of changing their minds is to hear from the folks at home. There is no time to lose. Both the House and Senate committees have reported the bill favorably, but according to reports a tough fight on the floor is expected. The Wisconsin congressional delegation could easily cast the deciding votes one way or the other as they have done so many times.

"Farmers, if you want fertilizer at lower costs, you now have a chance to swing into action. After the Idaho Power Co. develops this project with their proposed three small dams, the processing of this rock with cheap electricity is out of the question for good.

"So let's get our views in to our Representatives today without delay. We in the Farmers Union own these rich phosphate deposits. We need the finished product. We need the power. We need the Hells Canyon Dam, so let's get on the ball. You can bet that the Idaho Power Co. will spend a great sum of money to get votes against this bill, so let's get our boys set right."

Hon. Barry M. Goldwater, of Arizona

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. RHODES
OF ARIZONA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 18, 1956

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, under leave previously granted I would like to include in the RECORD for the attention of the House an article written by George Todt, a political columnist who was born and reared in Mesa, Ariz., my hometown in Arizona. In this column Mr. Todt discusses the distinguished junior Senator from Arizona:

I have previously quoted at length from a "political new look" address of Senator BARRY GOLDWATER entitled "The Fallacy of the Common Man." It is one of the most dynamic and constructive bits of American philosophy to emerge from our presently confused times; it ought to be read by everyone interested in preserving the traditional American way of life; it was placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of May 31, 1956, by Hon. BRUCE ALGER, of Texas, and may be found on page A4362.

But more than merely attacking the un-American concepts of socialism, pseudo-liberalism and the Marxian ideology of the politically corrupt New Deal—all bound up in the pitiful mass travesty of the "common man" we have so unthinkingly idolized in the past quarter of a century here in the United States—Senator GOLDWATER does more than this: He also points the constructive ideological pathway of our people for the future. In doing so, he looks intelligently forward instead of backward—but he employs some practical, down-to-earth wisdom in doing so. He takes the best thinking from good historical precedent and combines such correct thought with progress and old-fashioned liberalism which is diametrically opposed to Marxist collectivism of all descriptions.

Senator GOLDWATER is representative of a new, forward-looking type of thinking by younger men and women in the Nation which is commencing to take on a new look of boom proportions in our country today. This brilliant young solon could never, by any stretch of logic, be called a "reactionary" in the sense that he is old-fashioned or behind the times. On the contrary, he is the only jet fighter pilot in the Senate, and just as modern as the description implies. He is right up-to-the-minute in outlook, temperament, and philosophy. Why, then, does "traditional" Americanism appeal to successful young businessmen like BARRY GOLDWATER? The answer is not too complicated or sophisticated. It is simply that the pendulum is swinging back again in America—as the pendulum has a habit of doing in the course of time—and the younger, more advanced thinkers among our leaders are the quickest to perceive it. Youth, both on and off the campus today, is becoming more conservative with the passing of the days; there is a grass roots revulsion setting in—has been for some time—against the outworn political surrealism of impractical and corrupt Marxian Socialist plans of human coercion.

A new crop of youngsters is coming along with more wisdom than many of their immediate predecessors who bought the Marxist line, in whole or in part, because some nice old—or even young—strategically placed "plant" may have given them a bad steer somewhere along the line. These kids have more perspective and savvy in 1956 than, say, in 1946—when Old Nick of Moscow was our acknowledged "strange bedfellow" on the world stage—and certainly more than in 1936 when the entire country was in the throes of a moral toboggan ride which had sunk us as a people into the unaesthetic mire of the lowest kind of mental and spiritual stagnation.

Youth today is demanding intelligence and reason and demonstrable facts—and only scoffs at the outdated cliches which the Marxist planners have dangled as "come ons" before us for a quarter of a century from their intrenched New Deal sanctuary of collectivism for their nonexistent "common man." Youth wants brilliant and intelligent thinking for tomorrow and today, but wants it on-the-target and not wandering off into political quagmires and blind alleys. Youth desires bona fide intellectual realism and values, not phony utopias built on the theft complex of robbing Peter to pay Paul. This accounts for much of the appeal of Mr. GOLDWATER's level-headed approach with his "Uncommon Man."

S. 4146 and H. R. 12061

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT C. BYRD
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 27, 1956

Mr. BYRD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include a statement which I made today in an appearance before the House Committee on Rules. I spoke in opposition to S. 4146 and H. R. 12061, bills authorizing the construction of a number of atomic reactors and authorizing the expenditure of $400 million in furtherance of the acceleration program. The statement follows:

Mr. Chairman, you are extremely kind to permit me to appear before this committee today. I realize the pressure of business in these closing days of the Congress is such that the Committee on Rules is especially hard put. It would certainly be understandable if requests such as mine were rejected in the interest of expedition. Yet, the chairman and other members of this committee are so cognizant of the importance of the bills pertaining to the atomic reactor program that you would not be satisfied to act upon it without having heard the testimony of each interested party.

I should like to preface my remarks with the explanation that I have from the start been an enthusiastic advocate of the plan to put the atom to work in every way that it is economically feasible and practical. I am convinced that the research and development work should be left to private industry wherever possible, but I have not opposed the program by which the Federal Government would participate in the construction of experimental reactors. I speak in opposition to S. 4146 and H. R. 12061 because, among other reasons, they would go far beyond this concept. They would order and direct the Atomic Energy Commission to carry out a program to which the Commission itself is opposed—a program for duplication of facilities that have not yet been given an opportunity to demonstrate their worth.

Mr. Chairman, the principles involved in these bills are highly confusing in that they appear to be entirely devoid of reason. It would appear that the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, in its sincere and devoted effort to produce legislation of some sort before the 84th Congress becomes history, has created these bills in a desperate attempt to beat the clock at the 11th hour. The proposed legislation is entirely unnecessary. It would set up atomic generating facilities to compete with coal and other fossil fuels at AEC plants. Despite the fact that the Federal Government will absorb the cost of constructing and operating these facilities, they will still not be able to produce electricity nearly as economically as that which comes from steam plants using coal, oil, and gas. Thus, though there is no logical defense for the construction of these plants, they would nevertheless be put into operation as a losing proposition and at the same time threaten coal's markets—markets which provide for the very subsistence of many of the families in my congressional district.

Inasmuch as my district is the world's most productive bituminous coal region, Mr. Chairman, I could, in justice to my people, review in detail the importance of the electrical market to the coal industry. I shall not impose on your time, however, because I am certain that you understand the serious implications of this nature contained in these bills. Nor will I dwell upon the subject of atomic radiation and its effect on the health—mental and physical—of the human being. I am certain that you too were disturbed by the report of the National Academy of Sciences that emphasized the danger of exposure to these lethal rays and that you will take this factor into consideration in making your decision on this proposed legislation.

What I especially wish to point out to you at this time, Mr. Chairman, is that while it may appear to some advocates of this program that there will be no substantial harm in directing the AEC to put up reactors in these specified areas, so far as on-the-spot technical aspects are concerned, I submit that such a program would serve to accentuate the shortage of scientific and engineering manpower that already confronts us. You know the story. It persists in private plants and in Government laboratories. The Congress itself has time and again discussed means of alleviating the deficits in engineering manpower.

Admiral Radford referred to this important problem on April 18, 1956, when he appeared before a subcommittee of the House Appropriations Committee. He pointed up the shortage of scientific personnel for research and development work. The Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff said these words:

"I have come to the conclusion that we are spending probably all the money in research and development that we can spend to advantage. We have reached a stage where the limitation in that field is probably a matter of competent scientific personnel available for that work.

"We can give a contract to a company for research and usually they will take it. Then we see ads in the paper where they try to hire trained men away from some other company that is producing on some other defense research program. There is a shortage. If we were to materially increase our efforts in this line I think we would cause trouble."

Could we now in conscience subscribe to a program which would require the services of thousands of trained technicians to be used in a project that is not necessary to our

military or peacetime survival? I think you will find that this is one of the major reasons for the AEC's objection to the proposed legislation. For that matter, you will find that some members of the Commission are quite fearful that, if this program should become law, it would be necessary to take personnel away from defense research and development projects in order that they may fill the positions that will, in effect, be set up by a mandate of Congress under these bills.

Mr. Chairman, I ask that you consider this point very seriously. I shall not take any more of your time. Again, let me thank you for this opportunity to appear in opposition to S. 4146 and H. R. 12061.

The Textile Industry Must Be Preserved for Our Own Security

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD D. DONOHUE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 11, 1956

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, I should like to include a most interesting and erudite article by Mr. Peter Edson concerning the unhappy situation confronting our domestic textile industry, which appeared in the July 11, 1956 issue of the Waltham (Mass.) News Tribune.

Mr. Edson presents a very clear picture of the difficulties, beyond its control, plaguing our industry, and to my mind graphically points up the fact that the only preserving solution is the sensible application of import quota restrictions on foreign textiles, which I hope may, soon be accomplished.

The article follows:

WASHINGTON, July 11.—Before August 1, United States Department of Agriculture hopes to come up with a new cotton export plan. It will include what amounts to a cotton subsidy or two-price plan.

Its purpose is to enable United States cotton textile manufacturers to compete on a more even basis in foreign markets with foreign-made textiles woven from American grown, surplus raw cotton.

How much this will cost the taxpayers and just how it is going to work nobody yet knows. The August 1 date is significant because that's the start of the 1956 cotton crop marketing year, and policies must be firmed up before then.

United States Department of Agriculture's Commodity Credit Corporation, now owns over 6 million bales of surplus cotton. It also holds another 6 million bales as security on loans to cotton farmers. Most of this loan cotton will eventually be taken over by the Government. The total is equal to a full year's cotton crop and the 1956 crop will soon start piling on top of that.

CCC is now required by law to sell surplus cotton on the export market by competitive bids, at not less than 25½ cents a pound. With the Government support price on cotton between 32 and 33 cents and the New York market price between 34 and 35 cents, this gives foreign mills an advantage of 7 to 9 cents on their raw material supply.

It is this differential, according to the United States textile industry, which enables foreign mills to undersell American cottons on world markets. Another factor is lower labor costs, which in Japan are only 10 percent of United States wages.

But what particularly annoys the American textile industry is that Japanese exporters have been underselling and increasing their textile sales right here in the United States of America.

One way to beat this is to lower the price on cotton going into United States-made textiles for export. This could be done by the subsidy or two-price system mentioned above.

There is no legal authority to impose a processing tax to finance these subsidies. They would have to be paid right out of the Treasury. The subsidy would not apply on textiles sold on the United States domestic market so it would not end Japanese competition in this country.

This brings up the other approach to the problem. It is to apply import quota restrictions on foreign textiles made from United States-grown cotton. This is what the United States textile industry really wants. Alabama and South Carolina have already passed laws restricting the sale of foreign textiles.

An attempt was made to amend the United States foreign-aid bill to the same effect. The idea was to limit imports from foreign countries receiving United States aid, if made from agricultural products in surplus supply in this country.

But here the United States State, Commerce, Tariff Commission, and other Government agencies objected. This was held a violation of trade agreements and treaties with friendly countries like Japan, whose economies the United States is trying to make self-supporting.

Recognizing the American problem, Japan has voluntarily limited its cotton textile exports to the United States to 1.5 percent of American production. This amounts to 150 million square yards of fabrics and 2.5 million dozen cotton blouses a year.

It is claimed these amounts will not cause serious disruption of the American market. Other goods in which there is competition include pillowslips, printed ginghams, and velveteens. Several hearings are now pending before the United States Tariff Commission for relief of American manufacturers under the reciprocal trade agreements escape clause.

United States cotton cloth production last year was 11 billion square yards. In foreign trade with all countries, United States exports were 542 million square yards and imports were about a fourth of that, 1,333 million square yards.

United States cotton textile exports were valued at $242 million and imports at $160 million. Raw cotton exports were valued at $469 million, of which $120 million worth went to Japan. The Tariff Commission says about a fifth of this cotton came back to the United States in the form of textile imports. That's what all the trouble is about.

United States Prison Roster Up 3,018

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PETER F. MACK, JR.
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 18, 1956

Mr. MACK of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following item which appeared in the Washington Post, Monday, July 16, 1956, which points up the need for additional Federal maximum security facilities. The article follows:

UNITED STATES PRISON ROSTER UP 3,018

The Nation's prison population grew by 3,018 las year, but a decline in the rate of increase was shown for the first time in 3 years.

A report issued yesterday by the Federal Bureau of Prisons showed 185,069 persons held in State and Federal penitentiaries on last December 31. Of this number, 2,020 were in the District's Lorton and Occoquan reformatories.

The nationwide total was 1.7 percent higher than for 1954, when the rate of increase was reported as 5.4 percent. The District's rate of increase last year was 5.5 percent from the total of 1,914 prisoners listed on December 31, 1954.

In addition to the District, 33 States showed increases in the prison populations ranging from 0.1 percent in Indiana to 17.2 percent in New Hampshire—the latter a State which reported a total of only 198 prisoners.

Regionally, the greatest rate of increase was shown in the State prisons serving the 11 Western States. The overall increase for that area was 3.1 percent. This included Montana, which had a prison population decrease of 21.5 percent.

The population of Federal prisons went up only 85 during the year compared with 2,933 in State prisons. The biggest prison was listed as the Southern Michigan State Prison at Jackson with 5,715 inmates.

For the country as a whole, the report said, there were 114 prisoners confined for each 100,000 of the civilian population. The range was 35.6 in North Dakota to 243.1 in the District of Columbia.

"The high rate for the District of Columbia can be partly attributed to the fact," says the report, "that the District includes the more densely populated central section of a large metropolitan area which extends into Maryland and Virginia."

The Maryland prison population last December 31 was reported as 4,930, a decrease of 5 percent, and Virginia's as 4,938, a decrease of 1.4 percent.

Editor's Absence Felt by Black River Falls

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LESTER R. JOHNSON
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 18, 1956

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to put in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the fine article by Richard S. Davis of the Milwaukee Journal staff on the recent retirement of my friend, Mrs. Harriet Noble as local editor of the Black River Falls Banner-Journal.

I have known Mrs. Noble ever since the first day I set foot in Black River Falls. It was to her desk that I was sent in March of 1941 to talk over the possibilities of finding a place to rent when I moved from Madison to Black River Falls.

Mrs. Noble was very close to my predecessor in Congress, Hon. Merlin Hull. While she never served on his staff in Washington, she was there on the home front, along with Henry Olson, now deceased, watching out for his interest.

I have always admired Mrs. Noble's fine philosophy of life and zest for living. Many of us in Congress could benefit from her ability to take things as they come and keep on an even keel.

Mrs. Noble will be missed by all the readers of the Banner-Journal. I can think of no better wish for her than that she will fully enjoy the retirement years ahead.

The article, "Editor's Absence Felt by Black River Falls," printed in the July 15 issue of the Milwaukee Journal, follows:

EDITOR'S ABSENCE FELT BY BLACK RIVER FALLS—MRS. HARRIET NOBLE RAN NEWSPAPER FOR 40 YEARS, AND NOW SHE HAS RETIRED

(By Richard S. Davis)

BLACK RIVER FALLS, WIS.—Even a brief visit reveals that this small city in Jackson County, indeed the county itself, has a hollow feeling in its middle. Harriet Thomas Noble has retired as local editor of the Banner-Journal.

It was 40 years ago that Mrs. Noble joined the staff of the paper owned by the late Congressman from the ninth district, Merlin Hull. There was a gap of about 8 years which she spent in China with her husband, James Bowen Noble, an architect and structural engineer, but all the rest of the time she was devoted to rural journalism.

Devoted is decidely the word for it. Strictly speaking, she was the only reporter, but she developed a system whereby all the town and sundry near-by villages were here assistants and the news came pouring in without her leaving the office. It was a nice trick, but it took a knowing head to do it.

MISSES THE EXCITEMENT

This reporter called on Mrs. Noble in her big white house on the hill two weeks after her retirement. She was still speaking of the newspaper office as thought it were her other home, still missing the turmoil of Wednesday, the publication day, and most of all feeling the lack of callers.

The gray haired newspaper woman with the patrician face has not been an editor in the usual sense. She has never admonished Banner-Journal readers on how to solve their civic problems or on how they ought to vote. She has never had a personal column in which to air her views. She has written veritable bales of copy, many thousands of words for each issue, but she has not sought to influence people, but only to win friends.

"The province of a paper like ours," Mrs. Noble told the visitor, "is to print the news of the community just as it occurs. The big city newspapers can have the earth shaking events, but we must tell of the marriages, the births and the deaths of the people we know. To me, the births have always been the most pleasant to report, but it has been fun to recount the marriages. As for the obituaries, I consider them extremely important, if only for the record."

EDITED AN INDIAN

Mrs. Noble did not say so, but it may be assumed that she had something to do with the paper's custom of sending each issue to the city's young men in military service, a practice that began in World War II. Hospital patients also get free copies every week and Mrs. Noble relates with a chuckle that "there isn't a single buzzer pushed for an hour after the papers come."

The late Charles Lowe Cloud, the famed journalist of Indian Mission, for years depended on Mrs. Noble to get his column into the paper. He would come rolling into the office, take a seat opposite the editor at her desk and compose the delightful items that stirred Statewide interest.

"All in all," Mrs. Noble commented, "I think that Lowe Cloud's most intriguing column was also his briefest. It was only this: 'No news this week, Indian report in jail.'"

The Nobles were married in 1919 and went immediately to China, where the architect represented a New York firm. They returned to Black River Falls after two years in Shanghai—it was then that they bought the Sam Landon home—but they went back to the Orient after a year and remained until 1927, whereupon Mrs. Noble rejoined the Banner-Journal.

Mrs. Noble has no great regard for Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek, whom she considers just another Chinese war lord. He was in his ascendancy when she was in Shanghai and she learned a lot about him, but she says that she never trusted him. She declares that his chances of recapturing the Chinese mainland are, in her opinion, absolutely nil.

Three of the Noble children were born in China—Patricia, John and Jahala. The eldest, James, and the youngest, David, came along in America. Patricia, then Patricia Schofield, was killed in an accident in 1952. At the time she was, as her mother before her for a brief time, secretary to Congressman Hull.

Greek Refugees and the Immigration Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN D. DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 18, 1956

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, this great Republic stands for a large number of high ideals and as such it has been regarded as the best and perhaps the last refuge of freedom-loving, industrious, and enterprising people. In the past when there were few immigration restrictions, people flocked to this country and joined hands with native Americans in making this country a model, prosperous, and democratic commonwealth. America benefited by their industriousness, and they benefited by the freedom and the opportunities offered to them. It is no exaggeration to say that without the fine and lasting contribution of those immigrants to our civilization, we would be poorer in many ways today. We all readily admit that their share in the making of this country, as well as in the shaping of its destiny, has been immensely significant.

Fully conscious and duly appreciative of the fine qualities of the many immigrant elements in this country, I would like to say a few words in support of S. 3876 and S. 4088. As you are aware, there are a number of anomalies under the existing immigration laws. One of these is that while quotas allotted to countries of northwestern Europe remain unused, those for the Mediterranean countries, limited in numbers, are not. This is true even though the total number of quotas permitted under the McCarran-Walter Act of 1953 has not been filled. The purpose of these bills is to permit filling unused quotas with stated numbers of refugees of other nationalities.

I would like to give my unreserved and wholehearted support to these bills. Without increasing the total number of immigrants, they will provide an opportunity for a deserving number of people who will make good American citizens—many of whom will be joining relatives who are themselves American citizens.

Death of Federal School Aid Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. L. MENDEL RIVERS
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 18, 1956

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD I include an article entitled "Death of Federal School Aid Bill" appearing in the Evening Star under date of July 17, 1956, written by the eminent columnist and editor of the U. S. News & World Report, Mr. David Lawrence.

Mr. Lawrence is known for his accuracy, sincerity, and factual reporting. He is a passionate believer in the Constitution of the United States. His articles on the concept of State rights have made an invaluable contribution to the parliamentary thinking of this Nation.

In the enclosed article he deals with the reasons for the death of the so-called school aid bill. It is placed in the RECORD for the purpose of putting all Americans on record that an existing opinion of the Attorney General is extant and that regardless of the Powell or any other amendment, the President of the United States has issued an Executive order to the Interracial Commission which can vitiate any contract entered into by the Government of the United States and another party under the guise of racial discrimination.

In the days to come other school bills will be brought to the attention of the Congress. Let us not be hoodwinked with beatitudes and lots of wordy window dressings. So long as the opinion of the Attorney General is in force, any money from Washington can be stopped by the President of the United States under the guise of discrimination.

The article follows:

DEATH OF FEDERAL SCHOOL AID BILL—ACT BLAMED ON VIRTUAL FOUR-PARTY SYSTEM AND BLOC IS EXPECTED TO CONTINUE

(By David Lawrence)

Who killed the school bill with its billions of Federal money for education? That's still an unanswered question on Capitol Hill, where it may become known as the "mess of 1956."

It's too bad the "right to know" doctrine—espoused by the House committee which is seeking to rid official Washington of its tendency to suppress news—doesn't extend to the behind-the-scenes maneuvers of party leaders in Congress who pull the strings.

For the full story of what happened ought to be told. Four explanations are being offered. One is that the segregationists of the South killed the bill. The other is that the integrationists of the North did it. Another is that those who didn't want any Federal interference in the financing of the schools were influential in the result and that they were alarmed because of recent Supreme Court decisions whittling down States rights and increasing Federal authority.

But Senator HUMPHREY, Democrat of Minnesota, has a simpler explanation. He blames it all on "President Eisenhower's health or recuperation or concern over personal political problems" which are sup-

posed to have prevented him from "exerting some personal influence and leadership."

Eisenhower had already gone a long way in trying to get the bill passed. He had said once before that anything like the Powell amendment, denying Federal aid to schools in Southern States which do not adopt integration, shouldn't be tacked on to the bill. This was a daring expression on his part—a concession to expediency over and above principle.

But what did happen? Representative ADAM CLAYTON POWELL, Democrat, and one of the Negro leaders of the country, offered his amendment anyhow. It presented an issue which Republican Congressmen from districts where there are many Negro voters couldn't dodge. No amount of persuasion from Eisenhower could keep them from voting for the Powell amendment.

As for southern Congressmen, they abstained from voting so as to make sure the Powell amendment supporters would have a majority. They wanted the final measure to be unpalatable on every side.

But there are northern Republicans—about 65 of them—who don't believe in Federal control of education and they, too, voted for the Powell amendment because they knew it would help kill the bill. On final passage, they joined with the southern Democrats to make a majority against the entire bill.

Also important was the action of northern Democrats who helped to defeat amendments, proposed by Republicans, allocating the funds on the basis of the needs of the States. This principle previously had been endorsed, but the Democrats repudiated it. The final bill, therefore, was unsatisfactory to northern Republicans who favored Federal aid and southern Democrats who didn't, and thus was readily defeated.

It is a bit bewildering to see some of the so-called liberals ignoring what the southern Democrats did in helping the Powell amendment to pass or what the northern Democrats did in defeating the Republican amendments. And yet the defeat of the bill is characterized as a case of bad executive leadership.

The truth is there are four parties in Congress today. There hasn't been a 2-party system for 2 decades, and recent decision of the Supreme Court curtailing States rights mean that the 4-party bloc system will remain for many more years to come.

A significant aftermath of the school bill controversy is the discovery by southern Democrats of how near they come to being tricked by the argument that, if the measure were passed without the Powell amendment, they should have no objection to it. For the fact is that Federal funds could be withheld even without the Powell amendment or its counterpart. The administration has a legal opinion from the Department of Justice which is being used every day by the President's interracial commission. It claims the right of the Federal Government at any time to cancel any contract with any agency, public or private, which permits discrimination in employment on the basis of "race or creed, or color, or national origin."

The text of this important opinion has never been disclosed, though presumably the public has a right to know the exact contents of such an important document that supports an Executive order.

It's the knowledge that a threat exists to use Federal authority—even in the absence of a Powell amendment—to withhold funds from schools in the South which may prevent any school bill from ever being passed. It may lead to a demand for a specific stipulation in the law declaring that nothing in this or in any other law gives the Federal Government the right to withhold funds except for the reasons given in the measure itself.

What is surprising about the whole controversy is the assumption made by the liberals that those who voted for the Powell amendment should be reprimanded by President Eisenhower for voting their convictions. They are being upbraided for expressing themselves conscientiously. Because they are mostly Republicans, Eisenhower is being held responsible for their votes.

One wonders who is responsible for what the southern Democrats did and for the votes of those Democrats who don't want Federal interference in schools on any score. The theory that the Presidency is a sort of benevolent dictatorship and that the Congress must become a rubber stamp has lately become popular doctrine with many of the so-called liberals.

Status of Forces Agreements

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK T. BOW
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, July 7, 1956

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, the defenders of the NATO Status of Forces Agreement and similar agreements repeatedly point to the reciprocal features of the agreements as justification for their term. They ignore the fact that without some measure of equality there can scarcely be complete reciprocity. This means equality in the number of men affected, equality of justice, equality in the facilities available for use and other physical assets.

I have pointed out before that we are not interested in having the right to try foreign servicemen in our courts. The only ones who consider this an advantage are those who picture a serviceman from another nation committing a terrible crime. Only three foreign servicemen have been subjected to any charges in our courts, whereas over 10,000 of our men have been accused in foreign courts. That number has been increased since last November when the count was made, but recent statistics are not yet available. We know that there are only a few thousand foreign servicemen affected by the agreements, whereas hundreds of thousands of Americans are deprived of important rights through the surrender of criminal jurisdiction to foreign nations.

Little attention has been paid to the failure of the reciprocal provisions in other respects, such as who furnishes offices, or pays for such offices and office supplies and equipment in NATO offices here and abroad, who is paying for the use of buildings, grounds, facilities, or services by our troops abroad, who is the prime target for claims of damage by civilians in foreign countries.

Under article IX of the NATO Status of Forces Agreement a member of a foreign force or a civilian component thereof, whose country did not have adequate medical or dental facilities here, would be entitled to receive medical and dental care, including hospitalization, comparable to that furnished to our own personnel and dependents. On June 19 of this year we passed a bill to indemnify M. Sgt. Harold LeRoy Allen for the cost of medical services and hospitalization amounting to $672.25 for his dependent daughter during her illness in Canada. Although Sergeant Allen had been assured by Canadian authorities at the time of the illness of his daughter that the services would involve no expense to him it was later determined that the Status of Forces Agreement did not relieve him of these charges. The Queens Regulations governing the Canadian Army provide that dependents shall not be provided medical care at public expense, and Canada was not obliged under the status agreement to give more to an American dependent than was given to a Canadian dependent. Of course a Canadian dependent would receive such service and hospitalization here without question.

The United States furnishes complete medical and hospital care for the dependents of servicemen stationed in numbers in foreign countries and, if dependents of servicemen are in need of medical care beyond the scope of the facilities, they are ordinarily returned to this country for treatment in a service hospital. If this were not the case, the failure of the agreement to carry out its claimed reciprocal features would be even more obvious.

Gen. Williston B. Palmer and Maj. Gen. E. L. Cummings

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OVERTON BROOKS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 5, 1956

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, before this session closes, I believe the RECORD of the Congress should contain some recognition of the superior work of Gen. Williston B. Palmer, Vice Chief of Staff, United States Army, and Maj. Gen. E. L. Cummings, Chief of Ordnance, United States Army.

As a Member of Congress, and as a member of the Armed Services Committee and its Subcommittee for Special Investigations, I have had occasion to observe the manner in which these two officers have conducted Army business; and General Cummings that of the Ordnance Corps.

They have won for themselves and for the Army the confidence and the praise of my colleagues in the Congress. I would feel remiss in my duty if I did not publicly express to them the admiration which all of us have for them as devoted and efficient public administrators.

General Cummings, who has the strenuous and time-consuming job of Chief of Ordnance in our complex system of Ordnance Procurement, has done, in my opinion, an outstanding job. He is forthright, clear and courageous in his decisions. I compliment him, and the men with him, for the superior administration he is giving to the task committed to his care.

Mr. Speaker, in the past I have had occasion to inspect the type of work done by Army Ordnance. I have found its work of making ammunition excellent and most efficient. These leaders are doing a good job in producing our ammunition and I for one want to voice my own confidence in them and my appreciation of their abilities.

Nixon Leadership Followed When House Rejected U. N. Membership for Red China

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CRAIG HOSMER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 18, 1956

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, in passing the resolution today expressing the sense of Congress against U. N. membership for Red China the House followed the inspiring leadership of Vice President Nixon and President Eisenhower on this subject. A recent column by George Rothwell Brown recounts how the Vice President dealt with this matter during his recent trip around the world to assure many of our friends of the continued regard the United States holds for their friendship:

POLITICAL PARADE—NIXON SMACKS RED CHINA HOPES

(By George Rothwell Brown)

WASHINGTON, July 10.—Vice President RICHARD NIXON has again confounded his bitter critics in the opposition, and his lukewarm friends within his own party, by scoring another series of diplomatic successes on his latest dramatic flight around the world.

By far his most notable achievement, on this trip, and one with direct political effect upon the 1956 presidential campaign, scotches on the eve of the elections the persistent rumors that have been in circulation for months past, that in the Eisenhower second term Red China would be admitted to membership in the United Nations.

This is chiefly serving blunt notice on the British Government that the United States, so long as General Eisenhower is at the head of it, will not betray Nationalist China, by imitating the British example in giving recognition to the Peiping Government.

PLATFORM

Thus the statement the Vice President made after a long discussion in Taipei with Chiang Kai-shek clarifies the Chinese situation and foreshadows the adoption of a plank in the San Francisco platform pledging the Republican Party to resist the seating of Communist China in the U. N.

Senator KNOWLAND, of California, minority leader of the Senate, some time ago decided to sponsor such a plank in the 1956 platform of his party, and he was even hopeful that the Democratic Party in its national platform this year would take a similar stand.

Mr. NIXON'S blunt notice to Communist China—and to the British Government—may have greatly increased the probability of both the major political parties taking a strong stand this year on a position to which both parties are already committed in both branches of Congress.

UNDERCOVER

This should end, once for all, the insidious plot that has been long in the works, to throw Nationalist China out of the Security Council of the U. N., as soon as the American elections of 1956 were out of the way.

That Mr. NIXON spoke while in Formosa with the full knowledge and approval of the President is obvious.

His forthright statement means that the administration will not adopt the Dean Acheson policy enunciated by him when he permitted it to become known that the United States would not use its veto power in the Security Council, where Nationalist China also has that power.

It also means that this Government will not be a party to the pro-Communist scheme of transferring the question of the admission of Red China, as a substitute for Nationalist China, to the U. N. General Assembly, where that plan might be accomplished by a majority vote of the 60 member nations, under certain tricky interpretations of article 18 of the U. N. Charter.

DEMOCRATS, TOO?

The probability of the Republican National Convention at San Francisco backing up Vice President NIXON'S assurance that President Eisenhower is still firmly opposed to the recognition of Red China, and to giving it a seat in the U. N., poses a problem for the earlier Democratic National Convention platform builders at Chicago.

Civil Rights Legislation Aimed at States Rights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM C. CRAMER
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 18, 1956

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Tampa Times of July 14, 1956:

CIVIL RIGHTS LEGISLATION AIMED AT STATES RIGHTS

Southerners who are opposed to the civil-rights legislation sought by the Eisenhower administration may be defeated in their efforts to kill it, but they have some powerful arguments on their side.

The racial difficulties which plague the South, and other parts of the Nation, cannot be solved by Supreme Court edict. Particularly they cannot be solved by laws which abridge States rights.

A provision in currently sought legislation provides that the Attorney General would be permitted to bring suits in behalf of persons who contend their voting or other civil rights are abridged or threatened.

This would remove from the State the long-standing right to set qualifications for voting. It is conceivable that those States still requiring a poll tax could have this requirement challenged in suits charging that such a tax abridges the right to vote and the law could pave the way for action eliminating other basic voter registration requirements.

The requested legislation is vague concerning the definition of civil rights and would doubtlessly open the doors to investigation and suits intended to harass and annoy those Southern States which hold to traditions of long standing.

Here again, the question is not "racism," but the preservation of the basic rights of the States. The requested legislation is aimed principally at vesting more power in the bureaucracy in Washington. Mr. Eisenhower will not endear himself to the Southern States by insisting that Congress act positively on this request.

Our National Security

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 18, 1956

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the following is a statement which I submitted to the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee today:

STATEMENT OF REPRESENTATIVE ABRAHAM J. MULTER, DEMOCRAT, 13TH DISTRICT, NEW YORK, BEFORE THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON POST OFFICE AND CIVIL SERVICE, JULY 18, 1956

Mr. Chairman and distinguished members of the committee, I appreciate your invitation to testify before you on this important subject concerning amendment of Public Law 733 of the 81st Congress, to protect the national security of our country.

I had originally intended to express my views in great detail and to indicate to you what I think is appropriate language for the amendment of this law. Because of the pressure attendant upon the closing days of the session, which I am sure has been as great upon other Members as it has been upon me, I haven't had the time.

I very earnestly urge upon this committee that it do not attempt to write any legislation for presentation to this session of the Congress at this time. The matter is far too important for hasty action. It requires extensive study and thorough deliberation.

On August 1, 1955, I introduced my bill, H. R. 7813, which is pending before this committee. You will observe that it calls for the establishment of a commission to review all cases which have arisen under the act in question. Since the introduction of that bill, the Association of the Bar of the City of New York appointed an impartial committee, made up of distinguished members of the bar of the entire country, to study this matter. They have made an exhaustive study and have issued a very lengthy report. A copy of that report has been sent to every Member of the Congress. Whether we agree with all or part thereof, I believe it is incumbent upon this committee to thoroughly study that report before it makes any determination as to what form any amendatory legislation should take.

On July 10, 1956, I placed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, at page A5424, a statement from the New York Times which indicates the high caliber of the chairman of that committee. A copy is submitted herewith for your record.

On the same day, I placed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, at pages A5426 to A5428, a summary of the committee's report as prepared and released by the committee. A copy of that summary is submitted herewith for your record.

The bar association's study and report probably makes unnecessary the study commission suggested by my bill, and can easily take the place thereof. This committee could well take that report as its starting point and make a complete study of the subject so that it will be able to present to the next Congress, in the early days thereof, appro-

priate legislation to cover this very important subject.

I am certain that every Member of this Congress has the best interests of our country at heart and wants to give it the utmost protection against its enemies from within and from without. I am just as certain that every last member of this committee, like every Member of the Congress, is determined that in securing our country against its enemies, we must not destroy the very liberties and freedoms that are so precious to us and that make our country both great and powerful.

I again thank you for the opportunity of presenting this brief statement to you.

Fifteenth Anniversary of the Commissioning of the United States Naval Air Station at Quonset Point, R. I.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, July 19, 1956

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, on Saturday, July 14, it was my privilege to be the principal speaker at the 15th anniversary of the commissioning of the United States Naval Air Station at Quonset Point, R. I. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the address I gave at these exercises, and also in this connection three form letters, first from Capt. B. E. Close, United States Navy, commanding officer at the Naval Air Station, Quonset Point, entitled "A Sincere Welcome to You," and second, from the executive officer at the Naval Air Station, Comdr. George M. Cunha, United States Navy, and third, from Jack A. Smith, president of the Civilian Welfare Association at the Naval Air Station, entitled "Welcome Neighbors" and dated July 14, 1956.

These letters, I believe, will be of interest to all who are interested in our naval establishments.

There being no objection, the address and form letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS OF UNITED STATES SENATOR THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN AT THE 15TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE COMMISSIONING OF THE UNITED STATES NAVAL AIR STATION AT QUONSET POINT, RHODE ISLAND, JULY 14, 1956

Captain Close, officers and men of the Navy, employees of the Naval Air Station, honored guests, ladies and gentlemen, this 15th anniversary celebration of the establishment of the United States Naval Air Station here at Quonset Point, recalls vividly to me the ceremonies I attended in connection with the commissioning of this Northeastern Air Base in July 1941.

I am especially glad to be here again today as for these past 15 years it has been my privilege to be closely associated with the establishment and development of this base.

I remember well my talks with the late President Roosevelt relative to the original selection of this site, and later my sponsorship of the appropriation of $1 million for the purchase of additional land needed by the Navy for the base.

I also have in mind my conferences with the late President Roosevelt and Navy officials relative to the appropriation of sufficient funds to construct the base. Later I recall visiting this site when steam shovels, bulldozers, engineers, technicians and laborers were busy rushing the completion of the base so that the Northeastern part of our country would have an active Naval air facility in the event that some aggressor might declare war against us. It was not long before that declaration of war came and this great Naval Air Station was again expanded, and other Naval establishments, such as the Sea Bee Base at Davisville, were located in close proximity.

The 15 years have passed swiftly since the commissioning of this great Naval Air Station in 1941, and they have been filled with historical events.

Throughout the first 4 years our country was engaged in a war which threatened the very existence of all freedom loving nations. During that war the German submarine brought the fight to the shores of the United States. Many of you here today will recall how the Atlantic shores of our homeland, from Maine to Florida, were washed with the fuel oil of merchant ships sunk by German submarines in our coastal waters.

This United States Naval Air Station here at Quonset Point was a key base in that fight against the German submarine, for it was here that most of the patrols flown by aircraft over the North Atlantic shipping routes started. This air station provided all the required services for these flights—fuel, overhaul and repair, training of crews for the planes and for their overhaul and repair. Later on it served as a base for the hunter-killer aircraft carriers which proved to be the doom of the German submarine.

The years since World War II have been marked by significant changes. I remind you especially of the establishment and growth of collective security agreements among the free peoples of the world planning to preserve their independence and freedom. In these agreements, such as the charter of the United Nations and the charter of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, our country has pledged assistance to more than 60 nations.

These collective security agreements look to the United States for leadership and support. The seas are the common highways which link us together. Across the world's oceans we extend our economic strength and political power to our allies today more than ever before. Our Navy is the tool which we depend upon to keep these highways free—it is the strength and mobility of our naval forces which give meaning and reality to these collective security agreements.

The United States depends on these ocean highways now more than ever before to reach sources of raw materials. Of the 77 strategic and critical materials which are needed for our defense production, 66 must be imported in whole or in part from across the oceans. In only 11 are we self-sufficient. Most of all, the tin, rubber, chromium, cobalt, mica and aluminum must be imported, and can only be brought to this country, in the quantities needed, by ships. It may be truly stated that our country cannot afford to lose control of the seas if we are to survive. Today the American Navy is more important than ever before—not only to us, but also to the whole civilized world.

It is significant to remember that the Nazis started World War II with only 57 submarines, but with this small starting force, they brought the war to our very coast line. Today the Russians have some 400 submarines, more than 7 times the number the Germans had at the start of World War II.

A second significant change which has come to pass during the past 15 years, involves the tremendous new advancements in our Armed Forces. For example, in our Navy, here at this haval air station, we have seen the transition from propeller-driven aircraft to supersonic jet aircraft. Fifteen years ago naval aviators trained at this base joined the fleet to fly the *Hellcat* and *Corsair* aircraft with a top speed of about 400 knots. Today in our fleet, aircraft such as the *Banshee* and *Cougar*, with the same mission, operate at supersonic speeds. The aircraft carriers *Forrestal* and *Saratoga*, which are capable of operating these new aircraft, are now an active part of the United States Fleet. Recently I took a short cruise on the *Forrestal* and went all over her from stem to stern, on all her decks, flying ashore from the flight deck while at sea. She has all the latest equipment and is most impressive.

The U. S. S. *Nautilus* has successfully introduced nuclear power into the fleet. This change from fuel oil to nuclear power was described as a historical first. It was at first compared in importance to the introduction of steam power, and later on to the change from coal to oil fuel. It has been truly revolutionary and is significant of the advanced science in our Navy.

The U. S. S. *Boston* and U. S. S. *Canberra* have joined the fleet as the world's first guided-missile cruisers. This change from bullets to missiles is another significant event that has taken place within recent years.

We have every reason to expect that the employment of nuclear power and guided missiles will develop tremendously during the next 15 years, and that these developments will require still further changes in the designs of ships, submarines, and aircraft.

The very existence of this new Navy, and the versatility and mobility it represents, greatly increases the chances for avoiding other wars, either small or large. Our enemies who would conquer the world are persuaded that they must first conquer the seas. Our Navy today is a strong deterrent force, which today protects the peace of the free world.

I am one of those who definitely believe that our country can best be protected if we have a strong Navy and Naval Air Force. So, I express my congratulations to the officers and men of this base and to the civilian workers who are employed here, and also congratulations to the mothers and fathers of the officers and men who have served here since the base was commissioned. Their records are those of achievement and efficiency and I, for one, believe that in the years to come this station will continue its expansion, will increase its activity, and will add to its prestige, not only as a great naval activity but also as an important industrial development in our State.

A SINCERE WELCOME TO YOU

On behalf of all Navy-civilian personnel at United States Naval Air Station, Quonset Point, I am pleased to have this opportunity of extending to you a most cordial welcome to participate with us in celebrating the 15th anniversary of the commissioning of this important link in the great chain of Atlantic coastal defenses. We, at Quonset, are proud of our station and of the progress that we have made over the past 15 years in the impressive advancement accomplished in naval aviation—our contribution to America's defense system through service to the fleet. It is our sincere wish that you may have a thoroughly enjoyable day with us. We will do all within our power to make you welcome.

B. E. CLOSE,
Captain, United States Navy, Commanding Officer.

As a native-born Rhode Islander, I am vitally interested in anything that is advantageous in promoting the welfare of the State. The creation and ever-continuing development of Quonset as one of the most important naval air stations in America have been instrumental in achieving this by providing jobs for many of my Rhode Island neighbors

and friends and in improving economic conditions in general. Naturally, as a native, I would like to have people see what we are doing here at Quonset, therefore I am happy that Captain Close is so cordially welcoming you to help us celebrate our 15th anniversary on Saturday, July 14, in this way observing at first hand our Navy-civilian team in action and enjoying a day as our guests.

GEORGE M. CUNHA,
Commander, United States Navy,
Executive Officer.

UNITED STATES NAVAL AIR STATION,
Quonset Point, R. I., July 14, 1956.

WELCOME NEIGHBORS: The Civilian Welfare Association is organized, as its name implies, to promote the welfare and recreation of all civilian employees of United States NAS, Quonset Point. The directors of this association comprise two delegates from each of the employee organizations officially recognized at Quonset. They elect their own officers, prepare bylaws, appoint committees, and supervise the work of those committees.

The assistance committee accomplishes its work with the utmost tact and many times has stepped in to assist Quonset workers in financial difficulties as a result of prolonged sickness, fire, or other disaster. It has available for free loan to station employees hospital beds, wheel chairs, and crutches. Through shop and unit representatives of the association, this committee maintains an active line of communication to all workers.

The recreation committee works with all departments and work units through the same representatives to provide recreational facilities and to support recreational activities on the station on an equitable basis for all employees. The blood donor committee maintains at Rhode Island Hospital, Providence, R. I., what is believed to be the largest blood bank account of any single work group, from which withdrawals may be made by any employee or member of his immediate family. In addition, for workers living outside of Rhode Island, the blood donor committee arranges direct donations as they are needed.

Other committees work to support these and other activities of the association and to carry on its affairs expeditiously and efficiently in the interest of all civilian workers.

The association's shared sponsorship of tonight's "Welcome Neighbors" dance at landplane hangar No. 1 is a sample of the association's efforts to provide all civilian employees of Quonset an evening of enjoyable recreation, an opportunity to meet each others' families and friends, and to celebrate with them this station's 15th anniversary of "Service to the Fleet."

To all of our guests we extend a most cordial welcome.

JACK A. SMITH,
President.

Cathedral of the Pines

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STYLES BRIDGES
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, July 19, 1956

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article by Robert P. Allen, entitled "Cathedral of the Pines," which appeared in the Boston Sunday Globe. The story of the Cathedral of the Pines is truly inspirational, and I only wish that every American had the opportunity to visit the beautiful place of worship in New Hampshire.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CATHEDRAL OF THE PINES: "WHERE ALL PEOPLE MAY WORSHIP"

(By Robert P. Allen)

An advertisement of a farm for sale off Route 119 in Massachusetts captioned "A lot for a little" led to the creation of the world-famous Cathedral of the Pines in New Hampshire rather than in the Bay State.

Mr. and Mrs. Douglas Sloane founders of one of America's most unusual places of worship on a pine-shaded knoll 1,300 feet above sea level in Rindge, N. H., thought the words advertising the place near Ashby should have been transposed.

So the real estate agent with whom they were farm-hunting in the fall of 1937 talked them into seeing another place "just over the Massachusetts line in Rindge—and the price is right, too."

"It's only 11 miles from here," the real estate man told the Sloanes, "and only an hour and a half drive from your home in Newtonville."

Good salesmanship prevailed. The Sloanes drove on throughout the countryside where pines, spruce and hemlock contrasted with the fiery reds of the maples and the gold of the beeches and birch.

Magnificent vistas opened at almost every bend of the road. A glimpse of Mount Monadnock, up and down hills, then up the long climb into Rindge Center, circling around the old meeting house, off onto a dirt road which eventually skirted the shore of Grassy Pond.

Then up, up the big hill to "Interlaken," appropriately named because the property is almost circled by three ponds.

The Sloanes viewed the beautiful land and the buildings and knew in a moment this place would be theirs.

Early in the summer of 1938, the Sloane children—Douglas, Margaret, John, and Sanderson—were offered their choice of sections of the 128-acre farm on which they might at some time build a summer or permanent home.

Sandy chose the pine-dotted knoll "just inside the stone wall atop the 5-acre mowing piece" which overlooks the valley and lakes to Mount Monadnock miles away and the rolling Wachusett Divide.

"This," he said, "is the most beautiful view God ever put together. It's like being in a cathedral."

On the approximate spot where Sandy would have built his home is a boulder with a plaque bearing the inscription:

"Cathedral of the Pines. Dedicated to Almighty God as a place where all people may worship. In memory of Lt. Sanderson Sloane, killed in action over Germany, February 22, 1944. The gift of his parents Douglas and Sibyl Sanderson Sloane."

This is the memorial boulder of the Cathedral of the Pines—a spiritual haven where each in his own way pays tribute to all the country's war dead.

While he was in service, Sandy often expressed in letters to his parents the wish that "nothing on the knoll be touched" until he returned, because he wanted to do it.

And many times after he was reported missing in action after the B–17 he was piloting crashed, his parents visited Sandy's knoll.

After the first snowfall late in 1944, Mr. and Mrs. Sloane began clearing and burning the brush where the memorial boulder now stands with the plan to erect a modest memorial to their son.

But it soon became apparent that this was meant to be more than that. Friends of the Sloane family urged the creation of a memorial cathedral.

The clearing being sufficiently large by the middle of August 1945, it was decided to hold the first outdoor service there later that month.

The response by those present was such that immediate plans were made by the Sloanes to go ahead with the development of what is now the Cathedral of the Pines, to make the knoll available to all people for prayer and meditation, and to recall Sandy's sacrifice together with the war sacrifices of the sons and daughters of many other parents.

During the rest of that fall, all through the winter—many of the days the thermometer registered 20 degrees below zero with the wind zipping unchecked across from Monadnock—the job of clearing the grove went forward.

More than 300 dead or dying stumps of trees left standing after the 1938 hurricane had to be removed. The lower branches of all the pines cresting the knoll were dead and had to be removed.

Sawing, chopping, lugging, burning—each day saw some progress. By the time the frost was out of the ground the following spring, most of the crest of the knoll had been cleared.

First the Altar of the Nation was built, followed by the lectern, a memorial to the men on the bomber who died with Sandy. Then came the pulpit, the baptismal font and the Hilltop House, a retreat for visting clergymen.

Each structure was built of stones contributed from all over the world—many of them memorials to others who lost their lives, and many from famous people. There are bits of rock or soil from historic sites in every American State, and from virtually every country in the world.

The first sewice in the Cathedral of the Pines using the altar and pulpit was held July 4, 1946, and during the next 9 years, it received an estimated 1,500,000 visitors—many of whom came to pray, many of whom came just to visit. Upward of 10,000 have been there in a single day.

"Many who come to the Cathedral," explained Sandy's father, "are non-churchgoers who are troubled because they cannot finde real faith. For many of them, a few services at the Cathedral of the Pines are steppingstones to new religious inspiration.

And so it has been through the years.

Already known throughout the world, the Altar of the Nation, which not only recalls the sacrifices of all the American war dead but especially the Creator of those lives, may soon become a national shrine.

Bills to this effect have been introduced in Congress by New Hampshire legislators. The measures would not vest title to the property in the Government nor require Federal funds for upkeep of the shrine, but only to extend official recognition.

There's little doubt about it being worthy of such recognition.

The Situation on the Island of Cyprus

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. IRVING M. IVES
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, July 19, 1956

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the text of an editorial which appeared in the July 5 issue of the British publication, the Man-

chester Guardian Weekly, with respect to the present situation on the island of Cyprus.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MORE BUNGLING

The Prime Minister seems to have bungled his Cyprus policy yet again. After making our flesh creep with the tale of how we shall all starve unless we have an airfield from which to bomb the Arab States if they cut our oil, he allowed it to be given out to the conservative press that a new solution was ready. It was to be announced last week when Sir John Harding got back to Cyprus. There was to be a liberal constitution devised by Lord Radcliffe and a time limit for its operation before the inhabitants were given the right of self-determination. Then the Turks got on the rampage. The Turkish Government, having muzzled its press, stifled its opposition, and, being in desperate economic straits, welcomed the opportunity of a foreign diversion. So it has been breathing fire and slaughter and asserting majority rights for its small minority in Cyprus. The chance of offering a decent democratic constitution with adequate safeguards for minorities has been blocked by Turkish intransigence. The British Government was relying on the political appeasement of the nonviolent Greek Cypriots now since, according to Sir John Harding, the terrorists are on the way to rapid extinction. Now it is back where it began and we are in a worse mess. Cypriot hopes are dashed and, with our well-known tact, we are making the people love us by collective fines on their towns. (The bulk of those on whom fines are being laid must be innocent, since the Government's case is that only a tiny handful approves of terrorism.) The Prime Minister, with his peculiar obstinacy, apparently refused to bring in the Americans and the other members of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. He kept to the imperialist line. A wise Prime Minister would never have allowed himself to get in such an ignominious position. He would have tried the international approach and let the other members of NATO use their pressure on the Turks—and they are not without means—instead of giving the Turks the opening to use us for their own internal purposes. So confusion has become worse confounded. If Cyprus is, as the Prime Minister has admitted, an international problem, why not deal with it internationally? NATO cannot do worse than the British Government has done. But perhaps it is now too late.

The Steel Strike and the Public Interest

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STYLES BRIDGES
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, July 19, 1956

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Who Protects the Public Interest?" which was published in the Concord Daily Monitor, Concord, N. H., of July 16, 1956.

This excellent and thought-provoking editorial makes us aware that the public is the real loser in such a strike as the current steel strike. Everyone will suffer by this tragic lack of ability of management and labor to reach an amicable agreement.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHO PROTECTS THE PUBLIC INTEREST?

In the current steel strike there appears to be little real bitterness as between management and labor, probably because both have been doing pretty well, and no matter what the final terms of settlement are, each will likely do even better in the future.

What is not being determined is the relationship between those ultimate terms and the general economy. In short, are the terms to be justified by a proportionate increase in per capita production, or will the increases in pay and other benefits simply serve to jack up or inflate the American economy still further than it already has been inflated in recent years, which is about 100 percent.

In this instance both labor and management are well organized. There is no question of their not having observed minimum standards as to wages and hours which are established in law, or of their violation of the bargaining rules and regulations likewise imposed by law. However, the public interest may still be being ignored, for it is not represented in the negotiations for an agreement.

The agreement can become what in effect is a conspiracy against the public interest, with management and labor in the steel industry the conspirators rather than bona fide antagonists. For it is certain that if wages go up prices of steel will also go up, and there is no competitive way to prevent prices from rising, thus protecting the public interest.

What we have is an organized labor group willing to strike on the chance that it can distort the economy a little more than organized management in the steel industry feels should be done at this particular time. On the evidence, from the point of view of the public interest, what organized management has already offered organized labor in this instance goes beyond additional benefits to organized labor which have been earned by labor's increased production potential.

In a time of national emergency like war the public interest is protected by Government fixing of both wages and prices. Had such fixing not prevailed in the period of the last war this country probably would have come out of the war period with even greater inflation than has actually resulted. Now, with no war but with public spending for defense as great as they would be even though there was a minor war, the kind of brakes used in wartime are not being applied.

The ramifications of what is done in an industry so basic as steel should be readily apparent to all. An inflationary trend in fixing steel wages and prices will be reflected in similar inflationary actions across the whole American economy, this time as in each similar instance before.

Much the same situation exists in other major American industries.

Extension of Federal Production and Marketing Controls to Fruits and Vegetables for Processing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BOURKE B. HICKENLOOPER
OF IOWA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, July 19, 1956

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I have received a letter of protest concerning Senate bill 2933 which deals with Federal production and marketing controls of fruits and vegetables for processing. The protest is from the Iowa-Nebraska Canners' Association, and I ask unanimous consent that the statement from that association, entitled "The Fallacies of Extending Federal Production and Marketing Controls to Fruits and Vegetables for Processing," be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE FALLACIES OF EXTENDING FEDERAL PRODUCTION AND MARKETING CONTROLS TO FRUITS AND VEGETABLES FOR PROCESSING

Off and on during the past 20 years a few farm organization spokesmen and a few officials of the United States Department of Agriculture have advocated the extension of the order sections of the Federal Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act to all fruits and vegetables for processing. They suggest that the mandatory production and marketing controls authorized in that statute might be successfully used to stabilize or contribute to the orderly marketing of processed fruit or vegetable commodities.

The processing industries, canners and freezers, have vigorously opposed these efforts because they know that the controls provided for in the marketing law were not designed for crops for processing or adapted to canned or frozen fruits or vegetables. Processors also know that the proposed controls would adversely affect the growers of these commodities. The controls could take away the grower's freedom of choice in making up production schedules, limit his activities to historical patterns, and ultimately price his product off of grocers' shelves.

Canners and freezers likewise know that unnecessary production and marketing controls adversely affect consumers by increasing the price of processed fruits and vegetables and by limiting the selection of quality, grade, size, and variety. Most important, the complete absence of any need is a compelling reason for opposing artificial and arbitrary production and marketing controls over canned and frozen fruits and vegetables. The fact is that farmers and canners and freezers have worked out their economic salvation without the necessity for Federal Government intervention.

Vegetable growers and vegetable processors utilize the contract acreage method of securing the highest degree of market stability or orderly marketing without any outside counseling. Neither party becomes a captive and both maintain the opportunity to profit through enterprise, and efficiency.

Natural economic laws are constantly at work to assure fruit growers and fruit processors a better living for each. Fruits that are processed fall into two categories: Those that are now grown solely for the processing market and those that are grown for the fresh as well as the processing market. In each of these situations, the canner pays the grower for the raw product at the time of delivery. The grower receives cash in hand for his product. The canner carries the processing investment and risk and marketing responsibility.

But specifically where the fruit has its sole outlet in processed form, canner competition for the fruit has assured the grower an ever-increasing market, with a consequent increase in orchards and groves.

Where the fruit has a market both fresh and in processed form, the grower has profited from dual competition. Here, the increase in orchards and groves and cranberry bogs has been phenomenal. This growth proves the profit of the enterprise.

Finally, the total fallacy of Federal marketing orders controls is found within the law itself. Whether you are a grower, a canner, or freezer, study the attached out-

line of what the law would authorize if it were amended to apply to any or all processed fruits and vegetables. This indicates what a marketing order could do—to your growers, to you, and to your customers.

WHAT A MARKETING ORDER CAN DO

1. Control the quantity, quality, grade, size, source of every canner's raw material obtained from each grower. Since this must be done on a historical basis, new processors are curbed from entry.

2. Limit the total production nationally, by region, by area, by canner of each canned item on any basis administratively determined.

3. Allocate available raw material and production between canning, freezing, drying, fresh market outlets.

4. Do each of the above on a day-to-day, week-to-week, month-to-month, seasonal basis.

5. Provide for determination of surpluses, disposition of surplus, establishment of reserve pools for any canned product, and assess canners alone for costs of maintaining them.

6. Require inspection and install an inspection system.

7. Regulate cannery practices in the procurement of raw material, including, e. g., handling of crop receipts, field boxes, operation of vining stations, etc.

8. Limit the amount and size and grade of the canned product that may be shipped to each consumer market.

9. Regulate every phase of canning and marketing the canned product that may be administratively called an unfair trade practice.

10. Provide for market research, market development, advertising for any canned product, at canner costs alone.

11. Assess canners alone for the cost of administration, inspection systems, market research and promotion, surplus pools. Such collections do not go into United States Treasury, but are directly spent.

12. Apply all of the above controls and authority directly to the canned product.

Compulsory marketing orders can be put into operation over canner objection, that they are not needed, unworkable, and extremely costly.

The Reactor Rush

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT GORE
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, July 19, 1956

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "The Reactor Rush," published in the Memphis (Tenn.) Commercial Appeal, concerning the program of atomic power reactor construction.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE REACTOR RUSH

By a 49-to-40 vote the Senate has moved to launch a hurry-up program of atomic power reactor construction. The $400 million plan, sponsored by Tennessee Senator ALBERT GORE, still faces action in the House, where some Representatives have demanded a more exact comparison with Russian development than is now available.

The Gore bill was pushed with the contention that the American electrical industry is lagging in the use of atomic reactors while other nations—the Soviet Union, for example—are advancing smartly.

The bill would direct the Atomic Energy Commission to build five power reactors at or near AEC installations. This would provide electricity for atomic plants—easing TVA obligations in some cases—and at the same time advance technical knowledge as to how nuclear energy can best produce electricity.

There is a natural reluctance by private power to smile upon any possible intrusion by the Government that might mean competition.

In the specific field of electric power, nine reactors with a proposed total output of 1,112,500 kilowatts are actually scheduled for construction by private utilities. The Gore bill calls for three plants with 100,000-kilowatt output each and 2 in the 10,000 to 20,000-kilowatt range.

Listing of numerical strength is misleading. A utility group sponsored a recent nationwide advertisement stating that 90 reactors were now built or planned in the United States. Many of the utility firms have since repudiated the ad as incorrect and confusing. The same promotional material indicated a program of 30 reactors for Great Britain, 17 for Russia and 24 in the rest of the world.

Some private power leaders feel this suggests a race to produce kilowatts rather than an effort to stay ahead in reactor technology. It was also pointed out, in the wake of the appearance of the advertisement, that Britain's two operating reactors are primarily plutonium producers, with electricity as a byproduct, and that the 5,000-kilowatt French unit requires 8,000 kilowatts of outside power to run cooling fans.

The Gore bill seems to meet the demand for technological emphasis, and placement of Government reactors in the vicinity of AEC plants does not appear to be a competitive wedge.

The proposed power reactors would serve as a testing ground for both Government atomic development and private utilities. The Nation would not take the chance of letting its reactor research be retarded, and industry and taxpayer alike would be assured that future electrical needs could be met.

Hurricane Damage to North Carolina

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. W. KERR SCOTT
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, July 19, 1956

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address by Brig. Gen. Edward F. Griffin, State director of Civil Defense and Natural Disaster Coordinator for the State of North Carolina, delivered before the 43d national convention of the National Rivers and Harbors Congress, at the Mayflower Hotel, in Washington, D. C., on May 12, 1956.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY BRIG. GEN. EDWARD F. GRIFFIN, STATE DIRECTOR OF CIVIL DEFENSE AND NATURAL DISASTER COORDINATOR FOR THE STATE OF NORTH CAROLINA, BEFORE THE 43D NATIONAL CONVENTION OF THE NATIONAL RIVERS AND HARBORS CONGRESS, WASHINGTON, D. C., MAY 12, 1956

Mr. President, distinguished guests, members of the National Rivers and Harbors Congress, ladies and gentlemen, I am most grateful for this opportunity of appearing before you in order that I may bring you some of the gloomy picture of eastern North Carolina today which has been painted by the powerful and devastating hands of the hurricanes which visited us during 1954 and 1955.

Our troubles began along the coastal areas when Carol and Edna passed near our shores in August 1954, creating unusually high tides and damaging wave action, cutting away many of our natural sand dunes and protective structures. On October 15, which was soon after Carol and Edna, Hazel struck us and left her calling card of death and destruction; and then during August and September of last year Connie, Diane, and Ione found their way to our shores and inland, causing us the loss of many lives and a great property damage.

The entire economy of eastern North Carolina has suffered a devastating and staggering blow as a result of these hurricanes. Practically every farming and business operation in the eastern part of our State has been retarded and adversely affected. These storms have been so severe that it has been conservatively estimated by our engineers that we have lost from 15 to 60 feet of our entire coastal area adjacent to the Atlantic Ocean.

The great damage which we sustained as a result of Hurricane Hazel was caused by the terrifically high winds, and the accompanying high water. Luckily, we did not suffer a great crop damage as a result of this storm for most of our crops in the area had been harvested and sold. Farm property, however, suffered a tremendous impact and loss. We had more than 25,000 farm homes and buildings destroyed and damaged at a loss of more than $50 million. Our standing timbers in the area were given a terrific pounding by the winds, and we suffered a loss thereby in blown down and uprooted trees something more than $3 million. The hundreds of tributaries leading into our navigable waters were clogged, and dammed by the thousands of fallen trees and debris. The many district canals and ditches were likewise clogged and rendered useless by the fallen trees and debris. Our farmers have exhausted their means and resources in an effort to drain their farmlands, but are unable to clear out the tributaries and headwaters which are so vital in the drainage of the surrounding farmlands.

The condition just described has created a tremendous health hazard in that ideal breeding grounds for all types of mosquitoes now exist in the large areas of stagnant water pent up by the clogged canals, ditches, and streams. Local health officials and the State health department have been struggling for many months, with inadequate manpower and materials, attempting to eradicate these millions of disease-carrying pests. Their task can never be accomplished unless they are furnished greater financial aid than has so far been provided for drainage and stream clearance. We have done our best, but the resources of the localities and of our State have simply not been great enough to provide what is necessary.

To give some idea of the great and destructive force of Hurricane Hazel, we had 19 persons killed, approximately 4,000 urban homes destroyed, and 1,000 commercial and industrial buildings demolished. In fact, we had one little community which was completely wiped out. Before the storm there were 357 buildings in the town and after the storm, there were only 5 buildings which remained on their foundations. The total property damage as a result of Hurricane Hazel amounted to more than $125 million.

When Connie, Diane, and Ione arrived during August and September of last year, the storm area was still staggering under the blows of Hazel. The torrential rains, which fell throughout the area, in one instance measuring 15.25 inches in a 24-hour period, together with the terrifically high winds and pressures which pushed the waters inland

out of our sounds, flooded approximately 2,650 square miles, or 26 percent of the total land area of the 22 coastal counties. I am advised by engineers and other experts that this situation was greatly aggravated due to the clogged conditions of our headwaters and streams which were left in dire need of clearing as a result of Hurricane Hazel.

Some of our richest and most productive farmlands are located in the area which the storms embraced. Many of these productive farms were served by drainage districts. These suffered untold damages from debris being deposited in the canals and ditches—these drainage systems being the lifeline of our agriculture in many of the storm stricken eastern counties.

In 12 of our counties, we have had 45,328 acres of our croplands covered with salt water, which renders the land useless from 2 to 3 years. In 31 of our counties, we have had 86,590 of our acres of cropland covered with fresh water.

One of our eastern towns which was 35 or 40 miles from the ocean had more than 40 blocks completely inundated from high water for several days, which cost untold damage to private and public property.

The damages which we sustained as a result of the three 1955 hurricanes was in excess of more than $193 million. Agriculture suffered the great bulk of the loss from the storms, amounting to $131 million. One-third of North Carolina's population consists of farmers and farm families, and we have more individual farms than any State except Texas. A blow of such serious proportions to agriculture upsets the economy of our entire State.

If we are to save, from the ravages of hurricanes, some of our finest farmlands situated in our coastal counties, it is essential that we construct the necessary levees along our rivers and waterways to prevent the rising waters incident to a hurricane and torrential rains accompanying them from again flooding these lands. We are also faced with the problem of keeping open, free of debris, and operational our many drainage canals and ditches so that the waters may have an escape way to our sounds and the ocean.

There are many of our eastern towns and communities which are in dire need of permanent-type breakwaters and bulkheads—such structures would have saved in the past four storms many millions of dollars in property damage.

Unfortunately, the insurance coverage in the storm area was very small and inadequate when compared to the tremendous losses sustained. Our farmers and all manner of businesses, including our commercial fishing industries, private properties, public properties, and facilities owned by the various municipalities and counties. All suffered severe and staggering damages.

Under the provisions of Public Law 875, the President of the United States has declared our hurricane area a major disaster area and has allocated to the Federal Civil Defense Administrator the sum of $4 million to be used for debris clearance, health measures, and the temporary restoration of essential publicly owned facilities. This has helped us a great deal in the rehabilitation of the public facilities in our towns but is most inadequate in making the necessary permanent repairs that are required if we are to protect public property in the area.

The great protective bulwark for eastern North Carolina against the ravages of the Atlantic Ocean are our outer banks. They should and must be protected if we are to guarantee the safety of many of our coastal counties and communities. Along these outer banks lies the birthplace of the first English child in America, the historic site of the first airplane flight in America, and the Hatteras Lighthouse, which is vital to navigation on the Atlantic Ocean, as well as the National Seashore Park and some of the finest beaches and beach communities to be found anywhere in America.

Along our Outer Banks we have had many new inlets to be formed turning the saline ocean waters directly into our sounds. This creates a threat of great magnitude to our commercial fishing industry. Unfortunately, a vast part of our Outer Banks are uninhabited and according to the interpretation of Public Law 875 by the Federal Civil Defense Administration, those uninhabited threatened areas are not eligible for rehabilitation operations out of Federal funds under said law.

With more than 300 miles of shore line to be stabilized against hurricanes, the other ravages of nature, and the Atlantic Ocean, our State is faced with a problem of great magnitude and cost. Our State is not blessed with the rock ribbed coast line found in many States; and, in my opinion, if we are to save what we have left, it will be essential that we construct without delay the necessary breakwaters, groins, jetties, and seawalls.

There is one further point I would like to make while here today, and that is that North Carolina as a State has, and will continue, to make every effort to help take care of our disaster needs with our own resources. For instance, our State agencies, such as the highway department, agriculture department, etc., have expended considerable amounts from their normal budgets for administrative purposes in connection with these disasters. The Council of State authorized the expenditure of $27,000 for study known as North Caroline hurricane rehabilitation project. We have created a new office in our State government called the director of hurricane rehabilitation. This director is given the full-time job of doing everything possible through the planning and installation of protective devices to minimize the damages we may receive from any future hurricanes.

In short, the State of North Carolina is doing all it can to meet its own needs through its own efforts. This we will continue to do, but we need your assistance. It is imperative that we have relief or we will be faced with possibly disastrous consequences.

There are many projects which are needed if we are to preserve our great coastal area, and I plead with you this morning to assist us in having them investigated by the Corps of Engineers:

1. Groins to prevent further erosion of beaches and to preserve the Outer Banks, estimated cost—$11,865,000.
2. Reconstruction of destroyed sand dunes and sand fences, estimated cost—$1,580,000.
3. Drainage of agricultural lands, estimated cost—$5,386,000.
4. Breakwater to prevent inundation of Belhaven waterfront, estimated cost—$333,000.
5. Fort Fisher erosion.
6. Southport yacht basin enlargement and shrimp boat harbor.
7. Southport waterfront retaining bulkhead.

There are pending, which have been authorized for investigation by the Corps of Engineers, some 21 projects which are vital to our rehabilitation program. Unfortunately, these projects have not been investigated due to the fact that the Corps of Engineers has not received the necessary appropriation. It is our hope that this convention will go on record requesting the Congress to make funds available for these necessary authorized projects for investigation. All of these projects are most meritorious and should be constructed at an early date.

Funds for four of our essential projects have been included in budget recommendations for the fiscal year 1956–57. We hope that you will help us in obtaining this appropriation which is vital to our rehabilitation program.

We have approximately 20 projects which have been approved but still lack the funds for construction or completion. All of these are most worthy and we sincerely request that you assist us in obtaining the necessary appropriations.

In order that you may be fully advised as to the damages which we have sustained in North Carolina as a result of these four hurricanes, which have visited us within the past 18 months, I am attaching hereto an itemized statement which are the figures we arrived at based on surveys of local authorities and officials, local civil defense directors, engineers from our office, reports from the American Red Cross, reports from the United States Department of Agriculture, reports from the Federal Housing and Home Administration and from personal surveys and observations. We feel that they are reasonably accurate and can give you some idea as to the staggering blow delivered to the economy of eastern North Carolina, during the past 18 months.

Storm damage to State as a whole, hurricane Hazel, Oct. 15, 1954

Estimated damages to public highways, public utilities, State and municipally owned property	$10,000,000
ESTIMATED DAMAGE TO PRIVATE PROPERTY	
4,000 dwelling houses completely destroyed or suffering major damage, estimate at $7,500 average	$30,000,000
20,000 dwelling houses sustaining minor damage estimated at $1,000 average	20,000,000
10,000 farm buildings completely destroyed or suffering major damage estimated at $4,000	40,000,000
15,000 farm buildings sustaining minor damage estimated at $700 average	10,500,000
1,000 business buildings completely destroyed or sustaining major damage estimated at $5,000 average	5,000,000
4,000 business buildings and personal property sustaining minor damage estimated at $1,000	4,000,000
Estimated damage sustained by church, church property, private colleges, and schools	1,000,000
Estimated damage to standing timber	3,000,000
Total estimated damage in North Carolina	123,500,000
ESTIMATED DAMAGES SUSTAINED IN NORTH CAROLINA AS A RESULT OF HURRICANES CONNIE, DIANE, AND IONE	
Public utilities	$2,000,000
North Carolina State-owned property	500,000
North Carolina State highways and bridges	1,500,000
Farm crops and other agricultural losses	106,629,248
Cost of mosquito-control program	500,000
Services and contributions to disaster area by State departments	565,982
Private property damage other than agricultural	49,520,000
Damage to public property of counties, cities, and towns	7,839,000
Total damage in North Carolina	[1] 169,054,730

[1] The above figures were arrived at soon after the storms and according to our best available information. Based on the research in preparing for the North Carolina

hurricane rehabilitation project, the damages for the 1955 hurricanes now exceed $193 million. Of this amount it has been determined that the agricultural losses amount to $131 million.

Freedom Crusade

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUGH J. ADDONIZIO
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 16, 1956

Mr. ADDONIZIO. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to call attention to the vigorous campaign being conducted in the archdiocese of Newark, under the leadership of the Right Reverend Monsignor Cornelius J. Boyle, in behalf of the American citizens held in prison in Red China. This Freedom Crusade was initiated by the Reverend Harold W. Rigney, S. V. D., who was released from prison September 16, 1955, after 4 years and 2 months of confinement.

Messrs. Allen C. Bradley, of the Advocate, the official publication of the archdiocese of Newark, and Edward Cuffe, who served in China with the State Department, are cochairman of the archdiocesan crusade. Under their able direction, splendid progress has already been made. The campaign is now in high gear, as is indicated in the following article in the Advocate of July 14, 1956. I commend this noble cause to all my colleagues in the Congress.

ACCM To Sponsor Freedom Crusade To Free Americans

Newark.—Eleven American citizens are still held in prison by the Red Chinese and their plight has been noted by the Archdiocesan Council of Catholic Men as a matter of major concern and action.

At an executive board meeting July 9 at the Chancery Office the NCCM unit unanimously voted to adopt the Freedom Crusade inaugurated recently by Rev. Harold W. Rigney, S. V. D., himself released after serving 4 years and 2 months of a 10-year prison term imposed on him by the Reds.

The July 9 meeting was attended by 35 representatives of various Catholic men's organizations including the 4 county presidents of the ACCM. Appointed cochairman of the archdiocesan crusade to free the imprisoned Americans were Allen C. Bradley and Edward Cuffe, former member of the United States State Department who served in China.

Rt. Rev. Msgr. Cornelius J. Boyle archdiocesan director, urged the men to carry the message back to their various organizations and to ask their spiritual directors to back the Freedom Crusade.

"It is possible," he said, "that we could get a half-million letters going to Mao Tse-Tung from Bergen, Essex, Hudson, and Union Counties."

The plan as outlined by Monsignor Boyle will go into effect immediately. Each county will handle its own phase of the crusade with the county president as director. They in turn will report to the archdiocesan directors of the crusade.

As originally outlined by Father Rigney, the plan is a letter-writing campaign to Chairman Mao Tse-Tung, head of Red China's government, politely petitioning the release of the Americans still held prisoners by the Chinese Reds.

The address is Chairman Mao Tse-tung, Peking, China. Father Rigney recommends the use of a 25-cent airmail stamp because, as he has stated, "the misinformed Chinese will be astonished to see that American laborers can afford airmail. In Red China a carpenter must work several hours to purchase an airmail stamp."

The priest has declared that the letters should contain three principal points.

The writer should give his name, occupation, name of the labor union, if any, marital status, and number of children.

The Red chief should then be reminded that his government promised in September 1955 to free the American prisoners still held in Red China, and that the writer would like to see him keep his promise.

In conclusion the writer may say that he hopes Mao Tse-tung will demonstrate the policy of leniency which he has previously professed.

In his personal appeal to Americans throughout the country Father Rigney declared.

"I know what prison life is like in Red China, a veritable hell of mental and physical tortures. I am sure these prisoners are going through the same or similar tortures I endured. If your letter helps reduce even to a small extent the imprisonment of these fellow Americans it will be well worthwhile and they will be eternally grateful to you as I am to the tens of thousands who wrote letters in my behalf."

It was announced during the July 9 meeting that Monsignor Boyle's letter to the Advocate (June 30) was entered in the July 2 Congressional Record by Congressman T. James Tumulty.

The Congressional Record of June 20 also contains an appeal for support of the crusade by Congressman Hugh J. Addonizio. A letter from Congressman Addonizio was also read at the July 9 meeting. In this message, he stated that he had written to Mao Tse-tung and had also directed an appeal to the president of the American Broadcasting Co. to present the freedom crusade on a national basis.

Material for the freedom crusade will be in the hands of county presidents soon, according to the directors.

Hildrus Augustus Poindexter

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 19, 1956

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following deserved citation given to a great American on the occasion of his being awarded an honorary degree of doctor of science at Dartmouth College, June 1956:

Hildrus Augustus Poindexter, Medical Director, Chief of Health and Sanitation Division, United States Operations Mission to Vietnam, Doctor of Science

Lincoln University A. B., graduate of the Dartmouth Medical School in 1927, Harvard M. D., Columbia A. M. and Ph. D., sometime fellow of the Rockefeller Foundation, professor of Howard University, colonel of the United States Army Medical Corps, and one-time porter of the Pullman Co., you have the rare distinction of having saved human lives on a vast scale. Born into the poverty of a farming family in Shelby County, Tenn., educated through the generosity of others, and your own determination, you equipped yourself to become a world authority on the control and elimination of malaria, the largest health impairment of human effort on the face of the earth. As teacher and researcher and author of some 70 scientific publications in microbiology and public health, as Army officer, administrator, and public-health official, you have followed the trail of the malaria-bearing mosquito into well-nigh all the continents and archipelagos of the world. Holder of the Bronze Star for spectacular reduction of the malaria scourage among our soldiers in the South Pacific, Knight Commander of Liberia for a similar service to that land, Dartmouth, where you received your first professional education, is proud to count you among the most honored in her fellowship as doctor of science, honoris causa.

Adolphe H. Wenzell

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT GORE
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, July 19, 1956

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record an editorial entitled "A Tear for Adolphe," published in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, concerning Adolphe H. Wenzell, who, as consultant to the Government, helped to work out the Dixon-Yates deal.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

A Tear for Adolphe

We are beginning to feel sorry for Adolphe H. Wenzell. Poor Adolphe has all the earmarks of a scapegoat. He resembles the luckless native who is thrown from the sled to keep the wolves at bay. He is the ballast dropped to keep the balloon up, the cargo jettisoned to save the ship, the sacrificial lamb offered on the altar.

Mr. Wenzell was the vice president of First Boston Corp., who as consultant to the Government, helped work out the Dixon-Yates deal, which his own banking firm then undertook to help finance. The Dixon-Yates deal was the Eisenhower administration's scheme for supplying Memphis with power while simultaneously striking a crippling blow at TVA. For a long time there in 1954 and 1955, the administration poured ergs and ergs of energy into the drive to put Dixon-Yates across, and Adolphe H. Wenzell was in the thick of it all.

Alack, how fickle fortune can be. Under great pressure, President Eisenhower finally scuttled Dixon-Yates. Messrs. Dixon and Yates sued for their alleged expenses. Attorney General Brownell's Department of Justice, defending the suit, has now filed a reply which cites Mr. Wenzell's dual role as the main reason for repudiating any Government obligation under the canceled contract. Mr. Brownell, in other words, is blandly agreeing with the very charges that were brought by critics of Dixon-Yates at the time he and other administration officials were strenuously defending it.

Mr. Wenzell, as the architect of Dixon-Yates, was doing what Chairman Strauss, of the Atomic Energy Commision wanted done. He was doing what the Bureau of the Budget, Presidential Assistant Sherman Adams, and President Eisenhower wanted done.

Whether the Government which worked so closely with Mr. Wenzell in this enterprise can now escape legal responsiblity by calling it unlawful and denouncing Mr. Wenzell for conflict of interest is a matter for the courts to decide. But we can't help shedding a tear for poor Adolphe. It's a sad thing to happen to one of the boys.

Code for Contests in Public Speaking

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LESTER HOLTZMAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 11, 1956

Mr. HOLTZMAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a code for contests in public speaking, which was prepared by and endorsed by the membership and executive committee of the Speech Association of the Eastern States:

CODE FOR CONTESTS IN PUBLIC SPEAKING ENDORSED BY THE SPEECH ASSOCIATION OF THE EASTERN STATES

Observing the failure of many contests in oratory adequately to meet the educational needs of students in secondary schools, colleges, and universities in the eastern sector of the United States, the Speech Association of the Eastern States hereby records its approval of the following code for contests in public speaking:

A. Because of the sundry unpleasant associations which have clustered about the term "oratory," with its 19th century frame of reference carried into the mid-20th century, it would be prudent to replace the label "oratory" with one more connotatively acceptable, "public speaking."

B. Institutions and agencies which sponsor contests legitimately obtain therefrom public-relations prestige. This prestige is enhanced whenever the primary motivation becomes the providing of sound training in effective communication of ideas for American youth, the potential future leaders of American Government, society, the culture. Uppermost in the minds of all who direct such contests should be the future benefits which may accrue to all students who participate: all those who enter, all those who win. Directorial procedures should insure useful learning and just appraisal for each contestant.

C. All contests should be directed, and all students entering contests should be guided, by teachers competent in the discipline of public speaking. Normally such competence is attained through higher education and teaching experience in this area of the field of speech. If a secondary school, college, or university electing to participate in a contest has no teacher of public speaking on its faculty, it should either (1) employ one for the specific task of training its students for such contest or (2) enable a member of its existing faculty, at least by partial financial subsidy, to pursue summer-session study in public speaking at a recognized college or university in order to qualify for direction of such contest during the following year.

D. Judges:

1. All contests should be judged solely by persons competent in the discipline of public speaking. Normally such competence derives from higher education and teaching experience in this area of the field of speech. Competence may also derive from practical experience in communication. Community leaders are often wise judges of public speaking: Their wisdom, however, does not derive from such professions as law, ministry, and teaching of subjects other than speech. The criterion in selection of judges should always be not profession, not position, but knowledge of and ability to apply standards of effective modern speaking. Such selection renders superfluous the type of ballot which excessively classifies criteria and demands unreliable assignment of minute percentage points in rating scales. The importance of selection of judges cannot be overemphasized, since contests rewarding ineffectual communication swiftly and seriously sabotage the educational goals of such contests. A contestant who diligently, judiciously prepares a speech acquires an inalienable right to evaluation on the basis of sound, relevant criteria.

2. Further to insure competent decisions in contests, normally each judge should receive at least a token honorarium, plus expenses, for rendering his expert service. No administrator would employ in an athletic contest a referee who did not know the rules of the game; nor would he request such service without compensation. The analogy with contests in speaking is patent. When necessary to conserve finances, contest directors may employ a carefully selected single critic-judge; for such service a minimum fee would be $25, plus expense. On the other hand, this association believes that no educational institution or sponsoring agency which is honestly unable to include judging fees in its contest budget should thereby be deprived of the services of an expert evaluator. Members of this association should always stand ready to render such service gratis—provided, it must be added, that such contribution is unequivocally recognized and acknowledged by the sponsoring institution or agency as an educational contribution by a professionally trained expert.

E. Both in directing and in judging contests in public speaking the following standards should be adduced:

1. A basic criterion should be the conception of an original, significant, single idea in the speech. This idea should arise from the speaker's own knowledge and experience, with this initial conception supplemented by considerable research.

2. Another criterion should be the structuring or organizing of the speech which develops this single idea. It should be divided, logically, or psychologically, into its component subideas, which should add up to relevant, adequate support and development of the idea itself. Assertions should be followed by tangible evidence and proof; authorities should be identified. Abstractions should be translated into concrete instances. The specific should be preferred to the general. Examples, illustrations, and other devices of interest should enliven as well as clarify the development. Above all, adaptation to the particular audience should be stressed. A speech should never be presented in a vacuum to a phantom audience; it should be directed to real listeners, whose knowledge, experience, interests, and attitudes determine not the idea for the speech itself, but how that idea can be effectively presented. A contest speech on a single subject should mutate in its development as the audiences which hear it mutate; it should be restructured for each new group of listeners to whom it is given.

3. Still another criterion should be the delivery of the speech, which, because it is a means to an end, should not be adjudged more important than the factors of conception, organization, and development. Three methods of preparing to deliver a speech are available; each contest should prescribe one of these methods:

(a) The contestant may write out his speech and read it from manuscript. If this method is prescribed, he should be trained to write a manuscript which manifests oral rather than written style: it should not sound like "an essay standing on its hind legs." He should also be trained to read that manuscript so that he converses with his listeners, with spontaneity and with audience contact. His efforts should be judged on the basis of his ability to write and to speak as a speaker. Because this method of preparation will be employed only rarely in the contestant's later occupational and civic life, this association does not recommend this method.

(b) The contestant may write out his speech and memorize it. Again, he should be trained to write in oral rather than written style. In delivering his speech from memory, moreover, he should be trained so to speak it that no listener could possibly suspect it has been memorized by rote: the delivery should be utterly natural, spontaneous, conversational; never mechanical, artificial, or seemingly planned. Despite the fact that the contestant has memorized his speech, he should not merely repeat the words; he should communicate the ideas, what the words mean. Gesture and inflection of voice are significant only if they unpremeditatedly evolve from a sincere realization of the worth of what one is saying and contribute to the transference of meaning from speaker to auditor. The contestant's effort should be judged on the basis of his ability to write a speech rather than an essay and, as he speaks, to rethink his thoughts at the moment he utters them. Because of the enormous amount of time required successfully to write and to deliver from memory, because the memorized method is inefficient and rarely employed in the communicative situations in which a student will later engage in his vocational and avocational life, and because this method tends to produce a stilted, unnatural, often regrettably bombastic style, this association does not recommend this method. In an educationally defensible contest a student should prepare for life by employing a method which normally he will need to use in that life.

(c) Hence this association recommends the so-called extemporaneous method of preparing and delivering contest speeches. This method should not be confused with the impromptu method, in which no specific preparation occurs. With the extempore method a great deal of preparation precedes delivery: much thinking, investigating, careful planning, incorporating that planning into a competent outline, adapting content to the needs of listeners, practicing the speech aloud with or without outline or notes. All is prepared save the actual wording of the sentences expressing the ideas, which is spontaneously evolved as the speaker speaks—in his preliminary practice and in the contest speech itself. This method forces the speaker to think his way through the development of his idea as he speaks, thus to afford to his listeners the impression of a desire to communicate genuinely with them, with a becoming naturalness instead of a corrupting artificiality. The contest speaker should evidence an attempt to understand and to implement the paramount concept of modern oral communication: that the place where a speech really occurs is not on a platform, not even in the functioning intelligence of the speaker, but always in the minds of those who listen. A contest speech is not an exhibition of skill, not a performance before people: it must communicate ideas to and with people.

Adopted by the Speech Association of the Eastern States in annual business meeting on April 14, 1956. Approved in final form on May 18, 1956.

Defense: Too Little, Too Late?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 29, 1956

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I have been disturbed by the unwarranted and dangerous complacency which has characterized this administration's handling of our defense program. I include as part of my remarks for the information of my colleagues an excellent article on the subject Defense: Too Little, Too Late? which appears in the August 1956 issue of the Democratic Digest:

DEFENSE: TOO LITTLE, TOO LATE?

It was summer again all right, but somehow it didn't seem quite the same. The beaches were perhaps a little more crowded, turnpike traffic a little thicker, cars a little longer, your breath a little shorter. There were more television sets than ever before, more chromium on the family car—both of them. The fidelity was higher, the skin divers lower, the sports cars faster, the youngsters seemed a little older and the oldsters seemed a little younger.

But it was more than that—there was something nagging in the back of the mind, something in the air, something which seemed to say: It will never be the same again.

And the unhappy truth is that it never will. For in the spring of 1956, while Americans were planning their annual summer dispersal to the mountains and the shore, a Senate subcommittee, studying United States airpower, brought out the unpleasant fact that for the first time in history, it would soon be possible for another nation to attack America and deliver a knockout blow before her colossal production capacity could be thrown into high gear.

And as the subcommittee put on the record what had already been implied in a long series of forewarning speeches, documents and magazine articles, there was increasing doubt as to whether the country would be ready for that day of unprecedented peril when it arrived.

Three years ago, the leaders of a nation which could easily outproduce any two countries in the world had made a fateful decision. It had been foreshadowed in the campaign of 1952 by repeated statements of General Eisenhower and others. "But the big spending is, of course," said candidate Eisenhower in Baltimore, "the $60 billion we pay for national security. Here is where the largest savings can be made."

The problem, as the newly elected Eisenhower team saw it, was to balance the Great Equation—to equate needed military strength with maximum economic strength. In words they insisted that the efforts to achieve both sides of the equation should be equal. But in action, in everything they did, it was obvious they really believed that the efforts on one side, to paraphrase George Orwell, should be "more equal" than efforts on the other side. And for the Eisenhower team, made up mostly of big-business men, the "more equal" side was the economic.

They decided that, despite the changing nature of warfare resulting from the release of atomic energy, the most important thing still was to cut spending and balance the budget so that we would be in a position to reduce taxes as soon as possible—not so much individual taxes, it soon became clear, as corporate taxes.

It was called "a calculated risk," a description which was clarified by Senator STUART SYMINGTON: "They calculate the budget figures," Senator SYMINGTON said, "and the people take the risk."

As a result, by the spring of the year 11 A. H. (After Hiroshima), while the budget balancers boasted of a $2 billion surplus in the Treasury, while merchants were using fire-sale tactics to peddle TV sets, while every car lot in the Nation was packed with unsold automobiles, in Washington an alarmed group of Senators sat and listened to one Air Force General after another testify that because they had been denied the money (1) the world's most powerful Nation would soon have the world's second best Air Force, and (2) there were grave doubts about the future ability of the United States to defend itself against a coordinated surprise attack.

This came as a considerable shock to a nation which had been assured by the Eisenhower team, when it came up with its new look defense policy, that although there had been drastic cuts in our Armed Forces, we would have an overwhelmingly superior Air Force: "I assure you * * * most emphatically," said Defense Secretary Wilson, "that we are not going to have the second-best Air Force."

Just as there are today those who disagree with President Eisenhower and Wilson about the relative strength of United States-Russian air power, there were those who disagreed then with the reduction in the size of our ground forces. Among them was a member of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, Gen. Matthew Ridgway, who eventually resigned in protest. "I do not recall," Ridgway wrote in his memoirs, "that I ever felt a greater sense of surprise and shock than when I read in President Eisenhower's state of the Union message in 1954 that 'The defense program recommended for 1955 * * * is based on a new military program unanimously recommended by the Joint Chiefs of Staff.'

"As a member of the Joint Chiefs of Staff who most emphatically had not concurred in the 1955 military program as it was presented to the people, I was nonplussed by this statement. The fact is, the 1955 budget was a 'directed verdict,' as were the Army budgets for 1956 and 1957. The force levels provided in all three were not primarily based on military needs. They were squeezed within the framework of preset, arbitrary manpower and fiscal limits, a complete inversion of the normal process."

But when Ridgway objected to the policy, it was suggested "sometimes subtly, sometimes crudely," as he put it, that when all was said and done how could he really presume to know more about the subject than the President. On one occasion Secretary Wilson flatly stated that the forces recommended were approved by the President, who was, as everyone knows, a former soldier of wide experience, and to express opposing views would place Ridgway in the position of taking issue with his Commander in Chief. "And that," said Mr. Wilson, "would not be good."

When it would not be good for General Ridgway, a member of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, a soldier of wide experience and outstanding service in World War II and Korea, to question the President's judgment, then it was apparent that no one—from former Secretaries, Assistant Secretaries, and generals of the Air Force on down—should be presumptuous enough to question Ike's judgment.

That the Eisenhower team stands firmly on this position has been demonstrated over and over. Not long ago in a television debate, Paul Butler referred to the alarming testimony given by General LeMay, General Partridge and other Air Force chiefs, before the Symington subcommittee, and questioned the state of national security. Leonard Hall replied with considerable sarcasm: "I really do believe that * * * we will have more respect for [General Eisenhower's] opinion on what is preparedness rather than the opinion of General Butler or General Symington."

"But what about LeMay's testimony?" replied Butler, still trying to bring the issue out for debate.

"In my opinion," Hall repeated, "President Eisenhower will never let this Nation be unprepared."

Despite repeated efforts to impress upon us the infallibility of Ike's judgment, it has been apparent ever since the late Gen. Hoyt Vandenberg severely criticized the cuts imposed upon the Air Force, that there are many experienced, well-informed, responsible people—in and out of Government and the Armed Forces—who question the state of the Nation's preparedness, and who fortunately have not been intimidated by the presence of 5 stars at 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue. In fact, the criticism of the Nation's defense position is so widespread, it is almost as if President Eisenhower were standing alone in disagreement with the entire informed opinion of the country.

For instance:

After a long and impressive speech before the Society of Eusiness Magazine Editors in which he told how Russia was forging ahead of us with the speed and quality of their military production, Adm. H. G. Rickover asked: "Is the Soviet Union a serious threat to our survival? If the answer to that is 'Yea' then we must ask ourselves this second question: Is the Nation doing all that it can and all that it should to turn back that threat? If the answer to that is 'No.' then I submit that something is wrong with us and that we are in trouble."

That we are in trouble has been obvious to Senator SYMINGTON, who has been advocating increased defense appropriations for 3 years. Last February, while recommending an article by Arthur Godfrey stating that the United States needs 1,200 B–52 bombers, and that at the rate we are building them it will take 24 years, SYMINGTON asked if we should boast of our technical superiority at a time when "over one-third of our modern jet bombers attached to the Tactical Air Command were grounded because of lack of mechanics?" As for the lag in B–52 production, the Senator said he had asked the reason for it, and the answer was: "We have three problems—the first is money; the second is money; and the third is money."

Last year Dr. James Killian, Jr., president of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, formed a committee to study the relative military and industrial strength of Russia and the United States. Although the Killian report has not been made public, some of its conclusions were revealed last September by columnist Joseph Alsop writing in the New York Herald Tribune. Among other things, said Alsop, the Killian report shows that Russia is overtaking the United States in the air atomic weapons race and that between 1960 and 1965 the Russians will surpass us. To prevent this, the report concluded, it would be impossible not to upset the administration's budget planning.

Gen. Donald L. Putt, Air Force Deputy Chief of Staff, has warned that the United States is lagging in basic research. He was particularly concerned with the grave possibility that Russian scientists might come up with a technological surprise like a super-intercontinental guided-missile.

Last February, Senator HENRY M. JACKSON said in the Senate that there was good evidence Russia would test an intercontinental ballistic missile with a 1,500-mile range by the end of this year. He charged that the United States guided missile program was seriously bogged down.

Any doubts about the accuracy of Senator JACKSON'S statements were dispelled by two

articles written for Look magazine by former Air Force Assistant Secretary Trevor Gardner, after his resignation. Our program to build the first ICBM, Gardner concurred, "is snarled up in bureaucratic redtape * * * is smothering in an administrative nightmare of committees and subcommittees competing with each other for influence and appropriations. * * * With every tick of the clock the Soviet Union is moving closer to the capacity of knocking the country out * * * the danger America faces has not been apparent to the general public because it has not been revealed."

Further evidence of confusion in the Pentagon was revealed recently when an interservice feud broke out in the open.

The New York Coliseum

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LESTER HOLTZMAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 19, 1956

Mr. HOLTZMAN. Mr. Speaker, on Thursday, May 12, 1955, the Honorable James F. Walsh, managing director, New York Coliseum, spoke before the National Council of Business and Professional Men, Inc. on the subject The Effect the New York Coliseum Will Have and What It Will Mean to the Businesses in New York City and to the Exposition Business Throughout the World.

Mr. Walsh was the manager of exposition department, Grand Central Palace, New York City, until the exposition floors of the building were leased to the Internal Revenue Bureau of the United States Treasury Department. He is a recognized expert in this field, having had many years experience organizing and producing international, national, and local expositions. He is a vice president of the International Auditorium Managers Association and a member of the Horticultural Society and the Hotel Executives Club. He is now renting agent of the New York Coliseum which opened in April 1956.

Mr. Walsh showed the two scale models of the New York Coliseum. One is the neighborhood model, which shows all of that area; the other was a demountable or take-apart model, which showed the exhibit space, elevators, escalators, meeting room areas, and all of the facilities which are now available to exhibitors who will use the coliseum.

Because of their importance, I insert both the release of the Triborough Bridge and Tunnel Authority, of which the Honorable Robert Moses is chairman, and the address of Mr. Walsh:

RELEASE OF THE TRIBOROUGH BRIDGE AND TUNNEL AUTHORITY, MAY 12, 1956

About $60 million in new money will be brought to New York City each year by trade shows using the New York Coliseum, James Walsh told members of the Council of Business and Professional Men at a luncheon at the Advertising Club on May 12, 1956. Mr. Walsh, who is renting agent, also predicted that completion of the New York Coliseum would mark the start of a great improvement development for the whole west side of the island.

Formerly in charge of booking shows at Grand Central Palace, Mr. Walsh recalled that when that building was opened in 1911, there were hardly any buildings or businesses above 42d Street on the East Side. Soon after the palace opened, hotels, restaurants, drug and clothing stores and many other types of businesses sprang up around the palace. He predicted that a similar development would take place around the New York Coliseum.

Mr. Walsh also estimated that from 2½ to 3 million people would visit the New York Coliseum each year. These people will come from all parts of the world, and represent a huge source of buying power. The effect of their spending will be felt by every type of business in the city. Mr. Walsh revealed that already tentative bookings for shows have been made from the very day the building opens.

Mr. Walsh had high praise for Commissioner Robert Moses and his associates for their determination to erect this building in the heart of the city, convenient to all forms of transportation.

Using a demountable scale model, Mr. Walsh showed the council members just how the four floors of exhibit space could be used for one big exhibit, or broken up to handle several shows at one time.

SPEECH OF HON. JAMES F. WALSH

Mr. Chairman, Mr. Bayern, members, distinguished guests, I was very pleased and flattered when your chairman invited me to come down to the Council of Business and Professional Men and meet with you today, and I greatly appreciate the opportunity of being here—particularly when I am priviledged to talk with you about the New York Coliseum, in which I know you all have a great interest.

Your chairman was kind enough to send me a copy of the speech recently given you by the Honorable Abe Stark. That was a great speech. Mr. Stark has some prosperous ideas for the city of New York, and no small part of the future prosperity of this city is centered around the New York Coliseum.

It is estimated that the trade shows and public attractions that will be held in the new Coliseum will bring an additional $60 million to this city every year. That means that over a million dollars of new money will find its way into the cash registers of the businesses of this city after the New York Coliseum is open. And ladies and gentleman, that is a lot of money.

My predecessor in this business, Mr. Fred W. Payne, who opened the Grand Central Palace in 1911, often told me that when the palace was built, there were hardly any buildings or businesses above 42d Street on the East Side, but soon after shows began to be held and crowds began to come to the palace, hotels sprang up, restaurants, drug stores, clothing stores, etc., all came into being in that area. We can justly anticipate that new hotels, new restaurants, new stores and new business of all kinds will spring up around the New York Coliseum. If history repeats itself, there will be a great improvement in the whole West Side of Manhattan Island.

It is estimated that 2½ to 3 million people will visit the New York Coliseum each year, and they will come from all parts of the world. They represent a huge source of buying power, and more buying power means new businesses, and new businesses mean more employment.

The trade shows and public attractions that will be held in the New York Coliseum will all be of prestige nature. They will be the largest and finest that are now held not only in New York City, but in other parts of the country. We have a great many tentative bookings now from the very day the New York Coliseum will be open.

The businessmen in this city, in this Nation, and the exposition world universally, should be forever grateful to Commissioner Robert Moses and his associates for creating this magnet which will make New York City, in addition to being the financial and business capital of the world, the exposition capital of the world, come March 1, 1956.

The New York Coliseum will be located the very heart of New York City. Probably no other location in the city is accessible to more means of transportation. The Eighth Avenue, Sixth Avenue, and IRT subways are right at the building. The Eighth Avenue, Broadway, and Fifth Avenue buses pass the door. Another bus that passes the door is the 72d Street Crosstown. The BMT subway and the 57th Street Crosstown bus are only a block away. It is only minutes—perhaps less than 15—away from the Pennsylvania and New York Central terminals, and from a great collection of New York City's finest hotels.

Those of us who use the facilities created by the Triborough Bridge and Tunnel Authority—the bridges, the tunnels, the highways, etc.—have implicit faith that the New York Coliseum will, too, be the finest and most complete exposition hall that has ever been built.

The Triborough Bridge and Tunnel Authority has had these two models of the New York Coliseum built as a sales utensil. One is a neighborhood model and the other is a take-apart model, so that promoters of such activities as will be held there may have a visual concept of what the building is going to be like. In a minute I will take one of these models apart to show you the facilities of this great building, but before we do that I want to mention a few of the amazing features of the New York Coliseum.

In size it will be tremendous.

It will have approximately 300,000 square feet of net exhibit space, with zone-controlled air conditioning; beautifully and adequately lighted.

Ladies and gentlemen, it will be two blocks—a bus stop—from one side to the other.

It will have 4 floors, with 4 separate lobbies, so that 4 separate expositions can be held at the same time; however, all of this space can be thrown into one, for large expositions taking the entire building.

It has been estimated that the electric current that will be needed for this building would supply the average town of about 25,000 to 30,000 inhabitants.

One large freight elevator, which, by the way, is probably the largest in existence outside of what the armed services use, is designed to lift 40 tons at one time. Forty tons, as such, doesn't mean very much to the average person, but to put it in the language that even I understand, it means it would lift 10 full-grown elephants at one time.

Now let's take a look at the models.

Concern for Ike's Health

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM E. MINSHALL
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 16, 1956

Mr. MINSHALL. Mr. Speaker, to clear up a misunderstanding that seems to be prevalent among some of my colleagues on the other side, I wish to call attention to an editorial which appeared

in the Cleveland Plain Dealer on July 18, 1956.

The editorial follows:

CONCERN FOR IKE'S HEALTH

The Democrats are greatly concerned over President Eisenhower's health, if the Democratic Digest, which is the official publication of the Democratic National Committee, is representative of their thinking. For the Digest this month charges that a "snow job" was done by Mr. Eisenhower's associates to gloss over the President's illness and insinuates that it is much more serious than anyone has been led to believe, including the President and his family.

This attitude may seem strange, coming from the same source which did such a thorough "snow job" on the state of Franklin Roosevelt's health in 1944. Nevertheless, the health of presidential candidates is a proper subject of discussion during a campaign, as we have contended, but the Digest is in error, we think, when it asserts that information regarding Mr. Eisenhower's two illnesses has been concealed from the public. On the contrary, there has never been a case of presidential illness in the history of the country when the public has been kept so well informed.

The Digest attempts to make its case by quoting from the critical writings of newspaper reporters and columnists who had to find something to write about during the long period when Press Secretary Jim Hagerty was replying "no comment" to questions about the President's second term intentions. These articles pretty well dispose of the "one party press" charge which the Democrats are so fond of making.

What the Digest proposes, however, is that the President's doctors be grilled at another press conference. This presupposes that the doctors were lying the first time, that they deliberately concealed the facts from the patient, his family and the public, in order to accomplish the purpose of getting him to run again. Presumably the alert newsmen, who don't know a scalpel from a suture, but are armed with observations from other doctors who have never examined the patient, would be able to ferret out the truth.

The suggestion is utterly preposterous. Mr. Eisenhower has said in so many words that he would resign or not be available for another term if he felt he was incapable of doing his job. We believe him, and we think most of the people do also.

Still, it's nice to know that the Democrats are concerned about the President's health. We are, too. We hope that, because of this partisan needling, he doesn't try to do too much, too soon, just to prove that he is making satisfactory progress toward full recovery.

United States Servicemen Face Double Jeopardy in Foreign Courts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. H. R. GROSS
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 19, 1956

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, news dispatches from Japan report that two enlisted men of the United States Marine Corps, station in Japan, are scheduled to be tried twice on the same charges in a Japanese civil court.

According to the news dispatches, these marines were tried by a Japanese judge, convicted, and their sentences suspended. Now the Japanese prosecutor, dissatisfied with the decision of the Japanese judge, insists that these American servicemen be retried on the same charges again in a Japanese civil court.

The following excellent editorial from the pages of the Waterloo, Iowa, Daily Courier points up the jeopardy to which American servicemen are exposed when handed over for prosecution in foreign civil courts—a jeopardy which ought to be of grave concern to every American citizen:

MARINES MUST FACE SECOND TRIAL IN JAPAN

Although the United States Constitution guarantees certain protections to citizens accused of crimes, the Government has surrendered these rights for servicemen accused of off-duty offenses in many foreign countries.

Perhaps better relations with these countries are obtained by subjecting American servicemen to this hazard. But it nevertheless appears unfair to draft a man for military service and then compel him to surrender his constitutional rights. There is considerable—though not decisive—evidence that American servicemen have not received fair trials in countries like Japan where the judicial traditions are at such variance with our own.

Now the United States court of appeals has ruled that this surrender of rights is legal in the case of three marines. Two of them received suspended sentences in their first trial; but they are now to be exposed to a second trial because the prosecution is dissatisfied with the sentence.

We hope the case is carried to the United States Supreme Court. Would not the judges who have showed such an interest in the civil rights of American Communists be inclined to demonstrate greater concern for the rights of American servicemen?

One Hundred and Two Years

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS E. MORGAN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 19, 1956

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include an editorial from the Evening Standard, Uniontown, Pa., relative to Dr. John Dawson Sturgeon, Sr. Dr. Sturgeon, dean of Pennsylvania physicians, recently celebrated his 102d birthday. He has been an outstanding member of the medical profession for many, many years and is admired and beloved by all. Very few of us can hope to reach the imposing total of years to which Dr. Sturgeon has attained and I know that all of my constituents join me in extending congratulations to him. The editorial follows:

ONE HUNDRED AND TWO YEARS

Dr. John D. Sturgeon, Sr., started his 103d year this morning.

The gentleman who is reported to be the oldest living physician in the United States spent his birthday yesterday quietly at his home on North Gallatin Avenue.

To the good doctor have come many tributes.

Two years ago on his 100th birthday the community honored him.

He has watched Uniontown's passing parade for years from his sturdy rocking chair on the porch of his home. To many of us and our families he has been the family doctor. Hundreds of Uniontowners still look to him as their doctor because he was the one who brought them into this world.

Gen. George C. Marshall, a close friend, summed up a tribute to Dr. Sturgeon when he said:

"He represents the best of citizenship, a fine example of service to his fellow man, a model of integrity and simplicity and a great doctor of the humanities."

Congratulations and best wishes, Dr. Sturgeon.

More Social Security

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LESTER HOLTZMAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 19, 1956

Mr. HOLTZMAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to include an editorial which appeared in today's issue of the New York Times, entitled "More Social Security."

The editorial follows:

MORE SOCIAL SECURITY

The amendments to the Federal social security law passed by the Senate call for benefits to about 1.2 million men and women who don't receive them now. The bill provides that practically all the self-employed, except physicians and osteopaths, receive full coverage, adding about 200,000 to the present rolls. Working women—now in line for full benefits, as are men, at 65—would be eligible at 62 for 80 percent, and wives of retired workers for 75 percent, of what they would get if they had waited until they were 65, with yearly increases up to the full amount at that age. Widows, however, would be entitled to full benefits at 62. These new payments would be available to about 775,000 women. And, finally, all workers on the social security books who become disabled would get benefits at 50 under the same general formula now used for all those who are 65 and over—adding 250,000 more beneficiaries.

The bill provides for new taxes to meet the disability payments. Employers and employees would each pay one-quarter of 1 percent on the first $4,200 of initial earnings of those who are covered, while the self-employed would pay three-eighths of 1 percent. These contributions would be paid as part of the regular social security taxes—now 2 percent each from employers and employees—but the proceeds would go into a separate fund designed to be always in the black.

In voting on the disability and women's age provisions of the bill Senate majorities overcame strong opposition from the administration and overrode the recommendations of their own Finance Committee. This was a victory for the Democrats, who with only four exceptions (including Chairman BYRD of the Finance Committee) voted for the amendments. They were joined by only six Republicans. While the special treatment of women is open to serious question, the aging disabled deserve what the bill would give them—and with manageable financing. The expanded coverage has been long overdue.

The Senate bill now goes to a joint conference committee for reconciliation with a House bill, passed last year with little opposition. This is much the same, except that

it would give women full benefits at 62. When the measure reaches the President's desk the public interest, and that of his own party as well, will demand that he promptly sign it.

The liberalization and expansion of the Social Security Act has been necessary for some time, and when the bill is reported out of conference, I am sure that it will meet with no further delays in the House or the Senate.

I was happy to note that the bill as passed by the Senate carries a provision to lower the age limit for eligibility for benefits for working women and wives of retired workers from 65 to 62 years of age. I had previously introduced legislation which would have provided for the lowering of this age limit to 60 years, and while the pending bill did not go that far, I feel that this current provision is a well-won victory, as is the amendment calling for additional disability benefits.

In the interests of all those now eligible, or who will become eligible for social-security benefits, I urge the President to sign the bill as soon as the conference report has been approved by the House and the Senate.

Our Pigtail Veterans' Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE H. CHRISTOPHER
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 19, 1956

Mr. CHRISTOPHER. Mr. Speaker, when the Congress undertakes to pension America's old disabled and down-and-out veterans, invariably certain propagandists attempt to stampede the American taxpayers by citing astronomical cost projections. But what about our pigtail pension program? Yes, how much in dollars and cents are the taxpayers paying to pension Chiang Kai-shek's soldiers who turned their backs to the Communist invader?

According to reliable press reports, Mr. Eisenhower's ICA is really going to town for Chiang's army. I am talking about the Free China veterans' program being set up by Mr. Harold V. Sterling, a retired Assistant Administrator of our own Veterans' Administration.

Under this program $48 million ICA money will be spent this year—as initial outlay—to pension 70,000 veterans of Chiang's forces and to build old soldiers homes, military convalescent camps, a general hospital, a tuberculosis hospital, and several public works projects.

The projects are being supervised by the George Frye Associates, a management organization, with offices in New York and Chicago and, of course, at the taxpayers' expense.

Now the veterans being pensioned are not service-connected. They are just being retired at United States expense. According to Ralph Boyce, of the ICA, this "is a means of getting rid of old soldiers to make room for new ones." That's a service pension scheme if I ever heard of one.

Of course these expenditures represent only the beginning, and from year to year the Congress will be called on to appropriate the necessary funds for completion of Chiang's building program and to hand over the money for the pension payments.

Two More Germans Killed in Attacks Laid to GI's

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. L. FORRESTER
OF GEORGIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 19, 1956

Mr. FORRESTER. Mr. Speaker, we hear too often that we must or must not do certain things because we will offend Russia and her satellites. Actually, it would be more practical to consider the feelings of our Allies. Some people wonder why there is a growing demand in West Germany that our soldiers be brought home, and we should be interested in some of the reasons why.

To those who are interested, I refer them to an article in the Washington Evening Star of Monday, July 16, 1956, wherein it said that "There Is no Room for Gangsters and Sex Maniacs in the Federal Republic." This article states that they want the world to understand that "there is no room in the Federal Republic for gansters and sex maniacs who still believe they can treat our women and girls as unprotected game and who—apparently still under the influence of wartime agitation—would like to grant Germany only a sort of colonial status."

The article itemizes instances of gangsterism and sexual offenses and says that seven United States Negro soldiers are now charged with alleged rape of a 15-year old girl. In the name of decency and Christianity this should no longer be permitted. Our record in that regard is absolutely astounding. There is no hope in this world to gain respect of decent people when their women are raped and defiled. The thousands of mulattoes in Germany and the breakdown of morals is correctly charged to us. The article reads as follows:

TWO MORE GERMANS KILLED IN ATTACKS LAID TO GI'S

FRANKFURT, Germany, July 16.—American GIs today were blamed for two more attacks on Germans and a government spokesman fired off the strongest official blast so far at the alleged increase in crimes involving allied soldiers in Germany.

German police announced that a 20-year-old Munich construction worker had died after being seriously maltreated by a drunk American soldier.

They said a group of GIs attacked him as he was standing with his fiance and friends in a Munich street. United States Army officials said military police are investigating.

Bavarian police at Fuerth also reported that a 20-year-old German was struck fatally in a beer-hall argument with a GI. Meanwhile, State Government Press Chief Josef Gutberlet wrote in the official gazette of the Rhineland-Palatinate state that "there is no room for gangsters and sex maniacs in the federal republic." He claimed state authorities had registered almost as many indignities by allied troops in the first 5 months this year as in the whole of 1955.

The United States Army denies that there is any increase in the crime rate. But it says it is not standing on statistics and is working to improve the situation.

Mr. Gutberlet said in his article: "There is no room in the federal republic for gangsters and sex maniacs who still believe they can treat our women and girls as unprotected game and who—apparently still under the influence of wartime agitation—would like to grant Germany only a sort of colonial status."

A resolution by the Bamberg city council calling for the withdrawal of United States troops from that ancient Bavarian city was widely publicized last week. The demand, submitted to the Bonn Government, followed the alleged rape of a 15-year-old girl by 7 United States Negro soldiers. All of them are awaiting trial on charges of assault.

Dr. Edward A. Steiner, Friend of the Immigrant

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 19, 1956

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith an article written by John C. Sciranka, editor of the American Friends of Slovak Freedom, in tribute to the late Dr. Edward A. Steiner. The article which appeared in the Bethlehem (Pa.) Bulletin on July 13, 1956, follows:

DR. EDWARD A. STEINER, FRIEND OF THE IMMIGRANT

(By John C. Sciranka)

On Saturday, June 30, Dr. Edward A. Steiner, died in his 90th year at Claremont, Calif. The newspapers registered his death, noting that he was a scholar, lecturer and author.

I had a rare privilege to know Dr. Steiner and I had corresponded with him for many years. His last letter written to me 2 months ago was very inspiring. In spite of the fact that he celebrated his 90th birthday on November 1 last year, he was full of life.

Dr. Steiner was born in Slovakia, then the province of Hungary. He later wrote over 20 books in which he mentioned his native country. As described later by Annie E. S. Beard and Frederica Beard, in their "Our foreign-born citizens and what they have done for America," Dr. Steiner is placed in a category of such famous men as Felix Adler, philosopher, educator, reformer; Alexander Graham Bell, inventor of the telephone; Andrew Carnegie, a Scotch American philanthropist and steel kind; Dr. Alexis Carrel, a great medical investigator; George Washington Goethals, the builder of Panama Canal; Samuel Gompers, famous labor leader; Henry Morgenthau, famous ambassador; Joseph Pulitzer, famous journalist; Charles P. Steinmetz, Albert Einstein, etc.

Yes, through hunger, homelessness, and loneliness; the drudgery of work; the pangs of poverty and even the fire of affliction, Dr. Steiner was led in his experiences from alien to citizen and from his humble birthplace in Slovakia to an exalted position of

professor of applied Christianity in Grinnell College, Iowa, where he taught from 1903 until his retirement in 1941.

Dr. Steiner spent the best years of his life, pleading with voice and pen and sound, for an understanding of and a brotherly attitude toward the immigrant. He has often asserted that it ought to make no difference because they are Poles, Hungarians, Jews, Italians, Russians, or Slovaks. "For after all," he argued "they are human, and this immigration problem is a human problem with far-reaching consequences." Steiner dedicated his life to humanize the process of admission to this country and expose and abolish the worst abuses of the steerage. In his writings and lectures he used all his energy to interpret the quality and character of the new immigrant to those Americans who believed that these newer people were less than human.

Steiner dreamed in his native Slovakian village about America. Often he told his mother about his dreams. But she wanted her boy to stay near her. However, at last his boyish desire to get to America was fulfilled when one of his countrymen threatened to reveal to the government officials the awful fact that he had been guilty of sympathizing with and aiding the oppressed Slovaks. Steiner had to leave his native country and come to America, where he found no friends. In spite of knowledge of languages, he was destitute. All one day he walked the streets of New York looking for work and all day he had nothing to eat. He learned in this country the only thing free was ice water. Later he worked for $3.50 a week in New York. When there was no more work, he moved to New Jersey and worked on the farm. Losing his job, he started for Pennsylvania. The conductor put him off the train when he had no money for fare so he got a job in the tobacco field until Autumn, when he went to Pittsburgh and worked in a steel mill. He describes this as a bitter winter not alone of hard labor and small wage, but because of his utter isolation and the fact that no one had faith in him, for immigrants were regarded simply as cattle. He lived in a boarding house, where twenty boarders lived in two rooms. Life was merely, as expressed then, "work, eat, drink, get drunk and go to sleep." Just because he was a foreigner, he found it impossible to get a bath anywhere, for the boarding house did not provide one and he couldn't buy one in any decent place. He was happy in later years to register that through his efforts and appeals for decency his contemporaries of the Pittsburgh period are living under the best American ideals. The yearbook (Almanac) of the National Slovak Society marks the distance which these pioneers have traveled in less than a quarter of a century."

His life in Pittsburgh was hard and is well described in his autobiography "From Alien to Citizen." From Pittsburgh he went to Connellsville, Pa., where he worked in a mine for a dollar a day. But every evening he had to go to a saloon, where the boss drank at his expense. Here during the steel strike he was arrested, fined a hundred dollars, and spent 6 months in jail.

He determined later, as a result of this bitter experience, to visit prisons and penitentiaries, where he helped immigrants, who needed friends.

Once he helped six Greeks who were imprisoned in a Kansas town, because they bought beer in Nebraska and drank its contents on a Sunday in their camp by the railroad. Steiner's plea for them was so effective that the judge freed the Greeks. However, they had to pay $100 each as fine, which was a lot of money.

While later in Chicago, he lectured about Tolstoy and Bakunin. He later was sent to interview Tolstoy by the Outlook magazine. From Chicago he went to Minneapolis, where he enjoyed outdoor life on the farm and American education. Later, after many obstacles he enrolled to study for a minister at Oberlin College, where he graduated and was ordained. He served for a short time as minister and later went to Grinnell College, Iowa, where he spent most of his life outside of lecture and travels. The late Harry Hopkins, adviser to President F. D. Roosevelt, was one of Steiner's boys. Hopkins was a son of a poor saddler in Iowa. Steiner befriended him and gave him a start, by recommending Hopkins to his friends in New York where he met the Roosevelts.

In his writings to the undersigned, Dr. Steiner always liked to recall how he enjoyed himself while living in this country among his Slovak countrymen, hard-working miners in Streator, Ill., where he acted for a while as their correspondent. In his last letter, written to me over 2 months ago, Dr. Steiner invited me to California. In this last letter he wrote: "I often sing a few lines of a Slovak song. When I am asked, where I was born, I say always I am a Slovak." Dr. Steiner will always be remembered as a true friend of the immigrants. May his great work always inspire us to be like he was—do good to others.

New Department Commander of the American Legion, Department of Arizona

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. RHODES
OF ARIZONA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 19, 1956

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, under leave previously granted, I would like to include in the RECORD for the attention of the House a biographical sketch of the new department commander of the American Legion, Department of Arizona. This biographical sketch of Soleng Tom is truly an American success story. He is one of the few, if not the first Chinese American to achieve the position of department commander of the American Legion:

In 1930 when Tom, then 17 years old, arrived in San Francisco from Toyshan, Kwangtung, he had just about enough carfare to go to San Francisco's Chinatown.

Today his many businesses in Tucson are numerous. He now runs a real estate and insurance agency, three supermarkets, a drugstore, and an auction house. He owns a business center which houses a furniture store, a jewelry store, a clothing store, a variety store, a hardware store, a restaurant, a barber shop, a finance company, a beauty parlor, a bakery and a post office. He also is a cotton farmer.

Soleng Tom was born 43 years ago in Toyshan. He was reared by an uncle, who ran a hotel there, as his father was in Arizona most of his life, doing vegetable farming and laundry work.

In 1930 Soleng, then a student at the Toyshan Middle School, sailed for the United States to join his father. On arriving in San Francisco, he went to board, free of charge, at a Tom family benevolent house. He immediately tried to enroll at some school but he found it almost impossible because his English was so poor. Meanwhile he worked for a canning company, unloading crates of fruits from trucks. After several months in San Francisco, he went to Tucson to join his father, who was then running a one-man laundry.

Soleng's first job in Tucson was washing dishes in a Chinese restaurant. He got $3 a week plus all that he could eat.

Six months later his father received $1,000 from an insurance company when his policy matured. He quit the laundry and Soleng left the restaurant. Father and son started a grocery store.

The next year, 1932, Soleng's father took a trip to Kwangtung and Soleng took charge of the store. In the next 2 years, with a University of Arizona student working part time for him, Soleng managed to attend the Arizona Business College and also to learn to fly an airplane.

In 1934, his father returned from China, and Soleng, now armed with a diploma from the business college, went to the University of St. Louis to study aeronautical engineering. He recalls that there were seven other Chinese students in the engineering school, and all of them came from well-to-do families. But, he had to work his way through college—he took a job as a campus garbage collector and his wages paid his room and board. As his English was still rather poor, a sympathetic professor tutored him in the evenings. Soleng was so busy that he never saw a motion picture in his college days. By the end of 1936 he received a bachelor of science degree, having completed the two-and-one-half-year intensive course.

He then worked briefly for the Pan-American Airways at Alameda, Calif., near San Francisco. In the next 2 years, 1937–38, he became dean of the Chinese Aviation School at Alameda. The school, sponsored by the Chinese Six Companies, graduated 110 Chinese fliers in 2 years. After graduation, they returned to China to join the Generalissimo's air force. The school was suspended when World War II broke out—the United States Government launched its program of training Chinese airmen.

When Soleng went to the St. Louis University, he had not given up the grocery business in Tucson. Besides his interest in his father's store, he was 1 of 3 partners of a much bigger grocery store. When he worked for Pan-American and the aviation school in Alameda, he flew to Tucson every now and then to look after his interests.

In 1939, he proposed expansion but his 2 partners would not go along. With his share of $8,000, Soleng acquired credit for $56,000 to buy the site for his future business center and to build a supermarket and a drug store. The value of that property has increased tenfold in the last 16 years, due partly to the rapid growth of Tucson and partly to his capable management.

In 1942–44, he took a job with Consolidated Aircraft in Tucson, ferrying airplanes between San Diego, Calif., and Tucson. In 1944–46, he served in the United States Navy, working on transports flying between Alameda and inland. His father died while he was in the Navy.

In 1941, he had married Miss Mae Don, a Tucson girl, and the couple have 2 sons, 14 and 9 years old.

Nowadays, Soleng devotes most of his time to his real estate and insurance agency, supermarkets and drugstore. He is also very active in civic affairs.

He is a past commander of Post No. 7 of the American Legion in Tucson, a director of the National Foundation for Asthmatic Children, a director of the Tucson Red Cross, and a director of the Catalina (southern Arizona) Boy Scout Council. He is a member of the Lions Club.

He is past president of both the Tucson Chinese Anti-Communist League and the Chinese Chamber of Commerce. He is also a board member of the proposed Chinese Recreation Center in Tucson. (A Chinese school will be part of the recreation center to be built early next year.)

Voluntary Credit Home Mortgage Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD T. MILLER
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 19, 1956

Mr. MILLER of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, the Congress has repeatedly voiced its interest in providing means by which in proper cases veterans can be assisted in promptly securing homes for themselves and their families.

However, a situation has developed that has had a serious effect upon many veterans and is producing inexcusable delays in the housing program.

The difficulty is not occasioned by faults in the legislation but in the way in which it is administered.

The VA has quite properly adopted a policy of reserving direct loans for the cases which are sound but where for some reason or another, the veteran is unable to secure the necessary credit from private institutions. To facilitate this approach an organization of private lenders has been established under the name Voluntary Credit Home Mortgage Program, and through it, applications are channeled to be accepted or rejected by private lenders within a reasonable period. If the application is rejected by VCHMP, it then becomes eligible for consideration for a direct VA loan.

So far the procedure works reasonably well. The catch is that after a loan is accepted by VCHMP and is therefore ineligible for a direct loan, all too frequently action bogs down for long periods and months elapse before the loan is processed and available. Often the veteran and his contractor are placed in a frustrating and damaging position. This is particularly apt to occur in rural areas such as the district I represent. They cannot secure a direct loan, yet the guaranteed private loan is not forthcoming.

An examination of the records of a single real estate broker on the Eastern Shore of Maryland indicates that, at the present time, he has 18 purchases by veterans awaiting financing or which have been settled in the last 30 days. Of that 18, it took 12 months and 11 days to settle 1; it took 9 months and 21 days to settle 1; it took 7 months and 6 days to settle 1; it took 8 months and 14 days to settle 2; it took slightly over 9 months to settle 1, and of the ones unsettled, 4 have been approved more than 5 months ago with no apparent settlement date in sight, and 3 others have been in progress for at least 9 months.

An examination of the records of a local builder indicates that of 9 cases on which applications have been approved 4 are not yet settled, the applications on those having been approved in January of 1956 and in February of 1956. Of the ones which have been settled, there is an average of approximately 6 months' delay. This situation exists with all persons dealing with the veterans' mortgage field in this area.

These two examples are the result of a personal spot check and there are doubtless many similar situations.

As the result of the delay, two unfortunate situations are developing. First, the veteran is being seriously deprived of his ability to purchase a home, and in some instances where the seller has become dissatisfied, has been unable to make the necessary purchase at all. In some instances the veteran is obliged to pay rent for which he does not receive credit on his purchase price between the time he occupies the house after completion and the 7, 8, or 9 months in which he awaits a permanent financing. The second undesirable effect is the serious deterrent which there is to business in the construction industry generally, with the net effect that new starts are being seriously impeded and business activity generally is suffering.

I hope this state of affairs can be corrected administratively. If not, I trust appropriative legislation will be considered at the outset of the next session of Congress.

Farmers Union Favors Hells Canyon Dam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LESTER R. JOHNSON
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 18, 1956

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks, I wish to insert in the RECORD a portion of the National Farmers Union Washington newsletter pertaining to Hells Canyon dam.

The Farmers Union is one of the many national organizations interested in development of a federally owned high dam instead of the three dams proposed by a private power company.

Following is the text of the Farmers Union's newsletter dealing with Hells Canyon dam:

The Senate will vote within days on whether to authorize construction by the Federal Government of the high Hells Canyon Dam project in the Snake River between Idaho and Oregon.

The Senate vote, which will follow several days of debate, may occur by Wednesday, July 18, or within a day or so.

Jim Patton, NFU president, has written to every member of the Senate and the House to urge them to vote for the project. Other Farmers Union State and local leaders throughout the country are similarly contacting their Congressmen by letter and telegram to vote for Hells Canyon.

This is the long-awaited test that may decide, once and for all, the fate of the Hells Canyon project.

The vote is expected to be extremely close. Every Senator's vote and presence on the floor may possibly be of deciding importance.

If the Senate O. K.'s Hells Canyon Dam, it is expected to come up for a vote in the House soon afterward.

Patton stressed the importance of Hells Canyon Dam to the production of low-cost phosphate fertilizer for farmers throughout the great region west of the Allegheny Mountains.

The Nation's biggest deposits of phosphate rock are located in the mountains near the Hells Canyon gorge. Cheap electricity from the dam is needed in order to process the rock into super-phosphate fertilizer. Without Hells Canyon Dam, there will not be enough electricity available at low enough cost to permit the production of cheap fertilizer.

Both the National Farmers Union and the Farmers Union Central Exchange own phosphate rock deposits which require low-cost electricity from the Hells Canyon power project for economical development. These and other farm cooperative fertilizer programs in the Hells Canyon area would save millions of dollars a year on the fertilizer bills of United States farmers.

The key to these savings for farmers is the vast quantity of low-cost electricity which would be produced by the Hells Canyon power project.

Electrical power produced at the dam would be wholesaled by the Federal Government, through Bonneville Power Authority, to locally owned REA co-ops, municipalities, and public utility districts, as well as to locally and absentee-owned private electric companies.

In contrast to this, the Eisenhower administration favors giving up the Hells Canyon Dam site to the absentee-owned Idaho Power Co., a Maine corporation which holds its meetings in Portland, Maine, and which is owned and totally controlled by eastern financial and utility holding company interests.

Idaho Power Co. proposes to build a small dam, and possibly two more small dams several years from now, in the stretch of river gorge that would be occupied by the big Federal project.

Even if all three Idaho power dams are built, they would produce only half as much electricity as the high Federal dam, and it would cost more than twice as much per kilowatt hour. The comparative vital statistics on the two projects follow:

	Federal high Hells Canyon Dam	Idaho Power Co. 3 dams
Useful water storage....acre-feet..	3,880,000	1,000,000
Initial installed capacity kilowatts..	800,000	783,400
Prime power at site.....do....	688,000	577,000
Prime power at other sites..do....	436,000	103,000
Total prime power.....do....	1,124,000	680,000
Cost of power per kilowatt-hour mills..	2.71	6.69

The Government's investment in the high dam project would, like all public power projects, be repaid to the Treasury, with interest, long before the end of its useful and revenue-earning life.

In contrast to this self-liquidating financial procedure under Federal development, the Idaho Power Co. has applied to the Government for subsidies which would total $325 million in value over a period of 50 years, and which would never be reimbursed to the Government nor passed on to users of electricity.

The power lobby has made the fight against Hells Canyon Dam a national issue, with private power companies throughout the Nation pouring huge amounts of money into political advertising and other efforts to beat the project. The huge interlocked network of power company operations owned by the same interests as own Idaho Power Co. have millions of electricity consumers to whom they pass on the cost of this fight.

Public Housing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. O. C. FISHER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 19, 1956

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, since its inception public housing has degenerated from a welfare form of public assistance for a limited number of poor and unfortunate people, such as was envisioned by the late and lamented Senator Taft, to a program of state socialism. Under leave to extend my remarks, I include an article written in Human Events by Russell Turner. It deals objectively and accurately with some phases of socialized housing:

PAYING YOUR NEIGHBOR'S RENT—THE PUBLIC HOUSING PROGRAM

(By Russell Turner)

A long-time Republican Member of Congress from Pennsylvania named Robert Rich became famous around the Capital during the 1930's and 1940's for a simple question he invariably posed whenever a New Deal spending program was brought up for House consideration.

"Where are you going to get the money?" Rich's voice would boom out.

The question was appropriate during the many years he asked it. It is appropriate today in connection with many Government spending programs which now have come to be accepted as part of American life. It is peculiarly appropriate to the perennial wail of the liberal-left for public housing.

In all cases, of course, the answer to Rich's question is from you and me and all other American taxpayers.

In some cases, the expenditures are justified on grounds they are for the benefit of the entire nation, of all the taxpayers who contribute toward them. But in other cases, such as public housing, the expenditures amount to taxing all for the benefit of a few, no matter how their liberal advocates may seek to clothe them in the garb of "general welfare."

Taxpayers, throughout the country, have been contributing for 20 years to costs of the Tennessee Valley Authority program so that residents of that area might enjoy cheaper electricity. For almost as long, they have been contributing toward making possible cheap power rates to residents of the Pacific Northwest within range of the Bonneville power complex.

Public housing is an even more aggravated instance of unadulterated socialism having crept into our American life. This one directly penalizes the thrifty and the provident who own their own homes, with the penalty-tax payments being redistributed to the benefit of a selected few who for political or other reasons have been granted the privilege of an apartment in a public-housing project. Frequently, the recipients of this governmental largesse have more income than millions of those who ante up taxes to make possible that largesse.

Thanks to the commonsense of a majority of our national legislators, the public-housing program still is relatively small; taxpaying Americans are footing the bill for dwellings for a comparatively small number of their compatriots. It would not be so if the liberal left had its way.

Americans for Democratic Action is a self-styled liberal organization, numerically small but politically influential. Quite conceivably, it may succeed in its planned campaign to take over the Democratic national convention next month. The domestic policy statement adopted by this spring's ADA national convention shows clearly what will be in store in the housing field if liberals win control of the National Government:

"A progressive shift to public housing for lower-income families, because of its social urgency and to compensate for any saturation in the market for more expensive housing; coupled with an effective middle-income housing program backed by Federal credit.

"The housing goal is a proper dwelling in a suitable living environment for every American family, which requires an annual average of 2 million new homes for the next 10 years to replace slums and keep up with population growth."

Immediate socialization of all housing for lower-income groups, gradual repetition of the process for middle-income-bracket housing. Upper-income groups apparently are to continue providing their own homes, in addition to contributing substantially to those of the first two categories. To the trash heap goes the American theory of individuals earning their own living.

As a sociological goal, the ADA aim—"a proper dwelling in a suitable living environment for every American family"—is utopian. But ADA completely ignores the practical aspects—the regimentation inevitably attendant on any such program, the political implications bound to arise in assignment of choicest quarters, Mr. Rich's little question of how it is to be paid for.

Such mundane matters seemingly are beneath the dignity, and unworthy of consideration, of the lofty visionaries who make up ADA. Their entire policy statement, in fact, is devoted to items for which they say the Government should spend unspecified but vastly greater sums—public housing, a socialized medical system, increased public welfare grants, a food-stamp plan, direct subsidies to farmers, myriad other projects. This is coupled, of course, with a demand for sharp decreases in Federal income taxes on lower and middle income classes. Never a word about how to pay for any part of it.

Nor, in the case of public housing, is there any hint of how they would replace revenue lost to local governments when property to be used for public housing projects is taken off their local tax rolls. Apparently they would let stand the present system whereby tax rates on other property owners in the community are increased sufficiently to offset the deficit created by elimination of the public housing property from the tax rolls.

This means, of course, that the frugal and the thrifty who have had the fortitude and good sense to purchase their own homes, contribute twice toward the welfare of the less-provident who rent quarters in public housing projects: by direct taxes to pay for the projects; and by higher real estats levies to make up for the local taxes which the public housing projects would pay if they were privately owned, but being publicly owned, do not pay.

It is not just the ADA which is advocating this socialization of housing. The public housing lobby's roster is long and politically impressive; the AFL–CIO, for example, throws its entire weight behind the campaign.

It might, of course, be pertinent to inquire what the reaction would be among wage-earning union members with incomes of, say, less than $3,500 a year, to knowledge that their union organization is advocating a program whereby they would pay taxes to subsidize cut-rate housing facilities for a selected few families whose incomes may be $4,000, $5,000, or even more. Would they care for the idea?

The phrase "selected few families" is used advisedly. Most public housing projects are of a sufficiently attractive character, with rentals set far lower than if they were paying their own way, so that the demand for their apartments is many times greater than the available supply. In New York City, for example, where the city and State conduct supplemental programs in addition to the 8,000 units per year contracted for by the Federal Government, the total available supply now is about 30,000 new units a year. Close to 500,000 families have their names on the application rolls.

Inevitably, proven or promised political support can become a decisive factor in deciding which applicants will be accepted; and the projects can become a further means whereby those in control of Government can operate to perpetuate that control.

The basic theoretical purpose of public housing is to provide facilities for lower income families who have been living in slums or other substandard quarters. To carry out this intent, rents in public housing developments have no relation whatsoever to actual cost of the project. Instead, they are based on the individual tenant's income and his ability to pay. The general rule of thumb is that the rent shall be approximately 20 percent of the family's income, with the rent including all utilities.

As an example, a $20,800,000 public housing project known as the Christopher Columbus homes, with 1,556 units, was opened last August in Newark, N. J.; average cost per unit, $13,367. The project includes a health clinic, a library, hobby shops, an auditorium equipped for motion picture showings.

Louis Danzig, executive director of the Newark Housing Authority, proudly told newsmen that comparable privately owned apartments rented for at least $125 a month, whereas the average rental in his project (based on an average income per family of $200 a month) would be "$40 a month, with the rent charge including gas, electricity, heat, hot water, gas range and refrigerator."

"If that doesn't make our apartments a genuine bargain, I don't know what does," he said.

It certainly does—for the tenants. But what is it for the millions of taxpayers who must make up the difference between the $40 a month charged for the Christopher Columbus project apartments, and the close to $125 a month it actually costs to amortize and operate the project? Or for the Newark property owners who must make up for the taxes not being collected on this $20,800,000 project?

Equally as inherent in public housing as the political machine-building, is the constant specter of unwarranted and unwanted Government regulation of the private lives of residents.

In the article, This Was the House of Our Fathers, in the March 19, 1955, Human Events, James J. Kilpatrick told of the overzealous manager of a public housing project in the little town of Hopewell, Va., who decreed that in his project there should be no pet animals, no electric light bulbs larger than 60 watts, and no drinking whatsoever of any intoxicating liquors. The public furor was great, not only in Hopewell but around the country; the project manager beat a hasty retreat. Nevertheless, the power is there; equally noxious regulations can seep in gradually but inexorably to restrict the liberties and private lives of public housing tenants.

Because Congress has been persistently chary of undertaking any big-scale public housing program such as is sought by the liberal-left, there are only about 450,000 such units in existence or in stages of being under contract, going back to the days when the first public housing program was started as a public works project back in 1934. For these units, Congress now is appropriating approximately $87 million a year as the Federal contribution to their amortization and operation—contributions which are to extend over 40 years, putting the ultimate to-

tal cost of Federal taxpayers well up in the billions of dollars.

Public housing projects make token in lieu of taxes payments to the local community, but they do not even come close to the amount that would be paid on the project if it were privately owned. Estimates of amounts lost to local governments because of this nontaxability of public housing range up to half the Federal subsidy, or in excess of $40 million annually; a sum which must be made up by residents of the community not privileged to enjoy the Federal bounty.

Many communities, as a matter of fact, have affirmatively turned down proposed public housing projects when they learn what the projects will cost in the form of lost taxes and direct outlays. Disregarding impassioned pleas of lefties, plebiscites of voters have resulted in their rejection in community after community.

Despite the lack of congressional enthusiasm, the liberals are expanding their public housing demands rather than backing down. The middle-income program is a development of recent years; of even more recent vintage is a growing demand for a special housing program to care for persons over 60 years of age, known facetiously as the Townsend housing plan. Thus, the housing bill pending in Congress makes special provision for liberalization of Federal Housing Administration credit terms for elderly persons, for their acceptance in public housing projects, and for construction of 10,000 public housing units a year especially designed for them. A vote-buying bonanza for the demagogs; after this, will come the extravaganza of vote-luring promises of the better free life for the aged. As always, no mention of the slight items of answering Mr. Rich's question.

Probably the most effective, and undoubtedly the most outspoken opponent of public housing is the National Association of Real Estate Boards. Liberals rant that the NAREB typifies the mossback reactionary hatred for all social progress.

But is socialized housing progress? It it progress to tax all, even prudent and thrifty low income earners, for the benefit of the few, including the improvident and the spendthrift? Is it progress to abandon the free enterprise American way of life which many believe has served this country well throughout its history?

The liberals pooh-pooh, and brush aside as irrelevant, the fact that the NAREB has its own plan for eliminating slums and generally improving the presently-substandard housing available to lower income groups. Operated in conjunction with other groups such as the National Association of Home Builders, the plan is carried out by private enterprise in cooperation with local authorities and already has proven highly successful in many cities.

It is patterned after amazingly effective clean-up campaigns which were conducted in Baltimore, Md., and Charlotte, N. C. It is simple, but requires the hearty support of local civic organizations possessing a sincere desire to accomplish the job.

The ingredients are first, an intense campaign to compel compliance with local health and building codes (preceded by adoption of effective and adequate codes, if they are not already included in local ordinances); and secondly, a campaign to make slum and substandard dwelling owners realize that they will be aiding not only their tenants but themselves as well, if they will rehabilitate and modernize their properties. It has been effective in many cities; it can be made effective in others.

Widely known as the Baltimore plan after its first successful operation in a major city, this is private enterprise's answer to the public housing lobby. It is an effective answer; it can, and must, be made to work.

The alternative may well be expansion of the doctrine of taxing all for the benefit of the few.

Fancy Footwork on the Washington Post and Times Herald—No. 2. Republican Senators and Lack of Leadership by the President Responsible for Destroying Cultural Exchange Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 19, 1956

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, in the report, No. 2580, filed by the Appropriations Committee of the Senate to accompany the supplemental appropriation bill, 1957, H. R. 12138, this language occurs:

With respect to the sum recommended for expenditure by the State Department the committee disapproves the use of funds for jazz bands, ballet and dance groups and similar activities, and strongly urges that greater emphasis be placed in sponsoring choral groups and miscellaneous sports projects. The effectiveness of some of the musical groups heretofore sponsored appears questionable.

In addition to this limiting, nay, strangling, action the Senate Appropriations Committee cut the appropriation requested for the President's Emergency Fund from $2.5 million to $1.5 million. The Washington Post and Times Herald makes this comment editorially this morning, Thursday, July 19:

ART FOR EXPORT

The Senate Appropriations Committee has added insult to injury in dealing with the State Department's overseas cultural program. The injury took the form of cutting the program's appropriation from the $2.5 million requested to $1.5 million. The insult was contained in a paragraph of the committee's report which declared: "The committee disapproves the use of funds for jazz bands, ballet and dance groups, and similar activities, and strongly urges that greater emphasis be placed in sponsoring choral groups and miscellaneous sports projects."

Leaving entirely out of account the impropriety of this sort of legislative assumption of administrative responsibility, the committee's view seems to us a sadly mistaken one on esthetic and pragmatic grounds. Dizzy Gillespie's band may seem to produce nothing but pure noise to Senator ELLENDER, who led the attack on jazz in the committee; but the fact of the matter is that all over Europe, the Middle East, and the Far East crowds flocked to hear the Gillespie group. Similarly, Louis Armstrong, playing a type of music which might not be appealing to Senator ELLENDER, was hailed as genius by audiences all over the European continent.

Jazz music is a peculiarly American art form. As such, it has special interest for Europeans and constitutes a distinctive American contribution. It has won the flattery of extensive imitation abroad; but few if any of its alien imitators has ever matched the Gillespies and Armstrongs—or a host of other American band leaders—in quality or in popularity. Whether Senator ELLENDER appreciates it or not, American jazz orchestras have made friends abroad who could not have been won by any form of propaganda.

The United States has given hospitality to some of the great ballet corps exiled from totalitarian lands; as a result ballet under American sponsorship has a special significance to Europeans. To cut this art form out of a cultural program would be to deprive this country of one of its real assets. Choral groups are all very well, and it is nice to know that Senator ELLENDER likes them; but people abroad seem to have plenty of choral groups of their own. As for miscellaneous sports projects, it is hard to see how they contribute to a cultural program designed to demonstrate that the United States is a free society where the arts are fostered and flourish.

Now, Senator MCNAMARA, in an important speech on the floor of the Senate on Wednesday, July 18, which was reported by the Washington Star yesterday, had some things to say about the Washington Post and Times Herald and the way it reports, or, I should say, fails to report all the news that is fit to print.

I am disappointed—

Said Senator MCNAMARA—

that another great newspaper perhaps has not been so forthright as either John Knight of the Detroit Free Press or Mr. Reston of the New York Times. I refer to the Washington Post and Times Herald.

It is my painful duty today to call to the attention of my colleagues the way the Washington Post and Times Herald reported the action of the Senate Appropriations Committee. For the sake of the record I include the article from the news section of the Washington Post and Times Herald this morning:

JAZZ MISSING BEAT ABROAD, SENATE SQUARES SAY, BUT NOBODY WAS LOOKING AT THE WASHING MACHINE

(By Paul Hume)

American jazz will suffer some real licks if the Senate Appropriations Committee has its way on what this country sends abroad.

A report of this committee reads: "The committee disapproves the use of funds for jazz bands, ballet and dance groups, and similar activities, and strongly urges that greater emphasis be placed in sponsoring choral groups and miscellaneous sports projects."

This report accompanies the supplemental appropriations bill which was approved by the Senate last Tuesday. Opposition to sending jazz musicians overseas was voiced by Senator ALLEN J. ELLENDER, Democrat, of Louisiana, who said, after hearing Dizzy Gillespie's band, "I never heard so much pure noise in my life."

Last spring the Government spent $92,500 to help make possible a tour in which Gillespie and his band played in eight Middle Eastern and Balkan countries. According to a report of July 14 in the Saturday Review, Gillespie's tour was a complete and unqualified triumph for jazz, for American jazzmen, and for democratic ideas by this band during its travels.

Theodore C. Streibert, director of the United States Information Agency and coordinator of the international program, said he heard only one criticism of the Gillespie tour: People had difficulty getting in to hear the band because the response to its playing was so tremendous.

As the appropriation now stands, the State Department's share of funds for overseas music is a million dollars less than last year, while the Commerce Department has been granted an increase of $3 million in order to carry out an extensive program of trade shows. Regarding these shows, Representative JOHN J. ROONEY, Democrat of New York, said that he visited a trade fair in Europe where American machinery was on display.

"Nobody was looking at the washing machines," he said. "They were all standing

around a juke box made in Chicago listening to dance bands."

The Senators from Louisiana, one of the great sources of jazz, the brand known as Dixieland, do not share similar views on the subject. A recent radio program called Guest Conductor, which featured the favorite music of the junior Senator from Louisiana, RUSSELL B. LONG, closed with two of LONG'S favorite samples of New Orleans jazz: When the Saints Go Marching In and Tailgate Ramble.

American musicians, returning from both brief and extended tours abroad, universally report that the greatest interest overseas is in our jazz. A prominent Washington musician, just back from a year's study in Belgium on a Fulbright grant, said, concerning American choral groups touring Europe, "The people over there are just not interested in choral music."

The bill, of which the controversial supplemental report is a part, is H. R. 12138. It is now due to go into conference where jazz has one final chance of getting back into the act. House Members who, it is suggested, are perhaps younger and livelier than their Senate colleagues, are hoping to get the big beat back into the bill.

This report, and the editorial as well, completely overlooks the fact that there are 11 Republican members of the Senate Appropriations Committee. What were they doing when the appropriation for the President's Emergency Fund was under consideration?

Senator KARL F. MUNDT is on the committee. He is one of the authors of the Smith-Mundt Act which, with the Fulbright Act, is basic legislation in the field of cultural exchange.

Senator WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND, a member of the Appropriations Committee, is spokesman for the administration in the Senate. Everyone is familiar with President Eisenhower's numerous statements in support of cultural exchange programs in general and this Emergency Fund in particular. Certainly Senator KNOWLAND, who is so close to President Eisenhower, knows how he feels about this matter of sending performing artists overseas. He must know that the President initiated this Emergency Fund in July 1954 and that the Congress appropriated $5 million for it in 1954 and in 1955. The fact that the Senate on March 26, 1956, adopted S. 3116, a measure to make the President's Emergency Fund permanent, could not have escaped the attention of Senator KNOWLAND or any of the other Republican members of the Senate Appropriations Committee. They also must have been aware that the top officials of the Eisenhower administration have supported this very small $5 million fund before the various committees of the Congress.

I might add that my own interest in this matter is based on legislation which I cosponsored with Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, of Minnesota.

Now the point I want to make here is that the Washington Post and Times Herald this morning completely fails to mention the Republican Senators who are members of the Senate Appropriations Committee. Did they sit stolidly by when the President's fund was under consideration? Did they defend the program? How did they vote? Or were they absent? These things the Washington Post article does not go into.

Senator ELLENDER is mentioned both in the editorial and in the news article as the man who, it is said, led the attack on jazz in the committee. It seems to me that Senator ELLENDER or anyone else can like or not like jazz. Personally, I think it is a great art form, perhaps our very greatest art form, native to this country, completely democratic, telling our story as no amount of symphony orchestras can tell it by playing the music of the classical composers of Europe.

Senator ELLENDER has every right to oppose the appropriation of funds to send jazz bands abroad where they have been hailed as our finest export. He has the right to be wrong, and he is terribly wrong in this instance, I feel. Surely, too, the other Senators on the Appropriations Committee can vote their convictions. But I must point out that the Senate without a single dissenting vote, and without any discussion, adopted S. 3116, a bill to make this program permanent in its present form and without the modifying and limiting language of the Senate Appropriations Committee. It seems to me extremely unlikely that anything has happened since March 26, 1956, to have caused the Senate to accept the recommendation of the Senate Appropriations Committee on this important program without question. Nor do I yield to the suggestion that has been made that the other Chamber has grown unsteady, or unstable.

Surely, however, the action of the Senate Appropriations Committee and of the Senate itself on this matter raises some very interesting questions, in view of its action in adopting S. 3116 a few short weeks ago.

And one of these questions, certainly, is: Where were the Republican members of the Senate Appropriations Committee when this program was under consideration? Why did not they, or at least some of them, defend the program? They could certainly have outvoted Senator ELLENDER who is, after all, only 1 Senator and has only 1 vote in the committee.

Another thing. Why did not the Washington Post and Times Herald, in reporting this story, tell us what the Republican Senators were doing at the time? Could it be that this newspaper was printing only that part of the news that fits its special prejudices as has happened before? Was the Washington Post and Times Herald playing partisan politics?

What about the vaunted leadership of the President? Why was it not in evidence in support of his own program? If it was in evidence, did the Republican Senators on the committee and in the Senate vote against the program despite the President?

The Washington Post and Times Herald should try again and this time it should give us all of the story.

Agricultural Research To Increase Income of Farmers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN V. BEAMER
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 16, 1956

Mr. BEAMER. Mr. Speaker, a statement was presented to the House Agriculture Committee in explanation of certain bills that I introduced in behalf of the farmers and agriculture in general.

Under unanimous consent, this statement is included in the Appendix of the RECORD:

AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH TO INCREASE INCOME OF FARMERS

(By JOHN V. BEAMER, Member of Congress)

I appreciate the opportunity of appearing before your committee in behalf of H. R. 10148, a bill to provide for a scientific study and research program for the purpose of developing increased and additional industrial uses of agricultural products so as to reduce surpluses of such products and to increase the income of farmers, and for other purposes.

My interest in agriculture stems from many sources. First of all, I was born and raised on a farm and agriculture continues to be my personal main source of revenue and income. I also have the privilege to represent the Fifth Indiana Congressional District which boasts of some of the best farmlands in the United States. Real estate is at an alltime high in this area and farmers and all business dependent upon agriculture continue to express a keen interest in the welfare of agriculture.

It has been possible for me to meet with many farmers and small-business men and by means of these visits, questionnaires, and exchange of letters, I feel confident that all the people in our part of the State are keenly interested in this type of legislation.

Early this year I introduced H. R. 8586, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to relieve farmers from the excise tax on gasoline and lubricating oils used exclusively in farm tractors or farm machinery and for other agricultural purposes. The principles involved in this bill are incorporated in Public Law 466.

I also introduced H. R. 10742, a bill to provide for the protection and conservation of national soil, water, and forest resources and to provide an adequate, balanced, and orderly flow of agricultural commodities in interstate and foreign commerce, and for other purposes. A similar bill, H. R. 10875, which authorizes $1.2 billion for a voluntary soil-bank program to reduce production acreage of crops in surplus supply, fixes feed grain supports at 76 percent, and encourages disposal of surpluses at home and abroad, was passed by the Congress and now is Public Law 540.

All of these measures and numerous other worthwhile attempts on the part of the 83d and 84th Congresses to be of assistance to the farmer are appreciated and are recognized as necessary for reasonably immediate benefits.

However, it is felt that the future of agriculture must be a long-range program. The rapid rate of growth of our population, the changing tempo of the times, the remarkable discoveries and uses of new products, marketing conditions, and similar subjects, pre-

sent the greatest challenge to this segment of the economy.

It seems to be entirely in line with traditional American initiative to endeavor to study new approaches and new methods for any problem that presents itself. For example, private industries are constantly employing research in order to improve their products, to build up consumer acceptance, and to create new markets.

The agricultural colleges, the United States Department of Agriculture, and various private and public institutions have made it possible for the farmers of this country to produce more and more of their products with fewer people and in less time. The modern tractors have replaced the horses in the same manner that hybrid corn with its increased yields, for example, has replaced the open-pollinated corn of former years. The farmer has proven that he can produce both quality and quantity to meet any emergency that might arise.

However, after an emergency such as the recent wars has passed, the farmer has found himself with this high productive capacity that exceeded the demand for his goods. The idea of raising demand to meet production instead of pulling down production to meet demand is the course that has made this Nation great.

The potentialities for research for new uses of agricultural products are almost unlimited. The purposes of this bill and other bills of a similar nature which have been introduced is to increase scientific research by the use of Federal money.

It seems to me and to farmers with whom I have talked that a reduction in output in the long run would not help the farmer and might confront the Nation with a shortage in a sudden emergency. This program if brought to a successful fruition would permit the farmer to produce perhaps in greater quantity because the market would not only be adjusted but also be trained and educated to use more and more of these agricultural products.

The specific suggestion in the bill is that research facilities both private and public, including those of land-grant colleges and universities, should be used for an all-out attack on the developments of increased and additional industrial uses of agricultural products. This is a research program that would not cost a great sum of money comparatively speaking and one which would be more than offset by increased revenues resulting from increased earnings of both farmers and those who sell goods, wares, and merchandise to farmers. It also would help to eliminate the expensive and burdensome cost to the Government for its present surplus-storage program.

Briefly, the bill would create in the executive branch of the Government an Industrial Agricultural Products Administration. This Administration would be appointed by the President with the advice and consent of the Senate. Their duties would be to conduct research of various types, make tests, maintain and operate pilot plants whenever necessary, and to maintain and expand such facilities that would enable the research program to secure the necessary results.

Another provision would authorize this Administration to pay certain incentive awards to private citizens for studies in research marketing and other phases of agricultural work. Grants would also be made to accredited colleges and universities and fellowships and scholarships for research for the purposes of this act.

There are many other minor phases of this program but the entire purpose is to make possible a means of finding more uses for the farmers' goods and to create a large market and provide a ready acceptance for improved agricultural products resulting from such studies.

It is recommended that the sum of $100 million be appropriated for this specific study in order to initiate this program. It is felt that this type of research for the farmer will result in the correction of a fundamental error in the philosophy of helping agriculture. Instead of reducing production and instead of creating a scarcity, it then will be possible for the farmer and the manufacturer of agricultural products to increase production because there will be an increased demand for their goods.

Free Enterprise

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. RHODES
OF ARIZONA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 19, 1956

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, under leave previously granted, I would like to include in the RECORD an article written by Mr. Denison Kitchel, one of the most able lawyers in Arizona. I believe that this article should be brought to the attention of the entire Nation:

I am honored to be a guest of the Free Enterprise Council. Almost everyone, including myself, professes to be in favor of free enterprise.

It's like being against sin. Everyone is against sin, but few are sinless. Almost everyone is for free enterprise, but few are not guilty of inconsistencies which can ultimately destroy the free enterprise system.

How many of us really know what we mean by free enterprise?

How many of us can identify a socialistic scheme when it is disguised as something else?

The answers to these questions reveal the gravest internal threat which faces our Nation today.

Those of us who believe in the American way of life have taken it for granted for so long that we are unable to practice and preach consistently what we believe. Unwittingly, we even support some of the carefully planted schemes of the Socialists.

Let's look at ourselves for a few moments, whether we be advocates of free enterprise as businessmen, labor leaders, farmers, educators, or job holders.

The businessman cries out against high taxes. The cost of supporting big Government, he says, is preventing the expansion of our industrial economy. He deplores compulsory unionism. Every person, he says, should have the right to work without paying tribute.

Well spoken.

But while he is pontificating on this score, this same businessman is demanding and receiving Government subsidies in various forms. He clamors for "cheap" Federal power. He promotes the establishment of Federal "projects" in his business area. He seeks more and bigger purchase contracts from the Federal Government. Being afraid of union retaliation, he ignores the right-to-work law and connives with labor leaders to deny employment to those who do not belong to a union.

Take the labor leader. He inveighs against the evils of business monopoly. Big business, he says, is destroying competition—the antitrust laws must be more vigorously enforced. He deplores encroachments on the liberties of the individual. There must, he says, be no discrimination—all men are created free and equal.

Well spoken.

But at the same time this same labor leader, in the exercise of his uncurbed power, is threatening our economy with industrywide strikes and other monopolistic practices. And he insists that nobody shall earn a living without first joining his union and paying compulsory tribute to him.

Look at the farmer. He deplores the monopolistic practices of both labor and industry. By virtue of their abandonment of the free-enterprise system, he says, they have caught him in a squeeze of high costs and low prices.

He deplores the loss by others of the rugged individualism which, he says, has made the farmer the backbone of the Nation.

Well spoken.

But in the same breath this same farmer is demanding price supports from the Federal Government.

What about you and me?

All we ask is the opportunity for a decent job with a reasonable chance for advancement. Leave us alone, we say; let us work and play as we see fit.

Well spoken.

But at the same time we, too, are supporting schemes of the Socialists. Give us "social security," we say; protect us, beneficent Government, from any discomfort which may befall us.

How, in the light of all of these inconsistencies, can anyone tell what we stand for?

Are we for the free-enterprise system or against it?

If we ourselves don't know, we are ripe for the social planners. They know exactly where they stand and where they hope to lead us. They, at least, are always consistent.

The time has come when each of us must stand up and be counted.

Are we going to lead or be led?

If we can practice what we preach, we shall lead.

Three Hundred and Eighty Jets Warn Public of Secret Move

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALVIN M. BENTLEY
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 19, 1956

Mr. BENTLEY, Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I wish to insert the following editorial from the July 15 edition of the Sunday Detroit Times by William Randolph Hearst, Jr., entitled "Three Hundred and Eighty Jets":

THREE HUNDRED AND EIGHTY JETS WARN PUBLIC TO PROTEST SECRET MOVE

(By William Randolph Hearst, Jr.)

Hold your hats, everybody.

If you've been unhappy over the news that the administration still insists on sending aid to Tito despite his big kiss-and-make-up scene with the Kremlin, get ready for a real shocker—

Good old Uncle Sam plans to make available about 380 jet planes to the man who recently stood by without saying a word in contradiction when Marshal Zhukov declared "Russia and Yugoslavia would march shoulder to shoulder" in any future war.

This is the big story of last week's secret meeting between congressional leaders and Government spokesmen on the red-hot po-

litical subject of additional American aid to Communist dictator.

Senators and Representatives sat aghast as it slowly dawned on them that this new United States assistance to Yugoslavia contemplates the dispatch of modern jet aircraft. In fact, some have already gone.

AROUSED PUBLIC PROTEST NEEDED

The rest will eventually find their way to the Balkans—unless an aroused public protest and congressional opposition stymies the deal—without any guarantee that some day they might not be turned against America.

This despite the fact that some of our own National Guard units don't have the jet planes they need.

I have learned these facts from excellent sources, from people in a position to know what transpired at last week's huddle between Secretary Dulles and Members of Congress' Armed Forces Committees.

Yugoslavia has received well over $1 billion in economic and military aid from the United States since 1948.

ADMINISTRATION FAILS TO SHOW PROOF

The administration has failed to prove its case in asking that further funds should be voted for this so-called neutral nation whose Communist dictator has become publicly reconciled with Russia's rulers.

It made sense to show up Tito while he continued to be an ulcer in Stalin's flank, but this realistic if unpleasant approach became outdated the moment Khrushchev embraced Tito again with no apparent protest from the Yugoslavian dictator.

Secretary Dulles is asking for "freedom of action in a sensitive area." This skilled statesman should realize that the granting of further aid to Tito in the face of his reconciliation with Moscow is bound to have serious repercussions among our allies and the so-called uncommitted nations.

GIVES A BOOST TO NEUTRALISM

Neutralism will be encouraged as a paying proposition, our allies will wonder if Uncle Sam is more concerned about placating the neutrals than about the continuation of their friendship.

Let's stop this spending of American taxpayers' money, some place—some time. Why not now—and in Yugoslavia?

IKE'S POSITION

Ike runs again: The casual disclosure that President Eisenhower will seek reelection came as no surprise to the overwhelming majority of Americans, who all along accepted the medical verdict of the foremost physicians in the country that his stomach ailment would not incapacitate him for a second term.

Right until the last, however, certain columnists and commentators sought to maintain and artificial tension over the situation, trying to create a suspense that actually never existed.

It is quite apparent now that Ike viewed his present illness as a temporary stomach disorder, and did not place it in the same category as his heart attack of last September.

The moment he felt his recovery had reached the proper stage, he passed the word along to his chief lieutenants.

POLITICAL JUDGMENT

And the President showed shrewd political judgment in arranging that Senator KNOWLAND would be the one to make the first announcement.

Ike and the strong-minded California Senator have not always seen eye to eye on some projects, so it was sound strategy to indicate to the voters that they were united on the subject of the President's reelection.

As long ago as January 1, 1956, your favorite editor went out on a limb with a flat prediction, based on some solid inside information, that the Republican ticket in 1956 would be Eisenhower and NIXON again. Now I feel calmer.

Alcoholic ward: Comrade Khrushchev is quite a character. If he is not denouncing the murderer Stalin who made him what he is today, he is publicly losing his temper or getting boisterously drunk at some diplomatic function.

THE LATEST INSTANCE

The latest instance of Khrushchev's vodka venom (at the Moscow aviation day party) might well cost him his job as one of the top men in the Communist hierarchy.

According to the reports, Khrushchev got so loaded at the lawn party that he engaged in a shouting argument with Premier Bulganin, who also appears to have a weakness for vodka.

He insulted Nigel Birch, British air minister, and then made some far-from-diplomatic remarks to other foreign airmen about the methods and accomplishments of their countries.

So embarrassed was Marshal Zhukov, the Soviet defense minister and wartime hero of the Red army, he personally apologized to his Western guests.

Now, whether this sort of situation will lead to the political purging of Khrushchev remains to be seen. The possibility cannot, of course, be excluded.

I DON'T THINK SO

Following our trip to London last April to cover the visit of Khrushchev and Bulganin, I was invited to address the International trade fair in Seattle. In the course of that speech I made the following comment:

"To me, a very significant aspect of the Communist leaders' visit to Britain was Khrushchev's bad temper.

"He lost it at the Birmingham industrial fair, speaking before the completely respectful audience of industrialists. He threatened them and the free world with mass destruction through the use of already developed guided missiles.

"He got away a little with his drunkenness and antics in Yugoslavia and he was quite successful with his lamp-for-a-hat trick in India.

"(But) drinking and losing his temper may have a great deal more significance than appears on the surface today."

Again in the Editor's report of May 27, I wrote:

"It would not surprise me at all if the unbelievably bad show he put on in England might not be the cause of his receding some in power in their top ruling group—the presidium."

Whether Khrushchev can be unseated depends, of course, on how much power he possesses.

As first secretary of the party, he controls the political machine with its 6,000,000 members. Malenkov did not have this political power when he lost his job.

Nor, obviously, did he have the support of the army, the other major instrument of power in the Soviet Union today.

Whether he can behave like a Tartar and continue to maintain his position as one of Russia's top rulers is questionable.

I don't think so.

Transocean Air Lines

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE P. MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 19, 1956

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, on several occasions I have made comments concerning Transocean Air Lines which has its principal offices in my district in Oakland, Calif., and the entire business, civic, and social community in the Oakland Bay area is very proud of the accomplishments of Transocean, its affiliates, and their more than 2,500 employees.

I have just recently visited with my good friends at Transocean and I was extremely pleased to see how this young and vigorous great company continues to develop and make increasing important contributions to the national defense and overall public interest through its air transport and affiliated aeronautical enterprises.

However, I continue to be puzzled by the failure of the Civil Aeronautics Board and the President to grant even a temporary certificate of convenience and necessity or appropriate long-term exemption to this great company, authorizing the provision of nonsubsidized passenger and property services, despite the participation of the company in a number of costly CAB proceedings. For the convenience of the Members, I cite below a list of Transocean's applications before the CAB, the disposition of determined applications, and the status of pending applications:

LIST AND DESCRIPTION OF CAB APPLICATIONS OF TRANSOCEAN AIR LINES

Docket No. 2379: June 1946 application for special services. No action and application terminated upon institution of proceedings in Large Irregular Investigation, Docket No. 5132.

Docket No. 2537 et al.: Pacific Northwest-Hawaii Case. Application for scheduled services denied.

Docket No. 3041 et al.: Transatlantic Cargo Case. Application for transatlantic cargo service denied.

Docket No. 3041 et al.: Reopened Transatlantic Cargo Case. Application of Seaboard & Western granted, and Transocean's application denied.

Docket No. 5582 et al.: West Coast-Hawaii Case. Transocean's application denied.

Docket No. 5031 et al.: Transpacific Certificate Renewal Case. Examiner recommended temporary certificate to Transocean for carriage of persons and property only in the transpacifc area; but the Board by a 3 to 2 vote did not adopt the examiner's recommendation. Thereafter, the Board by a split of 2 to 2 vote denied Transocean's reconsideration petition, despite a concession of substantial error in original opinion, and without retransmitting to the President in light of such error, although one member urged that such retransmittal be made.

Docket No. 5132 et al.: Irregular Carrier Investigation. Granted supplemental authority of persons and property in domestic and overseas air transportation but denied supplemental authority for carriage of persons in foreign air transportation on a limited basis. The acquisition of the latter authority has been the 10-year quest of Transocean.

Docket No. 7300: Application for exemption for authority to engage in transportation of persons and property (charter and special services) between points in the United States and between points in the United States and overseas and foreign points. No action by CAB.

I am particularly concerned and grieved by the failure of the Board in the Transpacific Certificate Renewal Case to sustain the recommendation of an able and experienced assistant chief examiner of the CAB to grant a temporary certificate to Transocean to pro-

vide nonsubsidized, nonscheduled, irregular transportation by air of persons and property only in the transpacific areas. I am sure that it will be of interest to my colleagues to note that the adverse decision of the CAB and the President was on the basis of an adverse 3–2 vote within the CAB. The two Democratic members of the Board, Col. J. P. Adams and former Senator Josh Lee, filed a vigorous dissenting opinion urging that the Board and the President adopt the examiner's recommendation. It is of further interest that when the decision was affirmed by the President, one of the adverse voters, Hon. Oswald Ryan, had failed of reappointment to the Board. Transocean petitioned for reconsideration of the adverse decision but was turned down by a 2–2 vote of the Board and without sending the matter to the President despite the fact that the two adverse members admitted in the reconsideration order that certain errors had been made in the original majority decision in which the examiner's recommendation for certification of Transocean was not adopted.

It should be emphasized that the dedicated and prime objective of Transocean throughout its more than 10 years of operation has been to restrict itself to the providing of supplemental passenger and property air transport services in overseas and foreign areas. It should also be pointed out Transocean has religiously lived within the restrictive CAB regulations applicable to nonscheduled air carriers; and that no complaint by anyone has ever been filed against Transocean with respect to alleged violations of the Board's regulations.

By its decision with respect to Transocean in the Transpacific Certificate Renewal Case, the CAB has preserved, with the approval of the President, its dubious record of never having issued a route certificate to a new trunkline carrier in its 16-year history; and has throughout that period protected from new carrier competition the subsidized carriers which were blanketed in under the grandfather provisions of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938.

It is almost beyond belief that, in this Nation that was founded to give liberty, freedom and comprehensive opportunity to all, a monopolistic policy is to be maintained which bars new thinking, new blood and new enterprise in the dynamic aeronautical field, the newest product of man's ingenuity to protect and advance the rights of the whole people.

The abhorrence of this monopolistic policy in civil aviation is emphasized by the current trend of affairs in the Far East. It should be self-evident to the President and his advisers that the uncertainties in that area make more important than ever the preserving and strengthening of this Pacific area carrier which seeks to provide low cost commercial passenger and cargo service between the United States and the Orient without the payment of 1 cent of subsidy or mail pay and without causing the slightest increase in subsidy for the presently certificated and subsidized carriers.

The Civil Aeronautics Board has, among other things, in the past used as argument against certification of new carriers that such certification would divert traffic from carriers already certificated and would of necessity increase the subsidy needs of the presently certificated carriers. In reversing himself on the renewal of a certificate for Northwest Airlines between the Pacific Northwest and Honolulu, the President gave as his reason for such reversal that he had been advised by the Chairman of the CAB that within 2 years the Board believed that the entire subsidy would be eliminated from the Pacific runs. It would seem to follow that even if the limited certification of Transocean Air Lines were approved that there could be no increase in subsidy payments by reason of the admittedly insignificant diversion which such limited certification might inconceivably cause. In this connection, it is most interesting to note that the CAB is presently actively considering again permanent certification of Northwest's United States-Orient route and Pan American's United States-Orient Great Circle route application, with both carriers' primary contention being that the question of subsidy is no longer a factor in Pacific airline operations.

The perpetuation of monopoly and the continuation, in civil aviation, of a total lack of real freedom of entry is in strange contrast with the President's statement in his economic report of January 20, 1955:

> Government should persevere in its efforts to maintain easy entry into trade and industry, to check monopoly and preserve a competitive environment.

I am confident that the CAB under its new chairman, James R. Durfee, from that great progressive State of Wisconsin, will fittingly reward Transocean with early certification or appropriate long-term exemption for its great contributions to the air transport objectives of this country at home and throughout the world.

Certainly, such early authorization to Transocean would appear to be appropriate in light of Aviation Week's recent forecast of a $4 billion year for the world's airlines in 1957; and the fact that Transocean's supplemental nonsubsidized passenger and property operations would have infinitesimal, if any, adverse effect on the operations of any United States-flag carrier. I am hopeful that the CAB and the administration will fulfill its responsibility to the public, the national defense, and the commercial air transport industry generally by granting appropriate nonsubsidized passenger and property authorization to Transocean very soon. There is no doubt of Transocean's full ability to meet its high responsibilities under such authorization from our Government.

Adm. Arleigh Burke Receives Deserved Tribute

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CRAIG HOSMER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 19, 1956

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, Fulton Lewis, Jr., devoted his July 18 column to a well deserved tribute to the United States Navy's top commissioned officer, Adm. Arleigh Burke. It is a pleasure to call it to the attention of my colleagues. Following is the column as it appeared in the Los Angeles Examiner:

ADM. ARLEIGH BURKE 'NEW BREED OF BRASS'

(By Fulton Lewis, Jr.)

WASHINGTON, July 18.—Adm. Arleigh Albert Burke, the Navy's number one commissioned officer, is quietly gaining recognition as a new breed of brass.

He is instilling more confidence and respect among subordinate officers, especially juniors, than anyone else who has come along in some time. He is becoming known as a man who gets a job done and inspires others to help him do it.

Burke was only 53 when President Eisenhower dipped far down into the admirals' list 14 months ago to pluck him out for the vital post of Chief of Naval Operations. Typical of the seemingly routine but actually unusual steps to which Burke goes is a recent meeting he called of all commanders and captains attached to departmental headquarters here.

The meeting was held in the Interdepartmental Auditorium; an estimated 3,000 3- and 4-stripers showed up.

Burke began by telling his wondering audience that he had called the session because they were the men who in a few years would be running the Navy, and he thought they deserved a preview of the responsibilities they faced.

In ample detail, he outlined some of the problems and issues of administration, posed to officers of star rank. Ultimately he opened the meeting to questions. They were many and varied; he did his best to answer all.

BATTLE FOR CONVICTION

Finally came one that struck home. Suppose, asked one questioner, an officer sincerely and honestly has come to a conviction running counter to policy established by his superiors; should he bow to dictate with closed mouth or should he battle for his conviction?

Battle for it, came the answer, assuming it is honest and sincere; carry the battle to the highest levels available. But when a decision finally is reached by the highest authority, accept the decision and put into its effectuation as much energy as was put into the battle.

On this one he spoke from personal knowledge. In 1948, then Capt. Arleigh Burke was head of the research and promotional team set up by the Navy to put its case across to the public in the raging B–36 fight. Burke incurred the bitter enmity of many officers in the other services, some in the Navy itself.

In 1949, he was chosen by a Navy selection board for promotion to rear admiral. President Truman saw the name on the list, ordered it stricken. The late Adm. Forest

Sherman, then Chief of Naval Operations, led the so-called "revolt of the admirals" against such White House interference and ultimately Mr. Truman, backing down, sent his nomination along to the Senate.

EMPHASIZES NEED OF WIFE

He long has harbored another deep conviction that has raised his estimation among some officers, lowered it among a minority—that one of the most important attributes of a Navy officer is his wife. He reasons that a Navy officer must spend long periods away from home while on sea duty, and that an efficient officer must have confidence that his wife meanwhile is properly caring for finances, children, and their home; otherwise, extraneous worry about domestic matters will lower his efficiency in the Navy.

Death of Polish Workers Fails To Move Reds Here

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. R. WALTER RIEHLMAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 19, 1956

Mr. RIEHLMAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Syracuse Post Standard of July 13, pertaining to the recent tragic events in Poznan, Poland:

DEATH OF POLISH WORKERS FAILS TO MOVE REDS HERE

Two weeks have gone since the starved workers of Poznan, Poland, rose against their Communist oppressors.

Two weeks since the Reds turned rifles and machineguns on men who pleaded for freedom and bread, and shot them down in the streets.

Two weeks and not a single word from America's commies, who profess undying love and devotion for the working classes.

Two weeks and not a peep or murmur from the lunatic liberals and the professional bleeding hearts who are always quick enough to espouse a commie cause when the target is their own country.

Where are the signers of petitions for freedom for the traitor Rosenbergs?

Where are the framers of resolutions defending the Hisses and the Dexter Whites and the notorious Hollywood 10?

Where are the formers of committees for the defense of human liberties, the protection of the Constitution, and scores of other high-sounding names.

Are not human liberties behind the Iron Curtain important enough to stir even a ripple of concern?

Is not the slaughter of a hundred or more workers in the street worth at least one faint, little protest?

The silence is eloquent testimony that America's full-bellied Commies and their intellectual sycophants despise the workers and hold them in utter contempt.

But though these Polish workers have drawn not a word of praise for their fight for liberty nor evoked the slightest criticism for the brutality of the Communists from our professional lovers of the proletariat, their heroism will not be forgotten soon by freemen.

They proved that the spirit of freedom has not been crushed in their unhappy land by all the oppression dictated by Moscow.

Thus it has always been with Poland. In its 1,000-year history, the country has been overrun by invaders and partitioned time and again. It has had but few interludes of independence, but Polish life and culture have not been destroyed.

They live today and will continue to live, for Poznan's workers are but a small segment of a nation that puts liberty above life, a nation that has endured subjection but has never accepted it.

So, too, with the other captive peoples behind the Iron Curtain, the Lithuanians, Latvians, Estonians, Czechs, and East Germans.

The flame of freedom may burn low but the Communists have found that even by extermination of vast numbers of human beings they cannot put it out * * * even in Mother Russia, where there have recently been rumbles of revolt.

Resolution of Pulaski Club, of Phoenix, Ariz.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. RHODES
OF ARIZONA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 19, 1956

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, under leave previously granted, I would like to bring to the attention of the House a resolution adopted by the Pulaski Club, of Phoenix, Ariz. This resolution expresses the position of 5,000 Americans of Polish origin now residing in the State of Arizona. I would like to add my own personal expression of admiration to the brave people of Poland, particularly those of the city of Poznan.

The resolution follows:

1. That an appeal be addressed to the Government of the United States of America that it condemn in the strongest possible language this latest crime of the Communists, namely the murder of Polish youth and Polish workers in the city of Poznan, Poland, and that adequate additional action be taken to prevent a repetition of such acts of violence and the slaughter of innocent people.

2. That our heartfelt thanks and sincere appreciation be expressed to the Members of the Congress of the United States of America for their several resolutions of sympathy expressed on the floor of the Congress of the United States of America and included in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD in the matter of the uprising of the workers of Poznan and their appeal for bread, but we do and must insist that this matter be brought up and relentlessly followed through in the forum of the United Nations.

3. That the President of the United States, the Honorable Dwight D. Eisenhower, hear sympathetically our united appeal that he use any and all means at his disposal to hasten the liberation of Poland from the oppressive yoke of Communist domination through free and unfettered elections, and the swiftest elimination of Russians from a free and independent Poland.

4. That we urge our representatives in the Congress of the United States of America that they join the rank and file and give their proven leadership to the grand crusade of freeing all the enslaved countries from behind the Iron Curtain, and to use their positions as our representatives to give heed and warning to all our countrymen to be ever watchful and on their guard against Communist agents and their dupes in our own midst.

5. We salute and express our admiration to our brothers and sisters in Poznan, the workers and the youth—for their fight for freedom and bread. We wish to express our sentiments of deepest sympathy to the families of the heroes of Poznan, who gave their last full measure of devotion, their life's blood, on the altar of a free and independent Poland.

6. To all Poles behind the Iron Curtain we send our regard and respect, together with the assurance that we shall not fail nor falter in helping them to right the wrongs of Yalta. With the help of God, Poland shall yet be free.

A Witness Rejects Her Chance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUGH SCOTT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 16, 1956

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am inserting an editorial which appeared in the Philadelphia Inquirer of July 19, 1956:

A WITNESS REJECTS HER CHANCE

Gale Sondergaard had a wonderful opportunity, here in this city, to clear her record before the eyes of the American people. She chose to reject that opportunity, in her appearance before the House Un-American Activities Committee.

Six witnesses, including several other actors, had linked Miss Sondergaard with the Communist Party. The committee asked her to speak for herself. She could have said that she once was a Communist, and now regretted it. She could have denied the charges. But she refused to answer, invoking the fifth amendment.

Miss Sondergaard had an absolute legal right to invoke the fifth amendment. But the public has an equal right to draw its own conclusions from her action.

The House committee asked Miss Sondergaard whether she had contributed $20,000 to the Communist Party. Again she invoked the fifth amendment. And again the public can form its own judgment.

Miss Sondergaard was shown a photo of a Communist Party card with her name on it. She was asked once more whether she was a member. Again she had a choice of answers, but again she insisted on invoking the fifth amendment.

In the face of this record Miss Sondergaard can scarcely complain if she enjoys little popularity among Americans, save those who are either sympathetic to, or fooled by, the current campaign to lull people into believing that United States communism is "just another political party" and nothing to be concerned about.

The broader question raised by Miss Sondergaard's appearance is the attempt to suppress public protest against Communists by calling it "blacklisting." Under specific scrutiny by the committee is a pamphlet on "blacklisting" issued by the tax-exempt Fund for the Republic.

No one believes the Fund for the Republic is a Communist agency. But history has shown us two things:

First, that the most effective work done for communism in this country has been done not by Communists—but by well-meaning people who were fooled by Communists or used by them to further their objectives.

Second, that the Communists always have a handy arsenal of nasty names to use on their opponents. Anyone who dares to attack a Communist is called a Red baiter. Every effort by Congress to expose Communist operations has been called a "witch hunt." Now that Communists have had

their "day of reckoning" with the American people, the Reds call that "blacklisting."

The House inquiry will develop how far the Fund for the Republic may have played into Communist hands by its "blacklisting" pamphlet and other activities. But in the Sondergaard case alone the committee has shown bias in that pamphlet; how Miss Sondergaard was pictured as persecuted because her husband took the fifth amendment—with no mention of the fact that six witnesses testified under oath that she herself was a Communist, or that the committee had a Communist Party card bearing her name.

Communists, non-Communists, any of us, have a right to "take the fifth amendment." But as a New York court noted last week, those who aid Communist causes "perform a public act" and cannot expect to escape public objection to their conduct.

So with Miss Sondergaard. She had her chance to come clean before her fellow-countrymen. She rejected that opportunity. Let there be no more nonsense that she has been persecuted, harassed, or anything but judged by loyal Americans according to the company the House committee's records show that she kept.

Washington Star Praises Public Service of Congressman Jones of Alabama

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARL ELLIOTT
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 19, 1956

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, on yesterday the Evening Star, in its lead editorial, praised the public service of our colleague the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. JONES] as "exceptional" for his leadership in initiating the new long-range Federal building program for the Nation's Capital.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the editorial referred to:

LONG-OVERDUE PROGRAM

The General Services Administration, which drew up Washington's new long-range Federal building program, and Representative JONES, of Alabama, who initiated it, have performed an exceptional service to the Nation's Capital.

One of the program's dual goals is to complete permanent Federal buildings, long planned and long delayed, in the monumental Government area west of Capitol Hill. The other, with the availability of new, permanent office space, is to tear down, at last, the dozens of tempos which for years have marred the Federal landscape and provided intolerable working conditions for thousands of employees. Neither of these goals, as experience has proved, is attainable without an ambitious long-range program.

GSA is to be commended for making its new building locations "conform entirely" to plans of the National Capital Planning Commission. These plans strive to prevent undue concentrations of Federal employees, but also to continue development of this city as the Nation's Capital. The GSA plan would meet all the foreseeable housing needs of downtown agencies, and make unnecessary the Federal exodus to the suburbs which recently has reached alarming proportions.

It also is encouraging that GSA intends to ask the House and Senate Public Works Committees, before this session of Congress ends, to approve several lease-purchase projects for new Government buildings in the program. These projects make up the bulk of the program's 4-year "first stage." Committee endorsement now could substantially change the face of the Capital for the better by 1960.

How Tito Fooled the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALVIN M. BENTLEY
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 19, 1956

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I wish to insert the following editorial from the July 20 edition of U. S. News & World Report by Robert Strausz-Hupé entitled "How Tito Fooled the United States":

HOW TITO FOOLED THE UNITED STATES

(By Robert Strausz-Hupé)

(What did United States really get for the billion dollars of aid it has given Tito? An expert on foreign affairs here concludes that:

(Tito used aid from United States effectively—to strengthen Communist grip on Yugoslavia.

(United States arms built up Yugoslav forces while Tito secretly negotiated with Russia. Thus he nullified hope of a Western bastion there.

(Dollars, poured in with Tito's promise of mass defections behind the Iron Curtain, actually produced nothing along that line.

(Tito outfoxed the West, really used United States support as a lever to get favorable reconciliation terms from Communist Russia.

(These are the conclusions of Robert Strausz-Hupé, authority on foreign relations and director of the Foreign Policy Research Institute of the University of Pennsylvania.)

During its brief history as an independent state, the Kingdom of Serbia played a small but lively part in European politics. Its successor state, Yugoslavia, owed its existence to the peace settlement of the First World War, imposed upon the Central Powers by the Anglo-American-French victory.

Between the wars Yugoslavia's principal claim to international importance rested upon her membership in the system of Balkan alliances devised by France as a barrier against German aggression in southeastern Europe. In those years Yugoslavia never played an independent role in world politics, any more than her predecessor Serbia had; her foreign policies were made in the capitals of the Great Powers, not in Belgrade. For a time during the First World War, after the victories of the Austro-Hungarian armies, Serbia even disappeared temporarily from the map; during the Second World War Yugoslavia was similarly blotted out by the might of Nazi Germany, and she owed her resurrection to the victory and diplomatic agreement of the Big Three.

Until 1948, Yugoslavia was noted—as far as she was noted at all—as one of the Soviet Union's most pliant satellites, and Yugoslav diplomatic conduct was known as the most stereotyped mimicry of Stalinist diplomatic conduct, replete with the standard invectives and provocations addressed to the Western Powers.

But by 1950, Yugoslavia had skyrocketed to a place of world political eminence, and very soon thereafter the resplendently uniformed figure of Marshal Tito became familiar on the highways of diplomacy, exchanging state visits with elected and hereditary rulers, including Nehru and other Asian leaders, the Queen of England, and the King and Queen of Greece. Yet the most startling development was the singular distinction bestowed upon Yugoslavia by the Soviets. For 7 years they had professed their irreconcilable enmity and abiding contempt for the defector; yet in 1955, before the incredulous eyes of the Belgrade diplomatic corps and a hundred international reporters, Marshal Tito received the affectionate accolade of the putative leaders of orthodox world communism, Khrushchev and Bulganin.

What miracle raised Yugoslavia from an historically uncertain and comparatively humble status as one among several Balkan States—of whom some others are as rich in manpower, industry, and natural resources—to the rank of an influential member of the world community, dealing on equal terms with the most formidable powers of the globe? For the United States—which did so much to bring the miracle to pass—this question can be rephrased as follows: Precisely where does the consummation of this amazing development leave the foreign policy and security interests of the United States?

It is not necessary here to retell the story of the Russian Yugoslav break. Long and searching historical studies of that event have been composed in several languages. The overt or publicly acknowledged issue in conflict can be gleaned quickly from the pages of Soviet and Yugoslav official publications—"white papers" that are principally concerned with points of Marxist-Leninist dogma. On this, the philosophical level, the disagreement appears to have centered on the Yugoslav Communist Party's rejection of Soviet centralism as a model of domestic administration and of Soviet imperialism as a model of interstate relationships within the Communist orbit.

Interpretations begin to differ and, because of the scantiness of documentary evidence, cannot help differing, when it comes to the importance of the philosophical issue in the actual conflict.

It has been pointed out that the Yugoslav Communist Party was surprisingly slow in acknowledging the charges hurled at it by Moscow; that the philosophical exchanges between Moscow and Belgrade appear contrived; and that, more important still, the Yugoslav Communist leaders—and, foremost among them, Tito—had been associated intimately for the better part of their adult lives with Soviet theory and practice and could never have been under any misapprehension as to the meaning of that theory and practice either for the world in general or for themselves and their local concerns in particular.

None of them had been earlier known to entertain deep convictions in regard to such a bourgeois conception as national independence, except when "national independence" could be turned into an issue that afforded an opportunity for Soviet intervention—as, for example, it could on the occasion of the Civil War in Spain, where Tito represented the Comintern.

Since the explanation of the break on theoretical or philosophical grounds involves so many inconsistencies, perhaps the most plausible explanation, and the one most acceptable to ideologically temperate observers, relates the break to a clash of personalities: the aging Stalin, not an easy boss at the best of times, had conceived an intense dislike for Tito, and Tito reciprocated—first with circumspection and, then, with boldness born of desperation—his dislike.

This interpretation is probably close to the live truth, whereas the arid dispute over dogma most certainly is not. However, it rests upon guesswork. The evidence for any interpretation of the Russian-Yugoslav rift is tantalizingly meager. The principal actors of the drama were Communists and masters of the art of burying the truth under Aesopian double-talk. Only one fact is

incontrovertible: Tito was the first Communist who defied the organization in Moscow, survived, and retained control of the organization's local chapter.

How Tito was able to free himself of Stalin's domination is the truly mysterious part of the Yugoslav miracle. There is nothing mysterious about its other part—the massive intervention of the United States on behalf of the Yugoslav Communists once they had been read officially out of the Moscow fold. The quarrel with Stalin freed Tito to become a recipient of American help, and American help supplied him with the material basis of his influence in world politics.

Although no complete accounting has been made available by official sources, enough data have been released to give a fair approximation of the total costs involved in keeping Yugoslavia afloat. From 1949 to 1955, United States economic assistance to Yugoslavia amounted to nearly $450 million.

This does not include military assistance granted after July, 1951, or economic aid rendered by Great Britain and France under the Tripartite Agreement of 1951. Military assistance accounts for an additional expenditure for the years 1951–55 of about $500 million; in 1951–52 Britain and France paid out $63 million in the form of straight grants to Yugoslavia. To all these bilateral transactions must still be added loans granted, with the consent of the United States, by the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development and advances authorized by the International Monetary Fund.

On the basis of public records, it is possible to compute the total of gifts and loans received by Yugoslavia from the West in the last half-dozen years at well over $1,400 million. Approximately nine-tenths of this sum came directly out of the pocket of the United States or derived, under a set of complicated guaranties, from the United States Government acting through third parties.

Although the 5-year total is appreciably smaller than United States grants to major members of NATO (which Yugoslavia refused to join), Yugoslavia's population is only one-third the home population of the United Kingdom and France, not to speak of their overseas possessions and global commitments.

Measured against Yugoslavia's productivity and per capita income, American assistance to Yugoslavia represents an intervention in the national economy on a scale more massive than in the economy of any other country. Yet Yugoslavia refused to enter NATO [North Atlantic Treaty Organization], to harbor Western military bases, to adhere to any binding alliances except the pact with Greece and Turkey, or even to enter upon some of the contractual arrangements under which the United States obtained supervisory rights and reciprocal privileges similar to those granted it by all other recipient countries.

Yugoslavia has done very well indeed—as well as, if not better than any other protege of the United States in its role as dispenser of international munificence.

Presumably those who devised the Yugoslav policies of the United States expected some tangible returns on such an immense investment—if not dollar for dollar, then at least an increment of Western military security and specific political advantages in the Cold War.

Assistant Secretary of State George W. Perkins, testifying in November 1950, before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, urged that American economic aid should be extended to Yugoslavia, not only because of the suffering of the Yugoslav people confronted by crop failure, but also because "the humanitarian appeal is reinforced by the hard factor of national interest." He went on to argue that the interests of the United States were directly involved, that food shipments to Yugoslavia were a logical step in guarding United States security, and that as long as Yugoslavia maintained its independence it "continues to be a significant factor weakening the power and influence of Stalinist Communists throughout the world.

He enumerated the specific benefits of orienting Yugoslavia toward the West: Yugoslav support of the Greek Communist guerillas would cease; tensions between Yugoslavia and Austria would be relaxed; the Yugoslav army would be a factor in the world balance, deterring Soviet aggression in the Balkans and elsewhere in Europe; Yugoslavia would help to make the United Nations more effective; and Yugoslavia would make a contribution to the Western economy.

Mr. W. Averell Harriman, at that time Director of the Mutual Security Administration, requested President Truman to transfer military funds to the economic assistance of Yugoslavia because "Yugoslavia occupies a vital strategic position on the flank of the defense of Western Europe * * * and its ability to defend itself is considered essential to the security of Western Europe."

These statements do not stand alone. They were to be echoed by a long line of responsible officials who, as foreign aid administrators and State Department functionaries, were engaged in the formulation and execution of American policies toward Yugoslavia.

For a surprisingly long time these assumptions remained unchallenged. Yet they are corroborated neither by the history of Yugoslavia nor by the history of communism and Communist schisms. Was Yugoslavia under Tito or, for that matter, at any time and under any regime "essential to the security of Western Europe"?

In the First World War, the collapse of Serbia did not materially alter the balance of military power, and the western allies managed to defeat the central powers without Serbian assistance. Serbia's independence was restored through western military intervention, and greater Serbia (Yugoslavia) owed its existence to the West's military and diplomatic writ.

In the Second World War, Yugoslavia succumbed within a few weeks to the concentric attacks of the Germans, launched from the Danube Basin and Bulgaria. Although the Yugoslav guerillas performed notable feats of valor in their fight against the Germans and Italians, Yugoslavia, like most of continental Europe, owed its liberation to the victories of Stalingrad, the Normandy beachheads, and the Rhine.

Measured by these colossal feats of arms the military contribution of Yugoslavia was minute. In fact, the strategic geography of southeastern Europe precludes successful Yugoslav resistance against any major power operating from the northern and eastern approaches. Geographically, Yugoslavia is a long narrow strip of territory interposed between the Adriatic to the west and the Danube plain and the Balkan Mountains to the East. The openness of the Yugoslav frontier toward the north and east, the chain of mountains running from north to south and barring east-west movements, and the lack of a system of transversal railroads and highways, these geographical characteristics combine to pose virtually insuperable obstacles to an effective defense against continental aggression.

Both Yugoslava and western officials argued for western military assistance to Yugoslavia on the grounds that certain satellites of the Soviet Union—Hungary, Rumania, and Bulgaria—threatened armed attack. The principal supporting evidence for the seriousness of this threat was supplied by reports (emanating from Belgrade) for satellite troop concentrations along the Yugoslav border.

But against this alarming intelligence could be marshaled fairly ample information about the abysmal state of the satellites' national economies and the political unreliability and inadequate training of their military levies. None of Yugoslavia's eastern neighbors was in a condition to wage aggressive war, unless it had the outright military support of the Soviet Union. Any large-scale military operation against Yugoslavia would have brought Russian forces into action. Even if we assume, and it is a very large assumption indeed, that the Soviet Union might have ventured anywhere in Europe upon overt military aggression and might have dared to provoke a crisis leading inevitably to a general conflagration, it is difficult to see how the kind of military aid Yugoslavia had demanded and received from the west would have affected the outcome of such a war.

HOW STRONG IS YUGOSLAVIA?

Events would have conformed to the pattern of 1914 and 1941. Tito's estimated 30 divisions would have been unable to defend the eastern plains. In the best of circumstances, Tito's forces would have succeeded in falling back to the mountains, there to regroup in order to wage guerilla war. The fighter planes and tanks which Tito obtained from the West would have been useless for operations of the partisan type. Yugoslav guerilla bands might have inflicted as much damage on the Soviets as they did on the Germans in the Second World War, but it is still inconceivable that they would have contributed materially to the security of Western Europe.

Doubts as to the strategic and technical effectiveness of the Yugoslav defensive build-up are not allayed by considerations of national morale. The bulk of the Yugoslav Army consists of peasants. The food shortage of 1950, which the United States undertook to remedy by food shipments, was caused in part by insufficient rainfall, but it was also caused in part by the regime's ruthless attempt to collectivize private farm holdings.

The Yugoslav peasants responded to the Communists' agricultural program, copied from the Russian model, by reducing crop acreage, slaughtering pigs and cattle for their own consumption, and withholding farm produce from urban markets. The resultant crisis endangered Tito's hold on the Yugoslav people far more seriously than Stalinist sleepers in the Yugoslav Communist Party. The reversal of agricultural policies, especially the abandonment of the collectivization drive and the toleration of a thriving black market for farm produce, obliquely acknowledged the nature of the real threat to the regime.

New legislation promulgated in 1950 and 1951 sought to appease the resentments not only of the peasantry but also of industrial workers and national minorities. The regime proclaimed that the grant of greater autonomy to factory management and workers' councils marked the return to Marxist-Leninist principles. The party's theoreticians trained their dialectical guns on Stalinist centralism, but in fact, Tito yielded to popular discontent and not to the force of theoretical arguments. Though Tito's personal popularity had diminished less than the prestige of the Communist Party, it still depended heavily upon the contrived adulation of spontaneous (i. e., carefully staged) demonstrations.

It was not the unpurged Stalinists in the party or the intrigues of the Cominform or the Soviet economic blockade or foreign military threats that menaced Tito, but the Yugoslav people's growing distaste for his own ruling clique. Any other explanation would have to be based upon the assumption that the great mass of Tito's countrymen had been transformed, within a few years, into convinced Communists, and that all would have been well had it not been for a sudden access of Stalinist imperialism. In fairness to Tito, it must be conceded that not even he claimed as much.

WIDE APPEAL OF TITO: A MYTH

The amazing assumption that the Yugoslav population, composed predominantly of small freeholders, stood four-square behind Tito, underlies United States policy toward Yugoslavia. Once the makers of our foreign policy had persuaded themselves of the identity of interest linking the regime and the people and of Tito's right to speak for the nation, they were able to view aid to Yugoslavia as thoroughly compatible with the canons of international morality. Ambassador John Sherman Cooper, calling in 1952 upon the United Nations to censure the U. S. S. R. for its behavior toward Yugoslavia, invoked on the behalf of the latter country the "fundamental principles of national independence."

It would require considerable space to explore the meaning of these "fundamental principles" to the common people of a country where a small band of Communists, supported by the Red army, had usurped the government and held their power by virtue of coercive methods that differed not by a whit from those practiced anywhere in the Soviet orbit.

It must suffice here to note that the present regime has refrained consistently from consulting the will of the Yugoslav people and staking its tenure on elections which have not been rigged by all the familiar devices of "popular democracy." It is uncertain, to say the least, that the average Yugoslav citizen, deprived of political rights and denied the basic civil liberties, views Tito's one-party state as the legitimate defender of Yugoslavia's "national independence."

The "fundamental principles of national independence" are inseparable, one should presume, from the concept of freedom, internal as well as external, if they are not to serve a tyrannical regime as a propaganda screen for staying in power. Such a fraud was perpetrated successfully by Stalin on the Russian people at war with Germany.

It can be argued that Tito qualified, on a trial basis, for some Western support because dissension among Communists redounded, at the height of the cold war, to the patent advantage of the West. There was some propaganda value in showing the world that the West would not brush off a satellite that had defected from Moscow. However, it was unnecessary, for the purpose of Western policy, to acclaim Tito as the defender of national liberty.

An accident in the intramural politics of communism cast Tito adrift from Moscow leadership. The break was not of the West's making. Yet the accidental association of a professional Communist revolutionary, now denounced by Moscow as treacherous heretic, and the leading powers of the free world formed the basis of settled Western policies. At the start, these policies were addressed to the emergency created by the break and then increasingly to the long-range development of the Yugoslav economic and military potential.

In a series of agreements with the United States, Tito accepted, together with American economic and military assistance, certain conditions called for by United States law, such as the right of the United States to inspect the use made by the Yugoslav services of American military supplies. The text of these agreements is quite explicit on what Tito did and did not undertake to do. His public statements, which remained uncontradicted by the official voices of the West, should have dispelled all doubt as to the many and significant reservations with which he hedged in his Western commitments.

Whatever he may have conceded to his Western benefactors, Tito did not agree to join the Western system of collective security. He retained, to a remarkable degree, his freedom of political and ideological maneuver. Nevertheless, Tito's closefisted and reticent dealings with the West's foreign offices sparked great hopes and expectations: his example would unleash anti-Stalinist revolts in the Communist Parties outside the Iron Curtain and strengthen separatist tendencies within the Soviet orbit itself—perhaps even in Red China; at home, he would transform his dictatorship into a real democracy or at least make a beginning by granting his people some basic civil rights; and, in general, he would move ever closer to the West politically and spiritually. Many books and articles have been devoted to evoking and exploring these wholesome prospects.

In sober fact, Tito applied his considerable ingenuity and energy to tasks that either were not related to Western hopes and expectations or bid fair to embarrass Western strategy in the cold war. No sooner had Western aid secured his home base than he launched himself on a brilliant diplomatic and ideological campaign designed to strengthen his position as an independent power between the two hostile camps and to consolidate the so-called uncommitted forces the world over. Since the monolithic controls of Moscow closed the Soviet orbit to political and ideological penetration, the brunt of Tito's initiative necessarily fell upon the uncommitted countries of Asia—and upon the West itself.

With singular adroitness Tito perfected the two major instruments of his strategy: the appeals of the Socialist utopia and of neutralism. From the alchemy of his propaganda, Yugoslavia emerged as a model Socialist country, beset by the wicked machinations of the Kremlin yet valiantly applying the principles of Marxism in their pristine purity. This image corresponded happily with the longing of those western intellectuals who saw the Russia of the 1920's as socialism's promised land, then awakened to the grim realities of Soviet practice, yet kept on looking for the renaissance of Marxim freed of the Stalinist incubus.

Tito's proper communism exerted a powerful attraction not only upon those ex-Communists for whom the god had failed, but also upon not a few western Socialists whose anti-Communist records were unblemished. Pilgrims, eager to rejoice in Tito's achievements, arrived in Belgrade in growing numbers. Not all may have returned wholly reassured about the novelty of the Yugoslav experiment. But Tito's hospitality and the persuasiveness of the multilingual young men and women who guided the visitors through the intricacies of the Moscow-Belgrade dispute as well as through half-finished factories and housing projects were rewarded by wide and, for the most part, favorable publicity.

Only a few years earlier the Yugoslav Communists had vented their anti-Western sentiments in language more outrageous than that employed by any other representative of the Soviet bloc. These verbal barrages had been followed by acts of violence such as the shooting down of unarmed American planes. Never had Yugoslavia stood so low in the West's esteem. Yet all this was now forgotten or forgiven.

The western press accorded a sympathetic and respectful treatment to Tito's words and deeds. How much the West's left-wing intelligentsia and its influential ramifications in the world of journalism and literature stood for in Tito's reconversion to respectability can be easily seen by comparing their treatment of the Yugoslav dictatorship with their treatment of say, the Spanish and the Chinese Nationalist regimes. Although no one has been able to prove that the two latter governments have shown themselves less mindful of the rights of individuals and cultural minorities or more hostile to the United States and its allies, they consistently fared worse than Yugoslavia's red rebel in their publicity. Tito's subtle play upon the West's own ideological schisms has paid off handsomely.

TITO EXPLOITS COLD WAR

No less successful has been Tito's exploitation of the political and psychological divisions of the non-Communist world in the cold war. Although Western statesmen may have convinced themselves that Yugoslavia had become a bulwark of Western security, Tito's principal diplomatic efforts have been devoted to organizing the neutralist international. Even before Stalin's death, Belgrade appeared to exert a magnetic attraction on neutralist forces everywhere; and after Stalin's death Tito's statements on world affairs increasingly keynoted the theme of noncommitment, independence, and anti-imperialism.

The very example of Tito's evasion of binding commitments in return for Western goods and arms, suggested a similar strategy to whoever felt that Western aid was the due of independent, backward countries and entitled the donor to no other than psychological compensation. Especially in the arc of free Asia, Tito's prestige grew, and Yugoslav delegations were accorded the welcome usually reserved for the representatives of a major power. Nowhere did Tito's performance meet with a warmer approval than in New Delhi. Tito's triumphal visit, in December 1954, to Premier Nehru bore fruit in a joint statement of the two rulers that contains the following passages:

"The similarities of historic background and the social and economic conditions of their countries, and the fact that they have emerged as independent nations through powerful movements of national liberation have endowed their understanding of each other and of their countries with deeper significance and given their friendly nations greater ease and facility. * * *

"The President and the Prime Minister desire to proclaim that the policy of nonalinement adopted and pursued by their respective countries is not neutrality or neutralism and therefore passivity as sometimes alleged, but it is a positive, active, and constructive policy seeking to lead to a collective peace on which alone collective security can really rest."

Although the document rejected neutralism as a bad word its negative implications for Western diplomacy were plain: the cause of neutralism—under whatever name it is disguised—had scored a widely-publicized victory. Since, despite the document's preamble, the economic and cultural bonds between Yugoslavia and India are about as significant as those between Iceland and Afghanistan, we must presume that Yugoslav-Indian relations join at one point only: rejection of the security system forged by American leadershp.

ON RUSSIAN-YUGOSLAV AMITY

The visit in June, 1955, of the First Secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party, N. S. Khrushchev, and the Minister President of the Soviet Union, N. A. Bulganin, to Belgrade, marked the zenith of Tito's diplomacy after the break. Some shrewd observers of Tito's maneuvers on the morrow of his expulsion from the Soviet fold surmised that his main purpose in obtaining Western aid was to restore his bargaining position in future negotiations with the Kremlin—if not with Stalin then with his successors. What really happened in Tito's negotiations with his one-time comrades probably will never be disclosed to profane inspection, but the outcome is plain: the liquidation of Russian-Yugoslav conflict and a close reapproachment of the two regimes.

Although Tito sought by diverse gestures—such as his unsmiling reception of the Russian worthies at the Belgrade air-port minimize the portentousness of the occasion, the joint Soviet-Yugoslav declaration of June 2, 1955, revealed candidly the far-reaching na-

ture of the agreement that came out of it. The Yugoslav and Soviet leaders professed identity of opinion on virtually all issues affecting East-West relations.

The declaration denounced "military blocs" (which in Soviet parlance means specifically the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, since the Soviet Union contends that its own military system is a mere answer to the Atlantic alliance). It called for the admission of Red China to the U. N. and endorsed the results of the Bandung conference. It advocated German unification on a "democratic basis in conformity with the wishes and interest of the German people and the interests of general security" (substantially the Russian position on the German problem).

As striking as the content of the document is its wording, which employs the classic language of Soviet foreign propaganda and contrasts sharply with the style of western diplomatic notes and declaration. The document does not lack frankness. Whatever illusions the West still harbors are the product of its own wishful thinking.

To leave the United States in no doubt as to its precarious place in Yugoslavia's affection. Tito, in an address delivered on July 28, 1955, before a mass meeting in Croatia, praised the Soviet Union, criticized the West, and denounced supervision of military equipment granted under the United States aid program. He sharply asserted that Yugoslavia rejected certain types of inspection called for by United States foreign-aid legislation—types of inspection to which Tito had heretofore consented without noticeable scruples. Although it is still too early to assess the full consequences of these developments, which must have been preceded by many months of secret Yugoslav-Russian negotiations, it must be clear by now that Yugoslavia is no longer a stable factor in the system of Western security.

What have been the concrete gains of the United States Yugoslav investment? Since the Yugoslav Army never had to fight the Soviet satellites and accomplish its assigned mission, namely, to defend itself and Western Europe, we will never know how essential the Yugoslav contributions to the security of Western Europe might have been. As for sparking discord among the Soviet satellites and winning over disgruntled Communists from their allegiance to Moscow, Tito's achievements were singularly unimpressive.

There were no mass defections inside or outside the Iron Curtain for which he could be given credit. He did win friends among the uncommitted peoples, especially in non-Communist Asia; he professed sympathy for the aspirations of Red China, and thus aided the Soviet peace drive as well as Soviet attempts to split the free world on Asian issues. He used Western economic aid, on the whole wisely, to strengthen the Yugoslav economy and, incidentally, to strengthen the hold of communism on the Yugoslav people. He employed the leverage of Western support to pry open the doors of the Kremlin and to negotiate favorable terms for a reconciliation with his former associates in the world Communist movement.

Yugoslavia remains a Communist state, run by a small clique of party functionaries with the help of the secret police. It is difficult to enter these many and remarkable accomplishments of Marshal Tito on the credit side of the West's diplomatic ledger.

Before the fiasco of the West's—chiefly the United States'—Yugoslavia policy is allowed to fade into the vapors of the Geneva spirit, it would be well to contemplate its lessons.

WEST'S POLICY: "FUZZY"

To begin with, the West's policy toward Yugoslavia was a hasty improvisation. It was not carefully planned; it was intellectually fuzzy. It sought to draw the distinction between "good" and "bad"—pro-Western and anti-Western—Communists. Fifteen million Yugoslavs were friendly toward the West, their 20,000 Communist bosses were not—and could not be lest they cease to be Communists.

Since the West had no well-laid plan for such a contingency as a Communist schism within the Soviet orbit, it saw only one alternative where there was in fact a choice among several policies. When Stalin broke with Tito, the West could had awaited developments which, in all likelihood, would have culminated in internal revolution and thus would have opened the field to diverse factions, including the traditional pro-Western and democratic forces of Yugoslavia. As another alternative, the West could have given, while direct Soviet intervention seemed likely, modest aid to Tito and then could have made further support contingent upon a genuine democratic reform of Yugoslavia's political institutions.

Then again, the West could have called, immediately after the Moscow-Belgrade rift, for the overthrow by the Yugoslav people of the Communist dictatorship and the establishment of a truly popular regime representing the real interests of the present masses and of the national minorities. Admittedly, the last alternatives would have required, on the part of the West, a dedication to the cause of freedom everywhere and a capacity for effective action that it has displayed only reluctantly under conditions of dire emergency. But the question must now be asked as to whether such a bold course would not have led to a decisive victory in the Cold War: the liberation of Yugoslavia from Communist dictatorship would have exposed the pretensions of "popular democracy" and dispelled the myth of the "inevitability" of communism.

The West had—and missed—the chance of carrying the offensive into the enemy camp and of challenging the Soviets in the satellite country which was furthest removed from the centers of Soviet military power.

Weighty arguments can be adduced against the alternatives sketched out above. Each would have been fraught with considerable risks. But not one of them, had it been chosen, would have exposed the United States to greater humiliation than it has suffered—and is still to suffer—at the hands of Tito. This is no laughing matter even for so self-confident and so resilient a people as the Americans. For the enslaved peoples under Communist rule, the United States expedient support of a Communist regime, albeit a heretic one, which was subsequently reconciled to Moscow, is a shattering moral blow.

WHAT UNITED STATES SHOULD DO NEXT

Some of the losses incurred in our Yugoslav policy are irretrievable. Perhaps the most prudent course now would be to cut our losses, to write off a billion dollars as a poor political investment, and to draw satisfaction from the return of a measure of prosperity to Yugoslavia's hard-tried people. Against the adoption of such a course stands not only the magnitude of the investment but also the inertia of officialdoms notoriously disinclined to concede error. However, the thorough review of the United States Yugoslav policies cannot be postponed indefinitely, for the emboldened Tito can be relied upon to force the issue.

Out of the agony of such a reappraisal may come a deepened understanding of the nature of the conflict between West and East. This conflict is being waged over the allegiance of peoples and not merely over strategic positions. Our Yugoslav policies may pass, though barely, the test of Realpolitik. Yet Realpolitik has not been attended, in this century, by notable and lasting successes. The last battles have been won by those who nailed an ideal to the mast and refused to haul it down.

The United States, loath to risk atomic devastation, may have to settle down to coexistence with Communist tyrannies. It may have to deal with them. But it should disdain to cloak these dealings in the pretense of a cordial and lasting partnership. Such a pretense will deceive no one—certainly not professional revolutionaries—and it will only deepen the despair of the millions who look upon the United States as the last best hope of liberation from Communist rule.

Losing by Default

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. ROONEY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 19, 1956

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Daily News of July 19, 1956:

LOSING BY DEFAULT

Why have we taken such a propaganda clobbering in Japan on the Okinawa issue?

Why must we get our ears knocked down daily over the radio, in newspapers, on movie screens, and in huge synthetic rallies calculated to whip up anti-American sentiment?

The United States Information Agency and the United States Army public information sections have fantastic and high-paid staffs in Tokyo, and obviously ample budgets. Yet they sit on their hands and cover their typewriters in the face of daily barrages from left-wing rabble-rousers.

"Neither the State Department nor the Army here realizes," complains an American in Tokyo, "that they've got to keep answering and keep putting out correct information. They seem to think that if they make a statement, everybody in Japan remembers it for 6 months. They seem to have no idea about public relations, or propaganda."

While Japanese indignation mounts over Okinawa—as reflected in the July 8 national elections—the USIA in Tokyo feeds out innocuous, travel-type films to TV stations. Meanwhile Commie broadcasts paint lurid, lying word pictures of Okinawa girls being molested daily by Americans; of starving farmers forced to sell their daughters into prostitution.

Why doesn't USIA—or the Army—come up with some newsreel films showing the truth of the Okinawa situation and presenting the United States side?

Why doesn't the USIA point out that Americans wouldn't be on Okinawa today if Japan hadn't lost a war of aggression against America—and might lose another to Communist aggression if we weren't there to defend the area?

Why doesn't USIA point out how living standards have risen on Okinawa to an incredible degree under American administration? And why not set forth what Japan's army was paying for Okinawa land when it was in Okinawa?

And for good measure, our agencies might gently remind the Japanese occasionally how much aid and material help the United States has been giving Japan—hardly the usual procedure of a war victor.

We could jog their memories on the fact that we immediately returned Japanese prisoners of war when the fighting ended, whereas Russia and Communist China, their would-be pals, are still holding thousands of Japanese 11 years after war's end.

When our country is being hurt is no time to be soft or bashful. Our official representatives stationed in Japan are just as obligated to defend their country in cold war battles as they are in a hot war.

They should not forget that—and if they're reneging on the job, we think Congress would like to know about it. And ponder the usefulness of the USIA.

The Okinawa fight, or any other propaganda battle, cannot be won with infrequent news releases distributed from here. It has to be fought and won in the field where lies must be challenged daily, where false charges must be denied with vigor and where truth must be broadcast, printed and reiterated—incessantly.

Schedule of Tour of the 13th Ohio District

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. D. BAUMHART, JR.
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 19, 1956

Mr. BAUMHART. Mr. Speaker, despite the tremendous technological advances that have been made in the field of communications in recent years, there it no adequate substitute for face-to-face contact to enable a Member of Congress to learn the sentiments of his district and render the best possible service to his constituents.

It is for this reason that I look forward with fond anticipation to my annual postadjournment tour of each of the four counties in my congressional district.

Last year I was visited by constituents from all walks of life—housewives, farmers, mill workers, retailers, and manufacturers, retired people—a representative cross section of Lorain, Erie, Huron, and Sandusky Counties.

Many dropped in to see me about pending legislation, foreign affairs, farm policy, national defense. Still others came to discuss personal and business problems—servicemen's family hardship cases, Government employment, veterans and social security benefits, Academy appointments, harbor development and other public works, postal service, Government contracts, immigration procedures, and so forth.

Beginning on September 17, I will embark on another 4-week grassroots tour through the 13th Ohio District, according to the following schedule:

September 17–21: Loraine County Courthouse, Elyria, Ohio.

September 24–28: Erie County Courthouse, Sandusky, Ohio.

October 1–5: Sandusky County Courthouse, Fremont, Ohio.

October 8–12: Huron County Courthouse, Norwalk, Ohio.

I am grateful to the local officials who have made office space available to me for these conferences. I feel their cooperation and helpfulness deserve public acknowledgment.

Individuals and groups who wish to confer with me during this tour are welcome to visit me at their convenience. No appointments are necessary.

Our republican form of government demands that we, as the elected representatives of the people, keep open every possible channel to public opinion within our districts. I know that these meetings during September and October will be of great assistance in enabling me to discharge my responsibilities as a Member of the House of Representatives.

Steel Scrap Boondoggle

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH A. GAMBLE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 27, 1956

Mr. GAMBLE. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted by the House, I present for insertion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a short statement concerning a survey to be undertaken by the Secretary of Commerce to determine the iron and steel scrap available and potentially available, and an article from the Journal of Commerce titled "Steel Scrap Boondoggle."

Mr. Speaker, shortly the Secretary of Commerce will make a survey to determine the iron and steel scrap available and potentially available as directed by H. R. 9052 which extends the Export Control Act for an additional 2 years. This survey, I believe, will show that the amount of scrap potentially available is closely related to the price users are willing to pay. In any event, it will supply light on a problem where recently there has been only heat.

Mr. Heinze Leudicke, the editor of the Journal of Commerce, reviewed the fundamental issue in using export controls to influence the raw material costs of the steel industry in an editorial which appeared on June 25. He quotes the basic philosophy of my constituent, Assistant Secretary of the Interior Felix Wormser.

I am inserting Mr. Leudicke's editorial in the RECORD in accordance with leave previously granted for the benefit of my colleagues:

STEEL SCRAP BOONDOGGLE

It now seems likely that the Export Control Act will be extended before the end of the month—its expiration date—without any provision for an outright limitation on exports of iron and steel scrap.

Recent declines in the prices of steel scrap have weakened considerably the position of those who had strenuously argued for use of the Export Control Act to alleviate a squeeze on the users of steel scrap. The issue still is alive, however, and is bound to come to the fore anew as soon as steel scrap prices show signs of another sustained advance.

The significance of this episode lies in the fact that it is demonstrating once again the willingness of a considerable part of the American business community to compromise the principle of free markets if application of this principle threatens to cost it some money.

It is all too easy, under such circumstances, to appeal to Washington for help.

That is exactly how the steel scrap issue became an issue during the Congressional considerations of an extension of the Export Control Act.

Fortunately, in this instance, the majority of Congress protected industry against itself. It not only showed a cold shoulder to those arguing for scrap export limitations, but it also stopped those of its own members who attempted to parlay this debate into another controversy between big and smaller business.

The case of those favoring steel scrap export limitations from the start suffered from several weaknesses.

The issue was presented in the name of national defense wherever it truly applies. This certainly is a valid argument. Throughout the Congressional deliberations of the Export Control Act it became painfully clear, however, that, in this instance, the national defense argument was used to cover up an attempt to hold steel scrap prices down by actually introducing through a back door an indirect form of price control.

Steel scrap prices, to be sure, had been rising rather rapidly and part of the rise was due to strong demand from abroad.

This is exactly the way the free market system is supposed to work. If we had not been all too willing to compromise this principle in the field of agricultural commodities, we would never have gotten ourselves into the current mess with our farm surpluses.

National defense, we admit, is an overriding consideration, even when it involves tinkering with the law of supply and demand.

But—and here we come to the crux of the whole problem—if national defense is indeed involved here, then why restrict the export limitation to iron and steel scrap? Wouldn't it be logical and necessary to restrict the exportation of other steel items as well, including finished steel products?

Congress fully realized this weakness in the case for the export limitation of iron and steel scrap. Hence it ordered, through a proposed amendment to the Export Control Act, a full study of the defense essentiality of iron and steel scrap.

This study is not likely to come up with the conclusion that all steel exports should be limited in the interest of national defense, because there is no need for such action under current conditions.

This would—or at least should—completely stop the drive for limitations on scrap exports, except, of course, to countries behind the Iron Curtain.

The steel industry, we feel sure, is not inclined at this time to entertain a proposal for export limitations on other steel exports. Therefore, it should drop its drive for such limitations on scrap alone.

Its current stand is open to considerable suspicion as an attempt to use a general law—the Export Control Act—for purposes of controlling the price of one of its important cost factors without similar limitation on its finished goods prices.

Price control has no legitimate place in a peacetime economy in this country, regardless of whether openly labeled as such or whether sneaked in through a back door.

Industry should not forget Assistant Secretary of the Interior Wormser's recent timely remark that, war or peace, "one type of Government intervention in commodity markets, if successful, leads inevitably to another." He advised industry to "give Washington a particularly wide berth when markets apparently misbehave."

Railroad Retirement Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOR C. TOLLEFSON
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, July 7, 1956

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include the following article which appears in the July 21 issue of Labor:

APPEAL TO CONGRESS: VOTE OUT RAIL RETIREMENT BILL

Time is running out as Congress heads toward adjournment, and railroad labor's No. 1 measure—to increase railroad retirement benefits by 15 percent—has not yet been acted upon.

Labor urgently renews the plea to Congress which it sounded last week: namely, to jar this legislation loose and act on it before the curtain is hauled down on this session. Labor reiterates what it pointed out then: that the bill is of the most crucial concern to the million-plus workers on the railroads and to hundreds of thousands of anxious retired railmen, as well as widows, wives, dependent children and other beneficiaries. The measure is supported unanimously by the standard railroad labor organizations.

Once more labor calls upon Congress to act before it adjourns. If it does not do so, the consequences will be most serious and will undoubtedly be reflected at the polls next November.

H. R. 12302

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEE METCALF
OF MONTANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 19, 1956

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced H. R. 12302 to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to permit the United States Fish and Wildlife Service and other agencies within his department to enter into cooperative agreements with other Federal agencies, colleges and universities, State and Territorial fish and game departments, and non-profit organizations for the conducting of research, training, and demonstrational programs through the establishing of cooperative research units, which may be named for the various States and Territories in which they are formed.

The research work to be conducted under this proposed program definitely would constitute valuable training for graduate students who are required to perform field research as part of their formal educational training. This kind of a program, confined largely to wildlife activities, has been in operation in 16 of the land grant colleges and universities—among them Montana—throughout the United States and Alaska since 1935. This bill would stabilize, strengthen and broaden the existing program.

The present cooperative research unit program, which has been operating successfully for more than 20 years, has proved itself to be a highly valuable and economical method of getting research work done while training men for future careers in fish and wildlife research, management, and administration.

The 16 colleges and universities affiliated in the present cooperative research unit program have bestowed 2,373 degrees upon wildlife students since the program started. A high percentage of the graduates are employed in State and Federal agencies and educational institutions in all parts of the country. The existing unit program has provided splendid cooperation between the Federal and State agencies and colleges and universities, and there is no doubt but that such local programs are in the public interest.

This bill will be examined and discussed during adjournment. It will be introduced again early next session.

Influence of Lobbyists on the Decisions of the CAB

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 19, 1956

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, the following portion of a letter from a constituent of mine brings up some very pertinent questions in regard to the influence of lobbyists on the decisions of the CAB.

It is always a difficult matter to know how far a Member of Congress should go in pressuring boards that have been set up specifically to study technical questions and give final decisions on them.

It seems to me that Mr. Winn's letter deserves thoughtful consideration:

UPPER NYACK, N. Y., *July 17, 1956.*

Hon. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE,
Twenty-eighth District, New York,
Congress of the United States,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MRS. ST. GEORGE: I appreciate your letter of July 5; however, I believe a further examination of the situation is in order.

I recognize that the Civil Aeronautics Board, as opposed to the Civil Aeronautics Authority, is responsible for the award of any certificate of convenience and necessity for air transportation and that it functions as a quasi-judicial organization under the executive branch. I believe the circumstances surrounding the New York-Florida case are far above and beyond that Boards' immediate jurisdictional scope due to activities of lobbyists and Members of the Congress.

The newspapers and trade publications have recently been filled with local, State, and United States congressional groups who have been exerting pressure upon the Civil Aeronautics Board for approval of such carriers as Northeast and Pan American for operating certificates. The New England Governor's Council passed a resolution toward same.

Members of the United States Senate and the United States House of Representatives from the New England States joined in a common plea to the Civil Aeronautics Board as indicated in the attached article from the New York World-Telegram and Sun July 10. I consider such pressure as completely foreign to the intent of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938 and I am requesting that you as my Representative be aware of and take steps to protect those of us who will be the victims of such pressure tactics.

Very sincerely yours,

WARREN R. WINN, Jr.

American Indians: People Without a Future

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES T. PATTERSON
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 25, 1956

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Ralph Nader, editorial manager of the Harvard Law Record, has recently written an excellent article entitled "American Indians: People Without a Future." I wish to include excerpts from it in the RECORD and highly commend it to the attention of my colleagues:

"We are people who are better known for what we were not than what we were, for what we are not than for what we are."—A Crow Indian, 1955.

American historical land fictional writings have instilled in the American public a misinformed and highly inaccurate view of the American Indian.

What our forefathers conquered, according to the writers, was an almost empty land whose tranquility was disturbed by a few scattered groupings of wild savages whose chief vocations were scalp-collecting, potterymaking, and dancing. These primitimes, so the myth goes, steadily receded before the onrush of civilization and have now become the "Vanishing American" of novel and poem.

There developed a voluminous history of the American idea of the Indian as a savage, a concept indispensable to a righteous and ethnocentric people appropriating a continent. Even today, on the screen and in cheap fiction, the bloodthirsty Indian has too often been used as an ugly background against which the virtues of our pioneers may be projected.

In more recent times a more refined concept of the "savage" Indian performs another function. It provides a readily available rationalization for those who covet Indian lands and resources. Bureaucrats promote programs to liberate the Indian under the mistaken notion that Indian culture and misery go together.

There is also a strain running through our literary heritage which has depicted the noble side of the aborigine. At times this noble savage theme has done the Indian more harm than good.

Countering the common belief, Jack Schaefer, author of Shane, wrote: "These natives, on the whole, were not as savage as the Europeans who called them savages. They had a distinct and in some respects highly developed civilization. * * * In the fundamentals of human decency, the simple amenities of daily life, in the relationships between man and man and between man and his God, they were easily as refined as the Europeans. But from the conquerors' point of view they were guilty of two sins: They were different; they were in the way. So they were called savages."

LEGISLATIVE REFORM BRINGS IMPROVEMENT

The impending destruction of tribal cultures was finally halted by the Indian Reorganization Act of 1934 (IRA). This legislation was in response to a demand for a new Indian policy which arose in the late twenties.

The philosophy of the IRA was predicated on the belief that Indian culture should be regenerated to promote Indian well-being. Fundamental to this program were the preservation of the land base, organization of tribal self-government, the elimination of

remaining legal restrictions and the recognition that people once freed must be freed for something.

In this spirit, Indians were given the right to establish corporations. Two-thirds of the tribes took advantage of this opportunity. Tribal societies were empowered and aided in undertaking political, administrative, and economic self-government. Land allotments were stopped and purchase of more land was provided for by a special credit fund.

A system of agricultural and industrial credit was established under which the repayment record of the tribes was excellent. Useful education for children and adults was accompanied by a program promoting self-help in developing the tribal economy. Research, considered essential to the program, was employed as a basic tool of action.

Substantial improvement

As a result of this program, an atmosphere of hope and optimism spread over the Indian reservations. For the first time in 80 years Indian holdings increased—from 48 to 52 million acres. Indian real income doubled. The death rate was cut in half. Cultural and religious liberty was restored.

However, the interpretations of many of these policies by later legislative order and by administrators down to the reservation level often resulted in serious discrepancies between the stated goals of policies and the actual consequences—a situation often leading to Indian disillusionment with Government programs.

The IRA was a daring excursion into the field of Federal treatment of ethnic minorities. At once it violated the hallowed "melting pot" concept. It enunciated the belief that an Indian could own a car, volunteer for the Army, pay his taxes and still continue being an Indian. Patriotism, ethnic preservation and participation in the American social and economic milieu all in one package.

The theory of the IRA has not been universally accepted by any means and, as we shall see, it is undergoing a complete reversal at the present time. Critics of the IRA have inveighed against its undue extension of the Indian isolation and non-assimilation which they consider harmful to the goal of Indian adjustment.

But it was not the theory of the IRA which caused the partial failure of the program; rather it was the inability fully to implement all the program. In any field of human relations, one-sided emphasis result in failure to promote the whole. For example, to promote an educational program without solving the employment problem produces serious frustrations and defeats overall objectives.

Then too, policies were never carried out with sufficient personnel, funds and the quality of information necessary to cope with the prevailing social situation. The salient feature of Indian administration and legislative action has been the failure to take into account the implications of nice sounding policies. Objectives cannot be achieved by decree, whether it be the assimilation or the preservation of autonomous Indian tribes.

When parts of a way of life are destroyed or undermined, something must take their place to prevent moral and social dissolution. Since its establishment, the Indian Bureau has failed to follow through beyond appealing but potentially deadly policies.

Dillon Myer takes over

With the appointment of Dillon Myer as Commissioner of Indian Affairs in 1950 the hopeful atmosphere began to change rapidly. "The erosion of Indian rights" was the phrase which Mr. Cohen applied to the Myer regime (1950–1953) in an article, (62 Yale Law Journal 348).

During this period, interference with Indian voting rights, tribal elections and the right of certain tribes to select their own legal counsel increased. This latter infringement prompted the American Bar Association to appoint a commission which rebuked the Indian Bureau for overreaching its authority. Personal customs and religions were again interfered with. Telling Indians when to go to bed and when to get up is not just a whimsical bit of paternalism, but has deep roots in a long tradition of Indian Bureau policy.

Consultation with Indian tribes regarding policies or legislation affecting their welfare virtually ceased. Restrictions on the use of property were imposed. Arbitrary standards of Indian qualification for civil service employment were established. Experts in Indian affairs were not consulted. A shroud of secrecy hung over the Bureau. Commissioner Myer withdrew from public scrutiny facts upon which public appraisal of his administration must largely rest.

FEDERAL POLICY—MISGUIDED ZEAL, PRIVATE PRESSURES

The central feature of congressional policy in the 82d and 83d Congresses has been aimed at the solution of the "Indian problem" through termination of Federal responsibilities for Indian tribes. This general policy statement (enacted as H. Con. Res. 108, August 1953) is given local application when specific acts are passed regarding particular tribes. Termination bills for six Indian tribes have already been passed.

The general intention and procedure for accomplishing termination may be summarized as follows:

1. End all Federal relationships with the tribe, including trusteeship of tribal and individual property, all supervision of tribal assets and tribal government and all Federal services.

2. Thanfer to the State the services formerly provided by the State government. Bring the tribe and all its members under the laws of the State (Public Law 280, enacted July 1953). Cancel all provisions for tribal self-government, except the self-government allowed any community under State laws. Cancel Federal corporate charters.

3. Transfer tribal assets to individuals, partnerships, corporations, or to a trustee as the tribe elects. Allow tribal members to sell their undivided share in tribal assets.

4. Distribute tribal money on deposit in the United States Treasury on a per capita basis.

Along with this policy of Federal withdrawal is a small increase in appropriations to give the larger and less acculturated tribes better facilities for health, education and economic development.

Finally, the Indian Service's "voluntary" relocation program for relieving overpopulation on the reservations by locating Indians in major cities is being pushed vigorously.

Termination attacked

The most critical attack on the present termination of Federal Government services has come from Oliver La Farge of the Association on American Indian Affairs. Supported by many Indian leaders, he believes that a realistic investigation of recent policy trends shows a concentrated program to solve the Indian problem by doing away with the Indian.

Mr. La Farge sees three deadly factors working in unison to support present Federal policy, impatience, ignorant good intentions, and greed.

Impatience over the fact that a hundred years of Federal guidance has still not enabled the great majority of Indians to be able to take care of themselves without special help. He remarks that the amazing thing is not that the Indians did not make more progress, but that they were able to survive and retain so much of their integrity.

Greed: On the Navaho Reservation are valuable minerals; certain Alaskan tribes lay claim to excellent salmon fishing areas; on the northern plains and in the Northwest there are valuable grazing and timberlands. Employing legal counsel, Indians no longer allow predatory interests to rent their lands for a pittance and to overturn their rights.

Cattle, fishing, timber, and mining interests are now pushing for rapid termination. Shouting the slogan of liberty and equality for the Indian but significantly deleting the third part of this trinity—brotherhood—they are prevailing on the impatient and uninformed to annihilate the Indian land base for their own commercial advancement.

Concern voiced

What specifically do Mr. La Farge and the Indians fear? Basically it is that termination and concurrent policies will spell the end of the tribal land base and leave Indians homeless, hapless and destitute. Terminating the trusteeship status of Indian land at once places them on the property-tax roll. They are free to alienate their share of tribal lands, but too poor or unknowledgeable to work the land profitably. Indians will be tempted by the quick cash offerings of white men. The specter of the key tract will appear with ever-increasing frequency. It has happened in the past and will be stepped up rapidly under termination.

Once Indians become landless, do they have other employment opportunities? Lacking employment skills, having little or no command of English, despised by neighboring communities, thrown into strange cultural environments, and situated in the poorer economic areas in our country, the Indian is not likely to acquire an adequate livelihood.

Governed by State and local authorities hardly sympathetic to Indian needs and more easily influenced by local pressure groups than is the Federal Government, Indians rightly fear that necessary welfare services will not be forthcoming.

The relocation program

Does the relocation program provide a partial answer to Indian misery? If administered wisely and gradually one can expect some Indians to benefit from it. Some 5,000 Indians have been relocated in the past 2 years and with appropriations nearly doubling this year to $900,000, the number of relocatees is expected to increase.

There are, however, serious flaws in the Bureau's relocation program. The screening process for relocation application has not been adequate. Too often aged, physically handicapped, and wholly unacculturated Indians have been relocated.

The relocation agencies in large cities are doing, in many respects, a woefully inadequate job. The function of these agencies has really been to "place" the Indians and then forget about them. Perhaps this may explain why Indians, tempted to leave their homes by Bureau propaganda of the "land of sunshine awaiting them," are bitterly disillusioned and are returning to the reservations at an alarming rate—a statistic conspicuous in its absence from Bureau figures.

The second and more fundamental criticism of the program is that the Bureau is placing too great an emphasis on relocation and not attempting to build up the reservation economy, thus promoting a type of squeeze operation. For example, considerable amounts of funds were recently transferred from the welfare and relief funds of the Bureau to finance relocation.

Responsibility delegated

With adequate development many reservations could support most of their population. It is interesting to see what the Bureau has done in this respect. The drafting of comprehensive rehabilitation programs—in which lies the only real hope for Indian welfare—has been delegated to a proposed private nonprofit corporation which is sup-

posed to secure the necessary funds from private foundations. These economic surveys are basic to any proposed program of reservation rehabilitation. It does not seem wise for the Bureau to delegate such an important part of its work to a private committee which has not yet established the corporation since the idea was conceived 2 years ago.

It is difficult to see how the Bureau can place so much hope on relocation even if administered wisely. From the Bureau's own figures, it can be seen that the cost of expanding the program is practically prohibitive. The relocation of 2,553 Indians in fiscal year 1954 cost $589,600. It is the practical result of termination which makes mass relocation appear to be a necessity.

If the Bureau would consult with the Indians themselves they would discover that these people desire a vigorous program of reservation development where acculturation comes gradually and the frustrations of maladjustment are minimized.

DEVELOPMENT NEEDED BEFORE WITHDRAWAL

Indian leaders recognize that the perpetual Federal responsibilities embodied in the treaties must end sometime. But rapid Federal withdrawal would lead, they feel, to the annihilation of the tribes. In this connection, Clarence Wesley, an Apache tribal leader, said: "Indians are in favor of a modified withdrawal system which would provide a gradual assumption of activities now administered by the Indian Bureau."

The central problem, so far as the Indians are concerned, revolves around the preservation of their established rights, as defined by Federal laws; the full development of their reservation resources and the establishment of adequate schools, hospitals, and other institutional services.

The Government's legal and moral responsibilities toward the Indians were a recognition that they were unprepared to enter an aggressively competitive white society. That unpreparedness still prevails today. That Federal programs have failed so miserably over the years is no excuse to abandon the Indian today. Indians are too weak to hold on to what they have if termination is realized. Federal responsibility should end only when the conditions necessitating that responsibility be eliminated.

A recent conference of anthropologists concluded that "as adequate skills, techniques, and leadership are developed among them, and as the tribe's economic situation improves, Indians can and will assume responsibility for financing and operating many community and other services formerly provided by government, and in some cases will eventually be able to assume the entire burden.* * * An important factor in success is likely to be personnel at all levels who are not only competent, but understanding of the Indian point of view, nonauthoritarian, and 'people-oriented.'"

Challenge to the American credo

The American Indian is the greatest test to our professed humanitarian and moral impulses in the treatment of ethnic groups here and abroad. The reason for this is simple. Programs for improving the Indian's condition cannot be justified, as point 4 programs can, on the grounds that the Indians will turn Communist or revolt. Neither can one urge that in the absence of such programs, the Indians will wield his voting power or provide embarrassment for the United States in foreign countries like larger minorities can in this country.

The Indian has none of these "advantages" to spur programs designed to benefit him. The Indian is small, weak, expendable. He poses no threat to our security. Helping the Indian will not pay in the sense that foreign aid pays. The impulse to better the Indian's livelihood can only come from a sense of our moral obligations and our humanitarian ideals. Moral satisfaction and a healthy and vigorous Indian people will be the fruits of equitable treatment of the Indian.

The instances are rare when the Government has responded to a legitimate desire based only on hope and not on votes, lobbies, and other power factors. That is why the Indian is our greatest challenge.

Eisenhower Crusaders in Trouble

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 19, 1956

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith an editorial which appeared in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch on July 15, 1956. The editorial entitled "Why Did No One Know" follows:

WHY DID NO ONE KNOW?

It is quite clear now that nothing but the most searching investigation of all aspects of the scandal in the office of Illinois State Auditor Orville E. Hodge, of Granite City, will satisfy the public interest. Every day adds something about which the voters of Illinois have a right to ask questions and reason to expect answers.

Take, for example, the matter of the bank which cashed most of the questionable warrants for the auditor's office—the Southmoor Bank & Trust Co. of Chicago. This same bank is reported in a dispatch from Springfield as holding or having held a mortgage on Hodge's home at Lake Springfield. The president of the bank has now resigned, a few days before he is scheduled to testify before the grand jury.

A natural question is this: Is there any connection between Auditor Hodge's private dealings with the Southmoor Bank & Trust Co. and the official dealings of his office? Illinois voters will not know the answer, but the question will be in the minds of many.

Governor Stratton says that Auditor Hodge should get off the Republican ticket for the November election. Doubtless he ought to, but why is it that no one on the Stratton team at Springfield knew anything about the dubious financial practices of Auditor Hodge when he was renominated without opposition last April?

Hon. Frank J. Becker Advances a Cause

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 19, 1956

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, our Postmaster General has a remarkably fine record of improvements in postal services over the past 3 years but a debt of gratitude is also due our colleague, the Honorable FRANK J. BECKER, for his part in bringing about one of the happiest of improvements. The following editorial which appeared in the Long Island Daily Press, on July 6, 1956, tells the story:

L. I. CLAIMS PRIORITY ON THOSE NEW PENS

Long Island should have a top priority rating when the Government starts putting ball-point pens in all the 37,863 post offices of the land.

The day of the scratchy post-office pens is doomed—and presumably the jokes about 'em, too.

The beginning of the end came when two Long Island women wrote to their Congressmen a couple of years ago. They said it was time something was done about the pens, something like substituting low-priced ballpoints.

Nassau Congressman FRANK J. BECKER picked up the ball-point from there. He went to Postmaster General Arthur E. Summerfield. Since then things have been happening. First, new pens were installed on a trial basis in a number of post offices. Now, we're told, all post offices will have them by September 1.

The pens will be green and bear the words "property of the post office." They'll be chained to the writing desks, unlike the old ones which are so horrible nobody would swipe them.

One of the first things we expect to do, is to go over to the post office and write Congressman BECKER a real nice thank-you note with one of those new pens.

Illinois Press Commended for Exposé of Scandal Among Eisenhower Crusaders

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 19, 1956

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith an editorial from the July 16, 1956 issue of the St. Louis Post-Dispatch entitled "Get Out All the Facts."

GET OUT ALL THE FACTS

The competition among leading Illinois newspapers in digging out the news about the scandal in the office of State Auditor Orville E. Hodge, of Granite City, is writing a chapter in the history of journalism in the Prairie State.

First the Chicago Daily News presented a series of reports on the odd-looking payrolls in Auditor Hodge's office. Then it got into the matter of the questionable State checks, running to around $500,000, many of them put through the Southmoor Bank and Trust Co., Chicago.

Now the Chicago Daily Tribune has printed an account of how the scandalous financial operations were allegedly conducted. Quoting the resigned bank president, Edward A. Hintz, the Tribune says the auditor personally made arrangements for the cashing of checks written out to individuals or firms that did not get any of the money. The Tribune quotes the bank's expresident as saying that he personally approved the checks as brought to him by Edward Epping of Lebanon, Auditor Hodge's office manager, and directed a cashier to pay the money. Cash was kept at the bank in a large envelope marked "Hodge" but was not deposited.

The Tribune reports that $269,568.27 of these checks were cashed at the Southmoor Bank. Where were the rest cashed and what were the arrangements and who was in on it? There are more and more things to know about this amazing scandal.

SENATORS WITH RESIDENCES IN WASHINGTON

OFFICE ADDRESS: Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

[Streets northwest unless otherwise stated]

Vice President, Richard Nixon

Aiken, George D., *Vt*——Carroll Arms.
Allott, Gordon, *Colo*——
Anderson, Clinton P., *N. Mex.*——6 Wesley Circle.
Barrett, Frank A., *Wyo*——The Woodner.
Beall, J. Glenn, *Md*——
Bender, George H., *Ohio*——120 Schotts Court NE.
Bennett, Wallace F., *Utah*——
Bible, Alan, *Nev*——
Bricker, John W., *Ohio*——The Mayflower.
Bridges, Styles, *N. H*——
Bush, Prescott, *Conn*——
Butler, John Marshall, *Md*——
Byrd, Harry Flood, *Va*——The Shoreham.
Capehart, Homer E., *Ind*——The Westchester.
Carlson, Frank, *Kans*——Sheraton-Park
Case, Clifford P., *N. J*——
Case, Francis, *S. Dak*——4635 Mass. Ave.
Chavez, Dennis, *N. Mex*——3327 Cleveland Ave.
Clements, Earle C., *Ky*——The Congressional
Cotton, Norris, *N. H*——
Curtis, Carl T., *Nebr*——
Daniel, Price, *Tex*——
Dirksen, Everett M., *Ill*——
Douglas, Paul H., *Ill*——
Duff, James H., *Pa*——
Dworshak, Henry C., *Idaho*——
Eastland, James O., *Miss*——5101 Macomb St.
Ellender, Allen J., *La*——
Ervin, Samuel J., Jr., *N. C*——
Flanders, Ralph E., *Vt*——
Frear, J. Allen, Jr., *Del*——
Fulbright, J. William, *Ark*——
George, Walter F., *Ga*——The Mayflower.
Goldwater, Barry M., *Ariz*——
Gore, Albert, *Tenn*——
Green, Theodore Francis, *R. I.*——University Club.
Hayden, Carl, *Ariz*——
Hennings, Thomas C., Jr., *Mo.*——
Hickenlooper, Bourke B., *Iowa.*——5511 Cedar Parkway, Chevy Chase, Md.
Hill, Lister, *Ala*——
Holland, Spessard L., *Fla*——Sheraton-Park
Hruska, Roman L., *Nebr*——
Humphrey, Hubert H., *Minn.*——
Humphreys, Robert, *Ky*——
Ives, Irving M., *N. Y*——
Jackson, Henry M., *Wash*——
Jenner, William E., *Ind*——
Johnson, Lyndon B., *Tex*——
Johnston, Olin D., *S. C*——
Kefauver, Estes, *Tenn*——4848 Upton St.
Kennedy, John F., *Mass*——
Kerr, Robert S., *Okla*——
Knowland, William F., *Calif.*——
Kuchel, Thomas H., *Calif*——
Laird, William R. III, *W. Va*——
Langer, William, *N. Dak*——2101 Conn. Ave.
Lehman, Herbert H., *N. Y*——Sheraton-Park
Long, Russell B., *La*——
McCarthy, Joseph R., *Wis*——
McClellan, John L., *Ark*——
McNamara, Pat, *Mich*——
Magnuson, Warren G., *Wash.*——The Shoreham.
Malone, George W., *Nev*——The Mayflower.
Mansfield, Mike, *Mont*——
Martin, Edward, *Pa*——
Martin, Thos. E., *Iowa*——4545 Conn. Ave.
Millikin, Eugene D., *Colo*——
Monroney, A. S. Mike, *Okla.*——
Morse, Wayne, *Oreg*——5020 Lowell St.
Mundt, Karl E., *S. Dak*——122 Schotts Court NE.
Murray, James E., *Mont*——The Shoreham.
Neely, Matthew M., *W. Va*——
Neuberger, Richard L., *Oreg.*——
O'Mahoney, Joseph C., *Wyo.*——Sheraton-Park
Pastore, John O., *R. I*——
Payne, Frederick G., *Maine*——
Potter, Charles E., *Mich*——
Purtell, William A., *Conn*——
Robertson, A. Willis, *Va*——
Russell, Richard B., *Ga*——
Saltonstall, Leverett, *Mass*——2320 Tracy Pl.
Schoeppel, Andrew F., *Kans.*——
Scott, W. Kerr, *N. C*——
Smathers, George A., *Fla*——
Smith, H. Alexander, *N. J*——Sheraton-Park
Smith, Margaret Chase, (Mrs.), *Maine.*——
Sparkman, John J., *Ala*——4928 Indian Lane
Stennis, John, *Miss*——
Symington, Stuart, *Mo*——
Thye, Edward J., *Minn*——
Watkins, Arthur V., *Utah*——
Welker, Herman, *Idaho*——4823 Tilden St.
Wiley, Alexander, *Wis*——2122 Mass. Ave.
Williams, John J., *Del*——
Wofford, Thomas A., *S. C*——
Young, Milton R., *N. Dak*——Quebec House So.

OFFICERS OF THE SENATE

Secretary—Felton M. Johnston.
Chief Clerk—Emery L. Frazier.
Sergeant at Arms—Joseph C. Duke.
Secretary for the Majority—Robert G. Baker.
Secretary for the Minority—J. Mark Trice.
Chaplain—Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D.

STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE SENATE

Committee on Agriculture and Forestry

Messrs. Ellender (chairman), Johnston of South Carolina, Holland, Eastland, Clements, Humphrey, Scott, Symington, Aiken, Young, Thye, Hickenlooper, Mundt, Williams, and Schoeppel.

Committee on Appropriations

Messrs. Hayden (chairman), Russell, Chavez, Ellender, Hill, McClellan, Robertson, Magnuson, Holland, Stennis, Clements, Johnson of Texas, Bridges, Saltonstall, Young, Knowland, Thye, McCarthy, Mundt, Mrs. Smith of Maine, Messrs. Dworshak, Dirksen, and Potter.

Committee on Armed Services

Messrs. Russell (chairman), Byrd, Johnson of Texas, Kefauver, Stennis, Symington, Jackson, Ervin, Saltonstall, Bridges, Flanders, Mrs. Smith of Maine, Messrs. Case of South Dakota, Duff, and Welker.

Committee on Banking and Currency

Messrs. Fulbright (chairman), Robertson, Sparkman, Frear, Douglas, Lehman, Monroney, Morse, Capehart, Bricker, Ives, Bennett, Bush, Beall, and Payne.

Committee on the District of Columbia

Messrs. Neely (chairman), Bible, McNamara, Morse, Frear, Beall, Hruska, Case of New Jersey, and Allott.

Committee on Finance

Messrs. Byrd (chairman), George, Kerr, Frear, Long, Smathers, Anderson, Douglas, Millikin, Martin of Pennsylvania, Williams, Flanders, Malone, Carlson, and Bennett.

Committee on Foreign Relations

Messrs. George (chairman), Green, Fulbright, Sparkman, Humphrey, Mansfield, Morse, Long, Wiley, Smith of New Jersey, Hickenlooper, Langer, Knowland, Aiken, and Capehart.

Committee on Government Operations

Messrs. McClellan (chairman), Jackson, Kennedy, Symington, Ervin, Humphrey, Wofford, McCarthy, Mundt, Mrs. Smith of Maine, Messrs. Cotton, Bender, and Martin of Iowa.

Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs

Messrs. Murray (chairman), Anderson, Jackson, O'Mahoney, Bible, Neuberger, Laird, Scott, Millikin, Malone, Watkins, Dworshak, Kuchel, Barrett, and Goldwater.

Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce

Messrs. Magnuson (chairman), Pastore, Monroney, Smathers, Daniel, Ervin, Bible, Wofford, Bricker, Schoeppel, Butler, Potter, Duff, Purtell, and Payne.

Committee on the Judiciary

Messrs. Eastland (chairman), Kefauver, Johnston of South Carolina, Hennings, McClellan, Daniel, O'Mahoney, Neely, Wiley, Langer, Jenner, Watkins, Dirksen, Welker, and Butler.

Committee on Labor and Public Welfare

Messrs. Hill (chairman), Murray, Neely, Lehman, Kennedy, McNamara, ———, Smith of New Jersey, Ives, Purtell, Goldwater, Bender, and Allott.

Committee on Post Office and Civil Service

Messrs. Johnston of South Carolina (chairman), Pastore, Monroney, Hennings, Scott, Neuberger, Laird, Carlson, Jenner, Langer, Curtis, Martin of Iowa, and Case of New Jersey.

Committee on Public Works

Messrs. Chavez (chairman), Kerr, Gore, McNamara, Neuberger, Wofford, ———, Martin of Pennsylvania, Case of South Dakota, Bush, Kuchel, Cotton, and Hruska.

Committee on Rules and Administration

Messrs. Green (chairman), Hayden, Hennings, Gore, Mansfield, Jenner, Barrett, McCarthy, and Curtis.

UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT

Mr. Chief Justice Warren, of California, Hotel Sheraton-Park, Washington, D. C.
Mr. Justice Black, of Alabama, 619 S. Lee St., Alexandria, Va.
Mr. Justice Reed, of Kentucky, the Mayflower.
Mr. Justice Frankfurter, of Massachusetts, 3018 Dumbarton Ave.
Mr. Justice Douglas, of Washington, 3701 Connecticut Ave.
Mr. Justice Burton, of Ohio, the Dodge.
Mr. Justice Clark, of Texas, 2101 Connecticut Ave.
Mr. Justice Minton, of Indiana, the Methodist Building.
Mr. Justice Harlan, of New York, 1677 31st St.

OFFICERS OF THE SUPREME COURT

Clerk—Harold B. Willey, 3214 N. Wakefield St., Arlington, Va.
Deputy Clerk—Reginald C. Dilli, 1329 Hemlock St.
Deputy Clerk—Hugh W. Barr, 4701 Connecticut Ave.
Marshal—T. Perry Lippitt, 6004 Corbin Road.
Reporter—Walter Wyatt, 1702 Kalmia Rd.
Librarian—Helen Newman, 126 3d St. SE.

UNITED STATES JUDICIAL CIRCUITS

JUSTICES ASSIGNED
TERRITORY EMBRACED

District of Columbia: Mr. Chief Justice Warren. District of Columbia.

First judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Frankfurter. Maine, New Hampshire, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Puerto Rico.

Second judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Harlan. Vermont, Connecticut, New York.

Third judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Burton, Pennsylvania, New Jersey, Delaware, Virgin Islands.

Fourth judicial circuit: Mr. Chief Justice Warren. Maryland, Virginia, West Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina.

Fifth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Black. Georgia, Florida, Alabama, Mississippi, Louisiana, Texas, Canal Zone.

Sixth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Reed. Ohio, Michigan, Kentucky, Tennessee.

Seventh judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Minton. Indiana, Illinois, Wisconsin.

Eighth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Clark. Minnesota, North Dakota, South Dakota, Iowa, Nebraska, Missouri, Arkansas.

Ninth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Douglas. Washington, Oregon, Montana, Idaho, California, Nevada, Arizona, Alaska, Hawaii.

Tenth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Clark. Colorado, Wyoming, Utah, Kansas, Oklahoma, New Mexico.

Appendix

The Salt Creek-Wahoo Flood Control Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. PHIL WEAVER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 18, 1956

Mr. WEAVER. Mr. Speaker, I want to urge the membership of the House to read an article under date of May 26, 1956, from the Saturday Evening Post concerning the Salt Creek-Wahoo flood-control project in and near Lincoln, Nebr. This was one of the many fine projects recently approved by the House Public Works Committee and authorized by the House in the recent omnibus flood control bill.

The article follows:

THEY TAMED THEIR FLOODS

(By John Bird)

Just imagine that your house has sagged dangerously on its foundations, a supposedly gilt-edged stock in which you invested your life savings has gone sour, and your boss has suggested that you hunt for a new job. That gives you a rough idea of Jerry Kubik's predicament after a history-making rain poured down on his Nebraska farm, high on the bowl-like Salt Creek watershed.

The square-hewn, middle-aged Kubik was a happy man when the gray clouds first rolled overhead. His newly planted corn could use a shower—and Kubik needed good harvests as never before because he had worked most of his life as a tenant to buy this 240-acre farm. True, the land was sloping, the soil was thin and badly cut with gullies, but at least it was his own. Given time, he hoped to build a well-kept, prosperous dairy farm.

Then, on May 8, 1950, the rain fell. It was no spring shower. It crashed down as though a dam had burst in the sky. Kubig isn't sure how much water came down that day, that night, or the following day, because his rain gage spilled over. He estimates that at least 10 inches was dumped on his poor, nonabsorbent soil.

And what happened next demonstrates, in large part, why the United States is increasingly plagued by the twin problems of flood and water shortage. Both of those perils are born in our upstream watersheds where millions of Jerry Kubiks are custodians of the earth's thin mantle of soil. This farmer's tragedy explains, in part why masses of water and silt, rushing out of our highlands, have wrought savage destruction on many of our valleys. It tells why many of our once-clear streams have become foul, debris-clogged sewers. It shows why water tables in many natural basins have dropped alarmingly and why many of our industries and cities are searching frantically for new sources of supply as their wells go dry. It is one of the main reasons for the fantastic size of our annual average flood toll, now around $1,200,000,000, to say nothing of the toll in terror, dislocation and loss of life.

After that big rain, Jerry Kubik looked out on a scene of near ruin. "There was nothing to hold the water on the land," he told me. "It dashed right down the hillsides, taking out my corn. It cut my new-plowed land away, right down to the hard plow sole. I felt awful. Here the first farm I ever owned was washing away."

He wasn't alone in his troubles. There are 750 other farms scattered over this 170-square-mile basis known as the upper Salt Creek watershed, and much of the land was in no better shape than Kubik's. Since the densely matted prairie sad was first turned by the pioneers' plows, almost a century ago, much of the original black soil, rich and spongy with organic matter, had eroded away in the wash of rain and melting snow. Many a farmer, knowing no better, cultivated slopes that were dangerously steep, ran his crow rows up and down the hills like gutters, burned crop stubble and old grass, thus causing the soil to become lifeless, powdery, and unprotected.

The upper Salt hung like a tree with a decayed heart over the heads of the people down in the main Salt Valley. Hundreds of small twigs and branches of the stream start in the hills, flow down to several main limbs, which angle into the main trunk. The top of this drainage system is 1,500 feet in altitude, the bottom of the main valley 1,200, a drop of 300 feet in about 15 miles.

By Kublik's time, soil-conservation work was underway, but it wasn't catching up to the loss of soil and water. The Soil Conservation Service estimates that each year in the upper Salt the scoured fields, gullies, stream banks and roadsides were losing more than 1 million tons of soil. Small floods had become flashier and more frequent; rich bottom lands were usually underwater at least once, and sometimes several times a year.

The big storm of May 8 and 9 hit only about half of the Salt Creek watershed, but that was bad enough. The water rushed off the land into choked drainage channels. The streams roared out of banks, sweeping up fallen trees, fences and farm buildings, which became battering rams. After its swift downhill run, the muddy flood flashed out on the flat main valley in great waves. Here were rich farms, transcontinental highways, railroads, suburban developments, industries, and the city of Lincoln, capital of Nebraska, where lived 100,000 people.

Automobiles and trucks were trapped on the highways and some of them were swept away into the maelstrom, which in places, covered all but the tops of telephone poles. In the storm's whole area in southeastern Nebraska 27 people were drowned, several of them on U. S. 77, which runs north and south along the Salt Creek Valley. An 80-car freight train, standing near the village of Roca, where several branches of the Salt join, was scattered like a toy over nearby fields; the tracks were wrenched into fantastic curves. The flood lost much force as it surged across the bottom of the bowl toward Lincoln, but the industrial lowlands and part of the residential area of the town were inundated. The insignificant Salt Creek, which a small boy could wade a few days before, had dealt out $12 million in destruction. Three-fourths of the damage was agricultural, one-fourth was urban and industrial.

Some farsighted people in the valley had been conscious of the Salt's threat for several years and had urged the community to do something about it. One such worrier was Otto H. Liebers, a highly successful dairyman and State legislator, whose home farm is a few miles south of Lincoln at the edge of the valley.

"We had known for a long time that our livelihood, even our lives, were in danger," he told me. "We had been trying to get some safeguards. Back in 1947, after a bad flood from the upper Salt, a group in my neighborhood organized to look for some solution. We didn't quite know how to go about it, though. At first we thought we ought to clear the channel and get rid of the water faster, but we soon saw that we would just be dumping our problem on folks farther downstream. Then we called in the Army Corps of Engineers and asked them to build some dams for us, but they said, 'Sorry, you aren't big enough.'"

Another community prodder was Raymond A. McConnell, Jr., the youthful editor of the Lincoln Evening Journal. He had been reminding his readers, almost to the point of becoming a crank, that something should be done to prevent the water and soil in the watershed from speeding downhill. He pointed out that Lincoln, which seems to sit on a flat plain, actually is at the bottom of a huge three-quarters saucer, into which drain Salt Creek from the south and southeast, Middle Creek from the west, Oak Creek from the northwest and Wahoo Creek from the north. He wrote dozens of columns on the sorry condition of the soil and the drainage system; he made hundreds of speeches; he rated politicians for voters according to their views on conservation and flood control. He never tired of preaching what he regarded as sound guiding principles: "We need to do a total job of watershed conservation starting at the top and working down. It isn't a question of little dams versus big dams—it's a question of planning any and all dams and other measures to meet the needs of the basin."

Furthermore, he pointed out, the job couldn't be done simply by calling in a big Federal agency with a United States Treasury checkbook in one hand and the right of eminent domain in the other. "The people who live in a watershed know, better than outsiders, what they need," he said and wrote. "They should have a key part in the planning, and they should pay their fair share of the costs."

McConnell attracted much attention. The Journal won a Pulitzer prize in 1949 for "the most meritorious public service by any American newspaper." But the watershed continued to go downhill.

After that superstorm, before Lincoln had shoveled the mud from its face, McConnell turned on more pressure. About this time the elderly Otto Liebers came to the Journal office and suggested they team up. As a first step they called a mass meeting of "everyone interested in the problem"—civic groups, farm organizations, county officials and the like—and organized the Salt-Wahoo Watershed Association. The job of the association was to do anything and everything that might aid in converting the 1,600-square-mile basin into what McConnell likes to call "a valley of still waters."

There was plenty of enthusiastic support for the association from the farms, crossroads and towns, but during the next few years a less-dedicated group might well have concluded that erosion and flood were no harder to take than the baffling double talk and the guerrilla warfare among the Government agencies whose help was needed. Perhaps some bureaucrats underrated the pink-faced McConnell, who looked even younger than his then 35 years. They learned, the hard way, that his cherubic ex-

terior covers a man with a mission, a tough, persistent fighter.

Shortly after the big flood, the Army Corps of Engineers, which previously had shown scant interest in "this little crick," came in with a claim-staking proposal for four multimillion-dollar dams that would protect the city of Lincoln. The association quickly saw that the big dams wouldn't do a thing for the thousands of farms on which Lincoln makes most of its living. Also, it would put some of the best valley land permanently under water. The association turned thumbs down, and McConnell so informed the colonel who had presented the project. As this military gentleman folded his maps, he coldly stated one of the most arrogant twisteroos on record. "My agency represents the people of the United States," the colonel said. "This isn't Russia, and you folks out here can't push the people around."

The Salt-Wahoo Association kept plugging away on its theme of a complete, coordinated program for the whole valley. It produced several excellent booklets and movies showing how the job could be done and what it would mean. It particularly emphasized the point that while the big, disaster-type floods dramatized the problem, it was the poor condition of the land and the more frequent, smaller overflows that did the most damage in the long run.

Several years and several floods later, with the much-needed small dams still not built, McConnell and Liebers decided the valley needed a fairly large-scale demonstration of upstream flood control. "We've got plenty of stuff on paper; now we need it on the land," the Journal editor told everybody who would listen. The Salt-Wahoo Association tried to persuade the United States Department of Agriculture, through its Soil Conservation Service, to establish a modest but complete showcase of watershed renovation on Salt Creek. Although sympathetic, the USDA wasn't able to get down to cases. Since 1945 it had been doing somewhat similar work on 11 fairly large watersheds—so large, in fact, that progress was painfully slow. Why ask for more trouble? At a field hearing of the United States House Committee on Agriculture, McConnell made a strong pitch for a pilot-plant approach to upstream flood control in small, selected areas, so folks could see what could be done. The committee seemed impressed, but nothing happened.

Then when Dwight D. Eisenhower was inaugurated as President the McConnell-Liebers axis saw an opening and moved fast. Ike's campaign speeches had dwelt lovingly on his deep belief in local-State-Federal cooperation; he had said many kind words for conservation of natural resources. Why not slash straight across the redtape jungle and take the watershed plan to the White House?

McConnell asked 25 watershed leaders from different parts of the United States to meet him in Washington—at their own expense—to sell the pilot-program idea to President Eisenhower. On the appointed day, February 25, the boy from the country and his hastily gathered "citizens committee" put through one of the quickest coups in history. In the morning the group met with the President, who obligingly had called in all of his brass in the natural-resources field.

McConnell's committee presented its case. President Eisenhower agreed, saying the whole thing was right in line with his own ideas. He asked the group to take up the details with Congress and members of his "team," adding significantly, "If you run into any trouble anywhere along the line, you just come back and let me know."

After that it was a downhill pull. To be sure, some officeholders weren't exactly enthusiastic about breaking up a busy, busy Washington day to give this highly informal committee a hearing. One rather high official in the United States Department of Agriculture tried to excuse himself for the substantial reason that he had to testify before a House subcommittee. McConnell simply picked up the phone, called the chairman of the subcommittee and persuaded him to postpone the hearing. Slightly green and breathless, the official listened attentively to the group's ideas about the pilot-watershed program.

The 1-day blitz shook the situation off dead center. Under the leadership of Representative CLIFFORD HOPE and Senator FRANK CARLSON, both of Kansas, the 1st session of the 83d Congress was persuaded to add $5,100,000 to the Department of Agriculture's appropriations, earmarked for getting work started on pilot watersheds. In short order the Soil Conservation Service selected 60 small natural upstream basins in 34 States. By no coincidence whatever, weather-beaten upper Salt Creek was one of these, and soon the conservationists and engineers moved in and the roar of bulldozers echoed across the slopes.

Remember Jerry Kubik? Well, you ought to see his new farm today. It's still in the same old place, but the landscape is far safer and a lot more attractive. No longer do crop rows run up and down the hill. No longer do gullies eat the heart out of his land. Every field is a graceful pattern of broad, curving terraces that wind around the slopes, and all farming is on the contour. More of the land is covered with healing grasses, and the stubble from his cultivated crops is left on the top of the soil, holding it in place, encouraging insoak of water. Of course, even the best-conditioned soil can hold only so much moisture or can take in very little when frozen. But now the excess water, instead of dashing off, walks slowly around the hills in terrace channels. It is released downhill in specially prepared sod waterways, which route the runoff into the natural drainage system. Green blades of grass and the mat of sod act as brakes on the flow and strain out much of the sediment.

"It takes several days for the farm to drain now," the enthusiastic Kubik observed as we toured his place. "When the water leaves here, it's clear, not muddy."

Even the runoff doesn't flow directly into the creek. At the lower edge of the farm is a new, grass-covered Government dam which gives positive control of 3.6 inches of runoff from the Kubik farm and several others. The dam isn't a magnificent structure, not to be compared with the massive concrete-and-steel harnesses on major streams. But this farmer sees it as a thing of sheer beauty. He proudly drives visitors over the 850-foot-long top and points down to the 3½-acre permanent pond which he has stocked with crappies, bullheads, and blue-gilled bass. "The time I used to spend rebuilding flood-wrecked fences, now I use it for fishing," he said. And he added, "It's sure nice to have a good pond up here. For all our floods, this is dry country too much of the time."

The dam operates automatically. After the permanent pool fills up, the water reaches an inlet pipe which passes a reasonable flow downstream. In case of storms, the excess runoff collects behind the dam holding back 144 acre-feet of floodwater. Then the reservoir drains for about 5 to 7 days, slowly enough to keep the water within the stream channel just below.

The SCS engineer who explained the working of the dam was careful to point out that the structure was limited in its effect. "It will stop the smaller floods, the 10- and 25-year kind," he explained, "but a huge storm—the 100-year kind—would fill up everything and water would go over the spillway."

"But the flood still would be reduced?"

"By as much as the dam held back. Also, the water that gets away would carry a lot less of Jerry's farm with it."

Tidying up his farm called for a lot of work and expense on Kubik's part, although he was reimbursed, in part, by payments for soil conservation under the agricultural conservation program. He built 12 miles of terraces and is putting in 4 more miles now. This is a sizable earth-moving job, something like constructing a small road; it costs $150 to $200 a mile. Grassed waterways are costly, too, involving the laying out of carefully engineered channels and seeding them to tough-grass mixtures. Kubik has put in 8½ acres of these, investing $90 to $100 an acre in them. The detention dam, built by the SCS, cost $14,600, and although there was no cash outlay for Kubik, he furnished the land for the dam and pond, about five acres, worth $125 an acre at going prices. He also gave easement for flowage rights, meaning that he stands any damage when the flood pool backs up his draw. Altogether, he has invested perhaps $2,000, above any conservation payments, in the program.

Still, he's happy about the whole deal. "This pays off with a better farm," he said. "My land isn't going downhill now. My yields are 20 or 30 percent better than they would be without this conservation. We're making this a better community."

You get some idea of the vastness of the upstream job when you figure that Jerry Kubik's tiny bit of the landscape is just one-four hundred and fiftieth of the upper Salt area. Even for this small watershed the task is slow and complex, involving the building of 26 detention dams and more than 90 smaller structures to stabilize stream grades and control sediment. More than 750 farms must be completely planned for soil conservation, and this part of the assignment is just about half finished. Farmers must build enough terraces around the hills of this 109,000-acre watershed to reach from coast to coast and back to Lincoln again, more than 4,500 miles. Furthermore, all parts of the work plan must fit together in time as well as space. It isn't smart to put in a dam until the slopes above it have been healed and secured with grass and terraces; otherwise sliding silt would soon fill the reservoir.

The entire face-lifting job on the upper Salt is supposed to take 5 years and will cost a bit over $4 million. Uncle Sam will pick up the direct check for about $1,600,000 of this—mainly for structures and technical planning. Farmers in the watershed will put about $2,200,000 in work on their land, easements and rights-of-way. State and local governments are contributing necessary work along roads, worth around $200,000.

However, this large investment is expected to return benefits worth at least twice the cost on an annual-average breakdown, not including the value of peace of mind of the people on the land and in the valley towns. In evaluating such projects the Federal Government follows a complex formula which amortizes the installation cost over a 50-year period at going interest rates and also includes the probable expense of maintaining the works—although this latter is the responsibility of the local people. On this basis the average annual costs are estimated at $319,900, while the benefits are expected to be $718,628 a year, made up of $99,636 in reduction of flood and sediment damage, and $618,992 in increased productivity and more intensive use of the land.

More important, nationally, is the way such pilot demonstrations touched off a countrywide watershed-improvement boom. People from troubled valleys have swarmed over the pilot projects to see what is being done. In fact, so many carloads and busloads of visitors drive in Kubik's farm that he is hard pressed for time to do his chores. After seeing how the water is being saved and tamed, these scouts go home, asking, "How can we get this kind of program?"

This urgent demand from the hinterlands has swelled to such proportions that some bureaucrats are wondering if McConnell et al. didn't present them with a firm hold on the tail of a large grizzly bear. As one SCS official said, "There are about 16,000 small, upstream watersheds in this country, and it seems that most of them want us to plan a project for them."

It wouldn't be fair to give the leaders in the Salt-Wahoo area all of the credit for touching off this watershed revolution, although they certainly fired some well-aimed shots. In hundreds of upstream valleys, people have organized various kinds of associations to seek remedial action. The rising tide of pressure from the uplands finally overcame the obstructionists in the 2d session of the 83d Congress, when, with President Eisenhower's strong backing, the Hope-Aiken Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act passed and became known in the political trade as Public Law 566. As he signed it, President Eisenhower said "This act recognizes by law for the first time the great importance of upstream watershed protection. * * * For the first time, also, this act provides a broad program of Federal technical and financial assistance to such local watershed groups as are willing to assume the responsibility for initiating, carrying out, and sharing the costs."

The 566 program is a carefully limited one, seeking to avoid the incentives for the empire building which, in the past have led to bitter, costly warfare between Government bureaus. Federal aid is limited, under this act, to watersheds no larger than 250,000 acres. Only small dams, holding at most 5,000 acre-feet, can be built. Local organizations must provide the needed land, easements, rights-of-way and, in addition, must pay a fair share—50 percent by rule of thumb—of the installation costs of any works. The Bureau of the Budget and the USDA have added to the strictures with a pile of rules and regulations which, by actual measurement with my ruler, is 1 inch thick. A project submitted by a local group has to run the gamut of a State agency, the SCS, the Secretary of Agriculture, the Secretary of the Army, the Secretary of the Interior and the Office of the President. If the proposal survives, it goes to Congress, waits 45 days for possible disapproval, and, if there is none, work can begin.

Hardly was the ink dry on the law when applications began pouring in from States, and legislatures began to pass laws for local cooperation. More than 20 States had enacted different laws on the subject at last check. To date, the Soil Conservation Service has received 427 applications from watersheds in 42 States, and an additional 400 are in process. Nobody knows how many more are being generated out in the hills. Officials hope that at least 70 well-planned projects will be through the mill and be ready to go during the next Congress.

Also, something of a miracle came to pass recently when the Army engineers and the United States Department of Agriculture shook hands and agreed that there is need for both upstream and downstream flood control, and further, that the two methods should be fitted into a sensible pattern that will give the country the most effective and most economical protection. For example, the engineers have taken a new look at the Salt-Wahoo Basin, and have proposed to interlock their work with that on the upper Salt. The coordinated approach may make it possible for the SCS to eliminate 11 of their 26 proposed dams, and the engineers now figure that they can get their job done with 12 medium-sized dams instead of 17.

All of this doesn't mean that the United States can now sit back and relax, confident that the whole erosion and flood problem is being met. The fact is, we are generations behind our needs, and catching up is going to be a huge assignment. On our main rivers we have made heartening progress. The Army Engineers estimate that the total downstream potential damage of $911 million a year has been cut more than half by their control works now in full or partial operation—the bulk of them built within the past 20 years. This has cost $3,600,000,000 to date, out of a total of $9 billion authorized by Congress for active projects. Meanwhile, our headwaters streams are dealing out an estimated $677 million in damages per year, but we've just barely started to curb them. Total Federal appropriations for upstream work amount to $73 million—less than the interest on the big main-stream dams.

Out in Lincoln, where Nebraska's skyscraper capitol looks over the Salt-Wahoo basin, Ray McConnell doesn't regard his battle as won. He's unhappy because the bureaucrats loaded the new Watershed Act with so many regulations that it is slow and unwieldy. "That isn't the way to do it," he says. "You need to get the work started out on the land and along the creeks. Then folks become interested and it grows." No doubt Washington will be hearing about this.

Eighty Years of Progress by Cooper's, Kenosha

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 16, 1956

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, government has not provided the high standard of living which the American people enjoy today. It has been the private initiative of foresighted men and women who have built our great country from ocean to ocean and from Canada to the Gulf of Mexico. Many individuals have been willing to risk their money in private enterprise in an effort to serve the needs of our people.

One of the pioneer industrial organizations in the United States is Cooper's, Inc., Kenosha, Wis., and I am proud to say it is located within my congressional district. This firm 80 years ago was founded by a retired Methodist minister, Samuel T. Cooper. He had one simple idea which was to manufacture a better product for men. That idea is personified today in the present corporation with 5 manufacturing plants and more than 10,000 retail outlets.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I am including an article that appeared in the Kenosha Evening News last May 1, which relates the human interest story of Cooper's, Inc.:

COOPERS, INC.

Many of our Nation's great corporations have the same beginning. They are companies that began humbly—with a man, with an idea, and with courage to make the idea work.

Coopers is such a company. The man was a retired Methodist minister, Samuel T. Cooper, and his idea was simple: To manufacture a better product for men. This was in 1876, and 80 years later the idea which saw the initial founding of Cooper, Inc., has been nurtured into a multi-million-dollar corporation with 5 manufacturing plants, 10,000 retail outlets, licensees in 15 foreign men's underwear industry: Jockey.

EXCELLENT REPUTATION

But most of all the company during the past 80 years has earned a reputation for quality and leadership unmatched in the men's apparel field.

It was in St. Joseph, Mich., the Samuel T. Cooper founded the company. With his 3 sons and 6 old and battered knitting machines, S. T. Cooper & Sons began manucountries, and the most famous name in the facturing men's boot socks.

Gradually, the company expanded its line of products into a full line of utility hosiery for men, women, and children. For example, the first long, black "Ironclad" hose for children were Coopers' products.

Then, in 1892, Samuel T. Cooper died. The three sons, Henry, Willis, and Charles, disposed of the St. Joseph interests and moved to Kenosha, where they established hosiery and underwear manufacturing operations. The untimely deaths of Willis and Charles in Chicago's Iroquois Theatre fire in 1903 left only Henry to direct these plants, which he did until 1914. That year, he withdrew from the hosiery business in order to concentrate on his underwear plant, the Cooper Underwear Co., now Coopers, Inc.

President of the company today is R. Y. Cooper, a grandson of the founder.

The history of Coopers boasts an impressive list of "firsts," both in products and in marketing techniques. The company's most famous product—and the one for which it is best known today—is its line of "Jockey" brand knit briefs introduced in 1935.

JOCKEY FILLS THE BILL

Development of the Jockey brief culminated a product research program to find a product meeting three basic requirements: (1) it must fill a real need, (2) it must be popular priced, and (3) it must be marketable in volume at a profit.

This search was climaxed on a cold, snowy day in January of 1935, when a Chicago department store featured the brandnew Jockey knit brief in its windows. Crowds began forming at the counters inside, and extra salesmen were diverted to meet this traffic. The store placed a call to Kenosha, and special shipments of Jockey briefs were dispatched by train. In spite of the weather and a normally poor selling season, the entire stock was sold out before the day was over. Similar results were reported on following days from stores in other parts of the country. Coopers had indeed achieved its greatest triumph.

The original idea came to Arthur R. Kneibler, now senior vice president, from an abbreviated type of men's swimming trunk then in vogue on the French Riviera. From this, Coopers' designers fabricated a new kind of underwear made of knit fabric that fit comfortably, provided perspiration absorption, and yet was porous enough to let the skin "breathe."

The company proved more than equal to the task of making the modern knit idea—the Jockey idea—an acceptable one by the Nation's male population.

WIDELY ACCEPTED

Coopers launched into hard-hitting advertising and merchandising programs aimed at helping "Jockey" retailers successfully introduce the product to their customers. Through these first and following promotions, millions of men have been turned into Jockey customers. It is estimated that almost half of the Nation's male population now wears underwear of the knit-support type, originally introduced by Coopers back in 1935.

The success of Jockey has progressed far beyond the United States. Foreign underwear manufacturers, recognizing the importance of Coopers' development, received permission from the Kenosha Co. to manufacture "Jockey" in their own countries, on a royalty basis. Agreements were subsequently made with 15 foreign manufacturers and

Jockey underwear currently is produced and sold in Canada, Australia, Great Britain, New Zealand, Switzerland, France, Colombia, Italy, Denmark, South Africa, Germany, Austria, Ireland, Mexico, and Venezuela. Additional overseas distribution in other areas was established through foreign agents to Central America, the West Indies, South America, the Far East and Pacific isles, parts of the Near East and Army post exchanges and Navy ships stores.

Coopers first gained its reputation as an industry leader in 1910 when it patented the Kenosha Klosed Krotch, a feature that revolutionized the design of the then-popular union suit by eliminating the drop seat. This was advertised in the Saturday Evening Post in 1911, an historic moment in itself, for this ad is believed to be the first national advertisement for men's underwear.

MEET CHALLENGE

This progressive philosophy, too, was responsible for the company's continued success in later years. By 1915, the company—like all firms specializing in knitted underwear—was threatened by the introduction and sudden popularity of woven union suits. Coopers met this challenge by producing woven underwear with a knit crotch featuring the famous Kenosha Klosed Krotch design.

And, when servicemen during World War I became accustomed to two-piece underwear, Coopers added woven shorts and knit shirts to its line.

But the most serious threat to the company's position, during the 1920's and early 1930's, proved beyond all doubt the caliber of the company and its ability to assert leadership over the underwear industry.

At this time, many new underwear companies sprang up, using sweatshop labor and inferior fabrics to market products at prices quality companies like Coopers could not match. Coopers needed help badly, and the company turned to Arthur R. Kneibler in 1928.

A man with a broad background in advertising and selling, and with foresight matching the company founder, Kneibler surveyed the market and made certain recommendations which remain in force to this day. These included the company's present sales concept of retail-mindedness, which has grown into the industry's most complete and most effective program of selling not only merchandise but sales idcas that help the retailer sell his goods. Many a retailer, during the depression period of shrunken profit margins, became an eternal friend of Coopers because of the company's efforts to help him move merchandise.

It is this retail-mindedness that must be credited with a major role in keeping Jockey knit underwear on top in the years since its enthusiastic reception in 1935.

WIDELY ADVERTISED

No product in the history of the men's underwear industry has been merchandised so thoroughly and so continually. Jockey is, and has been, the most heavily nationally advertised item of its kind. The retailer has been supplied with every type of tested, effective merchandising tool to help move the product.

Constant innovations are made. For example, Jockey became the first prepackaged underwear, and it is only recently that other manufacturers, recognizing the trend toward self-selection, have followed suit. And, this packaging program led Coopers to design the first floor dispensers for displaying its products in the store—making self-selection even easier.

From the original Jockey brief have come additional items which have made the line the most complete of its type for men and boys. The Jockey brand now features, in addition to briefs, lowers of varying lengths, including the "Midway," "Over-Knee," and longs. And to go with the lowers, Coopers introduced the Jockey undershirt and T-shirt, which include contour-cut models to fit neatly under the lowers.

Additional research has led to the introduction of Jockey products in improved cotton fabrics such as Durene and in synthetic fabrics, such as stretch nylon. Recently, the ultra-high quality blend of Egyptian cotton and Irish linen, called "mercelin," was added to the line of Jockey underwear.

EXPAND FACILITIES

As Jockey has grown to become a byword throughout the world, so have Coopers expanded its facilities to meet the demand. Today, Jockey products are manufactured at Belzoni, Miss., and Millen, Ga., in addition to the original and expanded Kenosha headquarters.

Two other manufacturing plants at Wadley, Ga., and Carlisle, Ky., are devoted to the manufacture of other Coopers products for men.

Extensive distribution facilities are needed to service Coopers' 10,000 retail outlets, and this is accomplished through strategically placed distribution points at Los Angeles, Calif.; Seattle, Wash.; Lambertville, N. J.; Cedartown, Ga.; and Kenosha, Wis.

The company has much in which it takes a great deal of pride, but no phase of its operation is more noteworthy than its employees. As Coopers was founded and remained a family company, so have its employees remained as part of a happy family. Close to 400 employees at the Kenosha headquarters, out of a total of 750, have been associated with Coopers for 15 years or more—a remarkable record.

Officers, in addition to R. Y. Cooper, president, Arthur R. Kneibler, senior vice president, and G. S. Lance, secretary-treasurer, are: Robert F. Cooper, vice president in charge of production planning, procurement and special assignments; J. H. Wyss, vice president in charge of sales and advertising; H. L. Fredericksen, vice president in charge of manufacturing; and Oscar A. Wilkerson, Jr., vice president in charge of research and development.

The board of directors is comprised of R. Y. Cooper, Gilbert S. Lance, A. R. Kneibler, and Harry H. Wolf.

The company has grown and prospered with a simple philosophy of service to its customers, the retailers, and service to the consumer, the end-users of Cooopers and Jockey products. It is the careful maintenance of this philosophy, coupled with the progressive, youthful spirit of Coopers' management, gives promise of even greater growth in the years to come.

The story of Coopers dramatically shows how a good product, well merchandised, can add new meaning to a word that once meant only "a man who rides horses," and which today also signifies the world's most famous brand of underwear: "Jockey."

America Fooled

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEON H. GAVIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 11, 1956

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the St. Marys, Pa., Daily Press of July 17, 1956:

AMERICA FOOLED

This week's issue of U. S. News & World Report hints there never was a real break between the Soviet Union and Marshal Tito, that this country as well as other free world nations had their eye teeth yanked out falling for that chestnut.

As long ago as 4 years this country editor hinted that Tito was fronting for Joseph Stalin and the goods he was getting from United States for free were ultimately finding their way into the Soviet Union, but in that small town papers have little or no influence with the big brass in Washington the hint here never got any further than the paper on which it was printed.

When an American military mission was refused permission last year to accompany a shipment of military goods sent free of charge to Mr. Tito it became apparent then the marshal was playing ball with Russia.

This finally came out in the open this year when Tito got the red carpet treatment in Moscow and told audiences in Russia there was no differences between his country and Russia, finally attaching his signature to an agreement that in event of another war his soldiers and those of the Soviet Union would be found marching together, shoulder to shoulder. What more evidence does America want that Tito and the Kremlin bosses are as close together as Sunday midnight and Monday morning?

It was recently brought to light United States contemplates sending 380 jet planes to Yugoslavia at a time our own National Guard lacks this type of military craft. How nutsy can a nation get?

Sometime, says Dr. Alfred P. Haake, Uncle Sam may wake up from his dream world and take a more realistic view at world affairs.

This noted economist has this so say about America and Yugoslav relations:

"One wonders when we open-faced, fairy-loving Americans with our penchant for casting loaves of bread on the waters for later crumby returns, will ever realize the difference between being charitable or cooperative and being just a plain silly fool.

"Uncle Sam, with his long whiskers, really a pretty fine old gentleman and a credit to his bringing up, has been caricatured in many ways, but it remained for Marshal Tito of Yugoslavia really to show up Uncle Sam in the juvenile and uncomfortable role of 'Uncle Sap.' And the devil laughed.

"There was a time when it was undoubtedly wise for the United States to come to the aid of Tito. When the recently debunked and excoriated Stalin expelled Tito from the 'Communist family' in 1948, there was danger of invasion of Yugoslavia by its Communist-controlled neighbors—Rumania, Bulgaria, and Hungary. Such an invasion was highly distasteful in prospect to all of us and could have touched off another world war.

"The help we then gave Tito, and of which he was given without condition or consideration. That was the error. We asked no promises and laid down no conditions or terms, but just opened our hearts and pocketbook to the callous dictator of Yugoslavia, despite the wanton murder of five young American airmen who lost their bearings because of weather and flew over Yugoslavia. We accorded to the sensibilities of American mothers the same cynical lack of moral consideration which we showed for China when that country was sold down the river at Yalta.

"So we built up Tito as a hoped-for bulwark against Communist aggression, a useful future ally against a stab in the back through Yugoslavia. Well over a billion dollars have been sucked from the pockets of American taxpayers, as a gift to stanch old Tito.

"And now we have our reward. Bulgy Nikita Khrushchev has torn to shreds his

former boss and partner, Josef Stalin, and declares that Tito was right when he insisted that Yugoslavia—that is, Tito—must be free to rule itself instead of being a Stalin satellite. Tito accepts confirmation of his now-recognized high place in the Communist hierarchy, and openly announced that Yugoslavia will never again be split from the Soviet Union by misunderstandings."

Sermon by the Right Reverend John K. Cartwright, Requiem Mass for Fallen Workers of Poznan, St. Matthew's Cathedral, Washington, D. C., July 14, 1956

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 20, 1956

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, last Saturday upon invitation of the Polish American Congress, I attended a requiem mass for the workers of Poznan who were shot down in cold blood just a few weeks ago. These workers, Mr. Speaker, were merely asking for more bread to feed their families and themselves. A little relaxation of the iron first of totalitarianism that has ruled their lives gave them cause to believe that their request would not go unanswered. But tragedy stalked their demand. Cold, naked, brutal mass murder was the answer that the Communist Polish Government handed to the courageous people who sought a better deal for the people of Poland. June 28, 1956, is a day that will be remembered in the history of Poland—a day of courage for Polish patriots and a day of infamy for the present Polish Communist leaders.

Mr. Speaker, the sermon of Monsignor Cartwright delivered at the requiem mass points out some specific lessons of the Poznan uprising. It pays tribute to the faith and spirit of the Polish people. I commend it to the attention of the House and ask unanimous consent that it be included in the RECORD.

I also ask unanimous consent that an editorial from the Catholic Standard, the official diocesan Catholic publication of Washington, be printed along with Monsignor Cartwright's sermon.

The sermon and editorial follow:

SERMON DELIVERED BY THE RIGHT REVEREND JOHN K. CARTWRIGHT IN ST. MATTHEW'S CATHEDRAL, JULY 14, 1956, AT THE REQUIEM MASS FOR THE FALLEN WORKERS OF POZNAN

We have gathered this morning according to our Catholic custom to celebrate the Sacrifice of the Mass for the repose of the souls of those who died in Poznan. On this occasion, as on all similar occasions, we carry out the church's practice and injunction to pray to Almighty God for the remission of sins and for the purification of the faults of those who have passed on. It is not ordinarily in the spirit of the church to speak at the Requiem Mass in terms of eulogy. Yet on this occasion we feel that exception can very justly be made inasmuch as these heroic people laid down their lives for their fellow citizens and for the freedom of the world and, therefore, we feel more than usually confident that God has received them into his reward and peace.

The action taken by these heroes at Poznan electrified the world and taught it in a very vivid fashion certain lessons that needed to be inculcated anew. In the first place, their revolt against Marxian tyranny gave a further blow to the Marxist delusion that has captivated the minds of so many people in our world today. In Marxian theory, communism appeals above all to the workers whose lot it professes to improve and to youth since it holds out such rosy hopes of the future. The Poznan revolt, however, was not conducted by the privileged classes but was specifically a revolt of workers who were weary of the impostures of communism and of young people who made it clear that the deceptions of Marxism had had no hold upon their mind.

The second lesson of Poznan was to thrill the world with a new instance of human bravery. We are so much beset at this time of the world's history with the repetition of dull, political formulas that the simple beauty of a courageous act seems somehow new to us and so the whole world thrilled at this simple deed of human courage.

Thirdly, the revolt, although not immediately and completely successful, has undoubtedly awakened the hopes of many for freedom. Millions of people behind the Iron Curtain have heard of this and we can be sure that their confidence and their hopefulness for the future has been awakened and made stronger.

Lastly, among the free peoples and, particularly in the United States, the revolt has rendered a service in arousing those who needed to be aroused (and there are many such) from the opiate dream of acquiescence in coeixstence with the Communist tyranny.

Communism has gone on for so long now that many are contented to regard it as part of the permanent furniture of the world. It is in reality a detestable and unbearable tyranny which must at long last be ended. We now realize better than ever before that the spirit of Poznan, not the spirit of Yalta, holds the secret for the future and that communism's day will be over.

In the year 1963 we shall arrive at the close of the first millenium of Poland's history. The history of Poland as a nation and as a Christian people begins with the dedication of the country to Christianity and Western culture by Mieczyslaw in 963. During those thousand years Poland's history has been glorious not so much with triumphs as with the continued reappearance of courage after constant failures. Poland's efforts for independence have been time and again frustrated, but they have never ceased or died. Meanwhile Poland has made countless contributions to the freedom and peace of other countries as in 1683 when Sobieski relieved Vienna or as in the time of the American revolution when Pulaski and Kosciusko were among the first heroes of our independence or as in the Second World War when the conspicuous bravery of the Polish airmen was an indispensable factor in the English resistance to the Nazis. There is good hope that Poland's second millenium will begin with freedom and peace. But more than this, we may hope that freedom will have a glorious contribution to make to the general civilization of mankind. It was recently said that within 10 years the Communist countries will establish liberal constitutions and governments. However, liberal constitutions are not enough. There must be at their heart the inspiration which originally created them and without which they cannot flourish, namely, the inspiration of faith and religious principle. Given the abolition of communism these Western countries will need, therefore, not merely liberal constitutions but the spirit and heart which make liberal citizens. In giving them this we may hope that Polnad will take the lead and that her second millenium may be glorious not merely for courage in defeat and for hope that never dies, however much it may be deferred, but for freedom, peace, and leadership in the spiritual rebuilding of a devastated world.

[From the Catholic Standard of July 3, 1956]

WHAT CAN YOU DO?

"What can I do about it I really wish that there were something I could do about it." These were the laments of practically every able-bodied, loyal American as he read of the heroic Poznan rioters. It was the same reaction he had when he heard of the famous riots in East Germany on June 17, a few years ago.

That feeling of resentment and frustration only increased when we learned that the Polish rioters will be tried as subversive agents of a capitalist (American) power. This hideous hypocrisy only adds to the feeling of helpless resentment.

There is something that we can do to show our sympathy towards the Christian patriots of Poland and to ask God's omnipotent help to sustain them: we can attend the mass at 10 o'clock tomorrow morning in the cathedral and pray for that intention.

We must not underrate the power of God's grace through prayer and the great power of sympathy. The Polish people, made of heroic stuff, are capable of tremendous and sustained sacrifices for the benefit of all mankind if the free Christian world helps them by prayer and sympathy. The unparalleled resistance of the Poles to atheistic communism cannot be explained simply by natural causes and factors. Every report from Poland brings the same tale of supernatural persistent devotion to God and freedom in every rank and class of people.

The recent revolt or riot of the people deserves an added accolade since it was solely the action of workers who had no hope of winning a victory. It was a magnificent gesture of defiance of tyranny that deserves the admiration and the gratitude of all.

We can render that gratitude by attending mass in St. Matthew's Cathedral and praying for God's blessing on these and the millions of others who are suffering persecution for their devotion to God and freedom.

Civil Rights Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OTTO E. PASSMAN
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 20, 1956

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Speaker, I have obtained a leave of absence to be in Louisiana in my congressional district on official business until Saturday and, for this reason, I probably will not be present to vote upon the final passage of H. R. 627, commonly known as the civil rights bill.

I want you to know, however, that I am violently opposed to the enactment of this measure by the Congress of the United States.

If enacted, it would create a new department for the Justice Department staffed with several hundred attorneys whose sole purpose would be, under this act, to handle free of charge civil-rights cases against our people.

Parties on the other side of any civil-rights controversy are not provided in

any way with financial or legal help in defending these actions.

In addition to this, the bill would set up a Commission on Civil Rights to be appointed by the President of the United States. We have had these commissions in many instances and they have not worked and they are not good. My people do not want any such arrangement and I vigorously oppose this provision.

There are other provisions in the bill to which I also object most vigorously. Generally speaking, the bill is not good and I want no part of it. I hope it is defeated by the House of Representatives and returned to the calendar to die a musty death.

Poll Results

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT J. CORBETT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 20, 1956

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Speaker, in 1939 while a Member of the 76th Congress, I began to ascertain the thoughts of the citizens of my district by means of a written questionnaire. Since that time, while a Member of this body, I have conducted at least two such polls each session. The response of the people has always been excellent.

We send one questionnaire to each family that is included on the lists of permanently registered voters. My district, northern metropolitan Pittsburgh, has over the years been fairly equally divided between Republicans and Democrats. Likewise, it is properly classified as industrial and residential with considerable farming and coal mining included. Economically, it ranges from very wealthy to poor. Ethnically it is extremely varied.

Enough answers are always received to constitute a referendum. These replies keep me well informed of what my people are thinking on many vital national issues. They also serve as an excellent antidote for false information advanced by pressure groups. We find the results most interesting and informative. I trust my colleagues and anyone else who studies them will find them the same.

Herewith I include the results of the poll just completed and the one which was finished in February of this year:

POLL RESULTS, JULY 1956

1. Do you favor any increase in the number of qualified immigrants we will permit to enter the United States annually?. Yes, 27 percent; no, 73 percent.

2. Should the Federal Government use every means short of force to guarantee equal rights and privileges to all citizens? Yes, 75 percent; no, 25 percent.

3. Would you favor increasing veterans' pensions and compensation payments and liberalizing eligibility requirements? Yes, 42 percent; no, 58 percent.

4. Do you favor Federal financial aid for school-construction programs? Yes, 73 percent; no, 27 percent.

5. Do you object to the proposed increase of letter mail to 4 cents and airmail to 7 cents? Yes, 29 percent; no, 71 percent.

6. Do you object to receiving advertising matter through the mail? Yes, 54 percent; no, 46 percent.

7. Do you believe that magazines and newspapers should be delivered by the Post Office Department at something less than cost? Yes, 12 percent; no, 88 percent.

8. Do you believe our civilian-defense program is woefully inadequate? Yes, 77 percent; no, 23 percent.

9. Are you pleased with the new pay-as-you-go Federal highway program? Yes, 87 percent; no, 13 percent.

10. A sizable budget surplus is apparent. Would you prefer a personal income-tax reduction to a reduction of the national debt? Yes, 45 percent; no, 55 percent.

11. If you are inclined to vote for Eisenhower, are you satisfied with NIXON for Vice President? Yes, 84 percent; no, 16 percent.

12. If you are inclined to vote for Stevenson or Harriman, would Kefauver suit you for Vice President? Yes, 85 percent; no, 15 percent.

POLL RESULTS, FEBRUARY 1956

1. Is a tax cut more appealing to you than a balanced budget? Yes, 15 percent; no, 83 percent; no opinion, 2 percent.

2. If a budget surplus is apparent, would you prefer a tax cut to debt reduction? Yes, 29 percent; no, 68 percent; no opinion, 3 percent.

3. Should the United States resist with arms Communist aggression anywhere the people attacked desire help? Yes, 52 percent; no, 38 percent; no opinion, 10 percent.

4. Should the $25 billion interstate-highway program be financed with a combination of increased use taxes and bonds? Yes, 67 percent; no, 22 percent; no opinion, 11 percent.

5. Would you object to paying 4 cents, instead of 3-cent postage, for nonlocal first-class mail (ordinary letter)? Yes, 26 percent; no, 73 percent; no opinion, 1 percent.

6. Do you think we are moving with satisfactory rapidity to establish full civil rights for everyone? Yes, 80 percent; no, 15 percent; no opinion, 5 percent.

7. Do you think we are going too far, too fast with the reclamation and irrigation program? Yes, 25 percent; no, 59 percent; no opinion, 16 percent.

8. Do you believe that the proposed $4½ billion foreign-aid program should be cut 25 percent or more? Yes, 77 percent; no, 16 percent; no opinion, 7 percent.

9. Should the Government encourage and guarantee private health-insurance programs? Yes, 47 percent; no, 47 percent; no opinion, 6 percent.

10. Do you agree that the administration's farm price-support program is an improvement over previous programs? Yes, 70 percent; no, 15 percent; no opinion, 15 percent.

11. Eisenhower says our defense preparations are adequate. Do you agree? Yes, 68 percent; no, 19 percent; no opinion, 13 percent.

12. Do you believe that Eisenhower can and should stand for reelection? Yes, 64 percent; no, 22 percent; no opinion, 14 percent.

Dr. Ray W. Gifford, Jr.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN R. PILLION
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 20, 1956

Mr. PILLION. Mr. Speaker, I am informed that Dr. Ray W. Gifford, Jr., is being released from active Navy duty on August 1, 1956, with the rank of lieutenant commander. He will resume his duties as consultant in medicine at the Mayo Clinic.

I know that many Members like myself who have had the occasion to consult with him on medical matters deeply regret his leaving his position as assistant attending physician to the Capitol physician's office.

I have been very impressed with the patience, thoroughness, and all-around competence of his diagnosis, treatment, and medical care.

Dr. Gifford is a member of the permanent staff of the Mayo Clinic and is an associate member of the American College of Physicians. We have been fortunate in having his background and experience available to the Members of Congress.

His departure from the staff of the Capitol physician's office will be a loss to Congress and I am certain that every Member of Congress who has been his patient will join in this expression of gratitude for a job well done and best wishes for the future.

Death of Federal School Aid Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEON H. GAVIN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 5, 1956

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Washington Evening Star of July 17, 1956:

DEATH OF FEDERAL SCHOOL AID BILL—ACT BLAMED ON VIRTUAL FOUR-PARTY SYSTEM, AND BLOC IS EXPECTED TO CONTINUE

(By David Lawrence)

Who killed the school bill with its billions of Federal money for education? That's still an unanswered question on Capitol Hill, where it may become known as the "mess of 1956."

It's too bad the "right to know" doctrine—espoused by the House committee which is seeking to rid official Washington of its tendency to suppress news—doesn't extend to the behind-the-scenes maneuvers of party leaders in Congress who pull the strings.

For the full story of what happened ought to be told. Four explanations are being offered. One is that the segregationists of the South killed the bill. The other is that the integrationists of the North did it. Another is that those who didn't want any Federal interference in the financing of the schools were influential in the result and that they were alarmed because of recent Supreme Court decisions whittling down States rights and increasing Federal authority.

But Senator HUMPHREY, Democrat, of Minnesota, has a simpler explanation. He blames it all on "President Eisenhower's health or recuperation or concern over personal political problems" which are supposed to have prevented him from "exerting some personal influence and leadership."

Eisenhower had already gone a long way in trying to get the bill passed. He had said once before that anything like the Powell amendment, denying Federal aid to schools in Southern States which do not adopt integration, shouldn't be tacked on to the bill. This was a daring expression on his part—a concession to expediency over and above principle.

But what did happen? Representative ADAM CLAYTON POWELL, Democrat, and one of the Negro leaders of the country, offered his amendment anyhow. It presented an issue which Republican Congressmen from districts where there are many Negro voters couldn't dodge. No amount of persuasion from Eisenhower could keep them from voting for the Powell amendment.

As for southern Congressmen, they abstained from voting so as to make sure the Powell amendment supporters would have a majority. They wanted the final measure to be unpalatable on every side.

But there are northern Republicans—about 65 of them—who don't believe in Federal control of education and they too, voted for the Powell amendment because they knew it would help kill the bill. On final passage, they joined with the southern Democrats to make a majority against the entire bill.

Also important was the action of northern Democrats who helped to defeat amendments, proposed by Republicans, allocating the funds on the basis of the needs of the States. This principle previously had been indorsed, but the Democrats repudiated it. The final bill, therefore, was unsatisfactory to northern Republicans who favored Federal aid and southern Democrats who didn't, and thus was readily defeated.

It is a bit bewildering to see some of the so-called liberals ignoring what the southern Democrats did in helping the Powell amendment to pass or what the northern Democrats did in defeating the Republican amendments. And yet the defeat of the bill is characterized as a case of bad Executive leadership.

The truth is there are 4 parties in Congress today. There hasn't been a 2-party system for 2 decades, and recent decisions of the Supreme Court curtailing States rights mean that the 4-party bloc system will remain for many more years to come.

A significant aftermath of the school bill controversy is the discovery by southern Democrats of how near they came to being tricked by the argument that, if the measure were passed without the Powell amendment, they should have no objection to it. For the fact is that Federal funds could be withheld even without the Powell amendment or its counterpart. The administration has a legal opinion from the Department of Justice which is being used every day by the President's interracial commission. It claims the right of the Federal Government at any time to cancel any contract with any agency, public or private, which permits discrimination in employment on the basis of "race or creed or color or national origin."

The text of this important opinion has never been disclosed though presumably the public has a right to know the exact contents of such an important document that supports an executive order.

It's the knowledge that a threat exists to use Federal authority—even in the absence of a Powell amendment—to withhold funds from schools in the South which may prevent any school bill from ever being passed. It may lead to a demand for a specific stipulation in the law declarating that nothing in this or in any other law gives the Federal Government the right to withhold funds except for the reasons given in the measure itself.

What is surprising about the whole controversy is the assumption made by the "liberals" that those who voted for the Powell amendment should be reprimanded by President Eisenhower for voting their convictions. They are being upbraided for expressing themselves conscientiously. Because they are mostly Republicans, Eisenhower is being held responsible for their votes.

One wonders who is responsible for what the southern Democrats did and for the votes of those Democrats who don't want Federal interference in schools on any score. The theory that the Presidency is a sort of benevolent dictatorship and that the Congress must become a "rubber stamp" has lately become popular doctrine with many of the so-called liberals.

The Civil Rights Bill Confusion Confounded Attack on States Rights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 16, 1956

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the Washington Evening Star of July 18 had a pertinent editorial entitled "Alice Outdone." This editorial points out that the civil rights bill is before the House because of political pressure. It suggests that the bill might pass the House but will not pass the Senate and the editorial goes on to say "It is a good thing, in our judgment, that it will not."

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I am including the editorial in question:

ALICE OUTDONE

The expectation is that the House, with both Republicans and northern Democrats reacting in the usual way to political pressure, will pass the civil-rights bill. There is an equally strong expectation that it will not pass the Senate.

It is a good thing, in our judgment, that it will not. For anyone who takes the trouble to read the record of the House debate cannot fail to come away with the firm impression that few, if any, House Members fully understand the implications of this far-reaching bill.

For example, Representative CELLER, Democrat, of New York, one of the bill's sponsors, was asked whether it gives the right to sue members of a State legislature for damages for acts done in the exercise of their sworn duty. Mr. CELLER wasn't sure. "That is a difficult question to answer," he said, "but I am inclined to believe it would not."

There were many questions, and no satisfactory answers, about a provision which gives the Attorney General autnority to intervene when someone is "about to engage in an act" which might curtail a civil right. Representative TUMULTY, Democrat, of New Jersey, a civil-rights supporter, was disturbed by this and wanted to know what it meant. Representative FULTON, Republican, of Pennsylvania, answered him with this question: "Which part of the Democratic Party or what Democratic Party are you representing?"

Perhaps the most appropriate exchange came between Mr. CELLER and Representative DIES of Texas. Mr. DIES had been asking some needling questions designed to focus attention on what he regarded as flaws in the bill. This reminded Mr. CELLER of an exchange between Alice and Humpty Dumpty in which Alice asked: "How can you make words mean so many different things?" To which Mr. DIES responded: "Did Alice write this bill?"

It is our understanding that the Attorney General wrote the bill. But maybe Alice, or Humpty Dumpty, had a hand in it. At any rate its words mean, or could mean, so many different things that we think it ought to undergo careful, thorough, and searching study before it ever becomes law.

Miss Universe Contest at Long Beach Promotes World Understanding

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CRAIG HOSMER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 20, 1956

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, this evening, at Long Beach, Calif., part of California's 18th Congressional District, which I have the honor to represent, Miss Universe for 1956 will be chosen from comely contestants from many lands of the free world. The annual Miss Universe contest, sponsored wholly by individuals and businesses in the southern California area, is much more than a mere beauty pageant. Free nations throughout the world select and send their fairest representatives to a free America for this important event. Except for the chambers of the United Nations, probably no spot in the world concentrates so many nationalities together for a common purpose. By this means a greater understanding and a more peaceful intention flows between their countries.

These thoughts have been expressed more adequately than I am able to do in the following article by Spencer Crump appearing recently in the Southland magazine of the Independent-Press Telegram newspaper:

U. N. OF BEAUTY POWERFUL WEAPON FOR PEACE

(By Spencer Crump)

One of the world's greatest forces in the struggle for world peace, religious understanding and betterment of woman's position is in session here in Long Beach.

The Miss Universe beauties are damsels who would provoke an admiring whistle in any language.

But the Miss "U" girls are more than beauties, as their charms break down the barriers of international boundaries, language variations, differences in religion, and distances between continents.

As the beauties meet for the Universe festivities during the coming week, new understandings will develop between the girls for them to carry back to those at home.

These girls, as the stars of the fifth—and biggest yet—Miss Universe Pageant will be joining in a United Nations of Beauty.

As in past years, the spectacle of the world's most beautiful girls will be implemented by such inspiring and dramatic events as:

Miss France and Miss Germany, whose nations 3 times in 75 years warred, helping each other primp before parading before the judges.

A beauty of Greek Orthodox faith, an attractive Roman Catholic girl from Italy, and a charming Protestant contestant from Sweden forgetting differences in their interpretation of Christianity to help each other adjust ribbons before posing for photographers.

A curvaceous beaty from humid Panama and a sparkling damsel from cool Iceland finding that variations in climate mean nothing when it comes to holding mirrors as they adjust coiffures just before parade time.

An Austrian beauty demonstrating the fine points of her native waltz as a Brazilian contestant proudly shows the intricacies of her nation's rhumba.

A winsome lass from Iowa and an oriental beauty from Japan forgetting Pearl Harbor as they help each other to register.

A contestant from Africa and a competing beauty from Australia forgeting the isolation of different continents as they try to figure out American slang.

A shinto from Japan, a Buddhist from Ceylon, a Christian from South America, a Moslem from Turkey, a Jew from Israel and a Taoist from Hong Kong forgeting religious differences as they exchange hints on how to parade before the judges.

And a gal from Brooklyn and a miss from Texas forgeting mileage distances as they kid each other about their accents.

All of these things add up to make the Miss Universe Court of Beauty a virtual United Nations in itself, leading to more complete understandings of the countries which sent the girls.

While the public whistles and claps and the girls develop friendships to return to their homes, the universe spectacle takes on another importance in the field of human relationships.

It is the appreciation of womanhood itself.

Particularly in the Orient, and to a considerable degree in Europe, women have traditionally been accorded a secondary place in society.

In the Far East, custom in many places has it that women must walk behind their men in public places and cannot own property. In Europe, women have been taught that their mission in life can be litle more than home and children.

But, thanks in a large degree to the Miss Universe Pageant, new advantages, acclaim and appreciation of beauty is coming for womanhood.

Japan, where even the most attractive and brilliant girls traditionally were accorded second place in the family, has entered a contestant since the pageant started.

Its attractive entries have been hailed in America and in Japan have won new respect for womanhood as a means of national respect.

India entered a beauty in the first Miss "U" contest, but national religious feeling prevented subsequent entries. However, the controversy stirred up discussions relating to improvements of the rights of women.

Similarly, Ceylon has been noted for its attractive contestants but is not entering this year because of Buddhist religious injunctions. Former entries brought new acclaim for women in Ceylon; the injunction caused serious discussion of women's rights.

In Iceland, tradition has acclaimed women on their intellectual ability. The Miss "U" pageant has stirred thoughts of their physical beauty and this year the nation is sending a contestant.

The pageant has rightfully focused male eyes on milady and knowing men are recognizing that women, as well as being things of beauty, can perform important tasks in the field of science and industry.

Atom Liner Sought

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERBERT C. BONNER
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 20, 1956

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following newspaper item:

ATOM LINER SOUGHT

TOKYO, July 18.—Japan's big OSK (Osaka Shosen Kaisha) steamship line hopes to have a streamlined, atom-powered liner on its South American run by 1961—if it gets enriched uranium from the United States. OSK said the ship could cruise at 25 knots and carry 1,700 emigrants to South America three times a year.

The Thoughtless Whims of a Few Eisenhower Appointees Threaten To Ruin and Bankrupt Hundreds of Small-Business Men

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 19, 1956

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I have been trying to discover what the exodus from Washington to its surrounding suburbs will mean to the Nation's Capital in terms of lost purchasing power and taxes.

I have introduced a measure, House Joint Resolution 690, to preserve the economic basis of the Nation's Capital by establishing a basic policy and an orderly procedure for the location of new Federal buildings in the metropolitan area of the District of Columbia. The text of this resolution is included at the conclusion of my remarks.

I am concerned with the consequences of this thoughtless, unplanned exodus to thousands of human beings—to small-home owners forced to put their homes on the block and relocate their families—to hundreds of small-business men faced with bankruptcy due to the loss of customers—to thousands of white-collar workers who, unwilling or financially unable to relocate at the whim of agency heads appointed by the President, would be forced to give up jobs and would, perhaps, become a drain on the local economy—and to churches, whose parishioners would have to reestablish their religious ties in other communities.

You would expect that, with much of the fate and future of our Nation's Capital hanging in the balance, relocation of Federal agencies would be subject to a logical procedure of careful investigation and factfinding, stressing the interests of Government as a whole and the cumulative effect of such moves on the Capital city.

You would expect that, before an agency head were permitted to move his department and his thousands of employees, he would have to present irrefutable planning, engineering, and economic facts to justify his decision.

You would also expect that some democratic system of checks and balances would exist in the relocation procedure, to prevent the possible circumvention by agency heads, either deliberately or unintentionally, of any of the required steps for obtaining officials approval of his decision to relocate.

Fantastic as it may seem, none of this is true today. As the previously quoted editorials indicate, Federal agency relocation is currently being decided largely on the basis of two factors—politics and personal whim—with defense usually quoted as the ostensible reason.

Now we all agree that civil defense should have overriding consideration. But the plain fact is that in these days of the H-bomb and guided missile, much of our defense thinking is as out of date as the model T. Bear in mind that the possible immediate fallout from an H-bomb covers more than 200 miles, and that varying amounts of demolition are caused up to a radius of 20 miles. I ask you gentlemen, how much protection can be afforded an agency by moving it across the Potomac and within a few miles of the city? It seems to me that our whole defense policy needs clarification, and perhaps revision, in the light of new developments in atomic weapons.

When, for defense or other reasons, an agency head decides he would like to move his department out of the Capital, certain types of clearances are theoretically required. In securing approval to relocate, agency officials are supposed to contact the following authorities:

Bureau of the Budget and Congress, on requested appropriations; General Services Administration, on planning of buildings and, occasionally, of the site; National Capital Planning Commission—and, if the proposed move involves the metropolitan area, National Capital Regional Planning Council—on planning aspects of the proposed relocation; and Office of Defense Mobilization, on civil defense phases.

PRESENT CLEARANCES INEFFECTIVE

But the sad fact is that these required clearances are often ineffective. Many agency officials are apparently unaware that they even exist. Frequently, agencies desiring to relocate omit steps in the pattern or do not follow them in logical order.

The city's two planning agencies—National Capital Planning Commission and National Capital Regional Planning Council—lack enforcement authority. Therefore, they are all too frequently regarded as merely a rubber-stamp routine.

siderable degree in Europe, women have

There is a serious deficiency in the manner in which Federal agency relocations are being processed—

Writes Max Wehrly, chairman of the National Capital Regional Planning Council.

Steps requiring coordination through, and reports of the planning agencies are being circumvented until administrative commitments have been made, thus presenting them with what is in fact a "fait accompli."

Furthermore, the entire pattern for relocation has never been pinned down and defined in any one law.

The result of the present haphazard method of relocating Federal agencies is, to a large extent, to leave the final decision for moving up to each individual agency head. And the inevitable consequence of this, is that Federal dispersal has become a political football.

EXAMPLE OF CIA

I regard the Central Intelligence Agency's campaign to build its new headquarters at Langley, Va., and relocate all personnel there, as one outstanding example of the inadequacy and political aspects of present dispersal methods.

This move is being proposed against the advice of a large number of official planners, and of qualified, disinterested planning and economic consultants outside the planning agencies. It is occurring over what the New York Times terms "the vehement protests of—Langley—area property owners." From any logical viewpoint, involving the city's welfare and considerations of reasonable cost, CIA's move appears totally unjustifiable. Yet it has been allowed to progress to the final appropriations stage.

I do not have time here to outline the step-by-step development of this relocation project. But I would like to mention several facts in passing.

From the very start, the project was opposed by leading planners and consultants on the grounds of inadequacy of facilities at Langley, and the "disastrous" effect the relocation move might have on land use plans and community relationships.

In a study of possible CIA sites made by the two planning agencies at the request of CIA officials, more than 40 sites were included—but the planners did not even rank Langley in the first 20 possibilities.

At least two District sites were considered far superior to Langley by the planning agencies, but apparently neither ever received serious consideration by CIA officials.

One major consideration in CIA Director Allen Dulles' decision to relocate, according to some reports, has been his desire to provide his employees with a "Princeton type" campus atmosphere.

However, the most interesting fact of all concerns the manner in which final approval for the Langley site was obtained from the National Capital Planning Commission, chief planning agency for the District. The Commission's membership is made up of 12 persons—5 appointed by the White House, and 7 serving ex officio due to legislative or governmental positions.

In December of last year, Commission members disapproved the Langley site by a vote of 6 to 5. Soon after, two governmental employees serving on the Commission were replaced by two other individuals. One of those replaced was Fred S. Poorman, Deputy Public Buildings Administrator, who had abstained from voting. The other was Leon Zach, representing the Chief of Engineers. Mr. Zach had voted against Langley.

By a strange coincidence, immediately after these men were replaced, CIA requested a reconsideration of its proposal to relocate at Langley. At the next meeting of the Planning Commission, when the reconsideration took place, the two new men supported the site. Those were the only two votes that changed. The Commission was put on record as approving the site, by a vote of 7 to 5.

You can find these facts documented in the printed record of hearings held June 1 before the House Appropriations Committee's Subcommittee on Department of Defense Appropriations, in connection with CIA's request for additional appropriations.

Mr. Speaker, I believe you will agree that the entire manner in which CIA's relocation request has been handled, points up the urgent need for an airtight procedure free of politics and personal whims.

Fortunately, responsibile leaders in Washington are already alerted to this need. The alarm was sounded months ago by the Federal City Council, when it spearheaded a factfinding drive to develop better relocation procedure. In June the District Bankers Association added its support to this campaign by adopting a resolution expressing "deep concern" over present relocation methods, and pledging "unstinting cooperation until a logical and orderely procedure for Federal agency relocation is finally secured."

Both of the city's planning agencies have launched studies with a view to coming up with specific recommendations for improved relocation procedure.

RESPONSIBILITY OF CONGRESS

However, we cannot shirk the fact that prime responsibility for study and adoption of a better procedure rests with Congress. In Washington, as the editors of U. S. News & World Report have observed:

All fingers point to Congress. All the big decisions on affairs of the District of Columbia have to be made by District committees of the Senate and House, followed by action on the floor—just like any national law.

It was in recognition of our responsibilities in connection with Federal agency dispersal that I introduced House Joint Resolution 690 on July 17. This joint resolution sets forth Congress intent to preserve the District of Columbia as the seat of government as provided in article I of the Constitution. It calls for establishment of a basic policy for location of new Federal buildings as one means of implementing this intent.

Under the resolution, no funds appropriated before or after the date of its enactment shall be obligated or spent for construction of any building space for any agency of the Federal Government at any location outside the District of Columbia, but within 20 miles of the zero milestone, without express approval of Congress with respect to the proposed site for such construction.

By immediately adopting this resolution Congress can establish a policy and formally recognize its own decisive authority on relocation. I hope this will be done before the current session ends.

NEED FOR STUDY

However, I believe this resolution should be followed by a full-fledged study of present relocation methods, with a view to presenting specific recommendations to the next session of Congress. These proposals would outline further improvements which should be made in methods of relocating Federal agencies.

This study should take due cognizance of the new plan developed by General Services Administration for location of public buildings within the District and its environs. In accordance with GSA's proposed program, the National Capital Planning Commission is currently working to establish a floor for Federal employment in Washington—a minimum level below which population should not be depleted by Federal relocation.

The study which I am now proposing would go beyond these efforts with specific recommendations designed to:

First. Establish a standard operating procedure on relocation with adequate authority to see it is followed.

Second. Guarantee that planning agencies have sufficient time to study civic and economic effects of each proposed move.

Third. Insure that all agency officials are fully informed on relocation procedure.

Fourth. Give widest possible publicity to issues and problems involved in each agency relocation.

I hope this study will be launched before the current session ends. Until it is, the all-important matter of relocation of Federal agencies—to which the very future of our Nation's Capital is tied so closely—will continue to be decided on a basis of politics and personal whim, rather than on sound engineering and economic principles, as these relate to preservation of the Capital City.

In conclusion I would like to read the text of my House Joint Resolution 690:

Joint resolution to preserve the economic basis of the Nation's Capital by establishing a basic policy and an orderly procedure for the location of new Federal buildings in the metropolitan area of the District of Columbia

Whereas Congress finds that there is a growing tendency on the part of Federal agencies to seek new locations in the vicinity of the District of Columbia, considering only the desires of the particular agency and without regard to the interests of the Government as a whole or the cumulative effect which such moves will have on the District of Columbia; and

Whereas it is the intention of the Congress to preserve the District of Columbia as the seat of Government as provided in article I of the Constitution: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, etc., That it is declared to be the policy of the Congress that the development of the National Capital region shall be based upon the general concept that the District of Columbia shall be the seat of Government and that agencies which can be accommodated in the District of Columbia should be located there.

SEC. 2. All those responsible for the planning or construction of building space to accommodate agencies of the Federal Government within the greater metropolitan area of Washington shall be guided by the policy stated in the first section of this joint resolution.

SEC. 3. No funds appropriated before or after the date of enactment of this joint resolution shall be obligated or spent for the construction of any building space for any agency of the Federal Government at any location outside the District of Columbia, but within 20 miles of the zero milestone, without the express approval of the Congress with respect to the proposed site for such construction.

Address Delivered by Francis E. Walter, Representative in Congress, 15th District, Pennsylvania, at the 38th Annual Convention of the American Legion, Department of Pennsylvania, Convention Hall, Philadelphia, Pa., on July 20, 1956

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. FRANCIS E. WALTER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 20, 1956

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address:

ADDRESS DELIVERED BY FRANCES E. WALTER, REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS, 15TH DISTRICT, PENNSYLVANIA, AT THE 38TH ANNUAL CONVENTION OF THE AMERICAN LEGION, DEPARTMENT OF PENNSYLVANIA, CONVENTION HALL, PHILADELPHIA, ON JULY 20, 1956

I would like to take the opportunity offered by this great occasion to talk to you about a matter of great importance, which is now before the Congress.

Even at this very late hour when everybody in Washington seems to be eager to see the Congress adjourn and go home in order to do some work on mending of political fences, I sincerely hope that the legislation I wish to discuss with you today will be enacted into law before we go to Chicago and to San Francisco, as the case may be, to nominate presidential candidates.

The thing I have in mind is a bill which I have introduced in order to restore good sense to the laws governing the United States Government's power to dismiss civilian employees when their employment is deemed to be detrimental to the interests of the national security of this Nation.

The purpose of my bill is to protect the United States Government from foreign infiltration by Communist agents through the hole opened by the Supreme Court of the United States. Also, it would serve to remind the Supreme Court of the United States of the place it occupies in the Government of this Nation and of the impropriety to develop a strange forgetfulness of the wording of articles I, II, and III of the Constitution of the United States.

Realizing the clear and present danger which the international Communist conspiracy and its methods of penetration present to the United States, the Congress enacted, in 1950, a law designed to protect the United States Government from infiltration of disloyal employees. The President has implemented that law in an Executive order and as you well know, the so-called security and loyalty program as it affected employees of the United States Government has, since its inception, been under a constant and sharp attack by the Communists, their allies, and their dupes.

One rather enterprising employee of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare by the name of Kendrick M. Cole has agreed to become the tool of those who want to wreck this program, and after having been dismissed from Federal employment because of his questionable activities and associations he has taken his case to the courts.

He was turned down by a Federal district court and by a Federal court of appeals. He went to the Supreme Court of the United States and there he won a victory which represents one of the most stunning defeats for the United States Government.

A divided Supreme Court of the United States, with 6 Justices in the majority and 3 dissenting—Justices Clark, Reed, and Minton—has invaded the powers of the Congress and of the President of the United States and has mutilated the law of 1950 and the President's Executive Order No. 10450 of 1953. This unconstitutional action of the judiciary branch took the form of a decision (*Cole* v. *Young*), which, in effect, amends the law by adding to it just four words. Four words which, in limiting the scope of the law, open the entire United States Government to the infiltration of our mortal enemies.

In plain words, the law—the act of August 26, 1950—is applicable to "any civilian officer, or employee" of the United States. What it meant was simply that every civilian officer and employee who has the privilege of being employed by the United States Government must be without a peradventure of doubt loyal to the United States and not associated with any subversive organization.

To the words "any civilian officer, or employee" the Supreme Court has added four words, "in a sensitive position," thus providing that out of the 2,300,000 civilians who hold Government jobs, only one-fifth must be loyal Americans and the remaining four-fifths could keep their Federal jobs although their loyalty to the United States is questionable and although they may remain under Communist discipline.

Obviously, such preposterous thought never occurred to the Congress and it never occurred to the President of the United States that such was the intent of Congress in enacting the 1950 law.

The legislative history of that law is exceptionally clear, as legislative histories go. Reports filed by committee of the Senate and of the House of Representatives, and the debate held on the floors of both Houses of Congress, prove without a scintilla of doubt that the law was meant to apply to every executive agency, not only to the "sensitive" ones—and to every Federal employee, not only to those who hold "sensitive" positions.

No Member of the House and no Member of the Senate contradicted when those statements were made. In fact, no contradiction could have been voiced for there probably is no one in the Congress who believes that there is in the entire Federal Government one job which could be offered to a person whose loyalty to the United States is doubtful.

As Justice Clark—with whom Justices Reed and Minton joined—stated in his dissenting opinion, "the janitor may prove to be in as important a spot security-wise as the top employee in the building".

But let's not stop at janitors—look at the Tennessee Valley Authority. TVA supplies power for the most important of our atomic plants. An electrician in a TVA power plant is not classified as a "sensitive" employee. He certainly could not be so classified under the Supreme Court's ruling, and yet look at the extent of damage to our security that he could do. Think of the staggering blow that could be dealt to our atomic work if that electrician would simply throw a switch to cut off the power at a moment chosen by those under whose discipline he remains.

As a matter of fact, think of what a charwoman could find in an office that she is hired to clean after everybody else had left. And think about the nonsensitive file clerk who moves freely around offices where highly classified documents are stored.

The Supreme Court of the United States said in *Cole* v. *Young*, leaning over backward in order to misread and misinterpret congressional and presidential intent that all that was intended is to protect from subversive infiltration only those activities of the Government that are directly concerned with the protection of the Nation, and not those which contribute to the strength of the Nation "only through their impact on the general welfare." It clearly follows that the Supreme Court of the United States would not mind at all if agencies or parts of them, such as the services protecting the Nation's health and welfare, the education of our youth, agencies in charge of interstate and foreign commerce, mailing rooms, archives, certain communication rooms, etc., would become "honeycombed with subversives," if I may quote once more Justice Clark.

If we permit the decision of the Supreme Court of the United States to stand, we would simply open what Mr. Churchill so aptly called our "soft underbelly" to agents of the Communist conspiracy, who from that soft spot, skillfully worming their way upward, could easily reach the very nerve center of the Nation. In addition to that, if we do nothing about this decision, we would condone the Supreme Court's attempt to invade that area of Government which, under the Constitution, is reserved to the Congress and the President.

The 3 dissenting Justices were quite outspoken in that regard, actually accusing their 6 colleagues responsible for the Cole decision of raising a question as to the constitutional power of the President to authorize dismissal of executive employees whose further employment he believes to be inconsistent with national security.

In reading the Supreme Court's decision in the Cole case, I cannot help but feel that I was right several months ago when in reading another of our Supreme Court's decision, I felt that the illustrious Justices dwell in ivory towers with windows shut tight and shutters drawn, carefully looking away from the mortal danger facing our freedom—the freedom which our laws are designed to protect and not to help destroy.

There is something uncanny in the stubbornness of some of our courts, including the Supreme Bench, with which they refuse to appraise properly the true meaning of the new skin that the Soviet leopard has now clothed itself. They refuse to see the same old spots on the leopard's skin, thus aiding and abetting the Soviet's effort to confuse and disarm the free world by stressing their peaceful intentions while intensifying their attempt to conquer through infiltration rather than through an open attack. It could be that the Supreme Court is not fraid of the danger of Soviet infiltration through actions of the Communist conspiracy because some of our Justices have shortsightedly accepted the opinion of the Fund for the Republic, the opinion which maintains that the Communist Party is nothing else but a political party of the United States just as is the Democratic Party or the Republican Party. That opinion was clearly and unequivocally stated in the report of the Fund for the Republic, dated May 31, 1955, a report for which Mr. Robert M. Hutchins, the fund's president, must accept responsibility.

In spite of congressional findings made in two legislative enactments, the Internal Security Act of 1950 and the Communist Control Act of 1954, where on the basis of irrefutable proof it was found that "the Communist Party of the United States, although purportedly a political party, is in fact an instrumentality of a conspiracy to overthrow the Government of the United States"—Mr. Hutchins and his research specialists arrived at the opposite conclusion.

What the Congress found is, of course, of little interest to the Fund for the Republic and I wish therefore to invite their attention to a most recent pronouncement coming from a source to which they might want to give more credence. I have in mind a major pronouncement printed in the official organ of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, Pravda, just a few days ago, on July 16, 1956.

On that day, Pravda sounded a warning to the free world in general and to the United States in particular. Said Pravda:

"One should remember that among people who are insufficiently mature politically and excessively credulous, there may be some who would fall for the contention that international connections of Communist par-

ties became superfluous. The consolidation of international connections is a historical necessity both for the working class parties of the lands of socialism and for the Marxist parties of all capitalist countries."

If you strip that Marxist "gobbledegook" of its dialectical embellishments and if you translate it into plain english, it simply means that Communist parties of both the captive and the free nations remain but a foreign branch or an arm of the Soviet Union. Accordingly, to treat persons disloyal to the United States because of their adherence to the international communist conspiracy simply as persons who disagree with us on certain political issues, just as anyone of you, or I, myself, would disagree with a Republican or with a Democrat, is simply a case of suicidal folly.

Mr. Hutchins, of course, and some of the occupants of our Supreme Bench do not agree with that. However, in judging whether or not Communists and their sympathizers are agents of the Soviet Union and of the international Communist conspiracy, I prefer to accept Pravda's expert word rather than that of Mr. Hutchins. I feel today as if I should be making an award to you because after all it is you who are leading the fight to win the cold war in which it is my privilege to make some contribution. The things that are being done today by the committee of which I happen to be chairman are merely those things which have been of interest to our great organization for so long a time. I say with all the sincerity at my command it is you who should be receiving the award today because you have been steadfast in this cold war and I am sure that by your remaining steadfast we are going to win it, despite the opposition we find from many places today.

Wanted: A Reception Committee When Red China Is Admitted to the United Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 16, 1956

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, my attention has been called to an article that appeared in the Evening Star some weeks ago which I believe is pertinent to the proposed admission of Red China to the United Nations.

Mr. Speaker, the writer suggests that a reception committee be organized of the families, relatives, and friends of our 33,000 killed and 103,000 wounded in Korea. This would, indeed, be a proper reception for the occasion. At this point, I am inserting the letter referred to:

REJECTS RED CHINA

After an evening of radio news one is convinced that the good old American proletariat is being air-conditioned as to our recognition of Communist China and Red China admission into the United Nations. If and when these are accomplished, I suggest:

Instead of a smiling striped pants brigade at the airport, why not a reception committee of the families, relatives, and friends of our 33,000 killed and 103,500 wounded in Korea? If not enthusiastic gathering, it would at least be numerically impressive.

The American Legion, Catholic War Veterans, Veterans of Foreign Wars and other patriotic organizations could form a guard of honor and escort the delegation to the United Nations temple.

Then one of our outstanding liberal statesmen could deliver an address of welcome and present the Chinese Communist Ambassador to the United Nations with the usual gold key.

This time a key to the back door. For it is through the back that they will be admitted.

Watch it, Americans.

P. TURNER.

The Story of Plymouth Meeting

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DONALD L. JACKSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 20, 1956

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Philadelphia Inquirer of July 20, 1956:

THE STORY OF PLYMOUTH MEETING

Some years ago there was a play called Guest in the House which showed how one girl, quietly but insidiously, managed to wreck a whole happy household. The heartings of the House Un-American Activities Committee have shown us what one defiant woman—plus $5,000 from the Fund for the Republic—can do to an entire community.

The woman is Mrs. Mary Knowles, hired as librarian for the James Memorial Library despite the fact that she had been linked with Communist organizations by Herbert Philbrick, undercover agent for the FBI, and had taken the fifth amendment when asked about those Red connections.

The community is our neighbor, Plymouth Meeting, which for years was a quiet, easy-going place where there was little dissention and even less personal bitterness and public ill feeling.

The House committee's hearings have shown us how Plymouth Meeting was split over the hiring of Mrs. Knowles, and how the Fund for the Republic intensified the bitterness and dissention by awarding the Plymouth Quaker Meeting $5,000 for what it termed resisting "outside pressure" for dismissal of the librarian.

The House committee hearing also brought out the following truths, to replace former misunderstandings:

First, the Plymouth meeting has been pictured as unanimous in backing up Mrs. Knowles. It is not. Witnesses testified that 61 of the 108 members signed a petition for her removal, and that only 28 of the 108 are known to have approver her hiring.

Second, the so-called outside pressure, far from being a minority protest, resulted in resignation of a library board member after 27 years' service; withdrawal of contributions to the library by Plymouth and Whitemarsh townships; termination of support by the school board and the Community Chest, and resignation of a number of members of the meeting.

Now we come to the action of the Fund for the Republic in injecting itself into what previously had been a community issue. The fund sent a "researcher" to Plymouth meeting. The researcher, with one exception, talked only to persons who favored the hiring of the librarian. She did not inquire into Mrs. Knowles' Communist background. She did not go into the Communist question at all even though it was the heart of the matter.

Following such one-sided research, the Fund for the Republic awarded Plymouth meeting the $5,000. Instead of easing a tense situation, that made it worse. The money was not accepted and is still in escrow. But the effect of the award, as one witness put it, has been "to divide families and friends" and to "stigmatize" Plymouth meeting.

What does all this show us? It reminds us, for one thing, that a fundamental Communist tactic is to divide free world peoples and set them fighting each other. It reveals also that the Fund for the Republic, in its research and in the statement of Mrs. Eleanor B. Stevenson, chairman of the $5,000 award committee, is not concerned with the Communist conspiracy, does not aid in fighting it, and seems quite indifferent to the fact that the results of such actions as this award play into the Communists' hands.

Finally, these hearings show us that at the bottom of this sorry controversy lies not an issue of civil liberties—but rather an issue of whether disloyalty is to be tolerated, condoned, and rewarded, and whether resistance to communism is to be relaxed and weakened within our Nation.

The story of Plymouth meeting is no story of a Midas touch. It is the tale of a Moscow tactic.

Federal Aid to States for School Construction

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACKSON E. BETTS
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 20, 1956

Mr. BETTS. Mr. Speaker, I should like to express briefly my views with respect to the recent consideration of legislation which would provide Federal assistance to the States for school construction. I voted against this measure because of my conviction that our public schools should always be financed and controlled by the smallest governmental body capable of satisfactory performance. My record of 10 years' service in the Ohio Legislature clearly evidences my interest and concern for our schools, and my voting record there will indicate my support of a sound and forward-looking school program.

No evidence was brought before this House that the States have adjusted tax and debt limits or adjusted property valuations so as to provide adequately for their own needs. I am proud, though, of our record in Ohio, which shows that in the 1951–55 period 97.5 percent of all proposed school levies were approved by the voters.

By the provisions written into this bill, Ohio would pay in each year nearly $7 million more than received back in grants. To my way of thinking, it was unfortunate that the so-called Gwinn amendment was not adopted. Under this amendment 1 percent of all Federal revenue collected within a State would be paid to the treasurer of the State for school purposes. Unlike the other two proposals, the funds of the Gwinn amendment would be free of any Federal bureaucratic control.

In the entire area of Federal encroachment into the affairs of the people and

local government, certainly education should stand out as a bulwark in the defense of a free people protecting themselves from an omnipotent Federal Government. It is high time for more do-it-yourself on the home front. It will save time, money, and personnel, while preserving human pride and dignity.

A Friend Grows Stronger

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STYLES BRIDGES
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, July 20, 1956

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial, entitled "A Friend Grows Stronger," which appeared in The Concord Daily Monitor, Concord, N. H., on July 18, 1956, and which I feel will be of interest not only to Members of the Senate, but to the general public as well.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A FRIEND GROWS STRONGER

The Philippines, which celebrated the 10th anniversary of its independence July 4, has just ratified the 1951 San Francisco Peace Treaty With Japan and has also approved an $800 million reparations agreement with Japan. And on the anniversary date Vice President NIXON announced the United States would yield title to its bases in the Philippines, though they continue to be operated by us on long-term leases and will be expanded to meet military requirements.

These agreements with Japan and the United States eliminate principal sources of international irritations in Manila and so contribute to better feelings among the free nations. Incidentally, they will mean modifications of the trade pattern for these three and other nations.

With Japan paying some $800 million in cash, services, and goods as reparations for the damage she did in the Philippines during World War II the trade arrangements with this Pacific neighbor will change in the direction of a much greater exchange of goods. This will to some extent change the character of purchases by Filipinos from the United States, though this country will remain a principal outlet for Philippine sugar, hemp, and coconut products.

Years of free trade with the United States, inaugurated when the Philippines became a part of this country, and continued after independence by mutual agreement, had channeled Philippine trade so greatly in our direction as to tie the economy of the islands very tightly to that of the United States. Prior to the war the Philippines in almost every year had a balance of trade in this exchange of goods, but since the war the balance has been in the other direction and the Philippines has had to resort to exchange controls and quantitative quotas to maintain the value of its currency, which it has managed to do relatively well for a young and comparatively small nation.

The demand for our goods resulted from a combination of the free-trade agreement, the great need for reconstruction of war-damaged capital resources, and the liking of American products cultivated during the nearly half century the Philippines was a part of the United States. The free-trade period ended December 31, 1955, when both United States and Philippines tariff preferences began a progressive decline, until normal tariff relationship will prevail 18 years hence.

With independence there goes responsibility, and the Filipinos are exhibiting a faculty for adjusting to such responsibilities, as the several steps taken in the past year, and particularly this month, indicate. With these steps there also goes a true sense of political equality as between nations, even though one be large and another small.

The Filipinos have had no patience with Communist enticements. But even before China became communistic the Filipinos maintained strong barriers against immigration, especially from the Asian mainland. They felt that if such barriers were not maintained the excessive continental populations would overflow their islands, and they would soon become people without a country through the sheer force of numbers. The Filipinos are only about 22 million, and their homeland is one of the few Asiatic areas of considerable natural resources which is not overpopulated.

There are some 30,000 Americans in the Philippines, and Americans have investments in the islands which total in excess of $350 million. Though our trade pattern with the Philippines will inevitably change, our nationals and this country will still have a large part in the economic development of this nation across the Pacific.

It was a strange quirk of international circumstances which took us into these islands at the turn of the century, when they were still so far away and so alien, but time has proven it was probably a most fortunate occurrence for both our peoples.

Uprising in Poznan, Poland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. DODD
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 20, 1956

Mr. DODD. Mr. Speaker, the uprising in Poznan, Poland, has electrified the free world.

Thus far, the Government of the United States has failed to take full advantage of this great opportunity presented by the Polish patriots.

We have offered to supply free food, but we have done no more.

When the uprising in East Germany took place June 17, 1953, we also offered food and did no more.

Obviously, we have failed to develop a dynamic program which will meet these situations as they arise.

We appear to stand paralyzed today in the face of Communist aggression as we have stood for several years.

I have today sent a telegram to the Secretary of State in which I ask him to take stronger steps to help the Poznan people.

In my telegram, I suggest that the United States demand the release of the names of those who will be tried for participation in the revolt, and I have also suggested that the United States demand that Western observers be present at any trials which may be held.

These are definite and concrete things that we can offer to do.

An alert administration should think of many more opportunities which this situation presents to the cause of freedom in the world.

My telegram to Secretary of State Dulles reads as follows:

HON. JOHN FOSTER DULLES,
Secretary of State,
Washington, D. C.:

I respectfully urge that our Ambassador to the United Nations bring to the attention of the United Nations Security Council the uprising in Poznan, Poland. I particularly urge that our Ambassador impress upon the representatives of Communist Poland in the United Nations that the United States and the free world will watch with great interest the way in which the brave men and women of Poznan are treated by the Communist Government of Poland. I specifically urge that the United Nations institute an investigation of continued Communist oppression in Poland. I respectfully call to your attention a recent statement by General Bor concerning the Poznan revolt. General Bor suggests that we should demand the release of the names of those who will be tried for participation in the revolt, and he also suggests that we demand that Western observers be present at any trials that may be held. I respectfully urge that you accept both of these recommendations made by General Bor.

THOMAS J. DODD,
Member of Congress.

Mr. Sam and Mr. Joe

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM L. SPRINGER
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 20, 1956

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, we all know that Syracuse University recently honored our distinguished Speaker, Mr. RAYBURN, and our beloved minority leader, Mr. MARTIN, by conferring upon them the degree of doctor of laws.

On the occasion of a luncheon on June 4, 1956, at Syracuse University, R. Smith composed a poem entitled "Mr. SAM and Mr. JOE."

In these words the author certainly expresses so well the feeling of this House toward these two distinguished gentlemen who have cooperated over the years in so many ways in behalf of our great country. I am sure all the Members will take great delight in reading this poem.

My good friend, William P. Trolley, the chancellor of Syracuse University, sent it to me and I received it only today in the mail.

The poem follows:

MR. SAM AND MR. JOE
(By R. Smith)

Mr. SAM and Mr. JOE.
They come as two, as one they go
The weal of each the other's woe—
Mr. JOE and Mr. SAM

Mr. SAM and Mr. JOE
In public butt like any ram
But privately each is a lamb—
Mr. JOE and Mr. SAM.

One for the money, two for the show
Three to make ready, and four to go:
Whistle each triumph but whistle it low:
Honorable SAM and Honorable JOE.

How yields this miracle of strife: that two times two is five?
It yields when great men greatly strive,
When compromise is kept alive—
'Tis then that justice thrives.

To Dr. JOE and Dr. SAM our glasses now we raise:
To each and both let us invoke unnumbered happy days—
That party strife may justice raise,
And sportsmanship grace all our ways!

The Radford Proposals

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEVERETT SALTONSTALL
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, July 20, 1956

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article by Walter Lippmann, published in the Washington Post on July 19, entitled "The Radford Proposals." I believe it is the most discerning exposition concerning those proposals that I have read.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TODAY AND TOMORROW
(By Walter Lippmann)
THE RADFORD PROPOSALS

There are going on inside the Government two big arguments about military policy. The one has been brought into the open through the Symington subcommittee, prompted, it seems plain enough, by high but not the very highest officers of the Air Force. This argument is about whether the money asked for by the administration is enough to keep us ahead of the Soviet Union in the ultimate nuclear weapons. Out of this argument has come the action of Congress in voting $900 million more for the Air Force than the President asked for.

The second argument, which was brought into the open in dispatches by Mr. Anthony Leviero, turn on proposals by Admiral Radford to reduce the Armed Forces by about 800,000 men during the coming 3 years. This would mean a smaller Army but one armed with more deadly modern weapons. The Radford doctrine would give up the idea of being prepared to fight large local wars, like the Korean, with conventional, that is to say without nuclear, weapons.

There is a connection between the two arguments. It is that the cost of maintaining both kinds of military power would be prohibitive. It is not possible as the cost of weapons rises to keep up two military establishments—one for a world war and one for local wars, one with the big nuclear armaments and the other a powerful but conventional Army, Navy, and Air Force. It would mean that both military establishments would be second rate. Insofar as the Radford proposals face up to the dilemma, they will have a sympathetic hearing.

For the general public the most serious question is raised by those who make the following argument. Now that the U. S. S. R. and the United States of America have reached a stalemate in nuclear weapons, neither will dare to use them. This will mean that military aggression with conventional weapons—like that of the North Koreans—can be undertaken without fear of nuclear penalties. It is necessary, therefore, to be ready to resist conventional aggression with a conventional Army, Navy, and Air Force.

Without saying that it is theoretically impossible, it seems to me most unlikely that a war as big as the Korean war, which concerned the U. S. S. R. and the United States of America, could ever be fought again without the use of nuclear weapons. The chances would be very great that small atomic bombs would be followed by bigger bombs and these by still bigger ones. The chances of general war would be so great that a local war on the Korean scale would be an incalculable military risk. It is not absolutely certain but it is very probable that for the visible future wars of this type will be absorbed into the overall nuclear stalemate. This calculation should not prove to be an imprudent risk.

The assumption which lies at the root of the argument is that the alternative to general nuclear war is local conventional war. I wonder. It seems to me that the real alternative is first guerrilla warfare and second, political infiltration and maneuver. Against neither of these kinds of warfare are the conventional American military forces prepared to be effective.

What fighting there is in the world today is in Algeria and in Cyprus and in Palestine. Such guerrilla warfare can be an effective kind of warfare in a sense that it wins concessions. But it is not the kind of warfare for which American military power, nuclear or conventional, is prepared or even designed.

It follows, I believe, that if ever our vital interests are involved in an outbreak of local violence and disorder, for example in the Middle East, we shall not again do what we did in Korea. We shall not engage ourselves in a big land war on the other side of the world. We shall remember that we are a sea and an air power, and we shall tailor the shape of our intervention to the character of our military forces.

We are vulnerable in Germany, in Japan, in Vietnam, in Korea and in Formosa, not to military aggression but to political infiltration and maneuver. Red China is working to make a deal with the Chinese in Formosa, and who can be at all confident that they will not succeed, if not now behind Chiang's back then later on when Chiang goes? The same kind of thing is underway behind Dr. Syngman Rhee's back in South Korea and behind Diem's in South Vietnam. In Germany negotiations with the East are not very far off and once Dr. Adenauer retires, they are certain to take place.

The critics of the Radford thesis, who want to maintain conventional forces big enough to fight another Korean war, may fairly be asked at what place, where our interests are at stake, a war of the Korean type might break out. This is a fair question because a military establishment has to be designed for a war with a particular adversary. It cannot be designed for any kind of war anywhere with anybody. Our strategic Air Force is designed for a particular war. But is not the plea of those who believe that we must also have big conventional forces prepared for another Korean war a case of preparing for a war that is past?

Investigation of Foreign Capital

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. DODD
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 20, 1956

Mr. DODD. Mr. Speaker, on March 23, 1955, I introduced a resolution which called for a full and complete investigation of the growing practice in the United States of raiding established business enterprises, especially those engaged in national-defense work.

Under the resolution which I introduced, an investigation would have been instituted to determine the identity of the persons engaging in raiding practices and the sources of the money used by them and the effect of these activities on the defense production capacity of the United States and on the national economy.

Mr. Speaker, on that day in March of 1955 when I addressed this House, I urged that this resolution be adopted and I tried to point out the great danger which I thought confronted us at that time.

It is of great interest, therefore, that in today's issue of the New York Herald Tribune there appears a front-page article written by Mr. Don Whitehead, which tells of an investigation now under way by an appropriate committee of the Senate which is seeking to "unravel the mystery of what happened to untold billions of dollars of foreign capital which entered the United States during the last few years and then disappeared."

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased that the other body has taken up this important question, and my only regret is that this House did not adopt my resolution which was introduced more than 16 months ago, for I believe, Mr. Speaker, that a thorough investigation of this situation is long overdue.

Very recently Mr. Victor Riesel also published an article dealing with this same subject matter.

As a matter of interest to my colleagues, I attach the article by Mr. Don Whitehead and the article by Mr. Victor Riesel:

[From the New York Herald Tribune of July 20, 1956]

UNITED STATES FLOOD OF FOREIGN CAPITAL ON—SENATE GROUP PROBES MYSTERY

(By Don Whitehead)

WASHINGTON, July 19.—Senate investigations are seeking today to unravel the mystery of what happened to untold billions of dollars of foreign capital which entered the United States during the last few years and then disappeared.

Preliminary inquiries have developed the strong suspicion that the untraced funds have been used to an increasing degree to buy "hidden" control of some American companies and to gain at least a voice in the management of others which have important national defense contracts.

BEGAN IN 1951

A Senate Internal Security subcommittee headed by Senator OLIN JOHNSTON, Democrat, of South Carolina, has a staff of investigators, tax experts and economists checking into this now-you-see-it-and-now-you-don't financial shell game.

The investigation has gone far enough, Senate sources say, to make it clear that an unusual flight of foreign capital into the United States began in 1951 and has been increasing in volume. Most of it has been coming through Switzerland and Canada but no one can say who owns the money or controls the investments it has bought.

"This money may be entirely legitimate money," one source said, "and it may be that it is being used legally. But we can't say where this money is today except in a few cases and we don't know the owners."

Investigators do know that in 1950 about $1 billion was transferred out of France and

Italy into Uruguay. The Uruguayan economy, these sources say, was unable to absorb any such amount. As a result, it was transferred into Mexico, and then into the United States.

ACTIVITIES HIDDEN

In each movement of the money, they said, the owners' identities were hidden by numbered bank accounts—and the transfers were by number only.

There is concern not only in the Senate but in other agencies of the Government and in some parts of the business world over the amount of capital within the United States whose ownership is hidden.

The Senate subcommittee already has pointed out the potential danger of a Communist infiltration into the United States financial world, using Russia's vast gold reserves to buy into companies having defense contracts.

NO EVIDENCE YET

As yet, the Senate investigators are reported to have found no evidence that such a penetration has begun.

The subcommittee's aim as outlined by a committee source is this:

1. To discover where the foreign-controlled money has been invested and who the true owners are.

2. To close any tax loopholes by which the foreign owners are paying a disproportionate share of the income taxes.

The Senate group's inquiries indicate that in some cases American citizens have been employed as directors in companies without being aware that the companies actually are controlled by foreign interests operating through a brokerage, bank, or fictitious name.

ENTITLED TO KNOW

A source close to the investigation said: "Perhaps the owners of this foreign capital have nothing to hide. But it seems to us that the American taxpayer and stockholder is entitled to know who these people are and who are the true owners of the stocks that have been bought."

Next Tuesday the Senate subcommittee will hear testimony from Defense Department witnesses. They will be questioned about their knowledge of "hidden" ownership of companies which have vital defense contracts.

REDS PLOT FINANCIAL GRIP ON UNITED STATES FIRMS

(By Victor Riesel)

NEW YORK.—Two American financial wizards linked by the Senate with Communist spy rings, have infiltrated Wall Street and today are working for big investment firms.

It is believed that their assignment is to spot vital production firms and direct Soviet efforts to buy them up and tie them into the Russians' espionage and sabotage network in the United States.

Government officials in and out of the cloak-and-dagger business believe such plants have been purchased through camouflaged investors—using some of the $13,800,000,000 which has poured into the United States from abroad.

About $2 billion of these funds are from Swiss banks which are impenetrable. These banks don't have to show their records to anyone—not anyone, anywhere.

PROBE BY SENATE

A special two-man subcommittee of the Senate Internal Security Committee believes that some of these funds have been used to give Soviet agents entry into several strategic companies which have been taken over under circumstances which are not readily understood. So, they're investigating.

What must be understood is that any key knowledge of what American industry is producing is as vital in espionage as knowledge of even the most secret defense plant production know-how. Give an even half-brained intelligence headquarters such industrial knowledge and it will know where we are deploying our forces, where we are putting our heaviest concentration, where we are prepared to meet assault, where our bottlenecks are, and what unions to infiltrate so that slowdowns and sabotage can be ordered to hurt us.

Dr. Arthur Bloomfield, senior economist of the New York Federal Reserve Bank, pointed out that it was technically possible for hidden investors abroad to buy up our factories, but said he had no personal knowledge of any such coups.

WALL STREET SOVIETEERS

But there are Senators who have. Neither they, nor I, will name the two Sovieteers who work high on Wall Street today. I can't even give their initials here.

One has been linked by Government investigators to the notorious Victor Perlo spy ring.

The other, according to congressional records, set up the structure of Communist penetration of the Government by men identified as Communist underground agents.

But these two Red Wall Streeters are just a couple out of scores of others who are penetrating United States industry through a series of special survey, inventory, and industrial economic agencies which gather more vital statistics about the United States in 1 year than we get Soviet promises of good behavior in Moscow.

And for all this the Soviets can spend freely. It costs nothing but gold. And they've lots of that counterrevoluntionary stuff.

State of President Eisenhower's Health

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN LESINSKI, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 18, 1956

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, serious questions are being raised about the techniques being used to sell the American public the idea that the present incumbent of the White House is well and quite capable of carrying on the duties of the Presidency. The Republican promotion campaign may be convincing some, but not all are being fooled. Even some of the newspapers that have stanchly supported Mr. Eisenhower in the past are beginning to show evidence of doubt. As an example of this, I should like to quote the following article from the July 17, 1956, issue of the Boston Post:

NO GREAT SURPRISE

There was never very much doubt after President Eisenhower survived the ileitis operation that he would be a candidate for a second term, for all the considerable weight of the White House promotional planning apparatus was thrown into the task of preparing the country for the announcement.

* * * * *

The purpose of this, of course, is to have the announcement come from one of the GOP right wing stalwarts and thus help heal the breach between the right wing and the liberal wing of the GOP.

But, the almost hysterical assurances of great surprise at the announcement are strictly synthetic, for it is no great surprise. It was expected all along.

First, there were the assurances from doctors, surgeons, and medical pundits that the operation was a great success and the President was healthier than ever. Then the daily bulletins on the improvement of the President's general health, which, through constant reiteration, created an atmosphere of extreme confidence in the President's strength and endurance.

This is in no way an unprecedented technique. Something of the same approach to a health problem was utilized in the fourth-term campaign of President Roosevelt when he was paraded through the rain in New York and Brooklyn. Indeed, the fact that Roosevelt was increasingly confined to a wheelchair was consciously deemphasized during the last years of the Roosevelt administration.

It is important to point out, however, that the promotional technique is being used, and that the President's health is a real factor and a grave problem for the American people to consider. It cannot be brushed off on the basis of a promotional selling device.

The unvarnished fact is that President Eisenhower has survived a coronary attack, which curtailed his activity, and an ileitis operation, which further curtailed his activity, and that he is now convalescent. His fitness to run for a second term is something only he can judge. He seems to feel that he is capable and fit.

His fitness to serve for a second term is something that the American people have got to determine at the polls in November. And they are entitled to all the facts, which, to a degree, they have had. But the American people are also entitled to know that the manner in which all the facts have been presented is circumscribed by a promotional planning technique, which leaves considerable information in fine print, like the ingredients of a food package under food and drug law requirements.

The announcement from Gettysburg was no surprise. It would have been more surprising if he declined. His health is still a factor. And the state of any candidate's health, Democrat or Republican, is an important consideration.

What Is the Eisenhower Administration Trying To Do to the Seat-of-Government Concept Decreed by Article I of the Constitution?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 19, 1956

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, among all the subjects confronting Congress in the closing days of the present session, few are as important to our Nation as the problem I am about to outline. With concern over it mounting in the national press, in local government, and among citizens everywhere, it deserves immediate legislative attention and action.

I refer to the unplanned, uncoordinated, and thoroughly political manner in which Federal agencies are presently being permitted to move out of Washington. Because Government is the No. 1 industry of our Capital City, the net

effect of this trend, if allowed to continue, could be to turn Washington into a ghost city.

Washington has been aptly characterized in a recent magazine article as "the pride of every good American and in reality the capital of the free world." It is your city and mine. To most of us in this Congress, its stately buildings and leafy avenues symbolize a second home.

To millions of tourists its gleaming monuments are reminders of our Nation's glorious past. To visitors from other parts of the world, Washington stands as a constant symbol of liberty and freedom—and of hope that these priceless attributes may someday be attained by the enslaved millions of the world.

Yet today, the security of this, the world's most important Capital City, is threatened by an indiscriminate flight of Federal agencies to the suburbs. Although this threat is less dramatic than that posed by the H-bomb and intercontinental ballistic missile, it can, if allowed to continue, have the same effect over the long term.

You can find the problem outlined in headlines of the day: "City of Washington in Trouble," U. S. News & World Report, July 6, 1956; "United States Agencies Join Rush to Suburbs," New York Times, July 15, 1956; "Undermining the Capital," Washington Star, June 12, 1956; "Agencies Scored for Leaving District of Columbia," Washington Post and Times Herald.

I shall quote briefly from some of these news stories and editorials. On July 15, a New York Times story bearing a Washington dateline announced:

> The largest Federal construction program in years is underway with proposed and approved projects involving more than $400 million in the Washington area alone. And, like many citizens of this town, more of the Federal agencies are turning to the suburbs for their new homes. * * *
>
> All this, agency officials will explain, is because it is Government policy to disperse for defense reasons, there are few suitable sites left in Washington, and the modern buildings they want to build would run into trouble with the Fine Arts Commission.
>
> But there is suspicion among some Members of Congress that agency officials, who generally have had free rein in selecting their sites, simply want "hunt country" to work in with plenty of free parking space and plenty of lawn.
>
> The trend is causing some concern. Homeowners in the countryside are complaining. Businessmen in the city are protesting that the trend could be disastrous to Washington's economy.

A similar concern was voiced by the Washington Star in its lead editorial on June 12:

> The public generally (has) cause to be concerned over what seems to be happening to the original concept of Washington as the Nation's seat of Government. That time-honored concept is seriously threatened by a movement in some Government circles toward abandoning the District as a site of Federal activities in favor of decentralized locations in the suburbs and beyond.
>
> Equally disturbing is the apparent lack of a national policy governing so-called relocation. Heads of agencies have been given free rein, as a rule, in choosing sites for their new homes. It is all very haphazard, with planning agencies often assigned to subordinate roles.

And in its lead editorial for June 14, the Washington Post and Times Herald scored the "current confused relocation policy" which bases final decision for moving Federal agencies out of Washington on "the whims and preferences of individual agency heads."

REASONS FOR CONCERN

There is ample reason for this growing concern. The city of Washington, with its thousands of white-collar workers, small-home owners and small-business men, depends upon governmental activities for its very existence. Federal Government in this area accounts for nearly half of all employment. It also sustains a host of small businesses which exist to service Federal workers.

Directly or indirectly, Government accounts for the bulk of Washington's retail sales, rental payments and other basic activities. We already see a spiraling budget and falling revenues in the city—both largely caused by a population movement to the suburbs. We see Congress forced to refuse desperate requests from the District Commissioners for increased funds. Take away the operations of the Federal Government and Congresss share of maintaining our capital city would increase to truly astronomical proportions.

These budget requests point up the disturbing fact that Washington is already in trouble. As the U. S. News & World Report put it in the magazine's lead article on July 6:

> The visitor, captivated by the Capitol's lovely panorama and awed by the power that emanates from its portals, does not see the layers of troubles—governmental, social, financial—that are piling up to overburden the Nation's first city.

Yet these difficulties exist. In large part they are similar to the socioeconomic headaches suffered by other major cities. They include the familiar flight to the suburbs on the part of city families, the dwindling tax base, the traffic congestion, the rapidly mounting financial burdens and so on.

Today, gentlemen, I could take you only four blocks from where we sit in this Chamber and show you some of the worst slums in the Nation—houses without running water, and whose residents are forced to use outdoor toilets.

All of these problems are magnified by Washington's lack of any vote or true government of its own. They would be far worse were it not for the bolstering effect upon the local economy exerted by operations of the Federal Government.

It is against this background that a growing number of agency heads are deciding to relocate their departments outside the District. At least six major agencies are presently hoping to move. They include:

The Central Intelligence Agency, which plans to build a $56 million building near Langley, Va.

The Atomic Energy Commission, which has started work on its new $10 million headquarters near Germantown, Md.

The National Bureau of Standards, which is planning a $40 million home near Gaithersburg, Md.

The Weather Bureau and the Coast and Geodetic Survey, which are planning a joint $31 million building near Gaithersburg, Md.

The Geological Survey, which would like to construct another building, costing $23 million somewhere on the Potomac River in Maryland.

Still other agency officials are considering the possibilities of relocation. For example, there has reportedly been serious talk within the Navy Department about moving to the Midwest.

How this will affect the Nation's Capital in loss of population is summarized in the New York Times article from which I quoted previously:

> One estimate is that if all the proposals for the Federal agency exodus were adopted, some 50,000 residents of Washington would move out. Washington over recent years has lost a number of Federal employees to outlying areas, what with the Pentagon in Virginia and the National Institutes of Health and the Census Bureau in Maryland.

Now, on the basis of the best estimates available, it takes at least one person to service each governmental employee in Washington. Add to this the fact that, according to Census officials, the average Federal worker represents a family of three. This means that, for each Federal employee affected by relocation, at least four other individuals would be indirectly affected. And if 50,000 employees moved out of Washington, as the New York Times estimates they would, 200,000 people—or nearly one-third of the total population—would feel the consequences.

The President of the American Baptist Convention

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, July 20, 1956

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, Dr. Harry L. Dillin, the distinguished president of Linfield College, in McMinnville, Oreg., was recently honored by his election in Seattle as president of the American Baptist Convention.

Dr. Dillin, the second westerner to be honored by the American Baptist Convention as its president in 50 years came west to Oregon 25 years ago, and was named president of Linfield College in 1943 when he was 36, the youngest college president in the United States.

Linfield College, under the dynamic leadership of Dr. Dillin, has grown rapidly in size and prestige. Dr. Dillin has been noted for his civic work as well as his role as a college president, and has also served for two years as president of the Oregon Baptist Convention.

Also honored at the recent Seattle convention was Earl White, a Portland attorney and member of the First Baptist Church, who was named a commissioner of the American Baptist Convention.

Mr. President, Dr. Dillin is the second Oregonian within a year to be named head of his church. Dr. Paul S. Wright, pastor of the First Presbyterian Church of Portland, was elected moderator of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church, U. S. A.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an excellent biographical sketch of Dr. Harry L. Dillin by William Hilliard, religious editor, from the Oregonian of July 15, 1956.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEW BAPTIST LEADER GAINS RENOWN IN BUSINESS, EDUCATION

(By William Hillard)

A little man eminently capable of doing a big job—that's Dr. Harry Leslie Dillin, dynamic president of Linfield College and new head of the American Baptist convention.

The 48-year-old college preident was elected president of the large Baptist body 3 weeks ago at the convention's annual session in Seattle. He will be president for 1 year.

Dr. Dillin, an active Baptist since childhood, is only the second westerner to gain the presidency in the 50-year history of the convention.

Oddly enough, the only other westerner was elected at the only other meeting in the Pacific Northwest. Corwin Shank was named head of the convention in 1924 in Seattle.

Dr. Dillin, who stands 5 feet 7½ inches tall is one of the youngest men to be named president of the convention and only the second college president to head the group.

Born in the east, he came West 25 years ago to teach math and economics at Linfield for 1 year and to "see the cowboys and Indians." After a summer vacation in the East, he wired the college to see if his job was still open, found it was and has been at Linfield since.

Dr. Dillin was graduated from Columbia University, New York, cum laude in 1928. He followed this with graduate work at the University of North Carolina, where he had been accepted for a teaching fellowship. He also has done individual research work at the Universities of London and Michigan.

He received an honorary doctor of law degree from University of Redlands, Redlands, Calif., in 1944 in recognition of his outstanding and meritorious service in the field of Christian education.

His rise to the presidency of Linfield was comparatively swift. He was appointed professor of economics in 1936 and 2 years later he was made controller of the college. In 1941 he was made controller-business manager.

SUCCESS COMES EARLY

When named president of the school in 1943, Dr. Dillin as only 36 and was declared by the trustees who elected him to be the youngest college president in the United States. At the time he was named president he was professor of mathematics and economics, business manager-controller and investment analyst.

In addition to his teaching duties he was tennis and golf coach. His court teams won more than 100 collegiate matches and for a number of years he held the course record for 9 holes at Riverwood golf course, disrupting part with a sizzling 31—5 strokes under par. Dr. Dilling recalls his coaching days as "the great joys of my years."

Still athletically inclined but unable to find the time for golf and slowed down too much for tennis, Dr. Dillin has taken up water skiing and spends his spare time at the family's cottage at Devil's Lake practicing his new-found sport love.

COLLEGE GROWS RAPIDLY

Under Dr. Dillin's leadership, Linfield College has grown tremendously. He has taken part in the building or renovation of all but one of Linfield's 19 buildings. Two dormitories are under construction and will be ready for occupancy this fall. The school supervises all of its construction work, including awarding of contracts and buying of all materials.

When the American Baptist Convention elected Dr. Dillin, it reached out for a man well trained in leadership. He is a member of numerous organizations and has inevitably assumed the leadership of almost every one of them.

He is a member of Phi Beta Kappa, Pi Gamma Mu and an associate member of Sigma Psi.

In McMinnville he is a member of the chamber of commerce and a past president of the Rotary club. He was district No. 154 governor of Rotary International in 1953. He is a deacon of First Baptist Church in McMinnville and has served on the board of trustees.

COLLEGE POSTS HELD

In addition, Dr. Dillin has served as president of the Association of Independent Colleges of Oregon and chairman of the Foundation of Oregon Colleges and the Pacific Northwest Athletic Conference. He also serves on two commissions of the American Association of Colleges and is chairman of the board of directors of the newly created Linfield Research Institute.

Working with the American Baptist Convention will be nothing new to him. He served as president of the Oregon Baptist Convention for 2 years and was elected last year to a term on the general council of the American Baptist Convention.

First hint of any move to nominate him for president was heard by Dr. Dillin in 1955 at the convention's meeting in Atlantic City. Dr. Dillin addressed the convention on education. Following his speech, he was approached by some delegates who thought he should consider the president's post. Dr. Dillin didn't take them seriously then.

This year is a year of reorganization in the convention and Dr. Dillin thinks this move was instrumental in his promotion for the presidency.

EDUCATION TO BE STRESSED

"I think the people who promoted me were looking for men with a background in business and organization," Dillin surmised. "And, too, I believe the convention wanted to highlight education as a means of stimulating interest among church people to strengthen colleges."

Dr. Dillin said the American Baptist convention is constructed loosely of a central organization "very disorganized." Much emphasis is given individual interpretation of the scriptures and local autonomy, he said.

Under Dr. Dillin, the convention will seek to unify. At the Seattle meeting the first step in this direction was taken when the general council was upped from 36 to 42 members and the council was augmented with the creation of a coordinating staff, equally divided with laymen and clergymen.

In line with the reorganization program, it will be Dr. Dillin's duty to name nine people as commissioners to reevaluate and to study the work of reorganization in the convention and to report to the national body at the 1957 meeting in Philadelphia. The commissioners will make their final report at the annual meeting in 1958 and at that time recommend further steps to be taken in the reorganization program.

One of the commissioners will be Earl White, a Portland attorney and member of First Baptist church (White temple).

The "go go go" president of Linfield—or "fireball" as he is sometimes called by his students—has a full year ahead of him as president of the convention.

As chief officer, he will preside at all meetings of the convention and of the general council and will exercise general supervision over the affairs of the convention, a body representing a membership of 1,500,000 in approximately 6,500 churches in 34 States and the District of Columbia.

He takes off Sunday for meetings in Chicago and Greenlake, Wis., on the first round of activity that will keep him constantly on the go for a year.

At home will remain his wife, Irene, and two children, Harry Leslie, Jr., 14., and Kathleen, 12. A third child, John, 20, is a sophomore at Trinity University in San Antonio, Tex.

Dr. Dillin is the second Oregon man within a year to be named head of his denomination. In 1955 Dr. Paul S. Wright, pastor of First Presbyterian church, was elected moderator of the general assembly of the Presbyterian Church, U. S. A.

Lawrence F. Whittemore

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. NORRIS COTTON
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, July 20, 1956

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, one of the outstanding citizens of New Hampshire whose fame and influence extends far beyond the limits of our State is Lawrence F. Whittemore.

Mr. Whittemore is a former president of the New York, New Haven, & Hartford Railroad; former president of the Federal Reserve Bank of Boston; and former president, and now chairman of the board, of the Brown Co., at Berlin, N. H. The directorates upon which he serves and his business connections are far too many to enumerate here. He has long been a leader in the civic, educational, and political life of our State and of New England.

An interesting and inspiring bit of biography appears under the caption "Turning Points," in Dun's Review for July 1956. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TURNING POINTS

What makes a man successful? The question has always defied glib answers and is most profitably explored on an individual basis. In most men's experience major decisions translated into action have proved to be at least turning points. Mr. Warren Vierow has asked several major business leaders to relate the personal decisions that did the most to place them on the path toward success.

Here is one of the answers:

L. F. Whittemore: "After returning from World War I in 1919, I found an opportunity to work for the New Hampshire State Tax Commission as an accountant. In 1922 the chairman of that commission put me in charge of an estate carrying on an active lumber business doing about a million dollars a year. I was at that time 28 years old and, while I had worked in the woods,

I was without experience as a lumber manufacturer. I ran that estate for 3 years, successfully, I think, but when the estate was settled, the family of the deceased took over. I decided to leave them although we were close friends and have remained so ever since.

"The Supreme Court of New Hampshire appointed me tax commissioner of the State before I was 31 years old. At the end of 5 years I decided that this endeavor did not offer enough of a career, since in the meantime I had started a lumber business of my own with a partner.

"At first we rode high on the wings of success, in a small way but significant to youngsters. Our main outlet happened to be a company which manufactured chairs through prison labor. Congress suddenly passed an act forbidding shipment of prison-made goods in interstate commerce. All contracts were canceled at a very embarrassing time for us. I learned what 'force majeure' meant in that way. The losses were relatively heavy, and the growing Whittemore family went on a strict budget for a number of years. At least one-third of my gross earnings were applied to eradicating bank loans. Probably that experience coming in 1929 and 1930 did more to influence my business career than any other. The habit of budgeting expenditures became ingrained in our family and we have all lived on that basis since. It has been productive of savings and of thought habits which led to a sense of well-being I had not previously thought important.

"The determination to pay off my obligations rather than seek the ease and comfort of bankruptcy helped establish my reputation to the extent that I was asked to be a director of one of the banks to which I was indebted."

Statement of Andrew J. Biemiller, Legislative Representative, American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations Before the Senate Judiciary Committee on Civil Rights Legislation, May 25, 1956

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES ROOSEVELT
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 20, 1956

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, as promised in the debate of the Committee of the Whole, I include the following statement for the information of interested Members:

STATEMENT OF ANDREW J. BIEMILLER, LEGISLATIVE REPRESENTATIVE, AMERICAN FEDERATION OF LABOR AND CONGRESS OF INDUSTRIAL ORGANIZATIONS BEFORE THE SENATE JUDICIARY COMMITTEE ON CIVIL RIGHTS LEGISLATION, MAY 25, 1956

Mr. Chairman, my name is Andrew J. Biemiller. I am a legislative representative for the American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations. My office is located at 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C. I appear here today on behalf of that organization. We appreciate this opportunity to testify on this important subject of civil-rights legislation.

The resolution on civil rights adopted at the first constitutional convention of the AFL–CIO last December states:

"The AFL and the CIO have always believed in the principle and practice of equal rights for all, regardless of race, color, creed or national origin. Each federation has separately played a distinguished role in the continuing struggle to realize for all Americans the democratic rights promised to all by the Constitution of the United States.

"The AFL–CIO is similarly pledged and dedicated to promote and defend the civil rights of all Americans. Its constitution declares that one of its objects and principles is—

"'To encourage all workers without regard to race, creed, color or national origin to share in the full benefits of union organization.'

"Another such object and principal of the new federation is:

"'To protect and strengthen our democratic institutions, to secure full recognition and enjoyment of the rights and liberties to which we are justly entitled, and to preserve and perpetuate the cherished traditions of our democracy.'

"Our constitution likewise provides for a committee on civil rights which: 'shall be vested with the duty and responsibility to assist the executive council to bring about at the earliest possible date the effective implementation of the principle stated in this constitution of nondiscrimination in accordance with the provisions of this constitution.'

"Thus the AFL–CIO stands dedicated no less than its predecessors to bring about the full and equal rights for all Americans in every field of life."

The resolution further states:

"The AFL–CIO wholeheartedly supports the decisions of the Supreme Court outlawing segregation in the public schools. We urge all of our affiliated State and local bodies to work with other liberal forces in their communities to facilitate a peaceful and effective transition to an unsegregated American educational system. We urge the administration to utilize the full powers of the Federal Government to frustrate and punish unlawful attempts to block implementation of the Supreme Court's decision.

"We urge the Congress to enact legislation making lynching a Federal crime, and to invalidate State laws requiring the payment of a poll tax as a prerequisite to voting."

That is the general position taken by our organization on this subject of civil rights legislation.

Today I should like to state a little more fully our position with respect to the various specific proposals which are pending before this committee.

First, let us look at the civil rights proposals which have emanated from the administration through the person of Attorney General Brownell.

We are pleased that this administration has seen fit after a little over 3 years in office to turn its attention to this vital subject of civil rights legislation. We are sure that it is only coincidence that this subject is raised in an election year. Unfortunately, however, the administration proposals are not only belated but rather inadequate. Let us look at each of them.

The administration proposes first that there be established a Commission on Civil Rights.

It would be the duty of this Commission:

1. To investigate allegations that certain citizens of the United States are being deprived of the right to vote or are being subjected to unwarranted economic pressures by reason of their color or race;

2. To study developments constituting a denial of the equal protection of the law; and

3. To appraise the laws and policies of the Federal Government with resepct to equal protection of the laws under the Constitution.

While the proposal carefully avoids mentioning the school segregation issue I take it it is not really unrelated to that subject.

We are in favor of an investigation and study of this whole subject of civil rights. We would be happy to see such a study undertaken by appropriate committees of the Congress. If Congress does not care to undertake such a study, we agree with the administration that a public commission should be established.

We feel that such a commission could not accomplish its purpose unless it were composed of eminent and public spirited citizens and is adequately financed and adequately staffed. The bare appointment of a public commission to study a subject accomplishes nothing. A year ago the Congress established a public commission on the subject of internal security. As yet nothing has been forthcoming from that commission except one form letter. A public commission can be used as effectively to thwart action on a subject as to stimulate it.

Point two in the administration civil-rights program is the establishment in the Department of Justice of an additional Assistant Attorney General. Though the bill does not say so, the administration states that this Assistant Attorney General would be in charge of a Civil Rights Division.

While we are in favor of this proposal, it does not strike us as "earth-shaking." It seems more concerned with form than with substance.

We do not think it particularly important what title is given the lawyer in the Department of Justice who is in charge of enforcement of the civil rights laws. We do think it important that an adequate number of attorneys be assigned to this work and that they have the full cooperation of all branches of the Department of Justice both in Washington and throughout the United States.

When Mr. Brownell became Attorney General, the civil-rights section of the Department of Justice consisted of an attorney in charge and eight other attorneys. At the present time it consists of the attorney in charge and seven other attorneys. According to our arithmetic this adds up or subtracts down to a loss of 1 civil-rights attorney in 3 years. If Mr. Brownell is concerned with getting the job done on civil rights by his Department we do not know of anything that now prevents his assigning additional attorneys to this work.

Part 3 of the administration proposal, we are pleased to see, has somewhat more substance. This proposal would do two things. First, it would authorize the Attorney General to bring civil actions to prevent or redress certain acts or practices which violate existing civil rights acts. The existing civil rights laws authorize injured persons to bring civil suits and also authorize criminal prosecutions by the United States. As we understand it, the proposal the Department of Justice offers would not change the substantive provisions of the present law but would only provide for civil suit by the Attorney General.

We are strongly in favor of this proposal for three reasons:

1. The injured individuals are often not in a financial position to institute litigation to redress their own rights.

2. In criminal prosecutions instituted by the United States the trial must under the seventh amendment to the Constitution be before a jury drawn from the locality in which the crime was committed. Experience shows that in certain types of cases—not limited to those involving racial issues—the local juries simply will not convict regardless of the evidence.

3. The remedy of criminal prosecution is further undesirable because it tends to exacerbate the very community tensions which gave rise to the civil rights violation. From this standpoint a suit for an injunction before a Federal judge would be infinitely preferable.

The minority report of the House Judiciary Committee denounces this proposal as

"new", "novel", and "absolutely shocking". Actually, however, most Federal regulatory statutes are enforceable by civil suits for injunction instituted by the United States. There is likewise nothing novel about authorizing the United States to maintain civil suits on behalf of injured private individuals. Such suits are authorized, for example, by the Fair Labor Standards Act, and by the laws according reemployment rights to veterans.

The second branch of part 3 of the Government proposal makes it clear that these civil proceedings to prevent or redress violations of civil rights may be brought in the Federal courts, without regard to whether the injured party "shall have exhausted any administrative or other remedies that may be provided by [State] law."

We are strongly in favor of this provision. To show why we are, let me describe to you a situation which has recently arisen in Dublin, Ga.

The workers in a lumber mill there decided to form a union They asked the AFL–CIO to send an organizer, and we did. The city council, at the instance of local employers, thereupon passed an ordinance establishing an annual license fee for organizers of $2,500. The ordinance also provides that no person shall be granted a license who has not been a citizen of Dublin for 5 years, and that he must sign an oath that he is not a Communist and that "he does not believe in the overthrow of municipal and State laws in regard to segregation." Violation of the ordinance is criminally punishable.

This ordinance is of course unconstitutional: the Supreme Court has many times held such ordinances invalid, and has also held that they violate the civil rights laws. Probably even the ordinance's authors know that it is invalid.

When, however, we go into a Federal district court and seek to enjoin the enforcement of an ordinance like this we are always met with the contention that we must exhaust our remedies in the State courts. This means that our organizer must violate that ordinance, be arrested, go to jail, and take his chances on what will happen after that. These State court proceedings may take 2 or 3 years; and the momentum of the organizing campaign is of course lost during such a period.

It is not, I am advised, clear that this argument that we must exhaust State court remedies is well founded, but it is always advanced and we have had suits dismissed on the basis of it.

The fourth and last point of the administration proposal has to do with providing further protection for the right to vote. As we see it, the main effect of this proposal would be to authorize civil actions by the United States to redress or prevent unconstitutional deprivation of the right to vote. For the reasons we have just given, we are in favor of this proposal also.

In sum, therefore, we are in favor of the civil-rights proposals advanced by the administration. We think they are a step in the right direction. In our view the most important of these proposals are those authorizing civil actions by the United States, which are embodied in S. 903, introduced by Senator HUMPHREY. We strongly urge the enactment of that bill.

Senator HUMPHREY is also the author of S. 900, a Federal antilynching bill. The AFL–CIO convention resolution quoted above unequivocally commits our organization to the support of Federal antilynching legislation.

This is not a new subject. Our predecessor organizations and affiliated unions have testified on it many times over the years. I do not propose now to repeat that testimony. We simply urge that, to afford proper protection to our colored citizens and other minority groups, Congress now enact appropriate antilynching legislation.

We understand that this committee is also considering H. R. 5205, a bill to make it a Federal crime to kill a member of the Armed Forces "while engaged in the performance of his official duties, or on account of the performance of his official duties." This bill has already passed the House.

Section 1114 of the Criminal Code (title 18) now makes it a Federal crime to kill a Federal judge, United States attorney, employee of the FBI, members of the Coast Guard, etc., etc., while engaged in the performance of his official duties, or on account of the performance of his official duties. We see no reason why all members of the Armed Forces should not receive the same protection by Federal law.

In conclusion, I would like to make it clear that we do not view the measures which we have discussed as constituting a complete or adequate civil-rights program. We favor, for example, the enactment of a Federal antipoll-tax law, and a general revision and strengthening of the existing civil-rights laws. On this occasion, however, we have confined our statement to the particular measures which we understand to be pending before this committee.

Thank you.

America's Need for a Ready Reserve

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OVERTON BROOKS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 18, 1956

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I present herewith an able address delivered by a distinguished American. It is entitled "America's Need for a Ready Reserve" and was delivered by Carter L. Burgess, Assistant Secretary of Defense for Manpower, Personnel, and Reserve, before a civic group in the city of Shreveport, La. It was well received and has helped to fully explain our Reserve program in the southwest. It is as follows:

AMERICA'S NEED FOR A READY RESERVE

INTRODUCTION

I am greatly honored at being here in the hospitable city of Shreveport, on what has been a most auspicious and a most enjoyable day.

The beginning of work on your new Air Reserve installation, and the constructive interest shown in it by all levels of the community, indicates to me that presence of sound support for all that our Government is seeking to achieve in military defense. So does the high morale and spirit of the many Reserve and National Guard units which I have been privileged to visit. I am proud that I was able to take part in today's activities and to have the pleasure of meeting so many conscientious citizen soldiers.

CONGRESSMAN BROOKS

Being here this evening affords me the welcome opportunity to offer a few long overdue words of praise and appreciation for a man who has come to exemplify to me the very finest in America's system of representative government. I refer to your able and distinguished Congressman, the Honorable OVERTON BROOKS.

A man who served his country overseas in World War I, and who knows our defense requirements from long years spent in the highest councils of Government, he can rightly be called today the foremost congressional advocate of a sound military Reserve program, and one of the best friends the Reserves and the National Guard ever had. Without his support, his guidance, and his wise counsel—coupled with his willingness to fight for a just and necessary cause—I doubt if we would have the greatly improved Reserve program that is now in operation.

As chairman of the House Armed Services Subcommittee on Reserves, Congressman BROOKS led the legislative effort which resulted in passage of the Reserve Forces Act of 1955. As Congressman CARL VINSON, of Georgia, has so aptly put it, this law might better be called the Brooks Reserve Act since its final passage was largely the result of your Congressman's personal and determined efforts.

On this occasion, therefore, and before this fine audience of his friends and constituents, I wish to salute the Congressman from Shreveport, and to thank him for all he has done to advance the cause of a stronger and better defended America.

THE THREAT WE FACE

With the thought of our country's necessary defenses in mind, I have chosen as my subject here this evening "America's Need for a Ready Reserve." I should like to approach it by considering the nature of the military threat which faces the United States and the free world, and the conditions which this imposes upon us.

We are confronted by potential enemies of great strength. Despite much propaganda concerning forthcoming cuts in their manpower program, the Communist nations remain heavily armed at the present time, and are bending every effort to increase their strength through the perfection of advanced weapons systems.

Right now the Soviet Union has well over 4 million men in uniform, and Red China another 2.5 million. Each has great numbers of trained reserves, swiftly mobilizable, and swiftly deployable. Neither has agreed to any kind of international inspection system.

Actually, if the Soviet Union carries through what it has announced it intends to do, it will only be approaching what the United States has already done.

At the end of World War II, our forces were at a peak level of 12.3 million men. Soviet forces at that time were estimated at 11.5 million.

We then proceeded to reduce sharply to force levels of 3.3 million in 1946, 1.5 million in 1947 and in 1950—before the outbreak of hostilities in Korea—to a postwar low of 1.4 million men.

By 1950, the Soviet Union had reduced to 4.1 million men, or, in other words, had retained three times as high a force level as we had at that time. With Korea, the United States built back to a peak level of 3.6 million men, but today the figure stands at around 2.9 million—a sizable reduction. Added to this is the fact that we have offered to go down to a 2.5 million level with accompanying reductions in armament, provided the Communist bloc is willing to do the same on a verifiable basis.

This offer the Communist leadership has now said it is willing to accept—so far as numbers themselves are concerned. Nothing has been said, however, about the important question of inspection and verification.

What the latest Soviet maneuver will amount to in the long run remains to be seen. Obviously, however, it is plain that the United States and the free world will continue to be confronted by large masses of Communist manpower under arms, backed by well-trained reserves, and bolstered by an all-out program of technological development.

SOVIET WEAPONS DEVELOPMENT

This program of scientific weapons development in Russia is something I'd like to mention in a little greater detail.

Each day, the Soviet Union is adding to its total military power in jet bombers, long-range submarines, missiles, and nuclear weapons. Today the Soviet has an estimated 20,000 aircraft, including more than 1,000 bombers of which several hundred are medium jets, and some are long-range jet and turboprop heavy bombers.

Russia began testing and developing guided missiles shortly after World War II and has been engaged in an intensive missile program since then. Missiles of both short and medium ranges could have been developed by this time, and within a very few years they probably will be able to develop longer range ballistic missiles.

And, finally, it has been announced that last November the Soviet successfully dropped a hydrogen bomb from an aircraft, which indicates that a significant Soviet nuclear-weapons stockpile is being continuously increased.

Taken altogether, a steady, uninterrupted increase in military power rather than a reduction is the basic pattern of Soviet activity today. This power is being enlarged, moreover, by what appears to be a major effort to build up the Nation's standard of living through a broadened industrial and economic base. This effort, coupled with sizable encouragement to scientific research and develpment, could well be moving the Soviet Union forward to modernization at a far more rapid rate than was once thought possible.

When one reflects upon this trend, therefore, and relates it to the semimilitary nature of Russian society and the relative ease with which great reserves of men and equipment could be mobilized, the pattern of power development becomes quite clear.

This is what confronts the United States and its Allies.

AMERICA'S LONG-RANGE ANSWER

I have cited the overall Communist military potential to give emphasis to a particular fact. And that is the long-range and sustained nature of the threat which we face.

Confronted by such a threat, therefore, the United States and its Allies have no choice but to look to their security by providing an equally sustained, and an equally long-range defense—one that recognizes our need to be strong in every sense, militarily, industrially, and economically.

We have such a defense program today, and in cooperation with our Allies, we propose to maintain it. Taken in its entirety, it has proved to be a massive deterrent to war, and a firm foundation from which we can continue to work to advance the cause of freedom throughout the world.

This is a stable program. No longer are we following our one-time policy of dangerous peaks and valleys in our necessary defenses. No longer are we pursuing an up and down policy with respect to necessary spending. The American people are supporting a defense budget of around $35 billion, and the recognize this as an essential level. We are, as the President has many times emphasized, geared for the long pull.

Our program assures us a healthy and diversified economy. We are not maintaining unrealistically large forces which would exert a drastic burden on the American tax structure or lead to undesirable changes in our social order. We are, however, maintaining forces which our best military and civilian judgment believes to be entirely adequate.

This is admittedly a program requiring constant improvement, constant review and constant revision, but granting that, let me assure you that the men in the Kremlin understand full well that the United States is dealing today from a sure position of strength—backed by the resolute will of an entire nation.

We must continue to maintain military forces on active duty sufficient to deter aggression against us or our Allies. In the event we were attacked, however, despite all our efforts for peace, then we must be capable of striking back with tremendous, paralyzing force, enabling us to achieve successful mobilization and move ahead to ultimate victory.

We must be organized to employ the full capacity of our national resources. We must maintain our alliances with friendly nations, assuring them of our steadfastness, and integrating our strength with their own.

We must continue to advance and perfect our technological, economic, and inventive capacity, making certain that the man who wears the American military uniform has the finest weapons and equipment in the world. Here we need to bear in mind that today's needs will not be tomorrow's and that the swiftly changing situation calls for the very ultimate in wise planning and foresight.

With all these requirements in mind, I believe it is accurate to say that the American defense program measure up.

FOR FISCAL 1957

During the new fiscal year, our Armed Forces are going to continue to grow in striking power and effectiveness. The Strategice Air Command is replacing the B–36 with the intercontinental B–52. The carrier force of the Navy is increasing its combat power. Our continental defense system is growing in scope and effectiveness. Our air defense squadrons, already jet equipped, are receiving substantial numbers of supersonic aircraft.

On the ground, our forces will achieve even greater firepower. More and more Nike installations will replace standard antiaircraft. A major share of our 1957 procurement program in all the services will be for more advanced weapons.

Guided missiles alone will involve the expenditure of $2.5 billion in 1957, about $1 billion more than the total for the past fiscal year, and over 2½ times the amount spent on such weapons during fiscal 1955.

With regard to missiles and advanced weapons in general, the need is to see the problem in proper perspective. What needs to be understood is that in total deterrent power our Nation has not relinquished the leadership to its potential enemies, regardless of fluctuations in the scientific development field, nor will it.

It is true that today's complex weapons make it difficult to know exactly, from time to time, just where this or that country actually stands. A realistic attitude has to assume that occasionally we will surpass potential enemies in some ways, and occasionally they will surpass us in others.

The point to be kept constantly in mind, however, and one too frequently overlooked is just this: America is not falling behind in the technological race, and will continue to have a tremendous deterrent force in existence—ready to be used if necessary. And that, I submit is also a fact only too well known to the Kremlin.

THE ROLE OF RESERVES

Military Reserves enter this picture as a basic element permitting us a means to offset communism's depth of strength with a corresponding depth of strength of our own.

America, traditionally, has been a nation which relies upon Reserves. We have always recognized that we cannot maintain on an active footing all the forces a major conflict would require.

Today this is still our guiding principle. There is, however, one additional point which needs to be stressed, and that is the fact that today's Reserve must be a completely "Ready Reserve"—ready for action on an instant's notice. We are living in an age where delay could be fatal in a time of war.

In the past we worried little about such matters. We were scarcely susceptible to surprise attack, and consequently we assumed a "grace period" during which time we could mobilize in the event of hostilities against us.

These, however, are not the "good old days." Ocean and distance barriers no longer afford us protection. Today, with time and space conquered by technology, there would be no grace period, and there could be the reality of a sudden massive attack aimed at the heart of our Nation.

The lesson, therefore, is crystal clear—both our active forces and our essential Reserves must be in a continuous high state of readiness, organized and trained, and prepared to cope with any challenge.

THE RESERVE FORCES ACT

The Reserve Forces Act of 1955 provides us with a means of improving the readiness of our Reserve, and providing a stronger underpinning to our active forces.

Briefly, the new law provides for a scheduled build-up to move from a level of around 800,000 in actual paid training last August, to around 3 million by 1959. At the end of fiscal year 1957 this calls for a figure of 1.1 million, and with some 900,000 now in training we are moving ahead to meet this goal.

The law contains an impressive number of new and positive improvements:

For the first time young men are permitted to enlist directly into the Reserve. For the first time the President is given authority to call up to one million of the Ready Reserve in an emergency without prior congressional action. For the first time there is reasonable provision to insure compliance with the training requirements.

Other firsts include the fact that a number of distinct benefits are provided to business and industry, conserving critical civilian skills and giving employers an exact knowledge of which men would be called in event of an emergency.

Through careful screening, and a recall process administered by the Selective Service System, the Reserve Act affords a fair and equitable division of critical skills. Men with such skills will swiftly be screened out of Ready Reserve status, where military requirements permit, and assigned to the far less vulnerable Standby Reserve.

Another key provision making the Brooks Reserve Act uniquely valuable is that which allows certain skilled men in industry and key jobs who are over 18½ to take 6 months' training with the active forces, and then return to their jobs. These would then spend a reasonable time in their local Reserve in fulfillman of their total obligation. At the present time, the Army has received around 900 applications for this program with many more expected to come forward.

By 1958, we will begin to receive around 15,000 men a month from the active forces who will have a Reserve training obligation, under provisions of the Reserve Act. Right now, we need to be intent upon developing a steady volume of volunteer input, giving us necessary strength for today, and bolstering our entire program for tomorrow.

SIX MONTHS' TRAINING

In this connection we are placing a great emphasis upon still another productive aspect of the new Reserve law, and that is its provision for a special Reserve training program for young men under 18½. Because everybody can help us greatly in putting this constructive program across, I want to sum up its advantages for the young men at this time. Here is what it offers him: a 6 months' basic course at the Army, Coast Guard or Marine camp nearest home; a chance to finish high school; opportunity to plan his future; and better job prospects on the com-

munity level, for the employer has an exact knowledge of where he stands with respect to military obligation.

I wish to stress that this is a quota program, however, with an enlistment rate now well above 1,000 a week. The man who waits beyond age 18½ loses his chance to enlist and becomes ineligible for the program's many benefits. Right now, better than 30,000 young men have signed up for this program.

What happens to the youth who takes this special training? From the time he leaves, through 6 months of basic and some advanced courses, he receives the best instruction in the Armed Forces. He becomes skilled in a variety of military subjects, and rapidly acquires the know-how to defend himself and his country in an hour of emergency.

And let me say that a healthy majority of the boys who have gone into this program are glad they enlisted.

The Department of Defense believes the 6 months' training plan is a productive approach to the effective utilization of manpower. We further believe it is going to find its greatest supporters in the rank of these young volunteers who have already taken advantage of it and gone on with their education, career or other plans.

Taken altogether, it is a new and practical concept of military service that enables a young man to fulfill his military obligation by being a full-time citizen and a part-time soldier. It helps the individual be secure about his future, and it helps the Armed Forces guarantee the security of America.

SUMMARY

Here in Shreveport I am conscious of a living awareness of America's need for a Ready Reserve. You have strong public support for your National Guard and Reserve programs. You are aware of their value to you, of the protection which they afford your city and your homes.

Your distinguished Congressman BROOKS has taken the lead in the Nation's Capital in calling attention to our need for a properly trained and organized Reserve—one that is commensurate with the military realities of this day. Through his efforts he has done a great deal to make this Nation more Reserve conscious. He, and all like him, deserve thanks for helping build up our internal military strength, and in organizing our Nation for whatever dangers an indefinite future may hold.

The Congress as a whole has done a tremendous job this session and last in supporting the Armed Forces of the United States. It has recognized, realistically, that we can no longer afford extreme variations in the levels of our military strengths, and in the quality and training of our forces.

Consequently we have not only had approval for a plan to strengthen our Reserves, but we have had sound support in our overall efforts to make the military service more atractive as a career—thereby cutting down on turnover and training costs which run into billions of dollars.

The backing of our career incentive legislation, ranging from better housing to increased medical benefits for service families, has already had marked and positive effect in increased reenlistments and stabilization of forces.

The Reserve program itself, of course, will be what our citizens make it. Integrated with all our other defense efforts it can unquestionably provide a tremendous source of strength, and protection against invasion and disaster.

No amount of legislation, however, can substitute for the understanding of each citizen of why we need a Reserve, and of why he needs to do his full part in its support.

Our young men in particular need to come forward proudly and serve, and they need to be encouraged in this endeavor by their parents and their community. The Armed Forces today, in all their Active and Reserve programs, are able to offer better than 30 plans of enlisted and officer service. None of these choices, however, best fit the individual who is undecided or late, or who lacks the patriotic zeal to do his part for his country.

The responsibility for this Nation's defense is borne in one sense by the eexcutive and the representative branches of Government, delegating authority to the Department of Defense. Actually, it rests on each of us, as the citizens of a republic where the individual is the ultimate determinant of national policy and action. And it is upon the measure of our devotion, our willingness to serve and sacrifice, our acceptance of the burdens as well as the privileges of citizenship in this free land of ours, that the future of America so largely depends.

By knowing their obligations, making plans, and by performing military service at an early age, our youth can undertake responsible futures with predictability and certainty.

They can also, through a nationwide volunteer response, serve plain and lasting notice on the Communist leadership that our country is determined in its defense, and united in its outlook.

CONCLUSION

And now, you have been a most gracious audience, and I thank you again for the honor of being here tonight. I shall briefly conclude these remarks.

America's defense program, as the President and the Congress have many times emphasized, is not designed for aggression, but it is designed to deal with any aggressor. We intend to see that it remains strong, that it is flexible and resilient for the needs of today and tomorrow, and that it lacks nothing essential to carry us safely through the years which lie ahead.

In time, this program—coupled with our humane and consistent policies in support of the free aspirations of all people—may see the reactionary forces which confront us today melt away, ushering in a better and happier world for all mankind.

That, at any rate, is the hope with which free peoples everywhere must live. In the meantime, we must be self-reliant and clear-minded. We must overlook no honorable opportunity which would lead to an improvement in world relations but we must also overlook no detail, or aspect of our security precautions.

Our patern of strength for the future must continue to be strong Active Forces; strong Reserves, trained and ready; and a strong national economy, backed by the greatest industry on earth.

Working together—bearing in mind our obligations as citizens of the American Republic—we shall continue to assure our protection as we stand up for the cause of freedom.

Louisiana Honors Max Abelman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 11, 1956

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Max Abelman, who is sometimes described as "Brooklyn's ambassador of good will," is the recipient of many honors and citations from distinguished citizens of this country and abroad who have recognized his many and humanitarian deeds. He was recently honored by the Governor of Louisiana, the Honorable Earl K. Long, who appointed him a colonel on his staff.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to insert into the RECORD the brief letter from Governor Long appointing Mr. Abelman to the colonelship. The letter reads as follows:

STATE OF LOUISIANA,
EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT,
Baton Rouge, May 28, 1956.

Mr. MAX ABELMAN,
Brooklyn, N. Y.

DEAR FRIEND: It was my pleasure to appoint you a colonel on my staff, and your commission has gone forward to you. I am further pleased to hand you herewith wallet size ident card of your colonelship on my staff.

We hope you will visit with us at the State capitol at some time in the future, and that you will let us hear from you from time to time, giving us your valued opinions and views on matters of State, or on matters of immediate importance to you. I wish to maintain our good will policy all through the years.

Sincerely yours,

EARL K. LONG,
Governor.

The Long Count in 1924

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES A. VANIK
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 20, 1956

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, in a series of articles in the Cleveland Plain Dealer on previous conventions, Mr. Walker S. Buel, head of the Washington bureau of the Cleveland Plain Dealer, discusses the high points of the respective national conventions. In the Cleveland Plain Dealer of July 18, 1956, Mr. Buel writes about the long count in 1924 when 103 ballots were necessary at the Democratic convention in order to nominate a candidate.

Mr. Speaker, this analysis of previous national conventions should be required reading for delegates to the conventions of the Republican and Democratic Parties. The splendid article is entitled "The Long Count in 1924" and is as follows:

THE LONG COUNT IN 1924

(By Walker S. Buel)

WASHINGTON, July 17.—Whatever happens in the Democratic national convention next month in Chicago, it is doubtful whether it or any future political meeting ever will repeat the bitter fighting, the drama and the 103 ballots of the Democratic conclave which met June 24, 1924, at Madison Square Garden in New York.

For one thing, the Democrats still had the historic two-thirds rule, used by the Democratic South as a safety check on nominations opposed by southerners. The party abandoned this device at Philadelphia in 1936.

SKIPPED NAMING THE KLAN

The 1924 Democratic convention went to New York through the influence of the old New York World and other interests within the party which wanted to nominate the Governor of that State, Alfred E. Smith. Opposing Smith was William G. McAdoo, who had the backing of southern and western Democrats. The Ku Klux Klan was very much an issue at that time, and opposition to Smith on the grounds of his Catholic re-

ligion was attributed by his friends to the Klan.

The Klan sentiment was strong enough to stop an effort by anti-Klan delegates to write a plank in the platform denouncing the Klan by name. Perhaps the wildest pandemonium in political history broke loose when Smith was put in nomination by Franklin D. Roosevelt. Tammany door tenders threw wide the gates and Smith followers poured in, carrying fire department sirens and marching about the hall in loud clamor for 73 minutes.

It eventually became clear that neither McAdoo nor Smith could attain two-thirds. The 1920 nominee, James M. Cox, of Ohio, and other leaders went into behind-the-scenes conferences from which emerged the name of John W. Davis, New York lawyer, native of Clarksburg, W. Va. He was nominated on the 103d ballot.

While the Klan issue and prohibition (which Smith opposed) were the subject of the most blazing controversies, another was an attempt, led by Newton Baker, of Cleveland, to write renewed support of the League of Nations into the platform. This the more isolationist elements of the party were able to prevent, bringing about a long weasel-worded plank which said in part:

"There is no substitute for the League of Nations as an agency working for peace; therefore, we believe that, in the interest of permanent peace, and in the lifting of the great burdens of war from the backs of the people, and in order to establish a permanent foreign policy on the supreme questions, not subject to change with change of party administrations, it is desirable, wise, and necessary to lift this question out of party politics, and to that end to take the sense of the American people at a referendum election, advisory to the Government, to be held officially under act of Congress, free from all other questions and candidacies, after ample time for full consideration and discussion throughout the country, upon the question, in substance, as follows:

" 'Shall the United States become a member of the League of Nations upon such reservations or amendments to the covenant of the league as the President and the Senate of the United States may agree upon?'

"Immediately upon an affirmative vote we will carry out such mandate."

SKIRTED THE ISSUE OF PROHIBITION

The Republican plank was a forthright reiteration of the party's position of 1920 against joining the league. "On this we stand," it said.

Both major parties weaseled that year on prohibition. Both took refuge in similar unspecific language.

"The Democratic Party pledges itself to respect and enforce the Constitution and all laws," said the document written at New York.

Declaring law violations weaken and threaten Government itself, the GOP platform adopted at Cleveland said: "The Republican Party pledges the full strength of the Government for the maintenance of these principles by the enforcement of the Constitution and of all laws."

Pan American Airline

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES T. PATTERSON
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 25, 1956

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Speaker, it is a proven fact that New England needs another airline to service its expanding economy, vital defense plants, and travelers. The airline best qualified to provide this service is Pan American. As I have shown in previous remarks, Pan American can not only provide the quickest and most thorough service, but it can also provide the safest.

Pan American has a brilliant safety history. Its accident record is excellent. I would like to show the reasons for this fine performance.

In the first place, only the most modern planes are used. Pan American aircraft are equipped with all the latest safety devices which enable them to fly under any conditions anywhere in the world. Its equipment is the most comfortable and the safest available in passenger service today.

But fine equipment alone is not enough. Pan American takes many more precautions. To make triply sure, each plane and each piece of equipment is tested thoroughly at all altitudes, in all conditions, and at all times of the year before it carries one passenger or one piece of freight. And before each flight, highly trained mechanics and technicians give each plane a microscopic going-over. Every grease spot and scratch is serviced before the plane taxies on the runway. If there seems to be the slightest fault anywhere in the craft, it is replaced by one fresh off the production line or completely repaired until perfectly sound.

Further precautions are made because Pan American realizes that there is a human element which is very important in every flight. All Pan American personnel, from the pilot to the desk clerk, are thoroughly trained. They must undergo frequent rigid physical tests to determine their reactions to all conditions. Eyesight and reflexes must be perfect. Before flying a Pan American plane all personnel must have had long hours of experience in the air so that each piece of machinery is completely familiar, every airport recognizable, and every rattle can be fixed in a jiffy.

To provide still another check Pan American has a special training program to teach a pilot how to react to emergencies. He must undergo in practice, every type of possible accident so that he will know exactly what to do in case trouble develops on a real flight. He is trained to fly over and land on land and sea and is taught how to make his passengers feel totally comfortable and safe at all times. Hostesses are similarly trained to make each flight pleasant as well as free from danger, and all the latest conveniences are available for comfort.

As I have shown in previous remarks, this safe service is essential to New England's economic future. Latin America's raw materials and markets are vital to our growing defense industries. I have also shown how needed expanded service is to vacationers and tourists. I have not, however, mentioned the great diplomatic services which such a Pan American traffic would provide the Nation.

By linking the whole East Coast with Europe, Asia, and Latin America, Pan American would keep America much better informed on recent developments. Political, business, and industrial representatives from all nations could reach our shores much more quickly with the service Pan American would like to provide. Similarly, our representatives could be sent all over the world quickly, directly, and safely with such a service. Militarily, such a traffic could also be used as a basis for future troop movements and as a training medium for maintenance crews in the event of a world conflict. In this shadowy world of suspicion, where quick developments can have far-reaching consequences, the service Pan American offers would be a tremendous diplomatic and military advantage against the Communist bloc.

So in concluding, Mr. Speaker, I hope the Civil Aeronautics Board will pay the closest attention to Pan American's requests to provide the vital service which New England and the entire Nation needs so urgently. Such service is essential for economic, travel, diplomatic, and military reasons. Pan American can provide it in the safest and most thorough way.

Merry Memories

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES A. VANIK
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 20, 1956

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, with national convention time approaching for Democrats as well as Republicans, our attention is more frequently being focused to the work of the convention, the development of national platforms and the crystallization of issues for the coming campaign.

Mr. Speaker, I invite the attention of my distinguished colleagues to an article by Mr. Walker S. Buel, head of the Washington bureau of the Cleveland Plain Dealer, and published in the Cleveland Plain Dealer on July 14, 1956, in which Mr. Buel points out that it was in 1920 that the Democrats used the slogan: "peace, progress, and prosperity." Mr. Buel's analysis of the 1920 convention is good background reading for the conventions scheduled later this year. The article is as follows:

MERRY MEMORIES

(By Walker S. Buel)

WASHINGTON, July 13.—Politics produces many strange things, and I am having both pleasure and profit in marshaling memories of national conventions I have covered, beginning in 1920.

For example, the 1956 Republican slogan, reiterated time and again by National Chairman Leonard W. Hall and in party literature, is "Peace, prosperity, and progress." Before me is the Democratic textbook for the campaign of 1920. On its front cover above a picture of presidential nominee James M. Cox, and on the back cover above a picture of Franklin D. Roosevelt, vice presidential nominee, are three large-type words, each marked with an exclamation point: "Peace, progress, prosperity."

PARTY'S SLOGAN NOT NEW

What was good for the Democrats then, although they did not win with it, is good today, 36 years later, for the Republicans, who hope it will attract a majority of the November votes.

The convention which nominated Cox, then Governor of Ohio, was the first ever held in San Francisco. The GOP meeting there next month will be that city's second—one for each party. To attend the Democratic convention of 1920, a special train carried 77 newspapermen from the Republican convention at Chicago, which nominated Warren G. Harding of Ohio, to the Golden Gate. That is a significant figure, in view of the fact that to date, 4,321 representatives of press, radio, TV, newsreels, still photographers and others have applied for credentials to cover the forthcoming Republican session beginning August 20.

On the way west from Chicago I traveled in the same car with a newspaperman whose name is treasured in the annals of Ohio journalism, the late James W. Faulkner of the Cincinnati Enquirer. One morning when I awoke the atmosphere in the car was impregnated with a highly aromatic alcoholic fragrance. Men from other cars passing through toward breakfast stepped in the aisle and looked around hopefully for the source. At last there were so many crowded into our car that Faulkner stood up on the seat and addressed them.

"Gentlemen," he said, "what you now smell was once 3-Star Hennessy brandy, the property of James William Faulkner of Cincinnati, Ohio. Last night a great tragedy occurred—the cork came out of the bottle in my suitcase. The trouble with me is I am too new-fashioned. If I had just one set of old-fashioned flannel underwear, I could wring you out a drink."

There were three principal contenders at the 1920 Democratic convention—Governor Cox, William G. McAdoo, and the then Attorney General of the United States, A. Mitchell Palmer of Pennsylvania. The Palmer people sang to the tune of Glory, Glory, Hallelujah, a song beginning, "Palmer, Palmer, Pennsylvania." This the Ohio contingent parodied with a version of its own, "All his votes are on the payroll."

McAdoo, the son-in-law of Woodrow Wilson, was a favorite of the drys in that early stage of national prohibition, and prominent among them was William Bryan, attending the convention as in a journalistic capacity. The drys contended that Cox was a wet, and after his nomination Bryan said sadly, as nearly as I can recall his exact words: "My heart is in the grave, and I must pause till it comes back to me."

HISTORY SURELY REPEATS

There was much about the atmosphere of the 1920 Democratic convention to suggest the Democratic attitude of today. Speakers lambasted the Republicans as reactionary and devoted to selfish interests. The keynoter, Homer S. Cummings, of Connecticut, later Attorney General in the Cabinet of F. D. R., declared that the GOP "had persistently served special interests and had lost touch with the spirit of the time." He called the Republican platform "the work of men concerned more with material things than with human rights."

Governor Cox in his acceptance speech at Dayton, August 7, 1920, left no doubt that he followed in the footsteps of Wilson on the issue of the League of Nations.

"Senator Harding, as the Republican candidate for the Presidency, proposed in plain words that we remain out of it," he said. "As the Democratic candidate, I am in favor of going in."

There remain many persons who believe to this day that had the Nation followed Wilson and Cox, there would have been no World War II or threat of a possible world war III.

Status of Forces Agreements

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK T. BOW
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, July 7, 1956

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, the perils of double jeopardy to which our servicemen may be subjected in foreign courts by reason of the various status of forces agreements have not generally been noticed. We know that convicted servicemen have been reluctant or fearful to prosecute an appeal because of the possibility that thereby they may have greater punishment imposed by the higher court, but it has not been considered that under the guise of appeal the accused servicemen is actually subjected to a second trial for the same offense.

Under the common law a second trial for an offense was forbidden whether or not the accused had suffered punishment, or had been acquitted or convicted. This rule was carried into the fifth amendment to our Constitution which provides that no person shall be twice put in jeopardy of life or limb for the same offense. Many years ago the Supreme Court held that the protection against double jeopardy prevented an appeal by the Government after a verdict of acquittal.

It is true that there have occasionally been appeals in the courts of some States after an acquittal in a criminal trial, but these have been primarily to clarify or establish some rule of law that was in question. It is only in foreign courts where we have appeals of convictions by the prosecution which obviously arise out of caprice or prejudice of the prosecutor. These officials think they are better qualified to assess punishment than the court.

Last April in France an airman was sentenced to 2 months' imprisonment and 20,000 francs' fine for assault and battery. The public prosecutor almost immediately notified the Staff Judge Advocate that he had filed an appeal because in his opinion the sentence was not severe enough. It has already been demonstrated that the higher courts of France construe any appeal by the prosecutor as an official demand for increased penalty.

The Japanese are also addicted to this practice, since generally their system of law follows the civil code. It has recently been disclosed that 2 marines who were earlier sentenced, respectively, to 2 and 3 years' imprisonment, which was suspended, were tried again because the prosecution was dissatisfied with these sentences and appealed the convictions. Fortunately for them the same sentences were pronounced by the second court.

An appeal in Japan amounts to a second trial. The court has considerable latitude in reopening the case and considering new evidence. The court may impose a different sentence. This is double jeopardy. It is pure subterfuge to say that the proceedings from the indictment and trial through the last appeal is only one trial.

Even though a serviceman has been tried for an offense in a foreign court the military authorities, under the NATO Status of Forces Agreement, may try him also for any violation of rules of discipline arising from the same acts. This is an apparent double jeopardy which would be avoided if the accused had been tried in the first instance by court-martial and all degrees of the offense had been considered at one trial.

Slavery in Saudi Arabia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 20, 1956

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to take this means to make available to all Members the following item which was prepared for me by Virginia W. Brewer of the Library of Congress:

SLAVERY IN SAUDI ARABIA AND THE OFFICIAL ATTITUDE TOWARD IT

(By Virginia W. Brewer)

Despite decrees of King Ibn Saud of Saudi Arabia, made in 1936, which were supposed to abolish the trading in slaves if not slavery itself in that country, according to the report on slavery made to the Assembly of the French Union [1] by M. Emmanuel LaGraviere for the Commission on Social Affairs, at the session of November 17, 1955, not only is the practice of slavery continued, but it is increasing, and lamentable not only in itself but also because of the deplorable conditions accompanying it. An Arab official who was a leading statesman in Mecca was relieved of his duties because he denounced the manner in which the slave trade was conducted in Saudi Arabia (according to the same report).

In spite of the difficulties of making estimates, there is reason to believe that there are some 750,000 slaves in Arabia. There are numerous slave markets in Mecca. In the outskirts of Mecca the French, on a recent tour, found, slumping against the walls, beggars who had been slaves, but whose masters had driven them out because they could no longer work. Their only food was scraps; their only shelter tents made from rags, under which 7 or 8 huddled together at night for warmth.

Though Mecca appears to be the only place where slaves are displayed publicly as merchandise, in other cities and villages the sale of them continues clandestinely. Moreover, according to the same report,[2] the purchasers of slaves are to be found among the leaders of tribes—tribes numbering as many as 40,000. Those officials who disapprove of the practice, who would like to see it abolished, are in too small a minority to combat the social forces that sanction and desire its continuance.

The Secretary General of the United Nations was asked in 1948 by the Economic and Social Council to obtain information, including information from governments, to supplement material presented to the Council by the Ad Hoc Committee on Slavery, to examine the report of the Committee in the

Footnotes at end of speech.

light of the information obtained by him, and to report on it to the Council.

In 1952 he reported that he was still receiving replies to his requests to governments.[2] In 1953 Saudi Arabia was listed among the member countries of the United Nations from which no reply had yet been received; [4] and likewise in the 1954 report.[5]

In his 1953 report [6] on the subject the Secretary General noted the view expressed by the Ad Hoc Committee on Slavery (E/1938, par. 21):

"That even when all the above-mentioned information had been obtained, a complete and up-to-date survey of slavery still would not be possible unless a body of the United Nations were given authority to verify its information by appropriate means and to study such actual conditions of slavery or servitude as might exist in the world today."

In the 1954 report of the Secretary General on slavery a section is devoted to Saudi Arabia.[7] Following the form adopted in reporting on the numerous countries included in the report it indicates that of the materials collected under the resolution of the United Nations there had been for Saudi Arabia no government reply and no materials from nongovernmental organizations of Saudi Arabia.[8] The material which had been received was from the Antislavery Society, an organization associated with the United Nations on a consultative basis.

The Antislavery Society, as quoted in this report of the United Nations (E/2548), referred (as it consistently has in its various reports on the subject), to the existence of slavery in Saudi Arabia, its status there, and the sources—some secondary, some official—of its information. What the Secretary General quoted [9] in this connection is quoted in part below:

"Saudi Arabia: The Ottoman Empire claimed to have sovereignty over the greater part of Arabia, but it is doubtful whether the Sultan of Turkey really ruled over all that he claimed. In 1889 slavery was abolished by law in the Ottoman Empire, and that law applied in theory to a great part of Arabia, but was not effective in some of those countries. Turkey was defeated in the First World War (1914–18), and the Turkish colonies were ceded to the principal Allied Powers. Following that war the Hijaz, on the eastern shores of the Red Sea, which had certainly been under effective Turkish rule, was set up as an independent kingdom, and one of the first acts of the first ruler, King Hussein, was to abrogate the Ottoman law abolishing the status of slavery. He even imposed a tax of 10 percent on the sale of human beings. In due course King Hussein was defeated by King Ibn Saud, the ruler of the Nejd, the country to the east of the Hijaz, and the Hijaz and the Nejd were united under his rule in the year 1925, and given the name Saudi Arabia.

"There is no doubt about the status of slavery in Saudi Arabia. Many Europeans resident in Saudi Arabia in the past 15 years, sympathetic to the way of life of the inhabitants of that country, have testified in books written by them to that fact. Eldon Rutter, who has spent a great part of his life in Saudi Arabia, and in a lecture which Cities of Arabia, and in a lecture which he delivered to the Royal Asian Society in London in 1933, said, 'Slavery exists in every part of Arabia, except Aden, as a normal social institution, but I have only seen one slave market where slaves are displayed in a public place like merchandise. That was in Mecca in a narrow street called the Suk-el-Abed. In all the other towns and villages, including the Persian Gulf towns, the slaves are sold privately. In some places there are dealers who keep a definite stock of slaves; in other there are merely agents who dispose of any slave whom a person may wish to sell.'

Footnotes at end of speech.

"Col. Gerald de Gaury, who received high honor from King Ibn Saud, says in his book, Arabian Journey, published in 1950 (p. 89), 'Slaves are still sold in Saudi Arabia. * * * The chief market is the Sug at Suwaigua in Mecca (of which Eldon Rutter published a description), and the main route for them is to Mecca from the Yemen, to which they are brought in sailing boats from the opposite coast of Africa.' He mentions that he had heard on good authority that boys were still arriving on the Oman coast in 1947 from the Mukron coast of Baluchistan, and that girls are brought from Aleppo in Syria and sold in Arabia. These are unofficial sources of information, there is also official information which confirms the existence of slavery in Saudi Arabia by implication.

"On October 2, 1936, King Ibn Saud made a decree entitled 'The Instructions Concerning Traffic in Slaves.' Part I prohibits the importation of slaves into Saudi Arabia, as well as the enslavement of any free person; part II gives slaves rights of protection against their masters, as well as the right to buy their liberty, thereby admitting the existence of the slave status. Part III provides for the appointment of an inspector of slaves, and for the licensing of slave brokers. During the session of the ad hoc Committee on Slavery as well as during the preparation of the Secretary General's Report on Slavery (E. 2357), the United Nations addressed requests to the Government of Saudi Arabia for information on slavery. To none of these was a reply received. The inference to be drawn from this persistent silence is that the Government of Saudi Arabia did not wish to reveal the position on slavery existing within its borders."

In all fairness, it must be said that in Saudi Arabia, the largest of the Arab States, various aspects of the subject must be treated separately for a fair picture of what is often generalized as one, under the term "slavery." Slave trade, slave smuggling, slave life as an integral part of Arabic society present differing facets to the modern world.

King Abdul Aziz Ibn Saud, most important of the potentates who has recently held sway over Arabian territory—not only because of the extent of his domain, Saudi Arabia, but also because of his personality, his contacts with the West, his advanced ideas, and his record of accomplishments—undertook under article VII of the Treaty of Jedda of 1927 [10] to cooperate with the British for the suppression of the slave trade. In this he succeeded to a large extent. Although secondary sources vary, it seems from a coordination of them that probably the only parts of the Arabian Peninsula where the smuggling of slaves remains today are Oman, Yemen, and Asir.[11]

Writing in 1937, in what has been called "so authoritative and detailed a survey of slavery," Sir George MacMunn has this to say: [12]

"But taken as a whole the Arab slavery is of that benevolent kind that is very properly anathema to the antislavery gospel * * * it does not cry to high heaven for vengeance, and therefore gets a toleration which its soul-destroying effect by no means merits. Slavery in Arabia is a perfectly legal affair, sanctioned * * * by custom, and by the Moslem religion. * * * Slaves were and are part of the ancient system. * * * Hordes of slaves and slave children, often his own, appeal to an Arab, to be ruled—often kindly enough, but quite definitely ruled—fed, clothed, and supplied, and entirely unpaid. * * * Since the slave is usually friendless and homeless he has no other anchor in life save the patriarch's tent.

"No slave can leave his master. His only change, as in other slave systems, can come from being sold. In the desert, slaves are both cheaper than free labor and far less

Footnotes at end of speech.

expensive. As concubines, slave women are equally inexpensive. * * * A Moslem wife receives a dowry from the husband, that is both law and custom; and while a modern wife may be divorced easily enough, her dowry is her inalienable right and goes with her. The slave concubine may be sold off, and may even yield profit. These slave concubines, and the slave children born of them, are therefore useful assets in every way, apart from the charm just mentioned. It is not, therefore, to be expected that from within will come any great movement of conscience to rid themselves of so comfortable a system.

* * * * *

"There is nothing in Moslem religious teaching that militates against slave holding. On the contrary, the existence of slaves is especially recognized as the law of life. * * * The Koran * * * dealt with it as a recognized institution, and one can but infer that while good and fair treatment of slaves was enforced, and their liberation was considered meritorious, condemnation of the institution was not thought of.

* * * * *

"It is well to quote from Eldon Rutter's lecture of a few years ago to the Central Asia Society, because it does reassure us that a state of affairs which is impossible to remedy save in the slow march of time is not unbearable.

" 'Slavedom in Arabia is in its physical aspect a slight thing. Regarded in a material way only, the lot of a slave in Arabia is quite as happy as that of thousands of human beings in the most advanced countries of the world * * * and that is precisely why I regard slavery of the easy-going Mohammedan kind as the worst of all forms of slavery. * * * The rigg or slavery of Arabia, and the position of the abd or slave is not within the same four walls as slavery in its worst form.' "

As late as the 1930's the slave market and slave trading was a regular part of Arabian life:

"We may see, too, a few old slave women. They are recognizable by the poverty of their clothing and the lack of proper veils, but we see nothing of the several thousands of younger women slaves who are kept close in shuttered houses of the city. * * * A narrow street called the Suk-el-Abid. This is the slave market. The most desirable of the slave girls are not exposed to view. They are kept in houses where prospective buyers are taken in to view them. * * * The best slaves are sold among the citizens by private treaty this way. 'Men are unscrupulous in Arab life as elsewhere, for whereas an owner with slaves should care for their old age, there are the heartless and the hypocritical who manumit their slaves when they are too old to work and too old to sell. * * * They have no home but the mosque, and no food but what they receive in alms. * * * It is but fair to say that good masters maintain their slaves until they die * * * a sorry death * * *.'

"There is yet another repulsive blot on human manners which is rendered possible by Arab slavery. Mekka is always full of students who settle in the cities to study theology—some of these marry slave women belonging to the Arabs. Any child of these so-called marriages is born into slavery, and becomes the property of the woman's owner. The father is usually too poor to buy the woman's freedom. * * * I do not think I have anything more barbarous to report out of all I have seen and heard of Arabian slavery." [13]

MacMunn elsewhere in the same treatise had written: [14]

"The gravest and most pronounced slave-holding and slave-breeding that yet exists has its home in the Arabian countries, where the system is as old as slavery itself, and can

Footnotes at end of speech.

Footnotes at end of speech.

fade but slowly. * * * The blot is still inaccessible. * * * It has just been said that in Arabia slavery is as old as time; and still today, in this year of grace 1937, there are many hundred thousand slaves, real undisguised slaves, called by no camouflaged name and sold as chattels at their owner's will. The slaves are men and women bought in the past, and still smuggled in smaller numbers, from the black races of the Sudan and even from negro Africa by Arab and half-Arab dealers. * * * Tens of thousands have been born of slave mothers in Arabia. * * *

Nevertheless the measures that were taken by the late King of Saudi Arabia, Ibn Saud, were effective to a certain degree. In 1954, an authority writing on the Arabian Peninsula stated: "Raiding among tribes, involving slave snatching and slave marketing such as that still occurring in the Trucial Coast has been stopped in Saudi Arabia. King Ibn Saud put an end to intertribal wars." [15]

These accomplishments, great though they are in themselves, were however, distinctly limited in proportion to the regulations promulgated by him in 1936. Those were of sufficient import to alter British practices. Up to the time of their promulgation, in October 1936, the British consul at Jiddah, Saudi Arabia, had, by treaty and by consent, had the right of manumission of slaves if they came to him. We are told, however, by MacMunn, that: [16]

"In prosecution of a cooperative policy and in connection with the general activity regarding slavery of the League of Nations, the British Government has renounced that right from that day (October 2, 1936) consequent on the promulgation of slavery regulations by the King of Saudi Arabia. These regulations are immensely important in principle. In practice they depend on the extent to which the Saudi writ runs within the confines of his dominions. The principal provisions are as follows:

"It is absolutely prohibited:

"1. To import slaves from any country by sea.

"2. To import slaves by any land route, unless the importer proves by government document that the slave is recognized as such in the country from which he comes.

"3. To enslave any free person.

"4. To buy or obtain possession of any slave who has been imported or enslaved in contravention of the regulations.

"It will be evident that the above is a great step forward, but that it does not touch slave-holding because no monarch or government can go against the inherent mentality of its people * * *. The regulations * * * are, however, a considerable step in advance, and definitely support the British antislavery patrol * * *. The next step in years to come should be to * * * declare that no man or woman can be born a slave. But desert opinion is not yet ready for that."

The British antislavery patrol was still operating in 1949. We have this account of it: [17]

"In the Red Sea and the Persian Gulf slave running continued for many years [after 1907], so that as recently as 1927 Sir Austen Chamberlain stated that 'His Majesty's Government maintain a naval detachment in the Persian Gulf, one of whose duties is to do whatever may be possible to prevent slave dealing in that region, but in spite of this measure, it is not possible to abolish the traffic altogether.' Such precautions are still taken [1949]."

From the United Nations in 1954 the following account of the official attitude in Arabia to the age-old situation:

"THE PERSIAN GULF STATES [18]

"Materials from nongovernmental organizations

"The Antislavery Society: Bertram Thomas at one time Prime Minister to the Sultan of Muscat, wrote in his book The Arabs, published in 1937, 'Within Arabia itself slavery flourishes with the full support of public opinion, and any extraneous authority interfering becomes odious in the eyes of the people. It is a vested interest of immemorial respectability.' And he continues, 'Most enlightened Arabian rulers, through they doubtless privately consider that it would be a good thing if slavery were no more, dare not affront influential subjects who favor slavery and possess slaves. And short of coercive measures, which no one is likely to take, only a change of opinion—a new general attitude of mind—will ensure permanent abolition'." [19]

A year later the Antislavery Society in its chapter on Islamic Teaching on Slavery and Slavery in Arabia, reported: [20]

"The movement to unite Islam as a single political force is hampered by the appreciation by educated Muslims that the governments of the countries where slavery is an accepted institution have an attitude to humanity which is considered uncivilized by modern democracies. On the other hand many Muslims feel that it is politically inexpedient to risk alienating the feelings of those who condone slavery by too strong a reaction against it.

"These conflicting considerations have led Muslim scholars to a reexamination of their sacred teachings which has tended to bring out the strong bias of the Prophet against the institution of slavery."

When the United Nations requested a report on slavery from societies in consultative status,[21] the Antislavery Society submitted the report by Mr. Greenidge published and distributed to members in February 1954 under the title of "Memorandum on Slavery." The memorandum gave an account of the progress made in the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations up to the beginning of the present session on the question of slavery and accounts of slavery in various areas. It concluded the one on Saudi Arabia with the following statement, which was quoted by the Secretary-General of the United Nations: [22]

"Saudi Arabia * * *

"During the session of the ad hoc Committee on Slavery, as well as during the preparation of the Secretary-General's Report on Slavery (E/2357), the United Nations addressed requests to the Government of Saudi-Arabia for information on slavery. To none of these was a reply received. The inference to be drawn from this persistent silence is that the Government of Saudi-Arabia did not wish to reveal the position on slavery existing within its borders." [23]

Footnotes at end of speech.

[1] Assemblée de l'Union Française; session de 1955–56; Annexe au procés-berbal de la céance du 17 novembre 1955. Rapport fait * * * de MM. La Graviére et Le Brun Keris, Conseiliers de l'Union Franc.

[2] Ibid.

[3] United Nations. Economic and Social Council, 1952, 14th sess., item 16. E/2296. July 11, 1952. 1 p.

[4] Ibid., 1953, 18th sess., item 18. E/2357. Jan. 27, 1953, p. 12 n. and p. 14.

[5] Ibid., 1954, 17th sess., item 15 (b). E/1548. Feb. 26, 1954, p. 9.

[6] Ibid., 1953, 18th sess., item 18. E/2357. Jan. 27, 1953, p. 12 n. and p. 14.

[7] Ibid., 1953 E/2357, p. 13.

[8] Ibid., 1954, E/2548, p. 67 ff.

[9] Ibid.

[10] Because of the major part that Great Britain has played in ridding the world of the slave trade, the British treaties with Saudi Arabia on the subject are of major importance.

[11] While Yemen and Oman are independent the partly mountainous area Asir adjacent to Yemen is dependent and as late as 1937 was the subject of dispute as to the suzerainty over it.

[12] MacMunn, Sir George. Slavery Through the Ages. London, 1938, ch. XVI, passim; pp. 258–264.

[13] It will be noted that Eldon Rutter who is here quoted by MacMunn in his Slavery Through the Ages (pp. 260–264) is also quoted in the United Nations reports and in the report to the French Assembly referred to elsewhere in this paper.

[14] MacMunn, op. cit., p. 257.

[15] Sanger, Richard H. The Arabian Peninsula. New York, 1954, pp. 181–182.

[16] MacMunn, Sir George. Op. cit., pp. 265–266.

[17] Lloyd, Christopher. The Navy and the Slave Trade. London, etc., 1949, p. 272.

[18] The reply for the Persian Gulf States was submitted by the United Kingdom Government.

[19] United Nation's Economic and Social Council. Slavery (supplementary report submitted by the Secretary General, 17th sess.) Item 15 (b) of the provisional agenda. E/2548, Feb. 26, 1954, p. 90.

[20] The Antislavery Society. The annual report of the Antislavery Society for the year ending March 31, 1955. London, Denison House. P. 7.

[21] Antislavery Society. The annual report of the Antislavery Society for the year ending March 31, 1954. London, Denison House. P. 9:

"The Antislavery Society offered to draft the proposed supplementary covenant to that of the United Nations on Slavery for the British Foreign Office as Britain has now taken a lead in the action against slavery and other nations were beginning to look to her to take the initiative.

"The offer was accepted and the draft submitted and substantially agreed. It will be put forward at the 17th sess. of ECO-SOC in New York in April 1954, Mr. Greenidge attending the session."

[22] Quoted in full above.

[23] Greenidge, Charles Wilton Wood. Memorandum on Slavery. The Antislavery Society, London, Denison House, 1954, pp. 6–7.

Harvard Students to Get Indoctrination From Dr. J. Robert Oppenheimer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. TIMOTHY P. SHEEHAN
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 20, 1956

Mr. SHEEHAN. Mr. Speaker, the Chicago Tribune, in their editorial of July 20, points out that the well-known Harvard doctrine of hospitality to the intellectuals of the left is again going to be used so as to provide the students with a series of lectures on ethics and philosophy by Dr. J. Robert Oppenheimer. Dr. Oppenheimer, of course, is the man on whom the Atomic Energy Commission ruled that the evidence in his care showed "basic defects in character."

The editorial is as follows:

HARVARD'S EXPERT ON ETHICS AND MORALS

Kenneth D. Robertson, Jr., of Boston, Harvard '29, has released correspondence with Federal District Judge Charles E. Wyzanski of Boston, Harvard '27, chairman of the Harvard board of overseers. The letters relate to the appropriateness of the approval given by the overseers to the appointment of Dr. J. Robert Oppenheimer as William James lecturer on ethics and philosophy at Harvard next year. In this capacity Dr. Oppenheimer will lecture young Harvard students.

Dr. Oppenheimer is not known as a philosopher. He is a nuclear physicist who contributed to the development of the atomic bomb. In June 1954 a special Federal loyalty board ruled that he was to be judged as a security risk and that he therefore should be denied access to secret material. The Atomic Energy Commission, by a vote of 4 to 1, sustained this finding.

Among the findings which led to this pronouncement, particular emphasis was given to Dr. Oppenheimer's penchant for forming Communist associations. His former mistress was a Communist. He married the widow of a Communist. Speaking of his friends, the Atomic Energy Commission noted that "his associations with persons known to him to be Communists have extended far beyond the tolerable limits of prudence and self-restraint. * * * These associations have lasted too long to be justified as merely the intermittent and accidental revival of earlier friendships." It was also established that Dr. Oppenheimer had regularly contributed financial assistance to Communist causes.

Dr. Oppenheimer conceded during his security review that he had lied to security officers. "I invented a cock and bull story," the scientist remarked. Asked why he had done so, Dr. Oppenhimer replied, "Because I was an idiot." The AEC ruling held that the evidence demonstrated "basic defects in character."

The simple question raised by Mr. Robertson in his correspondence with Judge Wyzanski was whether a man with this background was exactly an appropriate choice to lecture in memory of William James on morals, ethics, and philosophy. Is a relationship with a Communist outside the marital bond a warrant of good morals? Is lying ethical? Are philosophers only those so lacking in sound judgment that they can, as Raymond Moley has remarked, entertain such silly delusions as that capitalism was dying or should be destroyed, or that the masters of the Soviet Union were legitimate reformers?

Judge Wyzanski showed a certain nimbleness in skirting these matters, although he finally did concede that "I do approve of his [Dr. Oppenheimer's] qualifications to hold the James lectureship." By resort to the ouija board or some other means of communication with the spirit world, to which James has passed, Judge Wyzanski was even able to vouch that "William James would have wanted Oppenheimer to hold the lectureship."

Mr. Robertson also polled Ambassador Charles E. Bohlen in Moscow, another member in absentia of the Harvard board of overseers. Remarkably enough, the man who is representing American interests against communism on its home grounds, wrote back that he would have approved Dr. Oppenheimer's appointment.

Both Judge Wyzanski and Mr. Bohlen were at pains to state that Mr. Robertson had no right to inquire into the views of any member of the board of overseers, although Dr. Nathan Pusey, president of Harvard, has described that bady as one "which directly represents alumni interests in the policies of the university."

When Mr. Robertson indicated to Judge Wyzanski that he felt that the issue should be taken to the forum of public opinion, the learned judge promptly warned him, "Pursuant to Massachusetts law in *Baker* v. *Libbey*, I warn you that I have the literary property in my own letters." This hinted a suit if the views of Judge Wyzanski were made public—certainly a rather strange proceeding in a matter of public interest in which the judge was acting in a quasi-public capacity as member of a board "which directly represents alumni interests in the policies" of Harvard university.

Judge Wyzanski is an old New Dealer, appointed to the Federal judiciary by Mr. Roosevelt. His defense of Dr. Oppenheimer as James lecturer need occasion no surprise, for he testified as a character witness in behalf of Alger Hiss at both of Hiss' trials. We do not know whether the judge reserves the literary property in this testimony. But he certainly adheres to the well-known Harvard doctrine of hospitality to the intellectuals of the left, disregarding, as he puts it, "their political complexion or the public response to them."

Discrimination Against American Citizens in the Middle East

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAURENCE CURTIS
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 20, 1956

Mr. CURTIS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, in extension of my remarks, I include an editorial from the Washington Post of Friday, July 20, 1956. This editorial was published on a day when the House had before it the civil rights bill, strengthening United States laws against discrimination.

Every right-thinking American deplores the discrimination referred to in this editorial, which results in part from an agreement between the United States and Saudi Arabia of June 18, 1951, and believes that the United States should take the strongest stand to defend its citizens from this sort of abuse.

The editorial follows:

DISCRIMINATION IN THE EAST

It is not surprising that Arab hostility to Israel should find expression in bitter discrimination against Jews in the United States as well as in other countries. But it is surprising indeed—surprising and disquieting—to find the Government of the United States acquiescing, and even concurring, in this discrimination. The Arab League countries have joined in denying entry or transit visas to American Jews, in boycotting American Jewish businesses and in distributing anti-Semitic literature in the United States. But the most flagrant instance is to be found in Saudi Arabia where American citizens of the Jewish faith are rigidly excluded from the Dharan airbase.

The ground on which the American State and Defense Departments acquiesce in this discrimination is that the agreement between the United States and Saudi Arabia regarding the establishment of an airbase authorizes the Saudi Arabian Government to exclude any individual it considers persona non grata. This is, of course, a sovereign right of any government. But exclusion of individuals on the basis of their religious belief is not exclusion on an individual basis. And acceptance of this kind by the American Government amounts to nothing less than a breach of the constitutional prohibition against religious discrimination.

Out of deference to Saudi Arabia, the Department of Defense now screens both civilians and military personnel assigned to the airbase there in order to keep out any Americans of the Jewish faith. Thus the United States Government directly applies a religious test to Federal employment in direct contravention of the constitutional stipulation that "no religious test shall ever be required as a qualification to any office or public trust under the United States."

Not long ago the Government of Spain sought to restrict the rights of American GIs to marry in that country. The United States Government promptly protested against such discrimination, and this country's military bases in Spain were not sacrificed as a result. The American agreement with Saudi Arabia respecting an airbase is founded on mutual advantage. There need be no fear that it will be abrogated if the United States insists on a decent respect for the fundamental principles which its whole defense program is designed to protect. Renewal of the airbase agreement with Saudi Arabia is about to be negotiated. Elimination of any form of religious discrimination in official matters is important for the sake of America's conscience and prestige in the free world.

Farm Housing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WAYNE L. HAYS
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 20, 1956

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, some people are apparently getting the impression that the housing bill reported by the Banking and Currency Committee is nothing more than a bill to expand the public housing program. Nothing could be further from the truth. I do not propose this morning to debate the merits pro and con of public housing. What I do want to emphasize is that the public housing section of H. R. 11742 is but a small part of what is truly a general omnibus housing bill. And more particularly, I would like to emphasize that it is just as much a farm housing bill as it is a public housing or urban housing bill.

Too many of our city dwelling colleagues seem to think that cities have a monopoly on housing problems. Those of us from farm districts know otherwise.

Actually, the farm housing problem is every bit as serious, if not more acute than the urban housing problem. The 1950 census showed 20 percent of farm houses were so dilapidated that they needed major repairs or needed to be completely replaced. The percentage of urban homes in this category was considerably lower. Mr. Speaker, the farm housing problem was bad enough back in 1950 when farm income was close to 100 percent of parity. With the sad deterioration in net farm income over the past 3 or 4 years, many farmers have found it even more difficult to improve the quality of their farm housing.

Section 701 of the bill would extend title V of the Housing Act of 1949 to provide for a 5-year farm-housing program.

Specifically, the bill would authorize, first, $450 million for direct farm-housing loans to be available during a 5-year period; second, an additional $10 million for contributions by the Secretary of Agriculture to prevent defaults in payments on loans for potentially ade-

quate farms, and third, an additional $50 million for grants and loans for improvements and repairs to keep houses safe and sanitary and also to encourage family-size farms.

These programs would make farm housing credit available on liberal terms and at a low cost to our farmers. It would supplement and not supplant the insured farm-loan program under the Bankhead-Jones Act. Insured loans under the Bankhead-Jones Act are helpful in the farm-housing field but they do not meet all of the need by any means. Just to give one example, Bankhead-Jones Act loans are restricted to economic family-sized farms, whereas loans under title V of the Housing Act of 1949 are not.

Actually, the bill does not provide a new loan authority. Instead it renews the increased loan authority which has accumulated since the title V loan program was launched in 1949.

The sad fact is that despite consistent congressional action each year, the administration has made the title V farm housing loan program meaningless through failure to implement it. I think this is a typical example of the present administration's failure to show any real concern over the problems facing American farmers.

Those of us who are deeply concerned with improving farm housing hope that by placing the program on a long-term basis we can induce a change of attitude on the part of the administration so that the title V program can really do its needed job.

As I see it the Rules Committee's tabling action was a blow not only against public housing but against farm housing, college housing, military housing, and just about any kind of housing you want to name. We need the farm-housing legislation in the bill just as we need many of the other sections and I deeply hope that the Rules Committee will reconsider its action.

LAWS AND RULES FOR PUBLICATION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

CODE OF LAWS OF THE UNITED STATES

TITLE 44, SECTION 181. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; ARRANGEMENT, STYLE, CONTENTS, AND INDEXES.—The Joint Committee on Printing shall have control of the arrangement and style of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and while providing that it shall be substantially a verbatim report of proceedings shall take all needed action for the reduction of unnecessary bulk, and shall provide for the publication of an index of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD semimonthly during the sessions of Congress and at the close thereof. (Jan. 12, 1895, c. 23, § 13, 28 Stat. 603.)

TITLE 44, SECTION 182b. SAME; ILLUSTRATIONS, MAPS, DIAGRAMS.—No maps, diagrams, or illustrations may be inserted in the RECORD without the approval of the Joint Committee on Printing. (June 20, 1936, c. 630, § 2, 49 Stat. 1546.)

Pursuant to the foregoing statute and in order to provide for the prompt publication and delivery of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the Joint Committee on Printing has adopted the following rules, to which the attention of Senators, Representatives, and Delegates is respectfully invited:

1. *Arrangement of the daily Record.*—The Public Printer will arrange the contents of the daily RECORD as follows: First, the Senate proceedings; second, the House proceedings; third, the Appendix: *Provided*, That when the proceedings of the Senate are not received in time to follow this arrangement, the Public Printer may begin the RECORD with the House proceedings. The proceedings of each House and the Appendix shall each begin a new page, with appropriate headings centered thereon.

2. *Type and style.*—The Public Printer shall print the report of the proceedings and debates of the Senate and House of Representatives, as furnished by the Official Reporters of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, in 7½-point type; and all matter included in the remarks or speeches of Members of Congress, other than their own words, and all reports, documents, and other matter authorized to be inserted in the RECORD shall be printed in 6½-point type; and all rollcalls shall be printed in 6-point type. No italic or black type nor words in capitals or small capitals shall be used for emphasis or prominence; nor will unusual indentions be permitted. These restrictions do not apply to the printing of or quotations from historical, official, or legal documents or papers of which a literal reproduction is necessary.

3. *Return of manuscript.*—When manuscript is submitted to Members for revision it should be returned to the Government Printing Office not later than 9 o'clock p. m. in order to insure publication in the RECORD issued on the following morning; and if all of said manuscript is not furnished at the time specified, the Public Printer is authorized to withhold it from the RECORD for 1 day. In no case will a speech be printed in the RECORD of the day of its delivery if the manuscript is furnished later than 12 o'clock midnight.

4. *Tabular matter.*—The manuscript of speeches containing tabular statements to be published in the RECORD shall be in the hands of the Public Printer not later than 7 o'clock p. m., to insure publication the following morning.

5. *Proof furnished.*—Proofs of "leave to print" and advance speeches will not be furnished the day the manuscript is received but will be submitted the following day, whenever possible to do so without causing delay in the publication of the regular proceedings of Congress. Advance speeches shall be set in the RECORD style of type, and not more than six sets of proofs may be furnished to Members without charge.

6. *Notation of withheld remarks.*—If manuscript or proofs have not been returned in time for publication in the proceedings, the Public Printer will insert the words "Mr. ——— addressed the Senate (House or Committee). His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix," and proceed with the printing of the RECORD.

7. *Thirty-day limit.*—The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD any speech or extension of remarks which has been withheld for a period exceeding 30 calendar days from the date when its printing was authorized: *Provided*, That at the expiration of each session of Congress the time limit herein fixed shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee.

8. *Corrections.*—The permanent RECORD is made up for printing and binding 30 days after each daily publication is issued; therefore all corrections must be sent to the Public Printer within that time: *Provided*, That upon the final adjournment of each session of Congress the time limit shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee: *Provided further*, That no Member of Congress shall be entitled to make more than one revision. Any revision shall consist only of corrections of the original copy and shall not include deletions of correct material, substitutions for correct material, or additions of new subject matter.

9. The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the full report or print of any committee or subcommittee when said report or print has been previously printed. This rule shall not be construed to apply to conference reports.

10. *Appendix to daily Record.*—When either House has granted leave to print (1) a speech not delivered in either House, (2) a newspaper or magazine article, or (3) any other matter not germane to the proceedings, the same shall be published in the Appendix except in cases of duplication. In such cases only the first item received in the Government Printing Office will be printed. This rule shall not apply to quotations which form part of a speech of a Member, or to an authorized extension of his own remarks: *Provided*, That no address, speech, or article delivered or released subsequently to the final adjournment of a session of Congress may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

11. *Estimate of cost.*—No extraneous matter in excess of two pages in any one instance may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by a Member under leave to print or to extend his remarks unless the manuscript is accompanied by an estimate in writing from the Public Printer of the probable cost of publishing the same, which estimate of cost must be announced by the Member when such leave is requested; but this rule shall not apply to excerpts from letters, telegrams, or articles presented in connection with a speech delivered in the course of debate or to communications from State legislatures, addresses or articles by the President and the members of his Cabinet, the Vice President, or a Member of Congress. For the purposes of this regulation, any one article printed in two or more parts, with or without individual headings, shall be considered as a single extension and the two-page rule shall apply. The Public Printer or the Official Reporters of the House or Senate shall return to the Member of the respective House any matter submitted for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which is in contravention of this paragraph.

12. *Official Reporters.*—The Official Reporters of each House shall indicate on the manuscript and prepare headings for all matter to be printed in the Appendix, and shall make suitable reference thereto at the proper place in the proceedings.

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

PRICE OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

The Public Printer is authorized to furnish to subscribers the daily RECORD at $1.50 per month, payable in advance.

Remit by money order payable to Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C.

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

SENATORS WITH RESIDENCES IN WASHINGTON

OFFICE ADDRESS: Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

[Streets northwest unless otherwise stated]

Vice President, Richard Nixon

Aiken, George D., *Vt*——Carroll Arms.
Allott, Gordon, *Colo*——
Anderson, Clinton P., *N. Mex.*—6 Wesley Circle.
Barrett, Frank A., *Wyo*——The Woodner.
Beall, J. Glenn, *Md*——
Bender, George H., *Ohio*——120 Schotts Court NE.
Bennett, Wallace F., *Utah*——
Bible, Alan, *Nev*——
Bricker, John W., *Ohio*——The Mayflower.
Bridges, Styles, *N. H*——
Bush, Prescott, *Conn*——
Butler, John Marshall, *Md*——
Byrd, Harry Flood, *Va*——The Shoreham.
Capehart, Homer E., *Ind*——The Westchester.
Carlson, Frank, *Kans*——Sheraton-Park
Case, Clifford P., *N. J*——
Case, Francis, *S. Dak*——4635 Mass. Ave.
Chavez, Dennis, *N. Mex*——3327 Cleveland Ave.
Clements, Earle C., *Ky*——The Congressional
Cotton, Norris, *N. H*——
Curtis, Carl T., *Nebr*——
Daniel, Price, *Tex*——
Dirksen, Everett M., *Ill*——
Douglas, Paul H., *Ill*——
Duff, James H., *Pa*——
Dworshak, Henry C., *Idaho*——
Eastland, James O., *Miss*——5101 Macomb St.
Ellender, Allen J., *La*——
Ervin, Samuel J., Jr., *N. C*——
Flanders, Ralph E., *Vt*——
Frear, J. Allen, Jr., *Del*——
Fulbright, J. William, *Ark*——
George, Walter F., *Ga*——The Mayflower.
Goldwater, Barry M., *Ariz*——
Gore, Albert, *Tenn*——
Green, Theodore Francis, *R. I.*—University Club.
Hayden, Carl, *Ariz*——
Hennings, Thomas C., Jr., *Mo.*
Hickenlooper, Bourke B., *Iowa.*—5511 Cedar Parkway, Chevy Chase, Md.
Hill, Lister, *Ala*——
Holland, Spessard L., *Fla*——Sheraton-Park
Hruska, Roman L., *Nebr*——
Humphrey, Hubert H., *Minn.*
Humphreys, Robert, *Ky*——
Ives, Irving M., *N. Y*——
Jackson, Henry M., *Wash*——
Jenner, William E., *Ind*——
Johnson, Lyndon B., *Tex*——
Johnston, Olin D., *S. C*——
Kefauver, Estes, *Tenn*——4848 Upton St.
Kennedy, John F., *Mass*——
Kerr, Robert S., *Okla*——
Knowland, William F., *Calif.*
Kuchel, Thomas H., *Calif*——
Laird, William R. III, *W. Va*——
Langer, William, *N. Dak*——2101 Conn. Ave.
Lehman, Herbert H., *N. Y*——Sheraton-Park
Long, Russell B., *La*——
McCarthy, Joseph R., *Wis*——
McClellan, John L., *Ark*——
McNamara, Pat, *Mich*——
Magnuson, Warren G., *Wash.*—The Shoreham.
Malone, George W., *Nev*——The Mayflower.
Mansfield, Mike, *Mont*——
Martin, Edward, *Pa*——
Martin, Thos. E., *Iowa*——4545 Conn. Ave.
Millikin, Eugene D., *Colo*——
Monroney, A. S. Mike, *Okla.*
Morse, Wayne, *Oreg*——5020 Lowell St.
Mundt, Karl E., *S. Dak*——122 Schotts Court NE.
Murray, James E., *Mont*——The Shoreham.
Neely, Matthew M., *W. Va*——
Neuberger, Richard L., *Oreg.*
O'Mahoney, Joseph C., *Wyo.*—Sheraton-Park
Pastore, John O., *R. I*——
Payne, Frederick G., *Maine*——
Potter, Charles E., *Mich*——
Purtell, William A., *Conn*——
Robertson, A. Willis, *Va*——
Russell, Richard B., *Ga*——
Saltonstall, Leverett, *Mass*—2320 Tracy Pl.
Schoeppel, Andrew F., *Kans.*
Scott, W. Kerr, *N. C*——
Smathers, George A., *Fla*——
Smith, H. Alexander, *N. J*——Sheraton-Park
Smith, Margaret Chase, (Mrs.), *Maine.*
Sparkman, John J., *Ala*——4928 Indian Lane
Stennis, John, *Miss*——
Symington, Stuart, *Mo*——
Thye, Edward J., *Minn*——
Watkins, Arthur V., *Utah*——
Welker, Herman, *Idaho*——4823 Tilden St.
Wiley, Alexander, *Wis*——2122 Mass. Ave.
Williams, John J., *Del*——
Wofford, Thomas A., *S. C*——
Young, Milton R., *N. Dak*——Quebec House So.

OFFICERS OF THE SENATE

Secretary—Felton M. Johnston.
Chief Clerk—Emery L. Frazier.
Sergeant at Arms—Joseph C. Duke.
Secretary for the Majority—Robert G. Baker.
Secretary for the Minority—J. Mark Trice.
Chaplain—Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D.

STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE SENATE

Committee on Agriculture and Forestry

Messrs. Ellender (chairman), Johnston of South Carolina, Holland, Eastland, Clements, Humphrey, Scott, Symington, Aiken, Young, Thye, Hickenlooper, Mundt, Williams, and Schoeppel.

Committee on Appropriations

Messrs. Hayden (chairman), Russell, Chavez, Ellender, Hill, McClellan, Robertson, Magnuson, Holland, Stennis, Clements, Johnson of Texas, Bridges, Saltonstall, Young, Knowland, Thye, McCarthy, Mundt, Mrs. Smith of Maine, Messrs. Dworshak, Dirksen, and Potter.

Committee on Armed Services

Messrs. Russell (chairman), Byrd, Johnson of Texas, Kefauver, Stennis, Symington, Jackson, Ervin, Saltonstall, Bridges, Flanders, Mrs. Smith of Maine, Messrs. Case of South Dakota, Duff, and Welker.

Committee on Banking and Currency

Messrs. Fulbright (chairman), Robertson, Sparkman, Frear, Douglas, Lehman, Monroney, Morse, Capehart, Bricker, Ives, Bennett, Bush, Beall, and Payne.

Committee on the District of Columbia

Messrs. Neely (chairman), Bible, McNamara, Morse, Frear, Beall, Hruska, Case of New Jersey, and Allott.

Committee on Finance

Messrs. Byrd (chairman), George, Kerr, Frear, Long, Smathers, Anderson, Douglas, Millikin, Martin of Pennsylvania, Williams, Flanders, Malone, Carlson, and Bennett.

Committee on Foreign Relations

Messrs. George (chairman), Green, Fulbright, Sparkman, Humphrey, Mansfield, Morse, Long, Wiley, Smith of New Jersey, Hickenlooper, Langer, Knowland, Aiken, and Capehart.

Committee on Government Operations

Messrs. McClellan (chairman), Jackson, Kennedy, Symington, Ervin, Humphrey, Wofford, McCarthy, Mundt, Mrs. Smith of Maine, Messrs. Cotton, Bender, and Martin of Iowa.

Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs

Messrs. Murray (chairman), Anderson, Jackson, O'Mahoney, Bible, Neuberger, Laird, Scott, Millikin, Malone, Watkins, Dworshak, Kuchel, Barrett, and Goldwater.

Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce

Messrs. Magnuson (chairman), Pastore, Monroney, Smathers, Daniel, Ervin, Bible, Wofford, Bricker, Schoeppel, Butler, Potter, Duff, Purtell, and Payne.

Committee on the Judiciary

Messrs. Eastland (chairman), Kefauver, Johnston of South Carolina, Hennings, McClellan, Daniel, O'Mahoney, Neely, Wiley, Langer, Jenner, Watkins, Dirksen, Welker, and Butler.

Committee on Labor and Public Welfare

Messrs. Hill (chairman), Murray, Neely, Lehman, Kennedy, McNamara, ———, Smith of New Jersey, Ives, Purtell, Goldwater, Bender, and Allott.

Committee on Post Office and Civil Service

Messrs. Johnston of South Carolina (chairman), Pastore, Monroney, Hennings, Scott, Neuberger, Laird, Carlson, Jenner, Langer, Curtis, Martin of Iowa, and Case of New Jersey.

Committee on Public Works

Messrs. Chavez (chairman), Kerr, Gore, McNamara, Neuberger, Wofford, ———, Martin of Pennsylvania, Case of South Dakota, Bush, Kuchel, Cotton, and Hruska.

Committee on Rules and Administration

Messrs. Green (chairman), Hayden, Hennings, Gore, Mansfield, Jenner, Barrett, McCarthy, and Curtis.

UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT

Mr. Chief Justice Warren, of California, Hotel Sheraton-Park, Washington, D. C.
Mr. Justice Black, of Alabama, 619 S. Lee St., Alexandria, Va.
Mr. Justice Reed, of Kentucky, the Mayflower.
Mr. Justice Frankfurter, of Massachusetts, 3018 Dumbarton Ave.
Mr. Justice Douglas, of Washington, 3701 Connecticut Ave.
Mr. Justice Burton, of Ohio, the Dodge.
Mr. Justice Clark, of Texas, 2101 Connecticut Ave.
Mr. Justice Minton, of Indiana, the Methodist Building.
Mr. Justice Harlan, of New York, 1677 31st St.

OFFICERS OF THE SUPREME COURT

Clerk—Harold B. Willey, 3214 N. Wakefield St., Arlington, Va.
Deputy Clerk—Reginald C. Dilli, 1329 Hemlock St.
Deputy Clerk—Hugh W. Barr, 4701 Connecticut Ave.
Marshal—T. Perry Lippitt, 6004 Corbin Road.
Reporter—Walter Wyatt, 1702 Kalmia Rd.
Librarian—Helen Newman, 126 3d St. SE.

UNITED STATES JUDICIAL CIRCUITS

JUSTICES ASSIGNED
TERRITORY EMBRACED

District of Columbia: Mr. Chief Justice Warren. District of Columbia.

First judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Frankfurter. Maine, New Hampshire, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Puerto Rico.

Second judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Harlan. Vermont, Connecticut, New York.

Third judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Burton, Pennsylvania, New Jersey, Delaware, Virgin Islands.

Fourth judicial circuit: Mr. Chief Justice Warren. Maryland, Virginia, West Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina.

Fifth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Black. Georgia, Florida, Alabama, Mississippi, Louisiana, Texas, Canal Zone.

Sixth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Reed. Ohio, Michigan, Kentucky, Tennessee.

Seventh judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Minton. Indiana, Illinois, Wisconsin.

Eighth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Clark. Minnesota, North Dakota, South Dakota, Iowa, Nebraska, Missouri, Arkansas.

Ninth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Douglas. Washington, Oregon, Montana, Idaho, California, Nevada, Arizona, Alaska, Hawaii.

Tenth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Clark. Colorado, Wyoming, Utah, Kansas, Oklahoma, New Mexico.

REPRESENTATIVES WITH RESIDENCES IN WASHINGTON

OFFICE ADDRESS: House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

[Streets northwest unless otherwise stated]

Speaker, Sam Rayburn

Abbitt, Watkins M., *Va*----
Abernethy, Thos. G., *Miss*--6278 29th St.
Adair, E. Ross, *Ind*-------4200 Cathedral Ave.
Addonizio, Hugh J., *N. J*---
Albert, Carl, *Okla*--------
Alexander, Hugh Q., *N. C*--
Alger, Bruce, *Tex*---------
Allen, John J., Jr., *Calif*---
Allen, Leo E., *Ill*---------University Club
Andersen, H. Carl, *Minn*---4545 Conn. Ave.
Andresen, August H., *Minn*-
Andrews, George W., *Ala*---3108 Cathedral Ave.
Anfuso, Victor L., *N. Y*----
Arends, Leslie C., *Ill*------4815 Dexter St.
Ashley, Thomas L., *Ohio*---
Ashmore, Robert T., *S. C*---
Aspinall, Wayne N., *Colo*--Arlington Towers, Arlington, Va.
Auchincloss, James C., *N. J*-113 S. Lee St., Alexandria, Va.
Avery, William H., *Kans*---
Ayres, William H., *Ohio*---

Bailey, Cleveland M., *W. Va*-
Baker, Howard H., *Tenn*---
Baldwin, John F., Jr., *Calif*-
Barden, Graham A., *N. C*--2601 Woodley Pl.
Barrett, William A., *Pa*----
Bass, Perkins, *N. H*-------
Bass, Ross, *Tenn*----------
Bates, William H., *Mass*----
Baumhart, A. D., Jr., *Ohio*-
Beamer, John V., *Ind*------110 Maryland Ave. NE.
Becker, Frank J., *N. Y*-----
Belcher, Page, *Okla*-------
Bell, John J., *Tex*---------
Bennett, Charles E., *Fla*---1530 38th St. SE.
Bennett, John B., *Mich*----5804 Bradley Blvd., Bethesda, Md.
Bentley, Alvin M., *Mich*---
Berry, E. Y., *S. Dak*-------2720 Terrace Road SE.
Betts, Jackson E., *Ohio*----
Blatnik, John A., *Minn*----
Blitch, Iris Faircloth, *Ga*--
Boggs, Hale, *La*----------
Boland, Edward P., *Mass*---
Bolling, Richard, *Mo*------3409 Lowell St.
Bolton, Frances P., *Ohio*---2301 Wyo. Ave.
Bolton, Oliver P., *Ohio*----
Bonner, Herbert C., *N. C*--The Dorchester
Bosch, Albert H., *N. Y*-----
Bow, Frank T., *Ohio*-------4301 Mass. Ave.
Bowler, James B., *Ill*------
Boykin, Frank W., *Ala*-----The Washington
Boyle, Charles A., *Ill*-----
Bray, William G., *Ind*-----
Brooks, Jack B., *Tex*-------
Brooks, Overton, *La*-------4413 46th St.
Brown, Clarence J., *Ohio*--Alban Towers
Brown, Paul, *Ga*----------Boston House
Brownson, Charles B., *Ind*-
Broyhill, Joel T., *Va*------
Buckley, Charles A., *N. Y*--
Budge, Hamer H., *Idaho*---
Burdick, Usher L., *N. Dak*--
Burleson, Omar, *Tex*------2737 Devonshire Pl.
Burnside, M. G., *W. Va*----
Bush, Alvin R., *Pa*--------
Byrd, Robert C., *W. Va*----
Byrne, James A., *Pa*-------
Byrnes, John W., *Wis*-----1215 25th St. So., Arlington, Va.

Canfield, Gordon, *N. J*-----
Cannon, Clarence, *Mo*------
Carlyle, F. Ertel, *N. C*-----The Washington
Carnahan, A. S. J., *Mo*----
Carrigg, Joseph L., *Pa*-----
Cederberg, Elford A., *Mich*-
Celler, Emanuel, *N. Y*-----The Mayflower
Chase, Jackson B., *Nebr*---Sheraton-Park
Chatham, Thurmond, *N. C*-
Chelf, Frank, *Ky*----------
Chenoweth, J. Edgar, *Colo*-
Chiperfield, Robert B., *Ill*--1713 House Office Building
Christopher, George H., *Mo*.
Chudoff, Earl, *Pa*---------
Church, Marguerite Stitt, *Ill*. 2122 Mass. Ave.
Clark, Frank M., *Pa*-------3735 Gunston Rd., Alexandria, Va.
Clevenger, Cliff, *Ohio*-----The Jefferson
Cole, W. Sterling, *N. Y*----1610 44th St.
Colmer, William M., *Miss*--
Cooley, Harold D., *N. C*----2480 16th St.
Coon, Sam, *Oreg*----------
Cooper, Jere, *Tenn*--------The Washington
Corbett, Robert J., *Pa*-----
Coudert, F. R., Jr., *N. Y*---
Cramer, William C., *Fla*---Hunting Towers, Alexandria, Va.
Cretella, Albert W., *Conn*--
Crumpacker, Shepard J., Jr., *Ind*.
Cunningham, Paul, *Iowa*--
Curtis, Laurence, *Mass*----3314 O St.
Curtis, Thomas B., *Mo*-----

Dague, Paul B., *Pa*--------
Davidson, Irwin D., *N. Y*---
Davis, Clifford, *Tenn*------4611 Butterworth Pl.
Davis, Glenn R., *Wis*------2550 South Joyce, Arlington, Va.
Davis, James C., *Ga*-------
Dawson, William A., *Utah*--
Dawson, William L., *Ill*---
Deane, Charles B., *N. C*----
Delaney, James J., *N. Y*----
Dempsey, John J., *N. Mex*--2500 Q St.
Denton, Winfield K., *Ind*--
Derounian, Steven B., *N. Y*-
Devereux, James P. S., *Md*-
Dies, Martin, *Tex*----------
Diggs, Charles C., Jr., *Mich*-2705 13th St. NE.
Dingell, John D., *Mich*-----
Dixon, Henry Aldous, *Utah*-
Dodd, Thomas J., *Conn*----
Dollinger, Isidore, *N. Y*----
Dolliver, James I., *Iowa*----3752 Jocelyn St.
Dondero, George A., *Mich*--The Continental
Donohue, Harold D., *Mass*-
Donovan, James G., *N. Y*--
Dorn, Francis E., *N. Y*-----
Dorn, W. J. Bryan, *S. C*----
Dowdy, John, *Tex*----------
Doyle, Clyde, *Calif*--------3877 30th St. N., Arlington, Va.
Durham, Carl T., *N. C*-----The Lee House
Eberharter, Herman P., *Pa*-3101 4th St. N., Arlington, Va.
Edmondson, Ed, *Okla*------
Elliott, Carl, *Ala*---------
Ellsworth, Harris, *Oreg*----4301 Mass. Ave.
Engle, Clair, *Calif*--------3840 Lorcom Lane Arlington, Va.
Evins, Joe L., *Tenn*-------5044 Klingle St.
Fallon, George H., *Md*-----
Fascell, Dante B., *Fla*-----
Feighan, Michael A., *Ohio*-
Fenton, Ivor D., *Pa*--------3725 Macomb St.
Fernandez, A. M., *N. Mex*--200 C St. SE.
Fino, Paul A., *N. Y*--------
Fisher, O. C., *Tex*---------Calvert-Woodley
Fjare, Orvin B., *Mont*-----
Flood, Daniel J., *Pa*-------The Congressional
Flynt, John J., Jr., *Ga*-----
Fogarty, John E., *R. I*-----3627 Chesapeake St.
Forand, Aime J., *R. I*------4108 Dresden St., Kensington, Md.
Ford, Gerald R., Jr., *Mich*--514 Crown View Dr., Alexandria, Va.
Forrester, E. L., *Ga*-------
Fountain, L. H., *N. C*------The Westchester
Frazier, Jas. B., Jr., *Tenn*--Fairfax Hotel
Frelinghuysen, Peter, Jr., *N. J*. 3014 N St.
Friedel, Samuel N., *Md*----
Fulton, James G., *Pa*------

Gamble, Ralph A., *N. Y*---
Garmatz, Edward A., *Md*---
Gary, J. Vaughan, *Va*-----
Gathings, E. C., *Ark*-------6377 31st Pl.
Gavin, Leon H., *Pa*--------
Gentry, Brady, *Tex*--------
George, Myron V., *Kans*---3801 Rodman St.
Gordon, Thomas S., *Ill*----
Grant, George M., *Ala*-----4801 Conn. Ave.
Gray, Kenneth J., *Ill*------
Green, Edith, *Oreg*--------
Green, William J., Jr., *Pa*--
Gregory, Noble J., *Ky*------2401 Calvert St.
Griffiths, Martha W., *Mich*-
Gross, H. R., *Iowa*--------
Gubser, Charles S., *Calif*---
Gwinn, Ralph W., *N. Y*----

Hagen, Harlan, *Calif*------
Hale, Robert, *Maine*-------2722 N St.
Haley, James A., *Fla*-------
Halleck, Charles A., *Ind*---4926 Upton St.
Hand, T. Millet, *N. J*------
Harden, Cecil M., *Ind*-----The Congressional
Hardy, Porter, Jr., *Va*-----
Harris, Oren, *Ark*---------1627 Myrtle St.
Harrison, Burr P., *Va*------4519 So. 34th St., Arlington, Va.
Harrison, Robert D., *Nebr*--
Harvey, Ralph, *Ind*--------110 Maryland Ave. NE.
Hays, Brooks, *Ark*---------314 2d St. SE.
Hays, Wayne L., *Ohio*------Arlington Towers, Arlington, Va.
Hayworth, Don, *Mich*------
Healey, James C., *N. Y*-----.
Hébert, F. Edward, *La*-----104 Cockrell St., Alexandria, Va.
Henderson, John E., *Ohio*--
Herlong, A. S., Jr., *Fla*----
Heselton, John W., *Mass*---
Hess, William E., *Ohio*-----
Hiestand, Edgar W., *Calif*--
Hill, William S., *Colo*------110 Maryland Ave. NE.
Hillings, Patrick J., *Calif*--
Hinshaw, Carl, *Calif*-------
Hoeven, Charles B., *Iowa*--100 Maryland Ave NE.
Hoffman, Clare E., *Mich*---Methodist Bldg.
Hoffman, Richard W., *Ill*---
Holifield, Chet, *Calif*------
Holland, Elmer J., *Pa*------
Holmes, Hal, *Wash*--------
Holt, Joe, *Calif*-----------
Holtzman, Lester, *N. Y*----
Hope, Clifford R., *Kans*----3541 Brandywine St.
Horan, Walt, *Wash*--------
Hosmer, Craig, *Calif*-------
Huddleston, George, Jr., *Ala*.
Hull, W. R., Jr., *Mo*-------
Hyde, DeWitt S., *Md*-------.

Ikard, Frank, *Tex*---------

Jackson, Donald L., *Calif*--
James, Benjamin F., *Pa*----200 C St. SE.
Jarman, John, *Okla*-------
Jenkins, Thomas A., *Ohio*--The Mayflower
Jennings, W. Pat, *Va*------
Jensen, Ben F., *Iowa*------2120 16th St.
Johansen, August E., *Mich*-
Johnson, Leroy, *Calif*------630 North Carolina Ave. SE.
Johnson, Lester R., *Wis*----3816 Pope St. SE.
Jonas, Charles Raper, *N. C*-
Jones, Paul C., *Mo*--------3613 Greenway Pl., Alexandria, Va.
Jones, Robert E., Jr., *Ala*--
Jones, Woodrow W., *N. C*--
Judd, Walter H., *Minn*----3083 Ordway St

Karsten, Frank M., *Mo*----
Kean, Robert W., *N. J*-----2435 Kalorama Road
Kearney, B. W. (Pat), *N. Y*-
Kearns, Carroll D., *Pa*-----Sheraton-Park
Keating, Kenneth B., *N. Y*-1612 34th St.
Kee, Elizabeth, *W. Va*-----
Kelley, Augustine B., *Pa*---
Kelly, Edna F., *N. Y*-------
Keogh, Eugene J., *N. Y*----The Mayflower
Kilburn, Clarence E., *N. Y*-The Gen. Scott
Kilday, Paul J., *Tex*-------3507 Albemarle St.
Kilgore, Joe M., *Tex*-------
King, Cecil R., *Calif*-------
King, Karl C., *Pa*----------
Kirwan, Michael J., *Ohio*--
Klein, Arthur G., *N. Y*-----
Kluczynski, John C., *Ill*---
Knox, Victor A., *Mich*-----
Knutson, Coya, *Minn*------
Krueger, Otto, *N. Dak*-----112 Schotts Court NE.

Laird, Melvin R., *Wis.*
Landrum, Phil M., *Ga.*
Lane, Thomas J., *Mass.*
Lanham, Henderson, *Ga.*
Lankford, Richard E., *Md.*
Latham, Henry J., *N. Y.*
LeCompte, Karl M., *Iowa*—Sheraton-Park
Lesinski, John, Jr., *Mich.*
Lipscomb, Glenard P., *Calif.*
Long, George S., *La.*—2136 31st St. SE.
Lovre, Harold O., *S. Dak.*—1605 Sherwood Road, Silver Spring, Md.
McCarthy, Eugene J., *Minn.*—419 Raymond St., Chevy Chase, Md.
McConnell, Samuel K., Jr., *Pa.*
McCormack, John W., *Mass.*—The Washington
McCulloch, Wm. M., *Ohio*—Westchester Apts.
McDonough, G. L., *Calif.*
McDowell, Harris B., Jr., *Del.*
McGregor, J. Harry, *Ohio*—The Westchester
McIntire, Clifford G., *Maine*—220 2d St. SE.
McMillan, John L., *S. C.*—1201 S. Barton St., Arlington, Va.
McVey, William E., *Ill.*—The Coronet
Macdonald, Torbert H., *Mass.*
Machrowicz, Thaddeus M., *Mich.*—812 Park Ave., Falls Church, Va.
Mack, Peter F., Jr., *Ill.*
Mack, Russell V., *Wash.*
Madden, Ray J., *Ind.*
Magnuson, Don, *Wash.*
Mahon, George H., *Tex.*—Alban Towers
Mailliard, William S., *Calif.*
Marshall, Fred, *Minn.*
Martin, Jos. W., Jr., *Mass.*—The Hay-Adams
Mason, Noah M., *Ill.*—The Baronet
Matthews, D. R. (Billy), *Fla.*
Meader, George, *Mich.*—3360 Tennyson St.
Merrow, Chester E., *N. H.*
Metcalf, Lee, *Mont.*
Miller, A. L., *Nebr.*—2801 East-West Highway, Chevy Chase, Md.
Miller, Edward T., *Md.*—2901 Conn. Ave.
Miller, George P., *Calif.*
Miller, William E., *N. Y.*—3708 Calvend Lane, Kensington, Md.
Mills, Wilbur D., *Ark.*—2701 Conn. Ave.
Minshall, William E., *Ohio.*
Mollohan, Robert H., *W. Va.*
Morano, Albert P., *Conn.*
Morgan, Thomas E., *Pa.*
Morrison, James H., *La.*—4301 Mass. Ave.
Moss, John E., *Calif.*—204 Jefferson St., Alexandria, Va.
Moulder, Morgan M., *Mo.*
Multer, Abraham J., *N. Y.*
Mumma, Walter M., *Pa.*—The Coronet
Murray, James C., *Ill.*
Murray, Tom, *Tenn.*
Natcher, William H., *Ky.*—5108 Bradley Blvd., Bethesda, Md.
Nelson, Charles P., *Maine.*
Nicholson, D. W., *Mass.*
Norblad, Walter, *Oreg.*
Norrell, W. F., *Ark.*—2301 Conn. Ave.
O'Brien, Leo W., *N. Y.*
O'Brien, Thomas J., *Ill.*—The Hamilton
O'Hara, Barratt, *Ill.*—The Congressional
O'Hara, Joseph P., *Minn.*—2813 31st St.
O'Konski, Alvin E., *Wis.*—4000 Mass. Ave.
O'Neill, Thomas P., Jr., *Mass.*
Osmers, Frank C., Jr., *N. J.*
Ostertag, Harold C., *N. Y.*—100 Maryland Ave. NE.
Passman, Otto E., *La.*
Patman, Wright, *Tex.*—117 Carroll St. SE.
Patterson, James T., *Conn.*
Pelly, Thomas M., *Wash.*
Perkins, Carl D., *Ky.*
Pfost, Gracie, *Idaho.*
Philbin, Philip J., *Mass.*
Phillips, John, *Calif.*
Pilcher, J. L., *Ga.*
Pillion, John R., *N. Y.*
Poage, W. R., *Tex.*—2309 Skyland Pl. SE.
Poff, Richard H., *Va.*
Polk, James G., *Ohio.*
Powell, Adam C., Jr., *N. Y.*
Preston, Prince H., Jr., *Ga.*
Price, Melvin, *Ill.*
Priest, J. Percy, *Tenn.*—The Berkshire
Prouty, Winston L., *Vt.*
Quigley, James M., *Pa.*
Rabaut, Louis C., *Mich.*
Radwan, Edmund P., *N. Y.*
Rains, Albert, *Ala.*
Ray, John H., *N. Y.*
Rayburn, Sam, *Tex.*
Reece, B. Carroll, *Tenn.*
Reed, Daniel A., *N. Y.*—The Woodner
Rees, Edward H., *Kans.*—1801 16th St.
Reuss, Henry S., *Wis.*—1650 30th St.
Rhodes, George M., *Pa.*—1809 Franklin St. NE.
Rhodes, John J., *Ariz.*
Richards, James P., *S. C.*
Riehlman, R. Walter, *N. Y.*—3210 Wis. Ave.
Riley, John J., *S. C.*
Rivers, L. Mendel, *S. C.*
Roberts, Kenneth A., *Ala.*—6102 Cromwell Dr.
Robeson, Edward J., Jr., *Va.*
Robsion, John M., Jr., *Ky.*—1500 Delafield Pl.
Rodino, Peter W., Jr., *N. J.*
Rogers, Byron G., *Colo.*
Rogers, Edith Nourse, *Mass.*—The Shoreham
Rogers, Paul G., *Fla.*—Sheraton-Park
Rogers, Walter, *Tex.*
Rooney, John J., *N. Y.*
Roosevelt, James, *Calif.*
Rutherford, J. T., *Tex.*
Sadlak, Antoni N., *Conn.*
St. George, Katharine, *N. Y.*
Saylor, John P., *Pa.*
Schenck, Paul F., *Ohio.*—3801 Conn. Ave., Apt. 307
Scherer, Gordon H., *Ohio*—The Mayflower
Schwengel, Fred, *Iowa.*
Scott, Hugh, *Pa.*
Scrivner, Errett P., *Kans.*—2331 Cathedral Ave.
Scudder, Hubert B., *Calif.*—4545 Conn. Ave.
Seely-Brown, Horace, Jr., *Conn.*
Selden, Armistead I., Jr., *Ala.*—4625 B 36th St. So., Arlington, Va.
Sheehan, Timothy P., *Ill.*
Shelley, John F., *Calif.*
Sheppard, Harry R., *Calif.*
Short, Dewey, *Mo.*
Shuford, George A., *N. C.*—Sheraton-Park
Sieminski, Alfred D., *N. J.*
Sikes, Robert L. F., *Fla.*
Siler, Eugene, *Ky.*
Simpson, Richard M., *Pa.*—5205 Lawn May, Chevy Chase, Md.
Simpson, Sid, *Ill.*—2100 Mass. Ave.
Sisk, B. F., *Calif.*
Smith, Frank E., *Miss.*
Smith, Howard W., *Va.*—204 W. Walnut St. Alexandria, Va.
Smith, Lawrence H., *Wis.*—2480 16th St.
Smith, Wint, *Kans.*
Spence, Brent, *Ky.*—Sheraton-Park
Springer, William L., *Ill.*
Staggers, Harley O., *W. Va.*
Steed, Tom, *Okla.*
Sullivan, Leonor K., *Mo.*
Taber, John, *N. Y.*
Talle, Henry O., *Iowa.*—4613 Harrison St.
Taylor, Dean P., *N. Y.*
Teague, Charles M., *Calif.*
Teague, Olin E., *Tex.*—6015 Mass. Ave.
Thomas, Albert, *Tex.*—2901 34th St.
Thompson, Clark W., *Tex.*—Sheraton-Park
Thompson, Frank, Jr., *N. J.*
Thompson, Ruth, *Mich.*
Thompson, T. A., *La.*—1600 Kenwood Av., Alexandria, Va.
Thomson, E. Keith, *Wyo.*
Thornberry, Homer, *Tex.*
Tollefson, Thor C., *Wash.*
Trimble, James W., *Ark.*
Tuck, William M., *Va.*
Tumulty, T. James, *N. J.*
Udall, Stewart L., *Ariz.*
Utt, James B., *Calif.*
Vanik, Charles A., *Ohio.*
Van Pelt, William K., *Wis.*
Van Zandt, James E., *Pa.*—Arlington Towers, Arlington, Va.
Velde, Harold H., *Ill.*
Vinson, Carl, *Ga.*—4 Primrose St., Chevy Chase, Md.
Vorys, John M., *Ohio.*—2032 Belmont Rd.
Vursell, Charles W., *Ill.*—The Congressional
Wainwright, Stuyvesant, *N. Y.*
Walter, Francis E., *Pa.*
Watts, John C., *Ky.*
Weaver, Phil, *Nebr.*—9408 Crosby Rd., Silver Spring, Md.
Westland, Jack, *Wash.*
Wharton, J. Ernest, *N. Y.*
Whitten, Jamie L., *Miss.*—5804 Nebraska Ave.
Wickersham, Victor, *Okla.*
Widnall, William B., *N. J.*
Wier, Roy W., *Minn.*
Wigglesworth, R. B., *Mass.*—3257 N. St.
Williams, Harrison A., Jr., *N. J.*
Williams, John Bell, *Miss.*—1001 26th Road S., Arlington, Va.
Williams, William R., *N. Y.*—1241 Pa. Ave. SE.
Willis, Edwin E., *La.*
Wilson, Earl, *Ind.*
Wilson, Robert C. (Bob), *Calif.*
Winstead, Arthur, *Miss.*
Withrow, Gardner R., *Wis.*
Wolcott, Jesse P., *Mich.*—3707 Thornapple St., Chevy Chase
Wolverton, Charles A., *N. J.*—1336 HOB
Wright, Jim, *Tex.*
Yates, Sidney R., *Ill.*
Young, Clifton (Cliff), *Nev.*—2705 Westminister Pl., Alexandria, Va.
Younger, J. Arthur, *Calif.*—4545 Conn. Ave.
Zablocki, Clement J., *Wis.*
Zelenko, Herbert, *N. Y.*

DELEGATES

Bartlett, E. L. (Bob), 1718 33d Pl. SE. *Alaska.*
Farrington, Mrs. Joseph R., *Hawaii.*

RESIDENT COMMISSIONER

Fernós-Isern, A., *P. R.*—2210 R St.

OFFICERS OF THE HOUSE

Clerk—Ralph R. Roberts.
Sergeant at Arms—Zeake W. Johnson, Jr.
Doorkeeper—William M. Miller, 1732 S St. SE.
Chaplain—Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., 1421 Montague St.
Postmaster—H. H. Morris.

OFFICIAL REPORTERS OF DEBATE

SENATE

James W. Murphy, 7 Primrose St., Chevy Chase, Md.
John D. Rhodes, 3535 Williamsburg Lane.
Gregor Macpherson, 3111 44th St.
Herbert N. Budlong, Kurtz Rd., McLean, Va.
J. Chester Wilfong, 4408 Fourth Road North, Arlington, Va.
Charles J. Drescher, 3738 North 4th St., Arlington, Va.
Francis J. Attig, 3919 Livingston St.
Nicholas J. Cinciotta, 400 Williamsburg Dr., Silver Spring, Md.
Elmer L. Koons (assistant), 826 Aspen St.
Willard W. Pruett (clerk), 1200 North Stuart St., Arlington, Va.
Placidino Zagami (clerk), 5805 10th Place, Chillum, Md.

HOUSE

W. L. Fenstermacher, 2929 Connecticut Ave.
Roy L. Whitman, 4820 Linnean Ave.
F. S. Milberg, 5032 Massachusetts Ave.
E. B. Clark, 604 Bennington Dr., Silver Spring, Md.
Frank E. Battaglia, 957 East-West Highway.
Claude S. Scheckel, 6 East Blackthorne St., Chevy Chase, Md.
Albert Schneider, 7516 14th St.
Paul L. Miller (clerk), Shadyside, Md.
Sidney W. Williston (assistant clerk), 1830 Longford Drive, Hyattsville, Md.
Bjarne J. Sigurdsen (assistant clerk), 1921 You Place, SE.